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Must History Repeat the Great Conflicts of this Century?

Scope:

This set of eight lectures examines the origins of the great conflicts of our century and asks if history is doomed to repeat them. Twice in the first half of this century, nearly all the great powers engaged in wars which killed nearly 70 million men. During the past fifty years, the cold war has dominated our lives and international politics. The aftermath of each war shook the international political system, changed the maps of the world, and set the scene for the next great conflict. The series examines how concepts like the balance of power and the international system interweave with history. It asks what actually happened in these great conflicts, so we can better evaluate if we are destined to repeat them.

The first three lectures give the listener some background and tools for the study of international politics. Lecture One discusses the basic international political systems and their characteristics, from empire to the anarchic state system in which we live today. Lecture Two deals with the key problem of defining an international system, and it uses the example of the unification of Germany to demonstrate an international political analysis on the individual, the state, and the systemic level. Lecture Three gives an introduction to one of the most frequently used concepts in international politics: the balance of power. Changing definitions of power are examined, as well as the varying definitions of the balance of power. The period between 1814 and 1914 in Europe is examined in order to demonstrate the different phases of a balance of powers.

Lectures Four through Six examine the origins of the great conflicts of the century and the attempts by world leaders to avoid history’s mistakes. The origins of World War I in the balance of power in Europe and increasingly nationalist politics are examined, as well as the fatalism which led states to believe war could not be averted. Woodrow Wilson’s attempt to eliminate war from the face of the earth is presented, along with the problems in U.S. domestic politics and the treaties themselves which doomed the League before it was begun. Whether World War II was an inevitable continuation of World War I is considered in Lecture Six, which distinguishes the causes of the war in the Pacific from those of the war in Europe. Hitler’s role in the war is assessed, along with other causes stemming from the Treaty of Versailles.

Lectures Seven and Eight discuss the origins of the cold war and the possibility for change in the international system in the post-cold war world. The aftermath of World War II and the confrontations which led to a period of intense U.S.-Soviet hostility are examined, as well as changes which have occurred in the international political system to preclude repetition of history. The series concludes with an admonition not to simplify current situations into historical analogies.
Lecture One

Continuity and Change in World Politics

Scope: The discussion opens with a debate on whether international politics has entered a new era. International political systems from the Roman Empire to the modern day are examined. The differences between international and domestic politics are discussed in their legal, social and political aspects. We then turn to the origins of the two major schools of analysis of international politics and discuss the relevance of each school in today’s world. Finally, the changes that have occurred in international politics in modern times are evaluated, as well as their significance for future conflict or cooperation.

Outline

I. The three basic forms of international politics are empire, feudal systems, and the anarchic state system.
   A. An empire is one government dominant over most of the world.
      1. An empire has not been seen in the Western world since the time of the Roman Empire.
      2. Spain in the seventeenth century and France under Louis XIV in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were imperfect empires.
      3. Even the Sumerian and Persian Empires were regional, in that only through lack of communications ability did they think they controlled the whole world.
      4. Such ancient empires fought wars with the barbarians on their borders.
   B. A feudal system consists of post-territorial loyalties, such as the West after the fall of the Roman Empire.
      1. A subject in a European political unit would have had loyalties to his family, to a local lord, a distant lord or king, even loyalty to the Pope.
      2. These loyalties were roughly evenly distributed, which led to a crazy-quilt pattern of political units.
      3. Wars waged in the feudal system were characterized by an odd back-and-forth across uncertain borders.
   C. The anarchic state system is characterized by cohesive states without a supreme ruler above them. This system can encompass many types of states.
      1. City-states were found as far back as ancient Greece, and as recently as the Italian city-states of the 15th century.
      2. Dynastic territorial states gain their coherence from a ruler or ruling family. This describes most of Europe after approximately the year 1500.
      3. Nation states are the most modern unit of the anarchic state system. Their coherence derives from a sense of common nationality. These emerged gradually in Europe after the Thirty Years War in the mid-seventeenth century.
   D. Modern international politics is an anarchic state system.
      1. International politics today functions in the absence of a common sovereign.
      2. The term anarchic in this context does not mean chaotic, but it refers simply to the absence of a ruler.
      3. The seventeenth century English philosopher Thomas Hobbes metaphorically described the anarchic system as a state of nature, or “a war of all against all.”

II. The differences between international and domestic politics fall along legal, political, and social dimensions.
   A. The legal dimension involves the rule of law.
      1. Domestic law is generally obeyed, and when it is not, sanction can be imposed.
      2. International law is not generally obeyed, and there exist competing legal systems.
   B. In the political realm, the differences stem from the role of force.
      1. In a polity, the government has a monopoly on the legitimate use of force.
      2. The realm of international politics is the “realm of self help,” in which the use of force is a traditional way for states to help themselves.
   C. In the social area, the differences involve commonalities.
      1. There is a strong sense of community in a society in a domestic polity. There exist common loyalties, standards of justice, and views of legitimate authority.
2. In international politics there is very little sense of common loyalty, or agreement about justice.

III. The two theoretical views of international politics are Realism and Liberalism.
   A. The philosophers John Locke and Thomas Hobbes had competing views of the state of nature. Hobbes is the precursor of the Realist school, while Locke is a classic Liberal.
      1. Hobbes’ view expressed insecurity and a state of constant war. This was consonant with the world he lived in – England in the mid-seventeenth century.
      2. For Locke, who lived a century later, the world was less threatening, so his concept of the state of nature was more benign and optimistic.
   B. Realists focus on the central problem of war and peace. Liberals argue for the existence of a functional world society.
      1. Realism has been the central and dominant tradition of modern international politics.
      2. Liberalism is used here in the classic European sense, not in the modern domestic political sense.
      3. Liberals argue that a global society exists and forms a context for states. This society is grounded on trade and common institutions. They argue that the Realist view of a constant state of war focuses on extreme cases and overlooks interdependence of states.
      4. Realists are convinced that the propensity to wage war makes states focus on war even in time of peace. Even though in 1910 Europe was tied together by social and economic contacts, it was all swept away in 1914 during World War I.
   C. In the 1970s, there was a resurgence of Liberal thought.
      1. The world saw rising social and economic interdependence.
      2. It was hypothesized that a state could gain more by trading and economic dominance than by military conquest of a region.
      3. Liberals argued that new economic and ecological issues blurred the borders of domestic and international politics.

