



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Summaries in English

N.A.

Citation

Summaries in English. (1968). Summaries in English. *Acta Politica*, 4: 1968/1969(1), 119-121.
Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3451095>

Version: Publisher's Version
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3451095>

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

één van de vele politieke rollen van het parlementslid, namelijk de vertegenwoordigende rol. Ondanks deze beperking onderscheidt Hoogerwerf niet minder dan 12 verschillende rolopvattingen (ietwat zwaar aangeduid als modellen). Allereerst presenteert hij een tweetal *besluitvormingsmodellen* uit de oude doos: het lastgevingsmodel (Rousseau) en het machtigingsmodel (Burke). Terecht constateert Hoogerwerf, dat deze rolopvattingen te eenzijdig gericht zijn op de besluitvorming. De relatie volksvertegenwoordiger/vertegenwoordigden omvat behalve besluitvorming ook raadpleging vooraf en verantwoording achteraf. Hij onderscheidt vervolgens een zevental, elkaar gedeeltelijk overlappende, *communicatiemodellen*: het steun- vs. het eisenmodel (Wahlke, maar vooral Easton), het eenheids- vs. het verscheidenheidsmodel en, als varianten op het laatste: het partijmodel en het belangengroepenmodel. Als variant op het eenheidsmodel noemt hij nog de makelaarsrol, een rolopvatting die zich richt op het in evenwicht brengen van verschillende belangen. Tenslotte noemt Hoogerwerf nog een drietal *beleidsmodellen*, in het bijzonder gericht op de gedragingen van het parlementslid ten opzichte van het overheidsbeleid, nl. het carrière-makersmodel, het oppositiemodel en het gouvernementele model.

Hoezeer elke rolopvatting op zich weer inviteert tot verdere verfijningen, blijkt bijv. uit Hoogerwerfs beschouwingen over het partijmodel.

Het partijmodel kent evenveel varianten als er categorieën van partijen zijn (men denke bijv. aan de representatie-, de integratie- en de communicatie-partijen). Het partijmodel kan voorts zowel met een lastgevings- als een machtigingsmodel samengaan. Maar ook als een parlementslid zich als lasthebber van zijn partij beschouwt, kan hij bij het woord partij nog aan heel verschillende dingen denken, aldus Hoogerwerf: het program, de leiding, de leden, de kiezers, bepaalde stromingen in de partij of bepaalde belangengroepen die met de partij verbonden zijn. Een materie die bij 'ontploffingen' nog wel eens ter sprake komt. Aan het slot van zijn speurtocht slaat Hoogerwerf zijn politicologische botaniseertrommel dicht met de verzuchting, dat hij nu nog niet veel verder is gekomen dan een nuancering van het begrip vertegenwoordiging. Hij kan dan ook niet nalaten om in de slotpagina's nog enkele grote lijnen te trekken. Maar juist na de verfijnde determinatie van varianten en subvarianten moet iedere poging om de veelheid van begrippen terug te voeren op enkele grondpatronen wel aanvechtbaar lijken.

Hoogerwerf onderscheidt er drie: het *autocratisch* model (een kruising van machtigingsmodel en het model van de neerwaartse communicatie), het *democratisch* model (lastgevingsmodel maal model opwaartse communicatie) en een gemengd model, dat Hoogerwerfs voorkeur blijkt te hebben. Afgezien van het feit, dat het gehanteerde begrippenpaar nogal zwart-wit is uitgevallen, kan een dergelijke twee-dimensionale hergroepering niet bevredigen, omdat diverse andere, in het voorgaande ontwikkelde dimensies (zoals het regerings- vs. oppositiemodel) nu buiten beschouwing blijven. Hoogerwerfs constructies zijn daardoor in de praktijk niet gemakkelijk te hanteren. Zo veronderstelt hij bijv. dat het democratisch model van de vertegenwoordigende rol van het parlementslid vaker zal voorkomen bij niet overbelaste dan bij wel overbelaste parlementsliden. Maar juist bij oppositionele kamerleden zou de 'opwaartse communicatie' wel eens een voorname bron van overbelasting kunnen zijn.

Resumerend kan men zeggen, dat Hoogerwerf de vertegenwoordigende rol van het parlementslid op uitstekende wijze heeft ontleed. Bij zijn — als voorzichtige toegift bedoelde — poging tot reconstructie is hij echter met enkele onderdeeljes blijven zitten. Voor denkers en/of discussianten over vernieuwing van onze democratie heeft Hoogerwerf echter belangwekkend en onontbeerlijk basismateriaal aangedragen.

E. VAN THIJN

SUMMARIES

BIJLMERMEER: A CASE STUDY IN DECISION-MAKING

by J. de Lange and L. M. A. Masset

The boundaries of municipalities in the Netherlands can only be altered by act of parliament. The article describes the decision-making process which resulted in the Bijlmermeerpolder being provisionally added to the municipality of Amsterdam. Up till then, this polder had constituted part of a municipality near Amsterdam and was planned as a new residential area for about a 100,000 people.

The problem was, should this project be realized as the responsibility of the Amsterdam city-government or as that of the authorities of a new municipality to be founded in the Bijlmermeerpolder.

The city-government held the opinion that only the first solution could render satisfactory results and therefore campaigned for annexation. It was argued that only Amsterdam was technically and administratively equipped for this task. The Minister of the Interior took the second view; he considered it in favour of local democracy to found a new and relatively small municipality.

