



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Summaries in English

Baehr, P.R.; Cramer, N.; Es, G.H. van; Hoogerwerf, A.; Land, L. van der

Citation

Baehr, P. R., Cramer, N., Es, G. H. van, Hoogerwerf, A., & Land, L. van der (Eds.). (1965). Summaries in English. *Acta Politica*, 1: 1965/1966(1/4), 278-290. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3449895>

Version: Publisher's Version

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3449895>

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

SUMMARIES*

Foreign readers find below summaries in English of the articles published in volume I of *Acta politica*. This volume consists of four issues which were published collectively in order to give the reader an idea of what kind of subjects Dutch political scientists are working on at the moment.

After having read the summaries, some readers might be interested in receiving full translations in English of one or more articles. The editors are looking into the practical possibility of procuring such translations. Any reader interested in obtaining an English translation of any article, if available, should write to the editors c/o P. R. Baehr, Instituut voor Wetenschap der Politiek, Oudezijds Voorburgwal 187, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

* The bibliography lists publications on political science, published between 1945 and 1965, by Dutch authors, see page 262. They deal mainly with Dutch problems. Main attention has been given to publications on 'political institutions' and 'the political process'. Articles in dailies or weeklies have not been listed.

POLITICAL FREEDOM

by L. van der Land

'Freedom' has not become impractical as a scientific term, because it does not exist, but because there are too many phenomena labeled with the word. Meaningful discussion about the nature of political freedom presupposes an agreed definition in nonvaluational terms. The aim of this article is to construct a concept of political freedom which may be linked to experimental data.

The author suggests that the following statements be considered in defining 'political freedom':

- (1) Political freedom must be interpreted as belonging to the external, 'permissive' conditions of human action, not to his 'self-realization' in *interiore hominis*, or to the freedom of his will.
- (2) 'Political freedom' must be defined by reference to 'political unfreedom', but the former is not simply the negation of the latter. A theory of political freedom is only possible when correlated concepts such as 'influence', 'power' and 'authority' are likewise defined in empirical terms.
- (3) Political freedom is only a meaningful notion, when it is related to the individual. One can only speak of political freedom of a group when this freedom can be derived directly from the political freedom of the individual members of this group. The question of political freedom in the relation between the citizen and the state arises only, when this relation is approached from the point of view of the citizen. To say that a state is 'free to', is meaningless.
- (4) Political freedom should not be considered as an ethical category, but it must be considered as a non-valuational notion concerning relationships of human interaction. Only this concept fulfills the requirements of operationalism, which make statements about political freedom empirically testable.
- (5) Political freedom should be interpreted in terms of clearly specifiable relationships between actors and their respective actual or potential actions. The value-judgements do not belong to the existence or nonexistence of freedom as such, but to what follows from the existence or nonexistence of a particular freedom in a particular context.
- (6) The relationships of political freedom with the concrete realities of human life affords the opportunity of distinguishing dimensions and degrees of political freedom, the comparison of which may be a meaningful activity.

DEPOLITICIZATION AND DECLINE OF IDEOLOGY: A THEORETICAL APPROACH

by A. Hoogerwerf

In this article the author tries to analyze the concepts of depoliticization and decline of ideology, and to formulate a theory which can explain at least part of these phenomena. Some possible forms of depoliticization are: (1) No choice is made as far as new purposes for the state are concerned; (2) no choice is made as far as new ways and means for the state are concerned; (3) the purposes of the state become less general and more differentiated; (4) the participation of the citizens in the political process diminishes; (5) the element of choice in the political process decreases, e.g. because the diversity of opinions is decreasing. Some possible forms of a decline of ideology are: (1) An ideology disintegrates; this disintegration can affect the relation between principles and purposes as well as the relation between objective and subjective elements of the ideology; (2) a disintegration of the grouping of those who once accepted the ideology.

So far there has been insufficient investigation of the question of to which extent these possible forms of depoliticization and decline of ideology do in fact occur.

Some of the purposes (or functions) for which a political ideology may be used are:

- a) the integration of knowledge and evaluation;
- b) the explanation and evaluation of the choice of political purposes;
- c) the explanation and evaluation of the choice of ways and means;
- d) the explanation and evaluation of the positions of the leaders;
- e) the explanation and evaluation of the positions, opinions and behaviour of the followers;
- f) the integration of adherents and the exclusion of others.

