

To Nederlandse Kring voor de Wetenschap der Politiek (NKWP)  
(The website of NKWP: "Dutch Political Science Association" <sup>1</sup>)  
NKWP board  
By email

September 29 2018  
Concerning: Science w.r.t. "political science on electoral systems" / Brexit  
Attached: Memo with appendices

Dear Sir, Madam,

This Spring I joined NKWP (my e-mail May 13 and your reply May 27).

This letter is to revoke my membership as of today. NKWP claims to be a scientific association, but doesn't act on a report that there is pseudo-science under its wings. I do not want to partake in this. Either you don't take me seriously enough or your level of tolerance for pseudo-science is too high.

I contacted your board on September 17 2018 (**Appendix G**) on my diagnosis that the (important) field of "political science on electoral systems" is pseudo-science, comparable to astrology, alchemy or homeopathy. My request for your board was to join me in thinking how this diagnosis might be handled. I expressed an interest to discuss this diagnosis with others, hopefully in the neighbourhood of The Hague. Yesterday evening in a telephone call with the secretary of the board I also indicated the relationship to Brexit, namely that "political science on electoral systems" gives false information to the UK electorate.

The secretary informed me in this phone call that the board had discussed the September 17 letter. The board sees its scope as limited. NKWP facilitates the annual convention "Politicologenetmaal" and in addition has only some minor activities, see the website. On issues on content I would be best advised to contact researchers who have similar interests.

I find the situation awkward. NKWP intends to be a scientific association but an important subfield consists of pseudo-science. As a scientist I would expect that the diagnosis on pseudo-science would be cause for alarm also for you, so that this diagnosis would get attention. I would expect some action. I am shocked that there will be no action. Let me recall that my submission to Politicologenetmaal 2018 in **Appendix F** was rejected. Thus the organising committee was not alarmed by the diagnosis that "political science on electoral systems" is pseudo-science. I already contacted some researchers on a bilateral basis but to no effect (with the exception of one person whom I actually met in person). My letter of September 17 2018 (**Appendix G**) drew on this experience: I only wrote it because of the failures on the other avenues. Now that your board refers to the same avenues that already failed, my inference is that I should not want to be part of this association.

Perhaps we are victims of over-specialisation in science here. I come from econometrics, political economy and public choice, and my approach to "political science on electoral systems" tends to be different from the approach by those trained in the traditional ways of that field. When I approach individual "political scientists" with my finding that "political science on electoral

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://politicologie.nl/?page\\_id=25](http://politicologie.nl/?page_id=25)

systems” is pseudo-science, the common reaction is non-response, which gives me the impression that there is no respect for econometrics, and as if I would be required to first get a thesis in political science accepted and earn a Ph.D. degree before one (members of NKWP) would take me seriously. However, the alarming diagnosis doesn't require a Ph.D. thesis in political science. Also, econometrics is no specialisation, but a generalisation, that allows a command of economics, mathematics and statistics (though not necessarily at the same level of specialists in each field). There is no rational reason for the non-response within NKWP. Obviously, each non-response might have its own individual reason that might seem rational within some frame of reference, but I cannot avoid the overall conclusion that (Dutch) political science has not enough respect for science. A person or association really aspiring at science would be alarmed about the presentation of evidence that there is pseudo-science, and it is shocking that “political science” doesn't show this alarm.

In May 2018 I gave NKWP the benefit of the doubt with its aspiration to be a scientific association but now I must diagnose that NKWP doesn't satisfy the criteria for this.

After September 17 2018 I was in the process of writing a more developed statement, with the intention to submit this to your board as additional information. My telephone call was to inform you that I intended to send you this statement, though I actually wrote this to you on September 26 as well. It appeared that the board already had reached a reply on the morning of September 28, mentioned above. For completeness I affix this more developed statement as a Memo, below.

If the NKWP board would change its position as reported by you by telephone yesterday evening, perhaps because this present letter or Memo contains information that you were not aware of, then this revoking of my membership can be annulled, but I do not expect this.

I will put this letter on my website. It has already been anonymised as far as relevant. My advice is that you discuss this letter and the enclosed Memo with the membership.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Econometrician (Groningen 1982) and teacher of mathematics (Leiden 2008)  
Scheveningen, The Netherlands  
<http://thomascool.eu>

# Memo

Additional information, including on my research history w.r.t. political science before 2017 and my finding in 2017 that “political science on electoral systems” is no science yet

Thomas Colignatus, September 29 2018

Memo	3
Introduction	3
Humanities and Science	4
An analogy for a larger audience	5
David Hume’s divide between Is and Ought	6
Dismal state of information on democracy	7
Specialisation in science	8
Concluding	9
Appendix A. Email 2017 to APSA, PSA and AFSP	10
Appendix B. Tempted by abstraction: example of mathematics education	11
Appendix C. Other	12
Appendix D. Emails in 2005 and 2010 to professor Rob Hoppe on an NWO project 2002-2010 also involving CPB	14
Appendix E. An email of 2010 to NKWP w.r.t. the economic crisis (crisis in economics)	18
Appendix F. Submission in December 2017 for Politicologenetmaal 2018 (rejected)	20
Appendix G. Information to the board of NKWP that “political science on electoral systems” is pseudo-science	21

## Introduction

Let me follow Aristotle in the rhetoric order of ethos, logos, pathos, and thus first introduce myself. I am an econometrician (Groningen 1982) and teacher of mathematics (Leiden 2008), and I arrived at NKWP from political economy (Dutch “staathuishoudkunde”) and the economic field of Public Choice.<sup>2</sup> Let me refer to Hans van den Doel (1937-2012) as an economist with a similar interest.<sup>3</sup> At the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB) (1982-1991) I developed, amongst other things, (1) an analysis on Arrow’s Impossibility Theorem on a generating mechanism for the aggregation of preferences into a social welfare function (SWF) – which analysis became the book “*Voting Theory for Democracy*” (VTFD) (2001, 2014)<sup>4</sup> with a presentation at Politicologenetmaal 2018<sup>5</sup> – and (2) an analysis on unemployment and the failure of the Trias Politica,<sup>6</sup> with the need for a constitutional Economic Supreme Court (DRGTPE (2000, 2011)).<sup>7,8</sup> My analysis at CPB encountered censorship of science by the directorate of CPB,<sup>9</sup> and since 2004 I advise the world to boycott of Holland till this censorship of science is resolved.<sup>10</sup> Please observe that my job description at CPB was a scientific one<sup>11</sup> and that CPB has claims in science.<sup>12</sup>

In 2010, I wrote a didactic exposition on the difference between Equal Proportional Representation (EPR) in Holland and District Representation (DR) in the UK.<sup>13</sup> In 2016 I was surprised by the events about the UK Brexit Referendum and decided to look at the deeper

<sup>2</sup> Gordon Tullock 1987 on Public Choice: “the use of economic tools to deal with traditional problems of political science”

<sup>3</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/SvHG/SvHPVdDoel.html>

<sup>4</sup> <https://zenodo.org/record/291985>

<sup>5</sup> <https://zenodo.org/record/1269392>

<sup>6</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/Record/1994/11/30/TPnCPB.html>

<sup>7</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.res.org.uk/view/art7Oct14Features.html>

<sup>9</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/NVMC/Verslag.html>

<sup>10</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/about/>

<sup>11</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/Record/1987/05/28/FIF.html>

<sup>12</sup> <https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/kst-29338-69-b1.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> <https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/22782/>

causes of what has been happening. A summary of findings is here.<sup>14 15</sup> In 2017 I came to the diagnosis that “political science on electoral systems” is no science but comparable to astrology, alchemy or homeopathy. (I haven’t looked at other branches within political science.) My suggestion is that the UK switches to EPR, say adopt the Dutch system of open lists, has proper elections, and then let the new House of Commons discuss the relation with the EU again. It is not unlikely that the EU would allow the UK the time for such a fundamental reconsideration on both democracy and Brexit. It remains to be seen whether the UK would want to switch from DR to EPR, but the first step would be to provide the UK public with proper information. I call upon political science to start giving proper information to the public. Please note that the public includes scientists who haven’t studied electoral systems yet.

Currently in Holland, there is the Staatscommissie parlementair stelsel (Scps) with members professors of political science Ruud Koole (Leiden) and Tom van der Meer (UvA). The minister of the Interior and Kingdom Relations might have, or might not have, presumed a competence in science. In my analysis it is warranted that NKWP informs the minister that “political science on electoral systems” is no science yet, or at the least that there exists a new insight to that effect.

