August 27th, 2013:

- Anarchy refers to the fact that there is no world government, we exist in sovereign states. Anarchy is not chaos. In a world of sovereign states, there is no real higher power that must be answered to – there is no higher law than the law of your land.
  - Distinctive feature of international relations: hierarchy versus anarchy.
- Can anarchy be overcome? How can you obtain power when there is no universal authoritative power? What are the implications of anarchy?
  - Some authors argue that anarchy is not inevitable, and that it is an imagined condition. Some authors believe that power can be tamed, while others say that power is the coin of the realm – it needs to be taken seriously.
- In anarchy, Syria, and thereby Assad, can do whatever they want to with their country and their citizens. This includes a strong presumption of noninterference with other countries and their actions.
  - Is US more responsible for upholding the system of sovereign states (anarchy), or rather for the intervention and protection of Syrian citizens targeted by chemical weapons? Is the US **more responsible** to protect the citizens of Syria?
- **R2P:** responsibility to protect. According to R2P we would need to respond to the situation in Syria.
- Interference in world affairs is not always seen as justified by other sovereign states. What is a legitimate use of force? This is an issue of living in an anarchic world. What are the implications of interfering in other state affairs? Sovereignty and Anarchy.
  - Does our responsibility lie with the system of states or with the people?

August 29th, 2013: Anarchy and Power

- Anarchy in international affairs refers to the simple fact that there is no world government. In a world of sovereign states, there is no agency that exists above individual states to make laws or to settle disputes.
  - Realists argue that international institutions – such as the EU, the Hague accord, etc. are not effective in governing. States are all about power, not interested in completely following laws above them.
- All states are equally sovereign, every state is in the United Nations, and each state in the UN gets one vote each. However, all states are not equally capable, are not equally powerful, and are not equally autonomous.
- **Thucydides and the Security Dilemma:** Thucydides concluded that it was the growth of the Athenian power and the fear that this generated and the uncertainty that is generated on the part of Sparta made war inevitable.
  - Sparta was afraid that Athens was growing more quickly and more powerful than Sparta. So Sparta launched a preventive war to stop Athens from getting more power.
  - **Thucydides point in the Melian Dialogue:** Power reigns supreme in international relations. Changes in relative power positions amongst states can cause war. Sometimes power positions can trigger war because some states can start preventive wars to stop other states from becoming too powerful.
  - “The strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they must” – Thucydides, The Melian Dialogue.
  - International affairs are all about power – power politics idea in international affairs. Power politics is the core of realism.
- **The security dilemma:** Anarchy is a self-help system. States must provide for their own security, through either external or internal means.
  - Such as building up your military power, declaring your state neutral (Switzerland + building tunnels), these are internal ways of providing your own security. External ways of doing this is building alliances with other states.
Another factor involved in the security dilemma is **mutual dependence.** That means that no state can afford to disregard what other states are doing, such as what its own actions will have on other nations behavior, or what other states are doing to enhance their own security.

- Enhancing one’s security may make others feel threatened. Your security in contingent on the behavior of other states. This can lead to the spiral model of escalation.
- Action-reaction dynamic.

**The security dilemma:** states feel insecure so they arm themselves, but that makes their rivals feel insecure so their rivals arm themselves, which makes states feel insecure, etc. This could lead to an arms race. Are they just trying to secure their state? Or are they looking to engage in conquest? This is the action reaction dynamic.

In the spiral model, the security dilemma applies to both nuclear weapons and other weapons. The spiral model is used to describe the lead up to WWI. Under the spiral model, fear is the cause of war.

- In 1894, France + Russia allied their powers, because they were afraid of the German Empire. Then Britain began to get worried about Germany, because the Germans launched a shipping empire, which made Britain extremely nervous.
  - Germany was afraid of the rise of Russian power. Some German strategists were arguing that a war with Russia now would be easier than a war later on when Russia is stronger – this is a preemptive war. The balance of power was shifting in Russia’s favor, so they wanted to nip it in the bud.
- Germany did not expect Britain to get involved.