IV. Realists stress continuity over time, and Liberals stress change. In order to study international politics, we must build on traditional approaches, but also adapt them as we recognize their limitations. There are three main categories of traditional analysis: actors, goals, and instruments.
   A. Traditionally, the only actors that mattered were states. Now, one must evaluate complex coalitions of state and post-state actors.
      1. In the past, only a few major states actually mattered (those were the great powers).
      2. One of the great changes in the last forty years has been the approximate quadrupling of the number of states extant.
      3. More significant than the increase in numbers of states is the rise in post-state actors. These include multi-national corporations, interest groups, and terrorist groups and others.
      4. An adequate understanding of regions such as the Middle East, cannot be achieved by discussing only states as actors.
   B. Security was the traditional goal in international politics. We are now witnessing a rise in other issues of importance.
      1. Economic and social questions now seem nearly as important as security.
      2. Issues related to global warming, terrorism, the drug trade, and economics now dominate the headlines, as opposed to traditional security threats.
   C. The traditional instrument used by states was military force. The link between military force and achievement has loosened.
      1. The heightened level of force made possible by nuclear weapons is disproportionately destructive. There exists a reluctance to use such extreme force.
      2. The conquest of poorer and weaker countries has become more difficult in a world with nationalism. It is more costly to rule a socially awakened, hostile population.
      3. There now exist more internal restraints on the use of force. There has been a growth of antimilitaristic ethics especially in Western democratic countries.
      4. The net effect of these costs has been to erode the hierarchy of international politics related to the use of force.
5. Use of force today must be supplemented by other instruments such as economic interdependence, international communications, and international organizations.

V. Have we ended the cycle of international politics, or merely complicated the game?
   A. Since the Peace of Westphalia, international politics has had a cycle of leading states which continues unbroken.
      1. These leading states help keep order in the system.
      2. When the leading state begins to decline, the whole system shakes, and the world undergoes a period of wars for hegemony, followed by a peace treaty and stability for a time.
      3. Spain, France, Britain, and the United States have each followed this pattern. Some argue that the United States is beginning its decline. We may now see a period of hegemonic war.
   B. There are many reasons to argue that we may be moving into a new period in international politics.
      1. The role of nuclear technology and the prospect of total devastation may help avert future wars.
      2. Economic interdependence is greater than it has ever been, and the costs of violence would be extremely high in economic terms.
      3. A global society has emerged, which will make future wars less likely.
   C. By studying the origins of World Wars I and II and the cold war, we may better understand if the hope of escaping the cycle is justified or not.

Essential Reading:

Supplemental Reading:
Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War.
Fukuyama, Francis. The End of History and the Last Man.

Questions to Consider:
1. How has international politics changed since the time of the Roman Empire?
2. Does the world today seem to be more accurately described by the Realist or Liberal school of thought?
Lecture Two
What is an International System?

Scope: In this lecture we examine the definition of an international political system and the patterns of relationships among states. German unification in 1870, which redrew the map of Europe and led to World War I, is used to model a systemic analysis and assess its advantages and limitations. Analysis of international politics often shows patterns with predictable consequences, and the recent unification of Germany raises the question, how much has changed since 1870 in the international political system? Have the changes been sufficient to avert the destabilizing effect of the first German unification?

Outline

I. A system is a set of interrelated units in which the pattern is greater than the sum of the parts.
   A. Domestically, a system tends to refer to institutions.
      1. Domestic institutions are tangible, such as the president and the congress.
      2. However, there are intangible parts of the system, which include public attitudes, the press, and the unwritten conventions of constitutions.
   B. International systems generally refer to intangibles.
      1. There is more decentralization in an international system, and institutions are less crucial.
      2. The pattern of relations among states is a key intangible factor in the system.
   C. A pattern can create consequences not intended by any of the actors in the system.
      1. In studying the anarchic state system one can often predict consequences on the basis of a pattern.
      2. The systemic need for a balance of power, for example, has produced a checkerboard pattern of alliances in such diverse places as post-colonial Africa, 15th century Italy, and ancient India.

II. Explanations in international politics can be made on three bases, or levels: individuals’ actions, the type of state, or the type of system.
   A. An explanation on the basis of individuals is rarely sufficient.
      1. International politics deals with relations among states, not individuals.
      2. Emphasis on the intentions of individuals often misses the unintended effects of their actions.
      3. Although individuals are key in many situations, such as Kennedy and Khrushchev in the Cuban Missile Crisis, or Hitler in World War II, their actions do not fully explain the origin of the situation.
   B. Explanations in terms of type of country usually do not suffice either.
      1. No breakdown by type of country can fully predict whether a country will go to war (for example, both communist and capitalist countries have done so).
      2. Although the type of state is an important factor, it is better used to supplement another analysis.
   C. A system-level explanation uses both structure and process to analyze a situation.
      1. Structure is the distribution of power between states in a system. In international politics, the structure can be unipolar, bipolar, multipolar, or dispersed.
      2. Process is the pattern of interactions among the states. The pattern is determined by the state’s incentives and capabilities for cooperation. It is affected by the type of goal the state has (revolutionary or traditional) and by the instruments that the states use to achieve their goals.
      3. The structure of a system changes more slowly than the process. For example, the Soviet Union evolved from a revolutionary to a status-quo state without change in the overall structure of the bipolar system.

III. An example of an analysis on the systemic level would be the unification of Germany in 1870.
   A. Unification in Germany changed the distribution of power in the center of Europe.
      1. Before 1870, the thirty German states had been minor actors compared to the unified Germany, which upset the balance of power in Europe.
      2. Unification led to a growing rigidity of alliances across Europe, then to bipolarity, and eventually to the explosion of war in 1914.
B. A merely structural analysis is overly deterministic and makes World War I seem inevitable. So we add an analysis of the process.

1. There was a change of goals held by states during that period: the ideology of democracy added domestic influences, and rising nationalism afforded less flexibility in state goals.

2. Change in the instruments used by states arose from the application of industrial technology to military force, producing massive but inflexible instruments of war (for example, machine guns and trench warfare).

IV. Is a modern unified Germany consistent with stability in Europe? What has changed?

A. There have been structural changes in the international system since 1914. The United States is now a major player in international politics, and it is four times the size of united Germany.

B. The process has undergone changes as well. The European system is now constrained by the European Community.

C. Even in an analysis of type of state there has been change. Germany has had 40 years of democracy, and some would argue that they may be less prone to go to war with other democracies.

Essential Reading:
Waltz, Kenneth. *Man, the State, and War: a Theoretical Analysis*.

