Pakistan Social Sciences Review
www.pssr.org.pk

**RESEARCH PAPER**

# The Rise of Asymmetrical Warfare in Great Power Competition

## [1]Hamna Jamil, [2]Noor Fatima and [3]Khadija Shahbaz

1. BS (Hons) International Relations, Department of International Relations, National University of Modern Languages Faisalabad Campus, Punjab, Pakistan
2. BS (Hons) International Relations, Department of International Relations, National University of Modern Languages Faisalabad Campus, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Lecturer, Department of International Relations, National University of Modern Languages Faisalabad Campus, Punjab, Pakistan

| **\*Corresponding Author:** | hamnajamil19@gmail.com |

**ABSTRACT**

This Qualitative study aims to explore the Asymmetric warfare has transformed the power relations among major countries such as Russia, China, and the United States, and has become an integral part of contemporary global conflicts. The non-state and state act as the weaker actors and can exploit their opponents by experiencing asymmetric perspective of the war such as cyberattacks, deception, proxy warfare, and guerilla tactics. This paper highlights the ways in which events like the US pullout from Afghanistan, Russia's hybrid war in Ukraine, and China's political warfare in the Indo-Pacific demonstrate how these approaches challenge conventional military dominance. Technology, urban combat, and strategic patience are emphasized as factors that enable asymmetry in the study, which draws on realist, hybrid, and revolution in military affairs (RMA) theories. Cyber defense, strategic communication, partnerships, and civic resilience are the new security tactics that the results strongly recommend. To keep the peace and safeguard national interests in a world where the international order is always changing, it is crucial to comprehend and combat asymmetric warfare.

| **KEYWORDS** | Asymmetric Warfare, Cyberwarfare, Great Power Competition, Geopolitical Rivalry, Global Security, Hybrid Conflict, Irregular Warfare, Military Innovation, Non-State Actors, Proxy Wars, Strategic Deterrence, Strategic Patience |

**Introduction**

Global power conflicts, national interests, and strategic domination are the focal points of geopolitical realism, according to Reuben Steff's paradigm. This chapter sets out the book's geopolitical realist framework, to lay the foundation for later chapters that take things further into geopolitics, strategic choices, and imperatives confronting New Zealand. It presents power structures of various international power structures shows a multipolar-multiplex system is coming into being and sketches important realist concepts like anarchy, intentions, the power imperative, rationality, the power trap, uncertainty, international institutions, and security communities (Muzaffar, et. al., 2017; ). In terms of this, one could say that it is the rivalry between the United States and China. This paradigm change affects every state and region in the international system and the Indo–Pacific area, New Zealand, and the South Pacific. The text also delves deeper to examine the significance of geography in determining human communities, interstate relations as well as national interests of a particular country. It states that the objective facts and the historical trends have to be taken into consideration as the options to understand the modern politics in the world. Geopolitical realism is a way of thinking about the future, but it does not mean the world is going to happen exactly as planned. Instead, it shows limited human agency and warns leaders about the dangers of going

too far with their ideologies, which can result in bad policies and even disaster (Steff, 2024).

Strategic choices, military operations, and the future of geopolitics are all affected by artificial intelligence, which Mark Abdollahian investigates. The entire foundation of future operating systems is being reshaped by artificial intelligence. Technological advancements, shifting environmental factors, and other external forces are quickly altering the components of national power.

Consequently, because of Russia's aggressive moves and China's economic and financial power, even allies and adversaries must now ask whether the US can still prevail in global competition. This chapter first considers the types of artificial intelligence, what drives them forward and how they are causing greater competition between great powers. At this stage, using a complex adaptive systems theory, students look at all the main influences on the operation and spot trends. Systems now depend on each other more, act faster, are more complicated and are harder to predict are major driving factors. When looking at future national security challenges against near-peer competitors, these factors shape the type, extent and setting of most defense threats. With powerful decision-making procedures, complexity frameworks create a secure and complete approach for dealing with various future challenges. This part of the book includes advice on how a school should prepare itself for the transformation that lies ahead (Abdollahian, 2024).