The hypothesis is developed that there is a decline of political ideology in as much as these purposes are promoted less than before and in as much as these purposes are promoted by means other than those of political ideology. One of these other means may be the use of applied or policy-oriented science, at least as far as such a science is not value-free.

TWO KINDS OF RESEARCH IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

by H. A. Brasz

Public administration (as an academic sub-field of political science) has as object of study the operation and structure of a political institution. Nowadays interest is directed to a high degree toward the decision-making process. Traditionally, all kinds of methods are used by man in order to acquire greater knowledge of the factual circumstances under which actual decisions are made. One of the most important methods used today is the procedure of scientific research. The institution of public administration as such has become a major object of research. In this article a comparison is made between practical research, which is part of the decision-making process in the administrative organization itself, and scientific research in the universities. Differences in aims, methods and techniques, types of research-institutions, types of researchers and plans of research are discussed. These differences are important, but not sufficiently so to speak of a dichotomy. The decision-making process in public administration is gradually becoming more and more scientific: therefore regular contact with institutions of higher learning is desirable. On the other hand, the universities need regular contact with the practical aspect of public administration: training and education should also be directed to satisfy the desires of society. With regard to the latter there is, in the Netherlands, a lack of possibilities for effective integration. The establishment of an inter-university institute for research in public administration should be given serious consideration.

PARLIAMENT, POLITICS AND THE VOTER: RESULTS OF AN OPINION-SURVEY

by H. Daudt and J. Stapel

The answers to questions put to a sample of Dutch households showed the following results:

- about two thirds had a positive judgment about the work of the members of the Second Chamber of parliament (tables 1a, 1b, 1c);
- about two thirds had a positive judgment about the working of the parliamentary system of government (tables 3a, 3b and 3c);

— three fourths had a favourable judgment about the parliament as an institution (tables 4a, 4b, 4c and scalometer-judgment, page 17).

These results were classified according to adherence to political parties.

In examining the reactions of the adherents of the five largest political parties, one should be aware of the fact that the results shown here do not lead to conclusions about the relative *strength* of the adherence, nor to judgments about the *whole* of the party-adherence. The sample was taken from Dutch family households, but not from the Dutch population of voting age. Moreover, data have been collected only from those who named one of the five largest political parties when asked: 'If elections were held today, which party would you vote for?' Seventy-one percent named one of the five largest political parties; in this report the political views of the remaining twenty-nine percent are not discussed.

The degree to which people are able to name members of parliament seems to provide a simple indicator for measuring political knowledge at various times. According to this indicator:

- one third of those questioned had no political knowledge;
- almost one third had 'some knowledge' (named one or two correct names, tables 5a, 5b and 5c).

The Guttman-scale used in the United States to measure the sense of political efficacy, when translated appeared unfit for use in the Netherlands. Therefore a new scale was developed (a quasi-scale according to Guttman) to measure the sense of political self-confidence. Three of the six elements used for this scale were translations of parts of the American scale. This new scale might also be helpful for future research in the Netherlands.

- Forty-four percent of the people questioned turned out to have a small amount of political self-confidence (table 7);
- people with a great amount of political self-confidence appear to have more political knowledge than people with little political self-confidence.

Women and young people showed fewer positive reactions than men and older people. Although the total number was too small to make a further analysis, it seems likely, on the basis of previous research, that the less positive reactions of the young people came mainly from young women. (Cf. H. Daudt and H. Lange, 'Youth and Politics in the Netherlands', paper presented at the sixth world congress of the International Political Science Association, September 21-25, 1964 in Geneva)

CABINET-FORMATION IN THE NETHERLANDS

by G. Ringnalda

Because of the multi-party system the formation of a new cabinet in the Netherlands requires a rather complicated procedure. That procedure is roughly as follows: 1) the old cabinet offers its resignation to the Queen; 2) after having asked for advice the Queen appoints a 'formateur'; 3) the 'formateur' forms a cabinet (consisting of representatives of several parties) which agrees with the policy program he has set up; 4) the Queen swears in the new cabinet.

