Chapter 11

Governance, Government and the State

B. GUY PETERS AND JON PIERRE

Governance is shorthand for the pursuit of collective interests and the steering and coordination of society. During the 1990s, new or emerging models of governance have become debated among social scientists and practitioners alike as a combined result of budgetary cutbacks, the 'hollowing out' of the state, the development towards an enabling or regulatory state, a growing interest among politicians to forge partnerships with strategic societal actors, and a 'multi-layering' of political authority. Together, these developments have raised questions about the ability of the state to be at the centre of governance. What is changing, in short, is the role of government in governance, and this change has brought with it complex questions concerning democratic input and accountability.

The recent debate on the role of the state in providing governance has featured growing doubts concerning the extent still can effectively play this role. Globalization theorists and 'hollow-state' observers alike seem to argue that governance is a process increasingly dominated by other actors than the state and its institutions. This chapter will argue that a more rewarding perspective on these issues is to conceive of recent changes within and outside the state in terms of a transformation of the state and its relationship to actors in its external environment. Theories of governance help us understand the historical trajectory of these developments and the current role of the state in the advanced Western democracies.

One of the fundamental tasks for any society is to govern itself. For most of the past three centuries or more we have associated that task with the state, and its monopoly of legitimate force within a territory. The term 'Westphalian state' is commonly used, denoting the inception of this type of governance structure at the termination of the Thirty Years' War in Europe. In other parts of the world, e.g. China and Japan, analogous state structures had grown independently of this concept. The dominant pattern of governing has been hierarchical, with governments deciding – through democratic means or not – what laws and policies would be adopted and then proceeding to attempt to implement those rules. Especially in

democratic systems societal actors may be involved in this process, on both the input and output sides, but government remained the final arbiter of law and policy.

The state has been experiencing challenges to its traditional role in governance coming from outside the society (globalization) and from within the society itself in the form of networks and other social actors seeking greater autonomy. In this paper we will be taking the currently unpopular view that, although governance has indeed changed, the state continues to play a major, if not the major, role in governing. Further we will argue that especially in democratic states we should value governance through institutions that are broadly, if imperfectly, accountable to the public as opposed to more narrowly conceived patterns of sectoral governance.

Understanding the so-called shift from government to governance

> Current use does not treat governance as a synonym for government. Rather governance signifies a change in the meaning of government, referring to a *new* process of governing; or a *changed* condition of ordered rule; or the *new* method by which society is governed. (Rhodes 1996:652–3; italics in original)

Well, yes and no. Rhodes' oft-cited argument that governance, the 'new governance', as it were, refers to fundamental changes in governing was instrumental in triggering widespread interest in governance as a phenomenon. Rhodes believed that the change in the style of governing in the United Kingdom during the 1980s meant the emergence of a distinctly new governing process summarized as 'governing without government'. Public–private partnerships, market-based administrative reform and the rolling back of the state coupled with the deregulation of markets were all seen as elements of a large-scale transformation of the ways in which the modern state – the 'hollow state' – governed society.

In this 'hollow state' the formal institutions of government have been largely replaced by the capacity of social actors such as networks and markets to govern. To the extent that it is important government is there to legitimate the actions of the social actors and to provide representative democracy, while the 'real' democracy is expressed through the involvement of individuals and groups in networks. Thatcherism clearly represented a new era in British politics and society, and that pattern has persisted, and in some ways been expanded by the Blair government.

All of that having been said, however, it also seems clear that some of the conclusions Rhodes drew from these changes were ethnocentric or

exaggerated, or possibly both. First of all, while the emergence of institutionalized forms of concerted action between public and private actors was a novelty to the British political milieu, it was certainly a familiar phenomenon both in (the rest of) Europe (Katzenstein 1984; Kraemer 1964) and even in the United States (see, for example, Beauregard 1988). Corporatism is perhaps the most obvious example of such public–private co-operation but there exist a wide variety of other forms of either ad hoc or more continuous and institutionalized forms of public–private exchanges at all levels of the political system. Thus, what struck Rhodes as new and original in Britain is part of the political history in many other parts of the world. This is not to denigrate his work, merely to suggest that the novelty of the phenomenon is called into question when applied to a cross-national comparison. Even so, however, the British developments over the past couple of decades have been more profound and have had bigger ramifications on the political system than in most other parts of the world with the exception of the Antipodes.

Second, and more important in terms of theory development, what is changing is not a process of governing from government to governance but the role of government in governance. It is, of course, not the case that contemporary British governance takes place without government; rather, what has changed is the centrality of government in governance and the *modus operandi* of government within that new model of governance. As soon as we conceptualize the developments Rhodes uses to illustrate his argument in that fashion, we can more easily ascertain what is new and what is not. Also, we will be in a better position to apply governance theory in comparative research. And, finally, by doing so we have also escaped the trap of singling out one national context – a case which arguably displays one of the more extreme transformations in these respects – as a norm or a yardstick with which we assess similar developments in other institutional and political contexts.

So exactly what is happening in terms of changes in governance? The next section of the chapter discusses some general patterns in contemporary governance change. Following that, we will briefly discuss how these changes have affected the state. The next section of the chapter looks more at the resilience of institutions and how institutions adapt to changes in their environment.

Emerging models of governance

In a different context (Pierre and Peters 2004) the present authors have elaborated a typology of governance model which aims at distinguishing between different such models along various key dimensions of governance, such as actors, processes and outcomes. One of the overarching problems in designing sustainable governance is how to weigh the significance of

institutions, as carriers of collective interests and objectives, against the autonomy of societal actors and markets.

On one end of the spectrum we see institutions powerful and resourceful enough to do basically what they see fit – either in terms of their own interests or in terms of what they believe to be in the interests of society – in any given situation (see Table 11.1). This model of governance ensures that collective goals are imposed on society but runs the risk of choking markets and civil society. This model of governance is also likely to make ill-informed decisions; the degree of institutional self-sufficiency which is typical to this type of governance provides few incentives for institutions to engage in dialogue with key actors in its external environment. The other end of the spectrum sees governance as a process shaped by inter-organizational networks at the level of the policy sector, pretty much the way Rhodes (1996) describes 'the new governance'. Here, collective objectives are obstructed by coalitions of sectoral actors and interests. While this model of governance might be said to be sufficiently in touch with society to make good choices, those choice will not reflect the collective preferences of the polity but rather those of a very small segment of society.

Between those two stark alternatives are a variety of forms of governing that relate state and society in different ways, but find a means of balancing the roles of those two broad segments of political and social life. For example, the pluralist (liberal) model of governing retains the public sector as the dominant actor, picking and choosing among alternative representatives of

Table 11.1   *Models of governance*

Model	Characteristics
Etatiste	Dominant role for state institutions. Limited involvement and feedback from society.
Liberal	Involvement of limited number of societal actors, selected carefully by state institutions. Pluralist, with government choosing the legitimate actors.
State-centric	State remains dominant actor, but societal actors have some autonomous sources of legitimacy, and some claims for involvement, corporatist bargaining being a prime example.
'Dutch'	Networks become central, if not dominant, participants, but state retains capacity to make autonomous decisions and and 'steer from a distance'.
Governace without government	Networks and markets are dominant actors. State legitimates the actions of these societal actors

civil society, but yet allowing that civil society some influence over policy. Likewise, a state-centric conception of governing, exemplified by corporatist models (Wiarda, 1996), permits societal actors even greater involvement, but at the price of co-optation into the governance activities of the state. Finally, the 'Dutch' model (Kooiman, 2004) uses networks for a significant portion of governance activity, but government still retains the capacity to 'steer at a distance'.

Given these complex trade-offs between different aspects of governance, it is perhaps little surprise that much of contemporary design of governance appears to be a process of trial and error. One example is the current wave of regional institutional reform across Europe where objectives related to economic development and EU-compatibility are weighed against collective input, democratic debate and accountability. The result, according to one observer, is that few countries, if any, have been able to present a reform which seems to work (Newman, 2000). Another example of problematic governance design can be found in the field of administrative reform. Many countries seem to experience a hangover from the aggressive market-based reforms implemented during the 1980s and 1990s and are now exploring alternative strategies to strengthen the role of political institutions and actors. The Antipodes, for example, were leaders in the market-based reforms of new public management (NPM) but now are finding ways to reassert a stronger governance role for the public sector.

At the same time, it should also be noted that although many of the currently emerging forms of governance display some form of institutional-ized exchange between state and society, the object of reform does not seem to be to look back in time at the models of governance that were typical to many countries prior to Thatcher, NPM and deregulated financial markets. Instead, there are signs that the pendulum movement is slowly beginning to swing back towards governance models that accord political institutions a more central role. In the Scandinavian countries, it appears as if the fascination with decentralized government is slowly fading and that processes of subtle forms of recentralization are on their way. In Sweden, for example, several major government commissions are examining carefully both the decentralized local government system and the deconcentrated system of public administration.

If anything, it seems clear from the current debate in many countries that institutions are much more capable of adapting than most observers have hitherto believed them to be. We will return to that issue later in this chapter. The state that remains in the face of the numerous changes in governance is still a powerful actor. There may have been some hollowing out, but when assessed more carefully we can now see that the 'shell' that remains retains much of its real power. While it is difficult to deny that there is now a powerful international marketplace that affects the capacity to make autonomous economic policy decisions, that market is itself, however,

negotiated rather than autonomous, and governments remain the major negotiators in fora such as the WTO, the IMF, and within numerous other international regimes.

Likewise, at the domestic level, clearing some of the baggage of the hierarchical state may produce even more capacity to govern. This enhancement in governance capacity is manifested simply because the power is not used on every minor detail of policy but instead is used to shape the directions of policy and the basic goals for governing. As described in several places the State now 'enables' as much as it 'directs', but it can still make the choice of what things to enable and what things not to support. That selectivity then becomes a means of husbanding resources, choosing those battles that must be fought, and making strategic choices about governance. Thus, the enabling state can also become the strategic state.

The resilience of institutions

States are more than simply an aggregation of institutions, but those institutions do a great deal to define a state, and to shape its capacity for governance (see Painter and Pierre 2004). If there is a well-developed and well-functioning set of institutions then the states blessed with those institutions are likely to be able to cope with increased strength and diversity of pressures coming from both the domestic and international environments. Conversely, in failing states, such as those found in much of Africa or the Caucasus, the institutions are present in form but not in function, so that these states are largely at the mercy of the external forces that impinge upon them. Thus, it may not be so much the state *per se* that has been failing in governance but certain forms of the state operating in certain conditions.

Joel Migdal (1988) has pointed out the importance of different types of matches and mismatches between the relative strengths of states and their societies. The interactions between the state and the environment become more complex when the international market becomes a player also, so that strong states may be able to mediate between their societies and the international environment, while weaker states may be at the mercy of both external forces. In some instances states can use the power of external economic actors – the World Trade Organization or the European Central bank – to overcome the power of entrenched social interests, or perhaps even forge coalitions with powerful domestic actors (environmental NGOs perhaps) against external actors (see Pauly and Grande, 2005). One of the clearest examples is the current fiscal probity of Italian and Irish governments in response to their membership in the EMS, after decades of huge deficits. The fundamental point is that states are not at the mercy of non-state actors and can govern. They may not always govern alone, but they can govern.

We have argued elsewhere (Peters 2002; Peters and Pierre forthcoming; Pierre and Peters 2000), and will continue to argue here, that the most appropriate place at which to begin an analysis of governance is the state, rather than beginning with the external actors – social or economic. This is in part an analytic stance, but it is also a theoretical position. Analytically, beginning with the state enables us to see when deviations from this *a priori* expectation may have occurred, and hence identify the points at which either international economic or domestic social forces may have intervened. Theoretically, we will be arguing that despite the important changes that many scholars of governance (Rhodes 1997; Tihonen 2004) have identified (and in some cases perhaps exaggerated) a great deal of the governance action in most societies, occurs through state organs.

What do state institutions do for governance?

Having said that the state and its institutions are central elements for an understanding of governance, how do we conceptualize that process actually functioning? Given that we have defined governance as a process of steering the economy and society, and have identified four key elements involved in that steering, we can more readily identify the manner in which the formal (and informal) institutions of the state influence that steering process. The central element of this analysis is that we are defining steering, and hence governance, as a goal-directed activity, with the need to establish collective goals and develop the means of reaching those goals. In a democratic context those societal goals would have to be identified by some more or less inclusive process, and attaining the goals would have to be accomplished through a process that recognizes individual rights and due process, but any method of governance will require goal setting and implementation. As Buchanan and Tullock (1962) argued, the general *ex ante* agreement on majority rule in most societies, once enshrined in formal rules, is a powerful means of ensuring legitimacy of decisions.

The most important thing about state institutions for the governance process is that they provide an agreed upon mechanism for establishing priorities, and for making choices among competing priorities. Social and political actors have any number of goals that they would like to see the society pursue, and to use the authority and financial resources of the state to make possible. However, given that resources are finite, there is a need to prioritize those goals. The political process, usually through a legislature of some sort, provides the means for making decisions that have the force of law. Whether by majority rule or other voting rules within these institutions provide a means of making the difficult choices required.

A second requirement for effective governance in the reconciliation of goals and programmes that, even with legislative choices, may be conflicting or at a minimum inconsistent. Governments adopt any number of laws and with the mobilization of different coalitions for different purposes with in governments there is no guarantee of consistency. Therefore, some means of co-ordination and clarification of the policies adopted by government will be required (see, for example, Scharpf 1996) for good governance. Although less formalized means have some potential (Bardach 1998), the general means of producing policy co-ordination is through institutions such as cabinets and central agencies.

A third component of governing is implementation, or the actual steering of economy and society. Implementation conventionally has been considered the province of the public bureaucracy, although increasingly it utilizes non-governmental actors and the instruments of 'new governance' (Salamon 2002), but even those instruments tend to function in the 'shadow of hierarchy' and to be backed by the possibility of using authority. Further, the macro-institutional structure of a country tends to have significant influence over implementation, given the importance of federalism, or other structures of sub-national government, for the implementation of programmes from the central government.