### Humanities and Science

The English language distinguishes the Humanities and Science, whereas Dutch uses the term “Wetenschap” for both scholarship and science. The Humanities in Dutch may be either “Geesteswetenschap” (alpha) or “sociale wetenschappen” (gamma), though English also has the term “social science”. NKWP claims to be “political science”. The common distinction in Dutch between alpha, beta and gamma is rather confusing w.r.t. philosophy and mathematics. In 2015 I proposed the following classification as more relevant. Experiments can be controlled or natural, and for the latter we have the observational sciences like astronomy or economics.<sup>16</sup> It is important to know about related insights on epistemology and the “definition & reality methodology”:<sup>17 18</sup>

		<i>Subject</i>	
		<i>Man</i>	<i>World (Not-Man, also Platonic)</i>
<i>Method</i>	<i>Non-experimental</i>	$\alpha$	philosophy ( $\Phi$ ), mathematics ( $\mu$ )
	<i>Experimental</i>	$\gamma$	$\delta = \beta - \mu$

With these distinctions I can state more specifically that “political science on electoral systems” is no science (gamma or delta) yet, but still locked in the humanities (alpha). With its claims on reality this branch of political science thus is comparable to astrology, alchemy or homeopathy.

- The proof is in “*One woman, one vote. Though not in the USA, UK and France*” (1W1V).<sup>19</sup>
- An aspect is the statistics of electoral outcomes. There are main paper (CVSC),<sup>20</sup> an overview paper (OESC),<sup>21</sup> and sheets<sup>22</sup> for a workshop at Politicologenetmaal 2018. In 1W1V I hadn’t read Shugart & Taagepera “*Votes from seats*” (2017), but in OESC I had (and this confirmed 1W1V).
- There is the Dutch book “*Democratie met en door Wetenschap*” (DMDW) (2018), that provides an overview for a general Dutch audience (including scientists who haven’t studied electoral systems).<sup>23 24</sup> (It doesn’t have the proof: this remains in 1W1V).

<sup>14</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2017/12/01/dealing-with-denial-cause-and-cure-of-brexit/>  
<sup>15</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2018/08/13/brexit-deep-roots-in-blindness-by-the-uk-intellectual-community/>  
<sup>16</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/10/02/pierre-van-hiele-and-gerald-goldin-2/>  
<sup>17</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/24/a-general-theory-of-knowledge/>  
<sup>18</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/09/08/pierre-van-hiele-and-epistemology/>  
<sup>19</sup> <https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/84482/>  
<sup>20</sup> <https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/84469/>  
<sup>21</sup> <https://zenodo.org/record/1228640>  
<sup>22</sup> <https://zenodo.org/record/1270381>  
<sup>23</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/DMDW/Index.html>  
<sup>24</sup> At Politicologenetmaal 2018, Joost Smits (<http://www.prize.nl/>) chaired a workshop at which I gave a presentation. On DMDW: <https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=10217050780931509&set=a.2378670315986&type=3&theater>

Subsidiary comments are:

- Let me indicate that the way forward for “political science on electoral systems” is to adopt more from economics, instead of neglecting the findings there and assuming that wisdom can only derive from the tradition in political science itself and the purity of its roots in the Humanities. With my background in economics, there is a risk that some scholars in NKWP might hold that I don’t understand the findings in “political science on electoral systems”. Thus let me insist that political science gives a reply on content. Please do not dismiss the message by referring to the origin of the messenger.<sup>25</sup>
- My comparison of EPR and DR in 2010, referred to above, already provided the proper approach in statistics (in showing where DR doesn’t provide the relevant statistics), but did not further deconstruct the confusion. It was only in 2017 that I arrived at the observation that the structural confusion about electoral systems can only be explained by the diagnosis that “political science on electoral systems” is no science yet.
- This branch of political science fails on the criteria of modern science of clear definitions, modelling in mathematics, relevant statistics, and the acute awareness of validity as developed in the observational sciences (the art of actually observing what is happening instead of looking for confirmation of what theory has told you to see).
- While VTFD deals with single seat elections, the above causes the prospect of VTFD2 dealing with multiple seats elections and contests. Dahl (1956:121) “*A preface to democratic theory*” (see the discussion in 1W1V:104) already translated Arrow’s paradox to the situation of a presidential election: “But neither [half] elections nor interelection activity provide much insurance that decisions will accord with the preferences of a majority of adults or voters.” Rae & Daudt (1976) translated this to multiple seats. Instead of baptising this as the Dahl-paradox they chose the less obvious name “Ostrogorski paradox”. This paradox is often mentioned as an argument to have referenda. The latter again neglects Arrow’s theorem, that shows that also referenda can be problematic. Apparently a new book VTFD2 might be useful for clarification, but the fact that VTFD already is so neglected makes me wary.
- A parallel may be found in my deconstruction of mathematics education (ME) and its research (MER). A key phenomenon is that mathematicians are trained on abstract thought and still meet with real live students when in class. Thus MER is an empirical science, but this doesn’t stop research mathematicians (RM) from wreaking havoc in education anyway. See **Appendix B**.

### ***An analogy for a larger audience***

To clarify the misstate in “political science on electoral systems”, the following analogy may be helpful for a larger audience. Consider the medieval *trial by combat* or the “*judgement of God*”. This persisted into the phenomenon of dueling, with mathematician Evariste Galois (1811-1832) as example. A duel was once seriously seen as befitting of the words “judgement” and “trial”. Compare the English “ordeal” with the German “Urteil” and Dutch “oordeel”. Eventually civilisation gave the application of law with procedures in court, and the application of governance to settle issues on policy. Using the same words “judgement” and “trial” for both a duel and a decision by court or governance confuses what is really involved, though the outward appearance may look the same.

“Political science on electoral systems” suffers the same kind of confusion because of traditional terminology. The confusion applies to the words “election” and “representative”.

- In District Representation (DR) the word “election” is falsely applied to *contests* for district winners. Take for example the single member district (SMD) in the UK. The (district) “representative” commonly is no (interest) representative, since often more than 50% of the voters in a district explicitly did not vote for that candidate (see OESC figure 4 on page 30) (a (new) way to present these crucial data). The votes for losing candidates are actually *discarded*. “Political science on electoral systems” fails to inform the public in the USA, UK and France that more than 50% of their voters have still “*taxation without representation*”. In comparing votes and seats, Shugart & Taagepera (2017) compare votes (in districts) with

---

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.knaw.nl/nl/actueel/publicaties/het-forumwaarmed-merk-van-wetenschap>

seats (in (other) districts), which means that voters in one district would be represented by someone from another district, which goes against the very idea of district representation anyway.

- In Equal Proportional Representation (EPR) there is a proper election in which voters choose their representatives. In Holland with EPR there are only 2% of voters who are not represented because they vote for parties that do not get a seat in the Dutch Tweede Kamer. These 2% of the votes might be said to be *wasted*.
- The distinction between *discarding* and *wasting* votes lies in the yardstick of the electoral quota at the aggregate level. Let  $Q = V / S$ , with  $V$  the number of votes and  $S$  the number of seats. In EPR there is an effort of matching votes with  $Q$ , and votes are only wasted if they fail on this. In DR there is no effort of matching votes with  $Q$ . A SMD district winner might not attain  $Q$ , and only needs to have more votes than other candidates. Discarding votes in DR means: deliberately not using losing district votes to aggregate them into seats.
- For economic theory, EPR is a far superior method than DR to arrive at a proper social welfare function (SWF). Since EPR gets better access to the SWF, it would be proper democratic, and DR would be proto-democratic. See below on the divide between Is and Ought.

Taylor, Shugart, Lijphart & Grofman “*A different democracy*” (2014) suffer this confusion on terms too. They explain the different mechanics of EPR and DR but then succumb to the confusion of “election” and “contest”, and the confusion on type of “representative”. They fail to explain that the same words actually mean entirely different things. Thus they train their students into confusion instead of crystal clarity. I have seen many sources in the literature and they all contain this confusion. Carey & Hix 2009 / 2011 on an “electoral sweet spot” are a top paper, they include the confusion, and being a top paper carries an implication with the rest of the iceberg. Thus “political science on electoral systems” adopts confusing terminology overall. It means that it fails in a critical discussion of the constitutions of the USA, UK and France.

Another analogy may be that “political science on electoral systems” still lumps bacteria and viruses into one category of pathogens, with uniform treatment of bloodletting.

Shugart & Taagepera 2017 obviously look at multimember districts too, and a suggestion is that there is a scale from SMD to EPR (say Holland with a district of  $S = 150$ ). Yet there is a key difference between DR and EPR that should not be obscured by such “scale”. An analogy might be that H<sub>2</sub>O has states of ice, water and steam, and that current “political science on electoral systems” only looks at the H<sub>2</sub>O count while the proper information is in the state.

### ***David Hume’s divide between Is and Ought***

David Hume called attention to the divide between Is and Ought.<sup>26</sup> In economic theory, the divide between Is and Ought is modelled by the distinction between data  $x$  and utility function  $u[x]$ , preferably with methodological individualism. See VTFD for the distinction between mere preferences and morality. While philosophers might have a problem on the divide between Is and Ought, for science there are clearly two dimensions, and it is rather obvious that one must make the distinction.

Within the Humanities there is no criterion for choosing between “proto-democracy” and “proper democracy”. Such choice is regarded as falling in the realm of the normative statements. Indeed, “political science” has developed various “democracy indices” (or V-dem “polyarchy” taken from Dahl) and all nations receive some score level, with the suggestion that it is arbitrary which score would mean “pass” and which “fail”. Thus “political science on electoral systems” is still locked in this view in the Humanities that constitutional choice is arbitrary. Thus it hasn’t understood the step taken in econometrics that science is concerned with empirics.