Questions to Consider:
1. What factors in the international system did not change between the first and second unification of Germany, and what are the ramifications for stability in Europe?

2. Does the method of systemic analysis described in the lecture lend itself more to a view of history as changing, or as constant?
Lecture Three
The Balance of Power and Its Problems

Scope: Over the centuries, power has been defined in terms of various resources, from gold to industry to information technology. A state’s access to resources determines its role in the international balance of power. The balance of power is a fundamental concept in international relations. It can be used as a policy predictor and tool for analysis, under the assumption that a state will act to prevent any other state from developing a preponderance of power. Nineteenth-century Europe serves as an excellent illustration of power politics as the region moved from a moderate balance, to the tense bipolar situation in which World War I broke out.

Outline

I. Introduction to the concept of the balance of power.
   A. The balance of power is one of the most frequently used concepts in international relations, but it is often loosely used.
   B. A balance of power does not necessarily produce peace. There have been 119 wars involving large powers over the last 500 years – 9 large (hegemonic).
   C. Neither does it necessarily preserve the independence of all states (for example, the Baltic republics in the cold war era.)

II. In order to study the balance of power, we must examine how we define power.
   A. Power is defined by political scientists as the ability to get others to do what they otherwise would not do. This definition, although frequently used, is better determined after the fact, and less easily predicted.
   B. Statesmen define power as a resource.
      1. A state’s population, territory, natural resources, and economy are all used as ways of measuring power.
      2. However, even a state less powerful in tangible terms will often start a war, sometimes as a gamble, and sometimes counting on a hidden resource.
   C. The definition of power has changed over time.
      1. In the time of the Spanish empire, gold was the source of wealth and power. Today, access to information may be the most powerful resource available to a nation.
      2. Due to economic, social, and military changes, science and knowledge play a larger role in determining power than ever before.
      3. Factors that determine internal growth in a country, such as access to information, may become more important in determining the balance of power.
   D. Since the nuclear age, war has become a less common method of measuring resources.
      1. War used to be the time when all cards were on the table in terms of international power contests.
      2. Since nuclear weapons have made war so costly, it is difficult to measure a country’s resources in the modern era.

III. There are different uses of the term “balance of power.”
   A. Balance of power can refer to the distribution of power.
      1. One problem with this definition is that any distribution of power is called a balance of power.
      2. Since any change in the distribution of power would mean a change in the balance of power, such a use is merely a code for the status quo.
      3. There is also a theory that the most stable situation in international politics is an unequal balance of power. War is more likely when the balance of power is changing.
      4. However, this theory does not explain why certain states do not go to war (for example, Britain and the United States during U.S. ascendency in the nineteenth century).
B. A more useful definition holds that a balance of power is a method of predicting the behavior of states, and it is one of most powerful predictions we have today.
   1. States will act to prevent any one state from developing a preponderance of power, according to balance of power policy predictions.
   2. That prediction is based on two assumptions: the international structure is anarchic, and states place a prime value on independence.
   3. The balance of power predicts not a maximization of power, but the prevention of any state from gaining too much power. Therefore, a state would be likely to join the weaker side in an alliance.

IV. There are six exceptions to the policy of balance of power.
   A. If a state has no alternative, it will join the stronger side or remain neutral.
   B. When there is a perception of threat from the weaker side, a state may join the stronger side.
   C. Proximity may affect the balance: a neighbor may be weaker globally but more of a threat to you.
   D. A state may join a more powerful side in expectation of short-run spoils.
   E. There may be economic gains for the regional or trading partners of the more powerful state.
   F. Shared ideology can play a role in affecting the balance of power policy prescriptions, but one should not expect too much from ideological similarity.

V. The period 1814-1914, in which no hegemonic war occurred in Europe, is often referred to as a classical balance of power. Although it was a moderate multipolar system, it actually involved several phases.
   A. A balance between three major powers was deliberately created at the Congress of Vienna, which reinstated France in order to preserve the balance. The following period, from 1814 to 1848, was known as the Concert of Europe.
   B. Rising nationalism in Europe began to disturb the balance in 1848, and eventually Bismarck, chancellor of Prussia, exploited German nationalism to create a united Germany in 1870. He delicately juggled alliances on both sides of Germany in order to preserve stability.
   C. Beginning in 1890, the balance of power in Europe began to polarize, partly because of aggressive maneuvering by Bismarck’s successors.
   D. By 1914, nearly all the European powers were in a coalition against Germany, resulting the tense, bipolar situation which led to World War I.

Essential Reading:
Rotberg, Robert and Rabb, Theodore, (eds.) The Origins and Prevention of Major Wars.

Questions to Consider:
1. How could one describe the world today in terms of balance of power?
2. If power is now defined more in terms of information and technology, how will actions based on balance of power politics be manifested?
Lecture Four
The Origins of the First World War

Scope: Was World War I inevitable? The war that killed millions, brought down three empires, and changed the face of international politics had complex origins. A woeful confluence of blundering foreign policy, corrupt domestic politics, and unhealed wounds from past crises brought the great powers into the Great War — the first true world war. The origins of the war are discussed, as well as alternative scenarios that might have played out if only things had been different.

Outline

I. The significance of World War I lies in both its scope and the outcomes of the war.
   A. It was a war on an extraordinary scale. The Battle of the Somme in 1916 had 1.3 million casualties. In comparison, the Vietnam War killed 55,000 Americans.
   B. Three empires were destroyed: the Turkish, the Russian, and the Austro-Hungarian.
   C. The war ushered in communism.
   D. It also ended the European domination of the balance of power as the United States became a world power.
   E. In World War I can be found many of the origins of World War II.

II. World War I had several causes. On the systemic level, there are explanations both in structure and process.
   A. On the structural level, the rise in German power increased the rigidity of alliances in Europe.
      1. Germany’s growing industrial and naval power threatened British interests.
      2. Britain sought allies in order that one country would not dominate Europe. In 1904 Britain formed an Entente with France. In 1907 they formed the Triple Entente with Russia.
      3. Germany felt encircled, and it responded by tightening its alliance with Austria. All flexibility of alliances had been lost in the system.
   B. The structural shifts in the system changed the process: how the game was played.
      1. The late nineteenth century saw an increase in nationalism. Pan-Slavism in Eastern Europe threatened both the Turkish and Austro-Hungarian empires.
      2. German hatred of Slavs on Darwinian/racist nationalist bases heightened tensions.
      3. The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand would, in an earlier time, have been seen as an assault on all monarchs.
      4. The great powers had become complacent during the hundred years of peace. It was felt that a short, sharp war would clear the air and settle unresolved disputes.
      5. Clumsy German policy eroded the balance of power and antagonized everyone, making the system less moderate.