Finally, in order to be able to steer effectively one needs to understand the consequences of previous decisions, and hence feedback and accountability are important to governance. in any society the feedback element is crucial, to provide for on-going correction and change of policy, but for democratic governments the accountability element included in this stage is also important. The public bureaucracy, and its agents when programmes are not implemented directly by public employees, must be held to account for their actions so that citizens can have some assurance that their rights are being respected, and that public money is being used appropriately. Thus, the feedback component of governance involves both policy change and scrutiny of the actions of individuals responsible. This aspect of governance also involves a number of institutional players, ranging from legislatures to specialized oversight and accountability organizations (Hood *et al.* 2004). Arguably, although some private sector 'watchdogs' can be useful, the ultimate responsibility for accountability must reside with public institutions.

Having described the role of existing public sector institutions in the process of governance, it is important to understand the role of these institutions in other than those descriptive terms. The inherited, and persisting, institutional structures of states are crucial first for the legitimation of the policy choices made by government. In a more globalized and inter-dependent world national governments may have to respond to a number of external forces, but policy choices may still need to be legitimated through some rather conventional mechanisms. Likewise, in a world of governance

in which networks of private sector actors are crucial to the formation and especially the implementation of public policy, the interactions of those social partners with government are important for the success of government, but cannot replace the legal mandates of states and governments. Thus, the actions of networks will in most circumstances be carried on within a context of state power, power that can be withdrawn if deemed necessary.

As well as conveying legitimacy, some of the institutions of the public sector are peculiarly well suited for performing certain governance activities. In particular, the institutions of the public sector have been designed to resolve conflicts, while neither markets nor networks are designed to do so. Markets tend to assume away conflicts, or assume that the most powerful economic actors will (and should) win. Networks are generally assumed to be co-operative and non-competitive, but if a network surrounding a policy area is inclusive and has within it a range of socio-economic interests it may well find collaborative solutions to problems impossible, having no *ex ante* method for legitimately deciding between winners and losers. Political institutions were designed under an assumption of conflict, often intense conflict, and their constitutive rules provide the means of providing a solution.

Further, although the critics of contemporary government would certainly not agree, conventional institutions of government do a reasonably good job of channelling the demands from the society into the processes of decision-making. Advocates of deliberative government (Dryzek 2003), communitarianism (Selznick 2002), referenda (but see Budge 1996) and networks argue that these conventional institutions privilege certain types of interests and exclude others. Although there is some logic to that position, there are several other points that should be made. First, the conventional political institutions establish *ex ante* rules for inclusion and have developed structures that channel and aggregate interests, so that the manner of inclusion is known in advance. Further, these structures are widely diverse and can provide a number of avenues for participation. For example, the public bureaucracy increasingly is a major, if not the major, locus of participation for social interests.

We should also point out that the proposed alternatives to the instruments of interest intermediation are perhaps no more inclusive than are the more conventional institutions. For example, although discursive democracy is meant to be inclusive, its reliance on advocacy and discourse advantages the more articulate, especially members of the middle class. Likewise, networks tend to involve the social actors that are immediately concerned with the policy area, but the broader society has little or no ability to exert any influence, even if they may be affected by the policy choices, if for no other reason than they are taxpayers. Thus, the advocates of other forms of governance can point to significant problems in producing better outcomes through presumably more open and democratic means of public involvement.

Institutions and political change

A focus on the institutions may appear to express an excessive concern with the persistence of patterns of governing. The path dependence that has been central to the study of public policy from an institutionalist perspective can also apply to the institutions themselves, so that many vestigial institutions may remain in contemporary governments. Once created, both institutions and the policies they make tend to persist unless there is a strong political force that can produce change. Even as governments are responding more to characteristics in their socio-economic environment, however, they are making those responses in the context of an institutional structure that may have been inherited from decades, if not centuries, before. Institutional, especially historical institutional, analysis tends to focus on the persistence of those institutions, but that should not obscure the fact that there has been institutional change, and that institutions can be adaptive. Still, change may often be in the form of a 'punctuated equilibrium' rather than steady adaptation to changing circumstances, given the capacity of institutions to protect themselves from external pressues.

The state is not as entrenched and inflexible as critics might like to have us believe. One of the standard justifications for the view of governance that stresses networks and other less formal means of action is that the state is bureaucratic, ossified, and non-responsive. Certainly governments at times do appear to correspond to those unflattering descriptions, but the political system has demonstrated that it can also be responsive and reformist. That is true both for the reform of policies being delivered by the state, and for the state itself (Bouckaert and Pollitt, 2004). Three particular forms of adaptation on the part of the state should be noted here, as reflecting their capacity to cope with changing circumstances.

One of the most important patterns of change in contemporary states has been their capacity to cope with blended, or dual, sovereignty, and to find means of continuing to act as state entities even in the face of merger into larger state-like unions – the European Union as the obvious example – or complex transnational regimes such as that managed by the World Trade Organization, or perhaps even more significantly the International Criminal Court. While state institutions persist, they share control over important sections of their policy regimens with other actors, but most have been able to do so with minimum difficulty. Thus, even in areas that have been 'defining functions' of states (Rose 1974) adaptation has been possible, and state-driven (if no longer exclusive) governance persists.

A second important change in the governance patterns of contemporary states has been in the selection of instruments used to achiever their policy purposes. At one level, rather than relying on command and control instruments as in the past governments are now utilizing 'softer' instruments to

achieve their policy goals. For example, social programmes increasingly are implemented through co-operative arrangements with partners in the not-for-profit sector that reduce the costs for government but perhaps more importantly reduce the perceived intrusiveness of the programmes. One of the best examples of the use of 'soft law' of this type is in the European Union, with its use of the 'open method of co-ordination' (Radealli 2003) as a means of achieving European social and employment goals. At a second level, governments have shifted from direct provision of some types of benefits to regulators of private provision, so that again the same services may be delivered but in a less intrusive, and less costly, manner.

Finally, states have changed structurally, and have decentralized and deconcentrated significantly. Part of the administrative logic of the new public management has been to empower managers of autonomous and quasi-autonomous public organizations to make more of their own decisions about policy and management, and to reduce hierarchical control over these managers and their organizations. This administrative policy has been adopted in the pursuit of greater efficiency in the public sector but it may have other policy and political consequences as well. In particular, this structural change may have opened up government for greater influence from social actors, while limiting the capacity of political leaders to control government. Those changes have, however, resulted in programmes in some governments to return to the centre and to attempt to find ways of imposing more central policy priorities on government as a whole (see Peters 2004).

These three types of change are all important, and they have altered some aspects of governance, but they by no means amount to an incapacity of the contemporary state to govern, and to govern effectively. Indeed, to the extent that one of the changes may have been having that effect the state has acted to reassert its influence, and reversed the reform, at least in part. Therefore, the sense of a state structure that is not sufficiently nimble to match environmental change does not appear supported by the evidence. If we were to examine policy changes at even more of a micro-level, e.g. specific types of taxation, we can also find that states have responded to meet the challenges posed by economic change, and have been able to maintain their streams of revenue despite those challenges.

Summary

The state and its institutions have been changing, but they remain viable actors in making and implementing policy, and in governance taken more generally. Indeed, the state to a great extent retains its central position in selecting and legitimating policy goals, although it may do so in a more

co-operative and less intrusive manner than in the past. The international environment can impact the range of possible actions for states, although certainly some more that others, and governments are increasingly involved with social partners in the selection and execution of laws, but the formal institutions do retain substantial importance. Indeed, in many ways the most remarkable feature of contemporary governance is not so much what has changed but what has remained the same.

Governance, the state and political power

To this point we have been painting a picture of the transformation of the hierarchical and autonomous state that had been the centrepiece of the Westphalian State system in international politics, and also the centre of the mixed-economy, welfare state in domestic politics. That model of governing was very convenient for those at the centre of the institutional apparatus. They could make decisions and expect them to be executed with minimal direct involvement of other actors. While the implementation literature made it clear to academics that these systems for making and executing policy did not necessarily function as smoothly as the models might have one believe, they did function, and during the post-World War II period helped produce an era of substantial economic growth and growing equality of opportunity, in the Western democracies at least. Although this form of governance was successful for a substantial period of time, overloads of demands and fiscal problems generated significant problems. Society also changed and demanded greater participation. Thus, both on the political right and the political left there were demands for change, and indeed some substantial change. As noted above, some of these changes involved altering forms of service delivery in order to enhance the efficiency of the public sector. Other changes involved debureaucratization and involving social actors in decisions. We could enumerate a number of changes of both sorts, but the fundamental point is that the linear, autonomous conception of governing had been replaced by far more complex arrangements for making and delivering policy.

The complexity that is inherent in contemporary patterns of governance does not, however, imply that governments have lost their power in governing. What it does mean is that the state is exercising that power in different ways. For example, as partnerships and other means of linking the public and private sectors become more prevalent, the state's power is exercised through bargaining and linking their resouces with those of the private sector. In many ways these arrangements may actually enhance public power. First, although government may want the resources brought to the table by private sector actors, government may bring a more central

resource, namely legitimacy for engaging in action in the name of the public. Governments at time squander that resource, but it remains a major asset.

In addition, the public sector can, if it is coordinated and can pursue coherent policy goals, provide a central direction to more diverse and diffuse actors in the private sector. One of the most important criteria for governance is the need to create a set of common goals for the society, and that goal setting function is most likely to occur in government, as opposed to the numerous and diverse groups pressing their demands on the public sector. Therefore, a common set of goals may be more effective in governing than the more complex and perhaps confused set coming from society. The 'central mind of government', in Dror's (2001) terms, and with that the opportunity to govern strategically, can be a decided advantage in governing.

Following from the above point, conflict resolution is a central activity for government and for governing. There are any number of policy views held by members of society, most of which contain some elements of the public interest as well as the more selective interests of the advocates. The difficulty in governing therefore is selecting among this array of worthy policy proposals. The institutions in the public sector have the mechanisms for doing this, whether through voting in legislative bodies, or more technocratic forms of decision-making in the bureaucracy, or even legal decision-making in the courts. Networks do not have such forms of conflict resolution that are agreed *ex ante*. Bargaining does provide a means of resolving some conflicts, but generally not those in which there are direct conflicts among groups. Thus, any movement toward 'governance without government' complicates conflict resolution, but government may have to come back in the end to cope with fundamental disagreements.

One of the luxuries that the development of networks and the involvement of the private sector in governance affords government is that its own involvement in governance can be selective and instrumental. That is, government can now govern with a lighter hand, and can use those instruments of 'new governance' (see Salamon 2002) that may be less obtrusive. So long as the decisions made by networks remain within the bounds acceptable to existing law and the general policy values of the government there may be no reason to squander scarce political capital and intervene. But we should not forget that those instruments still depend upon the power and legitimate authority of the public sector for much of their effectiveness, and that most of the goal-setting will still be done through the public sector.

Conclusion

In summary, the rumours of the death of the state are exaggerated. We would certainly not want to deny that governing has changed, and that

international, and especially societal, actors are important players. That having been said, for many countries they have been significant components of governance for decades if not centuries. Further, the international dimension of governance may have increased, but may serve as much as a locus and arena for state action as it does a real constraint on governing – at least for the affluent industrial countries.

Therefore, we would advocate some caution when considering many of the contemporary discussions of governance. They need to be considered in light of a complex history of governing and government. They also need ot be considered in light of the complexity of contemporary governance processes and structures. Governing still involves choosing and therefore advantages structures that have the capacity to produce more coherent and strategic decisions. Despite the numerous critiques of government, it may still be more capable of providing a coherent picture of the future of society than can any other institution, and is more capable of resolving the inherent conflicts among sectors of society that will be required to pursue that vision.

Further reading

Jreisat, J. S. (2002) *Governance and Developing Countries* (Leiden: Brill).

Kjaer, A. M. (2004) *Governance* (Cambridge: Polity).

Kooiman, J. (2004) *Governing as Governance* (London: Sage).

Nye, J. S. and Donahue, J. D. (2000) *Governance in a Globalizing World* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution).

Pierre, J. and Peters, B. G. (2000) *Goverance, Politics and the State* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance

Bibliography

Abdelal, Rawi, Blyth, Mark and Parsons, Craig (2005) *Constructivist Political Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Abrams, P. A. (1988) 'Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 1(1): 58–89.

Acker, Joan (1989) 'The Problem with Patriarchy', *Sociology* 23(2): 235–40.

Acker, Joan (1992) 'Gendering Organizational Theory', in Albert J. Mills and Peta Tancred (eds), *Gendering Organizational Analysis* (Newbury Park, London and New Delhi: Sage).

Adler, E. and Haas, P. (1992) 'Conclusion: Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Programme', in P. Haas (ed.), *Knowledge, Power and International Policy Co-ordination*, special issue of *International Organization*.

Adorno, T. W. and Horkheimer, M. (1944/1973) *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (London, Allen Lane).

Afshar, Haleh (ed.) (1996) *Women and Politics in the Third World* (London: Routledge).

Aglietta, M. (1979) *A Theory of Capitalist Regulation* (London: New Left Books).

Agnew, John and Ó Tuathail, Gearóid (1992) 'Geopolitics and discourse: practical geopolitical reasoning in American foreign policy', *Political Geography*, 11: 190–204.

Agnew, John and Corbridge, Stuart (1995) *Mastering Space: Hegemony, Territory and International Political Economy* (London: Routledge).

Allen, J. (1990) 'Does Feminism Need a Theory of the State?', in S. Watson (ed.), *Playing the State: Australian Feminist Interventions* (London: Verso).

Almond, G. A. and Powell, G. B. (1966) *Comparative Politics Today: A World View* (London and New York: HarperCollins).

Almond, Gabriel (1966) 'Political Theory and Political Science', *American Political Science Review*, 60:(4).

Althusser, L. (1969) *For Marx* (London: Allen Lane).

Althusser, L. (1974) *Essays in Self-Criticism* (London: New Left Books).

Altvater, E. (1973) 'Notes on Some Problems of State Interventionalism', *Kapitalistate*, 1: 97–108; 2: 76–83.

Alvarez, Sonia E. (1990) *Engendering Democracy in Brazil: Women's Movements in Transition Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Amos, Valerie and Parmar, Pratibha (1984) 'Challenging Imperial Feminism', *Feminist Review*, 17: 3–19.

Anttonen, Anneli (1994) 'Hyvinvointivaltion naisystävälliset kasvot', in Anneli Anttonen, Lea Henriksson and Ritva Nätkin (eds), *Naisten hyvinvointivaltio* (Tampere: Vastapaino).

Arrow, K. and Debreu, G. (1954), 'Existence of an Equilibrium for a Competitive Economy', *Econometrica*, 22: 265–90.

