



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## Summaries in English

N.A.

### Citation

Summaries in English. (1969). Summaries in English. *Acta Politica*, 4: 1968/1969(2), 224-226.

Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3451125>

Version: Publisher's Version

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3451125>

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

## SUMMARIES

### THEORISTS VERSUS BEHAVIORISTS

Some aspects of a contrast within American political science

by A. de Swaan

The development of a strict methodology of observation and analysis in social science has always met with resistance. In the current debate on this topic in the United States two positions can be distinguished.

There are the 'theorists', who find their inspiration in the work of recent philosophers such as Marcuse and Sartre; they rate the formation of a political theory as a first priority. And there are the 'behaviorists', whose first care is for scientific method. This contrast is reviewed on the basis of the document *Political science at Berkeley*, which was published anonymously by a group of students. The criticism of these students can be summarized under the headings 'commitment' and 'relevance'. As far as commitment is concerned the critics reproach the behaviorists for not taking stands in important contemporary moral issues, and for identifying with the *status quo*. The author argues that what leads to acceptance of and identification with the existing political order, is not behaviorist methodology as such, but rather the mood of the behaviorists.

As far as 'relevance' is concerned, the critics are impatient with the futile detail analysis and data collecting of the behaviorists. The behaviorists' use of a strict methodology of explanation by generalisation, leads to a reduction of the scope of analysis. And then only the 'easy' aspects ('easy' to quantify, 'easy' to collect, etc.) are analyzed, and discontinuous developments are neglected. The author argues that the lack of a dynamic theory of the political process is an impediment indeed for political science, but that, again, behaviorism as such cannot be accused of being 'conservative' or 'conformistic': the refutation of race theories for example was rather a radical undertaking. It is concluded that for the time being it is not necessary to lay other bounds on political science than those that follow from the claims of rational debate and intellectual honesty.

### DIPLOMACY: AN ORGANISATION IN TRANSITION

by J. Niezing

Any organization can be described in terms of internal and external functioning. There are clear connections between the two, and these connections become the more apparent in cases of rapid structural change. Hence structural changes within organizations can be tackled, sociologically, by analyzing these dynamic inter-relationships.

In this article an effort is made to study the foreign service from this point of view. Diplomatic organizations exercise some political functions; part of these political functions are policy-functions. As far as these are concerned, a distinction can be made between information, persuasion and advising (functions). Due to a number of external factors (such as improvement of communications, rise in the number of states, growth of the importance of multilateral negotiating activities, etc.) some shifts occur in the importance of these functions as a whole — as compared with those of competing organizations — as well as in the relative strength of each of them.

At the same time some important changes in the internal functioning of diplomatic organizations manifest themselves. Almost all foreign services are subject in several ways to a process of internal differentiation. These processes have to be examined carefully in order to be able to understand some problems the foreign service is faced with nowadays. Part of these problems have a temporary nature and can be understood as 'resistances to change'; another part however, can be expected to have a more permanent character. All in all, these problems can be described in terms of 'basic dilemmas' facing the organization as well as the profession. As such, three 'dilemmas' are mentioned here, and they are indicated as conflicts between 'elite orientation' versus 'structure orientation' (Galtung), 'generalism' versus 'specialist orientation', and 'bureaucratism' versus 'intermediarism'. Each of these three dichotomies is described in detail; these descriptions served as the main purpose of this study. At the end of the study a number of relations between organizational differentiation (types of specialists, types of career expectations, educational backgrounds etc.) and divergences of professional orientations are indicated, hypothetically. It is suggested that almost all diplomatic organisations may be described in terms of these three basic dilemmas.

### METHODOLOGY OF DETERMINING POSITIONS IN THE U.N.O. BY ROLL CALL ANALYSIS

The Netherlands and the Question of Apartheid in the General Assembly,  
1952–1956

by W. M. Mazee

The position of a country in the General Assembly is defined as the whole of formal utterances of that country in the General Assembly in terms of pro or contra something or somebody. While 'position' as such shows how pro or contra a country is, it is argued that it makes more sense to compare the position of one country with the positions of other countries.

In the General Assembly a country can sponsor, speak or vote. It is argued that the best way to determine the position of a country is by using roll calls. The implications of selecting a number of roll calls for analysis — as is usually done — are discussed; the author defends his view that no selection should take place and that *all* roll calls should be used for the analysis. Another problem discussed is how to select a panel of countries. This selection depends upon the question studied, and on this basis the author indicates which countries should be represented in the panel, in order to study the position of the Netherlands with regard to the apartheid question.

As to the problem of quantifying voting behavior, two techniques are distinguished, i.e. that of Alker and Russett (*World Politics in the General Assembly*, New Haven etc., 1965), and that of Lijphart ('The Analysis of Bloc Voting in the General Assembly: A Critique and a Proposal', *American Political Science Review*, 57 (1963) and others who compare the percentage agreement between pairs of states. The implications of both techniques are discussed.

The apartheid question is discussed against the background of these methodological studies. Of all countries in the General Assembly to take a position on this question, the Western countries most approximated the South African position. The Netherlands took a middle-of-the-road position, showing more agreement with South Africa than for instance Denmark, Italy and the United States, and showing less agreement than Belgium, France and Great Britain.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE NETHERLANDS PARLIAMENT,  
1965-1967

by C. H. van Alderwegen

A comparison is made of the average age and length of membership of members of parliament in 1965 and 1967.

