

on different congressional issues. This second mechanism creates different but enduring political supports to decisions on each issue and also tends to produce relative policy stability.

A number of empirical studies show that parliamentary regimes with proportional representation perform better regarding electoral participation, low levels of politically motivated violence, women's representation, and social and environmental policies. They also appear to be associated to better growth-promoting policies, although they tend to imply relatively high taxes and public spending, which do not necessarily favor growth. Parliamentary regimes with proportional representation tend to develop broad programs benefiting a majority of the voters, including redistribution through social security and welfare policies, in contrast to narrower targets in both parliamentary regimes with majoritarian elections and presidential regimes. Other favorable conditions for economic growth include administrative effectiveness and an independent judiciary, which may be favored by a robust and pluralistic democratic regime. However, economic performance also depends on other factors, such as economic institutions (including those regulating property rights, contracts, and finances) and an educated population able to make technological innovation available and operational, which may not be directly associated with specific constitutional formulas.

Different constitutional alternatives have been linked to different rates of success in attempts of democratization and the duration of democratic regimes. Strategic choices of different constitutional formulas may be driven by actors' relative bargaining strength, electoral expectations, and attitudes to risk. Citizens and political leaders tend to support those formulas producing satisfactory results for themselves and reject those making them permanently excluded and defeated. As a consequence, those constitutional formulas producing widely distributed satisfactory outcomes can be more able to develop endogenous support and endure. Widely representative and effective political outcomes can feed social support for the corresponding institutions, while exclusionary, biased, arbitrary, or ineffective outcomes might foster citizens' and leaders' rejection of the institutions producing such results.

Generally, constitutional democracies favoring power sharing and inclusiveness should be able to obtain higher endogenous support and have greater longevity than those favoring the concentration of power. Empirical accounts show that democratic regimes are the most peaceful ones, while semi-democratic or transitional regimes are most prone to conflict, even more than exclusionary dictatorships (basically because the latter increase the costs of rebellion). Among democracies, parliamentary constitutional regimes are more resilient to crises and more able to endure than presidential ones. More specifically, parliamentary regimes with majoritarian electoral systems appear to be associated to higher frequency of ethnic and civil wars than presidential regimes, while parliamentary regimes with proportional representation are the most peaceful ones.

See also *Coalition Theory; Cohabitation; Constitutional Law; Constitutional Monarchy; Constitutional Systems, Comparative;*

Constitutions and Constitutionalism; Divided Government; Dual Executive; Parliamentary Democracy; Proportional Representation; Unitary Government; Westminster Model; Winner-Take-All.

JOSEP M. COLOMER

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brennan, Geoffrey, and James Buchanan. *The Reason of Rules. Constitutional Political Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Buchanan, James, and Gordon Tullock. *The Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundations of Constitutional Democracy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1962.
- Cheibub, José A., and Fernando Limongi. "Modes of Government Formation and the Survival of Presidential Regimes." *Annual Review of Political Science* 5 (2002): 151–175.
- Colomer, Josep M. *Political Institutions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Colomer, Josep M., and Gabriel L. Negretto. "Can Presidentialism Work Like Parliamentarism?" *Government and Opposition* 40, no. 1 (2005): 60–89.
- Cox, Gary W. *The Efficient Secret: The Cabinet and the Development of Political Parties in Victorian England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Duverger, Maurice. *Les constitutions de la France*, 14th ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1998.
- Flinders, Matthew. "Shifting the Balance? Parliament, the Executive, and the British Constitution." *Political Studies* 50, no. 1: 23–42.
- Hammond, Thomas H., and Gary J. Miller. "The Core of the Constitution." *American Political Science Review*, 81 (1987): 1155–1174.
- Hardin, Russell. *Liberalism, Constitutionalism, and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Krehbiel, Kenneth. *Pivotal Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Laver, Michael, and Norman Schofield. *Multiparty Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Laver, Michael, and Kenneth Shepsle. "Divided Government: America Is Not Exceptional." *Governance* 4, no. 3 (1991): 250–269.
- Lijphart, Arend. *Patterns of Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Linz, Juan J., and Arturo Valenzuela, eds. *The Failure of Presidential Democracy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Mueller, Dennis. *Constitutional Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Müller, Wolfgang, and Kaare Strom. *Coalition Governments in Western Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Persson, Torsten, and Guido Tabellini. *The Economic Effects of Constitutions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2003.
- Powell, G. Bingham. *Elections as Instruments of Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Reynal-Querol, Marta. "Ethnicity, Political Systems, and Civil Wars." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46, no. 1 (2002): 29–54.
- Shugart, Matthew S., and John M. Carey. *Presidents and Assemblies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Constructivism

The term constructivism encompasses several schools of thought that emphasize the role of social constructions in the study and practice of politics. Social constructions are defined as shared interpretations or ideas on how the material world is or should be ordered. Constructions are neither objective, since they exist only by virtue of being agreed on by more or less extended groups of individuals, nor subjective, given their collective nature. Rather, they are *intersubjective*.

Social constructions operate at the epistemological as well as the ontological level. On the one hand, they provide

communities of scholars with common understandings of the reality they face; on the other hand, they are intersubjective structures influencing political life. While most, if not all, constructivists acknowledge the existence of both dimensions, they are divided as to which dimension should be assigned more weight in the analysis of political phenomena. This disagreement underlies the main cleavage in the constructivist camp—that between postmodern and modern constructivism.

POSTMODERN CONSTRUCTIVISM

The most radical of the two variants, postmodern constructivism, points to the role of constructions in the so-called scientific process to attack the positivist underpinnings of mainstream political science. Positivism asserts the existence of an objective political reality whose laws can be progressively discovered through the formulation and testing of theories. For postmodern constructivists, conversely, the presence of unobservable elements in any account of politics, and the need to replace these elements with assumptions and mental constructs, makes theory building necessarily a socially laden enterprise: one in which the formulation of hypotheses on the political world hinges to a large extent on the researcher's cultural, ideological, and political convictions. Empirical work, according to postmodern constructivists, can do very little to increase the objectivity of research. For one thing, the complexity of the sociopolitical reality, where perfect empirical tests are rare, and the ever-present possibility of formulating ad hoc explanations make it very hard, if not impossible, to disprove any theory. Second, and perhaps more important, most testing methods and procedures are themselves theory driven, and hence biased in favor of the hypotheses they are meant to evaluate.