Ashley, Richard K. (1988) 'Untying the Sovereign State: A Double Reading of the Anarchy Problematique', *Millennium*, 17(2): 227–62.

Auerbach, L., Donner, A., Peters, D., Townson, M. and Yalnizyan, A. (2003) *Finding Hospital Infrastructure: Why P3s Don't Work, and What Will* (Ottawa: CCPA).

Avineri, S. (1968) *The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Axelrod, Robert (1984) *The Evolution of Cooperation* (New York: Basic Books).

Bache, I. and Flinders, M. (2004) *Multi-level Governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M. (1962) 'Two Faces of Power', *American Political Science Review*, 56: 947–52.

Banaszak, Lee Ann, Beckwith, Karen and Rucht, Dieter (2003) 'When Power Relocates: Interactive Changes in Women's Movements and States', in *idem* (eds), *Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Banuri, Tariq and Spanger-Siegfried, Erika (2000) 'UNEP and Civil Society: Recommendations for a Coherent Framework of Engagement', paper prepared for UNEP by the Stockholm Environment Institute, Boston Centre and Tellus Institute.

Bardach, E. (1998) *Getting Agencies to Work Together* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution).

Barrett, Michèle (1980) *Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis* (London: Verso).

Barrett, Michèle and McIntosh, Mary (1985) 'Ethnocentrism and Socialist–Feminist Theory', *Feminist Review*, 20: 22–47.

Barrett, Michèle and Phillips, Anne (eds) (1992) *Destabilizing Theory* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Barrow, C. W. (1993) *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist* (Madiscon: University of Wisconsin Press).

Barry, Andrew *et al.* (eds) (1996) *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government* (London, UCL Press).

Barry, J. and Doherty, B. (2001) 'The Greens and Social Policy: Movements, Politics and Practice?', *Social Policy and Administration*, 35(5): 587–607.

Barry, John (1999a) *Rethinking Green Politics: Nature, Virtue and Progress* (London: Sage).

Barry, John (1999b) *Environment and Social Theory* (London: Routledge).

Barry, John (2003) 'Ecological Modernization', in J. Proops and E. Page (eds), *Environmental Thought* (Chelterham, Glos.: Edward Elgar).

Barry, John (2005) 'Resistance is Fertile: From Environmental to Sustainability Citizenship', in D. Bell and A. Dobson (eds), *Environmental Citizenship: Getting from Here to There?* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Barry, John and Eckersley, Robyn (eds) (2005) *The Global Ecological Crisis and the Nation-State* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Bates, R., Grief, A. Levi, M., Rosenthal J.-L. and Weingast, B. (1998) *Analytic Narratives* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Bates, Robert (1987) 'Contra Contractarianism: Some Reflections on the New Institutionalism', *Politics and Society*, 16: 387–401.

Bauman, Zygmunt (1989) *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge, Polity Press).

Beck, Ulrich (1992) *Risk Society: Toward a New Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Beck, Ulrich (1995) *Ecological Politics in an Age of Risk* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Beck, Ulrich, Lash, Scott and Giddens, Anthony (1994) *Reflexive Modernization*, (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Begg, Alex (2000) *Empowering the Earth: Strategies for Social Change* (Totnes: Green Books).

Bell, S. (2004) *Australia's Money Mandarins: The Reserve Bank and the Politics of Money* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Benhabib, Seyla (1995) 'Feminism and Postmodernism: An Uneasy Alliance', in Seyla Benhabib *et al.* (eds) *Feminist Contentions* (London: Routledge).

Benson, J. K. (1982) 'A Framework for Policy Analysis', in D. Rodgers, D. Whitton *et al.* (eds), *Intergovernmental Coordination* (Ames: Iowa State University Press).

Bentley, A. (1967) *The Process of Government* (Chicago, Chicago University Press).

Berg, A. van den (1988) *The Immanent Utopia: From Marxism on the State to the State of Marxism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Berg, A. van den (1988) *The Immanent Utopia: From Marxism on the State to the State of Marxism.* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Berger, Thomas U. (1998) *Cultures of Antimilitarism: National Security in Germany and Japan* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Bergqvist, Christina *et al.* (eds) (1999) *Equal Democracies: Gender and Politics in the Nordic Countries* (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press).

Berman, Sheri (1998) *The Social Democratic Moment: Ideas and Politics in the Making of Interwar Europe* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Betramsen, R. B., Frolund, J. P., and Torfing, J. (1991) *State, Economy and Society* (London: Unwin Hyman).

Bevir, Mark and Rhodes, R. A. W (2003) *Interpreting British Governance* (London: Routledge).

Bevir, Mark, Dowding, Keith, Finlayson, Alan, Hay, Colin and Rhodes, Rod (2004) 'The Interpretive Approach in Political Science: A Symposium', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 6(2): 129–64.

Biermann, Frank (2000) 'The Case for a World Environment Organization', *Environment*, 42(9): 22–31.

Biersteker, T. J. and Weber, Cynthia (eds) (1996) *State Sovereignty as Social Construct* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Birch, A. (1993) *The Concepts and Theories of Modern Democracy* (London: Routledge).

Block, F. (1987a) 'The Ruling Class Does Not Rule: Notes on the Marxist Theory of the State', in *Idem, Revising State Theory: Essays in Politics and Postindustrialism.* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Block, F. (1987b) 'Beyond Relative Autonomy: State Managers as Historical Subjects', in *Idem, Revising State Theory: Essays in Politics and Postindustrialism* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Block, F. (1990) *Revising State Theory: Essays in Politics and Postindustrialism* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Blyth, M. (1997) '"Any More Bright Ideas?" The Ideational Turn in Comparative Political Economy', *Comparative Politics*, 29(2): 229–50.

Blyth, M. (2002) *Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Institutional Change in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Blyth, M. (2003) 'Structures do not Come with an Instruction Sheet: Interests, Ideas, and Progress in Political Science', *Perspectives on Politics*, 1(4): 695–706.

Bonefeld, W. (1993) 'Crisis of Theory: Bob Jessop's Theory of Capitalist Reproduction', *Capital & Class*, 50: 25–48.

Bookchin, Murray (1980) *Toward an Ecological Society* (Montreal: Black Rose Books).

Bookchin, Murray (1982) *The Ecology of Freedom: The Emergence and Dissolution of Hierarchy* (Palo Alto, CA: Cheshire Books).

Bookchin, Murray (1992), 'Libertarian Municipalism', *Society and Nature*, 1(1): 93–104.

Borchorst, Anette and Siim, Birte (1987) 'Women and the Advanced Welfare State – A New Kind of Patriarchal Power', in Ann Showstack Sassoon (ed.), *Women and the State: The Shifting Boundaries of Public and Private* (London: Hutchinson).

Borchorst, Anette and Siim, Birte (2002) 'The Women-friendly Welfare States Revisited', *NORA: Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, 10(2): 90–8.

Bottomore, T. (1973) 'Ruling Elite or Ruling Class', in J. Urry and J. Wakeford (eds), *Power in Britain* (London: Heinemann).

Bottomore, T. (1993) *Elites and Society* (London: Routledge).

Bouckaert, G. and Pollitt, C. (2004) *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Bovaird, T. (2004a) 'Public–Private Partnerships in Western Europe and the US', in A. Ghobadian, N. O'Regan, D. Gallear and H. Viney (2004) *Public–Private Partnerships* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Bovaird, T. (2004b) 'Public–Private Partnerships: From Contested Concepts to Prevalent Practice', *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 70(2): 199–215.

Breen, R., Hannan, D. *et al.* (1990) *Understanding Contemporary Ireland: State, Class and Development in the Republic of Ireland* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan).

Brennan, G. and Lomasky, L. (1993) *Democracy and Decision* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Breslin, S. and Higgott, R. (2000) 'Studying Regions: Learning from the Old, Constructing the New', *New Political Economy*, 5(3): 333–53.

Breuilly, J. (1996) 'Approaches to Nationalism', in G. Balakrishnan, *Mapping the Nation* (London: Verso).

Briskin, Linda (1999) 'Mapping Women's Organizing in Sweden and Canada: Some Thematic Considerations', in Linda Briskin and Mona Eliasson (eds), *Women's Organizing and Public Policy in Canada and Sweden* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press).

Briskin, Linda and Eliasson, Mona (1999) 'Preface: Collaboration and Comparison', in *idem* (eds), *Women's Organizing and Public Policy in Canada and Sweden* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press).

Brown, W. (1992) 'Finding the Man in the State', *Feminist Studies*, 18(1): 7–34.

Brown, Wendy (1995) *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Bryson, V. (1992) *Feminist Political Theory* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Buchanan, J. (1984) 'Politics without Romance', in J. Buchanan and R. Tollison (eds), *The Theory of Public Choice II* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Buchanan, J. (1988) 'Market Failure and Political Failure', *Cato Journal*, 8: 1–13.

Buchanan, J. and Wagner, R. (1977) *Democracy in Deficit* (New York: Basic Books).

Buchanan, J. and Wagner, R. (1978) *The Consequences of Mr Keynes* (London: IEA).

Buchanan, J. M. and G. Tullock (1962) *The Calculus of Consent* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Budge, I. (1996) *The New Challenge of Direct Democracy* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Bukharin, N. I. (1921 [1926]) *Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology* (London: Allen & Unwin).

Buller, J. (1999) 'A Critical Appraisal of the Statecraft Interpretation', *Public Administration*, 77(4): 691–712.

Buller, J. (2000) *National Statecraft and European Integration* (London: Pinter).

Buller, J. and Flinders, M. (2005) 'Democracy, Depoliticization and Arena-Shifting', paper given at the SCANCOR 'Autonomization of the State' Conference, 1April 2005, Stanford University, USA.

Bulpitt, J. (1986a) 'The Discipline of the New Democracy: Mrs Thatcher's Domestic Statecraft', *Political Studies*, 34: 19–39.

Bulpitt, J. (1986b) 'Continuity, Autonomy and Peripheralization: the Anatomy of the Centre's Statecraft in England', in Z. Layton-Henry and P. Rich (eds), *Race, Government and Politics in Britain* (Basingstroke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Bulpitt, J. (1995) 'Historical Politics: Macro, In-Time, Governing Regime Analysis', in J. Lovenduski and J. Stanyer (eds), *Contemporary Political Studies 1995* Volume 2, Exeter: PSA).

Burchell, Gordon, Gordon, Colin and Miller, Peter (eds) (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Burnham, J. (1943) *The Managerial Revolution* (London: Putnam).

Burnham, P. (2001) 'New Labour and the Politics of Depoliticization', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 3(2): 127–49.

Cameron, D. R. (1978) 'The Expansion of the Public Economy: A Comparative Analysis', *American Political Science Review*, 72(4), 1243–61.

Camilleri, J. A. and Falk, J. (1992) *The End of Sovereignty?* (Aldershot: Edward Elgar).

Campbell, David (1992) *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (Manchester University Press: Manchester).

Campbell, David (1998) *National Deconstruction: Violence Identity and Justice in Bosnia* (University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis).

Campbell, David and Shapiro Michael (1999) *Moral Spaces: Rethinking Ethics and World Politics* (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press).

Campbell, J. L. (2001) 'Institutional Analysis and the Role of Ideas in Political Economy', in J. L. Campbell and O. K. Pedersen (eds), *The Second Movement* in *Institutional Analysis* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Campbell, J. L. and Pedersen, O. K. (eds) (2001) *The Second Movement* in *Institutional Analysis* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Campbell, John L. (2004) *Institutional Change and Globalization* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Campbell, John L. and Pedersen, Ove (2001) *The Rise of NeoLiberalism and Institutional Analysis* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Capling, A. and Galligan, B. (1992) *Beyond the Protective State: The Political Economy of Australia's Manufacturing Industry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Carnoy, M. (1984) *The State and Political Theory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Carter, Alan (1993) 'Towards a Green Political Theory', in Andrew Dobson and Paul Lucardie (eds) (1993) *The Politics of Nature: Explorations in Green Political Theory* (London: Routledge).

Castells, M. (1998) *The Power of Identity* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Cerny, P. G. (1997) 'Paradoxes of the Competition State: The Dynamics of Political Globalization', *Government and Opposition*, 32(2), 251–74.

Cerny, P. G. (2000) 'Political Globalization and the Competition state' in R. Stubbs and G. R. D. Underhill (eds), *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order* (Ontario: Oxford University Press).

Chappell, Louise (2000) 'Interacting with the State', in *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 2(2): 244–75.

Checkel, Jeffrey (1998) 'The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory', *World Politics*, 50: 324–48.

Chester, D. N. (1979) 'Fringe Bodies, Quangos and All That', *Public Administration*, 57.(1) pp 51–54

Chondroleou, G. (2002) *Policy Networks in Comparative Perspective: Media Policy Networks and Regulation Policy in Britain and Greece*, PhD: York University, UK.

Christensen, Ann-Dorte and Siim, Birte (2001) *Køn, Demokrati og Modernitet* (Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel).

Christoff, P. (1996) 'Ecological Modernisation, Ecological Modernities', *Environmental Politics*, 5(3): 476–500.

Cockett, R. (1995) *Thinking the Unthinkable : Think-Tanks and the Economic Counter-Revolution, 1931–1983* (London: Fontana).

Cohn, D. (2005) 'The Public–Private "Fetish": Moving beyond the Rhetoric', *Revue Gouvernance*, 1(2): 2–15.

Colletti, L. (1972) *From Rousseau to Lenin: Studies in Ideology and Society* (New York: Monthly Review Press).

Colletti, L. (1975) 'Introduction', in L. Colletti (ed.) *Karl Marx: Early Writings* (London: Pelican).

Collier, D. and Collier, R. (1991) *Shaping the Political Arena* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Conca, K. (1994) 'Untying the Ecology–Sovereignty Debate', *Millennium*, 23(3): 701–11.

Connell, R. W. (1987) *Gender and Power* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Connell, R. W. (1990) 'The State, Gender and Sexual Politics: Theory and Appraisal', *Theory and Society*, 19: 507–44.

Coole, D. (1988) *Women in Political Theory* (Brighton, Sussex: Wheatsheaf Books).

Cooper, D. (1994) *Sexing the City* (London: Rivers Oram Press).

Cooper, D. (1995) *Power in Struggle: Feminism, Sexuality and the State* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

Cooper, D. (1998) *Governing out of Order: Space, Law and the Politics of Belonging* (London and New York: Rivers Oram Press).

