



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Summaries in English

N.A.

Citation

Summaries in English. (1988). Summaries in English. *Acta Politica*, 23: 1988(3), 397-399. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3449695>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3449695>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Politicologenetmaal 1989

Degenen die een workshop willen organiseren voor het politicologenetmaal 1989, worden uitgenodigd een voorstel daartoe in te dienen bij het bestuur vóór 15 september a.s. Dit voorstel moet ten minste de titel van de workshop, een korte toelichting op het thema en de naam van de workshopvoorzitter bevatten.

De opzet van de workshops is als volgt:

1. de workshop bestaat uit 10-20 personen;
2. de voorzitter nodigt ten minste 4 paper-schrijvers en vier commentators van tevoren uit voor het leveren van een bijdrage;
3. overige deelnemers kunnen, mits de workshopvoorzitter daarin toestemt, eveneens een paper in de workshop indienen.

Tijdens de najaarsbijeenkomst zal een keuze uit de voorstellen worden gemaakt door het bestuur van de Kring. Voorstellen kan men toezenden aan de secretaris, drs. K.R.D. Lulofs, p/a Universiteit Twente, faculteit Bestuurskunde, Postbus 217, 7500 AE Enschede.

Changing involvements Theories on value change and new social movements

Symposium van de Werkgemeenschap Verklarende Sociologie op maandag 31 oktober 1988 te Utrecht, De Uithof, Bestuursgebouw. Aanvang: 10.30 uur.

Jan van Deth (Universiteit van Twente) 'Persistence and Change of Political Orientations';

Nan Dirk de Graaf (Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht) 'Individual and Structural Conditions affecting Postmaterialist Values'.

Anthony Heath (Nuffield College, Oxford) 'On Rationality in Voting - Party Identification or Issue Voting'.

Hanspeter Kriesi (Universiteit van Amsterdam en Université de Genève) 'The Structural and Cultural Basis of the New Social Movements in the Netherlands in 1987'.

Karl-Dieter Opp (Universität Hamburg) 'Sanctions as Incentives for Collective Action'.

Anmelding bij H. Ganzeboom, RUU-FSW-ETS, Heidelberglaan 2, 3584 CS Utrecht en gelijktijdige overmaking van f 75,- (studenten f 50,-) op giro 5469052 t.n.v. H. Ganzeboom o.v.v. WVS88.

Summaries

Rational choice, nonmarket decisionmaking and the need for norms

by Huib Pellikaan

Rational-choice theory is the economic study of nonmarket decisionmaking. The methodology of rational-choice is that of economics: (i) methodological individualism, (ii) rationality, and (iii) Pareto efficiency. Rational-choice theory is a generic title for four different decisionmaking theories: (1) the theory of Collective Action; (2) Public Choice theory; (3) Social Choice theory; and (4) Game theory. The distinction between these decisionmaking theories is the result of the development of the concept of rationality in classical and neoclassical economic theory.

For nonmarket decisions (in contrast to market decisions) the economic criterion of Pareto efficiency is not attainable if individuals are behaving as rational utility maximizers. This is one of the main problems for rational-choice theory and it has been described by the Prisoner's Dilemma game. Several solutions of this dilemma have been suggested. For example: (i) the acceptance of a moral code of behaviour by Sen, (ii) the integration of moral principles as a subset of rational principles for choice by Gauthier, and (iii) the proposal for Victorian Budgetary Norms by Buchanan. The problem with these solutions is that none of them can be accepted as conclusive. As to Sen's concepts of morality, it is not certain that every person will behave in accordance with these concepts; Gauthier's solution for the Prisoner's Dilemma is a *petitio principii*; while Buchanan's argument for the necessity of budgetary norms is not very persuasive.

The author concludes his essay with the assertion that the methodological point of departure of rational-choice theory prohibits a solution for the dilemma, because the crux of the economic approach consists in the realization that it is impossible to attain the Pareto optimal.

