

CONTENTS

Uses and Abuses of Political Concepts **x**

| | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| What is a concept? | xi |
| Normative and descriptive concepts | xi |
| Contested concepts | xii |
| Words and things | xiii |

Key Concepts: Their Meaning and Significance **1**

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|----------------------------|----|
| Absolutism | 1 | Collectivism | 26 |
| Accountability | 2 | Collectivization | 27 |
| Anarchism | 2 | Committee | 28 |
| Anarchy | 4 | Communism | 28 |
| Animal rights | 5 | Communitarianism | 30 |
| Anti-politics | 6 | Community | 32 |
| Arms race | 7 | Conflict of civilizations | 32 |
| Authoritarianism | 8 | Confucianism | 33 |
| Authority | 9 | Consensus | 34 |
| Autonomy | 10 | Consent | 35 |
| Balance of power | 11 | Conservatism | 36 |
| Behaviouralism | 12 | Consociationalism | 37 |
| Bicameralism | 13 | Constitution | 38 |
| Bill of rights | 14 | Constitutionalism | 40 |
| Bureaucracy | 15 | Constructivism | 41 |
| Cabinet | 16 | Consumerism | 42 |
| Capitalism | 17 | Corporatism | 43 |
| Centralization/decentralization | 18 | Cosmopolitanism | 44 |
| Checks and balances | 20 | Crimes against humanity | 45 |
| Christian democracy | 20 | Critical theory | 46 |
| Citizenship | 21 | Cross-generational justice | 48 |
| Civil disobedience | 22 | Democracy | 48 |
| Civil liberty | 23 | Democratic peace | 50 |
| Civil society | 24 | Democratization | 51 |
| Coalition | 24 | Deterrence | 52 |
| Collective security | 25 | Development | 53 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-----|-------------------------------|-----|
| Devolution | 54 | International organization | 105 |
| Dialectic | 55 | International relations | 106 |
| Dictatorship | 56 | International society | 107 |
| Diplomacy | 57 | Internationalism | 108 |
| Discourse | 58 | Islamism | 109 |
| Ecologism | 59 | <i>Jihad</i> | 111 |
| Election | 60 | Judiciary | 111 |
| Elitism | 62 | Just war | 113 |
| Empiricism | 63 | Justice | 114 |
| Equality | 64 | Laissez faire | 115 |
| Executive | 65 | Law | 116 |
| Failed state | 67 | Leadership | 117 |
| Fascism | 68 | Left/Right | 119 |
| Federalism | 69 | Legitimacy | 120 |
| Feminism | 72 | Liberal democracy | 121 |
| Free trade | 73 | Liberalism | 123 |
| Freedom | 74 | Libertarianism | 125 |
| Functionalism | 76 | Local government | 125 |
| Game theory | 77 | Mandate | 127 |
| Gender | 78 | Market | 127 |
| Geopolitics | 79 | Marxism | 128 |
| Global civil society | 79 | Mass media | 130 |
| Global governance | 80 | Meritocracy | 131 |
| Global justice | 81 | Militarism | 132 |
| Globalization | 82 | Minority rights | 133 |
| Governance | 84 | Monarchy | 134 |
| Government | 85 | Multiculturalism | 135 |
| Great power | 86 | Multilateralism | 136 |
| Hard/soft power | 87 | Multi-level governance | 137 |
| Hegemony | 88 | Nation | 138 |
| Historical materialism | 89 | Nation-state | 139 |
| Human development | 90 | Nationalism | 140 |
| Human nature | 91 | Nazism | 142 |
| Human rights | 92 | Neoliberalism | 143 |
| Humanitarian intervention | 93 | Neutrality | 144 |
| Idealism | 94 | Non-governmental organization | 145 |
| Identity politics | 95 | Obligation | 146 |
| Ideology | 96 | Opposition | 147 |
| Imperialism | 97 | Order | 148 |
| Individualism | 98 | Pacifism | 149 |
| Institutionalism | 100 | Paradigm | 150 |
| Interdependence | 101 | Parliament | 150 |
| Intergovernmentalism | 102 | Parliamentary government | 152 |
| International aid | 103 | Patriarchy | 153 |
| International law | 104 | Patriotism | 154 |

| | | | |
|---|-----|---------------------------|-----|
| Peace-building | 155 | Representation | 194 |
| Pluralism | 156 | Republicanism | 195 |
| Polarity | 157 | Responsibility | 196 |
| Policy | 158 | Revolution | 197 |
| Political culture | 159 | Rights | 199 |
| Political economy | 161 | Rule of law | 200 |
| Political party | 162 | Security | 201 |
| Political philosophy | 163 | Security dilemma | 202 |
| Political science | 165 | Separation of powers | 203 |
| Political theory | 166 | Social class | 204 |
| Politics | 168 | Social democracy | 205 |
| Populism | 169 | Social justice | 207 |
| Positivism | 170 | Social movement | 207 |
| Postcolonialism | 170 | Socialism | 209 |
| Postmodernism | 171 | Sovereignty | 210 |
| Power | 172 | State | 212 |
| Pragmatism | 174 | Subsidiarity | 214 |
| President | 174 | Superpower | 215 |
| Presidential government | 176 | Supranationalism | 215 |
| Pressure group | 177 | Sustainable development | 216 |
| Prime minister | 179 | Systems theory | 217 |
| Property | 180 | Terrorism | 218 |
| Proportional representation | 182 | Third Way | 220 |
| Punishment | 183 | Toleration | 221 |
| Race/ethnicity | 184 | Toryism | 222 |
| Racialism/racism | 185 | Totalitarianism | 223 |
| Rational choice | 186 | Tradition | 224 |
| Rationalism | 187 | Transnational corporation | 225 |
| Realism | 188 | Transnationalism | 226 |
| Referendum | 189 | Utilitarianism | 227 |
| Reform | 190 | Utopianism | 228 |
| Regionalism | 191 | War | 229 |
| Religious fundamentalism | 192 | Welfare | 231 |
| <i>List of Figures</i> | | | 233 |
| <i>Glossary of Key Political Thinkers</i> | | | 234 |
| <i>Bibliography</i> | | | 240 |
| <i>Index</i> | | | 247 |

KEY CONCEPTS: THEIR MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE

ABSOLUTISM

Absolutism is the theory or practice of absolute **government**. Government is 'absolute' in the sense that it possesses unfettered **power**: government cannot be constrained by a body external to itself. The most prominent manifestation of absolute government is the absolute **monarchy**. However, there is no necessary connection between monarchy and absolute government. Unfettered power can be placed in the hands of the monarch, but it can also be vested in a collective body such as the supreme legislature. Absolutism nevertheless differs from modern versions of **dictatorship**, notably **totalitarianism**. Whereas absolutist regimes aspire to a monopoly of political power, usually achieved by excluding the masses from **politics**, totalitarianism involves the establishment of 'total power' through the politicization of every aspect of social and personal existence. Absolutism thus differs significantly from, for example, **fascism**.

Significance

Absolutism was the dominant political form in Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was usually linked to the claim that **sovereignty**, representing unchallengeable and indivisible legal **authority**, resided in the monarchy. Absolutist rule was justified by both rationalist and theological theories. Rationalist theories of absolutism, such as those of Jean Bodin (1530–96) and Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), advanced the belief that only absolute government can guarantee **order** and social stability. Divided sovereignty or challengeable power is therefore a recipe for chaos and disorder. Theological theories of absolutism were based on the doctrine of divine right, according to which the absolute control a monarch exercises over his or her subjects derives from, and is analogous to, the power of God over His creation.

However, absolutist theories are now widely regarded as politically redundant and ideologically objectionable. They are politically redundant because the advance of **constitutionalism** and **representation** has fragmented power and resulted in a strengthening of checks and balances, and because, where dictatorship has survived, it has assumed a quite different political character. It is ideologically objectionable because absolutism serves as a cloak for tyranny and arbitrary government, and is, by definition, irreconcilable with ideas such as individual **rights** and democratic accountability. Nevertheless, a form of constitutional absolutism can be seen to survive in political systems based on respect for the principle of parliamentary sovereignty.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Accountability means answerability; it implies a duty to explain one's conduct and be open to criticism by another. Accountability requires that the duties, powers and functions of government bodies are defined in such a way that the performance of subordinate ones can be monitored and evaluated by 'higher' bodies. In this sense, **accountability** can operate only in a context of **constitutionalism**; being accountable does not mean being subject to arbitrary **authority** or capricious **punishment**. However, accountability may also amount to a weak form of **responsibility**, since it establishes a duty to answer and explain one's conduct, but not necessarily to bear guilt and accept punishment.

Significance

Accountability is an important feature of limited **government**, effective policy-making and **democracy**. It limits government **power** by establishing mechanisms of political control through which one institution oversees the working and performance of another. It can promote the quality of public **policy** by ensuring that policy proposals are carefully scrutinized and political performance is rigorously monitored. When this is achieved through regular and competitive elections, it amounts to a system of public control, public accountability being the practical face of democratic rule. However, accountability is effective only under certain circumstances. These include that the mechanisms for monitoring performance are rigorous; that 'higher' institutions or bodies have sufficient access to information to make critical and informed judgements; and that appropriate sanctions can be applied in the event of blunders or under-performance. The main drawback of accountability is that it may constrain independent judgement and action. For example, the accountability of civil servants to ministers can lead to politicization and allow bureaucratic power to be harnessed to the needs of the government of the day.

ANARCHISM

Anarchism is an **ideology** that is defined by the central belief that political **authority** in all its forms, and especially in the form of the **state**, is both evil and unnecessary (**anarchy** literally means 'without rule'). Anarchists believe that the state is evil because, as a repository of sovereign, compulsory and coercive authority, it is an offence against the principles of **freedom** and **equality**, the core value of anarchism being unrestricted personal **autonomy**. The state and the accompanying institutions **government** and **law** are therefore rejected as corrupt and corrupting. However, the belief that the state is unnecessary is no less important to anarchism. Anarchists reject 'political' **order** but have considerable faith in 'natural' order and spontaneous social harmony, ultimately underpinned by optimistic assumptions about **human nature**. Government, in other words, is not the solution to the problem of order, but its cause.

Nevertheless, the anarchist preference for a stateless society in which free individuals manage their own affairs through voluntary agreement and cooperation has been developed on the basis of two rival traditions: socialist **communitarianism** and liberal **individualism**. Anarchism can thus be thought of as a point of intersection between **socialism** and **liberalism**, the point at which each ideology generates anti-statist conclusions. Anarchism has therefore been thought of as a combination of ‘ultra-socialism’ and ‘ultra-liberalism’, taking the form, respectively, of collectivist anarchism and individualist anarchism. *Collectivist anarchism* (sometimes called ‘classical’ anarchism or ‘social’ anarchism) is rooted in the idea of social solidarity, or what Pyotr Kropotkin (1842–1921) called ‘mutual aid’, the belief that the natural and proper relationship among people is one of sympathy, affection and harmony. Collectivist anarchists have typically stressed the importance of social equality and common ownership, supporting Pierre-Joseph Proudhon’s (1809–65) famous assertion that ‘Property is theft’, most radically expressed in the form of anarcho-communism. *Individualist anarchism* is based on the idea of the sovereign individual, the belief that individual conscience and the pursuit of self-interest should not be constrained by any collective body or public authority. Individualist anarchism overlaps with **libertarianism** and is usually linked to a strong belief in the **market** as a self-regulating mechanism, most obviously manifest in the form of anarcho-capitalism.

Significance

Anarchism is unusual among political ideologies in that it has never succeeded in winning **power**, at least at a national level. As no society or **nation** has been remodelled according to anarchist principles, it is tempting to regard anarchism as an ideology of lesser significance. As a political movement, anarchism has suffered from three major drawbacks. First, its goal, the overthrow of the state and all forms of political authority, is often considered to be simply unrealistic. The most common criticism of anarchism is that it is an example of **utopianism** in its negative sense, in that it places excessive faith in ‘human goodness’ or in the capacity of social institutions, such as the market or social ownership, to maintain order and stability. Second, in viewing government as corrupt and corrupting, anarchists have rejected the conventional means of political activism, such as forming **political parties**, standing for **election** and seeking public office, and have relied instead on the willingness and capacity of the masses to engage in spontaneous rebellion. Third, anarchism does not constitute a single, coherent set of political ideas: apart from anti-statism, anarchists disagree profoundly about the nature of an anarchic society and particularly about property rights and economic organisation.

However, the significance of anarchism is perhaps less that it has provided an ideological basis for acquiring and retaining political power, and more that it has challenged, and thereby fertilized, other political creeds. Anarchists have highlighted the coercive and destructive nature of political power, and in so doing have countered statist tendencies within other ideologies, notably liberalism, socialism and **conservatism**. In this sense, anarchism has had growing influence on modern political thought. Both the New Left and New Right, for instance, have exhibited

libertarian tendencies, which bear the imprint of anarchist thinking. Indeed, the continuing importance of anarchism is perhaps merely concealed by its increasingly diverse character. In addition to, and in some ways in place of, established political and class struggles, anarchists address issues that range from ecology, transport and urban development to sexual relations, and they have been in the forefront in the campaign against neoliberal or 'corporate' **globalization**. To argue that anarchism is irrelevant because it has long since lost the potential to become a mass movement perhaps misses the point. As the world becomes increasingly complex and fragmented, it may be that it is mass **politics** itself that is dead.

ANARCHY

Anarchy literally means 'without rule', the absence of a supreme or sovereign **power**. In domestic politics, anarchy suggests there is no authority higher than the individual (or, possibly, the group). In international politics, anarchy suggests there is no authority higher than the **nation-state**. The term nevertheless generally carries heavily pejorative connotations, implying chaos, disorder and, not uncommonly, violence. In sharp contrast, within **anarchism**, anarchy is not only viewed as compatible with order, but it is taken to be the very foundation of stable and peaceful existence.

Significance

The concept of anarchy has played an important role in both mainstream **political theory** and **international relations** theory. In the former, it has been used to establish the legitimacy of the state and provide a basis for political **obligation**. Social-contract theorists, dating back to Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) and John Locke (1632–1704), have argued that citizens should behave as though the state had arisen out of a voluntary agreement, or social contract, made by individuals who recognized that only the establishment of a sovereign power could safeguard them from the insecurity, disorder and brutality of the 'state of nature' (a stateless or anarchic society). Without a state, individuals abuse, exploit and enslave one another; but with a state, order and civilized existence are guaranteed and liberty is protected. The obligation to obey and respect the state thus arises, ultimately, from self-interest and the awareness that anarchy would degenerate into a 'civil war of each against all' (Hobbes).

