
#101-Denmark: Center Democrats (CD)

**Note: All code justifications which appear in ALL CAPS were part of the original ICPP project (Janda, 1980). All other code justifications were subsequently provided by Robert Harmel and Lars Bille.*

Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure

1973-1990: 6

There is a clear, formal distinction between the EPO and parliamentary group at the national level, and the parliamentary group is given the power to decide matters of policy, government participation, and virtually anything else. The parliamentary group's decisions are final, and they apply to the local, as well as the national organization. Hence, a code of 6 is appropriate throughout the history of the party.

Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader

1973-1990: 3

The chair of the EPO, which is selected at the national congress, is the *de facto* leader of the party.

Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates

1973-1990: 2

Bille (see Bille, 1997: 110-120, 321-331) says that the nomination is determined locally by ballot among party members. Beginning in 1982, rules were changed to provide for an advisory role for the national committee, but the final decision on the selection was left to the local members. It should also be noted that an incumbent MP always has the right to run for re-election, in other words, her/his nomination is automatic. This is consistent with the general notion that guides the CD organization, "MP's should be guided only by their consciences."

Variable 9.04: Allocating Funds

(Note: Bille notes that until 1987, when state subsidies were introduced for the membership parties, party funds were collected primarily in the form of membership fees. Bille acknowledges that there were also: (1) private donations, which normally

constituted a small amount of the parties' overall funds; and (2) donations from labor unions, which were a significant amount (1/2 to 2/3 between 1960 and 1990) of the Social Democrat's income. It should also be noted that when doing this coding, state subsidies were NOT taken into account. However, references to percentages of national party income do take subsidies to the membership organizations into account. (Though subsidies have become a major source of party funding, they are a matter decided by the state, and not by the individual parties themselves.)

1973-1990: 6

According to Bille (1997: 259-265), membership fees are collected at the national level, and then a decision is made at the national conference concerning how that money should be allocated among the different levels of the party.

In this case, where there are no significant contributions from interest groups, etc., a 6 seems appropriate.

Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy

1973-1990: 6

The national level is clearly supreme in policy formation; furthermore, at the national level, there is no question that the parliamentary group is chiefly responsible for the party's public policy positions.

Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications

(Note: Bille, in a personal communication in late 1999, noted two relevant points of consideration for this variable. First, the newspapers were not controlled in a strict definition of control, but rather were, "influenced by the party" or "the newspapers supported the general viewpoints of the parties"; however, the editors still had editorial freedom. Second, we have emphasized a regular publishing of a party member magazine controlled in the strict sense by the national organization and we have supposed that these magazines were influential in the sense that they "were closely read by party members" (see Janda, 1980: p. 114). However, we don't know how many members actually read the magazine.)

1973-1990: 7

Throughout the period, the party produced at least one influential party magazine, on at least a quarterly basis (perhaps monthly), which had wide distribution among the party members. Hence, in spite of not having an influential newspaper, we find the code of 7 to be appropriate throughout the period.

Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline

(Note: In all Danish parties the parliamentary group itself can impose lesser forms of discipline; however, the person who is responsible, if anyone, for expelling party members - including MP's - varies from party to party. In our coding, we took expulsion from the party to be the ultimate form of discipline, and gave that greater weight than other forms of discipline.)

1973-1990: 4

There is no mention in the rules of procedures for disciplining MP's in particular; however, the national committee may expel members of the party.

Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration**1973: 6****1974-1990: 4**

During the first year, leadership was exercised by one person, the founder of the party. In 1974, rules were adopted, parliamentary representation was achieved, and the situation changed to include three or four individuals who were effectively in control of the party. These included the party chair, the chair of the parliamentary group, the political spokesperson, and from time to time, the chair of the national party organization (see Bille, 1997: 96-110, 379-386).

#102-Denmark: Christian People's Party (KrF)

**Note: All code justifications which appear in ALL CAPS were part of the original ICPP project (Janda, 1980). All other code justifications were subsequently provided by Robert Harmel and Lars Bille.*

Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure

1970-1990: 4

Though the distinction between the parliamentary group and the EPO is not as formal as in the Social Liberal Party, there is still an important distinction in fact which was true throughout the period, according to Bille. The importance of this was apparently underestimated by the coders for the ICPP. Hence, we deviate from the original code of 6, and instead apply a 4 throughout the period. It is true that there is a hierarchical arrangement, with the national party clearly more powerful than local organizations, but it is also true that the power is divided at the national level between the parliamentary group and extraparliamentary organization. Though the parliamentary group is generally more powerful than the EPO, it would be wrong to think that the latter offers no competition to the former when it comes to making guidelines/statements for the party (including the parliamentary group itself, which normally pays some attention to EPO guidance).

Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader

1970-1978: 3

1979-1987: 4

1988-1990: 3

Though we coded variable 12.07 for this party as a 3a throughout the period, indicating an even split in power between the positions of EPO chair and parliamentary group leader, we also noted there that the de facto leadership might change from one position to the other over time, depending on personalities. In fact, Bille (see Bille, 1997, p. 382) has identified an EPO chair as de facto leader from 1970-78 and from 1988-1990, with someone who was originally a parliamentary group leader being de facto party leader from 1979-1987. The latter individual first was selected as parliamentary group leader in 1973, and held that position until resigning from it due to becoming a minister in September 1982. He became de facto party leader as well when the chairman of the EPO resigned from politics in 1979, and he continued as de facto party leader through 1987 in spite of giving up the parliamentary group leader position in 1982. In 1987, when the latter individual died, the de facto leadership returned to the EPO.

Because the de facto party leader from 1979-1987 first became party leader while also serving as parliamentary group leader, we code the selection as 4 (by Folketing group) throughout that period. Because the EPO chair is selected by party conference, we apply a code of 3 to the periods 1970-1978 and 1988-1990.

Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates

1970-1990: 5

Bille (see Bille, 1997: 110-120, 321-331) says that the decision is made at the local level, by vote in local party meetings until 1969, and then by membership ballot after 1969. Then the selection must be approved by the national committee. The latter has been true throughout the period.

Variable 9.04: Allocating Funds

(Note: Bille notes that until 1987, when state subsidies were introduced for the membership parties, party funds were collected primarily in the form of membership fees. Bille acknowledges that there were also: (1) private donations, which normally constituted a small amount of the parties' overall funds; and (2) donations from labor unions, which were a significant amount ($\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$ between 1960 and 1990) of the Social Democrat's income. It should also be noted that when doing this coding, state subsidies were NOT taken into account. However, references to percentages of national party income do take subsidies to the membership organizations into account. Though subsidies have become a major source of party funding, they are a matter decided by the state, and not by the individual parties themselves.)

1970-1990: 5

According to Bille (1997: 259-265), the rules stipulate the national level is primarily responsible for collection of membership fees, though the national level may agree to allow regional ("county") organizations to receive the money instead. The funding profile for the party consists of membership fees and private contributions from members. A code of "5" seems completely appropriate in this case.

Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy

1970-1990: 6

Primary responsibility rests at the national level, and at the national level in the

non-conference organs (i.e., a combination of executive committee, national executive, and parliamentary group).

Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications

(Note: Bille, in a personal communication in late 1999, noted two relevant points of consideration for this variable. First, the newspapers were not controlled in a strict definition of control, but rather were, “influenced by the party” or “the newspapers supported the general viewpoints of the parties”; however, the editors still had editorial freedom. Second, we have emphasized a regular publishing of a party member magazine controlled in the strict sense by the national organization and we have supposed that these magazines were influential in the sense that they “were closely read by party members” (see Janda, 1980: p. 114). However, we don’t know how many members actually read the magazine.)

1970-1990: 7

Throughout our period, the party produced at least one influential party magazine, at least quarterly (perhaps monthly), with wide distribution among the members. (Bille, 4/19/99) Hence, in spite of not having an influential newspaper, we find the code of 7 to be appropriate throughout the period.

Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline

(Note: In all Danish parties the parliamentary group itself can impose lesser forms of discipline; however, the person who is responsible, if anyone, for expelling party members - including MP’s - varies from party to party. In our coding, we took expulsion from the party to be the ultimate form of discipline, and gave that greater weight than other forms of discipline.)

1970-1990: 4

There is no mention in the rules of procedures for disciplining MP's in particular. However, the national committee may expel members by 2/3 vote.

Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration

1970-1990: 3

When coding this variable, there has been some dispute over who is the official

leader of the party, the parliamentary group chair or the party chair (with the latter normally considered the de jure leader). However, in reality, the effective control of the party is shared by members of the national executive, whose size has been nine throughout the period. Hence we assign the code of 3. (Bille, 4/99 and Bille, 1997, 96-110 plus 379-386).

#103-Denmark: Conservative People's Party (Conservative; KF)

**Note: All code justifications which appear in ALL CAPS were part of the original ICPP project (Janda, 1980). All other code justifications were subsequently provided by Robert Harmel and Lars Bille.*

Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure**1950-1990: 4**

Though the distinction between the parliamentary group and the EPO is not as formal as in the Social Liberal Party, there is still an important distinction in fact which was true throughout the period, according to Bille. The importance of this was apparently underestimated by the coders for the ICPP. Hence, we deviate from the original code of 6, and instead apply a 4 throughout the period. It is true that there is a hierarchical arrangement, with the national party clearly more powerful than local organizations, but it is also true that the power is divided at the national level between the parliamentary group and extraparliamentary organization. Though the parliamentary group is generally more powerful than the EPO, it would be wrong to think that the latter offers no competition to the former when it comes to making guidelines/statements for the party (including the parliamentary group itself, which normally pays some attention to EPO guidance).

Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader**1950-1981: 4****1982-1990: 3**

From 1950 to 1981, the parliamentary group leader was *de facto* leader of the party. This leader was chosen by the Folketing group itself, justifying a code of 4.

From 1982 to the end of our period, the *de facto* leader was the EPO chair, chosen by the party conference, justifying a code of 3.

Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates**1950-1990: 2**

Bille (see Bille, 1997: 110-120, 321-331) says that while the local party leaders certainly have their "educated" opinions concerning potential nominees, other suggestions can be and are made from the floor of the local meetings, and the final

decision is made by vote of members at the local meeting. Though national party leaders and politicians may, at times, try to influence the decisions (either before or after they have been made), they in no sense have any official power to overturn local decisions. Hence, the code of "2" is appropriate throughout the period.

Variable 9.04: Allocating Funds

(Note: Bille notes that until 1987, when state subsidies were introduced for the membership parties, party funds were collected primarily in the form of membership fees. Bille acknowledges that there were also: (1) private donations, which normally constituted a small amount of the parties' overall funds; and (2) donations from labor unions, which were a significant amount ($\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$ between 1960 and 1990) of the Social Democrat's income. It should also be noted that when doing this coding, state subsidies were NOT taken into account. However, references to percentages of national party income do take subsidies to the membership organizations into account. Though subsidies have become a major source of party funding, they are a matter decided by the state, and not by the individual parties themselves.)

1950-1990: 5

According to Bille (1997: 259-265), all membership fees are collected at the local level. Though large amounts of those monies are transferred to the national level, according to a per member amount determined by the national party conference, it is left to the local organizations to determine how much additional they will collect from each member for local allocation purposes. It should be noted that the Conservative Party receives substantial donations (constituting perhaps as much as $\frac{2}{3}$ of party income through 1990) from interest groups, but until 1991, party accounts were not published and information concerning such donations is scarce. Nevertheless, it is safe to assume that a major proportion of those donations were made at the national level. Hence, taking all sources of funds (except subsidies) into account, a code of 5 seems appropriate, and is so throughout the period.

Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy

1950-1990: 6

The national conference "approves programs," however, in reality the parliamentary group tends to be dominant in the taking of public policy positions. (See coding justification for variable #107.) Local party organizations may put forward proposals for the program, but actual policy positions would be taken at the national conference.

Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications

(Note: Bille, in a personal communication in late 1999, noted two relevant points of consideration for this variable. First, the newspapers were not controlled in a strict definition of control, but rather were, "influenced by the party" or "the newspapers supported the general viewpoints of the parties"; however, the editors still had editorial freedom. Second, we have emphasized a regular publishing of a party member magazine controlled in the strict sense by the national organization and we have supposed that these magazines were influential in the sense that they "were closely read by party members" (see Janda, 1980: p. 114). However, we don't know how many members actually read the magazine.)

1950-1990: 7

Until at least 1970, the Conservative party had close association (including press representation on its main board) with very influential national newspapers, including Berlingske Tidende and Dagens Nyheder (until the latter paper's demise in 1961). In the early 1970s, as part of the general disassociation of national papers from parties in Denmark, Berlingske Tidende became independent. (Thomsen and Sollfinge note that the latter paper adopted an official position of independence already in 1949, but the paper continued to be considered party press after that, and continued to have representation on the party's main board.) Sauerberg and Thomsen (in Cerny, 1977: 203) note that "The Danish Conservatives lost their press support by the defection of seven or eight big newspapers." In spite of the loss of the party's national media, some regional papers continued to be associated with the Conservatives. Throughout our period, the party produced at least one influential party magazine, at least quarterly (perhaps monthly), with wide distribution among the members (Bille, 4/19/99). Hence, in spite of the change involving newspapers, we find the code of 7 to be appropriate throughout the period.

Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline

(Note: In all Danish parties the parliamentary group itself can impose lesser forms of discipline; however, the person who is responsible, if anyone, for expelling party members - including MP's - varies from party to party. In our coding, we took expulsion from the party to be the ultimate form of discipline, and gave that greater weight than other forms of discipline.)

1950-1970: 4

1971-1990: 3

The rules of 1954 state that the national committee has the power to expel members. MP's can be expelled by the parliamentary group, though the decision has to be confirmed by the national council by a 2/3 majority of those attending. In 1971, the rules were changed so that it is only the parliamentary group that could expel MP's, and the decision no longer had to be submitted to the council for approval. There is no

stipulation in the rules regarding other forms of discipline for MP's. This latter situation remained in effect through the end of our period.

Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration

1950-1990: 4

Throughout the period, effective leadership was shared by from 3 to 5 individuals, including the chair the parliamentary group, political spokesperson, and party chair (Bille, 4/99 and Bille, 1997, 96-110 plus 379-386).

#105-Denmark: Liberal Party (Venstre; V)

**Note: All code justifications which appear in ALL CAPS were part of the original ICPP project (Janda, 1980). All other code justifications were subsequently provided by Robert Harmel and Lars Bille.*

Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure**1950-1990: 4**

Though the distinction between the parliamentary group and the EPO is not as formal as in the Social Liberal Party, there is still an important distinction in fact which was true throughout the period, according to Bille. The importance of this was apparently underestimated by the coders for the ICPP. Hence, we deviate from the original code of 6, and instead apply a 4 throughout the period. It is true that there is a hierarchical arrangement, with the national party clearly more powerful than local organizations, but it is also true that the power is divided at the national level between the parliamentary group and extraparliamentary organization. Though the parliamentary group is generally more powerful than the EPO, it would be wrong to think that the latter offers no competition to the former when it comes to making guidelines/statements for the party (including the parliamentary group itself, which normally pays some attention to EPO guidance).

Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader**1950-1990: 3**

Bille notes that the EPO chair was leader of the party throughout the period, selected by the party conference; therefore, the ICPP code of 4 was incorrect.

Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates**1950-1990: 2**

Bille (see Bille, 1997: 110-120, 321-331) says that while the local party leaders certainly have their "educated" opinions concerning potential nominees, other suggestions can be and are made from the floor of the local meetings, and the final decision is made by vote of members at the local meeting. Though national party leaders and politicians may, at times, try to influence the decisions (either before or after they have been made), they in no sense have any official power to overturn local decisions. Hence, the code of "2" is appropriate throughout the period.

Variable 9.04: Allocating Funds

(Note: Bille notes that until 1987, when state subsidies were introduced for the membership parties, party funds were collected primarily in the form of membership fees. Bille acknowledges that there were also: (1) private donations, which normally constituted a small amount of the parties' overall funds; and (2) donations from labor unions, which were a significant amount (1/2 to 2/3 between 1960 and 1990) of the Social Democrat's income. It should also be noted that when doing this coding, state subsidies were NOT taken into account. However, references to percentages of national party income do take subsidies to the membership organizations into account. Though subsidies have become a major source of party funding, they are a matter decided by the state, and not by the individual parties themselves.)

1950-1990: 5

According to Bille (1997: 259-265), all membership fees were collected at the local level. Though large amounts of those monies are transferred to the national level, according to a per member amount determined by the national party conference, it is left to the local organizations to determine how much additional they will collect from each member for local allocation purposes. It should be noted that the Conservative Party receives substantial donations (constituting perhaps as much as 1/3 of party income through 1990) from interest groups, but until 1989 (when donations from interest groups accounted for 28% of national party income), party accounts were not published and information concerning such donations is scarce. Nevertheless, it is safe to assume that a major proportion of those donations were made at the national level. Hence, taking all sources of funds (except subsidies) into account, a code of 5 seems appropriate, and is so throughout the period.

Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy**1950-1990: 6**

The national conference "approves programs"; however, in reality the parliamentary group tends to be dominant in the taking of public policy positions. (See coding justification for variable #107.) Local party organizations may put forward proposals for the program, but actual policy positions would be taken at the national conference.

Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications

(Note: Bille, in a personal communication in late 1999, noted two relevant points of consideration for this variable. First, the newspapers were not controlled in a strict definition of control, but rather were, "influenced by the party" or "the newspapers

supported the general viewpoints of the parties”; however, the editors still had editorial freedom. Second, we have emphasized a regular publishing of a party member magazine controlled in the strict sense by the national organization and we have supposed that these magazines were influential in the sense that they “were closely read by party members” (see Janda, 1980: p. 114). However, we don’t know how many members actually read the magazine.)

1950-1990: 7

Throughout our period, the Liberals have had a substantial press including lots of regional papers, though not a Copenhagen or national newspaper. Together, these papers would be considered influential. This continued to be the case throughout 1990, in spite of the dismantling in the 1970s of the party press for the other old parties (See Sauerberg and Thomsen in Cerny, 1977: 203). Throughout our period, the party produced at least one influential party magazine, at least quarterly (perhaps monthly), with wide distribution among the members. (Bille, 4/19/99) Hence, we find the code of 7 to be appropriate throughout the period.

Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline

(Note: In all Danish parties the parliamentary group itself can impose lesser forms of discipline; however, the person who is responsible, if anyone, for expelling party members - including MP’s - varies from party to party. In our coding, we took expulsion from the party to be the ultimate form of discipline, and gave that greater weight than other forms of discipline.)

1950-1990: 4

There is nothing in the rules about MP’s in particular. A 2/3 vote of the national committee is necessary to expel party members. It has been this way throughout our period.

Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration

1950-1990: 4

Throughout the period, effective leadership was shared by from 3 to 5 individuals, including the chair the parliamentary group, political spokesperson, and party chair (Bille, 4/99 and Bille, 1997, 96-110 plus 379-386).

#106-Denmark: Progress Party (F)

**Note: All code justifications which appear in ALL CAPS were part of the original ICPP project (Janda, 1980). All other code justifications were subsequently provided by Robert Harmel and Lars Bille.*

Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure

1972-1990: 4

Though the distinction between the parliamentary group and the EPO is not as formal as in the Social Liberal Party, there is still an important distinction in fact which was true throughout the period, according to Bille. The importance of this was apparently underestimated by the coders for the ICPP. Hence, we deviate from the original code of 6, and instead apply a 4 throughout the period. It is true that there is a hierarchical arrangement, with the national party clearly more powerful than local organizations, but it is also true that the power is divided at the national level between the parliamentary group and extraparliamentary organization. Though the parliamentary group is generally more powerful than the EPO, it would be wrong to think that the latter offers no competition to the former when it comes to making guidelines/statements for the party (including the parliamentary group itself, which normally pays some attention to EPO guidance).

Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader

1972-1983: 8

1984-1990: 4

In the beginning, Glistrup held no official party leadership position, but functioned as *de facto* leader while being a member of the Folketing group. In effect, Glistrup was party leader because Glistrup designated himself to be the party's leader. He continued to function as such until he went to prison in the mid 1980s. In Glistrup's absence, effective party leadership was shared by the Folketing group chair, Helge Dohrmann, and by Pia Kjaersgaard, who was the first to use the position of Folketing group spokesperson as a base of leadership within the party. Upon Dohrmann's death in 1989, Kjaersgaard became *de facto* party leader alone. Hence we code this as 4, selection by parliamentary group, for the period 1984-1990.

Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates

1972-1990: 5

There are no rules at the national level for selection of parliamentary candidates. The ultimate selection of candidates is made at the national level, however, by the "Main Board." They can change the nominating rules for candidates in constituencies and veto nominations (Harmel and Svasand, 1989: 27; Pedersen, 1987: 39). Initial selection is made at the lower levels first by the party organization (by procedures that probably vary from local organization to local organization). Bille (2/93 and 4/99) concurs.

Variable 9.04: Allocating Funds

(Note: Bille notes that until 1987, when state subsidies were introduced for the membership parties, party funds were collected primarily in the form of membership fees. Bille acknowledges that there were also: (1) private donations, which normally constituted a small amount of the parties' overall funds; and (2) donations from labor unions, which were a significant amount ($\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$ between 1960 and 1990) of the Social Democrat's income. It should also be noted that when doing this coding, state subsidies were NOT taken into account. However, references to percentages of national party income do take subsidies to the membership organizations into account. Though subsidies have become a major source of party funding, they are a matter decided by the state, and not by the individual parties themselves.)

1972-1990: 2

According to Bille (1997: 259-265), all membership fees are collected at the local level. Though large amounts are transferred to the national level, according to a per-member amount determined by the national party conference, it is left to the local organizations to determine how much additional they will collect from each member for local allocation purposes. There are no significant non-subsidy sources of Progress party income other than the membership fees. Hence, a code of 2 seems appropriate, and is so throughout the period.

Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy

1972-1975: 7

1976-1990: 6

The first party program was written by Glistrup himself, and was never adopted by any other body within the party. It can be assumed that the code of 7 would still be appropriate through 1975, since Glistrup was clearly the dominant (i.e. nearly unchallengeable) force within the party until then. In 1976, rules were put into effect

which brought some elements of normal organization to the party (Bille, 1997: 61-63). One of those made the national conference, on paper at least, the supreme authority for the party. However, in practice, the parliamentary group has been more important in policy making. In any case, beginning in 1976, those responsible for policy making included more than just Glistrup, and in fact policy making being somewhat routinized in the parliamentary group and the national committee (See also coding justification for variable # 107).

Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications

(Note: Bille, in a personal communication in late 1999, noted two relevant points of consideration for this variable. First, the newspapers were not controlled in a strict definition of control, but rather were, "influenced by the party" or "the newspapers supported the general viewpoints of the parties"; however, the editors still had editorial freedom. Second, we have emphasized a regular publishing of a party member magazine controlled in the strict sense by the national organization and we have supposed that these magazines were influential in the sense that they "were closely read by party members" (see Janda, 1980: p. 114). However, we don't know how many members actually read the magazine.)

1972-1990: 7

Throughout our period, the party produced at least one influential party magazine, at least quarterly (perhaps monthly), with wide distribution among the members. (Bille, 4/19/99) Hence, in spite of not having an influential newspaper, we find the code of 7 to be appropriate throughout the period.

Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline

(Note: In all Danish parties the parliamentary group itself can impose lesser forms of discipline; however, the person who is responsible, if anyone, for expelling party members - including MP's - varies from party to party. In our coding, we took expulsion from the party to be the ultimate form of discipline, and gave that greater weight than other forms of discipline.)

1972-19XX: 0

In the earliest years of the party, before any national rules concerning discipline had been adopted, it was commonplace for local branches to expel members without approval of a higher level of party organization. The code of "0", indicating that "little or no structure is imposed on this aspect of party activity" is appropriate for this early stage in the party.

Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration

1972-1983: 6

1984-1988: 5

1989-1990: 2

From 1972 through 1983, the effective leadership was concentrated in the founder, Mogens Glistrup. Beginning in 1984, when Glistrup went to prison, leadership was effectively shared by Dohrman and Kjaersgaard. That situation lasted until Dohrman's death in 1989. Then, Kjaersgaard generally controlled the majority of the members of the national committee and within the parliamentary group (generally, though not always) until her departure from the party in 1995. However, it would be too strong to suggest that she was effectively in charge of the decision making for the party during this period. Though she was regarded by the press and the public as the party leader, the reality was a situation of internal squabbles where Kjaersgaard's authority was continually being challenged by leaders of the internal opposition (e.g. Kim Behnke and Kirsten Jacobsen). Hence, the code of 2 seems appropriate for the period beginning in 1989. Since Kjaersgaard's group left the party, the internal disagreements ceased, and effective leadership was exercised by the parliamentary group chair, the party chair, and the political spokesperson, plus Kirsten Jacobsen (as MP, even when not political spokesperson).

