



© IBU

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69648/UIIN02375>

Balkan Research Journal(BRJ), 2025; 1(2): 85-101

brj.ibupress.com

Online ISSN: 2955-2524



Application : 30.03.2025

Revision : 19.04.2025

Acceptance : 22.05.2025

Publication : 30.05.2025



Maqellara Memeti, R. (2025). Globalization and regional conflicts of the contemporary era. *Balkan Research Journal*, 1(2), 85-101

<https://doi.org/10.69648/UIIN02375>



Rilinda Maqellara Memeti

South East European University

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9581-4140>

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rilinda Maqellara Memeti. Email: rilinda.maqellara@gmail.com

Globalization and Regional Conflicts of the Contemporary Era

Rilinda Maqellara Memeti

Abstract

This paper explores the intricate relationship between globalization and regional conflicts in the contemporary era, focusing on specific case studies that illustrate the multifaceted impacts of global interconnectivity on local strife.

The ongoing war in Ukraine serves as a critical example of how geopolitical rivalries and economic dependencies shape conflict dynamics, prompting a re-evaluation of traditional security paradigms. The genocide in Gaza highlights the humanitarian crises exacerbated by globalization, revealing the complexities of international responses and the role of media in shaping perceptions.

Similarly, the evolving governance structure in Syria demonstrates the influence of external actors and regional powers in shaping conflict outcomes and post-conflict reconstruction efforts.

Turkey's role in regional conflicts and the role of its diplomacy were particularly emphasized, as it navigates its position between global powers and regional responsibilities.

As regional conflicts continue to unfold, the contemporary era is expected to witness further polarization and fragmentation, with rising nationalism and protectionism potentially challenging multilateral cooperation. The interconnected nature of today's global society may result in the spillover effects of regional conflicts, influencing global economics, migration patterns, as well as international security dynamics.

The findings indicate that an understanding of globalization's impacts is essential for effective conflict management and for anticipating future geopolitical trends in a rapidly changing global landscape.

The paper posits that addressing regional conflicts through a global lens is crucial for fostering sustainable peace and stability in an increasingly interconnected world.

Key words: Globalization, regional conflicts, contemporary era

Introduction

Globalization and regional conflicts of the contemporary era is a highly relevant and multifaceted topic, reflecting the interconnected nature of today's world and the intricate dynamics at play across various regions.

The landscape is currently marked by numerous complex and interconnected conflicts that have significant implications for international stability, economic development, and humanitarian conditions.

- The ongoing war in Ukraine, sparked by geopolitical tensions and territorial disputes, has not only caused a humanitarian crisis but also reshaped global alliances and economic policies. It has led to widespread sanctions, affecting global supply chains, particularly in energy and food.
- Hamas - Israeli war and the Middle East continues to experience turbulence, with the conflict in Syria persisting despite numerous international interventions and peace efforts. The complex geopolitical dynamics involving regional powers like Iran and its influence across various territories add layers of complexity to the regional stability.
- Additionally, localized conflicts and civil unrest in other regions, driven by ethnic, religious, and political tensions, further contribute to international challenges. These conflicts often result in displacement, economic disruptions, and heightened global security concerns.

The international community faces the critical task of navigating diplomacy, humanitarian aid, conflict resolution, and long-term development strategies to foster peace and stability.

Analyzing these situations requires a multidisciplinary approach, considering historical, political, and socio-economic factors, and emphasizes the importance of collaborative global efforts to mitigate conflict and promote development. "As outlined in the New Agenda for Peace, United Nations Member States hold both the responsibility and the capability to fulfill the shared commitments set forth in the UN Charter," he stated. He highlighted that the Secretary-General's good offices, along with the efforts of his envoys, remain available—not only to prevent and mediate conflicts, but also to serve as an impartial platform for Member States to come together and find mutually acceptable solutions.

