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**Annotated Bibliography**

**Gartzke, E., & Weisiger, A. (2014****).** **Under Construction; Development, Democracy, and Difference as Determinants of Systemic Liberal Peace.**

*The widely documented dyadic democratic peace observation has led to optimism that the spread of democracy might prove pacifying even outside of democratic dyads. Yet, tensions between the logic of liberal peace in dyads and systems suggest that economic development may be better suited than democracy as a determinant of systemic liberal peace. In particular, regime type heterogeneity (difference) stands to increase conflict at the system level. We argue that there exists a systemic developmental peace, in which increased wealth encourages powerful developed nations to discourage other countries from fighting, even as these same developed states continue to use force in service of their own private objectives. We also separate out the effects of aggregate democracy from regime type difference in our analysis. Systemic and cross-level statistical tests support the following propositions: greater systemic development encourages peace, difference propagates war, and increased systemic democracy has no consistent impact on interstate conflict.*

Gartzke and Weigner are outstanding authors who present the causes of peace on an international level. they present the arguments of dyadic democratic peace observations and their influence to spread of peace and the way pacification of democracy has been used to enhance peace even outside democratic dyads. Moreover, the book continues to insist that systemic liberal peace is determined by the economic development of states. Moreover, the issue of regime difference or heterogeneity has been blamed as a factor that contributes to increase of conflicts in nations. Another argument presented in the book is the influence that developed countries have on promoting peace. The wealthy nations discourage others to fight as they know that the greatest impacts and costs of the war and conflicts will fall o them. However, when it comes to their own needs and interests, they tend to use force on the developing countries and disregard peace. The authors present a systematic argument that depicts that greater systemic development leads to increase in peace, war is instigated by interstates heterogeneity, and finally, there is no guarantee that increased interstate systemic development has a consistent impact on interstate conflict.

**Weisiger, A., & Gartzke, E. (2016). Debating the Democratic peace in the international world**

*In recent publications, we inquire whether the pacifying effects that are often attributed to democracy are likely to con- tinue to hold as the world democratizes. Critics raise questions about the theoretical logic and especially the empirical re- sults that we present. After clarifying our theoretical arguments, we discuss the central empirical critiques. We demonstrate that Crescenzi and Kadera’s (2016) finding of a pacifying effect of systemic democracy is driven not, as they claim, by the use of a better measure of systemic democracy, but by the unjustified decision to omit systemic regime difference from their analysis. Once we restore this variable, we find no evidence that democratization produces a system-level pacifying ef- fect. We agree with our critics that the inclusion of dyadic regime difference produced misleading estimates for lower- threshold democracy. Because our arguments presume the historical existence of a dyadic democratic peace, however, this observation, if anything, resolves an apparent anomaly for our claims. Finally, we explain that Choi (2016) misunderstands the argument that systemic regime-type difference seeks to capture; we show that his proposed alternative neither captures our concept of interest nor accomplishes what he claims.*

In this book Weisiger and Gartzke tries to demystify and enquire whether the world of democracies will still be able to hold with its pacified effects attributed to democracy. It is from a critical point of view that the authors raise their concerns on the theoretical logics of the presented empirical result by democracy in regards to peace. The authors first clarify their theoretical arguments and then discuss various empirical critiques to the pacified effects of democracy in regards to fostering peace. The Crescenzi and Kadera’s critiques on the pacified effect of democracy are discussed and their claims that systemic democracy is driven by unjustified decisions in order to ensure that systemic regime difference are omitted to from the analysis.

The authors have evaluated the opinions of the critics and in the end they tend to agree with the critics on the fact that a pacifying effect on system level has is not produced by democracy. The authors have made their arguments very clear and systematic providing evidence and rational criticism concluding that dyadic regime difference in the lower-threshold democracy is totally misleading. As experienced authors, Weisiger and Gartzke present their logical arguments and critics on dyadic difference in regimes and the way they impact democracy in ensuring that peace is achieved.