III. Causes of the war also abound on the domestic and individual levels of analysis.
   A. Lenin’s theory of the causes of the war have been disproved.
      1. Lenin’s theory was that war stemmed from conflicts at peripheries, but World War I actually came from the center.
      2. Although he claimed that finance capitalism caused the war, the capitalists actually resisted war. The bankers were concerned about their businesses.
   B. A more credible cause was the internal crisis of two empires.
      1. Turkey was weak and corrupt, an easy target for Balkan nationalists.
      2. Serbia aspired to push Austria out of the Slavic Balkans. The Austro-Hungarian Empire faced disintegration. After the assassination, Austria issued an ultimatum as an excuse to destroy Serbia.
   C. Domestic politics in Germany were a significant cause of the war.
      1. Germany was ruled by an “Alliance of Iron and Rye” (aristocratic landowners and capitalists).
2. It has been stated that the post-democratic conditions in Germany enabled this coalition to divert attention from domestic problems by means of an aggressive foreign policy.

D. Leadership at the time of the outbreak of war was characterized by mediocrity on all sides.
   1. Franz Josef of Austria was a tired old man at the mercy of duplicitous advisers.
   2. Czar Nicholas II was an isolated autocrat, resisting change at home, and surrounded by incompetent ministers.
   3. Kaiser Wilhelm II was a blustering ruler with a sense of inferiority. He led Germany into risky policies without skill or consistency.

IV. There are three types of causes for any war: deep, intermediate, and precipitating.
   A. The deep causes of World War I were the previously discussed structural and domestic problems.
   B. The intermediate causes were aggressive German policy, the complacency of the great powers, and the mediocre nature of the leaders.
   C. The precipitating cause was the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand.

V. A counterfactual analysis helps evaluate if war was inevitable.
   A. Had there been no crisis in Sarajevo, there is a high probability that something else would have begun the war. However, had the crisis occurred later, there might have been a different outcome.
      1. Russians might have become more powerful by 1916 and deterred Germany from waging the war on two fronts.
      2. German industrial strength might have continued to grow, deterring Britain from attacking Germany.
   B. The war did not necessarily have to become a world war.
      1. It could have remained a Balkan crisis. Even the Kaiser did not expect a war over the assassination.
      2. There could have been a one-front war. When Russia mobilized, the Kaiser’s ministers said that he could not prevent the mobilization on the western front. Later that was proven false.
      3. The war could have been a two-front war without Britain. If Germany had not violated Belgium’s neutrality, the British cabinet might not have been able to make the case for going to war against Germany.
      4. The war could have remained contained to Europe. If Germany had not carried out U-boat attacks on civilian ships, the United States might not have entered the war.

VI. There is never an inevitable outcome in international politics, even in such a grim situation as World War I.
   A. World War I was deliberately undertaken.
      1. War was better for Austria than decline would be.
      2. Germany felt that war now was better than war later.
      3. The miscalculation was over the length and scope of war.
   B. The war was not a result of a naval arms race.
      1. By 1912, the Germans had accepted that the British had won the arms race.
      2. However, that defeat left a residue of bitterness and affected political relations.
   C. The arms race with Russia did not cause the war. Fear of Russia’s increased capability for mobilization affected the length and depth of the war, but did not cause it.

VII. World War I can offer some valuable lessons.
   A. It is important to judge the balance of power in terms of structure and process.
      1. Moderation comes from the process.
      2. The strength of the actors is not enough to determine the stability of the balance.
   B. There is danger when the great powers become too enmeshed. They can become complacent and assume crises will always pass safely.
   C. Stability is created when unneeded forces are held in reserve without fear of either deploying them or not.
   D. Fatalistic assumption that war is inevitable is extremely dangerous. One must remember that war always hold surprises.
Essential Reading:
Barbara Tuchman. The Guns of August.

Suggested Reading:
Fischer, Fritz. War of Illusions: German Policies from 1911 to 1914.

Questions to consider:
1. To what extent does Germany bear the responsibility for World War I?
2. What positive actions on the part of leaders at the time might have averted the war?
Lecture Five
The Problems and Promise of Collective Security

Scope: The horrors of World War I, and the waste of human life which it represented, caused a revolution in Western opinion. A leader in the new school of thought that blamed balance of power politics for World War I was Woodrow Wilson. The League of Nations embodied Wilson’s ideal of a system of collective security. This utopian system, in which aggression against one was aggression against all, enjoyed moderate success between 1924 and 1930. Fatal flaws in the system and Europe’s return to balance of power politics are examined here, as well as the lessons that history learned from the League of Nations.

Outline

I. The international effort to prevent a second world war was through an approach called collective security.
   A. The balance of power was blamed for the horror of World War I.
      1. The war changed the face of the world and was thought to have been caused by balance of power politics.
      2. Western opinion in the United States and Europe was anxious that such a war not be repeated.
   B. One prominent critic of the balance of power was Woodrow Wilson
      1. Wilson felt that the balance of power was immoral.
      2. He tried to find a practical alternative to the security dilemma, and turned to parliaments and laws.
      3. Wilson believed that liberal democracy would make the world safe. His conviction led him to form the League of Nations – the 14 points of whose charter he drafted in 1918.

II. Collective security was a new system within which international politics would function.
   A. Collective security has three main components.
      1. In order for security to be a collective responsibility, both moral force and institutions were needed.
      2. States opposed to aggression would be united against an aggressor.
      3. Peace was indivisible. All nations were responsible for each other.
   B. How did collective security work?
      1. It outlawed offensive war.
      2. War was deterred by a coalition of responsible states who would enforce sanctions to punish aggressors.
   C. Collective security differed from balance of power politics in several ways.
      1. The focus in collective security was on a state’s intentions of making war, not just its capacity for doing so.
      2. Alliances were never formed in advance of an act of aggression, but only after it had occurred.
      3. The system was global and universal—there was no neutrality in a situation of aggression.

