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Overall, there is no empirical evidence to support the ultimate hypothesis that the less trust exists (i. e. more treaties) the more conflict between parties will be evidenced. The reason why the hypothesis is un-useable is due to several facts. First, there is a missing and lurking variable that has to be incorporated. For example, according to the model on page 7, the two factors that result from distrust, fear and security, are the cause for the conflict to exist; however, these were not included in the hypothesis or the measurements. Indeed, the focus was mainly on the independent variable; which is the treaty and the dependent variable, which is the conflict. The time span between the years 1975 and 2011 that were chosen for the cases is another reason for the hypothesis to be un-valid. In fact, if the time period that was chosen were longer, it might affect the result positively or negatively. The third reason is that the independent variable, which is trust, was recognized as the number of treaties. In fact, if trust was identified as the number of parties then this proves that the hypothesis is valid and that there is a positive relationship between the number of parties and the number of conflicts. In other words, the hypothesis will be the less trust (the more parties) the more conflict. Furthermore, the reason why there was no relationship between treaties and conflict is due to the theoretical weaknesses associated with the argument of Machiavelli; as he claims that countries should not trust each other. Instead, countries should focus on increasing their military power and security to protect their state. Also Machiavelli believes that the more power a state has the better1. Indeed, if two parties do not trust each other and had a conflict then both countries will be less secured and powerless as each party will lose many of their citizens and damage their properties during the armed conflict. Thus, this shows that the hypothesis is weak because it contradicts itself. To illustrate, if there are two parties that did not trust each other and both increased their security and military power and were involved in an armed conflict with each other, then it is possible that both parties will lose power after the conflict because many of the many resources which will be wasted during the conflict. In fact, the longer the conflict the more power will be lost and the less likely that any party will gain any additional power. However, if there is trust between any two parties, then parties will benefit one another by sharing resources. Since each party depends on the other party then both will try to provide protection for each other as a means of continuing the symbiotic relationship. Moreover, the more trust between parties the less conflict and the more power and benefits will be gained by both parties; whereas when there is less trust, more conflict will exist and both parties will lose power and resources instead of gaining. Other views When it comes to others views, peace treaties are often seen as a sign of trust and respect between two ore more parties. The United Nation strongly supports having peace treaties singed between all countries in the world. Indeed, the United Nation Department of Political Affairs created the peacemaker database; this database includes 750 documents that are viewed as peace agreement and other related material to peace. According to the United Nations, the definition of a peace treaty can include different issues such as women and gender, children, law of labor and other materials2. Indeed, signing peace treaties does not mean conflict between two parties will disappear forever. Many countries such as Israel and Palestine signed peace treaties; however, conflict and violence attacks between the two parties still exist. 3 However, other countries such North Korea and South Korea have peace treaties between each other; yet there were not signed. As such, the conflict between the two parties still exists. 4 This means that conflict can still exist between any two parties whether there is a treaty or not. In addition, according to the article “ A history of the language of friendship in international treaties”, the reader is understands that treaties signed between countries can include different meanings. For example, peace treaties are signed between countries to solve their conflicts and create peace between the two parties but it does not mean that the two countries are friends. On the other hand, friendship treaties are signed between countries to show their trust in the other party when it comes to sharing resources with each other. 5 Thus, it is possible for conflict to exist after signing a peace treaty. Conclusion With various opinions about treaties and if it is an indication of trust or not most resources such as the UN and a variety of NGOs view treaties as important and as an indication that there is trust between any two parties or more. Furthermore, by using the two methods, the single linear regression and the multi linear regression proves that the hypothesis is invalid and there is no relationship between the existence of treaties and conflict. Indeed, the multi regression method provides another new hypothesis to explore in the future, which is that the more parties that exist, the more conflict is exhibited.