Chapter 1 : Liberalism (international relations) - Wikipedia

Democratic peace theory is a theory which posits that democracies are hesitant to engage in armed conflict with other identified democracies. In contrast to theories explaining war engagement, it is a "theory of peace" outlining motives that dissuade state-sponsored violence.

Kantian peace, liberal peace Democratic peace, the proposition that democratic states never or almost never wage war on one another. The concept of democratic peace must be distinguished from the claim that democracies are in general more peaceful than nondemocratic countries. Whereas the latter claim is controversial, the claim that democratic states do not fight each other is widely regarded as true by scholars and practitioners of international relations. Proponents of the democratic peace hark back to the German philosopher Immanuel Kant and, more recently, to U. Thus, the terms democratic peace or liberal peace and Kantian peace are today often used interchangeably. Subsequently, and especially after the end of the Cold War , the democratic peace became one of the most-popular subjects of research in international relations. Scores of studies were devoted to it, many of which employed quantitative methods to demonstrate that the democratic peace is a historical fact. What that research has shown is not that wars between nondemocracies, or between democracies and nondemocracies, have been frequent; instead, it has demonstrated that, although interstate war is a rare event in general, wars between democracies have been even rarer. Although a number of critics have questioned the veracity of the proposition, the claim that democracies do not fight each other continues to be widely accepted in the international relations discipline. There is less agreement, however, on why the democratic peace exists. Two major competing if not mutually exclusive explanations have been elaborated. While some argue that democracies are more peaceful to one another because of a shared culture , others consider the main factor to be structural or institutional. Proponents of the first view argue that the political culture of democratic societies is pervaded by the norm that disputes are to be settled by peaceful means. Democratic citizenries, the argument goes, apply that norm to their relations with other democratic societies; hence, when two democracies are locked in a dispute, their leaders expect each other to shun violent means of resolving the dispute. Proponents of the second explanation argue that the political institutions in democracies matter more than the norms harboured by their citizens. The separation of powers and the checks and balances characteristic of democratic political systems constrain the ability of elected leaders to move their countries rashly toward war. Thus, when a conflict arises between two democratic countries, their leaders need not fear a surprise attack; the inherently slow process of national-security decision making on both sides allows ample time for diplomats to resolve the conflict peacefully. In the debate over international relations theory, the democratic peace is identified with the liberal perspective, and it is closely associated with two other liberal claims about world politics: The major rival of international liberal theory is realism , which contends that the foreign policy behaviour of states is shaped primarily by the anarchic structure of the international system—that is, by the absence of a supranational authority capable of effectively providing for the security of individual states. For realists, so long as the international system is anarchic, violence will remain latent, if not always overt, in world politics regardless of the internal characteristics of individual states e. Thus, to the extent that a perpetual state of peace indeed prevails among liberal democracies, its emergence contradicts realist expectations and undermines the position of realism as the leading theory of international relations. The popularity of the democratic peace idea has not been confined to the academy. The foreign policy rhetoric of U. Bill Clinton during the s featured many appeals to this thesis. Spreading democracy throughout the globe was a principal aim of his foreign policy, and administration officials used the democratic peace idea to justify that policy. If the formerly autocratic nations of eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union democratized successfully, the argument went, the United States and its western European allies would no longer need to contain these nations militarily, because democracies do not fight each other. The democratic peace was also embraced by the neoconservative thinkers and officials who shaped U. The belief that a zone of democracy equaled a zone of peace and security buttressed the desire of the George W.

Chapter 2 : Democratic Peace Theory - Political Science - Oxford Bibliographies

Democratic peace is the proposition that democracies are more peaceful in their foreign relations. This idea dates back centuries, at least to Immanuel Kant and other 18th-century Enlightenment thinkers. In recent decades it has constituted a major research agenda, competing with and arguably.

This idea dates back centuries, at least to Immanuel Kant and other 18th-century Enlightenment thinkers. In recent decades it has constituted a major research agenda, competing with and arguably supplanting other research agendas such as neo-realism. The democratic peace proposition has many possible empirical and theoretical forms. Notably, most although not all empirical research on the democratic peace has employed quantitative methods of analysis. On the theoretical side, there are many different accounts of the relationship between democracy and peace, with most focusing on domestic political institutions, domestic political norms, and constructed identities. The democratic peace proposition is connected to many other propositions linking domestic politics and international relations, including that democracies are more likely to cooperate with each other, that democracies are more likely to win the wars they fight, that escalating military casualties degrade public support for war, that leaders initiate conflict to secure their domestic hold on power the diversionary hypothesis , that democracies fight shorter wars, that different kinds of democracies experience different kinds of conflict behavior, that different kinds of authoritarian systems experience different kinds of conflict behavior, and others. The democratic peace also overlaps with related ideas such as the liberal peace and the commercial peace. General Overviews The democratic peace proposition has been lurking in Western thought for millennia, as Weart shows, but Kant provides its first modern formulation. The idea that global democracy would provide a solid foundation for global peace was restated in by Woodrow Wilson as a justification for American entry into World War I and then as part of his vision for a new world order. Modern political science first observed the dyadic democratic peaceâ€"that democracies tend not to fight each otherâ€"in the s. The observation enjoyed greater attention in the s in particular in two pathbreaking essays by Michael Doyle, reprinted in Doyle It received fuller theoretical and empirical attention in the s. Other scholars sought to develop the theory and push forward more advanced research designs in works such as Russett ; Ray ; and Rousseau, et al. In the s, proponents of the democratic peace responded to their critics and embedded the democratic peace in a broader Kantian peace Russett and Oneal The End of History and the Last Man. The definitive intellectual statement that Western values triumphed in the Cold War. Cambridge University Press, Presents a massive new data set on territorial conflicts. Edited by Hans S. Originally published in Democracy and International Conflict: An Evaluation of the Democratic Peace Proposition. University of South Carolina Press, Available online by subscription. Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Postâ€"Cold War World. Princeton University Press, Lays out the normative and institutional explanations of the democratic peace and presents a variety of different forms of rigorous evidence demonstrating the dyadic democratic peace, including sophisticated analysis of post conflict behavior. Russett, Bruce, and John R. Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations. Presented more sophisticated empirical tests, addressing many s theoretical and empirical critiques. Yale University Press, Presents a narrative rather than statistical empirical tests. One main contribution is the analysis of democratic peace in pre-Napoleonic times, including ancient Greece and medieval Italy. Discusses the phenomena of democratic aggression and imperialism. Users without a subscription are not able to see the full content on this page. Please subscribe or login. How to Subscribe Oxford Bibliographies Online is available by subscription and perpetual access to institutions. For more information or to contact an Oxford Sales Representative click here.