Experts Jan De Loecker and Jan Eeckhout take a close look at the way global market dominance influences prices, wages, inequality and competition. In this chapter, attention is given to strategic competition in the South Pacific and its links to the great power rivalry between the United States and China. It describes the various ways in which China's regional influence is expanding, as well as the interests it has in the region, such as its rivalry with Taiwan, its desire to gain support from international organizations, its natural resource holdings, and its desire to establish security and strategic relationships, possibly including military bases, as part of its island chain strategy. Events in Oceania have existential implications for the capitals of New Zealand and Australia since they affect their territorial integrity and national security. This area is very important to the United States since it might be used to combat Eurasian forces or to guarantee free passage. Keeping their status as island governments' preferred security allies is a priority for all three countries, which are worried about China's growing influence. The area risks becoming a geopolitical flashpoint because of this rivalry. Initially optimistic, New Zealand's stance on China's regional involvement has been changing from asymmetric hedging to balancing against China since 2018, as shown in this chapter (De Loecker & Eeckhout, 2018).

Strategic alliances and energy interests are the focal points of Alice Dell'Era's analysis of the Gulf States and Japan's involvement in the Sino-American power struggle. SinoAmerican rivalry has grown into a worldwide phenomenon, even if the Indo-Pacific is still where the two superpowers are most at odds with one another. Many are worried about Beijing's strategic goals in the Arab Gulf region due to its fast economic and political influence development (Shah, et. al., 2020). Aside from Washington, other foreign powers, especially Japan, have been adjusting their stance toward Gulf allies on a slow but steady basis out of worry about Beijing's increasing regional influence. Tokyo has been gradually rethinking its strategy toward the Gulf as the scope of Sino-American rivalry grows. Geostrategic has replaced perceptions of the area as a whole, with China's influence seen as crucial to making sense of the current shifts.

As a consequence, Japan's strategy for the Middle East is now different. Japan is marketing itself as a leading alternative in the area, highlighting a role both Beijing and the country's energy needs want: helping the Gulf nations with their energy transition and diversification.

The altering relations between Tokyo Saudi Arabia and the UAE can be observed very fast.

One can say that work of Japan, in this area is the economic statecraft that Japan is competing in the soft way. Such operations follow the model that the Biden administration is developing in the Gulf region. One approach the US might employ is joining in Japan's kinds of efforts to more effectively address the specific needs of the Gulf States in partnership and alliance (Dell'Era, 2024).

Pennington traces space weapon technology, science, political conflicts and the highs and lows of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) during this time. The Strategic Defense Initiative's Ascent and Decline from the Perspective of Aaron Bateman offers a thorough account of the SDI's history, illuminating the program's diplomatic, political, and technical intricacies using recently disclosed documents. Bateman delves into the history of SDI, which sprang from Reagan's plan to eliminate nuclear threats and the problems that arose from its dependence on space-based technology, which made it difficult to distinguish between missile defense and offensive space weapons. Problems with logistics, such as the dependence on NASA's shuttle program, and the integration of SDI with arms control initiatives are detailed in the book. The book also addresses the worries of European allies over the militarization of space. It also shows the legacy of SDI influences the United States, Russia, and China see space in the present age of great power rivalry. For a better grasp of the strategic and technical challenges of SDI are still pertinent to modern discussions about missile defense and space militarization, Bateman's research is an excellent resource (Yaseen, Muzaffar, & Shahbaz, 2023).

**Literature Review**

According to Ahana Datta, tensions arise when major nations compete with one another online, which weakens confidence and security in international cyberspace. Cyberspace is a realm with a high conflict escalation threshold; states project their national authority there via cooperative and coercive competitive techniques. The Internet has evolved from a decentralized network of individual websites into interconnected ecosystems controlled by a small number of private or semi-private entities, such as Internet service providers (ISPs). Rival governments want to alter the current dynamics of the network by focusing on the concentration of information flows that travel through these nodes; this helps them achieve their strategic goals and protects their national interests. Trust in the internet is systematically declining, according to this article, which examines the growing problem of great power struggle in cyberspace. Cyberspace becomes more unstable as governments strive for politically or economically favorable positions, leading to less governability, less security, and reduced dependability of information systems (Datta, 2024).

