

Recent electoral development in the Netherlands in perspective

The spectacular results of the recent municipal elections (March 2002) and the equally spectacular position of the Pim Fortuyn List in the pre-General Election polls have caused the debate on the tenability of our system of representative democracy to flare up again. There is even some talk of the bankruptcy of our political democracy.

Following Pim Fortuyn's murder on May 6th, 2002, nine days before the general elections on May 15th, these facts have taken on a special significance, resulting in a detailed discussion of our democratic system. In themselves, however, they do not justify talk of the end of representative democracy. Whatever we may think about their programmes, there are new political movements within the democratic system reflecting the views or interests of sections of the population who clearly did not feel they are properly represented by the existing parties. Looked at in this light the rise of these new political groupings is evidence of the vitality of the democratic system rather than its bankruptcy.

At the same time, however, the new political movements do reflect the evident discontent among large sections of the population about the way our political system works, the loss of function the parties have suffered and the longstanding trend for voters to base their political preferences more on personalities, particular issues and eye-catching media presentations than on stable, like-minded, overall views of the public interest.

The debate following recent events ought therefore to be about the way our political system works and the function, or loss of function, of the parties in that system. This is not a new debate: it has been going on in academic and political circles for many years now(1). Indeed, the D'66 party (the left-wing Liberals) was founded 36 years ago with the express purpose of radically changing the democratic system. Ordinary citizens needed to be involved more directly in politics and to be able to exert a real influence on it; political decision-making needed to become more transparent; parties needed to have views and elected representatives that people could better identify with; and the primacy of politics needed to be restored. As we can see, none of this has happened.

What are the issues?

Election turnout is steadily declining: the turnout in the cities and provinces at the last municipal and provincial elections was generally below 50%. Only 2% of the electorate are members of a political party and no more than 10% of those members are in any way active in their party, influencing the election manifestos and lists of candidates on the basis of which political democracy and public administration are supposed to operate. On top of this - perhaps more importantly - in today's society and political culture the parties play only a limited role in the public debate on matters of public interest, the nature of society and how to solve a host of social issues. In other words, the parties are increasingly less able to develop coherent philosophies on matters of public interest or to inspire people to adopt communal standpoints on the kind of society they want, thus bridging the gap between individuals and public administration. This is making the support in society for government and governance weak and unstable.

The image of government in public opinion is increasingly influenced by incidents and topical management issues rather than important political choices. For many people it is losing its legitimacy as the body that defines the public interest after weighing up the various interests and opinions; increasingly it is just one of many interested parties in society. In a democratic system, however, the government is not just one organization among others, it is above all the expression of the social contract citizens have entered into among themselves to represent the public interest. In other words, democratic government, and the rule of law and welfare state created and guaranteed by it, are the foundations of a society not based on repression and violence; a society in which citizens, in freedom and equality, hand over part of their personal interests and income in exchange for sharing more security and equality under the law, safety and social security for all and for themselves than they could have achieved individually.

The effectiveness and legitimacy of government and governance in a democratic society thus depends largely on the trust government enjoys, the general public's involvement in and recognition of the public interest, the transparency of governance, and people's identification with the way government serves the public interest and their conviction that it takes their opinions and interests into account. In recent decades, however, these preconditions for an authoritative government accepted by broad sections of the population have been substantially undermined, resulting in growing alienation on the part of citizens in relation to government and politics.

Changing relationship in the social contract between state and citizens

This is largely due to the fact that the relationship between government and society, which underlies the traditional operation of the democratic system, at least in the Netherlands, has changed dramatically in just a few decades. People's attitudes to public administration have changed considerably, government has become bureaucratized and politics have been professionalized, both of them have become more difficult to identify with and more detached, and the legitimacy and acceptance of government and governance is something many people no longer take for granted. This is due mainly to certain developments in society itself, in politics and in public administration.