The resulting view of science is very far from the positivist ideals of neutrality, universality, and progress. For postmodern constructivists, the subjects (i.e., researchers) and the objects of political research can never be fully separated. If there are dominant theories in certain historical periods, this is due less to their actual validity than to their consistency with prevailing cultures or professional orientations influencing scholars' interpretation of the political reality. To the extent that any meaningful political research can exist at all, the postmodern constructivists conclude that it can only be a theoretically and methodologically "anarchic" activity, in which no approach can be deemed more "scientific" than others and, ultimately, anything goes.

MODERN CONSTRUCTIVISM

Unlike their postmodern counterparts, modern constructivists do not take their concern with the intersubjectivity of the scientific process as far as rejecting positivism altogether. While partially constructed, they contend, competing accounts of the political world are not all the same, and careful empirical research, combined with theoretical debate, can help the scholarly community distinguish between plausible and untenable explanations. At least in the long run, in sum, positivist research methods can result in a faithful depiction of the sociopolitical reality.

Far more important than the constructions of the researcher are, for modern constructivists, those of the actors of domestic and international politics: voters, leaders, parties, bureaucracies, states, and so on. In contrast to rationalist approaches, which view political actors as constantly maximizing certain stable objectives (e.g., power, wealth, security, etc.), modern constructivism argues that the nature, identity, and preferences of individual and collective agents are not fixed and exogenously given, but formed through processes of socialization that shape their interpretation of the world, define appropriate behaviors and, ultimately, influence political action. The field of nuclear proliferation provides a good illustration of the differences between rationalists and constructivists: While rationalists focus on the material side of the issue and see weapons as, in principle, equally threatening regardless of who proliferates, for constructivists the consequences of nuclear armaments on international security cannot be assessed apart from the identity of the countries involved, the nature and history of their relations, and their perception of each other.

If social constructions influence the behavior of political actors, social interactions derive, by definition, from individual actions. So, while constructivism rejects individualism—the idea that the characteristics of society stem from those of the individual agents in it—it does not embrace its opposite, holism, entirely. Rather, constructivists posit the "mutual constitution" of intersubjective structures and sociopolitical agents, in which neither part logically precedes the other. As a result, the basic coordinates of politics are always subject to (more or less gradual) change.

So defined, constructivism is more of a "thin" theoretical framework than a substantive theory of politics: It draws attention to the role of social structures in the explanation of political behavior but is compatible with different specific sources of political agents' identities and preferences. Three such sources so far have received particular attention in the constructivist literature: culture, ideas, and institutions. Constructivists of the first branch emphasize the impact of consolidated cultural elements on the behavior of individuals, groups, and entire communities. Ideas, on the contrary, figure in many explanations of political change, which concentrate particularly on the ways in which cognitive and normative meanings are expressed and transmitted. Analyses focusing on institutions, finally, explain how certain social and political practices often acquire a self-reproductive character by shaping the worldviews and preferences of the actors involved.

Modern constructivism has acquired great popularity in Western academia in the past few decades, particularly in the subfields of comparative politics and international relations, where constructivists contribute to the main debates and have produced a substantial body of empirical work. Methodologically, constructivism is especially—though not exclusively—compatible with studies analyzing a few empirical observations (small-*n* studies) and inductive research strategies, which attempt to generalize from the examination of specific cases instead of using the latter to test previously formulated hypotheses. These methods allow constructivist researchers to

better capture the qualitative variables they work with and to trace specific processes of agent constitution. In addition, constructivists make large use of several tools and techniques originally developed in other disciplines, such as fieldwork, participant observation, and discourse analysis. These methodological preferences have provoked the criticism of many rationalist scholars, who accuse constructivism of being unable to produce truly general and falsifiable explanations. To these allegations, constructivists respond mainly by pointing out their peculiar logic of inquiry, one that does not deny or underestimate the existence of universal social dynamics, but that is nonetheless more interested in the different and the unique in each political situation, process, or phenomenon.

See also *Cognitive Theory and Politics; Empiricism; Positive Theory; Small-n and Case Study.*

PIER DOMENICO TORTOLA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Emanuel. "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics." *European Journal of International Relations* 3, no. 3 (1997): 319–363.
- Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1966.
- Blyth, Mark. "Structures Do Not Come with an Instruction Sheet: Interests, Ideas, and Progress in Political Science." *Perspectives on Politics* 1, no. 4 (2003): 695–703.
- Feyerabend, Paul K. *Against Method*. London: New Left Books, 1975.
- Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4 (2001): 391–416.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984.
- Green, Daniel M. *Constructivism and Comparative Politics*. Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 2002.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Price, Richard, and Christian Reus-Smit. "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism." *European Journal of International Relations* 4, no. 3 (1998): 259–294.
- Ruggie, John G. "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge." *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 855–885.
- Sismondo, Sergio. *Science without Myth: On Constructions, Reality, and Social Knowledge*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1996.
- Wendt, Alexander. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Consultants, Political

Political consultants are professionals who assist candidates running for office by providing one or more specialized services. They work on an ad hoc basis, taking a different set of clients each election cycle. The work is typically done on a fee-for-service basis and confined to the specific election cycle. Consultants may work individually, or more typically, as part of a political consulting firm comprised of many professionals who provide the variety of service(s) the firm offers.