In a tradition that can be traced back to Thucydides (c. 460–406 BCE), such thinking about the link between anarchy and disorder has been applied to relations between societies and not merely within societies, becoming a major component of international relations theory through the influence of **realism**. It nevertheless gained greater prominence from the 1970s onwards through the rise of neorealism or 'structural realism'. Neorealists shifted their attention from the state to the international system, and placed primary emphasis on the implications of anarchy. The characteristics of international life were thus taken to stem from the fact that states (and other actors) operate within a domain that has no formal central authority. Neorealists argue that international anarchy necessarily tends towards tension,

conflict and the unavoidable possibility of war, for two main reasons. In the first place, as states are separate, autonomous and formally equal political units, they must ultimately rely on their own resources to realize their interest. International anarchy therefore results in a system of 'self-help', because states cannot rely on anyone else to 'take care of them'. Second, relationships between states are characterized by uncertainty and suspicion. This is best explained through the **security dilemma**. Uncertainty about motives therefore forces states to treat all other states as enemies, meaning that permanent insecurity is the inescapable consequence of living in conditions of anarchy.

ANIMAL RIGHTS

Animal rights are rights to which all animals, or certain categories of animals, are entitled. The idea underpinning animal rights is that the grounds for allocating rights to humans also applies to some or all non-human animals, and to deny rights to the latter amounts to 'speciesism', an arbitrary and irrational prejudice, akin to **racism** or sexism. As such, animal rights differ from 'special' rights, such as women's rights and **minority rights**, which belong only to a specific group, and are based on the particular needs and interests of that group. A distinction should nevertheless be drawn between the notion of animal welfare and the more radical idea of animal rights. Animal welfare reflects an altruistic concern for the well-being of other species, but does not necessarily place them on the same level as humans. To view all or some animals as rights-holders endows them with a moral status in their own right, and so goes beyond the desire to treat animals with dignity and respect, which stems from human moral sensibilities, notably compassion. The latter position may, at times, be compatible with killing and eating animals, or holding them captive, actions that would clearly be ruled out by the former position.

Significance

The notion of animal rights surfaced in the early 1960s, alongside burgeoning interest in 'green' or environment issues. It gained particular prominence through the growth of the animal liberation movement (sometimes called the animal rights movement), which embraces a form of deep **ecologism** that extols the virtues of 'bio-equality' and rejects any form of anthropocentrism (human-centredness). The case for animal rights was put forward by Tom Regan (2004). In his view, all creatures that are 'the subject of a life' qualify for rights. This implies that, as the right to life is the most fundamental of rights, the killing of an animal, however painless, is as morally indefensible as the killing of a human being. Regan acknowledges, however, that in some cases rights are invested in human beings on very different grounds, notably that they, unlike animals, are capable of rational thought and moral judgement. Rights such as freedom of speech and freedom of worship, as well as the right to education or to political participation, would thus seem bizarre if they were invested in animals. Others nevertheless point out that, as we learn more about the capacity of higher primates in particular to reason

and use language, the moral distinction between humans and animals becomes blurred.

Critics of animal rights tend to adopt one of two lines of attack. This first is that once we allow that the doctrine of rights can jump the species barrier, it is difficult to see how it can subsequently be confined. If the distinction between humans and animals is called into question, how adequate are the distinctions between mammals and fish, and between animals and trees and plants? Apart from anything else, if living is a sufficient basis for having, at a minimum, a right to life, it is difficult to see how the human species could long survive, or how rights could be denied to viruses and bacteria, say. The second line of attack is that, as human constructs, rights have been devised specifically to address predicaments that confront humans as morally self-conscious creatures, something that does not apply in the case of other species, despite the capacity they may possess to think and communicate. How meaningful is it, for example, to treat animals as rights holders when they are unaware that they possess such rights, have no ability to demand their rights, and cannot, in any reasonable sense, be expected to fulfil the duties that their rights may entail?

ANTI-POLITICS

Anti-politics refers to a rejection of, and/or alienation from, conventional politicians and political processes, especially mainstream political parties and established representative mechanisms. One aspect of anti-politics is a decline in civic engagement, as citizens turn away from **politics** and retreat into private existence. This is reflected most clearly in a fall in voter turnout and a decline in levels of both party membership and party activism, suggesting that political parties are failing in their traditional role as agents of popular mobilization and political participation. However, anti-politics does not only reflect a breakdown in trust between the public and the political elite; it has also spawned new forms of politics, which, in various ways, articulate resentment or hostility towards political structures and seek to offer more 'authentic' alternatives. These include 'fringe' parties, whose attraction is linked to their image as political 'outsiders' untainted by the exercise of power, and protest movements that embrace an activist-based style of politics, part of whose appeal is that they appear to resist compromise.

Significance

The rise of anti-politics is often seen as part of a malaise from which many, if not most, mature democracies have come to suffer. Evidence of this malaise can be found in a trend of declining political participation, particularly since the 1970s, in countries such as Canada and Japan, across much of Western Europe, and in parts of Latin America. The other manifestation of anti-politics is the emergence of populist leaders, movements and parties ('anti-party' parties) in many parts of the world, particularly since the early 2000s. However, even if anti-politics is taken to be a meaningful phenomenon in its own right, it is less clear why this is happening. Possible explanations or contributory factors include:

- The narrowing of the ideological divide between parties, meaning that modern politicians appear to lack vision and moral purpose, all of them looking the same and sounding the same.
- The tendency of the media to breed a climate of cynicism by ‘hying’ political events (all ‘problems’ become ‘crises’), in their attempt to make the coverage of politics ‘sexy’ and attention-grabbing.
- The flaw in electoral democracy that forces politicians to promise more in the campaign than they can deliver in office, thus ensuring inevitable dissatisfaction among voters.
- The fact that complex, modern societies are increasingly difficult to govern because of, among other things, the expanding power of corporate and other vested interests and an increasingly globalized economy.
- The emergence of a distinct political class whose members have little experience outside politics and so appear to be unable to relate to ordinary people.

ARMS RACE

An arms race is a concerted military build-up that occurs as two or more states acquire weapons or increase their military capacity in response to each other. Classic examples include the UK–German arms race that preceded World War I, and the US–Soviet nuclear arms race during the Cold War. Arms races may be fuelled by defensive calculations or miscalculations (the **security dilemma**), or they may occur as one or more states seek military advantage in order to pursue offensive policies. Arms races often take place in a context of technological innovation, as new or more sophisticated weapons or weapons systems become available. However, arms races are seldom ‘pure’, or seldom remain ‘pure’ for very long, in the sense that they are driven by an essentially military or technological dynamic, as they invariably become entangled with institutional, political, ideological and other factors.

Significance

The central debate about the significance of arms races concerns their relationship to **war**. While arms races may increase the likelihood of war, by heightening fear and paranoia, and strengthening **militarism** and aggressive **nationalism**, they may also help to maintain an overall **balance of power** and so to ensure **deterrence**. The spread of nuclear weapons during the Cold War period, either by their acquisition by more states or other actors (*horizontal* proliferation), or their accumulation by established nuclear states (*vertical* proliferation), is often used as an example of how arms races can promote peace and stability. Not only did the vertical proliferation of nuclear arms tend to preserve the balance of power, albeit through a ‘balance of terror’, but the technological innovations that enabled such devastating weapons to be developed also made them, in effect, ‘unusable’. However, there was no guarantee that nuclear proliferation would preserve the Cold War balance of power, and the possibility that a temporary nuclear imbalance could have been exploited by an

aggressive state could not have been ruled out. It is also possible that the dynamics usually associated with an arms race do not apply in the case of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

AUTHORITARIANISM

Authoritarianism is a belief in, or the practice of, **government** 'from above', in which political rule is imposed on society regardless of its **consent**. Authoritarianism thus differs from **authority**. The latter rests on **legitimacy**, and in that sense arises 'from below'. Authoritarianism is a very broad classification of government. It can be associated with monarchical **absolutism**, traditional **dictatorships** and most forms of military rule; and left-wing and right-wing versions of authoritarianism can be identified, associated, respectively, with **communism** and **capitalism**. However, authoritarianism is usually distinguished from **totalitarianism**, on the grounds that it is primarily concerned with the repression of opposition and political liberty, rather than with the more radical goal of obliterating the distinction between the **state** and **civil society**. Authoritarian regimes may therefore tolerate a significant range of economic, religious and other freedoms.

Significance

Authoritarianism was the dominant political form in pre-constitutional and pre-democratic societies, usually taking the form of monarchical rule and aristocratic privilege. Theories of authoritarianism can be traced back to thinkers such as Joseph de Maistre (1753–1821), who argued that the belief in the principle of authority, as opposed to individual **freedom**, is the only reliable means of securing **order**. In modern politics, however, authoritarianism is usually viewed as a regime type that differs from both **democracy** and totalitarianism. The value of the term is nevertheless limited by the fact that, while authoritarian regimes rely on command and obedience, they exhibit a wide range of political and ideological features. For example, so-called 'old' authoritarian regimes, such as General Franco's Spain, were often conservative in that they set out to protect traditional elites and de-politicize the masses, while 'new' authoritarian regimes, commonly found in the developing world, aim to bring about economic mobilization and, to some extent, rely on political agitation. Indeed, such regimes may develop authoritarian-populist features which resemble Bonapartism (after Louis Napoleon's regime in France, 1848–70), a style of government that fused personal leadership with conservative **nationalism**, or Peronism (after Juan Peron's regime in Argentina, 1946–55), a dictatorship that based its support on the impoverished masses and the promise of economic and social progress.

However, the stark authoritarian/democratic distinction is often misleading because authoritarian traits can be identified in democratic regimes. Examples of this include the McCarthyite 'witch hunts' of the 1950s in the USA and Thatcherism in the UK – the latter a combination of neo-liberal economics and neo-conservative social policies that has been interpreted as a form of 'authoritarian populism' (Hall and Jacques, 1983). Finally, authoritarianism has also been

viewed as a psychological or sociological phenomenon linked to a disposition to obey orders unthinkingly or a rigid insistence on obedience from subordinates. The classic contribution to this approach to authoritarianism was the idea of the ‘authoritarian personality’, developed by Adorno *et al.* (1950), which explains unquestioning obedience and rigidity of character in terms of an ‘extreme intolerance to ambiguity’; in other words, it is a response to deep insecurities precipitated by uncertainty and choice.

AUTHORITY

Authority, in its broadest sense, is a form of **power**, sometimes thought of as ‘legitimate power’. Whereas power is the ability to influence the behaviour of others, authority is the right to do so. Authority is therefore based on an acknowledged duty to obey rather than any form of coercion or manipulation. In this sense, authority is power cloaked in **legitimacy** or rightfulness. However, authority may be used as either a normative or a descriptive term. As a normative term, used by political philosophers, it refers to a ‘right to rule’ and takes the form of a moral claim. This implies that it is less important that authority is obeyed than that it *should be* obeyed. Leaders, for example, could in this sense continue to claim the right to rule, on the basis of election results, constitutional rules, divine right or whatever, even though the majority of the population does not recognize that right.

Political scientists and sociologists, on the other hand, treat authority as a descriptive term. Max Weber (1864–1920) defined authority simply as a matter of people’s belief about its rightfulness, regardless of where that belief came from and whether it is morally justified. Authority, in this sense, is ‘legitimate power’. Weber distinguished between three kinds of authority, based on the different grounds on which obedience can be established. *Traditional authority*, in this sense, is rooted in history and tradition; *charismatic authority* stems from the power of personality; and *legal-rational authority* is grounded in a set of impersonal rules associated with an office rather than the office holder. An alternative distinction can be made between de jure and de facto authority. *De jure* authority, or authority in law, operates according to a set of procedures or rules that designate who possesses authority and over what issues. People described as being ‘in authority’ can be said to possess de jure authority: their ‘powers’ can be traced back to a particular office. Both traditional and legal-rational authority can therefore be viewed as forms of de jure authority. *De facto* authority, or authority in practice, operates in circumstances in which authority is exercised but cannot be traced back to a set of procedural rules. This includes all forms of charismatic authority, and what is called expert authority, when a person is recognized as being ‘an authority’ by virtue of his or her specialist skills or knowledge.

Significance

Authority has been one of the most basic and enduring issues in political analysis. In a sense, all studies of **government** or the **state** are in fact examinations of

the nature and workings of political authority. Indeed, probably no system of rule could survive long without exercising some measure of authority, since to rule through power alone involves such a great expenditure of coercive resources as to be unsustainable. Nevertheless, there are recurrent debates regarding both the nature of authority and its value. Liberals and socialists tend to view authority as being instrumental, believing that it arises ‘from below’ through the **consent** of the governed. From this perspective, authority is rational, purposeful and limited, a view reflected in a preference for legal-rational authority and public **accountability**. Conservatives, by contrast, see authority as arising from natural necessity, being exercised ‘from above’ by virtue of the unequal distribution of experience, social position and wisdom. Those who exercise authority do so for the benefit of others, but this does not set clear limits or checks on authority, and it may blur the distinction between authority and **authoritarianism**.

The justifications for authority include, most basically, that it is essential for the maintenance of **order** and is thus the only means of escape from the barbarity and injustice of the ‘state of nature’, a society without political rule. Authority also establishes common norms and values that bind society together, and thereby gives individuals a social identity and sense of rootedness. Critics of authority, including, in particular, libertarians and anarchists, point out that authority is by definition the enemy of **freedom**; that it threatens reason and critical understanding by demanding unquestioning obedience; and that it is psychologically, and perhaps morally, corrupting in that it accustoms people to controlling or dominating others.

AUTONOMY

Autonomy literally means self-rule or self-government. **States**, institutions or groups can be said to be autonomous if they enjoy a substantial degree of independence, though autonomy in this connection is sometimes taken to imply a high measure of self-government, rather than sovereign independence. Applied to the individual, autonomy is linked closely with **freedom**. However, since it suggests not merely being ‘left alone’ but being rationally self-willed, autonomy is best classified as a form of positive freedom. By responding to inner or ‘genuine’ drives, the autonomous individual is seen to achieve authenticity and personal fulfilment.

Significance

In international politics, autonomy is widely used as an index of sovereignty, autonomous states being independent and self-governing. However, it is now widely accepted that very few, if any, states are autonomous in this sense, and pluralist theorists in particular now use autonomy in a relative, not an absolute, sense. As a constitutional principle, referring to institutions or levels of **government**, autonomy is linked closely to **decentralization**. Autonomy in this context is justified through an essentially liberal belief in fragmenting **power**, though the checks and balances thus established imply interdependence as well as independence. The term is also used in the analysis of the state, the autonomy of the state implying that it artic-

ulates its own interests and is not merely an instrument or agent through which powerful groups act in society at large. Liberals have traditionally defended this image of state autonomy against the Marxist theory of the class state, even though modern Marxists are prepared to accept the 'relative autonomy' of the state. Finally, the ideal of personal autonomy can be seen as the underlying value of libertarian and anarchist thought, self-governing individuals needing little or no guidance in the form of political **authority**. Autonomy in this sense is often linked with **democracy**, but may nevertheless also limit the jurisdiction of democracy, as it emphasizes individuality rather than collective or majority rule.

