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It is an honour and a great pleasure to contribute a few lines to the Liber Amicorum of Hans Keman to mark the occasion of his retirement as professor in (Comparative) Political Science at VU University Amsterdam, or rather to celebrate Hans’ 65th birthday. The contribution of Hans Keman to European political science over the past decades cannot be overstated. Especially, the combination of historical sensitivity and his strong methodological approach has served European political science well in staying clear from theoretical determinist straight-jacketing. For this foreword, I wish to address the two aspects of Hans’s academic output that I am most familiar with. I start with his contribution to international Political Science and continue with his incisive and unrelenting effort to raise and maintain the quality and output of academic research in Political Science in our Faculty. What has always struck me in Hans’ academic work is the increasingly unusual, but academically extremely fruitful, combination of rigorous quantitative comparative research and historical-institutionalist, qualitative and more case based political research. Hans fully adheres to the Dutch saying ‘meten is weten’ (to measure is to know). By pledging this allegiance, he has produced an abundant legacy of quantitative comparative research measuring the impact of institutions like political parties, corporatist concertation, and welfare state efforts on policy performance in various policy areas as well as on economic performance, more broadly, of advanced OECD democracies. With these publications, Hans deservedly gained the stature of one of Europe’s leading political scientists. However, at the same time Hans initiated and executed more broadly conceived qualitative historical-institutional research projects into questions of state formation, using the ascent of modern railways as an epiphenomenon for the modern state’s institutional development in countries like Australia, Italy and the Netherlands. I am sure and hopeful that one day soon, this material will materialize in a major book publication. In this particular combination of quantitative-contemporary and qualitative historical-institutionalist research, Hans resembles other giants in (European) comparative politics, ranging from for example Peter Hall, Susan Berger, Colin Crouch, John Stephens, Philippe C. Schmitter, Fritz W. Scharpf, to Dietrich Reuschemeyer. In my view, this increasingly rare combination of syn-
chronic quantitative comparative and more historical, qualitative case based research, sets
Hans apart from the more recent generations of (comparative) political scientists that appear
to have pursued only one of these two research traditions, most generally of the more quanti-
tative bent. To be fair, that quantitative approach is also increasingly based on fsQCA that
also allows for additional case based research. Regrettably, it seems that most researchers in
these traditions stop at a moment when correlations require deeper historical understanding
for advancing fuller and more plausible explanations, which at least Hans Keman always
dares to venture.

Stopping short of writing a nice and short hagiography of Hans’ research output, I
wish to raise two slightly critical issues. This concerns the impact of research, both for aca-
demic purpose as well as for practical affairs of public policy. Can or should we draw practi-
cal conclusions from the results of the academic research? On both issues I feel Hans could
have gone just one step further than he, in my view, has actually dared to venture.

Although many of the major international comparative research projects that Hans
participated in over his long career exemplified that ‘politics does matter’, his more recent
comparative research seems to suggest that political institutional structures like corporatism,
consensus democracy, government partisanship or central bank (in)dependence do not seem
to matter for economic performance of countries in the long run. Therefore, a general theory
on the (causal) relation between institutions and comparative economic performance is not
viable. For the explanation of economic performance, one should therefore return to the indi-
vidual cases (countries) to find out what the story is (I specifically draw on Vis et al. 2012
and 2013), and thereby give up on the (practical) of competitive political analysis. If we are to
delve into the individual cases, it is my strong conviction, based on my own empirical re-
search (Visser and Hemerijck, 1997; Hemerijck and Schludi, 2000; Hemerijck, 2013), we
will find that depending on substantive policy challenges of the specific circumstances in the
particular case (countries, but also clusters of countries), for instance, corporatist concertation
can sometimes prove to make a positive difference in terms of socioeconomic performance,
whereas under different conditions corporatist exchange failures immobilize the policy pro-
cess. In addition, institutional policy successes and decision-traps impact on subsequent polit-
cical mobilization, not least resulting in critical institutional re-engineering. Comparing corpo-
ratist institutions over time increasingly resembles comparing pears with oranges as institu-
tions themselves change, albeit in a path-dependent fashion (see also Streeck and Thelen,
2005). This issue of institutional change and recalibration I have tried to explore in my own
work on Dutch corporatism, social and economic policy and welfare state reform. Indeed, a
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general theory on, for example, the impact of corporatist institutions and proportional representation on economic and welfare performance is not really feasible, but we can (and should) state that in the medium term, under specific circumstances in particular places corporatism and consensus democracy can contribute to economic performance, broadly conceived. To be sure, we should give up on aiming for a general comparative theory of institutional effect. However, in my view, we should not give up on the promise of comparative institutional policy analysis by reducing the issue of institutional effect and economic performance to historically arbitrary individual case histories. Institutions can and do matter, but how and to what effect they matter depends critically on the specific challenges and circumstances such institutional structures are confronted with over time. Institutions do change in the exercise of political usage over time and therefore cannot be held constant in the long run. And even when institutions seem stable, the reason for institutional continuity is more often than not that institutions are purposefully maintained and actively tended to by political agents. Here lies the profound reason why quantitative comparative research requires continuous input from historically more sensitive qualitative case analyses.

Turning to the practical use of comparative political research, it is not a far cry to relate Hans Keman’s work with that famous (American) Dutchman in comparative political studies: Arend Lijphart. Also Arend Lijphart (2012) has always combined rigorous quantitative comparative methods with in-depth case studies. Over his long and extremely successful career, also Arend Lijphart has come to reach the sobering conclusion that in terms of effective policy-making or macroeconomic performance in the long run there is no significant difference between consensus and majoritarian democracies. My rebuttal would be that in the long run policy challenges and, as a consequence, institutional repertoires change through a variety of mechanisms, ranging from drift and exhaustion to conversion and policy learning by political intent. In contrast to Keman, Lijphart in the final analysis throws in the normative claim that consensus democracies are ‘kinder and gentler’ than majoritarian political systems (Lijphart 2012: 274 ff.) and states that thus all democratic nations, in as much as their political cultures allow it (and in his view these are up to voluntarist grasp), should pursue consensus decision-making policy styles. In a highly similar vein, also Hans in his down-to-earth and matter-of-fact Dutch sobriety (‘nuchterheid’) – not to be mistaken for rudeness (‘botheid’) has argued that while a general theory of corporatism and economic performance cannot stand the test of time, his case-based research does seem to reveal that it does not harm, both from the perspective of economic performance and of social peace (‘keeping society together’), that dem-
ocratic institutions, in as much as their surrounding political cultures allow them, they should advance in consensual-corporatist policy-making structures.

Should political science research be practically relevant for day-to-day policy-making? Originally trained as an economist, I would answer this question affirmatively and be explicit about when normative positions, based on objective empirical research, are ventured. To be sure, institutional political analyses is not for naïve social researchers. Past-time successes of consociationalism in the Netherlands have proven difficult to transport to places like Lebanon, Fiji, Venezuela and South-Africa, where they have been tried and tested. With these faults of institutional exportation in mind, I do believe Hans’s research output would have gained the practical impact it deserves if he would have dared to take that step, in awareness of relevant qualifiers that apply.

Next I wish to address Hans Keman’s everlasting insistence on the quality of research methods and output. Throughout his long-stay career at the VU, political science research quality has been one of his key concerns in faculty and university politics. Fair to say, is that by breeding a research culture of “noblesse oblige”, the VU’s relatively small political science department, has attracted many talents, from Kees van Kersbergen to Barbara Vis, who are now in their own accord well established professors in the field of comparative politics. Even for a Dutchman, Hans can be quite blunt, as he doesn’t suffer fools gladly when the issue of research quality and methods are at stake. I was once interviewed, about twenty years ago, for an assistant professorship position at the VU. In the end, the better candidate, my friend Kees van Kersbergen, got the job. Rambling on about the (it-depends) “contingencies” of Dutch corporatism, the subject of my Oxford dissertation, clearly got on Hans’ nerves. At some point he stopped me and subsequently gave a twenty minute lecture on comparative research methods. It felt like the coldest shower I ever took. But his urge came from the heart.

Then, close to twenty years later I became as dean of faculty, his boss. I was struck by the kindness, and constructive care he took of the research students of the department preparing their final thesis. I am sure he has softened, but luckily not his heart, which remained in the same tough “noblesse oblige” quality place. Political science research and output at the VU has greatly profited from his constant strive for improvement. Under his guidance, the political science department, small as it was, became one of the leading research departments¹, not only within the Faculty, but within political science in the Netherlands and Europe as well.

¹ My issue here is academic research but would like to stress also the consistent high marks the Political Science department has scored over the years as regards the assessments of its teaching programs.
Hans was particularly instrumental also in raising the general level of research quality and output in the Faculty as a whole by introducing minimum standards of performance when he was research director in the Faculty Board around 2000. Minimum standards are now part and parcel of research policy in the Faculty and have over the years greatly improved both the level and the quantity of research output. The raised level and increased output of research of the Faculty as a whole has also paid off. Research grants from a variety of funding agencies, both in the Netherlands and in Europe, significantly increased in the past decade or so. It is not an overstatement to declare that Hans has been one of the founders of that success. And in my mind there is no doubt that the research (and teaching) of the recently merged departments of Political Science and Public Administration will continue to profit from this now well institutionalize quality culture for continuous for improvement that Hans started almost three decades ago.
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Introduction

Jaap Woldendorp

In September 2013, Hans Keman has retired as a full professor in Political Science at the VU University (Amsterdam-NL). As with all rites of passage, becoming an emeritus professor is usually marked by a series of special events. Depending on one’s standing, these events may range from receptions to full blown academic symposia, and from speeches by the powers that be to farewell lectures by the (becoming) emeritus. Hans of course has gone for the whole hog. He will have a reception, several speeches from powers that be, a farewell lecture, participate in a full blown academic symposium and, on top of that, will be presented with this Liber Amicorum.

This Liber Amicorum is the result of some very hard work by all the contributors. All of them have been and quite often still are close academic collaborators of Hans in various ways and means. And it is their academic collaboration and the resulting, sometimes quite hilarious, experiences with Hans over the years that the authors refer to in their contributions. Hans’s academic exploits, told from the perspective of some of the fellow travelers he met en route make for some very funny reading indeed. Never a dull moment when Hans is up and about (in some cases more aptly probably: when Hans is on the warpath) in one of his many capacities in the international political science community over the years. Not to mention his lust for the good life: loud music, good wine and good food. At the same time the contributions also show Hans’s inclination and capacity for (very) hard work if and when he sets his mind to it and all the positive results reaped by the political science community, at the VU, in the Netherlands and abroad.

The order of the chapters in this Liber Amicorum is very simple. The book starts with the contribution of Hans Daalder, arguably one of the most important Dutch political scientist. Hans Daalder also happens to be Hans Keman’s Doktorvater who presided over Hans’s graduation into the illustrious rank of Doctor (in the Social Sciences) without which he could not have aspired to become a full blown professor himself. Hans Daalder has also kept a watchful and benign eye on Hans and his career before and after that other rite of passage, as you will
find out in his contribution. The other contributions are all listed in more or less alphabetical order to ensure sufficient variation of authors. The book ends with a short overview of Hans’s career and a systematic bibliography of his publications up to date. I am confident you will find the contributions to this Liber Amicorum to be both serious and with a light and personal touch that will bring Hans Keman and his academic work to life in the many manifestations of his personality and professional capacities.

Juni 2013
A Voyager in the world of political science

Hans Daalder

When did I first hear about Hans Keman? In the troubled times of the early 1970s when he was a leader of Mundus, the association of political science students at the Free University Amsterdam (in Dutch generally known by its two initials as the VU which stands for Vrije Universiteit). For all I know, the radical actions of students at that university fell far short of the sustained agitation by the battalion of politicized radicals at the larger University of Amsterdam who in collusion with a minority of staff sought to control decision-making in the Subfaculteit in general and the content of the political science curriculum in particular. Their provocations eventually led Hans Daudt, the holder of the first modern political science chair in the Netherlands and a majority of his staff to stop teaching. This resulted in arduous legal and political battles within the university, spreading from there to other arenas including nation-wide professional bodies, law courts, the left-wing Undersecretary in charge of Higher Education of the then Government, and even to Parliament.²

One of the curricular items Daudt had established was the so-called Friedrich Colloquium, named after the core text Man and His Government. An Empirical Theory of Politics (1963) by Carl J. Friedrich (not as some innocent hopefuls thought Friedrich Engels!). Pending law suits, the strike by Daudt c.s. continued. The new powers in the university of the day decided in 1975 to appoint a new Friedrich collective of five junior staff members to take over political science teaching. Four of them had been among Daudts most vociferous antagonists. One was an outsider, Hans Keman. Some saw him as a fig leave, to ‘prove’ that there had been an ‘open’ recruitment of the new staff after all.

Not unexpectedly, left-oriented historians claiming that they too represented a ‘broader political science’ and some of the new radical political science staff came to centre their teaching and research on left-wing thinkers, movements and causes. One of the more serious pro-

jects came to be a comparative research project on Social-Democracy and the Welfare State. Keman and I had accidentally met in 1982 at the European University Institute. He came to Leiden to consult with me on that project. In a later private communication he stated that the support for such a project was ‘essential for the development of those Amsterdam political scientists who wanted to work professionally (in Dutch: “vakinhoudelijk en ambachtelijk”)’, suggesting that people like Uwe Becker, Dietmar Braun, Kees van Kersbergen, and himself were saved from an otherwise inevitable ‘exit’ option, to contribute later substantially to the Dutch and European political science community.

Unlike many, Keman sought deliberately to cross the ‘provincial’ frontiers of the then Amsterdam scene. He immersed himself in the growing international literature in the field of political economy, neo-corporatism and comparative policy studies. His list of publications began to show the names of prominent scholars with whom he began to cooperate, among them Francis Castles (a useful contact contributing later to his regular research periods at the Australian University!), Franz Lehner, Manfred Schmidt, and not much later Ian Budge.

There is a gap in his otherwise detailed CV. This shows that his employment ended at Amsterdam in 1983 while he was appointed in the Leiden Department in 1986. This interim period was bridged to some extent by a fellowship at the European University Institute (witness the original and the typescript below);
To the Academic Service of
the European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana, Via dei Roccettini
50016 S. Domenico di Fiesole
Italia

March 20, 1984

Re: Application for Jean Monnet-fellowship of Mr Hans Keman.

I am writing to support the application of Hans Keman for a Jean Monnet-fellowship. Hans Keman has been known to me in the past three to four years as one of the most promising younger political scientists working in the University of Amsterdam.

After a period in which he had to shoulder a number of organizational duties in the somewhat unorganized Department of Political Science of that University, he developed in recent years as an outstanding young scholar working in the interstices of social theory on the one hand and comparative empirical research on the other. He did sterling work with Manfred Schmidt and Frank Castles, and he published a number of interesting congress-papers, and book-contributions. He has been active also within The Future of Party Government project of the European University Institute, directed by Rudolf Wildenmann and Ian Budge.

Mr. Keman is now engaged in the writing of a book which will deal with the issue of party control and public policy, investigating the differential effect of social democratic policies in a comparative study of 18 democracies. He is far advanced in the collection of research data, and he has also made considerable progress in the theoretical elaboration of his book.

He intends to present this book as a dissertation with myself and Professor Gerd Junne of the University of Amsterdam as his thesis supervisors.

Knowing the Institute well, I have no doubt that Hans Keman would profit greatly from a year’s writing at the European University Institute and that he would in turn contribute to research in progress in Florence, both in The Future of Party Government project, and also in the work on Neo-Corporatism.

I presume that the test for the award of a fellowship is individual scholarly quality. I think Hans Keman has it.

Sincerely yours,
Professor Hans Daalder
We in Leiden appointed Keman both for his comparative and substantive work. In 1988 he defended his doctorate with myself and the Amsterdam International Relations Professor Gerd Junne as promotores on a dissertation entitled *The Development Towards Surplus Welfare. Social Democratic Politics and Policies in Advanced Capitalist Democracies*. I found it hard work to supervise this thesis, largely because I was not very familiar with the literature in this field, and also because of the somewhat *Germanic* English in Keman’s writing at the time. The book did show a remarkable breadth of knowledge as well as a gift to use quantitative data in comparative research.

The period Keman worked with us at Leiden was full of national complications in our discipline. The national government (seeking economies then as later) intervened in Dutch university life with a presumably “rational program” entitled *Selectieve Krimp en Groei* under which certain disciplines were to shrink while others were told to expand in a policy of closing and amalgamating departments, and restricting the number of their locations. The (much larger field of) sociology was hit particularly hard hit, but the relatively small discipline of political science did not escape an onslaught either. Oddly enough, the two smallest departments of political science (Leiden and Rotterdam) were singled out especially, rather than the much larger and disorganized Amsterdam Department (where a former Socialist Minister of Education was Chairman of the Board), or the smaller departments of political science at the VU and Nijmegen. Rotterdam political science was to close, Leiden to grow on the assumption that bigger is better. But to do so, all staff members of the two departments were first to be dismissed in a reorganization plan, having to re-apply without any guarantees to positions in a new presumably more rational and efficient organization scheme. At the same time new initiatives were announced to strengthen public administration, to be separated clearly from departments of political science.

All this led to years of turmoil. After a negative advice from a leading scholar of the Dutch Royal Academy, the Minister of Education was forced to establish a pioneer Visitation Committee to probe the *Strength and Weaknesses of Sociology, Political Science and Public Administration* nation-wide, both in the field of teaching and research. Notwithstanding its rather controversial report (and in certain cases contradictory recommendations) proactive governing boards of different universities took drastic steps (in some cases in virtual

---

3 See for this report and extensive discussion of its merits (or lack of these) *Acta Política*, 1 (1988), pp.21-134.
collusive contacts with the Higher Education division of the Dutch Ministry of Education). Rotterdam political science (with a small but productive staff, yet depleted by a secession of some professors and younger staff to the now favoured area of a separate public administration) was to close, as was sociology at Leiden. Leiden political science came out with flying colours, in a position to attract some of the best Rotterdam political scientists. Amsterdam was not really touched, but Nijmegen and shortly afterwards the VU landed in a destructive storm. The Nijmegen Board closed its existing political science department, sacking its professors (except for Grahame Lock who was recently appointed as Professor of Political Theory), and forcing a complete organizational overhaul in which a new politics department combined with other disciplines had to become more ‘policy and market-oriented’. Shortly afterwards the political science department at the VU came in for another drastic reform, partly caused by the retirement c.q. departure of the two senior professors, and a negative assessment of its research output under a new governmental system of ‘conditional financing.’

In both the Nijmegen and the VU case, the Governing Boards sought advice from outside political scientists, in particular Jacques Thomassen (Professor of Political Science in the highly successful multi-disciplinary public administration department of the University of Twente) and myself. New political science appointment committees strengthened by a larger group of leading were set up to select professors in the resulting vacancies in Nijmegen and the VU. J.W. van Deth was to become the key man in Nijmegen, succeeded later by R.H. van Lieshout. Keman became the central figure at the VU, chosen for his rapidly growing comparative work and international orientation. Keman’s new phase of life at the VU began not long before I retired from Leiden and to some degree also from political science, to work on a long postponed multi-volume biography of the post-war Dutch Prime Minister Willem Drees. Shortly after his appointment, Keman bought the remaining copies of a book of some of my collected writings *Van oude en nieuwe regenten. Politiek in Nederland* (1995) when this book was being remaindered as texts for his VU. He even went as far to ask my permission to continue to duplicate this book in other ways once the stock was exhausted. An unusual honour!

I saw and occasionally shared in his comparative ventures contributing to one or two of the rapidly growing number collaborative volumes he edited. I witnessed his role as editor of the *European Journal of Political Research*. And I was interested to see him join in more general theoretical and empirical debates on democracy, party and party systems, the composition of governments, coalitions, rival interpretations of Dutch political developments, thorough.
analyses of the work of Arend Lijphart and other more general debates in the comparative politics in the quarter century between his appointment at the VU and his retirement.

For the rest one can only sit back and wonder about the energy which has gone into all his varied work. Those who have not done so, should simply google ‘Hans Keman’ They can marvel at two up to the minute publication lists as well as - new to a long and timely retired professor - a special link to the calculation of the citations to his work and their assumed impact in line with the most modern manner of bibliographic research assessment.
TO the Academic Service of the
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
Via dei Rococettini
50016 S. Domenico di Fiesole
Italia

March 20, 1964

Re: Application for Jean Monnet-fellowship of Mr Hans Keman.

I am writing to support the application of Hans Keman for a Jean Monnet-fellowship. Hans Keman has been known to me in the past three to four years as one of the most promising younger political scientists working in the University of Amsterdam.

After a period in which he had to shoulder a number of organizational duties in the somewhat unorganized Department of Political Science of that University, he developed in recent years as an outstanding young scholar working in the interface of social theory on the one hand and comparative empirical research on the other. He did sterling work with Manfred Schmidt and Frank Castles, and he published a number of interesting congress-papers, and book-contributions. He has been active also within the The Future of Party Government project of the European University Institute, directed by Rudolf Wildenmann and Ian Budge.

Mr. Keman is now engaged in the writing of a book which will deal with the issue of party control and public policy, investigating the differential effect of social democratic policies in a comparative study of 18 democracies. He is far advanced in the collection of research data, and he has also made considerable progress in the theoretical elaboration of his book. He intends to present this book as a dissertation with myself and Professor Gerd Junne of the University of Amsterdam as his thesis supervisors.

Knowing the institute well, I have no doubt that Hans Keman would profit greatly from a year's writing at the European University Institute and that he would in turn contribute to research in progress in Florence, both in The Future of Party Government project, and also in the work on Neo-Corporatism.

I presume that the test for the award of a fellowship is individual scholarly quality. I think Hans Keman has it.

Sincerely yours,

Professor Hans Daalder
'Will you still need me, when I’m 65 …?'

On Hans Keman

Manfred G. Schmidt

From 1977 to the present day

If my memory serves me right Hans Keman and I first met in 1977 or 1978 in a meeting organized by the European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR). The discussions we became involved in soon revealed that both of us shared a deep interest in at least three major academic topics.

The first topic consisted of the interest in a better understanding (and a better explanation) of defense policy in general and the relationship between government, the military apparatus and armament industry in democratic capitalism in particular. That this interest mirrored our experience as conscripts in the Dutch army (in Hans Keman’s case) and the German Bundeswehr (as far I was concerned) needs to be added for a better understanding.

A second common topic was derived from striking parallels in the literatures we were reading. Both of us were fascinated by studies on the political economy of advanced capitalism, such as Baran and Szeczy’s Monopoly Capitalism (1966) or Andrew Shonfield’s Modern Capitalism (1965), and marxist and neo-marxist theories of the state in democratic market economies, such as Ralph Miliband’s The State in Capitalist Society (1970), Nicos Poulantzas’ Pouvoir Politique et Classes Sociales (1971) and Claus Offe’s studies on the capitalist state, such as Strukturprobleme des kapitalistischen Staates (1972).

Although strongly impressed by these books, Hans Keman and I shared the view that these studies somehow failed to fully understand the sound and the rhythm of the variation in democratic capitalism. This group of countries included widely divergent cases, for example militant democracies, such as the US, and pacifist ones, such as the Nordic countries, and political systems with diverse profiles of economic policy and social protection. Because Hans Keman’s and my academic teachers included eminent comparativists, such as Arend Lijphart
and Hans Daalder in Hans Keman’s case, and Gerhard Lehbruch and Klaus von Beyme in my case, it was in a sense not too surprising that both of us considered the subdiscipline of Comparative Politics as one of the keys to a better understanding of why democratic capitalist states varied enormously in terms of politics and policy.

Until that time Hans Keman’s and my academic work was not comparative in nature. But that changed rather soon – for various reasons. One of the major causes was our participation in one of the first ECPR Research Groups, namely the *ECPR Research Group on Party Politics and Party Policy in Representative Democracies*, a research group which the ECPR’s Executive Council, led at that time by Professor Rudolf Wildenmann from Mannheim University, established.

The core of the *Research Group on Party Politics and Party Policy in Representative Democracies* consisted in the end of Frank Castles, Hans Keman, Klaus Armingeon, Corina von Arnhem, and me. The key topic of the *Research Group* was the debate on whether parties matter. Does the partisan complexion of government really make a difference in public policy outputs and outcomes in democratic states? And if so, to what extent do parties matter? Or is it just the case that in an age of the “end of ideology” (Daniel Bell) and within the context of the rise of “catch-all parties” (Otto Kirchheimer) political parties do not only longer produce significant policy differences? This was the research question which the *Research Group* addressed in comparative studies on a wide variety of public polices in 18 economically advanced democratic OECD member states.

The division of labour in the *Research Group* was as follows: The discussion of general theoretical and methodological issues as well as conceptual and empirical work on measuring policy positions of parties and the political complexion of government were a responsibility of all participants in the group. In addition, each participant of the Research Group was in charge of the study of at least one broadly defined policy domain. Frank Castles focused mainly on the welfare state, above all on spending on social protection; Klaus Armingeon’s role was to analyze the impact of trade unions and political party on wages; Corina van Arnhem focused on income distribution; my part was to study mainly the impact of political par-
ties on macroeconomic policy; and Hans Keman focused attention on topics of external security, above all on military expenditure.  

The many insights which one can derive from Hans Keman’s comparative analysis of defense spending included the finding that the share of military expenditure (measured as a percentage of GDP) declined in 16 of our 18-nations-sample in the period from 1955 to 1975 – a trend which continued beyond that period as well. Decline of spending on external security rather than increasing levels of spending for guns and soldiers was the overall tendency in the world of advanced capitalism. Moreover, these countries experienced at the same time a dramatic increase in spending on social protection – a topic which Hans Keman addressed a couple of years later in his chapter on ‘Welfare and Warfare’ in Managing Mixed Economies, edited by Frank Castles, Franz Lehner and the author of this essay in 1988.

Hans Keman’s studies shed new light upon the determinants of the cross-national variation in military expenditure. In an article published in 1992 Hans Keman summarized the main findings on the sources and causes of defense spending. These include the impact of the Cold War between East and West, the position of the various countries vis-à-vis the Cold War, the geopolitical position both before and after 1990, the membership or non-membership in a military alliance, and the type of military strategy adopted in a country. Moreover, domestic sources and causes were also related to military expenditure – a finding which lends further empirical support for the view proposed by leading peace researchers, such as Dieter Senghaas in his masterpiece on Abschreckung und Frieden (1981), that military policy in general, and the armaments race between East and West in particular, were to a significant extent caused by domestic determinants. According to Hans Keman’s findings, these determinants comprised technological resources, the political importance of the armed forces and the armament industry, economic variables, such as business cycles and the level of economic development, and, last but not least, preferences of political parties in defense policy.

4 The work of the Research Group was published in The Impact of Parties, edited by Francis G. Castles (1982) and in a wide variety of articles in journals and books. Klaus Armingeon’s contributions to the Research Group were also part of his PhD (published as Neo-korporatistische Einkommenspolitik in 1983), and my work in the Research Group did have an important impact on my Habilitationsschrift (published as Wohlfahrtstaatliche Politik unter bürgerlichen und sozialdemokratischen Regierungen. Ein internationaler Vergleich in 1982). Hans Keman’s PhD of 1988 (The Development towards Surplus Welfare: Social Democratic Politics and Policies in Advanced Capitalist Democracies) also mirrors his participation in the Research Group on party differences and public policy.

