Understanding of democracy and peace
Gershon H.Gordon Faculty of Social Sciences, Tel Aviv University

Yixin Zhang

Gershon H.Gordon Faculty of Social Sciences, Tel Aviv University,Israel.

zhangyixin0221@gmail.com

Abstract

One of the great changes in the world situation after World War II was the long period of peace without war between democracies and even great powers. However, the world is not easy in the halo of peace. The smoke of local wars such as the Iraq war has not yet dissipated, and frequent terrorist groups is worrying. In Asia, Japan's military influence, which is second only to the United States, cannot be underestimated. Its defense strategy changes from specialized defense to outward defense. This situation brings a new threat to the security of all countries in the Asia-Pacific region. The problem of the "security dilemma" remains one of the major issues in international politics today. In this regard, realism puts forward the theory of potential equalization and deterrence, while liberalism puts forward the theory of world government, collective security, economic interdependence, and democratic peace. Among them, democratic peace theory, as a popular theory in the field of western international relations research, has aroused wide controversy in the academic circles. "Democratic peace theory" believes that there is no or little war between democratic countries, and "non-democratic countries" are the root cause of war, and expanding democracy is the inevitable requirement for maintaining peace. "Democratic peace theory" does not conform with historical facts, it is the theoretical basis for neo-interventionism in promoting human rights diplomacy. The relationship between democracy and peace is complex: peace between international society and international relations requires not only a domestic democracy, but also in international life; democracy is only one of the many reasons affecting international peace, It has limited impact on peace; the "democracy peace theory" advocates established peace is essentially local peace between western countries based on unreasonable international political and economic order, the consolidation of overall world peace and the establishment of just and reasonable new international order call for new democracy.

Keywords

democracy, peace, democracy and peace theory, international relations.

1. "Democracy and Peace Theory" and its origin

In the study of war and peace in the international community from a democratic perspective, there are all kinds of theories, and the "democratic peace theory" is one of them. This theory holds that there is no or little war between democracies.For its school of theory, "democratic peace theory" is liberal, and for the main approach it applies, the national-level analysis as Kenneth Waltz calls. Unlike the liberal "democratic peace theory", Marxism believes that " the mutual relationship between ethnic groups depends on the productive forces, division of labor and the degree of development of each ethnic group. Yet not only the relationship of a nation to other peoples, but the whole internal structure of the nation itself depends on its own production and the development of its own internal and external communication." That is to say, the foreign behavior of a country depends not only on the structure, system, nature, contradictions, etc., but also on the international communication environment and conditions

where a country is located, which is the result of the interaction between internal, internal and external forces; under some conditions, the structure and mechanism of the international community play a decisive role in the country's foreign behavior. Therefore, Marxism not only attaches great importance to analyzing the problems of war and peace from the national political system, but also from the level of international exchanges, and pays attention to the unification of the international analysis with the domestic level. Marxism believed that from the perspective of a domestic ministry political structure, capitalism was the root cause of the war, which the socialist state would fundamentally eliminate. Lenin later pointed out that imperialism was the root cause of the war.Deng Xiaoping stood from the international community and pointed out that hegemonism is the root cause of contemporary war.

