When this occurs, other theories have to be brought in to provide more precise explanations. Social scientists have learned to be more realistic in their expectations of the effects of their theories. Offensive realism, a recent theory that attempts to explain the history of modern international relations as a single process, is now being questioned. It has been argued that the main assumption of offensive realism is that democracies cannot afford to tolerate each other—otherwise, they will be encouraged to attack the non-democracies. This is a flawed assumption, as it overlooks the fact that democracies have many other tools at their disposal to achieve their goals. The authors of the book have been criticized for their reliance on a single explanation for the behavior of states in international relations. The authors respond that their theory is not a monolithic explanation, but rather a framework for understanding the behavior of states in international relations. They argue that their theory is not an exhaustive explanation, but rather a way of thinking about the behavior of states in international relations. The authors also argue that their theory is not a deterministic explanation, but rather a way of understanding the behavior of states in international relations. They argue that their theory is not a predictive explanation, but rather a way of understanding the behavior of states in international relations.

6)	Why

7)	What explains the commitment of American troops to Europe and Northeast Asia in the late 1940s and early 1950s?