Inderjeet Parmar, "The 'Knowledge Politics' of Democratic Peace Theory"

Department of International Politics, City University London, UK
(Inderjeet.Parmar.1@city.ac.uk)

Abstract

How do academic ideas influence US foreign policy, under what conditions, and with what consequences? This article traces the rise, 'securitisation', and political consequences of democratic peace theory (DPT) in the United States by exploring the work of Doyle, Diamond, and Fukuyama. Ideas influence US foreign policy during/after crises when the policy environment permits 'new thinking'; when they have been developed/mobilised through state-connected elite knowledge networks; when they are or appear paradigmatically congenial to foreign policy-makers' mindsets; and when institutionally-embedded. The appropriation of DPT by foreign policy makers has categorised the world into antagonistic blocs – democratic/non-democratic, zones of peace/ turmoil – as the corollary to a renewed American mission to make the world "safer" through 'democracy' promotion. The roles of networked organic intellectuals – in universities and think tanks, for instance - were particularly important in elevating DPT from the academy to national security managers.

Key Words: knowledge politics; networks; democratic peace; elites; American foundations

How do academic ideas influence US foreign policy, under what conditions, and with what consequences? This article addresses these questions by tracing the transformation and indeed, 'securitisation', of democratic peace theory (DPT) in the United States from

an obscure social scientific finding to the "most productive" IR/political scientific theory (Levy, 1988; Maliniak, 2007). By appropriating DPT, US foreign policy-makers divided the world into antagonistic blocs of nations – democratic/non-democratic, zones of peace/turmoil – as the corollary of a renewed American mission to make the world "safer" through intervention (Ish-Shalom, 2008). DPT functions as a means of intellectual integration of several well-springs of US foreign policy, from Clinton to Bush and Obama.

The argument is advanced first by considering political circumstances, 'paradigm' compatibility, and the 'machinery' (networks) for ideas' mobilisation and articulation with state policymakers (Hill, 1994a) and, secondly, by considering the varying forms of influence that academic ideas might exercise. Ideas influence US foreign policy when political circumstances change and the policy environment is permissive of 'new thinking' (Ikenberry, 1993: 57-86; Hill, 1994b: 14; Parmar, 2005:1-25), especially during and after crises; when ideas have been developed and politically mobilised through respected elite knowledge networks linked with the state; when those new ideas are or can be made to appear as paradigmatically congenial to US foreign policy-makers' mindsets. Finally, ideas are influential when embedded in institutional norms (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993). The forms of influence of ideas also vary: some ideas gain *conceptual* influence (they change mindsets and create the intellectual conditions for policy change; Hill and Beshoff, 1994: 4), others may be used directly in policy-making and exercise *instrumental* influence, while still others may display *symbolic* influence, used to legitimise predetermined policies (Beyer, 1997: 17; Amara et al, 2004). DPT is especially interesting because it has become the *intellectual rationale* for America's global role since 1989 (Lynch, 2009: 57; Smith, 2007).

The role of organic intellectuals in each of the above processes – *interpreting and successfully promoting to and with policy communities that a new historical circumstance represents a crisis/opportunity requiring new thinking and elaborating ideas through dense political-intellectual knowledge networks, within paradigms that define problems congenial to policy-maker mindsets, and which work institutionally to*

embed and more broadly to disseminate ideas – is fundamental (Hoare and Nowell-Smith, 1971).[1] The social function of organic intellectuals is to elaborate a dominant ideology in order better to cohere and reproduce the capitalist order. To be sure, the production and mobilisation of ideas is a *political* process that has built-in conflict, especially at the level of tactical advantage-seeking behaviour vis a vis ideological-political tendencies among 'mainstream' elite knowledge institutions, but also at effectively setting the agenda to prevent the formation of radical challenges to 'mainstream' thinking and 'debates'. *Who* promotes an idea or theory is important, therefore, as are *when, how and to whom* those ideas are stated (Buger and Villumsen, 2007: 417).

The article, first, considers the rapid rise of DPT through the technology of elite knowledge networks that are, in effect, the sites at which 'paradigm compatibility/adaptability' is developed and determined, and which are also the principal mechanism through which 'new' ideas circulate among organic intellectuals and between them and the state; secondly, it briefly considers how the 'influence' of ideas may be understood and empirically recognised; thirdly, it separately examines the three principal lines of development of DPT by exploring the work of leading liberal and neo-conservative scholars Michael Doyle, Larry Diamond, and Francis Fukuyama; fourthly, it considers the role of 9-11 in bringing together previously separate tendencies favouring the democratic peace; finally, it moves to a Conclusion.

Democratic peace theory and knowledge networks

Democratic peace theory posits that mature democracies rarely fight wars against each other due to a number of key characteristics they possess, including the accountability of leadership to citizens, an attachment to diplomacy and negotiation rather than force, and a more general 'live-and-let-live' attitude to difference. If true, its implications are profound – that the spread of democracy around the globe would lead to increased US national security. Although the theory is widely associated with the work of Michael Doyle, and his *particular re-reading of Immanuel Kant*, it is also argued that the democratic peace and the concurrent rise of international liberal theory owe more to

republican security thinking than is usually acknowledged. The distinction is important in terms of the history of ideas but also, Deudney suggests, because Kantian ideas about 'pacific union' – based on a series of treaties between republics – would have little in common with a "global alliance of democracies" that some democratic peace theorists see as the route to peace and security (Deudney, 2004, 2007).

The 'democratic peace' is the underlying theoretical basis of the foreign and national security policies of President Barack Obama (as it was of his defeated Republican rival, Senator John McCain). There was a bipartisan consensus around the need for a "League" or "Concert of Democracies" as a key source of American national security (Carothers, 2008). The presidencies of Clinton (1993-2001) and Bush (2001-2009) were powerfully influenced by the tenets of DPT. Clinton championed "democratic enlargement" and "democratic engagement" in the 1990s, while promoting freedom and democracy was pivotal to the Bush doctrine (Buckley and Singh, 2006; CSIS, 2009: v).

Yet, it is also clear that within a broad consensus, there was a great deal of *jockeying for position and competition* over which foreign and national security paradigm would replace cold war "containment". Indeed, Clinton's national security adviser, Anthony Lake, termed the race to replace containment as the "Kennan sweepstake," and, it must be noted, the NSC's strategic approach outmuscled Warren Christopher's state department's case-by-case, ad hoc approach to foreign and national security policy (Brinkley, 1997). Even more than bureaucratic and personal politics, Lake's promulgation of "enlargement" as the keystone of Clinton's foreign policy also appealed to Republican representative, Newt Gingrich, who was especially attracted by the idea of expanding the parts of the world dominated by market/open democracies. Such hard-nosed market-democracy expansionism married the neo-Wilsonian idealism of the most liberal elements of the Democratic foreign policy think tank community (Hames, 1994) and the more pragmatic and realist Lake and Clinton. This combination, Brinkley argues, was used to overcome hold-over ideas from the Bush administration – such as Cheney's "world dominance", Bush's "new world order" – and Vice President Al Gore's ideas of "global civilization". Lake wanted more than a gimmick – he wanted his name to be

associated with nothing less than a blue print for post-cold war US foreign policy that would "merge strands of neo-Wilsonian idealism with hard-core neo-Morgenthauian realism" (Brinkley, 1997, 115).

Despite the "politics", however, the mix that Clinton/NSC/Lake/Gingrich developed would prove – in different hands, and at a different time - flexible enough to be radically reinterpreted by hard-core neoconservatives more firmly wedded to American preponderance and unipolarity to drive home America's advantage. The mix of Wilsonian ideals and realism provided a basin of power and purpose to satisfy a range of ideo-political tendencies in US foreign policy politics (especially after 9-11).

Knowledge production is deeply implicated in the organised power structures of American society. The processes of developing America's national security state and global superpower have transformed, and been influenced by, the university, philanthropic foundation and think tank. These processes have placed at the centre of attention the significance of knowledge to power. Knowledge-makers are history-makers, according to Gramsci (Hoare and Nowell-Smith, 1971: 172): knowledge is a key component of a hegemonic project – a master plan for prosperity, security, and stability underpinned by powerful ideas. History-makers build on firm political-economic foundations a structure of society that 'works' and which mobilises behind it a wide-ranging alliance – an historic bloc – comprising many classes, marginalising others. Knowledge networks, therefore, are fundamental to political and state power (Parmar, 2004; Anderson, 2003: 5).