Cooper, R. (1996) *The Post-Modern State and World Order* (London: Demos).

Cox, R. (2000) 'Political Economy and World Order: Problems of Power and Knowledge at the Turn of the Millennium', in R. Stubbs and G. R. D. Underhill (eds), *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*, 2nd edn (Ontario: Oxford University Press).

Crone, P. (1989) *Pre-Industrial Societies* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Dahl, R. (1958) 'A Critique of the Ruling Elite Model', *American Political Science Review*, 52(2): 463–9.

Dahl, R. (1961a) *Who Governs?* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Dahl, R. (1961b) 'The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest', *American Political Science Review*, 55(4): 763–72.

Dahl, R. (1963) *Pluralist Democracy in the United States: Conflict and Consent* (Chicago: Rand McNally).

Dahl, R. (1969) 'The Behavioral Approach in Political Science', in Heinz Eulau (ed.), *Behaviorism in Political Science* (New York: Atherton).

Dahlerup, D. (1987) 'Confusing Concepts, Confusing Reality: A Theoretical Discussion of the Patriarchal State', in Anne Showstack Sassoon (ed.), *Women and the State* (London: Routledge).

Dahlerup, D. (2002) 'Using Quotas to Increase Women's Political Representation', in Azza Karam (ed.), *Women in Parliament: Beyond Numbers*, 2nd edn (Stockholm: International IDEA).

Dahrendorf, R. (1959) *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Dale, J. and Foster, Peggy (1986) *Feminists and State Welfare* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

Daly, M. and Lewis, J. (1998) 'Introduction: Conceptualising Social Care in the Context of Welfare State Restructuring', in Jane Lewis (ed.), *Gender, Social Care and Welfare State Restructuring in Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Davies, J. S. (2001) *Partnerships and Regimes: The Politics of Urban Regeneration in the UK* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

DeFilippis, J. (2001) 'The Myth of Social Capital in Community Development', *Housing Policy Debate*, 12: 781–805.

Delphy, C. and Leonard, D. (1992) *Familiar Exploitation: A New Analysis of Marriage in Contemporary Western Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Deudney, D. and G. J. Ikenberry (1999) 'The Nature and Sources of Liberal International Order', *Review of International Studies*, 25(2): 179–96.

Devall, B. (1988) *Simple in Means, Rich in Ends: Practising Deep Ecology* (Salt Lake, Utah: Gibbs Smith).

Dicken, P. (1998) *Global Shift: Transforming the World Economy* (London: Paul Chapman).

Dicken, P. (2003) *Global Shift: Reshaping the Global Economic Map in the 21st Century* (London: Sage).

Dillon, M. (1996) *Politics of Security: Towards a Political Philosophy of Continental Thought* (London: Routledge).

DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W. (1983) 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields', *American Sociological Review*, 48: 147–60.

DiMaggio, P. J. and Powell, W. W. (1991) 'Introduction', in *idem, The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Dobbin, F. (1994) *Forging Industrial Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Dobson, A. (1990) *Green Political Thought* (London: Unwin Hyman).

Doel, M. (1999) *Poststructuralist Geographies: the Diabolical Art of Spatial Science* (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press).

Domhoff, G. W. (1967) *Who Rules America?* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall).

Domhoff, G. W. (1970) *The Higher Circles: the Governing Class in America* (New York: Random House).

Domhoff, G. W. (1979) *The Powers That Be: Processes of Ruling Class Domination in America* (New York: Vintage Books).

Domhoff, G. W. (1980) *Power Structure Research* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage).

Domhoff, G. W. (1987) *Who Rules America?* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall).

Domhoff, G. W. (1990) *The Power Elite and the State* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter).

Donzelot, J. (1980) *The Policing of Families* (London Hutchinson).

Dore, E. and Molyneux, M. (2000) (eds) *Hidden Stories of Gender and the State in Latin America* (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press).

Dowding, K. (1995) *The Civil Service* (London: Routledge).

Dowding, K. (2001) 'There Must Be An End to Confusion: Policy Networks, Intellectual Fatigue, and the Need for Political Science Methods Courses in British Universities', *Political Studies*, 49(1): 89–105.

Dowding, Keith (2001) 'There Must Be End to Confusion: Policy Networks, Intellectual Fatigue, and the Need for Political Science Methods Courses in British Universities', *Political Studies*, 49: 89–105.

Downs, A. (1957) *An Economic Theory of Democracy* (New York: Harper & Row).

Downs, A. (1967) *Inside Bureaucracy* (Boston: Little, Brown).

Draper, H. (1977) *Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution*. Volume 1: *State and Bureaucracy* (New York: Monthly Review Press).

Dror, Y. (2001) *The Capacity to Govern* (London: Frank Cass).

Dryzek, J. (1987) *Rational Ecology: Environment and Political Economy* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).

Dryzek, J. (1996) 'Political Inclusion and the Dynamics of Democratization', *American Political Science Review*, 90: 475–87.

Dryzek, J. (2000) *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Dryzek, J. (2000) *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Dryzek, J., Downes, D., Hunold, C., Schlosberg, D., with Hernes, H. K. (2003) *Green States and Social Movements* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Dunleavy, P. (1991) *Democracy, Bureaucracy and Public Choice: Economic Explanations in Political Science* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf).

Dunleavy, P. and O'Leary, B. (1987) *Theories of the State: The Politics of Liberal Democracy* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Dyke, G. (2004) *Inside Story* (London: HarperCollins).

Easton, D. (1953) *The Political System* (New York: Harper).

Easton, D. (1967) *A Framework for Political Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall).

Ebbinhaus, B. and Hassel, A. (1999) 'The role of tripartite concertation in the reform of the welfare state', in *State Intervention and Industrial Relations at the End of the 1990s* (Brussels: ETUI).

Eckersley, R. (1992) *Environmentalism and Political Theory: Towards an Ecocentric Approach* (London: UCL Press).

Eckersley, R. (2004) *The Green State: Rethinking Democracy and Sovereignty*, Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Edkins, J. (1999) *Poststructuralism and International Relations: Bringing the Political Back In* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner).

Eisenstein, H. (1991) 'Speaking for Women? Voices from the Australian Femocrat Experiment', in *Australian Feminist Studies*, 14: 29–42.

Eisenstein, H. (1996) *Inside Agitators: Australian Femocrats and the State* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Eisenstein, Z. (1979) 'Developing a Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy and Socialist Feminism', in *idem* (ed.), *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism* (New York and London: Monthly Review Press).

Eisenstein, Z. (1984) *Feminism and Sexual Equality: Crisis in Liberal America* (New York: Monthly Review Press).

Eisenstein, Z. (1986) *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism* (Boston: Northeastern University Press).

Elkin, S. (1986) 'Regulation and Regime: A Comparative Analysis', *Journal of Public Policy*, 6(1): 49–72.

Elkins, D. J. (1995) *Beyond Sovereignty: Territorial and Political Economy in the Twenty-First Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

Elshtain, J. B. (1981) *Public Man, Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought* (Oxford: Martin Robertson).

Elster, J. (1986), 'Introduction', in *idem* (ed.), *Rational Choice* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Elster, J. (1989), *The Cement of Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Elster, J. and Hylland, A. (eds) (1986) *Foundations of Social Choice Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Engels, F. (1844 [1975]) 'Outline of a Critique of Political Economy', in K. Marx and Engels, F. *Collected Works*, Vol. 3 (London: Lawrence & Wishart).

Engels, F. (1878 [1947]) *Anti-Dühring* (Moscow: Progress Publishers).

Engels, F. (1884 [1978]) *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (Peking: Foreign Language Press).

Enloe, C. (1990) *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).

European Policy Forum (2000) *Making Decisions in Britain* (London : European Policy Forum).

Evans, M. (2001) 'Understanding Dialectics in Policy Network Analysis', *Political Studies*, 49(3): 542–50.

Evans, P. B., Rueschemeyer, D. and Skocpol, T. (eds) (1985) *Bringing the State Back In* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Falconer, Lord 'Department for Constitutional Affairs: Justice, Rights and Democracy', speech to the Institute for Public Policy Research, London, 3 December 2003. See also Lord Falconer. Constitutional Reform Speech, University College London, 8 December 2003.

Femia, J. V. (1981) *Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness, and the Revolutionary Process* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Ferguson, Kathy (1984) *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Finegold, K. and Skocpol, T. (1995) 'Marxist Approaches to Politics and the State', in *idem, State and Party in America's New Deal* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).

Finer, S. (1966) *Anonymous Empire* (London: Pall Mall).

Finnemore, M. (1996a) 'Norms, Culture, and World Politics: Insights from Sociology's Institutionalism', *International Organization*, 50(2): 325–47.

Finnemore, M. (1996b) 'Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention', in Peter Katzenstein (ed.), *The Cultural of National Security* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Finnemore, M. and Sikkink, K. (1998) 'International Norm Dynamics and Political Change', *International Organization*, 52: 887–917.

Fiore, G. (1970) *Antonio Gramsci: Life of a Revolutionary* (London: New Left Books).

Fligstein, N. (1990) *The Transformation of Corporate Control* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Fligstein, N. and Mara-Drita, I. (1996) 'How to Make a Market: Reflections on the Attempt to Create a Single Market in the European Union', *American Journal of Sociology*, 102: 1–32.

Flinders, M. (2004) 'Distributed Public Governance in Britain', *Public Administration*, 82(4): 883–909.

Flinders, M. (2005) 'The Politics of Public–Private Partnerships', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 7(2): 543–67.

Flinders, M. (2006) *Walking Without Order: Delegated Governance and the British State* (Oxford : Oxford University Press).

Follett, M. P. (1918) *The New State* (New York: Longmans, Green).

Foreign Policy (2004) 'Globalization Index 2003' (A. T. Kearney), *Foreign Policy*, March/April.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish* (Harmondsworth, Penguin).

Foucault, M. (1980) 'Truth and Power', in Colin Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977* (London, Harvester Wheatsheaf).

Foucault, M. (1987) *The History of Sexuality*, Part I: *An Introduction* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Foucault, M. (1991) 'Governmentality', in Graham Burchell *et al.* (eds), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf).

Foucault, M. (2003) *Society Must Be Defended* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Fox, C. J. and Miller, H. T. (1995) *Postmodern Public Administration* (London: Sage).

Fraser, N. (1995) 'False Antitheses: A Response to Seyla Benhabib and Judith Butler', in Seyla Benhabib *et al.* (eds), *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange* (London: Routledge).

Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice Interrupts: Critical Reflections in the 'Post-Socialist' Condition* (Routledge: London).

Friedan, B. (1962) *The Feminine Mystique* (New York: Dell).

Friedman, M. and Schwartz, A. (1963) *A Monetary History of the United States, 1867–1960*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Gais, T. L., Peterson, M. A. and Walker, J. L. (1984) 'Interest Groups, Iron Triangles and Representative Institutions in American National Government', *British Journal of Political Studies*, 14: 161–85.

Galbraith, J. K. (1963) *American Capitalism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Gamble, A. (2000) *Politics and Fate* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Garrett, G. (1998) *Partisan Politics in the Global Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Gellner, E. (1983) *Nations and Nationalism* (Blackwell: Oxford).

Gertler, M. (1992) 'Flexibility Revisited: Districts, Nation-States, and the Forces of Production', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 17:259–78.

Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N. Gallear, D. and Viney, H. (2004) *Public–Private Partnerships* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Giddens, A. (1991a) *The Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge, Polity Press).

Giddens, A. (1991b) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Giddens, A. (1994) *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Giddens, A. (1999) *Runaway World: The Reith Lectures Revisited*, Lecture 1.

Gill, G. (2003) *The Nature and Development of the Modern State*' (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Gold, D. A. *et al.* (1975a) 'Recent Developments in Marxist Theories of the Capitalist State: Part I', *Monthly Review*, 27(5): 29–43.

Gold, D. A. *et al.* (1975b) 'Recent Developments in Marxist Theories of the Capitalist State: Part II', *Monthly Review*, 27 (6): 36–51.

Goldfinch, S. (2000) *Remaking New Zealand and Australian Economic Policy: Ideas, Institutions and Policy Communities* (Wellington: Victoria University Press).

Goldsmith, E. (1991) *The Way: 87 Principles for an Ecological World* (London: Rider).

Goldstein, J. (1993) *Ideas, Interests, and American Trade Policy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Goldstein, J. and Keohane, R. (1993) *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Goodin, R. (1992) *Green Political Theory* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Goodin, R. E. (1990) 'International Ethics and the Environmental Crisis', *Ethics and International Affairs*, 4: 90–105.

Gordon, C. (1991) 'Governmental Rationality: An Introduction', in Graham Burchell *et al*. (eds), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf).

Gordon, D. M. (1988) 'The Global Economy: New Edifice or Crumbling Foundations?' *New Left Review*, 168: 24–64.

Gourevitch, P. A. (1986) *Politics in Hard Times: Comparative Responses to International Economic Crises* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Gramsci, Antonio (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed., Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, (London: Lawrence & Wishart).

Gray, J. (1998) *False Dawn: The Delusions of Global Capitalism* (London: Granta).

Green, D. and Shapiro, I. (1994) *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Greider, W. (1997) *One World, Ready or Not* (New York: Simon & Schuster).

Greve, C., Flinders, M. and Van Thiel, S. (1999) 'Quangos – What's In a Name? Defining Quangos from a Comparative Perspective', *Governance*, 12(2): 129–47.

Grofman, B. (1995) 'Introduction', in *idem* (ed.), *Information, Participation and Choice: An Economic Theory of Democracy in Perspective* (Michigan: University of Michigan Press).

Grove-White, R. (1993) 'Environmentalism: A New Moral Discourse for Technological Society', in Kay Milton (ed.), *Environmentalism: The View from Anthropology* (London: Routledge).

Gutsman, W. (1963) *The British Political Elite* (London: MacGibbon & Kee).

Gwinnett, B. (1998) 'Policing Prostitution: Gender the State and Community Politics', in Vicky Randall and Georgina Waylen (eds), *Gender, Politics and the State* (London: Routledge).

Haas, E. (1990) *When Knowledge is Power: Three Models of Change in International Organizations* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Haas, P. (ed.) (1992) 'Knowledge, Power and International Policy Coordination', special issue of *International Organization*.