#107-Denmark: Social (Radical) Liberals (RV)

**Note: All code justifications which appear in ALL CAPS were part of the original ICPP project (Janda, 1980). All other code justifications were subsequently provided by Robert Harmel and Lars Bille.*

Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure

1950-1990: 4

Throughout the history of the Social Liberals, there has been a very sharp distinction, both formally and in fact, between the parliamentary group and the national party organization, according to Bille. The importance of this was apparently underestimated by the coders for the ICPP. Hence, this coding deviates from the original coding for this variable of 6. It is true that there is a hierarchical arrangement, with the national party clearly more powerful than local organizations, but it is also true that the power is divided at the national level between the parliamentary group and the extraparliamentary organization. Though the parliamentary group is generally more powerful than the EPO, it would be wrong to think that the latter offers no competition to the former when it comes to making guidelines/statements for the party (including the parliamentary group itself, which normally pays some attention to EPO guidance).

Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader

1950-1990: 4

For the Social Liberals, the parliamentary group leader is *de facto* leader of the national party. This leader is selected by the Folketing group itself, justifying a code of 4 throughout the period.

Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates

1950-1990: 2

Bille (see Bille, 1997: 110-120, 321-331) says that while the local party leaders certainly have their “educated” opinions concerning potential nominees, other suggestions can be, and are made, from the floor of the local meetings, and the final decision is made by vote of members at the local meeting. Though national party leaders and politicians may, at times, try to influence the decisions (either before or after they have been made) they in no sense have any official power to overturn local decisions. Hence, the code of “2” is appropriate throughout the period.

Variable 9.04: Allocating Funds

(Note: Bille notes that until 1987, when state subsidies were introduced for the membership parties, party funds were collected primarily in the form of membership fees. Bille acknowledges that there were also: (1) private donations, which normally constituted a small amount of the parties' overall funds; and (2) donations from labor unions, which were a significant amount ($\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$ between 1960 and 1990) of the Social Democrat's income. It should also be noted that when doing this coding, state subsidies were NOT taken into account. However, references to percentages of national party income do take subsidies to the membership organizations into account. Though subsidies have become a major source of party funding, they are a matter decided by the state, and not by the individual parties themselves.)

1950-1990: 2

According to Bille (1997: 259-265), all membership fees are collected at the local level. Though large amounts are transferred to the national level, according to a per-member amount determined by the national party conference, it is left to the local organizations to determine how much additional they will collect from each member for local allocation purposes. The party does not receive money from interest groups. Hence, a code of "2" seems appropriate throughout the entire period.

Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy**1950-1990: 6**

The national conference "approves programs"; however, in reality the parliamentary group tends to be dominant in the taking of public policy positions. Local party organizations may put forward proposals for the program, but actual policy positions would be taken at the national conference.

Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications

(Note: Bille, in a personal communication in late 1999, noted two relevant points of consideration for this variable. First, the newspapers were not controlled in a strict definition of control, but rather were, “influenced by the party” or “the newspapers supported the general viewpoints of the parties”; however, the editors still had editorial freedom. Second, we have emphasized a regular publishing of a party member magazine controlled in the strict sense by the national organization and we have supposed that these magazines were influential in the sense that they “were closely read by party members” (see Janda, 1980: p. 114). However, we don’t know how many members actually read the magazine.)

1950-1990: 7

Until 1970, the party had an affiliation (including press representation on the party’s main board) with the major newspaper *Politiken*, which was “controlled” by the national level- though the paper was owned by an independent shareholders’ company. In spite of the general dismantling of Danish party media around 1970 (due in part to the competition from television as well as from other newspapers), there continued to be two regional Social Liberal party newspapers throughout the period. These papers are influential only in their own regions, but the national level runs a press bureau and exercises some editorial control over the regional papers.

Throughout the period, the party produced at least one influential party magazine, at least quarterly (perhaps monthly), with wide distribution among the members. Hence, in spite of the change involving newspapers, we find the code of “7” to be appropriate throughout the period.

Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline

(Note: In all Danish parties the parliamentary group itself can impose lesser forms of discipline; however, the person who is responsible, if anyone, for expelling party members - including MP’s - varies from party to party. In our coding, we took expulsion from the party to be the ultimate form of discipline, and gave that greater weight than other forms of discipline.)