Knowledge network refers to a system of flows (of people, money, ideas) between significant spaces in which are located critical masses of thinkers/activists; the spaces reflect a division of labour in the complex process of producing, packaging, disseminating and applying knowledge; spaces and flows are funded and nurtured by entrepreneurial catalytic groupings that see an opportunity for innovation. Knowledge networks, a technology of power, do not 'create' ideas but provide the necessary conditions in which creativity may take place, especially by funding time and space to

think through intellectual problems, 'pure' research which may have 'real-world' applications. Foundation networks are 'fertilisers' of ideas, not creators, and suppliers of dissemination opportunities to established knowledge (Carnegie Corporation, 1945: 17-18). Policymakers interpret, even transmogrify, academics' ideas in ways that that may distort their originators' intentions. DPT, therefore, is an interesting case of conceptual, symbolic and instrumental influence of academic theories.

Knowledge institutions, however, are also composed of people, not merely structures – scientists and engineers, as well as artists and designers, who are both inward-looking (pursuing 'truth') and outward-looking (producing usable technologies). Knowledge networks *objectively* combine creative thinkers and those most engaged with the 'real' world in spaces/milieus that are conducive to inter-disciplinarity behind a shared sense of mission, frameworks for innovation for specific purposes (Brown, 1999). In consequence, academics' ideas may reach policy-makers though the interpretation of scholarly ideas by policy-makers may subvert their authors' intentions (Russett, 2005). This may, in part, result from the inherent difficulty of applying broad and crudely understood concepts – like democratic peace – to specific cases (Jentleson, 2000).

Such knowledge networks therefore include relations between philanthropic foundations and other knowledge institutions and between the funded institutions themselves, i.e., universities, think tanks, policy research institutes, government departments, professional academic associations, and learned (and other) journals. Network-building features regular organisational meetings, as well as research and policy-related events. The idea is to "put knowledge to work", in the service of the east coast foreign policy establishment's liberal-internationalism and globalism.[2]

Yet, it is also the case that foundations build networks as ends in themselves because networks produce results by virtue of merely being constructed (i.e., due to a range of 'internal' functions they perform); and secondly, because networks achieve ends other than those publicly stated (their 'external' functions). Foundation networks create frames of thought that cohere the network; finance spaces for the legitimisation of particular

types of knowledge; build careers and reputations; cohere and finance key scholars, policy-makers, universities, journals, professional societies; provide havens of "safe" ideas, strengthening some, combatting others.

Influence of Ideas

The influence of ideas on policymaking is extremely difficult to pin down. As Don Abelson argues, ideas cannot be contained until ready for deployment: they are in the air, subtly working their way in the media and the universities. Policymakers often use academic research to orient themselves to problems rather than directly for problem-solving (Bulmer, 1982: 48), further complicating the matter. Yet, ideas are also mobilizable once developed into packaged policy devices, stressing the need for researching how far policymakers draw on academic studies to advance specific agendas. Many ideas may be in the air but few go beyond faddish adherence to become central to policymakers' world-views (Abelson, 2006: xiii; 8). The influence of DPT, then, is discernable through the activities of key knowledge creation/mobilisation agencies such as think tanks, policy-oriented university institutes, foundations interested in US foreign policy, and key publications that cohere around key issues and debates, various sub-sets of America's organic intellectuals.[3] Clearly, evidence of DPT would need to be found in the above networks as well as in policymaking bureaucracies (Wilson, 2000).

In developing an analytical framework and offering some rules of evidence to 'test' the claims made for DPT's rise to policy influence, it is necessary briefly to reiterate those claims. It is argued that three key factors operated in DPT's rise: political crises that demand 'new thinking'; paradigmatic compatibility or malleability of 'new thinking' to foreign policy-makers' mindsets or world-views; and well-developed knowledge networks. It is also argued that there are three types of influence that 'new thinking' might exercise: conceptual, symbolic and instrumental.

What would evidence to sustain the argument above look like? It is suggested that crises that create demand for new thinking would be few and far between but would have large scale influence. Most straight-forwardly, in the context of DPT, the sudden end of the

Cold War, with its hardened political, intellectual and institutional boundaries, was vital to the elevation of DPT to policy centrality. Similarly, though somewhat secondarily, the terror attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, would also be expected to demand new thinking. The evidence of the work of three key knowledge networks (below) strongly suggests the importance of '1989' and '9-11' to DPT's rise from relative academic obscurity. Paradigm compatibility or malleability are key aspects of the kinds of 'new thinking' that would be welcomed during and after catalytic events. Democracy promotion, which is the heavy implication of DPT, is a liberal American value – its principal idea - with origins deep in US history and culture, most famously in the thought of President Woodrow Wilson. The most problematic element of deploying 'ideals' in US foreign policy is the anxiety of appearing 'soft' and idealistic. The role of DPT entrepreneurs – especially those less attached to Kantian/soft-Wilsonianism - was precisely to present the theory as both idealistic *and* realistic: America's values and strategic interests as unified, a position (objectively) shared by liberal internationalists, neo-conservatives and conservative nationalists.[4] The problem remained, however, that the eventual application of democratic peace theory depended on the specific policy means – coercive, unilateral or diplomatic – favoured by differing networks. Neo-conservatives' attachment to aspects of democratic peace theory was partly inspired by their desire to advance national greatness and martial spirit, allied to the lofty character of democracy promotion. Fukuyama, it will be recalled, lamented the loss of "men with chests" that he feared would occur once liberal democracy's triumph had brought "history" to an "end" (Fukuyama, 1992).

There is, however, another 'politics' involved in the triumph of democratic peace theory, over and above arguments between Democrats, Republicans and neo-conservatives. And that lies in the almost inevitable process of transforming an idea into policy technology in a specific elite political culture. A peace theory, in the hands of national security managers, and their security-conscious think tank supporters – such as at the Democrats' Progressive Policy Institute – is inevitably destined to be 'securitised'. That is politics too and normally explains why the relationship between intellectuals and policy makers is, in the words of Robert Merton, "nasty, brutish and short" (Merton cited in Coser, 1965).

Politics, therefore, is not only inherent where there is observable conflict or overt opposition: it is inherent in the very process by which strategic policy elites, with the help of policy entrepreneurs, transform a theory into policy (Smith, 2007).

The influence of elite knowledge networks that mobilised DPT may be recognised in a number of ways: conceptual and instrumental influence may be discerned in evidence suggesting changes to policymakers' thinking and actual policy innovation. To 'test' the argument, this paper examines the uses of DPT by the Clinton administration, especially its promulgation of 'democratic enlargement' and, later, 'democratic engagement'. Conceptually, it must be shown that US national security concepts changed from Cold War defensive containment to activism; instrumentally, such conceptual changes should be visible in policy statements and actions. DPT should also redraw foreign policy-makers' "map of global security" (Buger and Villumsen 2007: 434). DPT is compatible with most, if not all, of the major ideo-political tendencies in elite political circles in the United States. Therefore, its influence may be seen in the activities of liberal internationalists (Michael Doyle, Larry Diamond, the latter being close to the Clinton administration and its think tank, the Progressive Policy Institute) but also neo-conservatives (like Francis Fukuyama) and conservative nationalists like President George W. Bush and his secretary of state, Condoleeza Rice. Symbolic influence may be discerned by the transformation of an idea into policies strongly at variance with the ultimate aims of the idea's originators. In this regard, a 'peace' theory has clearly been 'securitised', transmutated into a theory that justifies military intervention and forcible regime change (Ish-Shalom, 2008; Hayes, 2009).[5]

DPT: Three Lines of Development

DPT provides democracy promotion intellectual legitimacy. Contrary to claims of a neo-conservative monopoly of 'new' thinking (and of their takeover of the Bush administration) over the past decade or so (Ish-Shalom, 2008; Parmar, 2009), this article explores three lines of development in the origins, development and rise to scientific law

and established political practice of DPT: first, the work of Ford (and, later, MacArthur) Foundation-funded Princeton scholar, Michael Doyle, in the 1980s, and leads to significant theoretical re-orientations among liberal internationalist IR scholars and the "democratic engagement" orientations of the second Clinton administration (1997-2001). The second line of development encompasses the work of Larry Diamond, the Hoover Institution scholar closely associated with the Democrats' Progressive Policy Institute and the "democratic enlargement" agenda of the first Clinton administration, as well as the Council of the Community of Democracies. The third line of development begins with Francis Fukuyama's "end of history" thesis, and develops through Joshua Muravchik, and William Kristol and Robert Kagan.

