

Discussion board 5 international relation



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

INTERNATIONAL RELATION College/ What is the relationship between group think and the decision to invade Iraq in 2003? Comment on the perception of this war by some scholars as Barash and Webel as a manifestation of modern imperialism (Neo-Imperialism), where the " continuing presence of American military bases throughout the Middle East and central Asia, are clearly not unrelated to the advanced industrial world's dependency on the oil resources in that region." Groupthink and its symptoms were very evident in the decision of Bush administration in 2003 to go to war with Iraq and dominate on that country. The groupthink process, which occurs when an individual is pressured to conform to the views of a small-group, leads to a shared illusion of unanimity which in turn often overcomes the personal inclinations and influences of members that derive out of their organizational roles. It also may occur when individual efforts are brought or encouraged to rationalize and justify the group's decisions (Russett, Starr and Kinsella, 2009, 179). The decision to go in war with Iraq, taken by Bush Government in 2003, was characterized by more direct pressures on those who argue against the typecasts of the group. The group thus is more likely to have features of unquestioned belief in justifying what it does, a general consensus that it is for good and a very different view that what opponents indulge with are quite evil-like-doings. Some academic scholars like Barash and Weber are of the opinion that terror is a last resort of weak as means of self defense and are those who feel militarily unable to confront their perceived enemies and thus use violence (Horowitz, 2007, p. 45). Based on this view, they argued that America's decision of war with Iraq was basically a way of new-imperialism, in which a Centre nation uses power over periphery nations (Galtung, p. 266) and thus America has used its

power to gains greater advantages on oil resources as well. 2) Provide some examples about relative deprivation and its link to violence and political instability. Relative deprivation is a significant term in politics, social studies and psychology, more often used to described the mental state of people who commit violence. It is a common cause of violence or civil conflict. It normally happens when people feel relatively deprived or relatively to their own expectations (Russett, Starr and Kinsella, 2009, p. 511). According to this theory, people experience aggressive behavior, become violent and turn to be often arrogant not because they are poor or deprived in some absolute sense, but rather they feel deprived-relative to other or to their expectations. A very good example, from various conflicts, for relative deprivation was Germany's strong desire to be in the place of sun during World War I. this desire was an example of relative deprivation because the country, both the government and its people, felt that it was not gaining the due recognition that it expected (Russett, Starr and Kinsella, 2009, p. 511). Another common example is that when people compare their current outcomes with their own outcomes that they achieved in the past, then they obviously do temporal comparison and feel a sense of dissatisfaction if past achievements exceed the level of current achievements. References Horowitz, D (2007), *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America*, Regency Publishing Russett, B, Starr, H and Kinsella, D (2009), *World Politics: The Menu for Choice*, Ninth revised edition, Cengage Learning