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 those credited after said justification.

Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure

1950-1990: 5

CONSERVATIVE PARTY WAS ORGANIZED INTO TWELVE AREA COUNCILS IN ENGLAND AND WALES AND TWO DIVISIONS IN SCOTLAND. AREA COUNCILS MET FROM TWO TO FOUR TIMES YEARLY, WHILE AREA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES FUNCTIONED IN THE INTERIM. AN AGENT OF THE CENTRAL OFFICE REPRESENTED THE INTERESTS OF THE NATIONAL PARTY, ACTING AS HONORARY SECRETARY FOR THE AREA COUNCIL. THESE REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, WHICH HAD NO RESTRICTIONS ON THE TOPICS THEY COULD DISCUSS, EXERCISED SOMEWHAT MORE INDEPENDENCE OF ACTION THAN THEIR COUNTERPARTS IN THE LABOUR PARTY. (JANDA, 1980: 209)

Norton notes that, "In terms of its internal organization, the party is hierarchical." (Norton, 1991:136) The hierarchy runs from the national organs through eleven regional offices in England, one in Wales and two in Scotland. Concerning the hierarchy and flow of authority, Kelly notes that even at the Conservative Local Government Conference and Exhibition, matters were arranged and managed at the national level. (Kelly,1989:58-9) [By Paul Sum]

The Conservative Party in its 1974 Manifesto (Craig, 1975: 446), agreed the following: "In Scotland, we will: set up a Scottish Assembly; give the Secretary of State for Scotland, acting with the Scottish assembly, the power to decide how to spend Scotland's share of the U.K. budget; establish a Scottish development fund to provide substantial help with both the new problems created by oil, and with Scotland's old deprived areas; transfer the Oil Division of the Department of Energy to Scotland." [By Renata Chopra]

As described in the Conservative Party publication The Right Approach (1976), Scotland feels that the Parliament and the government are out of touch with its needs. Consequently, Scotland would like its own say in affairs; they would like to form a directly elected Scottish assembly as a chamber of the United Kingdom Parliament. [By Renata Chopra]

Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader

1950-1963: 7
1964-1990: 4

THE LEADER EMERGED FROM AN OBSCURE PROCESS OF ELITE INTERACTION AND CONSENSUS-BUILDING, RATIFIED BY ACCLAMATION BY PARTY MEMBERS IN BOTH HOUSES, CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATES, AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL UNION. WHEN THE PARTY WAS IN POWER, THE MONARCH CONDITIONED THE CHOICE OF LEADERSHIP BY NAMING THE PRIME MINISTER. UPON THE RESIGNATION OF ANTHONY EDEN IN 1957, FOR EXAMPLE, SOUNDING IN THE TWO HOUSES AND THE CONSTITUENCY PARTIES WERE MADE BY LORDS SALISBURY, KILMUIR, AND OTHERS, AND THE QUEEN CHOSE HAROLD MACMILLAN TO SUCCEED EDEN AS PRIME MINISTER UPON ADVICE FROM CONSERVATIVE LEADERS. MACMILLAN SUBSEQUENTLY BECAME PARTY LEADER, BUT SOME CONCERN WAS REGISTERED OVER THE ROLE OF THE MONARCH IN THE PROCESS. THIS WAS HEIGHTENED AFTER OUR TIME PERIOD WITH THE SELECTION OF HOME TO REPLACE MACMILLAN IN 1963. AS OF 1965, THIS INFORMAL PROCESS WAS REPLACED BY BALLOTING AMONG ALL CONSERVATIVE MPS, WITH A 15 PERCENT MAJORITY REQUIRED TO WIN THE LEADERSHIP ON THE FIRST BALLOT. (JANDA, 1980: 209)

"Before 1964, the leader of the party was not elected but simply 'emerged'." This process entailed building a consensus within elite circles of the party to be ratified by Conservative MP's. (Norton in King et al,1993:35) [By Paul Sum]