Since 1951 it has become the custom for the Queen to appoint an 'informateur' before appointing a 'formateur'. In this article the question is discussed whether the assignment of the 'informateur' can be clearly distinguished from that of the 'formateur'. For that purpose a survey is given of the twenty-two cabinet formations which have taken place since 1946, classified according to type. The eleven 'in-formations' that have taken place since 1951 are classified according to the type of work done by the 'informateur'. The classification shows that before 1956 the work of the 'informateur' was often very similar to the work usually done by a 'formateur'. After 1956 the difference between the work done by the two types of officials has become greater.

Significant changes have occurred in the work done by the 'formateur'. It is becoming more and more usual for the 'formateur' to negotiate with the leaders of the parliamentary parties on particular desires which they want to see fulfilled in the policy program of the new cabinet. Thus policy is actually made during the formation. Therefore there must be someone who can be held politically responsible for this formation of policy. The person best fitted for that position is the 'formateur', who should then also become prime-minister in the new cabinet. An important problem is whether more publicity ought to be given on what is happening during the formation of the cabinet.

The task of the 'informateur' has thus become much more clear-cut. The precise nature of his work is discussed.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE NETHERLANDS PARLIAMENT, 1930–1965

by F. G. Moquette

Using material available to the public, the author tries to give a picture of the Netherlands parliament as a 'going concern'; although undergoing changes due to periodically held elections, the parliament remains a continuous body. For the period 1930–1965 the changes in composition of both Chambers of Parliament were studied on the following points: average age, average length of membership, previous education and the original or simultaneous non-political occupations of the members of Parliament. These factors were checked for the years 1930, 1935, 1940, 1945, 1946, 1950, 1955, 1956, 1960 and 1965. The material shows that with regard to average age and length of membership the post-war composition of both Chambers gradually regained the pre-war level. Changes in level of education and original occupation were partly related to the increase in membership of 1956.

After 1956 the average age of the members of Parliament became lower and the average length of membership shorter, which points to a greater overturn of the membership. The average level of education rose during the period under discussion. Since 1935 there were more members of the First Chamber of Parliament with a university education than without one. In the Second Chamber a similar change occurred after the increase in membership in 1956.

The number of mayors in the First Chamber has increased strikingly, while in the Second Chamber this number decreased. The number of university professors always has been and still is relatively high in the First Chamber as compared to the general situation in the Netherlands. In the Second Chamber one finds a great increase among former civil servants.

Before 1940 about four times as many members moved from the Second Chamber to the First Chamber than in the opposite direction. At once after the war, however, more members moved from the First Chamber to the Second Chamber. Since 1956 the pre-war situation has returned, but now the ratio has become one to two instead of one to four. In 1965 there were fewer members than in 1930 who were simultaneously or previously members of a lower administrative or legislative body.

The conclusions of this article should be supplemented by a further study, which should be a part of a research project covering the entire Netherlands state system using both quantitative and qualitative methods.

THE EXECUTIVE OF THE POLITICAL PARTY AND THE PARLIAMENTARY PARTY

by I. Lipschits

In the structure of a political party in the Netherlands a distinction can be made between the party executive and the parliamentary party. The author states that there are strong ties between the parliamentary party and the party as a whole in the Dutch political system. His findings are supported by his discussion of the problem of to which degree the relationship between the party executive and the parliamentary party is influenced by the organizational structure of the political parties. The following aspects are dealt with: nomination of candidates, formation and composition of the executive, affiliated organizations, the party congress, the party council, the formal regulations regarding the relationship between the executive and the parliamentary party, the smallest organizational units and their vertical and/or horizontal ties, and finally the special types of membership.

The discussion centers on six Dutch political parties with representatives in the Second Chamber (Lower House) of Parliament: the Catholic People's Party (KVP), Labour Party (PvdA), People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD), Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), Christian-Historical Union (CHU), and the Communist Party of the Netherlands (CPN). For those six political parties the following points are examined:

- (1) The different names of similar party bodies (table 1).
- (2) The presence (+) or absence (–) of formal regulations with regard to the relationship between the executive and the parliamentary party: incompatibilities of function, the number of members of parliament which may be members of the party executive, the existence of bodies of mediation between parliamentary party and executive, adherence of the parliamentary party to the party platform, adherence of the parliamentary party to party decisions, regulations with regard to the responsibilities of the parliamentary party to party decisions, regulations with regard to the responsibilities of the parliamentary party itself, admittance of the (chairman of) the parliamentary party to the party executive, obligations of the parliamentary party to maintain contact with the party as a whole (table 2).
- (3) The manner in which the policy of the parliamentary party is discussed in the party congress and the party council (table 3).
- (4) The number of members of the parliamentary party that is also member of different party bodies in absolute numbers (table 4), in percentages (table 5) and a comparative survey for all six political parties (table 6).

