

Regional conflict essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Contemporary political environment is characterized by numerous political hotspots. Iraq, Pakistan, Israel, and Palestine are the regional conflicts of international significance. Many national leaders neglect the risks of local military conflicts.

In reality, local conflicts possess considerable potential to be turned into a global war. Iraq: global perspectives of a local conflict The military intervention into Iraq was initiated by the U. S. with the desire to promote democracy; it was aimed at suppressing the regime of Saddam Hussein, which had been viewed as completely totalitarian and anti-democratic leader.

The question is not in whether the American intervention has brought the anticipated results, but whether the discussed local conflict has a potential to turn into the war of global scale. Evidently, there are several characteristics which could lead to the global military conflict. It is difficult to deny that with the beginning of Iraqi war, the world has actually divided itself into the two opposing camps. One of these camps supports the American initiatives in Iraq, while the other suggests that the American fight for democracy is nothing else but the fight for limited oil resources.

No matter what ideas the U. S. promotes in Iraq, but this conflict has already grown to an international issue. Other countries have not yet been involved into any military actions, but international relations become extremely heated.

There is high probability that the fight for the ideas and the desire to support either Iraq or the U. S. in this local conflict will end in bloody military

aggression. Moreover, innocent people will become the first victims of this conflict; this is why preventing it is crucial for the peaceful life of the whole humanity.

Why is it happening that local conflicts create global threats? History witnessed numerous examples when the small event of local meaning led to irreversible global changes. The Sarajevo assassination has initiated the beginning of the WWI (Badolato, 2005), and this is one of the brightest historical examples when local conflict has turned into international military aggression. There are usually two or more participants in the local conflict. As a result, the supporters of each conflicting party virtually form the so-called “ political camps”. As a result, the number of conflicting parties progressively increases, and ultimately leads to the situation when the whole world finds itself involved into the conflict of regional character. In such situation this conflict is no more considered regional: as soon as it is spread onto other political players, it changes its character and becomes global.

During the short period of our lives, we have already witnessed the processes which turn local conflicts into global. The development of communications and mass media seriously impact these tendencies. The war in Iraq turned into a global conflict far long before the American troops have entered the Iraqi territories. Such opposition between the parties which do not directly participate in the local conflict is caused by several factors. First, political ambitions of many countries do not allow them remaining neutral. Political leaders view their roles in openly expressing their political position, which usually supports one of the conflicting parties.

These are the most threatening tendencies of any local conflict. Second, local conflicts result in worsening political relations between nations; as a result, their economic and social (cultural, etc.) partnerships are also threatened. These are the logical steps, through which regional conflicts turn into global wars. What we currently observe is the visible improvement of the political situation in Iraq.

However, what efforts did other countries have to apply in order not to be directly involved into the discussed regional opposition? To be honest, the war in Iraq cannot be taken as a local conflict in its pure form: as soon as foreign troops have entered the Iraqi territory, it could be considered the war between the two different nations, the two different cultures, and the two different religions. The conflict had all chances to remain regional if not for the tensed political situation in the world. All major political players considered it necessary to express their displeasure with the American war in Iraq. The development of nuclear arms and proliferation of the weapons of mass destruction make the prospects of global war even more real: a single shot or attack may kill several cities, and even countries.

Such attack will mean the beginning of the cold military conflict which will touch all world states, countries, and cities. What should leaders do to prevent the discussed threats, or to minimize them? It is crucial that political leaders take neutrality as the top priority in evaluating the scales of regional conflicts. Neutrality is currently viewed as the best means of peacekeeping in the world. Regional conflicts are easily resolved within the limited circle of the conflicting parties.

Any outside involvement of other political players may grow the regional conflict to the scales of global war. What we currently witness in the politics is the vulnerable threat of global conflict caused by regional misunderstandings between Iraq and the U. S. , and especially between the U.

S. and Iran. Both the U. S. and Iran have already chosen wrong political positions, and intentionally promote the ideas of their political righteousness among their political supporters.

The position of both is understandable, and might be correct (justified), but other countries seem to have no other option but to be involved into these conflicts. Conclusion Local Iraqi conflict could forever remain the conflict of regional character, if not for the states, which could not remain neutral. Neutrality is crucial for preventing global military conflicts in the contemporary political context. The number of regional hotspots increases daily, and it is difficult to deny that those who keep political and military neutrality ultimately perceive the political, economic, cultural, and social benefits of living in peace.