Consultants are fixtures in campaigns at all levels in modern American electoral politics. Presidential candidates have

stables of consultants working for their campaigns, sometimes with multiple firms providing the same service. In addition, most congressional candidates also hire consultants, though how many varies depending on whether the candidate is an incumbent, challenger, or open-seat candidate, as well as the estimated competitiveness of the campaign. While no serious candidate for office at the federal level would proceed with the assistance of one or more political consultants, the use of such consultants has even spread to state legislative campaigns, mayoral races, and school board contests.

ORIGINS OF POLITICAL CONSULTING

Political consultants are nothing new to political campaigns, although there is some disagreement as to how political consulting originated. Some scholars state that consultants were not strictly an American phenomenon and date as far back as 63 BCE, when ancient Roman Quintus Tullius Cicero advised his brother, orator and philosopher Marcus Tullius Cicero in an election for the consulship of Rome. In the American context, however, some scholars point to the founding of and debate over the ratification of the U.S. Constitution when the Federalists and Anti-Federalists engaged in political tactics that are reminiscent of those used today. In a more modern context, many observers consider Clem Whitaker and Leone Baxter as the founders of the political consulting industry, as they were the first individuals to try and make a living by providing campaign services to clients through their formation of their firm, Campaigns Inc., in 1933.

The consulting industry developed slowly after Campaigns Inc., but was helped along with technological advancements like scientific polling and electronic media, such as radio and television. These advancements meant that campaigning was no longer only a political endeavor: Candidates would need help with the sophisticated and technical tools now at their disposal. In fact, many of the first media consultants were advertisers from Madison Avenue in New York who found new clients in the form of candidates running for office.

Technical advancements also spurred another important development in the consulting industry in the form of specialization. Before this, a single person or a small group of individuals could run the entire campaign, but as the tactics of campaigning became more and more sophisticated, specialization of the industry and skills needed for campaigning developed. Today, political consulting is a highly specialized industry, with thousands of individuals working in many different fields.

SERVICES PROVIDED AND EFFECTS MEASURED

There is a core group of services that define the political consulting industry and others that support or supplement the work of these central elements. The heart of political consulting is the creation and delivery of a candidate's message, or the short statement that gives voters the reasons they should vote for this candidate rather than the opponent. The consultants typically responsible for developing and disseminating the candidate's message include a pollster, a media consultant, a direct mail specialist, and a campaign manager or general

While these two theories have caused significant debate among scholars, policy makers, and corporate managers as to the actual objectives of a corporation, a simple deduction shows the two theories considerably overlap. When enough people, consumers, and corporate managers believe firms should be sensitive to interests of all stakeholders, it creates an incentive for firms to comply with this normative standard. In other words, adopting the stakeholder theory of corporate behavior may in fact be the best way to meet the goals of the shareholder theory.

NEW HORIZONS

Today we observe the proliferation of corporations engaged in voluntary self-regulation, self-auditing, and various other programs of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Even with little empirical evidence of a direct link between profits and CSR, corporations continue to adopt these practices, according to David Vogel in *The Market for Virtue: The Potential and Limits of Corporate Social Responsibility* (2005). Benjamin Cashore, in his 2002 article "Legitimacy and the Privatization of Environmental Governance," states the emergence of nongovernmental organizations, advocacy groups, corporate watchdog organizations, and nonstate market based governance systems create an institutional network of interests aiming to shift, yet again, the relationship between the corporation and the state. This shift, however, is not identical to the role corporations held centuries earlier, in which they were compelled to serve a role more aligned with larger public interests. While corporations may engage in more social and environmental responsibility, it is not necessarily born out of pressure or negotiations with states, but rather to appease the variety of actors and civil society groups, some of which are active stakeholders.

See also *Business Pressure in Politics; Capitalism and Democracy; Economic Interdependence; Multinational Corporation (MNC).*

..... RABIH HELOU

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cashore, Benjamin. "Legitimacy and the Privatization of Environmental Governance: How Non-state Market-driven (NSMD) Governance Systems Gain Rule-making Authority." *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions* 15, no. 4 (2002): 503–529.

Frederick W. Maitland. "Introduction." In *Political Theories of the Middle Ages*, edited by Otto von Guericke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900.

Gabel, M., and H. Bruner. *Global Inc.: An Atlas of the Multinational Corporation*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2003.

Friedman, Milton. "The Social Responsibility of Business Is to Increase Its Profits." *New York Times Magazine*, September 13, 1970.

Vogel, David. *The Market for Virtue: The Potential and Limits of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2005.

Correlation

In political science, two variables are said to correlate when they tend to vary together. More precisely, correlation can be positive if the variables move in the same direction (they both increase or decrease at the same time), or negative if they

move in opposite directions (when one variable increases, the other decreases).

In statistics, *correlation* is more specifically defined as a measure of the strength, or consistency, of the linear relationship between two variables in a population. Graphically, this statistic indicates how well the scatterplot obtained by representing the observations on a Cartesian plane with the two variables as dimensions fits along a straight line. Correlation is most commonly measured—or estimated, when only a sample is available—with the Pearson product-moment coefficient (ρ or r in statistical notation, respectively, for populations and samples), a standardized indicator whose value ranges between -1 (perfect negative correlation) and 1 (perfect positive correlation), and where 0 denotes the absence of correlation.

The correlation coefficient is an inadequate statistic when the relationship analyzed is believed to be nonlinear or when the variables of interest are nominal or ordinal. In these cases, alternative measures of association such as the chi-square, Spearman's ρ , or Kendall's τ might be more suitable.

See also *Causation and Correlation; Partial Least Squares; Regression with Categorical Data; Statistical Analysis.*

..... PIER DOMENICO TORTOLA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Freedman, David, Robert Pisani, and Roger Purves. *Statistics*, 4th ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007.

Corruption

See *Democracy and Corruption.*

Corruption, Political

Most definitions of *corruption* emphasize the abuse of public power or resources for private benefit. Many basic terms of that definition, however, are themselves contested: Legal standards, public opinion or social values, or the public good may judge *abuse*. Terms such as *public*, *private*, *power*, and *benefit* may also be matters of dispute. Variations on the theme emphasize public office dimensions (duties, powers and their limits, process issues, accountability), market processes (using public power to extract rents, or allocating public goods on the basis of demand rather than need), and the public interest, among other factors, as defining characteristics. A continuing debate has to do with the role, if any, that cultural differences should play in defining corruption. Thus, there is no universally agreed upon definition of corruption.