Chapter 3 : The Democratic Peace

peace theory and critics who level a number of counterattacks. Among others, these include charges that the theory is a statistical artifact, that the terms of its definition ('democratic' or 'liberal', 'war'.

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: But if the Kantian perspective is correct, recent events replacing authoritarian regimes with democratic values and institutions in much of Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America1 may have profound implications not just for governmental practices within states, but for worldwide peace among states. Politics within a democracy is seen as largely a nonzero-sum enterprise; by cooperating, all can gain something even if all do not gain equally, and the winners are restrained from crushing the losers. If the conflicts degenerate to physical violence, either by those in control of the state or by insurgents, all can lose. In most international politicsâ€" the anarchy of a self-help system with no overall governing authorityâ€" these norms and practices are not the same. By this structural realist understanding the kind of stable peace that exists among democracies cannot last, because eventually democracies would be compelled , by the structure of the international system and their eternal security dilemma, to enter a state of war or at best of military deterrence Waltz , Mearsheimer Realism has no place for an expectation that democracies will not fight each other. To the degree we establish that peace between democracies is a fact, and are able to explain it theoretically , we build an alternative view of the world with great import for expectations and for policy. We begin with the theories. Nor can the same generalization be supported for relations among other kinds of political systems for example, military or other dictatorships. Sharing common forms of political structure and political culture in general does not prevent war between independent states. Despite important differences in political values and organization among the communist countries , they were much more like one another in values and ideology than like the democracies or even like right-wing dictatorships. Yet war between these countries, and disputes that threatened to erupt in war, were commonplace. Certainly some kinds of differences, if politically salient, can cause conflict. But that becomes virtually tautological unless one can specify what differences will be salient. For sixteenth-century Europe religious differences between Catholics and Protestants provided politically salient ideological reasons for killing each other; by the twentieth century those differences were irrelevant to violent conflict save in isolated pockets like Northern Ireland. Some scholars vigorously question the causal inference that democracies are at peace with each other simply because they are democratic. They point instead to other influences that are correlated with democracy and hence create a spurious relation between democracy itself and general peace between democratic states. Without going into the vast range of hypotheses about the causes of war and peace, we need to consider some of the most important ones that You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Chapter 4 : Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War World by Bruce Russett

By illuminating the conflict-resolving mechanisms inherent in the relationships between democracies, Bruce Russett explains one of the most promising developments of the modern international system: the striking fact that the democracies that it comprises have almost never fought each other.

Democracy, Youth, and the United Nations Democracy: Overview Democracy is a universally recognized ideal and is one of the core values and principles of the United Nations. It provides an environment for the protection and effective realization of human rights. Democracy has emerged as a cross-cutting issue in the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits since the s and in the internationally agreed development goals they produced. At that summit governments renewed their commitment to support democracy and welcomed the establishment of a Democracy Fund at the United Nations. The International Day of Democracy On 8 November , the General Assembly proclaimed 15 September as the International Day of Democracy , inviting Member States, the United Nations system and other regional, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to commemorate the Day. The International Day of Democracy provides an opportunity to review the state of democracy in the world. Democracy is as much a process as a goal, and only with the full participation of and support by the international community, national governing bodies, civil society and individuals, can the ideal of democracy be made into a reality to be enjoyed by everyone, everywhere. This was hardly surprising. Others laid claim to it but did not practise it. And yet, in the seven decades since the Charter was signed, the UN as an institution has done more to support and strengthen democracy around the world than any other global organization -- from fostering good governance to monitoring elections, from supporting civil society to strengthening democratic institutions and accountability, from ensuring self-determination in decolonized countries to assisting the drafting of new constitutions in nations post-conflict. This brings home the fact that democracy is one of the universal and indivisible core values and principles of the United Nations. It is based on the freely expressed will of people and closely linked to the rule of law and exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms. People have a say in decisions that affect their lives and can hold decision-makers to account, based on inclusive and fair rules, institutions and practices that govern social interactions. Women are equal partners with men in private and public spheres of life and decision-making, and all people are free from discrimination based on race, ethnicity, class, gender or any other attribute. In essence, therefore, democratic governance is the process of creating and sustaining an environment for inclusive and responsive political processes and settlements. It is also important to note that the United Nations does not advocate for a specific model of government, but promotes democratic governance as a set of values and principles that should be followed for greater participation, equality, security and human development. The Secretary-General tasked the Democracy Working Group of the Executive Committee on Peace and Security â€" established in May â€" to ensure regular follow-up on the issue of democracy and, more specifically, on strategy development. Since its adoption, the Declaration has inspired constitution-making around the world and has contributed greatly to the global acceptance of democracy as a universal value and principle. The Covenant is binding on those States that have ratified it. As of July , the number of parties to the Covenant was , which constitutes approximately 85 per cent of the United Nations membership. The political work of the United Nations requires that it promote democratic outcomes; the development agencies seek to bolster national institutions like parliaments, electoral commissions and legal systems that form the bedrock of any democracy; and the human rights efforts support freedom of expression and association, the right to peaceful assembly, participation, and the rule of law, all of which are critical components of democracy. They resolved to strive for the full protection and promotion in all countries of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights for all and to strengthen the capacity of all countries to implement the principles and practices of democracy and respect for human rights. Democracy and Human Rights The human rights normative framework The values of freedom, respect for human rights and the principle of holding periodic and genuine elections by universal suffrage are essential elements of democracy. In turn, democracy provides the natural environment for the protection and effective