Those lines of thought and development intersect/ed with one another from time to time, especially through the Clinton era but did not fully cohere. Coherence and (*objective*) 'unity' were forged by the terror attacks of 9-11, which unified conservative nationalists, neo-conservatives, and liberal interventionist hawks: rhetorically, promoting democracy took on a crusading form as the means to security *and* global 'improvement', regardless of political party, even though partisan and ideological lines continued to differentiate, at the margins, the various tendencies.

Michael Doyle and the origins of DPT

DPT has gained widespread acceptance in the academic community and spawned a productive "research program" (George and Bennett, 2005: 37-38). Going even further, Jack Levy calls DPT IR's only "empirical law" (Lepgold and Nincic, 2001: 113).[6]

Though traceable to Kant, Montesquieu and American republican-federalists, there was a flurry of intellectual activity in regard to DPT's development in the 1960s and 1970s. However, it was Michael Doyle who placed the issue firmly back on the academic agenda, with funding from the Ford Foundation from 1979-1982.[7] The total Ford allotted to the project, "Support for Research on the Future of the International Economic Order", was $409,735.[8] Of that, $90,000 was granted to Doyle and Miles Kahler, for a study on North-South economic relations. The project included examination of the impact of

ideology on international economic relations. Doyle was also interested in testing foreign policy theories "that posit regular connections between state and society, interest and ideology, tradition and contemporary response, and systemic position and economic strategy." The project emphasised the increasing levels of economic differentiation among Third World states and probable policy consequences. When the more developed Third World states, like Kenya, liberalised, they would begin to form a 'party of liberty'.[9] The seeds of Doyle's subsequent work on the "liberal peace" are clearly present in his Ford-funded project. The "party of liberty" on the world stage has re-appeared as the Concert of Democracies, as this paper argues below. Of course, there are other important sources of Doyle's ideas on DPT and of their subsequent impact. For example, it is vital to recognise that Doyle's initial overt foray into DPT was "serendipitous" – the need to address a student meeting at short notice, and try to say something interesting. It is also evident, however, that bringing the ideas to publication required space and time for which Doyle graciously expressed his appreciation to the Ford Foundation. For his later work on the matter, Doyle acknowledges his debt to the MacArthur Foundation.[10]

Ahead of Doyle's 1983 article/s, however, President Ronald Reagan had declared the inherently "peaceful" character of "liberal foreign policies" in a speech in London in 1982 and, later established the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) to promote democracy. The re-birth of "liberal peace theory" in its sophisticated sense was Doyle's work; yet it was implicated also in the *context* of the aggressive anti-communism of the Reagan administration, providing an ominous warning about the uses of academic theories by policy-makers (Doyle, 1994: 98-101). Of course, Doyle's DPT contained an appreciation of the "liberal peace" as well as a critique of "liberal imperialism". Successive American presidents have taken aspects of DPT and used them for purposes unintended by its original authors. Undeniably, however, Doyle's theory was located within a broadly liberal framework that placed emphasis on the idea that free markets were also sources of world peace (Doyle, 1986; Deudney, 2004).

The Harvard-based, policy-oriented, journal, *International Security* played a key role in the development of the democratic peace by publishing a series of articles followed by a

reader in 1996.[11] Maliniak et al note that it is one of the twelve leading journals in the field and that security studies specialists are the keenest of IR scholars "to engage the policy community," with 30- 60 percent of articles addressing policy issues, in contrast with 10 to 20 percent of such articles in other IR journals. *International Security* has consistently been among the top five most cited IR journals (Miller, 2001: fn16).

International Security is the journal of Harvard's policy-oriented (Belfer) Center for Science and International Affairs. The 1996 "reader" was part-funded by support from the Carnegie Corporation (Brown, Lynne-Jones and Miller, 1996)[12] while the Belfer Center has long received support from the Ford Foundation.[13] The Belfer Center, part of the Kennedy School of Government, funded by the Kennedy family, turned its attention to the "lessons of Vietnam" in the late 1960s, examining the mis-uses of history and historical analogies by national security managers.

The Belfer Center continues to enjoy linkages with the Ford and other foundations. For instance, David Hamburg, former president of the Carnegie Corporation (CC) is a member of Belfer's International Council. In 1997, the Carnegie Corporation granted $700,000 to the Belfer Center for work on "new concepts of international security and formulating policy recommendations…" CC emphasised the work of the Center in identifying the "conditions favorable to the 'democratic peace' hypothesis….. whether U.S. foreign policy should seek to promote democracy… [and] the hypothesis that many democratizing states undergo a volatile transition in which they tend to be relatively more likely to engage in war" (Carnegie Corporation, 2007). The Center's members include Robert Zoellick, president of the World Bank and former deputy secretary of state, William Perry, Clinton's secretary of defense, historian Niall Ferguson, and General John Abizaid, commander of US central command. Paula Dobriansky, the Bush administration's under secretary of state for democracy and global affairs, and a leading neo-conservative, joined Belfer as a senior fellow. With over 100 scholars and practitioners from the worlds of business, government and the military, a constant stream of prestigious publications and conferences, the Belfer Center is a university-based think tank that aims to "advance policy-relevant knowledge."[14]

Promoting democracy occupied a key place in the pages of *International Security* in the 1990s, especially because President Clinton "was an explicit believer in the democratic peace hypothesis" (Miller, 2001: 5; 12 ;13; 34; Clinton, 1994). The complementarity of theory and practice were made clear in *Debating the Democratic Peace*: "Apart from the theoretical debate…the democratic peace also has practical significance. If democracies never go to war with one another, then the best prescription for international peace may be to encourage the spread of democracy.… and expand the democratic zone of peace…." The theory, if wrong, however, could lead the US into "major wars and years of occupation…." (Brown et al, 1996: xiv).

It was also in *International Security* that Snyder and Mansfield strengthened DPT and dampened the Clinton administration's ardour for democracy promotion in the late 1990s.[15] Deputy secretary of state Strobe Talbott indicated his familiarity with debates in *International Security* over the democratic peace and specifically of Mansfield and Snyder's article (Talbott, 1996).[16] Mansfield and Snyder noted that democratizing states are more likely to go to war than mature democracies, especially in the first decade. The lack of durable stabilising institutions in new democracies make it difficult to form stable coalitions. Mansfield and Snyder suggest that the West help promote pluralism through long-term engagement, minimizing the (Brown et al, 1996: xxvi) "dangers of the turbulent transition" (Mansfield and Snyder, 1995: 334). Their article was originally published in *Foreign Affairs* (May-June 1995) before its publication in *International Security* in its Summer 1995 issue, possibly its principal route to the Clinton administration (Wilson, 2000, 117).

Mansfield and Snyder developed their arguments along the above lines by publishing *From Voting to Violence* in 2000, funded in part by Ford and Carnegie, among others, and *Electing To Fight* in 2005, supported by the Hoover Institution and the Belfer Center. Mansfield and Snyder argued for concrete steps to encourage the development of the rule of law, a neutral civil service, civil rights and professional media, *ahead* of the holding of elections in would-be democracies (Mansfield and Snyder, 2000: 41), shifting emphasis from democracy to *stability*. In 2005, criticizing the Bush administration's crude

interpretation of the possibilities of DPT, Mansfield and Snyder implicitly complimented the Clinton administration's more nuanced understanding of the opportunities, and dangers, of democratization (Owen, 2005). The authors argued that for democracy to succeed, it was necessary that such states go through *sequenced* development of the pre-conditional bases of democracy (2005: 4). By 2007, Mansfield and Snyder were the subjects of criticism for being "optimists" about the prospects for sequenced democratization (Mansfield and Snyder, 2007:6). Despite criticism from some experts, this is arguably the more nuanced approach currently being pursued by the Obama administration (Obama, 2009a; McMahon, 2009). Mansfield and Snyder's work has not rejected DPT: they have developed it along "realist" lines so as to make its implementation more effective (Owen, 2005).