The author concludes that the problem does not lie in an excess of independence of the parliamentary party with regard to the party as a whole. Given the nature of the Dutch political system, that is both necessary and inevitable. But the final decision on parliamentary policy should lie with the parliamentary party.

SPLINTER PARTIES IN DUTCH POLITICS – A PROVISIONAL INVENTORY

by H. Daalder

Under the system of proportional representation which has existed in the Netherlands with only small variations since 1918, parties may present lists in national elections with only minimal legal requirements and a maximum chance to acquire representation in the Lower House of Parliament. At no election have parties needed more than 1% of the national vote to acquire a seat, and in 7 out of 12 elections the 'threshold' was lower. Compulsory attendance at the ballot-box (though hardly enforced in practice) probably tends to increase the votes available for small parties, as it encourages the expression of political protest and of political lack of interest in voting rather than in non-voting (table II).

The combined strength of small parties, including the permanently represented Communists and extreme Calvinist *Staatkundig Gereformeerde Partij*, has never been higher than 16.1% in 1933 and never lower than 8.4% in 1959 of the valid national vote (table I). This combined strength has wavered between a maximum of 13% of the seats of the Lower House (1918 and 1933) and a minimum of 6% (table III). Breakdowns are given for the number of lists presented and of lists successful at all elections since 1918 (table II), the size of all party groups in the Lower House (table V), the assiduity with which various special groups have sought representation (figure VI), and differences between the strength and representation of the small parties combined at national and provincial elections (tables VII and VIII). Table IX and figure X give a further breakdown in three categories: religious, left-wing, and right-wing and interest parties respectively.

In a final section an attempt is made to explain the splinter party phenomenon in the light of certain strains in the party system in general. Certain typical tensions result from intolerant dogmatism ('integralism') and from the tendency to combine various ideological traditions (oecumenical tendencies); from interest conflicts whether they be within an ideological group or across various ideological boundaries; and from antisystem-movements which may be located at either extreme or at the center of the political spectrum.

HOUSING POLICY IN THE NETHERLANDS SINCE THE WAR

by G. Kuypers en P. J. Duiker

The article analyzes the Netherlands government policy on housing. The term 'policy' is defined as the art of stating general purposes for a grouping, selecting ways, means and dates, and promoting the achievement of the selected purposes along the selected ways, with the selected means and at the selected times.

A survey was held among persons closely involved in housing policy. It appeared that party preferences play a role in the judgment of housing policy: thus, it seemed expedient to classify the respondents in 'socialistic thinking', 'non-socialistic thinking' and 'others'. It was possible to test hypotheses about inertia phenomena in political schemes by asking the respondents to judge purposes and means of the housing policy in the years 1945–1965. Means created in times when post-war purposes were valid were continued in new situations, while new purposes were not always considered. Hypotheses were tested on differences of opinion concerning the intended or unintended effects of particular means.

The study always stresses the fact that political science does not pretend to tell what a policy should be. It only tries to acquire knowledge about actual policy.

One of the most important means used in housing policy is government approval. The perception and use of government approval are analyzed in the light of relevant purposes. It is not surprising that no clear image of government approval could be discovered, as a change of situation apparently does not imply an automatic reconsideration of the entire political scheme. The factors of 'policy adaptation', 'expectations' and 'principles' appear to play an important role in housing policy.

THE FUNCTIONAL APPROACH OF G. A. ALMOND
IN COMPARING POLITICAL SYSTEMS

by Constance E. van der Maesen and G. H. Scholten

The purpose of comparative research on political systems is to gain a deeper insight in political reality by the discovery and interpretation of similarities and differences.