**Choi, S. W. (2016). A menace to the Democratic peace? Dyadic and Systemic Difference**

*Do democracies become less peaceful with one another as the overall number of democratic states in the international sys- tem increases? Gartzke and Weisiger (2013, 2014) claim that they do. However, I argue that their evidence stems from a mathematical error in their statistical model. Once I correct that error, their findings no longer hold. In other words, when Gartzke and Weisiger’s model receives proper specification, no dyadic and systemic difference persists, while democ- racy emerges as a pacifying factor that reduces the likelihood of interstate dispute.*

Seung-Whan Choi is an outstanding author from the University of Illinois at Chicago. He tries to evaluate if the increase in the number of democratic systems in an international level has any effect on peace on the democracies. He forms an argument based on Gartzke and Weisiger’s claims that increase in democratic systems results to increase of peace in democracies. She tries to present an argument on how their statistical models based on their claims and the errors that it presents. She continues to argue that after finding the errors in the model, Weiseiger’s claims do not hold anymore. She claims that under certain specifications, systemic difference and dyads do not hold anymore and the overall top-emergence is democracy as the main contributor to ascertaining reduction of likelihood of violence among states is democracy.

Cognitive and clarified and challenging arguments are presented against Gartzke and Weigner’s claims, that increase in democracies in international systems, autocratic states pose less threats to peace as chances for violence diminishes. The pacifying effects of democratic dyads are reduced by the heterogeneity demonstrated by the democratic states. By the end of the critics, research and arguments, Choi finds that there are no holding facts that the more democratic a country is, the less the prevalence of conflicts. The arguments here are set to dispute Gartzke and Weigner’s theories of democracy’s influence on peace. The book is therefore focused on mathematical analysis and arguments rather than theoretical aspects that promote peace.

**Crescenzi, M., & Kadera, K. M. (2016). Built to last; Understanding the Link between Democracy and conflict in the international system.**

*We revisit Gartzke and Weisiger’s (2014) claim that development and dyadic difference, rather than democracy or a strong democratic community, drive peace and conflict in the international system. In so doing, we identify important inconsisten- cies in their theoretical argument. We also find extensive instability and errors in their empirical tests. Corrected analyses sup- port the conclusion that a materially strong global democratic community dampens the onset of militarized violence. In addi- tion, we show that an accurate interpretation of models including Gartzke and Weisiger’s “dyadic difference” variable actually supports the conclusion that dyadic democracy reduces conflict. We recommend moving toward a more productive analysis of the interdependence between regime dynamics, political economy, and violence. This involves better theorizing about the emergence of market structures and their pacifying effects, treating global economic and democratic effects as complemen- tary, research designs that carefully adhere to logic, and a continued practice of sharing replication files.*

The book is aimed at countering Gartzke and Weisiger’s claims on development and dyadic difference drove peace and conflict in the international system. Instead, they have asserted that democracy itself and strong democratic community were in fact the drivers to peace and conflict among international communities. They have articulated a clear guideline in identification of all the inconsistencies argued by Gartzke and Weisiger as they theorize their arguments. In their view, the democracy dampens the onset of militarized violence and that conclusion was got after making extensive error and inconsistencies analysis on empirical tests stipulated by the prior authors. The authors have thus shown evidence and not only critical but logic argument when they conclude that dyadic democracy reduces violence. The errors that they find in various theories could be correct if they are well interpreted all support democracy in influencing peace and conflict. Their views advocates for an analysis on the interdependence between political economy, violence and regime dynamics.

**Literature Review**

Peace is an aspect that has cost lives and stability of many countries. In fact, peace does not come easy, there are global forces that determines who is peaceful and who is not. In the 19th and 20th century, the war was rampant (Crescenzi & Kadera, 2016). It is during these periods that the First World War, the second world wars, and numerous civil wars were experienced. However, the modern society is experiencing peace at a higher percentage in comparison to the past. There exists a systemic developmental peace that is mostly enjoyed by the developed or wealthy nations in the world. The article thus discusses the notions and arguments that the wealthy countries are most peaceful and are unlikely to propagate war. On the other hand, democracy has played a great role in fostering systemic and dyadic peace (Choi, 2016).

Wealthy nations wield economic power and as a result, they are able to control the developing states. It has been argued that the developed nations have large interests to protect and as a result, they are able to ensure that war does not occur (Gartzke & Weisiger, 2014). There are no check and balances to control the developed countries as they connive to protect their interests in the name of promoting peace. However, when a dispute arises between them and the developing and less powerful countries, they are quick to use force, not forgetting that they use negotiations among themselves. Therefore, systemic development has been attributed to peace as it encourages it. However, when differences occur in economic platforms, war occurs (Crescenzi & Kadera, 2016).

