

Contents

1 Introduction	2
1.1 EU Introduction	3
1.2 International Relations Theories	3
1.3 Relevance	3
1.4 Problem Formulation	4
2 Methodology	6
2.1 EU in a Continuing Context of Enlargement	6
2.2 Literature	6
2.3 Theories	7
3 European Union	9
3.1 History	9
4 Theory	12
4.1 Realism	12
4.1.1 Classical Realism	16
4.1.2 Structural Realism	19
4.1.3 Realism at the Basic Level	22
4.2 Liberalism	27
4.2.1 Liberalism as an International Theory	29
5 Analysis	32
5.1 The Definitive Articles of Perpetual Peace	33
5.2 Liberal Internationalism	36
5.3 Testing the Liberal Peace Theory	38
6 Conclusion	42
7 Appendix	43
7.1 Appendix A - The Melian Dialogue	43
7.2 Appendix B - Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union	50
8 Literature List	68
9 Executive Summary	70

1 Introduction

“It can be shown that this idea of federalism, extending gradually to encompass all states and thus leading to perpetual peace, is practicable and has objective reality. For if by good fortune one powerful and enlightened nation can form a republic (which is by nature inclined to seek perpetual peace, this will provide a focal point for federal association among other states. These will join up with the first one, thus securing the freedom of each state in accordance with the idea of international right, and the whole will gradually spread further and further by a series of alliances of this kind”.¹

Kant wrote the above quotation in 1795 and it is striking how it pictures what the European Union has become today. Michael W. Doyle has developed on writings of Kant in what Doyle has labelled liberal peace. The aim of this paper is to investigate Doyle’s theory and use it on the European Union

The main point in their argumentation is that liberal democracies do not go to war with each other. This thesis will investigate the question of what role liberal peace has played and do play in the external policy of the European Union and in the spread of democracy by the EU. In the enlargement process the EU was spreading democracy to Eastern Europe. Countries such as Ukraine are also a target for EU policy in democracy building all though the country is not a member of the Union. The democracy spreading policy of the EU may end up in perpetual peace which Kant spoke of several centuries ago. This thesis will investigate whether or not there is any truth to this.

Documents from the EU will be used to analyze the actions of the Union and scholars who have investigated the enlargement will also be used to give a broad answer to the problem formulation.

¹ Kant, Immanuel, in Reiss, Hans, 1991, page 104.

1.1 EU Introduction

Today the European Union consist of a variety of treaties which enables widespread continental cooperation which began with the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) from 1952. The ECSC evolved to the European Economic Community (EEC) and later on to the European Union (EU) with the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 which was further amended in 1997 with the signing of the Amsterdam Treaty. The ECSC began with only six members but now the EU consist of 27 member states with the latest members being Romania and Bulgaria who joined on January 1st 2007. The development of the EU from being a small group of countries focused on trade has now developed into being a large political union with many different areas of policy furthermore the union has also become a diverse international political actor².

1.2 International Relations Theories

The main focus of theories in international relations is to explain how states, their leaders and other actors on the international scene act. The method of doing this is by an analysis of the behaviour and choices made by the actors on the international political scene. The two most dominant schools of international relations theory are liberalism and realism. These two main theories of international relations do not share much common ground. They do though have one common denominator; they both deal with the relation between peace and war. Liberalism focuses on free trade and cooperation between states to ensure peace. Realism on the other hand is based on the principle of international anarchy among states and this assumption leads to a constant state of conflict between states.

1.3 Relevance

The subject of this paper is relevant as the EU continues to develop its policy areas and also continues to expand and include more and more countries. The EU is becoming a more and more powerful actor on the international political scene. It is therefore relevant to investigate the motives behind this and give an answer to where the European Union is headed in its development.

² Bache, Ian, and George, Stephen, 2006 page 79 – 189.

There are currently three candidate countries to join the EU. Croatia and Turkey began negotiations in October 2005. In December 2005 the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia gained status of a candidate country. Negotiations have however not yet begun.

Five Western Balkan countries have potential candidate country status. These countries are: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia and Kosovo. The EU has on several occasions reaffirmed its commitment to enable these countries to join provided they meet the accession criteria.

On 23 July 2009 Iceland submitted a membership application which is currently being processed³.

The sheer number of candidate and potential candidate countries show the intent of the EU which is to continue enlarging. It is therefore relevant to examine the intent and motives of the EU in this process. As the EU continues to enlarge countries outside the EU might feel threatened by the EU. Countries such as the United States of America, China and Russia are countries that have a dominant role on the international scene and the EU has to take the interest of these countries into account. Russia is the best example as many of the candidate and potential candidate countries have close ties to Russia. In the 2004 Eastern Enlargement many of the countries were former members of the Soviet Union and therefore have even closer ties to Russia.

1.4 Problem Formulation

Enlargement of the European Community dates back to 1973 with the acceptance of Great Britain and Denmark to become members of the European Economic Community. The European Union, as it is known today, has enlarged many times and now totals 27 member states.

Several countries are likely to join the EU in the future and nobody knows when the EU will stop enlarging. The EU is built on the principles of liberal democracy and therefore countries that wish to join have to live up to certain criteria. These criteria are called the Copenhagen Criteria.

³ European Commission, accessed on 04/20/2010.

Essentially these criteria are the principles of a liberal democracy in which e.g. the rule of law is essential.

Michael W. Doyle has developed a theory in which the main principle is that liberal democracies do not engage in wars with other liberal democracies and therefore there would be no wars if every country of the world was a liberal democracy. Immanuel Kant called this perpetual peace and it is on the thoughts of Kant that Doyle has developed his theory.

The problem formulation of this paper is therefore:

Can Michael W. Doyle's theory of liberal peace built on Kant's theory of perpetual peace be verified in the context of the continuing enlargement of the European Union?

2 Methodology

In this paper it will be attempted to investigate the theory of liberal peace in the context of the continuing enlargement of the European Union. To verify and also give critic to the theory realist and liberalist theory will be applied. These theories have been chosen because they have been the dominant theories of international relations in the last decades and they represent opposite views.

To enable a thorough investigation the paper will be divided into the necessary explanatory, theoretical and analytical sections with the relevant subsections.

2.1 EU in a Continuing Context of Enlargement

The development of the EU is an important part of this paper. Therefore an explanatory section will provide an overview of the ever enlarging EU. It is necessary to narrow this explanatory section into the most relevant areas of the EU. In this context these are the treaties of the Union and the intentions of these. In the treaties there is often a direct reference to the development of democracy and therefore the treaties are very relevant to this paper.

Another part of the EU which will need to be explained is the different enlargement processes of the Union. These are relevant as they have a direct impact on the accession countries. E.g. the Eastern Enlargement of 2004 in which it was a criteria for the accession countries that they moved in the direction of liberal democracy and they had to live up to EU political norms in the *acquis communautaire*.

2.2 Literature

This paper will include a wealth of sources such as official EU documents, scholarly papers and theoretical literature on international relations. The EU documents and scholarly papers will be used complementary as it necessary for a good analysis to be critical. The EU documents may not show the entire agenda of the EU as there may be certain areas which the EU does not wish to disclose and the EU documents may be bias in its critique of EU actions. Therefore it will give a better understanding of the process if scholarly work of scholars who do not have a personnel interest in the EU is used. The political agenda of the EU will be examined in the analysis part of the paper where relevant international relation theories will try to explain the agenda.

2.3 Theories

Doyle's theory of liberal peace will be the main theory of this paper. Realism will be used to either verify or reject Doyle's theory.

The method in which realism and liberalism will be used is on the international politics level. These theories are normally used to explain how individual states act towards other states.

Realism has its main focus on states that are legal sovereign actors. Essentially this means that to realists there are no actors above the state. Multinational corporations or international organisations all have to be subject to the state and work within the framework of inter-state relations.

Realists view humans to be selfish in nature which leads to the view on international relations that every state is in a constant struggle for power in its attempt to maximize its national interest. The order between states is a balance of power in which bargaining, alliances and diplomacy are important tools.

The most important tool for states is however war. As there is no actor above the state, each state has to rely on self-help to achieve its goals. Cooperation is a way that these goals can be achieved, but often it leads to conflict and war⁴.

Liberalism has many different variations but all liberals share the common view on humans as perfectible and that it is a necessity for this perfectibility to develop that democracy prevails. A belief in progress is deeply embedded in all liberalists. Furthermore liberalists do not share the notion that war is a natural condition of international relations with realists.

Liberalists view international actors such as multinational corporations as the central actor in international relations and thereby reject the realist belief of the state as the main actor. They view states as a set of bureaucracies with different interests and therefore the state, to liberalists, is not a unitary or united actor. National interest does not exist according to liberalists since it is only the interest of different bureaucracies within the states that promote their interest.

The relations between states are best practised through cooperation according to liberalists and the possibilities of cooperation are therefore essential for liberalists. International relations are a complex system of bargaining among all the different actors on the international scene. Military force is not the

⁴ Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 5.

most important tool in international relations. It is however still important. Economic, environmental, and technological issues are also highly important to liberalists.

Interactions between many different layers of governing arrangements such as laws, agreed norms, international regimes and institutional rules leads to world order.

According to liberalists the sovereignty of states can be legal but practically they have to interact with a variety of different actors and thereby their ability to act as they wish is severely restricted. Liberalists find interdependence between states as a vital part of international relations⁵.

⁵ Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 5.

3 European Union

3.1 History

The history of the European Union is very complex and long and for the purpose of this paper it is not necessary to cover all parts of the history. This part of the paper will focus on the treaties of the EU as they are the foundation on which the Union is built.

In the period after the Second World War Europe was a continent in chaos. Many political leaders in Europe wanted to have a close cooperation to ensure peace, stability and economic growth among the warring parties.

On May 9, 1950 the French foreign minister, Robert Schuman made a proposal in which the European Coal and Steel Union would be established. The main goal of the proposal was to set up a High Authority which would control the industries, which had made the arms race before and during the war possible. This High Authority would make it impossible to initiate an arms race and thereby ensuring peace in Europe.

Six countries signed the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC Treaty) in Paris in 1951 and became effective in July 1952. The countries were France, Germany, Italy and the Benelux countries^{6 7}.

The creation of the ECSC was the first step in Europe toward a supranational Europe. The six members' relinquished sovereignty to the Community. This was the first time in European history such a thing happened, however limited it was.

However this first step toward integration was halted in 1954 when attempts to create a European Defence Community (EDC) failed.

At this time it seemed that the ECSC would be a failure. The Messina Conference of June 1955 gave new hope to the creation of a common Europe. A committee was created as a result of

⁶ Europa, Summaries of EU legislation, accessed on 04/17/2010.

⁷ EU-Oplysningen, Hvad er EU?, EU's historie, accessed on 04/17/2010.

this conference with the aim of drafting a report on a European common market. It met under the Presidency of P. H. Spaak, the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs. The Committee finished its work in April 1956 when it submitted two drafts: A draft on the creation of a general common market and a draft on the creation of an atomic energy community.

This led to the signing of the famous “Treaties of Rome” in March 1957. The first of the treaties established the European Economic Community (EEC) and the second treaty created the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom). The Treaties became effective from 1 January 1958⁸.

In 1958 the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) was created after membership in the EEC was rejected. The countries were Great Britain, Denmark, Austria, Norway, Portugal, Sweden and Iceland. These countries became known as the ‘outer seven’ as opposed to the ‘inner six’ of the EEC. Great Britain and Denmark left EFTA in 1973 to join the EC (former EEC) and plans were created to include the last members of EFTA in the EC.

This process is known as the first enlargement of the European project which raised the number of members from six to eight. It also marked a new period in European integration as the EC began to use regional policy and financially supporting poorer parts of the Community to ensure a stable infrastructure.

In 1981 Greece joined the EC followed by Spain and Portugal in 1986. In 1995 Austria, Finland and Sweden joined what was now the European Union, which had been formally created in 1993 when the Maastricht Treaty was signed. In 1999 the Amsterdam Treaty was signed. These two treaties created the three pillar structure in which governments could cooperate and obtain the goal to ensure peace, prosperity and stability for its peoples⁹.

In 2004 the largest round of enlargements took place when the European Union was enlarged into the former Soviet Union countries of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia,

⁸ Europa, Summaries of EU legislation, accessed on 04/17/2010.

⁹ Europa, Europe in 12 Lessons – Why the European Union? accessed on 04/17/2010.

Lithuania Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia and the island states of Cyprus and Malta. In 2007 Romania and Bulgaria also joined the Union and the number of member states was now 27.

4 Theory

4.1 Realism

This chapter will provide an insight into realism. The first part will be a walkthrough of the history of realism. The second part will look into the discussion of 'one realism, or many'. This will include an explanation to different interpretations of realism. The third and last part will provide some common ground for realism.

