

# International Political Science Review

<http://ips.sagepub.com/>

---

## In This Issue

Mark Kesselman

*International Political Science Review* 2010 31: 259

DOI: 10.1177/0192512110371870

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://ips.sagepub.com/content/31/3/259.citation>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



International Political Science Association (IPSA)

**Additional services and information for *International Political Science Review* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://ips.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://ips.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Aug 2, 2010

[What is This?](#)



## In This Issue

International Political Science Review

31(3) 259–260

© The Author(s) 2010

Reprints and permission:

[sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav](http://sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav)

DOI: 10.1177/0192512110371870

[ips.sagepub.com](http://ips.sagepub.com)



The six articles in the June issue of *IPSR* testify to the diversity of topics studied by political scientists around the world. In “Beyond the Radial Delusion: Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy and non-Democracy,” Jorgen Møller and Svend-Erik Skaaning challenge what they provocatively name “the radial delusion,” which they define as the notion that the various elements of a rich conception of democracy are unrelated. Instead, they claim, on the basis of theoretical analysis and empirical testing, that there is an ordinal scale, that is, a constrained and hierarchical relationship, among three key features of democracy: electoral rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law. Their contribution should enrich the literature on defective or delegative democracy as well as related literature on improving the quality of democracy. It can also be useful for crafting policies to promote democratization.

Cigdem Kentmen’s “Bases of Support for the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy: Gender, Attitudes toward the Economic Integration and Attachment to Europe” analyzes the possible impact of gender on support for the EU. Possibly contrary to expectations of a gender gap, she finds that there is no significant difference between men and women regarding support for EU foreign and security policies. Thus, she rejects claims based on essentialist or socialization arguments. Instead, she finds that the division between those who support or oppose EU common foreign and security policies hinges on whether people believe that European economic integration has been beneficial for their country. She also finds that the strength of people’s European identity is influential, albeit to a smaller extent than is their utilitarian calculation of the EU’s economic impact.

Catharina Lindstedt and Daniel Naurin find, in “Transparency is not Enough: Making Transparency Effective in Reducing Corruption,” that, in order to eliminate corruption by public officials, it is not sufficient to rely on legal requirements ordering officials to make information publicly available. Among the takeaway points from their rich analysis: reducing corruption is more likely when independent monitoring agents exist, such as a relatively free press, as opposed to requirements for official disclosure (for example, laws mandating freedom of information). For transparency and monitoring to be effective, citizens must have sufficient education to digest information about corruption that is disseminated. Finally, institutional mechanisms must exist (in a word: free, competitive elections) by which corrupt officials can be held accountable.

Min-hyung Kim’s article is the second in this issue to deal with domestic attitudes toward the EU. And, like Kentmen’s article, Kim deals with an important theoretical issue as well: specifying the conditions under which international institutions change their members’ policy preferences. Kim provides evidence that French and German preferences regarding agricultural policies within the EU (the CAP) shifted with the deepening of European integration. The mechanism by which this occurred was a change in the composition of domestic policy coalitions as a result of actors’ changing calculations of the benefits that would accrue from deeper European integration.

Rollin F. Tusalem, author of a previous paper published in *IPSR*, “A Boon or Bane? The Role of Civil Society in Third- and Fourth-Wave Democracies,” contributes “Determinants of Coups d’état Events 1970–1990: The Role of Property Rights Protection” to the present issue. He finds that, in the period examined, military coups are less likely in Asia, Africa, and Latin America when the incumbent regime safeguarded property rights, and notably the economic interests of the elite. Conversely, the military was more likely to topple regimes that sponsored redistributive policies. Although Tusalem does not allude to neo-Marxist scholars like Poulantzas, who highlighted the relative autonomy of the state, as opposed to instrumental accounts, his article suggests one important limit to the autonomy that they analyzed.

Willy Jou’s “The Heuristic Value of the Left-Right Schema in East Asia” asks whether citizens of four East Asian countries are as familiar with the left-right ideological cleavage as is the case in Western democracies. By analyzing survey data from Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines, he finds considerable variation in the extent of the resonance of the left-right concept among countries, political parties, and groups of citizens. His article demonstrates the utility of extending research approaches and methods from more-studied countries and regions of the world to less-studied ones. The result considerably enriches our understanding of comparative theory and politics.

This is the first issue of *International Political Science Review* that I have edited. As I am sure readers of the journal will agree, outgoing co-editor Kay Lawson and co-editor Yvonne Galligan have set a daunting standard. I hope to maintain *IPSR*’s record of scholarly excellence and editorial nurturance that they have set. I also want to join Yvonne in thanking Kay for her years of extraordinary service as co-editor. The journal soared under her tutelage and we are all the richer for it.

Since my appointment last year as co-editor of *IPSR*, I have benefited from the very generous assistance of Kay and Yvonne, along with that of senior staff members at Sage, including David Mainwaring and Anthony Green. Thanks to these terrifically patient and helpful instructors for guiding me through this challenging period of transition.

My arrival coincides (coincidentally) with the launch of a tremendously useful complement to the print edition of *IPSR*. Working with Sage, the editors have initiated a new electronic feature designated as Online First. Henceforth, articles published in the print edition of *IPSR* will be electronically posted in Online First a month or more before publication in the journal. Articles posted in Online First can be accessed from *IPSR*’s home page at <http://ips.sagepub.com>, and click on Online First. They will be identical in all respects to the version published in the journal, save that they will not have pagination corresponding to the print edition. Online First articles can be referenced using their unique Digital Object Identifier (DOI) number. This number stays with the article throughout even after it has been assigned to a particular issue. The editors are delighted that Sage has developed this new feature: posting articles in Online First will significantly shorten the gap between acceptance of an article and publication.

Mark Kesselman