The root of many of these trends lies in the individualization of society, the articulacy that many citizens have developed and the increased prosperity of large sections of society. Major social differences and conflicting interests have thus lost a lot of their sting. Many people no longer accept all-encompassing ideologies as a frame of reference for their views and conduct, and traditional social ties and the associated social alignments, which long acted as guides to action for groups of like-minded citizens with the same social interests and ideals and the glue that held them together, have begun to disintegrate.(3)

These social and cultural developments have in particular led to a change in the relationship between ordinary people and the government, going hand in hand, as they have done, with the 'statism' of society. There is greater urbanization, many social relationships have become functional and a host of public bodies have become professionalized. There has been a considerable increase in the number and size of public bodies, and a highly bureaucratic and anonymous network of social security and care guarantees has sprung up, along with a multiplicity of laws, regulations and procedures in many areas of private as well as public life. Many of these rules and regulations were introduced over the years with the best of intentions, to ensure that scarce resources in society are fairly distributed. But however laudable the intentions, in many cases they have resulted in an untransparent system of entitlements and obligations which many people no longer recognize as reflecting the social contract designed to provide solidarity and safeguard shared interests.

Alongside individualization and the creation of equal opportunities there has been collectivization and statism: these processes have conflicted with one another but also strengthened one another: individualization and equal opportunities are only possible in a society that guarantees security under the law and a certain degree of prosperity for all and provides public amenities that enable individuals to develop and live in freedom and safety. Guaranteeing these things, however, requires more and more rules and regulations that restrict individual freedom and responsibility, against which self-confident, articulate and emancipated citizens rebel, thus undermining the support for rules and regulations and for the public interest - a vicious circle that has produced a welfare state based on the rule of law but at the same time an individualized society with little social cohesion or shared ideals.

This is not to say that the general public have lost all social involvement or interest in public issues, as we can see from attendance at public participation meetings and the growing memberships of movements, campaign groups and target-driven organizations.(4) There is a trend, however, for this involvement to be more ad hoc and changing in nature and for it to be manifested more through issue-based organizations, movements and campaigns than through traditional, broad-based organizations. This 'societal centre field' has changed radically in a relatively short time: it has become less predictable and more fragmented, affecting the relationship between government and citizens through their organizations, support has to be continually sought for government policy, unlike before, and government has to 'feel its way'.

Important ties and channels of communication between government and society or individuals have been lost, and clear-cut frames of reference for citizens in relation to government and the public interest have gone. On top of this the authorities are increasingly faced with unclear and confusing, even contradictory, signals and expectations from society, as citizens often have a range of interests, even conflicting interests, and there are no longer any forums or frameworks where these interests and views can be weighed up and promulgated in a coherent manner. With the political system unable to bring order or direction to this chaos of desires and demands, the government's ability to gain support for policy decisions is declining and it finds itself the butt of constantly changing criticism.

Changing position of political parties

The political parties too, against the changing backdrop of 'depillarization' (the breakdown of the denominational system), individualization, de-ideologization and the blurring of class distinctions, are no longer able to act as a go-between between the general public and the government, a platform for opinion-forming on public issues and an integratory framework for joint action. The parties - some more than others - have suffered a considerable loss of function and consequently a growing failure to articulate distinctive philosophies on the public domain and the interests involved. A clear profile of this kind is essential if people are to identify with and have trust in government

and accept government action as a legitimate and reliable expression of their interests and the social contract. Without an identifiable philosophy on public issues, compromises are no longer recognized as striking a fair balance between different interests and views and expressing the public interest, but as arbitrary, incomprehensible decisions. Large sections of the population see no difference between the parties, and that has a major effect on their involvement with the democratic system and government. Politics and democratic government are primarily about choices, weighing up interests and values, and political democracy stands or falls by there being choices to be made and it being clear to the general public what the choices are - which is often no longer clearly the case.(6)

Politics and political choices have also become much less easy to identify with in recent decades because of the sharp decline in the primacy of politics in public decision-making due to various trends:(7) the internationalization of the economy, the increasing influence of Europe, privatization, functional devolution, the professionalization of society, legalization, the bureaucratization of policy and especially its implementation, and the growing complexity of social issues have narrowed the playing field for politics and political parties and the role of politics in society.