Defense policy and military expenditure have of course been only one of several topics in Hans Keman’s research agenda. Others include

1. federalism and decentralisation in democracies,
2. political institutions, governance und political performance in old and new democracies,
3. the role of political parties in public policy areas beyond defense policy,
4. labour markets and social exclusion,
5. the politics and policy of infrastructure development,
6. and the analysis of the Netherlands from a comparative angle, a field of research in which Hans Keman complemented path breaking studies on Dutch institutions and Dutch politics, such as the writings of Arend Lijphart und Hans Daalder, with studies on the impact of political institutions and political processes on public policy.

My academic cooperation with Hans Keman was not confined to the ECPR’s Research Group on party differences and public policy. It also included follow-up projects. The Future of Party Government-project directed by Rudolf Wildenmann, at that time Professor at the European University Institute in Fiesole on the hills above Firenze, was one of them. Many others followed, most recently our collaboration in the book project on Party Government in the New Europe, edited by Hans Keman and Ferdinand Müller-Rommel in 2012.

Hans Keman’s program for the study of politics and policy in advanced democracies focused initially mainly of the policy impact of leftist parties. The title of Keman’s PhD at Leiden University in 1988, which I had the honour to review as one the external evaluators, mirrors this emphasis: The Development towards Surplus Welfare: Social Democratic Politics and Policies in Advanced Capitalist Democracies (published in Amsterdam in 1988).

In his post-PhD-period Hans Keman’s broadened the focus of his studies. Representative of the broader perspective is the title of Keman’s first chapter in his fine guide to contemporary comparative theory and research in Comparative Democratic Politics, edited by Hans himself. The chapter’s title is ‘The Comparative Approach to Democracy’.

The empirical and theoretical comparative study of democracy – and of the various forms of democracy – represents indeed the core of Hans Keman’s contributions to political science.
These contributions are based on an impressively large literature of Dutch, English and German origin. The architecture of Keman’s contributions is both empirical and theory-oriented, with a comparative historical institutionalist approach, I would argue, as the dominant, although not exclusive approach. Most of his contributions are rigorously comparative and focus attention on most-similar-cases-designs. Furthermore, in his contributions Hans Keman systematically explores the political domain in its three major dimensions – polity, politics and policy – and traces the relationships between political institutions, political processes and public policy in areas such as social protection, economic performance and external security.

Does the rise of the European Union and present day’s globalization turn comparative politics into an old-fashioned, hopelessly anachronistic discipline in which nothing but methodological nationalism prevails? This view, which is rather fashionable among experts of globalization studies, is not supported by Keman’s studies. His comparative contributions rather support a different view, that is, the view that one cannot understand modern democratic capitalism (and the varieties of democratic market economies) without the comparative method. He further demonstrates that comparative politics, if conducted properly, is capable of integrating both domestic determinants of politics and policy as well as international or transnational variables.

Hans Keman’s academic oeuvre is remarkably rich both in qualitative and quantitative terms. It includes 15 books and edited or co-edited volumes as well as a long, long list of articles in journals and books. Chapeau!

‘Will you still need me, will you still feed me, when I’m 64?’
‘Will you still need me, will you still feed me when I’m 64?’ The Beatles raised this question in their masterful *Sargent Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band* in 1967. If Hans Keman should be inspired by the *Sargent Pepper*-LP and if he should ask the profession of political scientists ‘Will you still need me when I’m 65 or 65+?’, I would suggest the following answer: ‘Yes, of course. We continue to need you and your contributions to the ‘Comparative Approach to Democracy’, to quote again the wonderful title of Keman’s book chapter in his 1992-volume.
I would also like to add two wishes to my answer, if I may. The first wish is that Hans Keman will have time to realize a plan he has been considering since the 1980’s. It is the plan to write – armed with qualitative methods and unconstrained by the restrictions which quantitative politometric methods and the ‘small N’-problem of comparative politics impose on the choice and the selection of explanatory variables – a historiographic study on an influential Dutch politician: Joop den Uyl, the prime minister of the Netherlands in the period from 1973 to 1977.

My second wish is related to Hans Keman’s studies on military expenditure in democratic states and mirrors the more recent interest in the comparative study of democracies and autocracies in our discipline. My wish is that Hans Keman would revisit the study of comparative data on military expenditure and that he would complement his comparative study of democracies with the comparative analysis of democracies and autocracies.

If Hans Keman would solve the following puzzle, I would be tempted to write a further essay on his work. The puzzle is this: Why is there a statistically insignificant relationship between the change in military expenditure (as a percentage of GDP) between 1990 and 2010 (expressed as first differences) on the one hand and an indicator of the democratic or autocratic quality of a country (measured by a proxy such as the annual average score of the political rights scale of Freedom House in the two decades since 1990) (see figure 1)? Why is there no democracy advantage over autocracies in the process of adjusting military spending to post-Cold-War-conditions? And why is it that one group of democracies reduces the level of military expenditure to a significant extent while another group of democratic states either maintains the level of spending attained in the late 1980s or cuts spending levels only to a limited extent? And why is it that some autocracies have been as active as, or even more active than, most democracies in cutting spending on military purposes while other autocracies tended to maintain the spending levels inherited from the past? Finally, what message does the unexpected insignificant relationship between regime type and change in military expenditure in the period from 1990 to 2010 provide for democratic theory on the hand and for theoretical work on autocracies on the other?
Figure 1: The change in military expenditure (as a percentage of GDP) between 1990 and 2010

$R^2 = 0.016$.

Note that most of the European and North American democracies cluster on the left hand side of the figure in the region between 0.0 and -1.4 on the Y-axis.
Four cheers for Hans Keman

Klaus Armingeon

Hans Keman has an impressive track record as a researcher and academic teacher. In this volume Manfred Schmidt discusses Hans’ major research interests and others report about his achievements as a teacher. I however wish to discuss another aspect, one which is of utmost importance for the development of political science and to which Hans contributed a great deal. This contribution has been to the scientific community, which requires that we have colleagues who are competent, decent, solidaristic, and who care about others.

Science is a collective endeavor; scientific progress is thus the result of a structured, critical, and fair discussion among many scientists. This is the major lesson that I draw from Popper’s ‘The Logic of the Social Sciences’ (published in Adorno et al. eds: Der Positivismsstreit in der deutschen Soziologie, Neuwied/Berlin: Luchterhand, 402-417) and has personally helped me in evaluation procedures to calibrate various information such as reputation, academic titles, formal achievements, number of citations, impact factors, or number of publications. What ultimately counts in the end is the contribution that we make to the discussion.

The fact that science is a collective endeavor that requires the input of one’s colleagues who grease the wheels of discussion is all too often overlooked. The ‘grease’ of science is the ability to work in teams, friendliness and generosity, investment in infrastructure, and the anchorage of basic research in real world problems. In this respect, the scientific community indeed owes a great deal to Hans. The empirical evidence underlying this argument is largely based on my personal interactions with Hans – and I apologize to the reader if the following report seems to be one about Hans and me.

Team player

In 1979 I wrote my MA thesis on trade union wage policy and social democratic parties under the supervision of Gerhard Lehmbruch at the University of Tuebingen. His assistant, Manfred Schmidt, who had already received his PhD in his mid-20’s, introduced me to com-
parative quantitative analysis. In my thesis I applied the research strategies and techniques that I had learned in Manfred’s seminars. Manfred teamed up with Frank Castles, then a promising 34 year old reader at the Open University in Milton Keynes to organize an international research group on how political parties matter for policy-making. Hans Keman and Corinna van Arnhem (both at the University of Amsterdam) were also members of that group. Manfred was so kind to invite me to a group meeting in Brussels in 1979. Although only in their early thirties, Frank, Manfred, and Hans were the three senior members of the group. They were and remain very different in terms of personality, research experience, and areas of expertise. But they worked together –sometimes laughing and sometimes grumbling – and accepted one another. I quickly grew to like Hans not only because he cared about socializing and the availability of sufficient beverages and his absolute lack of arrogance, but also because of his willingness to be a team player. He was not interested in the battles to occupy the top-dog positions, neither in this working group nor in other projects. He simply contributed; he defended his positions, but was always open to alternative arguments.

Friendliness and generosity

Academic work does not entail seemingly effortless hopping from one success to the next, nor are academics atomistic individuals who produce in isolation. Sometimes we lack a good idea, a convincing argument, the corresponding data, or research techniques and we need intellectual and emotional support. Sometimes we need help to get access to documents, persons, and institutions. And sometimes we just need shelter from the storm, a pleasant evening with friends over a bottle of wine and an invitation to stay the night. Like all of us, we need friendliness and generosity, and Hans has certainly proved himself a master in this regard. After having met Hans in seminar rooms and restaurants during our project on ‘Do Parties Matter’, I embarked on my PhD thesis, which dealt with corporatist incomes policies in various countries. Hans was my big supporter in the Netherlands when I was conducting expert interviews there. He clued me into literature and information that I should not overlook; he helped me in finding the right people to interview. He also commented on my findings, thereby providing valuable background information, which I otherwise would not have had a chance to acquire. He also invited me in his house in Haarlem during my stay in the Netherlands. This was not only a great financial relief due to my chronic shortage of money as a graduate student, but it was also a much-welcomed social highlight of my stay in the Nether-
lands. Finally, while Hans is certainly very critical about the politics and institutions of his home country, he is, at the same time, a proud Dutchman and showed me the natural beauties of his former hometown of Haarlem. I will never forget the walks and bike tours to Bloemendaal aan Zee or the tours on his sailboat of his current home in the Frisian part of the country.

I also observed this friendliness and generosity in Hans’ collaboration with his assistants and younger colleagues. He is tremendously proud of them and is as an ardent supporter of their budding careers, mentoring them both intellectually and emotionally.

**Down-to-earth**

Political science deals with intellectual problems; some intellectual problems, however, are not all that important in real life. You may even be able to publish findings that answer questions that are of little interest to those outside and (even inside) academia. Such findings are often most valuable to future research and we do need to be grateful to those scholars who analyze abstract problems that have no immediate relevance for real life. However, and even more frequently, such problems are manufactured problems and mainly serve to fluff up one’s publication list.

Hans was never interested in that kind of scholastic work. He is a Dutch citizen who is interested in military policy (see Manfred Schmidt’s contribution in this volume), Social Democracy, and the welfare state. Comparative politics is not only about theory building and the empirical analysis of empirical distributions and causes, but it is also frequently an attempt to understand one’s own country better. I read many of Hans’ contributions in an effort to understand Dutch politics and policies in a comparative perspective. Likewise, he was not interested in military policy and later in Social Democracy and the welfare state only because these topics were good for scientific impact factors: These were and are the problems that he truly cares about – both as a citizen and as a scientist. Being down-to-earth and having an interest in big and obviously important problems has guided Hans’ academic work and has prevented him from doing things that, while nice, are ultimately of little socio-political relevance.
Contributing to common goods

At first glance, serving on editorial boards and executive committees of academic associations would seem to be interesting and prestigious work that is therefore a reward in itself. These jobs, while in fact mostly prestigious and sometimes interesting, are rarely rewarding. Editors have to chase reviewers, read papers that really do not merit publication, and communicate not only acceptances but also rejections to authors who tend to have an overly positive assessment of their own articles. Executive committee meetings are often quite tedious and lengthy – given the fact that the professors on these committees always have something to say – and before and after the meetings members must write memos, forge compromises, and battle wits. However, the scientific community needs its associations and journals, and this means that we also need volunteers who serve on boards and committees. Hans Keman was inter alia a member of the executive committee of European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) and editor of its journal, the European Journal of Political Research. He also edited Acta Politica, the journal of the Dutch Political Science Association. He contributed more than his fair share to these common goods and we all owe him an enthusiastic ‘thank you’ for this work and participation in the self-organization of the Dutch and the European political science communities.

Likewise, Hans has contributed to the collective good by producing public access databases, editing textbooks, and teaching at international summer schools for PhD candidates. We would be hard pressed to do our jobs in research and teaching without colleagues such as Hans Keman, who combine their academic interests and enthusiasm with the willingness to give to others and to the entire scientific community.
The young radical. Hans Keman’s early years in political science.

Frans Becker

From the mid 1960’s onwards commotion and protest were rampant in the faculty of political science at the University of Amsterdam. No wonder, those historians would argue who believe that the genesis of a phenomenon determines its future characteristics. Wasn’t the start of the faculty of social and political sciences just after the war marked by a tragic and bitter conflict about the intended appointment of Jef Suys as professor of political science? The Minister of Education personally intervened to prevent the supposed fellow traveller from being appointed – an exceptional intervention in those days. Politics and political science: it was a troublesome relationship in 1948. It wouldn’t be very different some decades later.

To understand Hans Keman’s development as a young political scientist, it is helpful to sketch the turbulent circumstances he landed in in 1975 – the year that marked the beginning of our joint adventures and cooperation in the field of political science. During the 1960’s and 1970’s the faculty of political science of the University of Amsterdam (UvA) was the scene of violent conflicts about three main issues. The first one was the democratisation of the university. At stake was what the different echelons (students, faculty members, secretaries and professors) had to say about the content and organisation of the academic curriculum and research. The students were clear about that: ‘one man, one vote’.

Secondly, the basic idea what political science should be about and how it should be studied was contested. Today we would probably be extremely happy with the broad, liberal arts-type approach that characterized the political science curriculum in those days, but in the 1960s students started to criticize the lack of coherence in the study programme and the tendency of the different disciplines, such as economics, methodology, history, sociology, political science and law, to behave as imperialists and take up an increasing share of the students’ time. The main topic of debate and confrontation, however, turned out to be what kind of political science was to be practiced at the UvA. A substantial part of the student body and the faculty members were afraid that the department would follow the ‘positivist’ direction mainstream American political science had taken, neglecting other, more critical approaches. And while
some preferred a broad approach of politics, relating the political to social and economic processes and integrating political science with the other disciplines in common research projects, others favoured a more narrow approach, focusing on the central concepts of the discipline and the main aspects of the political process as such. In the end, these differences of opinion resulted in a legal fight about the responsibilities of the different chairs.

In the third place, there was a clash of opinions about the role of the university and the academic profession in society. Should the academy and academics be socially and politically engaged, addressing the most pressing issues in society? And if so, how should they go about? From its beginning, the radical student movement had rejected the accommodation of the university to the demands of the economy and the needs of the policy elites. Radical students questioned the involvement of academics in what they regarded as undesirable policies, such as the American intervention in Vietnam. It resulted in a highly ambiguous position. They defended a classical academic autonomy vis-à-vis the forces of instrumental rationality in society. But many wanted to use the university and academic knowledge to help deprived groups in society as well. Some joined the communist party or radical splinter groups as supposed allies of the working class. Opposed to the student activists and at the other end of the argument were those who stood in defence of modern, empirical social science as a value-free undertaking, strictly separating fact from value.

The turbulence in the faculty of political science resulted in a tough confrontation between professor of political science Hans Daudt and a group of staff members on one side, other chair holders, a significant part of the staff and a substantial part of the student body united in the student association Machiavelli, on the other. Whoever had an in-between opinion was practically crushed. The faculty magazine Discorsi reported regularly about the conflict – although not always quite objectively. Rereading the issues of that period led me into a surrealist world, where even I – as an active participant – got completely lost. Of course, these events were part of a much broader international trend of political and cultural change, which geographically stretched from the anti-Vietnam movement in the US to the student rebellions in Paris and Berlin. They were connected as well to the massive entry of new groups of students into the universities that up till then had almost exclusively been accessible to the happy few. By the way, even some 40 years later, it is not easy to find a satisfactory explanation for what happened then and to establish the significance of the events. At least we need
an *Annales*-light approach, taking account of the complex stratification of the historical process and distinguishing different dynamics with different time horizons.

The Amsterdam conflict took on un-Dutch dimensions and derailed completely, with both sides unyielding and uncompromising. After years of perseverance, in 1974 Daudt and a few of his staff decided to down tools and go on strike: ‘Daudt is not going to play any away matches any more’, as he let the world know. This caused an acute problem. Who would take over his teaching assignments? Four new staff members were to be appointed to provide for the political science courses in the pre-graduate curriculum. Once appointed, they presented themselves as the Friedrich-team (*Friedrich-collectief*), named not after Friedrich Engels as was often supposed – and whose writings were very popular among them – but after Carl Joachim Friedrich, whose *Man and His Government: An Empirical Theory of Politics* (1963) was part of our generations’ common knowledge, thanks to Hans Daudt’s classes.

Hans Keman decided to take the big step and apply for the job. I was a member of the selection committee – and that’s the way we first met. Although he had studied at the Free University in Amsterdam during the same period as I studied at the University of Amsterdam, and although we had both been active in the student movement, and both been working at the interface of history and political science, we didn’t know each other. Inevitably, the selection procedure aroused a lot of fuzz in the tense and politicised climate of those days. One member of the committee argued that the selection was too one-sided and proposed to nominate two other candidates. Hans Daudt criticized the result of the selection procedure openly in the newspapers. But at the end of the day the four selected candidates were appointed: member of the Communist Party with a bizarre sense of humour Meindert Fennema; the brilliant organizational talent Geert Jan van Oenen; the smart former astronomy student and mountain climber Siep Stuurman – all three of them alumni of the University of Amsterdam – and Hans Keman, alumnus of the protestant Free University, son of an Old-Catholic bishop and talented cricketer. In the small, limited circle of UvA-political scientists, he was the Unknown Outsider.

Amidst all the fuzz about his appointment, he remained rather sober and matter-of-fact. Why had he applied in the first place? *Discorsi* asked him. Well, he was about to graduate at the Free University, but there were no vacancies there, he replied. ‘So it was an opportune decision to apply for the job here. It matches with my own interests. The combination of teaching
and doing research is especially attractive.’. The conflicts in the faculty have not discouraged him: ‘I’m not afraid of conflict. I’m used to them at the Free University.’ His soberness about his appointment contrasts sharply with his political concerns and compassion. As a political scientist he wants to give priority to the most pressing issues in society. He wants to expose social structures and support deprived and suppressed groups. ‘As a university graduate, I have a responsibility vis-à-vis our society. This responsibility prohibits me from working for companies like Philips or Shell, because they preserve the structural inequality in our society.’ He is not an active participant in institutionalised politics: ‘I have been involved in the urban renewal project in the Spaarndammer-neighbourhood in Amsterdam, though.’

Hans Keman was not the only one with a radical heart and mind in the new team. The others, too, were inspired in their academic work by the revival of Marxism and political economy. In the curricula they offered, though, they chose explicitly to confront different academic traditions and approaches in political science with each other. Pluralism, elitism and Marxism were the constitutive elements of the first-years course they designed. It was rather abstract and theory-driven for freshmen, and this was even more true for the main class for undergraduates, the so-called Friedrich-colloquium, where students had to read a substantial part of Marx’ and Engels’ *The German Ideology*. The variety in approaches and topics corresponded with the interests of the broader community of political scientists who were at that time involved in the Friedrich teaching programme. Electoral research got new impulses in those years, and the political agenda-building approach was used in valuable research projects. Classes and research programmes with a gender perspective were introduced. A great variety, indeed, but with a predominantly progressive, sometimes radical touch.

The research projects of the Friedrich-team were guided by the search for a political theory that would put political processes and relations in a broader social and historical context. The debates about a Marxist theory of the state in Germany, France, Italy and Great Britain seemed to offer building blocks for such a political theory and were a source of inspiration. The related texts were eagerly read and discussed. Academic passion was more abundant than compassion. Although most political scientists involved in the Friedrich-programme knew each other well – also personally – the academic conversations were competitive and purist rather than open and constructive. Quite a few years ago I threw away all the documentation I had of this period and my memory is deficient and fallible, but if I remember well Hans Keman, Geert Jan van Oenen and I decided to discuss our research projects and papers in a more
relaxed atmosphere. Hans Kemans first project was about military expenditure and the military-industrial complex. He reviewed recent work done by our colleagues and wrote an article for the *Tijdschrift voor Politieke Economie* in 1978: *Armament, military expenditure and the state in the Netherlands*. Its subtitles reveal an Althuserian and Marxist touch: *The military-industrial-complex and Marxist political economy* and *The military apparatus as state apparatus*.

In the field of electoral research political scientists had well organized international networks. The three of us were interested in establishing contacts across the border as well, and found a useful platform in the conferences of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) that started to open up in the 1970’s to new approaches and topics such as ‘the multinational corporation as a political actor’ or ‘modern theories of the state’. In those years political scientists were a thirsty people – the drinking habits of our Scandinavian colleagues in particular had a certain reputation – but the discussions in the workshops were not always academic highlights. Hans Keman reported in *Discorsi* about our workshop at the ECPR-conference in Berlin (1977): ‘In short, we had some lively discussions in bad English, which quite often showed that the participants had not or barely read the papers.’ I have the impression this has changed.

In the mean time we organized a modest action during the conference to protest against the German *Berufsverbote* – without much success. As Hans Keman wrote: ‘After we had drafted a declaration of solidarity on behalf of the ECPR-conference on Wednesday-morning which was multiplied at the Max-Planck-Institute together with an explanatory note, we handed it out in the afternoon. One tiny part didn’t work out as planned. We would present it to a member of the Berlin Senate, but he had already left the sherry & sekt party early. There was this rumour that the well known political scientist Andries Hoogerwerf was rather upset by our action claiming that we were “Dutch communists” who should “take a look at the other side of the wall”.’.

Just as Hans Keman and his colleagues, I started my work as staff member at the department of political science on 1 February 1975, but I had another assignment. It was my job to develop a master in political theory, including a common research project with students and colleagues from other disciplines, such as law, history and economics. I got involved in the work of the Friedrich-team, teaching undergraduate classes; Hans Keman joined me as a col-
league in the political theory master – just as the other three member of the Friedrich-team. He had a fortunate hand in picking his assistants. For some years he worked with Kees van Kersbergen, Dietmar Braun and Jaap Woldendorp, who would all become excellent political scientists in Denmark, Switzerland and the Netherlands respectively. Hans Keman gradually went his own, independent way, and broke away from the dogma’s of Marxist theory. His most important research project at that time, carried out together with a group of students, focused on neo-corporatism as a political and economic model of crisis management. In 1985 Hans Keman, Dietmar Braun and Jaap Woldendorp would publish the results of the project, "Het neo-korporatisme als nieuwe politieke strategie: krisisbeheersing met beleid en (door) overleg? (Neo-corporatism as a new political strategy: crisis management by prudent policies and negotiation?). In the mean time he extended his international network and started to cooperate with, among others, Frank Castles and Manfred Schmidt, the comparative analysis of welfare states being one of the central topics.

With the benefit of the hindsight it is clear that during these first years at the University of Amsterdam Hans Keman embarked on a route that would determine his academic work in the decades that followed. In the first place, he started to focus on the institutional aspects of our democratic system, in other words: on the inside world of political decision making, putting the important institutional players - such as political parties, organized interests and social partners - center stage. In the second place, his work was deeply inspired and influenced by an international, comparative perspective. He was to make significant contributions to contemporary comparative politics and played a central role in the development of this field in the Netherlands. The political and intellectual roots for this later work are to be found in the 1970’s and early 1980’s. By the way, a contribution to a liber amicorum is not an academic in memoriam. Fortunately we are still expecting Hans Kemans international comparative analysis of social democracy, the political family I belong to.

During the days of democratisation, a faculty council and an executive committee that consisted of students, staff and chair holders governed the faculty of political science. Both Hans Keman and I – as others – have played our part in this democratised system, as members of the group of the ‘progressive staff’. Hans Keman happened to be in the executive committee in 1982, being responsible for a thorough reorganisation of the curriculum because of new government policies, aimed at limiting the study programme to 4 years. It was one of the first steps in a long goodbye to the traditional academy. Two years before, he had seen it coming.
‘It’s going to be tough, anyway. That doesn’t matter. But what kind of decisions will we take, which way out do we choose? […] I’m afraid that, taking responsibility for the organisation as a whole and in a top-down manner, we will find ourselves in exactly the same position as Daudt and a number of autocrats were in some 10 or 12 years ago, and that we will take similar decisions. That’s a pretty scary perspective.’ His colleague in the executive committee who represented the student body, Henny Helmich, described him as ‘somebody with his own political programme in his mind’, as somebody with an ‘iron’ – or rather ‘concrete’ – fist. A familiar picture for his later colleagues? To be honest, the same Henny Helmich described me at that occasion as ‘the iron fist with velvet gloves. You have to watch him. You should judge him by his deeds, not his words.’.

Hans Keman and I cooperated closely in the years after 1975, but in a way a certain reserve and detachment remained. I thought it was a natural reaction of the outsider, protecting himself vis-à-vis the young-boys-network of political scientists who had known each other since the end of the 1960’s as students and activists. But maybe I was wrong and this was typical for Hans Keman’s personality and attitude to life. We got together in other settings than our professional life. I remember going to a cricket match together with Geert Jan van Oenen, but indeed, the incomprehensible rules of the game stood in the way of closer relations. During the summer of 1982, Hans Keman and other friends visited the house in the Dordogne my new partner and I had rented for a few weeks. I had never seen a more relaxed, witty and cheerful Hans Keman. He was completely at ease. For me, his visit brought about a change in our relationship. We didn’t meet regularly in the years after, but whenever we met it was unreserved and with a lot of pleasure.

The years that followed were pretty tough and unpleasant. Conflicts arose among the group of political scientists – most of them old friends – who cooperated in the Friedrich-team and the master programme in political theory. They reached a low when one group refused to cooperate with the others any longer. Differences of opinion focused on the priorities and organization of our work. But it was really more like a family quarrel, between strong personalities tied too closely together for too long a period. In this joint venture of equals, without anyone enshrined with more authority than the others and without any professor willing to take responsibility, a mechanism to resolve such differences of opinion or conflicts was simply absent. We may have been a wild bunch, but we were not a very kind bunch, and sometimes a pretty nasty bunch. I decided to leave the University of Amsterdam and maybe
for Hans Keman the same kind of considerations played a role as well. Although: hadn’t he been used to conflict? And wouldn’t he have left for Florence anyway? And wasn’t the Free University the natural destination for him in the end?

The Friedrich-team generation of political scientists was ambitious and pretentious. They were highly critical of the established practices in their field. They would perhaps change the world, but certainly the world of political science. That’s why we have to ask: what has become of it? Were the expectations too high? The idea and ideal of the university as a centre of the independent mind and an institution where the different stake holders are involved in the major decisions has been under heavy pressure ever since the 1970s. Quite a few battles have been lost. Certainly, it was inevitable and necessary to modernize the academic institutions, if only because of the growing numbers of students and redress the over-democratisation of that period. But the scales have been tipped completely in favour of the New Public Management fashion. Instead of remaining the place for Bildung and reflection, universities are imprisoned in the ‘iron cages’ of bureaucracies and markets and are the victims of the more general neglect of the quality of the public domain. The 1970’s generation has not been able – and maybe not wanting – to stop this process. They have not founded a school with a new grand design or unifying paradigm in political science. They were too divers and too individualistic. The ideas they embraced in the 1970s were an insufficient base to do so. But they certainly have added new elements, perspectives and insights to what we considered to be a too narrow and one-sided political science. They have, maybe less spectacular than expected but in their own way, contributed to the development and enrichment of the discipline. Hans Keman is one of them.
Hans Keman was my teacher. It was 1976 when I arrived as a student at the Political Science Department of the University of Amsterdam, which had just seen a small “revolution” in ideological standing with four new and young scholars being employed who turned the Department upside down. All four were of course left-wing oriented but there were differences: three had studied at the Department itself, Hans – the fourth scholar – came from the protestant VU University of Amsterdam; three were overtly Marxists, Hans called himself a social democrat which almost made him a renegade. Hans had also a different scientific project than the others, less normatively driven but, influenced by his teacher Hans Daalder, searching for answers to the role of the state in “capitalist society” by historical and above all comparative research. Comparative Political Science became indeed his “calling”, his instrument of understanding not only public policies but a large variety of topics among them party systems, federalism, corporatism, the political system of the Netherlands and – one of his favourites reminding him of his childhood – the “political economy of transport systems”, in particular of trains. The advancement of comparative political science was and is his project, manifested in more general contributions to the understanding of the use of comparative methods, the teaching of courses, and in his activities within the European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR), both as a participant in annual events and as a political “animal”, in the governing board of the ECPR.

