

**Source:**

#flo #ret #disorganized #incomplete

**1 | Ope there goes gravity**

prompt:

\*\*

The political scientist Kenneth Waltz argues that the causes of war can be analyzed at three different

Analyze World War 1 according to one (or a blend) of these levels of analysis. Make an argument that co

\*\*

resources: GHMW Unit 4.pdf palmer reading <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1KTggTDz3YI7fT9MxwG4l25qMPNyiU>

levels of analysis:

- individual
- state
- systemic

example: put an egg in a highway, do you blame the car that chrushes it?

how do we think about inevitability?

relative usefullness of each one

how do they intersect? system provides inevitability, but is that emergent out of the qualities of the individual?

potential essay: top down, each one informs the next. simply map to analysis levels

claim: not actully three seperate levels? higher up levels cannot be generated without the previous?

systems need to account for randomness, which is inevitable. thus, higher level analysis?

the fact that ferdinand dying caused this meant that there was a higher level issue?

systems: random chance events will happen

was it a random chance event? was this the 'natural progression of things'?

or is the aproach, 'random chance events are inevitable (in a system with so many actors), thus the system must be set up for this? or it is part of the system?'

top down:

- because of this system, it was inevitable that a state would act out.
- lets look at this state. because of this state, it was inevitable that a person would act out
- lets look at that person
- discuss merits of different levels of analysis?

bottom up:

- this person did this, and that caused the war.

usefulness of analysis at different levels?

war is a local minima in the system

nukes have allowed us to jump peaks and reach a lower minima

warring state has incentive to bring allies into war

non warring states have incentive to ally with winning side and gain power with them, as well as prevent others from becoming too powerful – BOP dynamic from resan detant

this brings the entire system into war

as more actors join into the war, you MUST join the war. one side of the war will win, and massively gain power. you cannot stay at your old divided power level.

just as peace is an emergent property of raison detant (BOP), global war can be as well? easily “excitable” prisoners dilemma square, when tensions are high, best decision is to attack. also best decision to bring allies, and best decision for allies to join in. tragedy of the commons. war breaks out

OLD: aa => 1,1. da, ad => 0,3 3,0. dd => 2,2. || a NEW: aa, ad, da => 0,0. dd => 2,2. || d

system has changed, MAD has allowed us to jump peaks to a lower minima.

war only breaks out when tensions are high, otherwise you would just defend.

once tensions become high, war becomes inevitable, and can be triggered at the smallest event.

^^ goes in bp3

franz ferdinand died, and that caused the war. if that could cause the war, something was up.

germany caused the tensions which caused the war. but {transition}

system level game theory analysis

thesis ideas:

levels of analysis are useful at the level you can impact? doesn't work if higher level informs your level of impact...

causation is defined by what is useful?

potential outline:

start with small explanation: ferdinand and states || but were they really to blame? egg in street

systemic explanation

which requires tension

thesis: tension changed the local minima to global warfare

switch tension and system explanation?

everyone had huge armies, and they all took it for granted that a war was coming even though few wanted one pg. 1-2

“In the last years before 1914 the idea that war was bound to break out sooner or later probably made some statesmen, in some countries, more willing to unleash it.” is this because “it would happen anyways” or because “we want to be first”?

formed the triple alliance out of fear that the german empire would be torn to pieces in another european war

france formed their own alliance in response

britain and germany had a naval race

germans felt encircled by france and russia alliance even more concerned when france joined them

## 1.1 | Quote Bin

- Ferdinand and states
  - Ferdinand
    - On June 28, 1914, a young Bosnian revolutionary, a member of the Serbian secret society called "Union of Death" and commonly known as the Black Hand, acting with the knowledge of certain Serbian officials, assassinated the heir to the Habsburg empire, the Archduke Francis Ferdinand,
  - states
    - and above
    - The Germans, issuing their famous "blank check," encouraged the Austrians to be firm.
    - The Austrians, thus reassured, dispatched a drastic ultimatum to Serbia, demanding among other things that Austrian officials be permitted to collaborate in investigating and punishing the perpetrators of the assassination.
    - The Serbs counted on Russian support, even to the point of war, judging that Russia could not yield in a Balkan crisis, for the third time in six years, without losing its influence in the Balkans altogether.
    - The Russians in turn counted on France; and France, terrified at the possibility of being some day caught alone in a war with Germany and determined to keep Russia as an ally at any cost, in effect gave a blank check to Russia.
    - It has often been said that had the German government known as a positive fact that England would fight, the war might not have come. Hence the evasiveness of British policy is made a contributing cause of the war.
- tension and alliances
  - triple alliance
    - The Germans complained of being "encircled" by France and Russia. They dreaded the day when they might have to face a war on two fronts.
    - Bismarck after 1871 feared that in another European war his new German Empire might be torn to pieces. ... in 1879 he formed a military alliance with Austria-Hungary, to which Italy was added in 1882. Thus was formed the Triple Alliance,
  - triple entente
    - The French, faced by the Triple Alliance, soon seized the opportunity to form their own alliance with Russia
    - By 1907 England, France, and Russia were acting together. The older Triple Alliance faced a newer Triple Entente,
  - tension
    - that would arise in the future. Each power felt that it must stand by its allies whatever the specific issue. This was because all lived in the fear of war, of some nameless future war in which allies would be necessary.
    - Never had the European states maintained such huge armies in peacetime as at the beginning of the twentieth century. One, two, or even three years of compulsory military service for all young men became the rule. In 1914 each of the Continental Great Powers had not only a huge standing army but millions of trained reserves among the civilian population
    - The Germans, who already felt encircled by the alliance of France and Russia, naturally watched with concern the drift of England into the Franco-Russian camp.
    - Once united (or almost united), the Germans entered upon their industrial revolution. Manufacturing, finance, shipping, population grew phenomenally. By 1900, for example, Germany produced more steel than France and Britain combined,
- systemic

- “In the last years before 1914 the idea that war was bound to break out sooner or later probably made some statesmen, in some countries, **more willing to unleash it.**”
- Each power felt that it must stand by its allies whatever the specific issue.