“In a world growing ever more divided, we need at least one institution that all can trust,” he emphasized. He urged that no effort should be spared in the pursuit of de-escalation and trust-building. “This requires the courage to genuinely listen to others and consider their views in good faith,” he added.

He also stressed the vital role of regional frameworks and institutions in building bridges, noting: “In times of heightened tensions, it is our collective duty to do everything within our power to uphold the system of collective security that our predecessors established (United Nations, 2023).

Globalization and Its Phenomenology in War Conflicts

Globalization involves the ongoing transformation of global political institutions, organizational structures, and socio-economic relations. However, during times of military conflict, the focus of these transformations tends to shift away from political aspects and becomes increasingly centered on financial and economic support (Artemenko et al., 2024).

At its core, globalization can be defined as the growing economic interdependence among the world’s nations, gradually shaping them into a unified global system governed by its own dynamics and developmental trends.

This phenomenon is both complex and contradictory. On one hand, globalization fosters the growth of prosperous nations and draws people from less developed countries in search of better opportunities. On the other hand, it simultaneously addresses longstanding challenges while giving rise to new ones—particularly in the global economy—such as social differentiation and polarization.

Therefore, globalization must be recognized as an objective reality—neither wholly positive nor entirely negative. It offers vast opportunities but also poses significant risks to humanity. In essence, globalization is a multifaceted process that demands thorough and critical analysis, as its consequences are as varied and far-reaching as the phenomenon itself. When considering its substance, it is no exaggeration to say that the consequences of globalization have profoundly shaped the historical trajectories of entire nations across every continent. However, these impacts manifest in distinct ways depending on regional and national contexts. One notable example is the process of European integration, where globalization has played a significant and multifaceted role. Let us examine this influence in greater detail (Svirko, 2014).

A clear understanding of how globalization affects perceptions and experiences of war is critical for several reasons, including the following:

- Influence on National Identity,
- Media and Communication,
- Economic Interdependence,
- Humanitarian Perspectives,
- Technology and Warfare,
- Migration and Displacement,
- Perceptions of Threat.

Globalization can lead to new security threats, such as terrorism and cyber warfare, which are not confined by national borders. These changing perceptions of threat can influence both domestic and foreign policies on defense and security, and shape public opinion about military engagements.

In summary, understanding how globalization affects perceptions and experiences of war allows for a more nuanced analysis of conflicts in a contemporary context. It aids policymakers, scholars, and the general public in recognizing the interconnectedness of global events and promotes informed discussions about responsibility, intervention, and the nature of modern warfare.

- Importance of the globalization and its effects on perceptions and experiences in regional conflicts

Globalization is essential in shaping how regional conflicts are perceived and experienced, influencing public awareness, economic impacts, cultural dynamics, security considerations, and humanitarian responses. By understanding these dynamics, stakeholders can adopt more comprehensive approaches to conflict resolution that consider both local and global contexts, facilitating cooperation and promoting peace.

This conceptual framework underscores the multifaceted nature of globalization-related conflicts. These tensions reflect a growing global resolve among people to advocate for alternative approaches to the dominant model of globalization, seeking greater participation in decisions that shape the planet's future—a resolve that can be viewed as democratic in the broadest sense.

Yet, the persistent disconnect between global unity and true integration within the current world order suggests that tensions and conflicts are likely to continue. These challenges will endure until global institutions and governance structures evolve to address both the universalizing forces and the localized impacts of globalization (Lerche, 1998).

The Russian - Ukrainian War: Current Status and Expectations

The Russian-Ukrainian War represents the pursuit of the Russian Federation's political objectives through military means, primarily aimed at reasserting influence over territories lost following the dissolution of the Soviet Union. A key moment marking the beginning of this conflict is 20 February 2014, when Russia initiated operations to annex Ukraine's Autonomous Republic of Crimea.