An account of realism often begin in the inter-war period (1919-39) in which realists began to critique what they called idealist scholars. These scholars were, according to realism, focused on finding the remedy for the existence of war by understanding the reasons behind war. This approach was flawed in many ways according to realists. According to realists the idealists ignored the role of power, overestimated how rational humans are, and believed that there were common interest for nation-states and lastly idealists were too optimistic in the belief that war could be eliminated. In 1939 the Second World War broke out. To realists this was a confirmation of the shortage of the idealist approach¹⁰.

After this realism replaced the by now discredited idealist approach. In the late 1930s and early 1940s a Great Debate took place between the idealist writers and realist writers such as E. H. Carr¹¹, Hans J. Morgenthau¹², Reinhold Niebuhr¹³ and others. These writers were of the belief that power was the most important factor in international relations. Furthermore they highlighted the importance of the competitive nature among nations¹⁴.

Most agree that realists won the Great Debate and thereafter realism became the main theory of international relations. When realism emerged as a theory it used idealist theory as a tool to define itself by acting as an opposite to idealism. Realist theory has been dominant since 1939 and policy-makers have mainly viewed the world through realist lenses¹⁵.

¹⁰ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 92.

¹¹ British historian, journalist and international relations theorist.

¹² Considered one of the founding fathers of the realist approach. Has written widely on international politics and U.S. foreign policy.

¹³ American theologian and commentator on public affairs.

¹⁴ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 92.

¹⁵ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 92.

Realism had a profound effect on American leaders who started to focus on interests instead of ideology and furthermore use strength to secure peace. Realism is able to offer policy-makers a manual which shows them how to maximize the interests of the state in a world filled with hostility. This is also one of the reasons behind the success of realism in maintaining its dominant role in international relations theory¹⁶.

Realism after the Second World War has often been associated with an older, classical tradition of thought. Thucydides¹⁷, Niccolo Machiavelli¹⁸, Thomas Hobbes¹⁹, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau²⁰ are all grouped in international politics with the doctrine *raison d'État*, reason of state. This doctrine has provided policy-makers a guideline on how to conduct foreign affairs in a way that ensure the security of the state in the best possible way²¹.

Friedrich Meinecke²² has placed the reason of the state as a fundamental principle of international politics. The most important goal of the state is to pursue power and therefore the policy-maker must make the most rational choice towards this end. All realists agree that the survival of the state can never be guaranteed as war is a legitimate instrument in international politics²³.

Realists finds one more issue that they associate with the reason of the state. That is the role of morals and ethics in international politics. Universal moral principles do not exist according to realists and therefore realists are very sceptical when policy-makers neglect the state's interest when they try to adhere to moral and ethical conduct. Another important point is that realists are of the belief that it is necessary for the survival of the state that state's distance themselves from traditional morality such as caution, piety, and the greater good of mankind. Machiavelli even took the argument so far that he called these principles very harmful if applied by state leaders. State leaders and policy-makers had to distance themselves from traditional Christian virtues and instead opt for what was a political necessity and prudence²⁴.

¹⁶ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 92.

¹⁷ c.460-406BC. Greek historian. Writer of *The Peloponnesian War*.

¹⁸ 1469-1527. Italian political philosopher who is considered to be one of the founding fathers of political science.

¹⁹ 1588-1679. English philosopher who wrote the book *Leviathan* in 1651 which introduced the social contract in Western political philosophy.

²⁰ 1712-1778. Swiss philosopher who has greatly influenced the French Revolution via his political writings.

²¹ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 92.

²² 1862-1954. German historian.

²³ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 92.

²⁴ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 92 – 93.

This difference in morality of the individual and the states is labelled dual moral standard by proponents of the reason of the state. According to the proponents there are two different moral standards. One for the individual citizen and one for the state. Proponents find the justification for this in the condition of international politics which makes it necessary for policy-makers and state leaders to be amoral e.g. cheating, lying and killing. This would be unacceptable for an individual but necessary for the state. The proponents of the reason of the state claim that the state itself is a moral force. It is the moral duty of the policy-maker to preserve the state at all cost so that the ethical political community can exist within the state²⁵.

For realism the fundamental unit of political analysis is the group. For Thucydides and Machiavelli the fundamental unit was the polis or city-state. In 1648 came the Peace of Westphalia and since then realists has considered the state as the main actor in international relations. This has been labelled as the state-centric assumption of realism. The main idea of this state-centric assumption is that the state function as the collective will of the citizens of the state. Within the borders of a state it is necessary for the state to have legitimacy so it can exercise authority. When it comes to international relations realism argues that a condition of anarchy exists as there is no overarching authority and it is therefore necessary for the state to exercise power to survive²⁶.

There is a sharp distinction between domestic and international politics according to realists. The organisational structure of the two is very different. As mentioned before realists view international politics as anarchy where the state is the highest level and there is no higher authority above the state. Domestic politics however is defined by a hierarchical structure where a variety of political actors has various relations of super- and subordination. This difference and the view on international politics leads realists to depict the main task of the state as a task in which state leaders and policy makers have to do whatever they can to ensure the survival of the state²⁷.

Power is a key notion to realists and traditionally it has been defined in military strategic terms. As realists assume that the ultimate goal of all states is survival and as the international environment consist of anarchy every state have to maximise its own power. If a state (A) decides to enlarge its military capacity its neighbouring state (B) has to do the same as the intentions of state (A) is unknown. The very existence of state B is threatened by state A and looking at history this scenario has resulted in

²⁵ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 92 – 93.

²⁶ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 93.

²⁷ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 93.

states losing their existence. E.g. Poland has lost its independence four times in the last three centuries. The different levels of power are crucial for the survival of the state. The more power a state has, the bigger the chance is that the state will survive²⁸.

The best way to ensure survival in an anarchical system without a global government is via self-help. A state only has itself to ensure its survival according to realism. Therefore institutions such as the United Nations should not be relied on to ensure a state's survival. A question then arises on how a state then should secure its survival. Realism offers different approaches with the same premise. The state should augment its power capabilities. This can be done by a, arms build up which however can turn out to be impossible for a number of small states when threatened by a much larger state. This leads realists to another key tool of international politics – the balance of power. A number of small states if threatened by a large state or a bigger coalition should form an alliance to secure the survival of the smaller states. This would lead to equilibrium of power where no state or coalition is able to dominate others. The best example of this is the cold war in which the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) balanced against each other for half a century roughly²⁹.

With the end of the cold war being relatively peaceful realism faced an explanatory problem. Realism was unable to explain why the cold war did not end in all out war. Furthermore realism was unable to foresee the many different dynamics which ended the cold war. A powerful critique was given against realism which was based on the failure of realism to explain such new developments as regional integration, humanitarian intervention, the growing security community in Western Europe, and the many intra-state wars which plagued the global South. Another critique came from proponents of globalisation who argued that the state was losing its absolute power to non-state actors in the form of transnational corporations and regional institutions³⁰.

Another critique has been raised against realism as it is unable to explain why there has been a massive increase in intra-state wars in the global South after the end of the cold war. Realism has given a response to this critique and not surprising this does not agree with the proponents of globalisation. Realists argue that an intra-state war happens when a state collapses, as we have seen in Somalia and Haiti. The dichotomy between domestic order and international disorder collapses. This leads to anarchy on the domestic level as we have seen on the international level. According to realism the different

²⁸ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 93.

²⁹ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 93 – 94.

³⁰ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 94.

groups within a state then struggle for power as they try to assure their own security. Realists have named this the security dilemma when different ethnic, religious, and cultural groups now have to provide the security for themselves when the state is unable to. It is, according to the security dilemma, only natural for each group to seek security as their first priority. But when one group seeks to perpetuate their own security and increase power another group will feel threatened by this. As on the international level this can lead to conflict and war and an intra-state war such as civil war breaks out³¹.

A point worth mentioning is that realism has been announced dead as a theory several times, in the 1960s by the scientific approach and by transnationalism in the 1970s. Each time realism has re-emerged even stronger. The resilience of realism shows that one of its central claims, specifically, that realism will remain a theory across time and space. Even though the world may seem to change realists believe that the logic of realism will always prevail³².

A unified theory of realism will be very hard to make as realism has changed over time. Therefore it would be logical to group realism in different directions. A way of doing this is by categorising realism into three historical periods: Classical realism (up to the twentieth century). This period include the work of Thucydides' who has depicted the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta. Modern realism (1939-1979) which consists mainly of the Great Debate in the inter-war period and also includes the new scholars after the Second World War. Neo-realism, also called structural realism (1979-onwards) begins with Kenneth Waltz's³³ text "*Theory of International Politics*" from 1979. The grouping of these different approaches to realism is simplistic and easy to handle. However this simplicity has a price as the differentiation within each time period disappears. Therefore a different approach will be applied in the following. Realism will be divided into classical-, structural realism and neoclassical realism. At first glance there does not seem to be any difference between the two ways of categorizing realism but the last suggestion does not keep to different time periods. It does instead link the categories with different thinkers in the field from different time periods³⁴.

4.1.1 Classical Realism

The first of the different approaches to realism that will be explored is classical realism which draws its lineage back to Thucydides who stated that power politics is a law of human behaviour. A state's

³¹ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 94.

³² Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 94 – 94.

³³ Emeritus Professor of Political Science at UC Berkeley and Adjunct Senior Research Scholar at Columbia University and considered the father figure of structural realism.

³⁴ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 95.

behaviour is a reflection of the people living in the state and therefore the state seeks to build up as much power as possible. Hans J. Morgenthau has carried on this interpretation of realism as a condition of human nature. Competition, fear and war which are essential features of international politics can be explained by the nature of man according to realists such as Morgenthau³⁵.

Morgenthau stated that: *“politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature”*³⁶. The important point Morgenthau makes is that it is necessary to first recognize that these laws exist and thereafter to find the best policies despite human beings are flawed. Both Morgenthau and Thucydides are of the belief that the power-seeking drive in human beings is rooted in biology³⁷.

Classical realism differs from other forms of realism when it comes to the philosophical level. Classical realists such as Thucydides and Machiavelli have given much attention to what extent state’s can be guided by ethical considerations. Essentially classical realism is about the struggle for belonging. This give rise to patriotism so that a community can survive in the battle between good and evil. This predates the modern interpretation of sovereignty which dates back to the mid-seventeenth century. Classical realists engage themselves with matters such as morality and virtue³⁸.

Thucydides’ work on the Peloponnesian War is considered by many subsequent generations of realists to be one of the most important scholarly books from this era. Thucydides’ explanation of the cause of the war between Athens and Sparta is considered to be a text book example of the influence of the anarchy in international politics has on state actors and policy makers. According to Thucydides Sparta was acting in accordance with its national interest, namely that of survival, which according to realism is the main interest of all states. Sparta believed that Athenian power was growing and therefore had no other choice than go to war against Athens before they were too strong. On the other side the Athenians saw a build up in Spartan power and therefore they were forced to pursue power to maintain the Athenian empire. Pericles, the leader of the Athenians, is claimed to have been acting on the most basic of human nature, namely that of ambition, fear, and self-interest³⁹.

³⁵ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 95.

³⁶ Morgenthau, Hans J., as quoted in Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 95.

³⁷ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 95 – 96.

³⁸ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 96.

³⁹ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 96.

A passage in Thucydides book is known as the “*Melian dialogue*”⁴⁰ which illustrates key realist elements. The dialogue is focussed on the dialogue between the Athenian leaders, who wished to conquer the island of Melos and the Melians who did not want Athenian occupation. In other words the dialogue is about power politics at the basic level. The Athenian army was vastly superior to that of the Melians and the Athenians were therefore able to offer the Melians two options; either submit or die⁴¹.

The Melians tried to use terms such as justice and the will of God as means to persuade the Athenians not to attack as the will of God is on the Melians side. The Athenians however did not believe them and instead they did as the realist approach predicts and used their power to conquer the Melians as “*the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept*”⁴² which to realism is a fundamental principle⁴³. The following part of the dialogue shows this.

*Athenians: Well, then, we Athenians will use no flue words; we will not go out of our way to prove at length that we have a right to rule, because we overthrew the Persians; or that we attack you now because we are suffering any injury at your hands. We should not convince you if we did; nor must you expect to convince us by arguing that, although a colony of the Lacedaemonians, you have taken no part in their expeditions, or that you have never done us any wrong. But you and we should say what we really think, and aim only at what is possible, for we both alike know that into the discussion of human affairs the question of justice only enters where the pressure of necessity is equal, and that the powerful exact what they can, and the weak grant what they must*⁴⁴.

Other classical realists who agree with Thucydides on this are Machiavelli and Morgenthau. Athens and Melos could be replaced with Florence and the threat it was under from external powers in the time of Machiavelli. In the time of Morgenthau it can be transferred to that of Nazi Germany and Czechoslovakia in 1939, and the Soviet Union and Hungary in 1956. This continuation of the principle of the powerful overpowering the weak only confirmed to classical realists that human nature is basically

⁴⁰ For the full dialogue please see Appendix A.

⁴¹ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 96 – 97.

⁴² Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 97.

⁴³ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 97.

⁴⁴ The Melian Dialogue, Appendix A.

aggressive⁴⁵. Morgenthau stated that: *“the drives to live, to propagate, and to dominate are common to all men”*⁴⁶.

