Democracies, International Conflict, and Peace

Steven V. Miller

Sample Syllabus

E-mail: svmille@clemson.edu

Office Hours: TBD

Office: TBD

Web: svmiller.com/teaching

Class Hours: TBD

Class Room: TBD

Course Description

The democratic peace—the virtual absence of any war fought between two democracies in the international system—is one of the strongest and most important findings in the entirety of political science. Called "the closest thing to an empirical law in political science", the policy relevance of these findings has even motivated presidential administrations and our largest international organizations. This course will carefully consider the core elements of this important phenomenon. It is structured as both a biography of the democratic peace research program as well as an overview of its research findings. Students who complete this course will be better able to critically assess the dialogue on democracies in the international system, as this dialogue appears in both the classroom and in policy discussions.

Learning Outcomes

1. Understand what comprises the empirical core of the democratic peace, along with its auxiliary hypotheses about democratic conflict resolution and democratic conflict behavior.

2. Evaluate regression models and appropriate research designs for research questions

3. Explain the theoretical logic connecting democracy to peace in the democratic peace research program.

4. Connect the democratic peace findings to policy implications, caveats and all, to the past and future.

5. Contextualize the universality of the democratic peace to potential scope conditions and limits.

Books for the Semester

This is a class very much in the peace science tradition, which is more focused on articles than books. Instances where readings are book chapters or articles that might be inaccessible would be cases where readings would be disseminated by the author. These books should be understood as recommended, given this outline.

Gibler, Douglas M. 2012. *The Territorial Peace: Borders, State Development, and International Conflict*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Gleditsch, Kristan Skrede. 2002. *All International Politics Is Local*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Russett, Bruce M., and John R. Oneal. 2001. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Assessment

This class can be taught at either the undergraduate-level or graduate-level. The graduate-level version of this class would be heavier on readings and seminar-level discussion. The (upper-division) undergraduate-level version of this class would be lighter on readings and more focused on a traditional lecture and discussion format. The assessment would vary as well.

Undergraduate: an undergraduate version of this class would have two written exams and a final written exam. The writing assignment for this class would be less about an original research paper and more a term paper that takes inventory of the full scope of democratic peace scholarship and evaluates the behavior of a particular democracy in a war. Here, a student would select a war from an original list compiled by Gibler and Miller (Forthcoming)[1], identify a democracy participating in that war, and evaluate the decision-making and behavior in the war. The student will write a paper taking inventory of how concordant or discordant this case is with the body of scholarship on democracies in conflict.

Graduate: a graduate version of this class would have a midterm and a final exam, both written. Assuming a smaller class size than a typical undergraduate course, students are expected to participate more in discussion and to critically evaluate these readings. Every week, a student should select one of the readings and do an article summary of it.[2] Students are expected to put forward an original research paper on the topic of democratic peace by the end of the semester. Care will be given through the semester to walk the student through what this should look like, but the goal is the kind of research paper that could be presented at a conference.

---

[1] Gibler, Douglas M., and Steven V. Miller. Forthcoming. "The Militarized Interstate Confrontation (MIC) Dataset, 1816-2010." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

[2] Instructions for what I expect on this assignment are here: http://svmiller.com/article-summaries/

Class Schedule

What follows is a course outline, structured over 15 weeks, for this class. This outline can be extended in any number of ways. For example, a shorter semester can lead to some weeks being condensed (e.g. Week 6 and Week 7 can be combined, or perhaps even Week 1 and Week 2). Some weeks can be omitted altogether (e.g. Week 2 and perhaps Week 11). This outline is primarily structured as a graduate-level syllabus, which is why the reading list is long. An undergraduate version of this syllabus would be lighter on readings.

Week 1: "Democratic Peace Theory" as a "Democratic Peace Fact"

> *The readings provided here capture the reality that the theory of "democratic peace theory" is fundamentally a misnomer. The democratic peace discovery amounts to a fact that preceded the theoretical developments to follow. The early scholarship found some theoretical foundations in Immanuel Kant and a few others (e.g. Joseph Schumpeter), but these references obscure the nature of the discovery. It emerged as a "democratic peace fact."*

Babst, Dean V. 1964. "Elected Governments: A Force for Peace." *The Wisconsin Sociologist* 2: 9–14.