Norton notes that leadership selection was formalized, "in 1964 to a new procedure under which the leader was to be elected. The electorate was to be made up solely of Conservative MP's." Selection required an absolute majority of 15% of total the electorate for the leader to be selected in the first round. This procedure was first employed in 1965 with the selection of Edward Heath. The leader was selected for an unlimited term ending through voluntary retirement or death. Norton attributes the change to disputes within the "emergence" process, most notably in 1957 and 1963. (Norton in King et al,1993:37) Finer observes that,"sentiments of local associations are to be ascertained and conveyed to the MP's before they get down to balloting." (Finer,1980:79) However, evidence of this input is unclear and therefore, the change falls within coding parameters is not reflected in the coding value. [By Paul Sum]

Norton notes an additional change in the selection procedure. "At the end of 1974 the parliamentary party decided on a change in the rules for electing a leader, inserting a provision for annual election." New rules first applied in February 1975 in which Thatcher was elected. The change stems from discontent with the tenure granted to Edward Heath who experienced unpopularity within the party. (Norton in King et al,1993:37) [By Paul Sum]

The selection of leader was revised in 1975 so that three ballots would be included. For a candidate to win on the first ballot, she or he has to win the overall

majority with a 15% lead over the rival. If this is not accomplished, then on the second ballot, an overall majority must be won. If this is still not obtained, then a majority is assured by a system of transferable voting (King and Nugent, 1977: 50). [By Renata Chopra]

The 1974 rule change that required the Conservative leader to win by 15% over the second place candidate proved to be the undoing for Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in 1990. On the first ballot, Mrs. Thatcher fell just short of the required 15-percent advantage. She withdrew, and the second ballot elected Mr. Major. (Zeigler, 1993: 99) [By Kenneth Janda]

Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates

1950-1990: 5

THE NATIONAL UNION'S STANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CANDIDATES SUBMITTED A LIST OF POTENTIAL CANDIDATES TO THE CONSTITUENCY, WHICH WAS ALSO ABLE TO SUGGEST NAMES OF ITS OWN. A SELECTION COMMITTEE WITHIN THE CONSTITUENCY DREW UP A LIST OF CANDIDATES TO BE INTERVIEWED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE IN THE CONSTITUENCY, WHICH RECOMMENDED A CANDIDATE TO THE ASSOCIATION FOR APPROVAL. THE CHOICE MUST ALSO HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE CENTRAL OFFICE, AND ALMOST INVARIABLY WAS. (JANDA, 1980: 209)

New procedures for the selection of MP's were approved on July 27, 1972. The new criteria, which was described as being rather ambiguous, was formulated by a committee led by Lord Carrington with the purpose of centralizing governmental control. The first step MP's seeking another term must follow is that each MP must formally announce her or his readoption before each general election. Then each MP must offer alternative candidates to the association. A selection committee within the constituency then makes it choices, with the approval of central office (Layton, 1976: 396-405). [By Renata Chopra]

Finer observes that the Committee on Candidates, which is a sub-committee of the National Union, is,"responsible for interviewing would-be candidates and putting them on an approval list, although in practice this function is usually left to the vice-chairman of the party." He continues that, "local associations select their own candidate [from the list]; and although the Committee [on Candidates] may not wholly approve, the local association is almost certain to be able to get him endorsed if it is adamant enough." (Finer,1980:80) [By Paul Sum]

Ingle notes that since 1980, "residential selection boards" have been utilized as a screening process of potential candidates by local authorities before they are sent to the Committee on Candidates for final approval. These boards consist of an

MP, an industrialist and a member of the National Union. Ingle concludes that this has had the effect of decreasing diversity among candidates in favor of "candidates who correspond most closely to an amalgam of all desirable Conservative qualities. The day of the Conservative candidate clone may be coming; we have already seen that selection committees use candidate 'profiles'. (Ingle,1989:80) This change falls within the coding parameters and does not merit a value change. [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.04: Allocating Funds