In the 21st century, the great power rivalry, especially between Russia, China, and the US has made a comeback. Modern clashes are now being influenced differently from the traditional military battles that were the hallmarks of previous global rivalry as asymmetric warfare fashions weaker players to take advantage of the weaknesses of powerful players through the application of irregular forces and innovative tactics.

Other nontraditional types of combat: cyberattacks, disinformation operations, economic coercion, and the application of proxy troops. There has been an increased frequency of asymmetric warfare, which threatens the altered methods of conflict resolution, in traditional, more technologically advanced, and psychologically oriented ways. Asymmetric warfare has been around for some time, yet the emergence of great power rivalry during time indicates that international conflicts have adapted to the challenges that accompany transnational threats, digitization, and globalization (Chivvis, 2024).

Asymmetric warfare has a long and storied past, and it is most often linked with insurgencies, guerrilla tactics, and nontraditional forms of opposition against dominant powers. Both the American Revolution and the Vietnam War are classic instances of irregular warfare, with colonial militias using them to fight against British troops. Viet Cong had used a strategy that tested the American military greatness in the former. This idea has developed to the Cold war as a source of ideological and geopolitical conflicts via proxy war in Asia, Africa, as well as Latin America. This was however altered during the cold war and the post 9/11 era. An example of asymmetric approach would be in the case-study of the 2014 Russian annexation of Crimea that is the hybrid approach of China in the South China Sea and proxy militia that Iran employs in the Middle East (Se

The paper intends to discover the theoretical antecedents, history and current geopolitical manifestations of against warfare with the view of understanding how the difference has emerged in the circumstances of the great power struggle in the present-day times. To begin with, it will touch on some of the leading models of international relations such as realism and hybrid warfare models which seek to offer answers to questions as to why asymmetric methods are applied. Beyond that, it will explore asymmetric tactics have evolved and major nations have modified them for use in contemporary conflicts. The bulk of the study will focus on three countries—the US, Russia, and China—to show asymmetric warfare is implemented via cyber operations, proxy wars, and economic instruments. Furthermore, the work will address conventional military power becomes weak against nonconventional warnings, and that in turn alters the strategic advantage. The qualitative research will also analyze the wider consequences for world government, in that international standards disintegrate, the accountability is indefinite and the deterrence operates in an uneven playing field (Acharya 2014). Governments need to prioritize investment in the development of cyber security infrastructure, intelligence sharing networks, and reorientation of military doctrines in the fight against new-age asymmetric warfare in great power rivalry (Yacoubian et al., 2020).

**Theoretical Frameworks**

International relations and security studies provide a variety of theoretical frameworks that help to explain the emergence of asymmetric warfare under great power rivalry. These models provide light on the ineffectiveness of conventional military might as deterrence in contemporary geopolitical conflicts and weaker parties confront opponents that are more powerful.

**Asymmetric Conflict Theory**

A very persuasive explanation is provided by Ivan Arreguín-Toft's theory of strategic interaction. He contends that less-strong opponents often emerge victorious when they counter the techniques used by their more formidable rivals. Toft (2005) examined 202 asymmetric wars that occurred between 1800 and 2003 and found out that

weaker parties won 30.5 of the aforementioned situations. Such an outcome was more probable following WWII and when the weaker sides used the guerrilla warfare to take advantage of the traditional sides. Just like the Vietnam War and the Soviet-Afghan War, insurgents who were lessequipped prevailed over the United States and Soviet forces superiorly by adopting the tactic of the hit-and-run and maximum understanding of the terrain, respectively (Timothy Richardson, 2024; Muzaffar, Nawab, & Yaseen, 2021).

**Realist Theory**

The bridling power desire and the wildness of international system is the key problem of realist scholars like Kenneth Waltz. The non-state actors or weak states cannot accept any symmetrically rational war against the opponent: the asymmetric warfare is chosen in that case. Iranian policy of Iran and its proxies militia in Iraq and Yemen to counteract the military might of the United States without a full scale war is an example of this.

