

Lecture 4
7 October 2010
Copyright: Ronald B. Mitchell, 2010

- I. Introduction
 - A. Continue any uncompleted portion of realism lecture from Tuesday's class
 - B. Review Security Dilemma spiral
- II. Structural realism of Waltz:
 - A. Structure vs. unit level of analysis. Explaining conflict requires attention to international level factors, not state-level or human-level factors. Structure is the arrangement of the parts of a system.
 - B. Basic point: Structure forms wedge between intentions and outcomes.
 - 1. In PD, structure is caused by rules of prosecuting attorney; in international relations, structure is caused by anarchy of international system. In both cases, these structures prevent actors from getting what they want to get.
 - 2. Two factors of concern to Waltz:
 - a) Ordering principle: Anarchy/self-help. Waltz focuses on self-help nature of system. In absence of government, within system with no constraints on use of force, actors must rely on selves for protection and security.
 - b) Relative capabilities = distribution of power.
 - c) All states must undertake same tasks of providing for survival and protection from attack. No state wants to do that, but system's structure forces them to.
 - 3. Structure, not characteristics of states, dictates outcomes. Structure limits cooperation and specialization/interdependence that flow from cooperation in 2 ways:
 - a) Absence of government to protect against attack from others --> self-help system --> concern for survival --> relative gains concern --> failure to choose to cooperate --> little interdependence. In short, self-help leads states to care more about ensuring survival than about increasing social welfare.
 - b) Worried about dependence directly. State worries about interdependence because the other state may take advantage of it.
 - 4. Concern with relative gains rather than absolute gains says Grieco. A hypothetical example from trade demonstrating why there won't be a trade agreement

| | Country A | Country B |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| No trade | 100M GDP | 100M GDP |
| Trade agreement (year 1) | 120M GDP | 130M GDP |
| Trade pact (year 2) | 110M GDP + 100 tanks | 110M GDP + 200 tanks |
| War by B on A (year 3) | | |
| Trade pact (year 4) | 0M GDP + 0 tanks | 220M GDP + 100 tanks |

- 5. The main goal of states is to stay in the game. They are "positional" not "atomistic" -- i.e., they are concerned with relative gains (gains relative to other states) not absolute gains (gains relative to their own position in the previous time period).
- C. Anarchic, self-help nature of international system forces all states to seek power as means of preserving sovereignty and surviving. Regardless of cultural, moral, social or ethnic differences states seek their own survival, see force as useful and effective, and that international system does not impose constraints on use of force other than those imposed by unequal power. Thus, a state need only worry about accurately calculating whether, given the current distribution of power in the international system and its power relative to its opponent, the use of force will increase its power and likelihood of survival or decrease it.
 - 1. Nature of structural argument: why different actors with different motives, different characteristics and otherwise different nonetheless forced to behave the same. Elections and changes in leaders don't make a difference.
 - 2. Different than Thucydides/Morgenthau's argument based in human nature. Morgenthau declares that realism believes that international politics "is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature" (1993, 4). What would Waltz's response to this be, even though both are realists?
 - 3. Good because simple theory. Realism has parsimony or is parsimonious. Ockham's razor: The simpler of two competing theories is preferable. Simple but works pretty well: E.g., Clinton's defense budget not much different from Bush's; Benazir Bhutto continues nuclear program.
- D. Structure as a wedge between intentions and outcomes

1. Positive example of how structure can be a wedge: Bill Gates and hardware manufacturers examples.
 2. Negative examples: Fire in movie theater; Yosemite Valley hiking - no rules regarding who can go; Tobacco advertising story; whaling example; war.
 3. Intentions do not lead to desired outcomes because of structure of system. Note that this is different than saying that we don't always get what we want in the world. Its saying that we don't even come close to getting what we want because structure prevents us from doing so.
- III. Implications of realist theory for outcomes we will observe in IR.
- A. No cooperation, only strategic interaction, that sometimes is harmony of power and interests. Lots of other forms of interaction, but don't determine outcomes like power and interests do. Simple theory that explains a lot with a little. Realists concerned with the 80% puzzle of why always seeing conflict.
 - B. Three types of state interaction
 1. Conflict: independent decision-making produces bad outcomes
 2. Harmony: independent decision-making produces good outcomes. "a situation in which actors' policies (pursued in their own self-interests without regard to others) automatically facilitate the attainment of others' objectives" (Keohane, After Hegemony, 1986, 200-201)
 3. Cooperation: interdependent decision-making produces good outcomes. " when the policies followed by one government are regarded by its partners as facilitating realization of their own objectives, as the result of a process of policy coordination" (1986:199).
 - C. From realist perspective, when will we see international cooperation and international treaties? Treaties/regimes will arise, but only in the following circumstances:
 1. When put in writing or "codify" existing behavior or expected future behavior; nuclear weapons on seabed.
 2. When hegemonic state forces/induces other states to cooperate: Warsaw Pact.
 3. When resolving coordination games with few distributional effects: navigation and airplane traffic; diplomatic immunity.
- IV. Realism summarized
- A. Power and interests, not ideals and norms, determine international outcomes.
 - B. Structure, not intentions or desires, matter
 - C. Review of major tenets: Power And Interests Determine Outcomes In International Relations. Implication is that international institutions and international organizations have little effect on behavior and outcomes in real world.
 1. Focus: conflict. Notice this is puzzle realists are trying to explain.
 2. Actors: states are primary actors who act as unitary rational actors
 3. Goal: survival and power; therefore zero-sum gain concern with relative gains
 4. Organizing principle: anarchy, self-help
 5. Means: force is usable, effective and fungible.
 6. Dynamics of system: acquisition and balancing of power
 - D. Elegant theory that explains 80% or so of what happens in the world with reference to only two things: power and interests. Simple model for 80% is better than complex model for 90%. Stock market example.
 - E. Realists not cold and callous to moral concerns or inattentive to horrors of war. Rather, if war is due to forces inherent in human nature and the international system, then "to improve the world one must work with those forces, not against them." May disagree with this view, but important to understand it.