

Melissa Samarin
Ph.D. candidate, Department of Political Science
UC Berkeley
5 April 2017

I. Liberalism

A. Dictionary definitions and etymology

1. Miriam Webster Dictionary

‘Liberal’ shares a root with ‘liberty’ and can mean anything from ‘generous’ to ‘loose’ to ‘broad-minded.’

Liberal can be traced back to the Latin word *liber* (meaning ‘free’), which is also the root of *liberty* (‘the quality or state of being free’) and *libertine* (‘one leading a dissolute life’). However, we did not simply take the word *liber* and make it into *liberal*; our modern term for the inhabitants of the leftish side of the political spectrum comes more recently from the Latin *liberalis*, which means ‘of or constituting liberal arts, of freedom, of a freedman.’

In Latin, *liber* functioned as an adjective, to describe a person who was ‘free, independent,’ and contrasted with the word *servus* (‘slavish, servile’).

We borrowed ‘liberal arts’ from French in the 14th century, and sometime after this *liberal* began to be used in conjunction with other words (such as education, profession, and pastime). When paired with these other words *liberal* was serving to indicate that the things described were fitting for a person of high social status.

Liberal was also being used as an adjective to indicate ‘generosity’ and ‘bounteousness.’ By the 18th century, people were using *liberal* to indicate that something was ‘not strict or rigorous.’

The political antonyms of *liberal* and *conservative* began to take shape in the 19th century, as the British Whigs and Tories began to adopt these as titles for their respective parties.

Alternative meanings

1. The quality or state of being liberal.
2. A movement in modern Protestantism emphasizing intellectual liberty and the spiritual and ethical content of Christianity.
3. A theory in economics emphasizing individual freedom from restraint and usually based on free competition, the self-regulating market, and the gold standard.
4. A political philosophy based on belief in progress, the essential goodness of the human race, and the autonomy of the individual and standing for the protection of political and civil liberties; specifically: such a philosophy that considers government as a crucial instrument for amelioration of social inequities (such as those involving race, gender, or class)

2. Oxford English Dictionary

Etymology of ‘liberal’

1. free in giving, generous, benevolent, magnanimous (12th cent. in Old French)
2. suitable for a free or noble person (c1200; especially of studies, education, arts, professions)
3. independent, unconstrained (14th cent.)
4. (of the will) free (14th cent.)
5. of noble birth (14th cent.)
6. (with reference to the ancient world) free, not servile (late 14th cent.)
7. speaking freely (c1480) and its etymon classical Latin *līberālis* of or relating to a free man, worthy or typical of a free man (especially of studies, education, arts, professions)

Meanings

1. Support for or advocacy of individual rights, civil liberties, and reform tending towards individual freedom, democracy, or social equality; a political and social philosophy based on these principles; *spec.* (freq. with capital initial) the doctrine or practice of the Liberal Party in Britain or elsewhere. First used in 1816.
2. Freedom from bias, prejudice, or bigotry; open-mindedness, tolerance; (*Polit.*) liberal left-wing political views and policies. First used in 1820.
3. Supporting or advocating individual rights, civil liberties, and political and social reform tending towards individual freedom or democracy with little state intervention.

3. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy:

‘Liberalism’ fractures into a variety of types and competing visions

- liberals accord liberty primacy as a political value
- freedom is normatively basic, and so the onus of justification is on those who would limit freedom, especially through coercive means
- disagree about the concept of liberty, so ideal of protecting individual liberty can lead to very different conceptions of the task of government

Fundamental Liberal Principle holds that restrictions on liberty must be justified

Negative Liberty: absence of coercion (Isaiah Berlin)

Positive Liberty: acting in accordance to one’s will (Jean Jacques Rousseau); neo-Hegelian view of being self-autonomous (Thomas Hill Green)

Republican/Neo-Roman Liberty: liberalism is the opposite of dominion, so entails not living in servitude (Philip Pettit)

Republicanism as opposite to liberalism (Quentin Skinner, Maurizio Viroli, Philip Pettit)

Classical vs. new:

- For classical liberals — sometimes called ‘old’ liberalism — liberty and private property are intimately related.
- Classical liberals and libertarians have often asserted that in some way liberty and property are really the same thing.
- ‘Libertarian’ acceptance of state intervention to protect property rights.
- ‘New,’ ‘revisionist,’ ‘welfare state,’ or perhaps best, ‘social justice,’ liberalism challenges intimate connection between personal liberty and a private property.