The way public administration operates has also been responsible for alienating government from its citizens. To many people government looks like a supermarket for public services run by a politico-bureaucratic complex -- an intricate network of officials, committees, mandates and rules. A complex in which input, political control, responsibility and power are scarcely identifiable. For many people government is no longer the political arena where arguments are exchanged in public, interests balanced against one another, standpoints formulated and compromises finally reached. It is not surprising, then, that many people see the political parties as being 'all tarred with the same brush', they no longer regard politicians as their representatives but as part of the government machinery, and they no longer feel that public administration is the arena where their interests and views are put into words and weighed up. Hence the general public are often no longer treated as 'electors' in the literal sense, as members of a community presented with choices, with all the consequences these entail for themselves and their fellow citizens. On the contrary, the choices are often not clear to people, so it is no wonder if they behave more and more like customers.

Many people no longer feel committed to the public interest and are critical of government and politics, even though about half of the electorate claim to be interested in politics and as many as half to two-thirds of the electorate claim to follow political developments in the press or on the radio or television.(8) There is now a split between interest in ad hoc political or public issues and acceptance of democratic government as the body that represents the public interest by weighing up particular interests and making choices. For many people government is now merely one party among others in the field of social forces: you make use of it if it is to your advantage, and you resist it if you think it is harming your interests or not doing them justice. The system of administrative law, originally intended to safeguard citizens against maladministration, is increasingly being used as a means of getting your own way if you are not satisfied with the democratic balance of interests.(9)

The steady crumbling of government's authority and status in society in relation to the public interest has resulted in the broadly-supported call from practically all the political parties - or at least the desire - to restore the primacy of politics. This desire, while justified in a democratic society, becomes strained and implausible if the primary aim is not to revitalize politics and the political parties themselves - of which there is not much evidence yet. The question, then, is whether this is possible and whether our familiar representative democracy based on political parties still provides an adequate and tenable system for public decision-making in an articulate, individualized, 'de-pillarized' and de-ideologized society.

Different visions on the evolution of democracy

The strongest exponent of such ideas in the Netherlands is undoubtedly Frissen.(10) He convincingly argues that the concept of central control of the public domain, supported by public opinion-forming and communal representation of interests in stable political groupings, has been considerably weakened by social trends such as individualization, professionalization, social and cultural diversity and fragmentation, the broad availability of information as a result of ICT developments, and the changes in public administration itself. These, he believes, have created a fragmented society without normative political centres, a republic of citizens in which consensus is reached on constantly changing matters of public interest by constantly changing groups of interested parties on a case-by-case basis, through debate, consultation and negotiation, and self-management and self-regulation. This, in his view, leaves the political parties with at most a procedural role: facilitating and encouraging the debate here and there, and occasionally making an invigorating contribution. They should certainly not claim to distil coherent philosophies from this for the purpose of public administration.

This Socratic model of right-thinking, well-informed citizens who reach public arrangements with one another in freedom and open debate looks attractive but is in fact very naive. It entirely ignores the fact that not everyone is informed in the same way and to the same extent and can take part in the debate, that self-interest is a not insignificant factor in society, and that power, and thus group-formation and the organization of like-minded people, plays an important role in the choices made regarding the nature of society. Democracy organized on

political lines is precisely how a modern, complex society tries to place limits on self-interest at the expense of other people and restrict the unbridled exercise of power by certain individuals. Debate, consultation and free exchange of ideas are certainly important preconditions for this, but as Tromp pointed out recently, they should lead to organized opinion-forming, and programmatic choices and recruitment of MPs and administrators based on this.(11) At the moment a party-less democracy seems to me to be an essentially academic, virtual construction, moreover not without danger to the orderly functioning of our political democracy and democratic government.

