IR 207 Introduction to IR

Lecture Notes

What are International Relations?

The world is a stage and all the men and women merely players

The Actors:

States

International Organizations

Non- Governmental Organizations

Multi -National Corporations

What is the biggest problem with world politics?

Anarchical International System

One in which there is no central authority to set and enforce rules and resolve disputes

This remains the main thrust of world politics. But increasingly there is an alternative approach in evidence

Traditional System (Westphalian) versus Globalization (Post-Westphalian)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Dimension | Westphalian | PostWestphalian |
| Human Organization | National societies | Global society |
| Interests | Self-interests | Mutual/Global Interests |
| Interaction | Competition | Cooperation |
| Basis of Safety | Self-Protection | Collective security |
| Problem prosperity | Self-Help | Mutual Assistance |
| Ultimate Authority | Sovereign States | International Organization |
| Dispute Resolution | Power Prevails | Law Prevails |

Is Post-Westphalian System Possible?

Question: Is this new alternative system possible?

Think of the individual n a society and how we interact

There is a sense of common good in a domestic society

A century ago the UN, the WTO, the EU, the ICC would have been considered science fiction!

Questions to look at:

Q1: How many countries are there in the world?

Q2: Are all countries equal?

Q3: What are the 3 biggest MNCs and their earnings?

Q4: Name 3 people who have changed the way we look at the world and Why?

What is a state?

Country=State

Sovereign

The monopoly on the use of legitimate force within a territory

A state is the sovereign entity of a territory

What is Sovereignty?

Sovereign entities are not supposed to meddle in the internal affairs of other sovereign entities.

This is mostly true today but was not always the case.

A trivial Analogy- Parents and children and Kingdom A and B

Where did all start?

→Treaty of Westphalia \*Signed in 1648

→Ended the 30 yrs War

→Established the principle of sovereignty

What does it mean then?

Definition: the monopoly on the legitimate use of force within a territory

Dispute Resolution between two or more sub-state actors occurs through the sovereign states

Sovereigns are expected to ensure their sub-state actors do not use force against foreign actors

Sovereign states control their own domestic affairs

Sovereign states do not meddle with internal affairs in other states.

→But states violate this rule all the time!

→US incursion into Pakistan to kill Bin Ladin

→US in Libya

→Russia protecting South Ossetia from Georgia

Violating the Sovereign Rule

Why do states violate the sovereign rule?

→Strong actors can violate sovereignty and get away with it

→They can do this because there is no punishment

→Why is there no punishment? Anarchy?

What is Anarchy?

Who is sovereign over the sovereigns?

→No one!

Domestic analogy: In a state

→A man kills his neigh our

→A bank robber steals millions in gold

Solution?

→The police come take care of it- provided there is strong domestic policy

In weak systems this might not be true

→A mafia boss kills a rival

→A drug lord assassinates a rival cartel leader

→The local police is too weak to handle this situation

At the International Level; Violations of Sovereignty

No one comes to arrest:

→US going into Pakistan

→NATO going into Libya

→USSR in Afghanistan

→USA in Iraq

Life in International Relations is closer to the Mafia world

World Police (UN ad-hoc military force) is either too weak or non-existent to bring justice.

Anarchy

Definition The Lack of overall political Authority

In international relations, no one is sovereign over the sovereign

Anarchy is a world of self-help

→Solve it on your own

→Convince a friend to come and help you

→The government is not going to come to your rescue

Anarchy is Not chaos

→Most states are not fighting

→Anarchy permits many different outcomes

IR Challenge

If anything can happen, how do we predict or explain outcomes?

→Anarchy is a trivial explanation-explains everything and nothing

→We need more precise predictions and explanations

Thinking About World Politics Strategically

Two types of explanations:

Proximate cause: Why did this happen the way it happened?

Underlying cause: why was this thing asking to happen?

We prefer underlying cause to proximate cause because:

→Proximate gives us silly policy ideas

→Underlying cause tells us how o solve the problem

Car Accident Analogy

Proximate cause: the driver died because he went through the wind shield of his vehicle

What we have learnt: Do not fly through the wind shield of your vehicle. Do not get into car accidents

Underlying Cause: the driver died because he was not wearing his seatbelt.