On 21 February 2022, the Kremlin officially recognized the self-proclaimed Donetsk People's Republic and Luhansk People's Republic as independent entities—an act that paved the way for their eventual annexation by the Russian Federation. Just three days later, on 24 February 2022, Russia launched a full-scale invasion of Ukraine, marking a new and more aggressive phase of the war, intended to reestablish Russian political dominance over the country.

The Essence of Ukraine War

The essence of the war in Ukraine—particularly the dramatic escalation in 2022—centers on a complex interplay of historical grievances, geopolitical rivalries, and struggles over national identity. Several key elements define the nature of this conflict:

- Historical Context and National Identity

The roots of the conflict lie in Ukraine's historical ties to Russia during its time as part of the Soviet Union. Since gaining independence in 1991, Ukraine has faced ongoing challenges in forging a cohesive national identity, influenced by both Western ideals and longstanding connections with Russia.

This internal struggle is further complicated by regional divisions: western Ukraine generally supports European integration, while eastern regions have maintained stronger cultural and political ties to Russia. These divisions have significantly shaped the dynamics of the conflict.

Geopolitical Tensions and Russian Expansionism

A core driver of the war is Russia's ambition to reassert its influence in the post-Soviet space. Moscow perceives NATO's eastward expansion and Ukraine's aspirations to join the European Union as direct threats to its strategic interests and traditional sphere of influence.

In this context, the war is emblematic of Ukraine's fight to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity in the face of external aggression. Ukraine's pursuit of deeper ties with the West reflects its broader goal of establishing independence from Russian dominance.

Military and Humanitarian Aspects

The war has evolved into a protracted military conflict characterized by significant battles, strategies, and devastating consequences for both combatants and civilians.

The war has led to a massive humanitarian crisis, with millions displaced, civilian casualties, and widespread destruction. This aspect highlights the human cost of geopolitical conflicts.⁴

Global Implications

The war has triggered a robust international response, with Western nations supporting Ukraine through military aid, sanctions against Russia, and diplomatic efforts. This reflects a broader struggle between authoritarianism and democratic values on the global stage.

Geopolitical Realignments

The conflict has also led to significant shifts in global alliances and energy dynamics, impacting not only Europe but worldwide, as countries reassess their security strategies and economic dependencies.

Cultural and Ideological Dimensions

Identity and Resistance: The war has sparked a strong sense of national identity and unity among Ukrainians, fostering a cultural resistance against perceived oppression. This is reflected in the widespread nationalism and solidarity within the country.

Narratives of Democracy vs. Authoritarianism: The conflict embodies a struggle between democratic aspirations in Ukraine and authoritarian tendencies in Russia, influencing global discourse around governance and human rights.

The War and its Historical Development

The broad trajectory of Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, launched on February 24, 2022, can be summarized in several key phases.

Initially, Russia launched a major assault with the apparent goal of toppling the Ukrainian government and potentially installing a pro-Moscow regime. However, this plan was quickly thwarted by strong Ukrainian resistance. In the second phase, Russia was forced to retreat from significant portions of territory in northern and eastern Ukraine, relinquishing nearly half of what it had seized in the initial weeks of the war.

During the summer and fall of 2022, Ukraine went on the offensive, successfully reclaiming several eastern cities and the strategically important city of Kherson in the south. By the end of that year, the front lines largely stabilized.

In 2023, Ukraine launched a broad counteroffensive, making limited gains but ultimately falling short of its objectives. Russian forces, having adopted more effective defensive tactics, proved more resilient than during their initial invasion. Ukraine's progress was hampered by Russia's extensive fortifications and the Ukrainian military's limited resources and manpower. In early 2024, Russia initiated its own counteroffensive, achieving modest territorial gains in the eastern regions of Ukraine. These advances were partly enabled by Ukraine's failure to establish strong defensive positions in some areas—still hoping to resume offensive operations—and by delays in receiving U.S. military aid, which was not approved by Congress until spring.