On similar lines In't Veld and Kruiter have recently argued in favour of an albeit less virtual but nonetheless extremely radical change in the democratic system and public decision-making.(12) They posit that the present territorially-based representative democracy is bankrupt for various reasons and needs to be replaced with interactive policy-making involving citizens, directly elected functional organizations in various fields, directly elected professional auditors or auditing bodies, and directly elected administrative bodies above all to guarantee the coherence of these functions and the 'process architecture' of interactive policy-making. A system, then, without general representative bodies and, as I deduce from their argument, without political parties whose function is to put forward programmes that integrate and inspire citizens.

Although, as will be clear from the foregoing, I largely agree with their diagnosis of the failure of our current system to function properly, it does not seem to me that their therapy would contribute to the revitalization of the political democracy or to the greater involvement of citizens in the public debate that they sincerely envisage. In my opinion their proposals would in fact adversely affect the working of an effective democratic system that people can identify with: first of all there is for instance the risk of a democracy of and for interested parties and the well-informed and well-educated, in which organized interests with power or financial muscle would play a dominant role.

In other words, the oft maligned 'polder model' would be replaced by government of and by the polder itself. The interests of socially weak or badly-organized groups of citizens would be in danger of being pushed onto the back burner, and they would be even more alienated from politics and government. The strong emphasis in In't Veld and Kruiter's proposals on electing personalities as administrators, auditors etc. would then result in a democracy based even more on personality, a battle between gladiators rather than between ideas and opinions on the nature of society, with all this entails when it comes to gaining the favour of voters.

This effect would moreover be intensified by the absence from their proposed system of general representative bodies, i.e. elected parliaments, that direct policy and exercise political control over it through the public exchange of opinion on the nature of society and by reaching majority standpoints in the public arena of a council or parliament. Public administration and public policy are thus in danger of becoming the exclusive province of professionals and technocrats, uncoupled from the normative political context that always underlies the representation of public interests. Because of this, and because of the prominent position of target-driven organizations in their proposals, the weighing-up of functional interests as part of setting a general political framework is largely lost, and there is the danger of policy becoming even more segmented.

A democratic system without general, elected representative bodies, based on political groupings of like-minded people, which through their programmatic function lend coherence, meaning and direction to the representation of public interests and recruit people who are willing and able to put this coherence and direction into practice in administration and in the political arena on a day-to-day basis, is lacking in the political dimension - i.e. the dimension based on values, opinions and interests - that is essential to public administration. Without a democratic system of this kind, public administration and democratic government are in danger of becoming unstable and taking on an arbitrary, ad hoc nature. But - as In't Veld and Kruiter point out - parliamentarians and political groupings must therefore exercise these functions properly and in a way that people can identify with, which they are currently not doing.

This in itself, however, is no reason, in my view, to write off the political organization of the democratic system and government based upon it as irrelevant, as Frissen does, or to radically rebuild and depoliticize it, as In't Veld and Kruiter seem to me to be doing. Given the importance of representative democracy to an orderly society we need rather to examine how the operation of the system, and of the political parties that are its foundation, can be improved under current social and cultural conditions, how we can modify them so that large sections of the population can again identify with them as expressing their interests and opinions and the social contract that binds them in the public interest.

Five proposals to revitalize multiparty democracy in the Netherlands

I should like to contribute five suggestions to the debate, without claiming to be exhaustive or to be presenting new ideas. The following elements could in my view considerably help to improve the way our democratic system and our administrative and political system work.

1. A serious attempt should be made *to bring the nature and modus operandi of the political parties into line with the changes in the electorate*, many of whom are more articulate now, clearly interested in ad hoc public issues but not having much need to identify with particular organizations, groups or ideologies.

Parties are nowadays no longer the guardians of ideologies or the representatives of stable, historically-rooted groups of like-minded people. In the circumstances they need to move towards being centres to encourage and facilitate the discussion of public issues by experts, those working in the particular field and groups of interested citizens. They need to bring programmatic coherence and consistency to the results of these debates and present the resulting proposals to those who have taken part and then to their members for approval. They also need to recruit people, from among those who have taken an active part in the debate, who are willing and able to put forward these proposals in their council or parliament and where possible translate them into policy, giving all their members an opportunity to elect their representatives to direct and oversee the policy as part of the programme. In other words the parties need to be much more open to interested citizens in both their policy-making and recruiting, and to keep extending their reach beyond the 2% of the electorate who are currently constitute their membership.

