

SUMMARIES

Aspects on the decision-making system and position of the Finnish parliament

By Jaakko Nousiainen

In his observations of the parliaments of mainly western political systems, with a view on their independence of external influence, Nelson W. Polsby has separated *transformative parliaments*, which have sufficient capacity for policy formation on self-reliant decisions, and *arena-type parliaments*, which offer a formal interaction framework and discussion level for the political powers dominant in decision-making, from each other.

According to the hypothesis presented in the writing, *the constitutional arrangements as well as the political group structure have laid hindrances for the Finnish parliament in its rising either to the capacity of an independently policy-forming decision maker or to an arena of interaction between the political forces, notwithstanding it being the parliamentary actor setting forth fundamental solutions it formally is.* The general setting of social policies has favoured this development lately. Thus, in the econopolitical solutions of the latter years, it has been characteristic that negotiation and arbitration systems have been wholly withdrawn from the sphere of the parliament, to be negotiated between political parties, interest groups and the government.

In the manner which is common to parliamentary states in continental Europe, both the *dominant position of externally directed party organizations and the relative orientation to committees, in the activities of the parliament, is characteristic for Finland.* Together with a normative arrangement which stiffly channels operations this is apt to leave a public plenary session in a secondary position. But the general restricted role of the parliament may be considered to have an effect on the special committees, such that *neither they have a particularly strongly institutionalized structure.* This is expressly shown by the fact that their boundaries — measured in terms of permanency of membership and chairman structure — towards the parliament and each other are not very definite and permanent. Likewise, they have been functionally dependent on the bureaucracy of the country's central administration.

There are, however, distinct *differences between committees* insofar as the number of issues, the social significance of the matters treated and the effect of the activity are concerned. Thereby differences between committees are also seen in how they are valued and sought for, and, lastly, in their member structure. The writing views the division of committees into rank groups and presents hypothetical observations of the position of committees in relation to two variables, both of which are in connection with the external relations of the institutions: their contact with bureaucracy and the pressure exerted on them mainly from the direction of political parties and interest groups.

Interdependence vs. self-reliance: two approaches to international relations

Raimo Väyrynen

Changing power relations between industrialized capitalist countries and the Third World have given rise to policy strategies which can be termed *interdependence* and *(collective) self-reliance*. The interdependence strategy, which is based on the belief to manage international relations, postulates that the Third World should refrain from any actions which would hurt the economy of the industrialized countries the stability of which is a precondition for the economic progress of the Third World. It is concluded in the article that the roots of this policy are in the economic crisis of the West which compels the First World to seek strategies which would guarantee its continued domination of the world economy. Being in economic crisis the First World cannot stand any strong measures of anti-domination from the part of the Third World.

A great majority of both politicians and scholars of the Third World reject the idea of interdependence as advocated by leading Western powers and start from the conception that the realization of the New International Economic Order and of a more egalitarian character of international and national system would pave way for real, genuine interdependence. As a strategy to this direction the policy of self-reliance is advocated. The essence of this policy is the mobilization of domestic resources, both human and material, to attain various goals of development. Collective self-reliance, in turn, means the collaboration and institution-formation between Third World countries to complement each others' economies and make use of the economies of scale. These both forms of self-reliance are basically alternative development strategies which aim at replacing present domination patterns.

The policy of (collective) self-reliance is not, however, any uniform pattern of thought, but it seems to be possible to make a distinction between two predominant orientations. The first one conceives the self-reliance strategy as a means of attaining a higher degree of democratization and mass participation as well as of fulfilling basic human needs. This view is advocated mostly by scholars and by some radical politicians. On the other hand there seems to be a strong stream of thought among Third-World elites which appears to propagate self-reliance as a new strategy of accumulating further wealth to them through international income transfers. Thus there are obvious contradictions among actors speaking in favor of self-reliance.

Some aspects of the study of militarism in developing countries

Eeva-Liisa Myllymäki

The trends in the literature on third world militarism, which has notably spread since the mid-60's, can be directly related to the development of militarism and the increasing number and variety of military governments in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

On the other hand the literature belongs to the Western tradition of development research.

The studies mainly consist of area-based approaches and case-analyses

either by countries or by military coups. Theoretically relevant approaches are still lacking. The most common »theories» of militarism could be categorized according to their focus on the military establishment or on the developing society. The military has been studied as a cohesive institution with professional interests, or as a social group reflecting the social contradictions. The role of the military in development has been crucial from the view-point of (a) the nature of the political system, (b) the »modernizing» or developing effect of the military, or (c) the international relations.

The author emphasizes the recent trends both in the research of development and of militarism which focus on the role of the state: the functions of a military state in a neocolonial dependency system are of special interest. Considering the whole problem of militarism, the specific features of less dependent but military ruled countries need explanations of another type.