Assumption is that property rights generate an unjust inequality of power that leads to a less-than-equal liberty.

4. Daniel P. Klein, ("The Origins of Liberalism," *The Atlantic*, February 2014):

In the 1820s the suffix '-ism' was attached to create 'liberalism.' and later in the century the Liberal Party rose in British politics....Up to 1769 the word was used only in pre-political ways, but in and around 1769 such terms as 'liberal policy,' 'liberal plan,' 'liberal system,' 'liberal views,' 'liberal ideas,' and 'liberal principles' begin sprouting like flowers. Its use originated in Great Britain. On the Continent, 'liberal' was used, as compared to in Britain, more to denote constitutional reform and political participation, as opposed to natural liberty.

B. Selected normative statements

1. John Locke ("Two Treatises of Government", 1689):

Though in the state of nature he has an unrestricted right to his possessions, he is far from assured that he will be able to get the use of them, because they are constantly exposed to invasion by others. All men are kings as much as he is, every man is his equal, and most men are not strict observers of fairness and justice; so his hold on the property he has in this state is very unsafe, very insecure. This makes him willing to leave a state in which he is very free, but which is full of fears and continual dangers; and not unreasonably he looks for others with whom he can enter into a society for the mutual preservation of their •lives, •liberties and •estates, which I call by the general name 'property'. (The others may be ones who are already united in such a society, or ones who would like to be so united.)

2. John Stewart Mill (*On Liberty*, 1859):

The subject of this essay is...civil or social liberty: the nature and limits of the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual.

That principle is that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant. He cannot rightfully be compelled to do or forbear because it will be better for him to do so, because it will make him happier, because, in the opinion of others, to do so would be wise, or even right.

... the appropriate region of human liberty...comprises, first, the inward domain of consciousness, demanding liberty of conscience in the most comprehensive sense, liberty of thought and feeling; absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral or theological. The liberty of expressing and publishing opinions may seem to fall under a different principle, since it belongs to that part of the conduct of an individual which concerns other people; but, being almost of as much importance as the liberty of thought itself, and resting in great part on the same reasons, is practically inseparable from it. Secondly, the principle requires liberty of tastes and pursuits; of framing the plan of our life to suit our own character... without impediment from our fellow creatures, so long as what we do does not harm them...

Thirdly, from this liberty of each individual, follows the liberty, within the same limits, of combination among individuals.”

3. Adam Smith (*Wealth of Nations*, 1776):

[Advocates] the liberal system of free exportation and free importation... But very countries have entirely adopted this liberal system. [Advocates] allowing every man to pursue his interest in his own way, upon the liberal plan of equality, liberty, and justice.

All systems either of preference or of restraint, therefore, being thus completely taken away, the obvious and simple system of natural liberty establishes itself of its own accord. Every man, as long as he does not violate the laws of justice, is left perfectly free to pursue his own interest in his own way, and to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man, or order or men.

4. Immanuel Kant (*Basic Writings of Kant*, 2001 [1793]):

No one may force anyone to be happy according to his manner of imagining the well-being of other men; instead, everyone may seek his happiness in the way that seems good to him as long as he does not infringe on the freedom of others to pursue a similar purpose, when such freedom may coexist with the freedom of every other man according to a possible and general law.

5. Ludwig von Mises (*Liberalism*, 2012 [1927]):

The term ‘liberalism,’ from the Latin ‘liber’ meaning ‘free,’ referred originally to the philosophy of freedom. It still retained this meaning in Europe when this book was written (1927)...

Unfortunately, however, in recent decades, ‘liberalism’ has come to mean something very different. The word has been taken over, especially in the United States, by philosophical socialists and used by them to refer to their government intervention and ‘welfare state’ programs.

6. Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1938):

... as new conditions and problems arise beyond the power of men and women to meet as individuals, it becomes the duty of Government itself to find new remedies with which to meet them. The liberal party insists that the Government has the definite duty to use all its power and resources to meet new social problems with new social controls—to ensure to the average person the right to his own economic and political life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

7. Joseph S. Clark, Jr. (U.S. Senator [1957-1969 and mayor of Philadelphia [1952-1956] (1953):

To lay a ghost at the outset and to dismiss semantics, a liberal is here defined as one who believes in utilizing the full force of government for the advancement of social, political, and economic justice at the municipal, state, national, and international levels. . . A liberal believes government is a proper tool to use in the development of a society which attempts to carry Christian principles of conduct into practical effect. (*The Atlantic*, July 1953, p. 27)

8. John F. Kennedy (1960):

[A liberal is] someone who looks ahead and not behind, someone who welcomes new ideas without rigid reactions, someone who cares about the welfare of the people—their health, their housing, their schools, their jobs, their civil rights, and their civil liberties—someone who believes we can break through the stalemate and suspicions that grip us in our policies abroad, if that is what they mean by a ‘Liberal’, then I’m proud to say I’m a ‘Liberal’.”

9. Friedrich Hayek (*The Constitution of Liberty*, 2011 [1960]):

Liberalism is a doctrine about what the law ought to be, democracy a doctrine about the manner of determining what it will be the law.”

10. John Rawls (*Political Liberalism*, 1993):

... the fundamental question about political justice lies in considering the liberalism of justice as fairness to be a political conception, the operation of which makes ‘space’ for individual citizens to adopt whatever comprehensive doctrines they please (subject to certain constraints)...

Each person has an equal claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic rights and liberties, which scheme is compatible with the same scheme for all; and in this scheme the equal basic liberties, and only those liberties, are to be guaranteed their fair value...

Social and economic inequalities are to satisfy two conditions: first, they are to be attached to positions and offices open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity; and second, they are to be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society...

11. Olivia Newman (*Liberalism in Practice*, 2015):

Practical liberalism, concerned with inclusion and practical implementation, also moves us beyond ideal theory and Rawls’s realistic utopia, toward an account of liberalism that we can conceivably put into action, on the ground, today. It offers a clear blueprint for meeting liberalism’s twin goals of liberty and consent while ensuring the broadest inclusion possible...

Practical liberalism addresses this weakness by concerning itself more directly with inclusion and implementation. Practical liberalism directs us to the possible public reasoning of actual agents, demanding that we attend to the psychological conditions of public reason as well as the kinds of pedagogical practices and institutional arrangements that might foster these commitments among more citizens.

C. Selected empirical theorists

1. Michael Doyle (“Liberalism and World Politics”, 1986):

What we tend to call liberal resembles a family portrait of principles and institutions, recognizable by certain characteristics – for example, individual freedom, political participation, private property, and equality of opportunity that most liberal states share, although none has perfected them all.

2. Francis Fukuyama (*The End of History and the Last Man*, 1992):

Modern liberalism itself was historically a consequence of the weakness of religiously-based societies which, failing to agree on the nature of the good life, could not provide even the minimal preconditions of peace and stability...

Political liberalism can be defined simply as a rule of law that recognizes certain individual rights or freedoms from government control.

Fundamental rights (Lord Bryce): “the exemption from control of the citizen in respect of his person and property”; religious rights, “exemption from control in the expression of religious opinions and the practice of worship”; and what he calls political rights, “exemption from control in matters which do not so plainly affect the welfare of the whole community as to render control necessary,” including the fundamental right of press freedom.

3. Iu. I. Aver'ianov, ed., *Politologiya: entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* (Moskva: Moskovskogo Kommercheskogo Universiteta, 1993), p. 154, in Marcia A. Weigle (“Political Liberalism in Postcommunist Russia”):

“In its wide meaning, [liberalism] is an intellectual and moral principle on which social life is organized and which is built on the recognition of political and economic rights of the individual within the limits prescribed by the operation of laws.... In its narrower meaning, liberalism—the ideology and politics of liberal parties—as a whole is oriented to the preservation of the market economy and free competition in conjunction with the minimal necessary regulatory role of the state.”

4. Philippe Schmitter (“More Liberal, Preliberal, or Postliberal?”, 1995):

Liberalism, either as a conception of political liberty or as a doctrine about economic policy, may have coincided in some countries with the rise of democracy, but has never been immutably or unambiguously linked to its practice—least of all once democracy was extended to include mass publics, popularly elected executives, specialized interest associations, and boisterous social movements...