His “calling” and his personality had a deep influence on my own way of becoming a political scientist. While it was discussing decreasing profit rates, “conjoncture”, and the “hegemony” of the ruling class with other teachers, Hans insisted on the gathering of empirical facts, data “crunching” and comparative observation. The topic of corporatism, which at this point of time – think of Schmitter’s and Lehmbruch’s contributions – had a strong support in comparative research, was the ideal subject of sticking to the topics of political economy so dear to Marxism – relationships of employers, workers, and the state – and at the same time to engage oneself into the comparison of different types of corporatism in countries by empirical observation and data analysis.
After becoming an assistant of Hans in the Department, intense discussions started about the definition and operationalization of corporatist types. Such discussions revealed the personality of Hans as a teacher: he integrated his assistants, his students into an open discussion without pretending to know better, without dominating. He made the discussion a “forum of ideas” that were exchanged. When preparing common papers for the annual ECPR congress, my own ideas could thus become part of the common paper. The encouragement to think, the non-oppressive way of exchanging ideas, and the cooperative form of writing a paper were all important elements to develop my own scientific personality, to become a part of the wider “comparative political science community”.

The ECPR, which means its scholars from all over Europe, represented this community. It has been so important for Hans for three reasons: First of all, it was a kind of vanishing point that allowed to free himself of existing quarrels with his fellow colleagues that, over the years, became time-absorbing. The ECPR opened up an alternative working environment with colleagues he often became friends with. Second, the ECPR gave a framework to his own research, simply by its conceptual orientation to comparative political science, by scholars that were united by a same method but also by an interest into the more concrete fabrics of political life: parties, interest groups, electoral systems, public policies and what have you. And third, he became part of a group of young scholars he learnt to know in one of those fabulous workshops of the ECPR who shared a more specific interest for political economy, the role of the state, labour unions and employer organisations, the questioning of inflation and unemployment rates as well as economic growth. The whole bunch of scholars who started to work together on joint research and publication projects stayed together in one form or another until today and have become close friends of Hans. All have also become eminent scholars in comparative political science, including Hans. Which demonstrates the useful network building function of the ECPR as such.

It takes no wonder that Hans insisted on participation of his assistants into this alternative working environment, which meant for example, as mentioned already, to start writing joint session papers together with him and presenting them at one of the workshops. Participating in one of these workshops was – at least in those days – quite intimidating as a novice in the “community”. Sitting together with a group of scientists in which well-known elderly scholars, “rising stars”, and young people find their place is certainly the right way to learn but it
needs courage to speak up, to debate and contest what “authorities” have to say. I never found any hesitation in Hans’ behaviour to demand his speaking time and to say what he thought was justified on the base of what he or we had found out. This was reassuring to his assistants and a great help to overcome shyness and intimidation. Not that he challenged the “authorities”, who were sitting in front of him in any provoking manner. On the contrary, he had and still has a very “social” way of bringing forward his arguments, of talking to people. This explains his great network-building ability. On the other hand, he always had a somewhat anarchic element in his thinking and behaviour: authority needs to be contested in order to prove the claim of authority, which, of course, is the very essence of any scientific progress. Sitting next to him in these sessions was, therefore, like going into school, a school to learn the “art of science”. This was probably nothing he ever learnt. It is built into his character and has served him well.

Participation in such sessions was one thing, getting a decent education in the “technics” of comparative political science was another. Hans’ orientation in comparative political science has always been a quantitative one and he needed not only support in data gathering and data handling but thought it also as an absolute must to develop skills in the quantitative management of data. I do not remember how many days and nights I spent to find the right and reliable OECD data, to put them into the computer – which was still a big deal at this time, the 1980s, because everything had to be done by hand - and to run the first correlation and regression analyses. It goes almost without saying that the participation in one of those summer schools of the ECPR in Essex, which Hans had visited himself, was a condition sine qua non. Today, it seems strange to state this so clearly, as summer schools in comparative methodology have become such a normal way of life of young scholars no one would even mention it. But in the 1970s and 1980s this was still different. It was part of the “building” of the ECPR community and, by insisting on the participation of his assistants in joint sessions and summer schools, Hans made his contribution to the building of the big enterprise the ECPR has become today.

Hans was and probably still is a “manager”, not only a scientist. Strategic thinking is certainly something he has developed in his long experience in Department and Faculty boards, first at the University of Amsterdam and, then, when he became professor of political science at the VU University of Amsterdam, the place he came from. On several occasions he discussed his plans for the next meeting, how to proceed and how to “win” important contested issues
about resource distribution, which, of course, is what scientific struggle is all about in institutions. He has done remarkably well in getting what he wanted without, it seems to me, becoming seen as a person, which would defend only its personal interests. One of his main contributions was certainly the building up of the political science department at the VU University of Amsterdam. Almost unnoticed on the international level of political science before, Hans was able to build up a department that fitted into his “way of life” – it became a contributing part to the ECPR and well regarded among European political scientists. Everything he had applied before concerning the education of his assistants, he now applied to the level of the department. He was able to attract the necessary resources and above all, from times to times by active headhunting, the right people who could give the department an international standing, something which was the more necessary, as the rapidly expanding new public management philosophy at Universities in the Netherlands made excellency in every way an absolute must. One should not forget that several political science departments in the Netherlands were shut down in the 1990s and the threat hangs over each other department. Hans has managed to transform the department into a sustainable unit, which is still thriving – though he did this, of course, not alone. But his abilities in “playing the chords” in Faculty meetings and with the university rectorate have certainly been an essential part in this. Playing the chords meant not only to have the right strategy at the right moment but also to have patience to wait for the right moment. Hans could wait. He could be impatient when data were disappearing or data analysis was not ready at the right time but he was not when he took over his role as manager. This has certainly played him well.

There is still one other side of Hans’ remarkable personality I have not discussed before, that is Hans as a private person. He not only educated and encouraged his assistants but he also treated them – as in the exchange of ideas I mentioned before – as people, sometimes as friends, who had the right to share his personal interests. This is how I learnt to know still another Hans. His love and adoration of cricket is well known all over the community because he always proclaimed and defended this sport, which, for most of us in Continental Europe seemed somewhat exotic, though only the Channel separates the world of “cricketers” and “non-cricketers”. Hans was, and will never stop being so, zealous when talking about cricket, players, latest matches and, of course rules. This addiction to cricket brought me my first real life experience in cricket in Essex when Hans organised a match between the “English” and the “Continents”, which – the English had no mercy – we awfully lost. But we learnt to know what cricket meant. His love for cricket is, of course, explained by his own
experience as an active cricketer, which he continued until he was physically unable to do so. By the way, he was not the worst cricketer in the Netherlands, having been part of the national team in his younger days. The remarkable thing about Hans is probably that he is able to separate well his work from what he loves to do in his private life. This is certainly a way to cope with the intense and demanding life of a scientist. Finding his distance to what has played a role during the day at the university when coming home serves to rebuild strength, which does absolutely not say that Hans could not start working again late in the night if necessary.

I certainly believe that Hans has contributed significantly to what European political science is today, first of all by his publications, which repeatedly have played a role in the development of political science, but also by his commitment and dedication to this “enterprise” by participation in the governance structures and by his ability to create enthusiasm among his assistants and fellow colleagues about the value of European comparative political science. In this sense, he has without a doubt had a lasting influence on the practice of comparative political science in Europe.
Johannes Engelbertus Keman
Ex-Dutch radical, Frisian nationalist, and abiding friend

Ian Budge

I had heard vaguely of the student revolution that paralyzed the VU University 1966-7 long before I met the Red Hans who played a prominent part in it. Unlike the Marxists and neo-Marxists trying to gain control at the University of Essex, who denounced statistics and computers as instruments of capitalism, Dutch radicals took Marx’s own use of statistics as an example and stimulus. So Hans arrived at the Essex Summer School in 1973 – very red, both in appearance and politics, with the goal of demonstrating the inexorably declining rate of return on capital with comparative statistics. We talked about this in the bar over a liquid lunch where all the solutions seemed easier as the time wore on. Hans never did succeed in producing a conclusive demonstration of the argument but the statistics he collected provided the basis for seminal articles in comparative political economy at a time when the subject was just developing in Europe. The new networks of the ECPR and the EJPR helped spread his ideas, so he rapidly established his academic credentials both in the Netherlands and internationally.

I helped on the English of some drafts and provided comments, so when the Joint Sessions of the ECPR came to Amsterdam Hans invited me and other friends like Manfred Schmidt to his charming house in Haarlem where I stayed with him on other visits. Hans’ orientation towards comparative policy outcomes usefully complemented mine towards parties and coalitions. We ended up planning a project and book together. My move to the EUI in 1982 helped facilitate this, as the Institute provided very generous financial support both for research assistance and visitors, and Hans came for some months so we could work together in 1984-5. We did a lot more together than just work, as we explored Tuscany and Northern Italy, making a particularly memorable visit to the Carnival in Venice where Hans’ car broke down along the way because he had run a wire from the engine to his radio which sucked off power – feeding the radical voice from a capitalist engine? Possibly however it was Dutch frugality, as by this time Hans’ earlier radicalism was fading a bit, diverted into dedicated support for Haarlem Cricket Club for which he was still playing in the eighties, at the cost of quite serious sports injuries.
Several important things happened at the end of that decade. We were still working on the book from OUP which eventually appeared as *Parties & Democracy* (1990). So we had to make frequent visits in both directions across the North Sea, which were always quite convivial in nature as well as research-oriented. Hans by this time had exchanged his house on the outskirts of Haarlem for an apartment right next to the station where accommodation was more cramped. I shared a small bed-room with some of his wine collection which left little space for a bed. He had wined and dined me too well in his favourite fish restaurant to be tempted into midnight raids on the stocks but the labels made interesting reading. The wine came in very useful on the memorable occasion of Hans’ public PhD examination at Leiden – my first experience of such an occasion in the Netherlands. A largely foreign panel were disguised as Dutch Calvinist Professors in full-length black robes and caps, and competed to ask Hans the most difficult questions – to all of which he had to respond gravely with thanks for making such an interesting point. (Of course the outcome had all been agreed beforehand by the examiners with the exception of his distinction.)

The occasion may have marked a milestone in Hans’ transition from revolutionary radicalism to bourgeois respectability. I doubt if the old Red Hans would have agreed to appearing in full morning dress with two supporters similarly clad. Perhaps however he would have offered the memorable banquet for 80 examiners, family and friends in the elegant house of a traiteur, washed down by his own wine. It was after all showing off Haarlem, in which he had an intense civic pride. Shortly afterwards he accepted a chair in the expanding and rising VU of Amsterdam, but continued to commute from Haarlem – where else? It was the only place to stay – and there was the cricket club.

The late eighties and early nineties were a time of personal turmoil and emotional ups and downs for Hans, as his brief marriage broke down and he grieved about it for a considerable time. He also had trouble with blood clots and circulation and subsequent medication. After he recovered he had a bewildering series of brief liaisons - rather confusing for friends who had to cope with new female names and faces at every encounter. At a reception in Madrid with a particularly flamboyant partner he had a moment of introspection and muttered ‘Ian, I can’t really go on like this’ – to which I could only reply ‘Enjoy it while it lasts’.

As I got to know Hans better and had the privilege of being introduced to the Netherlands by him, I learned more about his background in Ijmuiden and the Old Catholic Church, in which his father was a Bishop. (Incidentally, this gave me the opportunity in all subsequent seminars where I presided and he spoke, to introduce him as the son of a Catholic bishop. This
always created a stir of initial interest which he loftily ignored. How it would go down nowadays is hard to imagine.)

After years of pumping up the organ every Sunday in the church, Hans rebelled against his background, beginning by concealing his full name which only emerged after repeated questioning on my part about the middle ‘E’. His signature was also suspiciously cryptic and illegible, causing difficulty with money transfers when he was in Italy. There he had to write out the full shameful signature legibly, so the world could see.

His youthful rebellion extended to thinking of becoming a fisherman (one trawler trip cured him of that) and a professional footballer – before he found cricket and revolution. He had also quizzed his father on what he did during the war. His father replied more or less along the lines of the Abbé Siéyes, asked a similar question about his activities during the French Revolution – I survived. Hans however had a soldier uncle who was a hero of the resistance, though he only found out about him in later life. Hans’ youthful rebellion obviously spilled over into University when he became Red Hans. At the VU in the ‘eighties’ however the main manifestations of his earlier activities were the volumes of the collected works of Marx and Engels which filled his shelves. This was available free from a State publishing house in Beijing, so it was again a moot point whether they reflected radical beliefs or the Dutch eye for a bargain – perhaps both, a revolution carried through by economical means. In any case the books got dumped when Hans moved from the charming old offices behind the Rijksmuseum to the concrete wastes of the new VU buildings in outer Amsterdam. Indeed when he moved offices Hans had a practical solution for documents and papers – he piled them in a large heap in the middle of the floor. If they remained there without having to be excavated he got rid of them – unlike myself, a hoarder by nature, who will end up going through tunnels between boxes and old newspapers as an elderly recluse.

In the early nineties Hans and I collaborated with Jaap Woldendorp to make the data collection underpinning Parties & Democracy publicly available. Thanks largely to Jaap’s dedicated work it was published as a special data-issue of the EJPR and then by Kluwer as Party Government in 48 Democracies (1945-1998).

I well remember Hans and Jaap getting off the boat from Harwich and arriving at our house in Colchester where they ate a hearty breakfast, worked together till late afternoon, had a longish walk and got the night boat back in the evening. Usually our trips were two or three days however with more scope for conviviality in Amsterdam.

Our collaboration on the data book led naturally into a project on which I was engaged with Rick Hofferbert, to relate parties’ election emphases in their manifestos to their spending pri-
orities once they got into government. Thanks largely to Hans’ efforts this brought the two of us, with Rick, Paul Pennings and Michael McDonald, together at the wonderful NIAS (Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences & Humanities) at Waasenaar among the dunes, where we spent a whole year from 1995-6. It is a wonderfully generous gesture by the Dutch Government to fund such an institution and allow foreigners to share in its benefits.

Unfortunately Rick’s health broke down during the year and Hans, owing to his medical complications, was not at the top of his form either. We enjoyed the full social programme of the institute, with the Dutch fellows taking us to their home cities and even to their homes, the herring festival and the commemoration of the Siege of Leiden. It was a wonderful time during which I and Judith my wife felt we had really got to know Holland. To acquaint us with the broader Netherlands Hans took us on a visit to Friesland where his family had roots (a grandfather had been skipper on a small trading boat on the Zuider Zee and his father had had a holiday cottage there – another secret from Hans’ past!). We even visited Hans’ wine merchant in his subaqueous cellar in Haarlem lit by impressive pewter candelabra for a tri-annual wine-tasting.

These activities got in the way of the main project, so we left with the wrong book written – a text-book on European politics, pioneering in its way (it was the first to cover the whole continent from East to West) – but this was not the research volume on comparative political representation we had been signed up to do. A rather melancholy dinner emphasised this just before we were due to leave, at an hotel in the dunes where we had to sit outside in a biting wind out of consideration for Rick’s sinuses and Hans’ smoking. I had anticipated this with five layers of clothing but poor Paul Pennings had only a shell suit on and shivered throughout the occasion. Hans does not feel the cold and smoked imperturbably.

It is highly symbolic that the NIAS book, after six revisions, is finally appearing this year from OUP under the title of *Organizing Democratic Choice*. Hans helped substantially by finding money and space for us all to come together at the VU, so it fittingly marks his retirement year with a comparative quantitative volume – though I have to say that it still avoids the question of the inexorably declining rate of return on capital under the present system.

One of our meetings on the book took place at Binghamton, where Hans stayed with the McDonalds and we were all invited to go to Atlantic City, the Las Vegas of the East, as guests of Alenna’s mother. Hans relished the prospect of driving us there in a powerful car but we unfortunately ran into a small hurricane as we approached the sand-spit on which At-
Atlantic City is located. Water covered the road while fallen power cables spat fire on the road. Hans drove bravely on into this miniature vision of hell but it was not what we had expected. However we enjoyed the gambling hells the next day, mostly owned by Donald Trump – and Isabel, Alenna’s mother won $20,000 and got her photograph up in lights. Pure research has its compensations.

Our last big social occasion with Hans was his 60th birthday celebration organized by Saskia, his Frisian love to whom he has come through so many storms. Hans has now put his roots down in Fryslân, the home of his ancestors, bought a house there (abandoning Haarlem and cricket) and passed a preliminary exam in Fries. The celebration was in many ways a rite of passage, with improving slogans on the walls (in neutral English) such as ‘Life begins at 60’ and ‘Matured to Perfection’. The Dutch party from Amsterdam mingled rather uneasily with the Vriesians, who were mostly golfers rather than cricketers. It turned out that the golf club secretary was a farmer whose family had sheltered Hans’ uncle in their home during the occupation. Life has turned full circle from Holland to Fryslân and Hans now looks forward to a full retirement and more settled life there. Moderation in all things however - and I don’t expect he will really abandon either research or travel. As this account demonstrates these go together anyway. We look forward to visiting him in his new role as Frisian patriarch and expect to hear reports of demonstrations in nearby universities soon. Fryslân for the Frisians – and the Kemans’. We wish both him and Saskia as well for the coming years. They will never be dull.
Reminiscences Concerning a Double Dutch Fanatic

Francis G. Castles

I have always argued that the only good political science is about answering questions. Hans is a good political scientist, which is why we celebrate him here. So here are a few questions about Hans Keman.

Is Hans Keman Dutch? At first blush, undoubtedly. Indeed, he is the internationally recognisable face of Dutch political science, having chaired one of its most prestigious academic departments for many years and having, under his editorship, brought its leading academic journal, Acta Politica, kicking and struggling into ‘the year of the fruit bat’, so that today it is widely recognized not only as an excellent international journal, but also as the place to go to learn more about Dutch politics.

But looks can be deceptive. Hans may be the face of Dutch political science, but he is no less an international citizen, having achieved no little of his eminence in the field of comparative politics and public policy and having, as we shall see, travelled the world in fanatical pursuit of an interest still more compelling even than academic vainglory.

But the fact that Hans has an international reputation and international interests is not the only reason we cannot classify him as exclusively a Dutchman in an increasingly globalised world. To his friends, Hans does not present himself as a Dutchman or a citizen of the world, but as a man of Friesland, an area of Holland, which Hans has demonstrated to me over many years is as beautiful as anywhere in Europe.

Before I knew Hans, my knowledge of Friesland was restricted to its ruminant inhabitants and their overseas descendents, but to Hans it is his homeland, where he comes from and where he wants to spend his time. That is why, at some considerable cost in speeding fines and motor repairs and, although Hans would not admit it, no little anxiety to others on the road, he has in recent years lived in Friesland despite teaching in Amsterdam. That is also why, with his retirement from full-time political science, he intends to spend more and more of his time in Friesland. Dutch and international colleagues will wish him well in his retreat, à la Candide, to tend his own little garden.
But, if Hans is not properly Dutch, how can he be double Dutch? On this, I can speak with some authority. I was Hans’ first editor in English and, at that time, he really needed one. My first long acquaintance with Hans was spending three weeks in his apartment in the very early 1980s reconstructing what Hans thought he was saying about arms policy into what he really wanted to say in English. But again first appearances can be deceiving. In the three decades since then, more than half of Hans’ academic output has been in English and he has been the extremely successful editor of several English-language political science journals.

So, if double Dutch no longer applies in a linguistic sense, does the word double apply in some other sense and I think it does. Hans is not just an eminent political scientist. He leads a double life. No less important to him than scholarship are his private interests, which, over much of the period I have known him, focus on following – for Dutchman and, perhaps, even more a Frieslander – the somewhat arcane game of cricket. The simple truth of the matter is that when you strip Hans of his academic robes [heaven forefend], what you find underneath are cricketing whites.

Hans is a cricket tragic and, since in some small measure I share his interest and have shared it with him at a variety of cricket grounds around the world, I intend in these pages to offer some reminiscences that illustrate this side of his character. You cannot understand the man unless you realise that, in departing the classroom or research arena and donning the white floppy hat of the cricket player or spectator, ‘mild-mannered’ Professor Keman became a true cricketing fanatic.

The fanaticism showed through early in our relationship. When we met, Hans was a scholar relatively early on in his career and I was a Senior Lecturer in the early stages of organizing the project that led to the publication of *The Impact of Parties* (Sage, 1982). Manfred Schmidt introduced Hans as someone who could possibly write on the impact of parties on foreign policy stances and cross-national patterns of defence expenditure. We met up at the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) Workshops in Grenoble in 1978. Did we talk about parties and publication policy? Did we hell? No, once Hans had me sussed out as interested in cricket, we talked about the game all the three or so hours of the introductory drinks reception in Grenoble Town Hall.

In all those hours, I don’t think expenditure policy was mentioned once. No, what Hans wanted to tell me about was that he had played representative cricket for the Netherlands and that he was a spin bowler and an aggressive late order batsman, whom captains tended to relegate to a point in the batting order lower than was warranted by his [self-confessed] great
talents. As I remember a conversation that became more animated as the wine flowed more freely, we then moved on to an inventory of greats of the game, and especially great spin bowlers, such as Bill O'Reilly, Hedley Verity, Jim Laker, Tony Locke and Richie Benaud. At the end of the evening, I didn't know much more about Hans’ views or knowledge on foreign policy in general or defence expenditure patterns in particular, but I did know that he was a veritable encyclopaedia on what both of us considered to be the ‘Great(est) Game’ of all.

Now another question relevant to a burgeoning field of political science, counter-terrorism studies: can one recognize a fanatic by appearance alone? In the early 1980s, with the *Impact of Parties* in press, Hans, Manfred and I met up at the Freiburg Workshops and arranged a little excursion into Alsace for the food, wine and walking. At the German border, the border guards stopped us, looked at Hans’ beat-up 2CV askance, ordered us from the car, took our passports and held us there for no less than twenty minutes while making what seemed to be urgent phone calls.

Clearly, the German authorities thought they were dealing with a bunch of terrorists. Was that, I wonder, because they could see the light of Hans’ cricket fanaticism in his eyes? Or was it because of our – at that time – standard young [or, in my case, already, early middle-aged] academic apparel and demeanour: I, with a black beard and black curls down to my shoulders; Manfred with a “mean and hungry look” and a black ankle length leather coat and Hans, most splendiferous of all, with a bushy red beard straight out of the revolutionary anarchist style manual [or, for cricket aficionados, looking a bit like a young W. G. Grace]. Eventually, the German border guards let us through, almost certainly because they could not believe that real terrorists could possibly be that obvious.

Later in the 1980s, Hans and I watched cricket in both England and in the Netherlands. In England, on neutral ground as it were, Hans’ fanaticism was not so pronounced. Since the teams we watched were not Dutch, he could sit back and be judicial as to merits of the competing sides. Cricket there was for watching, conversation and beer. Those who criticize the game as boring for taking up five six-hour days fail to understand the game’s massive advantages in these latter respects. Sometimes, when the cricket was in a somewhat quiet phase, we even talked about political science.

In the Netherlands, though, he was a more committed protagonist, applauding Machiavellian strategies to ensure that his Haarlem team won at all costs. The Haarlem ground was beneath the Schiphol flight path and Hans told me with much hilarity how the team had recruited a
West Indian fast bowler who would time his run in just as the shadow of a 747 moved down the pitch towards the opposition batsman. Not strictly illegal according to the rules of the game, but not entirely in the spirit of fair play.

Later in the 1980s, I moved my academic domicile to Australia and Hans moved with me. No, that is not really true. What Hans did was to come out to Australia whenever [and that is every four years] there were Test Matches between England and Australia in Australia. Now, once again, it is necessary to stress that cricket games last a long time [to allow time for the conversation and the beer], so Hans, being a sensible and calculating man [as well as a cricket tragic] needed to find ways of spending months at a time in Australia. This he did in the time-honoured academic way by obtaining research grants to study in Australia. Nothing dodgy about that – combining work and pleasure is what the academic life is [or at least was] all about – but Hans did it better than most.

Hans’ love of cricket was encompassing and his interest in sport eclectic. He spent some time on his visits to England teaching my kids cricket. I know he had an important role in encouraging and coaching his niece who went on to represent the Netherlands in the women’s game. One of his visits to Australia coincided with an important women’s competition and he attended many of the matches. Hans also spent some of his time in Australia seeking to recruit professionals for his beloved Haarlem team. When Hans was in Australia, he and I also played golf and as Hans’ days of active club cricket became less frequent, he took up that game with more and more enthusiasm. Today, he may be almost as fanatical about that game as a player, as he once was about cricket as both a player and spectator.

Cricket took Hans around the world; not just Australia, but to World Cups in South Africa and Rhodesia. He also, I know, visited the West indies, I believe as a member of a cricket team somehow representing the Netherlands parliament. Wherever he went he made enormous numbers of friends, as was also his greatest talent in the international political science community. Although I have called him a fanatic, he is actually sound and measured in his judgements on cricket as on politics and a man others always like to be around.

I have been sort of worried that now Hans is retiring to Friesland, I will necessarily see less of him, but I gather that may not be true. I hear rumours of a possible research project timed for late 2013 and early 2014, quite fortuitously when England next come out to match their skills in Australia. I hope those rumours are correct.
About actors and institutions

Anne Marije van Essen

Consider attending a freshman course in political science taught by Hans Keman, Paul Pennings and André Krouwel. I thought lecturers cannot be more different: Paul explaining the subject calm en clear, André being very energetic and Hans making political science look very complicated. From a political science perspective you might say: ‘Most different cases’⁶. My impression at that time was that teaching political science was the only thing they had in common. Later on, I realized that the basic principles I learned during that course have established a sound basis for my career.

The title of my contribution to this liber amicorum ‘About actors and institutions’ refers, first, to Hans’ contributions to political science and second to my personal experiences at the political science department at the VU University. The combination of empirical research and the methodological discussion are in my view the most noteworthy contributions of Hans to political science. In addition, his studies about actor behaviour and institutions are of great significance. In the acknowledgements of my thesis I wrote: ‘Hans, I would like to thank you for many things in particular for being demanding’. Three years later I am still benefiting from particular this element of working with Hans.

There are quite a few ‘academic principles’, which Hans emphasised during the years I had been working with him. I will highlight here a few of them. Probably not all these principles can be credited to Hans, but since he taught me them, I have chosen to assume they are Hans’ principles.

---

Lawyers and institutions

In December 2004 I started a PhD project titled ‘Good governance in health care’. The project was part of a multidisciplinary VU-sterproject Public Domain and markets (Publiek domein en markten). VU-sterprojects had been characterized by the fact that at least two faculties were involved. In this case it was a joined project between the department of Constitutional and Administrative Law of the Law Faculty and the department of Political Science of the Faculty of Social Sciences. All (originally) four projects had to do with the extent of market and state involvement in public utilities. Onno Bosch conducted a research into state involvement at the construction and operation of railways. At the law faculty studies were conducted into the energy market and education.

