

**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 levels of analysis.

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

\*\*

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 chcrushes it?

how do we think about inevitability?

relative usefulness 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 actually three separate 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 approach, '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.
- let's look at this state. because of this state, it was inevitable that a person would act out
- let's 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 *raison d'état*

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 d'état* (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.