BALANCE OF POWER

The term 'balance of power' has been used in a wide variety of political contexts, but it features most prominently in **international relations**, where it has been accorded a number of meanings. As a *policy*, the balance of power refers to a deliberate attempt to promote a power equilibrium, using diplomacy, or possibly war, to prevent any individual state from achieving a predominant position. As a *system*, it refers to a condition in which no single state predominates over others, tending to create general equilibrium and curb the hegemonic ambitions of all states. Although such a balance of power may simply be fortuitous, neorealists argue that the international system tends naturally towards equilibrium because states are particularly fearful of a would-be hegemon, or dominant power. The term is also sometimes used to refer to power relationships generally, unconnected with the idea of equilibrium. This makes it possible to talk, for example, about 'the changing balance of power'.

Significance

The idea of the balance of power has played a central role within **realism**, even being viewed by Kenneth Waltz (1979) as the theory of international relations. For realists, the balance of power is the principal means through which the tendencies within international politics towards conflict and **war** can be constrained. However, while classical realists treat the balance of power as a product of prudent statecraft, neorealists see it more as a consequence of structural interactions that take place within the international system, which are, in turn, shaped by the distribution of **power** (or capacities) between and among states. From the neorealist perspective, the likelihood of a balance of power, and therefore the prospect of war or peace, largely boil down to the number of **great powers** operating in the international system, or what is called polarity (the existence within a system of one or more significant actors, or 'poles'). Bipolarity, as typified by the **superpower** rivalry of the Cold War period, is usually taken to be more favourable for the emergence of a balance of power than is multipolarity, the latter being biased in favour of fluidity and increasing the scope for great-power conflict.

However, liberals have generally been critical of the idea of the balance of power, believing that it legitimizes and entrenches power politics and international rivalry.

This is because the basic premise of the balance of power is that other states, or coalitions of states, pose a threat to **security**, and this can only be contained through a build-up of power or the formation of a rival alliance. A balance-of-power mindset is therefore more likely to cause war than prevent it. Constructivists, for their part, have emphasized the extent to which any assessment of the balance of power is dependent on perception, ideas and beliefs. In short, paraphrasing Wendt's (1992) oft-quoted assertion about **anarchy**, the balance of power is what states make of it.

BEHAVIOURALISM

Behaviouralism is the belief that social theories should be constructed only on the basis of observable behaviour (as opposed to behaviourism, which is the school of psychology that holds that human behaviour can ultimately be explained in terms of conditioned reactions or reflexes). The behavioural approach to political analysis developed out of **positivism**, adopting its assertion that scientific knowledge can be developed only on the basis of explanatory theories that are verifiable or falsifiable. Behavioural analysis typically involves the collection of quantifiable data through research surveys, statistical analysis and the construction of empirical theories that have predictive capacity.

Significance

The so-called 'behavioural revolution' of the 1950s made behaviouralism the dominant force in US **political science** and a powerful influence elsewhere, notably in the UK. The attraction of behaviouralism was that it allowed political analysis to break away from its concern with **constitutions** and normative theory, and gave the study of **politics**, perhaps for the first time, reliable scientific credentials. This fuelled the belief, expressed by political analysts such as David Easton (1979), that politics could adopt the methodology of the natural sciences through the use of quantitative research methods in areas such as voting behaviour and the behaviour of legislators, lobbyists and municipal politicians. Behaviouralism, however, came under growing pressure from the 1960s onwards. In the first place, it constrained the scope of political analysis significantly, preventing it going beyond what was directly observable. While behavioural analysis produced, and continues to produce, invaluable insights in fields such as voting studies, a narrow obsession with quantifiable data threatens to reduce the discipline of politics to little else.

Moreover, the scientific credentials of behaviouralism were called into question, in that its claim to be objective, reliable and 'value-free' is compromised by a range of unstated biases. For example, if **democracy** is redefined in terms of observable behaviour, it means what goes on in so-called democratic political systems in the developed West, and is disengaged from ideas such as popular participation and public accountability. Behaviouralism has, finally, been criticized for treating human behaviour as predictable and determined by the interaction of objective factors, when in fact it is shaped by a variable mix of psychological, social, cultural

and historical circumstances. The now more common stance of post-behaviouralism differs from behaviouralism in that it goes further in recognizing the role of theory in imposing meaning on data, and acknowledges the degree to which theoretical perspectives may impinge on seemingly objective observations.

BICAMERALISM

Bicameralism is the fragmentation of legislative **power**, established through the existence of two chambers or houses in the **parliament**. Bicameral systems are usually classified according to the role, powers and composition of the 'second' chamber or 'upper' house. Most second chambers are constitutionally and politically subordinate to the first chamber, which is usually seen as the locus of popular **authority**. This is particularly the case in parliamentary systems in which **government** is generally responsible to, and drawn, largely or wholly, from the lower house. Second chambers often also exercise limited legislative power, meaning that they function essentially as 'revising' chambers. Not uncommonly, such weaker versions of bicameralism reflect the restrictive representative basis of the upper house, which may be selected through indirect elections, partial elections, appointment or, though rarely, inheritance. A stronger version of bicameralism is found in assemblies with two popularly elected chambers that have broadly equal powers. The US Congress is perhaps the only example of a legislative body that has a dominant upper chamber (while all taxation must be introduced in the House of Representatives, the Senate alone exercises ratification and confirmation powers).

Significance

Bicameralism is usually seen as a central principle of liberal **constitutionalism**. The chief benefits of bicameralism are that second chambers can check the power of first chambers and prevent majoritarian rule; that bicameral assemblies check the power of the executive more effectively; that the existence of two chambers widens the basis of **representation** and interest articulation; that the legislative burden of the first chamber can be relieved and legislation can be more thoroughly scrutinized; and that the second chamber can act as a constitutional safeguard, preventing or delaying the passage of controversial legislation. The representative advantages of bicameralism may be particularly important in systems in which **federalism** or **devolution** operate, as the second chamber can help to overcome conflict between the centre and the periphery by representing provincial or regional interests at the national level.

However, there was a clear trend towards unicameralism in the post-1945 period (with second chambers being abolished in New Zealand, Denmark and Sweden), and bicameralism has been criticized for a number of reasons. Unicameral assemblies may be more efficient, because the existence of a second chamber can make the legislative process unnecessarily complex and difficult. Second chambers may act as a check on democratic rule, particularly when their members are non-elected or indirectly elected. Bicameral parliaments may be a recipe for institu-

tional conflict in the parliament, and may make strong or effective government impossible. The existence of two co-equal chambers may narrow access to policy-making by forcing joint committees to make decisions when there is disagreement between the chambers. Finally, second chambers may introduce a conservative political bias by upholding existing constitutional arrangements and, sometimes, the interests of social elites.

BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill of rights is a legal document that specifies the privileges, **rights** and liberties of the individual. As such, it defines the relationship between the **state** and the citizen, and establishes the legal extent of **civil liberty**. Bills of rights may either be entrenched or statutory. An *entrenched bill of rights* has the status of 'higher' or constitutional law and often comprises part of a written **constitution**. The first ten amendments of the US Constitution, which specify a collection of individual rights and freedoms, thus came to be known as the Bill of Rights, with the Fourteenth, Fifteenth and Nineteenth Amendments subsequently being accorded the same status. Entrenched rights are binding on the legislature, can usually be introduced, amended or removed only through a complex, constitutional process, and are ultimately upheld by a supreme or constitutional court. A *statutory bill of rights* has the same legal status as any other legislature-made **law** and can therefore be changed through the normal legislative process. Sometimes called a statute of rights, such a bill of rights can operate in the absence of a written constitution and a constitutional court, as in the case of the Human Rights Act 1998 in the UK, which incorporated the European Convention on Human Rights into British law. In other cases, *advisory bills of rights* may operate, which oblige **government** to consider individual rights formally in the process of policy formulation without being bound to respect them.

Significance

Bills of rights are often considered a valuable, and perhaps essential, means of guaranteeing limited government and of protecting **freedom**. Not only does a bill of rights provide the individual with a means of defence against overbearing public **authority**, but it also has an educational value in heightening sensitivity towards individual rights within government, among the **judiciary** and, most important, among the public at large. Underlying this argument is often a belief in the doctrine of **human rights**, the idea that there are certain fundamental, inviolable human rights to which all human beings are entitled, and that these should enjoy the protection of both international and state law. Opponents of this view may either question the validity of the idea of human rights or suggest that rights are adequately protected by common law and, in relation to entrenched bills of rights, by statute law. Other criticisms are that bills of rights compromise the **neutrality** of judges and inevitably draw them into political disputes; that rights are better left in the hands of elected politicians rather than non-elected judges; and that bills of rights legally embed

ideological biases (for example, in relation to property rights) that are difficult to remove and may precipitate conflict.

BUREAUCRACY

Bureaucracy (literally ‘rule by officials’) is, in everyday language, a pejorative term meaning pointless administrative routine, or ‘red tape’. In the social sciences the concept of bureaucracy is used in a more specific and neutral sense, but refers to phenomena as different as rule by non-elected officials, the administrative machinery of **government**, and a rational mode of organization. Despite disagreement regarding its location and character, it is generally accepted that abstract organization and rule-governed professional administration are features of bureaucracy. There are fewer difficulties with the use of the term bureaucracy in the field of comparative government. Here, it refers to the administrative machinery of the **state**, bureaucrats being non-elected state officials or civil servants.

Significance

The core function of the bureaucracy is to implement or execute **law** and **policy**. The broadening of the responsibilities of government has therefore been accompanied by a general increase in the size of bureaucracies across the globe. However, the political significance of the bureaucracy largely stems from its role as the chief source of policy information and advice available to governments. The principal sources of bureaucratic power therefore include the ability of civil servants to control the flow of information and thus determine what their political masters know; the logistical advantages they enjoy as permanent and full-time public officials; and their status as experts and supposed custodians of the national interest. The growth in bureaucratic power since the early twentieth century is usually explained in terms of the increased premium put on expertise and specialist knowledge by the fact that the task of policy-making in modern societies has become increasingly complex and demanding. This has made the control of the bureaucracy an important issue in all political systems. The principal means through which this control is exerted include mechanisms of public accountability to ministers, assemblies, the courts or sometimes an ombudsman; the politicization (either formally or informally) of senior bureaucratic posts; and the construction of counter-bureaucracies that provide politicians with alternative sources of advice.

The political role and impact of bureaucracy has been the source of considerable debate. Max Weber’s (1864–1920) classic account of bureaucracy portrayed it as a reliable, efficient and, above all, rational means of social organization characterized by rule-governed behaviour, an ordered hierarchy, the use of written documents and a filing system, and an impersonal authority system in which appointment and advancement are based on professional criteria. Socialists, and particularly Marxists, on the other hand, have viewed bureaucracy as a power-bloc that can

resist political control and reflects broader class interests, through either the social composition of the senior civil service or structural links between government departments and business interests. However, as communist regimes demonstrated, bureaucracy cannot be viewed as a narrowly capitalist phenomenon. Public choice theorists have interpreted bureaucracy in terms of career self-interest on the part of civil servants. In this view, the growth of government intervention is essentially a manifestation of bureaucratic power and the extent to which top bureaucrats are able to resist political control.

CABINET

A cabinet is a **committee** of senior ministers who represent the various **government** departments or ministries (this should not be confused with *cabinet*, as used in France and the EU to denote groups of policy advisers who support individual ministers). In presidential systems the cabinet usually exists to serve the **president** by acting as a policy adviser rather than a policy-maker. Such cabinets function largely as an administrative tool and a ‘sounding board’, but are constitutionally subordinate to the president, who monopolizes formal policy-making responsibility. In contrast, the cabinet, in theory at least, is the apex of the **executive** in states that respect the principle of cabinet government. ‘Cabinet government’ is characterized by two features. First, the cabinet constitutes the principal link between the legislative and executive branches of government; its members are drawn from and accountable to the **parliament**, but also serve as the political heads of the various government departments. Second, the cabinet is the senior executive organ and policy-making responsibility is shared within it, the **prime minister** being merely ‘first’ in name only. This system is usually underpinned by collective responsibility – all cabinet ministers (and sometimes non-cabinet ministers) are required to ‘sing the same song’ and support official government policy.

Significance

The widespread use of cabinets reflects the political and administrative need for collective procedures within the political executive. In the first place, cabinets enable government to present a collective face to parliaments and the public. Without a cabinet, government could appear to be a personal tool wielded by a single individual. Second, cabinets are an administrative device designed to ensure the effective co-ordination of government **policy**. In short, in the absence of a cabinet, government would consist of rival bureaucratic empires each bent on self-aggrandisement. The virtues of cabinet government are therefore that it encourages full and frank policy debate within the **democracy** of a cabinet meeting, subjecting proposals to wide and effective scrutiny; and that it guarantees the unity and cohesion of government, since the cabinet makes decisions collectively, and collectively stands by them. Cabinet government has nevertheless been criticized because it acts as a cloak for prime-ministerial power by forcing dissenting ministers to support agreed government policy in public, and because it makes government policy inco-

herent and inconsistent, as decisions tend to be based on compromises between competing ministers and departmental interests.

Whether cabinets are invested with formal policy-making responsibility or not, they have struggled to maintain their political role and status. This is largely a consequence of the growing prominence of the chief executive (whether a president or prime minister), resulting from the media's, and particularly television's, tendency to focus on personality and image, and the need for clear policy **leadership** in an era of complex and widespread government intervention and global interdependence. Cabinets have also been weakened by the increased size and importance of government departments and other agencies, meaning that policy proposals emerge pre-packaged, with meaningful debate and scrutiny having happened elsewhere. However, cabinets continue to fulfil a residual and irreducible function as a means of policy co-ordination, and, particularly when they contain members with significant party or public support or when the chief executive's **authority** is weak, they may exert decisive policy influence.

CAPITALISM

Capitalism is an economic system as well as a form of property ownership. Its central features include the following. First, it is based on generalized commodity production, a 'commodity' being a good or service produced for exchange – it has **market** value rather than use value. Second, productive wealth in a capitalist economy is predominantly held in private hands. Third, economic life is organized according to impersonal market forces, in particular the forces of demand (what consumers are willing and able to consume) and supply (what producers are willing and able to produce). Fourth, in a capitalist economy, material self-interest and profit maximization provide the main motivations for enterprise and hard work.

However, there is no such thing as a 'pure' capitalist system; that is, one not contaminated by socialist and other impurities, such as public ownership, economic management, or collective practices. Moreover, all economic systems are shaped by the historical, cultural and ideological context in which they operate. At least three types of capitalist system can therefore be identified in the modern world. *Enterprise capitalism*, or free-market capitalism (found in the USA and, since the 1980s, the UK), is characterized by faith in the untrammelled workings of market competition, minimal public ownership, safety-net welfare provision and weak trade unions. *Social capitalism*, or Rhine-Alpine capitalism (found throughout continental Europe, especially in Germany) is characterized by the idea of a social market; that is, it attempts to balance the disciplines of market competition against the need for social cohesion and solidarity guaranteed by economic and social intervention. *Collective capitalism*, or 'tiger' capitalism (found in East Asia generally, and increasingly in China) is characterized by what had been called 'relational markets': close connections between industry and finance, and between producers and **government**; and by an emphasis on collaborative effort sometimes dubbed 'peoplism'.