Although it had been an excellent ambition of the VU University to start multidisciplinary projects in which researchers could benefit from each other’s skills, I still remember the confusion about the word ‘institution’ during our project between lawyers and political scientists. Theories about the effects of institutions on political processes had been at core at political science from the starting of the discipline. Hans has made major contributions to discussions around new institutionalism7. I have to admit, even after four years of undergraduate studies and five years of graduate studies in which I read multiple books and articles about institutionalism, I had to look up a suitable definition for this piece. I found a – according to Hodgson – multidisciplinary definition: ‘they make up the stuff of social life’ and ‘much of human interaction and activity is structured in terms of overt and implicit rules’8. However, defining institutions in this way - as political scientists often do – let the law scholars of the VU University heave a sigh. In their eyes such a definition means that institutions can be everything besides official rules.

Since all four projects focussed on the role of the state, theories about institutions were prominent. The projects at the political science departments studied the way governance is given shape in health care and railways. Political scientists chose a specific theoretical perspective on how institutions play a role in the way a specific balance between market and state develops while the projects at the law faculty aimed on developing a legal framework.

---

against which rules or situations can be verified in education and public utilities. In my dissertation I showed how bargaining strategies and preferences of medical specialists in their specific institutional contexts influenced the way marketization has entered in health care systems. Studies of Hans (and Jaap Woldendorp) about the role of social partners in welfare state have been very useful in this regard.

In retrospect, the VU-sterproject has not contributed to a large extent to the contents of my dissertation. However, I learned how to explain political research to non-social scientists. This ability is still very useful in my current job. Nevertheless, the project was particular of great benefit to me in understanding academics. During the informal meetings of the project team it was possible to talk about ‘academic life’, being a Phd student and the different manners at the Law and Social Sciences faculty (for instance the fact Law professors often wear ties). Participating in the VU-stern project was a great way to get introduced into academic life.

**Political scientists and empirical Political Science**

As a freshman I learned that political phenomena could be measured. I have really enjoyed the connection between mathematics, logic and political processes. Being only 18-years old, I did not doubt whether this would be the only way of conducting research. I found it remarkable that you can measure distances between political parties (like in Vote Compass), to what extent preferences of voters are the same as political standpoints and which coalition governments tend to be more stable than others.

Later on, I realized that measuring political phenomena is not as straightforward as it seemed in my first year of study. In the department of Political Science there was a large variety in the research approaches of professors. Hans emphasized the importance of empirical research, but he has remained open for experiments with case studies and content analysis. He also emphasized to keep the statistical models as simple as possible: it is very important to understand your own statistical methods.

---


Since I worked at the department in a period with quite a few PhD students, there was much room to discuss my work with PhD students who had had different research approaches. During these discussions, I learned to distinguish between criticism that really has to do with the quality of the work and criticism on my research approach. The latter is, of course, relevant for understanding how your work will be received and to substantiate your arguments why you chose a specific approach. However, it has usually nothing to do with how ‘good’ your work is. In my current job, this insight helps a lot in dealing with reluctant civil servants who ‘don’t belief in statistics’.

**Avoid stating the obvious**

I cannot remember any work of Hans without an interesting research question. He has remained inquisitive over the years as he shows in his later work. The question to what extent new parties are able to last in government is certainly not stating the obvious.\(^\text{11}\)

Hans has many interests outside his main field of research. During my third year of undergraduate studies I worked for Hans as a student assistant. At the time (and maybe still) Hans had been interested in the Committee for Vigilance against Fascism (*Comité van Waakzaamheid*). It had been my task to find out more about this committee which members were particularly found among writers and academics (as for instance Anton van Duinkerken/W.J.M.A Asselbergs and Menno ter Braak). Also Hans’ broad range of interests outside of political science has made him pleasant company, since he likes to discuss and philosophize on a variety of issues.

**First comes the theory than the practice**

I remember a seminar at the Erasmus University in Rotterdam organized for PhD students and their promoters. A few PhD students at the seminar searched for a research question that could be answered with an already existing specific dataset. Instead of looking for an interesting research question, browsing through the literature, posing some hypotheses and choosing

---

a research method, they started off with a dataset. It became clear that this makes writing a PhD a very complicated struggle. Although it might have finally led to very interesting dissertations, the seminar showed me that writing a question-led dissertation is far more interesting and provides the opportunity for new insights.

As a PhD student I realized that curiosity is very important to make your work enjoyable. In this respect it is regrettable that nowadays (young) scholars often have little room for conducting research that has their specific interest.

In my current job I conduct applied research. However, also in that case question-led research is most interesting and worthwhile. For instance, when a manager of a childcare institution wonders why parents at location A visit spontaneously and at location B they do not.

**Conclusion**

Hans, you often told me that writing a dissertation is different from writing a novel. My purple prose and Dunglish has made editing my dissertation not an easy job. I found it difficult to determine whether a contribution to a *Liber Amicorum* is more like a dissertation or a novel. The (Dutch) examples I came across on the Internet varied quite widely in this respect. As you see, I chose to write down my own experiences with some references to your contributions to political science. This choice is driven by the fact that, first, your contribution to my personal development has been far more important for me than your contribution to an academic field in which I am nowadays only indirectly involved. Second, I have – in comparison to the other contributors of this *Liber Amicorum* – worked with you for only a short period of time. I think they will provide a far more accurate overview of your contribution to Political Science.

I do not know your future plans as professor emeritus. Perhaps you are going to organize graduate summer schools where you (like Ian Budge) will show participants the fastest way to the pub (through fields and over unguarded railway crossings). Whatever your plans are, I hope you can execute them in good health.
Hans Keman - More often than not: patterned variation

Kees van Kersbergen

It was when a Marxist fellow-student (not a rare figure in those days) explained to me that the agitated man, whom we had just seen running up the stairs, barking ‘nothing works here’, was called Hans Keman, that I first heard (about) him. It must have been around 1980 and it must have been in the cozy, but also old and draughty building of the University of Amsterdam’s Political Science Department on the Herengracht in Amsterdam. This guy Keman, I was told, was a bit of a strange character among the teaching staff of the Department, because he was not a Marxist, or at least not a real one. It was probably even worse than that, because rumour had it that he had moved dangerously close to bourgeois social science, because he was experimenting, God forbid, with number-crunching computers. Admittedly, he was offering a Marx-Weber course, which made him sort of half-OK – and certainly not as bad as the much maligned Hans Daudt – but still, you had to remain suspicious of this guy Keman.

The second time I came across Hans’ name was a few years later, when another fellow-student (not a Marxist, so a bit of an odd type) advised me that if I were seriously interested in real (comparative) political science, I should read an English-language book that had just come out: *The Impact of Parties. Politics and Policies in Democratic Capitalist Countries*, a book to which Hans had contributed. I remember that I borrowed the book from the library and that the librarian André Mommen made some cynical remark about me borrowing a book (he always did that). I wish, for this story’s sake, that I could declare here and now that reading this book changed my life, made me fall in love with quantitative, empirical comparative political science, and incited me to choose a career in academia. But I can’t say that, because it would not be true.

I do remember, however, that I was positively impressed by the book, not only because there were Dutch authors, like Hans, writing in English in an international cooperative volume (still an exceptional phenomenon at the time), but also because the type of questions, analysis, the approach, the techniques, in short, the whole set-up of the study was so different from what I was used to, so much more – what is the word – scientific. It showed that one should always look for patterned variation in the spending records of countries, because more often
than not this is because politics matters, a recurrent if not perpetual theme and phrase in Hans’ work (check it!).

Around the same time, I was lucky enough to get a student-assistant job with the rather unconventional but energetic and always inspiring Uwe Becker. Through him and the job, I got to know the Department and Hans much better. Learning about the Department from the inside was, I am sorry to say, not a particularly enjoyable experience. Petty politics and a low level of quality of most of the influential staff members seemed to correlate strongly and significantly. Getting to know Hans, however, was a pleasure. Hans, of course, played the political game at the Department con gusto (he actually seemed to enjoy it), but his identity and mood did not depend on the outcome of the power game, but rather on his rapidly increasing esteem as a professional political scientist. I am not sure, but I think Hans realized that the hornet’s nest that the Department was stood in the way of his own personal and professional progress. This must have informed his decision to move on, first to the European University Institute (EUI), and later to Leiden. A smart move, both for Hans and for political science.

For me personally, however, Hans leaving the Department in Amsterdam meant, first of all, that I did not get the chance to take his Marx-Weber course. As a result, I had to struggle and discover Weber all on my own, which I tried to do by reading first the parts in *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* that focused on social class (obviously as a counterweight to all the Marxist stuff I had been forced to chew on), and later by reading *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus*, a book that did have an immediate impact on me (but that is another story). But the real life-changing event came, when Hans upon his return in 1985 (I had just graduated the year before), enthusiastically talked about his stay and work at the EUI and his experiences in European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) conferences. He inspired my then close colleague Dietmar Braun and me to assume a more international orientation and break loose from the – at the time prevailing – overall Dutch provincialism. I do not remember if Hans put it quite that way, but that is how I (like to) remember it. Dietmar and I took Hans’ message seriously and as a first small step, we started to write what was to become my first conference paper. I presented the paper at what I recall as an enormously chaotic workshop at the ECPR joint sessions in Gothenburg in 1986. We rewrote the paper during a holiday (!) on Cyprus and published it, in German (!), in the unsurpassed journal *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik* (!). Hans must have been so proud of us.
In any case, this got me going and I decided that I wanted to pursue a research and teaching career in academia. I tried hard to promote myself at the Department in Amsterdam to get, just as Dietmar, an opportunity to write a dissertation. But to no avail. With the benefit of hindsight, I can now say that this was my luck of course, because it forced me to explore alternatives, but at the time I saw that slightly differently, I must admit. Hans was the first to suggest that I apply for a grant to do a PhD at the EUI and with the help of many others I managed to write a proposal that got me an invitation for an interview and a couple of months later the much coveted funding.

In late August 1987 I arrived at the Badia in San Domenico di Fiesole, where the EUI is located. I quickly learned that Hans had made quite an impression there, because whenever I introduced myself as coming from the Netherlands, someone would ask me, sometimes apprehensively and sometimes expectantly, if I knew Hans Keman. I occasionally have wondered whether it would be better to deny that I knew him, but – unlike Saint Peter – I never did that. Hans came and visited the EUI several times during my stay and we had some memorable get-togethers, the most unforgettable being my PhD defense and the dinner afterwards at the restaurant Le Cave di Maiano. I say “unforgettable”, but strictly speaking this is not true, because there is actually not much I remember from that party. The photographs that my wife Inger Stokkink took prove that I was wearing a tie, that is to say, Hans’s tie … on my head.

In the meantime (August 1991), Hans had already hired me as an assistant professor at the Department of Political Science and Public Administration of the Vrije Universiteit (VU), where he had become full professor the year before. This was my first proper job and I am unreservedly thankful that I got this opportunity. I learned a lot, for instance by watching Hans teach first year students about what politics is all about. His style was unlike I had seen before, uninhibited, improvising, challenging, energetic, sometimes cynical and with a quick temper, but always committed, in short, teaching exactly as he behaves in normal life. He could be tough on students, very tough sometimes for sure – but always with good reason, of course. Interestingly enough, it was the quality of toughness that stood out in the students’ evaluation that earned him the teacher of the year award, I think, in 1993. Hans taught me that it was critical to take students seriously, but that in return you must demand from students that they take you seriously too. It is this reciprocity in the teacher-student relationship that I learned is a necessary condition for any course to be successful.
In 1995/1996 I taught Hans’ courses, so he could spend a productive research year at the Netherlands Institute of Advanced Studies. In return, he took over my teaching obligations the year after, which allowed me to return again to the EUI for the autumn/winter term in 1996 and spend half a year (spring 1997) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. In the meantime Nijmegen University was advertising a full professorship in comparative politics (well, it was called National Political Systems for some political reason) and I was contemplating whether I should apply. I was hesitant, because I was happy where I was and feared the heavy administrative and managerial duties that come with the position of a full professor in the Netherlands. I had long conversations, mainly over the phone, with Hans, about the pros and cons of applying, and finally I decided – I believe against his recommendation – not to submit an application. (Why in the end I did take up the position in Nijmegen can be explained, but is too long a story to tell here.) At the occasion of my inaugural address Hans gave one of his inimitable speeches of which the main message was that whatever happened, I would always turn out all right. I still have the rocker toy he gave me that was to illustrate this main point.

The Department of Political Science in Nijmegen was a warm and welcoming place, with good people and the right ambitions, but alas forced to operate in a, let’s say, less than optimal governance setting of a Faculty first called ‘Policy Sciences’ and later renamed ‘Nijmegen School of Management’. Need I say more? The outcome of the political game played out in that faculty implied that resources were being transferred from the thriving and well-functioning Political Science Department to the underperforming business school. This imperiled the existence of political science in Nijmegen and caused job satisfaction of the faculty members, and certainly mine, to drop though the floor. I complained with Hans, in long telephone calls and – to the chagrin of the other guests, I am sure – at a dinner party at Hans’ new house in Friesland.

But Hans, as I was soon to learn, had already come up with a trick, as he put it, to make sure his prediction that everything would turn out all right for me would come true. He had found some ingenious way to facilitate my return to his Department through what in good management lingo is called a ‘roof tile construction’. This construction helped to organize (and finance!) Hans’ gradual retreat, and my slow phasing in, as Head of the Department. In the mean time I could make myself useful for the Faculty of Social Sciences in some other way.
until I was ready to take over completely Hans’ responsibilities. This was a great deal and although I was sad to leave the Nijmegen Department, I was extremely relieved to be able to escape from that depressing Management Faculty.

Due to some regrettable, but fortunately no longer pertaining circumstances, I had to take over from Hans as Head of Department somewhat earlier than anticipated. But no problem, because when Hans stepped down (abdicated, I probably should write) and I took over, I found the Department in excellent shape. My job, even though it would require that I surrender to some extent to the oppressive weight of administrative and managerial tasks, was to make sure that substantially, organizationally and financially the Department would remain on the course that Hans had laid out. Higher forces and my own lack of (political) skill, however, threw a monkey wrench into this noble plan. Retrenchment in higher education at national level and an abrupt and disastrous change in the resource allocation system at university level were two of the important factors that caused the Department’s budget to suddenly have a large deficit. Endless useless meetings and therefore many hours wasted did not help to solve the problem. So, I reckoned that me leaving would be the only way to rebalance the budget, because I was – besides Hans – the most expensive member of staff. And with this self-sacrificing act I saved the Department.

None of this is true, of course. Yes, I did leave the VU, but for much more selfish reasons. The administrative and managerial duties that I had feared when I first became full professor had become so overwhelming that I hardly had time for teaching and research. I then first had the opportunity to spend a year at Konstanz University and subsequently was lucky enough to be offered a job at the University of Aarhus, where I can focus on teaching and research. So much for the roof tile construction. I am looking at the rocker toy, thinking that Hans’ prediction that I would turn out all right has come true yet again. I know Hans was not happy with my decision, but sharing the same passion for the profession, I also know he understands.
“And now we are going to do real science” (Hans Keman 1991)

The first time I met Hans Keman was when he was just appointed as the Chair of Comparative Political Science at the Vrije Universiteit. His predecessor Jan van Putten had accepted a position at the University of Galway, which left me without a thesis supervisor. In those days, the Social Science departments of the VU were still housed in villas around the Vondelpark, so my first meeting with Hans was at the Koningslaan after he was assigned as my supervisor. When I entered the room, it was full of open boxes and Hans was sitting at his desk in between those boxes, tons of papers around. It was just one big mess. At the time, I assumed that this was just because he had recently moved his office, but now 20 years later I know that Hans will never empty those boxes. He is not bothered by the aesthetics of a workspace. While the mess was already impressive enough, Hans’ behaviour was even more overwhelming. For my MA-thesis – on coalition formation in the Netherlands - I had written a 60-page document, which was in front of him. When I sat down he picked up the paper-stack, threw it demonstrably in the bin next to him and said: “So Mister Krouwel, now you are finally going to do some real science”. Needless to say I had expected a more pedagogic approach, but that is not how Hans works. What you see is what you get, direct and in-the-face. After my initial shock, I came to appreciate his no-nonsense approach.

Hans outlined the basics of comparative politics, in a manner that I had not encountered in my five years at the university. Hans gave me tons of interesting articles to read and motivated me to redo the entire analysis according to the canon of comparative political enquiry. We discussed the comparative literature on coalition formation, from de Swaan’s early work on minimally-connected-winning-coalitions to Hans’ latest work (with Ian Budge) on portfolio preferences (Budge and Keman 1990).
“RQ= RD” (Hans Keman 1992)

Hans has strong convictions when it comes to political science. Most memorable for me is how Hans’ presented his ‘first law’ of comparative political research design: RQ = RD. With this simple equation he explained to me the logic between cases and variables and how your research design logically follows from the type of research question you pose. In the months of writing my MA-thesis, Hans basically gave me a crash course in comparative politics and quantitative data-analysis. While I was finishing my degree, Hans was restructuring the Political Science and Public Administration Department at the Vrije Universiteit. He recruited a group of scholars that started to produce high quality academic output and developed a common focus. After finishing my MA-thesis, I was able to become part of that team as Hans had developed a research project on testing Kirchheimer’s catch-all party together with Peter Mair. Through reading Hans’ own PhD - on the transformation of social democratic parties in European democracies, written under supervision of Hans Daalder – I became increasingly interested in party transformation. Hans and I shared an interest in analysing the strengths and weaknesses of the various party families, particular of the social and Christian Democrats. A test of the Kirchheimer party model was in line with the research agenda both Hans Keman and Peter Mair were pushing at VU and Leiden universities respectively. Both were also very dedicated to the nitty-gritty work of collecting the necessary data for comparative analyses. Peter Mair was already collecting the data on party organisations (published in 1992 with Dick Katz) and Hans was compiling data on party composition of government and the distribution of ministerial portfolios (better known as Woldendorp et al). Both Hans and Peter became my supervisors within the Polybios framework, after a nerve-wrecking application procedure that included an interview with the nestor of Dutch political science, Prof. Hans Daalder.

The Department under Hans Keman was a very inspiring work environment in the 1990s. After the break with Public Administration (Bestuurskunde) the focus became increasingly international and comparative. The collapse of the bi-polar world system and the ensuing rapid transformation of many countries in Eastern Europe made this an exciting time to observe politics. Hans and I were both interested in the institutionalisation of democracy in the East and the development of their party systems. On top of that, novel coalition patterns, such as the Purple coalition in the Netherlands, the rise of populism in both East and West and the acceleration of the European integration process made being a political scientist intensely
rewarding during the 1990s. Inside and outside the Department, Hans pushed for internationalisation. Within the Dutch Political Science Association (NKWP) Hans succeeded in making Acta Politica a full English language journal under the Palgrave umbrella. At the VU, all staff members were encouraged to develop international networks and participate in comparative research projects. Also, an increasing number of courses were given in English to make them accessible for exchange students and slowly a full English language MSc-degree was developed. No doubt, the department gained international recognition under Hans’ chairmanship and it is regrettable that the comparative politics component of the Department is weakened by Hans’s departure and there is still no successor (now that Kees van Kersbergen also left the Department). Hans’ departure basically leaves Political Science at the VU ‘decapitated’.

‘Stop moonlighting’ (Hans Keman 1999)

All of those who have worked with Hans know that you need an elephant skin to deal with his rather straightforward ways of communication. For me this directness was never a problem and I worked with pleasure on my PhD under Hans’ supervision. Hans was less enthusiastic about all the extra-curricular activities I had developed in Eastern Europe after the collapse of the Berlin Wall. At one point he told me very clearly to “stop moonlighting” and finish my book. I decided to listen to him and quit my seat in the local council as well as downsize my activities in the East. Because of the very generous intellectual input from Hans and Peter, and also of co-promoters Kees van Kersbergen and Ruud Koole, I was able to finish my study in 1999 and become Hans’ first successful PhD. Shortly after, Hans asked me to apply to a position that was opening at the Department. Once a full staff member, Hans and I found a common interest in the rise of populist parties and their impact on European party systems. We developed a project (funded by NWO) comparing the variety of populists that emerged across Europe and wrote two Working Papers for the Departmental series. One of these papers was developed into a publication of the impact of the rise of populism on mainstream political parties. Over time, Hans had become very dissatisfied with the direction in which social democracy was developing. This even culminated in running for a Senate-seat on the SP ticket, abandoning his long-term allegiance with the mainstream centre-left (or did the centre-left abandon it’s own core beliefs?). Unfortunately Hans’ own ‘moonlighting’ attempt was unsuccessful. I think we would all loved to have seen Hans debating government ministers.
In addition to research on populism, Hans was also very interested in neo-institutionalism. In my first years as a full staff member at the Department, I developed a PhD project on the political battles fought in Eastern Europe over their institutional arrangements during the formation of democratic regimes, for which Hans became the formal supervisor. After my PhD on party transformation and the PhD-thesis of Noel Vergunst on consensus democracy, this study by Jasper de Raadt on ‘institutional battles’ in the East became Hans’ third successful PhD project. While still sharing a profound interest in party politics, our research efforts then drifted in different directions. While Hans remained loyal to his analyses of party government and policy formation, I started to work on voting behaviour and online opinion-polling methodologies. In the meantime, Kees van Kersbergen had taken over as Head of the Department, which also resulted in less frequent opportunities for joint research activities with Hans.

**Comparative politics: Du sollst kein Krimi schreiben (Hans Keman 1992).**

The contribution of Hans Keman to political science cannot be found in developing grand new theories or coining new concepts (bar perhaps the concept of ‘pivot party’). Also, do not expect Hans to write a sweeping and wide-ranging exposé on world politics. Hans Keman’s main contribution to comparative politics is the constant rigorous testing of existing theories by collecting core political data. His basic approach to social science is a search for patterns of similarities and differences across carefully selected cases, with straightforward analyses of datasets. Hans’ focus is mainly on national politics, on parties, government and policies, or as Hans would frame it “polity, politics and policy”. This triad of institutions (the ‘polity’), the political game and its actors (‘politics’) and their outcomes (‘policies’) are the cornerstones of political science a la Hans Keman. I have always found Hans’ basic no-nonsense approach to political science very refreshing and his usage of the comparative method to reduce complexity by ‘controlling for variation by careful selection of cases and variables’ guided me through my PhD project. Hans also made an impact on me and his other (PhD) students by emphasising: “Du sollst kein Krimi schreiben.” Hans bluntly told us to give it all away in the first paragraph! For Hans, science simply starts by developing clear testable hypotheses, asking oneself; “what evidence do I need to be wrong (or right)”. His basic approach to comparative politics can be found in three edited volumes that Hans compiled (Keman 1993; Keman 1999; Keman 2002). In these volume Hans explains his basic assump-
tions on comparative political enquiry and provides clear examples on how to apply the tenets of comparative politics.

**Politics matters**

Hans has made several important contributions to comparative political science, but it is safe to say that his main preoccupation, in terms of research topics, is the idea that ‘politics matters’. Going against the dominant grain of political commentary that ‘all parties are the same’ and that it does not matter who governs, Hans has repeatedly shown that it does matter which parties are in control of the executive, particularly with respect to the development (and retrenchment) of the welfare state. Hans has written many articles and book chapters on the substantive transformation of European welfare states. Most importantly, in collaboration with Jaap Woldendorp and Ian Budge, Hans has collected a vast database on the party composition of governments in 48 democracies, including the ministries held by each of the parties, as well as the duration of governments. Incidentally, many of Hans’ PhD- and MA-students have fallen victim to this project, as they were asked to collect the data on the individual ministers in European governments. While such basic data are crucial to the development of our field, finding the information is a daunting task: thus, I take full responsibility for any mistakes in the chapters on France and Italy in the first volume! For sure they have been corrected in the second volume.

In ’Parties and Democracy: Coalition Formation and Government Functioning in Twenty States’ Hans delves deeper into how political parties are linkages between popular preferences and social (welfare state) policies. This theme is also analysed in his book on ‘The Politics of Problem Solving in Postwar Democracies.’ Here, policy formation in multi-party democracies is seen as a way to find legitimate and effective solutions for societal problems that transcend the capacity of individuals. Hans’ work on how parties aggregate individual interests into governmental programmes and the manner these policies translate in variation for welfare policies forms the core of his influential oeuvre.

Hans Keman has been a very inspiring boss, and he was my intellectual mentor and ‘Doktorvater’ from whom I inherited a deep and lasting interest in the development and transformation of political parties and party-government. Hans transformed the Political Science Department at the VU from a parochial focus on national politics into a renowned research
group with an international orientation and high quality academic output. In contrast to this internationalism, he decided to live in a parochial place to be able to live in his beloved Friesland. Hans’ actions may not always make immediate sense to everybody and his stubbornness and determination is often misread and frequently meets resistance and conflict. Yet, those who dare to look deeper into will recognise a dedicated scientist, a devout Frysian regionalist and a generous person in Hans Keman.
HANS KEMAN: explorer of macro-political comparison

Jan-Erik Lane

I met Hans Keman for the first time around 1990 at a conference that his VU University had arranged. I was immediately struck by his openness to other scholars' argument and his willingness to listen to what they had to say. He did not attempt to impose himself upon others, or bore them with a repetition of his particular views. Yet, I could not imagine that he was going to play such an important role in my peculiar career as social scientist.

Hans had developed two major concerns as the foci for his own research: comparative politics in a real sense of comparison on the one hand and the theory and practice of social democracy on the other hand. The first interest was purely scientific whereas the second concern carried a strong element of morals, or normative interests. Both these foci have strong relevance for political science and social studies, which is no doubt the reason that Hans had put them centre stage in his writings.

Hans has supported numerous scholars and students, including me, engaging in comparative research. It was always based on generosity in recognition of other peoples' ideas as well as on broadmindedness in accepting criticism of his own work. Hans had realised through his own massive research efforts, on party programs (difficult research) and government coalitions (time consuming effort) that the case study method was deficient. When Hans started out on his brilliant academic career, the case study method dominated in all areas of political science, for instance in the analysis of government structures (consociationalism), election formulas and the structure of organized interests (neo-corporatism).

From the Case Study Method to the Comparative Methods

Hans started out from the classical Dutch theme of consociationalism, explored first in a case study by Arend Lijphart (1968). It proved so successful that it could be generalised into a set of political institutions to be found in other democracies: Switzerland, Austria and Belgium. If consociational rules or practices could account for political stability in the Netherlands,
offering a quite different mechanism compared with Westminster democracy in the United Kingdom (UK), then could the comparative methods be used to engage in systematic comparison of political stability in different types of democracies? Besides the four jewels in the non Westminster type of democracy, there were consociational practices to be explored in several other countries, both advanced and developing ones. So Hans faced the crucial question: What was the core of consociationalism?

At first, consociational scholars targeted government structure: type of cabinet and electoral formulas. Later they enlarged the set of relevant institutions to include not only political decentralisation – unitarism – federalism – but also the structure of organised interests. Here Hans was to make his first much debated contribution to comparative politics, arguing for a clear distinction between consociationalism and neo-corporatism (Keman and Pennings, 1995).