The question then arises on how state leaders should act in a world filled with potential enemies. Machiavelli's advice to the state leaders is clear. For him it is clear that all obligations and treaties are subordinate to the survival of the state and these should therefore be disregarded if the security of the state is under threat. Furthermore it is legitimate to use imperial expansion as a way of gaining security. Not all classical realists agree with this absolute belief. Realists such as Butterfield, Carr, Morgenthau, and Wolfers are slightly more liberal than Machiavelli in the sense that it would not be wise to act only on power and self-interest without taking into consideration such things as moral and ethics. The Athenians did after all suffer defeat when they followed the realist tenet of self-interest⁴⁷.

4.1.2 Structural Realism

Structural realism differs from classical realism in its interpretation of the power struggle. To classical realists the struggle for power is a consequence of human nature. Structural realists see the struggle for power as a consequence of the lack of an overarching international authority above the state⁴⁸.

Waltz has defined the structure of the international system into three different elements, namely that of organizing principle, differentiation of units, and distribution of capabilities. The organizing principle is differentiated into two different elements.

The first element being that of anarchy which places international politics into a decentralised realm, and the second being that of hierarchy, which provide the basic necessities of the domestic order.

According to Waltz the units of the international system consists of similar sovereign states in which unit level variations are irrelevant when international outcomes are to be explained. The distribution of capabilities, which is also the third element, among the units is of fundamental importance in achieving an understanding of international outcomes. Structural realists consider the relative distribution of power as the key variant in the understanding of international outcomes e.g. war and peace, alliance politics, and the balance of power. The interesting element for structural realists is a rank-ordering of states so that the number of great powers can be counted at all times. This number is the determining

⁴⁵ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 97 – 98.

⁴⁶ Morgenthau, Hans J., as quoted in Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 97 – 98.

⁴⁷ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 98.

⁴⁸ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 98.

measuring rod so that we can be able to determine the structure of the international system. During the cold war a bipolar system existed with the Soviet Union on the one side and the United States on the other⁴⁹.

The behaviour of states is naturally affected by the international distribution of power. Waltz argues that all states have to be aware of the capabilities of other states which lead to distrust among states as all states are worried about their survival if other states build up military force. Unlike classical realists Waltz argues that states are more security maximizers than power maximizers as classical realism claims. According to Waltz power maximization leads to a dysfunctional international system as all states counter balance against each other all the time⁵⁰.

Waltz theory is also labelled defensive realism. John Mearsheimer⁵¹ has made another account of the power dynamics within the anarchic system, namely that of offensive realism. Many of the assumptions as Waltz made are shared by Mearsheimer. Mearsheimer's theory differentiates in describing how states behave and act. According to Mearsheimer no state is satisfied with its current level of power and all states therefore seek ways to achieve more power. Unlike defensive realism, offensive realism states that the best way to preserve peace is by accumulating as much power as possible. Mearsheimer is of the belief that the most ideal position for a state is to be the global hegemon. He however notes that global hegemony is not possible and therefore his conclusion is that the world will always be in a great power struggle⁵².

A group of contemporary realists have shown some scepticism about the offensive realist notion that the international distribution of power is the best explanation on how states act and behave. The end of the Cold War has brought along a new group of realists who have moved beyond the somewhat parsimonious assumptions of structural realism and have taken into account a number of other factors at the individual and domestic level in their attempt to explain international politics. These new factors are factors such as the perceptions of state leaders, state contra society relationships, and what motivates a state. Gideon Rose⁵³ has labelled this group of scholars as neoclassical realists⁵⁴. Stephen

⁴⁹ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 98.

⁵⁰ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 98 – 99.

⁵¹ American professor of political science at the University of Chicago.

⁵² Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 98 – 99.

⁵³ Served on the National Security Council during the Clinton Administration.

⁵⁴ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 99.

Walt⁵⁵ has stated that he “places domestic politics as an intervening variable between the distribution of power and foreign policy behaviour”⁵⁶.

A variable such as state leaders is important in this regard and especially how they look at the international distribution of power. According to neoclassical realists the assumption that there is an objective, independent reading of the distribution of power is wrong. Instead neoclassical realists are of the belief that what matters is instead how state leaders achieve an understanding of this distribution. According to structural realist all states have a common and shared basis of interests. According to neoclassical realists such as Randall Schweller⁵⁷ this is not true if you look at it from a historical perspective. According to Schweller in his article “*Neorealism’s status-quo bias: what security dilemma?*” from 1996 where he states that structural realism or neo-realism as he calls it is basically a status quo theory as it assumes that all states have their main interest in security. Schweller takes up the writings of e.g. Morgenthau to highlight that he made a key distinction between a revisionist state and a status quo state^{58, 59}. According to neoclassical realism Germany was a revisionist state in the 1930s as it was discontent with its position in the international system. After the Second World War this changed and Germany now became a status quo state. According to neoclassical realism this understanding of the state’s position in the international system is very important. Fareed Zakarias⁶⁰ article “*From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America’s World Role*”⁶¹ from 1998 also highlight the importance of to what level a state is able to use the resources from its society. Zakaria has introduced the concept of state strength to what he calls state-centred realism. The ability of the state to use the resources at its disposal is the strength of the state. According to neoclassical realism states have different abilities to use the state’s strength and therefore all states cannot be treated as equal units as Waltz states^{62, 63}.

⁵⁵ Professor of international affairs at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government.

⁵⁶ Walt, Stephen as quoted in Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 99.

⁵⁷ Professor of Political Science at The Ohio State University.

⁵⁸ Schweller, Randall, “*Neorealism’s Status-Quo Bias: What Security Dilemma?*”, 1996, page 90 – 121.

⁵⁹ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 99.

⁶⁰ Indian-American journalist and author at CNN and editor of Newsweek’s International editions.

⁶¹ Zakaria, Fareed, “*Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America’s World Role*”, Princeton University Press, 1998.

⁶² Zakaria, Fareed, “*Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America’s World Role*”, Princeton University Press, 1998.

⁶³ Walt, Stephen as quoted in Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 99.

As has been shown in the previous pages there is a variety of different interpretations of what realism is which have given rise to question the overall coherence in realism. Here it is important not to look at realism as a static theory which does not change to the circumstances in which it operates. Realism consists of both continuity and conflict which perhaps plays a role in the survival of the theory. Despite of the fact that there is conflict and different interpretations within realism there is a number of assumptions which are common to all realists. This will be explored in the following⁶⁴.

4.1.3 Realism at the Basic Level

As mentioned in the previous part realism has many different interpretations. To find the basics of realism it is necessary to use what is labelled the three Ss': statism, survival, self-help. These three elements will be explored in the following.

Statism

The state is the most important factor to realists and the sovereignty of the state is highly important. Force is necessary for the state to upkeep its sovereignty. The relationship between the state and violence has been defined by Max Weber⁶⁵ as he defined the state by stating that "*the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory*"⁶⁶. This means that the state, which is the sovereign, is the supreme authority which can make and enforce laws within its territory. Hobbes compares this to a contract in which the citizens of the state trade liberty for security given by the state. When the citizen of the state feels secure civil society can begin and only then things like art, culture etc. will flourish. After this power need to be organized domestically according to realism and thereafter a community can be established⁶⁷.

Realism is essentially focused on the international level as it assumes that the domestic problems of order and security have been solved. It is however very different among states as there is no sovereign or overarching authority to provide security for the states. Therefore the international community consists of anarchy. In this anarchy states compete with each other to gain power and security. Realists view this in zero-sum terms which basically means more for one actor, less for another. This anarchy leads to trouble in establishing universal principles. There is however one principle which realist claim to

⁶⁴ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 100.

⁶⁵ German sociologist and political economist who have had, and still have, a large influence on social theory and social research.

⁶⁶ Weber, Max as quoted in Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 100.

⁶⁷ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 100.

be universal, namely that of non-intervention in the internal affairs of a sovereign state. This principle is however suspended when it comes to great powers and their actions when e.g. national security is threatened as seen in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq⁶⁸.

Power as a concept has now been mentioned a couple of times but have yet not been defined in detail. It is easy to state that international politics is a struggle for power, but then the question arises of what realists actually mean by power. Morgenthau stated that power is "*man's control over the minds and actions of other men*"⁶⁹. This leads to two points which realists use to define power. The first point is that power is a relational concept. This means that it is necessary to have two persons or states to exercise power as it can not be done in a vacuum but need to be exercised towards another entity. The second point being that power is a relative term. It is not enough to only calculate one owns power, but it is also necessary to calculate other actor's power. This is however a very complicated task and therefore it has often been reduced to measuring the military strength of a state e.g. number of troops, tanks, aircraft etc. to measure to what extent a state is able to get other actors to submit. This has naturally given rise to some criticisms. Briefly said the concept of power has been and remains under-theorized⁷⁰.

Structural realists or neo-realists have tried to define power in other terms. Waltz changed the focus from power to capabilities. According to Waltz capabilities is ranked in the following ways: Size of population and territory, resource endowment, economic capability, military strength, political stability and competence. Logic tells us that the state with the largest strength in resources should win a war. History however has shown us otherwise as for example in 1967 with the Six Day War between Israel and the Arab coalition of Egypt, Jordan and Syria. The Arab coalition war clearly favoured by the distribution of resources. However Israel won the war and was able to seize a lot of the coalition's territories. Another example is the Vietnam War where the United States was superior in every way, but was forced to retreat in humiliating fashion. These examples show us that a more sophisticated explanation is necessary to explain international politics⁷¹.

Another critique against realism has been raised in its focus upon state power and its assumption that other actors such as transnational corporations, international organizations, and terrorist networks do

⁶⁸ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 100.

⁶⁹ Morgenthau, Hans J., as quoted in Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 100.

⁷⁰ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 100 – 101.

⁷¹ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 100 – 101.

not really count in the big picture. Realists view such actors as a passing entity whereas the state persists and as a concept is eternal⁷². This has given rise to serious critique when contemporary scholars look upon institutions such as the European Union and others who are gaining more and more strength. This subject will be discussed in detail in the later analytical section of this paper.

Survival

The second principle which is common to all realists is that of state survival. Security is another term which realists use as an ultimate concern of a state. This give rise to some ambiguity within realism and with a just cause. However realists hold survival as a precondition for all other goals including security. In other words, security is worthless if you are dead.

Previously it has been explained that there recently have been controversy on whether or not state seeks to maximise power or security namely offensive realism against defensive realism. When it comes to survival offensive realists are of the position that the competition for power is ongoing as revisionist states and aspiring hegemons will always take risks to better their position in the hierarchy. Defensive realists on the other hand hold the position that the competition is lessened by status quo states⁷³.

Machiavelli has set up a set of maxims which can enable leaders to keep power. Two of Machiavelli's themes recur in the writings of contemporary realists. Both are based on the realist principle that different moral and political rules apply to international politics and domestic politics. This is not an easy task for state leaders as they may have to sacrifice their own citizens to ensure the survival of the state. Henry Kissinger⁷⁴ stated that *"a nation's survival is its first and ultimate responsibility; it cannot be compromised or put to risk"*⁷⁵. It is therefore necessary for state leaders to think of the greater good at all times to ensure the survival of the state. Realists have introduced the concept of ethics of responsibility. This means that political and legal rights can be suspended if it is necessary in order to protect the survival of state. The problem is however that there is no clear guide to when and how state leaders can do this and weigh the consequences of their actions⁷⁶.

⁷² Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 101.

⁷³ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 101.

⁷⁴ Secretary of State during the Nixon Administration and an academic realist.

⁷⁵ Kissinger, Henry as quoted in Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 102.

⁷⁶ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 101 – 102.

Realism objects to bringing in moral and ethics to international politics as each state is sovereign and has its own set of moral values and ethics. This has generated much critique especially from liberal theorists which will be explored latter on⁷⁷.

Self-help

The third and last principle is that of self-help which has been especially used by Waltz who argued unlike other realists that international politics is not unique because of the many wars and conflicts. Domestic politics also experience many wars and conflicts and therefore there is nothing special about international politics in this regard. To Waltz the key difference between domestic and international politics is to be found in the structure. On the domestic level the state ensures the security of the citizens but on the international level there is no overarching sovereign to ensure security. The only way for a state to ensure security, according to Waltz, is therefore via self-help. The problem with this is that when a state tries to act and help itself it threatens the security of other, as mentioned before this is called the security dilemma. States end up in an endless spiral were they keep on building up power and thereby an ironic thing often happens when states end up being no more secure then before they undertook the task of enhancing their security⁷⁸.

Structural realists is of the belief that the international system will always end up in a balancing of power where states balance against each irrespective whether or not this was the intention of the states in the first place. Classical realists on the other hand believe that state leaders and diplomats have a crucial role to play in maintaining the balance of power. This shows that the balance of power is a constructed entity and not a given or natural thing⁷⁹.