———. 1972. "A Force for Peace." *Industrial Research* 14(4): 55–58.

Doyle, Michael W. 1986. "Liberalism and World Politics." *American Political Science Review* 80(4): 1151–69.

Kant, Immanuel. 1991. "Perpetual Peace." In *Kant: Political Writings*, Cambridge texts in the history of political thought, eds. H. Reiss and H. B. Nisbet. Cambridge University Press, 93–130.

Levy, Jack S. 1988. "Domestic Politics and War." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4): 653–73.

Small, Melvin, and J. David Singer. 1976. "The War-Proneness of Democratic Regimes, 1816-1965." *Jerusalem Journal of International Relations* 1(4): 50–69.

Week 2: Making Sense of the Discovery: Freedom and Libertarianism

> *We elevate this theoretical debate not because it is timely, but the debate around Rummel's argument serves three major purposes here. First, Rummel, to his credit, was one of the earliest efforts at a theoretical argument for the democratic peace fact that thinks outside a narrow focus on the empirical relationship. Second, it will further ease the student into thinking about research designs. Third, the accumulation of critiques against Rummel served as a pivot to next week. The "democratic peace" is a dyadic phenomenon, and not necessarily something innate about democracies."*

Chan, Steve. 1984. "Mirror, Mirror on the Wall… Are the Freer Countries More Pacific?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 28(4): 617–48.

Ray, James Lee. 1982. "Understanding Rummel." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 26(1): 161–87.

Rummel, R. J. 1983. "Libertarianism and International Violence." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 27(1): 27–71.

———. 1987. "On Vincent's View of Freedom and International Conflict." *International Studies Quarterly* 31(1): 113–17.

Vincent, Jack. 1987. "Freedom and International Conflict: Another Look." *International Studies Quarterly* 31(1): 103–12.

Weede, Erich. 1984. "Democracy and War Involvement." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 28(4): 649–64.

Week 3: A Dyadic Peace

This week reviews the core empirical findings, certainly as they started to accumulate in the 1990s. The democratic is a peace between/among democracies. Not only are democracies not necessarily more peaceful in general, but their relationships with non-democracies are distinctly conflict-prone. There were some efforts to explicate the latter ("monadic") argument, but the empirical support is weak.

Altman, David, Federico Rojas-de-Galarreta, and Francisco Urdinez. 2021. "An Interactive Model of Democratic Peace." *Journal of Peace Research* 58(3): 384–98.

Benoit, Kenneth. 1996. "Democracies Really Are More Pacific (in General): Reexamining Regime Type and War Involvement." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 40(4): 636–57.

Gleditsch, Nils Petter. 1992. "Democracy and Peace." *Journal of Peace Research* 29(4): 369–76.

Maoz, Zeev, and Nasrin Abdolali. 1989. "Regime Types and International Conflict, 1816-1976." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 33(1): 3–35.

Rousseau, David L., Christopher Gelpi, Dan Reiter, and Paul K. Huth. 1996. "Assessing the Dyadic Nature of the Democratic Peace, 1918-88." *American Political Science Review* 90(3): 512–33.

Werner, Suzanne. 2000. "The Effects of Political Similarity on the Onset of Militarized Disputes, 1816–1985." *Political Research Quarterly* 53(2): 343–74.

Week 4: Institutions or "Norms?"

After settling on the (dyadic) empirical core of the democratic peace, scholars then tried to parse what is it about democracies that accounts for these findings? Is there something about democratic institutions or is it something bigger about democratic values and approaches to governance? This is the debate on democratic institutions vs. democratic norms. The latter seemed to hold more weight until a recent turn toward institutions brought on by the likes of Bueno de Mesquita et al. (1999) and Schultz (1999).

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith. 1999. "An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace." *American Political Science Review* 93(4): 791–807.

Friedman, Gil. 2008. "Identifying the Place of Democratic Norms in Democratic Peace." *International Studies Review* 10(3): 548–70.

Maoz, Zeev, and Bruce Russett. 1993. "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986." *American Political Science Review* 87(3): 624–38.

Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin. 2012. "Norms and the Democratic Peace." In *What Do We Know about War?*, ed. John A. Vasquez. Lanham, MD: Rowman-Littlefield, 167–88.