**The security dilemma** is that state actors cannot risk NOT reacting to security actions of other states. But in reacting they can produce circumstances that leave them worse off than before (such as in the Peloponnesian war).

- Wars can occur when no one wants them, and wars typically do occur when some state wants the war as well.

**Three Images Article:** what causes war? Man? The state? The international system?

- Is human nature good or bad? If people are corrupt or evil, etc. this can cause war according to some thinkers. Waltz doesn’t find the human nature argument particularly compelling.
  - Are there good regimes and bad regimes? Good states and bad states?
- Waltz is thought of as a founder of realism. Waltz conceptualized anarchy. His explanation for war is war happens because there is nothing to prevent it. Under conditions of anarchy, self-help and the security dilemma, there is no external force that will settle your dispute and prevent war. The anarchic condition causes war according to Waltz. The structure of the system is the permissive condition of war.

**Levels of analysis:** one level that Waltz doesn’t really consider is the transnational level.

**Causation: outside in? Inside out?** – Causation comes from the system down to the states according to Waltz. There will be a lot of functional similarity due to the anarchic condition, since they all need to secure their states. They all need to fulfill the same functions because anarchy exists.

- Sometimes what goes on domestically can be projected internationally. Sometimes important things can happen from the agency of one individual. The interaction of these different levels is the most intriguing part of international affairs according to professor.

**Many levels** – Al Qaeda is transnational. There are multicultural organizations, such as multinational corporations. These are important when looking at international affairs. Transnational, multinational, etc.

- You can think of states as billiard balls – you don’t crack balls open to see what is going on inside. States are functionally similar due to anarchy so this is not required.
- But then at the state level, nation-states are distinct entities, and the values, type of government, etc. is important at this level according to liberalism or the democratic peace theory.

Mature democracies tend to not go to war with one another, so if we open up these “balls” and analyze them we can understand why.

- Look at the system of government, the arrangement of their bureaucracy, state society relationships (how much voice does society get in the process of the country, who has a lot of this voice, etc.), military and civilian relations (US should reinstate the military draft according to some theorists // otherwise the military is so distant from civilian lives)
  - These factors could be referred to as the “black box”.

- These factors could be referred to as the “black box”.
October 4th Section:
- Given strong evidence supporting the security model as an explanation for the build-up of nuclear weapons, why then does the nuclear nonproliferation treaty generally work?
  - Swaggering potentially in North Korea. Plus North Korea is using their nuclear weapons program as a bargaining chip to get foreign aid.
- Hegemon Dilemma: one of the major theories for economic trade. To promote international trade, a hegemon is necessary. A hegemon is the only thing that can create a stable economic order. The decline of the hegemon leads to the decline of the international free market system.
  - Uses Britain in the 1800s as an example. Hegemons cannot bring about liberal trade by themselves, other countries must agree to it.
- To have a free market a country must be financially and internally stable.
- Netherlands only country that didn’t change its policies.
- US after WWII became a hegemon and were supposed to bring about free trade internationally, but never did and instead pursued a more isolationist policy in regard to economics.
- Stein’s article: being a hegemon is economically beneficial. The problem with being the hegemon is that you provide collective good, and the problem with this is that it will lead eventually to your decline, as other states will free ride off you.
  - Over time the economic vitality of the hegemon will erode, which will lead a hegemon to becoming protectionist. The problem is that this will just further implement the hegemons decline. This relates to Gilpin article apparently.
- World Trade Organization: 150 members today.
- Stiglitz his view is that the playing field across developed and developing nations regarding economics is not equal.