After the end of the Cold War the debate among realists about the stability of the balance of power system. This is due to the shift in international society. There is no longer a bipolar system but instead a unipolar order where the United States is the only great power and it is not being balanced against as realist theory predicts and it is unsure if this will ever happen. The security dilemma persists even though a unipolar system now exists. This is due to the lack of trust in international relations. According to Waltz cooperation between states is hard to achieve as states tend to only look after their own interests. In this a factor like short-term benefits plays a huge role. If all countries opened up and enabled free-trade everyone would benefit from it in the long-term. But a large state or group of states

⁷⁷ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 101 – 102.

⁷⁸ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 102.

⁷⁹ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 102.

can benefit in the short-term by using protectionist policies. This would lead to protectionist policies by other states and eventually international trade would collapse and nobody would benefit in the long-term. This is the discussion of the concern with relative gains which realists argue is hard to achieve via cooperation in a self-help system⁸⁰.

⁸⁰ Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 102 – 103.

4.2 Liberalism

Realism has throughout history had the dominant position as a theory in international relations. Liberalism has always been second and too many have been the only natural alternative to realism. Therefore and exploration of liberalism naturally begins with the inter-war period (1919-39) in which realists began to critique what they called idealist scholars. These idealist scholars are where liberalism has its origins as they are in opposition to realism. After the Second World War liberalism had a short re-emergence which ended with the beginning of the Cold War and the return of power politics. In the 1990s world leaders were quick to announce a new world order with the end of the Cold War. Until 9/11 2001 liberal values flourished and it seemed that liberalism had won the battle against realism. This however changed dramatically after 9/11 where the United States and its allies engaged in a war against terror. This shows that liberalism is very much a theory for peacetime but when wars begin to happen again realism takes over⁸¹.

Stanley Hoffman⁸² has described the problems of liberalism in the following phrase:

*“international affairs have been the nemesis of Liberalism. The essence of liberalism is self-restraint, moderation, compromise and peace, whereas the essence of international politics is exactly the opposite: troubled peace, at best, or the state of war.”*⁸³

Realists view this statement by Stanley Hoffman as a given because they are of the belief that without power there can be no progress, no law, and no justice. Truly a compelling argument, but liberals reject this on the notion that power politics in itself is the product of ideas and liberalism is of the firm belief that ideas can change. So even though liberalism has seen its fair share of trouble as a theory throughout history liberals still believe that the world can be re-made in the image of liberalism⁸⁴.

This belief in progress is another core idea of liberalism but instead of exploring liberalism this way it would be more prudent to explain and begin the discussion with a definition presented by Michael W.

⁸¹ Dunne, Tim in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 110.

⁸² Political scientist at Harvard University.

⁸³ Hoffman, Stanley as quoted in Dunne, Tim in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 110.

⁸⁴ Dunne, Tim in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 110.

Doyle⁸⁵ in his book “*Ways of War and Peace*” from 1997 in which he points out a four-dimensional definition of liberalism. The definition is as follows:

*“First, citizens possess juridical equality and other fundamental civic rights, such as freedom of religion and the press. Second, the effective sovereigns of the state are representative legislatures deriving their authority from the consent of the electorate and exercising their authority free from all restraint apart from the requirement that basic civic rights be preserved. Most pertinently for the impact of Liberalism on foreign affairs, the state is subject to neither the external authority of other states nor the internal authority of special prerogatives over foreign policy held, for example, by monarchs or military bureaucracies. Third, the economy rests on a recognition of the rights of private property, including the ownership of means of production. Property is justified by individual acquisition (for example, by labor) or by social agreement or social utility. This excludes state Socialism or state capitalism, but it need not exclude market Socialism or various forms of the mixed economy. Fourth, economic decisions are predominantly shaped by the forces of supply and demand, domestically and internationally, and are free from strict control by bureaucracies”.*⁸⁶

These positions are the direct opposite of realist values. Liberal values of individualism, tolerance, freedom, and constitutionalism are the opposite of realist thinking which is willing to sacrifice the liberties of the individual in order to secure the state or community⁸⁷.

Furthermore these positions have given rise to a differentiation of liberalism into two different approaches namely those of laissez-faire liberalism and welfare liberalism. Laissez-faire liberals believe that the best way to enable citizens to exercise freedom is via a highly constrained role for the state. Instead private property and the market are the driving forces of society. On the other hand welfare liberals highlight the role of the state that has to have a high level of influence on the opportunity of the citizen to exercise freedom whereas the role of the market is restricted. The two different types of liberalism both accept the above mentioned four positions and are in direct contrast with, for example monarchical regimes, military dictatorships etc.⁸⁸.

⁸⁵ International relations scholar, known for his work on democratic peace theory.

⁸⁶ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 207.

⁸⁷ Dunne, Tim in Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, 2008, page 110.

⁸⁸ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 207 – 208.

There are other differentiations of liberalism which are linked to the above mentioned, namely that of a law-and-order authoritarian rule without respect for democracy. This law-and-order rule can come from the laissez-faire liberalism which is overly terrified of for example anarchy which can lead them to fail to comply to all of the liberal values as for example freedom. Another example of other differentiations is that of a totalitarian dictatorship which undermines the liberal value of a representative government⁸⁹.

4.2.1 Liberalism as an International Theory

Liberalism is basically founded on the domestic level as the most important aspects of liberalism are those of individual rights, private property, and representative government and thereby liberalism has its focus on the domestic level. Realism however has its focus on the international level as it views the state of war as a central aspect. A simple theoretical integration of the two is not easy to find because if realism was portrayed as a domestic theory it would lose its value as an explanatory element of international relations. Likewise would liberalism be a limited theory of the natural harmony of world politics if only the international level was taken into account. Realists are as different as liberalists. Some realists like Hobbes justified authoritarian states and thereby were totalitarian. Others like Rousseau were democratic communitarians. On the liberal side we had theorists such as Bentham, Cobden and Schumpeter who were homogeneously pacifistic. John Stuart Mill believed imperialism was just under some circumstances and under others intervention. All these different beliefs and approaches show that the actual richness of their worldviews cannot be simplified⁹⁰.

According to Doyle it is necessary to expand the analysis and therefore it is necessary to find a conception of world political liberalism. This liberalism need to identify what it is that makes the international among liberal states special without caricaturing them. Unfortunately worldviews do not fit into neat boxes; instead they align themselves on spectrums. Therefore Doyle highlights the importance of *“looking for a world politics in which liberal individualism makes a difference, in which the good of individuals has moral weight against the good of the state or the nation”*⁹¹. Furthermore he wants to look for *“a world politics in which the state of war is not the general characteristic of international relations”*⁹². Doyle also notes that it is important to remember not to make a circle of

⁸⁹ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 208.

⁹⁰ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 208 – 209.

⁹¹ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 209.

⁹² Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 209.

cause and effect by making sure the models are disconfirmable and to distinguish between true liberals and almost liberals. Therefore it is necessary to account for the differences in cause and effect⁹³.

As mentioned before realism is basically about anarchy and the power struggle between states. According to Doyle liberalism is quite different. World politics are not as realism states a homogeneous state of war; instead it is a heterogeneous state of war and peace at the basic level. It might even become a global state in which war is not a factor that needs to be taken into account. Other policies come into play when the international system consists of two or more liberal societies than a security rationale as realism predicts; instead the liberal societies will compete to become wealthier, more glorious, cultured and healthy without having to go to war. International organization and the rule of law will drive the international society instead of warriors and diplomats whom dominate the realist international society⁹⁴. According to Doyle this is because of the following:

“1. Although states live under international anarchy, meaning the absence of a global government, they do not experience a general, state of war.

2. States are inherently different ‘units’, differentiated by how they relate to individual human rights. So Liberals distinguish Liberal from non-Liberal societies, republican from autocratic or totalitarian states, capitalist from communist, fascist, and corporatist economies. Differences in international behaviour then reflect these differences.

3. The aims of the state, as do the aims of the individual, go beyond security to the protection and promotion of individual rights.”⁹⁵

This means that to liberals states have not yet been homogenized by the international system, instead they act differently and thus have not been competed out of existence or socialized into structural strategies. Many liberals view states as inherently respectful of international law, or inherently peaceful, or inherently peaceful towards other liberal states⁹⁶.

Liberals agree with realists that the world system consists of anarchy without an overarching authority, liberals differ in their point of view on the anarchy in which realists state that all states are in contest

⁹³ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 209.

⁹⁴ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 210.

⁹⁵ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 210 – 211.

⁹⁶ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 211.

against each other in which war is a tool like anything else. Liberals instead state that the contest is a positive- or negative-sum game whereas realists view this as a zero-sum game. This means that in the liberal view liberal states can cooperate and do not view each other as a threat to their survival. The cooperation opens up for mutually beneficial trade⁹⁷.

Liberalists, like realists, make assumptions about the international structure, domestic society, and human nature. Factors like domestic structures and diverse human interests play a larger role to liberalists than to realists. Liberalists do not believe that the overriding influence of the international system has such a large role to play on the domestic level as realists do. Liberalists also differ from each other according to Doyle who identifies three different images of liberalism, namely those of Image 1 (human nature), Image 2 (domestic society), and Image 3 (international system) in which liberalists locate predominant causes⁹⁸.

These three different images can be associated with different liberal thinkers. Image 1 can be associated with John Locke⁹⁹ who had a focus on human rights and consequent international duties. Image 2 can be associated with Schumpeter with a focus on the effects of variations in domestic society, economy, and state structure. Image 3 can be associated with Immanuel Kant¹⁰⁰ who focused on a 'Pacific Union' of liberal states and the interaction of states.

⁹⁷ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 211.

⁹⁸ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 211.

⁹⁹ English philosopher and physician, who is known as one of the father figures of liberalism.

¹⁰⁰ 18th-century German philosopher

5 Analysis

Michael Doyle has written an article called *“Liberalism and World Politics”* from 1986 in which he explores the three different images of liberalism. As mentioned earlier Doyle has also written the book *“Ways of War and Peace”* from 1997. Both the article and the book will be used to explain the democratic peace theory followed by an analysis of the European Union and the thesis in regards to how they correspond.

First a short presentation of Michael Doyle. Doyle is employed as Harold Brown Professor of U.S. Foreign and Security Policy at Columbia University. Before working at Columbia University Doyle worked at Princeton University where he was professor of politics and international affairs, furthermore he has also worked as a special advisor to UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan¹⁰¹.

Before an exploration of Doyle’s theory it is prudent to look at Kant’s theory of the ‘Pacific Union’ or ‘Perpetual Peace’ which is also the title of his book from 1795 which Doyle has based much of his theory on. This will be done via Doyle’s interpretation of Kant’s work as it is Doyle’s theory that will be tested.

The book ‘Perpetual Peace’ was written after Kant established his system of philosophy. The main thesis of the book is that of the ‘liberal pacific union’ which states that liberal states do not go to war with each other and that the union of liberal states will gradually spread to other states, thus making them liberal and eventually perpetual peace will be achieved as liberal states do not go to war against each other¹⁰². This is basically the main point of the book, but naturally this need to be explored further which will follow in the following sections of this paper.

Kant states that three definitive articles will guarantee perpetual peace. These articles will need to be accepted by all states and when this happens perpetual peace will be achieved. Before giving the three definitive articles Kant states that it is necessary with six preliminary articles which will build confidence among the states which are still in anarchy, thus in a state of war. The six preliminary articles are:

1. *“No Peace treaty will be considered valid if it harbors a secret intent to resume war at some more favorable opportunity. True peace agreements should be distinguished from truces if states are going to learn to trust each other.”*

¹⁰¹ Carnegie Council, accessed on 05/01/2010.

¹⁰² Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 253.

2. *No independent state should be subject to conquest, purchase, or inheritance. This provision is designed to establish the norm of 'territorial integrity'.*
3. *Standing armies will be gradually abolished.*
4. *No national debt will be incurred with the purpose of enhancing international power. This provision is designed to limit the incentives to engage in war by requiring that wars be fought from current revenues.*
5. *No state will forcibly interfere in the constitution or government of another. Supplementing the second provision, this guarantees 'political independence' – the second of the two principles underlying modern sovereign equality.*
6. *No state will commit war crimes – use poisoners, assassins, promote subversion – because these are acts that destroy the mutual confidence a future peace will require".¹⁰³*

The preliminary articles have the purpose of building the mutual confidence and respect that the establishment of true peace will require. Kant uses the term 'enlightened despots' who he requires to work on using these articles. Kant however notes that in the state of war these articles will not be enough as confusion and powerful incentives for aggressive behaviour is natural. Therefore Kant argues that an institutionalization, a constitutionalization, of peace is necessary¹⁰⁴. This leads us to the definitive articles which will be presented in the following.

5.1 The Definitive Articles of Perpetual Peace

The First Definitive Article of a Perpetual Peace– the Civil Constitution of Every State shall be Republican

Three principles must be applied to a republican constitution, namely the principles of freedom, dependence, and equality. The principle of freedom must imply to all members of society (as men). The principle of dependence means that everyone is subject to a single common legislation (as subjects). The last and third principle of equality means that everyone is an equal citizen in the society and therefore is equal to the law (as citizens).¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 256.