**Hybrid Warfare and Gray Zone Theory**

The concept of hybrid warfare is used to refer to traditional and non-conventional warfare that is popular in modern warfare. Hacking and propaganda as well as the ability to trace and dispatch unmarked soldiers occupied in 2014 used by the Russians to seize control of Crimea and made it extremely difficult to attribute and counterattack. NATO has since re-evaluated its deterrence policy in which the Strategic concept of 2022 cited the hybrid threats as its rationale. The asymmetric warfare, according to these models, is not just a desperate action, but a premeditated way of waging war in a new world order (David Carment, 2018).

**Conceptual Framework and Historical Background**

The choice to adopt asymmetric war has been adopted as the norm of small powers and non-state actors against the increasing competition between the big powers in cases where neither citizen experiences an upper hand in terms of military power. The players that comprise cyber attacks, guerilla wars, and proxy wars are crowding out the old dominance as opposed to the fact that the world super powers have gone this far in terms of military might and technological prowess. This phenomenon raises certain questioning issues, which strike against the effectiveness of the conventional types of deterrence and dynamicity of discord.

This research selects a qualitative research method as a result of the theoretical frameworks of the professional fields of international relations and security studies, the analysis of the issue, and a case study involving the analysis of documents. To make sense of the patterns, motives, and strategic implication of asymmetric warfare in the context of the bigger picture, the rivalry of the great powers, the secondary sources such as scholarly writing and history, governmental reports and policy papers will help in making such sense.

With changes in military technology, geopolitical institutions, and global power balances, asymmetric warfare has always been a part of human conflict. War has been around for a long time, evolving from its original definition as an imbalance of power between two or more powerful entities (usually states or non-state actors). Its relevance has grown in the current age of great power rivalry.

**Results and Discussion**

**Early Instances of Asymmetry**

The Athenians' maritime empire and the Spartan coalition's land-based alliance battled as early as the Peloponnesian War (431-404 BCE). Despite their relative strength, asymmetry resulted from their differing strategic advantages. An early example of using a vulnerability via indirect tactics, Sparta ultimately succeeded by taking advantage of Athens' reliance on trade channels. To fight the technologically superior European imperial armies throughout the colonial period, several indigenous resistance groups used asymmetric tactics. In the Boer Wars (1880– 1881) and 1899–1902, for example, Boer guerrilla fighters from South Africa regularly thwarted British forces by making use of their mobility and familiarity with the surrounding terrain (Lumen, 2019).

**The Cold War and Proxy Warfare**

The size and breadth of asymmetric warfare were greatly increased during the Cold War. The United States and the Soviet Union backed proxy wars all over the world because they could not fight openly without risking nuclear escalation. North Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops used guerilla tactics, tunnels, and psychological operations to overcome the overwhelming U.S. firepower throughout the Vietnam War (1955–1975), which is still often referenced as an example. Vietnam was able to drive out American soldiers despite suffering casualties of over a million, demonstrating the strategic value of imbalance. In a similar vein, the Soviet-Afghan War (1979– 1989) showed guerrilla organizations like the Mujahedeen could derail Soviet helicopters and change the tide of war with the help of U.S.-supplied Stinger missiles. The fall of the Soviet Union was one of the turning points in the national history of the nation that demonstrated the extent to which the unbalanced struggle can reach.

**Post-Cold War and the War on Terror**

In the post 1991 years, the U.S military supremacy was an unequal challenge with the non state actors. The 9/11 attacks were a watershed moment; al-Qaeda hijacked civilian jets and used them as weapons, killing almost 3,000 people and launching the United States into two decades of war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Over 387,000 people were murdered in direct violence in U.S. wars after 9/11, according to the Costs of War Project at Brown University. This shows asymmetric battles may turn into costly, drawn-out confrontations with hazy frontlines and high civilian casualties (NATO, 2024).

**Contemporary Examples of Asymmetric Warfare**

Asymmetric warfare has become more complex and widespread in the twenty-first century, with state and non-state entities alike using cyber operations, psychological warfare, proxy troops, and irregular tactics to take on militarily stronger enemies. The modern instances show conventional military might is no longer a guarantee of strategic victory in battle.