Average age has decreased in the Second Chamber (table 1) and increased in the First Chamber (table 5).

Table 2 and 6 give subdivisions by party and agegroups for the Second resp. the First Chamber.

Average length of membership has decreased in the Second Chamber (table 3, subdivisions in table 4) and has increased in the First Chamber (table 7, subdivisions in table 8).

TER RECENSIE ONTVANGEN PUBLIKATIES

De redactie kan zich door gebrek aan plaatsruimte gedwongen zien niet alle ontvangende publikaties te doen recenseren en behoudt zich het recht voor uit onderstaande lijst zo nodig een keuze te maken. Daarbij zal voorrang worden gegeven aan Nederlandse politicologische publikaties en aan werken die in het algemeen van belang zijn.

- Anwar, Yozar, *Dagboek van een kami-student*. Meppel (Boom), 1968. -134 p. f 7,50 (vert. door Beb Vuyk).
- Barros, James *The Aland Islands Question*. Its settlement by the League of Nations. New Haven etc. (Yale U.P.), 1968. -362 p. 90 sh.
- Boukema, P. J., *Vragen van partijrecht*. Alphen a/d Rijn (Samson), 1968. -43 p. f 5,-.
- Daalen, P. van, *Wij Nederlanders*. Een sociologische verkenning. Utrecht (Aula-boeken), 1967. -256 p.
- Ehrmann, Henry W. *Politics in France*. A country study. Boston (Little Brown and Comp.), 1968. -368 p.
- Fenno Jr., R. F., *The power of the purse*. Appropriations politics in Congress. Boston etc., 1967. -704 p.
- Kleijn, A., *Beleid en wetenschap*. Alphen a/d Rijn (Samson), 1968. -72 p. f 6,90.
- Kruijjer, G. J., *Cuba*. Voorbeeld en uitdaging. Amsterdam (Polak & Van Gennep), 1968. -146 p. f 6,50.
- Lafeber, C. V., *Nieuw-Guinea en de Volkskrant*. Assen (Van Gorcum) 1968. -135 p. f 14,75 (Polemologische Studiën, 9).
- Mackintosh, J. P., *The British cabinet*. London (Methuen), 1968 (2nd ed.). -651 p.
- Pesonen, Pertti, *An election in Finland*. Party activities and voter reactions. New Haven etc. (Yale U.P.), 1968. -146 p. 112 sh. 6 d.
- Polak, F. L., *Prognostica*. Deventer (Kluwer), 1968. f 90,-.
- Rapport - Eerste - van de Staatscommissie van advies inzake de Grondwet en de Kieswet*. Den Haag, 1968. -94 p. f 5,20.
- Sharp, Paul, *Communism and the Yugoslav national question*. New York etc. (Columbia U.P.), 1968. -38 p. 86 sh.

Waleffe, Bernard, *Some constitutional aspects of recent cabinet development in Great-Britain and in Belgium*. Prime Ministers position and Cabinet committees. Brussel (Emile Bruylant), 1968. -210 p. Bfr. 480.

Wilson, F. M. G., *The organization of British central government, 1919-1964*. London (Allen & Unwin), 1968 (2nd. ed.). -521 p. 55 sh.

Zijlstra, Bernard, *From pluralism to collectivism*. The development of Harold Laski's political thought. Assen (Van Gorcum), 1968. -236 p. f 25,90.

MEDEWERKERS AAN DIT NUMMER

Dr. M. Albrecht promoveerde in 1960 aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam op *De invloed van het kiesstelsel op de samenstelling van de volksvertegenwoordiging en op de vorming van de regering*. Amsterdam, 1960.

C. H. van Alderwegen studeert rechten aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden met als hoofdvak staatsrecht.

Prof. dr. C. Boekestijn is hoogleraar in de sociale psychologie aan de Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam.

Dr. W. Drees was van 1948 tot 1958 ministerpresident en is vanaf 1958 minister van staat.

Dr. A. Hoogerwerf is lector in de politicologie aan de Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam. Hij is redacteur van ACTA POLITICA.

Dr. I. Lipschits is medewerker bij het Nederlandsch Genootschap voor Internationale Zaken te Den Haag.

W. M. Mazee studeert politicologie aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam. In het kader van zijn doctoraalstudie schreef hij een scriptie over *Nederland en de Apartheidskwestie*.

Dr. J. Niezing studeerde sociale wetenschappen aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen en promoveerde in 1962 aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht op *Functies der sociologie*. Beschouwingen over haar betekenis voor wetenschap en samenleving. Meppel, 1962. Hij is thans lector in de politieke sociologie aan de KMA te Breda. Publicaties o.a. *Onheilsprofetie en radicalisme*, Assen 1965; *Inleiding tot de politieke sociologie*, Assen, 1966; *Aufgaben und Funktionen der Soziologie*, Köln, 1967. Hij is redacteur van MENS EN MAATSCHAPPIJ.

Drs. A. Nuis is wetenschappelijk medewerker voor moderne Nederlandse letterkunde aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden.

Drs. A. de Swaan studeerde politieke en sociale wetenschappen aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam. Hij verbleef van 1966 tot 1968 op een Harkness Fellowship in de Verenigde Staten. Hij bereidt thans een proefschrift voor over coalitievorming.

Drs. H. H. van der Wusten is wetenschappelijk medewerker bij het Sociaal-geografisch Instituut van de Universiteit van Amsterdam.