There are some interesting initiatives worth imitating and developing - for example the Labour Party's knowledge centres, and the Christian Democrats' facility for citizens to contribute ideas on items in the party programme via the Internet.

The parties also need to make real efforts to deal with people's specific needs and complaints. They should not just pass motions and amendments, they should stand side-by-side with citizens and help them when the bureaucracy or institutions are slow, unfair or deaf to their problems, as the Socialist Party does in a number of municipalities. In other words they should demonstrate in their day-to-day work what they stand for and help citizens confront the authorities or interest groups when there are abuses. They need to go into the communities, not to listen or to preach, but to help people and in the process gain the experience they need for their programmes and their political work.

2. The politicians and parties need *to restore the primacy of politics in matters of public interest*. This includes reconsidering the privatization of public bodies and thinking again about the general urge to roll back the frontiers of government.⁽¹⁴⁾ It also calls for a different style of governance, with the government consulting those concerned and seeking support for its policies in society while not being over-dependent on this. Government should enter into the consultation process more confidently, putting forward the political point of view, making it clear from the outset that the political democracy will ultimately make the decisions and it is willing to take the lead and settle matters if the consultations stagnate or fail to produce politically acceptable solutions. Consultation and advice, while worthwhile in itself, is too often used, at all levels of government, to postpone or avoid political decisions, making the government and the politicians look powerless and indecisive to many people and failing to make it clear what political choices need to be made.

If we are to restore the primacy of politics we also need a clearer separation between the administration and parliament, in other words a more dualistic relationship between them. This is often not the case in practice at local, provincial and national level. Government and politics have become synonymous for many people, whereas these are two related but separate functions in a democratic system. Government is responsible mainly for shaping and implementing policy, which it does, in a complex society such as ours, in coordination and consultation with other government bodies and organizations in society.

The function of politics is to set priorities and the direction of policy, based on philosophies of the kind of society we want, insofar as compromises acceptable to the majority can be reached while taking other views into account. In our system, however, politics has become bureaucratized and managerial, owing to the increasing monism between the government and the coalition parties; the growing intertwining of the bureaucracy and elected representatives; and the blurring of distinctions between political philosophies, inability to express these clearly or reluctance to do so in case it upsets the coalition. In other words politics, with government, has gone into the polder of official consultation and thus lost much of its distinctiveness and primacy.

Restoring the primacy of politics requires first and foremost clear manifestos from the politicians and parties, and elected representatives who do not behave like civil servants or administrators but act as advocates of the interests and views of sections of the population and are able to formulate the compromises they opt for clearly, and stand up for them in the public arena. In other words it requires not so much the stepping-up of central government control - though this may sometimes be necessary - as a political system, parties and politicians that again give meaning and direction to society and are able to win over and involve citizens for the achievement of ideals in the public domain.

3. Means need to be found whereby articulate *individuals can be more involved in, and exert influence on, the policies and policy-making of the various authorities*. Ways of doing this that could be developed include good interactive government;(15) introducing a popular initiative system, which would enable groups of people to place subjects for decision-making on the parliamentary agenda; and better use of referenda, putting alternatives with their pros and cons to the electorate.(16)

When it comes to increasing the involvement of the general public in policy, however, In't Veld and Kruitert's plea for forms of functional democracy provide interesting starting points - not as a replacement for the democratic system or separate from it, but within the political frameworks it provides, by analogy with the relationship between the water control corporations and the provinces. New democratic relationships of this kind are also conceivable in other areas, e.g. the police, the fire services, public utilities, education, transport, health care, and recreation and nature areas - functional organizations whose policies are influenced by directly elected councils within the policy frameworks laid down by the democratic system. This would enable interested citizens to be more directly involved in these public bodies' policy-making and implementation without taking them out of the integrated weighing-up of interests and options through the democratic system. I think it would be worthwhile to develop such hybrid forms of functional and general democracy and consider what effects they would have, as they could help to revitalize the democratic system, retaining its essential achievements, and directly involve the general public more in matters of public interest.

