

# Theories

[History](#)



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

1. There are a number of efforts and treaties in place to stop the proliferation of nuclear warheads. The most important treaty is the Nuclear non-Proliferation Treaty, to which almost every country in the world is a signatory. This treaty essentially states that each signatory will not allow or encourage the spread of weapons to territories that currently do not have them, nor seek to develop weapons. The issue with this treaty is that it is fairly easy for countries to avoid it: they simply do not have to sign it. None of India, Pakistan or Israel has signed it, and each are developing increasing nuclear capabilities.

2. Neo-Realists would not buy in to the idea that treaties or other laws could actually do a great deal to control the spread of nuclear weapons. Neo-realism essentially states that there are states that succeed and states that fail based on their behavior, and that a state will do whatever it can to survive, often emulating successful states. As nuclear weapons can be seen as an impregnable defense against invasion, as one could always use it to utterly dismantle an invading country as a last result, countries will obviously seek this course. There is very little incentive to abide by international law, and a great incentive to fail to do so (or simply opt out).

3. Liberals pay much greater attention to the economic side of things than other political theorists, basing a great deal of weight of international relations on what happens economically. A liberal would argue that the best way to assure a lasting peace is twofold: to promote economic development in countries to give them fewer reasons to go to war or have strife, and to create stronger international trade agreements, because countries that are close trading partners both stand to suffer a great deal should they go to war with each other.

4. This article demonstrates that terrorism is largely in the eyes of the beholder. The tactics that he has supposedly undertaken, if allegations are to be believed, would certainly constitute terrorism in almost anyone's mind: he killed civilians with a tube of toothpaste. Yet, he was also a CIA operative. This makes one think that many of the terrorists in Iraq and Afghanistan might be considered freedom fighters if one were to shift one's perspective slightly. This shows that terrorism can be very subjective in nature.

5. A realist would believe that emerging economies have a chance at creating world peace, because the more stable a country is the less likely it is to engage in armed violence. A liberal would likely agree, because they see the emergence of economies as essentially linked to free trade policies and a lack of economic interference by the government. Thus they would argue that developing economies, by fostering greater trade relations with foreign countries and stabilizing their own internal politics, would be less likely to be either the victim or the perpetrator of international violence, as they have significant amounts to lose.