¹⁰⁴ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 256.

¹⁰⁵ Reiss, Hans, 1991, page 99.

According to Kant the republican constitution is the only form of constitution which resembles an original contract, which he states that all rightful legislation must be founded on. The republican constitution is also pure as it is based on the pure concept of right and furthermore it has the prospect of attaining perpetual peace. This is because the consent of the citizen is required when war is to be declared and for the citizen it is natural to be very hesitant in declaring a war as war would mean that the citizen himself will have to do the fighting, paying for the war and make debt to pay for the burden of war which in fact never can be paid off as the threat of war persists. When the constitution is not republican it is very easy for the state to go to war as the sovereign is not a fellow citizen and therefore do not have to bear the burden of war¹⁰⁶.

The economy will need to be market-oriented which will help making the state republican in the private sphere. In the public or political sphere the republic will need to preserve juridical freedom which means that the legal equality of citizens as subjects will be ensured and furthermore a representative government with a separation of power will be necessary. The separation of powers is important as it leads to that the morally autonomous individual makes the laws and another individual administers them which help to avoid tyranny¹⁰⁷.

The Second Definitive article of a Perpetual Peace – the Right of Nations shall be based on a Federation of Free States

It is necessary for each state to have security and therefore they should enter into a federation of peoples in which the constitution is similar to that of a civil one. This federation of states should not be an international state as that would be contradictory because a state involves the relationship between a superior (the legislator) and an inferior (the people) thus an international state would be a number of nations constituting a single state, which is in contradiction to the assumption that the states are separate units and not welded together in one unit¹⁰⁸.

The need for a general agreement will be necessary as the achievement of perpetual peace will be impossible without. Kant states that this will be a pacific federation which differ from a peace treaty as a peace treaty ends *one* war and a pacific federation would end *all* wars. Kant notes that this federation will not aim to resemble a state in acquiring power; instead it would seek to preserve and secure the freedom of the states within the federation. Kant stated that:

¹⁰⁶ Reiss, Hans, 1991, page 99 – 100.

¹⁰⁷ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 257.

¹⁰⁸ Reiss, Hans, 1991, page 102.

*“It can be shown that this idea of federalism, extending gradually to encompass all states and thus leading to perpetual peace, is practicable and has objective reality. For if by good fortune one powerful and enlightened nation can form a republic (which is by nature inclined to seek perpetual peace, this will provide a focal point for federal association among other states. These will join up with the first one, thus securing the freedom of each state in accordance with the idea of international right, and the whole will gradually spread further and further by a series of alliances of this kind”.*¹⁰⁹

It will be necessary for a people to accept a supreme legislative, executive and juridical power to resolve conflicts in a peaceful way to have no wars and therefore states also need to accept a supreme legislative, executive and juridical power in their conflict resolution if they want to avoid war. International right cannot be interpreted as a right to go to war as this would be a one-sided arrangement, thus there is only one option according to Kant and that is that states have to give up the freedom of not having an overarching sovereign and adapt themselves to some kind of public coercive laws, in other words – form an international state. Kant acknowledge that this is not possible in his time as the states of the world were not willing to give up their freedoms in this sense and therefore making an international state impossible. Then instead he states that the best substitute is a federation which will gradually expand and perhaps one day include the entire world^{110, 111}.

According to Doyle, Kant develops no systemic organizational body of the treaty as he does not believe an institutionalization is necessary. Instead he finds it sufficient with a nonaggression pact or maybe a security agreement built on the cosmopolitan law which he introduces in the third definitive article¹¹².

The Third Definitive Article of a Perpetual Peace – Cosmopolitan Right shall be limited to Conditions of Universal Hospitality

This third and last definitive article table a cosmopolitan law which will function within the pacific union. It is limited to universal hospitality to foreigners according to Doyle. Foreigners have a right not to be treated with hostility when he visits the pacific union. This right does not extend any further then to what is necessary to enable commerce with the inhabitants. It is not necessary to offer citizenship or the

¹⁰⁹ Kant, Immanuel, in Reiss, Hans, 1991, page 104.

¹¹⁰ Reiss, Hans, 1991, page 104 – 105.

¹¹¹ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 257.

¹¹² Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 258.

right to settlement to foreigners in this case, unless the settlers are threatened in any way. Kant also states that liberal states will establish a pacific union among themselves but they will remain at war with non republics¹¹³.

5.2 Liberal Internationalism

According to Doyle liberal principles in conjunction with institutions have had three seemingly striking effect on liberal states foreign policy. There has indeed been created a separate peace among liberal states meanwhile aggression against non-liberal states still happen often. Furthermore cooperation in vital matters such as security and economy is rising among liberal states¹¹⁴.

During the nineteenth century we have seen a lot of different countries ending hostilities towards one and another after introducing liberal values and becoming liberal states. For example The United States and Great Britain was in almost constant conflict ending in the War of 1812. After 1832 when the Reform Act of 1832 was signed which defined the actual representation as the formal source of the sovereignty of the British Parliament hostilities between the United States and Great Britain were settled at the negotiation table instead of fought at the battlefield in spite of large grievances amongst the two. There are several other examples of former enemies entering peaceful relations after they have become liberal states¹¹⁵. In April 1917 President Woodrow Wilson put it quite clearly when he said that:

“Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and self-governed people of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth ensure the observance of those principle.”¹¹⁶

So in the eighteenth century a zone of peace or pacific union as Kant labelled it has slowly emerged mostly in Europe and North America. In this zone liberalism has flourished and cooperation in many ways has intensified. It seems unlikely, according to Doyle that two adjacent states over a substantial period of time would not go to war against each other unless they are liberal states and this is exactly the case. For almost two hundred years this has not happened. During the two world wars liberals states also ended up on the same side, in spite of the huge differences in the states and the road that brought them their. Europe has always been a continent with many wars and conflicts but after the countries

¹¹³ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 258.

¹¹⁴ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 258 – 259.

¹¹⁵ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 259.

¹¹⁶ Wilson, Woodrow as quoted in Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 259.

became liberal states war is no longer the main tool of foreign policy by the states within Europe against each other¹¹⁷.

Other types of government are not as peaceful towards one and another as liberalism has shown to be. Among the feudal states of Europe war was almost the norm and fascist states fought each other in the 1930s. Communist countries are likewise war prone towards each other e.g. the Chinese invasion of Vietnam and the Vietnam invasion of Cambodia. Socialist democratic states can not be defined as there simply have not been enough of them. This leads Doyle to conclude that liberal states thus appear to be pacifist towards each other and thereby have a special characteristic unlike other types of government¹¹⁸.

Doyle notes that liberal states only are pacifistic towards other liberal states. Toward non liberal states history has shown that liberal states are very aggressive. The wars against non liberal states have been mostly defensive and according to Doyle therefore necessary and prudent. In Europe this is exemplified by authoritarian regimes like those of Louis XIV, Napoleon, Mussolini, and Hitler etc. who have been very aggressive toward the liberal states and therefore forced them to defend themselves. It is however not only prudent wars that have been fought by liberal states. Liberal France for example fought many expansionist colonial wars in the nineteenth century. The United States against Mexico in 1846-1848 and there are more examples of liberal imprudent aggression. One thing shown in almost all the wars has been the level of distrust towards non-liberal states by the liberal states¹¹⁹.

Another point which Doyle highlights in the cosmopolitan legal state of perpetual peace is that of commerce. It is necessary to remove the control of production and distribution from the sphere of a particular state's policy so that the market can sort it selfish and the state only functions as a crisis resolver thus enabling a high level of interdependence in which transnational ties between states can work as lobbies for mutual accommodation. Doyle refer to modern liberal scholars who state that *"international financiers and transnational and transgovernmental organizations create interests in favour of accommodation"*¹²⁰ Furthermore this will ensure that small conflicts cannot destroy an otherwise good relationship by retaliation¹²¹.

¹¹⁷ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 260.

¹¹⁸ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 265.

¹¹⁹ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 265 – 268.

¹²⁰ Doyle, W. Michael, 1986, page 1161.

¹²¹ Doyle, W. Michael, 1986, page 1161

According to Doyle there is enough evidence to suggest that a separate peace in fact does exist among liberal states, however the anarchy in the world political system still affect them especially in their relations with non-liberal states which they are in more or less constant conflict with¹²².

5.3 Testing the Liberal Peace Theory

The aim of this paper is to test the liberal peace theory on the European Union which will be done by using the theory presented by Doyle. After this test other relevant points will be drawn into the analysis and international relations theory will be applied to the case study. After the analysis a conclusion will be presented with the relevant points.

Many violent and prolonged conflicts have ended when both states have become liberal democracies and the zone of liberal peace has spread as Doyle has pointed out. According to Doyle something as rare as an empirical law have emerged in international relations – or at least something close to a law, namely that of the non existence of war between liberal democracies. This is very atypical of international relations as it has been tested as a causal theory which in principle can be confirmed or disconfirmed¹²³.

To test this it is necessary to apply the theoretical basis to the European Union. Before achieving perpetual peace the three definitive articles will have to be applied to a state or in this case the European Union. The first article being that of the Civil Constitution, the second being that of the Federation of Free States, and the third being that of the Cosmopolitan Right.

The first article stipulates that the constitution need to be republican; this means that the constitution shall be built upon the principles of freedom, dependence and equality. If we transfer these principles to the European Union we can see a number of examples of the Union using these principles. In 1990 the 'Charter of the Fundamental Rights of the European Union'¹²⁴ was signed. This Charter was based on the liberal principles of freedom, dependence and equality. In the preamble to the Charter it is stated that:

“Conscious of its spiritual and moral heritage, the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law. It places the individual at the heart of its

¹²² Doyle, W. Michael, 1986, page 1162.

¹²³ Doyle, W. Michael, 1997, page 285.

¹²⁴ Please see Appendix B for the full text of the Charter.

activities, by establishing the citizenship of the Union and by creating an area of freedom, security and justice.”¹²⁵

This passage of the Charter clearly shows that the European Union’s basic ideas are similar to Kant’s first definitive article. Before 2009 the Charter was not written into the treaties and therefore the legality of the Charter was in question. In December 2009 the Lisbon Treaty went into force and the Charter was given legal status which means that the Charter now has a binding effect to the treaties. The purpose of this was to make the basic rights of the citizens clear to all¹²⁶. Another example of the EU’s commitment to liberal principles is the Copenhagen Criteria which was negotiated at the Copenhagen Summit in 1993. Potential member states must live up to the three criteria set out in the Copenhagen Criteria. The Criteria are as follows:

- *Political: stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities;*
- *economic: existence of a functioning market economy and the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union;*
- *acceptance of the Community acquis: ability to take on the obligations of membership, including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union¹²⁷.*

Before accession negotiations can be opened the political criterion need to be fulfilled by the application country.

The Copenhagen Criteria are important as it stipulates among other things that application countries need to have a functioning market economy which is also a criterion in Kant’s first definitive article.

The second definitive article states that it is a necessary for a state to have security and the best way of achieving this Kant believes is via a federation of states or a pacific union. The European Union is exactly a pacific union. In fact the Union was created to ensure peace in Europe. After the end of the Second World War France was trying to keep Germany down as the country was the reason behind the Second World War. This was however very hard as the British and the Americans wanted to revive Germany’s economy. The French civil servant Jean Monnet created what was to be known as the Schuman Plan

¹²⁵ Charter of the Fundamental Rights of the European Union, Appendix B, preamble.

¹²⁶ Europa, Summaries of EU legislation, accessed on 05/04/2010.

¹²⁷ Europa, Glossary, accessed on 05/24/2010.

which led to the establishment of the ECSC which had the main goal of setting up a High Authority which would control the industries, which had made the arms race before and during the war possible. This High Authority would make it impossible to initiate an arms race and thereby ensuring peace in Europe. In this case the EU moves beyond what was Kant's idea of a pacific union. He stated that the sole purpose of the pacific union was to ensure peace and work almost like a non-aggression pact. The EU has moved beyond this as it has developed into a full political union with a variety of policies.

The following quote from Kant can be compared to the development of the EU

"It can be shown that this idea of federalism, extending gradually to encompass all states and thus leading to perpetual peace, is practicable and has objective reality. For if by good fortune one powerful and enlightened nation can form a republic (which is by nature inclined to seek perpetual peace, this will provide a focal point for federal association among other states. These will join up with the first one, thus securing the freedom of each state in accordance with the idea of international right, and the whole will gradually spread further and further by a series of alliances of this kind".¹²⁸

The EU began with ECSC of six countries and has gradually developed to a larger and larger union with 27 member states and a population around 500 million people. At the same time as the EU has been growing larger and larger it has become more and more clear that further development of policy areas was necessary and therefore the EU has also developed extensive policies. Kant stated that the pacific union should not resemble a state and therefore it should only focus on security. But he also stated as mentioned before that the pacific union should have a working market economy which in fact contradicts his own statement of limiting the pacific union to security. To have a working market it is necessary to have the basics of such a market in working order, namely those of no trade barriers in the form of either customs duty or technical trade barriers such as different standards etc. To make the market open it is necessary to have extensive legislation and standardisation or else the market will not function.