Haas, P. M. (1992) 'Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination'. *International Organization*, 46: 1–35.

Habermas, J. (1975) *Legitimation Crisis* (London: Heinemann).

Habermas, J. (1996) *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Hacking, I. (1991) 'How Should We Do the History of Statistics?', in Graham Burchell *et al*. (eds), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf).

Hajer, M. (1995) *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernisation and the Policy Process* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Hall, J. A. and G. J. Ikenberry (1989) *The State* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

Hall, P. (1986) *Governing the Economy: The Politics of State Intervention in Britain and France* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Hall, P. (1989) 'Conclusion', in *idem* (ed.), *The Political Power of Economic Ideas: Keynesianism across Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Hall, P. (1993) 'Policy Paradigms, Social Learning and the State: The Case of Economic Policy-Making in Britain', *Comparative Politics*, 25: 275–96.

Hall, P. A. and Taylor, R. C. R. (1996) 'Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms', *Political Studies*, 44(4): 936–57.

Hall, P. and Soskice, D. (2001) 'Introduction', in *idem* (eds), *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Hall, P. and Taylor, R. (1996) 'Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms', *Political Studies*, 44: 936–57.

Hall, S. and Jacques, M. (1983) *The Politics of Thatcherism* (London: Lawrence & Wishart).

Harding, S. (1981) 'What is the Real Material Base of Patriarchy and Capital?', in Lydia Sargent (ed.), *Women and Revolution: The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism* (London: Pluto Press).

Hartmann, H. (1981) 'The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a more Progressive Union', in Lydia Sargent (ed.) *Women and Revolution: The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism* (London: Pluto Press).

Harvey, D. (1990) *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Hay, C. (1994a) 'Environmental Security and State Legitimacy', in M. O' Connor (ed.), *Is Capitalism Sustainable? Political Economy and the Politics of Ecology* (New York: Guilford Press).

Hay, C. (1994b) 'Werner in Wunderland: Bob Jessop's Strategic–Relational Approach', in F. Sebäi & C. Vercellone (eds.), *École de la Régulation et Critique de La Raison Économique* (Paris: L'Harmattan).

Hay, C. (1996a) *Re-Stating Social and Political Change* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

Hay, C. (1996b) 'Narrating Crisis: The Discursive Construction of the Winter of Discontent', *Sociology*, 30 (2), 253–77.

Hay, C. (2000) 'Contemporary Capitalism, Globalization, Regionalization and the Persistence of National Variation', *Review of International Studies*, 26: 509–31.

Hay, C. (2001) 'The "Crisis" of Keynesianism and the Rise of NeoLiberalism in Britain: An Ideational Institutionalist Approach', in John L. Campbell and Ove Pedersen (eds), *The Rise of NeoLiberalism and Institutional Analysis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Hay, C. (2002) *Political Analysis* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Hay, C. (2004a) 'Re-Stating Politics, Re-Politicizing the State: Neoliberalism, Economic Imperatives and the Rise of the Competition State', *Political Quarterly*, 75 special issue pp 38–50.

Hay, C. (2004b) 'Common trajectories, variable paces, divergent outcomes? Models of European capitalism under conditions of complex economic interdependence', *Review of International Political Economy*, 11(2): 231–62.

Hay, C. (2004c) 'The Normalising Role of Rationalist Assumptions in the Institutional Embedding of Neo-Liberalism', *Economy and Society*, 33(4): 500–27.

Hay, C. (2006) 'Constructivist Institutionalism', in R. A. W. Rhodes, Sarah Binder and Bert Rockman (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Hay, C. and Marsh, D. (2000) *Demystifying Globalization* (London: Macmillan).

Hay, C. and Rosamond, B. (2002) 'Globalisation, European Integration and the Discursive Construction of Economic Imperatives', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9(2): 147–67.

Hay, C. and Wincott, D. (1998) 'Structure, Agency and Historical Institutionalism', *Political Studies*, 46(5): 951–7.

Hayek, F. (1978) *Law, Legislation and Liberty* (London: Routledge).

Heclo, H. (1978) 'Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment', in King, A. (ed.), *The New American Political System* (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute).

Heffernan, R. (2002) '"The possible as the art of politics": understanding consensus politics', *Political Studies*, 50(4): 742–60.

Heilbroner, Robert (1974) *An Inquiry into the Human Prospect* (New York: Harper & Row).

Held, D., A. McGrew, D. Goldblatt, J. Perraton (1999) *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Held, David (1980) *Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas* (London: Hutchinson).

Hernes, H. M. (1987) *Welfare State and Woman Power* (Oslo: Norwegian University Press).

Hernes, H. M. (1988a) 'Scandinavian Citizenship', *Acta Sociologica* 31(3): 199–215.

Hernes, H. M. (1988b) 'Women and the Welfare State: the Transition from Private to Public Dependence', in Anne Showstack Sassoon (ed.), *Women and the State* (London: Routledge).

Hewitt, C. J. (1974) 'Elites and the Distribution of Power in British Society', in Giddens, A. and Stanworth, P. (eds), *Elites and Power in British Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Heywood, A. (1997) *Politics* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Higgott, R. (1996) 'Beyond Embedded Liberalism: Governing the International Trade Regime in an Era of Economic Nationalism', in P. Gummett (ed.), *Globalisation and Public Policy* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar).

Hindmoor, A. (2004) *The Construction of Political Space: New Labour at the Centre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Hirsch, J. (1978) 'The State Apparatus and Social Reproduction: Elements of a Theory of the Bourgeois State', in J. Holloway and S. Picciotto (eds), *State and Capital: A Marxist Debate* (London: Arnold).

Hirst, P. (1994) *Associative Democracy* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Hirst, P. and Thompson, G. (1999) *Globalisation in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Hix, S. (1998) 'The Study of the EU II', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 5(1): 38–65.

Hobbes, T. (1951[1968]) *Leviathan*, ed. C. Macpherson (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1990) *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Hodge, G. and Greve, C. (2005) *The Challenge of Public–Private Partnerships* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar).

Holm, H.-H. and Sørensen, G. (1995) 'International Relations Theory in a World of Variation', in H.-H. Holm and G. Sørensen (eds), *Whose World Order? Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War* (Boulder, CO: Westview).

Hood, C. (2002) 'The Risk Game and the Blame Game', *Government and Opposition*, 37(1): 15–37.

Hood, C. Rothstein, H. and Baldwin, R. (2004) *The Government of Risk* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2003) 'Unravelling the Central State, But How?', *American Political Science Review*, 97(2): 233–43.

Howarth, David, Norval, Aletta J. and Stavrakakis, Yannis (eds) (2000) *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: Identities, Hegemonies and Social Change* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Immergut, E. (1998) 'The Theoretical Core of the New Institutionalism', *Politics and Society*, 26:1: 5–34.

Immergut, Ellen (1992) *Health Politics: Interests and Institutions in Western Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Immergut, Ellen (1998) 'The Theoretical Core of the New Institutionalism', *Politics and Society*, 26(1): 5–34.

Ingaro, B. and Israel, G. (1990) *The Invisible Hand: Economic Equilibrium in the History of Science* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

IPPR (2002) *Building Better Partnerships* (London: IPPR).

IPPR (2004) *Opening It Up: Accountability and Partnerships* (London: IPPR).

Jänicke, M. (1990) *State Failure: The Impotence of Politics in Industrial Society*. Cambridge: Polity.

Jänicke, M., Mönch, H. and Binder, M. (2000) 'Structural change and environmental policy', in Stephen Young (ed.), *The Emergence of Ecological Modernisation: Integrating the Environment and the Economy?* (London: Routledge).

Jackson, R. (1999) 'Sovereignty in World Politics: A Glance at the Conceptual and Historical Landscape', *Political Studies*, 47(3): 431–57.

Jackson, R. and G. Sørensen (2003) *Introduction to International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Jacobs, S. (2000) 'Globalisation, States and Women's Agency: Possibilities and Pitfalls', in Susie Jacobs, Ruth Jacobson and Jen Marchbank (eds), *States of Conflict: Gender, Violence and Resistance* (London and New York: Zed Books).

Jacobsen, J. K. (1995) 'Much Ado about Ideas: The Cognitive Factor in Economic Policy', *World Politics*, 47: 283–310.

Jacobsen, K. (2001) 'Political Scientists Have Turned Guerrillas', *The Guardian*, 3 April: 14.

James, A. (1999) 'The Practice of Sovereign Statehood in Contemporary International Society', Special Issue of *Political Studies*, 47:3: 457–74.

Jaquette, Jane S. (2003) 'Feminism and the Challenges of the "Post-Cold War" World', *International Journal of Feminist Politics*, 5(3): 331–54.

Jenkins, K. (1991) *Re-thinking History* (London: Routledge).

Jessop, B. (1977) 'Recent Theories of the Capitalist State', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 1(4), 353–72.

Jessop, B. (1978) 'Marx and Engels on the State', in S. Hibbin *et al.* (eds), *Politics, Ideology and the State* (London: Lawrence & Wishart).

Jessop, B. (1982) *The Capitalist State* (Oxford: Martin Robertson).

Jessop, B. (1985) *Nicos Poulantzas: Marxist Theory and Political Strategy* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Jessop, B. (1990) *State Theory: Putting Capitalist States in Their Place* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Jessop, B. (1997). 'Capitalism and its Future: Remarks on Regulation, Government and Governance', *Review of International Political Economy*, 4:3: 561–81.

Jessop, B. (2002) *The Future of the Capitalist State* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Jobert, B. (1992) 'Représentations Sociales, Controverses et Débats dans la Conduite des Politiques Publiques', *Revue Française de Science Politique*, 42: 219–34.

Jones, R. (1999) 'The European Union as a Promoter of Public–Private Partnerships', *International Journal of Public–Private Partnerships*, 1(3): 289–305.

Jordan, A. and Richardson, J. (1982) 'The Policy Process in Britain', in J. Richardson (ed.), *Policy Styles in Western Europe* (London: Allen & Unwin).

Jordan, A. G. (1981) 'Iron Triangles, Wooly Corporatisms and Elastic Nets: Images of the Policy Process' *Journal of Public Policy*, 1: 95–123.

Jordan, A. G. and Richardson, J. (1987a) *Government and Pressure Groups in Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Jordan, A. G. and Richardson, J. (1987b) *British Politics and the Policy Process* (London: Unwin Hyman).

Jordan, G. (1990) 'The Pluralism of Pluralism: An Anti-Theory', *Political Studies*, 38(2): 286–301.

Jreisat, J. S. (2002) *Governance and Developing Countries* (Leiden: Brill).

Kadushin, C. (1974) *The American Intellectual Elite* (Boston: Little, Brown).

Katzenstein, P. (ed.) (1978) *Between Power and Plenty* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press).

Katzenstein, P. J. (1985), *Corporatism and Change* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Katzenstein, P. J. (ed.) (l996a) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Katzenstein, P. J. (l996b) *Cultural Norms and National Security: Policy and Military in Postwar Japan* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Kearney A. T. (2003) *Globalisation Index* (Foreign Policy).

Keating, M. (2000) 'The pressures for change', in M. Keating and G. Davis, *The Future of Governance* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin).

Keck, M. E. and Sikkink, K. (1998) *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Kelly, P. (1992) *The End of Certainty* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin).

Kelly, R. M., Bayes, J. H., Hawkesworth, M. E. and Brigitte Young (eds) (2001) *Gender, Globalisation and Democratization* (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield).

Kelso, W. A. (1978) *American Democratic Theory: Pluralism and its Critics* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press).

Keohane, R. and Nye, J. (1977) *Power and Interdependence* (Boston: Little, Brown).

Kerr, P. (1999) 'The Postwar Consensus: A Woozle that Wasn't?' in D. Marsh, J. Buller, C. Hay *et al.*, *Post-war British Politics in Perspective* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Kerr, P. and D. Marsh (1999) 'Explaining Thatcherism: Towards a Multidimensional Approach', in D. Marsh, J. Buller, C. Hay *et al.*, *Post-war British Politics in Perspective* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Keynes, J. M. (1936) *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Kimber, R. (1993) 'Interest Groups and the Fallacy of the Liberal Fallacy', in J. Richardson (ed.), *Pressure Groups* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

King, D. (1987) *The New Right* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

King, D. (1999) *In the Name of Liberalism: Illiberal Social Policy in the United States and Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Kirkpatrick, Evron (1971) 'The Impact of the Behavioral Approach on Traditional Political Science', in Howard Ball and James A. Lauth, Jr (eds), *Changing Perspectives in Contemporary Political Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall).

Kjaer, A. M. (2004) *Governance* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Klein, R. (2004) 'The First Wave of NHS Foundation Trusts', *British Medical Journal*, 328: 1332.

Kooiman, J. (2004) *Governing as Governance* (London: Sage).

Koppell, J. (2003) *The Politics of Quasi-Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Kraemer, P. E. (1968) *The Societal State* (Amsterdam: Kobra).

Krasner, S. (1980) *Defending the National Interest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Krasner, S. (1988) 'Sovereignty: An Institutional Perspective', *Comparative Political Studies*, 21: 66–94.

Krasner, S. (ed.) (1937) *International Regimes* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Kreisky, E. (1995) 'Der Staat ohne Geschlecht? Ansätze feministischer Staatskritik und feministischer Staatserklärung', in Eva Kreisky and Birgit Sauer (eds), *Feministische Standpunkte in der Politikwissenschaft: Eine Einführung* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus).

Kristol, I. (1983) *Reflections of a Neoconservative: Looking Back, Looking Ahead* (New York: Basic Books).

Krook, M. L. (2004) *Politicizing Representation: Campaigns for Candidate Gender Quotas Worldwide*, PhD thesis, Columbia University.

Kuhn, A. and Wolpe, A. M. (eds) (1978) *Feminism and Materialism: Women and the Modes of Production* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

Kymlicka, W. (2001) 'Western Political Theory and Ethnic Relations in Eastern Europe', in W. Kymlicka and M. Opalski (eds), *Can Liberal Pluralism be Exported?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Laborde, C. (2000) *Pluralist Thought and the State in Britain and France, 1900–25* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Laclau, E. (1975) 'The Specificity of the Political', *Economy & Society*, 4(1): 87–110, reprinted in *idem* (1977) *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory: Capitalism, Fascism, Populism* (London: New Left Books).

Laclau, Ernesto (1996) *Emancipation(s)* (London and New York: Verso).