They will focus increasingly on certain basic principles of “real existing” liberal democracy:

1. its exclusive emphasis on individualism;
2. its commitment to voluntarism in the form and content of political participation, as well as in the recruitment of politicians;
3. its reliance on territorial representation and partisan competition to provide the sole legitimate links between citizen and state;
4. its confinement to the bounds of national state institutions as well as its (tacit) complicity with nationalism;
5. its indifference to persistent and systemic inequalities in both the distribution of benefits and the representation of interests.

5. Stephen Holmes (*The Anatomy of Antiliberalism*, 1996):

Very briefly, liberalism is a political theory and program that flourished from the middle of the seventeenth to the middle of the eighteenth century.... the core practices of a liberal political order are religious toleration, freedom of discussion, restrictions on police behavior, free elections, constitutional government based on separation of powers, publically inspectable state budgets to inhibit corruption, and economic policy committed to sustained growth on the basis of private ownership and freedom of contract. Liberalism's four core norms or values are personal security (the monopolization of legitimate violence by agents of the state who are themselves monitored and regulated by the law), impartiality (a single system of law applied equally to all), individual liberty (a broad sphere of freedom from collective or governmental supervision, including freedom of conscience, the right to be different, the right to pursue ideals one's neighbors thinks wrong, the freedom to travel and emigrate and so forth), and democracy or the right to participate in lawmaking by means of elections and public discussion through a free press. That public disagreement is a creative force may have been the most novel and radical principle of liberal politics.

6. Stephen Gardbaum ("Liberalism, Autonomy, and Moral Conflict", 1996):

Political liberalism explicitly defines itself in contrast to a second, and more traditional, conception of liberal political theory. This conception, which has recently come to be labeled 'comprehensive,' 'perfectionist,' or 'ethical liberalism,' takes its central task to be that of specifying how the state may fulfill its general duty of enhancing the moral lives of its citizens, while respecting certain values that are constitutive of liberal political practice, such as tolerance, individual freedom, and equality.

7. Andrew C. Janos (*East Central Europe in the Modern World*, 2000)

But this was only the first step in the evolution of modern consciousness. If humanity could change its material environment, why not take charge of its political destiny? This question seemed justified to many, and in answer to it there emerged a new political consciousness, rooted in the belief that society itself was a human construct and that political authority must find justification in finite and discernible human purposes.

Latched on to the economic interests of the new entrepreneurial classes, this new consciousness became the cornerstone of the ideology of liberalism. This ideology embraced the ideas of the freedom of markets from political intervention, the freedom of the subject from arbitrary rule, and finally the freedom to participate in the affairs of government.

8. Ian Adams (*Political Ideology Today*, 2001):

... ideologically, all US parties are liberal and always have been. Essentially they espouse classic liberalism, that is, a form of democratized Whig constitutionalism plus the free market. The point of difference comes with the influence of social liberalism. How far should the free market be left alone; how far should the state regulate or manage; and how far should government at federal or local level provide social security or welfare services?

9. Shawn Young (Beyond Rawls: An Analysis of the Concept of Political Liberalism, 2002)]

Whereas classical liberalism and European liberalism prioritize liberty, American liberalism and social liberalism stress equality. Liberals espouse a wide array of views depending on their understanding of these principles, but generally they support ideas and programs such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, free markets, civil rights, democratic societies, secular governments, and international cooperation.

10. David Held (Models of Democracy, 2006):

It is important to be clear about the meaning of ‘liberalism’. While it is a controversial concept, and its meaning has shifted historically, it is used here to signify the attempt to uphold the values of freedom of choice, reason and toleration in the face of tyranny, the absolutist system and religious intolerance...

Gradually, liberalism became associated with the doctrine that individuals should be free to pursue their own preferences in religious, economic and political affairs...

Modern liberalism holds “that government exists to safeguard the rights and liberties of citizens who are ultimately the best judges of their own interests; and that accordingly government must be restricted in scope and constrained in practice in order to ensure the maximum possible freedom of every citizen.”

11. Beth A. Simmons, Frank Dobbin and Geoffrey Garrett (“Introduction: The International Diffusion of Liberalism”, 2006):

Political liberalism refers to policies that reduce government constraints on political behavior, promote free political exchange, and establish rights to political participation: ‘democratization.’ Economic liberalism, in the classic rather than the American sense, refers to policies that reduce government constraints on economic behavior and thereby promote economic exchange: ‘marketization’.