As 2024 progressed, the front lines hardened, and a strategic stalemate took hold. Neither side appeared capable of achieving a decisive breakthrough heading into 2025. Over the winter of 2023–2024, Russia shifted tactics by targeting Ukraine's power infrastructure, inflicting major damage. With roughly half of Ukraine's electricity production capacity either significantly impaired or destroyed, this campaign caused serious hardship and may be repeated in the coming winter as a form of political pressure.

One of Ukraine's most notable achievements has been its naval campaign in the Black Sea. By damaging or sinking more than half of Russia's Black Sea Fleet, Ukraine forced the remaining vessels to retreat further east. Additionally, Ukraine's attack on the Kerch Bridge has likely disrupted Russian logistics and supply lines to Crimea (O'Hanlon et al., 2024).

Future Scenarios for the Resolution of the Conflict, Considering the Role of International Actors, Potential Negotiations, or Further Escalation.

In general, all analyze is based on scenarios for the resolution of the conflict, consider the role of international actors, potential negotiations, or further escalation. All wars, regardless of their duration or nature, ultimately come to an end. Since the onset of Russia's invasion of Ukraine, many predictions about the conflict's conclusion have surfaced—yet as the war has dragged on, several of these forecasts have become increasingly unlikely.

To anticipate how the war might end, it is crucial to understand the objectives of each side. From the outset, Russia's intentions were somewhat ambiguous. Was its aim to conquer all or part of Ukraine, expand its borders, or gain leverage in negotiations with the West? Initially, Russia appeared confident in achieving broad goals, but as Ukrainian resistance grew fiercer and exacted significant costs, Russia's objectives shifted. Today, Russia seems more open to negotiations, focusing mainly on securing territorial gains, ensuring Ukraine remains neutral, and preventing direct NATO involvement.

Ukraine's objectives, by contrast, are more straightforward: the restoration of its territorial integrity and eventual membership in NATO. While reclaiming occupied territory is a key goal, it remains a challenging task. Ukraine also seeks continued NATO support throughout the conflict and hopes to secure membership afterward, though it recognizes its limited leverage in negotiations. The ultimate outcome will depend heavily on Russia, the United States, and its allies. For the latter two, the primary aims are to defend Ukraine's sovereignty while preventing the conflict from escalating or drawing them directly into the war.

Donald Trump's election as U.S. President suggests a possible shift toward reduced American support for Ukraine. At the same time, Ukraine's deployment of U.S.-supplied missiles and Russia's retaliatory use of ballistic missiles mark significant escalations in the conflict. These recent developments call for a reassessment and update of existing scenarios.

Under the Trump administration, the U.S. is expected to reduce its support for Ukraine. The escalating attacks from both sides may be interpreted as strategic efforts to strengthen their positions ahead of any potential decline in American assistance. Barring unexpected events—such as a regime change or nuclear escalation—before the start of Trump's term, the following scenarios are among the most likely outcomes:

1. The Trump administration's reluctance to continue supporting Ukraine could pressure both Russia and Ukraine to enter negotiations. In this context, Ukraine is likely to secure some form of security guarantee. Under mutual pressure to compromise, Ukraine may agree to become a neutral zone, positioned between NATO and Russia. However, the long-term viability of this arrangement is uncertain, as the Ukrainian population may eventually feel compelled to align with one side or the other.
2. Secondly, the possibility for the conflict to reach a deadlock. A U.S. withdrawal would lead to a loss of motivation for its allies to persist with support and to a loss of incoming resources for Ukraine. In this scenario, while Europe remains committed to protecting Ukraine, the ongoing war becomes increasingly unsustainable for European states.

On the other hand, Russia achieves some key military objectives and is prepared to the potential halting of hostilities, having secured the occupied territories. If a ceasefire were to be signed, a comprehensive peace agreement would be far from being reached due to conflicting interests. Hypothetically, Ukraine would be unable to join NATO, which aligns with Russia's interests.

The conflict would remain frozen and unsolved, opening to the possibility for future escalation. However, this scenario would pose significant domestic challenges for the Russian leadership, as they would need to justify the loss of thousands of lives for limited territorial gains and their inability to decisively conclude the war they initiated.