Laclau, Ernesto and Mouffe, Chantal (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (London, Verso).

Lapidoth, R. (1992) 'Sovereignty in Transition', *Journal of International Affairs*, 45, (2): 325–46.

Laski, H. J. (1989) 'The Foundations of Sovereignty and Other Essays', in P. Hirst (ed.) *The Pluralist Theory of the State* (London: Routledge).

Latouche, S. (1993) *In the Wake of the Affluent Society: An Exploration of Post-Development* (London: Zed Books).

Latour, B. (2004) *Politics of Nature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Laumann, E. (1976) *Networks of Collective Action: A Perspective on Community Influence Systems* (New York: Academic).

Laumann, E. and Pappi, F. (1973) 'New Directions in the Study of Community Elites', *American Sociological Review*, 38: 212–29.

Laumann, E. *et al.* (1977) 'Community-elite Influence Structures: Extension of a Network Approach', *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 594–631.

Lawson, T. (1997) *Economics and Reality* (London: Routledge).

Lefebvre, H. (1972) *The Sociology of Marx* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Leigh, D. and Vulliamy, E. (1997) *Sleaze: The Corruption of Parliament* (London: Fourth Estate).

Leitch, S. and Motion, J. (2003) 'Public–Private Partnerships: Consultation, Co-operation and Collusion', *Journal of Public Affairs*, 3 (3): 273–8.

Lenin, V. I. (1917 [1968]) *The State and Revolution*, in V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works* (Moscow: Progress Publishers).

Leopold, Aldo (1949) *A Sand County Almanac* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Levett, R. (2001) 'What Quality, Whose Lives?' *Green Futures*, 28 (May/June): 28–30.

Levi, M. (1989) *Of Rule and Revenue* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).

Lindblom, C. (1977) *Politics and Markets* (New York: Basic Books).

Lindblom, C. (1982) 'Another State of Mind', *American Political Science Review*, 76(1): 9–21.

Lindvert, J. (2002) 'A World Apart: Swedish and Australian Gender Equality Policy', *NORA* 2(10): 99–107.

Linklater, A. (1998) *The Transformation of Political Community* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Lister, R. (1997) *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Litfin, K. (ed.) (1998) *The Greening of Sovereignty* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Lockwood, D. (1964) 'Social Integration and System Integration', in G. K. Zolschan and W. Hirsch (eds), *Explorations in Social Change* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

Lockwood, S. (1990) *Public–Private Partnerships in US Highway Finance* (London: PTRC).

Low, N. and Gleeson, B. (1998) Justice, Society and Nature: An Exploration of Political Ecology (London: Routledge).

Lowi, T. (1969) *The End of Liberalism* (New York: Norton).

Lowndes, V. (1996) 'Varieties of New Institutionalism: A Critical Appraisal', *Public Administration*, 74: 181–97.

Lowndes, V. (2002) 'Institutionalism', in David Marsh and Gerry Stoker (eds), *Theory and Methods in Political Science* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Lowndes, V. and Skelcher, C. (1998) 'The Dynamics of Multi-organisational Partnerships: An Analysis of Changing Modes of Governance', *Public Administration*, 76(2): 313–33.

Luke, T. (1999) *Capitalism, Democracy, and Ecology: Departing from Marx* (Illinois: University of Illinois Press).

Lukes, S. (1974) *Power: A Radical View* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Lustick, I. (1997) 'The Disciplines of Political Science: Studying the Culture of Rational Choice as a case, in point', *Political Science and Politics* 30(2): 175–9.

M. Laver (1997) *Private Desires, Political Action* (London: Sage).

Machiavelli, N. (1513/1988) *The Prince*, trans. Q. Skinner and R. Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

MacKinnon, C. A. (1982) 'Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State: An Agenda for Theory', *Signs*, 7(3): 515–44.

MacKinnon, C. A. (1983) 'Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State: Toward Feminist Jurisprudence', *Signs*, 8(4): 645–58.

MacKinnon, C. A. (1985) *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

MacKinnon, C. A. (1987) 'Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State', in Sandra Harding (ed.), *Feminism and Methodology* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press).

MacKinnon, C. A. (1989) *Towards a Feminist Theory of the State* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Mahon, R. (1991) 'From "Bringing" to "Putting": The State in Late Twentieth-Century Social Thought', *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 16(2), 119–44.

Majone, G. (1998) 'Europe's Democratic Deficit'. *European Law Journal*, 4(1): 5–28.

Majone, G. (2002) 'The European Commission: The Limits of Centralization and the Perils of Parliamentarization', *Governance*, 15(3): 375–92.

Mann, Michael (1986) *The Sources of Social Power, Vol. I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Mann, Michael (1988) *States, War and Capitalism* (New York: Basil Blackwell).

Mansbridge, J. (ed.) (1990) *Beyond Self-Interest* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

March, J. G. and Olsen, J. P. (1984) 'The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life', *American Political Science Review*, 78: 734–49.

March, J. G. and Olsen, J. P. (1989) *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics* (New York: Free Press).

Marsh, D. (1995) 'The Convergence between Theories of the State', in D. Marsh and G. Stoker (eds) *Theory and Methods of Political Science* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Marsh, D. (1999) 'Explaining Change in the Post-war Period', in *idem* (ed.), *Post-war British Politics in Perspective* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Marsh, D. (2002) 'Pluralism and the Study of British Politics: It is Always the Happy Hour for Men with Money, Knowledge and Power', in C. Hay (ed.), *British Politics Today* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Marsh, D. (ed.) (1998) *Comparing Policy Networks* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press).

Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R. A. W. (eds) (1992) *Policy Networks in British Government* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Marsh, D. and Smith, M. (2000) 'Understanding Policy Networks: Towards a Dialectical Approach', *Political Studies*, 48: 4–21.

Marsh, D. and Stoker G. (eds) (1995) *Theory and Methods in Political Science* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Marsh, D. and Stoker, G. (eds) (2002) *Theory and Methods in Political Science,* 2nd edn (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Marsh, D., Richards, D. and Smith, M. (2001) *Changing Patterns of Governance within the UK* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Marsh, D., Richards, D. and Smith, M. J. (2003) 'Unequal Plurality: Towards an Asymmetric Power Model of British Government', *Government and Opposition*, 38: 306–32.

Martin, L. (2000) *Democratic Commitments* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Marx, K. (1843a [1975]) *Critique of Hegel's Doctine of the State*, in L. Colletti (ed.), *Karl Marx: Early Writings* (London: Pelican).

Marx, K. (1843b [1975]) 'On the Jewish Question', in L. Colletti (ed.), *Karl Marx: Early Writings* (London: Pelican).

Marx, K. (1844 [1975]) 'Introduction to a Contribution to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law', in L. Colletti (ed.), *Karl Marx: Early Writings* (London: Pelican).

Marx, K. (1850 [1978]) *The Class Stuggles in France: 1845 to 1850*, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10 (London: Lawrence & Wishart).

Marx, K. (1852 [1979]) *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11 (London: Lawrence & Wishart).

Marx, K. (1859 [1987]) 'Preface to a Contribution to a Critique of Political Economy', in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29 (London: Lawrence & Wishart).

Marx, K. (1871 [1986]) *The Civil War in France*, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22 (London: Lawrence & Wishart).

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1845/6 [1964] *The German Ideology* (Moscow: Progress Publishers).

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1848 [1967]) *The Communist Manifesto* (London: Pelican).

Mazur, A. (ed.) (2001) *State Feminism, Women's Movements and Job Training: Making Democracies Work in the Global Economy* (New York and London: Routledge).

McClure, K. (1992) 'On the Subject of Rights: Pluralism, Plurality and Political Identity', in C. Mouffe (ed.), *Dimensions of Radical Democracy* (London: Verso).

McConnell, G. (1953) *The Decline of American Democracy* (New York: Atheneum).

McConnell, G. (1966) *Private Power and American Democracy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

McCubbins, M. D. and Sullivan, T. (1987) *Congress: Structure and Policy* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press).

McFarland, A. (2004) *Neopluralism: The Evolution of Political Process Theory* (Kansas: University Press of Kansas).

McIntosh, M. (1978) 'The State and the Oppression of Women', in A. Kuhn and A. Wolpe (eds), *Feminism and Materialism: Women and Modes of Production* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

McLennan, G. (1989) *Marxism, Pluralism and Beyond* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

McLuhan, Marshall (1964) *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

McNamara, K. (1998) *The Currency of Ideas: Monetary Politics in the European Union* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

McNay, L. (1992) *Foucault and Feminism: Power, Gender and the Self* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

McNay, L. (1999) 'Subject, Psyche and Agency: The Work of Judith Butler', in *Theory, Culture and Society*, 16(2): 175–93.

Merchant, C. (1980) *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution* (San Francisco: Harper & Row).

Merelman R. (2003) *Pluralism at Yale* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press).

Meyer, John W. and Rowan, Brian (1977) 'Institutionalized Organizations: formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony', *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 340–63.

Michels, R. (1911 [1962]) *Political Parties* (New York: Free Press).

Middlemas, K. (1979) *Politics in Industrial Society* (London: André Deutsch).

Migdal, J. (1988) *Strong Societies and Weak States* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Miliband, R. (1965) 'Marx and the State', *Socialist Register 1965*: 278–96.

Miliband, R. (1969) *The State in Capitalist Society: An Analysis of the Western System of Power* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson).

Miliband, R. (1970) 'The Capitalist State – Reply to Poulantzas', *New Left Review*, 59: 53–60, reprinted in R. Blackburn (ed.) (1972) *Ideology in Social Science* (London: Fontana).

Miliband, R. (1973) 'Poulantzas and the Capitalist State', *New Left Review*, 82: 83–92.

Miliband, R. (1977) *Marxism and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Miliband, R. (1994) *Socialism for a Sceptical Age* (London: Verso).

Millett, K. (1970) *Sexual Politics* (Gardencity: Doubleday).

Mills, C. W. (1956) *The Power Elite* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Milward, H. and Provan, K. (2000) 'Governing the Hollow State', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2): 359–79.

Mintz, B. and Schwartz, M. (1985) *The Power Structure of American Business* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Modeen, T. and Rosas, A. (1988) *Indirect Public Administration in Fourteen Countries* (Helsinki: Abo Academy Press).

Moe, T. (2003) 'Power and Political Institutions', paper read at conference on Crafting and Operating Institutions, Yale University (New Haven, CT, April 11–13).

Mol, A. (1996) 'Ecological Modernisation and Institutional Reflexivity: Environmental Reform in the Late Modern Age', *Environmental Politics*, 5(2): 302–23.

Mol, A. (2001) *Globalization and Environmental Reform: The Ecological Modernization of the Global Economy* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Molyneux, M. (1979) 'Beyond the Domestic Labour Debate', *New Left Review*, 116: 3–27.

Monbiot, G. (2004), *The Age of Consent: A Manifesto for a New World Order* (New York: The New Press).

Moore, G. (1979) 'The Structure of a National Elite Network', *American Sociological Review*, 44 (October): 673–92.

Moravcsik, A. (1998) *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Morgenthau, H. (1966). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred Knopf).

Mosca, G. (1896 [1939]) *The Ruling Class* (New York: McGraw Hill).

Mouffe, C. (2000) *The Democratic Paradox* (London: Verso).

Mouzelis, N. (1991) *Back to Sociological Theory: The Construction of Social Orders* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Mouzelis, N. (1995) *Sociological Theory: What Went Wrong?* (London: Routledge).

Mueller, D. (1993) 'The Future of Public Choice', *Public Choice*, 77: 145–50.

Mueller, D. (2003), *Public Choice III* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Mueller, D. and Murrell, P. (1986), 'Interest Groups Size and the Size of Government', *Public Choice*, 48: 125–45.

Muller, P. (1995) 'Les Politiques publiques comme construction d'un rapport au monde', in Alain Faure, Gielles Pollet and Philippe Warin (eds), *La Construction du sens dans les politiques publiques: Débats autour de la notion de référentiel* (Paris: L'Harmattan).

Mutz, D. C., Sniderman, P. M. and Brody, R. (eds.) (1996) *Political Persuasion* and *Attitude Change* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Naess, A. (1995) 'Deep Ecology and Lifestyle', in G. Sessions (ed.), *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century* (Boston and London: Shambala Press).

Nash, K. (2002) 'Thinking Political Sociology: Beyond the Limits of Post-Marxism', *History of the Human Sciences*, 15(4): 97–114.

Newell, P. (2001) 'New Environmental Architectures and the Search for Effectiveness', *Global Environmental Politics* 1(1): 35–44.

Newman, P. (2000) 'Changing Patterns of Regional Governance in the EU', *Urban Studies* 37:895–909.

Nichols, D. (1975) *Three Varieties of Pluralism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Nichols, D. (1994) *The Pluralist State*, 2nd edn (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Niskanen, W. (1971) *Bureaucracy and Representative Government* (Chicago: Aldine).

Niskanen, W. (1994) *Bureaucracy and Public Economics* (Aldershot: Edward Elgar).

Nordlinger, E. A. (1981) *On the Autonomy of the Democratic State* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

North, Douglass C. (1990) *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Nye, J. S. (1990) *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power* (New York: Basic Books).

Nye, J. S. (2002) *The Paradox of American Power* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Nye, J. S. (2003) 'US Power and Strategy After Iraq', *Foreign Affairs*, 82(4): 60–73.

Nye, J. S. and Donahue, J. D. (2000) *Governance in a Globalizing World* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution).

Nye, J. S. Jr (2001) 'Globalization's Democratic Deficit', *Foreign Affairs*, 80(4): 2–6.

O'Brien, R. (1992) *Global Financial Integration: The End of Geography* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press).

O'Connor, J., Orloff, A. S. and Shaver, S. (1999) *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

O'Donnell, L. (1997) 'Opening address by the Minister of State at the Department of Foreign Affairs with Special Responsibility for Overseas Aid and Human Rights', paper presented to 19th Annual Conference, Royal Irish Academy, 20 November 1997.

OECD (2002) *Distributed Public Governance: Agencies, Authorities and other Autonomous Bodies* (London: OECD).

Offe, C. (1973) *Political Power and Social Classes* (London: New Left Books).

Offe, C. (1974) 'Structural Problems of the Capitalist State: Class Rule and the Political System. On the Selectiveness of Political Institutions', in K. von Beyme (ed.), *German Political Studies* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage).

