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1. The international theory that best explains the Iraq War and Marshall Plan is theory of Realism. This theory suggests that war is most likely to occur because humans have self interest. War is unavoidable according to realism because states are selfish that act for their interest. Marxists believed that wealthy states can wage war because they are acting selfishly. Iraq War is best explained by realism that is based on the assumption that ‘states are the only political actors’ (Lieberfeld, 2005). It is also believed that no rules are applicable on international realm. Second prominent assumption states that ‘politics is driven by law of human behavior’ (Deudney & Ikenberry, 2017). This means human nature has significant impact on war. States are hungry for power and are motivated by self-interest. Politics in the world is the struggle for power and survival. The decision of US President Bush to wage war confirms the assumptions of realism. When America perceived threats from Iraq to their national security the leaders decided to act violently. According to realists Bush’s decision reflects his realist intentions because he was convinced that the survival of America was dependent on destabilizing Iraq.

Marshall Plan was the effective program presented in Cold War that focused on economic recovery and stabilization. Theory of liberalism best explains Marshal Plan because America offered billion dollars aid for the recovery of European economy. Europe faced devastation after World War II and conditions of survival were minimal. American leaders were convinced that Soviet Union would succeed in spreading communism if European economy fails. Therefore offering aid for economic recovery was essential. Theory of liberalism assumes that states could work together and negotiate for avoiding conflict. The role of America in Marshall Plan was formulated under liberal mindset (Deudney & Ikenberry, 2017). Liberal theorists emphasize on International Corporation for avoiding conflict. According to this theory war will have negative implications for both countries. It is a rational decision to avoid war by negotiating with other countries. Liberals also believe that institutions play central role on eliminating conflicting situations. Financial aid reflect America’s decision of building state-to-state interactions. The role of American state in Marshall Plan was to promote peace and stability.

1. I think different theories explain the events of Iraq War and Marshall Plan. Realism best explains Iraq War 2003 because American President Bush was motivated by self-interest. This war remained controversial and also known as war of self-interest. Bush didn’t waited for UN resolution and waged war without receiving support from UN. This reflects America acted selfishly and was not interested in setting conflicts. Radical use of military force, resources and reflected realist intentions. America was unwilling to negotiate with Iraq that reveals its aggressive nature (Deudney & Ikenberry, 2017). Realism believes that humans are aggressive and selfish in nature who are motivated to gain benefit. America neglected the repercussions of war on Iraq as it caused deaths of innocent and large-scale destructions.

I believe that theory of liberalism justifies the role of American state in Marshal Plan. Economic destruction in Europe strengthened Soviet Union and paved way for them to promote communism (Lieberfeld, 2005). America was against communism and perceived that by cooperating with European countries it could seek advantage in future. Theory of liberalism assumes that by cooperating both nations receive some benefit. By offering aid to Europe, US managed to help it economic recovery. America managed to become more powerful by aligning with European countries rather than reacting aggressively to Soviet Union.
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