Morgan, T. Clifton, and Sally Howard Campbell. 1991. "Domestic Structures, Decisional Constraints and War: So Why Kant Democracies Fight?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35: 187–211.

Schultz, Kenneth A. 1999. "Do Democratic Institutions Constrain or Inform? Contrasting Two Institutional Perspectives on Democracy and War." *International Organization* 53(2): 233–66.

Week 5: "Triangulating" the Democratic Peace?

Russett and Oneal's (2001) book was the most influential book on this topic, picking up several awards for its impact on the profession (and this important topic). The argument here is multifaceted. Democracies do not just enjoy a peace among themselves because of their mutual democracy, but also because they engage in behavior (e.g. trade and international governance) that reinforces that peace. This section does involve a slight detour in the discussion of trade and conflict, since skepticism still persists about this relationship.

Barbieri, Katherine, Omar M. G. Keshk, and Brian Pollins. 2009. "Trading Data: Evaluating Our Assumptions and Coding Rules." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 26(5): 471–91.

Barbieri, Katherine, and Richard Alan Peters. 2003. "Measure for Mis-Measure: A Response to Gartzke & Li." *Journal of Peace Research* 40(6): 713–19.

Dorussen, Han, and Hugh Ward. 2008. "Intergovernmental Organizations and the Kantian Peace: A Network Perspective." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52(2): 189–212.

Gartzke, Erik, and Quan Li. 2003. "Measure for Measure: Concept Operationalization and the Trade Interdependence-Conflict Debate." *Journal of Peace Research* 40(5): 553–71.

Gleditsch, Kristian Skrede. 2010. "On Ignoring Missing Data and the Robustness of Trade and Conflict Results: A Reply to Barbieri, Keshk, and Pollins." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 27(2): 153–57.

Kim, Hyung Min, and David L. Rousseau. 2005. "The Classical Liberals Were Half Right (or Half Wrong): New Tests of the Liberal Peace, 1960-88." *Journal of Peace Research* 42(5): 523–43.

Oneal, John R., and Bruce M. Russet. 2002. "The Classical Liberals Were Right: Democracy, Interdependence, and Conflict, 1950–1985." *International Studies Quarterly* 41(2): 267–93.

Russett, Bruce, John R. Oneal, and David R. Davis. 1998. "The Third Leg of the Kantian Tripod for Peace: International Organizations and Militarized Disputes, 1950–85." *International Organization* 52(3): 441–67.

Week 6: Democracies and Conflict Avoidance

The next two weeks constitute a turn to what I call the auxiliary hypotheses of the "empirical core" of democratic peace. Here: democratic peace scholarship takes a turn to the conflict resolution literature, which had been previously the domain of those working in international law. Beyond also having the seminal statement of the democratic norms hypothesis, Dixon (1994) also has the seminal contribution to the democratic peace research program. Democracies avoid war with each other because they peacefully settle what disputes they do have before escalation to war.

Dixon, William J. 1993. "Democracy and the Management of International Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37(1): 42–68.

———. 1994. "Democracy and the Peaceful Settlement of International Conflict." *American Political Science Review* 88(1): 14–32.

Dixon, William J., and Paul D. Senese. 2002. "Democracy, Disputes, and Negotiated Settlements." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46: 547–71.

Frazier, Derrick V., and William J. Dixon. 2006. "Third-Party Intermediaries and Negotiated Settlements, 1946-2000." *International Interactions* 32(4): 385–408.

Mousseau, Michael. 1998. "Democracy and Compromise in Militarized Interstate Conflicts, 1816-1992." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42(2): 210–30.

Raymond, Gregory A. 1994. "Democracies, Disputes, and Third-Party Intermediaries." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38(1): 24–42.

———. 1996. "Demosthenes and Democracies: Regime-Types and Arbitration Outcomes." *International Interactions* 22(1): 1–20.

Week 7: Democracies and Conflict Behavior

Democracies are still conflict-prone, if not with each other. Turns out, though, democracies tend to do fairly well in their conflicts. Their performance is obviously not perfect, and this relationship comes with some caveats.

Bennett, D. Scott, and Allan C. Stam. 1998. "The Declining Advantages of Democracy: A Combined Model of War Outcomes and Duration." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42(3): 344–66.