Significance

Capitalist economic forms first emerged in seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century Europe, developing from within predominantly feudal societies. Capitalist practices initially took root in the form of commercial agriculture orientated towards the market, and increasingly relied on waged labour rather than bonded serfs. Developed or industrial capitalism started to emerge from the mid-nineteenth century onwards, first in the UK but soon in the USA and across Europe, with the advent of machine-based factory production and the gradual shift of populations from the land to the expanding towns and cities. Having defied socialist predictions about its inevitable demise, and withstood the twentieth-century ideological battle against **communism**, capitalism has, since the Eastern European Revolutions of 1989–91, emerged as a global system without serious rivals. The dual secrets of its success have been its flexibility, which has enabled it to absorb non-capitalist ‘impurities’ and adapt to a variety of cultures, and its seemingly relentless capacity to generate technological development, which has enabled it to deliver widespread, if uneven, prosperity.

Few issues have polarized political debate so effectively as capitalism; indeed, the **left/right** ideological divide is commonly interpreted as a battle between anti-capitalist and pro-capitalist positions. Three broad stances have been adopted in relation to capitalism. The first, taken up by fundamentalist socialists, rejects capitalism out of hand on the grounds that it amounts to a system of mass exploitation. Karl Marx (1818–83) was undoubtedly the foremost exponent of this view, arguing that capitalism, like all other class societies, is doomed because it is based on a fundamental contradiction between oppressors (the bourgeoisie) and the oppressed (the proletariat). The second stance, adopted in different ways by parliamentary socialists, modern liberals and paternalist conservatives, can be summed up in the assertion that capitalism is a good servant but a bad master. This view accepts that capitalism is the most reliable, perhaps the only reliable, mechanism for generating wealth, but emphasizes that unregulated capitalism is chronically unstable and prone to high unemployment and wide material inequalities. Associated with the ideas of J. M. Keynes (1883–1946), this perspective suggests that the issue is not so much capitalism but how and to what extent the capitalist system should be reformed or ‘humanized’. The third stance, adopted by classical liberals, the New Right and, in its most extreme form, by anarcho-capitalists, is that capitalism is a self-regulating mechanism and should therefore be encumbered as little as possible by external controls, an idea summed up in the principle of **laissez-faire**, literally meaning ‘leave to do’. The earliest and most influential exponent of this view was Adam Smith (1723–90), who argued that the market is regulated by ‘an invisible hand’ and so tends towards long-run equilibrium.

CENTRALIZATION/DECENTRALIZATION

Centralization is the concentration of political **power** or government **authority** within central institutions. These institutions are normally considered to be central

because they operate at the national level; however, the term centralization is sometimes used to describe the concentration of power or authority within the national level of **government**, as, for example, when **executives** dominate legislatures or **parliaments**, or when **cabinets** are subordinate to chief executives. Decentralization is usually understood to refer to the expansion of local **autonomy** through the transfer of powers and responsibilities away from national bodies. Centralization and decentralization thus highlight different territorial divisions of power within the **state** between central (national) and peripheral (regional, provincial or local) institutions.

Significance

All modern states contain territorial divisions. The nature of these divisions nevertheless varies enormously. The divisions are structured by the constitutional framework within which centre–periphery relationships are conducted; the distribution of functions and responsibilities between the levels of government; the means by which their personnel are appointed and recruited; the political, economic, administrative and other powers the centre can use to control the periphery; and the independence that peripheral bodies enjoy. What is clear, however, is that neither central nor peripheral bodies can be dispensed with completely. In the absence of central government, a state would not be able to function as an actor on the international stage.

The case for centralization is that:

- Central government alone articulates the interests of the whole rather than its various parts; that is, the interests of the **nation** rather than those of sectional, ethnic or regional groups.
- Only central government can establish uniform **laws** and public services which help people to move easily from one part of the country to another.
- Central government is able to rectify inequalities that arise as a result of the areas with the greatest social needs invariably being those with the least potential for raising revenue to meet them.
- Economic development and centralization are invariably found in close association; only a central authority, for example, can manage a single currency, control tax and spending policies with a view to ensuring sustainable growth, and provide an economic infrastructure.

The case for decentralization includes the following:

- Local or regional government is more effective than central government in providing opportunities for citizens to participate in the political life of their community, thus creating a better-educated and a more informed citizenry.
- Peripheral institutions are usually ‘closer’ to the people and are more sensitive to their needs.
- Decisions made at a local level are more likely to be seen as intelligible and therefore legitimate, whereas central government may appear to be remote, both geographically and politically.

- Decentralization protects **freedom** by dispersing government power and creating a network of checks and balances; peripheral bodies check central government as well as each other.

CHECKS AND BALANCES

Checks and balances are a network of tensions within a system, usually a governmental system, that results from the fragmentation of **power**. While such a system may involve independence, its crucial feature is **interdependence**, ensuring that each element in it is able to check the power of other elements. Checks and balances can be found in all liberal political systems, each exhibiting some measure of institutional fragmentation, but the principle has been applied most rigorously to the US governmental system, where it amounted to, in effect, a constitutional blueprint. Not only do checks and balances operate among the legislature, executive and judicial branches (the **separation of powers**) but also between the two houses of the legislature (**bicameralism**), and between the national/federal **government** and the fifty states (**federalism**).

Significance

The principle of checks and balances is a cornerstone of liberal **constitutionalism**. It is based on the assumption that, as human beings are inherently self-interested, all systems of rule are likely to become tyrannical and oppressive. The purpose of checks and balances is therefore to safeguard liberty by creating internal tensions within the governmental system, thereby reducing its capacity to interfere in citizens' private affairs. Individual **freedom** thus expands to the extent to which government is fragmented. Two main criticisms have been levelled at the principle of checks and balances. First, institutional checks and balances may lead to deadlock, preventing government from acting, even in areas where intervention is widely deemed to be legitimate or necessary. This can be seen in the recurrent tendency of the US system towards 'government gridlock'. Second, ideological reservations have been expressed about the widespread use of checks and balances, on the grounds that this tends to minimize the role of the state, and so serves the interest of untrammelled **capitalism**.

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY

Christian democracy is a political and ideological movement that advances a moderate and welfarist brand of **conservatism**. The origins of Christian democracy lie in Catholic social theory, which, in contrast to Protestantism's stress on **individualism**, emphasizes the importance of social groups, in particular the family, and highlights a harmony of interests among these groups. While Christian democracy is ideologically vague and has adapted itself to different national cultures and political circumstances, two major themes have been recurrent. The first is a concern about the effects of unregulated market capitalism, reflected in a willingness to embrace

INDEX

bold type = extended discussion; f = figure

- Abacha, S. 132
 abortion 92, 200
 absolutism 1, 8, **134**, 148, 211, 235, 236
 accountability 2, 10, 52, 61, 67, 119, 122, 135, 147, 182, 196, 197
 act-utilitarianism **227**
 additional member system (AMS) 61
 administrative federalism **70**
 Adorno, T. 9, 47, **234**, 240
 affluence 208, 224
 Afghanistan 68, 110, 111, 230
 Africa 98, 122, 141, 193
 African National Congress (ANC) 184
Agenda for Peace (UN, 1992) 155
 agenda-setting 173, 190
 Algeria 219
 Allende, S. 143
 Almond, G. A. **160**, 240
 al-Qaeda 110, 219
 alternative vote 61
 altruism 24, 103
 American Revolution (1776) 198
 Amnesty International 145
Analects (Confucius) 33
 'anarchical society' (Bull) 108, 241
 anarchism 2–4, 26, 31, 47, 75, 119, 129, 148, 213, 228, 236, 244
 'collectivist' versus 'individualist' **3**
 anarchists xii, 99, 117, 126, 183, 219, 238
 anarcho-capitalism 3, 18, 120f, 125
 anarcho-communism 3
 anarchy 4–5, 12, 67, 211
 IR 26, 81, 87, 188, 189, 202, 239, 246
 Ancient Greece 22, 25, 45, 164, 168, 234, 238
 Athenian democracy 48, 49
 Ancient Rome 98
 Roman Republic 56, 196
 animal rights 5–6, 59, 120, 200, 245
anomie 32
 anthropocentrism 5, 59, 101
 anti-colonial nationalism **141**
Anti-Dühring (Engels, 1876) 129
 anti-party parties 163
 anti-politics 6–7, 174
 anti-Semitism 69, 185
see also fascism
 anti-Westernism 110
apartheid 184, 185
 Aquinas, T. 113, 164, **234**
 Arab world 88, 110
 Arab-Israeli conflict 33, 110, 211, 230
 Arendt, H. 168, 208, **234**
 Argentina 8, 143, 144
 Aristotle 31, 63, 85, 100, 115, 116, 164, 168, **234**, 235
 'Armenian Genocide' (1915–17) 46
 arms race 7–8, 53, 102, 189
see also deterrence
Art of War (Sun Tzu) 188–9
 Aryanism 69, 142, 185
 Asia 98, 122, 141, 193
 Asian values 34
 Augustine of Hippo 113, 164, **234**
 Augustus Caesar 56
 Aum Shinryko 219
 Austin, J. 116, 211
 Australia 70, 71, 143, 153, 231
 Austria 21, 38, 44, 70, 86, 238
 authoritarianism 8–9, 10, 31, 49, 51, 56, 104, 120, 170, 199, 234, 238
 'new' versus 'old' 8
 versus 'totalitarianism' **223**
 authoritarian populism 8
 authority xii, xi, 1, 2, **9–10**, 11, 15, 17, 27, 31, 35, 39, 75, 117, 119, 120f, 125, 146, 148, 153, 175, 180, 191, 192, 196, 213, 228
 Weberian types (charismatic, legal-rational, traditional) **10**, **121**
 autocracy 56, 120, 242
 versus 'totalitarianism' 223
 autonomy 2, **10–11**, 19, 38, 71, 147, 222
 Bakunin, M. 26, **234**
 balance of power 7, **11–12**, 174, 188
 'policy' versus 'system' **11**
 balance of terror 7
 Ball, T. xi, 240
 Barber, B. 42, 240
 behaviouralism **12–13**, 64, 100, 160, 164, 167, 170, 218
 behaviouralists , versus 'traditionalists' (IR) 106
 behaviourism 12
 Belgium 21, 38, 184
 Bell, D. 97, 240
 Bentham, J. 25, 99, 106, 191, 227, **234**, 240
 Berlin, I. 74–5, 240
 Berman, P. 111, 240
 Bernstein, E. 191, 240
 Beveridge Report (1942) 231
 bicameralism **13–14**, 20, 40, 71, 151, 152, 156, 236
 bill of rights **14–15**, 23, 40
 advisory **14**
 'entrenched' versus 'statutory' **14**
see also constitution
 Bill of Rights (1689) 39
 bipolarity 11, 87, **157**
 Bismarck, O. von 56
 black consciousness movement 95
 Black Power 184
 Blair, A. C. L. 220
 Bloch, E. 229
 Bodin, J. 1, 211, **234**
 Bonaparte, N. 56
 Bonapartism 8

- 'borderless world'
(Ohmae) 226, 244
- Boulding, K. 173, 241
- bourgeois ideology 89, 96,
124, 131, 200
see also 'end of ideology'
- 'bourgeois' state 213
- bourgeoisie 18, 161, 204
- Brazil 44, 71, 143
- Bretton Woods system
(1944-) 136
- Britain *see* United Kingdom
- British National Party
(BNP) 185
- Brundtland Report
(1987) 216, 241
- 'Brunei' [Negara Brunei
Darussalam] 134
- Brzezinski, Z. 223, 242
- Buchanan, J. 187, 241
- Buddhism xiv, 34, 149, 193,
235
- Bull, H. 108, 241
- bureaucracies 100, 151, 232
- bureaucracy xi, 15-16, 65, 66,
84, 180, 186
- Burke, E. 36, 194, 195, 224,
235
- Bush administration
(2001-9) 88
- cabinet 16-17, 28, 65, 66, 173
presidential systems 176
- cabinet* (France/EU) 16
- cabinet government 16, 152,
179-80
- cadre party 162
- Canada 6, 38, 70, 71, 88, 143,
192, 235
- capitalism xi, 8, 17-18, 20, 29,
41, 52, 59, 78, 89, 91, 117,
121, 122, 123, 124, 128,
129, 131, 133, 154, 157,
159, 161, 179, 181, 191,
198, 200, 204, 205, 206,
207, 209, 210, 222, 223,
229, 231
susceptibility to reform
192
see also collectivism
- capitalist systems 17
- Care International 145
- Carter, J. E. 175, 177, 244
- Catholic Church 208, 211
social theory 20, 43
- central government 54, 70,
70f, 126
- central planning
(communism) 212-13
- centralization 18-20, 71, 126
- decentralization 10, 18-20,
40, 55, 191, 208, 214
- Chamberlain, H. S. 185
- chancellor (Germany) 179
- charisma 57, 69, 118, 121, 132,
169, 224
- checks and balances 20, 52,
122, 176f, 203, 203f, 211
- federal systems 70f, 71
- Chile 132, 143, 144
- China 17, 27, 29, 33-4, 87, 93,
98, 189, 215
- Chinese Communist Party 34
- Chinese Revolution (1949) 198
- Christian democracy 20-1
- Christian Democratic Union
(CDU) 21
- Christianity 149, 193, 234, 239
- Churchill, Lord Randolph 222
- CIA 143
- Cicero 196
- citizens 116
'duty of obedience' 120
- citizenship 20-1, 92, 138, 139,
146, 155, 160
active 22, 196
social 22
- 'citizenship of duty',
versus 'citizenship of
rights' 21
- Civic Culture* (Almond and
Verba, 1963/1980) 160,
240
- civic nationalism 185, 193
- 'civic republicanism' 196
- civil disobedience 22-3, 149
- civil liberty 14, 23, 39, 41, 92,
116, 122, 199
see also freedom
- civil rights xii, 23, 92, 184
- civil society 8, 24, 26, 49, 89,
117, 122, 163, 179, 212, 223
see also global civil society
- civil war 67, 229
- clash of civilizations 32-3,
110, 220, 236, 243
- class *see* social class
- 'classical' anarchism 3
- classical liberalism 18, 75, 99,
123, 124, 125, 212, 227, 239
see also neo-liberalism
- climate change 48, 102, 107
- Clinton administration
(1993-2001) 220
- co-operation 71, 186, 191, 203,
209, 213, 226, 230, 238
see also internationalism
- coalition governments 61, 147,
157, 163, 180, 182
- coalition/s 24-5, 35
- coercion 2, 3, 87, 116, 146,
199, 201, 212, 218
- cohabitation* (France) 177
- Cold War 7, 11, 53, 83, 87, 96,
97, 150, 158, 215, 223
failure to predict end 189
see also post-Cold War
- collective capitalism 17
- collective responsibility 16
- collective security 25-6, 203
see also security
- collectivism 26-7, 115, 119,
209, 210, 237
see also communism
- 'collectivist anarchism'
(Bakunin) 26, 234
- collectivization 26, 27-8, 29,
221
- collectivized states 212-13
- colonialism 33, 68, 97, 98, 184,
219, 225
see also post-colonialism
- 'command power' 87
- 'commercial liberals' 124
- committee 16, 28, 197
'ad hoc' versus
'permanent/standing' 28
- Commonwealth of
Nations 102
- communism 8, 18, 21, 28-30,
57, 97, 110, 112, 119f, 119,
120f, 129, 162, 192, 209,
210, 212, 219, 220, 223,
229, 238
collapse 49, 51, 52, 69, 83,
98, 122, 128, 130, 182
see also government
intervention
- Communist International
(Comintern) 109
- Communist Manifesto (Marx
and Engels, 1848) 28,
237, 244
- communist revolutions 198
see also revolutions
- communists 91, 181-2
- communitarianism 3, 21,
30-1, 32, 165, 167, 172,
206, 220, 242
- 'high' versus 'low' forms 31
- communitarians 92-3, 99, 124,
147, 188, 196, 200
- community 21, 30, 32, 50, 65,
75, 99, 115, 116, 132, 167,
182, 206
- competition 209, 221, 222,
228
transnational 212
- 'competition states' 84
- Comte, A. 170