This article contains a critical appraisal of a recent and promising approach in this field: G. A. Almond's 'Introduction' to *The Politics of Developing Areas*, Princeton N. J., 1960.

The functional approach enables us to compare western and non-western systems in terms of a common conceptual framework. It is more free from over-emphasis on formal institutions than the traditional approaches. There are, however, theoretical as well as practical objections to the framework offered by Almond.

Almond does not offer a clear theoretical reason for selecting particular functions. The distinction between the output-functions (rule-making, rule-application and rule-adjudication) is no great improvement over the traditional distinction between legislative, executive and judicial powers. Almond, however, concentrates on the input-functions. He thereby underestimates the importance for the political system of the making of binding decisions.

When Almond's scheme is applied to existing systems, it becomes very difficult to distinguish political socialization from recruitment. The distinction between interest articulation and interest aggregation depends on the level of decision-making. The communication function is all-pervading. Most cabinet decisions, for example, are mixtures of communication, articulation, aggregation, rule-making and rule-application. The functions described in the 'Introduction' are not made operational: no suggestions as to possible indicators are offered; no way to gauge how much a particular function is fulfilled by a particular structure is indicated.

These questions must be solved before Almond's scheme may become a useful tool in comparative research.

THE UNITED STATES
AND PROBLEMS OF NATIONAL SELF-DETERMINATION:
ROLL-CALL ANALYSIS IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

by P. R. Baehr

Since the Second World War the United States has continuously faced a great dilemma in its foreign policy with regard to problems of national self-determination. Should it support its traditional European allies or the new nations of Asia and Africa whenever a problem of self-determination came up for debate? Various authors have expressed various opinions as to how the United States has answered that question. Some think that the United States has always supported the anti-colonial point of view (see for examples, notes 2 and 3); others think that the United States has usually supported the colonial point of view (see note 4); still others contend that the United States took a position somewhere in between (see note 5). It is also often assumed that the United States delegation abstained more often on such items than other delegations (see note 17).

This study compares the position taken by the United States in roll-call votes on questions of national self-determination, during the first fourteen sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, with the position of four West-European, six Afro-Asian states and the Soviet Union. It also examines a number of methodological problems encountered in conducting this type of research, such as: which roll-calls should be selected; can one make a general distinction between 'colonial' and 'anti-colonial' votes; which states should be selected for comparison; which bodies of the United Nations should be preferred. The general conclusion is that during the first fourteen sessions of the General Assembly the United States supported the position taken by the Western European states on questions of national self-determination more often than that taken by the Afro-Asian states. The United States and the Soviet Union were nearly always in opposition when such questions were put to a roll-call vote. The assumption that there had been an unusually high rate of abstentions in the United States roll-call votes on matters of national self-determination was not proved to be correct.

STANLEY HOFFMAN VERSUS MORTON KAPLAN

by A. de Swaan

The study of international relations, as all new branches of knowledge, presents the scholar with a dilemma: should he concentrate on general theory-formation or give priority to the collection of facts and the formulation of conclusions with restricted validity? In the United States a number of students opt for the former approach, using as tools mathematical and quasi-mathematical theories.

This article is a critical review of the objections raised by Stanley Hoffman in his *Contemporary Theory in International Relations* against Morton A. Kaplan. Both Kaplan and Hoffmann want an empirical study of international relations, but they differ in their views on the desirability of a general and systematic theory at this stage.

In his *System and Process in International Relations* Kaplan constructs six models of international relations with the apparatus of Systems Theory: the 'balance of power' system, the contemporary 'loose bipolar system' and four others of a hypothetical nature, 'without counterpart in reality'. In subsequent chapters the author formulates hypotheses on the behavior of actors in the system and of regulation mechanisms. His purpose is the construction of models that 'aid progress in research' by presenting simplifying assumptions on reality.

To Hoffman this endeavor appears both inspired and frustrated by a misunderstanding of the natural sciences: social science cannot formulate laws, only suggest tendencies. Neither can it predict future events. Therefore the student of the social world should not try to make such forecasts. He rejects Kaplan's view that one can only proceed by formulating 'analytical' (in the sense of Arnold Brecht) conclusions from sets of hypotheses. For Hoffmann this yields no more than 'the sin of tautological prediction'. In his opinion, also, the necessary simplifications in the assumptions, quantifying or not, rob the theory of all realism. There is, furthermore, a hidden tendency to identify contemporary reality with the system and the system with the desirable state of affairs.