October 10th Lecture: Financial Crises
- 1970s-1980s Oil Crisis and Petrodollars: what’s a petrodollar? A petrodollar refers to money that oil-producing countries earn by selling oil and the depositing of these dollars into international commercial banks.
  - In 1973 during the Yom Kippur War, there was the OPEC embargo that made it harder for the US to get oil and they did this to punish the United States for their involvement and help of the Israelis. Oil was very scarce during this period in the US.
- In 1979 there was another spike in oil prices during the Iran Revolution and the Iran-Iraq war. During this time the Gulf States were awash with petrodollars.
  - Developing countries and developed countries make oil payments, and the OPEC takes these dollar deposits from oil sales, and then this money is invested in international commercial banks, and then these banks use the money for loans for development projects to increase their own wealth.
    - Therefore the petrodollars are being recycled through the international system. The banks are motivated to get this money out there through loans so that they could make money off the interest of these loans.
- So developing countries started taking out loans from commercial banks for development projects. These countries ended up going into debt. Countries such as those in Latin America went on huge borrowing sprees, so then in 1980 Latin American debt went through the roof.
  - As a result, many of the developing countries said they weren’t able to pay the money back, so commercial banks stopped lending money.
    - To try and rescue the situation, developed countries gave loans to the Paris Club, IMF, and World Bank, and tried to negotiate with these institutions to try and negotiate how the debt crisis for Latin America could be solved. They agreed to financial rescues to lower the amount of debt. But this rescue was based on conditionality, so in order to get this rescue; you would have to do something in return as the developing country.
      - Washington consensus: raise taxes, privatization, liberalization, and cut spending. Washington believed if they followed these conditions that Latin America would be able to pay back some of its debt.
• Set out rigid criteria for humanitarian intervention: “strong identifiable national interest” and “clear exit strategy”.

• PDD25 crystalized growing resistance to humanitarian interventions, because of what happened in Somalia when 18 of our servicemen died.
  - Resistance widespread within US military, the administration, and on Capitol Hill.
  - With the strict language (“strong identifiable national interest” and “clear exit strategy”), it made it virtually impossible to launch the US military into this kind of adventure again in Rwanda.

• The role of the United Nations: many argue that the case of Rwanda shows the inability of the United Nations to act effectively. It restricted its interpretation of Chapter 6 on peacekeeping.
  - United Nations said the parties must agree to the intervention, there should be a ceasefire, and if the fighting breaks out the UN will do noting to attempt to stop it.

• Darfur: area affected by violence in Sudan. Darfur means land of the Fur people. In 2003, the Fur people finally rose up against years of harassment and marginalization by country’s Arab Muslim leadership and its proxies.
  - They didn’t want to overthrow the government, they wanted infrastructure, and they wanted basic structure that they felt the government should provide for.
    - They also wanted proceeds from oil wealth. The oil is where the people live in Darfur, yet they don’t even receive the proceeds. Oil in South Sudan, but money distributed to the north of Sudan.
  - They also wanted power sharing; they wanted their interests to be heard and their interests to be taken into account in Sudan. Not a radical request.

• So the government of Sudan organized and supplied the Janjaweed militia, because people in Darfur were questioning the government.
  - Documentary – “the devil came on horseback”. “In 2004 a ceasefire ended a 20 year civil war in Sudan.”

• In the case of Darfur, there were the Janjaweed who were nomadic Arab Muslims killing black Muslims.

• Genocide: Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide: signed by all members of the UN General Assembly in 1948. It doesn’t legally require states to intervene in genocide.
  - In July 2007, the UNSC passed a unanimous resolution, which was a joint UN/African Union peacekeeping force UNAMID.
    - It authorized 26,000 soldiers, but a year later less than 10,000 soldiers were actually deployed. The UN depends on countries volunteering their forces. Looked good on paper, but not in reality.

• UNAMID was trying to keep a peace that doesn’t exist, and the government did not want to uphold it. The Sudanese government did want them in. The violence and the location of Darfur make it difficult to operate in that area.

• South Sudan: the struggle for independence. They wanted to be independent of the North for a long time.
  - Problems post-independence from Britain in 1955. They wanted self-determination/minority rights. But the country overall was controlled by Arab-led government in the North.
  - Religion – Islamicization policy.
  - Resources – access to oil revenues.
  - Development grievances – infrastructure, wanting more representation in government as well.