- Confederation of Independent States (CIS, 1991–) 103
- conflict of civilizations 32–3, 110, 220, 236, 243
see also cosmopolitanism
- ‘conflict of laws’ 104
- conflict resolution 168, 169
- Confucianism 33–4
- Congo (DRC) 67
- Congress of Vienna (1815) 86
- consensus 25, 34–5, 38, 61, 156, 169, 183, 231
- ‘procedural’ versus ‘substantive’ 35
- consent 8, 10, 35–6, 50, 121, 123, 135, 209, 236, 241
- conservatism 3, 20, 21, 36–7, 97, 119f, 120f, 172, 174, 186, 188, 222, 224, 235, 245
- types (authoritarian, libertarian, paternalistic) 36–7
- conservative nationalism 141, 142
- Conservative Party 162, 222
- conservatives 23, 32, 75, 92–3, 96, 109, 117, 131, 138, 139, 147, 148, 155, 167, 181, 200, 206, 213, 218, 231
see also traditional conservatives
- consociationalism 37–8, 243
- constitution/s 38–40, 63, 66, 85, 100, 160, 203
- codified (written) 38–9, 71, 100, 112–13, 204
- uncodified (unwritten) 38, 39, 100
- constitutional and administrative law 116
- constitutionalism 1, 2, 13, 20, 37, 39, 40–1, 124, 198, 201, 204, 209, 211, 236
- constructivism 12, 41–2, 107, 158, 203, 239
- types (holistic, systemic, unit-level) 41
- consumerism 42–3
- ‘contingent pacifism’ 149
- contingently contested concepts xi
- conventional constructivism 42
- core-periphery analysis 19, 54, 74, 98, 185
- corporatism 43–4, 178, 179, 220
- ‘authoritarian’ versus ‘liberal’ 43, 44
- corruption 2, 3, 91, 103, 110, 163, 199, 238
- cosmopolitanism 44–5, 46, 80, 82
- ‘moral’ versus ‘political’ 44–5
see also culture
- coup d’état*, versus ‘revolution’ 198
- crime 90, 107, 148
- crimes against humanity 45–6
- criminal law 53, 116
- ‘crisis of nation-state’ 140
- ‘crisis of party politics’ 163
- critical constructivism 42
- critical theory 46–7, 107, 234, 235
see also dialectical materialism
- Cromwell, O. 56
- cross-generational justice 48
- Cuba 27, 29
- Cuban Revolution (1959) 198
- cultural nationalism 140
- cultural revolutions 198
- culture 83, 84, 89, 95, 98, 108, 109, 117, 133, 138, 139, 140, 157, 167, 171, 184, 222
 versus ‘nature’ 159–60
see also multiculturalism
- currently contested concepts xi
- Czech Republic 175
- Czechoslovakia 185
- Czenpiel E.-O. 84, 245
- Dahl, R. 157, 241
- Dalai Lama 88
- Daoism 34
- Darwinism 185
- ‘death of socialism’ 210
- decision-making 100, 158–9, 172–4, 190, 195, 214, 216
- Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen (France, 1789) 39
- deep ecology 59, 101, 217
- ‘deformed polyarchies’ 156
- delegation 194, 195
- democracy xii xiii, 2, 11, 12, 35, 37, 48–50, 57, 62, 84, 98, 118, 120, 121, 141, 142, 153, 156–7, 160, 170, 172, 174, 178, 187, 190, 195, 211
- ‘direct’ versus ‘representative’ 49
- economic theory 63
- parliamentary 62
- democratic centralism (Lenin) 163
- democratic mandate 127
- democratic peace 50–1, 52, 124, 230
- democratic socialism 209, 212, 213
- democratization 51–2, 80, 122
- Denmark 13
- dependency 54, 232
- deserts 207, 208
- ‘despotism of custom’ (J. S. Mill) 224–5
- deterrence 7, 52–3, 158, 183
see also security dilemma
- development 53–4
see also economic growth
- developmental states 212
- Devlin, P. 117, 241
- devolution 12, 36, 53–4, 136f, 136, 190, 213
- ‘administrative’ versus ‘legislative’ 53
- versus ‘federalism’ 68
- Dewey, J. 174
- dialectic 55–6
- dialectical materialism (Plekhanov) 29, 56, 89, 129
see also historical materialism
- dictatorship/s 8, 52, 56–7, 69, 104, 132, 163, 169, 189
- ‘totalitarian’ versus ‘traditional’ 56
see also totalitarianism
- dictatorship of proletariat 29, 56
- Diogenes of Sinope 45
- diplomacy 57–8, 108, 203
- direct democracy 189
- disabilities 133, 200
- discourse 58–9, 157, 172
- ‘discursive formation’ (Foucault) 58
- Disraeli, B. 36
- diversity 168, 228, 229
- divine right 1, 134
- Donne, J. 209
- ‘due process’ doctrine (USA) 200
- Durkheim, É. 32
- East Asia 17, 212
- ‘East India Company’ [Dutch VOC] 225
- East Timor 93
- Eastern Europe 21, 29, 69
- Eastern European Revolutions (1989–91) x, 18, 21, 27, 30, 128, 130, 182, 210
- Easton, D. 12, 100, 168–9, 218, 241

- eco-anarchism 59
 eco-feminism 59
 eco-socialism 59
 ecologism 4, 5, 59–60, 97, 101, 120, 167, 208, 217, 228
 economic development 19, 79
 economic growth 43, 48, 54, 212
 see also sustainable development
 economic liberalism 54, 123, 124
 economic superpowers 215
 economic theory 63, 167, 186
 economics and economists 8, 80, 89, 90, 115, 150, 186, 206, 207, 235, 237–9
 see also political economy
 economies of scale 74, 225–6
 education 34, 90, 205, 208, 231
 egoism 24, 188, 200
 Egypt 98, 230
 election/s 3, 35, 50, 60–2, 100, 122, 126, 127, 152, 162, 175, 194, 197
 ‘bottom-up’ versus ‘top-down’ functions 61
 ‘democratic’ versus ‘non-democratic’ 60
 versus ‘referendum’ 189
 ‘elective dictatorship’ (Hailsham) 153, 242
 ‘elective kingship’ 175
 electoral systems 127
 ‘majoritarian’ versus ‘proportional’ 61–2
 electorate 176f, 197
 Eleventh of September terrorist attacks (2001) 33, 87, 137, 214, 219
 elites 21, 68, 104, 109, 139, 142, 156, 169, 198, 222, 225, 231
 political 6, 61
 social 14, 195
 elitism 62–3, 101, 122, 157, 173, 237, 238
 types (classical, modern, normative) 62
 empiricism 63–4, 81, 94, 99, 164, 165, 166, 185, 191
 versus rationalism 187
 see also positivism
 ‘end of history’ 49, 122, 124, 235, 242
 ‘end of ideology’ (Bell) 97, 240
 see also ideology
 Engels, F. 29, 56, 89, 129, 235, 244
 England 211, 235, 236
 England and Wales 126
 English Revolution (1642–60) 196, 198
 ‘English School’ (IR) 108
 Enlightenment 172, 187
 environment 43, 48, 202, 216, 217
 environmentalism, versus ‘ecologism’ 59
 epistemology 63, 164
 equality 2, 27, 31, 37, 49, 59, 64–5, 68, 72, 73, 78, 91, 94, 115, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 125, 164, 167, 182, 200, 206, 209, 231, 239
 ‘absolute’ versus ‘relative’ 207
 ‘formal’ versus ‘foundational’ 64
 equality before law 64
 equality of opportunity 64, 114, 123, 131
 equality of outcome 64
 Esping-Andersen, G. 231, 242
 essentially contested concepts (Gallie) xiii, 49, 96, 114, 242
 ethical socialism 206, 209
 ethics 80, 113, 157, 164, 167, 234, 236
 ethnic cleansing 94, 140
 ethnic nationalism 140
 ethnicity 33, 68, 84, 95, 135, 137, 138, 139, 154, 178, 184–5, 219, 220, 227
 Etzioni, A. 31, 242
 Europe 1, 17, 21, 37, 38, 51, 141, 161, 171, 184, 198, 200, 208, 243
 European Convention on Human Rights (1953) 14, 92
 European Court of Human Rights 112
 European Court of Justice 112
 European Economic Community (EEC) 103
 European Union 70, 72, 81, 103, 138, 139, 214
 evolutionary socialism 209
Evolutionary Socialism (Bernstein, 1898) 191
 executive 16, 19, 65–7, 85
 executive branch 66, 70, 151, 176, 177, 180, 182, 203, 203f
 executive federalism 70
 expansionist nationalism 141, 142
 Fabian Society 191
 ‘facts’ xi–xii, 165
 failed state 67–8
 Falklands War (1982) 230
 false consciousness 96
 family 24, 31, 72, 76, 85, 99, 117, 123, 134, 153, 166, 169, 235
 fascism 1, 31, 37, 43–4, 57, 68–9, 76, 96, 110, 119f, 119, 120f, 130, 138, 155, 162, 184, 185, 187, 208, 220, 222, 223
 ‘leader principle’ 118
 ‘1789 is dead’ (slogan) 68
 see also Nazism
 ‘fear of freedom’ (Fromm) 76, 208, 235, 242
 federalism 13, 20, 38, 54, 55, 69–72, 100, 103, 125, 138, 156, 191, 196, 211, 214, 236
 see also devolution
Federalist Papers (1787–9) 156, 236
 feminism 27, 72–3, 95, 97, 107, 108, 120, 129, 153, 165, 167, 169, 228
 new types 73
 second-wave 73, 154
 traditions (liberal, radical, socialist) 72, 78
 waves 73
 feminists xii, 22, 31, 86, 117, 122, 145, 159, 201, 213
 feudalism 124, 198, 222
 Finland 177
 ‘First Nations’ 135
 ‘first-past-the-post’ (SMP) system 182
 Five-Year Plans (USSR, 1928–) 27
 FLN (Algeria) 219
 food aid/food dumping 104
 Fordism/post-Fordism 205
 foreign aid *see* international aid
 ‘formal political theory’ (rational choice) 167, 186
 Foucault, M. 58, 235
 Fox, W. 215, 242
 France 8, 52, 55, 86, 98, 126, 171, 177, 192, 211, 215, 237, 238
 Fourth Republic 21, 153
 Franco y Bahamonde, F. 8
 Frankfurt School 46–7, 234, 235
 free trade 51, 73–4, 80, 102, 103, 124, 144, 191, 230
 free-market capitalism 16

- freedom/liberty 2, 8, 10, 14,
 20, 24, 27, 31, 37, 39, 40, 50,
 65, 68, 74–6, 90, 92, 100,
 114, 117, 119, 120f, 122,
 123, 126, 130, 142, 147,
 149, 156, 164, 167, 177,
 178, 181, 196, 201, 209,
 210, 211, 221, 228, 231,
 237, 240, 242
 versus ‘licence’ 75
 ‘negative’ versus ‘positive’
 74–5, 99, 125, 244
see also civil liberty
- freedom of movement 23, 199
 ‘freedom of pike, death to
 minnows’ (Tawney) 75
 freedom of speech 23, 199
 French Revolution (1789) x, 37,
 68, 119, 196, 198, 235, 236
 Friedrich, C. J. 223, 242
 Fromm, E. 76, 208, 235, 242
 Fukuyama, F. 122, 124, 235, 242
 full employment 206, 212, 231
 functionalism 76–7
 fundamentalist socialism 209
 future generations 216, 224
 futurity 48
- Gallie, W. B. xiii, 242
 game theory 77–8, 161, 186
 Gandhi, M. K. 22, 95, 149, 171
Gemeinschaft versus *Gesellschaft*
 (Tönnies) 32
 gender 31, 72, 78, 95, 109, 152,
 154, 227
 General Agreement on Tariffs
 and Trade (GATT) 74
 ‘general will’ (Rousseau) 57,
 146, 169, 196, 211
 genocide 143
 Genocide Convention
 (1948) 46
 Gentile, G. 69
 geographical determinism 79
 geopolitics 79
 Georgia 51
 Germany 7, 17, 21, 35, 44, 60,
 70, 79, 86, 126, 142–3, 152,
 174, 213, 214, 215, 231,
 235, 236, 237, 239
 Gettysburg Address (1863) 49
 global civil society 79–80,
 81, 146
see also civil society
 global financial crisis
 (2007–9) 144, 214
 global governance 45, 58, 79,
 80–1, 85, 137
see also governance
 global hegemon 215
 global interdependencies 83f
 global justice 45, 80, 81–2, 245
see also justice
 global South 54
 global terrorism 219
 ‘global tribes’ 227
 globalization 4, 60, 67, 69, 80,
 82–4, 102, 107, 128, 135,
 137, 140, 141, 144, 146,
 175, 185, 189, 193, 202,
 210, 212, 216, 219, 225,
 226, 230, 231, 235
 types (cultural, economic,
 political) 83
see also regionalism
 Glorious Revolution (England,
 1688) 197–8
 Gobineau, J. A., Count 185
 God 1, 92, 116, 134, 199, 211,
 224, 234
 Goodman, P. 229
 Gosplan (State Planning
 Committee, USSR) 27
 governance 51, 84–5, 86, 100,
 124, 155
see also multi-level
 governance
 ‘governance without
 government’ 84
 governing mandate 127
 government xii, 1, 2, 23, 63,
 69–70, 85–6, 137, 152f, 168,
 169, 234, 236, 237
 ‘effective’ versus
 ‘representative’ 61
 ‘rowing’ versus ‘steering’ 85
 ‘strong but responsible’ 153
see also parliamentary
 government
 government coalitions 25
 ‘government gridlock’
 (USA) 20, 177, 204
 government institutions 116,
 165, 169
 government intervention 115,
 116, 119, 123, 124, 125,
 157, 175, 220
see also individualism
 government ‘of, by, for people’
 (Lincoln) 49
 government policy 158–9
 government power 162–3
 governments 35, 44, 49, 57, 61,
 67, 83, 102, 121, 144, 151,
 156, 174, 190, 194, 195,
 196, 197, 206, 212, 217f,
 218, 225
 Gramsci, A. 88–9, 96–7, 235,
 242
 grand coalition 25
 great power/s 11, 86–7, 215
 Greece 52, 132
 greed 144, 182, 188
 green movement/parties 60,
 163, 208
 Greenpeace 145
 Grotius, H. 108
 Gulf War (1991) 216
- Habermas, J. 47, 121, 235, 242
 Hailsham, Lord 153, 242
 Haiti 67
 Hamas 110
 hard/soft power 87–8
 ‘harm principle’ (J. S. Mill) 117
 Hart, H. L. A. 116
 Hay, C. 107, 242
 head of government 152, 176,
 177
see also prime minister
 head of state 66, 152, 176,
 177, 179
 hedonism 42, 228
 Hegel, G.W.F. 24, 56, 94, 129,
 235
 hegemonic powers 105, 106
 hegemony 57, 87–8, 95, 120,
 129, 135, 157, 159, 188, 232
 Heywood, A. 242–43
 Hezbollah 110
 hierarchy 34, 64, 84, 112, 119,
 131, 135, 172, 222, 230
 Hinduism 149, 171, 193
 historical materialism 76,
 89–90, 129, 164
see also Marxism
 history 27, 56, 138, 140, 141,
 165, 166, 174, 188, 204,
 224, 225, 237
 Hitler, A. 57, 69, 132, 140,
 142–3, 189, 213, 223, 243
 Hobbes, T. 1, 4, 99, 100, 117,
 121, 146, 148, 164, 173,
 186, 188, 211, 212, 213, 235
 holistic approach 56, 101, 218
 Holy Roman Empire 211
 Hong Kong 34
 Horkheimer, M. 47
 human development 54, 90,
 210, 228, 245
 Human Development Index
 (HDI) 90
Human Development Report
 (UN, 1990–) 90
 human nature 2, 26, 36, 37, 42,
 63, 75, 91–2, 99, 113, 117,
 148, 166, 186, 188, 213,
 228, 235
 versus ‘culture’ 159–60
see also biology