As a peace theory popular in western academia after the Cold War, "democratic peace theory" has a long history. From its development, its rise has three climax. The first was during the Enlightenment period. As early as 1795, Kant, in his book "On Permanent Peace", explained the relations between states from moral laws and human rights ideas, and advocated achieving peace between states on the principles of sovereign independence, adherence to morality, and maintenance of peace. Later, the relevant exposition of Rousseau, Wilson and others, as well as the "idealism" mature after World War I, pushed the "democratic peace theory" to a new stage of development in theory and practice, advocating the combination of freedom, human rights and democracy with international security and international peace. The outbreak of World War II has greatly shrunk the market of "democratic peace theory". In 1973, Bitt Warrenstynn argued about a war-free democracy in "Structure and War: On International Relations, 1820-1968". In 1976, Melvin Small and David Singh in "Democracy: 1816-1865" formally made the assertion that "democracy was no war (few)". In 1983, in his article Kant, Liberal Heritage and Foreign Affairs, Michael Doly, based on comprehensively summarizing the achievements of previous predecessors, comparatively and systematically demonstrated the relationship between democracy and peace from the liberal point of view, and raised the empirical hypothesis of "democratic peace theory" to the level of theoretical judgment. After the end of the Cold War, in the discussion of the "long-term peace" phenomenon in Europe and even the world, "democratic peace theory" once again became prominent in the flood of liberalism. Taking the emergence of American scholar Bruce Roussett's Grasping the Democratic Peace: the Principles after the Cold War in 1993, the "democratic peace theory" aroused heated discussion in the western world. Russett even argued that "it is possible now that the democratic peace view partly replaces the principles of realism." In 1994, Clinton formally wrote "never fought" between "democracies" into his state of the union address.

The Clinton administration used the "participation and expansion strategy" to replace the "containment strategy" of the United States during the Cold War, based on "no war between democracies" and "the market economy can promote democratization". To this end, the Clinton administration regards the implementation of human rights diplomacy, expand democracy outward, and export American-style values as one of the important elements of its foreign policy. The Cold War and other "human rights and democracy" launched by western countries, the rise of interventionism and the strengthening of power politics, were more or less affected by the "democratic peace theory". The United States was a democratic missionary with repeated armed interference in his domestic affairs, while the NATO invasion of the Southern Union was another act of this new "jihad".

2. The basic view of the "democratic peace theory"

The core view of the democratic peace theory is that there is no or little war between "democracies". This is not, as classical liberalism suggests, because there are no differences

and conflicts between them, but because the "democracies" can solve their differences and conflicts by consultative, compromise methods. "Democracies" can achieve reciprocal self-restraint when dealing with mutual conflicts, and less tend to resort to force or by threat of force to maximize the interests of one party's interests. In short, the unique attributes of "democracies" enable them to resolve differences and contradictions in interests in peace, thus avoiding war, maintaining peace and promoting stability. The absence of war between "democracies" does not mean a poetic state of natural harmony between them, the conflict of interest between them may be manifested in the form of comprehensive economic war, which is also cruel and ruthless, life and death. Moreover, as post-war history has proved, although no war has broken out between the Western countries of the so-called "democracy", but the economic war is intensifying. These show that "the fact that the United States, Europe and Japan do not prevent a common market and are willing to share a share in it does not mean that competition between them is not cruel, undestructive and unviolent." Why is there little or no war between democracies? The perspectives and methods adopted by liberal scholars are different in their answers to this question. Based on summarizing the discussions, Bruce Roussett summarized them into two different modes of interpretation: "structural or institutional mode" and "cultural or normative mode". In fact, the "structural or institutional model" demonstrates the proposition of little or little war between the democratic states; by its approach, it starts from the structuralist paradigm of structure explaining function. As far as the democratic system of democratic countries is concerned, both the power checks and balances and multiple decision-making in the democratic system are conducive to reduce the war tendency of democratic countries. If we put aside the ideological bias of "democratic peace theory" that only regards western countries as "democratic countries", this discussion is undoubtedly somewhat scientific. The so-called "cultural or normative mode" mainly reviews the way of national behavior from the perspective of democratic culture. As a systematic value concept, the democratic culture comes from the influence of the democratic thoughts, which is a kind of regulation of the national behavior mode after the democratic theory is precipitated into the democratic habits. Because of their common democratic culture and values, "democracies" have mutual respect and "can achieve compromise and peaceful conflict settlement without the threat of violence". Of course, this induction does not cover the discourse of all "democratic peace theories". Francis Fukuyama, for example, came from the ruling desire of the non-democratic rulers to prove the peace among the "democratic states". This analysis method is different from institutional or cultural analysis methods, which is not a macroanalysis method at the "national level", but a microanalysis method at the "psychological level", and a demonstration idea of scientific behaviorism. In addition to these theoretical analyses mentioned above, attempts have been made to justify the rationality of this hypothesis from historical statistics and provide empirical evidence. In response to people's criticism of "democratic peace theory", Edward Monsfield and Jack Snyder in "democratization and war", on the basis of the situation after the cold war, the world's countries into three: the first kind is mature, stable western democratic country, the second kind is immature, in the transition to the western democracy "democratic country", the third kind of non-democratic "autocratic country".Based on the analysis of the history of war from 1811 to 1980, they made an important addition to the "democratic peace theory": although "a world with more mature and stable democracy will be safer", in the "transition stage of democratization, countries become more aggressive and war", they are more inclined to wage war against democracies. In such a world divided in three, "democratisation countries" were the most unstable and challenging countries, and in the first 10 years of democratization tended much more war than "autocratic" and "democracies." Therefore, although in the long run, "democratized countries" are more conducive to world peace and ensuring world security than "autocratic countries", in the medium and recent future, "democratized