As a concept, corruption has a long lineage. In classical times, it referred to a collective state of being. In this state, leaders forfeit, by their conduct, their claims to virtue and thus their right to lead; citizens or followers fail to play their roles in society; and the overall political order loses its moral structure and justifications. Modern conceptions of corruption originate not only in the works of thinkers like French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau but also out of political contention over accountability and the limits of power. These

First Past the Post

First past the post is an electoral formula whereby the candidate who obtains a plurality of votes in a single-member district wins the corresponding seat. One of the simplest, oldest, and most widely adopted election mechanisms—used by countries including the United States and the United Kingdom—first past the post is also highly disproportional as it grants, by definition, 100 percent of district representation to the party that wins a simple majority of the vote while leaving the remaining competitors unrepresented regardless of their electoral strength. This incentivizes electoral aggregation at the constituency and national level and penalizes third parties with a geographically dispersed support. Based on this logic and on empirical evidence, most comparativists believe that in the medium or long run first past the post favors a two-party system—the oft-cited Duverger’s law—or at least decreases the number of parties compared to other mechanisms such as proportional or runoff formulas (exemplified, respectively, by the German and French systems).

For advocates of first past the post, by simplifying the party system and facilitating the formation of single-party or small coalition governments, this formula allows voters to choose between clear public policy alternatives and increases the stability, efficiency, and democratic accountability of parliamentary executives. Critics, on the other hand, view first past the post as a less than democratic mechanism, which reduces the options of the electorate and produces a distorted picture of the society in representative institutions, where cleavages are artificially reduced, minorities are systematically underrepresented, and political diversity all but disappears.

See also *Duverger’s Law; Electoral Formulas; Electoral Rules; Proportional Representation; Run-Off; Winner-Take-All.*

PIER DOMENICO TORTOLA

Fiscal Conservatism

Fiscal conservatism is an ideological perspective on what constitutes the appropriate approach to economic matters within modern capitalist states; it is a term more commonly used in the United States, Canada, and Australia, but the perspective can be found throughout Europe as well. The fundamentals of the approach favored by this perspective include limited government spending, low tax rates, free trade agreements with other nations, only modest amounts of business regulation, a strong respect for individual property rights, and balanced budgets. Sometimes referred to as “traditional economic conservatism” or “classical liberal economics,” this perspective grounds itself in what its advocates see as the *laissez-faire* tradition of economic thought, beginning with Adam Smith and David Ricardo, and continuing on through contemporary economists such as Milton Friedman and George Stigler. As such, it is a perspective that either completely rejects or greatly qualifies the economic arguments advanced by contemporary liberal thinkers such as John Maynard Keynes, agrarian or

protectionist political leaders such as John Taylor or Henry Clay, and socialist thinkers such as Karl Marx.

Fiscal conservatism does not carry with it any necessary connection with traditionalism or conservatism on social or moral matters. In fact, it is not uncommon to find fiscal conservatism paired with social libertarianism, assuming that a leave-it-alone approach to matters of individual wealth and economic growth ought to be paralleled with a similar hands-off attitude toward matters of lifestyle and culture. Many fiscal conservatives, while not embracing a fully libertarian attitude with regard to social issues, will nonetheless often emphasize their identity as economic conservatives as opposed to people whose conservative beliefs are focused more on social or moral matters and are rooted in religious or traditionalist beliefs. At the same time, some fiscal conservatives embrace some form of social conservatism as a necessary supplement to their own fiscal preferences, arguing that a virtuous culture is the most likely foundation for the trust that capitalist economies require. This intersection of contrasting conservative priorities has often been the cause of deep disputes among those political parties that have most strongly adopted fiscal conservatism as part of their platform.

Fiscal conservatism’s use as a descriptive label was greatly shaped by the historical contest between collectivist economic theories and capitalist ones throughout the twentieth century in the United States and Europe. For example, the growth of government spending, federal regulations, and tax rates in the United States, particularly through and following the Great Depression of 1929 and World War II (1939–1945), led many to believe that local and free enterprise economic principles were being consciously undermined by opponents of economic freedom. Through the 1960s and 1970s, the notion of fiscal responsibility was put forward by many conservative thinkers and activists in the United States in contrast to what they perceived as the socialist-influenced profligacy and bureaucratic entanglements that resulted from postwar economic planning. This movement was paralleled by similar efforts during the same time period to reform the economic restrictions that had been put in place by social democratic governments in many western European nations following the war. With the election of Margaret Thatcher as prime minister in Great Britain in 1979, Ronald Reagan to the American presidency in 1980, and Helmut Kohl as prime minister of West Germany in 1982, the fiscal conservative reaction attained significant power, and the economic deregulation, reduction, or simplification of tax rates; privatization of industries; cutting of government social services; and other moves in the direction of less intervention in the operations of the free market during the 1980s are often looked on by fiscal conservatives as a high-water mark for the ideology.

Fiscal conservatism does not necessarily mandate an opposition to all government spending, regulation, or taxation, particularly if the policies in question are tied to matters of national defense, which is generally recognized by voters and parties alike to not be a matter particularly governed by economic realities. In regard to government spending or

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bush, George H.W., and Brent Scowcroft. *A World Transformed*. New York: Knopf, 1998.
- Carr, E. H. *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919–1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. Hampshire, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001. Originally published 1939.
- Lenin, V. I. *The State and Revolution*. Whitefish, Mont.: Kessinger, 2004. Originally published 1917.
- Schmidt, Brian C. *The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press, 1998.

Niebuhr, Reinhold

Karl Paul Reinhold Niebuhr (1892–1971) was an American theologian and political theorist best known among political scientists for his contributions to the classical realist school of international relations and particularly to its Christian branch.