Other journals were also important in the development and discussion of DPT. *World Politics* published articles by Randall Schweller (1992), C.R. and M. Ember and Bruce Russett (1992), and John Oneal (1999). The *Journal of Democracy* defended and promoted the implementation of DPT. For example, Morton Halperin (director, PPS at State, 1998–2001, and senior director for Democracy at the NSC,1994–96) co-wrote articles on how the major powers increasingly were "guaranteeing democracy" where it was actively undermined (Halperin and Lomasney (1993; 1998), while political scientist James Lee Ray provided a robust theoretical and methodological defence of DPT (Ray, 1997:50).

Clearly, DPT became influential only after the Cold War – principally with the Clinton administration - and only after it had been legitimized by policy-oriented elite knowledge institutions. In the process of moving from academic theory to foreign policy, however, the 'peace' theory was 'securitised', though the precise degree of securitization depended on the politics of specific networks..

Larry Diamond and the Clinton administration

Diamond is a key figure in the migration of DPT from academia to policy-makers. An academic at Stanford, he has co-edited NED's *Journal of Democracy* since 1990, closely

associated with the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) of the Democratic Party, and contributed an important study on democracy promotion to the Carnegie Commission on the Prevention of Deadly Violence in 1995. He is a leading member of the Council of the Community of Democracies. Finally, Diamond served the Bush administration in Iraq as a Senior Adviser to the Coalition Provisional Authority in Baghdad (January to April 2004).

Diamond (1991) introduced DPT to the PPI and, through that, to the Clinton administration, with his report, *An American Foreign Policy for Democracy*, that enunciated the basic principles of DPT and *extended* the peace thesis to argue that democracies are more reliable as trading partners, offer more stable "climates for investment… honor international treaties…" Welcoming the end of the Cold War, Diamond argues that the United States had a golden opportunity "*to reshape the world*" (emphasis added) and transform US opinion from attachment to global "order and stability" to reshaping national sovereignty to enable American interventions abroad. With the collapse of Soviet socialism, Diamond emphasised America's "*scope to shape the political character of the entire world for generations.*" (Emphasis added). Linking idealism with realism, Diamond claims that America's own security is protected by democratising other nations, providing a strategically compelling reason to make democracy America's mission, a viable alternative to President George HW Bush's "New World Order". The latter, Diamond argues was obsessed "with order, stability, and 'balance of power' – often at the expense of freedom and self-determination…" Finally, Diamond argued that the US should form a new association of democracies to mobilize rapid action.

Diamond's PPI report had not appeared as a "bolt from the blue" to Democrats, however. The Clinton Democrats rolled out their orientations in 1990 and 1991: *The New Orleans Declaration* (of 1 March 1990) of the DLC by Governor Bill Clinton endorsed the DLC's support for Jimmy Carter's "commitment to human rights" and America's need to "remain energetically engaged in the worldwide struggle for individual liberty, human rights, and prosperity…";[17] in May 1991, *The New American Choice Resolution*, as

adopted by the DLC in Cleveland, Ohio, strongly endorsed democracy promotion as a US national interest. Diamond's unique contribution was to introduce DPT to Clintonite thinking. The PPI helped harness academic ideas to Clinton, shown by Clinton's speech in December 1991 important parts of which appear to paraphrase Diamond's PPI report.[18] But even more than Diamond, Clinton stressed the dangers of the "new security environment" in which to build on "freedom's victory in the Cold War."

Clinton more sharply "securitized" DPT, dividing the world into democratic and autocratic zones, the latter as threat to the former. As Buger and Villumsen (2007: 433) argue, "Creating the certainty of democratic peace …increased the uncertainty about the relations between democratic and non-democratic states…. thinking in terms of a zone of democratic peace also created a vision of a 'zone of turmoil'…" Clinton's national security adviser, Tony Lake, noted in 1993, Americans should now "visualise our security mission as promoting the enlargement of the 'blue areas' [of the world] of market democracies."[19] Lake, who proclaimed Clinton's foreign policy as "pragmatic neo-Wilsonianism" (Hyland, 1999: 23), overtly promoted enlargement as "the successor to a doctrine of containment," the substitution of a defensive concept for an active and expansionist one (Lake, 1993). In the same securitising vein, deputy secretary of state Strobe Talbot noted that America operated in "The new geopolitics: *defending* democracy in the post-cold war era."[20] Joseph Kruzel notes DPT provided a *pre-emptive* strategy for national security, eliminating threats "by turning a country into a democracy" (1994, 180). In 1993, the future Senior Director for Democracy at the NSC, Morton Halperin, argued that "a true world order requires" American-style limited government, while the global community should embrace a "*duty of interference* in the internal affairs of a state…" to save democracy (Halperin et al, 1993: 60-64; emphasis added).

It is important to note, however, that DPT needed additional ballast if its potential of global transformation was fully to be exploited by US national security managers. As Smith (2007) notes, democratic transition theory also had a role to play and Diamond merged the two approaches. The net effect is to argue with "certainty" that not only does democracy guarantee peace, it is also straight-forward rapidly to transition towards it.

Diamond's theoretical synthesis is exemplified in his work for the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict. In December 1995, he published *Promoting Democracy in the 1990s*, suggesting that democratic transitions were propelled by political factors and need not be hamstrung by historic or "societal pre-conditions". Diamond argued that instability in democratising states opened the way for intervention.[21] Diamond suggested democratic states prioritise democratic transitions in countries of "importance… to their own security and to regional and global security more generally," selecting countries for transition that could "serve as a … '*beachhead*' for democratic development…" [emphasis added].

The Clinton Administration and the Community of Democracies

The Clinton administrations worked actively to construct a "Community of Democracies", along the lines indicated in Diamond's PPI Report. Championed by secretary of state Madeleine Albright, a Council for the Community of Democracies (CCD) was founded in 2000, in Warsaw, continuing a process of dividing the world into zones of democratic peace and the rest, and increasingly hardening the boundaries as a precursor to greater pressure on some powers to democratise. The CCD was especially interested in engaging with nations that were in danger of back-sliding on democracy during the "turbulent transition" that had been identified by Mansfield and Snyder (1995). As a result, CCD developed a number of regional groupings of democracies and a Democracy Caucus at the United Nations. It is very much an American enterprise that is funded from numerous sources, including the US Department of State and the Rockefeller Foundation.[22]

The Wilsonian origins of the work of the CCD have explicitly been stated by State Department representatives who, by 2000, were "focusing on *making democracy the key to safety, security, cooperation and human rights*." (Emphasis added). Explicitly building on DPT's broad conclusions, assistant secretary of state Koh wanted to build "a caucus of democratic countries who are capable of responding when democratic norms are threatened…",[23] a message underlined by Paula Dobriansky, a member of the hawkish

Project for the New American Century (PNAC). Dobriansky divided the world into "solid" and "emerging democracies", followed by "offenders" against whom democracies should "band… together to exert some pressure…."[24] The principal difference between CCD and PNAC, however, turned on their respective assessment on the precise mix of coercion and diplomacy to be applied in promoting democracy.

The coincidence of the Cold War's end with the rise of Bill Clinton's presidential ambitions presented an opportunity for DPT – via scholar-activists like Diamond – to go straight from opposition platforms to policy-making circles. In its migration from academia to the state, however, DPT became militarised: words like "threat", "national security", "zones of peace" and "zones of turmoil" became increasingly associated with "peace" theory.