Those objections raised by Hoffmann are inadequately supported by quotations from Kaplan's text, or even refuted by them. Kaplan shows, especially in his introductory chapter, a keen awareness of the limits to predictability in natural as well as in social science; e.g. the dependence on specified conditions, the difficulty of treating elements in numbers that are neither very small nor very large. These restrictions are even more acutely felt in the social sciences.

MEDEWERKERS AAN DIT NUMMER

Dr. P. R. Baehr studeerde politieke en sociale wetenschappen aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam en Georgetown University in Washington D. C. Aan de laatste universiteit promoveerde hij in 1964 op *Dilemmas in United States Foreign Policy in the United Nations with regard to Problems of National Self-Determination*. Hij werkte mee aan *Kiezer en Verkiezing*, Amsterdam, 1963 en *Pressiegroepen in de E.E.G.*, Deventer, 1965. Hij is als medewerker verbonden aan het Instituut voor Wetenschap der Politiek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Prof. Dr. H. A. Brasz werd gevormd in een aantal praktische functies in openbare dienst en studeerde vervolgens sociale wetenschappen aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, waar hij in 1961 promoveerde op *Veranderingen in het Nederlandse Communalisme*, Assen, 1961. Hij is thans hoogleraar in de bestuurswetenschappen en de inleiding tot het staatsrecht aan de Vrije Universiteit en hoofd van de afdeling bestuurskunde van het Sociaal-Wetenschappelijk Instituut van de V.U. Andere publikaties: *Inleiding tot de Bestuurswetenschappen*, Arnhem, 1962, en *De Studie van het Openbaar Bestuur*, Alphen, 1964.

Prof. Dr. H. Daalder studeerde politieke en sociale wetenschappen aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam en de London School of Economics. Hij promoveerde in 1960 aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam op *Organisatie en Reorganisatie van de Britse Regering 1914—1958*, Assen, 1960. Van 1958 tot 1963 was hij als staflid verbonden aan het Institute of Social Studies in Den Haag. Thans is hij hoogleraar in de politieke wetenschap aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden. Publikaties o.a.: *The Role of the Military in the Emerging Countries*, Den Haag, 1962; 'Capitalism, Colonialism and the Underdeveloped Areas: The Political Economy of (Anti) Imperialism,' in: E. de Vries (ed.), *Essays on Unbalanced Growth*, Den Haag, 1962; *Leiding en Lijdelijkheid in de Nederlandse Politiek* (oratie), Assen, 1964; hoofdstuk over Nederland in: Robert A. Dahl (ed.), *Political Oppositions in Western Democracies*, New Haven, 1966.

Prof. Dr. H. Daudt studeerde politieke en sociale wetenschappen aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam, waar hij in 1961 promoveerde op *Floating Voters and the Floating Vote*, Leiden, 1961. Tot 1963 was hij medewerker aan het Instituut voor Perswetenschap aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam; sindsdien is hij hoogleraar in de wetenschap der politiek en directeur van het Instituut voor Wetenschap der Politiek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam. Publikaties o.a.: 'Sociaal-Wetenschappelijke Bestudering van Politieke Verschijnselen,' in: *Het Conflict als Maatschappelijk Verschijnsel*, Utrecht, 1962; *Enige Recente Ontwikkelingen in de Wetenschap der Politiek* (oratie), Leiden, 1963.

P. D. Duiker studeert politicologie en is als assistent verbonden aan het Sociaal-Wetenschappelijk Instituut der Vrije Universiteit.

G. H. van Es studeert politieke en sociale wetenschappen aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam. Hij is als kandidaat-assistent verbonden aan het Instituut voor Wetenschap der Politiek, waar hij zich speciaal bezighoudt met het aanschaffingsbeleid van de bibliotheek.

Dr. A. Hoogerwerf studeerde politicologie aan de Vrije Universiteit, waar hij in 1964 promoveerde op *Protestantisme en Progressiviteit: Een Politicologisch Onderzoek naar Opvattingen van Nederlandse Protestanten over Verandering*