Niebuhr was born on June 21, 1892, in Wright City, Missouri. The son of a German Protestant pastor, at age fifteen he decided to follow in his father's footsteps and began his theological studies at the *Evangelische Proseminar* (now Elmhurst College) in Elmhurst, Illinois. After completing his education at Eden Seminary and Yale Divinity School, in 1915 he was ordained pastor of the Bethel Evangelical Church in Detroit, Michigan, where he remained for thirteen years. In this period—recounted in the autobiographical *Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic* (1929)—Niebuhr's closeness to the city's working-class communities and his exposure to the injustices of early twentieth-century industrial capitalism (epitomized by the Ford factory) led him to abandon his early liberalism in favor of a growing sympathy with the principles of Marxism. His new convictions resulted in his becoming a leader of the Socialist Party of America.

In 1928, Niebuhr left his pastorate for an academic position at Union Theological Seminary in New York. There he began a twofold intellectual transition that would characterize his thought until the end of his academic career in 1960. First, he became even more interested in the problems and questions of international affairs. Second, from a fundamentally class-based view of society Niebuhr switched to a political realism founded on the idea of the original sin as a unifying and degrading element of humanity—a realism that, however, retained some Marxist nuances, especially when applied to issues of political economy. This vision of politics is expressed in the several works he published during these years, which placed him in the pantheon of classical realism with authors like E. H. Carr, Henry Morgenthau, and George Kennan. These works include *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (1932), *Christianity and Power Politics* (1940), the two volumes of *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (1941, 1943), *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness* (1944), and *Christian Realism and Political Problems* (1953).

In addition to his focus on the theory of international relations—and unlike many of his fellow realists—Niebuhr had a strong interest in the problems of morality and its application to political practice. *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics* of 1935 is perhaps his main work in this field. He was also engaged as a public intellectual by contributing to periodicals such as *The New Republic*, *The Nation*, *Christianity and Crisis*,

and *The New Leader*. Finally, throughout his academic years, Niebuhr remained active in politics as the leader of movements like the Fellowship of Socialist Christians and Americans for Democratic Action and as a consultant to American diplomat George F. Kennan's policy planning staff.

In 1952, Niebuhr suffered a stroke that gradually debilitated him and eventually led to his retirement from Union Seminary in 1960. After holding a few short-term positions at Harvard, Princeton, and Barnard College, he died in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, on June 1, 1971.

See also *International Relations; International Relations Theory; Marxism; Political Theory; Realism and Neorealism; Socialism.*

PIER DOMENICO TORTOLA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, Charles C. *Niebuhr and His Age: Reinhold Niebuhr's Prophetic Role in the Twentieth Century*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992.
- Fox, Richard W. *Reinhold Niebuhr: A Biography*. 2nd ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.
- Kegley, Charles W., ed. *Reinhold Niebuhr: His Religious, Social, and Political Thought*. 2nd ed. New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1984.
- Merkeley, Paul. *Reinhold Niebuhr: A Political Account*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1975.

Nietzsche, Friedrich

German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900) was born in Prussia in 1844, the son of a Protestant pastor. He attended Schulpforta boarding school and completed his PhD in classical philology in Bonn and Leipzig, where he became friends with composer Richard Wagner. In 1869 Nietzsche became a professor in Basel, Switzerland, and a colleague of Swiss art and culture historian Jacob Burckhardt.

In 1872 Nietzsche published *Birth of Tragedy*, which contained his analysis of art in terms of the Apollonian/Dionysian duality as well as effusive praise of Wagner. This was followed by *Untimely Meditations* (1873–1876), a study of European culture, and *Human, All-Too-Human* (1878), in which he explored such topics as religion, psychology, and social reality. In 1879 he retired from teaching for health reasons and lived for the rest of his life variously in Switzerland, Italy, and on the French Riviera, writing *The Dawn* (1881), *The Joyful Wisdom* (1882), his magnum opus *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (1883–1885), *Beyond Good and Evil* (1886), *On the Genealogy of Morality* (1887), *Twilight of the Idols* (1888), *The Antichrist* (1888), *The Case of Wagner* (1888), and his autobiography *Ecce Homo* (1888). In 1889 he had a mental breakdown from which he never recovered, and he died in 1900. His sister rewrote portions of his works to reflect her own anti-Semitism, and in 1901 she published *The Will to Power*, a collection of his notes that she claimed was his magnum opus. Her distortions facilitated the reception of Nietzsche's thought by the Fascists and Nazis.

Nietzsche is best known for proclaiming the death of God in several of his works. He is also often identified with the concept of nihilism, a spiritual malaise that he believed was undermining European morality and would give birth to terrible wars. Much of his thought was devoted to explaining the

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brehm, John, and Scott Gates. *Working, Shirking, and Sabotage*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Calvert, Randall, Matthew D. McCubbins, and Barry R. Weingast. "A Theory of Political Control and Agency Discretion." *American Journal of Political Science* 33, no. 3 (1989): 588–611.
- Golden, Marissa Martino. *What Motivates Bureaucrats?* New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Gormley, William T. *Taming Bureaucracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Gormley, William T., and Steven J. Balla. *Bureaucracy and Democracy*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2008.
- McCubbins, Matthew, Roger Noll, and Barry Weingast. "Administrative Procedures as Instruments of Political Control." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 3, no. 2 (1987): 243–277.
- McCubbins, Matthew, and Thomas Schwartz. "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols versus Fire Alarms." *American Journal of Political Science* 28, no. 1 (1984): 165–179.
- Meier, Kenneth J. *Politics and the Bureaucracy: Policymaking in the Fourth Branch of Government*. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1987.
- Mitnick, Barry. "The Bureaucrat as Agent." Paper presented at the 1984 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., August 30–September 2, 1984.
- Moe, Terry. "An Assessment of the Positive Theory of Congressional Dominance." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 12, no. 4 (1987): 475–525.
- . "The New Economics of Organization." *American Journal of Political Science* 28, no. 4 (1984): 739–777.
- Ringquist, Evan J., Jeff Worsham, and Marc Allen Eisner. "Salience, Complexity, and the Legislative Direction of Regulatory Bureaucracies." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 13, no. 2 (2003): 141–164.
- Weingast, Barry R. "Bureaucratic Discretion or Congressional Control? Regulatory Policy Making by the Federal Trade Commission." *Journal of Political Economy* 91, no. 1 (1983): 765–800.
- . "The Congressional-bureaucratic System: A Principal Agent Perspective (with Applications to the SEC)." *Public Choice* 44, no. 1 (1984): 147–191.
- Wilson, James Q. *Bureaucracy*. New York: Basic Books, 1989.