**Russia-Ukraine Conflict (2014–Present)**

The Russia-Ukraine conflict is a prime example of asymmetric warfare in the contemporary era. Russia has been using unidentified "little green men," cyberattacks, and disinformation operations to destabilize Ukraine since 2014, when it seized Crimea, to avoid a confrontation with NATO (Yaseen, Muzaffar & Aman, 2022). The full-scale

invasion in 2022 switched to conventional warfare, although the reaction from Ukraine has been mostly uneven. Ukraine's military has successfully targeted Russian convoys and supply networks using small mobile units, drones built in Turkey (Baraktar TB2), and missiles provided by the United States (Javelin). It had crippled one of the biggest military giants of Russia, in unconventional methods, by 2023 Ukraine was crowing that it had obliterated more than 11,000 Russian armored vehicles and tanks

## Iran's Proxy Network

Iran, as part of its asymmetric policy, keeps Shiite militias to control the situation in Iraq and Syria, Hezbollah in Lebanon and the Houthis in Yemen which are controlled by it as proxies without the necessity of launching a military operation. A yearly expenditure of almost $700 million by Iran on Hezbollah enables Tehran to project influence across the Middle East, as revealed in a study by the U.S. Department of Defense in 2022. These organizations provide Iran with strategic depth and plausible deniability via conducting cyber operations, political manipulation, and missile assaults (Lane, 2023).

## Cyber Warfare by North Korea

Even though it is economically isolated, North Korea has used cyberwarfare to its advantage. Sony lost more than $100 million due to the Lazarus Group-attributed 2014 Sony

Pictures breach, which disclosed confidential business information. It was alleged in 2016 that the Bangladesh Bank lost $81 million due to cyber theft by North Korea. All of these things show tiny nations can hurt bigger ones more than they can with digital asymmetry.

## Great Power Competition

Because of economic, technical and ideological reasons, GPC in the twenty-first century moved beyond the limits of just direct military conflict. More and more, the struggle between Russia, China and the US for authority in a multipolar world is shaping today's world. Nowadays, there are additional domains in the struggle because the United States and Soviet Union were the sole superpowers during the Cold War. (Muzaffar, & Khan, 2016). The domains are cyber capabilities, misinformation, regional proxy warfare and control over resources.

## The Growing Hostility between the U.S. and China

Right now, the main focus of GPC is linking the United States and China. Because the US spent $877 billion on defense last year (SIPRI), it is the world's top military force. China has launched a combined attack on this dominance. Beijing is using the Belt and Road Initiative to helphttp://ww.beijingboost.com/blog/the-belt-and-road-initiative-is-a-major-part-ofenumerating-beijings-global-influence. Over 140 countries are part of this system. The country's fleet is expanding at the fastest pace globally and they have high-speed hypersonic missiles within their A2/AD capabilities. Still, it takes straightforward action by reshaping balance on the South China Sea through non-traditional approaches like lawfare, the use of maritime militaries and building artificial islands . China can establish its sovereignty via these means since they do not provoke a physical reaction from the United States or its allies (Lippert & Perthes, 2020).

**Russia's Revisionist Strategy**

Russia continues to use asymmetric and hybrid measures to preserve its position as a great power, despite its weakening economy. Its low-cost regional influence has been enhanced by its engagement in Syria since 2015, using private military contractors like the Wagner Group. Russia also uses cyber operations to weaken its competitors. For example, it interfered in the 2016 US elections and 2017 launched the NotPetya cyberattack, which caused over $10 billion in worldwide losses.

**Impact on Global Stability**

The possibility of miscalculation has grown, diplomatic institutions are under stress, and weapons races have been stoked again by GPC. Unexpected escalations may occur due to a lack of communication routes between countries, according to a 2023 study by the RAND Corporation.

This is especially true during crises such as the ones in the Taiwan Strait (Stanzel, 2024).