The local authorities and pressure groups in Amsterdam and some directly interested municipalities tried to influence parliament and the parliamentary parties during the years of discussion on the repeatedly modified bill.

The authors regard the administrative arrangement of an expending metropolitan area as a political problem, since the entire area is the scene of the economic, social and cultural life of the residents, whereas they are politically relevant in only part of it, namely the municipality they happen to live in. This problem was hardly touched upon in the discussion on the Bijlmermeerpolder. The dimension in the largest parliamentary group has contributed to the focusing of attention on technical and managerial matters.

The decision which was finally reached may be considered as a specimen of incremental or marginal decision-making.

THE CONCEPT OF 'UNAMBIGUITY' IN DUTCH POLITICS AN ATTEMPTED OPERATIONALISATION

by A. A. J. Jacobs and W. Jacobs-Wessel

Two out of several possible interpretations of 'unambiguity' in Dutch multi-party politics have been chosen for operationalisation.

The nine most important political parties were ranked accordingly.

The first operational definition is in terms of the 'recognizability' of the party standpoints, the second considers the political 'colour' of the parties.

One hundred and twelve respondents had to recognise the standpoints of the parties on the most important issues of the 1967 general election campaign.

Two hundred and nineteen people ranked the parties from left to right.

According to the first operationalisation a party is the more 'unambiguous' the better its standpoints are recognised; according to the second a party is the more 'unambiguous' the better the respondents agree on its location on the left-right dimension.

WHICH PEOPLE AND WHICH PARTIES STAND BETWEEN LEFT AND RIGHT?

by J. Stapel

In april 1968 a nationwide sample was asked to rate political parties, politicians and itself on an Osgood scale running from extremely left to extremely right. The arithmetic means for the position of the parties (table 1) and of the politicians (table 2) show the familiar pattern, but cell scores indicate that the meaning of the terms 'left' and 'right' is not unequivocal. In table 5 and 7 respondents' rating of themselves and ratings of the parties they would vote for, are compared. Though absolute numbers in the subdivisions are small, there is some tentative evidence that the P.v.d.A. (Labour Party) and the A.R.P. (Anti Revolutionary Party) are seen as tending more to the left than their voters while the K.V.P. (Catholic People's Party) and the V.V.D. (People's Party for Freedom and Democracy) are seen as being more to the right than their voters. In May 1968 another nationwide sample was asked to define the terms 'left' and 'right'. Thirty-six percent did not give an answer; the obtained answers show a variety of meanings, the term 'left' being most frequently associated with 'socialist/communist', the term 'right' with 'Christian religion/religious parties'.

POLITICAL SCIENCE — THE PROBLEM OF A DEFINITION

by J. K. de Vree

The definition of a particular science is necessarily based upon certain pre-suppositions — which often remain implicit — concerning the way to approach reality or that part of it which can be isolated as the subject matter of that science. Consequently, the importance of an inquiry into this problem lies just as much in the delimitation of *what* to study as in the question of *how* to study it. It is argued that far from being an independently existing entity, reality is to be conceived as a *construction* of man's knowing mind. Knowledge consists of giving a definite and reliable form to sensory experiences through the formation of concepts and relationships in order to answer questions or to solve problems posed by man with regard to certain initially formed concepts. Reality consists of everything which has a status and function in such constructions. While sensory experiences as such are to be postulated as independently given, their content and form are not. Instead, these and our reality as a whole are the products of the long history of human evolution. Knowledge progresses through the solving of problems originated in an earlier phase, thus leading to another structuring of our experiences and the formation of a somewhat different reality. Thus science consists of the self-conscious construction of a particular reality serving the understanding of a well-defined problem. That problem is generated by, and derives its significance from, the reality of everyday life. Defining our science means to give an 'explication' of 'politics', as it poses a significant problem in everyday life, and is to serve as the starting-point for the construction of a particular political-scientific reality.

Considering that human life implies the striving for the realization of values, which takes place in and is dependent on social interactions, this problem is then defined as the fact that authoritative allocation of values for the participants in such interactions will necessarily and inevitably take place. It is finally argued that it is both necessary and scientifically fruitful to give political science

a wide scope: as regards the participants in the interactions (groups or individuals), the character of the interactions (international, state, or non-state) and the way in which allocations take place (institutionalized or not).

ELECTORAL SYSTEMS AND COOPERATION BETWEEN POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE NETHERLANDS

by D. Boonstra

An answer is sought to the following two questions: (1) what is the influence of the electoral system on the cooperation between political parties and (2) how do the voters get an opportunity — in case of party-cooperation — to influence cabinet formation and cabinet policy?

After a brief survey of electoral systems, the following four of these are closely analyzed: proportional representation as it exists today in the Netherlands, proportional representation within several independent districts (a moderate form of proportional representation) relative majority system within triple districts, (triple district system) and the absolute majority system within single districts with the possibility of a second round (district system).

The assumption is made that political parties will cooperate only if they can thus gain more seats than they would if they fought the election on their own. The author then reaches the following conclusions:

(1) If proportional representation in the Netherlands is changed into some form of district system, chances will increase that the political parties will cooperate. This does not mean, however, that the influence of the voters with regard to cabinet formation and cabinet policy will increase at the same time. (2) That influence could only increase if formation and policy of the next cabinet are made into an issue at the elections. This means that a number of political parties would have to form a nation-wide combination, which would fight the elections on a clear and workable platform. Chances that the latter would happen, would diminish, if a form of district system were introduced in the Netherlands.