Hans was convinced that the contradiction between the positive theory of Lehmbruch and Schmitter on the one hand and the negative theory of Mancur Olson on the other hand could not be resolved by the case study method, however deep empirical insights it could provide about one country, like Sweden, Norway, the UK or France. The two methods of comparative analysis, the method of agreement and the method of difference, provided a test of necessary or sufficient conditions, as argued in Hans’ book on methodology (the best in the field). Yet, soon Hans went one step further, resorting to the analysis of correlations and regression, using large data sets on countries. These were the heydays of comparative politics, scholars enlarging the data sets and employing refined statistical tools. Hans was no doubt one of the leading figures, either with his own research or in stimulating others along this path. One result was his central publication on consociationalism and corporatism that showed how difficult it is to do concept formation only within the framework of the case study method.

The strength of the methods of comparison is to indicate the key causal problematic:

- a) same cause – same effect (sufficient condition),
- b) same effect – same cause (necessary condition),
- c) different cause - same effect (sufficient condition)

by either maximizing similarities or differences (method of agreement and method of difference). Thus, one would have a reasonable set of units of analysis – not too small and not too large, with data allowing for various forms of comparative analyses. Country analysis became
the model of this macro research into regimes, institutions and political economy. But enquiries into country features in a globalised world could not leave out the global relationships, calling for an amalgamation of the two disciplines: comparative politics with international relations.

Keman and Pennings showed that the country practices of consociationalism and of neo-corporatism included much variation, even in a small set of West-European countries after the Great War. Thus, they could argue convincingly that consociationalism and neo-corporatism constitute different sets of institutions and social realities. Austria may satisfy both, but Sweden and Norway adhered to neo-corporatism but not consociationalism. Norway is still doing so today. Switzerland has definitely been consociational, but hardly truly neo-corporatist. The Netherlands has changed from the golden period of Zuilen. The finesse of the analysis of Keman and Pennings was to employ the comparative methods to clarify the difficult problematic of defining and measuring these key notions of consensus government and the structure of organised interests, which implied taking election rules and their consequences into account.

To me, the core idea of consensus government, or consociationalism with old Dutch master Althusius, has always been the employment of plurality election formulas in order to set up an oversized coalition cabinet. Thus, Finland practiced consociationalism at times, but hardly India. It is difficult to agree with Lijphart (1996) that the present democracy of India is basically consociational. At all levels of government, India practices strong adversarial politics on the basis of majoritarian election formulas. And government formation tends to minimum winning and minimum sized coalitions. Democratic stability in India has, it seems, other sources than consociationalism, like for instance the legacies of tolerance and rule of law. I would argue for a strict and narrow definition of the concept of consociationalism as PR and oversized coalition governments, like Keman and Pennings (1995)

Let us therefore move on to the enquiry into election institutions in OECD democracies, constituting a central challenge for macropolitical comparison. Could one employ electoral formulas to identify consociationalism? Yet, a necessary condition is that the country in question employs any Proportional Representation (PR) technique. But it is not a sufficient condition, as will be shown below.
From Induction to Correlation and Regression

Once Hans focussed upon systematic comparison in macropolitics, he moved quickly to endorse the use of the methods of correlation and regression. Already in the article on neo-corporatism was regression employed to separate consociationalism from neo-corporatism. As the theory of consociationalism was generalised into the theory of consensus democracies, meant to cover all democratic polities on Planet Earth, the number of cases increased much. Only the methods of correlation and regression could handle the analysis of interactions, conditions and effects. And more and more countries adopted or stabilised their democratic institutions, in Latin America, in Eastern Europe and also in Africa and Asia to some extent. Only econometric tools could handle the advanced analysis of so many cases and so much information on institutions and outcomes, especially if one wished to measure partial effects from the operation of alternative institutions. Thus, Keman’s textbook on methodology with his Dutch collaborators teaches European students all the variety of comparative methods, from most similar systems and most different systems design to correlation and regression. When information about macropolitical units can be stated in a quantitative form, then the methods of regression offer the most suitable tools of enquiry.

Yet, Rein Taagepera (2007, 2008) has recently received much attention for his work on election systems and their consequences for the party system, especially its size. In addition, his questioning of quantitative techniques – correlation and regression - and their usefulness in political science has aroused debate.

In this small piece, I deal only with the often mentioned Taagepera model:

\[ P = (M*S)^{0.25} \]

in which P is the absolute number of parties, M the electoral district size and S the size of the national assembly or lower house of parliament.

The study of election rules is a core concern in political science. Taagepera has put new wine in old bottles with his research combining new ideas going beyond the Duverger model with bold methodology, criticizing the employment of correlations and regression (Taagepera, 2007, 2008). The method that Taagepera argues for is hardly superior to the regression technique, because the latter can very well handle the test of the model (1). I will point at some difficulties with the Taagepera model of the size of party systems here. Taagepera has expressed doubts about the method of correlation and regression to identify relationships among
political variables. Instead, he prefers to employ to fit a curve through the data by means of takings roots out of variables.

Theories are instruments for the interpretation of reality, offering guidance. They perform well when they summarize the facts adequately, meaning that the models in question meet with goodness of fit when compared with the data. The instrumental view of theories has a strong foothold in the philosophy of science, suggesting a somewhat different view of hypotheses than the realism standpoint, looking upon models as abstract pictures of reality – the correspondence view.

Now, to what extent does the Taagepera model of the size of the party system offer guidance to the understanding of the variation in the size of the party systems in constitutional democracies? Let us look at the data for the OECD countries according to recent elections (Table 1). Table 1 contains the information in these three variables P, M and S for the OECD countries in 2007. All the countries in Table 1 are constitutional democracies with competitive elections.
Table 1. Election results in OECD countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ctry</th>
<th>N of parties</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20,33</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13,64</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14,29</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17,50</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13,33</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,97</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,26</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,97</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,84</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22,04</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,54</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,22</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15,00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,66</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,74</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,89</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,22</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,45</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,73</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,63</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7,69</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,96</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: P = absolute number of parties, M = electoral district size, S = size of national assembly.

Looking at Table 1, one may argue that the Westminster democracies are to be found among the countries with electoral district size M at 1.00 or close to that. Consensus democracies, on
the other hand, would always have PR systems with sometimes the whole country being one electoral district. However, PR is a necessary but not sufficient condition for consociationalism. There must also be an oversized coalition government, or grand coalition. What is fascinating with the simple data in Table 1 is the immense variation among these democracies. Can it be explained by an abstract model, like Taagepera’s model (1), summarising all this variation?

In Taagepera’s comparative model (1), the dependent variable is \( P \), or the number of parties. The two independent variables are electoral district size \( M \) and size of the national assembly \( S \). And the model states that the number of parties is the fourth root of district magnitude * seats. One may note a considerable variation in the number of parties, in electoral district size and in the size of Parliament and question does model (1) give guidance when accounting for the country differences in Table 1?

We will transform the values of all the variables into logarithmic ones, given the large numbers that the Taagepera suggested multiplication \( M \times S \) results in, because we deal with exponents. The regression of \( P \) onto the function of \( M \times S \) results in \( \text{Probab}(>|t|)=0.54 \) for \( M \times S \); the function is not significant at all: \( R^2=0.01, F=0.36 \). This interesting and highly relevant finding, constituting, it seems to me, a partial falsification of the Taagepera model, can be visualized in the following Diagrams. Figure 1 shows the actual scores for \( P \) (absolute number of parties), given the data presented above.
Figure 1. Diagram for $P$ according to real data in Table 1

Figure 2 presents the predicted scores for party system size, using the Taagepera model (1) above. The real pattern depicted in Figure 1 has little resemblance with the pattern modelled in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Diagram for computed $P$ function of $M*S$ according to Taagepera model

The finding here is that the Taagepera model (1) $P = (M*S)^{0.25}$ explains almost nothing of the variation in Table 1, constituting a cross-section of the election systems of OECD countries today. Taagepera’s model has aroused admiration for its simplicity, with the appearance of a lawlike statement in physics. However, there is also the second requirement upon models in science, namely besides formal elegance they must meet with empirical confirmation or corroboration. Regression is the most powerful tools for making an enquiry that may meet
both the requirement of model simplicity and high goodness of fit. One should combine curve fitting with regression modelling in relation to the data set.

Keman and associates are in my view right. Regression is the most powerful tool for macropolitical comparison. It allows for not only prediction of new data but also explanation of given data. It is widely employed in all the sciences, natural as well as cultural. Besides model elegance – simplicity or Occam’s razor – there is empirical validity, or data confirmation. Real world complexity, like election formulas or the structure of organised interests requires regression analysis.

**Social Democracy and the Eurozone Crisis**

Hans’s interest in social democracy grew no doubt out of his profound insights into Marxism. He would definitely have preferred Europe adopting the social democratic model of the welfare state instead of running into the financial disaster, created no doubt by neo-liberalism and its excessive deregulation. What Hans must now consider is whether the model of social democracy can help against the severe Eurozone crisis. He promised me several times a major book on Social Democracy – time now for HANS to deliver a masterpiece. It is an open question whether the social democratic model can offer guidance for European democracies in the present extremely difficult situation, involving rising inequalities, increasing unemployment, unmanageable state deficits and debts, growing cultural tensions of civilisation import, as well as immense challenge that expanding Chinese economic power presents. We have been in a void after the failure of neo-liberalism and its extreme deregulation of financial markets.
Summing Up

Hans Keman has had a terrific career, reaching the highest echelon of European political science, including so many roles in various settings: the VU University, the European Consortium for Political Research, as well as the journals that he edited. However, his greatest contribution to us all has been to personify the ideal-type values of Max Weber’s model of the professor: impartiality, objectivity, neutrality and achievement, perhaps more than any other scholar after the Great War.
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Cricket.

Monique Leyenaar & Kees Niemöller

For us Hans is cricket. His love for this game was the subject of the many hours we spent together in the pub, often in European cities after spending a long day at the Joint Sessions of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR). The only time we ‘played’ together was at his birthday party in Haarlem, although the dislocation of one of his arms almost spoiled the party. But then for Hans a handicap is a nuisance but also the source of many exciting stories.

Religion.

Remnants of his upbringing as the son of a pastor of the old-catholic church are well hidden, although ……….

Instituut voor de Wetenschap der Politiek.

Herengracht, Amsterdam. This is the location where we met for the first time, Monique as a student and Kees as a colleague. Hans arrived there in 1975. He was far more in favour of proper methodology education in the political science curriculum than his colleagues from the Friedrich Collective. So he became an ally in all the committee-meetings in which students were demanding fewer methodology courses and preferably courses on qualitative and not on quantitative methodology.
Comparative data source on democratic government: the development of an integrated and comprehensive data set. Well, maybe a challenge for an emeritus?

Keman and Leyenaar.

The ‘Amsterdammers in Leiden’. The second time that Hans and my (Monique) career paths crossed was at the Department of Political Science, Leiden University. I started there in 1985 as a junior lecturer and Hans arrived in 1986 to become senior lecturer in Comparative Politics. From the first moment onwards we were looked upon by our Leiden colleagues as the two coming from Amsterdam. Sometimes meant as a compliment! At that time there was one striking distinction between the ‘Leienaars’ and the ‘Amsterdammers’: we were used to the ventilation of our opinions, to heated debates among colleagues and –consequently- to long departmental meetings.

Ecpr.

The third time that our career paths crossed was in the Executive of the European Consortium for Political Research. We were both elected in the Executive in 1994; Hans served until 1997 to become the editor of the European Journal of Political Research, while Monique stayed on until 2000 and continued her job as chair of the workshop committee until 2000. Out time together in the Executive was pleasant and fun. Hans was missed as an ally in the second period when the animosity between the ECPR and the Thematic Network began.

Travelling.

Traveling together. Once upon a time, four political scientists, Van der Eijk, Keman, Leyenaar, and Niemöller, travelled together by car to Arhus, Denmark. In the end we arrived in
Arhus, but first we had to overcome customs officers at the Dutch-German border who were quite suspicious and wanted to search the car. This however was easier and less time consuming than the second hurdle we had to take, the fact that we ran out of petrol! We left the motorway to look for petrol and, yes in a small village Hans disappeared in the semi-dark and came back with sufficient supply.
An extraordinary man

Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks

We are writing these reminiscences together and take turns in telling our story with Hans. Gary begins.

Gary

“We are newcomers to the Keman fan-club. Out of the blue Liesbet and I each received an invitation from Hans Keman to give a talk in Amsterdam. January 2002. I had never met Hans, but Liesbet remembered him from an ECPR workshop. She responded on behalf of the two of us that this would be great – especially if he could schedule our talks a few days apart so we could weave in a few days in Amsterdam. Ever the pragmatic gentleman, Hans obliged. My first conversation with Hans was about the First World War. I was writing a paper on why some socialist parties were revolutionary and some reformist in the early decades of the 20th century, and I soon realized that Hans was as crazy about history as I was. We talked in detail about those years as if they took place yesterday – and I immediately recognized that Hans was not about analyzing data, he was intent on understanding the passions that drove politics.”

Liesbet

“I came to know Hans about a decade before as a white knight. I was a junior participant in a high-powered ECPR workshop, in which the director, a well-known political scientist with a personality defect, had taken to interrupt presenters at will to provide stinging criticisms (or worse). This was slowly but surely poisoning the atmosphere. When it was my turn to be grilled, Hans Keman and David Marsh rode to the rescue. They deposed the chair and took over proceedings. Hans’ intervention saved the workshop. I had lost touch with Hans since, but the email jogged my memory.

We arrived in Amsterdam the week before Christmas. Since the visit had been scaled back to two days, we suggested it might be better if we gave a joint talk, or two if there was interest. Naively, we provided three topics to choose from. And there the message came back: could you please give those three talks, and while you are in town, also provide feedback on five papers at a small workshop on our project, ‘The Hollow State’? Never give Hans a hand unless you can afford to lose an arm!

They make us work hard here, we thought, and all that for a karnemelk-en-kaas lunch! After the first shift Gary came back to the hotel, and I asked: How did it go? Well, he said, that is one feisty, well-
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prepared audience. By the end of two full days, we had taken some punches (and given some) and acquired some basic VU survival skills, such as elementary Frisian and cricket. A ‘borreltje’ (decidedly not karnemelk) concluded our visit, and the whole department joined happily on the corridor. This was a rolling community.

Little did we know this had been a job interview. As they say in Holland, *Hans liet er geen gras over groeien*. We had barely returned to Berlin (where we were on leave that year), or there was an email from Hans offering two positions! We fell off our chairs, and then started thinking about how to make this happen. Hans kept the pressure on, and turned it up in a charm visit to Berlin. Over a good bottle of wine (or two), the conversation darted from cricket to academics, then back to cricket. Hans and Gary seemed to like the cricket best, and the conversation went well.”

Gary

“There was a lasting meeting of the minds. We shared similar interests and goals: a desire to ask big questions and address them with feet on the ground, or more precisely, with one foot in systematic evidence and the other in history. It was during that Berlin visit that Hans and I hatched the plan to bring together the manifesto and party expert people and get them to talk *to* each other rather than *past* each other. Liesbet insisted on one amendment: no karnemelk for lunch.

Hans took the lead in writing a funding application in Amsterdam, I raised some funds in the US. We combined our networks to get a strong set of conferees, and Liesbet picked the venue for the meeting: the delightful Pulitzer hotel. The Pulitzer conference room, full of light and greenery, did wonders in softening frayed relations among some conference participants, and Hans’ intellectual brokering between the manifesto and expert camps was immensely welcome. The outcome was a special issue of *Electoral Studies* containing an unusually coherent set of papers on measurement of party positioning. The contributors included Ken Benoit, Ian Budge, Hans-Dieter Klingemann, Mick Laver, Michael McDonald, Paul Pennings, Robert Rohrschneider, Marco Steenbergen, and Andrea Volkens. Hans’ paper on manifestoes and expert data is a model of deeply informed, empirically sensitive investigation.

Hans had been working for decades with the comparative manifesto data, and friendship as well as professional ties should have predisposed him to defend that corner. Liesbet and I had set up the Chapel Hill expert survey and were rather skeptical of the left/right CMP coding frame. Hans is a Lakatosian. He is not one to defend an ideological castle purely for the turrets, but relishes robust but playful intellectual sparring, during which evidence and argument are thrown together as atoms in the Hadron collider in search of the Higgs boson. Or something more modest and more immediately useful, such as the insights that a) each method has distinctive pros and cons, b) scientific progress begins...
with specifying the conditions under which one or the other method is heuristically valuable, and that

c) combining two (or more) methods produces usually better estimates than any one. We arrived at
these conclusions together, and Hans’ uncommon intellectual flexibility inspired the workshop.”

Liesbet

“When Hans came to see us in Berlin, he told us that the department had a research programme on
multilevel governance and our opportunity was to give it a frame. Hans, together with Bert Klander-
mans, asked us for a research plan and gave us the freedom to think large. The strategic chair at the
VU University brought additional research time and resources, being in Europe provided unexpected
intellectual stimuli, and the VU University gave us access to excellent young researchers, including
one in particular—Arjan Schakel—whom Hans had spotted in his undergraduate classes. We continue
to have a small, multinational research team lodged in the department working on multilevel govern-
ance. Back in 2002, neither Hans nor Gary nor I could have imagined we would be writing about re-
gional authority in Latin America and authority in 72 international organizations, but it was Hans’ call
to arms which gave us the opportunity to think out-of-the-box.

This says something about vintage Keman. Hans is a visionary, a risk-taker, an institutional entrepre-
neur. During his years as head of the department at the VU University he used his negotiating skills to
put the department of political science on the map in Europe. He hired and promoted a special set of
people, including Bastiaan van Apeldoorn, Andreas Nölke, Ben Crum, Kees van Kersbergen, Henk
Overbeek as well as a slew of bright, young, ambitious researchers. This was a place where research
was fun as well as challenging. As any visionary in a hurry he must have made mistakes, but they are
probably tucked away in his Frisian attic.

Along the way, Hans Keman has forged many friendships—and, I am sure, some enemies to boot.
One cannot be neutral about Hans. But neither friend nor foe will ever question his profound loyalty
to the people he has worked with. And his great heart: not exactly a choirboy himself, he has a soft
spot for ‘a-typical’ people, those with values, habits or traits that set them apart from mainstream so-
ciety or the standard academic world. It is a tolerance that goes beyond ‘passive acceptance of the
other’s difference’; he actually enjoys engaging with these people, perhaps because they remind him
of the ordered but closed world he came from, and how lucky he has been to have been able to carve
his own path in life and career. There is a human curiosity that complements the intellectual inquisi-
tiveness Gary remarked on. There was perhaps no more telling moment than when I introduced Hans
to my dad some ten years ago—a 75 year-old Flemish farmer who left school at 13 and speaks his
own dialect—not Dutch, Flemish, Elsegems or Langemarks, but his personal concoction. Hans sat
next to him all evening, and carried on a conversation with hand waves, words from some distant
shared medieval past, and body language. They both had a wail of a time, and if there is one thing my
dad remembers, ten years hence, of that visit to the big city of Amsterdam: it is that tall man with the white beard.”

A long time has passed since that dinner in Berlin, when Gary and Hans discovered similar passions for political history, the study of world wars, and measurement. Not to speak of cricket and golf. A longer time still since the white knight came to my rescue. Friesland, Workum, Sneek, Rijs and Oudemirdum have become part of our world, though we don’t get there as often as we wish. Hans visited us once in Chapel Hill. At night, we sat out on the deck smoking cigarettes (him) or drinking wine (all), ruminating about life and science. During the day, once the workshop was over, he and Paul would go off and explore the Amtrack railway tracks and accompanying non-stations in North Carolina which remain—till today—an unused public resource to us. Since his last visit, Hans has found Saskia, and we are trying to get both of them on our deck to philosophize about life, happiness and the meaning of being Hans.
I feel deprived every time I have to remind myself that I met Hans Keman for the first time only as I approached my mid-forties. Life has been more enjoyable ever since. The occasion was a planning meeting in Wassenaar for a potential research group project to be carried out at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study (NIAS). That was the summer of 1994.

Most of our five days of meetings had a wonderful symmetry. Hans, Ian Budge, Rick Hoff-ferbert, Paul Pennings, Cees van der Eijk (for those five days only), and I worked diligently—well, truth be told, talked and debated mostly—from 9 to 4 and drank wine in the garden from 4 to 9. Thanks to Ian skipping his nap one day, so that we would have our plan on paper in text form, we left with a 15 page proposal in hand. Hans carried it forward to the NIAS Awards Committee, and it went sailing through with only one hitch. The Committee was unconvinced that I had a useful role to play in executing the project. Hans, Ian, and Rick mounted an offensive on my behalf. So it was in September 1995 that I joined forces with Hans in earnest.

On the first morning of actual work, our five-member theme group on ‘Political Parties and the Quality of Democracy’ met on the veranda where Hans, along with Paul, pulled out the data they had collected in anticipation of getting started. Problem was that they were two months ahead of me. Hans had to show me the way to Netherlands Statistics (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek – CBS) in Voorburg; there, I spent too many of my September and October days. The monotony of data collection was broken by new, more substantive experiences. I had to change my outlook from political representation American style to representation in widespread democratic style, most notably Dutch style. In addition, I felt compelled to spend my evenings on far removed fields of negotiation and diplomacy. This was in anticipation of our weekly team meetings where someone had to moderate the debates between Marx and Hayek—as embodied in the persons of Hans and Rick.
It wasn’t until two-thirds of the way into the NIAS year, on 21 March 1996, that Hans made a Thursday afternoon presentation to the full delegation of 1995-96 NIAS Fellows. His ideas were grounded in a Northian/Rikerian rational institutionalist perspective to democratic politics, even if he would have liked to think they were in the vein of March and Olsen’s ‘logic of appropriateness’. Immediately following his presentation I didn’t take the opportunity to tell Hans of the impact of his ideas about “room to maneuver” or his embrace of the Lijphartian celebration of Dutch-style democracy with ‘pivot parties’. I should note here that my failure to take that opportunity was NIAS’s doing, as the jenever-laced reception that followed on this, as on every other Thursday afternoon at NIAS, sent conversations far away from the afternoon topic. So, until this day of writing, I have never told Hans about the impacts of his ideas on the development of the concept of a ‘median mandate’ and on the pace of democratic policy change as it ebbs and flows within the room to maneuver.

The week after Hans’s presentation our research group went off to the Joint Sessions in Oslo. There Hans’s introduced me around to his friends at the VU and from elsewhere in Europe. Hans, Ian, and I concluded the Sessions with a dinner at a swank Oslo restaurant. With too much wine flowing much too freely for the good of any of us, Hans and I nearly suffocated Ian, first, with wild-eyed claims about how soon we could produce what we now called the NIAS book and, throughout the evening, with a seeming commitment to fill the room about the size of the Winchester Cathedral with cigarette smoke. More sober thoughts filled my head over the last few months we had together in Wassenaar, concluding on the Fletcher Hotel and Restaurant patio on the most windswept and cold June evening I’ve ever experienced. This thought kept running through my head: I had a couple of publications on representation (still) American style and a few conference NIAS-based papers to show for my year; Hans and Paul had produced a book on comparative methods; Ian had all but completed his book on the politics of the ‘New Europe’; and Rick was going home with two unsuccessful operations to fix his sinus problems (and a stronger than ever anti-smoking commitment)—no NIAS book was much in sight.

Thankfully, 1995-96 marked only a beginning, a slow beginning to be sure but a useful one. Fifteen months later, autumn 1997, Hans, Ian, Rick, and I met in Binghamton to reinitiate what we all had allowed to lie dormant in the interim. If we made any progress during that week is unclear. The only memory any of us have mentioned ever since was the decision to conclude the visit by traveling to Atlantic City for a weekend of fun and gambling, hosted by
my mother-in-law. Talk about walking into the eye of a storm! As we got within 25 miles of the coast some sort of miniature hurricane swept in. We travelled those last miles in 50 to 70 mph winds to arrive in a City with streets awash in 6-inch deep water and power lines dangling from the utility poles. Hans emerged from his car head high, chest out, with the look of a proud pre-teen who had survived a most harrowing roller coaster ride and was looking to go back and do it again.

That same fall Hans was taking on responsibilities as head of his department and as editor of the European Journal of Political Research and I was taking over the reins of my own department—i.e., the distractions grew. A few years later I was sending my students to Amsterdam for Hans’s political parties summer school sessions—or Amsterdam so my students excitedly thought, but Hans was by then in transition back to his Friesian roots and held the meetings in Rijs. This was a prelude to Hans coming to Binghamton to serve as an external PhD examiner for the first of my students that I had sent to Rijs. Upon arriving in Binghamton that spring for the exam, he took over my home office for several days. The next day, as my wife Alenna tells it and as all my local friends remember, while I was off to my university office he regaled the neighborhood with six hours a day of stereo blasts of The Dark Side of the Moon, Wish You Were Here and Graceland while he sat first in the office and later in our garden drafting letters, writing articles, and preparing questions for the dissertation defense. The defense came off without any fumbles by the student and we recessed for a NIAS-style Thursday afternoon celebration at my daughter’s house. As we gathered to toast Hans’ tour de force 50 minute questioning of the student the crowd of students and faculty became so large and enthusiastic that the deck on which we all were standing collapsed. Thankfully it was only 18 inches off the ground.

Next came my two month visit to the VU. This time Hans turned his office over to me, the only office at the VU where (according to Hans) one was allowed to smoke. I saw him once in the next seven weeks as by this time he was firmly ensconced in his house in Friesland waiting for spring golf season to arrive. It was a productive time, at least through the good offices of Paul who wrote computer code in a matter of hours to overcome problems that might otherwise have lingered for weeks without solution. To celebrate the productivity—prematurely, as it turned out, for the conclusion to the project was still seven years away—Hans invited me to his house in Friesland, along with my son, Zac, who joined me for the last week of my visit. Hans wined and dined us at a truly fine restaurant adjacent to his boat club, toured his grandfather’s Friesian town, showed off the most magnificent and longest levee
I’ve ever seen, and took us for a round of golf at his club. We capped of our visit with a fine Dutch dining on onion smothered brined herring washed down with jenever. The jenever encouraged conversation led Hans to stories of his uncle’s trials and travails as a resistance fighter, but led also to belated thoughts about the train we needed to catch to get back to Amsterdam for our flight the next day. Not to worry, Hans assured us, he could outrun any train north of Paris with that Peugeot of his. He did, I suppose, for we traveled on a white knuckle 160 kpm ride in the dead of night to arrive as the last train for the night to Amsterdam was already at the Wolvega platform—or was it the Meppel platform? or maybe Zwolle’s? Can’t remember, it was all a blur.

Next came a series of secretive seeming computer messages from some sort of *swamptromp* account asking whether I would be in Chicago for the 2007 APSA meeting. The messages were signed by a person named Hans, but the *swamptromp* moniker on the e-mail made me so suspicious that I asked the folks in the University Computer Center to check to see whether this was an attempt to invade my computer with a virus. Sure enough, it was not. I found out while in Chicago that Hans was spending extended periods in Atlanta with Saskia, a woman he had met on her summer trip to her Friesian homestead. He was undeniably and proudly smitten. Discussion of our project, now but a mere five years from completion, took a distant second place to stories of his time in Friesland and Atlanta with Saskia.

Back he came to Binghamton for a second stint as an outside examiner to one of my PhD students, this time arm-in-arm with Saskia. He performed his due diligence with aplomb, scaring the student to his core with another 50 minutes of questions about his beloved politics of the welfare state. For fear of another collapse from a swelling crowd on the deck of a house we retired to celebrate at a local bar and trekked with a cadre of what had become Ke-man-admiring students for dinner down the street.