Prisoner's Dilemma

In political science, one of the most popular game theory tools, the prisoner's dilemma, is a nonzero-sum game in which two suspects of a crime are arrested and each given the option of either accusing the other prisoner—*defect*, in game theory jargon—or stay silent—*cooperate*. Jail terms attach to the four resulting combinations such that each player's order of preferences is: unilateral defection (DC) > mutual cooperation (CC) > mutual defection (DD) > unilateral cooperation (CD). This configuration makes defection the dominant strategy for both players.

The prisoner's dilemma describes and analyzes strategic political interactions characterized by the relative payoff structure, and its peculiarity is that the Nash equilibrium solution, DD, is a Pareto-inefficient point, as all players would be better off if they could move to the unstable solution, CC. Put differently, this game illustrates domestic or international situations in which reciprocal cooperation is advantageous for all actors involved, but it is nonetheless difficult to achieve because of the incentives at work. Examples include disarmament, trade wars, and the provision of public goods.

Given the problematic nature of the prisoner's dilemma, political scientists have devoted much effort to studying the

conditions under which stable cooperation is possible. Two of these are the intervention of a superimposed enforcing agency, such as the state, or the infinite, or indefinite, iteration of the game.

See also *Behavioral Game Theory; Cooperative Security; Game Theory; International Cooperation; Pareto, Vilfredo; Tragedy of the Commons.*

PIER DOMENICO TORTOLA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Axelrod, Robert. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books, 1984.
- Dixit, Avinash and Susan Skeath. *Games of Strategy*. 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 2004.

Prisoners of War (POWs)

Since ancient times, the status of prisoners of war has been an indispensable aspect of warfare and their treatment has oscillated between extermination, enslavement, ransom, and practices of exchange and parole.

The ethics of war have been a hotly debated feature of international relations since the seventeenth century. Hugo Grotius raised issues regarding the ethics of war in his seminal work, *The Law of War and Peace* (1625). Grotius examined the laws of war from two different perspectives: *jus ad bellum*, the law concerning the rights of states to engage in armed conflict, and *jus in bello*, the law governing how wars are to be fought once they have started. Generally the status of prisoners of war is covered by the principles of *jus in bello*. In the same period, the development of the idea of the nation-state after the 1648 Westphalia agreement shifted the control of prisoners of war from the individual captor to the sovereign. Consequently, the economic exploitation of war captives for labor or ransom was regularized.

In the nineteenth century, the *just war* tradition that Grotius discussed in *The Law of War and Peace* began to be formally declared as positive law. In 1862, a code of rules was developed for the conduct of the U.S. Civil War (1861–1865) in accordance with President Abraham Lincoln's directions. This code was known as General Order 100, or Lieber's Code, and was the first formal code of law to regulate an army's conduct toward enemy soldiers since ancient Rome. In this sense, the United States played a key role in developing humanitarian and legal doctrines concerning prisoners of war. About the same time, in 1863, the International Committee of the Red Cross was established in Geneva and an international conference adopted the Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded Armies in the Field in 1906. Furthermore, a series of international conventions were held to contribute to the development of an internationally recognized law of war. These were formulated during conferences in Brussels in 1874, The Hague in 1899 and 1907, Copenhagen in 1917, and Geneva in 1929 and 1949.

The 1929 Geneva Convention concerned the treatment of prisoners of war. It completed the rules of the previous regulations by prohibiting reprisals and collective punishment

The bureaucracy must play a proactive role in providing the necessary information, assistance, and support to the government in making privatization policies and implementing them effectively. The bureaucrats help identify the public enterprises, utilities, and services to be privatized. They suggest the modalities and time schedule. They also provide the necessary financial expertise in evaluating the value of public assets or fixing the price of a share to be floated. If these are overvalued, the privatization drive may be halted, and if these are undervalued, the government may be criticized for selling family silver at throwaway prices. Once the government decides to privatize a particular enterprise, a high level of administrative efficiency is required to assess the bids made by the potential buyers, arrange finance and insurance cover, provide a safety net for the staff retrenched, and deal with legal matters. An incompetent bureaucracy can never lead to economic efficiency—the hallmark of privatization.

Many believe that even after privatization, the role of public bureaucracy is not really reduced. The nature of its job merely changes. The bureaucracy now must regulate the privatized bodies in public interest. For example, privatization in the United Kingdom actually led to the proliferation of regulatory watchdogs, such as the Monopolies Commission and the Merger Commission to look after the interests of industrial customers of British Gas. Once a public enterprise, utility, or service is privatized, the cardinal values of traditional public administration are likely to conflict with the modern requirements of knowledge-based and technology-driven market economies.

SHIFT IN PARADIGM

With privatization, the very administrative culture, in terms of red tape, is replaced with a managerial and entrepreneurial culture. Instead of inputs, the focus is now on outputs and performance monitoring. Instead of autonomy, the focus is more on accountability. Instead of standardized procedures, the emphasis is more on innovation and flexibility. Under the traditional public administration, personnel are recruited either on the grounds of merit or seniority, under privatized administration; whereas with privatization, the stress is more on contractual arrangements.