1950-1990: 2

FUNDS WERE COLLECTED AT ALL LEVELS OF THE PARTY ORGANISATION, WITH MOST OF THE FUNDS RAISED BY CONSTITUENCY ASSOCIATIONS. LOCALLY COLLECTED MONEYS WERE ALLOCATED TO THE CENTRE BUT THE CONSTITUENCIES COLLECTIVELY RECEIVED MORE THAN THEY SUPPLIED. THE CENTRAL BOARD OF FINANCE SEEMED TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DUNNING WEALTHY PRIVATE SUPPORTERS AT THE REGIONAL LEVEL. (JANDA, 1980: 209)

Finer points out that sources of funds have not altered since 1945. "Constituencies are expected to fund themselves, and in the Conservative case they make a substantial contribution to headquarters funds (one-third of the total)...Two thirds of the Conservative party headquarters income are donations from private companies, mostly small, but a few substantial." (Finer,1980:106) [By Paul Sum]

The Conservative Central Office does not disclose a list of corporate or individual donors to the party (Duschinsky, 1989: 197). [By Renata Chopra]

Norton observes that income is generated from three general sources: business donations, individual donations, constituency associations. He notes that although constituency association income and business donations have steadily decreased, individual donations have increased and now constitute the bulk of the party's central funds. A second tier of money-raising takes place at the local level in which constituency associations raise their own funds and send approximately one-third to the national organization although this amount varies widely. (Norton,1991:136-9) This confirms Finer's finding above. [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy

1950-1990: 7

THE FORMATION OF POLICY WAS THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF

THE PARTY LEADER, ACTING ON THE ADVICE OF HIS CABINET OR CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE COLLEAGUES AND THE STANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POLICY. THE 1922 COMMITTEE AND THE PARTY CONFERENCE ACTED AS SOUNDING-BOARDS FOR RANK-AND-FILE SENTIMENTS AND PARTY POLICY HAD TO TAKE THESE INTO ACCOUNT. HOWEVER, DEFERENCE TO THE LEADER'S DECISION ENSURED THE ADOPTION OF EVEN INITIALLY UNCONGENIAL POLICIES. POLICY INITIATIVES OFTEN CAME FROM INFORMAL ORGANISATIONS SUCH AS THE BOW GROUP AS WELL AS THROUGH ESTABLISHED CHANNELS. (JANDA, 1980: 209)

In 1970, while Edward Heath was Prime Minister, he was concerned with forward planning and management of policy development. He constructed a large shadow administration and divided the front bench into a numerous specialist teams, with an emphasis on collective decision making (Burch, 1980: 182). [By Renata Chopra]

Finer notes that the Annual Conference, the Research Development Council and the Advisory Committee on Policy all contribute to policy formulation from an advisory sense. However, he continues, "In the Conservative party, policy is in the last resort, the prerogative of the leader, who is the leader of the parliamentary party." (Finer,1980:91) [By Paul Sum]

The Prime Minister is now guided by an Advisory Committee on Policy, a group which meets once a month to consult, advise and warn about consequences of public policy. The group was formed as a result of negative reactions to policy when it was scrutinized only by ministers and officials (Patten, 1980: 9-11). [By Renata Chopra]

Thatcher has been considered to be the most radical leader of Britain since World War II, and the most reactionary in Europe (Hall and Jacques, 1983: 110). [By Renata Chopra]

While Margaret Thatcher was Prime Minister, she was concerned with strong party management; backbenchers played a central role in policy formulation. The overall influence of the Cabinet on policy weakened during Thatcher's reign, probably as a result of her dominant leadership style (Burch, 1988: 44). The cabinet's role was to endorse rather than to make decisions. Thatcher took issues into her own hands, deeming what she considered the appropriate action. [By Renata Chopra]

Ingle confirms the central role played by the party leader in terms of policy formulation. However, he adds that, "it is essential for Conservatives to sustain contacts with the party at all levels, so that the process of consultation is believed to operate." (Ingle,1989:56) [By Paul Sum]