realization of human rights. This led to the articulation of several landmark resolutions of the former Commission on Human Rights. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms Freedom of association Freedom of expression and opinion Access to power and its exercise in accordance with the rule of law The holding of periodic free and fair elections by universal suffrage and by secret ballot as the expression of the will of the people A pluralistic system of political parties and organizations The separation of powers The independence of the judiciary Transparency and accountability in public administration Free, independent and pluralistic media Since its establishment in , the Human Rights Council successor to the Commission has adopted a number of resolutions highlighting the interdependent and mutually reinforcing relationship between democracy and human rights. Addressing democracy deficits Democracy deficits, weak institutions and poor governance are among the main challenges to the effective realization of human rights. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights OHCHR and the United Nations Development Programme UNDP seek to address these challenges through their advisory services and programmes, which focus on strengthening the legal framework for human rights protection and promotion institutional and legal reform ; capacity building for stronger national human rights systems; implementation of the Universal Periodic Review recommendations, promoting human rights-based approaches, including empowering vulnerable and disadvantaged segments of the society to claim their rights; advocacy, awareness raising and human rights education. In transitional democracies and countries emerging from conflicts, OHCHR collaborates with national governments and actors to build a strong and independent judiciary, a representative, efficient and accountable parliament, an independent and effective national human rights institution, and a vibrant civil society. Promoting democratic governance Democratic governance, as supported by the United Nations emphasizes the role of individuals and peoples â€" all of them, without any exclusion â€" in shaping their human growth and the human development of societies. But individuals can only make such contributions when their individual potential is unleashed through the enjoyment of human rights. UNDP supports one in three parliaments in the developing world and an election every two weeks. In , UNDP programmes strengthened electoral processes around the world and helped register 18 million new voters. UNDP also works to foster partnerships and share ways to promote participation, accountability and effectiveness at all levels, aiming to build effective and capable states that are accountable and transparent, inclusive and responsive â€" from elections to participation of women and the poor. OHCHR promotes democratic governance by providing sustained support to democratic institutions, including national actors and institutions involved in the administration of justice; enhancing the capacity of parliamentarians to engage in human rights protection, supporting civil society, facilitating constitution-making, and conducting human rights monitoring in the context of electoral processes. Supporting transitional democracies Popular uprisings across the world were led by youth, women, and men from all social strata and are opening greater space for civic engagement in decision making. These events have reaffirmed the pivotal importance of democratic governance as a system premised on inclusion, participation, non-discrimination and accountability. In transitional democracies and countries emerging from conflict, OHCHR collaborates with national governments and other actors to confront the past in order to rebuild public confidence and restore peace and the rule of law. OHCHR has actively supported transitional justice programmes in more than 20 countries around the world over the past decade. Its support includes ensuring that human rights and transitional justice considerations are reflected in peace agreements; engaging in the design and implementation of inclusive national consultations on transitional justice mechanisms; supporting the establishment of truth-seeking processes, judicial accountability mechanisms, and reparations programmes; and enhancing institutional reform. The Council called upon States to make continuous efforts to strengthen the rule of law and promote democracy through a wide range of measures. Further to this resolution, OHCHR, in consultation with States, national human rights institutions, civil society, relevant intergovernmental bodies and international organizations, published a study on challenges, lessons learned and best practices in securing democracy and the rule of law from a human rights perspective. OHCHR also works to underline the close relationship between human rights and democracy within the United Nations system. The round table discussed democracy movements and their characteristics in a number of States, including those involved in the Arab Spring. It