Democracy promotion and the Neoconservatives

Francis Fukuyama provided some philosophical 'depth' to the neoconservative persuasion with his "The End of History?" article in *National Interest* magazine (1989)[25] and book (1992) of the same title taking the first major steps towards neo-conservatives' embrace of democracy promotion. At the time of his article, Fukuyama was deputy director of the State Department's policy planning staff – the administration's foreign policy think tank (Hill, 1994: 19). In his article, Fukuyama notes "The triumph of the West, of the Western *idea*…" and the disappearance of alternatives. While critics – such as Realists – suggest that power politics will continue to dominate post-communist world affairs, Fukuyama argues that national interests are based mainly on ideological factors. In practice, war is now unlikely among the advanced democracies. Conflict, however, would still occur as the world remained divided between historical and post-historical states.

In his book, Fukuyama (1992: 220) further elaborated on his ideas related to the democratic peace (citing Doyle's work, and Kant's, but clearly advancing beyond the former's warnings about the imperial dangers of resurgent liberalism) and, equally interestingly, on how effective democratic transitions came about, echoing Diamond,

suggesting that leadership was the most important factor in determining transitions to democracy (1992: 222). Emphasising the revolutionary character of American power, Fukuyama envisaged suspicious, parallel and occasionally conflicting relations between nations "stuck in history" and the advanced liberal powers, especially over oil, immigration, and non-democratic states with weapons of mass destruction. "Force will continue to be the *ultima ratio* in their [historical/post-historical nations') mutual relations." (277-279).

International organisation is vital to that effort, Fukuyama (1992) continues: a (non) Kantian "international league of democracies" more like NATO than the United Nations, however. That is, Fukuyama embraces the idea of an armed league of (liberal) democracies to thwart "threats arising from the non-democratic part of the world" (282-3), *even more overtly securitising DPT than the Clinton administration*. NATO as a *global* alliance of democracies was promoted by the Clinton administration in the 1990s (Talbott, 1995) and is now championed by Ivo Daalder, President Obama's ambassador to NATO (Daalder and Goldeiger, 2006; NATO, 2010).[1]

Following Fukuyama, Joshua Muravchik of the American Enterprise Institute, and William Kristol and Robert Kagan, further promoted the morality of spreading democracy and intervening forcefully to halt humanitarian crises (Halper and Clarke, 2004). However, they favoured democracy promotion and humanitarian intervention on a case-by-case basis, rather than as a general principle of US foreign policy. Though Kristol and Kagan (1996: 27) argued that America's "moral goals and its fundamental national interests are almost always in harmony," they recognised that the United States had a range of powers through which its influence worked to better secure her against threats: "The purpose was not Wilsonian idealistic whimsy" but securing American power and asserting its greatness. Fukuyama (2007-08: 33-34; 29), despite his drift away from neoconservatism, argues that pragmatic democracy promotion by the United States improves America's global image and its international influence. The evidence above in regard to the Clinton era, however, suggests that though the neoconservatives were more

[1] NATO's new strategic concept was developed by an expert group chaired by Madeleine Albright.

strident in language and style, they hardly differed from liberal internationalists in the 1990s.

The end of the Cold War created a demand for 'new thinking' that influenced the Clinton administration (Jentleson, 2000). Democracy promotion, boosted by intellectual support from DPT, became the preferred orientation of the Clinton administration, although in a securitised form. The role of Doyle, the Belfer Center and *International Security*, as well as Larry Diamond and the PPI, were of central importance during the 1990s in securing the place of DPT in foreign policy discourse and action. This is further seen by the temporary withdrawal from overly optimistic versions of DPT in the second Clinton administration with the inauguration of 'democratic engagement', prompted by the work of Mansfield and Snyder. However, this merely endorsed a more aggressive democracy-consolidation programme as suggested by Mansfield and Snyder, whose research findings – published for the Belfer Center by MIT Press - indicated that the conditions for successful democratization included US assistance to build a multiparty system and a vigorous free press, among other things (Mansfield and Snyder, 2005). Relatedly, the expansion of NATO as a global alliance of democracies, underpinned by DPT, also shows the influence of the theory, and its securitisation. According to Strobe Talbott, candidates for NATO membership needed to demonstrate "the strength of their democratic institutions", and willingness to confront "new threats". The very prospect of NATO membership would act as a catalyst to democratic reform and economic liberalisation, and contribute to the peaceful resolution of disputes and general stability (Talbott, 1995; NATO, 2010).

Further to the political-ideological right, Fukuyama's championing of DPT set in train a movement among neoconservatives more militantly and aggressively to pursue DPT to its' logical' conclusion: forcible regime change. Interestingly, groups such as PNAC were actively engaged with Clinton's Pentagon by 2000, while Fukuyama became prominent in the Princeton Project on National Security, headed by John Ikenberry and Anne-Marie Slaughter, as well as Tony Lake and George Shultz (Parmar, 2009).

The evidence shows the conceptual, symbolic and instrumental influence of DPT. Conceptually, from Clinton to the neoconservatives, there occurred a change in the purposes and rhetorical justifications of American power. America's liberal values and its national security interests were unified by DPT. Symbolically, DPT legitimised American preponderance in a world made dangerous by rogue and terrorist states. Intervening against such regimes further secured America's self-image as a good state while maintaining powerful armed forces and increasing military budgets at near Cold War levels, and heading off demands for a "peace dividend". The instrumental influence of DPT is seen in the Clinton era and, perhaps, most clearly, in the post-9-11 Bush doctrine and the war on Iraq that followed.

This is much tidier than what actually occurred, however. DPT was initially ignored. Later, its influence ebbed and flowed; it had its triumphalists and critics; there were competing paradigms. Its influence relied on a combination of unforeseen shocks and powerful networks that both promoted and refined the theory. Jentleson shows it took a specific mindset – that of a former policy planner and college professor, Tony Lake, as opposed to the lawyerly secretary of state, Warren Christopher – to concretise Clinton's espousal of "almost pure Kantianism" in his 1994 State of the Union address (Jentleson, 2000:141). Yet, it has continued to exert influence regardless of the party in power.

The activities of the three networks were organisationally separate in many respects but were effectively part of an emergent belief in the national security benefits and American power justifications of democracy promotion in the 1990s. The three networks would never be *fully unified* in a single organization, but they moved closer together in the wake of another catalytic event, 9-11, that demanded 'new thinking' and 'muscular' responses.

ROLE OF 9-11 IN 'FUSING' NEO-CONSERVATIVES, LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISTS, AND CONSERVATIVE NATIONALISTS

According to Wolfson (2004) and Abelson (2006: 216), the democracy-promotion views of Kagan, Kristol et al made surprisingly little impression on George W. Bush in 2000, but did on Clinton's Pentagon team. After 9-11, however, things changed (Wolfson,

2004). Drezner (2008) similarly argues that after 9-11, "Neoconservative ideas – particularly democracy promotion – were placed at the heart of the Bush administration's grand strategy."

By 2005, the Bush administration had embedded a version of DPT in its national security strategy and (post-facto) justified the Iraq War on that basis (Owen IV, 2005). Even the erstwhile realist secretary of state, Condoleeza Rice, proclaimed with gusto "The Promise of a Democratic Peace" in which violence between advanced states was "unthinkable" and the principal threats incubated in "weak and failing states". Rice justified democracy promotion as the most realistic option, combining optimism/idealism with "sound strategic logic."[26] Previously, Paula Dobriansky (2003), the-then under-secretary of state for democracy and global affairs, argued that *idealism and realism* were the bedrocks of Bush foreign policy, that although democracy and security concerns had always to be balanced against each other, they were also intimately related. The fight against al Qaeda, she argued, successfully combined security and democracy-promotion concerns. In Bush's second inauguration speech, he declared that "The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands…. *America's vital interests and our deepest beliefs are now one*." (Emphasis added).