**Findings**

**Conventional Military Superiority**

Asymmetric warfare may greatly counteract the benefits of a conventionally stronger army, according to one of the most notable conclusions. Take the U.S. occupation of Afghanistan from 2001 to 2021 as an example. The Taliban, armed with guerilla tactics, local backing, and terrain expertise, managed to outlive the technologically sophisticated U.S. force. The Costs of War Project reports that despite investing over $2.3 trillion in Afghanistan, the United States did not accomplish any long-term strategic gains. This shows asymmetrical power dynamics allow less powerful parties to affect conflict outcomes via resilience and strategy rather than brute force Muzaffar, Yaseen, & Afzal, 2021).

**Proxy and Hybrid Warfare**

Currently, using proxies and fighting by hybrid means has made asymmetric tactics a necessity for great powers to use in conflicts. Russia's actions in Ukraine since 2014 are an obvious example. The use of cyberattacks, spread of wrong information and involvement of groups such as the Wagner Group have all been ways to confuse international reactions about Moscow's actions, in addition to regular military operations. Russian efforts to influence elections in more than 20 nations since 2014 have cost more than $300 million, according to the European Council on Foreign Relations. This demonstrates Russia uses hybrid techniques to further its geopolitical goals without resorting to open hostility (Saira Nawaz Abbasi, Sadia Nasir, 2021).

**Cyber and Information Warfare**

Asymmetric warfare currently mostly consists of cyber operations and propaganda tactics. An example of even economically isolated regimes that may do disproportionate harm using digital means is the Lazarus Group of North Korea, which is responsible for the Sony breach (2014) and the Bangladesh Bank robbery (2016). As an example of its approach to influencing narratives and accomplishing goals without physical force, China has its "Three Warfare" concept, which includes public opinion,

psychological warfare, and legal warfare. According to a NATO study from 2022, the majority of cyberattacks (80%) against member nations were carried out by individuals or groups associated with Russia, China, or Iran.

## Weak Institutions and Civilian Vulnerabilities

Weak governance, broken communities, and inadequate international control are frequently the conditions in which asymmetric players flourish, according to another report. When the Syrian government collapsed, non-state organizations like ISIS took advantage of the chaos to quickly gain territory. Despite without having a conventional army, ISIS in 2015 held an area equal to that of Great Britain. Terror, internet recruiting, and insurgency tactics were their asymmetrical weapons of choice (Karimi & Mousavi Shafaee, 2018).

## Asymmetric Warfare

Lastly, because of greater threats, the current military is needing to adapt. Integrated deterrence stood out in the US Department of Defense's 2022 National Defense Strategy which focused on cyber security, partnerships and readiness for special combat. Because of asymmetric threats, NATO is now revising its strategic thinking, rather than conventional state-on-state hostilities, will be the primary focus of future conflicts.

## Technology Democratizes Power in Asymmetric Conflict

The use of easily available technology in leveling the battlefield is one of the most important breakthroughs in contemporary asymmetric warfare. Drones, encrypted messaging applications, and social media are just a few examples of commercially accessible technologies that have given non-state actors an advantage in operations. To illustrate relatively affordable technology might overcome conventional defenses; consider Azerbaijan's employment of Turkish Bayraktar TB2 drones in the 2020 Nagorno-Karabakh war, which had a catastrophic impact on Armenian troops. Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) research indicates that these drones helped derail the advance of the Armenian army by destroying more than half of its artillery and air defense systems. Smaller players may confront more traditionally equipped competitors in this situation with superior but inexpensive technology (Gaibulloev & Sandler, 2019).

## Urban Environments Are Favorable for Asymmetric Actors

Asymmetric players are gravitating toward urban combat because of the cover, civilian shielding, and complicated surroundings that negate many conventional advantages. Urban areas were a tactic utilized by ISIS in battles like the 2017 Battle of Mosul to impede the progress of the Iraqi and coalition forces.

The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs said the conflict caused more than 900,000 people to become internally displaced. It underlines that with asymmetric organizations, urban environments play an important psychological and strategic role. Because there is a lot of damage that cannot be avoided and the rules are very complex, groups that do not follow traditional rules may take advantage to win.