underlined the importance of working with regional and sub-regional organizations when dealing with unconstitutional changes of Government, and when promoting democratic movements and democracies more generally. Elections sit at the heart of this, making possible the act of self-determination envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations. During the subsequent era of trusteeship and decolonization, it supervised and observed plebiscites, referenda and elections worldwide. Today, the United Nations continues to be a trusted impartial actor providing electoral assistance to approximately 60 countries each year, either at the request of Member States or based on a Security Council or General Assembly mandate. Electoral assistance is based on the principle established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that the will of the people, as expressed through periodic and genuine elections, shall be the basis of government authority. Electoral assistance also recognizes the principles of state sovereignty and national ownership of elections, and that there is no single model of democracy. The main goal of United Nations electoral assistance is to support Member States in holding periodic, inclusive and transparent elections that are credible and popularly perceived as such and establishing nationally sustainable electoral processes. The provision of electoral assistance by the United Nations is a team effort involving a number of programmes, funds, agencies and departments under the mandate provided by the General Assembly. The Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs is designated by the Secretary-General as the UN Focal Point for Electoral Assistance Activities, with a leadership role in ensuring system-wide coherence and consistency and in strengthening the institutional memory and the development, dissemination and issuance of United Nations electoral assistance policies. This includes undertaking electoral needs assessments, recommending parameters for all United Nations electoral assistance, advising on the design of projects, developing electoral policy, maintaining institutional memory, and providing technical guidance and support in the implementation of electoral projects. In peacekeeping or post-conflict environments, electoral assistance is generally provided through components of field missions under the aegis of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations DPKO or the DPA. Military and police components of peacekeeping missions support national law enforcement agencies in providing security for electoral processes. UNDP provides electoral assistance to develop sustainable electoral management capacities, to foster inclusive participation in elections, particularly of women and youth and other underrepresented groups, and to coordinate donor support to electoral processes. This includes seven countries where special political missions are deployed, and eight where peacekeeping missions are deployed. United Nations electoral assistance has been a crucial and successful component in peacekeeping, peacebuilding, and in establishing and deepening democratic governance. As democracy has spread, so has the role of elections as the means to establish legitimate government. The United Nations has been engaged in elections in all regions of the world, with assistance provided recently in the Afghanistan, Mali, Somalia, Jordan, Nepal, Bangladesh and Iraq, to name just a few. In Tunisia for example, the UN supported civil society in the October National Constituent Assembly elections and continues to provide technical assistance to the national authorities. In , the United Nations provided technical and logistical support to Malian authorities in the conduct of Presidential elections. In addition, the United Nations is currently in the the process of supporting electoral reform in Afghanistan. Other partners are the many international non-governmental organizations working in the field of electoral assistance. These relationships provide opportunities for collaboration on electoral support activities as well as for sharing lessons and experiences. It is recognized that addressing the capacity of an electoral management body in isolation will not necessarily produce credible elections. There also needs to be a focus on the overall political environment in which the elections take place. The United Nations therefore also makes efforts to build capacity outside the electoral authorities. This involves working with voters, the media, political parties and civil society, as well as other actors and institutions of democratic governance such as parliament and the judiciary. This is the basis for regular training for field and headquarters based staff. However, for civil society activists and organizations in a range of countries covering every continent, space is shrinking â€" or even closing. Governments have adopted restrictions that limit the ability of NGOs to work or to receive funding. As the Secretary-General has said, the hallmark of successful and stable democracies is the presence of a strong and freely operating civil society -- in which Government and civil society work together for common goals for a better future, and at the same time, civil society helps

keep Government accountable. Since Secretary-General Kofi A. These have ranged from supporting civil society efforts for accountability and transparency to building capacity for strengthening good governance and the rule of law. The large majority of UNDEF funds go to local civil society organizations in countries in both the transition and consolidation phases of democratisation. It targets the demand side of democracy, rather than the supply side. UNDEF projects are in seven main areas:

Chapter 5 : Freedom's Principles [Democratic Peace]

Democratic peace theory as a formal idea was established in the s, while the US was leading a coalition of mostly democratic nations against the authoritarian USSR. However, the basis for this.

The Forward to the book is below. It has been extensively revised as of January 17, Preface In Terms of Freedom This is a book for those who want to foster freedom at home and abroad. The pages that follow offer nothing less than a fundamental understanding of the psychological, socio-economic, and political roots of a worldview that I call freedomism. So what is this freedomism? Why do I use this new term, instead of adopting a conventional political party label? I might explain by considering the political labels of my own country, the United States. Looking at American politics alone, it can be readily understood that the general positions of the Democrats, Republicans, Reform Party, Libertarian Party, Green Party, Socialist Party, and Communist Party, not to mention the plethora of even smaller groups, do not emphasize freedom at home and abroad as a core theme, although some of their political leaders may come close to doing so at times. Republicans, for example, if I may take President Bush as most representative, are freedomists in their foreign policy, to a much lesser extent in their economic policies, and not at all in their traditional social conservatism. Then there are the Democrats who are keen to spread democratic freedom abroad, if we are to believe the public statements of such leading figures as Bill and Hillary Clinton. In practice, this means an emphasis on working through the United Nations, and the maintenance of stability in international relations. National defense is also important for Democrats, but, as an issue, it ranks second to international aid, to sensitivity to the "international community", and to "building bridges. That said, American Democrats do also emphasize freedom, and not only rhetorically, but also in their policies, for the American citizen, at least. What, then, of the libertarians? For sure, the beliefs of libertarians move us closer to what I mean by freedomism. As a young man, I was a self-professed democratic socialist, but in the early s, under the hammer blows of Ludwig von Mises, F. Hayek, and Milton Friedman, I gave up my belief in socialism in favor of democratic libertarianism. And libertarian is what I called myself until recently. Indeed, I remain libertarian in domestic policy. I contend that the more domestic freedom there is from regulation, government control, taxation, and oppressive laws, the better. But only up to a point. I am not an anarchist. I believe that social justice means minimal government consistent with the guaranteed protection of equal civil and political rights for all. Yet this is a view that is commonly held by libertarian thinkers. Why, then, do I no longer describe my own view as libertarian? The reason lies beyond domestic politics. On foreign policy, the libertarian is typically an isolationist, fundamentally opposed to foreign involvements and interventions, a perspective that has led some libertarians into an odd coalition with the democratic socialist and the communist Marxist left. Put simply, the libertarian argument is, "As domestic politics should be free, let international relations also be free. Let there be free trade and commerce, and freedom for other countries to do whatever they want with their people. What goes on in such countries is not our business. Should those with a dangerous infectious disease remain free, when they could spread it everywhere, killing maybe hundreds with it? Unfortunately, by their isolationism, libertarians make life easier for the gangs of thugs blandly called dictatorships that murder, torture, and oppress their people as a routine matter of policy. Not our business, our libertarian says, even though his fundamental belief in freedom is being violated in the most horrible ways, and even though he knows this to be the case. This is a position I have found myself unable to hold, and not because I care any less about my own personal security. Indeed, it is my contention that the isolationist ultimately plays fast and loose with his own welfare and that of his loved ones. For in an age of nuclear weapons and readily transportable biological, free nations can no longer sit back and ignore what goes on elsewhere in the production and deliverability of such weapons. Opposition to the rapacious affairs of thug regimes, including military intervention, is, in my view, absolutely necessary to secure and defend existing democracies, leaving aside the issue of advancing democracy further throughout our world. In short, I believe that thug regimes cannot be trusted with either the possession or the capability for production of weapons of mass destruction. Yet the isolationists, whatever their party, seem willing to let the thugs rule not only their enslaved peoples, but, in due course, the world, too.

