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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 ‘hyping’ 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 militari sm 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 distinc-
tion 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 estab-
lishes common norms and values that bind society together, and thereby gives indi-
viduals 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 inde-
pendence, 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 classi-
fied 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, auton-
omous 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 to 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 ‘peopiasm’.
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
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