Police State

Key Concepts in Political Science

GENERAL EDITOR: Leonard Schapiro

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Peter Calvert

Other titles in the same series include:

ALREADY PUBLISHED

Martin Albrow

Peter Calvert

Ioan Davies

Joseph Frankel

John Plamenatz

Bureaucracy

Revolution

**Social Mobility and
Political Change**

National Interest

Ideology

IN PREPARATION

Shlomo Avineri

Stanley Benn

Anthony H. Birch

Karl Deutsch

S. E. Finer

C. J. Friedrich

Julius Gould

E. Kamenka and

Alice Erh-Soon Tay

J. F. Lively

Robert Orr

P. H. Partridge

John C. Rees

Bernard Schaffer

Leonard Schapiro

Henry Tudor

Utopianism

Power

Representation

Legitimacy

Dictatorship

Tradition and Authority

Violence

Law

Democracy

Liberty

Consent and Consensus

Equality

Modernization

Totalitarianism

Political Myth

Police State

Brian Chapman

University of Manchester

Macmillan Education

ISBN 978-0-333-11355-4

ISBN 978-1-349-00944-2 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-1-349-00944-2

© 1970 by Pall Mall Press Ltd, London

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission.

Published in the United States of America in 1970
by Praeger Publishers Inc.

This edition published in 1971 by

MACMILLAN AND CO LTD

London and Basingstoke

*Associated companies in New York Toronto
Dublin Melbourne Johannesburg and Madras*

SBN 333 11355 1 (paper cover)

Not for sale in the U.S.A.

The Papermac edition of this book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, resold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent, in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

Contents

'Key Concepts'	
an Introductory Note	7
1/The Origins of the Term	11
2/The Traditional Police State	20
3/The Police State in Transition	33
4/New Meanings of the Term	50
5/The Modern Police State	58
6/Police Methods	81
7/Police Psychology	95
8/The Totalitarian Police State	106
9/Conclusion	116
References	139
Bibliography	143
Index	147

'Key Concepts'

an Introductory Note

Political concepts are part of our daily speech—we abuse 'bureaucracy' and praise 'democracy', welcome or recoil from 'revolution'. Emotive words such as 'equality', 'dictatorship', 'élite' or even 'power' can often, by the very passions which they raise, obscure a proper understanding of the sense in which they are, or should be, or should not be, or have been used. Confucius regarded the 'rectification of names' as the first task of government. 'If names are not correct, language will not be in accordance with the truth of things', and this in time would lead to the end of justice, to anarchy and to war. One could with some truth point out that the attempts hitherto by governments to enforce their own quaint meanings on words have not been conspicuous for their success in the advancement of justice. 'Rectification of names' there must certainly be: but most of us would prefer such rectification to take place in the free debate of the university, in the competitive arena of the pages of the book or journal.

Analysis of commonly used political terms, their reassessment or their 'rectification', is, of course, normal activity in the political science departments of our universities. The idea of this series was indeed born in the course of discussion between a few university teachers of political science, of whom Professor S. E. Finer of Manchester University was one. It occurred to us that a series of short books, discussing the 'Key Concepts' in political science would serve two purposes. In universities these books could provide the kind of brief political texts which might be of assistance to students in gaining a fuller understanding of the terms which they were constantly using. But we also hoped that outside the universities there exists a reading public which has the time, the

8/ *'Key Concepts' an Introductory Note*

curiosity and the inclination to pause to reflect on some of those words and ideas which are so often taken for granted. Perhaps even 'that insidious and crafty animal', as Adam Smith described the politician and statesman, will occasionally derive some pleasure or even profit from the more leisurely analysis which academic study can afford, and which a busy life in the practice of politics often denies.

It has been very far from the minds of those who have been concerned in planning and bringing into being the 'Key Concepts' series to try and impose (as if that were possible!) any uniform pattern on the authors who have contributed, or will contribute, to it. I, for one, hope that each author will, in his own individual manner, seek and find the best way of helping us to a fuller understanding of the concept which he has chosen to analyse. But whatever form the individual exposition may take, there are, I believe, three aspects of illumination which we can confidently expect from each volume in this series. First, we can look for some examination of the history of the concept, and of its evolution against a changing social and political background. I believe, as many do who are concerned with the study of political science, that it is primarily in history that the explanation must be sought for many of the perplexing problems of political analysis and judgement which beset us today. Second, there is the semantic aspect. To look in depth at a 'key concept' necessarily entails a study of the name which attached itself to it; of the different ways in which, and the different purposes for which, the name was used; of the way in which in the course of history the same name was applied to several concepts, or several names were applied to one and the same concept; and, indeed, of the changes which the same concept, or what appears to be the same concept, has undergone in the course of time. This analysis will usually require a searching examination of the relevant literature in order to assess the present stage of scholarship in each particular field. And thirdly, I hope that the reader of each volume in this series will be able to decide for himself what the proper and

valid use should be of a familiar term in politics, and will gain, as it were, from each volume a sharper and better-tempered tool of political analysis.

There are many today who would disagree with Bismarck's view that politics can never be an exact science. I express no opinion on this much debated question. But all of us who are students of politics—and our numbers both inside and outside the universities continue to grow—will be the better for knowing what precisely we mean when we use a common political term.

London School of Economics
and Political Science

Leonard Schapiro
General Editor