As a freedomist, I say this is wrong. This, then, is my position. I am a freedomist, and I believe many others are as well. I intend this book to give substance to this belief, to provide not only the intellectual understanding of why the political world is as it is today, but also a path to a future world that is free, bountiful, and at peace. This is an ambitious undertaking, to be sure. Only you, the reader, can judge whether I succeed. Rummel Friday, January 18,

Chapter 6 : Democratic peace theory - Wikipedia

Democratic Peace Theory suggests that there are qualitatively different international relations within the community of liberal democracies (referred to by some as the "Zone of Peace").

Areas of study[edit] Broad areas of study within liberal international relations theory include: The democratic peace theory , and, more broadly, the effect of domestic political regime types and domestic politics on international relations; [7] [8] The commercial peace theory , arguing that free trade has pacifying effects on international relations. Current explorations of globalization and interdependence are a broader continuation of this line of inquiry; Institutional peace theory , which attempts to demonstrate how cooperation can be sustained in anarchy , how long-term interests can be pursued over short-term interests, and how actors may realize absolute gains instead of seeking relative gains ; Related, the effect of international organizations on international politics, both in their role as forums for states to pursue their interests, and in their role as actors in their own right; The role of international law in moderating or constraining state behavior; The effects of liberal norms on international politics, especially relations between liberal states; The role of various types of unions in international politics relations , such as highly institutionalized alliances e. NATO , confederations , leagues, federations , and evolving entities like the European Union ; and, The role, or potential role, of cosmopolitanism in transcending the state and affecting international relations. Early beginnings[edit] Liberalism originally arose from both deep scholarly and philosophical roots. It was later in the 17th and 18th centuries in which political liberalism began to take form that challenged nobility and inherited equality. Thinkers, like Locke and Kant, wrote about what they saw in the world around them. John Locke discusses many ideas that are now attributed to Liberalism in Two Treatises of Government, [11] published in In his second treatise, Locke comments on society and outlines the importance of natural rights and laws. Locke believes that people are born as blank slates without any preordained ideas or notions. This state is known as the State of Nature because it shows people in their most barbaric form. As people grow, their experiences begin to shape their thoughts and actions. They are naturally in the State of Nature until they choose not to be, until something changes their barbaric nature. Locke says that, civil government can remedy this anarchy. Locke argues that civil government can help people gain the basic human rights of health, liberty and possession. This program would require cooperation between states as well as the mutual pursuit of secure freedom and shared benefits. Because war was naturally unpopular, Kant thought that leaders would avoid burdening voters with its costs. After seeing success in intertwining states through economic coalition, liberal supporters began to believe that warfare was not always an inevitable part of IR. Keohane and Joseph S. These theorists have seen that democracies do in fact fight wars. However, democracies do not fight wars with other democracies because of capitalist ties. Democracies are economically dependent and therefore are more likely to resolve issues diplomatically. Furthermore, citizens in democracies are less likely to think of citizens in other democracies as enemies because of shared morals.

Chapter 7 : Democracy | United Nations

In the modern world, the phenomenon of democratic peace is real. In this chapter we find strong evidence of the relative lack of conflict and the absence of war between democracies during the last half-century.

