

Today's Agenda

- Wagner, chapter 1 (no reading comprehension due)

For Thursday:

- Wagner, chapter 2 (no reading comprehension due)
- Essay 1 regarding the Crimean War:
 - Write a short essay (approximately 5-7 pages, double-spaced, typed, not including a works-cited page) in which you apply three theories we have read to the origins of the Crimean War. For each theory, clearly identify the theoretical concepts that are most salient for understanding the Crimean War and the level of analysis of those salient theoretical concepts. Also for each theory, explain how the theory helps explain the Crimean War as well as aspects of the Crimean War that the theory does not explain. Begin and end your essay with a clear theory statement of which theory you argue explains the origins of the Crimean War the best. The following outline may be used to structure your essay.

1. Introduction
 - A. Thesis statement (which theory best explains the origins of the Crimean War)
 - B. Which theories you apply to the Crimean War
2. Applying theories to the Crimean War
 - A. Theory 1
 - a. Brief summary of theory 1 and how it explains the causes of war in general
 - b. Salient theoretical concepts regarding the Crimean War
 1. Which concepts?
 2. Why salient for the Crimean War?
 3. Level of analysis?
 - c. How theory 1 helps explain the Crimean War
 - d. Aspects of the Crimean War that are not explained by theory 1
 - B. Theory 2 (repeat above but for theory 2)
 - C. Theory 3 (repeat above but for theory 3)
3. Evaluation of theories
 - A. Which theory best explains the most important aspects of the origins of the Crimean War?
 - B. How might the short-comings of the best theory be addressed in some revised theory?
4. Conclusion
 - A. What theories you applied to the Crimean War
 - B. Recap of thesis statement

Wagner, chapter 1

Guided-Discussion Questions

- What is the main point of this chapter?
- What is the importance of having a valid argument?
- We have been stressing the importance of theory and evidence. Why can evidence neither support nor refute an invalid argument?
- What does the author mean by the following quote: "if the weatherman does not know why snow occurs, one cannot have much confidence in his forecast." (52n) How does this apply to our understanding of war?
- How is it that Realism does not explain war?
- Why is the Prisoner's Dilemma not a model of the Security Dilemma?
- How is it that negotiating for a mutually beneficial agreement has elements of both absolute and relative gains?
- Why is it that neither anarchy nor hierarchy explain the occurrence of war?

Chapter Outline

- Theories, Arguments, and Explanations
 - Arguments and Explanations
 - Science, Causes, Variables, and Theories
 - Causality and Meaning
 - Models: Method or Madness?
 - A Guide for the Reader
- Offensive Realism
- Defensive Realism
- Structural Realism
- Anarchy and War

- The Security Dilemma
- Offensive and Defense
- The Security Dilemma and the Prisoner's Dilemma
- Hierarchy and Peace
- Realism's Competitors
 - Neoliberal Institutionalism
 - Constructivism
- Generic Realism
- What Next?
 - The reason of state

Chapter Quotes

"logical validity is an important criterion in evaluating arguments. Empirical evidence cannot confirm or disconfirm an explanation if the evidence is not actually implied by the explanation." (37)

"if facts are to support explanations, the facts must be implied by the explanation." (43)

"However, there is actually no explanation of the occurrence of war in Van Evera's book, which instead contains a number of more or less plausible claims about what influences the probability that war will occur. This is like substituting a weather forecast for an explanation of the occurrence of snow. But if the weatherman does not know why snow occurs, one cannot have much confidence in his forecast." (52n77)