3. A significant reduction in U.S. and European support could lead to Ukraine's defeat. Despite Ukraine's continued requests for assistance, European countries may gradually lose motivation, resulting in increasing divisions among them. This shift would give Russia a substantial advantage, potentially allowing it to seize additional territories and exert indirect political control over Ukraine.

While a full Russian conquest of Ukraine is unlikely and strategically undesirable—due to direct borders with NATO members like Romania and Poland—Ukraine risks becoming a satellite state similar to Belarus. This outcome would considerably weaken NATO over time and might prompt some member states to reassess their commitment to the alliance.

4. A U.S. withdrawal does not necessarily mean a decline in European commitment, as the conflict directly affects Europe's geographic security. However,

this escalation could prolong the war and eventually compel direct European involvement to halt further Russian advances. Such a development might lead to a full-scale war between NATO and Russia.

5. Final, Building on the premise of a U.S. withdrawal, if Europe intensifies its support for Ukraine, Russia may still sustain military operations over an extended period, supported by allied states such as North Korea, China, and Iran. However, over time, Russia could face significant economic and military strains, gradually depleting its capacity to exert leverage.

This eventual exhaustion would give Ukraine a substantial advantage in negotiations, potentially enabling it to reclaim occupied territories. Over the long term, this could even pave the way for Ukraine's membership in NATO. However, achieving this outcome would require the conflict to persist for a considerably prolonged period.

Predicting the end of any war is inherently complex due to the multitude of factors at play, many of which are beyond the control of the parties involved. This complexity introduces a high level of uncertainty and sometimes challenges conventional theories of war termination.

Nonetheless, based on the current information about the Ukraine conflict and insights drawn from the new U.S. strategy under the elected President and past foreign policy priorities, the scenarios outlined above represent some of the most plausible paths toward resolution.

These scenarios depend on evolving dynamics—including geopolitical shifts, internal political pressures, and the strategies pursued by Ukraine, Russia, and international actors. Recognizing these variables highlights the need for continuous analysis and flexible approaches to understanding and anticipating the conflict's trajectory (Mammadov, 2024).

Israeli - Hamas War

Overview of the Gaza Conflict

The situation in Gaza represents a complex and tragic dimension of the broader Israeli-Palestinian conflict, raising critical issues surrounding the concepts of genocide, humanitarian law, and the ethics of military engagement. Addressing these issues requires nuanced understanding and dialogue aimed at achieving lasting peace while ensuring the protection of human rights for all parties involved.

The Gaza conflict is part of the broader Israeli-Palestinian conflict, characterized by cycles of violence, political strife, and humanitarian crises. Gaza, governed by Hamas since 2007, faces ongoing military actions from Israel, which views Hamas as a terrorist organization threatening its security.

- Atrocities and Humanitarian Impact,
- Genocide Considerations,
- Israeli Justifications and Security Concerns,
- International Law and Human Rights.

From the view of Legal Framework, the conduct of both sides in the conflict is scrutinized under International law, including humanitarian law and human rights law.

Accusations of war crimes have been made against both Israel for its military actions and Hamas for targeting civilians and using human shields.

There have been persistent calls from various international and local organizations for accountability regarding actions taken during the conflict, including demands for investigations into alleged war crimes.

On October 7, the State of Israel swiftly declared war on Hamas in Gaza following a brutal attack, and its leadership has since reiterated that military operations will not cease until all objectives are met—chief among them, the destruction of Hamas. However, three months into the Israeli ground invasion of the Gaza Strip and as the conflict enters a new phase, it remains unclear whether this primary objective is realistically achievable, and what the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) have concretely accomplished so far.

The attack by Hamas, which resulted in the deaths of at least 1,400 Israelis, marked a devastating collapse of Israel's longstanding security strategy. The magnitude of the failure by Israel's intelligence and security forces—as well as the government officials overseeing them—cannot be overstated.