- human rights xiii, 23, 45, 80, 82, 92–3, 95, 102, 105, 108, 116, 155, 189, 199, 228
versus ‘civil rights’ 92
see also minority rights
- Human Rights Act (UK, 1998) 14, 201
- human security 90, 202
- humanitarian intervention 45, 93–4, 105, 108, 149
- Hume, D. 63
- Huntington, S. 32–3, 52, 236, 243
- ‘ideal types’ (Weber) xiii
- idealism 56, 94–5
‘metaphysical’ versus
‘political’ 94
- ideals xi, 109, 132
- ‘ideas’ versus ‘things’ xi
- identity politics 95
- ideology x, xi, xii, 2, 3, 7, 18, 20, 29, 30, 35, 37, 40, 58, 59, 60, 62, 68, 72, 73, 76, 80, 85, 88, 91, 96–7, 109, 110, 112, 118–32 *passim*, 142, 144, 159, 160, 162, 167, 169, 172, 173, 174, 177, 181, 205, 209, 213, 215, 219, 220, 222, 223, 231
political ideology 96f
see also meta-ideology
- image 17, 118
- ‘imagined communities’ (Anderson) 139, 240
- Impartiality,
versus ‘neutrality’ 144
- impeachment 176, 177
- imperialism 97–8, 109, 185, 245
versus ‘colonialism’ 97
‘final stage of capitalism’ (Lenin) 98, 236
- ‘imperial presidency’ 175
- income 115, 204
- India 22, 52, 71, 152, 174, 182, 192, 193
- Indifference,
versus ‘toleration’ 221
- individual responsibility 232
- individualism 3, 20, 21, 52, 69, 73, 91, 98–9, 101, 108, 115, 119, 122, 123, 171, 199, 209, 210, 220, 221, 222, 237
types (developmental, egoistical, methodological) 98–9
see also *laissez-faire*
- industrialization 48, 207, 229, 231
- inequalities 18, 19, 23, 84, 128, 131, 144, 154, 157, 169, 183
- information 15, 82, 83, 130, 171
- input-output 198, 217f, 217–18
- insecurity 143, 186
- institutionalism 100–1, 102
‘new’ versus ‘traditional’ 100
- institutionalized racism 185
- institutional public choice theory 186
- institutions 3, 68, 76, 100, 190, 203, 204, 210, 222
‘private’ versus ‘public’ 212
- insurrectionary terrorism 219
- inter-paradigm debate (IR) 106
- interdependence 20, 51, 74, 83f, 87, 95, 101–2, 105, 107, 136, 158, 212, 216, 236, 243
- interdisciplinarity 150
- interest groups *see* pressure groups
- intergovernmentalism 102–3, 149, 191, 216
versus ‘supranationalism’ 215
- internal markets 85, 128
- international aid 103–4, 145
‘bilateral’ versus
‘multilateral’ 103
‘developmental’ versus
‘humanitarian’ 103
- international anarchy 4–5, 216
- International Court of Justice (ICJ, UN) 104, 105
- International Criminal Court (ICC, 2002–) 46, 105
- international governmental organization (IGO) 105
- international law 14, 46, 80, 92, 94, 104–5, 108, 138–9, 149, 199, 230
- International Monetary Fund (IMF) 54, 81, 136, 144
- international organization/s 26, 57, 78, 80, 83, 103, 104, 105–6, 108, 137f, 203, 214, 245
actors, arenas,
instruments 105
- international relations (IR) 11, 25, 47, 106–7, 237, 239
- anarchy 4–5
constructivism 41–2
deterrence 52–3
diplomacy 57–8
friction 58
game theory 77–8
geopolitics 79
global governance 80–1
great debates 106–7
- great powers 86–7
‘hard’ versus ‘soft’
power 87–8
- idealism 94–5
- liberalism 123–4
- neutrality 144–5
- polarity 157–8
versus ‘political science’ 106, 107
- ‘positive-sum’ versus ‘zero-sum’ game 78
- realism 188–9
- ‘repeat-play’ versus ‘single-play’ games 78
- security 201–2
state 212
war 229–30
- international society 107–8
‘pluralist’ versus
‘solidarist’ 108
- internationalism 29, 108–9, 119, 123, 139, 189, 216
versus
‘transnationalism’ 226
- ‘invisible hand’ (Smith) 18, 161
- Iranian Revolution (1979) 110, 193
- Iraq 68, 92, 93, 216, 230
- Ireland 179
- ‘iron law of oligarchy’ (Michels) 62, 163
- Islam 84, 88, 171, 220, 234, 243
- Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS) 110
- Islamism 32–3, 109–11, 171, 193, 219
see also religious fundamentalism
- Israel 38, 174, 193, 230
- issue terrorism 219
- Italy 21, 26, 43, 52, 68, 69, 86, 153, 160, 184, 196, 220, 223, 234–38
- Jainism 149
- James, W. 174
- Japan 6, 26, 44, 52, 86, 153, 215
- jihad* 111, 240
- Jordan 230
- judicial independence (principle) 112
- judiciary 14, 40, 66, 100, 111–13, 117, 144, 201, 203, 203f
- Julius Caesar 56
- junta* 57, 132
- junzi* (virtuous person) 34

- jus ad bellum* 113, 114
jus in bello 113, 114
 just war 113–14
 see also militarism
 justice 23, 37, 48, 65, 92, 94,
 100, 105, 108, 111, 114–15,
 116, 118, 123, 149, 164,
 167, 202, 238, 245
 ‘concrete’ versus
 ‘formal’ 114
 ‘procedural’ versus
 ‘substantive’ 114
 see also social justice
- Kant, I. 25, 45, 50, 94, 109,
 236, 243
 Kautsky, K. 129
 Keohane, R. 102, 236, 243
 Keynes, J. M. 18, 116, 236
 Keynesianism 21, 144, 150,
 206, 220
 demand management 115,
 236
 King, M. L. 22, 95, 184
 Kirchheimer, O. 162, 243
 Kong Fuzi 33
 Kosovo 51
 Kropotkin, P. 3, 31, 148, 236
 Kuhn, T. 150, 243
 Kymlicka, W. 133, 243
- Labour Party (UK) 162
laissez-faire 18, 31, 37, 101,
 115–16, 124, 125, 161
 see also socialism
 language xiv, 6, 58, 78, 133,
 135, 140, 172
 bias-free terminology xii
 Latin America 6, 21, 52, 122,
 141, 175, 177
 law xii, 2, 14, 22, 23, 24, 56, 63,
 64, 76, 85, 89, 111, 116–17,
 180, 193
 versus ‘international
 law’ 104
 versus ‘justice’ 114
 ‘natural’ versus
 ‘positive’ 116
 ‘primary’ versus ‘secondary’
 (Hart) 116
 ‘private’ versus
 ‘public’ 116–17
 see also parliament
 law-breaking (civil
 disobedience) 22
 law and order 67, 171, 148
 laws 19, 36, 121, 146, 237, 238
 leadership 17, 52, 66, 68,
 117–19, 151, 169, 179,
 180, 236
 ‘collective’ versus
 ‘personal’ 175–6
 ‘pattern of behaviour’ 117
 ‘personal quality’ 117
 ‘political value’ 117
 League of Nations 26, 86, 102,
 149
 leagues 102, 109
 left/right 18, 22, 64, 119–20,
 174, 181
 horseshoe spectrum 120f
 linear spectrum 119f
 two-dimensional
 spectrum 120f
 legal justice 114
 ‘legal positivism’ (Austin) 116
 legal rights 199
 legal sovereignty 210, 212
 legislative branch 66, 70, 152,
 176, 176f, 177, 180, 203,
 203f
 legitimacy 8, 9, 35, 51, 55, 61,
 67, 120–1, 126, 139, 144,
 151, 169, 171, 182, 189,
 212, 219
 versus ‘legality’ 120
 ‘legitimation crises’
 (Habermas) 121, 235, 242
 Lenin, V.I. 98, 118, 163, 236,
 243
 ‘primacy of economics’ 90
 Leninism 29, 130
 Lewis, B. 110, 243
 liberal democracies 43, 112,
 152, 203, 204
 liberal democracy 24, 33, 40,
 49, 84, 121–3, 124, 130,
 147, 157, 177, 194, 211,
 218, 223
 liberal feminists 154
 liberal individualism 27, 238
 liberal institutionalism 77–8,
 105–6
 liberal internationalism 106,
 108
 liberal nationalism 141, 142
 liberal realism (IR) 108
 liberalism 3, 21, 24, 31, 35, 37,
 40, 42, 93, 95, 96, 97, 99,
 101, 109, 119f, 123–4, 129,
 155, 165, 167, 171, 172,
 187, 190, 193, 221, 227,
 228, 236, 237, 238, 245
 ‘classical’ versus
 ‘modern’ 123
 fragmentation 167
 liberals 11, 81, 86, 106, 117,
 118, 138, 139, 157, 158,
 181, 185, 200, 202, 206,
 207, 212, 213, 230, 231
- Liberia 67
 libertarianism 3, 4, 22, 117,
 120, 125, 207, 231, 238
 liberty *see* freedom
 Libya 67
 Lijphart, A. 37–8, 243
 Lincoln, A. 49
 Lindblom, C. 159, 244
 local government 54, 125–6,
 137f, 214
 Locke, J. 4, 63, 99, 100, 117,
 121, 146, 156, 164, 181,
 213, 221, 236, 238
 loner terrorism 219
 Louis Napoleon 8
 Lukes, S. xiii, 173, 244
 Luxembourg 38
 Lyotard, J.-F. 172, 244
- Maastricht Treaty (1993) 214
 MacCallum, G.C. 75, 244
 Machiavelli, N. 63, 100, 188,
 236
 MacIntyre, A. 31, 244
 Mackinder, H. 79
 Madison, J. 156, 236
Magna Carta (1215) 39
 Mahan, A. 79
 Maistre, J. de 8, 236
 majoritarianism 37, 156
 mandate 49, 61, 127, 153,
 194, 195
 Marcuse, H. 47, 224, 229, 237,
 244
 market/s 3, 18, 29, 102, 115,
 122, 123, 127–8, 143, 205,
 214
 market economics 206
 market economy 122, 124, 128
 market forces 17, 103, 119,
 120, 125, 127–8, 213
 market reforms (shock
 therapy) 144
 market socialism 128
 Marx, K. 18, 28–30, 56, 88,
 89, 96, 161, 164, 166, 169,
 204–5, 229, 235, 236, 237,
 244
 prediction failure 30, 205
 Marxism 27, 29, 30, 59, 63, 72,
 78, 88, 101, 128–30, 141,
 165, 167, 172, 173, 191,
 192, 209, 229, 239
 economic base, political
 superstructure 89
 theory of revolution 198
 types (classical, modern,
 orthodox) 129
 see also critical theory
 Marxism-Leninism 29, 34, 112