Kagan (2007) champions a "global concert or league of democratic states" to "complement, not replace, the United Nations, the G-8, and other global forums." Kagan was a close foreign policy adviser to defeated Republican presidential candidate, Senator John McCain, who declared his support for a "league of democracies" in early 2008.[27] McCain's league of democracies is an echo of the "concert of democracies" promoted by liberal internationalist John Ikenberry and Anne-Marie Slaughter's Princeton Project on National Security (2006). Brookings' Ivo Daalder is a convert, and was an election campaign foreign policy advisor to candidate Barack Obama, the latter advocating a "Rapid Response Fund for young democracies" in March 2008 (McMahon, 2009: 37). Daalder was appointed President Obama's ambassador to NATO, an organisation touted as a 'global democratic alliance' by many, including PPI's Will Marshall (Marshall, 2009). Slaughter headed the State Department's policy planning staff; other democracy-promoters in the Obama administration include Samantha Power, Susan Rice, Michael

McFaul, and Philip Gordon. Vice President Joe Biden was long the voice of the PPI in the US Senate. Space prohibits discussion of the details of the Concert of Democracies but there are definite similarities between the latter and Clarence Streit's Federal Union of the Democracies of the North Atlantic organisation of the late 1930s and early 1940s. Instructively, Streit's organisation, which called for a federal union of democracies to save western civilisation, is cited as an *aspiration* for the West after 1989 by Deudney and Ikenberry in an essay entitled "Wither the West?"[28] There is an active Streit Council for a Union of Democracies (SCUD), based in Washington, DC, that holds regular conferences and seminars. Interestingly, in 1978, Board members of Federal Union formed the Committee (now, the Council) for a Community of Democracies, later endorsed by Madeleine Albright, as shown in the Clinton section above. Smith (2007: 108) argues that such associations of democracy initiatives, based on the academic legitimacy of DPT have become "a claim to cultural superiority and an encouragement to belligerent behavior – an update of race theory." The Obama administration has committed itself to strengthening the Community of Democracies (McMahon, 2009; Allen, 2009) in order more consensually to support democratization. The concert of democracies is central to foreign policy elites' discourse in the United States, pivotal in "ratifying the democratic peace", and in hardening conceptually and institutionally the boundaries between the liberal democratic and non-democratic worlds (Ikenberry and Slaughter, 2006: 25).

CONCLUSION

This paper has shown that *knowledge networks* are a vital aspect of power in the United States, managing to elaborate and mobilise a "peace" theory that ultimately was transformed into a technology of aggressive 'democracy' promotion/imposition within a threat-oriented and threat-confronting policy-orientation. The confident public rhetoric inspired by the theory played a key role in justifying the Iraq War.

What would US foreign policy have looked like without DPT? Certainly, neo-Wilsonianism would still have been available to Clintonites and, therefore, democracy promotion. But in an uncertain post-Cold War world, the social scientific 'certainties'

promised by DPT – with all the hallmarks of scholarly legitimacy, relative simplicity of its underlying thesis and the marketability of spreading/defending democracy, and thereby dealing with the 'Vietnam syndrome' – proved decisive. The fact that there was support for DPT from across the political spectrum made its adoption more likely. Without DPT – which could operate either unilaterally or multilaterally, peacefully or coercively – US foreign policy might not have a concept that could cohere its identity, or supply it a value-free, scientific post-Soviet era rationale. From the intellectual straitjacket of Cold War containment mentalities in which almost anything could be justified if it diminished Soviet influence, DPT offered a scientifically proven and easily comprehended "law" of international behaviour: from then on, it would be the 'truth'in the service of democracy that would drive US national security rather than convenient truths to undermine communism.

The paper also shows that despite the relatively distinct sources of the theory and its reasonably distinct lines of development, there was always a certain level of objective, if not subjective or personal, 'unity' and coherence in the underlying motivation of the actors and institutions: a sense that US power is a force for good, that responsibility comes with power, and a sense of America's mission.

This sense of shared mission of American global responsibility – actually an imperial creed (Barnett, 1973: 19) – was strengthened in practical terms by a vitally important (effective but not intentional) specialisation of functions or a division of labour among the key organisations of the knowledge network. As Brown argues, there are truth-seekers and engineers; but there are also mediating organisations or hybrids (such as Belfer, a university-based policy-oriented think tank, that are composed of both groups). Inside the network, there are key nodes between which there are overlaps and interlocks such as universities, journals (*International Security*; *National Interest*; *Journal of Democracy*; *Foreign Affairs*), think tanks (CFR, PPNS, CCD, Brookings, PPI), foundations (Ford, Carnegie, MacArthur). There is a revolving door among many of the organisations due to a widespread belief that US power is a force for good, its values universal and transferable, the defender against threats. This has fostered intellectual

capital production through a sense of a shared mission among like-minded but differently positioned and qualified individuals.

The knowledge ecology is diverse and tends to pivot on the balance between "spontaneity and structure" – a balance between space for creativity within a structure of goals related to a mission i.e., US power. Therefore, milieu are fostered that encourage creativity and innovation. To some extent, universities provide loose structures for spontaneity – the space for curiosity to be pursued and for unexpected discoveries and insights. Doyle's insights were a spin-off from an unanticipated student event, a Ford-funded scholarly study of international (North-South) economic relations, and the time that grant bought to write up and publish new ideas, an 'accidental' by-product of the space for curiosity to follow its own course. Yet, the 'success' of DPT was in large part dependent on the relatively agile structures composed of the Belfer Center at Harvard and its Ford-funded journal, *International Security* which, at that time, was not a peer reviewed journal and, therefore, better able to set its own agenda.[29] The production and elaboration of DPT in the universities was also predicated on funding from liberal internationalist foundations like Ford and Carnegie, a further unifying factor (Berman, 1983).[30] The status bestowed upon DPT by its 'adoption' by Belfer and *International Security*, as recognised by the Carnegie Corporation, both further elevated the standing of Doyle in the scholarly community but also brought policy-community recognition, adding to his credentials. This suggests that there is a key element of knowledge networks that is social: a social process of ideas' acceptance due to their elitist and therefore respectable provenance, based on credible, i.e., widely accepted theoretical and methodological bases, which gains positive responses from other scholars, policy entrepreneurs (think tanks, foundations, opposition party) and policy-makers (Clinton, Albright, Bush, Obama). Acceptance by policymakers feeds back to scholars and scholar-activists, encouraging them further to continue working on and refining the theory, with the promise that their ideas might be taken seriously and, in turn, scholars stood to gain recognition and prestige through 'knowledge transfer' and also, therefore, further foundation-funding.

Propelled by curiosity in its earliest forms, DPT became *politically viable* and conceptually and instrumentally influential principally because of catalytic events: the sudden cessation of the Cold War and the crisis in foreign policy thinking that ensued provided a permissive environment for 'new' thinking. The theory's refinement and mobilisation led to its adoption in the 1990s by differing tendencies – liberal hawks and neoconservatives - and, most importantly, its *securitisation* – that is, "peace" theory was truncated and transmutated into a vital policy technology to confront external threats from non-democratic/rogue/failing/ and failed states by military and other coercive means. Designating zones of peace simultaneously delineated zones of turmoil, defining the latter as a threat to the former, redrawing intellectual maps (Wilson, 2000: 122). Liberal hawks *and* neocons alike were involved in this transformative process. The latter were joined after another catalytic event - 9-11 - by conservative nationalists who went on to justify the Bush doctrine in part by democratic peace theory. The Iraq War of 2003, and the failure to suppress quickly resistance to the US occupation, created a "crisis" seized upon by the bi-partisan Princeton Project on National Security. PPNS advanced their own version of DPT proposed for use to confront threats to security through democracy promotion and military intervention, among other things. According to Ikenberry and Slaughter (2006: 11; 16), as "the world seems a more menacing place than ever", "it means safeguarding our alliances and promoting security cooperation *among liberal democracies*, ensuring the safety of Americans abroad as well as at home, avoiding the emergence of hostile great powers *or balancing coalitions* against the United States, and *encouraging liberal democracy and responsible government worldwide*." The weight here rests a little more on developing 'liberal' institutions and, perhaps, leaving the 'democracy' till later; sequenced political development, in Mansfield and Snyder's terms. Interestingly, PPNS was led by Clinton's former national security adviser Tony Lake and Reagan's former secretary of state, George Shultz; Francis Fukuyama was a key figure on the Project's steering committee. A liberal hawk, a conservative nationalist and a neoconservative: a perfect example of post-9-11 fusion. Democracy promotion based on democratic peace theory is now effectively a non-issue as both main political parties have adopted it, and the Obama administration is continuing to champion it in Iraq and, indeed, seeking to extend the strategy to Afghanistan and

elsewhere. Obama stridently reiterated his commitment to democracy promotion, the universality of democratic principles, and the greater levels of security, stability and success of democratic states (Obama, 2009b).[31]

The final point to be made is that democratic peace theory is an easy theory to promote in the United States given the deeply-held character of democratic values. It has great symbolic resonance and reaffirms positive ideas about American national identity and as a force for doing good in world affairs. It also serves as an excellent rationalizing device for Establishment forces that wish to promote the consolidation of American power using the cover of promoting democracy and eliminating brutal dictatorships. That is, democratic peace theory exercises symbolic influence, a new legitimating rhetoric for American hegemony.

