Series editor's foreword

Bertrand Russell once argued that power is to social science what energy is to physics (Russell 1937: 10). While power is one of the most important concepts in the social sciences, it is also one of the most complex and elusive to research.

Weber's analysis of power and authority (1947 and 1978) is one of the first social scientific discussions of power and it influenced the US power debates, which developed post-Second World War. In these debates Dahl's careful analysis stands out for its clarity in providing us with a conceptual vocabulary of power (Dahl 1957 and 1968). This includes an agency-based, exercise and decision-making definition of power; conceptualized in terms of powerful actors (A) making subordinates (B) do something that they would not otherwise do. This exercise of power is distinct from resources (that may or may not be exercised) and it provides power-holders with power of specific scope. However, while providing a new set of conceptual tools to analyse about power relations, Dahl's work was subject to sustained critique from Bachrach and Baratz and others, who argued that power is also exercised through structural biases that are not necessarily reducible to overt decision-making (Bachrach and Baratz 1962). Lukes followed this critique with his theorization of the third-dimension of power (Lukes 1974), which concerns the mobilization of belief and ideology to legitimize power relations of domination. The three-dimensional model was applied in a richly textured empirical study of Appalachian mining communities (Gaventa 1982). Overall, as the three-dimensional power debates develop, the focus shifts from actions of the dominating actor A to the counter-intuitive and fascinating phenomenon that subordinate actors B often appear to actively acquiesce or participate in their own domination.

In a qualified critique of Lukes, Scott argued that appearances are often deceptive (Scott 1990). The relationship between public and private discourse renders the working of three-dimensional power more complex

than any simplistic images of the oppressed willingly participating in their own domination, or internalizing false-consciousness. In turn, Scott's work has inspired an on-going power-literature on the complexities of resistance versus acquiescence.

In the 1980s, under the influence of the translation of Foucault's work (for instance, Foucault 1979 and 1982), the Anglophone power debates shifted towards more epistemic and ontological analysis, which resonated with the shift of emphasis from the powerful to the conditions of the oppressed. This gave rise to fascinating work on the relation between power and discourse; power and truth; the way power influences the ontological formation of social subjects through discipline; and how governmentality has changed systemic power relations (including Clegg 1989, Dean 2010, Laclau 2005, Flyvbjerg 1997 and Hayward 2000). However, in critique, many have argued that neo-Foucauldians tend to lose sight of the significance of individual agency (Lukes 2005).

Bridging the intellectual divide between those following the Dahl-Lukes trajectory and the neo-Foucauldians, another important thread to the power debates comes from Giddens (1984) and Bourdieu's (1989) conceptualizations of structure as a verb. This way of thinking provides us with conceptual tools for making sense of how agents both structure and are structured by relations of power.

In international relations, the shift from agency toward systemic, epistemic and ontological perceptions of power took the form of a gradual move from realist focus on resources to a more idealist emphasis upon soft power (Nye 1992 and 2012). Similarly, in rational choice theory, there emerged an emphasis upon the systemic situatedness of strategic choices. This gave rise to Keith Dowding's critique of Brian Barry, 'Resources, Power and Systemic Luck' which appears in this collection as Chapter 5 (pp. 105–20).

The effect of interrogating the social contexts and social ontology of agents caused many theorists to re-evaluate the nature of power normatively, moving away from the automatic equation between power and domination to a perception of power as a condition of possibility for agency, thus freedom (Morris 2002 and 2009). Thus, freedom and power move from being opposing categories to being mutually constitutive. Associated with this normative re-evaluation, power theorists distinguish between power-to, power-with and power-over (Allen 1998 and 1999; Pansardi 2012). To begin with power-over was considered a normative negative, suggesting oppression, while power-to and power-with were the positives. However, recently some theorists argue power-over can also have emancipatory, as well as the more obvious dominating, aspects (Haugaard 2012).

This book series seeks to build upon these rich traditions of power

analysis, which currently make the study of social and political power one of the most vibrant fields in the social and political sciences. It also builds upon the success of the *Journal of Political Power*, which provides an important forum for article analysis, while this book series facilitates longer works on social and political power.

The book series is open to any of the multiplicity of traditions of power analysis, and it welcomes research that is theoretically oriented, as well as empirical research on power or practitioner-oriented applications.

Mark Haugaard
National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland

References

- Allen, A. (1998) 'Rethinking power', *Hyptia*, vol. 13.
- Allen, A. (1999) *The Power of Feminist Theory: Domination, Resistance, Solidarity*, (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press).
- Bachrach, P. and Baratz Morton S. (1962) 'The two faces of power', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 56.4: 947–52.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989) 'Social space and symbolic power', *Sociological Theory* (7)1: 14–25.
- Clegg, S. (1989) *Frameworks of Power* (London: Sage).
- Dahl, R. A. (1957) 'The concept of power', *Behavioural Science*, Vol. 2(3): 201–15.
- Dahl, R. A. (1968) 'Power' in David L. Shills (1968) *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (12): 405–15 (New York, Macmillan).
- Dean, M. (2010) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society* (Second edition) (London: Sage).
- Flyvbjerg, B. (1998) *Rationality and Power: Democracy in Practice* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).
- Foucault, M. (1982) 'The subject and power' in H. L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, London).
- Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. (Harmondsworth: Penguin).
- Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Gaventa, J. (1982) *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Hayward C. (2000) *De-facing Power* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Haugaard, M. (2012) 'Rethinking the four dimensions of power', *Journal of Political Power* 5(1): 35–54
- Laclau, E. (2005) *On Populist Reason* (London: Verso).
- Lukes, S. (1974) *Power: A Radical View* (London: Macmillan).
- Lukes, S. (2005) *Power: A Radical View*, 2nd edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Morris, P. (2002) *Power: A Philosophical Analysis*, 2nd edn (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

- Morriss, P. (2009) 'Power and liberalism' in (ed.) S. Clegg and M. Haugaard *The Sage Handbook of Power* (London: Sage).
- Nye, J. S. (1990) 'Soft power', *Foreign Policy* (80): 153–72.
- Nye J. S. (2011) 'Power and foreign policy', *Journal of Political Power*, 4(1): 9–24.
- Pensardi, P. (2012) 'Power to and power over: two distinct concepts?', *Journal of Political Power*, 5(1): 73–89.
- Russell, B. (1938) *Power: A New Social Analysis* (London: George Allen & Unwin).
- Scott, J. C. (1990) *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Weber, M. (1947) *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, ed. T. Parsons (New York: New York Free Press).
- Weber Max (1978) *Economy and Society Vols 1 and 2*, ed. G. Roth and C. Wittich (Berkeley: University of California Press).