Downes, Alexander B. 2009. "How Smart and Tough Are Democracies?: Reassessing Theories of Democratic Victory in War." *International Security* 33(4): 9–51.

Lake, David A. 1992. "Powerful Pacifists: Democratic States and War." *American Political Science Review* 86(1): 24–37.

Reiter, Dan, and Allan C. Stam. 1998a. "Democracy and Battlefield Military Effectiveness." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42(3): 259–77.

———. 1998b. "Democracy, War Initiation and Victory." *American Political Science Review* 92(2): 377–89.

Valentino, Benjamin A., Paul K. Huth, and Sarah E. Croco. 2010. "Bear Any Burden? How Democracies Minimize the Costs of War." *Journal of Politics* 72(2): 528–44.

Week 8: Democrat*izing* and Bushwhacking

This week starts a turn into our assessment of the democratic peace research program. The hard part for proponents of the democratic peace was seeing it become operationalized as foreign policy objectives of the United States (and the institutions built after the second world war that mirror its interests). The process of democratization can be conflict-prone and the democratic peace is too easily "bushwhacked" (pun intended, in this application).

Büger, Christian, and Trine Villumsen. 2007. "Beyond the Gap: Relevance, Fields of Practice and the Securitizing Consequences of (Democratic Peace) Research." *Journal of International Relations and Development* 10: 417–48.

Downes, Alexander B., and Jonathan Monten. 2013. "Forced to Be Free?: Why Foreign-Imposed Regime Change Rarely Leads to Democratization." *International Security* 37(4): 90–131.

Downes, Alexander B., and Lindsey A. O'Rourke. 2016. "You Can't Always Get What You Want: Why Foreign-Imposed Regime Change Seldom Improves Interstate Relations." *International Security* 41(2): 43–89.

Mansfield, Edward D., and Jack Snyder. 1995. "Democratization and the Danger of War." *International Security* 20(1): 5–38.

Narang, Vipin, and Rebecca M. Nelson. 2009. "Who Are These Belligerent Democratizers? Reassessing the Impact of Democratization on War." *International Organization* 63(2): 357–79.

Russett, Bruce. 2005. "Bushwhacking the Democratic Peace." *International Studies Perspectives* 6(4): 395–408.

Ward, Michael D., and Kristian S. Gleditsch. 1998. "Democratizing for Peace." *American Political Science Review* 92(1): 51–61.

Week 9: Joint Democracy or Joint Interests?

Skepticism about the democratic peace fact is as old as its discovery, but important theoretical critiques emerged that drew attention to the fact that the democratic peace emerges as a Cold War discovery. The bulk of support for the democratic peace is after World War II, for which the Cold War is an important collider. Are democracies more peaceful with each other, or is that peace an artifact of shared (anti-communist) interests?

Farber, Henry S., and Joanne Gowa. 1997. "Common Interests or Common Polities? Reinterpreting the Democratic Peace." *Journal of Politics* 59(2): 393–417.

Gartzke, Erik. 1998. "Kant We All Just Get Along? Motive, Opportunity, and the Origins of the Democratic Peace." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(1): 1–27.

———. 2002. "Preferences and the Democratic Peace." *International Studies Quarterly* 44(2): 191–212.

Gowa, Joanne. 2011. "The Democratic Peace After the Cold War." *Economics and Politics* 23(2): 153–71.

Park, Johann. 2013. "Forward to the Future? The Democratic Peace After the Cold War." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 30(2): 178–94.

Thompson, William R., and Richard Tucker. 1997. "A Tale of Two Democratic Peace Critiques." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(3): 428–54.

Week 10: Just How Universal is the Democratic Peace?

The previous week touched on potential limits—namely: a temporal limit—of the democratic peace. Are there regional limits as well? The "democratic peace" purports to be universal, but it may be a peace observed mostly in Western Europe and North America.

Cohen, Raymond. 1994. "Pacific Unions: A Reappraisal of the Theory That Democracies Do Not Go to War with Each Other." *Review of International Studies* 20(3): 207–23.

Gleditsch, Kristan Skrede. 2002a. "A Regional Approach to Conflict, Integration, and Democratization." In *All International Politics Is Local*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 31–63.

———. 2002b. "Zones of Peace, Conflict, and Democracy." In *All International Politics Is Local*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1–29.