What we have learnt: Wear your seat belt

Cause of World War 1

Proximate Cause; ●Underlying Cause;

Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated Military tech. gave countries a huge 1st strike advantage

What we have learnt? ●What we have learnt?

Do not let assassinations of dukes 1st strike advantages causes war. Build defensive weapons not offensive

Causes of World War 11

●Proximate causes; ●Underlying Cause;

Hitler was a bad person Reparations from WW1 bankrupted Germany, allowing domestic institutions to fail

●What we have learnt? ●What we have learnt?

Let all aspiring Artists into art school Be magnanimous in victory

The Lesson

●Proximate causes are shortsighted

Discovering underlying causes allows us to connect dissimilar situations and make sensible recommendations

Question: Can Hitler rise again?

Watch the 2008 German Film “Die Welle” (The Wave) and analyze the conditions that lead to an autocratic set up in a nation state? Do you think that it is possible that it might happen in the world again?

How can we predict outcomes?

The International realm is anarchic so how can we predict what’s going to happen? How can we narrow down our expectations?

Solution: analyze actor’s abilities and desires and find plausible outcomes…

We need to develop tools of strategy to understand how the international world works

Narrow down and eliminate

The strategic World

States are strategically inter-dependent (how state 1 acts affects state’s 2 outcome and vice versa)

States know they are so

→Intelligence is power

→US spends so much money on intelligence. Why?

Is there a way to scientifically study strategic interdependence?

→Game theory

Originally developed in the 1950s by Neuman and Nash to study economic interactions

Applies very well to state level behavior

→Create some assumptions using research

→Conduct some analysis of those assumptions

→Reach logically valid conclusions

Cooperation vs Competition

Big Question:

→Under what conditions can two parties play nice with one another?

→Remember there is no authority figure!

Incentive to cheat

→Example: Your roommate leaves 2000TL outside

Disincentive to cheat- consequences

→If you steal the money you go to jail

But in the international world…

→Anarchy- no world police

→No laws forcing two states to play nice

Is cooperation under these circumstances?

How can individually rational behavior lead to collectively bad outcomes for all?

Can the shadow of future interaction induce two states to play nice with one another?

 →No if we know when the period of play ends

 →Yes if we do not know when the period of play ends

Prisoner’s Dilemma

The situation

2 students caught by the Dean

→The Dean thinks they were both smoking

→But the Dean can only smell smoke, he cannot prove it

Thus the Dean needs one of them to rat out the other

The Deal

If one confesses to the smoking, the Dean can only punish them for being out late

 →Punishment- Dorm pounding

If one confesses and the other does not

 →The confessor gets off

 →The other one gets expelled

If both confess

 →Both gets suspended

Imagine that they are working in their best interest

How will they react?

Nash equilibrium is for both to confess even though it socially the worst possible outcome

Applications in IR

Cult of offensive and the origins of WW1

Tariffs and free trade policy

Arms races and arms treaties

The evolution of cooperation

What about war?

Why do states fight costly wars?

Analogy

A man falls over a wet floor and sues you for negligence

Your lawyer and his lawyer agree on the following:

→There is 60% chance of the lawsuit will be successful.

→If he wins you have to pay him 40,000tl

→Going to court will cost you each of you 10,000tl in fees regardless of outcome

Possible Resolutions:

Either you or him concede immediately

→Your payoffs: 40,000

→His payoffs: 0

You reach an out of court settlement

→A settlement of less than 34,000 is better for you

→A settlement of more than 14,000 is better for him

You let the court decide the matter

→Your payoffs: (-40,000) (0.6)-10,000= 34,000

→His pay offs: (40,000) (0.6)-10,000= 14,000

How should we expect the matter to be resolved?

This is just like War

War produces a winner and a loser- unless the power is much skewed, probabilistic.

Fighting is costly because it kills people and destroys things

So why can’t two state settle the matter of the battlefield?

Rationalist’s Explanation

 Outline of the Rationality of War

Part 1: The research question Part2: The Answers

 Assumptions Preventive War

 War’s Inefficiency Puzzle Issue Indivisibility

 Preventive War

The Unitary Actor Assumption

Big Question: Can two perfectly intelligent, perfectly unbiased leaders fight a war against each other?