III. The League of Nations was formed at the Versailles Conference that ended World War I.
   A. Several articles of the League’s charter exemplify key elements of collective security.
      1. In Article 10 all states pledged to protect all other members against external aggression.
      2. Article 11 stated that any war or threat would be a concern to all states.
      3. In Articles 12 and 15, states agreed to submit disputes to the League for arbitration, and not to wage war until 3 months after the arbitration.
      4. Article 16 stated that any war disregarding the League would ipso facto be a war against all the members of the League. Those who violated the injunction would be immediately subject to economic sanctions and possibly military intervention.
   B. The charter, however, contained several legal and political ambiguities.
      1. It was difficult to judge when an Article 16 aggression really occurred. Each state could decide for itself if the situation called for invoking the article.
      2. It remained unclear what kinds of sanctions would be applied, and how they would be implemented.
3. A fatal political ambiguity was the failure of the U.S. Senate to ratify the charter, so it was never global or universal.

C. Why didn’t the United States ratify the charter of the League of Nations?
   1. In the post-World War I United States, there was an overwhelming desire for a return to normalcy.
   2. American resistance to becoming too involved in European events stemmed in part from the Monroe Doctrine and George Washington’s warning against entangling alliances.
   3. Henry Cabot Lodge, a senator from Massachusetts, helped to kill the bill in the Congress out of fear of the demands which Article 16 might make on the country.

IV. Other actors were also important in the failure of collective security.
   A. France was very insecure after World War I.
      1. The French wanted a guarantee that Germany would never attack them again.
      2. They pressed for military reparations and formed alliances with Belgium, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.
   B. Germany was enormously weakened after the war.
      1. The famous war guilt clause and the economic effects of crippling reparations created a great German resentment against the postwar order.
      2. Tremendous inflation in Germany wiped out the middle class and left little support for democracy.
   C. Italy resented the Treaty of Versailles.
      1. Italy had entered the war with the promise of victors’ spoils and colonies which it did not receive.
      2. In 1922 Mussolini’s rise to power made Italy the first country to leave democracy for Fascism.

V. 1924-30 was the zenith of League of Nations, during which it enjoyed some success.
   A. Reparations repayment plans took some of the economic pressure off Germany.
   B. A protocol on peaceful settlement of disputes was signed in 1924.
   C. In 1925 the Treaty of Locarno allowed Germany to join League of Nations, and guaranteed its western border and stipulated that before the eastern border changed, it would be subject to arbitration.
   D. The League settled a number of minor disputes among members during these years.
   E. The Kellogg-Briand Pact was signed in 1928, outlawing all war.
   F. The League became a diplomatic center in Geneva where some actors cooperated on various levels.

VI. The League was tested, and failed, in conflicts in Manchuria and Ethiopia.
   A. The conflict in Manchuria was between a disgruntled, imperialist Japan and an increasingly nationalist China.
      1. In September 1931 Japan drove the Chinese out of Manchuria and instituted a puppet state there.
      2. China appealed to the League of Nations, and an investigating commission was sent to Manchuria.
      3. However, not much pressure was applied as a result of the report.
      4. In March 1933, Japan quit the League of Nations and continued its aggression in Manchuria.
   B. Fascist Italy, dissatisfied with the Treaty of Versailles, invaded Ethiopia in 1936.
      1. The invasion was a clear case of aggression violating the League articles, a treaty between Italy and Ethiopia, and the Kellogg-Briand Pact.
      2. The League committee recommended economic sanctions, but it did not break diplomatic relations with Italy or close the Suez Canal.
      3. Britain and France wanted to avoid alienating Italy, since it was supporting them against Hitler. This represented the beginning of a return to balance of power politics.
      4. In 1936, when Hitler marched troops into the demilitarized Rhineland area, the British and French met with Italy, choosing European balance of power politics over League of Nations collective diplomacy.

VII. Could collective security have worked?
   A. It had several fatal flaws.
      1. It was inextricably tied to the status quo, and it favored order over justice.
2. Another major problem was related to military technology and plans. In a system of collective security, one cannot prepare for the aggressor, who will always have the advantage of surprise.
3. There is a problem in developing the trust necessary for the system to work.
4. If a large state such as the United States were to become an aggressor, it would be a difficult if not impossible problem to solve within the system.

**B.** Collective security was a noble idea and a rational plan which left valuable norms for posterity.
1. The indivisibility of peace has remained with the international political system as an important value.
2. The collective concern of all states against aggression, as demonstrated in the Gulf War, is also a relic of collective security.

**Essential Reading:**
Craig, Gordon Alexander, and George, Alexander L. *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of Our Time.*

**Suggested Reading:**

**Questions to Consider:**
1. Was it inevitable that the League of Nations fail?
2. Was the Treaty of Versailles consistent with the ideals of collective security?
Lecture Six
The Origins of the Second World War

Scope: World War II saw the deaths of more than 35 million people, genocide, and the invention and use of the atomic bomb. It ushered in a bipolar world in which Europe was finally dwarfed on the international scene. The origins of the war lie in the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, the changes in national domestic political ideologies, and the personality of Hitler himself. Hitler’s actions, while strategic, eventually cost him the war when he involved the United States. Similarly, Japan lost its bid to dominate Asia militarily when they declared war upon the United States. In seeking lessons to be learned from the tragedy of World War II, one must return to its origins. Blame must be laid not merely on appeasement policies, but on a general failure to assess accurately the motives and options of other nations.

Outline

I. World War II was a war on unprecedented scale which changed both the international system and the internal structure of several states. What were its origins?
   A. It is too simplistic merely to call it “Hitler’s War”.
      1. That analysis ignores the war in the Pacific.
      2. There were also underlying causes unresolved from World War I.
   B. Another oversimplified theory is that the war was an inevitable “Part II” of World War I.
      1. Some historians go too far in exonerating Hitler as an extremist and opportunist who simply moved into a political vacuum.
      2. Hitler’s own writings, in which he set forth his plans, should be taken into account.
      3. The Hossbach memorandum of 1937, which set forth the general plan for war, also demonstrates deliberate planning on Hitler’s part.
   C. Hitler’s Germany could have followed four strategies.
      1. The country could have passively accepted its postwar situation.
      2. It could have used economic growth to prevail in Europe.
      3. A push to revise the Treaty of Versailles back to the 1914 borders could have allowed Germany to recover lost territory and power.
      4. The strategy Hitler chose was to break out on land and then overseas.