II. Related terms

A. Libertarianism

1. John Hospers (“What Libertarianism Is”, 1974):

The political philosophy that is called libertarianism (from the Latin *libertas*, liberty) is the doctrine that every person is the owner of his own life, and that no one is the owner of anyone else’s life; and that consequently every human being has the right to act in accordance with his own choices, unless those actions infringe on the equal liberty of other human beings to act in accordance with their choices.

2. Robert Nozick (*Anarchy State and Utopia*, 1974):

We can imagine at least one social arrangement intermediate between the scheme of private protective associations and the night watchman state. Since the night watchman state is often

called minimal state we call this other arrangement the ultra-minimal state. An ultra-minimal state maintains a monopoly over all the use of force...but it provides protection and enforcement services only to those who purchase its protection and enforcement policies.

B. Liberal democracy

1. Larry Diamond (“Thinking About Hybrid Regimes”, 2002):

Liberal democracy extends freedom, fairness, transparency, accountability, and the rule of law from the electoral process into all other major aspects of governance and interest articulation, competition, and representation.

2. Larry Diamond (*Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation*, 1999):

In addition to the elements of electoral democracy, [liberal democracy] requires, first, the absence of reserved domains of power for the military or other actors not accountable to the electorate, directly or indirectly...it requires the horizontal accountability of officeholders to one another; this constrains executive power and so helps protect constitutionalism, legality, and the deliberative process...it encompasses extensive provisions for political and civic pluralism as well as for individual and group freedoms, so that contending interests and values may be expressed and complete through ongoing processes of articulation and representation, beyond periodic elections.

3. Benjamin Radcliff (“Liberalism, Populism, and Collective Choice”, 1991):

Liberalism—or what Macpherson (1977) more descriptively calls ‘protective democracy’—is predicated upon the notion that the function of competitive election is the preservation of liberty. Based on the fear that freedom is in constant danger of usurpation by government, liberalism is an attempt to create a theory of political organization in which such usurpation cannot occur. The method to be utilized in attainment of this goal is election with limited tenure, in that periodic elections will restrain governmental officials from engaging in repressive policies out of fear of dismissal. All that is envisioned is that when the incumbent holders of political authority have transgressed their responsibilities as public trustees, they can be removed by the public via the electoral sanction...

Define liberal democracy, then, as a system for making collective decisions in which political authority is vested in individuals who are chosen by citizens in a competitive fashion for limited tenures via the institutionalization of voting scheme.

C. Illiberal democracy

1. Fareed Zakaria (“The Rise of Illiberal Democracy”, 1997):

.... [Illiberal democracies are] democratically elected regimes, often ones that have been reelected or reaffirmed through referenda, that routinely ignore constitutional limits on their power and [deprive] their citizens of basic rights and freedoms.

2. Henry Wismayer, (“The Crisis of Liberalism”, *LA Review of Books*, January 2017):

There are distinct strands of liberalism, of course. The first is social liberalism, a political doctrine built around the central tenets of equality and representative democracy. The argument against this form of liberalism, and its pejorative byword “political correctness,” contends that it has mutated over time into a form of moral absolutism...

Economic liberalism is different. Rooted in the idea of open markets, it’s a 19th-century market theory that advocates free trade and the pursuit of material self-interest. Advocates of economic liberalism tend to believe in small government and low taxation, maintaining instead that forces of supply and demand — what Adam Smith called the “invisible hand” — would automatically yield benefits for society at large.

Its contemporary offspring, neoliberalism, formulated by radical academics like Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, later turned into concrete government policy by Reagan and Thatcher, is a form of libertarian capitalism that has shaped our globalized world.

By conflating social liberalism with its invidious economic namesake, populists in the United States and Europe have been able to condense the whole seething polity into a simple picture of us versus them. In that one word, “liberal,” the enemy now had a name. Liberalism had, in Trump’s words, become “the swamp” — while the opportunity to get revenge on the liberal elite has become a rallying cry.

D. Neoliberalism

1. David Harvey (*A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 2005):

...the doctrine that market exchange is an ethic in itself, capable of acting as a guide for all human action—has become dominant in both thought and practice throughout much of the world since 1970 or so...

... a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong property rights, free markets, and free trade.