This crisis has exposed the inadequacies of the previous deterrence model, which was built on the assumption that Hamas could be contained through advanced technological defenses and periodic, limited military operations. That strategy has now been fundamentally discredited.

The first challenge is how to stabilize Gaza. While Israel cannot and should not assume direct responsibility for governing the territory, it must act responsibly by enabling relevant stakeholders and international partners to address the

humanitarian needs of the Palestinian civilian population and to prevent the resurgence of terrorist threats.

Secondly, Israel must formulate a new security strategy—one that goes beyond its previous deterrence model—to effectively safeguard its borders and ensure the safety of its citizens.

The potential for broader regional destabilization is significant, particularly in areas adjacent to the conflict such as Egypt, the West Bank, and Lebanon. The conflict is deeply multi-dimensional, heavily influenced by Iran's network of proxy forces seeking regional dominance.

Complicating matters further, Israel proposed the relocation of Palestinians from Gaza to the Sinai Peninsula—a plan that was firmly rejected not only by Egypt but also by other regional actors, the United States, and the European Union, all of whom opposed the notion of forced displacement.

The humanitarian crisis facing Palestinians in Gaza, combined with the hardline stance of the Netanyahu government, is placing significant strain on Israeli-American relations. The moral capital Israel initially held at the start of its military operations is rapidly eroding.

Currently, the Israel-Hamas conflict presents overlapping dynamics: the risk of further escalation, the potential for regional military action against Iran, and simultaneous efforts aimed at political and military de-escalation. A critical question remains—can U.S. policy effectively manage the conflict and maintain its strategic influence in the region?

Signs of regional spillover are already evident. The Houthi attacks in the Red Sea and the looming threat of war with Hezbollah in Lebanon exemplify how the conflict could expand. These developments threaten to destabilize the broader Middle East, jeopardizing access to vital energy supplies—particularly oil and gas—which could, in turn, trigger significant global economic repercussions.

There is no doubt that Israel's war in Gaza will have far-reaching implications for the geopolitical landscape of the Middle East (Bordas, 2024).

Unprecedented Scale and Magnitude

Israel's response to the deadly Hamas attacks of October 7, 2023, has brought the population of Gaza to the brink of collapse. By October 7, 2024, the Israeli military offensive had resulted in the deaths of more than 42,000 Palestinians, including

over 13,300 children, and injured more than 97,000 others. Many of these casualties occurred in direct or deliberately indiscriminate attacks, often annihilating entire multigenerational families.

The scale and speed of destruction have been described by experts as unprecedented in any 21st-century conflict. Entire cities have been leveled, and critical infrastructure, agricultural lands, and numerous cultural and religious sites have been destroyed. As a result, vast areas of the Gaza Strip have been rendered uninhabitable (Amnesty International, 2024).

Us-Israeli Relations

While the United States continues to support Israel in its war against Hamas, tensions between the two governments—and their leaders—appear to be growing. The conflict has also had a noticeable impact on public opinion in both countries, with Americans and Israelis increasingly viewing each other's leadership more negatively than in recent years. Broader attitudes on the U.S. role in the conflict are shifting as well.

In Israel, there is strong support for U.S. diplomatic engagement: approximately 72% of Israelis want the United States to play a major role in helping to resolve the war. In contrast, Americans are more divided on the issue. While a majority of U.S. respondents (55%) agree that their country should be involved in ending the conflict, they are more likely to favor a minor role (35%) than a major one (20%). Another 27% believe the U.S. should not be involved at all—a view held by only 10% of Israelis.

In the United States, support for a major diplomatic role varies by political orientation. Those on the ideological left are more likely to back robust U.S. involvement than those in the center or on the right. In Israel, however, support for U.S. involvement is consistent across the ideological spectrum.