II. There were four phases to Hitler’s approach.
   A. 1933-36 was the phase of utilizing clever diplomacy to destroy the international post war system.
      1. Germany withdrew from the League of Nations, blaming French intransigence.
      2. In 1934 Hitler signed a treaty with Poland to worry the French.
      3. In March 1935, he denounced the clauses in the Versailles treaty which restricted Germany’s army and began to build up the army and air force.
      4. In 1936, Hitler marched into the Rhineland but hinted that he might be persuaded to leave.
   B. 1936-40 marked a phase of expansion against small neighbors.
      1. Hitler made pacts with Italy and Japan, and then he intervened in Spain on behalf of Franco.
      2. In 1938, Hitler invaded Austria in the Anschluss, and he claimed the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia.
      3. The British become alarmed but in Munich, Neville Chamberlain agreed to a partition of Czechoslovakia.
      4. In 1939 Germany invaded Prague and partitioned Poland with the USSR.
   C. 1940 marked Hitler’s military mastery of Europe.
      1. In the spring of 1940 Germany took action in Scandinavia.
      2. With the blitzkrieg in France, Hitler remained the master of the European continent.
   D. Between 1941 and 1945, Hitler overreached his capabilities.
      1. In the summer of 1940 Hitler had wanted to attack Russia but hoped first to vanquish Britain.
      2. Without first winning the air battle for Britain, Hitler decided in June 1941 to attack Russia anyway.
3. After Pearl Harbor, Hitler declared war on the United States.
4. The entrance of the United States into the combat unleashed a global war that Hitler could not win.

III. What role did Hitler as an individual play in bringing about World War II?
   A. In phase one, any conservative German politician might have acted similarly.
   B. Phases two and three are tributes to Hitler’s skill, audacity of approach, and bellicose ideology.
   C. Phase four depended upon Hitler’s personality and megalomania. His arrogance in declaring war on the United States gave Roosevelt an excuse to bring us into the war.
   D. Hitler could not exploit all of his political advantages because of his own racism. For example, the expulsion of Jews was costly to the progress of developing the atomic bomb in Germany.

IV. Other causes of World War II can be assessed using the techniques taught earlier.
   A. There were causes on the systemic level.
      1. World War I did not solve the German problem.
      2. The Treaty of Versailles was both too harsh and too lenient.
      3. The absence of the United States and the USSR in the balance of power in the interwar period was problematic.
   B. Other causes were due to changes in the process of the international system.
      1. The revisionist ideology of Germany, Italy, and Japan attempted to change the status quo.
      2. There had been a rise in ideological politics.
      3. Racist and extremist policies eliminated much moderation from the process.
   C. There were also important causes on the domestic level.
      1. The weakness of democracies was due to class cleavages and ideological disputes within states.
      2. The economic collapse and depression of the 1930s exacerbated class cleavages and weakened democracies further.
      3. A desire to return to normalcy and preoccupation with the Depression constrained the United States from playing an active role in Europe.

V. The war in the Pacific stemmed from separate causes.
   A. Domestic conditions in Japan were important causative factors.
      1. Japan was a highly militarized, very traditional society in the 1930s.
      2. Imperial expansion was popularly supported. There was great concern over the constraints of the island’s resources.
      3. Japan’s plan for regional hegemony led it to expand into China, and they also led Japan into conflict with the United States.
   B. In 1940 with the fall of France, Japan moved into French colonies in Indochina. It had three options.
      1. Japan could strike west against the Soviet Union – there were clashes in Manchuria.
      2. It could move south to the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia) and seize their oil.
      3. Or it could strike eastward where the United States had bases in the Philippines and Hawaii.
   C. Why did Japan choose the third, most risky alternative?
      1. In Hawaii, there was no Soviet threat.
      2. The United States had imposed an oil embargo against Japan. The embargo essentially meant defeat of the navy since most of Japan’s oil was imported.
      3. Japan viewed war as better than a process of slow exhaustion. It merely hoped to maintain the status quo.

VI. What are the lessons of World War II? Beware of overly simplified historical analogies, and learn to differentiate the policies and lessons learned.
   A. It is said that in World War II, the world learned the dangers of appeasement.
      1. Appeasement is not necessarily bad. It is a classic tool often used successfully in Europe.
      2. It might have been right tool against Germany if it had been used earlier.
B. The war is also blamed on a failure to deter planned aggression.
   1. It is true that one has to assess motives, not just situations.
   2. By putting the enemy in a corner, one loses the ability to deter war.

Essential Reading:
Bell, P.M.H. *The Origins of the Second World War in Europe*.

Suggested Reading:
Craig, Gordon Alexander, and George, Alexander L. *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of Our Time*.

Questions to Consider:
1. To what extent were the interpretations of historical “lessons” by world leaders responsible for World War II?
2. What comparisons can be made between Germany’s and Japan’s imperial efforts, and what differentiates them?
Lecture Seven
The Origins of the Cold War

Scope: The cold war, which spanned more than four decades and encompassed minor confrontations in nations around the world, never resulted in direct combat between the United States and the Soviet Union. Despite efforts on Roosevelt’s part to remake the post-World War II world so as to avoid another great conflict, the United States came to the brink of war with the Soviet Union over the Cuban Missile Crisis fewer than twenty years later. The clashing ideologies of the United States and the Soviet Union and the vacuum of power in postwar Europe inexorably led the two great powers into a spiral of hostility which defined international politics for the latter half of the twentieth century.

Outline

I. What was the cold war?
   A. The cold war lasted from 1947 to 1989, and it was a period of intense hostility without direct superpower combat.
   B. The height of the war from 1947 to 1963 (also known as the tight cold war) was characterized by hostility without any negotiations.
   C. The little cold war, during the 1980s, involved more contact and negotiations.

II. There are three views regarding the causes of the cold war.
   A. The traditionalist view is that cold war was caused by the USSR, and that the United States was defensive while the Soviets were aggressive and expansive.
      2. The United States demobilized soon after World War II ended, but the Soviets left troops in Eastern Europe.
      3. The Soviets failed to live up to the terms of the Yalta agreement.
      4. The traditionalist view is supported by Soviet actions in countries such as Iran, Korea, and Germany in the decade following the war.
   B. The revisionist view, most popular in the 1960s and 1970s, held that the cold war was caused by American expansionism.
      1. At the end of World War II, the USSR was much weaker than the United States in terms of industrial capacity, war losses, and nuclear technology.
      2. The revisionists claim that Stalin was inward-looking, not expansionist. He tried to restrain other Communist leaders such as Mao.
      3. The “soft revisionists” blame individuals for the cold war. President Truman, for example, was not very experienced in diplomatic affairs.
      4. The “hard revisionists” blame the cold war on the nature of America as a capitalist society seeking global economic hegemony.
   C. The post-revisionists theorize that the cold war was bound to happen and that its causes were inherent in the structure of the postwar system.
      1. After World War II, there was no international balance of power. Instead, there were two superpowers in 1945, and a vacuum of power in Europe.
      2. Both the United States and the Soviet Union were bound to expand in search of security, and they were bound to meet in Europe.
      3. Once the two great powers were face-to-face in Europe, the spiral of hostility set in.