Privatization can be regarded as an administrative tool, yet certainly not an end in itself. There may be conflict in values as far as the new role of entrepreneurial managers. While entrepreneurship requires autonomy, personal vision, secrecy, and risk taking behavior on the part of administrators-cum-managers, the democratic norms of the society may call for accountability, citizen's participation, openness, and transparency in policy making and stewardship. Therefore, privatization cannot be seen as a panacea to political, economic, sociocultural, or administrative problems. The more one is privatized, the less part one likely takes in collective actions or civic engagements.

See also *Bureaucracy; Deregulation; Nationalization.*
 ASHA GUPTA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arestis, Philip, and Malcolm Sawyer, eds. *Critical Essays on the Privatization Experience*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
 Gupta, Asha. *Beyond Privatization*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Macmillan, 2000.
 Parker, David. *The Official History of Privatization*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
 Savas, Emanuel S. *Privatization and Public-private Partnerships*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 2010.
 Woodward, Nick. "Ownership and Management—the Concepts." In *Privatization, Ownership, and Management*, edited by V.V. Ramanadham. London: Routledge, 1991.

Process Tracing

In political science methodology, process tracing indicates the detailed and systematic empirical analysis of the causal mechanisms—or processes—linking political outcomes to their putative or possible explanatory factors. Based on a variety of sources such as interviews, memoirs, surveys, and historical documents, this procedure complements and reinforces more traditional correlational methods, which focus exclusively on the causal effect of independent variables (X) on dependent variables (Y). More precisely, process tracing allows the researcher to open the "black box" of causality and examine the path through which X leads to Y, thus gaining a better knowledge of its observable components (such as the intervening variables) and achieving a more reliable account of its unobservable parts. This makes process tracing an especially useful tool not only for testing hypotheses, but also for generating and refining them.

Process tracing is an in-depth methodological procedure. The requirements in terms of data, time, energies, and resources usually limit its use to small-n or single case studies. On the theoretical side, process tracing is compatible with all positivist research programs, and it is particularly useful in theoretically eclectic works where, in addition to the functions previously described, it can help delimit the domains of application of different logics of sociopolitical behavior.

See also *Qualitative Analysis; Qualitative Methodologies; Quantitative Analysis.*

. PIER DOMENICO TORTOLA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bennett, Andrew, and Alexander George. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005.
 Checkel, Jeffrey T. "Tracing Causal Mechanisms." *International Studies Review* 8, no. 2 (2006): 362–370.

Professional Lobbies

See *Lobbies, Professional.*

Program Evaluation and Auditing

The structure of policy making is a continuous multistage process during which programs or policies are designed, implemented, evaluated, and modified. Program evaluations are the part of the process focused on determining whether

1892 to represent the interests of farmers, and in 1924 the Progressive Party introduced issues such as economic progressivism, welfare, and worker's rights. The dominant parties during both eras subsequently consumed the newly created parties' positions. Newly emerging parties can often become large enough to constitute major parties while other parties dissolve.

Partisan identification strengthens before partisan realignment. This leads to polarization of the two parties. These realigning elections are often known to have emotional and symbolic overtones that bring a larger than average number of voters to the polls. The increased turnout brings the minority party to power due to its distance from the other party and its position on issues. To stay in power, the new majority must institute policies or reforms that the previous government failed to achieve.

See also *Freezing of Party Alternatives*; *Key, V. O., Jr.*; *Latino Partisanship and Ideological Orientations*; *Party Identification*; *Political Parties*; *Political Party Platform*.

. JASON R. BOSSIE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burnham, Walter Dean. *Critical Elections and the Mainsprings of American Politics*. New York: Norton, 1970.
- Key, Vladimir Orlando. "A Theory of Critical Elections." *The Journal of Politics* 17, no. 1 (1955): 3–18.
- Mayhew, David R. *Electoral Realignments*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Sundquist, James L. *Dynamics of the Party System: Alignment and Realignment of Political Parties in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1973.

Realism and Neorealism

Broadly defined, realism is one of the major and most long-standing theoretical traditions in the study of international and foreign affairs. Realists view the world as a naturally conflictual arena in which rational and selfish states compete for the pursuit of their mutually incompatible interests. Power, especially in its military form, is for realists the main ingredient of international politics. On the one hand each state needs power to advance its interests and protect itself in an anarchical and hostile environment—an environment in which war is the rule rather than the exception. On the other hand, power is the key to international order and cooperation: the former can only be structured along the lines of a balance of power or a hegemonic system (or a mixture of the two), while the latter materializes out of fear or imposition rather than trust or altruism.

With their focus on power, conflict, and violence, realists assign a very limited role to those who do not control the means of physical force, like sub-, trans-, or supranational actors. For one thing, the sovereign state is seen as a unitary actor, whose vital interests are unaltered by the groups in power, its leadership, or its domestic institutions. As for international non-governmental and governmental organizations, they lack the means to impose their preferences and decisions when they are inconsistent with the interests of the states involved. Similarly, the realist worldview relegates factors such as ethics, law,

culture, and ideology to a secondary position, from which they can influence politics only to the extent that they do not contrast with the states' attainment of power and security.

The above common tenets of realism coexist with a number of theoretical and methodological differences originating several branches and subdivisions within this broad tradition. The most important of these divisions is between classical realism and neorealism.

CLASSICAL REALISM

Classical realism emerged in the 1930s and developed primarily in the following two decades. It is one of the oldest paradigms in the study of world affairs. In its initial phases, realism represented a reaction to the utopian liberalism that had dominated the discipline of international relations since its birth, right after World War I (1914–1918). Early realists such as Reinhold Niebuhr, Edward Carr, and Hans Morgenthau attacked utopianism on two fronts. First, they criticized the utopianist prescriptive approach to international politics, proposing description and explanation instead. The world, realists argued, should be portrayed as it is rather than as it ought to be.