Now the page has turned. The NIAS project is behind us in the form of *Organizing Democratic Choice*, published by Oxford University Press in 2012, a mere 18 years from its initiation at that fateful 1994 meeting in Wassenaar. If Hans is game for another 18 years of socializing and fun interspersed with a useful political science idea thrown in every three or four years, he can count me in. If that prospect isn’t enough, I’ll quadruple the appeal by telling him that Alenna is eager for periodic trips to the Netherlands and for more visits to Binghamton by Saskia and him.
Hans Keman: A reliable friend and an excellent political scientist

Ferdinand Müller-Rommel

Even after more than thirty years of friendship with Hans Keman, which have allowed me to familiarize myself with his many personal and scientific qualities, it is a great challenge to write a personal eulogy about him. This is of course not the place to write a resume about Hans’s excellent academic contributions, although his publications, his institutional contributions to the scientific community, and his constructive support of young researchers is outstanding. It is predictable that Hans will continue to develop further activities in the field of political science over the next years. I also do not want to introduce Hans as the best man at a wedding, because I know that he would feel embarrassed. I therefore simply take the liberty of putting a spotlight on three aspects that spontaneously came into my mind while reflecting about our working and personal relationship over the past decades. The first point focuses on where and how we have met, the second on our mutual interest in the subject of party government and the third on his contributions within the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR).

Our first meetings: Hans the historian

If my memory doesn’t fail me, Hans Keman and I have met for the first time at the 1982 ECPR Joint Sessions in Aarhus where we both participated in a workshop on The Future of Party Government, organized by Rudolf Wildenmann. This first meeting was, however, rather superficial. Since many renowned colleagues from all over the world participated in this workshop, Hans and I were busy in sharing views with the distinguished political scientists in our narrow field of interest. The workshop participants basically split into two groups: those who were primarily interested in party organization and the relation of parties and citizen (among them were Stefano Bartolini, Russel Dalton, Richard Katz, Peter Mair, Gordon Smith, myself and some others) and those who studied policy outcomes of party governments (among them were Francis Castles, Manfred G. Schmidt, Hans Keman and a few others). Thus, Hans and I got to know each other in Aarhus, but we really did not become familiar
with each other until the 1983 ECPR workshop on the internal structure of political parties, which took place in Freiburg and was organized by Henry Valen and Lars Svasand.

During this week, Hans and I have spend several evenings with long discussions in the student bars of Freiburg. Very soon, our conversation on party politics became a minor issue and Hans started to talk about his other major field of interest: the history of the Netherlands which had been effected by Nazi Germany in a sad and inglorious way. I was not at all informed about the details that Hans knew about the history of both our countries. For example the ties between Friesland and Northern Germany or the threatening presence of the German occupation troops in the Netherlands during the Second World War. In fact, it was the first time in my life that I was confronted with a historical analysis of a non-German who described precisely how the German troops treated the Dutch citizens in the 1940’s. I was extremely shocked. Yet, I also argued that the Germany’s post-war generation could not be claimed to take responsibility for these actions. Hans only partly agreed. He stated that the younger generation in Germany has to cope with its political heritage, but he also emphasized that it is the responsibility of our generation to guarantee that military interventions never happen again on European territory. It took me a while to understand what he meant. He was right and I was fascinated by his differentiated historical view about Europe and his open mind towards a German colleague in spite of the terrible experiences his family had made under the German invasion and occupation. This enlightening discussion about the Dutch-Germany historical legacy (and not the mutual interest in party politics!) was - at least for me - the starting point of a long lasting friendship.

*Party Government and Beyond: Hans the true comparative political scientist*

Two years after the Freiburg meeting, Hans and I met again at the European University Institute (EUI) in Florence. Embedded in the intellectually stimulating environment at the EUI, we detected our mutual interest in the analysis of party governments in parliamentary democracies. At the time, Hans was a senior lecturer of comparative politics at Leiden University. He also worked together with Ian Budge, professor at the EUI until 1985, on a comparative book about the impact of governmental coalitions on public policies. In 1985, I held a Jean Monnet Fellowship at the EUI and worked with Jean Blondel (who succeeded Ian Budge in his position) on a new project about political-decision making in European party governments. Although being in two different projects, there was a clear overlap of interests in the fields of government composition, termination, ministers, and ministries. Ian Budge and Jean
Blondel (who had been close friends since working together in Essex) collected (more or less) similar data on party governments in Western Europe. They even had the same research assistant at the EUI, who once in a while just copied Ian’s data into Jean’s “new” data bank on party governments. Hans and I made fun about this, but we also had very serious and – at least for my part – most enlightening discussions about the problems of systematic and reliable data collection on various institutional aspects of party government.

Keman and Budge published the results of their EUI project a few years later in an excellent monograph (*Parties and Democracy*, 1990 & 1993). Furthermore, Hans Keman was always an ardent advocate for data collection on party governments in liberal democracies. He therefore edited (together with Ian Budge and Jaap Woldendorp) a most valuable data handbook on *Party Governments in 48 Democracies* (2000). This handbook is a “gold mine” and laid the groundwork for some data-anchored comparative studies on party governments. Meanwhile, Jean Blondel and I published two books: one on cabinet decision-making in Western European party governments (1993) and the other on Central Eastern Europe (2006). In both projects the empirical definition of party government was based on the study by Budge and Keman. It is therefore not surprising that Hans and I decided to launch a new project taking into account the development of party government in all countries of the enlarged European Union since 1990. A few years later we have successfully applied for an ECPR workshop on *Party Governments in the New Europe*. The workshop took place during the ECPR joint sessions in Lisbon. It goes without saying that the “fine-tuning” of our application was completed just in time for the joint sessions to be held in a country with climatic, cultural, and culinary comfort!

This ECPR workshop was not only fruitful in academic terms, but also in regard to the congenial atmosphere among the participants for which Hans as chairman of the workshop sessions deserved all the credit. Participants immediately noticed that he was not only open to new theories and new methodological approaches but also interested in arguments and discussions rather than in his personal recognition. After the workshop, Hans and I published some of the ECPR papers together with our ideas on party government in the new Europe as an edited volume in the ECPR Routledge series. Working with Hans on this book was a great pleasure and at the same time a wonderful experience. We never pressed ourselves for time, thorough discussions were held on each chapter, and yet we met the deadline. In short: I have never been this relaxed about editing a book.
ECPR Joint “Venture”: Hans the scientific manager

During his academic life, Hans did not only concentrate on research. He also actively operated in the representation of the discipline on the European level: first as a member of the ECPR executive committee (1994-1996) and later as editor of the European Journal of Political Research (EJPR). A position he pursued with a conscientiousness invariable delight!

I had the privilege of working with Hans in the ECPR executive committee for two years. During this time he was certainly one of the moving spirits, especially when it came to supporting research and publications as well as training young scholars. He was also guided by the belief that the ECPR should offer academic services to its members. Hans therefore scrutinized all decisions taken by the executive committee and provided support only for those activities that were in the interest of the majority of member institutions.

In 1996, Hans and I evaluated the Essex Summer School in Social Science, Data Analysis and Collection. I was impressed about the unrelenting energy that he put into his efforts to provide better services for graduate students from ECPR member institutions. (At the time the Essex Summer School received a fairly high institutional grant from the ECPR. In reverse, the Summer School offered “discount fees” for applicants from ECPR member institutions). In the ECPR minutes of the Essex Summer School evaluation from September 11, 1996 it reads as follows:

“Hans Keman has evaluated the 1996 brochure as well as the syllabus for each course, given to the students upon arrival in Essex. On the basis of his evaluation, the Summer School agreed (as of 1997):
- to ask each faculty member to use a standardised coherent design format across all courses which will be sent to participants early in time. The format should include the following items: aim of the course; description of topics to be covered, references and its possible application in social science and political science research
- to explain in the brochure what is meant by “advanced”, “moderate”, “elementary” level of knowledge in certain fields. This should help participants to classify themselves and reduce variations of knowledge within a course among participants
- to send a questionnaire to students which should have the function of a self “diagnostic test”. Participating students should recognize whether or not they are able to follow
courses they have registered for. The questionnaire has to be sent back to the Summer School together with the application. Both documents have to be verified by the ECPR Official Representative.

(...) 

Furthermore, Hans Keman requested that two or three courses with explicit political science topics should be added to the programme. Hans Keman had brought with him a possible course outline on Theories and Methods in Comparative Politics.”

There is not much more to be said about Hans Keman as an indefatigable promoter for the interests of ECPR member institutions and for improving the training of European doctoral students in political science. His clear dedication to the European political science community, his generous support of the younger scholars and his complete lack of arrogance make him an extraordinary person.

Epilogue

While writing this short contribution, I noticed that there are many more aspects (aside from our mutual interest in academic affairs) that would be worthwhile mentioning in context of a real friendship: we both like Italian food and good red wine, we both like the sun and the water (including sailing!), and we both like to play Golf at which, I had to experience, he is far better than myself. Hans: I will work on it!
Who is J.E. Keman? (aka Hans Keman)

Wim Noomen

Good question! Well, see for an extensive answer his Curriculum Vitae on the Internet, although the category ‘Hobby’ is lacking. So, it is an extensive but not a complete curriculum. Is this a surprising conclusion? No, it is definitely not for one of the most intriguing questions in the life of human beings is: ‘When one is speaking the whole truth and nothing but the truth in saying that one really does know a person?’ I still don’t know in a general way but specifically with respect to my old friend Hans Keman. So it is very risky to contribute to a Liber Amicorum for this now retired Professor of Political Science. Nevertheless I’ll try and do my best for I am aware of his existence since a long time, during which he developed himself from a respected leftist student to a respected well known professor.

In the mean time we met regularly to speak about his great love, Cricket, about his Old Catholic father and mother, about health problems, about the joy and danger of smoking and about a lot of other things. Also about Comparative Politics? I am afraid we did not. That is to say, may be Hans did or tried to do so, but in that time I was only a less clever professor of Masscommunication, a Dean of the Faculty of Socio-Cultural Sciences and later President of the Vrije Universiteit. So it is not surprising that other subjects did dominate the agenda, that is to say my agenda… Also, and that is actually the reason why the agenda was not dominated by Comparative Politics, because I was not clever enough to understand what Hans was doing in developing this field of study after he succeeded Prof. Gijs Kuijpers as Professor of Political Science at the Vrije Universiteit. That is not to say that I was not interested in what he was doing. On the contrary I do remember that I contributed to one of his international activities by participating in a lunch for well known and respected international political scientists at the Vrije Universiteit, among whom the late Peter Mair. Hans and, in my memory, the other participants did appreciate, in one way or the other, my presence. In order to prevent misunderstandings I have to add: ‘When men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences.’. This, also for Comparative Politics very essential wisdom, I have borrowed from a Genius whose name I have forgotten. I am very sorry to say that. Growing older has its price…. 
Also with respect to Hans I have forgotten a lot of very important things and facts, because of busy and diverging agendas. This however I will never forget: my endeavours to buy the newest World Wide Cricket Guide or something like that in a London bookshop. When Hans heard that I was going to visit my friends in a small village near London he asked me to do him a favour. And indeed why not? So I said: ’tell me’ and he told me that he was very interested in getting that Guide but that he had no plans or opportunities to leave his chair and department before long, so if I would be so good… Of course I would, but it was a rather disappointing experience to find out that the interest for that guide was so overwhelming (or so small) that it took a lot of time to find a bookshop where I could buy the desired booklet with all ins and outs of that very weird sport. If I am not mistaken, unfortunately it proved to be the wrong guide as well… but Hans did appreciate my time consuming, mono-disciplinary search. Actually I must say that is was not a disappointing experience at all, for I never had realized before that so many books had been written about a sport that, as well as Comparative Politics, was and is to difficult to understand for a layman as I was and still am. So I did not regret the time I invested in trying to do him the asked favour. It really was an eye-opener!

What I do regret is this: despite the many efforts by Hans to get me in his house in Friesland for a high level talk and a drink, he did not succeed. That is not his fault but it was the combination of my agenda and the distance I had to travel to reach his house in the middle of nowhere. That is not an excuse but the stating of a fact…. As well it is a fact that Hans was travelling more abroad than I was, so the unsuccessful efforts may have some symmetry.

By way of summary of ‘who is J.E.Keman?’: it was and is a privilege to know him, although ‘knowing’ is too pretentious, but I am sure he will accept this human failure.
In December 2012, an era came to an end when Sachin Tendulkar, after an international career of 23 years, decided to retire from international cricket. In September 2013, another era is drawing to a close: Hans Keman is retiring from his chair in Comparative Politics after a professorial career of 23 years. It will be a different world in the department without him. Even though Hans had already gradually reduced the amount of time spent in the department (probably to help us to slowly get used to the idea of his absence), for many of us the official date of his departure is an occasion to mark. Hans is undeniably a major figure in European and Dutch political science. Many friends and colleagues present in this collection pay attention to his many achievements in this respect, academically of course (as the author of numerous books and articles in the field of comparative political science), and also as an influential figure in European and Dutch professional associations such as the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) and the Nederlandse Kring voor Wetenschap der Politiek (the Dutch Political Science Association). For me personally this cannot be the focus of my modest contribution here. In spite of the efforts of both of us (from a very early date onwards actually) to overcome the divide between the fields of international relations (IR) and comparative politics (CP), there are few bridges, and they have perhaps in some ways become fewer over the years as IR grew and developed more and more into a separate discipline with its own professional organisations, its own journals, and its own sub-disciplines. As a consequence I know Hans much better (and have been influenced by him much more) in his roles as colleague, fellow teacher, head of department and university administrator.

Looking at the Curriculum Vitae of Hans Keman, it is striking how many parallels and interfaces there have been in our careers. We have both studied political science in Amsterdam during the years 1969-1975. Actually, I started one year earlier and obtained my Master’s nearly two years later, which of course is characteristic more generally for the different times when our careers accelerated and slowed down. We did not know each other yet at that time, because I studied at the (Municipal) University of Amsterdam (UvA) while Hans was at the Free University (Vrije Universiteit or VU). That changed when Hans was appointed as be-
ginner lecturer at the University of Amsterdam in 1975. The foundations for our friendship were laid during the following eight, rather turbulent years.

Political Science at the UvA was in turmoil when Hans arrived; it had been for some years. Actually, Hans was one of a ‘Gang of Four’ appointed to replace Professor Hans Daudt and his staff. Over the previous years, a struggle in the university had developed regarding the level of student influence on the curriculum. In the historical context of those years, the university had been democratized, giving students equal say in many decisions. This had led to a fundamental restructuring of the curriculum of Political Science. Eventually, it came to the point that Daudt and a few of his colleagues refused to implement the new curriculum and to teach to hostile groups of students. In the end, the university appointed four young new lecturers to fill the void: Meindert Fennema, Hans Keman, Geert-Jan van Oenen and Siep Stuurman. These four men formed the hard core of what was known as the Friedrich Collective of (mostly young) political science instructors who took over the teaching of the basic introductory curriculum. The Collective derived its name from the author of the text book (see Friedrich 1963) already in use for quite a few years as the core of the so-called Friedrich Colloquium as it had been taught by Prof. Daudt and his staff.  

The core of the conflict was a confrontation over the nature of political science as an academic discipline, and over how to teach it. Several of the established professors teaching in the political science programme had great difficulty dealing with the new and assertive generation of students who had the audacity to openly contradict their professors and to demand ‘equal time’ in the curriculum for ‘critical’ approaches. The confrontation was as much a confrontation of style as it was a conflict over substance. Stylistically, the older generation of professors, not just Hans Daudt but for instance also the sociologist and specialist in American studies Arie den Hollander, were just not cut out to deal with lecture rooms with hundreds of students and compensated for this by assuming a confrontational attitude, understood by many as authoritarian. Substantively, Daudt defended the fundamental ontological and epistemological foundations of American political science and the imperative to aspire to empirically grounded objective knowledge (cf. Brecht 1959 and Dahl 1963). He refused to

---

12 An ironic anecdote: the former political science student and columnist Stephan Sanders, in his quest to show how as an innocent youth he was indoctrinated by Marxist zealots, in his obituary for Hans Daudt in the weekly *Vrij Nederland* (November 1, 2008) claimed that the Friedrich Collective had named itself after *Friedrich Engels*!
teach contributions from other traditions in his introductory lectures, arguing that students first needed to learn the fundamentals of the trade before they would be equipped to confront dissenting opinions. His most vocal student opponents (among them Siep Stuurman) confronted him with the ideas of the Frankfurter Schule (e.g. Adorno/Horkheimer 1947; Marcuse 1964) and of classical Marxism (e.g. Marx/Engels 1845-6) to demand a ‘critical’, emancipatory social science instead of the ‘value-free’ approach that Daudt defended.

In the end, this ‘critical’ approach came to dominate the teachings in the Friedrich Collective, to which both Hans and I belonged until his departure from the UvA in 1983. However, we were in different departments: Hans was located in the Political Science Department, I was in the International Relations Department; we met only in the Friedrich Collective. In that context we were involved in many meetings in which heated debates took place about academic, political and sometimes personal issues. What I remember most from those days is that Hans and I seemed to share a sense of relative detachment: we regularly met outside the meetings to share our exasperation with the uncompromising attitude of many of our colleagues.

Our ways parted when Hans left for the EUI in Florence in 1984; from there he went on in 1985 to Leiden University. We both received our doctorates in 1988, Hans in Leiden, I at the UvA, and we shared one of our supervisors, Gerd Junne. In 1990 Hans returned ‘home’ to the VU when he was appointed to the chair in political science. These were the days of a far reaching restructuring of Dutch universities. Of course – what else – the objective of the operation was to realise considerable reductions in overall expenditure for higher education. One of the key instruments was a top down concentration and redistribution of disciplines and specialisations among universities by the Ministry of Education. The VU University in that process lost International Relations as a sub-discipline of political science. At the UvA we experienced the effects of this as an influx of a fairly large number of students who transferred to UvA in order to finish their degree.

One of Hans’ major contributions in the following years was his refusal to accept the idea of a programme in political science without the fundamentals of international relations as a key component. In contravention of the nationally decreed policies he convinced the VU authorities to re-establish an IR component. Without this recalcitrant insistence of Hans there would have been no vacancy in 1998 when I decided it was time for me to leave the UvA and to move to another university.
With hindsight, I can imagine how Hans succeeded in getting his way as regards the return of IR in the political science curriculum at the Vu in the 1990s. In fact, one of the things I have come to admire in Hans after coming to the VU in 1999 is his particular modus operandi in managerial and policy-making circles in the academy at large. Hans has fulfilled countless functions (and still does) at all levels. In that sense he is the embodiment of multi-level governance as praxis, simultaneously operating in local, national and international circles. His positioning in one context is always informed by strategic and tactical considerations of how decisions affect realities and relationships in other contexts. In doing this, Hans is always guided by the overriding objective of furthering the interests of his department, the discipline, and social science in general (where he will normally argue that these coincide for practical purposes). Hans is also difficult to stop or distract: he has a deep knowledge of the matter at hand, and a very determined and imperturbable negotiating style. It is wonderful to sit side by side with Hans in joint discussions with ‘adversaries’ such as a Dean or an external research evaluation committee. In fact the university bureaucrats who might have wanted to deter Hans from binging IR back on the basis of national regulation and inter-university agreements had no chance once Hans had concluded that IR was indispensable.

Come to think of it, it is really ironic to realise that Hans started his career in the wake of a student revolt against alleged authoritarian professors and against American dominated empirical political science. Many of the students at the VU, and actually many colleagues in the university as well, experience Hans’ posture as quite authoritarian. In addition, Hans’ scientific reputation is in no small measure based on his achievements in and contributions to developing the theory and methodology of empirical political science. Not quite the original intention when the Friedrich Collective was formed, perhaps! Nevertheless, the authoritarian posture is mostly play for Hans, and many students usually figure this out quite quickly. For students Hans is typically someone you either hate or love as a professor, but he doesn’t leave you unaffected. His dry and sometimes satanic sense of humour is not always properly understood.

Two years ago, in the spring of 2011, for the first time since the days of the Friedrich Collective, Hans and I co-taught a course: Comparative and International Political Economy. Of course in the days of ‘operational excellence’ (and other Newspeak produced by neoliberal university administrators) co-teaching in fact means each teaching his own half of the course.
But: we had one interesting nexus that tied the two parts together, namely Colin Hay’s discussion (Hay 2004) on the convergence-divergence debate in globalisation theory. From his piece it was very clear that the convergence-divergence theme is very much the theme of a ‘comparative politics’ approach in a traditional sense of the word, one also that is common in the Varieties of Capitalism literature (cf. Hall and Soskice 2001). Colin Hay suggested in his article (although serving other purposed with that suggestion) that this may be a false dichotomy and that a third issue is equally important, namely that of ‘common trajectories’. Applied to the neoliberal globalisation debate, this means that traditional comparativists are mostly engaged in studying processes of convergence and divergence under conditions of globalisation, trying to explain why some countries has much more radical free market policies than others in spite of the similar pro-market impact of neoliberal globalisation. Others however, and I considered this to be applicable to the concerns of International Political Economy, are more concerned with trying to understand common trajectories. Applied to the same debate: why do practically all OECD countries move, in the years since the 1980s, in the direction of more market and less state involvement in the economy in spite of their hugely different institutional heritages? The realisation that the second question of course rests as much on the application of the comparative method puts me forever in Hans’ debt, as it reveals how we have basically been driven by similar interests after all!
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Watching from silly mid-on as Keman bowls another googly

Ed Page

I had seen him before at conferences, but the first time I really met Hans was in June 2000. I had just been appointed as co-editor of the European Journal of Political Research (EJPR), taking over from the late Peter Mair, and Hans was the other coeditor, with whom I worked until late 2003. He had a clear idea of what articles had come in, pointing to various piles in different parts of his room, and the secretarial assistance to handle them. He also had a pretty clear idea of what the division of labour between us would be. These were the days just before electronic submission. Hans was the "commissioning editor", deciding what got in and I was to be the "production editor", deciding which articles went in which issue and editing them (cutting and putting them into clear English).

I got the feeling early on that he felt this partnership might not work from the disappointment on his face caused by my blank looks and evasive words when he raised the question of the state of English cricket. But this feeling soon disappeared after I got to know him as a warm and generous colleague and friend. I had confused a look of puzzlement that someone from England could not like cricket for disappointment. His cricket fanaticism made it pretty easy for me to know what sort of thing to buy as a Christmas present.

Hans' great strength as a colleague in this context as co-editor was his ability to get the measure of people and know exactly how to deal with them without unduly alienating them. As with many journals, problems might arise from relations with the publishers, there were the occasional slightly awkward authors, the odd bits of friction with some parts of the association publishing the Journal (the European Consortium for Political Research - ECPR), and there were commissioned pieces for the Journal that ran behind schedule. He could usually see the problems coming long before I could and the wider issues behind them. And Hans did not often deal with them by flattery, gentle cajoling or anything particularly touchy-feely. He was generally rather blunt and attributed this to his Frisian upbringing. "I know what you are up to and here's why you should not be doing it" was often the general message. It tended to work pretty well.
For some reason one or two members of the Executive Committee of the ECPR at the time had got it into their heads that Hans and I should be treated like naughty schoolboys for much of the three years we worked together. Neither of us took kindly to this but Hans did not take it lying down. At one meeting we were summoned in to talk to the Committee about the editorial budget increase we planned to propose. Having been called into the room and made to wait while they discussed something else, they then decided to go off and have coffee and left us sitting there in an otherwise empty room. After a while he said to me "We should ask for six thousand". "But Hans, we only want three and we agreed to ask for four" I replied. "They'll be happy agreeing to five" he said. "How do you know?" I asked. He nodded to the pile of papers on the desk near him left by one of those gone off for their coffee. It was open at a page with the running heading "Budget. Confidential" with the comment along the lines "it should be possible to contain the editors' request to four thousand five hundred". He was right and we got five.

On Hans' watch the editorship of journal was not only put on a more professional footing, a process continued by his successors, the journal itself also made a significant leap towards the higher international impact it enjoys today. I was very sorry when our partnership at the helm of EJPR ended. I remember that I happened to be visiting him in Fryslân (he was a generous host to me and my family) on the exact day that his term expired and we raised several glasses to various glories of the preceding three years. We have, of course, kept in touch, and cricket has helped here as I have been pleased to be able to pass on, every now and then, things cricket that can only easily be bought in England.
For me Hans Keman is the driving force behind doing research in Political Science at the VU University Amsterdam. During the 34 years that Hans and I have known each other, we have been cooperating most intensely in the period 1995-2003 when many of our co-publications were written. Here follows an overview of some of the main developments during the last 34 years in which I will focus on the role that research has played in our working life.

Hans and I first met at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) in 1979 when universities were still democratically organized by giving staff and students a formal and decisive vote on all main decisions. At that time I was a member of the student fraction of the Faculty Council (Machiavelli) and Hans was the Chair of the representatives of the staff in that Council (PPV). In that role he insisted that his voice was heard and he managed to manipulate the staff representatives in such a way that they voted on all important issues as one bloc following his preferences. In that way he became a powerful man who played a central role during the meetings because his preference was decisive for nearly all decisions and he often overshadowed the members of the Faculty Board.

In the beginning of the 1980s I attended his course on Political Economy that he taught with his assistant professor Dietmar Braun. This was also the time that he cooperated intensely with Manfred Schmidt, Klaus Armingeon, Frank Castles, Roland Czada and Heikki Paloheimo on topics that are still intensively researched and related to the welfare state, the world market integration and strategies to overcome the economic crisis (for example their co-production *Coping with the Economic Crisis. Alternative Responses to Economic Recession in Advanced Industrial Societies* from 1987). During this course the students read the latest conference papers of this international research group which familiarized us with some of the ins and outs of doing research.

The central research problem in this time period was how do parties and governments matter for democratic decision-making and for socioeconomic performance in different institutional
contexts? This distinction between decisions and impact has been central in Hans’ research because the issue at stake was not solely what was decided but also how this decision impacts on economy and society. Hans wanted to show how the socioeconomic performance of countries is affected by the behavior of parties, governments and interest groups under different institutional conditions.

In the middle of the 1980s I started to work on my PhD (on local variations in Dutch pillarization) at the Faculty of Spatial Sciences (UvA) whereas Hans went to Leyden University where he wrote his PhD: The Development towards Surplus Welfare: Social democratic politics and policies in advanced capitalist democracies (1988). In 1990 our roads crossed again when there were a number of vacancies at the Political Science Department of the VU University after a reorganization (as a result of poor research performance). Our appointment at the VU started on the same day: 1 october 1990 and for both of us the year 1990 is probably the most important turning point in our career. Working at the VU meant both changing to a new working environment and it also implied a major shift in the substantial topics than we were working on. Whereas the main research topics of Hans had been corporatism, social democracy and military expense, these gradually have been changing into (or were combined with) the study of party government, democratic institutions and economic performance. For Hans the VU seemed to offer the ideal start for a full Professorship because here he could run the Political Science section of the Department on his own. In addition, he was granted the funding of a number of new assistant professors that he could select himself. We started in the early 1990s with a brand new team consisting of Kees van Kersbergen, Bertjan Verbeek, Jaap Woldendorp and myself. Since this time Hans and I started to cooperate on doing comparative empirical research on the impact of parties and institutions on socio-economic policy-making. Between 1990 and 2000 the research of the Department was quite focused and many of the staff members were co-publishing which resulted, for example, into the edited volume on The Politics of Problem-Solving in Postwar Democracies in 1997. In a later volume on Comparative Democratic Politics (2002) the contributing authors were a mix of political scientists from the VU and elsewhere (most of them already mentioned above). Projects like these show that Hans has been very successful and productive in his strategy of networking as a means to internationalize the Political Science research at the VU.