- 'Marxism of Marx' 129
 Marxists 15–16, 22, 24, 86, 93, 106, 117, 122, 124, 132–3, 145, 157, 159, 160–1, 179, 198, 200, 201, 204, 205, 206, 213
 'modern Marxists' 11, 205
 mass media 42, 67, 80, 89, 130–1, 146, 151, 178, 223
 broadcast media 130, 180
 'freedom of press' 23
 'new' media 130
 print media 130
 television 17, 93, 110, 118, 130, 175
 mass party 162
 May the Fourth Movement (1915–19) 34
 Mazzini, G. 139, 237
 McLuhan, M. 131
 McWorld (Barber) 42, 240
 'medium is message' (McLuhan) 131
Mein Kampf (Hitler, 1925) 142
 meritocracy 34, 64, 115, 123, 131–2, 207, 223
 meta-ideology 124
see also bourgeois ideology
 meta-narratives 172
 metaphysics 94, 164, 170, 174
 'methodological collectivism' (Marxism) 27
 Mexico 44, 71, 160
 Michels, R. 62, 163, 237, 244
 Middle East 33, 110, 193
 militant Islam *see* Islamism
 militarism 7, 132–3
see also war
 military rule 57, 163
 military -industrial complex 63
 Mill, J. 237
 Mill, J. S. 76, 115, 117, 126, 164, 221–2, 224–5, 228, 237
 Millett, K. 153, 169, 237, 244
 Mills, C. Wright 62, 244
 'minarchists' 125
 minimal state 187, 212
 ministerial responsibility
 'collective' versus 'individual' (UK) 197
 minority rights xii, 5, 133–4, 135, 156, 200
 types (polyethnic, representational, self-governmental) 133
see also rights
 mixed member proportional (MMP) system 182
 modern liberalism 18, 75, 115, 123, 148–9, 206, 231
 modernization 134, 193
 'monarch in Parliament' (Austin) 211
 monarchy 77, 134–5, 177, 195, 196, 222
 'absolute' 1, 134, 211
 'constitutional' 134–5, 151
 monopoly of coercive power 210, 211, 212
 Montesquieu, C.-L. de S. 63, 156, 204, 237
 morality xi, 83, 95, 109, 113, 114, 169, 170, 189, 193, 197, 200, 205, 209, 210, 212, 219, 227, 228, 238
 moral relativism 157, 221
 moral responsibility 34, 184
 moral rights 199
 More, T. 29, 228, 244
 Morgenthau, H. 237
 Mosca, G. 62, 237
 most-favoured nation status 136
 motive-utilitarianism 227
Mujahideen 111
 multiculturalism 95, 133, 135–6, 184, 185, 201
see also conflict of civilizations
 multidimensional peacekeeping 155
 multilateralism 136–7, 245
 multilevel governance 85, 137–8
see also world government
 multinational corporations (MNCs) versus 'TNCs' 225
 multiparty systems 147, 163, 182
 multipolarity 11, 137, 159, 230
 Muslim Brotherhood (Egypt, 1928–) 110
 Mussolini, B. 43, 69, 132, 220
 'mutual aid' (Kropotkin) 3
 mutually assured destruction (MAD) 53
 Napoleon III 56
 nation 3, 68, 83, 138–9, 140, 154
 'cultural' versus 'political' 138
 Nation of Islam 184
 nation-building 141, 155
 nation-state/s 4, 81, 82, 102, 106, 109, 135, 137, 139–40, 185, 192, 214, 215, 216
 National Front (France) 185
 national interest/s 15, 58, 102, 104, 105, 106, 108, 174, 237
 national security 25, 74
 national
 self-determination 141
 national sovereignty 210, 211, 214
 nationalism 7, 8, 27, 37, 55, 69, 84, 95, 98, 108, 119, 132, 137, 139, 140–2, 184, 192, 200, 212, 226
 developing-world 109
 types (cultural, ethnic, political) 140
 nationalist terrorism 219
 nationality 84, 92
 nationalization 181, 206
 nationhood,
 'civic' versus 'organic' concept 138
 NATO 24, 50, 201
 natural law 116, 211, 234
 'natural order of things' 207
 natural rights 199, 227
 natural sciences 12, 165, 166, 170
 Nazi Germany 26, 69, 112, 201, 223
 Nazism (national socialism) 32, 59, 140, 142–3, 184, 185
see also racialism
 need (Brundtland) 216
 needs 76, 207
 neo-classical economics 186, 236
 neo-classical liberalism *see* neo-liberalism
 neo-colonialism 68, 97, 98
 neo-conservatism 8, 33, 224
 neo-corporatism 43
 neo-fascism 69
 neo-idealism 95
 neo-imperialism 97
 neo-institutionalism 100
 neo-liberal economics 8, 80
 neo-liberal
 institutionalists 102, 236, 239
 neo-liberalism 4, 115, 143–4
see also classical liberalism
 neo-Marxism 47, 54, 90, 98, 121, 129
 neo-Nazism 142, 143
 neo-pluralism 156, 157
 neo-realism 11, 158, 188, 189, 236, 239
 same as 'structural realism' 4, 188

- neo-revisionist socialists 174
 Netherlands 21, 38, 44, 98, 134
 networks 80, 84, 85
 Neustadt, R. 175, 204, 244
 neutrality 14, 112, 144–5, 166
 ‘new’ Labour 220
 New Left 3–4, 47, 167, 208, 229
 ‘new man’ (fascist) 68
 ‘new political economy’ 161
 ‘new politics’ 208
 New Right 3–4, 18, 21, 22, 37, 44, 73, 75, 97, 99, 115, 117, 120f, 125, 157, 167, 179, 182, 196, 200, 206, 212, 213, 222, 231, 238
 ‘new’ social democracy 206
 ‘new’ social movements 47, 163, 208
 ‘new’ wars 229
 New Zealand 13, 143, 153
 Nicaraguan Revolution (1979) 198
 Nietzsche, F. 118, 187, 237–8
 Nigeria 132
 night-watchman states 212
 Nixon, R. M. 175
 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) 79–80, 105, 145–6
 ‘advocacy’ versus ‘operational’ 145
 international 145, 177–8
 World Bank’s definition 145
 non-state actors 105, 189, 214, 229
 normative approach 62, 81, 96, 99, 121, 141, 156, 164, 165, 166, 170
see also values
 North America 51
 Northern Ireland Assembly 55
 Norway 88
 Nozick, R. 167, 238, 244
 nuclear weaponry 53, 149, 189, 215, 219, 230
 ‘horizontal’ versus ‘vertical’ proliferation 7
 Nuremberg Charter (1945) 45–6
 nurture -nature debate 91
 Nye, J. 102, 236, 243, 244
 Oakeshott, M. 96, 238, 244
 Obama administration (2009–) 88
 objectivity 106, 164, 165, 166
 obligation/s 4, 35, 82, 85, 121, 146–7, 213
 ‘legal’ versus ‘moral’ 146
 official executive 65, 67
 Ohmae, K. 226, 244
 oligarchy 62, 163, 244
 ‘one-dimensional societies’ (Marcuse) 224, 237, 244
 one-nation conservatism 37, 206, 222
 one-party states 29, 30, 57, 162, 223
 one-worldism 107, 109
 opposition 147–8, 224
 oppression 22, 47, 95, 199, 201
 order 1, 2, 3, 10, 38, 75, 100, 117, 119, 123, 125, 148–9, 181, 201, 224
 ‘natural’ versus ‘political’ 148
 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) 102
 ‘organization is mobilization of bias’ 173
 Organization of Petroleum-Exporting Countries (OPEC) 102
 ‘organized interests’ 178
see also pressure groups
 Orientalism (Said, 2003) 171, 245
 orthodox communism 29, 112
 overseas aid *see* international aid
 Owen, R. 31, 238
 pacifism 149
see also terrorism
 Pakistan 193
 Papadopoulos, G. 132
 paradigm/s 107, 150, 245
 paradigm shift 101, 150
 Pareto, V. 238
 ‘foxes’ versus ‘lions’ 62
 parliament/s 13, 16, 19, 25, 39, 61, 65, 66, 100, 134, 150–1, 169, 179, 180, 195, 197
 committee system 151
 ‘policy-influencing’ versus ‘policy-making’ 151
see also US Constitution
 parliamentary democracy 157, 170, 237
 parliamentary executives 65–6
 parliamentary government 152f, 152–3, 174, 176, 198
see also government
 parliamentary socialism 209
 parliamentary sovereignty 211
 parliamentary systems 13, 67, 69, 100, 147, 179, 182, 204
 party leaders 180
 party list system 61, 182
 party politics, ‘de-ideologized’ 174
 party systems 100, 151, 153, 163, 178
 paternalism 18, 206
 patriarchy 22, 59, 72, 78, 95, 117, 123, 124, 153–4, 213
see also women
 patriotism 132, 134, 138, 141, 154–5, 177, 196
 peace 93, 106, 158, 174
 peace-building 155
 peace movement 208
 Peloponnesian War 188
 ‘peoplism’ 17
 perception 63, 78, 82, 203, 218
 ‘perfect competition’ 115
 Permissiveness, versus ‘toleration’ 221
 Peronism 8
Perpetual Peace (Kant) 45
 Persian Empire 98
 personality 17, 118
 ‘personal is political’ (slogan) 153
 Peru 44
 philosopher-kings (Plato) 62
 philosophical anarchists 147
 philosophical materialism 94
 philosophy 163–4, 165
 Pinochet y Ugarte, A. 132
 Plato 29, 55–6, 62, 94, 100, 115, 116, 146, 164, 166, 238
 Plekhanov, G. 56, 129
 pluralism 63, 69, 101, 122, 123, 130, 135, 156–7, 170, 173, 178, 194, 211, 221, 236
 ‘classical’ versus ‘reformed’ 156
 ‘descriptive’ versus ‘normative’ 156
 varieties (cultural, moral, political) 156
 ‘pluralistic stagnation’ 157
 Plymouth Brethren 149
 Poland 175
 polarity 11, 87, 157–8
 policing 213, 223
 policy 2, 15, 16, 44, 61, 85, 112, 118, 132, 158–9, 197, 218
 policy-making stages 158
 policy mandate 127
 policy networks 85
polis 168
 political correctness (PC) xii

- political culture 62, 88, 153,
159–61, 178, 183
types (parochial, participant,
subject) 160
- political economy 143, 161–2
see also economics
- political executive 65, 66
- political Islam *see* Islamism
- political nationalism
types (anti-colonial,
conservative, expansionist,
liberal) 140–1
see also nationalism
- 'political obligation' 146
- political participation 6, 190
- political party/parties 3, 24–5,
35, 59, 60, 65, 66, 119,
126, 127, 151, 162–3, 175,
178–9, 180, 182, 194, 206,
208, 209, 218, 222, 237,
243, 244
- 'cadre' versus 'mass' 162
- 'catch-all'
(Kirchheimer) 162
- 'constitutional' versus
'revolutionary' 162
- distinguishing
characteristics 162
- 'integrative' versus
'representative'
(Neumann) 162
- versus 'pressure groups'
177
- social class 205
see also law
- political philosophy 85, 120,
148, 156, 163–5, 167, 170
- political revolutions 198
- political science 85, 106, 120,
165–6, 167, 170, 204, 218
- political spectrum 119, 119f
- political system 217–18
- political theory 4, 62, 75, 115,
154, 164, 166–7, 171, 196,
213, 229
- politicians (professional) x
- politics 1, 4, 12, 23, 35, 84,
117, 165, 168–9, 189
'domestic' versus
'international' 107
identification with
'government' 85
- 'Politics' (academic
subject) 168, 173
- Politics* (Aristotle) 234
- Popper, K. 165, 238
- popular mandate 127
- popular sovereignty 211
- population size 79
- populism 6, 8, 169–70, 221
- Portugal 44, 52, 98
- 'positive' discrimination 133
- positive law 116
- positive rights 23
- positivism xi, 12, 42, 64, 107,
165, 167, 170
see also empiricism
- post-behaviouralism 13
- post-Cold War 41, 47, 81, 105,
136, 155, 215
- post-colonialism 107, 108,
135, 141, 170–1, 193
- post-communist states 160,
175
- post-feminism 73, 154
- post-industrial society 60,
171–2, 205, 208
- 'post-liberal' perspective 135
- post-materialism 208
- post-modernism xiv, 42, 58,
73, 158, 167, 171–2, 188,
244
- post-positivists 107
- post-structuralism 172, 235
- poverty 33, 45, 53, 54, 65, 68,
82, 90, 104, 115, 128, 145,
183, 202, 207, 210, 212, 231
- poverty trap 103
- power xiii, 1, 3, 7, 10, 11–12,
13, 18, 19, 20, 23, 40, 49,
56, 58, 61, 63, 67, 68, 73,
79, 101, 106, 108, 114, 119,
120, 131, 151, 156, 157,
161, 163, 168, 169, 172–4,
175, 176, 177, 179, 180,
190, 195, 197, 208, 212,
222, 225, 226
versus 'authority' 173
'faces' 173, 241
'radical' face (Lukes) 173,
244
see also hard/soft power
- power elite (Mills) 62, 63, 244
- 'power over' versus 'power
to' 172
- 'power to persuade'
(Neustadt) 175
- power politics 95, 106, 173,
188
- pragmatism 63, 162, 174, 219
- president/s 174–6, 179, 244
'constitutional' versus
'executive' 174–5
non-executive 152, 174
versus 'presidency' xi
- presidential appointments
(USA) 177
- presidential executives 66
- presidential government 175,
176–7
- presidential systems 16, 38,
67, 70, 85, 100, 147, 151,
153, 203
- pressure group/s 24, 59, 151,
157, 162, 177–9, 208, 218
'insider' versus
'outsider' 178
- 'promotional' versus
'sectional' 178
- prime minister 16, 66, 134,
152, 175, 176, 179–80
see also head of government
- Principles of Morals and
Legislation* (Bentham,
1789) 106, 234, 240
- Prison Notebooks*
(Gramsci) 89, 235, 242
- prisoners' dilemma (PD) 77,
77f, 186
- private interest groups
(USA) 178
- privatization 54, 143, 182, 196
- professionals 131, 146, 204
- profit motive 27, 98, 128, 220,
232
- proletariat 18, 89, 108, 129,
161, 204
- 'promotional pressure
groups' 145, 178
- property 27, 28, 36, 93, 117,
125, 180–2, 200, 201, 235,
238
types (common, private,
state) 181, 182
- property law 117
- property rights 15, 23
- 'property is theft'
(Proudhon) 3
- proportional representation
(PR) 61, 153, 182–3
- protective groups 178
- protest politics 163, 208
see also 'new' social
movements
- Protestantism 20, 42, 239
- Proudhon, P.-J. 3, 238
- psychology 12, 138, 148, 149,
154, 160, 171, 173, 193–4,
227, 238
- public choice theory 16, 161,
186
- public demands 217f, 217–18
- public interest 210
- 'public interest groups' 145,
178
- public morality 117, 241
- public opinion 61, 174, 190
versus 'political culture' 160
- public policy 147, 158, 178,
189, 206