Assume that states are a single entity and their leader is only interested in maximizing the overall welfare of the state

→Is this always true? No

→Is this true some of the time? May be

Leaders often justify wars using the unitary actor assumption

Things you will never hear a leader say

I really suck at running our domestic economy. Everything is terrible so I will start a war to distract you from that. You will see I am a war hero and then you will reelect me

The media is too involved in a scandal about an intern and me so I am going to bomb some country in Africa that you have never heard of to distract them

What do you usually hear?

This war is in the best interest of our national security

Fight them there so you do not have to fight them at home

We have a moral obligation to intervene

Stabilizing the region will secure our economic interests

→It is about we not me

Justifying the unitary actor

The unitary actor assumption allows us to analyze the validity of these assumptions

The war dynamics we will discuss also affect sates that are not unitary actors

War’s Inefficiency Puzzle: Can wars be mutually beneficial?

Why do states sometimes choose to resolve their differences through the inefficient means of war when bargaining in theory leaves both parties better off.

→May be the assumptions are not agreeable. May be there is a mathematical quirk to the numbers?

Think about the The Syrian Crisis:

Using your understanding of the recent Syrian situation, and what we have learnt about the rationality for war, argue a case for President Obama requesting the Congress to approve military action against Syria.

Types of War

Preemptive

Preventative

War from misinformation

Preventive War

To prevent a shift in the balance of power

A war to prevent an inevitable war

→Self fulfilling expectations

Examples

→Pearl Harbour

→The 1967 6 Day War

→The 2003 Gulf War 11

The Legality of Preventive War

Preventive War without the permission of the UN is illegal.

→The Bush Doctrine declared that these expectations are unrealistic

Pursing Security

A hypothetical situation

→Consider two tribes Og and Ug

→Og has game, and Ug does not

→What happens?

Causes of War: 3 Levels of analysis

System Level of Causes

→The distribution of power

→The anarchical nature of the system

→System level economic factors

→System level biosphere stress

State level Causes of War

→Militarism

→Externalization of Internal Conflict

Individual Level Causes of War

→Human characteristics

→Individual Leader’s Characteristics

Theories: Development of political theory from the medieval times

Realism

Realist- a zero sum game.

Classic and Neo Realism→Difference in root of conflict

→Inherent distrust v. anarchy

→No place for morality or ideology in foreign policy

Realism- emphasis on power

→Secure your own country’s interest

→Establish a balance of power

→Peace through strength

→Do not waste power on peripheral goals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Human Nature●Pessimistic, self interest, competitive | International System●Anarchic |
| Core Concepts●Power, conflict | Cause of conlict●Pursing Self interest |
| Reality●Largely objective | Best Path to Peace●Balance of Power |
| Political states●Zero-sum | Key Organizations●States |
| Conflict in System●Central and inevitable | MoralityNone |

Liberalism

* People and countries are capable o finding mutual interests and cooperating to achieve them by working through and with international organizations and international law.

Liberalism v. Realism

* Liberals reject the realists’ contention that politics is inherently and exclusively a struggle for power.
* Unlike realists, for liberals morality plays a large role in the play for power.
* Altruism is a weapon for realists.
* Non zero sum game.

Classical and Neo Liberalism

* Classical is direct descendant of idealism
* Unlike realists, classical liberals are optimistic about human nature

→Jean Jacques Rousseau- the Social Contract

Humans join together in society because it is easier to survive.

* Neoliberalism developed in the 1970s and 80s.
* Competiton between states in the anarchic world causes conflict- parallel to Neorealism
* However, unlike Neorealists, Neoliberals believe in a complex interdependency of states in the anarchic world which may help to promote internationalism.

Liberalism- Emphasis on cooperation

* Cooperation does not mean that they are unwilling to use military power.
* However, place emphasis of legitimacy on the UN and IGOs.
* Surrender some sovereignty to improve themselves

→European Union

Post Modernism

* “There is nothing good or bad, but thinking makes it so”- Hamlet
* Political realities are mind sets.
* Politics is driven by class warfare- Marx and Engels
* ….or by structures such as states and organized religion- Feminists
* States are held together by means of force for the structure, not the people.