- The Waning of War
 - O Generation by generation, the effect from wars have decreased
 - O consistent trend suggests an overall movement toward less war in the international system
- Liberal Theories
 - O draw mostly on the reciprocity and identity principles
 - O generally are more optimistic than realism about the prospects for peace
 - O Realists view vs Liberalists view
 - Realists: laws of power politics as relatively timeless and unchanging
 - Liberalists: rules of IR as slowly evolve through time, becoming more and more peaceful as time lengthens
 - O Evolution results:
 - Primarily from the gradual buildup of international organizations and mutual cooperation (reciprocity)
 - Secondarily from changes in norms and public opinion (identity)
- Kant and Peace
 - O According to German philosopher Immanuel Kant:
 - states could develop the organizations and rules to facilitate cooperation specifically by forming a world federation (resembling today's United Nations)
 - peace depends on the internal character of governments
 - democracies do not fight each other, is the basis of present democratic peace theory
 - trade between states promotes peace
 - relies on the presumption that trade increases wealth, cooperation, and local wellbeing
 - Economic interdependence: as trade between states increase, they become more mutually dependent on one other for goods
 - sensitivity: one state relies on another to provide an important good but can find alternate suppliers
 - vulnerability: few or no alternative suppliers
- Liberal Institutionalism
 - O Liberal theories treat national actors as capable of forgoing short-term individual interest in order to further the long-term well-being of a community to which they belong.
 - For example the WTO and the EU decisions require consensus among all members, making them all equal in governance.
 - Kant's argument: Although autonomous, they could join a worldwide federation like the UN and respect its principles even at the cost of forgoing. International cooperation was a more rational option for for states than resorting to war.

- War and violence appear as irrational deviations that result from defective and that harms the long term interest of warring states.
 - **Neoliberal** differes at it concedes to realism, such as the states are unitary actors that rationally pursuing their self-interests in a system of anarchy.
 - It is in their interest to achieve cooperation, and they use institutions to ease the pursuit of mutual gains and the reduction of possibilities for cheating or taking advantages.
 - Uses the **Prisoner's Dilemma** to illustrate their argument that cooperation is possible.
 - The dilemma can be solved if the "game" is played over and over.
 - States rely on a context of rules, norms, habits, and institutions that make it rational for all sides to avoid the self-defeating outcomes that would result from pursuing narrow, short term self-interest.
 - Study to see how institutions and norms affect the possibilities for overcoming dilemmas and achieving international cooperation.

International Regimes

- O It is difficult to resolve conflicts without a third party to arbitrate or an overall framework to set common expectations for all parties.
 - International regime is a set of rules, norms, and procedures, around which the expectations of actors converge in a certain issue area.
 - Help solve collective goods problems by increasing transparency.
 - Regimes come into existence of overcome collective goods dilemmas by coordinating the behaviors of individual states.
 - Facilitate and empower national governments.
 - Hegemony are when regimes are most effective when the international system is most concentrated
 - Not necessary for maintaining them
 - Depends on their imbedding n permanent institutions such as the UN or NATO.
- O Institutions gain greater stability than do non-institutional regimes, since it can actively promote adherence to the rules.

Collective Security

O Formation of a broad alliance of most major actors in an international system for the purpose of jointly opposing aggression by any actor

- O Kant's proposal: the majority of states could unite to punish any one state that committed aggression, safeguarding the collective interest of all the nations while protecting the self-determination of small nations that are easily becoming pawns under the great powers
- O The League of Nations flawed in two ways:
 - membership did not include all the great powers (including the most powerful one, the United States)
 - its members proved unwilling to bear the costs of collective action to oppose aggression when it did occur in the 1930s, starting with Japan and Italy
- O United Nations created as the League's successor to promote collective security
 - Regional IGOs also currently perform collective security functions (deterring aggression) as well as economic and cultural ones—the *Organization of American States (OAS)*, the *Arab League*, and the *African Union*
- O Collective Security successes if:
 - members keep their alliance commitments to the group, in other words, members must not free ride on the efforts of other members
 - enough members must agree on what constitutes aggression
- O failed states have very weak control of their territory, causing it to become potential havens for drug trafficking, money laundering, and terrorist bases

Democratic Peace

- O Kant's Argument: Lasting peace would depend on states' becoming republics, with legislatures to check the power of monarchs and believes that an international community based on peaceful relations may emerge.
 - Cheques and balances in government would act as a brake on the use of military forces
 - Democracies are generally more peaceful than authoritarian governments.
 - Turned out not to be true —> Fight equal amounts of war
 - Three most war prone states: France, Russia, and Britain
 - Democracies almost never fight against each other, democratic peace
 - Possibly due to the citizens not seeing each other as an enemy or trade relations create strong interdependence.
 - Democratic institutions can make cooperation more difficult because countries may fail to join international organizations because of domestic opposition
 - USA can't join the League of Nations due to the Congress opposing it