## 1.2 | **Outline (finally (hopefully))**

THESIS: In a system of *raison d'état*, increase in tension and the formation of alliances shifted the local minima from peace to global warfare.

- Ferdinand and states
  - Ferdinand got assassinated by the black hand, this caused the war.
    - for Ferdinand getting assassinated to cause such a large scale war, larger factors must have been at play.
  - exactly what state caused what is heavily debated
    - it could have been the Germans, who attempted to destroy Serbia
    - could have been Serbia, who backed the black hand's assassination
    - the fact of the matter is, quote “In the last years before 1914 the idea was that war was bound to break out sooner or later.” and this wasn't due to one meddling state.
- tension and alliances
  - to better understand the true causes, we first must understand the situation.
  - alliances formed, tension formed
  - alliances:
    - formed the triple alliance
      - out of fear of a European war
    - formed the triple entente
      - scared the Germans even more
    - these alliances also contributed heavily to growing –
  - tension:
    - large armies,
    - naval race,
    - technological and economic growth
- systemic
  - BOP prisoners dilemma reward square is 0,0 for the AD scenario
    - once you have alliances, it becomes 0,3 again
  - tension ensures that the other wants to attack, meaning it is clear that you must first.
  - ALSO there's the snowball effect
    - OUTSIDER: if there is a large war you must join in or be left in the dust.
    - INSIDER: best option is to bring in allies
    - leads to massive wars
  - with tension and alliances, local minima becomes massive wars as opposed to peace

conclusion – nukes?

## 1.3 | **Goddamn. Writing. Time.**

In a system of *raison d'état*, increase in tension and the formation of alliances shifted the local minima from peace to global warfare.

analyzing individual actors in a broader system

While many individual actors could be blamed, analysis at this level is not useful for understanding causation.

The assassination of Franz Ferdinand caused World War One. In 1914, a Serbian member of the Black Hand “assassinated the heir to the Hapsburg empire.” (citation). This murder caused the Austrian government to try and end Serbia’s independence; global warfare ensued. However, for the assassination of Ferdinand to cause such a large scale event, larger factors must have been at play. The situation was akin to an egg sitting in a busy highway – at some point, the egg will get cracked. Yes, the driver who runs the egg over caused it to crack, but a deeper and more useful understanding of causation comes from analyzing the situation rather than the one of many possible drivers. At a higher level of removal, it could be argued that Serbia was the cause of the war, as the assassin was “acting with the knowledge of certain Serbian officials.”(citation). Or perhaps it was Austria, who issued a “drastic ultimatum to Serbia.” (citation). But Austria only did so after Germany delivered “their famous ‘blank check,’ encouraging the Austrians to be firm.”(citation). Trying to determine which point in this causal chain truly led to World War One is a fruitless exercise, as the fact of the matter is, “in the last years before 1914 the idea was that war was bound to break out sooner or later” – and this wasn’t due to one meddling state (citation).

To better understand the cause of the war, we must first understand the geopolitical situation at the time – a time of growing alliances and tensions. In 1817, the fear of warfare led Germany to form “a military alliance with Austria-Hungary, to which Italy was added in 1882.” (citation). This alliance led to the creation of another; faced by this new threat, France allied with Russia, and later, England. Tension only grew, as Germany “who already felt encircled by the alliance of France and Russia, naturally watched with concern the drift of England into the Franco-Russian camp.”(citation). The Continental Great Powers were now riddled with alliances. These alliances contributed to the massive amount of tension, evident by the “huge standing army” and “millions of trained reserves among the civilian population” of each Continental Great Power. (citation). This tension created a feeling of impending war, “in which allies would be necessary.” (citation). This feeling tightened existing alliances and led to the creation of new ones, in turn contributing to even greater tension. Alliances formed, tension grew, and with this change the local minima began to shift. { could mention: Massive industrial and economic growth }

The emergent property from *raison d’etat* changes from a balance of power to large scale conflict when alliances and tension are introduced. A system of states all enacting *raison d’etat* is known to lead to a balance of power, as when any one state gains power, the others act in their own best interest and crush the rising state. Out of pure self interest arises peace. We can represent this scenario with a payoff matrix – two actors, state 1 and state 2, each with two possible actions: attack or defend. If both states defend, they each get a score of two. If both attack, they each lose resources, and any power gained would be crushed; each state gets a zero. If one state attacks while the other defends, the same scenario occurs. In this case, defending is clearly the best action. However, as alliances form, this payoff matrix changes. If an alliance attacks, it becomes much more likely that they will reap a reward, as crushing them requires an alliance of equal or greater size. If one doesn’t form, the alliance for any insider – an attacking or defending party – the best course of action would be to try and recruit more allies.

- *raison d’etat* leads to balance of power
  - states all crush others when they gain power cuz it’s their best interest
  - we can represent this scenario with a payoff matrix, with two actors who can either defend or attack
    - if both actors defend, they get a reward, say two.
    - if both actors attack, any resulting power gained would just be crushed by the state system, so each state would get 0 or lower.
    - if one actor attacks and another defends, then any resulting power would again be crushed, resulting in 0.
  - the best option is clearly to defend.
- when large alliances form, it becomes a lot more likely that the AD scenario results in a reward, 0,3.

- if the balance of power system is to be preserved, allainces of greater size must be formed (temp?)
- Unsure of whether or not attacking will be fruitfull. With tension, you want to attack first.