4. Stronger ties between the people and the politicians could also be brought about by *making voting easier and more attractive and changing the electoral system* so that there are more direct links between the voters and the people they elect.

A recent study of non-voters by the Social and Cultural Planning Office(17) showed that some voters claim they did not vote for various practical reasons, although there is some doubt as to whether these were the real reasons and whether removing these practical obstacles would substantially increase turnout.(18) Nevertheless it makes sense to bring the opportunities for voting into line with present-day conditions and make voting less restricted in terms of time and place, for example by keeping the polling stations open for several days, by providing the option of voting on the Internet with a unique personal code like that used by the Inland Revenue, and by making it much easier to vote at other polling stations, not just your local one. In an age when we can get money from a cash dispenser anywhere with a plastic card it must be possible to vote at other places than just the school round the corner.

More importantly, however, we need to change the electoral system so as to make the ties between voters and the people they elect stronger. Under our current system of proportional representation most candidates are not elected on their personal strength but in the slipstream of the party leader, hence the parties do not need to find people whom sections of the public can identify with to put on their lists of candidates, parliament is a collection of unfamiliar faces as far as a lot of the general public are concerned, and MPs wishing to be re-elected have to curry favour with the party leadership rather than the voters. Stronger ties between the voters and the people they elect could undoubtedly be achieved by introducing a constituency-based system, as for example in the UK, but this, as we know, has major drawbacks when it comes to fair representation.

To avoid the disadvantages of an entirely constituency-based system while still strengthening the ties between the voters and their elected representatives we could go for a mixed system, as in Germany, or a multiple-vote system, under which each voter casts two votes, one for a party and the other for a candidate of that party or another party. Each party is then allocated a number of seats in parliament corresponding to the number of times they achieved the quota with the first vote. The seats are assigned to those candidates who reached the preference threshold with the second vote, supplemented with candidates from the party's list in the order as shown on the list. This gives voters an influence on both policy and personnel; it invites them to express their preferences not only as to persons but also as to general policy. It also forces the parties to present clear profiles in terms of policy, not just to rely on the personality of the party leader but also to ensure that there are candidates on their lists that various target groups among the voters can identify with. I believe it would be worthwhile to analyse and develop an electoral system of this kind: on the one hand it could strengthen the ties between the voters and the people they elect; on the other hand it would be an obstacle to the over-personalization of democracy.(19)

5. Lastly, the nature of our domestic government and the political system that has grown up historically make it difficult for many people to follow public decision-making and shifts in political power in the Netherlands. The fact that the scale of municipalities and provinces does not correspond to the nature and scale of many public issues results in a host of complex, semi-democratic half-way houses and partnerships in which democratic responsibility and accountability gets lost, as far as many people are concerned, including the administrators themselves.(20)

Many functional public organizations that are not coordinated with one another and not geared to the scale of the democratic system escape transparent democratic influence and supervision. At national level the horde of separate ministries, the many devolved government agencies and independent administrative bodies make integrated and effective governance more difficult. This reduces the effectiveness and decisiveness of policy - as is only too clear from policy e.g. on the cities, the integration of minorities, major accidents, and educational deprivation among certain sections of the population - and makes it more difficult for both the general public and the administrators to have an overview of, and control over, democratic decision-making on many public issues.

This lack of unity and transparency in public administration, and the limited scope for the public to keep an eye on it, feel involved and make clear political choices are only aggravated by our multi-party system and the necessity of forming coalition governments and administrative bodies. The result of this political system is that citizens exert only a limited influence on who has political power, as this depends largely on the coalition-forming and bargaining that goes on following each general election. If policy is to be more effective, and above all if the democratic system is to be more transparent to voters, public decision-making more transparent and more accountable, and political power clearer and easier for voters to influence, we *need to reorganize our local, provincial and national systems of administration and plot our political landscape and political system afresh.*

The formation of a progressive people's party, for example, could make an important contribution to this. This and similar alliances of political groupings would also clear the way for the direct election of administrators and administrative bodies, which is not feasible in our coalition-based democracy, resulting in complex splits between government and parliament.(21)

These, then, are five sets of suggestions and considerations that could in my view help to revitalize our democratic system, or reduce the democratic deficit. They undoubtedly need to be examined and developed along with many others, and are intended solely as a stimulus to further debate and study.