Econometrics describes developments in the real world and aspires to test theories by means of forecasts that might falsify invalid theories. For econometrics there is the empirical question how the aggregation of individual preferences generates a social welfare function (SWF) that

---

<sup>26</sup> Within the literature there is an idea that Arrow’s Impossibility Theorem would codify Hume’s divide, and provide evidence that an objective ideal on democracy wouldn’t exist. This idea shows a misunderstanding of Arrow’s Theorem, see VTFD. Hume’s divide holds by itself, and doesn’t need Arrow’s Theorem or its confusions.

determines economic developments. DRGTPE fnnt 63 on page 79 indicates that the difference between the social optimum and the observations might be negligible when countries learn how to manage their economies. DRGTPE p207 clarifies that the state of information  $I$  is important, which gives the general functional form  $SWF[x, I]$ . If economic agents get false information then the economy may get stuck in a suboptimal situation. If economic agents get adequate information, and have some memory and can check that the information is adequate or improves, the economy may move to the new optimum as perceived by the agents and modelled by the SWF. A situation with lower unemployment and inflation would generally be judged as better.

When there is only a difference in information then it would be possible to say that one situation is better than the other, namely by using the SWF with full information. Assuming a preference for true information in itself seems arbitrary but it can be observed empirically whether such preference exists or not. The condition of full information is more neutral.

This approach in econometrics can also be applied on the choice between DR and EPR. The crux lies in the state of information. If voters in the USA, UK and France would be given proper information, and they would adjust their views, thus if they would no longer regard DR but rather EPR as their preferred choice, then it would be valid to say that DR is inoptimal w.r.t. EPR, and that DR is proto-democratic and EPR proper democratic (for them too). This diagnosis thus represents a falsifiable hypothesis about reality. The scientist refrains from normative statements but only provides adequate information (with the expectation that it will be used too).

In Holland, relevant information was given around 1900, and Holland made the switch from DR to EPR in 1917, and included women in 1919. The Dutch information of that time might not be sufficient for the USA, UK and France nowadays, with higher standards on the quality of information. However, identifying DR as proto-democratic and EPR as proper democratic still is warranted. Empirical developments in other nations can be explained by looking at their state of information. The diagnosis that "political science on electoral systems" gives disinformation is crucial. I again refer to 1W1V for the proof. (The reduction of Weimar to dictatorship was not based upon better information but rather the converse.)

### ***Dismal state of information on democracy***

There are some points that I deem useful to highlight here.

(1) Montesquieu's model of the separation of powers of the Trias Politica fails on the economic dimension. Each democracy needs the fourth power of an Economic Supreme Court, see DRGTPE for both a structural analysis and a proof using a reduced form on a stylised economy.

(2) There exists a confusion w.r.t. the interpretation of Arrow's Impossibility Theorem on democracy. A main role is by mathematicians who neglect empirics, see VTFD Ch. 9.2. <sup>27</sup>

(3) The UK Electoral Reform Society (ERS) was originally founded in 1884 as the Proportional Representation Society. Somewhere the ERS got confused. Nowadays ERS doesn't support EPR, like the open list system used in Holland, but it wants a transferable vote. Their claim that transferability generates proportionality is false, but they still want transferability apparently at all cost. <sup>28</sup> Their confusion and misdirection contributed to the debacle of the 2011 Referendum on the "alternative vote" (which voting method is counterproductive anyway). <sup>29</sup> We see similar confusions in the USA e.g. w.r.t. FairVote.

(4) In the Dutch system of EPR voters can always vote for a regional candidate but few voters actually do so, and somehow the "political science on electoral systems" does not highlight this possibility within EPR, and still wants to enforce districts at all cost, like astrologers may use modern computers to calculate the stars but continue invoking their phantasies. Voters are indoctrinated to think in terms of districts, they may reflect this in questionnaires about their preferences, and then political scientists might infer that the electorate wants to see districts: but the proper reply is to stop the indoctrination and to start informing the public properly.

<sup>27</sup> Dutch readers may benefit from <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/Artikelen/2013-02-14-PasOpMetWiskundeOverVerkiezingen.html>

<sup>28</sup> When in Holland 2% of the votes are wasted, ERS might say that this can be resolved with a transferable vote. It is curious however to make this mandatory for all and then to forget about the open list system. Rather, ERS wants to maintain districts and use transferability within this disproportional setting, further leading the UK into the morass.

<sup>29</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2017/06/21/also-scotland-doesnt-understand-democracy/>

(5) The UK Electoral Commission (EC) does not properly tabulate and display the electoral *contests* that constitute the UK General “*Election*”. The EC thus disinforms the public. A proper presentation should show the distinction between an election and a contest. Voters should be clearly informed that most votes tend to be discarded, see OESC figure 4. (One might also make a histogram with votes that won a seat and votes that are discarded.)

(6a) A common measure in “political science on electoral systems” looks at the difference between vote shares and seat shares. For EPR this tends to be superfluous because the system causes a close match. For DR this difference tends to be disinformative, because votes are actually discarded (and should not be compared to seats in other districts) while many voters do not express their first preference anyway out of fear that their vote would be lost on a losing candidate. (6b) The plain difference in shares has drawbacks. Political science never managed to find a good measure on votes and seats. My proposal is to use the “sine-diagonal inequality / disproportionality” (SDID) measure, that does for democracy what the Richter scale does for earthquakes, though with the caveat in (6a). Political science has shown less understanding of statistics, or perhaps failed in finding such a measure because statistical science did not develop this theory or did not understand what the political scientists were looking for. This hole has been plugged now, see CVSC and OESC for this innovation in statistics as well. (6c) This diagnosis itself already calls for a reorganisation of university courses in statistics and political science.

(7) When historians describe how the West developed into democracy, they occlude the fact that the USA, UK and France are still in a proto-democratic phase. The branch in political science on “electoral systems” is no science yet, but still locked in the Humanities, and quite alike astrology, alchemy and homeopathy. Voters are disinformed on a grand scale, both in the textbooks in government classes and in public discussion e.g. at “election” nights. Statistics and sciences like physics, biology, psychometrics and econometrics could help “political science on electoral systems” to become a proper science.

### ***Specialisation in science***

Let me make some comments on how my analysis from econometrics and Public Choice might be received within “political science on electoral systems”.

Econometrics combines economics, mathematics and statistics. It is not a specialisation but a generalisation, since one acquires some competences in different areas though not necessarily at the level of specialists in such areas. The field may cause needless and confusing discussion with specialists who are not aware of the other areas.

There is a distinction between academics who are supposed to find new ways and who thus might criticise whatever they read, and applied research (engineering) where new findings meet with the condition that they must be used, thus with a convergence on usability. It is fortunate that “political science on electoral systems” is developing the idea to call themselves “electoral engineers”. Even though they still lack basic training in empirical science, at least the discussion then would not be burdened too much with academic frivolities.

There is a distinction between applied science and the use of statistics. Statistics can only generate correlation while we need science to clarify causality. See 1W1V for a deconstruction of an analysis by Carey & Hix on a supposed “electoral sweet spot”.

In academics, there still are mechanisms that remind of the medieval guild system. There is a professor who promotes a Ph.D. thesis for youngsters who haven’t shown a track record yet. I wonder about this: Apparently researchers don’t do much “peer review on the spot”, but apparently tend to trust that others (the professor, the editors) have done their job. Someone may gain a reputation based upon some publications and then others might assume that this person might know more about also other issues, even though there is no evidence for this. For social psychology there is a growing awareness of the need of replication, but for electoral systems there might be the idea that applications are so specialised per country that replication is hardly possible. Advisors for committees of Parliaments still might tend to be professors who have gained some reputation within what reminds of that guild system. If this would be the true state of affairs then this would be awkward.



Academic research still much disappears behind paywalls by commercial publishers.<sup>30</sup> I find it problematic. This explains why my research can be found in open access places and not the official journals. Curiously, peer review tends to be confused with the commercial process, and undoubtedly commercial publishers encourage this confusion. I am much in support of peer review and hold that this should be an open access process too. Given the current confusion about commercial publishing and peer review, my work is not much referred to in the literature. For the future: Each Alma Mater can create a database with work by its graduates, and the open access peer reviewing can start from there.<sup>31</sup> I encourage peer review on the spot. Give something a critical read and report about it on the spot. Journals need only recommend links and that is it. Currently, Acta Politica (supported by NKWP) is with Springer / Palgrave / Macmillan and asks an “open access publication fee” of some EUR 2200 excl. VAT.<sup>32</sup> This is a preposterous fee when papers can be open access at the database of the Alma Mater at low cost. Currently, a confused recommendation is CC BY<sup>33</sup> but this allows free commercial use, so that one might hand over the paper to commercial journals anyway. Thus the recommendation should be CC BY NC.