¹²⁸ Kant, Immanuel, in Reiss, Hans, 1991, page 104.

The EU has created the internal market in which the *“aim is to remove barriers to the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital between the EU Member States, thereby establishing an ‘internal market’ in the EU in which traditional barriers to exchanges of services and persons between the EU countries are absent”*.¹²⁹

As mentioned before it is necessary for the internal market to work to have a large body of legislation. This can be attributed to the rise of consumerism where consumers can buy anything they want no matter of where it is produced in the EU. A point that would be almost impossible for Kant to predict as this is the result of technological development. It is important to remember that Kant published his book in 1795 long before modern inventions as the internet, the telephone etc. It would be very hard for Kant to imagine a society like the one we have today.

The third and last definitive article is that of the cosmopolitan right. This article stipulates that a foreigner shall be met with hospitality when the person visits the pacific union. Between the members of the EU people can travel freely and work wherever they want. When people from outside the EU want to visit the EU they do not have the same rights. Kant notes that visiting people only need to have the right to enable commerce with the inhabitants of the pacific union. He does not make it clear what is exactly meant by this but an interpretation could be that the foreigner should not be blocked in any way when he wants to trade with the EU. This is however what is happening as there are massive customs barriers when a person wants to enter goods into the EU and thereby making it very hard and costly to do this. The Banana ‘War’ between the EU and the United States is a good example of this. The ‘war’ is about the export of bananas to the EU from certain favoured countries. The United States is opposed to this as a group of American business men owns a company that wants to export bananas to the EU but cannot due this due the EU import policy. The United States have threatened to put a 100 % duty on different European exports to the United States if this is not changed¹³⁰.

The interpretation of what Kant meant by cosmopolitan right led to the conclusion that third definitive article is not fulfilled. The first and second articles however are fulfilled as the EU has policies similar to what Kant proposed.

¹²⁹ EU-oplysning, accessed on 03/24/2010.

¹³⁰ Satapathy, C., 1998, accessed on 03/25/2010.

6 Conclusion

Can Michael W. Doyle's theory of liberal peace built on Kant's theory of perpetual peace be verified in the context of the continuing enlargement of the European Union?

The aim of this paper has been to analyze whether or not Doyle's theory of liberal peace in the context of the continuing enlargement of the European Union could be verified or not. To do this an analysis has been made which supports that a liberal peace has been achieved. It has not been achieved worldwide but among the liberal states of the world there is peace. The most striking example is that of the Europe who have not seen war for over half a century which is quite uncommon to European history. In Europe there have even been created a Union which has helped transform the relations between the states of Europe from being enemies to being partners and friends who share a lot of policies.

What would the international relations theories of liberalism and realism say about this? Liberalists such as Doyle would say that we have a pacific union in which anarchy has been removed as the dominating order of international relations. Realists on the other hand would say that no pacific union exists as the world system consists of anarchy. The European Union is only maximising its powers so that it eventually will be able to overtake the United States position as hegemon or at least be able to balance against the United States.

7 Appendix

7.1 Appendix A - The Melian Dialogue¹³¹

In the ensuing summer [416 B.C.], Alcibiades sailed to Argos with twenty ships, and seized any of the Argives who were still suspected to be of the Lacedaemonian faction, 300 in number; and the Athenians deposited them in the subject islands near at hand. The Athenians next made an expedition against the island of Melos with thirty ships of their own, six Chian, and two Lesbian, 1,200 hoplites and 300 archers besides twenty mounted archers of their own, and about 1500 hoplites furnished by their allies in the islands. The Melians are colonists of the Lacedaemonians who would not submit to Athens like the other islanders. At first they were neutral and took no part. But when the Athenians tried to coerce them by ravaging their lands, they were driven into open hostilities. The generals, Cleomedes the son of Lycomedes and Tisias the son of Tisimachus, encamped with the Athenian forces on the island. But before they did the country any harm they sent envoys to negotiate with the Melians. Instead of bringing these envoys before the people, the Melians desired them to explain their errand to the magistrates and to the chief men. They spoke as follows:

"Since we are not allowed to speak to the people, lest, forsooth, they should be deceived by seductive and unanswerable arguments which they would hear set forth in a single uninterrupted oration (for we are perfectly aware that this is what you mean in bringing us before a select few), you who are sitting here may as well make assurance yet surer. Let us have no set speeches at all, but do you reply to each several statement of which you disapprove, and criticise it at once. Say first of all how you like this mode of proceeding."

The Melian representatives answered: "The quiet interchange of explanations is a reasonable thing, and we do not object to that. But your warlike movements, which are present not only to our fears but to our eyes, seem to belie your words. We see that, although you may reason with us, you mean to be our judges; and that at the end of the discussion, if the Justice of our cause prevail and we therefore refuse to yield, we may expect war; if we are convinced by you, slavery."

¹³¹ Sam Houston State University, accessed on May 17 2010.

Athenians: Nay, but if you are only going to argue from fancies about the future, or if you meet us with any other purpose than that of looking your circumstances in the face and saving your city, we have done; but if this is your intention we will proceed.

Melians: It is an excusable and natural thing that men in our position should have much to say and should indulge in many fancies. But we admit that this conference has met to consider the question of our preservation; and therefore let the argument proceed in the manner which you propose.

Athenians: Well, then, we Athenians will use no flue words; we will not go out of our way to prove at length that we have a right to rule, because we overthrew the Persians; or that we attack you now because we are suffering any injury at your hands. We should not convince you if we did; nor must you expect to convince us by arguing that, although a colony of the Lacedaemonians, you have taken no part in their expeditions, or that you have never done us any wrong. But you and we should say what we really think, and aim only at what is possible, for we both alike know that into the discussion of human affairs the question of justice only enters where the pressure of necessity is equal, and that the powerful exact what they can, and the weak grant what they must.

Melians: Well, then, since you set aside justice and invite us to speak of expediency, in our judgment it is certainly expedient that you should respect a principle which is for the common good; and that to every man when in peril a reasonable claim should be accounted a claim of right, and any plea which he is disposed to urge, even if failing of the point a little, should help his cause. Your interest in this principle is quite as great as ours, inasmuch as you, if you fall, will incur the heaviest vengeance, and will be the most terrible example to mankind.

Athenians: The fall of our empire, if it should fall, is not an event to which we look forward with dismay; for ruling states such as Lacedaemon are not cruel to their vanquished enemies. And we are fighting not so much against the Lacedaemonians, as against our own subjects who may some day rise up and overcome their former masters. But this is a danger which you may leave to us. And we will now endeavour to show that we have come in the interests of our empire, and that in what we are about to say we are only seeking the preservation of your city. For we want to make you ours with the least trouble to ourselves, and it is for the interests of us both that you should not be destroyed.

Athenians: It may be your interest to be our masters, but how can it be ours to be your slaves?

Athenians: To you the gain will be that by submission you will avert the worst; and we shall be all the richer for your preservation.

Melians: But must we be your enemies? Will you not receive us as friends if we are neutral and remain at peace with you?

Athenians: No, your enmity is not half so mischievous to us as your friendship; for the one is in the eyes of our subjects an argument of our power, the other of our weakness.

Melians: But are your subjects really unable to distinguish between states in which you have no concern, and those which are chiefly your own colonies, and in some cases have revolted and been subdued by you?

Athenians: Why, they do not doubt that both of them have a good deal to say for themselves on the score of justice, but they think that states like yours are left free because they are able to defend themselves, and that we do not attack them because we dare not. So that your subjection will give us an increase of security, as well as an extension of empire. For we are masters of the sea and you who are islanders, and insignificant islanders too, must not be allowed to escape us.

Melians: But do you not recognise another danger? For, once more, since you drive us from the plea of justice and press upon us your doctrine of expediency, we must show you what is for our interest, and, if it be for yours also, may hope to convince you: Will you not be making enemies of all who are now neutrals? When they see how you are treating us they will expect you some day to turn against them; and if so, are you not strengthening the enemies whom you already have, and bringing upon you others who, if they could help, would never dream of being your enemies at all?

Athenians: We do not consider our really dangerous enemies to be any of the peoples inhabiting the mainland who, secure in their freedom, may defer indefinitely any measures of precaution which they take against us, but islanders who, like you, happen to be under no control, and all who may be already irritated by the necessity of submission to our empire--these are our real enemies, for they are the most reckless and most likely to bring themselves as well as us into a danger which they cannot but foresee.

Melians: Surely then, if you and your subjects will brave all this risk, you to preserve your empire and they to be quit of it, how base and cowardly would it be in us, who retain our freedom, not to do and suffer anything rather than be your slaves.

Athenians: Not so, if you calmly reflect: for you are not fighting against equals to whom you cannot yield without disgrace, but you are taking counsel whether or no you shall resist an overwhelming force. The question is not one of honour but of prudence.

Melians: But we know that the fortune of war is sometimes impartial, and not always on the side of numbers, If we yield now, all is over; but if we fight, there is yet a hope that we may stand upright.

Athenians: Hope is a good comforter in the hour of danger, and when men have something else to depend upon, although hurtful, she is not ruinous. But when her spendthrift nature has induced them to stake their all, they see her as she is in the moment of their fall, and not till then. While the knowledge of her might enable them to beware of her, she never fails. You are weak and a single turn of the scale might be your ruin. Do not you be thus deluded; avoid the error of which so many are guilty, who, although they might still be saved if they would take the natural means, when visible grounds of confidence forsake them, have recourse to the invisible, to prophecies and oracles and the like, which ruin men by the hopes which they inspire in them.

Melians: We know only too well how hard the struggle must be against your power, and against fortune, if she does not mean to be impartial. Nevertheless we do not despair of fortune; for we hope to stand as high as you in the favour of heaven, because we are righteous, and you against whom' we contend are unrighteous; and we are satisfied that our deficiency in power will be compensated by the aid of our allies the Lacedaemonians; they cannot refuse to help us, if only because we are their kinsmen, and for the sake of their own honour. And therefore our confidence is not so utterly blind as you suppose.

Athenians: As for the gods, we expect to have quite as much of their favour as you: for we are not doing or claiming anything which goes beyond common opinion about divine or men's desires about human things. Of the gods we believe, and of men we know, that by a law of their nature wherever they can rule they will, This law was not made by us, and we are not the first who have acted upon it; we did but inherit it, and shall bequeath it to all time, and we know that you and all mankind, if you were as strong as we are, would do as we do. So much for the gods; we have told you why we expect to stand as high in

their good opinion as you. And then as to the Lacedaemonians when you imagine that out of very shame they will assist you, we admire the simplicity of your idea, but we do not envy you the folly of it. The Lacedaemonians are exceedingly virtuous among themselves, and according to their national standard of morality. But, in respect of their dealings with others, although many things might' be said, a word is enough to describe them, of all men whom we know they are the most notorious for identifying what is pleasant with what is honourable, and what is expedient with what is just. But how inconsistent is such a character with your present blind hope of deliverance!

Athenians: That is the very reason why we trust them; they will look to their interest, and therefore will not be willing to betray the Melians, who are their own colonists, lest they should be distrusted by their friends in Hellas and play into the hands of their enemies.

Athenians: But do you not see that the path of expediency is safe, whereas justice and honour involve danger in practice, and such dangers the Lacedaemonians seldom care to face?

Melians: On the other hand, we think that whatever perils there may be, they will be ready to face them for our sakes, and will consider danger less dangerous where we are concerned. For if they need to act we are close at hand, and they can better trust our loyal feeling because we are their kinsmen.

Athenians: Yes, but what encourages men who are invited to join in a conflict is clearly not the good-will of those who summon them to their side, but a decided superiority in real power. To this no men look more keenly than the Lacedaemonians; so little confidence have they in their own resources, that they only attack their neighbours when they have numerous allies, and therefore they are not likely to God their way by themselves to an island, when we are masters of the sea.

Melians: But they may send their allies: the Cretan sea is a large place; and the masters of the sea will have more difficulty in overtaking vessels which want to escape than the pursued in escaping, If the attempt should fail they may invade Attica itself, and End their way to allies of yours whom Brasidas did not reach: and then you will have to fight, not for the conquest of a land in which you have no concern, but nearer home, for the preservation of your confederacy and of your own territory.