- public-private divide 24, 81, 193, 228
- public-private partnerships 85, 137
- punishment 114, 116, 146, 148, 173, 183–4
- Qatar 134
- Quakers 149
- quality of life 208
- quantitative research 12
- quasi-state *see* failed state
- race 26, 68, 92, 108, 135, 138, 154, 184–5
- racialism/racism 5, 22, 69, 97, 141, 142, 165, 185–6, 222
see also anti-Semitism
- radical democracy 122, 196
- radical ecologists 217
- radical feminism 124, 153, 237
- radical Islam *see* Islamism
- r ratification powers 13
- rational choice 78, 99, 101, 129, 159, 161, 167, 186–7
- rationalism 68, 123, 187–8, 222, 224, 238
- rationality 53, 170, 173, 221, 235
- Rawls, J. 82, 131, 167, 238, 245
- reactionary ecologism 59
- Reaganism 143, 215, 220
- realism 11, 41, 94, 104, 108, 109, 123, 173, 188–9, 236
‘classical’ versus
‘structural’ 188
- realists 26, 51, 58, 77, 79, 81, 87, 106, 202, 203, 230
- reason 5, 117, 187, 234, 236, 237
- reasoning,
‘inductive’ versus
‘deductive’ 164
- rebellion/s 3, 198, 208
- Rechtsstaat* 200
- referendum 49, 189–90
- reform 187, 190–1, 205, 207, 209
- reformist socialism 209
- Regan, T. 5, 245
- regional powers 86
- regionalism 191–2
‘international’ versus
‘sub-national’ 191
‘new’ 192
see also globalization
- régions* (France) 126
- regions (sub-national) 71, 140
- rehabilitation 183–4
- religion 21, 23, 95, 109, 133, 140, 149, 178, 219, 221, 227, 239
- religious fundamentalism 76, 95, 97, 108, 141, 157, 171, 192–4, 224
see also Islamism
- ren* (humanity) 34
- representation 1, 13, 25, 35, 44, 49, 61, 127, 178, 194–5, 197, 237
- Republic* (Cicero) 196, 241
- republican liberals 124
- republicanism 195–6, 237, 238
- resemblance model 194–5
- ‘resource security’ 79
- responsibility 2, 21, 27, 152, 152f, 190, 196–7, 220
- responsibility to protect (R2P) 94
- retribution 183
- revisionist socialism 209
- revolution/s x, 69, 129, 147, 166, 197–9, 205, 231, 236, 237
causes and consequences 198–9
versus ‘reform’ 190
types (cultural, political, social) 198
- revolutionary socialism 191, 193, 209
- rewards 65, 123, 205, 207, 212
- Rhine-Alpine capitalism 17
- Ricardo, D. 74, 115, 161
- right [wing] *see* left/right
- right to life 6
- rights 1, 21, 22, 48, 72, 78, 95, 114, 116, 119, 125, 164, 177, 178, 181, 199–200, 207, 208, 212, 219
‘legal’ versus ‘moral’ 199
‘negative’ 23, 199
‘positive’ 199
see also human rights
- rising expectations 166, 198
- Rittberger, V. 105, 245
- ‘rolling back state’ 37, 75
- Rome Statute (1998) 46
- Roosevelt, F. D. 244
- Rosenau, J. 84, 245
- Rousseau, J.-J. 100, 146, 164, 169, 211, 238
- Ruggie, J. 136, 245
- rule of law 112, 117, 200–1
- rule-utilitarianism 227
- ruling class 37, 63, 89, 96, 156, 209, 213, 222, 237
- Russian Federation 51, 93, 144, 175
- Russian Revolution (1917) x, 69, 198
- Russia (Tsarist) 86, 141
- Rwanda 33, 46, 67
- Saddam Hussein 132
- Said, E. 171, 245
- Saint-Simon, C.-H. 170
- Salafism (Wahhabism) 110, 111
- Salazar, A. 44
- Sandel, M. 31, 245
- Sartre, J.-P.,
‘existence comes before
essence’ 92
- satyagraha* (Gandhi) 22
- Saudi Arabia 110, 134
- Schattschneider, E. E. 173, 245
- Schumpeter, J. A. 63
- science 164, 170, 172, 191, 241
‘can only falsify hypotheses’ (Popper) 165
- science of muddling through (Lindblom) 159, 244
- science of politics xi–xii
- ‘scientific method’ 165
- ‘scientific socialism’ 129, 209, 229
- scientism 165
- Scotland 237, 238
- Scottish Parliament 55
- sectional groups 178
- secularism 193
- security 12, 86, 123, 189, 192, 201–2, 207, 214, 219
see also collective security
- security dilemma 5, 7, 53, 202–3, 241
‘dilemma of interpretation’ versus ‘dilemma of response’ 202
see also arms race
- self-defence 94, 149
- self-determination 141, 200, 237
- self-government 142
- ‘self-help’ 5, 26, 58, 188, 202
- self-interest 3, 99, 103, 104, 186, 188, 228
- semi-presidential executives 66
- semi-presidential systems 176, 177, 179, 204
- Sen, A. 90, 245
- separation of powers 20, 40, 70, 112, 152, 156, 176, 179, 196, 203–4, 236
‘invitation to struggle’ 204
- Serbia 51, 92
- ‘sex’ versus ‘gender’ 77

- sexual politics 86, 237, 244
see also feminism
- sexuality 95, 208, 235
- shallow ecologism 60
- Sharia law 109, 115
- Shia Islam 110
- Siberia 79
- Sikhism 193
- Simon, H. 159, 243
- sin 183
- Singapore 34
- single transferable vote (STV) 61, 182
- single-member plurality (SMP) system 182
- Six-Day War (1967) 230
- 'smart' power 87, 88f
- Smith, A. 18, 74, 99, 115, 161, 239
- 'social' anarchism 3
- social capital 160
- social capitalism 17
- social choice theory 161, 186
- social class 4, 16, 18, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31, 62, 69, 78, 86, 88, 89, 96, 117, 121, 122, 124, 129, 154, 161, 163, 166, 169, 171, 173, 198, 200, 201, 204–5, 208, 209, 213, 218, 223, 227, 239
- 'class consciousness' (Marx) 204–5
- 'class-for-itself' versus 'class-in-itself' (Marx) 205
- definitions (Marxist versus non-Marxist) 204
- international solidarity 108
- marketing-based distinction (A–E) 204
- social cohesion 136, 141, 182, 185, 191, 209, 221, 224, 231
- social constructivism ,
 same as 'constructivism' 41
- social contract 4, 85, 99, 121, 146, 164, 199, 213, 238
- social democracy 21, 22, 31, 80, 94, 120f, 123, 205–6, 207, 209, 210, 220, 231
- forms 206
- modern 207
- Social Democratic Party (SPD, Germany) 162
- social democratic states 212
- social justice 82, 114, 125, 131, 178, 206, 207, 219, 235
- deserts, needs, rights 207
see also global justice
- social liberalism 124
- social movements 79, 80, 146, 162, 207–8
- versus 'pressure groups' 177
- social responsibility 99, 196, 231
- social revolutions 198
- social sciences 15, 170
- social status 34, 78, 114
- socialism 3, 17, 21, 29, 37, 59, 62, 89, 97, 97, 115, 119f, 120f, 128, 129, 171, 181, 182, 187, 190, 192, 209–10, 228, 239
- 'ethical' versus
 'scientific' 209
- 'fundamentalist' versus
 'revisionist' 209
- 'reformist' versus
 'revolutionary' 209
- top-down 210
- types 209
see also third way
- socialist feminists 154
- socialist internationalism 109
- 'socialist legality' 112
- socialist libertarianism 125
- socialists 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 31, 32, 41, 75, 99, 118, 127, 131, 138, 139, 148–9, 162, 185, 200, 207, 231
- society 99, 100, 101, 117, 159, 166, 184, 238, 239
- society of states 108
- sociobiologists 154
- sociology and sociologists 63, 76, 86, 121, 159, 204, 239, 244
- Socrates 56, 228
- soft power 145, 244
- Somalia 67
- South Africa 184
- South America 143
- Southeast Asia 212
- South Korea 34
- sovereignty 10, 39, 54, 55, 67, 81, 98, 102, 105, 125, 133, 152, 191, 195, 210–12, 216, 234
- 'external' versus
 'internal' 210–11
- federal systems 70, 70f
- 'legal' versus 'political' 210
- 'pooled'/shared' 70, 72, 105
- Spain 8, 52, 55, 134, 192, 211
- Sri Lanka 193, 219
- Stalin, J. 27, 57, 213, 223, 243
- Stalinism 29, 46, 120f, 130
- state/s 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 49, 58, 66, 75, 76, 80, 82, 84, 85, 87, 88, 100, 104, 105, 107–8, 114, 116, 120, 121, 124, 125, 129, 137, 144, 146, 156, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, 181, 188, 191, 193, 202, 203, 205, 210, 212–14, 215, 220, 223, 225, 226, 229, 230, 235, 239, 244
- 'decline', 'retreat' 213–14
- 'five key features' 212
- 'four features' (IR) 212
- need for (debate) 213
- sub-national 70f, 71, 72, 126
- types 212–13
- 'withering away' (Marx) 29, 30
- state-building 68, 155
- 'state of nature' 4, 10, 213
- state power (debate) 213
- state socialism 130
- state sovereignty/sovereign state 92, 105, 210
- Stormont Parliament 55
- subsidiarity 214
- Sudan 193
- Sulla 56
- Sun Tzu 188–9
- Sunni Islam 110
- superpower/s 11, 53, 83, 87, 93, 95, 136, 158, 189, 215, 242
- supply and demand 84, 127
- supranationalism 69, 105, 141, 191, 214, 215–16
 versus 'intergovernmentalism' 102, 103
- supreme courts 71
- sustainable development 54, 216–17
see also development
- Sweden 13, 44, 152, 220, 231
- Switzerland 70, 189, 214
- Syria 67, 230
- system of states 107
- systems theory 86, 100, 198, 217–18, 239
- 'tadpole philosophy' (Tawney) 132
- Taiping Rebellion (1850–64) 34
- Taiwan 87
- Taliban 110
- Tamil Tigers 219
- Tawney, R. H. 75, 132, 239
- taxation 13, 19, 126, 146, 177, 218, 220, 232
- taxation and welfare law 116
- terrorism 33, 87–8, 107, 202, 218–20, 229, 230
see also violence
- Thailand 34

- Thatcherism 8, 143, 162, 220, 242
 'no such thing as society' 98–9
- theocracy 193
- 'think globally, act locally' 60
- third way 120, 220–1
see also capitalism
- Third World 54
- Thoreau, H. D. 22
- Thucydides 4, 188
- Tibet 98
- toleration 69, 123, 157, 202, 221–2, 236
 'negative' versus 'positive' 221
- Tönnies, F. 32
- Toryism 222–3
- totalitarian democracy 224
- totalitarian states 69, 213
- totalitarianism 1, 8, 24, 28, 119, 132, 169, 194, 208, 223–4, 229, 234, 238, 242
- traits 223
- Tracy: A. L. C. Destutt, Comte de ~ 96
- trade unions 24, 44, 85, 89, 178, 200, 205, 208, 226, 238
- tradition/custom 36, 121, 125, 174, 187, 222, 224–5, 237
 versus 'progress' and 'reaction' 224
- traditional conservatives 99, 131, 157, 174, 207, 238
- 'transcendental idealism' (Kant) 94
- transnational corporations (TNCs) 54, 68, 79, 80, 98, 140, 145, 214, 225–6
 'economies in own right' 225
- transnational terrorism 219
- transnationalism 83, 225, 226–7
- treaties 102, 104, 177
- Treaty of European Union (1993) 214
- Treaty of Versailles (1919) 141, 143
- trust 6, 58, 102, 106, 118, 203, 235
 'distrust' 77
- trusteeship model (Burke) 194, 195
- truth xi, xii–xiii, 22, 96, 165, 221
 'absolute' versus 'conventional' xiv
 Mahayana Buddhism xiv
- 'social construct' (Foucault) 58
see also postmodernism
- Tulloch, G. 187, 241
- two-party systems 147, 152, 163
- 'tyranny of majority' 50
- Übermensch* (superman) 118
- ultra vires* principle 113
- ultra-liberalism 3
- ultra-socialism 3
- uncertainty 158, 218
- underclass 205
- unemployment 18, 33, 149, 157, 183, 205
- unicameralism 13, 151
- Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) 7, 27, 29, 41, 53, 71, 87, 89, 105, 110, 129, 141, 185, 201, 213, 215, 223, 242
 collapse 98, 103
 imperialism 109
 'socialist legality' 112
- unipolarity 158
- United Kingdom 7, 12, 17, 21, 35, 39, 41, 52, 55, 98, 112, 134, 143, 153, 160, 171, 184, 191, 205, 215, 220, 222, 227, 231, 238, 239, 242
 responsible government 197
 rule of law 200
- United Nations 54, 81, 105, 145, 149, 202, 216, 230
- UN Declaration of Human Rights (1948) 92
- UN peacekeeping 155
- UN Security Council 26, 87
- United States of America (USA) 7, 8, 12, 17, 20, 21, 33, 47, 52, 53, 54, 63, 70, 71, 76, 87–8, 93, 105, 110, 112, 115, 136–7, 143, 158, 160, 166, 171, 178, 182, 184, 193, 200, 203, 204, 205, 215, 220, 222, 230, 231, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 242
- black consciousness movement (1960s) 135
- isolationist phase 86
- president 175
- municipalities and towns 126
- republicanism 196
- Southern states 23
- US Congress 13, 151, 177
- US House of Representatives 13
- US Senate 13, 177
- US Constitution (1787) 39, 177
- 1st–10th Amendments (Bill of Rights) 14
- 10th Amendment (state rights) 72
- 14th, 15th, 19th Amendments 14
see also bill of rights
- utilitarian generalization 227
- utilitarianism 3, 43, 45, 99, 159, 165, 186, 190, 200, 227–8, 234, 237
- Utopia* (More, 1516) 228, 244
- 'utopian socialism' 209, 229, 238
- utopianism 94, 189, 199, 210, 228–9, 238
- value judgements x
- values xi–xii, xiv, 12, 34, 62, 96f, 108, 110, 117, 132, 133, 147, 148, 150, 156, 159, 165, 166, 167, 172, 184, 185, 187, 193, 208, 222, 224
 versus 'facts' 63
see also normative approach
- 'vanguard party' (Lenin) 118
- Vatican 88, 134
- Verba, S. 160, 240
- Vienna Circle 170
- Vietnam 29, 167, 198
- violence 148, 194, 198, 199, 229
see also pacifism
- Virginia school 186
- Völksgemeinschaft* 32
- voting and voting behaviour 7, 12, 127, 160, 166, 186
- wages 207, 226
- Waltz, K. 11, 239, 246
- war 5, 7, 11, 53, 57, 74, 84, 102, 109, 144, 158, 175, 177, 201, 203, 214, 229–30
see also just war
- war crimes 46
- 'wars of plunder' 229
- 'war on terror' 87
- Washington Consensus 54, 144
- waves of democratization (Huntington) 52, 243
- weak state *see* failed state
- wealth 114, 115, 161
- weapons of mass destruction (WMD) 8, 219
- Weber, M. xiii, 15, 212, 239
 authority (types) 9, 121
- welfare 27, 75, 143, 205, 231–2

- welfare benefits 207
- welfare liberalism 123
- welfare rights 199
- welfare state/s 206
 - types (Esping-Andersen) 231, 242
- welfare Toryism 222
- Welsh Assembly 55
- Wendt, A. 12, 239, 246
- Western Marxism 129
- Western world 32-3, 75, 97, 105, 110, 124
- West Germany 52, 160
- Western Marxism 129
- Western world 32-3, 75, 97, 105, 110, 124
- Westminster model 37, 152
- 'will to power' (Nietzsche) 187, 237
- Wilson, T. W. 50
- women 90, 117, 133, 136, 171, 195, 200, 237
 - see also* patriarchy
- women's liberation
 - movement 73, 95, 208, 209
- women's suffrage 73
- workers/workforce 79, 178
 - 'blue-collar versus 'white-collar' 204
 - 'manual' versus 'non-manual' 204
- working class 204, 208, 209
- World Bank 54, 136, 144, 145
- World Court 112
- world government 45
 - see also* global governance
- World Trade Organization (WTO, 1995-) 74, 81
 - GATT 136
- World War I 7, 25, 69, 105, 106, 141, 143, 230
- World War II 26, 46, 105, 136, 141, 143, 215, 230
- world-system theorists 54
- Yugoslavia 33, 46, 185, 211
- Zen xiv
- zones of peace 51