



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Summaries in English

N.A.

Citation

Summaries in English. (1978). Summaries in English. *Acta Politica*, 13: 1978(4), 570-573. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3451941>

Version: Publisher's Version
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3451941>

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

Property, Exploitation, Justice: An Inquiry into their Relationship in the Work of Nozick, Rawls, and Marx

by Robert J. van der Veen

The article represents an attempt to analyze the relationship between different conceptions of social justice and ideas on property rights. After some basic concepts have been clarified in Part I, Robert Nozick's *Anarchy, State and Utopia* and John Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* are compared in Part II. The analysis turns on an interpretation of social justice as distributive justice in which special attention is paid to the different kinds of distributional entities which may be distributed among the members of society: (property) rights, opportunities, economic goods, economic welfare, and the capacity to derive economic welfare from the productive use or consumption of goods. While many comparisons of distributive evaluations in various theories of justice assume implicitly that the respective entities of distribution are directly comparable, it is argued here that such theories typically define their own morally most relevant type of distributive variable. In Nozick this appears to be the Lockean property right of self-ownership; in Rawls it is 'expectations of life', to which various primary goods are then related. When one takes account of the fundamentally different distributive concerns expressed by these entities, the respective positions of the two authors on admissible systems of property rights can be fully explained.

Part III examines the justice-property nexus in the work of Karl Marx. Given the fact that Marx has a definite theory of property relations but did not formulate an explicit normative theory of social justice — the latter concept being regarded by him as an ideological derivative of the prevailing economic structure — the direction of inquiry is reversed.

Instead of arguing from justice to property, the argument proceeds in two steps. First, the role of property rights in Marx's theory of exploitation is treated. Secondly, it is asked whether the Marxian account of capitalist exploitation can be taken to contain certain criteria of injustice.

Notwithstanding the negative answer to this question given in well documented interpretations of Marx's critique of justice (Dahrendorf, Tucker, Wood), it is maintained that given a broader definition of distributive justice than the one adopted by Marx, he certainly may be said to have an implicit substantive conception of justice which is indeed in part based on his theory of capitalist exploitation. Although this procedure does not yield determinate principles of justice, it does identify some relevant entities of distribution (rights of use of socially owned capital,

democratic political rights, access to skills and most importantly: humane work) that play a major role in a reconstructed Marxian theory of justice.

The Correlates of War Project: international relations as quantitative history

by Henk W. Houweling and Jan G. Siccama

This article discusses some theoretical and methodological aspects of the publications by the Correlates of War Project, the research group at the University of Michigan headed by J. David Singer.

For the theoretical orientation of the COW-group four choices with respect to issues in the study of international relations are considered fundamental:

- 1 Emphasis on the comparability instead of the uniqueness of wars;
- 2 The view on wars as (sometimes unintended) outcomes instead of instruments consciously used by policy-makers in order to attain national goals;
- 3 The differentiation between various levels of analysis corresponding with discernible acting units instead of the study of foreign policy or the application of systems analysis to social phenomena without being able to specify which acting units are performing the functions the system 'should' be able to fulfil;
- 4 Use of history for constructing an empirical domain as well as a source for constructing rivalizing hypotheses.

Next the research designs (diachronic as well as synchronic) utilized by the COW-researchers are described systematically. Investigations at the national level of analysis are principally of a cross-sectional nature, which does not allow for conclusions about the development of the phenomena in time. Investigations at the level of the international system utilize time-ordered data. But the chronological ordering of those data is not made the most of since only the connection between the series is computed, while multiple time series analysis would be required. This criticism is also referred to by Job and Ostrom in their appraisal of the research design and the philosophy of science of the COW-project. Job and Ostrom's contribution was published in combination with Duvall's criticism of methodological and statistical procedures and Starr's review of substantive findings in the volume *Quantitative International Politics. An Appraisal*, edited by Francis W. Hoole and Dina A. Zinnes in 1976. However, the present authors think that Job and Ostrom's plea for 'theorizing' fails to appreciate the *ex post facto*-nature of most social research, which makes the COW-studies quite different from the pure laboratory experiment. Thus conceived, their criticism cannot but be considered a cheap shot, especially when considering the deplorable state of research into the causes of war generally.