Timing is a powerful way to gain an advantage as an asymmetric policy. When facing political, economic or moral opponents, some asymmetric players prefer to put off

and prolong any confrontation. The Vietnam War took such a long time to settle because the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong continued fighting until the US stopped supporting the war and then the US withdrew. The Taliban waited for the United States to make their decision for twenty years. Before the U.S. left, the Taliban attacked on average fifty times per day, Brookings Institution reported. This demonstrates their tenacity and capacity to continue until political circumstances worked to their advantage (Horowitz, 2020).

**Conclusion**

The dynamics of conflict have taken a new turn as great power rivalry has come to include asymmetric warfare. The case studies of Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea, among other nonstarter entities, argue that asymmetric methods are vital for confrontations with conventional military forces without resorting to full-scale conflict. State and non-state actors could put strategic costs on more powerful enemies through cyberattacks, misinformation, guerilla warfare, and proxy battles among other weapons they possess, from the limited resources they may have at their disposal. Repeatedly, irregular tactics challenged the notion that having more weaponry, troops or technology would bring victory. The U.S.'s experiences in Afghanistan and Iraq, Russia's hybrid warfare in Ukraine, and China's psychological and economic coercion in the South China Sea are the additional success of contemporary combat in the field of influence, adaptability, and invention — not in its craft and skill set. This is raising the question of how power and victory would be in a 21 st century strategic world. This takes some important lessons into consideration. The highly armed governments will have to defend their space in contention of cyber defense, narratives control and citizens resistance. Secondly, the super powers must make strategic alliances and bilateral dealings so that they create economic, information, and, on the other hand, military stability. Third, the presence of asymmetric actors implies that the absent ought to know and take time to know more about the societal and cultural and political context of the environment since they can be exploited to the benefit of the actors.

Flexibility is, also, applicable under this study in statecraft. The probe-ovis consciousness and stiffened ideologies is an afflicted weakness when it comes to the intent of decentralizing and adjusting threats. The military must be proactive and turn their response into proactive that will require the use of both soft and hard power to still appease the threats which are not only dynamic. At this time the power games are being played, whoever can graduate the same thing as the military strength and arms, tactics and restraint that can adapt flexibly to the tactics and time period that will be followed in strategy, in the supremacy of the local of the region countries. Thinking and strategizing within the asymmetric warfare is, therefore, necessary, not just in the military context, but also at the strategic focus in the present geopolitical climate of this century, which is bewildering.

**Recommendations**

- Put money into the ability to fight misinformation and communicate strategically.
- For better information-sharing coordination, fortify relationships and partnerships.
- Prepare the military for situations involving irregular and hybrid forms of conflict.
- To detect new asymmetric threats, early warning systems should be put in place.
- Research on unusual security concerns should get more financing.
- Take part in diplomatic initiatives to control proxy wars and cyberspace.

- Incorporate political and cultural understanding of the area into military strategy.

## References

Abdollahian, M. (2024). AI, Great Power Competition and the Future-Operating Environment. *AI, Great Power Competition and the Future-Operating Environment*, *1*(1), 17–44. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-70767-4_2

Acharya, A. (2014). Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds. *International Studies Quarterly*, *58*(4), 647–659. https://doi.org/10.1111/isqu.12171

Chivvis, C. (2024, October 17). *U.S.-China Relations for the 2030s: Toward a Realistic Scenario for Coexistence*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Datta, A. (2024). Structural Volatility: how great power cyber competition undermines trust in cyberspace. *Structural Volatility: How Great Power Cyber Competition Undermines Trust in Cyberspace*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5139072

David Carment. (2018). *War's Future: The Risks and Rewards of Grey-Zone Conflict and Hybrid Warfare*. Canadian Global Affairs Institute.