III. President Roosevelt had a grand design to avoid the errors of the last war. Some have misunderstood this design as “selling out” the United States.
A. Roosevelt wanted to demand unconditional surrender and remake Germany’s and Japan’s domestic politics.
   1. He hoped to avoid economic depression and isolationism.
   2. It was also important to strengthen the collective security system.

B. The plan had two tactics.
   1. It was essential to maintain bipartisan consensus on the policy at home.
   2. Stalin also needed to be reassured that the United States was sensitive to his security needs.

C. Roosevelt’s plan was not naïve in design but rather in its tactics.
   1. It placed too much emphasis on the United Nations.
   2. Roosevelt underestimated Stalin and overlooked their important ideological differences.

D. Roosevelt did not sell out the United States, but he did several shrewd things.
   1. He delayed opening the second front in Europe for two years.
   2. He also tried to tie reconstruction aid to political concessions from Stalin.

IV. Stalin’s own postwar plan differed greatly from Roosevelt’s.

A. Stalin was in a difficult situation at home.
   1. He had to de-emphasize nationalism in the postwar Soviet Union, and tighten domestic control.
   2. He saw some value in having the United States as an enemy around which he could rally support.

B. Stalin preferred some cooperation to total hostility.
   1. With some flexibility, he could accomplish some goals in Europe.
   2. He truly believed that the crisis of capitalism would occur and then USSR could benefit from a sphere of influence in Europe.

C. He had three foreign policy objectives.
   1. In order protect the system at home, he had to limit contact with capitalist countries.
   2. He also wanted to maintain the gains of the 1939 pact with Hitler which included the Baltic states and parts of Poland.
   3. Stalin probed soft spots, but he did not take great risks in his foreign policy.

V. The tight cold war had four phases.

A. The years between 1945 and 1947 marked the gradual onset of the cold war, which neither Stalin nor Truman really sought.
   1. First came the issue of Poland, where Stalin broke his promise to allow free elections.
   2. There was also disagreement over economic assistance from the United States to the USSR.
   3. In Germany, the Soviets wanted reparations from the Western zones, which led to basic disagreements over reconstruction between the USSR and the other allies.
   4. Although the Soviets had joined the war at the last minute in Asia, Stalin wanted control over a zone in Manchuria.
   5. Resentment was fueled by the U.S. refusal to share atom bomb technology with the Soviets.

B. 1947-49 was the real declaration of the cold war.
   1. In 1947, in order to step into Greece and Turkey to supplant British influence, Truman used ideological exaggeration to rally U.S. support against the Soviets.
   3. In order to prevent the Czechs from taking control of their nation, the USSR invaded Prague in 1948.
   4. The Berlin blockade by the Soviet Union and airlift by Western nations became a symbolic front in the cold war.

C. 1950-55 was the most rigid period of the cold war.
   1. Dual shocks in to the United States in 1949 were the transition of China to communism and the Soviet explosion of an atom bomb.
   2. In 1950 the Korean War locked in a much higher U.S. defense budget and committed both sides to the cold war.
   3. The war continued with U.S. nonrecognition of communist China for more than a decade.

D. 1955-62 saw the beginnings of détente.
1. In the Soviet Union, de-Stalinization occurred.
2. Increased tension resulted from the 1956 Soviet invasion of Hungary.
3. Khrushchev maneuvered toward détente with United States, although a by-product of these strategies was the Cuban missile crisis.

VI. The cold war was, in fact, highly likely.

A. The post-revisionists are both right and wrong.
   1. The process was not moderate due to ideological differences between the two great powers.
   2. However, internal strategies might have alleviated some tensions.
   3. The revisionists overlook Stalin’s personality, which led to much tension between the powers.

B. Why did the war stay cold?
   1. Nuclear weapons cause disproportionate destruction.
   2. Statesmen could foresee the outcome of war, which was a great deterrent.

Essential Reading:
Gaddis, John Lewis. *Russia, the Soviet Union, and the United States: an Interpretive History.*
Nye, Joseph S. *Nuclear Ethics.*

Supplemental Reading:
Blight, James G, and Welch, David A. *On the Brink: Americans and Soviets reexamine the Cuban Missile Crisis.*

Questions to Consider:
1. Was collective security as envisioned by Roosevelt an improvement upon Wilson’s vision which led to the League of Nations?
2. Evaluate the legitimacy of Soviet actions after World War II according to their security concerns.
Lecture Eight

Alternatives to the Present International System

Scope: The post-cold war world will be the first time in centuries that the international system will not change as the result of a great war between world powers. Asking who will become the new enemy is no longer a useful exercise. Perhaps we are now entering a new world order. In order for the United States to remain an international power, it must combine a strategy of traditional concerns with respect for new views and players on the international scene. Since history never repeats itself, we must not forsake the future in order to avoid the past.

Outline

I. What will the post-cold war world look like? Declinists believe that the U.S. position will continue to worsen. Revivalists believe that our problems can be remedied.
   A. What will happen to the United States?
      1. It is unfair to compare the United States today to the United States after World War II, since our relative position was artificially inflated by other countries’ misfortune.
      2. In terms of economic power, the United States has been constant or growing since 1975.
   B. Declinists often compare the United States today to Britain at the turn of the twentieth century.
      1. However, the United States remains the world’s largest economy which Britain was not.
      2. Britain was an empire which dissolved because of nationalist issues that the United States does not face.
      3. Power is relative, and our military competitor (the USSR) has declined.
   C. Under the theory of imperial overstretch, the political-military machine which oversees an empire grows so expensive that it leads to decline.
      1. However, the U.S. burden of military expenditure has declined in terms of GNP over the past half-century.
      2. That theory fits the USSR better. Its defense budget rose to more than 20% of GNP.
      3. The central planning system also did not work fast enough in the information technology age, and they remain orders of magnitude behind.