In the middle of the 1990s Hans and I have spent nine months at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIAS) in Wassenaar. We were ac-
cepted as a Research Theme Group on the topic ‘Parties and the Quality of Democracy’ to-
gether with Ian Budge, Michael McDonald and late Richard Hofferbert. Although the main
collective outcome was published in 2012 (17 years later) under the title Organizing Demo-
cratic Choice. Party Representation over Time, we have been quite productive in this period
and produced several journal articles and a text book on methodology (together with Jan
Kleinnijenhuis): Doing Research in Political Science. An Introduction to Comparative Meth-

Due to these and other research efforts (that were all initiated by Hans) the international repu-
tation of Political Science at the VU improved significantly. This development was strength-
ened by supplementary research funding from the Central Board and the Faculty Board which
facilitated the appointment of top-professors (in particular Gary Marks and Liesbet Hooghe)
and made the Department successful in training PhDs because the best students opted for the
VU. Nearly all PhD students graduated within 4 or 5 years and many were able to start an
academic career afterwards which is quite exceptional.

But, and this is the first lesson than can be learned, the overall success in academia is not
solely measured in terms of research output. Teaching and especially student numbers and
finances have an even stronger impact on the fate of any Department. Since 2000 the organi-
zational pressures on smaller Departments have been increasing. These pressures led to a
desintegration of the cooperation between the smaller Political Science section and the much
larger Organizational Science section. Political science turned into a separate Department but
thanks to the growth of the IR-section (in which Henk Overbeek and Bastiaan van Apeldoorn
played a decisive role) it managed to survive (financially). In addition some significant deci-
sions related to teaching were taken. The most important one is probably the selective Master
which attracted a fair number of students (30 to 50) and resulted in the ranking as the one of
the best masters of the VU in 2012 (according to the National Student Evaluation).

Since 2003 Hans has gradually stepped back while Kees van Kersbergen took over his Chair.
The working conditions for all of us stayed largely the same. In 2005 I became a member of
the Faculty Board (Research Director) for three years and after that I joined the Management
Team (as Research Manager) and during this time dean Bert Klandermans tried to improve
the level of research in the faculty as a whole more or less comparable as Hans has done for
the Department. This certainly has helped to raise that level significantly, but it is also aston-
ishing how fast a number of cornerstones of that research policy have been vanished after Bert Klandermans retired. This hints at a second lesson to be learned: what has been built up in terms of research may deteriorate quickly if the initiators retire or leave their post.

Since 2010 the Department is again at risk because it remains relatively small while the financial pressures have been increasing. Paradoxically, a re-merger with Public Administration has become a serious option in the years to come. So, the main challenge is to maintain the internationally recognized high level of research in Political Science at the VU while the pressures on small departments are increasing.

Looking back at Hans contribution to Political Science, he has laid the foundation for comparative political economy: how politics matters for socioeconomic performance, how institutions hamper or enable governments to deliver what parties have promised. Organizationally he has been able to re-build a political science department that is still internationally recognized because of its high level of teaching and research. But the last 12 years at the VU also show that political science is continually under pressure and that it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain what has been built up in the past. Indeed, looking back at the past 34 years it is a remarkable achievement that Hans has survived all struggles and changes so well. Hans was inclined to seek a confrontation when decision-makers introduced decisions that undermined his work and principles. This made working with him very lively (never a dull moment) but also quite demanding (especially for Hans himself).

Will the achievement of Hans to build up a renowned Political Science Department be viable and survive in the future? This is doubtful because the institutional logic of the VU has changed from a traditional university (that values both academic research and teaching which are both publicly funded) to an entrepreneurial model that focuses on external funding (valorisation). This development is clearly not in line with what Hans would prefer. Central in Hans’ view on politics is Easton’s system theory in which there are demands (the input) which are translated into policy (the output). In a similar fashion Hans views the academic system: we teach in order to generate income and research is what comes out of it as the ultimate goal of being academics. Teaching is a means to enable (and finance) the goal of publishing. This logic has worked for a long time, but it is being gradually replaced by a new logic that is almost the opposite: academics mainly teach and those that are able to generate external funding (by meeting externally defined criteria and standards) will be able to do re-
search. This means that research time diminishes and is assigned to a small number of researchers. It also implies that small departments like Political Science suffer because if their income diminishes staff members that leave cannot be replaced so that those who stay will have to do more teaching and hence less research.

Finally, this implies that there is a continuous tension between the ideal academia (which is publicly financed) and the real world developments (towards valorization). This can be seen as a culmination of the same tension in which Hans’ contribution to Political Science has taken place during the past 25 years: the ideal situation and the real world were often opposites. The zest for doing research in Political Science at the VU does still exist, but it will become increasingly harder to materialize in the way that Hans Keman has managed this.
Hans Keman

Jasper de Raadt

Like many other students in the political science department, I did not really know what to think of Hans Keman when I arrived at VU University in 1996 and attended my first lectures with this somewhat intimidating professor. Sure, he knew a lot about Dutch politics, about party systems and consociational democracy, but his ways of teaching were also a bit out of the ordinary. What to think of his regular references to the politics of Australia and New Zealand, countries that, for a novice in the field, did not seem to be *that* relevant. Hans found it important that his students were up to date about Dutch political history. Therefore, long gone – and rather exotic sounding – politicians such as Abraham Kuyper (naturally, when studying at VU University…), Pieter Cort van der Linden and Charles Ruys de Beerenbrouck were given ample attention. It should be no surprise for those who know Hans well that cricket also played an important role in his lectures. Although few students knew something about this complicated and funny sport, Hans managed to explain some of the basics of politics by using the analogy of the cricket field and the rules of that *other* gentlemen’s game. Attending Hans’ courses also brought along a bit of anxiety as he often asked questions directly, trying to get students to participate. Yet, students were often caught off guard as it was difficult to anticipate when and what Hans would be asking, or who the question was aimed at exactly. In sum, as an academic teacher, Hans knows how to fascinate his students and how to convey his passion for political science. He does this by choosing topics that at first glance do not really seem related to his courses, and by applying a teaching style that sometimes destabilizes his students. Yet, the result of this carefully chosen strategy is exactly what every teacher should strive for: a classroom full of motivated students who know that with political science they have made the right choice of studies.

Shortly after finishing my studies I got to know Hans a bit better, when I became a research assistant in a NWO-funded project studying populist parties in Western Europe. Together with André Krouwel and David Hollanders we analyzed party programs for populist rhetoric and although Hans acted mainly in the background, his influence on the research project was substantial. David and I, being the two junior members of the research team, were given the
opportunity to present a jointly written research paper at the 2004 European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) general conference in Bologna. Hans was present in the room and although he did not mention it explicitly, he seemed to be pleased with our presentation and with how we had replied to the various questions. He was a lot noisier though, when one of the other young researchers in the panel consumed every minute of his time slot by reading out loud his entire paper.

During this conference it became clear that Hans was a respected member of the European political science community. He ran from committee to committee and was constantly being addressed by other, mostly elderly, researchers. Yet, he did not forget about David and me and presented us to some of his colleagues and friends. Hans also wanted to use his reputation and network in order to provide young researchers a chance to enter the political science community and to help them building their own academic career.

Our visit to Bologna would not be our last joint trip abroad. In December 2004, I became a doctoral researcher in the Political Science department at VU University where Hans was head of department at that time. I worked under the daily supervision of André Krouwel and Hans became my “promotor”. During the first one-and-a-half years, Hans took on a somewhat secondary role in my Ph.D. project. André and I had already been working on this research project for about a year and it seemed that Hans did not think that many direct interventions from his side were needed. We met from time to time to discuss my progress, but since I had some difficulty focusing my research, I was relieved every time our get-together was concluded. Hans probably had ideas about how I should proceed, yet he clearly thought that I should take the initiative and make important theoretical and methodological decisions on my own. This was a challenging period that most Ph.D. candidates have to go through one way or another. I am not sure, though, if many thesis supervisors would be actually willing to give their students the room to manoeuver I was given by Hans. I tried out various theoretical and methodological approaches and included new countries in my dataset, which I then threw out again. In sum, it took me more than two years before it was getting clear where the thesis would be going and all this time Hans did not once lose his patience, at least so it seemed from the outside. Once he was convinced that I independently had designed the outlines of my dissertation, our working relationship intensified. During the last eighteen months of my Ph.D. project we met several times a month, and our discussions were increasingly taking place on the basis of academic and personal equality. Hans did not shy away from criticizing my numerous writings, but he was also willing to accept my opinion, on the condition that it
was well explained and justified convincingly. This fruitful cooperation led to several journal publications and I finished my dissertation almost in time. The fact that Hans was also satisfied with end result was reflected in his choice of the thesis committee. He tried to get Arend Lijphart to come to Amsterdam, which is obviously near to impossible given the man’s busy schedule. This indeed did not go through, and Hans approached several respected professors in his network who all immediately agreed to sit on the committee. Among them were Manfred Schmidt, Ian Budge and Gary Marks and both Hans and I were proud when the thesis was awarded cum laude.

Next to a great teacher and researcher, Hans has thus also been very successful as a thesis supervisor. What he appreciates is independently thinking academics, willing to stand for their work and to defend it against criticism. His way of supervising is aimed at producing exactly that. By giving them the freedom to develop their own ideas, Hans has contributed enormously to the academic and personal development of his doctoral students, and not in the least to my own.

It has been a great pleasure to write this contribution to Hans’ liber amoricum. During his career, Hans has meant a lot to Dutch and international political science and it has been an honor to work with him and to be able to call him my Doktorvater. During the fourteen years I spent at the department of political science of VU University, I have come to appreciate Hans enormously. Not only for his great expertise in the field and his pedagogic qualities, but especially for his humor, his patience and for the personal relationship that has grown between us. I wish Hans all the best for the future and hope he and Saskia will spend many more happy years together in Rijs.
How to read Hans. Secret stories from the secretary office.

Aniek IJbema
Margriet Lambert
Sabine Luursema

As colleagues from the secretary office we have been in the privileged position of working for Hans for many years, which has turned out to be a unique and enriching experience. Margriet had been working for the VU for ten years when she met Hans. Sabine was “screened” by him for the job as office manager in the year 2000. She had applied for a different job at the Faculty of Social Sciences, but was re-directed to the secretarial office of the Department of Public Administration and the Department of Political Science – for her a golden choice. Aniek had her job interview with Hans as well. In this interview the (at that moment mysterious) question came up about her capability to decode handwriting.

In the many years we worked for Hans, we have had many possibilities to see his way of teaching, directing the department, and writing many articles. He was an excellent – political – negotiator for “his” department and knew how to “manage” the Faculty. The department had to move twice and every time he managed to organize the best rooms for his people and to keep out of reach of the Public Administration department.

Working for Hans was always pleasant and hardly impeded by misfortune. Among the few incidents that did occur we recollect Hans losing his email account and all of his mailing addresses or using old files instead of the ones already edited by us. Of course, it is tempting to focus on more anecdotes and we can hardly resist the temptation to mention some of them.

Handwriting

As Hans has no feeling for the computer keyboard he wrote everything down (left handed) on paper. The secretaries were supposed to “translate” it into readable stuff. As his thinking was faster than his writing, he sometimes forgot a word or sentence, or he made all sorts of alterations in the text on different pieces of paper. We often had the feeling that we were pioneers
in an unknown world. A complicating factor was that the papers were usually sent to us by fax, increasing the risk that they were blank, had their margins cut off, or were completely missing.

Losing things

As the editing secretary of Acta Politica, Margriet had a special mail folder in which she handled all mails sent to the secretary office of the journal. Hans, the editor, had access to this mail folder as well. At a certain moment, the constant flow of incoming mail was bothering him too much and he decided to delete the entire folder. As a result, Margriet lost her entire archive. As this happened during her holidays, it was impossible to recover the mails upon her return. A small disaster…

Another day, Hans lost his bag, containing several very important papers. He was absolutely sure that he left the bag at the university, either at the secretary office or in his room. The rooms were searched for several hours, but the bag could not be found. Later, Hans’ housekeeper lady told us that she had found his bag in a cupboard in his house in Friesland.
Nerve-wrecking incidents

One day, a grant proposal had to be submitted by internet. The deadline was at 4 p.m. At 3.50, Hans entered the secretary office with the required documents and asked us to forward them. It took a while to find the correct web site, which appeared to require a login code and password. Several minutes passed by and the tension was rising. Hans, pacing up and down the room, was summing up the disastrous consequences of the fact that this was going to be a complete failure and Margriet was desperately trying to find a solution. This solution was to call Paul Pennings, the very picture of calmness, who happened to know the code and password. A few seconds before 16.00, the application was successfully submitted, immediately followed by the message that the deadline for submission had expired.

Rules (and breaking them)

Since several years, it is strictly forbidden to smoke in the building. The rule does not apply to Hans. When entering the third floor, where the department of Political Science is housed, it is immediately clear whether Hans is present or not.

Traveling

Hans liked to give guest lectures, especially in parts of the world (Australia, South Africa) in which a cricket tournament was organized at the same time. Of course, the secretary office was informed extensively about all results of the cricket matches Hans attended. Despite all his travels, Hans was always happy to return to his beloved Friesland. We have been invited several times to his home. We were guided through the southwestern part of Friesland and introduced to the roots of Hans and his family and admired the new house of Hans and Saskia.

As a person we like Hans a lot – he is who he is. Sometimes difficult – especially if something or somebody angers him, i.e. the traffic jams on his way to the VU or if somebody mislays his books or papers. Sometimes very easy going – especially when he talks about his love for Friesland or cricket.
We are sure that we do not lose touch with him after his retirement. We think of him – and Saskia – as our friends. We hope that he will continue dropping into the secretary office to chat about golf, cricket, renovating his new house, and his troubles with the local council. And we are sure that he has good reasons to keep in touch with us.
An institutional perspective on Keman as an institution

Noël Vergunst

The last question that Hans Keman asked me during my job interview was about the Nijmegen based multi-sport club Quick. The question was which sports were exercised at this club. When I answered 'football', he yelled from the other side of the table: 'wrong, cricket'. From this moment, I knew this man, soon to be my supervisor, was going to be clear about his strong opinions. And although I am aware that this provocative behaviour scares many people, it has always stimulated me to discuss with him using the strongest and most appropriate arguments.

Hans certainly is an institution in comparative politics. His main contribution to the study of comparative politics is the institutional perspective. Before Hans, to explain political behaviour and events political scientists focused either on historical roots or on interests of individuals and groups. Hans has connected historical patterns and individual rational behaviour and developed the rational-institutional perspective in comparative politics.

Hans used his rational-institutional perspective to explain the pacification in Dutch politics in 1917. In the Netherlands around 1900, there were several crucial issues that divided liberals, christian-democrats and social-democrats deeply. Two important issues that needed the adjustment of the constitution were universal suffrage, suffrage was limited to wealthy and male people, and public funding of private schools, only public schools were financed by the government and not private schools that had a religious (protestant or catholic) basis. These three political groups occupies almost the same number of seats in parliament. The liberals were both against universal suffrage and public financing of private schools. The socialists were strong in favour of universal suffrage -they expected to receive a majority of votes -, but opposed to private schooling. The Christian-democrats, both Catholics and Protestants, were strong in favour of public financing of the private schools, but were opposed to universal suffrage. Voting on these issues would have led to rejection of both proposals. A majority of liberals and Christians was against universal suffrage and a majority of liberals and socialists was against private schooling. However, there was a difference in the salience of the issues to
the parties. To the socialists universal suffrage was most important and private schooling less important, whereas the Christian-democrats had the reversed priority. This enabled them to establish a compromise. They exchanged their votes: the socialists supported the public financing of private schooling, whereas the Christian-democrats supported universal suffrage. The compromise solved the deadlock. A third issue appeared crucially for the pacification in Dutch politics: the regulation of welfare.

Did an analysis of the Dutch pacification using these three issues. He reconstructed the priorities that the three parties have regarding these issues from urgent need, important and indifference. The ranking by the socialists is, from most to least important: universal suffrage, welfare regulation and schooling. The liberals: schooling (in favour of public schooling), universal suffrage and welfare regulation. The Christians: schooling (in favour of private schooling, i.e. religious schools funded by the state), welfare regulation and universal suffrage. From these preferences it is difficult to come to a decision. The solution was to exchange votes between the parties. The result from the pacification was a package deal of public financing of private schools, which was preferred by the Christians and tolerated by the socialists, universal suffrage, which was preferred by the socialists and liberals, and welfare finally would be regulated in the future, which was a priority of the socialists, whereas the others had no strong objections. This package deal was essential for institutional change in two respects. First, it was the beginning of use of informal rules by the political elites of the subgroups. All major parties were involved in this package deal, which means that they more or less accepted these new rules. Second, the outcome of the compromise has led to the introduction of the proportional electoral system in the Netherlands. This has been also an important factor in the creation of consensus democracy.

This case-study by Hans shows that institutions not only affect the outcomes of decision-making, but that the actors involved can also change both the formal and informal institutions or rules. This case-study provides a new perspective on the interaction between the formal institutions and informal rules created by the actors to move from a deadlock to an optimal solution. It has demonstrated how the specific rules in use determine which solutions are feasible. Moreover it shows that to agree on a package deal, sometimes a larger coalition is needed than a minimal winning. Another important conclusion for the understanding of consociational practices, is that there is not only a game between elites, but at another level a game between the elites and their followers. These case studies are only valid for these cases.
It is difficult to generalise them into theories and to examine them in a comparative perspective. Nevertheless, these models have shown that in their struggle with others the political elites has to be supported by their followers and that what agreement is made is dependent on the institutional context.

The pacification of Dutch politics in 1917 was the start of the period of political accommodation that lasted until approximately 1967. Dutch accommodation can be understood as a transformation from confrontation to problem solving. From this perspective, a zero sum game changed into a positive sum game. New actors entered the arena. The rules of the game were adjusted to solve the game. Proportional redistribution was used as a leading principle. In order for these new rules to be applied party elites had to be unchallenged and in control of their own pillar. Apart from agreements made about several issues, the electoral system was also reformed. The move towards a proportional electoral system, which was consistent with the proportional redistribution principle, had its reflection on the institutional setting. The Dutch case of accommodation shows that both rules in use and rules for use may change if and when preferences are revealed and recognised by all.

What were the rules in use? Society was strongly divided at mass level. Most people stayed within the confines of their own pillar. Pillars were ‘closed shops’ directed by their elites. Most people had only superficial contact with people who belonged to other pillars. People mostly voted for the political party of their own pillar. Opposed to the everyday life situation there were very frequent contacts at elite level. Constrained by institutional arrangements, political leaders had found a way to govern the country and to cooperate with each other, namely by segregation at the ‘bottom’ and conferences at the ‘top’. This was an elitist style of political decision-making. At mass level there was little influence. As a result, the pacification led to a passive political structure based on *divide et empira* made possible by a shared rule of proportional distribution and ‘live and let live’. The stability of democracy was guaranteed by the elites’ behaviour, while the role of voters was limited. They were expected to vote according to cleavage lines and not to participate actively. These additional informal rules were needed to prevent a deadlock in decision-making. These informal rules seem to fit the elitist character of the Dutch political system. When it gets tough, decisions are taken behind closed doors between the elites of the major political parties.
How useful is the rational-institutional perspective to explain current events in Dutch politics? What is its relevance almost 100 years after the pacification of 1917 and almost 50 years after the end of the period of accommodation in Dutch politics? One way to test a theory is to apply it to a case in a different context and time. Dutch politics in 2012 seems very different from the age of pacification. Does this mean that the formal and informal rules of the Dutch pacification are no longer in use?

The campaign for the election of Dutch parliament in 12 September 2012 shows a strongly divided political landscape. Important issues during this campaign were, among others, balancing the budget, health care, labour market, housing and international aid. The expectation was that it would be very difficult to find a majority that could form a stable coalition. To the surprise of many, the Liberal and Labour party received enough seats for a majority. For the first time since the 1990s two parties had such a majority. The past years at least three parties were needed to form a majority government. How difficult would it be to create a coalition agreement between these two parties. Although they did not have to negotiate with a third party, on many issues they had strong disagreement. Table 1 shows the preferences of the Liberal and Labour and the outcome of the initial agreement.
Table 1 Preferences and outcomes of initial coalition agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Liberals</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Coalition agreement (initial)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>deficit below 3%</td>
<td>Moderately balancing the budget</td>
<td>deficit below 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>free market</td>
<td>no free market progressive rates</td>
<td>no change in state-market progressive rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour market</td>
<td>shorter unemployment benefits less protection workers</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>shorter unemployment benefits less protection workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>no change in mortgage interest deduction higher rents</td>
<td>maximum to deduction mortgage interest</td>
<td>maximum to deduction mortgage interest higher rents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International aid</td>
<td>3 billions less</td>
<td>no more cuts</td>
<td>1 billion less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>lower tax rates</td>
<td>Progressive tax rates</td>
<td>lower tax rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **bold** labels indicate for which issue the outcome largely coincides with the party's preference. The *italic* labels indicate strong disagreement. *Underscored* labels indicate no real gain or loss for that party.

Before the start of the negotiation the parties had stressed that they were not going to make compromises that would be unsatisfactory to both of them. They wanted to exchange important issues. For some of the issues one party would receive its maximum, for other issues the other party was going to be satisfied. Table 1 is certainly not complete, but it identifies some of the major issues at the time. Contrary to what many perceived, the liberals gained more than the Labour. It was even worse, after the publication of the negotiation results, a revolt started by conservative media en members of the Liberal party. They declared that they had made too much concessions to the Labour party. Most prominent issue was the proposal to collect health insurance rates through a progressive system, i.e. depending on your income. After two weeks of unrest, a unique thing happened. The parties renegotiated the deal in or-
der to satisfy the Liberals and their supporters. This has led to adjusted coalition agreement, which is shown in table 2.

Table 2 Preferences and outcomes of adjusted coalition agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Liberals</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Coalition agreement (adjusted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>deficit below 3%</td>
<td>Moderately balancing the budget</td>
<td>deficit below 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health care</strong></td>
<td>free market</td>
<td>no free market</td>
<td>no change in state-market flat rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour market</strong></td>
<td>shorter unemployment benefits less protection workers</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>shorter unemployment benefits less protection workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>no change in mortgage interest deduction higher rents</td>
<td>maximum to deduction mortgage interest higher rents</td>
<td>maximum to deduction mortgage interest higher rents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International aid</strong></td>
<td>3 billions less</td>
<td>no more cuts</td>
<td>1 billion less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxes</strong></td>
<td>decrease</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most important difference with the initial coalition agreement, is that the health insurance revenues are still collected using a flat rate instead of an income-related (progressive) rate. To fulfil this request of the Liberals, tax rates were no longer decreased. But when looking at table 2, it appears that the Liberals were even more the real winners of the negotiations and the Labour party paid a high price to become a governing party again.

The situation is very different from the age of pacification, but also from the period thereafter, since only two parties were at the negotiation table. This means it is difficult to use a third party to soften the direct confrontation you are in when you are in a duel. These two parties probably were well aware of the possible danger of a chicken game. They were still used to complicated coalition-making and tried to avoid zero- or negative sum game negotiating and created a situation of exchanging instead of splitting the difference. At first, the coalition agreement appeared to have been made in a very short time. But because they kept the process of negotiating totally secret, the followers of Liberals were not prepared to support the
initial outcome and demanded adjustments of the deal. Of course, this presentation and analysis of the recent coalition-making is not complete. It is only a demonstration that, as Hans has taught me, we must link actors and institutions and the political arena and socio-economic policy. Only this way we are be able to understand the process and the outcomes of political decision-making.

One main contribution of Hans Keman to the comparative study of politics is linking institutions to actors. A second contribution is his explicit connection of political decision-making and institutions with socio-economic problem-solving. He has ignited the study of the relation between consensus democracy and corporatism. And since then, it is almost impossible to study political decision-making without taking account the socio-economic dimension and vice-versa.

Finally, to end on a more personal note: Hans divides people in two categories: he likes you or he does not like you. One way to find out to what category you belong, is whether he is able (and willing) to spell and pronounce your name correctly. Whenever he misspells someone's name, I know something many people are possibly not aware of: he does not like you. And it is even worse, you can’t do anything to change that.

Writing my PhD thesis was quite an effort for me. I will never forget Hans' support and patience when I was struggling to finish it. He was always interested in my personal wellbeing. That is why I respect Hans so much. He can act bluntly and has always strong opinions about anyone and everything. But he also has an eye for what goes on in your mind and life. If truly necessary, Hans is prepared to break with rational behaviour.
From supervisee, to co-author, to “walker in footsteps”

Barbara Vis

It is my great pleasure to contribute to this Liber Amicorum in the honor of Hans Keman’s retirement as a professor (emeritaat). I start with the story of how Hans and I have met about 8½ years ago and I became his PhD supervisee. Next, I tell something about a joint project, or more accurately, a series of projects. I end by going into the substantive and methodological contributions of Hans to the field of Political Science.

How it all started and the PhD period

The PhD project supervised by Hans Keman that I ended up undertaking since April 2004 was my proverbial good luck with bad luck. Being turned down for a different PhD position at the Department of Political Science of VU University Amsterdam, the search and selection committee of that position informed me about Hans’ job opening; a position that he so far has had no luck finding a suitable candidate for. This introduction, which also included Kees van Kersbergen who was the project’s intended second supervisor, proved a win–win situation. First of all – and not unimportantly when embarking upon a four-year project – the three of us could get along very well. Second, and more importantly, Hans’ vacant PhD position tied in perfectly with my interests and background. That I was not hired for the first position thus turned out to be perhaps the best thing that could have happened. In any case, it was the beginning of a highly enjoyable PhD trajectory.

One of the reasons why it was so pleasant to be one of Hans’ supervisees was that there were more of us. At that time, Hans supervised around 6 PhD students, quite a few of whom were in a similar phase. This meant that we experienced similar issues at about the same time, such as how to come up with a good research design or how to get a paper published, and could and did help each other with these issues. Hans, as well as Kees van Kersbergen, did a very good job in stressing how important such “peer-teaching” is in a PhD trajectory. A PhD candidate may learn most from his or her fellow PhD students, with the supervisor(s) being there
to keep an eye on the bigger picture and to get the candidate back on track when he or she divert too much.

Even though a group of interested, constructively critical and fun fellow-PhD students does indeed seems a very welcome ingredient for a successful PhD, it is not a sufficient condition; the supervisor’s role is also essential in this regard. And when it comes to teams of supervisors, I do not think there are many – if any – better teams than the Hans Keman–Kees van Kersbergen one. While Kees was responsible for the so-called daily supervision, Hans’ role was more from a distance but therefore not less important. Hans and Kees taught me what being an academic is like by, among other things, taking me on board on several of their own research projects. It was, for example, a great pleasure to think jointly about the direction of these studies, the appropriate methodological approach, and the implications of the studies’ results. Moreover, this experience has boosted my academic writing skills.

Hans and Kees also stressed the importance of presenting work-in-progress at international conferences and workshops. Hans in particular has shown me firsthand how much conference participation can do for your network, and how much fun it can be since colleagues can turn into co-authors or even good friend. What I really appreciated, and very much enjoyed, was that Hans introduced me to his colleagues and good friends, who for me were often scholars whose work I had read and used with pleasure. These introductions have not only helped a little bit by spreading my name in the field but also – and more importantly – have shown me how accessible many Big Names often are.