On the other hand, democracy has been seen to contribute positively to promoting peace. Democratic countries have been praised to vouch for peace and as a result creating a positive influence even to autocratic countries (Weisiger & Gartzke, 2016). However, democracy has not shown consistency in maintaining peace and ending interstate conflicts. It has been acting as a platform for developed countries to secure their interests. The behavior and leadership of many countries are being changed through democracy in a systemic and dyadic manner. It is through systemic levels that the economic development of nations is achieved and the control of conflict in developing countries is enabled (Gartzke & Weisiger, 2014).

Powerful countries have the power of control and as a result, they are able to dictate who will be peaceful and who will not among the developing countries. However, they have been able to solicit for peace in developing countries through the use of incentives (Choi, 2016). They offer incentives to the developing countries to end conflicts among developing countries so as to protect their interests as they have much more to lose than them in the case of a World War Three. However, a notion of hypocrisy is depicted by the developed countries. They tend to use force when the situation is not favoring them or rather when they are adamant in securing favorable international policies and objectives (Crescenzi & Kadera, 2016).

International hypocrisy is wielded by the powerful nations which apparently, have also been imposed on the developing countries. There are notions that the richer countries are more at peace in comparison to the developing ones (Weisiger & Gartzke, 2016). The reason behind it is that they use the wealth to equip themselves with weaponry and are as a result a threat to each other. On the other hand, they feel that peace is the only way to safeguard their developed economies. It is through dyadic democratic observations that search for systemic peace is achieved. In fact, systemic analysis has been used to test if the dyadic peace arguments are valid (Gartzke & Weisiger, 2014).

In fact, democratic regimes have been able to survive for a long time under the spread democracies in as they promote liberal peace. It is through this peace fostering system via democracy that has seen even non-democracies and apparently, the same peace is promoted beyond the dyads. According to constructivists, anarchy is realized or created by a single nation, it is a system collectively made by nations with like minds. As a result, it has been argued that social norms of a community contribute to the level of systemic democratic peace in the society (Gartzke & Weisiger, 2014). The developed countries fear the costs of war as pressures of social legitimacy mount on them. Therefore, under those grounds, very few countries find it valid to declare wars. However, there is no guarantee that democracy ascertains lack of conflicts among developed and democratic countries, but it rather plays a great role in enhancing i it (Choi, 2016).

It is only through democracy that security is held collectively. Peace is fostered through democratic transformations both in developed and developing countries. Therefore, democracy and societal norms are related and they go hand in hand too and they are extended beyond the liberal communities. Democratization and norms create a link between non-democratic countries and dyadic democratic peace. In the end, constructivists have it that benefits of democracy pre-empt those of democratization. Evolving democratic communities influence non-democratic countries to appear less violent and less warlike (Weisiger & Gartzke, 2016).

Reverting to developed countries and their power, they tend to be overoptimistic in military prowess. The same way that development and power cultivate peace, the same threat is possessed by the developed nations towards each other (Weisiger & Gartzke, 2016). Therefore, even though the fear to provoke each other also plays a crucial role, development is not a guarantee of peace. However, it means that developed countries use to manipulate the developing countries into peace but when their interests are threatened, they result to war. Therefore, they opt to become trade partners to each other and continue amassing wealth instead of waging war. As a result, peace is instilled through a democratic approach (Crescenzi & Kadera, 2016).

However, there are people who oppose the argument that developed countries fear to start conflicts and war as they would incur high costs and lose a lot. I am also of the view that if provoked accordingly, the great weapons that have been constantly developed by developed nations would still be used without fear of costs (Choi, 2016). Comparing the two classes of categorized countries, it would be true to say that poor or third world countries are more into conflicts that the developed nations. The reason behind it is that developed countries have liberal sponsors that prefer bargaining for peace rather than coercion. I would, therefore, agree that utility and conquest are reduced via development while at the same time, power is increased to developed countries and thus their ability to control others (Gartzke & Weisiger, 2014).

While other countries are fighting for resources and other religious and border conflicts, the developed countries deter military conflicts and focus on the fight on policy and goals. In this way, their interaction in heightened. However, I can retaliate that there is no guarantee that developed countries are less prone to conflicts just because they are wealthy. As a result, development has made war obsolete among the developed countries and as a result they prefer to become trading states rather than engage in war. Democracy and development have played a crucial role in ensuring that peace prevails between countries (Crescenzi & Kadera, 2016).