Religious affiliation also influences views. Among Americans, 45% of Jewish respondents support a major U.S. role in resolving the war, compared to 27% of Muslim respondents. In Israel, both Jewish (74%) and Arab (62%) citizens express general support for strong U.S. diplomatic engagement (Silver, 2024).

Turkey's Role in the Regional Conflicts

- *An analysis of Turkey's role in regional conflicts, particularly focusing on the Ukrainian war, the Hamas-Israel conflict, its relations with Israel and the USA, and the new political establishment in Syria.*

Turkey's Role in the Ukrainian War- Support for Ukraine

Turkey has taken a firm stance in support of Ukraine since the onset of the conflict, primarily by condemning Russia's aggression and calling for the respect of Ukraine's territorial integrity. Turkey's historical ties to Ukraine and its advocacy for the Crimean Tatars have influenced its position.

Turkey has supplied Ukraine with military drones, which have played a significant role in Ukraine's defensive operations against Russian forces. This military cooperation has solidified Turkey's position as a key player in the conflict.

Turkey has also sought to position itself as a mediator between Ukraine and Russia, hosting high-level talks aimed at achieving a ceasefire and facilitating grain exports through the Black Sea.

Turkey's Role in the Hamas-Israel Conflict

Support for Hamas: Turkey has historically supported Hamas, both politically and diplomatically. Turkish leaders have openly criticized Israeli military actions in Gaza and have positioned themselves as advocates for Palestinian rights, contributing to Hamas's legitimacy within the broader Islamic context.

Humanitarian Aid: Turkey has provided humanitarian assistance to Gaza and has called for international action to address the humanitarian crises resulting from Israeli military operations. This support aligns with Turkey's broader foreign policy of championing Muslim causes.

Relations with Israel: While Turkey has had a contentious relationship with Israel, marked by periods of severe tension, it has also engaged in diplomatic efforts and attempts to normalize relations, particularly in response to shifts in regional dynamics. Recent years have seen attempts to mend ties, driven by economic considerations and geopolitical interests.

Turkey's Relations with the USA

Strategic Partnership: Turkey's relationship with the USA has fluctuated, influenced by varying foreign policy objectives, such as Turkey's stance on Syria, its

procurement of Russian military hardware, and its support for different factions within the Syrian conflict.

Collaboration and Tensions: While the two countries have cooperated on several issues, including NATO commitments, tensions have arisen due to the U.S. support for Kurdish groups in northern Syria, which Turkey views as terrorist organizations.

Regional Influence: Turkey seeks to assert itself as a regional power, often competing with U.S. influence in the Middle East. This pursuit can lead to divergences in strategy and alliances within the broader context of U.S. foreign policy.

Turkey and the New Political Establishment in Syria

Turkey has conducted several military operations in northern Syria in an effort to combat Kurdish forces and to establish a buffer zone against potential threats to its border. These operations are aimed at influencing the evolving political landscape in Syria.

Turkey has supported various Syrian opposition groups in their fight against the Assad regime, positioning itself as a key player in the Syrian civil war. This involvement aligns with Turkey's regional strategy of countering Iranian influence and promoting a Sunni Arab order.

Turkey remains engaged in diplomatic efforts regarding Syria, including participation in talks with Russia and Iran as part of the Astana Process, while also seeking to negotiate the return of Syrian refugees to Turkey.

Summary and Future Expectations

Most interstate conflicts ultimately conclude through negotiated settlements rather than outright victories. Such outcomes often require mediation by actors perceived as neutral by all parties, particularly when neither side is capable of unilaterally imposing a resolution. In the case of the war in Ukraine, few states are positioned to serve as effective mediators. However, Turkey stands out as a potential candidate, despite not being entirely neutral.

As a NATO member and one of the few suppliers of military equipment to Ukraine early in the conflict, Turkey has taken a clear strategic stance. Its relationship with Ukraine extends beyond transactional arms sales—such as the provision of drones—to a broader strategic defense partnership. Nonetheless, Ankara has carefully cultivated a diplomatic posture aimed at balancing its Western alliances with continued engagement with Russia.