In sum, I do not come from political science per se, I come from an adjoint and overlapping field, I haven't performed the rite of passage within the incrowd of political science, I have no reputation based upon such journal articles, and I come carrying gifts of enlightenment and criticism about the confusions amongst the locals. Social psychology would suggest that the expected likelihood of success would not be great.<sup>34</sup> Beware of Greeks bringing gifts. Socrates: “Regard your good name as the richest jewel you can possibly be possessed of (...)”.<sup>35 36</sup> Cicero: “Take from a man his reputation for probity, and the more shrewd and clever he is, the more hated and mistrusted he becomes.”<sup>37</sup> Indeed, I did not get a reply from NKWP in 2010, see **Appendix E**. Some researchers in “Administration and Policy Science” (“Bestuurskunde”), who studied CPB, treated my information horribly, see **Appendix D**.

Hopefully the criticism in 1W1V concerning “political science on electoral systems” starts opening some eyes. In Troy, Cassandra wasn't listened to, but NKWP would be aware that science comes with the obligation to listen to criticism<sup>38</sup> (and my criticism arose from listening to “political science”, so NKWP is receiving crucial feedback).

### **Concluding**

Given the objective of NKWP to be a scientific association, I expect NKWP to be greatly alarmed by the proof in 1W1V that “political science on electoral systems” is no science yet. I have asked the NKWP board to assist me in thinking about how to proceed with this information. This request has not been successful. Apparently the board has considered the question but the reply was that the thinking stopped there.

I can imagine various ways for NKWP to respond, but my first suggestion is that the board informs the membership of this finding, so that all members may check the argument. Please invite members to engage (proper) scientists to assist them in deconstructing the confusion and bias in “political science on electoral systems”. There is a (new) tendency amongst “political scientists on electoral systems” to call themselves “electoral engineers” but please consult with real engineers on the evidence in 1W1V. It would seem to be a good idea to invite KIVI to set up a buddy system.<sup>39</sup>

I feel sorry for the people in the UK who suffer from the disinformation by the “political science on electoral systems”, also perpetrated by academics in the UK itself, though also by at least

---

<sup>30</sup> [https://horizon-magazine.eu/article/open-access-scientific-publications-must-become-reality-2020-robert-jan-smits\\_en.html](https://horizon-magazine.eu/article/open-access-scientific-publications-must-become-reality-2020-robert-jan-smits_en.html)

<sup>31</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2016/10/12/letter-to-vsnu-and-others-on-membership-dues-and-open-access-publishing/>

<sup>32</sup> <https://www.springer.com/gp/open-access/springer-open-choice?countryChanged=true>

<sup>33</sup> [https://www.scienceeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Plan\\_S.pdf](https://www.scienceeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Plan_S.pdf)

<sup>34</sup> <https://econwpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/econ-wp/othr/papers/9605/9605001.pdf>

<sup>35</sup> <http://www.textjournal.com.au/april09/carthew.htm>

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/cn/blog/2018-global-academic-reputation-survey-why-you-should-take-part#survey-answer>

<sup>37</sup> <http://www.quoteauthors.com/marcus-tullius-cicero-quotes/>

<sup>38</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/English/Science/2016-06-12-Essay-NRC-KHMW.pdf>

<sup>39</sup> <https://www.kivi.nl/>

one Dutch researcher who moved to the UK (whom I informed and who did not react).<sup>40</sup> Let me invite the board of NKWP to inform also the fellow organisations APSA in USA, PSA in UK, AFSP in France and EPSA in Europe. At this early stage the board of NKWP obviously cannot state that it has confirmed my analysis, but at least one can alert others to the analysis. My own e-mail (**Appendix A**) got no response but perhaps NKWP will be listened to.

Because of Brexit, please inform also the Dutch Prime Minister and Parliament so that they can contact the UK and EU at the level of the executive and legislative. Inform KNAW so that they can contact the Royal Society. Because of Scps, please inform the Scps, the minister of the Interior and Parliament.

I hope that NKWP will also protest against the censorship of science since 1990 by the directorate of the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB) (partly on research that is also relevant for NKWP, see the failure of the Trias Politica and see my paper on Arrow's Theorem). Please observe that my protest concerns the directorate. My fellow econometricians at CPB are witnesses and have little knowledge about my analysis since it got censored. They might not even know that there is this censorship. My analysis on unemployment<sup>41</sup> better is subjected to an exercise with an econometric model and then discussed with the colleagues and then published under the name of the author, to allow a discussion that can show what other econometricians think internationally.

There are some subsidiary aspects or comments that I have put in the **Appendices (A to G)**.

#### ***Appendix A. Email 2017 to APSA, PSA and AFSP***

Date: Sun, 12 Nov 2017

To: [chairpersons of APSA, PSA and AFSP]

From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Subject: Analysis that "political science on electoral systems" is still pre-science

To the chairpersons of APSA, PSA and AFSP

Dear professors [Kathleen] Thelen (USA), Angelia Wilson (PSA) and Andy Smith (AFSP),

This paper concludes that political science on electoral systems still is pre-science:

"One woman, one vote. Though not in the USA, UK and France"

<https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/82513/> [update: <https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/84482/> ]

The abstract is below.

My suggestion is that each of your learned societies sets up a committee to report on the analysis, so that we can compare the independent findings. If there is a draft report, I would appreciate an opportunity to comment on that draft in order to prevent misunderstandings. It should be possible to have a draft report in a month.

PM. An earlier deconstruction concerned the "research in mathematics education":

<https://zenodo.org/communities/re-engineering-math-ed/about/>

Sincerely yours,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Econometrician and teacher of mathematics  
Scheveningen, Holland

---

<sup>40</sup> <https://boycotholland.wordpress.com/2018/08/11/een-bevestiging-van-vooringenomenheid-in-strijd-met-empirische-wetenschap/>

<sup>41</sup> <https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/brede-werkloosheid-in-nederland-in-vier-jaar-bijna-gehalveerd-maar-daling-vlakt-af~b35c210d/>

Abstract "One woman, one vote. Though not in the USA, UK and France"

This paper gives an economic analysis of the design of electoral systems. It particular it evaluates how political science has been dealing with this issue. The main choice is between either district representation (DR) or equal or proportional representation (EPR). It appears that DR obliterates votes so that the principle of One Woman, One Vote and also article 21 in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are violated. Holland in 1917 switched from DR to EPR but countries like the USA, UK and France still adopt DR. Brexit can be diagnosed as a result of the UK system of DR and the build-up of frustration on democracy within the UK itself. It appears that the advisory role of political scientists cannot be overlooked. Political science started in the humanities and only gradually adopted the methods of science, e.g. with the foundation of APSA in 1903. However, political science on the particular topic of electoral systems apparently still remains with its tradition in the humanities, in which assumptions are more important than analysis and hard data. Political science on electoral systems is no experimental science, since one cannot experiment with nations and their elections. The situation is similar as for macro-economics or astronomy that also are observational sciences, yet the latter fields have managed better in adopting the methods of science. A new development uses laboratory experiments, but these obviously cannot replace actual elections for the US House of Representatives or the UK House of Commons. This paper focuses on a deconstruction of a study by Carey & Hix (2011) (C&H) on an "electoral sweet spot", that favours DR and that would mean the end of EPR. Other evidence on other studies is given in appendices. The deconstruction of the C&H study is sufficient evidence though, since it constitutes the culmination of a particular branch in political science. This branch appears to contain fundamental confusion and bias. Political science might regard this deconstruction as mere opinion but for science an empirical observation constitutes a fact. C&H also take 'the most frequent of good outcomes' as 'thus the best overall', which confuses frequency with optimality. This is more particular to their study though other political scientists are already copying this confusion instead of criticising it. Proper science should step in and assist political science to become a real science.

P.S. There is also a new measure on inequality / disproportionality:

<https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/81389/> [update: <https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/84469/> ]

The latter has this non-technical overview:

<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2017/10/21/statistics-slope-cosine-sine-sign-significance-and-r-squared/>

### ***Appendix B. Tempted by abstraction: example of mathematics education***

Abstraction is leaving things out. It is tempting to do so just to make things look simple.

Since "political science on electoral systems" has such lock-in w.r.t. the Humanities at a distance from empirical observation, let us look at mathematics, that also has such distance to empirical science. We see a similar cost from getting lost in abstraction.

There is also the phenomenon that political science may draw students from highschool who have had less mathematics ("wiskunde A") than those going to study science ("wiskunde B"). An improvement in the education in mathematics might be beneficial overall.