Gleditsch, Nils Petter. 1995. "Democracy and the Future of European Peace." *European Journal of International Relations* 1(4): 539–71.

Goldsmith, Benjamin E. 2013. "Domestic Political Institutions and the Initiation of International Conflict in East Asia: Some Evidence for an Asian Democratic Peace." *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 14(1): 59–90.

Henderson, Errol A. 2009. "Disturbing the Peace: African Warfare, Political Inversion and the Universality of the Democratic Peace Thesis." *British Journal of Political Science* 39(1): 25–58.

Russett, Bruce, and James Lee Ray. 1995. "Raymond Cohen on Pacific Unions: A Response and a Reply." *Review of International Studies* 21(3): 319–25.

Week 11: The "Dirty Pool" Debate

This week is a bit of a detour, at least in substance. No matter, the bulk of the debate about the democratic peace is still an argument about statistical methods that can produce null effects of joint democracy. The "dirty pool" debate is a nice reminder that debating the democratic peace still involves debating statistical analyses, appropriate research designs, and the data to be included for analysis.

Beck, Nathaniel. 2001. "Time-Series-Cross-Section Data: What Have We Learned in the Past Few Years?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 4(1): 271–93.

Erikson, Robert S., Pablo M. Pinto, and Kelly T. Rader. 2009. "Dirty Pool Revisited: When Less Is More." Unpublished manuscript, available from instructor.

Green, Donald P., Soo Yeon Kim, and David H. Yoon. 2001. "Dirty Pool." *International Organization* 55(2): 441–68.

King, Gary. 2001. "Proper Nouns and Methodological Propriety: Pooling Dyads in International Relations Data." *International Organization* 55(2): 497–507.

Oneal, John R., and Bruce Russett. 2001. "Clear and Clean: The Fixed Effects of the Liberal Peace." *International Organization* 55(2): 469–85.

Week 12: The Capitalist/Contractualist Peace?

Previously thought complementary components to "triangulating" the democratic peace, challenges emerged that argue the peace among democracies is more about economic factors greater than simple trade. Capitalism, purportedly, encourages peaceful relations the extent to which open markets deem militarized conflict to be a large opportunity cost over an issue that is better diffused through market activity. However, democratic peace scholars typically contend the evidence for this argument against the democratic peace is an amalgam of forked paths.

Choi, Seung-Whan. 2011. "Re-Evaluating Capitalist and Democratic Peace Models." *International Studies Quarterly* 55(3): 759–69.

Dafoe, Allan. 2011. "Statistical Critiques of the Democratic Peace: Caveat Emptor." *American Journal of Political Science* 55(2): 247–62.

Dafoe, Allan, John R. Oneal, and Bruce Russett. 2013. "The Democratic Peace: Weighing the Evidence and Cautious Inference." *International Studies Quarterly* 57(1): 201–14.

Gartzke, Erik. 2007. "The Capitalist Peace." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 166–91.

Imai, Kosuke, and James Lo. 2021. "Robustness of Empirical Evidence for the Democratic Peace: A Nonparametric Sensitivity Analysis." *International Organization* 75(3): 901–19.

Mousseau, Michael. 2000. "Market Prosperity, Democratic Consolidation, and Democratic Peace." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44(4): 472–507.

———. 2005. "Comparing New Theory with Prior Beliefs: Market Civilization and the Democratic Peace." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22(1): 63–77.

———. 2009. "The Social Market Roots of Democratic Peace." *International Security* 33(4): 52–86.

———. 2013. "The Democratic Peace Unraveled: It's the Economy." *International Studies Quarterly* 57(1): 186–97.

———. 2019a. "Four Ways We Know the Democratic Peace Correlation Does Not Exist in the State of Knowledge." *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy* 45(3): 1–8.

———. 2019b. "The End of War: How a Robust Marketplace and Liberal Hegemony Are Leading to Perpetual World Peace." *International Security* 44(1): 160–96.

Ray, James Lee, and Allan Dafoe. 2018. "Democratic Peace Versus Contractualism." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 35(2): 193–203.

Week 13: Did the Cart go Before the Horse Again? Peace and Democracy Reconsidered

The democratic peace research program contends the proliferation of democracy (and democratic dyads) leads to peace. Did they get the causal arrow wrong? In a sense, the cart already came before the horse since the discovery of a democratic peace preceded an argument for why we should have expected to observe this phenomenon. Skeptics argue it makes sense the cart went before the horse again.