Since the war began, Turkey has made concerted efforts to mediate, despite criticism from Western allies. These efforts have yielded concrete outcomes. On July 22, 2022, Turkey—alongside the United Nations—successfully brokered the Black Sea Grain Initiative, establishing a humanitarian shipping corridor that became a vital lifeline for an estimated 349 million people reliant on Ukrainian grain exports. Turkey's balancing act is not limited to the Ukrainian theater. It also competes and cooperates with Russia in other strategic arenas such as Syria and Libya. This broader context of calibrated diplomacy could serve as a foundation for meaningful U.S.–Turkey coordination aimed at achieving a sustained ceasefire in Ukraine.

A future Trump administration would have the opportunity to leverage Turkey's unique position. While Ankara has strongly supported Ukraine's right to self-defense and sovereignty—including supplying UAVs and other military hardware—it has also refrained from joining Western sanctions against Russia. Moreover, Turkey has preserved crucial energy ties, facilitating the continued transfer of Russian gas, which remains vital to the Russian economy.

Turkey's dual-track approach underscores its potential as a pragmatic mediator. If strategically engaged, its role could help create conditions conducive to ending the conflict in a way that aligns with both Ukrainian interests and broader regional stability (Atalan, 2024).

Conclusion

The future of globalization is likely to be characterized by a nuanced and multifaceted evolution rather than a simple continuation or reversal.

It will involve a blend of increased regionalism, technological advancement, geopolitical competition, cultural exchange, and socio-environmental considerations.

The trajectory of globalization will depend on how nations navigate these dynamics, balancing cooperation with the challenges posed by identity, security, and sustainability.

Providing adaptive responses to these complexities will be essential for shaping a more inclusive and equitable global future.

References

- Amnesty International. (2024). *Amnesty International investigation concludes Israel is committing genocide against Palestinians in Gaza*. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2024/12/amnesty-international-concludes-israel-is-committing-genocide-against-palestinians-in-gaza/>
- Artemenko, F. Y., Hovorov, Y. I., Maksymova, I., & Kostiuk, V. (2024). The impact of conflict on contemporary global dynamics: Integration, globalisation, and polarisation trends. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*. Retrieved from ResearchGate.
- Atalan, Y. (2024). *What role can Turkey play in Ukraine negotiations?* Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS).
- Bordas, M. (2024). Hamas-Israel war: A brief analysis of first two phases of war. *European Scientific Journal*, 20(11), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n11p1>
- Humanitarian Situation Update 226 | Gaza Strip. (2024, October 4). OCHA. Accessed October 29, 2024, from <https://tinyurl.com/yrkwy5ar>
- Mammadov, A. (2024). Opinion – Five scenarios for the war in Ukraine under a Trump presidency. *E-International Relations*. <https://www.e-ir.info/>
- O’Hanlon, M. E., Rocha, A., Roehse, S., & Yadwad, M. (2024). *What next on the war in Ukraine?* Brookings Institution.
- Pew Research Center. (2024). *How Americans and Israelis view one another and the U.S. role in the Israel-Hamas war*. Pew Research Center.
- Silver, L., & Smerkovich, M. (2024). *Assessing the future in light of the war*. Pew Research Center.
- Lerche, C. O. III. (1998). *The conflicts of globalization*. The International Journal of Peace Studies. Retrieved from https://www3.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol3_1/learch.htm
- UNHCR. (2024). *Regional flash update 7: Syria situation crisis*. <https://www.unhcr.org>
- UNHCR. (2024). *Syria situation*. Global Focus. <https://www.unhcr.org>
- United Nations. (2023). As geopolitical tensions escalate, United Nations, regional organizations must strengthen cooperation, preventive diplomacy, speakers tell Security Council. *United Nations Meetings Coverage and Press Releases*. <https://press.un.org/en/2023/sc14548.doc.htm>