countries" threatens world peace, especially western "democratic countries", which is much greater and urgent than "autocratic countries". In terms of the security of the whole world, "democratized country" is the primary and realistic source of war, while the threat of "autocratic country" is secondary to world peace, more manifested in a potential form.

There is also an important inference of "democratic peace theory": there is war between "democratic countries" and non-democratic democracies, and the responsibility of war is caused by the defects of the social system of the non-democratic country itself. Therefore, it puts forward an important task for "democratic countries": transforming "non-democratic countries" and expanding the scope of democracy is an important prerequisite and inevitable requirement for realizing the security of democratic countries. In the sequence from high to low composed of "democratic country", "democratized country" and "autocratic country", "democratized country" is the inevitable destination and the highest form of realization of all "democratized countries" and "despotic countries". Of the six international relations composed of these three countries, only "democracies" are in a peaceful zone, between "democratic countries", "democratic countries" and "autocratic countries", but they will not expect nondemocratic countries to use democratic norms to restrain themselves. "Democracies may feel the need to adapt to the stricter international codes of conduct in nondemocratic countries not to use their natural mild qualities to bargain or eliminate them." The implication is that compared with democratic countries, non-democratic countries are more militable and are the root cause of war, conflicts and unrest in the international community. In order to ensure the security of the international community, we must transform these countries into democracies and make them join the democratic family.

3. Further discussion on the relationship between democracy and peace

To effectively respond to the challenge of "democratic peace theory", it is not enough to make the corresponding criticism. We must also deeply investigate the relationship between democracy and peace, and make a comprehensive, objective and scientific investigation of it. In fact, if it is to put the ideological bias of "democratic peace theory" aside, there are some reasonable factors. From the overall perspective of historical development, although democracy will not inevitably avoid war and ensure peace, historical development proves that democracy is indeed conducive to peace. The key is to scientifically define the nature and content of democracy and understand the conditions that democracy is conducive to peace. The biggest deficiency of "democratic peace theory" lies in the abstract and unconditional belief that democracy is necessarily conducive to peace.

3.1.   What kind of democracy favors peace?

This article does not want to discuss the connotation of democracy, but to talk about the impact of democracy on peace just on the scope of democracy. As a common feature of a modern nation-state, there are two basic ways to realize democracy: democratic capitalism and socialist democracy. Although the two democratic bodies are different, they should be common, modern national system and the spirit of law and rational concept. In terms of the realization of domestic peace, the development of democracy and the monopoly of modern democratic countries on tools of violence, the perfection of modern administrative forces and the establishment of legal system, promote the national reconciliation within national countries, conducive to realizing peace and stability. However, the improvement of domestic democracy only restricts the arbitrariness of a country's foreign war, and expands the social foundation of foreign war, but it cannot eliminate the root cause of international war. As far as international peace is concerned, the so-called democracy is conducive to international peace and even world security, in which the said democracy is different from domestic democracy. It