(A) Though I have a teaching degree in economics, I preferred teaching mathematics, and got the additional degree in Leiden 2008. The experience caused me to look closer at didactics of mathematics. It appeared to me that mathematicians have been trained to think abstractly but that education in mathematics is an empirical issue. Much in mathematics education appears crooked with an origin in tradition, instead of the myth of clarity, and instead of looking at the empirics for didactics for students. This generated the books "*Elegance with*

*Substance*" (EWS) (2009, 2015),<sup>42</sup> "*Conquest of the Plane*" (COTP) (2011)<sup>43 44</sup> and "*A child wants nice and no mean numbers*" (2015, 2018).<sup>45 46</sup>

- (B) While there is "official research in mathematics education", it leaves much to be desired. Teachers and researchers in mathematics education tend to have a basis in training for mathematics and thus abstract thinking instead of empirics. (See this example.<sup>47</sup>)
- (C) It also appeared that abstract thinking mathematicians had engaged in a "math war". Hans Freudenthal teamed up with reform pedagogues and created "realistic mathematics education" (RME), though without empirical research. When the level of performance in Holland dropped, Jan van de Craats defended "traditional mathematics education" (TME). My approach under (A) was neglected by both sides.<sup>48</sup> As a political economist, my diagnosis was that there was an institutional void in the management of mathematics education and its research. For Holland I advised a "Simon Stevin Institute".<sup>49</sup> It also appeared that Freudenthal committed fraud by appropriating ideas by Pierre van Hiele and displaying those as his own.<sup>50 51 52</sup>
- (D) Research mathematicians at KWG who have no background in mathematics education managed to create the one-dimensional psychological frame "mathematics is mathematics", and use this frame to convince the association of teachers of mathematics (who have no background in empirical research) NVvW to team up in a new club PWN, thus institutionalising the confusion between research mathematics and education of mathematics (and the research on that education). They now apply for subsidies at the Ministry of Education, claiming that they intend to improve education in mathematics, but they have no background in empirical research in mathematics education and they neglect the criticism in EWS, COTP and CWNN.<sup>53 54 55</sup>
- (E) While mathematicians have no background in empirical research, they have allowed psychometricians to do statistics. In Holland there are for example the CITO tests for kids finishing elementary school. Yet these psychometricians have no background in didactics of mathematics either. See the discussion in CWNN (2018) p 175-204.
- (F) My advice for Dutch Parliament is an enquiry.<sup>56</sup>

### Appendix C. Other

- (G) There is the NVMC-report.<sup>57</sup> At that time, professor in anthropology A.F. Köbben was known to have made some statements on integrity of science, and he was willing to speak with me. He mentioned that there was a new association NVMC that might set up a committee to look at such a case. Since my work had some overlap with NVMC (via institutional economics<sup>58</sup>) I found it acceptable and expedient to join NVMC. To my regret, the report got no follow-up. Some years later, there was a split-up, and members had to choose between culture or sociology.<sup>59</sup> This was too specialised for me, and thus I dropped out of that community.

<sup>42</sup> <https://zenodo.org/record/291974>

<sup>43</sup> <https://zenodo.org/record/291972>

<sup>44</sup> <https://zenodo.org/record/292257>

<sup>45</sup> <https://zenodo.org/record/1434693>

<sup>46</sup> <https://zenodo.org/communities/re-engineering-math-ed/about/>

<sup>47</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-12-21-Vos-Roorda-Afgeleide.pdf>

<sup>48</sup> Not totally, but still: <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2009-10-15-Reacties.pdf>

<sup>49</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2016/01/24/graphical-displays-about-the-math-war/>

<sup>50</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2015-10-14-Rekenen-Fraude-Freudenthal-Parlement.pdf>

<sup>51</sup> <http://www.wiskundebrief.nl/718.htm#7>

<sup>52</sup> <https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.1930>

<sup>53</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2016-06-28-Letter-to-NVvW-with-Red-Card.pdf>

<sup>54</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-03-22-Minister-krijgt-een-misleidend-Deltaplan-Wiskunde.pdf>

<sup>55</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-03-03-Het-Simon-Stevin-Instituut.pdf>

<sup>56</sup> <https://www.ipetitions.com/petition/tk-onderzoek-wiskundeonderwijs/>

<sup>57</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/NVMC/Verslag.html>

<sup>58</sup> <https://econpapers.repec.org/paper/wpawuwpot/9605001.htm>

<sup>59</sup> The magazine Facta became Sociologie Magazine. <https://sociologiemagazine.nl/colofon>

- (H) I never aspired to become a research mathematician. My work might be seen as applied mathematics.<sup>60</sup> Research mathematicians might look at my analysis on Arrow's Theorem (VTFD chapter 9.2) and react that "it is not (research) mathematics" which is true for them but such comment is both obvious and irrelevant for econometrics or political economy which the analysis is about. My invitation to research mathematicians is to not maltreat "applied mathematics", study the empirical problem that is the object of study too, and assist in the communication that would be helpful for mathematicians themselves, at least if they want that mathematicians play a useful role rather than sabotage science.
- (I) I am amazed by the lack of awareness about integrity of science in the Dutch world of (proclaimed) science. The KNAW has set up LOWI but this looks at universities only and not at research institutes like TNO or CPB. The KNAW / LOWI notion of integrity is rather targetted at lawyers instead of science.<sup>61 62</sup> I found LOWI to have been deficient in awareness of empirical science in two crucial cases, and LOWI allowed breaches of integrity to continue.<sup>63 64</sup> Professors in economics do not protest against the censorship of economic science by the directorate of CPB, and thus since 2005 I advise that they be dismissed collectively for failing to understand integrity of science.<sup>65 66 67</sup> A professor of economics is allowed to falsify history.<sup>68</sup> Research mathematicians meddle in mathematics education without proper background.<sup>69 70 71</sup> Mathematicians deliberately abuse the "this is not (research) mathematics" fallacy to misrepresent an argument that is not intended to be (research) mathematics but that is a step in didactics or applied mathematics to a particular issue.<sup>72 73</sup> A professor of mathematics switches to philosophy and social choice theory without looking at the empirics, shows that he doesn't quite understand Arrow's Theorem, neglects to answer to criticism, and commits fraud ("valsheid in geschrifte") without NWO looking into it, and pulling others along.<sup>74</sup> Someone writes a thesis on Freudenthal, refuses to answer a question on an inconsistency w.r.t. Van Hiele, and then lets the thesis be translated into English,<sup>75</sup> where an American reviewer doesn't see that inconsistency.<sup>76</sup> Food technology engineer Klaas van Egmond starts a new career on the environment, declares himself competent in economics too, disinforms Parliament, and attacks the messenger of criticism,<sup>77</sup> taking along Rob van Dorland<sup>78</sup> who apparently enjoys getting false information from non-economists for use at IPCC on Climate Change. Please recall that in 1990 I was involved in the CPB scenario study (1992) "*Scanning the Future 1990-2015*". Some 25 years have been lost for effective policy making. Science journalism also isn't what you hope that it is.<sup>79 80 81</sup> Within economics, Lans Bovenberg, Ruud de Mooij and Rick van der Ploeg create confusion about a "double dividend" analysis<sup>82</sup> but neglect the analysis in DRGTPE (and a CPB memo in 1991), and thus distort the discussion on environmental economics.

<sup>60</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2013-03-26-WAMMWTKAMW.pdf>

<sup>61</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/26/allea-defines-research-integrity-too-narrow/>

<sup>62</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2018/03/13/de-knaw-heeft-teveel-invloed-van-juristen/>

<sup>63</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/COTP/LOWI/Index.html>

<sup>64</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/CWI-Leiden/2016-09-30-Letter-to-CWI-anonimised.pdf>

<sup>65</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/Artikelen/AdviesOntslagHooglerarenEconomie.pdf>

<sup>66</sup> <https://www.vecon.nl/tijdschriften/27813/teo-2005-nr-2>

<sup>67</sup> <http://www.frontaalnaakt.nl/archives/00000100.html>

<sup>68</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Crisis-2007plus/2013-03-17-TPE-FAGdenButter.pdf>

<sup>69</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/09/19/jan-van-de-craats-tortures-kids-with-fractions/>

<sup>70</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-10-07-Brief-aan-Henk-Broer.pdf>

<sup>71</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-10-05-Afscheidsrede-Henk-Broer-en-diens-KNAW-sectie-voorzitterschap.pdf>

<sup>72</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/COTP/LOWI/Index.html>

<sup>73</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/JB/Index.html>

<sup>74</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2016/03/02/h-c-m-de-swart-breaches-integrity-of-science/>

<sup>75</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/10/13/pierre-van-hiele-and-sacha-la-bastide-van-gemert/>

<sup>76</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/10/15/pierre-van-hiele-and-annie-selden/>

<sup>77</sup> <http://www.thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Crisis-2007plus/2013-05-01-SFL.html>

<sup>78</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Crisis-2007plus/2015-11-30-Let-Rob-Dorland-admit-his-breach-of-scientific-integrity.pdf>

<sup>79</sup> <http://www.thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/2013-06-10-PosterBessensap.html>

<sup>80</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-07-04-Nav-JanHogendijk-en-DonQuichot.pdf>

<sup>81</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2016/09/10/draaicirkel-en-draaischijf-met-maat-1-voor-goniometrie/>

<sup>82</sup> <https://www.nwo.nl/onderzoek-en>

<https://www.nwo.nl/onderzoek-en/resultaten/programmas/spinozapremie/spinozalaureaten/alfabetisch+overzicht/lans+bovenberg>

(J) Political economy: <sup>83 84 85</sup> Why did the CPB directorate block my analysis since 1990 ? I have only little information. <sup>86 87 88</sup> An element may be that my draft paper <sup>89</sup> advises to an enquiry by Parliament. A fleeting remark by a vice-director at that time (now deceased), but not put onto paper, was that this is not the kind of advice given at the CPB. Well, obviously I gave the advice, and thus his comment was contrary to fact, and actually ex cathedra since he did not substantiate why such advice would not be given while my paper gave the argumentation. I later checked with Gerard Visscher at Leiden university (apparently now retired) that it was a perfectly normal thing for scholars to discuss the notion of an enquiry by Parliament. For economics, part of my innovation was to look at the role of information, and obviously such an enquiry by Parliament would generate information for policy making and better legislation (e.g. on the position of CPB itself). Potentially, if also the current directorate of CPB feels that advice at the CPB cannot be to advise an enquiry by Parliament, then perhaps NKWP might help out in informing the directorate of CPB that it is a perfectly normal thing for scholars to discuss the notion of an enquiry by Parliament. My current impression is that it would help to get clarity whether the directorate of CPB still treats this as a taboo. For the directorate it is also a taboo to investigate the evidence that the economic crisis since 2007 confirms my analysis from 1990. By such taboos, CPB fails to learn from mistakes in the past.