Contemporary marxism

by Hans Oversloot

In this article the author argues that contemporary marxism is in a crisis from which it is not likely to recover. Nevertheless an article on marxism in a special issue devoted to recent and contemporary political philosophy is appropriate for

two reasons. Firstly, whatever the 'intrinsic merits' of marxist political philosophy, in the late 1960s and 1970s marxists set the agenda for political and philosophical debate. And secondly: marxism has recently, at least in the West, given rise to a new and lively debate about the value of 'fundamental marxian notions' such as the idea of historical materialism and exploitation by the so-called (and self-styled) 'analytical marxists'. These 'marxians' have, as (former) marxists, undertaken a critical evaluation of marxist political philosophy and have, to a large extent, departed from marxism in all of its 'orthodox' forms. Some of the 'analytical marxists' have tried to rephrase and uphold the framework of Marx's political and materialist philosophy (notably Cohen) or have taken it upon themselves to construct a new marxist edifice of political philosophy (Roemer), others (notably Elster) have given up on even trying to reconstruct the whole marxist (marxian) scheme, but still consider Marx's political philosophy to be an important source of inspiration. To this 'analytical marxism' the second part of this article is devoted. The first part of this article takes up topics that have been widely discussed by marxists in the late 1960s and 1970s: (neo-)imperialism, and the role of the state in capitalism and socialism. It deals in particular with endeavours by Western marxists and dissident marxists in and from Eastern Europe to come to terms with 'actually existing' socialist societies and their basic political tenets.

Between Kant and convention: the justification of principles of justice

by Mark A.P. Bovens

The debate on social justice, which has been flourishing since Rawls published his *A theory of justice* (1971), has not only been a debate about rights, principles and policies, but is also, and increasingly, a debate about the justification and foundation of theories of justice. Two kinds of justifying principles are discussed in this essay.

In the universalistic approach, a small set of general principles, grounded in nature, human reason or any other kind of 'Archimedean point', is given 'sub specie aeternitatis', for all times and places. The best, but in the end not fully convincing example of this kind of justification is the Kantian approach of Rawls, as originally developed by him in *A theory of justice*. The universalistic approach to social justice in general, and Rawls' and Nozick's deontological liberalism in particular, have recently been under fierce attack.

MacIntyre, Sandel, Sullivan and Walzer propose a more Aristotelian approach to social justice, in which principles of justice have their foundation in the traditions and conventions of a concrete social and political community. The best example of such a particularistic approach yet available, Walzer's *Spheres of justice* (1983), does not however survive closer scrutiny either.

At the end of the essay, several ways out of this stalemate are discussed.

The coupling principle in Spinoza's political theory

by W. Klever

The brothers De la Court, but especially Johan, formulated a postulate for political strategy, consisting in the rule that the well-being (and income) of officials and public ministers should be made straightly dependent from the execution of their task. Sincerety, loyalty, good faith and other personal attitudes are considered irrelevant. Starting from the 'natural law' that everybody always looks after his own profit, legislators have to organise political life in such a way that general well-being will be the automatic and necessary result of personal profit maximization.

This idea, contained in the *Polityke Weegschaal*, was fully exploited by Spinoza in the political architecture of the *Tractatus Politicus*. This article defends the thesis that the whole treatise and every chapter are based on the requirement of this coupling principle. Spinoza appears to be a master in political psychology and in the analysis of behavioral mechanisms. His detailed suggestions about the optimization of a monarchy, an aristocracy and a democracy are in fact institutional programs or law propositions, built on this very same axiom. He even goes so far that he invents means and techniques in order to further the individual ambition and the search for material wealth. So he systematically anticipated and developed Mandeville's slogan: 'private vices, public benefits'.

The merits of Spinoza's treatise, as distinguished from its forerunners, are the result of consequently taking into account human nature as it actually is and works. Therefore Spinoza's theory, though oriented on improvement, is not utopian, but realistic. Its cash value is constituted by its descriptive character and its geometrical precision.