A new liberal state was established during and after the New Deal, and it grew immensely in size and presence but without self-examination. Its particular way of using government, through broad delegation and interest representation, is undermining liberalism itself. What is left is a powerful apparatus run by career administrators and controlled by special interests hiding behind an optimistic but increasingly irrelevant liberal rhetoric. It is the second republic of the US, and in character it is 'a state of permanent receivership.' [The Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) indicates that this book has been cited in over 615 publications since 1969.]
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"This was not the book I set out to write. In 1964, I had published a book on New York City in which I proposed a theory of politics critical of the liberal pluralist model prevailing at that time. I argued that analysis must begin with the institutions of government ('the state') and move out from there to politics. The politics of groups and interests, I argued, takes its shape from the state, not the other way around. I had located three (eventually four) distinct areas of government activity (types of public policy), and I was able to show that some important political attributes were distributed very differently from one area to the other. I called my theory 'arenas of power' and argued that in any political system there will be several areas of government activity; that each will develop its own distinctive arena of power; and that of the four identified in US contexts, only one arena fit the classical pluralist model.

"To pursue the theory further, I turned from cities to national policies and published several articles advancing the theory and reporting empirical results. By 1967, more convinced than ever that a theory of politics must begin with 'the state,' or its policies, I took leave on a Guggenheim and set out for Paris—where else?—to write Arenas of Power. As the writing progressed, I discovered that the liberal administrations of the 1930s and 1960s had a definite preference in their use of the state, that this preference shaped their choice of policies, and that their policies were producing forms of politics antagonistic to their own goals. That is to say, I was getting a confirmation of my theory that the state creates its own politics, but I was becoming so alarmed by the real world it was revealing to me that I abandoned the analytic book in favor of the normative, critical essay that became The End of Liberalism.

"I have continued to work on Arenas of Power. Since the articles published from it have been widely cited, Arenas of Power has become one of the best-known unpublished books in political science. And I continue to see The End of Liberalism as volume II of this endeavor. I cannot explain why The End of Liberalism is widely cited; my publisher tells me it is something of an underground best-seller. (A new edition of the book appeared in 1979.) My guess is that it hit a highly responsive chord because it was one of the first books of its time to discover, or rediscover, 'the state' as a real political force. America had for 150 years been a stateless society. American political science had developed around a stateless political theory, and this was the essence of realism only as long as reality continued to be relatively stateless. Reality changed after the 1930s. I suppose I helped bring political science around to the realization."