consists of two parts: democracy in domestic life and democracy in international life. "Democratic peace theory" only discusses the domestic democracy and democratic culture and its relationship with peace, and avoiding the issue of democracy in international relations is its biggest deficiency, which may also be out of the rational need of demonstrating interference. As far as international democracy is concerned, the core is the independence and equality of sovereignty, that is, the equality among nations in the form of state. To abandon this and talk that democracy is conducive to peace is the opposite way and seeking fish. After the war, the western countries can maintain peace, such as in terms of democracy, the contribution of the international democracy mechanism established between each other is more important than the consistency of their internal democratic system and democratic concepts. Historical experience has proved that there are not necessarily confrontation and conflicts of interests between countries with different social systems, and countries with the same social systems are not natural peace zones. The key depends on whether they have common national interests, and in terms of the mechanism arrangement, the key is whether they establish a truly equal democratic relationship between them.

In fact, due to the anarchy of the international community, the process of democratization in international relations is more difficult, slow, and is the most urgent and direct influencing factor in promoting international peace and human progress. To ensure democratic consultation, equal dialogue, mutual understanding, accommodation and reserving differences, of course, cannot be separated from the continuous improvement of human understanding, the continuous improvement of the democratic mechanism in the international community, and the continuous progress of the whole history. The Five Fundamental Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and some recognized international law and international practices are the crystallization of the wisdom of the world people and should serve as the basic starting point of international democracy. But in a world where hegemonism and powerful politics still exist, the most important thing is to establish a system of multi-polar power balance and mutual checks and balances. The world history after the formation of the world system has proved that the unipolar world is difficult to establish, and the two polar pattern will cause hot war or cold war due to confrontation. Only in the international pattern of multi-polar checks and balances can democracy in international relations be guaranteed and overall world peace remain stable.

Finally, democracy is just one of the many reasons that determine war or peace and is neither primary nor alone. In the anarchy international community, the limitation of resources will lead to competition among countries, which periodically causes war and peace in the international community. Fundamentally, international war arises from the intensification of competition for limited resources between countries and the confrontation of interest conflicts. If there is a sound democratic mechanism in the international community, countries can resolve conflicts, resolve conflicts, control confrontation and avoid wars to maintain peace, if this mechanism, international relations is highly militarized, trying to maximize unilateral interests, and stimulate the countries concerned to adopt arms race or acts of war. In addition, the restrictive role of the international democratic mechanism on the war is limited. If the confrontation of interest between the relevant states develops to an irreconcilable extent, the regulatory role of the democratic mechanisms in the international community will fail, and the relevant countries concerned will tend to promote their politics through war. It can be seen that not only domestic democracy, but also international democracy, the limited restrictions on war, will be restricted by other social conditions.

3.2. What kind of peace will democracy benefit for?

It is also necessary for us to make a specific analysis and investigation of peace, which is ignored by the "democratic peace theory". It is seen from the discourse of "democratic peace

theory" that the peace it refers to is a peace between "democratic states". From its space, this peace is not a global general peace, but a regional local peace, in its true content, it is based on the old international political and economic order of the world dominated by Western developed countries. Understanding these two points, we will not only have a clearer understanding of the "democratic peace theory", but also have a more conscious grasp of how to promote the comprehensive realization of democracy and to promote the development of world peace.