Defining democracy[edit] Democracies have been defined differently by different theorists and researchers; this accounts for some of the variations in their findings. Doyle requires 1 that "liberal regimes" have market or private property economics, 2 they have policies that are internally sovereign, 3 they have citizens with juridical rights, and 4 they have representative governments. He allows greater power to hereditary monarchs than other researchers; for example, he counts the rule of Louis-Philippe of France as a liberal regime. This definition excludes long periods often viewed as democratic. For example, the United States until , India from independence until , and Japan until were all under one-party rule, and thus would not be counted under this definition Ray , p. Many researchers have instead used more finely grained scales. One example is the Polity data series which scores each state on two scales, one for democracy and one for autocracy, for each year since ; as well as several others. Some researchers have done correlations between the democracy scale and belligerence; others have treated it as a binary classification by as its maker does calling all states with a high democracy score and a low autocracy score democracies; yet others have used the difference of the two scores, sometimes again making this into a binary classification Gleditsch Young democracies[edit] Several researchers have observed that many of the possible exceptions to the democratic peace have occurred when at least one of the involved democracies was very young. Many of them have therefore added a qualifier, typically stating that the peacefulness apply to democracies older than three years Doyle , Russett , Rummel , Weart Rummel argues that this is enough time for "democratic procedures to be accepted, and democratic culture to settle in. Mansfield and Snyder , , while agreeing that there have been no wars between mature liberal democracies, state that countries in transition to democracy are especially likely to be involved in wars. They find that democratizing countries are even more warlike than stable democracies, stable autocracies or even countries in transition towards autocracy. So, they suggest caution in eliminating these wars from the analysis, because this might hide a negative aspect of the process of democratization. A review Ray cites several other studies finding that the increase in the risk of war in democratizing countries happens only if many or most of the surrounding nations are undemocratic. Defining war[edit] Quantitative research on international wars usually define war as a military conflict with more than killed in battle in one year. This is the definition used in the Correlates of War Project which has also supplied the data for many studies on war. It turns out that most of the military conflicts in question fall clearly above or below this threshold Ray , p. Some researchers have used different definitions. For example, Weart defines war as more than battle deaths. Such a conflict may be no more than military display of force with no battle deaths. Wars are relatively rare. An average ratio of 30 MIDs to one war provides a richer statistical environment for analysis. Very few researchers have supported the monadic peace, that democracies are more peaceful in general. There are some recent papers that find a slight monadic effect. List of wars between democracies Some scholars support the democratic peace on probabilistic grounds: The total number of cases suggested in the literature is at least The data set Bremer was using showed one exception, the French-Thai War of ; Gleditsch sees the somewhat technical state of war between Finland and UK during World War II , as a special case, which should probably be treated separately: However, the UK did bomb Finland, implying the war was not only on paper. Page Fortna discusses the Turkish invasion of Cyprus and the Kargil War as exceptions, finding the latter to be the most significant. However, the status of these countries as being truly democratic is a matter of debate. Similarly, the Turkish intervention in Cyprus occurred only after the Cypriot elected government was abolished in a coup sponsored by the military government of Greece. Limiting the theory to only truly stable and genuine democracies leads to a very restrictive set of highly prosperous nations with little incentive in armed conflict that might harm their economies, in which the theory might be expected to hold virtually by definition. One advocate of the democratic peace explains that his reason to choose a definition of democracy sufficiently restrictive to exclude all wars between democracies are what "might be disparagingly termed

public relations": One problem with the research on wars is that, as the Realist Mearsheimer , p. Democracies have been very rare until recently. Freedom House finds no independent state with universal suffrage in Studying lesser conflicts[edit] Many researchers have reacted to this limitation by studying lesser conflicts instead, since they have been far more common. There have been many more MIDs than wars; the Correlates of War Project counts several thousand during the last two centuries. A review Ray lists many studies that have reported that democratic pairs of states are less likely to be involved in MIDs than other pairs of states. When examining the inter-liberal MIDs in more detail, one study Wayman finds that they are less likely to involve third parties, and that the target of the hostility is less likely to reciprocate, if the target reciprocates the response is usually proportional to the provocation, and the disputes are less likely to cause any loss of life. The most common action was "Seizure of Material or Personnel". Studies find that the probability that disputes between states will be resolved peacefully is positively affected by the degree of democracy exhibited by the lesser democratic state involved in that dispute. Disputes between democratic states are significantly shorter than disputes involving at least one undemocratic state. Democratic states are more likely to be amenable to third party mediation when they are involved in disputes with each other Ray In international crises that include the threat or use of military force, one study finds that if the parties are democracies, then relative military strength has no effect on who wins. This is different from when nondemocracies are involved. Similarly, a study of the behavior of states that joined ongoing militarized disputes reports that power is important only to autocracies: Conflict initiation[edit] According to a review study, "there is enough evidence to conclude that democracy does cause peace at least between democracies, that the observed correlation between democracy and peace is not spurious. In many conflicts both sides argue that the other side was initiator. Even so, several studies have examined this. Reiter and Stam argue that autocracies initiate conflicts against democracies more frequently than democracies do against autocracies. Personalistic and military dictatorships may be particularly prone to conflict initiation, as compared to other types of autocracy such as one party states, but also more likely to be targeted in a war having other initiators. One study found that democracies are no less likely to settle border disputes peacefully than non-democracies. However, there is also evidence that democracies have less internal systematic violence. For instance, one study finds that the most democratic and the most authoritarian states have few civil wars , and intermediate regimes the most. The probability for a civil war is also increased by political change, regardless whether toward greater democracy or greater autocracy. Intermediate regimes continue to be the most prone to civil war, regardless of the time since the political change. In the long run, since intermediate regimes are less stable than autocracies, which in turn are less stable than democracies, durable democracy is the most probable end-point of the process of democratization Hegre et al. Abadie study finds that the most democratic nations have the least terrorism. Harff finds that genocide and politicide are rare in democracies. Rummel finds that the more democratic a regime, the less its democide. He finds that democide has killed six times as many people as battles. Davenport and Armstrong lists several other studies and states: Statistically, a MENA democracy makes a country more prone to both the onset and incidence of civil war, and the more democratic a MENA state is, the more likely it is to experience violent intrastate strife. Moreover, anocracies do not seem to be predisposed to civil war, either worldwide or in MENA. Note that they usually are meant to be explanations for little violence between democracies, not for a low level of internal violence in democracies. Several of these mechanisms may also apply to countries of similar systems. The book Never at War finds evidence for an oligarchic peace. Another that a belief in human rights may make people in democracies reluctant to go to war, especially against other democracies. Bruce Russett , p. In addition, he holds that a social norm emerged toward the end of the nineteenth century; that democracies should not fight each other, which strengthened when the democratic culture and the degree of democracy increased, for example by widening the franchise. Increasing democratic stability allowed partners in foreign affairs to perceive a nation as reliably democratic. The alliances between democracies during the two World Wars and the Cold War also strengthened the norms. He sees less effective traces of this norm in Greek antiquity. He refers in particular to the Swiss practice of participatory democracy. Mousseau , argues that it is market-oriented development that creates the norms and values that explain both democracy and the peace. In less developed countries individuals often depend on

