Realism vs. Idealism

- Idealism
  - International law, morality, international organizations
  - IR: the study of international laws
- Realism’s response
  - Do international laws explain war?
  - How are international laws and organizations effective?
  - Needs to broaden perspectives and analyze what is happening, not what is written or should be done.

Interactions among States

- Bargaining
  - Negotiation by states to try to settle disputes
- Leverage
  - Power, resources,
- Strategy
  - Military and non-military
  - Threat

Realism Basic Argument

- Difference between domestic and international politics
  - No central government
  - Subjective nature of international laws not certain
  - Self-help
- (Nation states as primary actors in IR
  - a monitory actor
  - rational actor
- = utility maximization: benefit-end result

Security Dilemma

- "State’s action taken to assure own security tend to threaten other states" (Thucydidas)
- Strengthening in State A => threat (signal) => State B
  - Reciprocation by State B
  - One’s multiplication of forces induces the other’s
- Spiral Model (Robert Service)
  - Arms accumulation
  - Mental strain
  - Escalating arms race => more dangerous

Power Politics

- State as power workers
  - Stronger power, stronger security
  - Military power
  - Arms and size of auxiliary forces
  - Quality and quantity
  - Economic power
  - Monetary
  - Wealts
- - State’s approach rich states, strong army
- Technology
  - Defense Department’s commitment to technology development: high technology

Balance of power

- International System
  - Anarchy: no world government
  - Sovereignty: each nation autonomous
- Balance of power
  - Power will be maintained when military power is distributed in a manner that no state is strong enough to dominate the others.
  - Equilibrium of stability
  - Equilibrium: equilibrium
  - Micromanagement: balancing out the dominant power through alliances

Bargaining and Games Prisoner’s Dilemma

Player 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperate</th>
<th>Defect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3,3)</td>
<td>(4,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,3)</td>
<td>(1,4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Player 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperate</th>
<th>Defect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.1)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Balance of Power continued

- Alignments—shifts neutrals to one coalition
- Size principle—Forming coalitions only sufficient in size to ensure victory (but not larger)
- Balance—A great power (Britain in the 19th century) supporting the weaker

Balance of Power in the Post-World War II period?

- Balance of terror after 1945
  - Minimal nuclear deterrence between the U.S. and the Soviet Union
- Collective security and multilateralism after the end of the Cold War
  - Collective response to aggression
  - Attack on one state ⇒ attack on member states

Polarity and stability

- Multi-polarity, Bi-polarity, and uni-polarity
  - Which is more stable? Why?
- Hegemony—One disproportionately strong power
  - Britain in the 19th century, the U.S. immediately after World War II

Power distribution

- Unipolarity—The U.S. in the early period after World War II
- Concentration of power in the hegemon
- Unilateral actions

- Bipolarity—U.S./Soviet rivalry
- Opposing blocs: NATO vs. Warsaw Pact
- Deterrence

Polarity continued

- Multipolarity—Post Cold War period
  - The U.S., China, Germany, Japan, and Russia (E3)
  - Each pole becoming more assertive
  - Less ideological diplomacy
  - U.S. bipolar vs. multi-polarity
- Unipolar system again?
  - The Bush Doctrine
  - Assertive hegemon leadership
  - Unilateral action
  - Requirement but not realistic coalitions