1950-1969: 3

1970-1990: 2

In the Social Liberal party, there is a clear differentiation, organizationally, between the parliamentary group and the party organization. Though the parliamentary group can expel members from the parliamentary group only, and apparently it has been this way since at least 1950, since a rules change in 1970 a party member can only be removed by a five-person arbitration board. This board consists of two members of the national executive, a lawyer chosen by the national committee, and two persons from the affected constituency or local organization. In the latter case, the

member would lose all rights of party membership, including but not limited to parliamentary group membership. Given its makeup, we consider the arbitration panel to be “an independent disciplinary tribunal”, and hence the code of “2” is appropriate for the latter period.

Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration

1950-1960: 5

1961-1990: 4

From 1950 through 1960, two individuals— Jorgen Jorgensen, chair of the parliamentary group, and Bertel Dahlgaard, political spokesperson— effectively shared the authoritative leadership of the party. Then, beginning in 1961, those two stepped down due to age, and a slightly larger group of three to five persons were effectively in charge of the party (Bille, 4/99; and Bille, 1997: 96-110 and 379-386).

#108-Denmark: Social Democratic Party (SD)

**Note: All code justifications which appear in ALL CAPS were part of the original ICPP project (Janda, 1980). All other code justifications were subsequently provided by Robert Harmel and Lars Bille.*

Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure

1950-1990: 4

Though the distinction between the parliamentary group and the EPO is not as formal as in the Social Liberal Party, there is still an important distinction in fact which was true throughout the period, according to Bille. The importance of this was apparently underestimated by the coders for the ICPP. Hence, we deviate from the original code of "6", and instead apply a "4" throughout the period. It is true that there is a hierarchical arrangement, with the national party clearly more powerful than local organizations, but it is also true that the power is divided at the national level between the parliamentary group and extraparliamentary organization. Though the parliamentary group is generally more powerful than the EPO, it would be wrong to think that the latter offers no competition to the former when it comes to making guidelines/statements for the party (including the parliamentary group itself, which normally pays some attention to EPO guidance).

Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader

1950-1990: 3

The national Congress elects the EPO chair, who is effectively the party's leader. (The ICPP code of 4 was incorrect.)

Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates

1950-1990: 5

Bille (see Bille, 1997: 110-120, 321-331) says that the decision is made at the local level, by vote in local party meetings until 1969, and then by membership ballot after 1969. Then the selection must be approved by the national committee. The latter has been true throughout the period.

Variable 9.04: Allocating Funds

(Note: Bille notes that until 1987, when state subsidies were introduced for the membership parties, party funds were collected primarily in the form of membership fees. Bille acknowledges that there were also: (1) private donations, which normally constituted a small amount of the parties' overall funds; and (2) donations from labor unions, which were a significant amount ($\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$ between 1960 and 1990) of the Social Democrat's income. It should also be noted that when doing this coding, state subsidies were NOT taken into account. However, references to percentages of national party income do take subsidies to the membership organizations into account. Though subsidies have become a major source of party funding, they are a matter decided by the state, and not by the individual parties themselves.)

1950-1990: 5

According to Bille (1997: 259-265), all membership fees are collected at the local level. Though large amounts of those monies are transferred to the national level, according to a per member amount determined by the national party conference, it is left to the local organizations to determine how much additional they will collect from each member for local allocation purposes. From at least 1960 through 1990, the contributions from trade unions constituted between $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{2}{3}$ of national party income (and we can assume that this was the same earlier). In addition, labor organizations also contribute to the party at the local level. Hence, a code of 5 seems appropriate, and is so throughout the period.

Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy

1950-1990: 5

Primary responsibility clearly rests at the national level, and in this party the responsibility at the national level rests more with the extraparliamentary organization, and at the national level with the party conference--though, admittedly, the national executive also plays a role in day-to-day policy making (See coding justification for variable #107).

Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications

(Note: Bille, in a personal communication in late 1999, noted two relevant points of consideration for this variable. First, the newspapers were not controlled in a strict definition of control, but rather were, "influenced by the party" or "the newspapers supported the general viewpoints of the parties"; however, the editors still had editorial freedom. Second, we have emphasized a regular publishing of a party member magazine controlled in the strict sense by the national organization and we have supposed that these magazines were influential in the sense that they "were closely read by party members" (see Janda, 1980: p. 114). However, we don't know how many

members actually read the magazine.)

1950-1990: 7

For 1950, the ICPP coder stated "The Social Democratic Party press has its own organization which is represented on the highest, most influential levels of the party. The party actually owns only a small percentage of the press which is almost completely owned by the trade unions. The press, however, appears to serve the purposes of the national leaders of the party, and the party and trade union movement are organizationally interlocked in a combined labor movement." In conformity with what was happening to Danish party press generally in the 1970s, the Social Democrats' press also became much smaller. Sauerberg and Thomsen (in Cerny, 1977: 203) report that "the Social Democrats had to close all their local newspapers except two very small ones." In addition, the party continued to have close association with a small national paper owned by the trade unions. Throughout our period, the party produced at least one influential party magazine, at least quarterly (perhaps monthly), with wide distribution among the members (Bille, 4/19/99). Hence, in spite of the change involving newspapers, we find the code of 7 to be appropriate throughout the period.

Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline

(Note: In all Danish parties the parliamentary group itself can impose lesser forms of discipline; however, the person who is responsible, if anyone, for expelling party members - including MP's - varies from party to party. In our coding, we took expulsion from the party to be the ultimate form of discipline, and gave that greater weight than other forms of discipline.)

1950-1990: 4

There is nothing in the rules about discipline of MP's in particular. To expel a member of the party requires a 2/3 vote at the general meeting of the local branch, but the decision must be approved by the national executive, whose decision can only be changed by the party congress.

Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration

1950-1990: 3

Though the party leader is generally quite strong, it is better to see leadership as collective, with more than five effectively sharing power. These individuals are generally found on the national executive, which has varied from 11 to 18 members during our period. Hence we assign the code of 3 throughout (Bille, 4/99 and Bille,

1997, 96-110 plus 379-386).

#109-Denmark: Socialist People's Party (SF)

**Note: All code justifications which appear in ALL CAPS were part of the original ICPP project (Janda, 1980). All other code justifications were subsequently provided by Robert Harmel and Lars Bille.*

Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure

1959-1964: 4

1965-1990: 5

Formally, the parliamentary group is clearly subordinated to the EPO, by rules adopted in 1965 as a consequence of a disagreement in the party. The rift, in fact, was caused by the issue of which part of the party at the national level should be the ultimate decision-maker concerning party policy. Until that time, a code of "4" is more appropriate, reflecting the situation of greater equality between the EPO and parliamentary group.

The reason for the "5" rather than "6" for the later period is because, in Bille's view, the day-to-day functioning of the party still allows some flexibility for the parliamentary group to affect party policy.

Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader

1959-1990: 3

The national Congress elects the EPO chair, who is effectively the party's leader.

Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates

1959-1990: 5

Bille (see Bille, 1997: 110-120, 321-331) says that the decision is made at the local level, by vote in local party meetings until 1969, and then by membership ballot after 1969. Then the selection must be approved by the national committee. The latter has been true throughout the period.

Variable 9.04: Allocating Funds

(Note: Bille notes that until 1987, when state subsidies were introduced for the membership parties, party funds were collected primarily in the form of membership fees. Bille acknowledges that there were also: (1) private donations, which normally constituted a small amount of the parties' overall funds; and (2) donations from labor unions, which were a significant amount (1/2 to 2/3 between 1960 and 1990) of the Social Democrat's income. It should also be noted that when doing this coding, state subsidies were NOT taken into account. However, references to percentages of national party income do take subsidies to the membership organizations into account. Though subsidies have become a major source of party funding, they are a matter decided by the state, and not by the individual parties themselves.)

1959-1990: 5

According to Bille (1997: 259-265), membership fees are collected primarily by the national level, but a significant amount of those monies is then automatically "refunded" to the local organizations, and it's possible that local organizations may collect additional money on their own. Labor unions and "party taxes" also account for some of the income of the national party organization. Labour union contributions may amount for from 15-25% of national party income, and such contributions may be made also at the local level.

Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy

1959-1990: 5

Primary responsibility clearly rests at the national level, and in this party the responsibility at the national level rests more with the extraparliamentary organization, and at the national level with the party conference--though, admittedly, the national executive also plays a role in day-today policy making (See coding justification for variable #107).

Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications

(Note: Bille, in a personal communication in late 1999, noted two relevant points of consideration for this variable. First, the newspapers were not controlled in a strict definition of control, but rather were, "influenced by the party" or "the newspapers supported the general viewpoints of the parties"; however, the editors still had editorial freedom. Second, we have emphasized a regular publishing of a party member magazine controlled in the strict sense by the national organization and we have supposed that these magazines were influential in the sense that they "were closely read by party members" (see Janda, 1980: p. 114). However, we don't know how many members actually read the magazine.)

1959-1990: 7

The party has tried to develop a newspaper, but sporadically and not very successfully. Throughout our period, though, the party produced at least one influential party magazine, at least quarterly (perhaps monthly), with wide distribution among the members (Bille, 4/19/99). Hence, we find the code of 7 to be appropriate throughout the period.

Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline

(Note: In all Danish parties the parliamentary group itself can impose lesser forms of discipline; however, the person who is responsible, if anyone, for expelling party members - including MP's - varies from party to party. In our coding, we took expulsion from the party to be the ultimate form of discipline, and gave that greater weight than other forms of discipline.)

1959-1990: 4

There is nothing in the rules about discipline of MP's in particular. To expel a member of the party requires a 2/3 vote at the general meeting of the local branch, but the decision must be approved by the national executive, whose decision can only be changed by the party congress.

Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration

1959-1990: 3

During the formative years, party chair Axel Larsen was certainly a strong leader, but it is still best to see leadership as collective throughout the period, with more than five effectively sharing power. These individuals are generally found on the national committee, which has varied from 27 to 45 members during our period. Even the smaller body, the national executive, has varied from 9 to 15. Hence we assign the code of 3 throughout (Bille, 4/99 and Bille, 1997, 96-110 plus 379-386).