(In 1990-2007, my analysis on unemployment got little attention perhaps because unemployment in Holland was rather low in the commonly used statistic. Yet it was low because of the wage moderation policy, that exported unemployment to the rest of the world. In 2007+ it was confirmed that this was a beggar-thy-neighbour policy, as I had already explained in 1990 (and partly CPB colleagues Marein van Schaaijk and (now deceased) Anton Bakhoven). Dutch employment was financed by capital exports or loans say (indirectly) to Southern Europe, to provide them with the funds to buy Dutch exports. The crisis showed that such “foreign investments” may have evaporated.)<sup>90</sup>

#### **Appendix D. Emails in 2005 and 2010 to professor Rob Hoppe on an NWO project 2002-2010 also involving CPB**

[adapted dataweb.nl into thomascool.eu]

Professor Robert Hoppe <sup>91</sup> (formerly political science at VU, in 1997-2015 “policy and knowledge” at Twente, now retired) had the NWO project 410-42-016, running from 2002-2010: “Rethinking political judgment and science-based expertise: Boundary work at the science/politics nexus by Dutch knowledge institutes”. <sup>92 93 94</sup> The Project summary:

“The relationship between political judgment and scientific expertise is a troubled one. This research program intends to rethink the confusing and shifting popular images and scientific models of the links between political judgment and science-based expertise. The general research problem can be stated as: How can we describe, analyze, and assess the (dys)functions of discursive and non-discursive practices in boundary work between political judgment and science-based expertise for dealing with different types of policy problems, as manifested in the interaction between Dutch knowledge institutes and representatives of politics, policy, and interests? The empirical research is about (dys)functions of science-based expertise for political judgment as manifested in

<sup>83</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

<sup>84</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/SvHG/DenS/Index.html>

<sup>85</sup> [https://www.ipetitions.com/petition/pe\\_werk\\_cpb/](https://www.ipetitions.com/petition/pe_werk_cpb/)

<sup>86</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/NVMC/Verslag.html>

<sup>87</sup> “De ontketende kiezer” p111-116 <http://thomascool.eu/SvHG/DOK/DOK-Aankondiging.html>

<sup>88</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/SvHG/DenS/Index.html>

<sup>89</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/Record/1990/12/18/index.html>

<sup>90</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2017/05/15/from-trauma-at-tu-delft-to-collapse-of-the-euro/>

<sup>91</sup> <https://www.utwente.nl/en/bms/steps/staff/hoppe/>

<sup>92</sup> [https://www.utwente.nl/en/bms/steps/research/areas/sip/projects/Rethinking\\_Political\\_Judgment\\_and\\_Science-Based\\_Expertise/](https://www.utwente.nl/en/bms/steps/research/areas/sip/projects/Rethinking_Political_Judgment_and_Science-Based_Expertise/)

<sup>93</sup> <https://www.nwo.nl/en/research-and-results/research-projects/i/34/19834.html>

<sup>94</sup> <https://www.nwo.nl/en/research-and-results/research-projects/i/61/17161.html>

extended case histories/studies of boundary work at the science/politics nexus by five Dutch knowledge institutes, i.e. WRR, CPB, CBS, RIVM and Alterra. Based on an inventory of models of boundary work and its (dys)functions, the program intends to discover, through systematic comparative case research and analysis, the conditions under which some of these models may claim greater verisimilitude. Such empirically informed evaluative research into the meanings and functions of strategic science may suggest strategies for more productive boundary work.”

For CPB, this issue was already solved by DRGTPE Background Papers 1992 and TP & CPB 1994, see now DRGTPE: that the Trias Politica are inconsistent w.r.t. scientific advice on the management of the state, so that there is need of an Economic Supreme Court at the same constitutional level as the other three powers. Professor Hoppe might not understand the econometric underpinning of this analysis, but he might respect a finding by a fellow scientist, in particular when he studies the “nexus” of science and policy making, and did so before him, so that this work might at least be referred to.

There is a paper by Annick de Vries, Willem Halffman, Robert Hoppe (2010), “Policy workers tinkering with uncertainty: Dutch econometric policy advice in action”.<sup>95</sup> Apparently a subproject was done by C. van Egmond: “Modeling the future. Rethinking boundary work for economic policy making: the Central Planning Bureau (CPB) case”.<sup>96</sup> In her thesis of December 2010 there is mainly reference to health policy modelling at CPB.<sup>97</sup>

I discovered this project in 2005 and then informed professor Hoppe and his project members of the censorship by the directorate of CPB. In January 2010 I reminded him of this. In 2010 I also asked Van Egmond for a PDF of her report but she did not send it too me. There is an article by Van Egmond and Bal 2010.<sup>98</sup> There is this book by Bal and others 2009.<sup>99</sup>

What I am rather shocked about is that in 2005 professor Roland Bal,<sup>100</sup> who ran the CPB-part of this project (and who later appears to be the thesis supervisor of Van Egmond), reacted in a strange manner. He misrepresented my message, gave a vague general but not concrete criticism, and basically slandered as if I would be confused about ethics of science, and did so in carbon-copy (cc) to the research group without first trying to establish in bilateral manner whether he understood me properly. In 2005 I protested only to Hoppe and Bal. I did not receive a reply. When reminding Hoppe in 2010 I included this protest for the research group to see.

My diagnosis is (i) that Bal’s email in 2005 was inappropriate, and likely not well dealt with by Hoppe and others, (ii) that this research group neglected information that they should have been able to recognise as important for their research, (iii) that this still is better resolved because of bias in the research record (and tainted memories by researchers).

The email exchange:

Date: Mon, 25 Jan 2010  
To: Rob Hoppe (Twente)  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: Memo on censorship of science  
Cc: roland bal (Erasmus MC), a.rip (Twente), w.halffman (Twente), n.s.groenendijk (Twente), p.w.a.scholten (Twente), a.e.steenge (Twente), A.S.DeVries (Twente), b.devroom (Twente), d.b.d.bannink (Twente), r.l.holz hacker (Twente), m.rosema (Twente), p.w.a.scholten (Twente), klaus.schubert (Muenster), j.j.a.thomassen (Twente), byoung (Muenster), zimmean (Muenster), vanderveen(FSW EUR), s.donnely (Twente),

Dear professor Hoppe,

<sup>95</sup> [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242387053\\_Policy\\_workers\\_tinkering\\_with\\_uncertainty\\_Dutch\\_econometric\\_policy\\_advice\\_in\\_action](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242387053_Policy_workers_tinkering_with_uncertainty_Dutch_econometric_policy_advice_in_action)

<sup>96</sup> <https://www.narcis.nl/research/RecordID/OND1297240/Language/en>

<sup>97</sup> <https://repub.eur.nl/pub/22194/BMG%20101209%20Egmond,%20Stans%20van.pdf>

<sup>98</sup> <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0162243910366131>

<sup>99</sup> <https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/paradox-scientific-authority>

<sup>100</sup> <https://www.eur.nl/people/roland-bal>

As you know I protest against the censorship of science by the directorate of the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB). My research is relevant for the current economic crisis. You study governance, with attention to the CPB (see the link to your page below). It appears that some members of your study group have left the UT and/or group. I take the liberty to include persons who are likely to find this email relevant for their research as well; they might ask you, as I do, how far you have progressed in analyzing the censorship.

Almost 5 years ago we had a small exchange by email, see below, in which I advised that this research be done with care and scrutiny. It seems that dr. Bal misinterpreted my advice but no doubt you will have clarified matters.