II. What type of world will we see? There are several theories.
   A. A return to bipolarity: but it is unlikely that hard liners will bring back a new cold war.
   B. A multipolar world: this is unlikely unless Europe overcomes divisions or Japan gains military power.
   C. A three-bloc world (Japan, the United States and Europe) is also unlikely, since nationalism and global economies may combat that tendency.
   D. Polycentric independence is more likely, with constellations of power in different sectors. However, the United States may remain the largest power.

III. Will the United States become a hegemon? No, diffusion of power will prevent that.
   A. Traditional instruments of military power are no longer sufficient to overcome nationalism.
   B. Growth of global markets and economic interdependence also prevents hegemony.
   C. The spread of technology enables smaller states to project more deadly threats (chemical, nuclear).
   D. There has also been a change in the agenda of international politics which no one state can dominate: global warming, Third World debt, drug trade.

IV. The ability to co-opt is another dimension of power – but the relevant resources differ.
   A. Hard power resources are traditional: military force and economic capabilities.
B. Soft power resources are cultural: ideological appeal and the ability to use international institutions to your advantage.

C. The United States used both types of power resources in the Gulf War.

V. The United States will need a new strategy in the post-cold war world. Much will depend on domestic politics.
   A. It must learn not to neglect geopolitical military balances.
   B. It is also important to maintain open international economy – a source of strength.
   C. The successful state will pay more attention to questions of democracy and pluralism and to multilateral institutions.
   D. In a world in which much depends on soft power resources, it is important to pay attention to domestic problems in order to keep ahead.

VI. The final lesson is that it is a mistake to use historical metaphors as a cause for complacency or despair. History does not repeat itself – our future is always in our own hands.

**Essential Reading:**
Nye, Joseph S. *Bound to Lead: the Changing Nature of American Power*.

**Suggested Reading:**
A contemporary examination of the lessons of the cold war from one of its most eminent historians.

**Questions to Consider:**
1. What may be the United States’ greatest sources of power in the post cold-war world?
2. What is the role of the former Soviet Union likely to be in the post cold-war international political system?
Timeline
Origins of the Great Conflicts of this Century

May 14, 1643……………..Louis XIV comes to power in France
April 11, 1713……………..The Treaty of Utrecht
August 20, 1648…………..The Treaty of Westphalia
1776……………………..Adam Smith publishes The Wealth of Nations
May 14, 1789…………….The storming of the Bastille marks the beginning of the French Revolution
1814-15…………………..The Congress of Vienna
March 14, 1861…………..The Kingdom of Italy is proclaimed
September 22, 1861……..Bismarck is appointed chancellor of Prussia
January 18, 1871…………..Proclamation of the German Reich; William I of Prussia becomes Kaiser
October 1879……………..Germany forms an alliance with Austria-Hungary
1890……………………..Bismarck dismissed by William II
1907……………………..Triple Entente formed between Britain, France and Russia
June 28, 1914……………..Archduke Ferdinand assassinated in Sarajevo
July 28, 1914……………..Austria-Hungary declares war on Serbia
August 1, 1914…………..Germany declares war on Russia
August 3, 1914…………..Germany declares war on France and enters Belgium
August 4, 1914…………..Great Britain declares war on Germany
April 6, 1916……………..United States declares war on Germany
November 7, 1916……….October Revolution in Russia
November 11, 1918……..Armistice signed between the Allies and Germany
June 28, 1919…………….The Treaty of Versailles is signed
April, 1922………………..Stalin becomes general secretary of the Communist Party
October 29, 1922…………..Mussolini becomes head of Italy
October 16, 1925………….The Treaty of Locarno
1928……………………..The Kellogg-Briand Pact outlaws all war
October 24, 1929…………..“Black Thursday” on Wall Street ushers in worldwide economic depression
September, 1931…………..Japan invades Manchuria
January 30, 1933…………..Hitler becomes chancellor of Germany
March, 1933……………..Japan leaves the League of Nations
October 3, 1935…………..Italy invades Ethiopia
March 7, 1936……………..Germany occupies the Rhineland
November 1, 1936………..Proclamation of the Berlin-Rome Axis
November 5, 1937………..Hossboch memorandum lays out Hitler’s plans
March 12-13, 1938 The Anschluss in Austria
September 29-30, 1938..... The Munich Agreement
September 1, 1939.........Invasion of Poland by Germany
September 3, 1939.........Britain and France declare war on Germany
June 22, 1941.............Germany invades USSR
December 7, 1941.........Pearl Harbor. United States enters war
February 4-11, 1945.......Conference at Yalta
May 7-8, 1945.............Germany surrenders
August 6, 1945............United States bombs Hiroshima
August 15, 1945...........Japan surrenders
March 5, 1946.............Churchill’s “Iron Curtain” speech
June 5, 1946...............Marshall Plan is launched
June 20, 1948.............Berlin blockade and airlift begin
July 14, 1949...............First Soviet atomic bomb
October 1, 1949............Proclamation of People’s Republic of China
June 25, 1950.............Beginning of the Korean War
September 3, 1953......Khrushchev becomes First Secretary of the Communist Party in the USSR
October 1956..............Soviet intervention in Hungary
August 12, 1961..........Berlin Wall is begun
October 18, 1962.........Cuban Missile Crisis begins
Glossary

*Anarchic state system:* an international system made up of cohesive states without a supreme ruler above them.

*Anschluss:* the forced union of Austria with Germany in 1938.

*Appeasement:* a policy of negotiation and mediation rather than direct confrontation, appeasement was much criticized after World War II.

*Blitzkrieg:* “lightning war” in German; refers to German armed forces’ strategy of bypassing resistance in the early stages of World War II.

*Collective Security:* a doctrine under which war against one is war against all, inspired by a backlash against balance of power politics. Collective security was embodied in the League of Nations.

*League of Nations:* the international institution for collective security whose constitution was drafted by Woodrow Wilson at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919.

*Liberalism:* a school of thought in international politics which argues that a global society functions to provide a context for the actions of states.

*Peace of Westphalia:* the peace which ended the Thirty Year’s War in Europe in 1648.

*Process:* in systemic analysis, the pattern of interactions among the states.

*Realism:* a school of thought in international politics which argues that the propensity to make war is the focus of state actions even in times of peace.

*Structure:* in systemic analysis, the distribution of power between states in a system.

*System:* a set of interrelated units in which the pattern is greater than the sum of the parts.

*Treaty of Versailles:* the treaty between Germany and the Allies which ended World War I in 1919. It included the controversial “war guilt clause”.
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