De Loecker, J., & Eeckhout, J. (2018). Global Market Power. *Great Power Competition in Oceania and New Zealand's Shift from Hedging to Balancing*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.3386/w24768

Dell'Era, A. (2024). Japan, the Gulf, and the Sino-American Great Power Competition. *The Great Power Competition Volume 6*, *1*(1), 79–101. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-70767-4_5

Gaibulloev, K., & Sandler, T. (2019). What We Have Learned about Terrorism since 9/11. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *57*(2), 275–328. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20181444

Horowitz, M. C. (2020). Do Emerging Military Technologies Matter for International Politics? *Annual Review of Political Science*, *23*(1), 385–400. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurevpolisci-050718-032725

https://www.cgai.ca/wars_future_the_risks_and_rewards_of_grey_zone_conflict_and_hy brid_warfare

Karimi, M., & Mousavi Shafaee, S. M. (2018). Poor Governance and Civil War in Syria. *Turkey Ortadoğu Çalışmaları Dergisi*, *5*(1), 31–55. https://doi.org/10.26513/tocd.383377

Lane, A. (2023, September 12). *Iran's Islamist Proxies in the Middle East* Wilson Center. https://www.wilsoncenter.org/article/irans-islamist-proxies

Lippert, B., & Perthes, V. (2020). Strategic rivalry between the United States and China: causes trajectories and implications for Europe Zur Verfügung gestellt in Cooperation mit / provided in cooperation with: Sifting Wissenschaft und Politic (SWP). *Strategic Rivalry between the United States and China*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.18449/2020RP04

Lumen. (2019). *Introduction to the Peloponnesian War*, Western Civilization.

Muzaffar, M. & Khan, I (2016). China-Russia Relations after the Cold War, *Orient Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 1 (II), 151-169

Muzaffar, M., Khan, I., & Yaseen, Z. (2019). End Game or a New Great Game? Indo-Pakistan Rivalry and Post Withdrawal Afghanistan, *Asian Journal of International Peace & Security (AJIPS), 3*, 1-11

Muzaffar, M., Nawab, M. W. & Yaseen, Z. (2021). The US Exit from Afghanistan: A Way Forward, *Journal of Development and Social Sciences, 2*(2), 30-41

Muzaffar, M., Yaseen, Z., & Afzal, N. (2021a). US Exit from Afghanistan: Impacts on Pakistan and India, *Journal of Political Studies 28* (2), 55–68

Muzaffar, M., Yaseen, Z., & Rahim, N. (2017)**.** Changing Dynamics of Global Politics: Transition from Unipolar to tipolar World**.** *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal*, I (I), 49-61

NATO.          (2024, July    25).    *Countering    Terrorism*.    NATO.

Saira Nawaz Abbasi, Sadia Nasir. (2021). Hybrid Warfare: A Reorientation of Russian Foreign Policy in Syria. *Pakistan Journal of International Affairs*, 4(2). https://doi.org/10.52337/pjia.v4i2.177

Sexton, E. (2019). Asymmetrical warfare | Britannica. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. https://www.britannica.com/topic/asymmetrical-warfare

Shah, S. T. A., Muzaffar, M., & Karamat, S. (2020). Asia-Pacific under Obama's Rebalance Strategy: Regional Responses, Journal of Development and Social Sciences, 1 (1), 30-41

Stanzel, V. (2024). *New Realities in Foreign Affairs: Diplomacy in the 21st Century*. Sifting Wissenschaft Und Politic (SWP). https://www.swp-berlin.org/publikation/new-realitiesin-foreign-affairs-diplomacy-in-the-21st-century

Steff, R. (2024). Theoretical Framework: Geopolitical Realism and Great Power Competition. *Global Political Transitions*, *1*(1), 15–59. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-0282-7_2

Timothy Richardson. (2024). Book Review: How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict      *Small   Wars   Journal*.

Yaacoub, J.-P. A., Salman, O., Noura, H. N., Kaaniche, N., Chehab, A., & Malli, M. (2020). Cyber-physical systems security: Limitations, issues, and future trends. *Microprocessors and Microsystems*, *77*(1), 103201.

Yaseen, Z., Muzaffar, M., & Shahbaz, K. (2023). Defensive Strategies of Central Asian Republics: From Bipolarity to Multipolarity, *Asian journal of International Peace and Security, 7*(1), 143-156

Yaseen, Z., Muzaffar, M. & Aman, A. (2022). Russia-Ukraine War and Hybrid Attitude of European Union: A Critical Analysis, *Pakistan Journal of Social Issues, XIII*, 180-185