A series of joint publications

Hans and I have worked on a series of joint-publications, including the research projects mentioned earlier. While all of these are memorable to some extent, a couple of them especially stand out. We began working on the latter publications when I was in the final stages of my PhD project and Hans proposed that Jaap Woldendorp, he and I would work on a joint publication loosely based on Jaap’s PhD dissertation. What was intended as one paper turned out as a series of three journal articles on economic miracles, or more aptly, the typical absence thereof, that we worked on for a period of no less than five years (between 2007 and 2012). What makes these three publications especially memorable is that they include both
my easiest publication ever (immediate acceptance with some stylistic changes only) and the hardest one (a lengthy, lengthy process involving several journals and a lot of proverbial sweat and tears). Even though the latter experience has obviously curbed the enthusiasm to work on the topic at least somewhat, we feel that there are still some open questions so a “miracle 4” is not out of the question.

Hans’ substantive and methodological contributions to Political Science

With respect to Hans’ academic record, the breath and depth of the topics he addressed throughout his career are very impressive. If I would have to pick one of Hans’ biggest substantive interests, it would be the partisan politics theory. According to this theory, parties are representatives of social (class) constituencies, and have a clear ideological stance for left-wing or right-wing socio-economic policies. Left-wing parties typically favor generous welfare state programs organized by the state; right-wing parties, conversely, generally favor lean welfare state programs arranged through the market. The key finding stemming this theory, that politics matter in that the policy output of different kind of party governments differs, has its roots already in the late 1970s. But even though it has been adjusted since, overall Hans and his collaborators were right at the time: politics does matter. A recent review of the literature on the partisan politics theory and the welfare state by Häusermann et al. (forthcoming) indicates that the literature has changed from the original theory in three ways. First, the literature shows that electoral constituencies have changed and no longer correspond to those of the industrial age. Left-wing parties’ constituency, for example, is no longer a relatively homogenous group of blue collar, male workers earning a household income. Second, the literature also reveals that institutional context, especially the party system and party competition, matters for the kind of welfare policies political parties advocate. Similar parties might thus push for different policies depending on the institutional context. Hans’, also extensive, research agenda of new institutionalism has contributed to this literature. The third adjustment of the original partisan politics theory is that it matters for parties’ policy strategies whether the link between parties and electorates is particularistic or programmatic. Despite these diversions from the original partisan politics theory, Häusermann and colleagues con-
vincingly show that the “new” school of partisan politics theory is still, and needs to be, root-
ed in the “old” school that Hans co-developed years ago.\[^{13}\]

In terms of method, Hans is a true comparativist. One of the first things that I have learnt from him is the importance of a good research design (RD) – preferably comparative in na-
ture. For Hans, and I heartily agree with him on this, a good research design starts with a
good research question (RQ), which ideally should be derived from theory. There should be a
perfect match between the RQ and the RD so that the result will be a convincing and plausi-
ble research answer (RA). Although I do not think that for Hans ‘the content [of science] is
the method’ (King et al. 1994: 9), I do think that research design and method more generally rank somewhere in his top-3.

One of Hans’ favorite research designs – favorite, because of its excellent fit to his research
questions – is a comparison across advanced democracies and over time, typically by means
of regression analysis. In the early stages of my PhD project, Hans was skeptical of newish
comparative approaches, such as configurational comparative analysis like fuzzy-set Qualita-
tive Comparative Analysis as introduced to the social sciences by Charles Ragin (1987, 2000,
2008). Consequently, when Hans and I first talked about a paper I was writing that was com-
parative in nature but used fuzzy-set analysis instead of a – at least in 2005 still – more con-
ventional comparative approach, he was highly skeptical. I went along with the paper any-
way, which I could improve substantially with the help of Hans’ devil’s advocate comments.
Even after the paper was accepted for publication in *Policy & Politics* (Vis 2007), Hans was
not entirely convinced of the approach. Nonetheless, and I have really appreciated this, he
was willing to give it a try and apply the approach in one of the papers we were writing joint-
ly with Jaap Woldendorp. When Hans saw firsthand that the fuzzy-set approach actually
made sense given our research question, i.e., it made for a perfect RQ-RD relationship, he
started to turn enthusiastic about it. And even though Hans has certainly not departed from
his “old” approaches, this enthusiasm has been rising ever since. By now, Hans has discussed
the method in book chapters on comparative research (positively, I should add) and has in-

\[^{13}\] As a personal note, I think that it will please Hans that about 5 years after having finished my PhD dissertation
– which, I guess, included (way) too little discussion of political parties or party government for Hans’ taste,
political parties and party government have become a central element in the research project I will be working on for the next 5 years. Even though my theoretical and empirical focus will differ from Hans’, I hope that I will at least to some extent be able to walk in his footsteps in this substantive area.
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cluded it in his comparative politics classes. I am quite sure that the latter is one of the key reasons why quite a few master students end up conducting a fuzzy-set analysis or another configurational analysis in their master thesis, even though they have had no hands-on experience with this approach.

All in all, I think it is very hard to overestimate what Hans Keman has done for the field of Political Science in the Netherlands, Europe and beyond, not just in academic terms but also with respect to managerial terms – and issue I have not discussed in this contribution. For me, Hans is the prototype of someone with a very strong academic career who at the same time reserves enough time for his friends and hobbies (like golf and cricket). He has stayed ambitious to the end of this career, which is among other things testified by a recently published book with Oxford University Press (Budge et al. 2012), one by Routledge (Keman & Muller-Rommel 2012) and the publications of numerous journal articles over the past years. Consequently, I am sure that the impact of Hans to Political Science will continue for many years to come.

References

The ‘Hans Keman Experience’ in International Political Science

Jaap Woldendorp

Hans Keman and I first met in the early 1980s. At the time I was a student-assistant with the Department of Political Science at the University of Amsterdam (UvA). Hans Keman was one of the new ‘gang’ of five young professors that were employed to reorganize the department after the clashes between some members of the resident staff and the student body in the decade before. One of my duties was to assist the new professors with their research and teaching, in particular with the graduate research seminars. In these two-year seminars graduate students under the guidance of the professor and assisted by the student-assistant developed, executed and reported an extensive research project. That research was closely related to one of the research projects of the professor organizing the seminar, in which also the student-assistant was involved. This particular research project organized by Hans was on (neo-)corporatism, at the time a prominent item internationally in political science and economics. Although I was blissfully ignorant of that raging international debate, Hans of course was at that time already getting very much involved in that international debate and the related research agenda; and in international Political Science in general through the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR).

Unlike some of the other research seminars, we (students and faculty) indeed not only managed to develop, execute and report on our research project, but did it within the prescribed period as well. On top of that, together with Dietmar Braun, Hans and I also produced a Dutch edited volume on (neo-)corporatism, which was among the first to introduce in the Netherlands the burgeoning international academic debate on the issue. Both publications were also among the first, nationally and internationally, to conceptualise corporatism from an actor-oriented perspective of strategic interdependent behavior of government, trade unions and employers organizations that may explain the success or failure of policy formation, but not necessarily also of socio- or macroeconomic performance, as opposed to the more static structural and functional (institutional) perspective in which corporatism (corporatist institutions) by producing coordinated and consensual behavior explains that performance.
And that was and is in my view one of Hans’s major scholarly contributions to the never ending international academic debate on corporatism.

As a not-so-young student-assistant at the time I was thrilled to be taken seriously as a collaborator and co-author in real academic research. And I was particularly thrilled that all that collaboration and co-authoring actually produced tangible results: publications. It was quite a contrast to my rather frustrating experience with a previous research project in which I had invested a few years of hard work and that with great difficulty was only barely completed and after quite some delay. Ever since my motto regarding the completion of any sort of research project has been ‘als er maar een kaftje om zit’ which roughly translates as ‘as long as it is published somehow somewhere’.

Hans’s enormous drive, propensity for hard work and almost uncanny capacity to involve you in some of his many projects that always result in some sort of publication, not to mention regular good food and excellent wine in quite unexpected surroundings with very distinguished national and international academic guests have been the constant features of our continuing collaboration from that time onwards.

Although we went our separate ways after my long delayed graduation in 1985 we kept in touch. Railways, one of the many of Hans’s projects, being the issue although at the time this did not materialize in any concrete research let alone publications. But when Hans became full professor of Political Science at the Vrije Universiteit (VU) in Amsterdam in 1991 he somehow managed to get some money to take me on as a researcher for another of his many projects, the now famous Party Government Data Set (PGDS) that he and Ian Budge had started working on in the European University Institute (EUI) in Florence (Italy). This dataset was one of the important academic off-shoots of the now famous ‘Politics does matter’ debate and research agenda in international Political Science to which Hans was one of the major contributors.

But, Hans being Hans, having more projects on his hands than a mere mortal could manage even in an abnormal working week, he soon found additional odd jobs for me, which I gallantly tried to master. I found myself teaching academic skills to 1st year students and running an ERASMUS project; organizing an international symposium on Comparative Politics to mark the start of Hans’s full professorship at the VU and attending to a PhD-student from
Australia who did a PhD on corporatism in the Netherlands. Not to mention doing some research on my own on corporatism as well, a continuation of the projects started at the UvA. He even sent me to the ECPR Summer School in Essex which was a great experience. However, after my original 7-month contract had been several times extended to cover 29 months in the end, the money definitely ran out in 1993. But again this relatively short period of collaboration proved to be great fun, hard work and very productive in ensuing publications. There was no shortage of good food and wine either, especially in connection with the ERASMUS project, although the catering in Essex at that time still left a lot to desire, food wise and especially regarding opening hours of the University’s shop and cafeteria. The development of new directions in Comparative Politics, both theoretically and regarding the research agenda concerning the New or Rational Institutionalism, and the creation of the PGDS are, in my view, two other important scholarly contributions of Hans to international Political Science. In particular, the PGDS is widely used by comparativists in political science and economic research. In addition, Hans contributed significantly to the internationalization of Dutch Political Science through the ECPR and the Dutch Political science Association (De Kring).

Between 1993 and 1998 I was otherwise engaged, but having a part time job, I continued to spend one day a week at the VU, working on my own academic publications on corporatism and updating the PGDS. Off and on, Hans broached the subject of doing a dissertation. I felt at the time that that would really be a waste of time as it would keep me from my publications and from updating the PGDS. Besides, I also quite liked the idea of being one of the few remaining Drs. in or around academia in the Netherlands as all the others in the end either left or did a PhD. So, I managed to keep Hans at a distance in this respect. But alas, fate cruelly interfered. In 1998 Hans succeeded in raising some money to take me on at the VU again. He then slowly but surely increased the pressure. When he noticed that his initial attempts to get me doing a dissertation did not produce the desired result, he decided on a two-pronged strategy. First he enlisted the (virtual?) help of the late Peter Mair and Hans Daalder, at least he told me that they had also been asking him when I would finally start on my PhD (I have never dared to enquire whether they actually had or that he simply made it up). I was rather surprised but also flattered pink that except Hans, giants like Peter Mair and Hans Daalder (seemed) to have actually taken notice of my existence. In addition, he told me straightforward that he could only change my temporary contract into tenure if and when I had obtained a PhD. Against this combined approach I was, of course, completely powerless and suc-
cumbed. But, Hans being Hans, before I could actually start with my PhD-project, first there was the next update of the PGDS to attend to and that was published in 2000. Hans, in the mean time, was quite busy to develop the research program of Political Science at the VU into one of the leading programs in this field in Europe.

I finally started my PhD research on corporatism in the Netherlands in 2000 and completed the project in 2005. Without Hans’ persistence I would never even have started. And without his patience – he literally had to wade through reams and reams of draft chapters – and diligence – he actually read all of them and extensively commented on their contents – I don’t think I would have ever finished it. And it was not as if Hans had nothing else to do in those years. Political Science became an independent department at the VU, headed by Hans. Hans also took on the portfolio of research manager in the Board of the Faculty of Social Science (with me as his humble technical assistant) and relentlessly applied for funds, inside and outside the VU, for his numerous research projects. Not to mention all his international exploits, in particular in the context of the ECPR. With respect to fundraising he was quite successful as well. One the projects funded was about the political history of the Dutch railways from the start in the mid 19th century until the EU-driven privatization in the 1990s that I took over after completing my dissertation. This was one of Hans’s many projects that finally came to fruition, albeit partly. As with all aspects of infrastructure, historically the main political issue with railways is whether they should be privately or state run as it is usually very difficult to actually make them profitable. Another of his successfully funded projects in which I assisted was a Socrates Intensive Programme from 2004 through 2006, a Summer School on Democracy in Europe: European politics and multi-level governance, that moved around European departments of Political Science that were affiliated to the ECPR.

After completing my PhD in 2005 and getting my tenure, I finally became a proper academic, PhD and all. For my collaboration with Hans that did, however, not make much difference. Hans had and still has more projects at hand than, in my view, can be humanly managed, but somehow he always manages to enlist sufficient help, including mine, to successfully complete most of them, albeit sometimes quite a few years later than originally envisaged. Actually, since he is no longer Head of Department and partly retired, the sheer number of projects seems to be proliferating at a rather alarming rate. But being relieved of his many bureaucratic duties he of course also has more time to invest in his own projects than he had in
the past, consequently, slightly less need for assistance. His many recent publications are a testimony that his drive and propensity for hard work even seem to be increasing with age.

Looking back I feel it was a lucky stroke of fate that I met Hans at the University of Amsterdam in the early 1980s. Without our collaboration over the years I would not have been where I am now, in academia and, to my own surprise, with a PhD, where I sometimes even briefly enjoy that ever rarer experience in Dutch universities, to be able to actually do some academic research, in my case on the political history of the Dutch railways. And although working with Hans sometimes comes close to being involved in some sort of a total institution, the projects he comes up with are always exciting, often pushing the boundaries of political science and usually bring great rewards in terms of getting somehow published somewhere and being served excellent dinners and wines in very interesting places and in the company of quite distinguished social scientists. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to have been part of a few aspects of the much larger ‘Hans Keman experience’ in international Political Science over the past years and I hope and expect there are still some projects and many years in store for the both of us.
Career Hans Keman

Hans Keman was educated at the VU University Amsterdam where he received his BA in Contemporary History in June 1973 (including a teaching certificate) and his MA degree (cum laude) in Political Science in January 1975. His Thesis was on the relationship between History and Political Science. In September 1973 he became Research and Teaching Assistant in Contemporary History at the VU. From January 1975 until 1983 he was lecturer in Political Science and Contemporary History at the University of Amsterdam. Thereafter he conducted a major research project on political parties and democratic government at the European University Institute (EUI - Florence, Italy). This resulted in a book: Budge and Keman, 1990 (reprinted as paperback in 1993). At the same time he was a member of an international research group working on the relationship between politics and public policies. In 1985 he returned to the Netherlands and became Senior Lecturer in Comparative Politics at the University of Leiden where he obtained his PhD in Political Science (on the development of Welfare States and the role of Social Democracy, 1988). In 1990 he was appointed Full Professor of Political Science at the VU University and in 2005 Professor of Comparative Political Science. During this period he has been active as an administrator, editor, Member of the Executive Board of European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), Chairman of the Dutch Association for the Social Sciences as well as President of the Dutch Political Science Association (de “Kring”) and of the Chamber of Social-Cultural Sciences (VSNU).

Hans Keman rebuilt the Department of Political Science of the VU and developed its research into a leading program in Europe. The research quality assessment 1995-2000 concluded: “It […] scores high in terms of relevance of its theme, its methodological contribution, quality of output, integration in international state of the art, and viability. […] focuses on an important theoretical question […] Its contribution to comparative methodology is internationally acclaimed […] It is one of the best programmes in the country”.14 The most recent assessment covering 2001-2006 reads: “the quality of the programme is excellent and […] is already making a very significant mark internationally” (publications are “undoubtedly world-

---
leading”) due to its “leadership” that is “exceptionally strong” resulting in a “strong international standing” of the research program.15

The Department is also one of the strongest in the Netherlands in teaching political science according to the nation-wide (annual) Elsevier Faculty Rating (http://www.researchned.nl/cms/) and the Keuzegids (http://www.keuzegids.org/p5). The Department is also in the top quartile of such departments in Europe on a per capita basis.16

In 2000, under his leadership, the research program changed direction. The focus on ‘Politics, Policies, and Society’ (description and explanation of the political chain of democratic control and command and public policy formation in national contexts) was redirected into ‘Multi-layered Governance in Europe and beyond’ (MLG). The central idea of MLG is that political processes cannot adequately be studied from either a national or an international level alone as these levels are more interdependent than ever before. State centric theories and policy-making analyses of the European Union (EU) or member states fail to appreciate that the position of democratic party government as an autonomous actor has profoundly changed: regional and global interdependencies are conducive to new institutional dynamics and political interactions. This shifting focus requires an integration of the Comparative approach and Democratic theory, to be applied to empirical-analytical research of the relations between the institutional and policy performances of intra-state and international politics, in particular in the context of the emerging EU governance.

Hans Keman is a prolific author of 20 books and edited volumes, over 60 articles in refereed journals and over 70 refereed chapters in edited volumes (Publish or Perish: h-index = 26; g-index = 56). His work has had a major impact in various research fields of Political Science, notably the comparative study of political parties and the institutional analysis of governance in established democracies. In these fields, he is not only one of the leading scholars in Europe, but also the founding father of large comparative projects on European and transatlantic cooperation that have established the standards of contemporary empirical research in the discipline. He also has had an important influence on the methodology of theory-guided, comparative empirical research and has provided the discipline with indispensable data-sets

for empirical research (see: Woldendorp et al., 1993 – 1998 – 2000 – 2011). In particular, his work has taught the Political Science community that the comparative method is essential in Political Science. Moreover, his advanced use of the comparative method has helped develop Comparative Political Science into a genuine sub-discipline, i.e. a field recognized (and taught) everywhere as the core of the discipline.

Professionals have greatly profited from his commitment to theory-building, methodological reflections and data collection efforts. Without his intellectual and organisational efforts, our understanding of the impact of political parties on public policy and the working of democracy would not have reached the level and quality that it presently has. Moreover, Political Science students all over the world greatly benefit from his work, as many are taught the principles and techniques of Political Science research on the basis of a well-known textbook that Keman published (with Pennings and Kleinnijenhuis) in 1999 (2nd edition 2006). This book has been highly praised. David D. Laitin (University of Chicago), for example, said: ‘My dream is that all undergraduate majors in political science would be guided through a text such as Doing Research in Political Science.’ And Richard S. Katz (Johns Hopkins University) states that ‘(...) students will constantly be drawn into the excitement of learning interesting things about politics as well as learning about the methods’.

Finally, he has also been the editor of Europe’s top Political Science Journal (European Journal of Political Research) as well as the first editor of the European Political Science Book Series (Routledge) and editor of the Dutch Political Science Journal (Acta Politica). He received many grants and is regularly asked as a guest professor and keynote speaker around the globe.

Hans Keman has made four major contributions to Political Science. First, in the late 1970s he was one of the leading members of an international research group that took up two important questions in Political Science: a) what is the impact of political parties on public policy (the output of the political system) and b) what are the effects of public policies (the outcome of the political system), in particular on the welfare and well-being of citizens? The research group of – by now – renowned political scientists (like Klaus Armingeon, Francis Castles and Manfred Schmidt) developed theories, collected data and tested whether and to what extent politics actually mattered. This group encouraged very productive research efforts among scholars and incited a lively debate that became famous under the heading of “Politics Does
Matter”. One example: the first collection of essays (published in 1982) has been quoted well over 600 times (Publish and Perish). The project was concluded with another volume (published in 2002) that received over 275 citations (Publish and Perish). The research of this group and the research that it inspired has greatly advanced our theoretically informed empirical knowledge of how the power of political actors causes (and therefore can be held responsible for) policy outcomes in representative democracies. The “Politics Does Matter” theories by now belong to the mainstream body of knowledge of Political Science (Keman, 2002).

His second major contribution concerns the study of how and why political actors cooperate and collaborate (particularly in government) even if such behaviour seems highly unlikely, as when actors are in overt or covert conflict. This is actually the normal condition of representative democracy and party government. Therefore, this “paradox” of conflict and cooperation needed to be incorporated in Political Science theories of coalition formation in democracies. Here, too, he demonstrated the benefits of theory-guided empirical research and the comparative method. We now know much better why, when and how parties cooperate and what the effects of coalition government are on policy formation, on the policy performance of governments and on the effects of public policy (Keman, 2006; with Müller-Rommel, 2012).

A third major contribution concerns his efforts not only to collect the data necessary for the comparative study of parties, governments and public policies, but also to make these data available to the Political Science community worldwide. First of all, Keman’s work – on close collaboration with Paul Pennings (VU) - on the organisation, extension and modernization of the so-called Manifesto Research dataset provides detailed and quantified information on the electoral and policy statements of all major parties in Western democracies (1945–2010). This unique dataset is used by researchers who study political parties empirically and comparatively and allows for computer-guided analysis of the development of the ideology and policy preferences of political parties. The dataset is consistently developed further and has received a large grant in the NWO-investment programme in the late 1990s. Second, Keman – in collaboration with Ian Budge (Essex) and Jaap Woldendorp (VU) – has built an impressive databank on the composition of party government in 40 democracies (post-1945) that is
regularly updated and electronically available. This data set is frequently cited (over 600 citations in Publish and Perish).17

Finally, a fourth major contribution is his methodological work, particularly his promotion in European Political Science of positive political theory, (in contrast to normative political theory), i.e. empirically grounded theories of political processes and political behavioural interactions that can be tested. In his empirical and collaborative work, Hans Keman has promoted this for the comparative study of democracy worldwide. This type of work has contributed to the development of Comparative Political Science and has helped to bridge research practices in Europe and the USA.

To sum up, Hans Keman is a highly reputed scholar who stands out as a leading political scientist as well as a “Macher” (taking inititatives and making these work) who has certainly not been shy to serve the political science community, both nationally and internationally.

His international reputation is easily illustrated by his invitations to visit other universities as a Fellow, a key-note speaker, or to present his research and his regular attendance of international conferences (for an extensive overview, see below). Hans Keman also co-organised many workshops and symposiums, to name but a few: the NVMC Annual Conference in 2000 in Utrecht; workshops on “EuroScepticism” in 2005 and on “Comparative Data Validation” in 2006 (both in Amsterdam with Professors Marks and Hooghe); the “Politicolgen Etmaal” (annual conference of the Dutch and Flemish Political Science Associations) in 2004 & 2005 (both in Antwerp); workshops on “The Disappearing State” in 2006 (Delmenhorst (Germany) with Francis G. Castles) and on “Party Government in the New Europe” in 2010 (Lüneburg (Germany) with Ferdinand Müller-Rommel).

Throughout his career Keman has organized international Summer Schools (in which Jaap Woldendorp was always co-organizer). Between 1993-1996 he developed a Summer School together with the University of Berne and Bielefeld on EU Governance and between 2004-

2007 the *Socrates Graduate Summer School* on “European politics and multi-level governance” (in the Netherlands and in Florence, with the late Peter Mair, EUI).

**Citations and total N of publications** [see also the bibliography]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>In Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books [including Edited Special Issues]*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed Articles*</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Volumes*</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Papers**</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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  Career: Lecturer at the VU – Professor: University of Nijmegen.
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• Jo-Ansie van Wyk (University of South Africa, Pretoria): “Globalization and South African development”* [not yet finished].
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Thematic Bibliography Hans Keman

This bibliography intends to give both an overview of Hans Keman’s publications as well as an insight into the development of his research interests over the years. Overall, there is not a specific topic or point of gravity, except perhaps the prevalent use of the comparative approach and related methods. Nevertheless his publications were organised into a number of broad themes that do have in common the analysis of democratic politics, governance and public policy formation a established democracies.

Democracy

This theme has always been on Hans’s mind, but for a long time he has not dealt with it directly, but rather as the systemic context of politics – polity - policy. In the course of the second half of the 1990s his research became more and more focussed on the democratic performance, representation and accountability of political systems.


**Parties - Party Systems – Government**

The core of any study on established democracies is party behaviour and their interactions within party systems. One specific element is the formation, life and features of party government. Hans started to do extensive research on this topic during his stay at the European University Institute (EUI) in the 1980s together with Ian Budge as a mentor. Presently Hans still works on this subject, but with a changing emphasis towards issues like democratic performance and legitimacy.


Social Democracy

The origins and development of the Social Democratic party family has always been one of Hans’s primary research interests. His dissertation (1988) is a good example and presently he is finishing a more elaborated comparative analysis of Social Democracy over time and across established democracies using new information and alternative explanations based on extended and new data. His main concern is how Social Democracy’s development over time can account for its present (say after 1990) performance as a vote-seeking, office-seeking and policy-making party with a distinct view on how society can be organized through the state.


Comparative Methods & Data

Most if not all Hans’s publications are comparative and reflect an important dimension of comparative political science that is all too often overlooked: to discuss and develop the comparative method and collect valid and reliable data that is open for others to use. In collaboration with Ian Budge, Paul Pennings and Jaap Woldendorp extensive Data on Party Government and related institutional features has been developed.


**Institutions**

The institutional approach lost its attraction for many researchers due to the advent of ‘behaviouralism’ and Rational Choice theory in the course of the 1960s. However, Hans emerged from an age in which ‘neo-Marxist’ theories were quite prominent in Europe (around the early 1970s) and had the (capitalist) state as a main focus and. Combined with the ideas on ‘rational institutionalism’ Hans always kept institutions and the state alive in his research.


Welfare State & Public Policy

The issue of public policy performance has always been part of Hans’s comparative research. In particular the comparative analysis of the “welfare state” figures prominently. An important addition to the literature has been the relationship between policy outputs and out-
comes (or: policy performance), on the one hand, and the effect-producing features of (party) governance (or: how institutional differences make a difference), on the other hand.

(see also: Social democracy).


Corporatism

Corporatism (or: New Corporatism) has been a going concern in Hans’s research. Over the years, together with Dietmar Braun and Jaap Woldendorp, he has regularly published articles and also one book focussing mostly on the working and consequences of corporatist arrangements in relation to economic policy performances in Europe.

- Medezeggenschap en neo-corporatisme; Hoe de Wet op de Ondernemingsraden van 1950 tot stand kwam [with Bert van Hijfte, Jaap Jong, Koen de Pater and Jaap Woldendorp], in: Intermediair, 19/18: 19-27 – 1983
The Netherlands

Publishing on the Netherlands has been stimulated paradoxically by visiting conferences in Germany and Switzerland in the 1980s and 1990s. The common interest was the emergence of neo-corporatism, party politics and government policy-making in small[er] democracies. Also contributions to comparative volumes added to this as well as Hans’s growing interest in the provision and organisation of public goods through the state. More recently Hans has also published on the development of the Dutch party system and its performance.


Military

As a student Hans did a special track in Political Science: ‘Peace Studies’ (in Dutch: Polemologie) and in the earlier part of his career – up to the end of the Cold War - wrote on the role of the Military as a public policy, combining Foreign Policy issues with Defence efforts and the budgetary consequences from a comparative perspective within the context of the Cold War and NATO.


Miscellaneous

Apart from a few contributions to national newspapers (mainly De Volkskrant, de NRC and the Leeuwarder Courant) Hans did not publish much outside academia, but he produced some articles regarding his most preferred sport, cricket, on the history of the first Department of Political Science in Amsterdam (University of Amsterdam) and when he was very young on racial discrimination, peace and the meaning of Christmas.


Contributions/entries in Encyclopedia & Dictionaries