social networks that impose conformity to in-group norms and beliefs, and loyalty to group leaders. When jobs are plentiful on the market, in contrast, as in market-oriented developed countries, individuals depend on a strong state that enforces contracts equally. Cognitive routines emerge of abiding by state law rather than group leaders, and, as in contracts, tolerating differences among individuals. Marketplace democracies thus share common foreign policy interests in the supremacyâ€"and predictabilityâ€"of international law over brute power politics, and equal and open global trade over closed trade and imperial preferences. When disputes do originate between marketplace democracies, they are less likely than others to escalate to violence because both states, even the stronger one, perceive greater long-term interests in the supremacy of law over power politics. Braumoeller argues that liberal norms of conflict resolution vary because liberalism takes many forms. By examining survey results from the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union, the author demonstrates that liberalism in that region bears a stronger resemblance to 19th-century liberal nationalism than to the sort of universalist, Wilsonian liberalism described by democratic peace theorists, and that, as a result, liberals in the region are more, not less, aggressive than non-liberals. Democratic political structures[edit] The case for institutional constraints goes back to Kant , who wrote: Among the latter would be: This monadic theory must, however, explain why democracies do attack non-democratic states. One explanation is that these democracies were threatened or otherwise were provoked by the non-democratic states. Doyle also notes p. One explanation is that democracies, for internal political and economic reasons, have greater resources. This might mean that democratic leaders are unlikely to select other democratic states as targets because they perceive them to be particularly formidable opponents. One study finds that interstate wars have important impacts on the fate of political regimes, and that the probability that a political leader will fall from power in the wake of a lost war is particularly high in democratic states Ray Survey results that compare the attitudes of citizens and elites in the Soviet successor states are consistent with this argument Braumoeller Moreover, these constraints are readily apparent to other states and cannot be manipulated by leaders. Thus, democracies send credible signals to other states of an aversion to using force. These signals allow democratic states to avoid conflicts with one another, but they may attract aggression from nondemocratic states. Democracies may be pressured to respond to such aggressionâ€"perhaps even preemptivelyâ€"through the use of force. In disputes between liberal states, the credibility of their bargaining signals allows them to negotiate a peaceful settlement before mobilization. An explanation based on game theory similar to the last two above is that the participation of the public and the open debate send clear and reliable information regarding the intentions of democracies to other states.

The democratic peace theory proposes that democratic states are less likely to go to war with each other, but will go to war with nondemocratic states, and usually win. This is a theory.

This series provides the reader with an overview paper and then breaks down the specific elements of democratic governance into individual topics. Each paper in the series reflects both the thinking of mainstream theorists and common practices of the many free societies now flourishing under systems of democratic governance. In democracies, it is the people who hold sovereign power over legislator and government. All democracies, while respecting the will of the majority, zealously protect the fundamental rights of individuals and minority groups. Elections in a democracy cannot be facades that dictators or a single party hide behind, but authentic competitions for the support of the people. Democracies rest upon fundamental principles, not uniform practices. Democracies recognize that reaching consensus requires compromise and that it may not always be attainable. In fact, however, these principles are twin pillars holding up the very foundation of what we mean by democratic government. Just as no self-appointed group has the right to oppress others, so no majority, even in a democracy, should take away the basic rights and freedoms of a minority group or individual. But democracies recognize that diversity can be an enormous asset. They treat these differences in identity, culture, and values as a challenge that can strengthen and enrich them, not as a threat. In democracies, questions of peace and war or other threats to national security are the most important issues a society faces, and thus must be decided by the people, acting through their elected representatives. A democratic military serves its nation rather than leads it. Military leaders advise the elected leaders and carry out their decisions. Only those who are elected by the people have the authority and the responsibility to decide the fate of a nation. This idea of civilian control and authority over the military is thus, fundamental to democracy. It does not represent or support any political viewpoint or ethnic and social group. Its loyalty is to the larger ideals of the nation, to the rule of law, and to the principle of democracy itself. The purpose of a military is to defend society, not define it. Civilian officials rely upon the military for expert advice on these matters and to carry out the decisions of the government. But only the elected civilian leadership should make ultimate policy decisions â€" which the military then implements in its sphere. Military people must first retire from military service before becoming involved in politics; armed services must remain separate from politics. The military are the neutral servants of the state, and the guardians of society. It is the responsibility of all political leaders to enforce civilian control and the responsibility of the military to obey the lawful orders of civilian authorities. And the principal way of doing that is through political parties. Parties recruit candidates and campaign to elect them to public office, and they mobilize people to participate in selecting government leaders. Some are small and built around a set of political beliefs. Others are organized around economic interests, or shared history. Still others are loose alliances of different citizens who may only come together at election time. They know that only through broad alliances and cooperation with other political parties and organizations can they provide the leadership and common vision that will win the support of the people of the nation. It means that all sides in political debate â€" however deep their differences â€" share the fundamental democratic values of freedom of speech and faith, and equal protection under law. Parties that lose elections step into the role of opposition â€" confident that the political system will continue to protect their right to organize and speak out. In time, their party will have a chance to campaign again for its ideas, and the votes of the people. Democracies grant many freedoms to their citizens including the freedom to dissent and criticize the government. Citizenship in a democracy requires participation, civility, and even patience. They recognize that democracy requires an investment of time and hard work â€" a government of the people demands constant vigilance and support by the people. Other obligations apply to all democracies and are the sole responsibility of the citizen â€" chief among these is respect for law. In turn, government officials understand that all citizens should be treated equally and that bribery has no place in a democratic government. They need the steady attention, time, and commitment of large numbers of their citizens who, in turn, look to the government to protect their rights and freedoms. They accept the fact that their party may not always be in