J.A. van Kemenade, chairperson IMD.

Notes

1. See e.g. Parliamentary paper 26422 "Inrichting en functioneren van het binnenlands bestuur", February 1999 and A. Peper, "Op zoek naar samenhang en richting", The Hague, 1999.
2. See e.g. J.A. van Kemenade, "De overheid in niemandsland" in J.A. van Kemenade, "Democratie als opgave", The Hague, 2002, and J.A. van Kemenade, "De kwetsbare overheid" in Socialisme en Democratie, Vol. 56, November 1999.
3. Cf. D.M. Berkhout, "Overheid en middenveld in een ontzuilde samenleving" in RBB. "De ontzuiling voorbij". The Hague, 1996.
4. See SCPB, "25 jaar sociale verandering", Social and Cultural Rapport 1998, Rijswijk, 1998.
5. Raad voor het Binnenlands Bestuur (Local Government Council), "Besturen op de tast", The Hague, 1996.
6. Parts of the introduction are taken from my article "Een partijloze democratie?" in Jaarboek Parlementaire Geschiedenis 2000, Nijmegen, September 2000.
7. See J.A. van Kemenade, "Sneeuwwitje en de zeven dwergen" in "Democratie als opgave", op. cit., 2002.
8. See M. Metze et al., "De staat van Nederland", Nijmegen, 1996.
9. See J.A. van Kemenade and C.J.N. Verstedden, "Bestuur in geding", Haarlem, 1997.
10. See P. Frissen, "De virtuele Staat", Schoonhoven, 1996 and "Sturing en publiek domein", Amsterdam, 2000.
11. Tromp, "Een partijloze democratie" in De Gids, July 2000.
12. In't Veld and A.J. Kruijer, "Volksvertegenwoordiging moet worden afgeschaft", article in NRC Handelsblad, 22 March 2002.
13. See e.g. A. Peper, op. cit.; G. van Enthoven et al., "Open het politieke systeem", article in NRC Handelsblad, 16 March 2002; H. Wansink, "Democratie zonder partijen?", article in de Volkskrant, 26 August 2000; E. van Thijn, "De lokale crisis" in Bestuurskunde, No. 2, March 2000, p. 9; and "Voorbij de sorry-democratie" in Socialisme en Democratie, no 4. 1999, p. 56; J. de Beus, "Een primaat van politiek", Amsterdam, 2001; U. Rosenthal et al. (eds.), "Het democratisch tekort", The Hague, 2002.
14. See J.A. van Kemenade, "De nieuwe overheid" in SER, "Herijken achter de dijken", The Hague, 2000.
15. See ROB, "Primaat in de polder", The Hague, 2002.
16. See J.A. van Kemenade, "Digitale democratie" in Democratie als opgave, op. cit., 2002.

17. SCPB, "Niet-stemmers", The Hague, 2002.
18. Aarts, "Opkomst bij verkiezingen", Enschede, 1999.
19. Van Kemenade, "Een meerstemmig kiesstelsel" in J.A. van Schagen and H.R.B.M. Kummeling, "Proeve van een nieuw kiesstelsel", Deventer 1998.
20. Geelhoed, "Op schaal gewogen", The Hague, 2002.
21. Van Kemenade, "Benoemd of gekozen?" in Democratie als opgave, op. cit., 2002.
22. The title of this introduction is taken from the Liber Amicorum presented to me on leaving my post as Queen's Commissioner, U. Rosenthal et al. (eds.), "Het democratisch tekort", The Hague, 2002.