Crescenzi, Mark J. C., and Andrew J. Enterline. 1999. "Ripples from the Waves? A Systemic, Time-Series Analysis of Democracy, Democratization, and Interstate War." *Journal of Peace Research* 36(1): 75–94.

Gates, Scott, Torbjørn L. Knutsen, and Jonathon W. Moses. 1996. "Democracy and Peace: A More Skeptical View." *Journal of Peace Research* 33(1): 1–10.

James, Patrick, Eric Solbert, and Murray Wolfson. 1999. "An Identified Systemic Model of the Democracy-Peace Nexus." *Defence and Peace Economics* 10(1): 1–37.

Mousseau, Michael, and Yuhang Shi. 1999. "A Test for Reverse Causality in the Democratic Peace Relationship." *Journal of Peace Research* 36(6): 639–63.

Reiter, Dan. 2001. "Does Peace Nurture Democracy?" *Journal of Politics* 63(3): 935–48.

Thompson, William. 1996. "Democracy and Peace: Putting the Cart Before the Horse?" *International Organization* 50(1): 141–74.

Week 14: The Territorial Peace?

A spiritual successor to the previous week, and the past discussion of the true universality of the democratic peace, the "territorial peace" argues that the bulk of what we assume to be about democracy is more about the emergence of democracy in peaceful environments that have settled their disputes about the allocation of territory.

Gibler, Doublas M., and Andrew P. Owsiak. 2018. "Democracy and the Settlement of International Borders, 1919-2001." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62(9): 1847–75.

Gibler, Douglas M. 2014. "Contiguous States, Stable Borders, and the Peace Between Democracies." *International Studies Quarterly* 58(1): 126–29.

Gibler, Douglas M., and Steven V. Miller. 2013. "Quick Victories? Territory, Democracies, and Their Disputes." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 57(2): 258–84.

Miller, Steven V. 2017. "Individual-Level Expectations of Executive Authority Under Territorial Threat." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 34(5): 526–45.

Miller, Steven V., and Doublas M. Gibler. 2011. "Democracies, Territory, and Negotiated Compromises." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 28(3): 261–79.

Owsiak, Andrew P. 2019. "Foundations for Integrating the Democratic and Territorial Peace Arguments." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 36(1): 63–87.

Owsiak, Andrew P., and John A. Vasquez. 2019. "The Cart and the Horse Redux: The Timing of Border Settlement and Joint Democracy." *British Journal of Political Science* 49(1): 339–54.

Park, Johann, and Michael Colaresi. 2014. "Safe Across the Border: The Continued Significance of the Democratic Peace When Controlling for Stable Borders." *International Studies Quarterly* 58(1): 118–25.

Week 15: Is There a Future for the Democratic Peace?

We conclude with an assessment of where the democratic peace research program can go, with an eye toward future problems that confront democracies in the international system. The big concern here is about whether the democratic peace, as we know it and researched it, is just a moment in time. What is the future of democratic peace in a changing world that moves further from the Cold War and the 'third wave?'

Cooley, Alexander, and Daniel H. Nexon. 2020. "How Hegemony Ends: The Unraveling of American Power." *Foreign Affairs* 99: 143–57.

Cranmer, Skyler J., and Randolph M. Siverson. 2008. "Demography, Democracy and Disputes: The Search for the Elusive Relationship Between Population Growth and International Conflict." *Journal of Politics* 70(3): 794–806.

Gartzke, Erik. 2003. "The Classical Liberals Were Just Lucky." In *Economic Interdependence and International Conflict: New Perspectives on an Enduring Debate*, eds. Edward D. Mansfield and Brian M. Pollins. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 96–110.

Gartzke, Erik, and Alex Weisiger. 2013. "Permanent Friends? Dynamic Difference and the Democratic Peace." *International Studies Quarterly* 57(1): 171–85.

Hobson, Christopher. 2017. "Democratic Peace: Progress and Crisis." *Perspectives on Politics* 15(3): 697–710.

Ray, James Lee. 2013. "War on Democratic Peace." *International Studies Quarterly* 57(1): 198–200.