• There have been decades of conflict with the North – 1.5 million died.

• Africa is much more intervention prone than anywhere else.

• In 2005 there was a peace agreement with the Sudanese People’s Liberation Army (SPLA), which ended the second civil war because there was a peace to keep.
  - UNMIS established UNRES 1590. Referendum held 9-15 January in 2011. In the referendum people in South Sudan could vote on whether they wanted to remain part of the government or secede from Sudan.
    - Referendum passes, 99% want independence. Yet violence persists. UN peacekeepers killed summer 2013.

• Republic of South Sudan gains independence on July 9th, 2011.
terrorist activities; the US does not have the resources to keep helping the have-nots. Allows for phenomena that individual governments do not have particular control over, such as the 2008 financial crisis.

- War on terrorism is best viewed on the international scale. Globalization Models: civil war within Islam (Palestinian-Israeli conflict), asymmetrical warfare (how much money we spend on military, and how this pisses off other countries).
- Number of myths that Cronin tries to knock down regarding terrorism: “Historical Patterns of Ending Terrorism”.
  - She doesn’t bring up the cultural sensitivity issue. We don’t really have any idea of what the culture on the ground is – exacerbated because we don’t speak the local language, etc. gives terrorists the opportunity to say that look the foreign invader doesn’t really know you, I’m your neighbor I understand more, etc.
    - “Stopping terrorism is hard,” “terrorism does end,” these are both myths covered by Cronin.
- When governments are unable to provide for certain services for its people, then terrorist groups can step in to provide these services. This allows locals to allow the terrorists to operate within their local communities just for a means of survival.
  - Such as Muslim Brotherhood providing services for Egyptians before they were elected into government.
- Cronin believes terrorism does end. The decapitation of a terrorist organization has been debunked – if you kill off the leader it has a higher chance of surviving longer.
- Success reduces the need for terrorism. Once terrorist groups succeed in attaining their goals, they will transition from being a non-state actor into being an actual state.
  - Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a great example of this. A lot of terrorist leaders have turned into state leaders in Israel. The Palestinians have yet to make this transition however.
- Terrorism is a politically charged word – it is a verb not a noun. Keep this in mind.
- There’s not a single religion that you can draw a causal link between that religion and suicidal terrorism. A lot of suicidal terrorist groups are secular groups and are not interested in religion, such as with the Tamil Tigers.
  - Religion allows you to mobilize support and cast the occupier as the “other” – Pape’s NY Times article. You can’t draw a causal link between religion and suicidal terrorism specifically according to Pape.
    - If you remove occupation, the incidence of suicide terrorism decreases dramatically, and increases dramatically as well when foreign occupation starts.
- Biddle: if the US withdraws from Iraq, it will lead to a religious war between the Sunnis and Shiites, and this will lead to a regional Sunni and Shia conflict.
- Pape believes the US occupies countries because we are hugely powerful and no one will stop us. This creates a blowback effect with terrorism.

**November 12th Lecture: Globalization**

- Why Thomas Friedman is a hack in terms of globalization. He wrote a book called “The World is Flat”. Professor Sell believes the idea that the world is flat is in fact wrong. Globalization is not an even process, and the oversimplification of globalization does more damage to what our understanding of its implications is in the world.
  - Thomas Friedman is also a hack because he is profoundly ahistorical – everything is about the now, and not the past. Michael Lang points out these problems in his piece.
- Realist approach to globalization: you think globalization is inevitable and that it is a good thing, one system of states or economy, to that the realists say 1914 – when the whole carnival was shut down over war. When it comes to security issues, all of this economic integration can be cut off in a heartbeat.
- Michael Lang’s argument shows that he is much more of a constructivist. He emphasizes the history, the dynamics, and the agency through which people were making choices. Changes in the world are much more driven by agency, i.e. People and their choices.
  - He is a constructivist because he argues that markets are social constructions, and state systems are social constructions. What’s happening today isn’t new or novel.
    - The problems of thinking of the Westphalia systems as considering them to be the best way to run the world.