

# The likeliness of liberal state and realism state survival

[Politics](#)



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

My personal definition of survival in this context is I believe to bring the highest possibility of peace to our world. Since the seventies, interstate wars are in decline, and overall we can state the world is heading towards a peaceful, stable future. Realists may say that it is due to the invention of Nuclear Weapons, while on the other hand, Liberalists may say its thanks to the establishment of international institutions.

Liberal perspective may claim that the rise of economic independence and international organisations triggered the increase in weapons, causing wars to be costly and undesirable for states. Throughout the past decades, expanding globalisation has only accelerated this trend resulting in wars to be unaffordable and irrational for a state economy. This created an awareness or realisation that a state can profit more from peaceful encounters rather than violent exchanges. However, Realists offer a alternate explanation, suggesting that the invention of Nuclear Weapons have greatly contributed to world peace. This is because of the prospect that a Nuclear launch is inescapable and the chaotic aftermath is an adequate punishment, a threat to prevent wars from breaking out in the first place. Take North Korea for example, despite the tension that was built up surrounding the issue, no real war took place as the idea of nuclear war frightens the actors in the issue. Overall, from these reasons the state more likely to survive international relation is the realists.

The reason being is that the idea of countries not causing wars because of limitation to their economy is petty and unreliable. It may be true that some wars between small, less economically developed countries can be prevented, countries with the capability to offer war may go against each

<https://assignbuster.com/the-likeliness-of-liberal-state-and-realism-state-survival/>

other. Realism can secure a more peaceful world through the use of threats notably more reliable and easy to achieve. It does not initiate any kind of violence, but just the possession of a killer weapon frightens the opponent countries, we can avert any further outbreak of wars.