REFERENCES

Abelson, DE. (2006) *A Capitol Idea.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Allen, M (2009) Promote Democracy? – Yes, we can (and should!) *Democracy Digest* April 14; at http://www.demdigest.net/blog/regions/lac/promote-democracy-yes-we-can-and-should.html (accessed 26 June 2009)

Amara, N., M. Ouimet, and R. Landry (2004) New Evidence on Instrumental, Conceptual, and Symbolic Utilization of University Research in Government Agencies, *Science Communication* 26: 75-106.

Anderson, Lisa (2003) *Pursuing Truth, Exercising Power* New York: Columbia University Press.

Barnett, RJ (1973) *Roots of War* Baltimore: Penguin

Berman, E.H. (1983) *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy* Albany: SUNY Press.

Beyer, J.M. (1997) Research Utilization *Journal of Management Inquiry* 6: 17-22.

Brown, ME, SM Lynn-Jones, and SE Miller (1996), eds., *Debating the Democratic Peace* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Brown, JS (1999) Sustaining the Ecology of Knowledge *Leader to Leader* 12 at http://www.johnseeleybrown.com/Sustaining_the_Ecology_of_Knowledge.pdf (accessed 10 October 2008).

Buckley, Mary and Robert Singh (2006), eds., *The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terrorism* London: Routledge.

Buger, C. and T. Villumsen (2007) Beyond the gap: relevance, fields of practice and the securitizing consequences of (democratic peace) theory, *Journal of International Relations and Development* 10: 417-448

Bulmer, M (1982) *The Uses of Social Research* London: Allen and Unwin

Carnegie Corporation (1945) *Annual Report*

Carnegie Corporation (2007) *Annual Report*

Carothers, Thomas (2008) "A League of their Own," *Foreign Policy* July-August

Clinton, William Jefferson (1994) *State of the Union* http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/P/bc42/speeches/sud94wjc.htm (accessed 12 June 2009)

Coser, Lewis (1965) *Men of Ideas* New York: Free Press.

Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (2009) *Democracy in U.S. Security Strategy* Washington, DC

Daalder, I. and J. Goldeiger (2006) "For global security, expand the alliance," *International Herald Tribune* 12 October 2006

Deudney, Daniel (2007) *Bounding Power Republican Security Theory From the Polis to the Global Village* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Deudney, Daniel (2004) "Publius Before Kant: Federal-Republican Security and Democratic Peace," *European Journal of International Relations* 10: 315-356

Diamond, Larry (1991) *An American Foreign Policy for Democracy* Progressive Policy Institute Policy Report http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=450004&subsecID=900020&contentID=2044 (accessed 16 May 2007)

Dobriansky, Paula and Thomas Carothers (2003) Democracy Promotion *Foreign Affairs* 82: 141-145.

Doyle, Michael W. (1986) Liberalism and World Politics *American Political Science Review* 80: 1151-1169

Doyle, Michael W. (1994) "Liberalism and the Transition to a Post-Cold War System." In *The International System After the Collapse of the East-West Order,* edited by A. Clesse, R. Cooper, and Y. Sakamoto. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff

Doyle, Michael W. (1997) *Ways of War and Peace* New York: WW Norton and Company

Drezner, D. (2008) "The Realists vs. the Neocons," *The National Interest online*, 20 March

Ember, CR M. Ember, and Bruce Russett (1992) Peace Between Participatory Polities *World Politics* 44: 573-599

Fukuyama, Francis (1992) *The End of History and the Last Man* London: Hamish Hamilton

Fukuyama, Francis and Michael McFaul (2007-08) Should Democracy Be Promoted or Demoted? *The Washington Quarterly* 31: 1-24.

George, AL. and A. Bennett (2005), *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* Cambridge: MIT Press

Goldman, EO and L. Berman (2000) “Engaging the World,” in C. Campbell and BA Rockman, eds., *The Clinton Legacy* New York: Chatham House

Goldstein and Keohane introductory essay, “Ideas and Foreign Policy,” in Goldstein and Keohane, pp.3-12.

Halper, Stefan and Jonathan Clarke (2004) *America Alone* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Halperin, M.H. and Kristen Lomasney (1993) Toward a Global ‘Guarantee Clause’ *Journal of Democracy* 4: 60-64;

Halperin, M.H. and Kristen Lomasney (1998) Guaranteeing Democracy *Journal of Democracy* 9: 134-147

Hames, T (1994) “Searching for the New World Order: The Clinton Administration and Foreign Policy in 1993,” *International Relations* 12: 109-127

Hayes, J. (2009) Identity and Securitization in the Democratic Peace International Studies Quarterly 53:977-100

Hill, Christopher (1994a), Preface, *Two Worlds of International Relations* London: Routledge.

Hill, Christopher (1994b) “Academic International Relations,” in C. Hill and P. Beshoff, eds., *Two Worlds of International Relations* London: Routledge.

Hoare, Q and G. Nowell-Smith (1971) *Selections From the Prison Writings of Antonio Gramsci* London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hyland, W.G. (1999) *Clinton’s World* Westport, CT: Praeger

Ikenberry, G. John (1993) “Creating Yesterday’s New World Order.” In *Ideas and Foreign Policy*, edited by J. Goldstein and R. Keohane, pp.57-86. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Ikenberry, G. John and Anne-Marie Slaughter (2006), *Forging a World of Liberty Under Law* Princeton: Woordrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

Ish-Shalom, Piki (2009) Therizing Politics, Politicizing Theory, and the Responsibility That Runs Between *Perspectives on Politics* 7:303-316

Ish-Shalom, Piki (2008) Theorization, Harm, and the Democratic Imperative *International Studies Review* 10: 680-692.

Jenkins, J. Craig and Craig M. Eckert (1989), The corporate elite, the new conservative policy network, and Reaganomics *Critical Sociology* 16: 121-144

Jentleson, B.W. (2000) "In Pursuit of Praxis." In *Being Useful* edited by M. Nincic and J. Lepgold, pp.129-149. AnnArbor: University of Michigan Press

Kagan, Robert (2007) End of Dreams, Return of History *Policy Review* 144: 17-45.

Kristol, W. and R. Kagan (1996) Towards a Neo-Reaganite Foreign Policy *Foreign Affairs* 75: 18-33

Kruzel, Joseph (1994) More a Chasm than a Gap *Mershon International Studies Review* 38: 179-181.

Lake, Anthony (1993) Remarks of Anthony Lake September 21 1993 at http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/lakedoc.html (accessed 12 June 2009)

Lepgold, Joseph and Miroslav Nincic (2001) *Beyond the Ivory Tower* New York: Columbia University Press

Levy, Jack S. (1988) Domestic Politics and War *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18: 653-673

Lynch, Tim (2009) Liberalism and Neoliberalism in Inderjeet Parmar, Linda Miller, and Mark Ledwidge, eds., New Directions in American Foreign Policy London: Routledge; pp.48-61

Maliniak, D. et al (2007) "The View from the Ivory Tower,"; at http://www.wm.edu/irtheoryandpractice/trip/surveyreport06-07.pdf

Mansfield, E.D. and J. Snyder (1995) Democratization and the Danger of War *International Security* 20: 5-38

Mansfield, E.D. and J. Snyder (2000) *From Voting to Violence* New York: WW Norton

Mansfield, E.D. and J. Snyder (2005) *Electing To Fight. Why Emerging Democracies Go To War* Cambridge: MIT Press

Mansfield, E.D. and J. Snyder (2007) "The Sequencing 'Fallacy'" *Journal of Democracy* 18 3:5-9

Marshall, W. (2009) "Taking NATO Global," January 15; http://www.ppionline.org (accessed June 8 2009)

McMahon, R. (2009) The Brave New World of Democracy Promotion *Foreign Service Journal* January: 31-39

Miller, S.E. (2001) *International Security* at Twenty-five *International Security* 26: 5-39.