Athenians: Help may come from Lacedaemon to you as it has come to others, and should you ever have actual experience of it, then you will know that never once have the Athenians retired from a siege through fear of a foe elsewhere. You told us that the safety of your city would be your first care, but we

remark that, in this long discussion, not a word has been uttered by you which would give a reasonable man expectation of deliverance. Your strongest grounds are hopes deferred, and what power you have is not to be compared with that which is already arrayed against you. Unless after we have withdrawn you mean to come, as even now you may, to a wiser conclusion, you are showing a great want of sense. For surely you cannot dream of flying to that false sense of honour which has been the ruin of so many when danger and dishonour were staring them in the face. Many men with their eyes still open to the consequences have found the word honour too much for them, and have suffered a mere name to lure them on, until it has drawn down upon them real and irretrievable calamities; through their own folly they have incurred a worse dishonour than fortune would have inflicted upon them. If you are wise you will not run this risk; you ought to see that there can be no disgrace in yielding to a great city which invites you to become her ally on reasonable terms, keeping your own land, and merely paying tribute; and that you will certainly gain no honour if, having to choose between two alternatives, safety and war, you obstinately prefer the worse. To maintain our rights against equals, to be politic with superiors, and to be moderate towards inferiors is the path of safety. Reflect once more when we have withdrawn, and say to yourselves over and over again that you are deliberating about your one and only country, which may be saved or may be destroyed by a single decision,

The Athenians left the conference: the Melians, after consulting among themselves, resolved to persevere in their refusal, and answered as follows, "Men of Athens, our resolution is unchanged; and we will not in a moment surrender that liberty which our city, founded 700 years ago, still enjoys; we will trust to the good-fortune which, by the favour of the gods, has hitherto preserved us, and for human help to the Lacedaemonians, and endeavour to save ourselves. We are ready however to be your friends, and the enemies neither of you nor of the Lacedaemonians, and we ask you to leave our country when you have made such a peace as may appear to be in the interest of both parties."

Such was the answer of the Melians; the Athenians, as they quitted the conference, spoke as follows, "Well, we must say, judging from the decision at which you have arrived, that you are the only men who deem the future to be more certain than the present, and regard things unseen as already realised in your fond anticipation, and that the more you cast yourselves upon the Lacedaemonians and fortune, and hope, and trust them, the more complete will be your ruin."

The Athenian envoys returned to the army; and the generals, when they found that the Melians would not yield, immediately commenced hostilities. They surrounded the town of Melos with a wall, dividing

the work among the several contingents. They then left troops of their own and of their allies to keep guard both by land and by sea, and retired with the greater part of their army; the remainder carried on the blockade.

About the same time the Argives made an inroad into Phlissia, and lost nearly eighty men, who were caught in an ambuscade by the Phlissians and the Argive exiles. The Athenian garrison in Pylos took much spoil from the Lacedaemonians; nevertheless the latter did not renounce the peace and go to war, but only notified by a proclamation that if any one of their own people had a mind to make reprisals on the Athenians he might. The Corinthians next declared war upon the Athenians on some private grounds, but the rest of the Peloponnesians did not join them. The Melians took that part of the Athenian wall which looked towards the agora by a night assault, killed a few men, and brought in as much corn and other necessaries as they could; they then retreated and remained inactive. After this the Athenians set a better watch. So the summer ended.

In the following winter the Lacedaemonians had intended to make an expedition into the Argive territory, but finding that the sacrifices which they offered at the frontier were unfavourable they returned home. The Argives, suspecting that the threatened invasion was instigated by citizens of their own, apprehended some of them; others however escaped. About the same time the Melians took another part of the Athenian wall; for the fortifications were insufficiently guarded. Whereupon the Athenians sent fresh troops, under the command of Philocrates the son of Demeas. The place was now closely invested, and there was treachery among the citizens themselves. So the Melians were induced to surrender at discretion. The Athenians thereupon put to death all who were of military age, and made slaves of the women and children. They then colonised the island, sending thither 500 settlers of their own.

7.2 Appendix B - Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union¹³²

(2000/C 364/01)

PROCLAMACIÓN SOLEMNE/HØJTIDELIG PROKLAMATION/FEIERLICHE PROKLAMATION/ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΚΗ
 ΔΙΑΚΗΡΥΞΗ/SOLEMN PROCLAMATION/PROCLAMATION SOLENNELLE/FORÓGRA
 SOLLÚNTA/PROCLAMAZIONE SOLENNE/PLECHTIGE AFKONDIGING/PROCLAMAÇÃO
 SOLENE/JUHLALLINEN JULISTUS/HÖGTIDLIG PROKLAMATION

El Parlamento Europeo, el Consejo y la Comisión proclaman solemnemente en tanto que Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea el texto que figura a continuación./Europa-Parlamentet, Rådet og Kommissionen proklamerer højtideligt den tekst, der følger nedenfor, som Den Europæiske Unions charter om grundlæggende rettigheder./Das Europäische Parlament, der Rat und die Kommission proklamieren feierlich den nachstehenden Text als Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union./Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, το Συμβούλιο και η Επιτροπή διακηρύσσουν πανηγυρικά, ως Χάρτη Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, το κείμενο που ακολουθεί./The European Parliament, the Council and the Commission solemnly proclaim the text below as the Charter of fundamental rights of the European Union./Le Parlement européen, le Conseil et la Commission proclament solennellement en tant que Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne le texte repris ci-après./Forógraíonn Parlaimint na hEorpa, an Chomhairle agus an Coimisiún go sollúnta an téacs thíos mar an Chairt um Chearta Bunúsacha den Aontas Eorpach./Il Parlamento europeo, il Consiglio e la Commissione proclamano solennemente quale Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea il testo riportato in appresso./Het Europees Parlement, de Raad en de Commissie kondigen plechtig als Handvest van de grondrechten van de Europese Unie de hierna opgenomen tekst af./O Parlamento Europeu, o Conselho e a Comissão proclamam solenemente, enquanto Carta dos Direitos Fundamentais da União Europeia, o texto a seguir transcrito./Euroopan parlamentti, neuvosto ja komissio juhlallisesti julistavat jäljempänä esitetyn tekstin Euroopan unionin perusoikeuskirjaksi./Europaparlamentet, rådet och kommissionen tillkännager högtidligt denna text såsom stadga om de grundläggande rättigheterna i Europeiska unionen.

Hecho en Niza, el siete de diciembre del año dos mil./Udfærdiget i Nice den syvende december to tusind./Geschehen zu Nizza am siebten Dezember zweitausend./Έγινε στη Νίκαια, στις επτά Δεκεμβρίου

¹³² EUR-lex, accessed 1 May 2010.

δύο χιλιάδες./Done at Nice on the seventh day of December in the year two thousand./Fait à Nice, le sept décembre deux mille./Arna dhéanamh i Nice, an seachtú lá de Nollaig sa bhliain dhá mhíle./Fatto a Nizza, addì sette dicembre duemila./Gedaan te Nice, de zevende december tweeduizend./Feito em Nice, em sete de Dezembro de dois mil./Tehty Nizzassa seitsemäntenä päivänä joulukuuta vuonna kaksituhatta./Som skedde i Nice den sjunde december tjugohundra.

Por el Parlamento Europeo/For Europa-Parlamentet/Für das Europäische Parlament/Για το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο/For the European Parliament/Pour le Parlement européen/Thar ceann Pharlaimint na hEorpa/Per il Parlamento europeo/Voor het Europees Parlement/Pelo Parlamento Europeu/Euroopan parlamentin puolesta/För Europaparlamentet

>PIC FILE= "C_2000364EN.000701.TIF">

Por el Consejo de la Unión Europea/For Rådet for Den Europæiske Union/Für den Rat der Europäischen Union/Για το Συμβούλιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης/For the Council of the European Union/Pour le Conseil de l'Union européenne/Thar ceann Chomhairle an Aontais Eorpaigh/Per il Consiglio dell'Unione europea/Voor de Raad van de Europese Unie/Pelo Conselho da União Europeia/Euroopan unionin neuvoston puolesta/För Europeiska unionens råd

>PIC FILE= "C_2000364EN.000702.TIF">

Por la Comisión Europea/For Europa-kommissionen/Für die Europäische Kommission/Για την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή/For the European Commission/Pour la Commission européenne/Thar ceann an Choimisiúin Eorpaigh/Per la Commissione europea/Voor de Europese Commissie/Pela Comissão Europeia/Euroopan komission puolesta/För Europeiska kommissionen

>PIC FILE= "C_2000364EN.000703.TIF">

PREAMBLE

The peoples of Europe, in creating an ever closer union among them, are resolved to share a peaceful future based on common values.

Conscious of its spiritual and moral heritage, the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule

of law. It places the individual at the heart of its activities, by establishing the citizenship of the Union and by creating an area of freedom, security and justice.

The Union contributes to the preservation and to the development of these common values while respecting the diversity of the cultures and traditions of the peoples of Europe as well as the national identities of the Member States and the organisation of their public authorities at national, regional and local levels; it seeks to promote balanced and sustainable development and ensures free movement of persons, goods, services and capital, and the freedom of establishment.

To this end, it is necessary to strengthen the protection of fundamental rights in the light of changes in society, social progress and scientific and technological developments by making those rights more visible in a Charter.

This Charter reaffirms, with due regard for the powers and tasks of the Community and the Union and the principle of subsidiarity, the rights as they result, in particular, from the constitutional traditions and international obligations common to the Member States, the Treaty on European Union, the Community Treaties, the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the Social Charters adopted by the Community and by the Council of Europe and the case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Communities and of the European Court of Human Rights.

Enjoyment of these rights entails responsibilities and duties with regard to other persons, to the human community and to future generations.

The Union therefore recognises the rights, freedoms and principles set out hereafter.

CHAPTER I

DIGNITY

Article 1

Human dignity

Human dignity is inviolable. It must be respected and protected.

Article 2

Right to life

1. Everyone has the right to life.
2. No one shall be condemned to the death penalty, or executed.

Article 3

Right to the integrity of the person

1. Everyone has the right to respect for his or her physical and mental integrity.
2. In the fields of medicine and biology, the following must be respected in particular:
 - the free and informed consent of the person concerned, according to the procedures laid down by law,
 - the prohibition of eugenic practices, in particular those aiming at the selection of persons,
 - the prohibition on making the human body and its parts as such a source of financial gain,
 - the prohibition of the reproductive cloning of human beings.

Article 4

Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 5

Prohibition of slavery and forced labour

1. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude.
2. No one shall be required to perform forced or compulsory labour.

3. Trafficking in human beings is prohibited.

CHAPTER II

FREEDOMS

Article 6

Right to liberty and security

Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person.

Article 7

Respect for private and family life

Everyone has the right to respect for his or her private and family life, home and communications.

Article 8

Protection of personal data

1. Everyone has the right to the protection of personal data concerning him or her.
2. Such data must be processed fairly for specified purposes and on the basis of the consent of the person concerned or some other legitimate basis laid down by law. Everyone has the right of access to data which has been collected concerning him or her, and the right to have it rectified.
3. Compliance with these rules shall be subject to control by an independent authority.

Article 9

Right to marry and right to found a family

The right to marry and the right to found a family shall be guaranteed in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of these rights.

Article 10

Freedom of thought, conscience and religion

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right includes freedom to change religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or in private, to manifest religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance.
2. The right to conscientious objection is recognised, in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of this right.

Article 11

Freedom of expression and information

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers.
2. The freedom and pluralism of the media shall be respected.

Article 12

Freedom of assembly and of association

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and to freedom of association at all levels, in particular in political, trade union and civic matters, which implies the right of everyone to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his or her interests.
2. Political parties at Union level contribute to expressing the political will of the citizens of the Union.

Article 13

Freedom of the arts and sciences

The arts and scientific research shall be free of constraint. Academic freedom shall be respected.

Article 14

Right to education

1. Everyone has the right to education and to have access to vocational and continuing training.
2. This right includes the possibility to receive free compulsory education.
3. The freedom to found educational establishments with due respect for democratic principles and the right of parents to ensure the education and teaching of their children in conformity with their religious, philosophical and pedagogical convictions shall be respected, in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of such freedom and right.

Article 15

Freedom to choose an occupation and right to engage in work

1. Everyone has the right to engage in work and to pursue a freely chosen or accepted occupation.
2. Every citizen of the Union has the freedom to seek employment, to work, to exercise the right of establishment and to provide services in any Member State.
3. Nationals of third countries who are authorised to work in the territories of the Member States are entitled to working conditions equivalent to those of citizens of the Union.

Article 16

Freedom to conduct a business

The freedom to conduct a business in accordance with Community law and national laws and practices is recognised.

Article 17

Right to property

1. Everyone has the right to own, use, dispose of and bequeath his or her lawfully acquired possessions. No one may be deprived of his or her possessions, except in the public interest and in the cases and under the conditions provided for by law, subject to fair compensation being paid in good time for their loss. The use of property may be regulated by law in so far as is necessary for the general interest.

2. Intellectual property shall be protected.

Article 18

Right to asylum

The right to asylum shall be guaranteed with due respect for the rules of the Geneva Convention of 28 July 1951 and the Protocol of 31 January 1967 relating to the status of refugees and in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community.

Article 19

Protection in the event of removal, expulsion or extradition

1. Collective expulsions are prohibited.

2. No one may be removed, expelled or extradited to a State where there is a serious risk that he or she would be subjected to the death penalty, torture or other inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

CHAPTER III

EQUALITY

Article 20

Equality before the law

Everyone is equal before the law.

