

Structural Theory - Premises And Deductions

I. First Premise - Dichotomous

Order - Hierarchy or Anarchy

A. First Deduction - If Anarchy,
The Balance of Power Is A Balance
of Conflict, Given Power Maximization
And Resource Scarcity (Relative
Power Is The Metric)

II. Second Premise - The Unitary
Actor (States Must Approximate
Individuals In Order To Survive,
Otherwise, Anarchy Will Select
Them Out)

A. Second Deduction:

1. Rational Self-Interests +
Cold Realism

2. Rational Self-Help (First
Preference Strategy - Alliance
of Convenience)

3. Rational Distrust

B. Note On the Unitary Actor

1 In Anarchy, Critical Choices Must Be Made By States (like WAR AND PEACE)

2. The Rational/WAR Choice
(Benefits > Costs)

3 States That Are Unable To Make Unitary Choices Will Be Preyed On By Adversaries And Disappear

4. The Selection Mechanism
- Anarchy

6. Example Poland 1900-15

4. Conflict Over Scarce Resources Is A Conflict For Relative Power

I. A Structural Theory (Explanation
of W. W. I (and By Analogy Any
Major Power War)

A. Context - Fundamental/
Faultline - Major Power
Conflict (Historically Context,
Objective: 'Hegemonic')

1. The German Paradox:
Potential / Strategic Encirclement,
Potential / Hegemonic Power

B. Armed Anarchy - The
European Security Dilemma
1. Arms-Races (Land & Sea)

C. Alliance Polarization
And Alliance Lock-In

D. Alliances (Gains From Trade)

1. France, Russia - Geography
Outflanking Germany

2. Britain joins France,
Russia owing to Strategic Threat
(The Channel And Belgium)

3. Germany - Austria-Hungary
(Strongest - Nearest -

Most Complementary Coalition)

E. Alliance Lock-In - No
Third Party Balance

Example - Britain 1815-1850s

F. Survival/Threat - Decline
of Austria-Hungary -

Strategic Hard Choice - Punish
Serbia, Risk Systemic War - Risk Collapse

G. WAR As Better Than A
Bargain No Bargain Available
1 A Declining Power
Chooses WAR In Order To
Pre-empt Decline And Restore
The Balance of Power
a. Rational / Gamble -
Rational / WAR Choice

2. Hegemonic WAR -

A Potential Hegemon Is
An Objective Threat -

Because A Hegemon (Actual)

Can Control The Behavior
of All Other Powers In A System

B Threatened Powers Attack

To Prevent Hegemony (Germany)

I Institutional Analysis

A Core Conception:

The Benefits From WAR

Are Always Less Than

The Benefits From Bargaining

(The Winner's Loss Gain

From The Exchange

1 Gains From Trade

WAR IS The Result of

1. Failed Bargaining

(Owing to Institutions, Information

or

2. Regime Types -

Pre WAR STATE

II, First Premise -

A Non-Antagonistic
Interests - The Balance
of Power Is A Balance of
The States Quo (Peace To WAR)
B First Deduction - Anarchy
Is Not Inherently Conflictual

III, Second Premise -

A. The Disutility of WAR
1 WAR Is Costly, (Costs
of Losing, WAR Termination,
Resource Utilization

B. Second Deduction - The Better
Bargain - Benefits of Bargaining
Always Exceed The Benefits of WAR
1 Win without WAR (win) > Win
WAR And Win.

I. An Institutional/Explanation
of W.I.Z (Analogy: General/
Theory of WAR)

A. Two Levels Possible - Domestic
And International

B. Domestic - Presence of
WAR STATE - WAR STATE OR
WAR STARTER (B/C, 4 Check,
Shows Dependence on Aus. Hungary's
Behavior

C. Domestic Constraints
On Aggressive WAR (All
Major Powers)

1. WAR AS Externalization
of Domestic Conflict (Not A
Rational Strategy

2. Increase Probability of Resistance

C. 2. Parliamentary Veto Power
Budgetary Veto Power And
WAR Credits

3. Public Opinion And
Peace Parties

4. Necessity of Clear Cause
For WAR Choice

D. International Level
Explanation -

1. Absent Bargaining
Institutions - But Offset By

2. International Networks
of Negotiation.

a. Diplomatic Networks

b. Capacity/Capability of Resolving
Enforceable, Binding Bargains

Part Prevent WAR (Crisis Management)
Affect To Behavior WAR (Deterrence)

E. The Institutional Decline
of Austria-Hungary (1890-1914)

1 Decline Caused By
External Destabilization (By
Russia, Serbia)

2. Internal Ethnic Conflict

3 The Necessity of Credibility
OR Possibility of Collapse

4. Must Demonstrate That The
Security of Ethnic Groups Is
Greater Inside Austria-Hungary
Rather Than Through Secession.
(Benefits > Costs)

5. Therefore, the Attack on
the Monarchy Is An Attack on
Central Core of the State

4. a. The Monarchy Is The
1. Symbolic Core,
2. Administrative Core
3. Military Core

b. The Assassination Thus
Demands A Military Response
Against Serbia In Order To
Demonstrate Survival As A
Major Power, And Secure Stability
F. Incomplete Information

1 Austria-Hungary's Choice To
Punish Serbia Can Trigger
Systemic WAR (Russia Signs/Russia
2. Aus. Hun. Must Sign / It will
Localize WAR (Partial / Not
Total Mobilization - Is This
Credible -

F3 Only If Russia Believes
I + Ad Germany
Does Nothing,
Otherwise WAR Results

G. A Bluffing Application -
Aus. Hun. Believes Russian
Resolve Is Bluffing, Calls
Bluff, WAR Results

1 Caused By Incomplete
Incomplete - Not Sufficient
Information

2. Not All Payoffs From
WAR Are Known,

3. Russia's Pay-Off Higher
Than Aus. Hungary's Estimation