Currently, the Dutch government has instituted 20 committees to find 35 billion euro's of savings on the national budget. One of the committees is on the tax system. My censored analysis is relevant here. Since about 1970 the tax systems in the OECD area have gotten off track, causing widespread unemployment. Governments did not see that cause, and to solve that unemployment they started to deregulate. Deregulation of financial markets gave us the present crisis. Re-regulation will cause mass unemployment to return. The problem best be solved at the root: in the tax system. However, my analysis is censored by the directorate of the Dutch CPB, and the tax specialists working for the current committee neglect that censorship.

Here is my letter to the committee (in Dutch):

<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Crisis-2007plus/2010-01-23-Studiecommissie.pdf>

If you have any questions, feel free to ask them.

PM 1. Looking at this (apparently dated) research page <http://www.mb.utwente.nl/rethinking/program/> I would consider it helpful when the results on CPB and the censorship were more clearly linked to.

PM 2. As you also study CBS Statistics Netherlands and the environmental accounts, I can usefully refer you to my paper "The Old Man and the SNI" on the position of Roefie Hueting and his eSNI at CBS, see <http://www.sni-hueting.info> and <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/12690/>.

Kind regards,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

At 09:41 2005-07-01, Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus wrote:  
Geachte professor Hoppe,

Ik stuur dit email alleen aan u, met kopie aan dr. Bal.

De opmerking die dr. Bal maakt bevestigt dat men de grootst mogelijke zorgvuldigheid moet betrachten.

Ik stelde slechts dat ik de schijn van belangenverstremgeling wenste te vermijden.

De opmerking van dr. Bal stelt dat dit neerkomt op een 'guilty by association'. Dat is niet correct.

Vervolgens spreekt dr. Bal een 'hoop' uit.

M.i. is dat nergens voor nodig.

Als projectleider t.a.v. het onderzoeksveld 'CPB' kan dr. Bal het beschikbare materiaal, met daarin ook mijn teksten, bestuderen en evalueren. Het verbaast me een beetje dat dit nog niet gebeurd is.

Met vriendelijke groet,



Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

>Date: Thu, 30 Jun 2005  
>From: roland bal (BMG / Erasmus MC)  
>To: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
>CC: r.hoppe (Twente), roland bal (BMG / Erasmus MC), vanegmond (BMG / Erasmus MC),  
> p.groenewegen (FSW VU), w.halfman (Twente),  
> matthijs.hisschemoller (IVM VU), dave.huitema (IVM VU),  
> udo.pesch (IVM VU), a.rip (Twente), p.w.a.scholten (Twente),  
> p.j.stauvermann (Twente), a.e.steenge (Twente),  
> r.j.vanderveen (Twente), A.S.DeVries (Twente), b.devroom (Twente),  
> R.Zeiss (FSW VU)  
>Subject: Re: Rethinking project (o.m. Trias Politica & Centraal Planbureau)  
>  
>Geachte heer Kool,  
>  
>Mooi is dat: guilty by association. Ik hoop dat u zich in uw overige  
>correspondentie over de wetenschappelijke ethiek van betere argumenten  
>bedient.  
>  
>vriendelijke groet,  
>  
>Roland Bal  
>  
> Thu, 30 Jun 2005 Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus wrote:  
>  
>>Geachte professor Hoppe,  
>>  
>>Hartelijk dank voor het telefoongesprek dat ik vanochtend met u  
>>mocht voeren.  
>>  
>>Ik doe kopie van dit email aan uw gehele onderzoeksgroep, omdat ik  
>>zag dat mijn vroegere docent aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen Bert  
>>Steenge daar deel van uitmaakt: zodat ik het wel zo 'clean' acht dat  
>>eenieder alle informatie heeft.  
>>  
>>(a) Zoals u weet heb ik grote waardering voor uw onderzoeksproject  
>>"RETHINKING POLITICAL JUDGMENT AND SCIENCE-BASED  
>>EXPERTISE: BOUNDARY WORK AT THE SCIENCE/POLITICS  
>>NEXUS OF DUTCH KNOWLEDGE INSTITUTES." [http://bbt-  
>>webserver.bbt.utwente.nl/rethinking/](http://bbt-webserver.bbt.utwente.nl/rethinking/)  
>>  
>  
>  
[parts of this email have not been intended for publication]

## **Appendix E. An email of 2010 to NKWP w.r.t. the economic crisis (crisis in economics)**

[website links updated from dataweb.nl to thomascool.eu]

[It later appeared that Jos de Beus (1952-2013) was hit by a peculiar disease in the Summer of 2009. <sup>101</sup> This email likely hasn't received the attention that it might have received in normal times given my earlier contact with De Beus.]

Date: Sun, 31 Jan 2010

To: J.W. de Beus (UvA), NKWP, acta.politica (fsw.vu.nl), Marc.Hooghe (Leuven)

From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Subject: N.a.v. het aanbod van Abraham de Swaan

Cc: Henriette Prast (Tilburg, WRR), A. de Swaan (Uva), Kees Aarts (Twente)

Aan NKWP, professor De Beus (voorzitter)

en de redactie van Acta Politica

<http://www.politicologie.nl/>

<http://www.palgrave-journals.com/ap/about.html>

<http://www.bbt.utwente.nl/polmt/staff/Aarts/>

Geachte hoogleraren De Beus, <sup>102</sup> Hooghe en Van Kersbergen,

Ik doe kopie aan professores De Swaan en Prast wegens de crisis in de economische wetenschapsbeoefening waarbij socioloog De Swaan wil helpen bij een oplossing (zie onderstaand email). Misschien dat u vanuit de politicologie ook naar de economen kijkt? Ik doe kopie aan professor Aarts wegens diens methodologische interesse. [See also physics. <sup>103</sup>]

Van belang is: er is geen crisis in de economische wetenschap, want ik had e.e.a. al opgelost, maar slechts een crisis in de beoefening, namelijk met censuur en machtsmisbruik. Voor degenen die denken dat er altijd mogelijkheden zijn voor het plaatsen van artikelen in peer-reviewed tijdschriften: dat is het punt niet, het punt is dat censuur opgelost moet worden waar die ontstaat. U kent me wellicht als die econometrist die in 1991 bij het Centraal Planbureau is ontslagen en die protesteert tegen met machtsmisbruik en de censuur van de wetenschap door die directie. Dat is dan een juiste observatie. Punt is wel dat er sprake is van censuur en dat dit opgelost moet worden. En u weet niet 100% wat mijn analyse is zolang die door censuur is getroffen.

Ik heb wel een paar aspecten kunnen documenteren. In mijn boek DRGTPE laat ik zien dat Montesquieu's Trias Politica (wellicht altijd al maar zeker in een moderne samenleving) uitbreiding behoeven met een grondwettelijk wetenschappelijk Economisch Hof. Zie daarin ook mijn D&R methodologie waarin dit met wiskunde 100% zeker getoond wordt. In mijn boek VTFD laat ik zien hoe het probleem van de Stelling van Arrow opgelost kan worden. Nuttig te vermelden is ook deze bespreking van mijn boek over de logica ALOE, zie [<http://www.nieuwarchief.nl/serie5/pdf/naw5-2008-09-3-217.pdf>] Het is mij onduidelijk of DRGTPE en VTFD ooit in Acta Politica zijn besproken. Ik heb ooit een exemplaar van een van deze boeken aan het blad gezonden maar verder dan "ingekomen boeken" is het denkelijk nooit gekomen. Hoewel ik mij nooit begeef in de officiële kringen der politicologen, men kan immers niet van alles lid worden, hoop ik dat u oog heeft voor mijn besef van de raakvlakken.

Terwijl ik adviseer dat de Nederlandse hoogleraren economie zijn te ontslaan en terwijl zich laat constateren dat economen internationaal in grote meerderheid de crisis niet zagen aankomen, blijft mijn advies tot zo'n Economisch Hof in stand. Slechts de wetenschap zal ons vooruithelpen, en met een Economisch Hof hadden andersluidende gedachten, zoals van mijzelf, veel meer kans gehad om die crisis te vermijden. Hier doet de D&R methodologie zich weer gelden.

Mijn verzoek is dat in kringen van politicologie met voorrang aandacht gegeven gaat worden aan mijn studies DRGTPE en VTFD, en aan mijn protest tegen de censuur van de wetenschap.

<sup>101</sup> <http://aissr.uva.nl/news/content/2013/01/in-memoriam-jos-de-beus.html>

<sup>102</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/Brieven/2013-03-22-BijeenkomstJosDeBeus.html>

<sup>103</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Crisis-2007plus/2010-02-07-Natuurkundigen.pdf>

Politicalogische besprekingen daarvan kunnen van nut zijn voor professor De Swaan en zijn helpende hand aan professor Prast en haar inbreng in de WRR. Een verzoek daarbij is dat men er bij het lezen van DRGTPE en VTFD goed aan doet om eerst vragen te stellen alvorens te oordelen, want het is voor mij natuurlijk onmogelijk om op ieder misverstand te anticiperen dat niet-economen kunnen bedenken.