power. Democratic governments do not have ministries of information to regulate content of newspapers or the activities of journalists; requirements that journalists be vetted by the state; or force journalists to join government-controlled unions. An independent judiciary, civil society with rule of law, and free speech all support a free press. A free press must have legal protections. Citizens therefore expect to be informed about decisions their governments make on their behalf. The press facilitates this "right to know," by serving as a watchdog over the government, helping citizens to hold government accountable, and questioning its policies. Democratic governments grant journalists access to public meetings and public documents. They do not place prior restraints on what journalists may say or print. Through professional associations, independent press councils, and "ombudsmen," in-house critics who hear public complaints, the press responds to complaints of its own excesses and remains internally accountable. In order for the public to trust the press, journalists must provide factual reporting based on credible sources and information. Plagiarism and false reporting are counterproductive to a free press. A democracy allows the press to go about its business of collecting and reporting the news without fear or favor from the government. Governments sometimes need to limit access to information considered too sensitive for general distribution. But journalists in democracies are fully justified in pursuing such information. A federal system of government â€" power shared at the local, regional, and national levels â€" empowers elected officials who design and administer policies tailored to local and regional needs. They work in partnership with a national government and with each other to solve the many problems the nation faces. It grants and protects decision-making ability where results are most immediately felt â€" in local communities, as well as at higher levels of government. Defense, international treaties, federal budgets, and postal services are often cited as examples. The national government often has authority to mediate disputes between regions. Citizens are free to run for government positions at all levels â€" local and regional governments offer the most positions and, perhaps, the most opportunity to make a difference in their communities. Even if a particular party does not hold a majority in the national legislature or the executive, it is permitted to participate at the regional and local levels. A first step away from such tyranny was the notion of rule by law, including the notion that even a ruler is under the law and should rule by virtue of legal means. Democracies went further by establishing the rule of law. Although no society or government system is problem-free, rule of law protects fundamental political, social, and economic rights and reminds us that tyranny and lawlessness are not the only alternatives. Justice is best achieved when the laws are established by the very people who must obey them. To serve their necessary role in the legal and political system, judges must be committed to the principles of democracy. Regardless of origin the law should enshrine certain provisions to protect the rights and freedoms of citizens: If convicted, they may not be subjected to cruel or unusual punishment. This principle protects citizens from coercion, abuse, or torture and greatly reduces the temptation of police to employ such measures. These human rights empower people to pursue lives of dignity â€" thus, no government can bestow them but all governments should protect them. Freedom, built on a foundation of justice, tolerance, dignity, and respect â€" regardless of ethnicity, religion, political association, or social standing â€" allows people to pursue these fundamental rights. Whereas dictatorships deny human rights, free societies continually strive to attain them. Human rights are interdependent and indivisible; they encompass myriad facets of human existence including social, political, and economic issues. Among the most commonly accepted are: Governments should create laws that protect human rights while justice systems enforce those laws equally among the population. A professional police force respects all citizens as it enforces the laws of the nation. Governments should recognize the rights of minorities while respecting the will of the majority. They should receive at least an elementary education, proper nutrition, and healthcare. Citizen responsibility â€" through a variety of participatory activities â€" ensures that government remains accountable to the people. The family of free nations is committed to work toward protection of human rights. They formalize their commitment through a number of international treaties and covenants on human rights. Such leaders are powerful not because they command armies or economic wealth, but because they respect the limits placed on them by the electorate in a free and fair election. In a constitutional democracy, power is divided so that the legislature makes the laws, the executive authority enforces and carries them out, and the judiciary operates independently. In such systems, the political opposition serves as a chief means of limiting,

or checking the authority of the executive. Consequently, democracies may be slow to reach agreement on national issues; yet when they do, their leaders can act with great authority and confidence. They perform a number of roles essential to the functioning of a healthy democracy. They are not so-called rubber stamp parliaments merely approving the decisions of an authoritarian leader. In some democracies, legislative committees provide lawmakers a forum for these public examinations of national issues. But they must work within the democratic ethic of tolerance, respect, and compromise to reach agreements that will benefit the general welfare of all the people â€" not just their political supporters. Each legislator must alone decide on how to balance the general welfare with the needs of a local constituency. To do this, they often maintain a staff of trained aides. Plurality elections encourage a looser, two-party system. Under either system, representatives engage in the debate, negotiation, coalition building, and compromise that are the hallmarks of democratic legislatures. This independence does not imply judges can make decisions based on personal preferences but rather that they are free to make lawful decisions â€" even if those decisions contradict the government or powerful parties involved in a case. Judicial rulings should be impartial, based on the facts of a case, individual merits and legal arguments, and relevant laws, without any restrictions or improper influence by interested parties. These principles ensure equal legal protection for all. This power, however, requires that the courts be seen as independent and able to rest their decisions upon the law, not political considerations. A civil society recognizes the importance of professional judges by providing them with adequate training and remuneration. Freedom of speech belongs to all: Instead, they can be removed only for serious crimes or infractions through the lengthy and difficult procedure of impeachment bringing charges and trial â€" either in the legislature or before a separate court panel.

Chapter 9 : Project MUSE - Grasping the Democratic Peace

democratic peace, and therefore are more likely to have internal conflict and engage in external wars. 10 As there is a gradient between autocracy and democracy, states fall somewhere between the two, and the pacific benefits of democracy can still be found to.