Norton observes that, "The fount of all policy is the party leader. The party's annual conference as well as other organs serve in an advisory role only. At the end of the day, the leader determines the policy of the party and contents of the

election manifesto." (Norton,1991:136) [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications

1950-1990: 0

PARTY CONTROL OF COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA WAS CONCENTRATED AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL AND SUCH COMMUNICATIONS WERE INFLUENTIAL WITHIN THE PARTY. PRESS RELEASES FROM THE CHIEF AND AREA PUBLICITY OFFICERS OFTEN REACHED THE INDEPENDENT NATIONAL AND LOCAL PRESS. (JANDA, 1980: 209-210)

Finer notes that since 1945, there has been "an absence of a party press". However, the independent press has increasingly favored the Conservative Party and they have been relatively successful in utilizing it toward their own ends. Nevertheless, the coding reflects the party controlling on important communications media because the independent press, "all have a highly idiosyncratic view of politics which is not necessarily at all the same as the official party line." (Finer,1980:140)   [By Paul Sum]

At the 1950 Conservative Conference, the party deemed the control and quantity of communication "inadequate to ensure a well informed public opinion" (Craig, 1982: 11). [By Renata Chopra]

At the 1980 conference, the conservatives felt that they were failing in their duty to inform the public of Conservative principles; however, they acknowledged that this was due to lack of efficiency, not to lack of control (Craig, 1982: 13). [By Renata Chopra]

Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline

1950-1990: 4

THE PARTY LEADER CONTROLLED THE PERSONNEL AT CENTRAL OFFICE, ACTING THROUGH THE PARTY CHAIRMAN HE APPOINTED. THE PARTY WHIPS, APPOINTED BY THE LEADER, CONTROLLED THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE AND MAY WITHDRAW THE WHIP, THE PARTY'S REGULAR COMMUNICATION MEMORANDUM. THE LEADER CAN DISMISS HIS CABINET COLLEAGUES AT WILL OR WHIM, AS MACMILLAN DID IN 1962. (Janda, 1980: 210)

Concerning the reshuffling, the Prime Minister usually changes his cabinet after 12-18 months, after careful consideration of the consequences. As authors

Alderman and Cross describe (1987: 17), "The timing of Cabinet reshuffles is influenced by a complex number of factors: some long-term, strategic, or general; some short-term, tactical or limited to a single objective such as the replacement of an inadequate minister)."   [By Renata Chopra]

Finer notes that, "the National Union has the power to disaffiliate [a] local association." (Finer,1980:80)

Ingle observes that, "...it is an important task of the whips to attempt to persuade backbenchers to support the leadership...but they have few sanctions at their disposal should this fail." Of these sanctions, he cites the threat of denying promotion through the party hierarchy and indirect constituency executive pressure as the most used weapons of discipline. Ingle further notes that the recent large majority held by the party in the House of Commons has made party discipline less crucial to the operating of the party. (Ingle,1989:59)

Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration

1950-1990: 6

LEADERSHIP IN THE PARTY WAS CONCENTRATED IN THE LEADER, WHO MAY COMMIT THE PARTY TO BINDING COURSES OF ACTION. THIS POWER, HOWEVER, WAS MAINTAINED BY THE CIRCUMSPECTION OF THE LEADER, WHO HAD TO BE CAREFUL NOT TO OVERBURDEN THE PATIENCE OF HIS FOLLOWERS, WHO MIGHT REVOLT IN A BODY IF PUSHED TOO FAR. (Janda, 1980: 210)

Leadership is clearly concentrated in the party leader who heads all major national party organs, and has the final say over organizational and policy matters. Although the relationship might be characterized as authoritarian, Norton likens it more to a "traditional family model" with a strong leadership figure within a complex set of dependent relationships among members. (Norton,1991:136) [By Paul Sum]