Mijn verzoek is dit email in het bestuur van de NKPW en de redactie van Acta Politica te bespreken, en u mag het ook in een nieuwsbrief plaatsen of aan uw collegae hoogleraren sturen. Een gevolg van dit email is natuurlijk dat ik zou kunnen gaan adviseren ook de hoogleraren politicologie te ontslaan, bij aantoonbaar disfunctioneren. Politicologen moeten inderdaad ook eens ophouden onwaarheden over de Trias Politica en de Stelling van Arrow te vertellen.

Hier staan de boeken:

<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/VTFD/Index.html>

Voor degene die VTFD bespreekt geldt vanzelfsprekend dat ik ook een password voor de software ter beschikking stel.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
<http://econpapers.hhs.se/RAS/pco170.htm>

Date: Sat, 30 Jan 2010 19:03:25 +0100  
To: A.deswaan (uva)  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: N.a.v. uw gedachtenuitwisseling met Henriette Prast  
Cc: "henriette prast"

Geachte professor De Swaan,

Ik las uw uitnodiging "De economie bevindt zich in een intellectuele crisis zonder weerga. Nu gaat het om het zelfdenkend en het zelfreinigend vermogen van de economen in eigen kring, daarin bijgestaan door hun wetenschappelijke vrienden in verwante disciplines (wij zijn bereid)."

Ik protesteer al 20 jaar tegen de censuur van de wetenschap door de directie van het Centraal Planbureau. Hieronder enkele links. Ik houd me beschikbaar voor vragen.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
<http://econpapers.hhs.se/RAS/pco170.htm>

<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

<http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/TPnCPB.html>

## **Appendix F. Submission in December 2017 for Politicologenetmaal 2018 (rejected)**

Proposal, December 8 2017

Workshop at the annual Dutch-Belgian Political Science Conference June 7 - 8 2018  
<http://politicologenetmaal.eu/call-for-workshops/>

Title: Re-engineering “political science on electoral systems”  
Alternative title: The impact of article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) on the choice between District Representation (DR) or Equal or Proportional Representation (EPR)  
Alternative title (Dutch): Raden naar Remkes

Convenor: Thomas Colignatus (cool [at] dataweb.nl, <http://thomascool.eu>, Samuel van Houten Genootschap, scientific bureau of the Sociaal Liberaal Forum) (open for suggestions) (English if there is a non-Dutch speaking person present)

### **Abstract**

The paper "One woman, one vote. Though not in the USA, UK and France" (1W1V)<sup>104</sup> establishes that “political science on electoral systems” still doesn’t meet the criteria for proper science. Its terms like “vote” and “election” are based in colloquial language and do not have the strictness that science requires. District representation (DR) is in violation of article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Only equal or proportional representation (EPR) fits this article. An example of policy impact is Brexit.<sup>105</sup> Apparently the field of “political science on electoral systems” is locked in confusion and bias, in which tradition is more important than proper methods of science. Thus, other fields of political science and scientists from other fields are invited to help out. To do so, these other fields obviously must study the field of “political science on electoral systems” too. For this reason, said paper 1W1V provides a re-engineering of “political science on electoral systems”. In Holland, there is a state commission under chair of Johan Remkes who looks into the Dutch parliamentary system.<sup>106</sup> When this commission receives advice from “political scientists on electoral systems” then one might fear for the future of Dutch democracy. The author of said paper is an econometrician (Groningen 1982) and teacher of mathematics (Leiden 2008), and uses Political Economy and Public Choice.

### **Papers and proceedings**

The session requires 8-12 papers.

Papers or books (1) – (4) are covered by Colignatus: 1W1V,<sup>107 108</sup> Voting Theory for Democracy (VTFD),<sup>109 110</sup> “Definition & Reality in the General Theory of Political Economy” (DRGTPE).<sup>111</sup>

Papers (5) & (6): Political scientists who partake in the Remkes commission are Ruud Koole (Leiden) and Tom van der Meer (UvA). It would be logical to invite them to write a critical review of (1) - (4) and present this in the workshop. It would be logical to invite the Remkes commission to send an observer (other than these two mentioned) to write a report on the proceedings.

(7) Rudi Andeweg and Jacques Thomassen have looked at the issue of interest representation and accountability from the angle of EPR, and one of them might be willing to check the relations for DR given the analysis from 1W1V.<sup>112</sup>

(8) Armen Hakhverdian (UvA) has written about voter-government congruence.<sup>113</sup> He might be willing to look at 1W1V and accountability under DR.

<sup>104</sup> <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/82513/> [update <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/84482/>]

<sup>105</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2017/12/01/dealing-with-denial-cause-and-cure-of-brexit>

<sup>106</sup> <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/parlement/staatscommissie>

<sup>107</sup> <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/82513/> [update <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/84482/>]

<sup>108</sup> <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/81389/> [update <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/84469/>]

<sup>109</sup> <https://zenodo.org/record/291985> (VTFD)

<sup>110</sup> <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/77616/>

<sup>111</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

<sup>112</sup> <https://research.utwente.nl/en/publications/modes-of-political-representation-toward-a-new-typology>

<sup>113</sup> <https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/25302405/Mayne%20%20Hakhverdian%20-%20Ideological%20Congruence%20and%20Citizen%20Satisfaction.pdf>

**Appendix G. Information to the board of NKWP that “political science on electoral systems” is pseudo-science**

Date: Mon, 17 Sep 2018  
To: secretaris [at] politicologie.nl  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: Boek: "Democratie met en door Wetenschap" / Pseudo-wetenschap "politicologie over kiesstelsels"  
Cc: "Jasperblom"

Geachte heer Kok,

Ik wil het bestuur van de Kring graag laten weten dat ik nu dit boek heb doen verschijnen:

"Democratie met en door Wetenschap" (DMDW) (pdf online):

<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/DMDW/Index.html>

Ik zag dat de Kring ook zelf uitgaven verzorgt, en ik heb overwogen te vragen of dit ook met DMDW gedaan kon worden, maar vooralsnog heb ik gekozen voor de snelheid van een eigen P.O.D. uitgave. Ik zou het bestuur willen verzoeken vanaf papier te lezen, omdat dit zoveel geduldiger is.

Mijn kerndiagnose is dat de "politicologie over kiesstelsels" nog geen wetenschap is, maar vergelijkbaar aan astrologie, alchemie of homeopathie. De bundel DMDW geeft slechts een overzicht voor het grotere publiek. Het bewijs staat in dit Engelse artikel (qua lengte wellicht een concept-boek waarvoor ik dan eigenlijk een uitgever zoek):

<https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/84482/>

Een diagnose van me is ook dat de Trias Politica faalt, en dat er een uitbreiding met een grondwettelijk Economisch Hof nodig is, met een basis in de wetenschap, en met als taak een rijksbegroting met veto te treffen wanneer het Hof vindt dat er onjuiste informatie in staat. Een Engelse tekst staat hier:

<http://www.res.org.uk/view/art7Oct14Features.html>

<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

Een vraag aan uw bestuur is of u met me wilt meedenken hoe met deze inzichten om te gaan. Ik kom uit de econometrie (Public Choice) en sta op afstand van de traditionele politicologie, maar weer dicht bij Hans van den Doel en ik had sporadisch contact met Jos de Beus zaliger. Ik proef verschillen in paradigma's, maar houd vast aan de gedachte dat het toch mogelijk moet zijn om als wetenschappers vooruitgang te boeken. Ik zou het fijn vinden wanneer ik hierover met deze of gene kon praten, het liefst in de regio.

Hier staan de sheets van twee presentaties op het jongste Politicologenetmaal:

<https://zenodo.org/record/1269392>

<https://zenodo.org/record/1270381>

Met hartelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Econometrist (Groningen 1982) en leraar wiskunde (Leiden 2008)  
Scheveningen  
<http://econpapers.repec.org/RAS/pco170.htm>  
<https://boycotholland.wordpress.com/about/>

At 2018-05-27 14:08, secretaris [at] politicologie.nl wrote:  
Dag Thomas,

Hartelijk dank voor je aanmelding. De contributie van €29 kan betaald worden op NL80 TRIO 0212438395 t.n.v. Vereniging Nederlandse Kring voor Wetenschap der Politiek. Ik stuur je als welkomstgeschenk ons jubileumboek.

Succes met de presentatie op ons etmaal.

Hartelijke groet,

Walther Kok (secretaris)

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus schreef op 2018-05-13  
Geachte heer Kok,  
Ik heb al jaren veel onderzocht en geschreven over theorie van verkiezingen.  
Dit jaar doe ik ook een presentatie op het politicologen etmaal,  
sessie 18 over methodologie.  
Het lijkt me een goed idee om dan ook lid van de NKWP te worden.  
Hieronder staan mijn gegevens.  
Ik hoor graag van u.  
Met vriendelijke groet,  
Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Econometrist (Groningen 1982) en leraar wiskunde (Leiden 2008)  
[...] Scheveningen  
[...]  
[...]  
Lidmaatschap zonder bladen EUR 29  
"Voting theory for democracy": <https://zenodo.org/record/291985>  
Recent artikel: <https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/86307/>  
<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2017/05/06/the-dark-horse-and-a-2012-interview-with-kenneth-arrow/>