2. Wendy Brown (“Neo-liberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy”, 2003):

... neo-liberalism refers to the repudiation of Keynesian welfare state economics and the ascendancy of the Chicago School of political economy — von Hayek, Friedman, et al. In popular usage, neo-liberalism is equated with a radically free market: maximized competition and free trade achieved through economic de-regulation, elimination of tariffs, and a range of monetary and social policies favorable to business and indifferent toward poverty, social deracination, cultural decimation, long term resource depletion and environmental destruction...

... the liberalism in what has come to be called neo-liberalism refers to liberalism’s economic variant...

... indeed, the American convention of referring to advocates of the welfare state as political liberals is especially peculiar given that American conservatives generally hew more closely to

both the classical economic and political doctrines of liberalism — it turns the meaning of liberalism in the direction of liberality rather than liberty.

E. The Open Society

1. Popper, Karl (*The Open Society and Its Enemies*, 1942):

In what follows, the magical or tribal or collectivist society will also be called the closed society, and the society in which individuals are confronted with personal decisions, the open society...

A powerful cause of the breakdown of the closed society was the development of sea-communications and commerce...

The new faith of the open society, its only possible faith, humanitarianism, was beginning to assert itself, but was not yet formulated...

The closed society, and with it its creed that the tribe is everything and the individual nothing, had broken down. Individual initiative and self-assertion had become a fact...

I think that the name may be used to indicate that, though liberal, it has nothing to do with the policy of strict non-intervention (often, but not quite correctly, called 'laissez faire'). Liberalism and state-interference are not opposed to each other. On the contrary, any kind of freedom is clearly impossible unless it is guaranteed by the state.

F. The Liberal International Order

1. John Ruggie ("International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order", 1982):

"Applied to the post-World War II context, this argument leads me to characterize the international economic order by the term 'embedded liberalism,' which I show to differ from both its classical ancestor and its ignominious predecessor even if it has systematically combined central features of both."

"The essence of embedded liberalism, it will be recalled, is to devise a form of multilateralism that is compatible with the requirements of domestic stability."

2. Stephen Krasner ("State Power and the Structure of International Trade", 1976):

"Liberalism, or openness, as the dependent variable rather than an order or cooperation. Cooperation and liberalism are conceptually distinct."

3. John Ruggie ("International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order", 1982):

In its simplest form, the model makes this prediction: if economic capabilities are so concentrated that a hegemon exists, as in the case of Great Britain in the late 19th century and the U.S.A. after World War II, an 'open' or 'liberal' international economic order will come into being. In the organization of a liberal order, pride of place is given to market rationality. This is

not to say that authority is absent from such an order. It is to say that authority relations are constructed in such a way as to give maximum scope to market forces rather than to constrain them. Specific regimes that serve such an order, in the areas of money and trade, for example, limit the discretion of states to intervene in the functioning of self-regulating currency and commodity markets.

4. John M. Owen (“How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace”, 1994):

“I define a liberal democracy as a state that instantiates liberal ideas, one where liberalism is the dominant ideology and citizens have leverage over war decisions. That is, liberal democracies are those states with a visible liberal presence, and that feature free speech and regular competitive elections of the officials empowered to declare war. I argue that liberal ideology and institutions work in tandem to bring about democratic peace.”

“Liberals believe that individuals everywhere are fundamentally the same, and are best off pursuing self-preservation and material well-being. Freedom is required for these pursuits, and peace is required for freedom; coercion and violence are counter-productive. Thus all individuals share an interest in peace, and should want war only as an instrument to bring about peace. Liberals believe that democracies seek their citizens’ true interests and that thus by definition they are pacific and trustworthy. Non-democracies may be dangerous because they seek other ends, such as conquest or plunder. Liberals thus hold that the national interest calls for accommodation of fellow democracies, but sometimes calls for war with non-democracies.”

“I describe a second force—liberalism, which prods democracies toward peace with each other, and toward war with non-democracies.”

5. Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry (“The Nature and Sources of Liberal International Order”, 1999):

Distinctive features mark postwar liberal order—co-binding security institutions, penetrated American hegemony, semi-sovereign great powers, economic openness, and civic identity. It is these multifaceted and interlocking features of Western liberal order that give it a durability and significance...