Margaret Thatcher can be considered one of the most revolutionary Prime Ministers in this century; she employed a highly abrasive and ideological governing style that often did overburden the patience of her followers. For example, she took a hard-lined stance against the USSR, cut the number of civil servants working for her, sold many government owned industries, and dramatically curtailed spending. As a result, unemployment rose drastically, her own party split into many factions, and she became extremely unpopular with the public because of her dominating leadership (Bonnett, Bromley, and Jessop, 1990: 102). In April, 1982, she redeemed herself to many, as she sent British troops to defend the Faukland Islands (of British possession) that were being attacked by Argentina. [By Renata Chopra]

Ingle, emphasizing the concentration of leadership within the party leader, observes that, "If the relationship with senior members of the parliamentary party is one key indicator of the power of the Conservative leader, another is surely the relationship with the party bureaucracy. In fact this relationship is quite unequivocal: the party chairman is appointed by the prime minister, and the main organ of the party bureaucracy, the Central Office, has been referred to as the leader's personal machine." (Ingle,1989:55) [By Paul Sum]

#302-United Kingdom: The Labour Party

Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure

1950-1990: 4

ALTHOUGH THE LABOUR PARTY HAS ELEVEN REGIONAL COUNCILS IN ITS ORGANIZATION OF STRUCTURE, THESE COUNCILS PLAY AN UNIMPORTANT PART IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF POWER WITH THE PARTY. THE PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION WAS RESPONSIBLE TO THE NATIONAL OFFICE AND THE COUNCIL WAS FORBIDDEN TO DISCUSS NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS. (JANDA, 1980: 205)

The Labour Party is dominated by national organs. However, for the time period under consideration, tension (sometimes turning to open conflict) has existed between the Conference, represented through the NEC, and the Parliamentary Labour Party. "The parliamentary Labour party is autonomous." (Macridis,1983:43) Most internal conflict during the time period stems from this division as the two vie for power and alliances throughout party membership. [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader

1950-1980: 4
1981-1987: 3
1988-1990: 1

THE LEADER OF THE LABOUR PARTY WAS ELECTED BY THE PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION OF THE PARTY. (JANDA, 1980: 205)

Clement Attlee assumed the post, in 1935 and remained in office until 1955, when he resigned and was replaced by Hugh Gaitskill, who remained leader throughout our time period until his death in 1963.   Deputy leaders during our period were Morrison 1950-55, Griffith 1955-1959, and Brown 1959-1962. [By Kelli Haynes]

In February,1964, Harold Wilson was elected as leader of the Labour Party. (Lees, 1990, p105)   [By Kelli Haynes]

In 1976, James Callaghan succeeded Harold Wilson. (Breckinridge, 1988, p216) [By Kelli Haynes]

"The parliamentary Labour party annually elects a leader who to date has automatically become the leader of the party." (Finer,1980:75) [By Paul Sum]

In 1980,Michael Foot was chosen leader. (Breckinridge, 1988: 216) [By Kelli Haynes]

"Until 1980 the Labour Party leader was elected more or less like the Conservative one, by the Labour members of Parliament. However, a series of intraparty democracy demands, principally from the constituency associations, resulted in an electoral college of sorts (with unions having 40 percent of the votes, and the constituency associations and members of Parliament 30 percent each. This change caused right-wing Labour leaders to withdraw from the party to organize the Social Democrats.. The Parliamentary Labour Party had always been more centrist and moderate than the constituency associations. By creating an electoral college, and diluting the power of the parliamentary party, Labour made it very likely that more radial candidates would rise to the top." (Ziegler, 1993: 106-107) [By Kenneth Janda]

"At a special conference in January 1981 the party adopted a formula for the election of the leader by an electoral college [of widespread regional and local representation]." This new method was first used in 1983. The change occurred as a result of the left's dissatisfaction with Parliamentary leadership and their inability to choose leadership. This faction of the party gained the momentum to enact this change after widespread dissatisfaction ran through the party after the 1979 electoral defeat. (Norton,1991:142) [By Paul Sum]

