

Classical realism and neo- realism

[History](#)



Realism and Neo-realism Explanation of Causes of War of Realism and Neo-realism Explanation of Causes of War

A number of theories have been given recognition in the international relations to create understanding of political concepts. The purpose of the international relations among countries is to provide peace dialogue opportunities in order to settle issues without ending up in wars. World War I and II taught a lesson to the states and resulted in establishment of different settlements based upon theories such as realism and neo-realism. The aim of this paper is to analyze different causes of war in the light of political or international relations theories. This will help in formulating ideals regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the theories in explaining the causes of war.

Realism is basically a dimension to look at the relations between different states being insecure and constantly gaining power. In other words, it could be said that under the study of realism, states remain in state of war to exercise their power to get more privilege than other states of the world. As studied by Hans Morgenthau, all states seek power that makes them to remain in a state craft. It is the strength of realism in explaining the war that it defines the phenomenon of politics in a sole larger aspect of international system. Realism posits that it is mainly because there is no supreme authority above the states that would allow rules and policies for them to follow to restrain international relations with other states. It is because of the insecurity among states that leads to war. Realism falls short in explaining the causes of war in terms of international system being categorized in different polarity. This weakness has been addressed in theories which were coined later (Evera 1999).

<https://assignbuster.com/classical-realism-and-neo-realism/>

On the other hand, neo-realism (also referred to as structural realism) refers to the causes of war being as the result of polarity of international system. This states that international systems being categorized in bipolar and multi-polar systems have different degree of probability for being at war. Under this position, multi-polar international system which is basically formed with the inclusion of more than two countries is safer and less likely to result in a war. This is merely because the bipolar international system including two states and allies will have more economic and political interaction. An example to prove such a premise is cold war in which communist states shared same ideologies as USSR and democratic states defended the ideologies of US. But it should be noted that some of the neo-realists believe that multi-polar international system is more likely to end up in war circumstances because of the involvement of many states and misjudgment of intentions towards each other. Notably, the weaknesses of neo-realism are evident from its assumption that is noted as a reverse of its own theory (Evera 1999).

Through the above understanding of causes of war through the lens of realism and neo-realism, it can be stated that states remain in state of war because of the insecurity. The further classification of international system also allows understanding of the intensity of risk of being at war which is fairly a lacking point of realism being governed by neo-realism.

List of References

Evera, S., 1999. *Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict*. New York: Cornell University Press.