

# The arguments put forth by camille pecastaing

[Life](#)



The arguments put forth by Camille Pecastaing, in her article named "A Brief History of the Next War," are mainly based on the international system. While analyzing the book 'Iran, The Choice of Arms?' an international security analysis by François Heisbourg, she exposes the major chinks in the author's arguments. She draws a clear distinction between fact and speculation.

François Heisbourg, in his theory which is in fact speculation interlaced with facts, argues that a nuclear Iran will be the most serious threat to the world peace. Camille Pecastaing has rightly called his bluff when she points out that such a scenario simply does not exist.

Instead she emphasizes on the unforeseen economical fallout on the world economy in the wake of any unilateral strike by the US. Iran's capability to block the straits of Hormuz is real and if the tactics employed by Iran in the Afghanistan and Iraq are any indication, the strike will only damage America's own economy and the international standing than that of Iran. So she stresses that it is in America's interest not to think of such a misadventure.

The arguments of Camille Pecastaing in this article reflect a realist thought process. It examines the international security scenario analysis and possible remedial actions proposed by another author who takes inferences from the actions and imaginary intentions of certain countries.

Ambition of Iran to acquire nuclear deterrent is seen by the West as a threat to world peace, fearing regional proliferation and irresponsible posturing. But she sees no imminent danger to the world peace by the actions of Iran and

on the contrary, as she understands it, will lead only to a more mature behavior on the part of Iran and Israel as in the case of India and Pakistan.

The question of proliferation does not arise as the neighboring countries are too dependent on US military know how and support that they cannot think of acquiring a nuclear weapon.

I am in complete agreement with the arguments of Camille Pecastaing. In order to prove Heisbourg's arguments wrong in saying that the Iranian bomb is 'apocalyptic', and it needs to be stopped at any cost, she depicts the futility of strike without a ground invasion, the prospect of failures similar to the one America now faces in Iraq and Afghanistan, the possible negative fallout on America's already troubled economy and the weakening clout of the dollar. Iran is in a position to cause more damage to the world economy in general and the US economy in specific than the damage the US action can cause to the Iranian economy.

The argument of Heisbourg that Iran will slip into anarchy and the nuclear arsenal will fall into the hands of Hezbollah is only a wishful thinking. As she rightly points out, in all probability, an Iranian nuclear weapon will make both Iran and the nuclear Israel more responsible and the chances of further confrontations between these two countries and the related chaos that may ensue, will only decline.

It is evident from the above paragraph that I am in complete agreement with Camille Pecastaing and it is needless to say that my opinions belong to the realist school of thoughts. To further my arguments in that favor, I can point out some of the past events that led to the invasion of Iraq.

American intelligence and spy agencies had manufactured false evidences to strengthen their claim that Iraq is in the process of building weapons of mass destruction which will threaten the world peace and this was believed by the other countries without any doubt who in turn lend their support for an American invasion.

Later, when it was found out that it was only a fear psychosis created by the US, it was too late to rectify the damage and the difficulties it caused in Iraq. Moreover, the monumental expenditure for the Iraq war has only put the US economy in undue trouble.