Offe, C. (1975) 'The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation', in L. Lindberg *et al.* (eds), *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism* (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath).

Offe, C. (1975) *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism* (London: New Left Books).

Offe, C. (1976) 'The Capitalist State: A Reply to Miliband and Laclau', *New Left Review*, 95: 63–83.

Offe, C. (1978) *State, Power, Socialism* (London: New Left Books).

Offe, C. (1984) *Contradictions of the Welfare State* (London: Hutchinson).

Ohmae, K. (1996). *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economics* (London: HarperCollins).

Okin, S. M. (1989) *Justice, Gender, and the Family* (New York: Basic Books).

Olsen, M. and Marger, M. (1993) *Power in Modern Societies* (Oxford: Westview Press).

Olson, M. (1971) *The Logic of Collective Action* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

O'Neill, J. (1993) *Ecology, Policy and Politics: Human Well-Being and the Natural World* (London: Routledge).

Ophuls, W. (1977) *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity* (San Francisco: Freeman).

Osborne, S. (2000) *Public–Private Partnerships: Theory and Practice in International Perspective* (London: Routledge).

Osei, P. (2004) 'Public–Private Partnerships in Service Delivery in Developing Countries', in A. Ghobadian, N. O'Regan, D. Gallear and H. Viney (2004) *Public–Private Partnerships* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Ostrom, E. (1982) 'Beyond Positivism', in *idem, Strategies of Political Inquiry* (Beverly Hills: Sage).

Ostrom, E. (1990) *Governing the Commons* (New York: Cambridge).

Ó Tuathail, G. (1996) *Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space* (London, Routledge).

Ougaard, M. and Higgott, R. (2002) 'Introduction', in *idem* (eds), *Towards a Global Polity* (London: Routledge).

Outshoorn, Joyce (2004) 'Introduction: Prostitution, Women's Movements and Democratic Politics', in *idem* (ed.), *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States and the Globalisation of Sex Commerce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Painter, M. and Pierre, J. (eds) (2004) *Challenges to Policy Capacity* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Palmer, P. (1983) 'White Women/Black Women: The Dualism of Female Identity and Experience in the United States', *Feminist Studies*, 9(1).

Pareto, V. (1935) *The Mind and Society* (London: Cape).

Pareto, V. (1966) *Sociological Writings* (London: Pall Mall).

Paterson, M. (2000) *Understanding Global Environmental Politics: Domination, Accumulation, Resistance*. (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Paterson, M. (2001) 'Green Politics', in Scott Burchill *et al.*, *Theories of International Relations* (London: Palgrave).

Paul, E., Miller, F. and Paul, J. (eds) (1997) *Self-Interest* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Pauly, L. and Grande, E. (forthcoming) *Complex Sovereignty* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

Peters, B. G. (2002) 'The Future of Governance: Bringing the State Back In – Again', in J. Moon and B. Stone (eds), *Power and Freedom in Modern Politics* (Perth: University of Western Australia Press).

Peters, B. G. (2004) 'Back to the Centre: Rebuilding the State', *Political Quarterly*, 75, special issue: 130–40.

Pettman, J. J. (1996) 'An International Political Economy of Sex?' in E. Kofman and G. Youngs (eds), *Globalization: Theory and Practice* (London: Pinter).

Pettman, J. J. (1999) 'Globalization and the Gendered Politics of Citizenship', in Nira Yuval-Davis and Pnina Werbner (eds), *Women, Citizenship and Difference* (London and New York: Zed Books).

Phillips, Anne (1998) 'Introduction', in *idem* (ed.), *Feminism and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Pierce, R. (2004) 'Clemenson Revisited – the Rise and Fall of the Great English Landowner?' *Policy Studies*, 25(4): 1–17.

Pierre, J. (2000) 'Introduction: Understanding Governance', in *idem*. (ed.), *Debating Governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Pierre, J. and Peters, B. G. (2000) *Governance, Politics and the State* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Pierre, J. and Peters, B. G. (2004) *Governing Complex Societies* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Pierson, C. (1996) *The Modern State* (London: Routledge).

Pierson, Paul (1994) *Dismantling the Welfare State?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Pierson, Paul (2004) *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Piven, F. F. and Cloward, R. A. (1989) *Why Americans Don't Vote* (New York: Pantheon).

Poggi, G. (1990) *The State: Its Nature, Development and Prospects* (Cambridge : Polity Press).

Polanyi, K. (1944 [1957]). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (Boston: Beacon Books).

Pollack, Mark (1997) 'Delegation, Agency, and Agenda Setting in the European Community', *International Organization*, 51(1): 99–134.

Pollitt, C. (2004) 'Castles Built on Sand? Agencies in Latvia', in C. Pollitt and C. Talbot (eds), *Unbundled Government: A Critical Analysis of the Global Trend to Agencies, Quangos and Contractualisation* (London: Routledge).

Pollitt, C. and Talbot, C. (2004) *Unbundled Government: A Critical Analysis of the Global Trend to Agencies, Quangos and Contractualisation* (London: Routledge).

Pollock, A. Shaoul, J., Rowland, D. and Player, S. (2001) *Public Services and the Private Sector* (London: Catalyst).

Polsby, N. (1960) 'How to Study Community Power: the Pluralists Alternative', *Journal of Politics*, 22: 474–84.

Polsby, N. (1963) *Community Power and Democratic Theory* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

Polsby, N. (1980) *Community Power and Political Theory* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

Posen, B. R. (2003) 'Command of the Commons. The Military Foundation of US Hegemony', *International Security*, 28(1): 5–46.

Poulantzas, N. (1969) 'The Problems of the Capitalist State', *New Left Review*, 58: 67–78; reprinted in R. Blackburn (ed.) (1972) *Ideology in Social Science* (London: Fontana).

Poulantzas, N. (1976) 'The Capitalist State: A Reply to Miliband and Laclau', *New Left Review*, 95: 63–83.

Poulantzas, Nicos (1978) *State, Power, Socialism* (London: New Left Books).

Pressman, J. L. and Wildavsky, A. (1976) *Implementation* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Pringle, R. and Watson, S. (1990) 'Fathers, Brothers, Mates: The Fraternal State in Australia', in Sophie Watson (ed.), *Playing the State* (London: Verso).

Pringle, R. and Watson, S. (1992) '"Women's Interests" and the Post-Structuralist State', in Michele Barrett and Anne Phillips (eds), *Destabilizing Theory* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Programme of the German Green Party (1983) (London: Heretic).

Prügl, Elisabeth and Meyer, Mary K. (1999) 'Gender Politics in Global Governance', in *idem* (eds), *Gender Politics in Global Governance* (Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield).

Przeworski, A. (1991) *Democracy and the Market* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Przeworski, A. and Teune, H. (1970) *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry.* (New York: Wiley).

Putnam, R. (1993) 'The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life', *The American Prospect*, Spring: 35–42.

Raab, C. (2001) 'Understanding Policy Networks: A Comment on Marsh and Smith', *Political Studies*, 49: 551–6.

Raaum, N. (1995) 'The Political Representation of Women: A Bird's Eye View', in Lauri Karvonen and Per Selle (eds), *Women in Nordic Politics* (Aldershot, Hants: Dartmouth Publishing Company).

Radealli, C. (2003) *The Open Method of Coordination: A New Governance Architecture for the European Union* (Stockholm: Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies).

Rai, S. (1996) 'Women and the State in the Third World: Some Issues for Debate', in Shirin Rai and Geraldine Lievesley (eds), *Women and the State: International Perspectives* (London: Taylor & Francis).

Rai, S. (2003) 'Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancement of Women: Mainstreaming Gender, Democratising the State?' in Shirin Rai (ed.), *Mainstreaming Gender: Democratising the State? Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancement of Women* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Rai, S. and Lievesley, G. (eds) (1996) *Women and the State: International Perspectives* (London: Taylor & Francis).

Randall, V. (1998) 'Gender and Power: Women Engage the State', in Vicky Randall and Georgina Waylen (eds), *Gender, Politics and the State* (London: Routledge).

Randall, V. (2002) 'Feminism', in David Marsh and Gerry Stoker (eds), *Theories and Methods in Political Science,* 2nd edn (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Ratner, S. and Altman, J.(1964) *John Dewey and Arthur F. Bentley: A Philosophical Correspondence* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press).

Rawls, J. (1973) *A Theory of Justice* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Rawls, J. (1996) *Political Liberalism* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Rawnsley, A. (1998), *Servants of the People* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Rees, Teresa (1998) *Mainstreaming Equality in the European Union* (London: Routledge).

Reich, R. B. (1991) *The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for 21st-Century Capitalism* (New York: Knopf).

Rein, M. and Schön, D. A. (1991). 'Frame-Reflective Policy Discourse', in P. Wagner *et al.* (eds), *Social Sciences, Modern States, National Experiences, and Theoretical Crossroads* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Reinicke, W. H. (2000) 'The Other World-wide Web: Global Public Policy Networks', *Foreign Policy*, 117: 44–57.

Rhodes, M. (1997) 'The Welfare State: Internal Challenges, External Constraints', in M. Rhodes, P. Heywood and V. Wright (ed.), *Developments in West European Politics* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Rhodes, R. (1994), 'The Hollowing Out of the State', *Political Quarterly*, 65: 138–51.

Rhodes, R. (1997) *Understanding Governance* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press).

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996) 'The New Governance: Governing Without Governance', *Political Sudies*, 44, 652–67.

Rhodes, R. A. W. and Weller, P. (1999) *The Changing World of Top Officials: Mandarins or Valets?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Richardson, J. and Jordan, A. (1979) *Governing under Pressure* (Oxford: Martin Robertson).

Riker, W. (1980) 'Implications from the disequilibrium of majority rule for the study of institutions', *American Political Science Review*, 75: 432–47.

Riker, W. (1982) *Liberalism Against Populism* (San Francisco: Freeman).

Riker, W. and Ordeshook, P. (1968) 'A Theory of the Calculus of Voting', *American Political Science Review*, 62: 25–42.

Rima, I. (1996) *Development of Economic Analysis* (London: Routledge).

Ripley, R. and Franklin, G. (1984) *Congress, the Bureaucracy and Public Policy* (Homewood, IL.: Dorsey).

Risse, T. (2001) 'Who Are We? A Europeanization of National Identities?' in Maria Green Cowles, James Caporaso and Thomas Risse (eds), *Europeanization and Domestic Change.* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Robertson, R. (1992) *Globalisation: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London: Sage).

Rodrik, D. (1997) *Has Globalization Gone Too Far?* (Washington, DC: Institute of International Economics).

Rogoff, K. (1985) 'The Optimal Degree of Commitment to an Intermediate Target', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 100: 1169–90.

Rosamond, B. (2002) 'Imaging the European Economy: "Competitiveness" and the Social Construction of "Europe" as an Economic Space, *New Political Economy*, 7(2): 157–77.

Rose, N. (1996) 'Governing "Advanced" Liberal Democracies', in Andrew Barry *et al.* (eds), *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government* (London: UCL Press).

Rose, N. (1999) *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N. and Miller, P. (1992), 'Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government', *British Journal of Sociology*, 43(2): 172–205.

Rose, R. (1974) *The Problem of Party Government* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Rose, R. (1990) 'Inheritance Before Choice in Public Policy', *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 2(3): 263–91.

Rosecrance, R. (1999) *The Rise of the Virtual State* (New York: Basic Books).

Rosenau, J. (2004) 'Huge Demand, Over-Supply: Governance in an Emerging Epoch', in Bache, I. and Flinders, M. (eds), *Multi-Level Governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Rosenau, J. N. (1990) *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Rosenau, J. N. (1992) 'Governance, Order and Change in World Politics', in J. Rosenau and E. O. Czempiel (eds), *Governance with Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rosenau, J. N. (1993) 'Citizenship in a changing global order', in J. N. Rosenau and E.-O. Czempiel (eds), *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rosenau, J. N. (1997) *Along the Domestic–Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rosenberg, A. (1995) *The Philosophy of Social Science* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press).

Routlege, P. (1998) *Gordon Brown* (London: Simon & Schuster).

Rowley, C. and Tullock, G. (1988) 'Introduction', in Rowley, C., Tollison, R. and Tullock, G. (eds), *The Political Economy of Rent Seeking* (Boston: Kluwer Academic).

Ruggie, J. (1998) 'What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge', *International Organization*, 52(4): 855–85.

Rugman, A. (2000) *The End of Globalisation* (London: Random House).

Rutherford, P. (1999) 'The Entry of Life into History', in Eric Darier (ed.), *Discourses of the Environment* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Sabatier, P. and Jenkins-Smith, H. C. (eds) (1993) *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach* (Boulder, CO: Westview).

Sachs, W. (1999) *Planet Dialectics: Explorations in Environment and Development* (London: Zed Books).

Sagoff, M. (1988) *The Economy of the Earth,: Philosophy, Law and the Environment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Sahlins, M. (1974) *Stone Age Economics* (London: Tavistock).

Salamon, L. M. (2002) Introduction, in *idem*, (ed.), *Handbook of Policy Instruments* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Sampson, A. (1962) *The Anatomy of Britain* (London: Hodder & Stoughton).

Sampson, A. (1965) *The Anatomy of Britain Today* (London: Hodder & Stoughton).

Sampson, A. (1971) *The New Anatomy of Britain* (London: Hodder & Stoughton).

Sampson, A. (1982) *The Changing Anatomy of Britain* (London: Hodder & Stoughton).

Sanderson, J. (1963) 'Marx and Engels on the State', *Western Political Quarterly*, December 16(4): 946–55.

Sandler, T. (2001) *Economic Concepts for the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Sargent, Lydia (1981) 'New Left Women and Men: The Honeymoon is Over', in *idem* (ed.), *Women and Revolution: The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism* (London: Pluto Press).

Saurin, J. (1994) 'Global Environmental Degradation, Modernity and Environmental Knowledge', in Caroline Thomas (ed.), *Rio: Unravelling the Consequences* (London: Frank Cass).

Sawer, M. (1990) *Sisters in Suites: Women and Public Policy in Australia* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin).

Sawer, M. (1991) 'Why has the Australian Women's Movement Had More Influence on Government in Australia than Elsewhere?' in Francis Castles (ed.), *Australia Compared* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin).