NATO (2010) *NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement* (http://www.nato.int/strategic-concept/expertsreport.pdf)

Obama, Barack (2009a) *Pan American Day and Pan American Week* Press Release 14 April

Obama, Barack (2009b) "Text of Obama's speech in Cairo," June 4 The Associated Press

Oneal, JR and Bruce Russett (1999) The Kantian Peace *World Politics* 52: 1-37

Owen IV, John M. (2005) Iraq and the Democratic Peace *Foreign Affairs* 84: 122-127

Parmar, I. (2002b) 'To Relate Knowledge and Action': the Impact of the Rockefeller Foundation on Foreign Policy Thinking During America's Rise to Globalism 1939-1945, *Minerva* XL:235-263.

Parmar, I. (2004) *Think Tanks and Power in Foreign Policy* Basingstoke: Palgrave

Parmar, I. (2005) Catalytic events, think tanks and American foreign policy shifts: A comparative analysis of the impacts of Pearl Harbor 1941 and 11 September 2001, *Government and Opposition* 40:1-25.

Parmar, I. (2009) Foreign policy fusion: Liberal interventionists, conservative nationalists and neoconservatives – the new alliance dominating the US foreign policy establishment, *International Politics* 46:177-209.

Peschek, Joseph G. (1989) " 'Free the Fortune 500': The American Enterprise Institute and the Politics of the Capitalist Class in the 1970s," *Critical Sociology* 16 2/3: 165-181.

Ray, JL (1997) The Democratic Path to Peace *Journal of Democracy* 8: 49-64

Russett, Bruce (2005) Bushwhacking the Democratic Peace *International Studies Perspectives* 6:395-408

Schweller, Randall L. (1992) Domestic Structure and Preventive War *World Politics* 44: 235-269

Smith, Tony (2007) *A Pact With the Devil* New York: Routledge

Talbott, Strobe (1995) "Why NATO Should Grow," *The New York Review of Books*: 42 August 10

Talbott, Strobe (1996) "Democracy and the national interest," *Foreign Affairs* 75: 47-64.

Wilson III, E.J. (2000) "How Social Science Can Help Policymakers." In *Being Useful*, edited by M. Nincic and J. Lepgold, pp.109-128. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press

Wolfson, A. (2004) Conservatives and neoconservatives *Public Interest*: 32-49.

Zahran, G and L. Ramos (2010) **"**From Hegemony to Soft Power." In *Soft Power and US Foreign Affairs*, edited by Inderjeet Parmar and Michael Cox. London: Routledge.

---

[1] The roles of networked organic intellectuals are objectively and (normally) subjectively conditioned by the importance and influence of state imperatives. Hence, Ish-Shalom's (2008) thesis suggesting separation of 'scientific' theoreticians and unreflective ideologues, and opportunist politicians/policymakers gives insufficient weight to the idea that these are interlocked knowledge systems behind a common national mission.

[2] Statement by a Rockefeller Foundation official; cited in Parmar (2002b). For right-wing network power, see Jenkins and Eckert (1989).

[3] *Critical Sociology* 16 2/3 (1989).

[4] As Richard N. Haass, George W. Bush's former director of Policy Planning, argued: "Democracy promotion efforts are based on the most hard-headed of calculations…"; see "Planning Policy in Today's World," 22 May 2003; at http://www.state.gov/s/p/rem/2003/20910.htm (accessed 5 December 2008).

[5] In a personal communication with the author, Michael Doyle characterized such uses of DPT as "transmogrification".

[6] Quotation from Levy (1988), part financed by a Carnegie grant.

[7] Doyle, "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12 (4) 1983; in Ford Foundation records, see letter, Doyle to Laurice H. Sarraf (Grants administrator, International Affairs Programs, Ford Foundation) 20 July 1983; in PA795-677, Reel 3751.

[8] Grant number 07990618; Reels 3038; 5376-78; Ford Foundation archives, New York.

[9] Michael Doyle and Miles Kahler, "North and South in the International Economy," in PA 795-677; reel 3751.

[10] Doyle, *Ways of War and Peace* (1997), acknowledges support of a SSRC/MacArthur Foundation Fellowship, and of Harvard's Belfer Center, noting MacArthur's conscious plan to develop ideas challenging Cold War realist thinking; Doyle, private communication with the author; undated but ca. May 2009.

[11] See http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/project/58/quarterly_journal.html?page_id=146&parent_id=46 (accessed 20 August 2008).

[12] See "Acknowledgements" page.

[13] The original idea came from McGeorge Bundy, Ford Foundation president, and former national security adviser to presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Ford's endowment to Harvard's Center grew to $6 million in 1979; see http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu.

[14] Graham Allison, "Message from the Director," at http://belfer.ksg.harvard.edu/about/welcome.html.

[15] Goldman and Berman (2000: 236) argue that Clinton dropped "democratic enlargement" and retained "engagement" due to "a set of academic arguments that democratization was often a conflict-prone process".

[16] In footnote 2, Talbott cites academics on democratic peace, including John Ikenberry, David Lake, and Christopher Layne.

[17] *The New Orleans Declaration*, p.1; at http://www.dlc.org; accessed 16 May 2008.

[18] Clinton's words appear to have been lifted from Diamond's report: "Democracies don't go to war with each other… Democracies don't sponsor terrorist acts against each other. They are more likely to be reliable trading partners, protect the global environment, and abide by international law"; speech, "A New Covenant for American Security," Georgetown University 12 December 1991; at http://www.ndol.org; accessed 25 April 2008.

[19] Lake quoted in Buger and Villumsen, p.435.
[20] Strobe Talbott, "The new geopolitics," US Department of State Dispatch, 14 November 1994.
[21] Larry Diamond, *Promoting Democracy in the 1990s*, December 1995; at http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/di.htm; accessed 16 May 2008.
[22] Council for the Community of Democracies: CCD: The First Five Years 2001-2005; www.ccd21.org (accessed 15 August 2008).
[23] Remarks of Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, Harold H. Koh, at the Woodrow Wilson Center and the CCD Conference on The Community of Democracies meeting in Warsaw, Poland," 2 May 2000; www.ccd21.org/articles/wwc-502.htm (accessed 15 August 2008).
[24] Remarks of Paula Dobriansky at WWC and CCD Conference, 2 May 2000; www.ccd21.org/articles/wwc-502.htm (accessed 15 August 2008). Dobriansky was Under-Secretary of State for Democracy & Global Affairs from 2001.
[25] Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History," *The National Interest Summer* 1989; http://www.wesjones.com/eoh.htm; accessed May 2008.
[26] Condoleeza Rice, "The Promise of Democratic Peace," Washingtonpost.com, 11 December 2005; at http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/12/09/AR2005120901711.html.
[27] "Remarks by John McCain to the Los Angeles World Affairs Council," 26 March 2008; at http://www.johnmccain.com/Informing/News/Speeches/872473dd-9ccb-4ab4-9d0d-ec54f0e7a497.htm; accessed 10 October 2008.
[28] A. Clesse, R. Cooper and Y. Sakamoto, *The International System After the Collapse of the East-West Order* (Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1994), p.50. Interestingly, Michael Doyle, in Clesse, cites Streit as the first to note the pacific character of democracies and need for unity.
[29] L. Martin and C. Goodwin, *A Report to the Ford Foundation on the Center for Science and International Affairs*; 30 July 1980; in PA73-2004, 009254; Ford Foundation archives; New York.
[30] The big foundations like Ford, Carnegie and Rockefeller, constitute key elements of a liberal establishment, recognized on both the left and right of the political-ideological spectrum.
[31] A CSIS survey of senior policymakers and analysts, including Brent Scowcroft, Richard Armitage, Joseph Nye, Strobe Talbott, and Anne-Marie Slaughter, shows a continuing attachment to the strategic importance of democracy promotion and its theoretical basis, "democratic peace theory" (CSIS, 2009:10-12).