Article 21

Non-discrimination

1. Any discrimination based on any ground such as sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, membership of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age or sexual orientation shall be prohibited.
2. Within the scope of application of the Treaty establishing the European Community and of the Treaty on European Union, and without prejudice to the special provisions of those Treaties, any discrimination on grounds of nationality shall be prohibited.

Article 22

Cultural, religious and linguistic diversity

The Union shall respect cultural, religious and linguistic diversity.

Article 23

Equality between men and women

Equality between men and women must be ensured in all areas, including employment, work and pay.

The principle of equality shall not prevent the maintenance or adoption of measures providing for specific advantages in favour of the under-represented sex.

Article 24

The rights of the child

1. Children shall have the right to such protection and care as is necessary for their well-being. They may express their views freely. Such views shall be taken into consideration on matters which concern them in accordance with their age and maturity.
2. In all actions relating to children, whether taken by public authorities or private institutions, the child's best interests must be a primary consideration.

3. Every child shall have the right to maintain on a regular basis a personal relationship and direct contact with both his or her parents, unless that is contrary to his or her interests.

Article 25

The rights of the elderly

The Union recognises and respects the rights of the elderly to lead a life of dignity and independence and to participate in social and cultural life.

Article 26

Integration of persons with disabilities

The Union recognises and respects the right of persons with disabilities to benefit from measures designed to ensure their independence, social and occupational integration and participation in the life of the community.

CHAPTER IV

SOLIDARITY

Article 27

Workers' right to information and consultation within the undertaking

Workers or their representatives must, at the appropriate levels, be guaranteed information and consultation in good time in the cases and under the conditions provided for by Community law and national laws and practices.

Article 28

Right of collective bargaining and action

Workers and employers, or their respective organisations, have, in accordance with Community law and national laws and practices, the right to negotiate and conclude collective agreements at the

appropriate levels and, in cases of conflicts of interest, to take collective action to defend their interests, including strike action.

Article 29

Right of access to placement services

Everyone has the right of access to a free placement service.

Article 30

Protection in the event of unjustified dismissal

Every worker has the right to protection against unjustified dismissal, in accordance with Community law and national laws and practices.

Article 31

Fair and just working conditions

1. Every worker has the right to working conditions which respect his or her health, safety and dignity.
2. Every worker has the right to limitation of maximum working hours, to daily and weekly rest periods and to an annual period of paid leave.

Article 32

Prohibition of child labour and protection of young people at work

The employment of children is prohibited. The minimum age of admission to employment may not be lower than the minimum school-leaving age, without prejudice to such rules as may be more favourable to young people and except for limited derogations.

Young people admitted to work must have working conditions appropriate to their age and be protected against economic exploitation and any work likely to harm their safety, health or physical, mental, moral or social development or to interfere with their education.

Article 33

Family and professional life

1. The family shall enjoy legal, economic and social protection.
2. To reconcile family and professional life, everyone shall have the right to protection from dismissal for a reason connected with maternity and the right to paid maternity leave and to parental leave following the birth or adoption of a child.

Article 34

Social security and social assistance

1. The Union recognises and respects the entitlement to social security benefits and social services providing protection in cases such as maternity, illness, industrial accidents, dependency or old age, and in the case of loss of employment, in accordance with the rules laid down by Community law and national laws and practices.
2. Everyone residing and moving legally within the European Union is entitled to social security benefits and social advantages in accordance with Community law and national laws and practices.
3. In order to combat social exclusion and poverty, the Union recognises and respects the right to social and housing assistance so as to ensure a decent existence for all those who lack sufficient resources, in accordance with the rules laid down by Community law and national laws and practices.

Article 35

Health care

Everyone has the right of access to preventive health care and the right to benefit from medical treatment under the conditions established by national laws and practices. A high level of human health protection shall be ensured in the definition and implementation of all Union policies and activities.

Article 36

Access to services of general economic interest

The Union recognises and respects access to services of general economic interest as provided for in national laws and practices, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, in order to promote the social and territorial cohesion of the Union.

Article 37

Environmental protection

A high level of environmental protection and the improvement of the quality of the environment must be integrated into the policies of the Union and ensured in accordance with the principle of sustainable development.

Article 38

Consumer protection

Union policies shall ensure a high level of consumer protection.

CHAPTER V

CITIZENS' RIGHTS

Article 39

Right to vote and to stand as a candidate at elections to the European Parliament

1. Every citizen of the Union has the right to vote and to stand as a candidate at elections to the European Parliament in the Member State in which he or she resides, under the same conditions as nationals of that State.

2. Members of the European Parliament shall be elected by direct universal suffrage in a free and secret ballot.

Article 40

Right to vote and to stand as a candidate at municipal elections

Every citizen of the Union has the right to vote and to stand as a candidate at municipal elections in the Member State in which he or she resides under the same conditions as nationals of that State.

Article 41

Right to good administration

1. Every person has the right to have his or her affairs handled impartially, fairly and within a reasonable time by the institutions and bodies of the Union.

2. This right includes:

- the right of every person to be heard, before any individual measure which would affect him or her adversely is taken;
- the right of every person to have access to his or her file, while respecting the legitimate interests of confidentiality and of professional and business secrecy;
- the obligation of the administration to give reasons for its decisions.

3. Every person has the right to have the Community make good any damage caused by its institutions or by its servants in the performance of their duties, in accordance with the general principles common to the laws of the Member States.

4. Every person may write to the institutions of the Union in one of the languages of the Treaties and must have an answer in the same language.

Article 42

Right of access to documents

Any citizen of the Union, and any natural or legal person residing or having its registered office in a Member State, has a right of access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents.

Article 43

Ombudsman

Any citizen of the Union and any natural or legal person residing or having its registered office in a Member State has the right to refer to the Ombudsman of the Union cases of maladministration in the activities of the Community institutions or bodies, with the exception of the Court of Justice and the Court of First Instance acting in their judicial role.

Article 44

Right to petition

Any citizen of the Union and any natural or legal person residing or having its registered office in a Member State has the right to petition the European Parliament.

Article 45

Freedom of movement and of residence

1. Every citizen of the Union has the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States.
2. Freedom of movement and residence may be granted, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, to nationals of third countries legally resident in the territory of a Member State.

Article 46

Diplomatic and consular protection

Every citizen of the Union shall, in the territory of a third country in which the Member State of which he or she is a national is not represented, be entitled to protection by the diplomatic or consular authorities of any Member State, on the same conditions as the nationals of that Member State.

CHAPTER VI

JUSTICE

Article 47

Right to an effective remedy and to a fair trial

Everyone whose rights and freedoms guaranteed by the law of the Union are violated has the right to an effective remedy before a tribunal in compliance with the conditions laid down in this Article.

Everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal previously established by law. Everyone shall have the possibility of being advised, defended and represented.

Legal aid shall be made available to those who lack sufficient resources in so far as such aid is necessary to ensure effective access to justice.

Article 48

Presumption of innocence and right of defence

1. Everyone who has been charged shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law.
2. Respect for the rights of the defence of anyone who has been charged shall be guaranteed.

Article 49

Principles of legality and proportionality of criminal offences and penalties

1. No one shall be held guilty of any criminal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a criminal offence under national law or international law at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than that which was applicable at the time the criminal offence was committed. If, subsequent to the commission of a criminal offence, the law provides for a lighter penalty, that penalty shall be applicable.

2. This Article shall not prejudice the trial and punishment of any person for any act or omission which, at the time when it was committed, was criminal according to the general principles recognised by the community of nations.

3. The severity of penalties must not be disproportionate to the criminal offence.

Article 50

Right not to be tried or punished twice in criminal proceedings for the same criminal offence

No one shall be liable to be tried or punished again in criminal proceedings for an offence for which he or she has already been finally acquitted or convicted within the Union in accordance with the law.

CHAPTER VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 51

Scope

1. The provisions of this Charter are addressed to the institutions and bodies of the Union with due regard for the principle of subsidiarity and to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law. They shall therefore respect the rights, observe the principles and promote the application thereof in accordance with their respective powers.

2. This Charter does not establish any new power or task for the Community or the Union, or modify powers and tasks defined by the Treaties.

Article 52

Scope of guaranteed rights

1. Any limitation on the exercise of the rights and freedoms recognised by this Charter must be provided for by law and respect the essence of those rights and freedoms. Subject to the principle of

proportionality, limitations may be made only if they are necessary and genuinely meet objectives of general interest recognised by the Union or the need to protect the rights and freedoms of others.

2. Rights recognised by this Charter which are based on the Community Treaties or the Treaty on European Union shall be exercised under the conditions and within the limits defined by those Treaties.

3. In so far as this Charter contains rights which correspond to rights guaranteed by the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the meaning and scope of those rights shall be the same as those laid down by the said Convention. This provision shall not prevent Union law providing more extensive protection.

Article 53

Level of protection

Nothing in this Charter shall be interpreted as restricting or adversely affecting human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognised, in their respective fields of application, by Union law and international law and by international agreements to which the Union, the Community or all the Member States are party, including the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and by the Member States' constitutions.

Article 54

Prohibition of abuse of rights

Nothing in this Charter shall be interpreted as implying any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms recognised in this Charter or at their limitation to a greater extent than is provided for herein.

8 Literature List

- Bache, Ian, and George, Stephen, *“Politics in the EUROPEAN UNION”*, second edition, Oxford University Press, 2006
- Baylis, John, Smith, Steve, and Owens, Patricia, *“The Globalization of World Politics – An introduction to international relations”*, Fourth edition, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Carnegie Council
 - http://www.cceia.org/people/data/michael_doyle.html accessed on 01/05/2010.
- Doyle, Michael W., *“Liberalism and world Politics”*, The American Political Science Review, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Dec., 1986), page 1151 – 1169, accessed on 13/04/2010 via JSTOR.
- Doyle, Michael W., *“Ways of War and Peace Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism”*, W. W. Norton & Company, New York, 1997.
- EU-Oplysningen,
 - <http://www.eu-oplysningen.dk/fakta/historie/> accessed on 17/04/2010.
 - http://www.eu-oplysningen.dk/euo_en/spsv/all/88/ accessed on 24/03/2010.
- EUR-lex,
 - [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32000X1218\(01\):EN:HTML](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32000X1218(01):EN:HTML) accessed 01/05/2010.
- Europa, Europe in 12 Lessons – Why the European Union?
 - http://europa.eu/abc/12lessons/lesson_1/index_en.htm accessed on 17/04/2010.
- Europa, Glossary
 - <http://europa.eu/cgi-bin/etal.pl> accessed on 24/05/2010
- Europa, Summaries of EU legislation
 - http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/treaties_ecsc_en.htm# accessed on 17/04/2010.
 - http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/human_rights/fundamental_rights_within_european_union/l33501_en.htm accessed on 04/05/2010.
- European Commission
 - http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/index_en.htm accessed on 20/04/2010.
- Reiss, Hans, *“KANT Political Writings”*, translated by H. B. Nisbet, Second, Enlarged Edition, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

- Sam Houston State University.
 - http://www.shsu.edu/~his_ncp/Melian.html accessed on 17/05/2010.
- Satapathy, C., *"US-EU Trade War over Bananas"*, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 33, No. 52 (Dec. 26, 1998 - Jan. 1, 1999), pp. 3303-3304, accessed on 25/03/2010.
- Schweller, Randall, *"Neorealism's Status-Quo Bias: What Security Dilemma?"*, *Security Studies*, vol. 5, issue 3, 1996.
- Zakaria, Fareed, *"Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role"*, Princeton University Press, 1998, accessed on 27/04/2010 via JSTOR.

9 Executive Summary

*“It can be shown that this idea of federalism, extending gradually to encompass all states and thus leading to perpetual peace, is practicable and has objective reality. For if by good fortune one powerful and enlightened nation can form a republic (which is by nature inclined to seek perpetual peace, this will provide a focal point for federal association among other states. These will join up with the first one, thus securing the freedom of each state in accordance with the idea of international right, and the whole will gradually spread further and further by a series of alliances of this kind”.*¹³³

Kant wrote the above quotation in 1795 and it is striking how it pictures what the European Union has become today. Michael W. Doyle has developed on writings of Kant in what Doyle has labelled liberal peace. The aim of this paper is to investigate Doyle’s theory and use it on the European Union

The main point in their argumentation is that liberal democracies do not go to war with each other. This thesis will investigate the question of what role liberal peace has played and do play in the external policy of the European Union and in the spread of democracy by the EU. In the enlargement process the EU was spreading democracy to Eastern Europe. Countries such as Ukraine are also a target for EU policy in democracy building all though the country is not a member of the Union. The democracy spreading policy of the EU may end up in perpetual peace which Kant spoke of several centuries ago. This thesis will investigate whether or not there is any truth to this.

Documents from the EU will be used to analyze the actions of the Union and scholars who have investigated the enlargement will also be used to give a broad answer to the problem formulation.

The main conclusions of this paper are that the theory has substance but it also has difficulties in explaining all the facets of the European Union.

¹³³ Kant, Immanuel, in Reiss, Hans, 1991, page 104.