Scharpf, F. W. (1991) *Crisis and Choice in Social Democracy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Scharpf, F. W. (1997) *Games Real Actors Play: Actor-Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press).

Scharpf, F. W. (1996) 'Negative and Positive Integration in the Political Economy of European Welfare States', G. Marks, F. W. Scharpf, P. C. Schmitter and W. Streek (eds), *Governance in the European Union* (London: Sage).

Scharpf, F. W. (1999) *Governing in Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Scharpf, F. W. (2000) *Governing in Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Schattschneider, E. (1935) *Politics, Pressures and the Tariff* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall).

Schmidt, V. A. (2000) 'Values and Discourse in the Politics of Adjustment', in Fritz W. Scharpf and Vivien A. Schmidt (eds), *Welfare and Work in the Open Economy*, Volume I: *From Vulnerability to Competitiveness,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Schmidt, V. A. (2002) *The Futures of European Capitalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Schmidt, V. A. (2004) 'The European Union: Democratic Legitimacy in a Regional State?', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 42 (5), 975–97.

Schmidt, V. A. and Radaelli, C. (2004) 'Policy Change and Discourse in Europe: Conceptual and Methodological Issues', *West European Politics*, 27 (2): 183–210.

Schmitter, P. (1985) 'Neo-Corporatism and the State', in W. Grant (ed.), *The Political Economy of Corporatism* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Schmitter, P. C. and Grote, J. R. (1997) *The Corporate Sisyphus: Past, Present and Future* (Florence: European University Institute).

Scholte, J. A. (2000) *Globalization: A Critical Introduction* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Schumacher, E. F. (1976) *Small is Beautiful* (London: Sphere).

Scott, J. (1991) *Who Rules Britain?* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Scott, J. C (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press).

Self, P. (1993) *Government by the Market* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Selznick, P. (2002) *The Communitarian Persuasion* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center).

Sen, A. (2002) *Rationality and Freedom* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Shapiro, M. (1997) 'The Problems of Independent Agencies in the United States and the European Union', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4(2): 276–91.

Shennan, J. (1974) *The Origins of the Modern European State, 1450–1725* (London: Hutchinson).

Shepsle, K. (1986) 'Institutional Equilibrium and Equilibrium Institutions', in Herbert F. Weisburg (ed.) *Political Science: The Science of Politics* (New York: Agathon).

Siim, B. (1988) 'Towards a Feminist Rethinking of the Welfare State', in Kathleen Jones and Anna Jónasdóttir (eds), *The Political Interests of Gender* (Oxford: Sage).

Siim, B. (2000) *Gender and Citizenship: Politics and Agency in France, Britain and Denmark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Singleton, G. (1990) *The Accord and the Australian Labour Movement* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press).

Skidelsky, R. (1992) *John Maynard Keynes: The Economist as Saviour* (Basingstoke: Macmillan).

Skinner, Q. (1978) *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Volume 1: *The Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Skinner, Q. (1989) 'The State', in T. Ball *et al.* (eds), *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Skocpol, T. (1979) *States and Social Revolutions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Skowrenek, S. (1995) *The Politics Presidents Make: Leadership from John Adams to George Bush* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Slaughter, A.-M. (1997) 'The Real New World Order', *Foreign Affairs*, 76(5): 183–98.

Slaughter, A.-M. (2004) *A New World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Smart, C. (1989) *Feminism and the Power of Law* (London: Routledge).

Smith, A. (1759 [1976]) *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Smith, A. (1776 [1983]), *The Wealth of Nations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Smith, M. A. (1990) 'Pluralism, Reformed Pluralism and Neo-Pluralism: The Role of Pressure Groups in Policy Making', *Political Studies*, 38: 302–22.

Smith, N. J.-A. (2003) 'Discourses of globalisation and European integration in the Irish Republic', paper presented to UACES Annual Conference, University of Newcastle, 2–4 September 2003.

Smith, N. J.-A. (2005) *Showcasing Globalisation? The Political Economy of the Irish Republic* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Somit, A. and Tanenhaus, J. (1982) *The Development of American Political Science from Burgess to Behavioralism* (New York: Irvington).

Sørensen, G. (2004) *The Transformation of the State: Beyond the Myth of Retreat* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Soysal, Y. N. (1994) *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Spretnak, C. and Capra, F. (1985) *Green Politics: The Global Promise* (London: Paladin).

Squires, J. (2004) 'Politics Beyond Boundaries? A Feminist Perspective', in Adrian Leftwich (ed.), *What is Politics?* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Stears, M. (2002) *Progressives, Pluralists and the Problems of the State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Steinmo, S. Thelen, K. and Longstreth, F. (eds) (1992) *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Stephens, G. (1991) 'On the Critique of Rational Choice', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 24: 429–31.

Stetson, D. (2001) *Abortion Politics, Women's Movements and the Democratic State: A Comparative Study of State Feminism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Stetson, D. and Mazur, A. (1995) 'Introduction', in *idem* (eds) (1995), *Comparative State Feminism* (London: Sage).

Stiglitz, G. (1996) *Whither Socialism?* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Stiglitz, J. E. (1997) *Economics,* 2nd edn (New York: W. W. Norton & Co).

Stoker, G. and Mossberger, K. (1994), 'Urban Regime Theory in Comparative Perspective', in *Environment and Planning: Government and Policy*, 12: 195–212.

Stone, C. (1989) *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta 1946–1988* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas).

Strange, S. (1996) *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Stretton, H. and Orchard, L. (1994) *Public Goods, Public Enterprise, Public Choice* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Sweezy, P. (1942) *The Theory of Capitalist Development* (New York: Monthly Review Press).

Talbot, C. (2004) 'A Radical Departure? Executive Agencies in Jamaica', in C. Pollitt and C. Talbot (eds), *Unbundled Government: A Critical Analysis of the Global Trend to Agencies, Quangos and Contractualisation* (London: Routledge).

Tanzi, V. and Schuknecht, L. (2000) *Public Spending in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Tarrow, S. (1998) *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Taylor, C. (1967) 'Neutrality in Political Science', in Alan Ryan (ed.), *The Philosophy of Social Explanation* (London: Oxford University Press).

Taylor, C. (1985) *Philosophy and the Human Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Taylor, M. (1987) *The Possibility of Cooperation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Thatcher, M. (1993) *The Downing Street Years* (London: HarperCollins).

The Ecologist (1972) *Blueprint for Survival* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

The Ecologist (1993) *Whose Common Future? Reclaiming the Commons* (London: Earthscan).

Thelen, K. (2003) 'How Institutions Evolve: Insights from Comparative Historical Analysis', in James Mahoney and Dietrich Ruschemeyer (eds), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Thelen, K. (2004) *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain, the United States, and Japan* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Thelen, K. (l999) 'Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics', in *The Annual Review of Political Science* (Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc.).

Thiel, S. van (2001) *Quangos: Trends, Causes, Consequences* (London : Ashgate).

Thompson, G. (2003) *Between Hierarchies and Markets: The Logic and Limits of Network Forms of Organization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Thompson, G., Frances, J., Levacic, R. and Mitchell, J. (eds) (1991) *Markets, Hierarchies and Networks: The Coordination of Social Life* (London: Sage).

Thomson, J. E. and Krasner, S. D. (1989). 'Global Transactions and the Consolidation of Sovereignty', in E.-O. Czempiel and J. N. Rosenau (eds), *Global Changes and*

Theoretical Challenges. Approaches to World Politics for the 1990s (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books).

Tihonen, S. (2004) *From Governing to Governance* (Tampere: University of Tampere Press).

Tilly, C. (ed.) (1975) *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Tilly, Charles (1990) *Coercion, Capital and European States, AD 990–1992* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).

Tollison, R. (1997) 'Rent-Seeking', in D. Mueller (ed.), *Perspectives on Public Choice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Torfing, J. (1991) 'A Hegemony Approach to Capitalist Regulation', in R. B. Bertramsen, J. P. F. Thomsen and J. Torfing (eds), *State, Economy and Society* (London: Unwin Hyman).

Torgerson, D. (1999) *The Promise of Green Politics: Environmentalism and the Public Sphere* (London: Duke University Press).

Towns, A. (2002) 'Paradoxes of (In)Equality: Something is Rotten in the Gender Equal State of Sweden', in *Cooperation and Conflict*, 37(2): 157–79.

Truman, D. (1951a) *The Governmental Process* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

Truman, D. (1951b) 'The Implications of Political Behavior Research', Social Science Research Council *Items* (December): 37–9.

Tsebelis, G. (2002) *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Tullock, G. (1967) 'The Welfare Costs of Monopolies, Tariffs and Theft', *Western Economic Journal*, 5: 224–32.

Tullock, G. (1976) *The Vote Motive* (London: Institute of Economic Affairs).

Tullock, G. (1989) *The Economics of Special Privilege and Rent Seeking* (Boston: Kluwer Academic).

Tullock, G. (1990) *The Economics of Special Privilege*, in J. Alt and K. Shepsle (eds), *Perspectives on Positive Political Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

UNCTAD (1993) *World Investment Report 1993: Transnational Corporations and Integrated International Production* (New York: United Nations).

Viroli, M. (1992) *From Politics to Reason of State: The Acquisition and Transformation of the Language of Politics, 1250–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Visser, J. and P. Hemerijk (1999) *A Dutch Miracle* (Amsterdam University Press).

Visvanathan, N., Duggan, L., Nisonoff, L. and Wiegersma, N. (eds) (1997) *The Women, Gender and Development Reader* (London: Zed Books).

Vitols, S. and Casper, S. (1997) 'The German model in the 1990s: problems and prospects', *Industry and Innovation*, 4(1): 1–14.

Vogler, J. (2003) 'Taking Institutions Seriously: How Regime Analysis Can Be Relevant to Multilevel Environmental Governance', *Global Environmental Politics*, 3: (2) 25–39.

Wade, R. (1996) 'Globalisation and its Limits: Reports of the Death of the National Economy are Greatly Exaggerated', in S. Berger and R. P. Dore (eds), *National Diversity and Global Capitalism* (London: Cornell University Press).

Wahl, J. (1925) *Pluralist Philosophies of England and America* (London: Open Court Company).

Wahlke, John C. (1979) 'Pre-Behavioralism in Political Science', *American Political Science Review*, 73: 19.

Wainwright, H. (1993) *Arguments for a New Left* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).

Walby, S. (1992) 'Post-Post-Modernism? Theorizing Social Complexity' in Michèle Barrett and Anne Phillips (eds), *Destabilizing Theory* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Walker, J. (1989) 'Introduction: Policy Communities as Global Phenomena', *Governance*, 2:1–4.

Walker, R. B. J. (1993) *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Walsh, J. I. (2000) 'When do Ideas Matter? Explaining the Successes and Failures of Thatcherite Ideas', *Comparative Political Studies*, 33(4), 483–516.

Waltz, K. N. (1979) *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, PA: Addison-Wesley).

Walzer, M. (2001) 'Nation States and Immigrant Societies', in W. Kymlicka and M. Opalski (eds), *Can Liberal Pluralism be Exported?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Watson, M. and Hay, C. (2003) 'The Discourse of Globalisation and the Logic of No Alternative: Rendering the Contingent Necessary in the Political Economy of New Labour', *Policy & Politics*, 31(3): 289–305.

Watson, Sophie (1990) 'The State of Play: An Introduction', in *idem* (ed.), *Playing the State* (London: Verso).

Watson, Sophie (1992) 'Femocratic Feminism', in Mike Savage and Anne Witz (eds), *Gender and Bureaucracy* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Waylen, G. (1998) 'Gender, Feminism and the State: an Overview', in Vicky Randall and Georgina Waylen (eds), *Gender, Politics and the State* (London: Routledge).

WCED (1987) *Our Common Future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Weber, M. (1925/1978) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretative Sociology* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).

Weingast, B. (1995) 'A Rational Choice Perspective on the Role of Ideas: Shared Belief Systems, State Sovereignty, and International Cooperation', *Politics and Society*, 23(4) 449–64.

Weingest, B. and Marshall, W. (1988) 'The Industrial Organisation of Congress: or, Why Legislatures, Like Firms, are not Organised as Markets', *Journal of Political Economy*, 96: 132–63.

Weiss, L. (1998) *The Myth of the Powerless State: Governing the Economy in a Global Era* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Weiss, L. (2003) *States in the Global Economy: Bringing Domestic Institutions Back In* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Wendt, Alexander (1987) 'The Agent–Structure Problem in International Relations Theory', *International Organization*, 41(3): 335–70.

Wendt, Alexander (1999) *Social Theory of International Relations Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

White, H. (1987) *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Wiarda, H. J. (1996) *Corporatism and Comparative Politics: The Other Great Ism* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe).

Williamson, O. (1985) *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism* (New York: Free Press).

Wilson, R. (1999) 'The Civil Service in the New Millennium', speech given at City University, London, 5 May 1999.

Wittgenstein, L. (1958) *Philosophical Investigations* (Oxford, Blackwell).

Wolfe, A. (1974) 'New Directions in the Marxist Theory of Politics', *Politics and Society*, 4(2), 131–60.

Wolfe, A. (1977) *The Limits of Legitimacy: Political Contradictions of Late Capitalism* (New York: Free Press).

Wright, V. and Hayward, J. (2000) 'Governing from the Centre: Policy Co-ordination in Six European Core Executives', in R. A. W. Rhodes (ed.), *Transforming British Government*: Volume 2: *Changing Roles and Relationships* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Wriston, W. B. (1992) *The Twilight of Sovereignty: How the Information Revolution is Transforming Our World* (New York: Charles Scribner).

www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance

Young, I. M. (1981) 'Beyond the Unhappy Marriage: A Critique of the Dual-Systems Theory', in Lydia Sargent (ed.), *Women and Revolution: The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism* (London: Pluto Press).

Youngs, G. (2000) 'Breaking Patriarchal Bonds: Demythologizing the Public–Private', in Marianne Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan (eds), *Gender and Global Restructuring* (London and New York: Routledge).

Zacher, M. V. (1992) 'The decaying pillars of the Westphalian temple: implications for international order and governance', in J. N. Rosenau and E.-O. Czempiel (eds), *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Zürn, Michael, (1999) 'The State in this Post National Constellation – Societal Denationalisation and Multilevel Governance', *Arena Working Papers*, WP 99'/35

Zysman, J. (l994) 'How Institutions Create Historically Rooted Trajectories of Growth', *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 3, (1): 243–83.