In terms of the spatial scope of the peace maintained by the Western-style democracy, the "democratic peace theory" demonstrates the peace between democracy with the instability and conflict between democratic countries and nondemocratic countries, and further attributes the peace between democratic countries to their common national characteristics: democratic system and democratic concepts. There is thus a corollary that "non-democracies" are the root of war, and that the war between "democracy" and "non-democracies" is initiated by "non-democracies." Thus, the world is divided into democratic peaceful zones and non-democratic war zones. The "democratic peace theory" is to eliminate the root causes of war and expand the peace zone by the democratization of "non-democratic countries". In fact, the war between "non-democratic countries" is complex, after the cold war conflict in developing countries directly from national conflict, religious disputes and territorial disputes, and once the power intervene in it, the conflict will become complicated, its energy will be strengthened, so there is the possibility of upgrading and out of control. Even in terms of the conflict with non-Western countries, the emergence of conflict does not come from the non-Western countries, but from the hegemony and interference in his domestic politics. It has proved that forced export of western democracy will not cause peace, only aggravate the conflict, mutual peace between "democratic" western countries can not become the universal truth of forging overall world peace, it can only achieve regional local peace. That is to say, the regional limitations of peace between the western countries do not come from the provocation of the "non-democratic countries", but precisely from the inherent defects of the democratic system and democratic concept pursued by the "democratic countries". The conflict between "democratic countries" and the majority of "non-democratic countries" is not the argument for the rationality of the existence and the necessity for expansion of western democracy. On the contrary, it is a realistic manifestation of the inherent irrationality of such democracy and a necessary prerequisite for the establishment and existence of such democracy. Democracy in the Western way cannot provide effective access to universal general peace.

From the political content of the peace maintained by Western democracy, the peace between Western countries realized by Western democracy is based on an unreasonable old international political order. From the political field, hegemonism and powerful politics are the essential characteristics of the old international political order. The old international political order is in essence advocates power and opposes democracy. In such an international system, The majority of non-Western countries in oppression and control are always facing strong pressure from Western powers, To get rid of its control, Taking a good position in the struggle, To realize national rejuvenation and national prosperity, There must achieve some degree of concentration of power in domestic political life, Take a path of democratic construction different from Western countries, Establish a model of democracy different from Western countries; If we copy the democratic model and social system of a few developed western developed countries, It will disperse the domestic power, Even even intensified domestic conflicts, Making domestic peace unsustainable, Breaking for Western countries, It will help Western countries to strengthen their control over it. The real purpose of Western countries' enthusiasm to promote their democracy around the world may be in this: to

safeguard hegemony and consolidate special interests.

From the economic perspective of the content of peace maintained by Western-style democracy, it is based on the old international economic order and is at the cost of its existence with unequal exchange and control of the vast majority of the Third World countries. Peace is not only a non-war state, but also should be a just and reasonable international order. To ensure the long-term existence of peace, it is not enough to control violence. We must also eliminate the economic root causes of war, that is, to eliminate poverty in the third world countries and change the unreasonable old international economic order. "Granaries know integrity and shame". Although prosperity will not automatically create democracy and ensure stability, poverty will not achieve democracy and eliminate conflicts. If third world countries want to lift unequal international economic relations and revitalize the national economy, they must adopt a comprehensive-developed market economy model and appropriately protect and cultivate some ethnic industries related to the national economy and people's livelihood, before they can open their hands and allow international capital to participate in competition. Only when the economic development and strength of the third world countries grow, can democracy in North-South relations continue to develop, and overall peace in the world be more effectively guaranteed.

References

[1]   Marx and Engels anthology, Volume 1 [M].

[2] [US] Russette. Can democratic peace be established? [J]. International Exchange, 1993, (Spring Number).

[3] Danoel Burnstein: "Euro guakeEurope's Explosive Economic Challenge will Change the world", Simon & Schuster 1991..

[4] Bruce Russett, "Grasping the Democratic Peace".

[5] Edward Monsfield, Jack Snyder. International Security [J]. 1995, (Summer Number).

[6] Joanne Gowa, "The Democratic Peace after the Cold War", Economics & Politics, Vol.23, No.2,2011, p. 153 — 170.

[7] Sebastian Rosato, "Explaining the Democratic Peace", American Political Science Review, Vol.99, No.3,2005, p. 467 — 472.

[8] Xu Xiaochun, Ge Xin: A Reexamination of "Democracy and Peace Theory" from the diplomatic perspective of "Democracy", p. 37-43.