This order has five distinctive and important components that together constitute structural liberalism: security co-binding, penetrated hegemony, semi-sovereignty and partial great powers, economic openness, and civic identity and community. The overall liberal political order is a complex composite in which these elements interact and mutually reinforce each other. It is the overall pattern of these elements and their interaction that constitute the structure of the liberal political order; the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. Any understanding of the liberal order that fails to bring in all of these components will fail to capture its structural character.

6. G. John Ikenberry (“The Liberal International Order and its Discontents”, 2010):

This is true if by liberal order we mean an open, rule-based relations system organized around expanding forms of institutionalized cooperation. In this sense, liberal international order can be contrasted with alternative logics of order – blocs, exclusive spheres and closed geopolitical systems. The future still belongs to the liberal international order.

7. G. John Ikenberry, ("The Future of the Liberal World Order: Internationalism After America", 2011):

The hallmarks of liberal internationalism—openness and rule-based relations enshrined in institutions such as the United Nations and norms such as multilateralism—could give way to a more contested and fragmented system of blocs, spheres of influence, mercantilist networks, and regional rivalries.

G. Globalization

1. Mike Featherstone, (*Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, 1990):

... nation-states are not seem to simply interact but to constitute a world, a global context in which the world becomes a singular place with its own processes and forms of integration (Robertson)...

... emphasizes the autonomy of the globalization process, which should be seen not as the outcome of the inter-state processes, but to operate in relative independence of conventionally designated societal and socio-cultural processes" (Robertson).

This globalization process which points to the extension of global cultural interrelatedness also can be understood as leading to a global ecumene, defined as a 'region of persistent culture interaction and exchange'

2. Roland Robertson, (*Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, 1992):

Globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole.

3. Ronen Shamir ("Without borders? Notes on globalization as a Mobility regime", 2005):

A significant body of literature indicates that the era of globalization is simultaneously an era of growing restrictions on movement...globalization is predominantly theorized in terms of social openness and social fluidity...

The suggested framework points at the emergence of a global mobility regime that actively seeks to contain social movement both within and across borders.

4. John Baylis, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens (*The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, 2011):

Globalization is most simply...defined as a process of increasing interconnectedness between societies such that events in one part of the world increasingly have effects on peoples and societies far away...

Globalization is associated with a shift in the scale of social organization, the emergence of a world as a shared social space, the relative deterritorialization of social, economic, and political activity, and relative denationalization of power...

Globalization can be conceptualized as a fundamental shift or transformation in the spatial scale of human social organization that links distant communities and expands the reach of power relations across regions and continents...

Globalization is to be distinguished from internationalization or regionalism.

H. Multiculturalism

1. Charles Taylor (*Multiculturalism*, 1994):

Multiculturalism is in another of its forms a demand to minimize the risks for all nationalities, social unions, and cultural communities. The state is called upon to take responsibility for everyone's (cultural) survival...this is liberalism of a second kind.

2. Tariq Modood and Pnina Werbner (*The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism, Identity and Community*, 1997):

Multiculturalism is the political outcome of ongoing power struggles and collective negotiations of cultural, ethnic, and racial differences. These reshape public spheres and civil societies [in Europe].

3. Keith Banting and Will Kymlicka (*Multiculturalism and the Welfare State: Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Democracies*, 2006):

Widespread adoption of multiculturalism policies for immigrant groups, the acceptance of territorial autonomy and language rights for national minorities, and the recognition of land claims and self-government rights for indigenous peoples.

We refer to all such policies as multiculturalism policies...but what they all have in common is that they go beyond the protection of basic civil and political rights guaranteed to all individuals in a liberal-democratic state.

4. Steven Vertovec and Susanne Wessendorf (*Multiculturalism Backlash: European Discourses, Policies and Practices*, 2010):

Multiculturalism can at best be described as a broad set of mutually reinforcing approaches and methodologies concerning the incorporation and participation of immigrants and ethnic minorities and their modes of cultural/religious difference...

Within and cutting across such varied institutions, the rubric multiculturalism has entailed diverse measures such as:

Public 'recognition': support for ethnic minority organizations, facilities and activities...

Education: consideration for dress-codes, gender-specific practices, and other issues sensitive to the values of specific ethnic and religious minorities...

Social services: information for restructuring and retraining for delivering culturally sensitive practices...

Public materials: state sponsored information provided in multiple languages...

Law: cultural exceptions in law protection from discrimination and incitement to hatred...

Religious accommodation: permission and support for the establishment of places of worship and practice..."