After presenting various other criticisms which were raised against the Project, the present authors conclude to three main weaknesses:

- 1 The treatment of the time variable is, as mentioned before, unsatisfactory;
- 2 Singer's claim that the results of bivariate studies will have a theoretical spin-off for multivariate models is neither warranted nor sustained by the factual research in the COW-Project;
- 3 While agreeing with the rejection of the concepts of 'structural violence' and 'positive peace' by the COW-researchers, one would welcome the possibility of studying colonialism and imperialism since these phenomena seem extremely relevant for the time span since 1816. This would necessitate the addition of variables indicating the territorial expansion of states and the military capacity of

'non-states' to the conceptual framework of the COW-Project. Despite these criticism, the judgement of the publications of the COW-group is very positive. The authors are especially attracted by the agnosticistic and qualitative orientation of the COW-research.

The structure of the progressive-conservative controversy; (II) A structural analysis of ideological developments in the Netherlands, 1970-1975

bij C. P. Middendorp

The stability of dimensions within progressive-conservative domains, which were found in 1970 in the Dutch populations, has been tested in 1975. Relative structural stability was found in a context of substantial positional change along most dimensions.

The three philosophies of conservatism, liberalism and socialism reappeared in 1975 with only slight modifications and almost all attitude scales proved to be very stable in terms of their scale-coefficients. The ideological domain — 22 attitude scales in the areas of socio-economic government policies, non-economic politics, family life, sexuality and religion, 2 single items and the 3 philosophies- proved to be *relatively* stable. The major development has been the increased *ideological* nature of the left-right dimension. No such development took place along the libertarian-traditional dimension and the authoritarian subdimension became somewhat less stable.

Results have been interpreted in terms of (a) the appearance of the Den Uyl administration in 1973, (b) policies followed by Christian-democrats and social-democrats during cabinet formation of 1977 and (c) socio-economic developments during the period under investigation. The rather fundamental nature of the dimensions of ideological controversy within progressive-conservative domains has been confirmed.

Cabinet formation in The Netherlands and the concept of 'majority'

by J. Th. J. van den Berg

The concept of 'majority-' as legitimation in the formation of cabinets in the Netherlands is used at three different levels. The question arises as to which possible coalition the majority of *voters* have given their support, even though, because of the multi-party system of the Netherlands, elections afford no opportunity of determining the existence of such a majority. The extent to which a majority in *parliament* and to what extent a majority of *ministers* of a specifically defined political leaning can be found are questions of importance in the process of formation.

This discussion has been brought about by those who in the 60's, against the prevailing tradition, pleaded for the formation of a majority prior to the elections. It has taken on a greater importance since progressive elements, the social-democratic Labour Party (PvdA) in particular, sought to achieve a majority position during the the 1977 cabinet formation. After the Van Agt coalition of christian-democrats and liberals had been formed a lively discussion arose as to whether or not this coalition was supported by a majority in parliament.

Survey research shows that a rather stable relative majority of voters can be found favoring a cabinet of christian-democrats and social-democrats. This support varies somewhat, but is generally about 50 % of the electorate. However, the voters have

proven quite flexible in supporting cabinets based upon coalitions other than that which they had preferred.

Despite the calls for change, formation of a majority coalition occurs only after the elections and has often proven to be quite diffuse in character. The 'supporting' parties in parliament have shown a tendency to hold considerable reserves with regard to a new cabinet. In assessing the support for the cabinet, the margin of tolerance held by the respective parties has proven a more important criterium than the willingness to take a positive approach. This gives the parliamentary opposition relatively large possibilities for influencing governmental policy.

Majorities of ministers within the cabinet have proven to be of no importance, unless this majority cuts across party lines. Except in quite exceptional circumstances, parties are not able to push through decisions via a majority in the cabinet.

Majorities in The Netherlands are constructions of political minorities, and as such not constructed upon the hearty support of these minorities but upon their 'tolerance' of one another. A majority in the government, and to a degree also in parliament and in the electorate, is only as strong as the minorities allow it to be.