

This article has extended research on the democratic peace to the analysis of internal security cooperation in order to serve a double purpose. First, the study of internal security cooperation yields additional data that may help to specify the mechanisms at work when democratic states cooperate on security issues. Second, the incorporation of internal security into the larger research program on the democratic peace helps to highlight characteristic features of international cooperation on internal security. I will conclude with examining each contribution in turn.

As the development of extradition politics among the Western European democracies illustrates, liberal democracies not only refrain from waging war against each other but also pursue active policies to contribute to each other's security. This finding can be added to a long list of further observable implications of the original democratic peace thesis, affirming the importance of regime type to state behavior and international politics. At the same time, however, conflicts between the USA and the EU have highlighted the importance of differences among democracies. Though both are liberal democracies that attribute great importance to the protection of individual rights, the EU member-states, on the one hand, and the USA, on the other hand, subscribe to *different sets* of individual rights (e.g. as regards capital punishment), which severely inhibits effective cooperation between them.

These differences have, of course, not been reflected in most of the democratic peace research that has focused on issues of external security. The more the focus is shifted towards issues of internal security (or the more the line between internal and external security is blurred), the more important different sets of individual rights are likely to become for the analysis of security politics – the dispute over the establishment of the International Criminal Court is just another case in point. Though the difference between democracies and non-democracies may still carry the better part of the explanatory burden in security politics, differences between various types of democracies may acquire more importance. In this regard, research on internal security cooperation may indicate a possible future development of democratic peace research.

The analysis of extradition politics has contributed to our understanding of the mechanisms linking regime type and security policy. The high level of responsiveness of democratic leaders to public demands has had ambivalent effects on democracies' extradition policies. As survey data have illustrated, democratic leaders are expected to enhance internal security, if necessary by cooperating internationally, and at the same time to keep competencies for justice at the national level. An enhanced awareness of external threats after 11 September 2001 seems to have tipped the balance towards security considerations. The high level of responsiveness to public demands in democratic states can be regarded as an important source of democracies' proactive policies on internal security after the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington. A shared liberal political culture based on the rule of law and the respect of individual rights has proved to be equally important. The 'zone of law' that exists among the Western European democracies has enabled them to negotiate effective extradition regimes, including a European arrest warrant. The importance of a shared liberal political culture is underlined by the numerous references to the high level of mutual trust that can be found in European Commission proposals, European Parliament resolutions, and

European Union law. Finally, the institutional constraints characteristic of democratic states turned out to have an inhibiting effect whenever standards of individual rights were in danger of being undermined by international commitments. Taken together, high responsiveness, political culture, and institutional constraints have not been mutually reinforcing. By contrast, the interplay of the mechanisms are better characterized as an antinomy (Müller, 2002a): democratic leaders have had to cope with contradicting expectations to enhance internal security without undermining national democratic control over individual rights.

The democratic peace perspective has also helped to highlight important features of extradition politics (or internal security cooperation more broadly). To be sure, one can hardly account for the development of extradition politics without reference to growing levels of interdependence. Particularly among the member-states of the EU, the free movement of people and the abolition of border controls have been strong incentives for international cooperation in internal security politics. Thus, interdependence may be regarded as the most important factor in extradition politics. Notwithstanding the pivotal role of interdependence, however, the democratic peace perspective adds to our understanding of the mechanisms at play. Indeed, it is hardly possible to understand the introduction of the principle of mutual recognition and the arrest warrant (as well as the public's acceptance of these measures) without reference to the high level of mutual trust that has evolved among the Western European democracies. Moreover, only the democratic peace perspective can account for the fact that liberal democracies refuse to negotiate effective extradition agreements with countries with which a large number of requests for extradition exist (e.g. Turkey), whereas other countries with which only little interdependence in criminal matters exists have been a party to very efficient extradition regimes. As pointed out above, however, the single case study of extradition politics in Europe does not allow for any test of the explanatory value of 'democracy' against other possible explanations (e.g. interdependence). As an explorative study, it may demonstrate, however, that a further analysis of internal security cooperation from a democratic peace perspective is warranted and promising. Given that the security agenda after 11 September 2001 will further blur the differences between external and internal security, there will be no shortage of cases to be studied.