Second, supported by the crisis of some of the main political products of liberalism, like the open international economic system and the League of Nations, classical realists rejected the interpretation of the world as a harmonious environment in which law, commerce, and social learning would guarantee peace and prosperity. In its place, they propounded a pessimistic analysis of sociopolitical behavior that built on the work of past thinkers, such as Hobbes and Thucydides, to describe the international system as a state of nature writ large—the so-called domestic analogy—in which states, like Hobbesian natural men, are engaged in an endless struggle for power and domination. Far from being an aberration, war is, in this view, just the most obvious expression of the inherent friction in the system. Similarly, peace and security are not the products of integration and institutions but the result of a careful balancing of power (through rearmament or alliances) and policies of national independence.

On neither the methodological nor the theoretical front, however, did classical realism reach radical positions. For one thing, while condemning the naive normativism of the utopianists, realists never advocated the opposite extreme of a detached scientism. Rather, theirs was a pragmatic approach, which acknowledged the existence of some eternal laws of politics but admitted that human behavior can sometimes deviate from these laws and that policy needs to be corrected when this happens. Their writings, therefore, can be seen as both explanations of the political reality and guides for good statecraft. This dualism is particularly clear in the work of policy-oriented realists such as George Kennan, Walter Lippmann, and Henry Kissinger. In the second place, the interpretation of international politics in terms of power did not imply a total rejection of alternative principles like law, ethics, and ideology. In the classical realist scheme, these factors can and often do operate at the margins of power politics, sometimes mitigating it, sometimes exacerbating it—although never replacing it.

NEOREALISM

Unlike classical realism, neorealism (or structural realism) owes most of its development and success to the work of a single scholar: Kenneth Waltz. In *Man, the State, and War* (1959) and *Theory of International Politics* (1979), Waltz laid the philosophical and theoretical foundations of what would become one of the dominant international relations paradigms in the last decade of the cold war, and remains a popular research program in the early twenty-first century.

Waltz's neorealism departs from classical realism both ontologically and epistemologically. In the first place, while Waltz shares the classical realist understanding of international politics as a sphere of egotism and conflict, he rejects the anthropological pessimism on which this understanding rests. Borrowing from Rousseau and his "stag hunt" episode, Waltz offers an alternative reading of the state of nature in which man is neither good nor bad (or, put differently, can be both) but just rational and in which conflict results from the mutual mistrust that the lack of a central coercive authority generates among rational beings. While sovereignty solves the problem domestically, it reproduces it at the international level. In an anarchic system, Waltz argues, states are concerned primarily with their survival and physical security. However, each step toward the maximization of one state's security (most notably rearmament) produces more insecurity for other states. This permanent clash of interests makes, first, interstate cooperation in the military or in other fields highly unlikely unless this constitutes the lesser evil in security terms (defensive alliances are a case in point). Second, it easily entraps states in a "security dilemma"—whereby the improvement of one state's security ends up creating more tension in the system—that can sometimes spiral out of control to the point of attacking, not to be attacked first.

Although re-elaborated as a means rather than an end in itself, power remains central in the neorealist framework: in its systemic configuration, polarity, power is one of the two crucial structural variables (the other being anarchy) for the explanation of international politics. On the other side of the equation, the balance of power is for Waltz one of the main recurrent outcomes of the international system.

Epistemologically, neorealists usually reject the ambiguities of classical realism in favor of a stricter form of positivism characterized by a complete detachment between the analyst and the object of study (which can neither influence nor be influenced by the analyst), by a quasi-mechanical view of sociopolitical behavior in which the maximization of security is taken as an exogenously given objective and ideational factors have hardly any space and, finally, by a predilection for deductive and universally applicable theories. Nowhere are all these features more manifest than in the more recent rational choice applications of the neorealist paradigm.

See also *Hegemony; International Relations Theory; Liberalism, Classical; Political Theory; Rational Choice Theory; Utopias and Politics.*

PIER DOMENICO TORTOLA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Carr, Edward H. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919–1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. London: Macmillan, 1939.
- Donnelly, Jack. *Realism and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Frankel Benjamin, ed. *Roots of Realism*. London: Cass, 1996.
- Herz, John H. *Political Realism and Political Idealism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Kennan, George F. *American Diplomacy (1900–1950)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Keohane, Robert O., ed. *Neorealism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Lippmann, Walter. *U.S. War Aims*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1944.
- Morgenthau, Hans. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 5th ed. New York: Knopf, 1978.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.
- Smith, Michael J. *Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987.
- Wolfer, Arnold. *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1962.

Realpolitik

See *Realism and Neorealism*.

Recall

To remove an elected official from office, an electorate gathers signatures to petition for a referendum. The recall is traceable to Rome in 133 BCE, when Tribune Octavius was removed from office by a vote of the people because he vetoed a Senate bill, and to the Pennsylvania state Constitution of 1776, which in article VI declared the people possessed "a right, at such periods they may think proper, to reduce their public officers to a private station, and supply vacancies by certain and regular elections," but its current form dates to nineteenth-century Switzerland and to Los Angeles in 1903. Eighteen state constitutions and numerous local government charters in the United States authorize voters to employ a recall. Members of the U.S. Congress cannot be recalled.

Elected judges in seven U.S. states cannot be recalled, and the Montana statutory provision stipulates that a government official is not subject to the recall for performing a mandatory duty. A Minnesota statute authorizes county voters to employ the recall only if the charges against an officer are malfeasance or misfeasance. An officer, upon assuming office in the states of California and Washington, becomes subject to recall, but the recall cannot be employed against an officer during the first two months to one year of service. A 1995 British Columbia law authorizes Canadian voters to place on the ballot by petition the question of removing a member of the Legislative Assembly from office between elections. The Korean Assembly in 2005 authorized the recall to remove local government officials. President Hugo Chávez of Venezuela survived a recall election in 2004.

The first step in the process is the filing and publishing or posting of a notice of intent to circulate a petition. Every petition must contain a declaration by the circulator that each signature is a genuine, and petitions must be filed within a stated