International relations study tries to distinguish between systems and dyads in systemic theories but it is really challenging. As conflicts get rampant in the third world countries, war becomes less common on a global scale. The systemic drop in war and upgrade in social norms and behavior can all be attributed to democracy and development (Weisiger & Gartzke, 2016). The strength and manifestation of democracy can be tested and verified with the non-democrats and one will note that they have great cooperation and relationship with democracies; as a result, peaceful communities are created (Choi, 2016).

However, the relationship between the democracies and the autocrats is always constrained due to the difference in political views and structures. Apparently, the democrats try to exhibit peace and in the process lure the autocrats into it, however, other times they do not practice the peace they advocate for so vehemently; they tend to disorient the non-democrats. Therefore, autocrats and democrats never auger well due to the dynamics of difference exhibited. Conflict is therefore created as threats to peace increase from time to time. I, therefore, agree that regime types are also sources of peace violation and conflicts since the difference in ideologies and political structures tend to collide in one way or the other. Moreover, militarized disputes are promoted as a result of the systemic differences between regimes thus disrupting peace (Choi, 2016).

When we reflect on incentives, what do we mean and how do they impact development's contribution to peace. Violence is discouraged by the developed countries through incentives to third world countries. The incentives may be in form of rewards or punishments. The punishments may come in form of economic sanctions and denial to loans until the stipulated measures towards promoting peace are enhanced (Gartzke & Weisiger, 2014). On the other hand, rewards include grants, loans, and economic promotions through trade amalgamations. It is through these measures that systemic interdependence between peace and development is created. It is not that the developed countries do not have conflicts based on political or economic interests but it is the fact that they cannot stand others promoting disputes and ignore it (Crescenzi & Kadera, 2016).

There are patterns that exhibit and influence systemic conflicts and they include the strength of the democratic communities. How do we then measure or determine which nation is developed and which is not. There are independent and dependent factors that are used to measure the success of a country. The global per capita energy consumption is a clear indicator of the development level of a country (Choi, 2016). It shows how industrialized a country is as the energy consumed reflects the same level of output that a country produces. The other indicator is the Gross domestic product (GDP). Therefore, the two reflects the level of development. I would, therefore, assert that development and differences in economic levels and socio-political structures and democracy are the major factors that have dictated the modern peace and stability level as well as dictating interpersonal wars (Gartzke & Weisiger, 2014).

Liberal peace has been advocated for in many countries and it is through dyadic democratic peace that it is achieved. When comparing democracies and non-democracies, I would agree that democracies are monadically more peaceful (Crescenzi & Kadera, 2016). There are many factors that tend to instigate war and self-interests is one of them. The developed countries advocate for liberal peace as they are in control of the major decisions in the international security organizations. The major decisions made there are usually influenced by the large representations those countries have in the councils. On the other hand, what happens to the third world countries that are underrepresented in the unions? The peace policies set internationally do not favor the developing countries and thus they remain at the mercy of the developed nations (Choi, 2016).

However, the issue of hypocrisy clouds the whole issue of the developed countries trying to argue that they advocate for liberal peace by using incentives. Apparently, their strategies are conformed to international laws just because they have no direct interest to a certain country and the presence of peace favors their economic growth. However, if they have direct interests, they disregard the advocacy for peace especially if it pertains to the weak third world countries. Peace is, therefore, circumstantial for these countries as they would to hesitate to use military force to get what they want from the developing countries (Gartzke & Weisiger, 2014).

When it comes to other developed countries, they fear the costs of war and hence they would rather employ economic sanctions and trade barriers than engaging in war as they fear to lose what they have already built. Therefore, I would say that peace in the international system and the platform is full of hypocrisy (Crescenzi & Kadera, 2016). Taking another turn into the issues, the third world countries tend to have more wars and conflicts in comparison to the developed countries. I would say that some of these wars are initiated through the same incentives that they use to advocate for peace. A powerful country initiates war on the other so as to create demand for their own selfish interests. Therefore, as much as development brings peace, it is the same rate that it instigates conflict (Choi, 2016).

Developing countries are therefore active globally and they have the best chance to play the card for peace. However, the same rate that helps them promote peace is the same one that may promote conflicts and war (Choi, 2016). Weaker states, on the other hand, are more involved in wars and conflicts. However, there is no guarantee that developed countries have no conflicts. Therefore, we can only ascertain that peace at the system level is thus linked to development. Factors such as development and democracy promote peace in the world but they could also be serious in the same way in causing conflicts.
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