Neil Kinnock was elected by new procedures established at a conference January 1981, (Ingle, 1987, p121) which removed the election of party leader from parliamentary party to an electoral college in which Trade Unions had 40% of the votes, the parliamentary party and constituency parties had 30% each. (Breckinridge, 1988, p217) [By Kelli Haynes]

Neil Kinnock's selection as party leader in 1983 marked a crucial stage in the struggle for control of the Labour Party organization. As prime minister, James Callahan had of necessity neglected party matters and left the party in disarray when it shifted to opposition in 1979. He was replaced by hard leftist Michael Foot, who was unable to heal the rift between left and right. Kinnock was determined to do so. The Left--principally Militant Tendency--introduced the reselection rule, designed to reduce the influence of the parliamentary Labour Party and so enhanced the power of the constituency Labour Party. Unlike the Conservatives, Labour required that all incumbent MPs would need to be reselected, a full selection process. (Zeigler, 1993: 107) [By Kenneth Janda]

The change in 1988 stems from the election of party leadership on a "one-man, one-vote" principle by all individual members of the party. This extended to seven seats on the NEC one year later. The change may be attributed to Kinnock's attempt to

reduce trade unionist (and the left's) influence within the party. (Seyd in King et al,1993:88-9)   [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates

1950-1989: 5
1990: 6

THE SELECTION OF PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATES BY THE LABOUR PARTY FOLLOWED TWO DISTINCT PATTERNS IN THIS PERIOD. ON THE ONE HAND, THERE WERE CANDIDATES SPONSORED BY THE TRADES UNIONS (20 PERCENT), COOPERATIVE SOCIETIES (5 PERCENT) AND OTHER LESS IMPORTANT AFFILIATED ORGANISATIONS. ON THE OTHER, MOST WERE NOMINATED BY THE CLPS AND APPROVED BY THE NEC. THE NEC HELD THE POWER OF VETO BUT IN FACT LOCAL WISHES WERE GENERALLY, THOUGH NOT INVARIABLY, RESPECTED. (JANDA, 1980: 205)

Janosik observes that primary control over the selection process resides within the constituency Labour parties. He argues that constituency parties influence the conduct of British politics more by their choice of candidates than in any other way. (Janosik,1968:113-4) He further notes that the candidate must then be validated by the NEC. However, "The validation phase of the selection process was probably more important in the past than at present, when this step seems completely *pro forma*." (Janosik,1968:120) [By Paul Sum]

In the 1970 Annual Conference, the Labour Party accepted an amendment making the National Executive the final arbiter on candidate selection in the constituencies.(Lees, 1990, p81) At the national level the party organization maintains a list of available candidates and applicants for the list are screened on behalf of the party headquarters by regional committees.(Lees, 1990, p92) Unlike the Conservatives, a future Labour candidate must be nominated by a local party organization.(Lees, 1990, p94) In the Labour Party, political factors matter more in the selection process Many selections are decided on a left-right basis.(Lees, 1990, p95) [By Kelli Haynes]

Finer notes that "A would be [Labour] candidate must be nominated by some constituent of the local party, and such nominations are then validated by the NEC in London. (None appear ever to have been referred back)." A candidate is selected within a conference of the General Management Council (GMC) of each constituency Labour party. The GMC selection conference averages between 20 and 120 persons. (Finer,1980:98-9)   [By Paul Sum]

Norton notes that in 1980, a change in the selection process of MP's occurred. He characterizes this as, "the compulsory reselection of MP's-that is for MP's

to be subject to a full reselection process by local parties during the lifetime of Parliament rather than the usual process of automatic readoption when an election was called." (Norton,1991:142) This change does not warrant a coding change since the selecting unit remains unchanged. Norton further notes that this change had little affect on sitting MP's. (Norton,1991:143)   [By Paul Sum]

At the Party Conference the Labour Party decided upon the reselection of MPs between elections. (Breckinridge, 1988 p216) [By Kelli Haynes]

A dual change occurred in the selection process. On one hand, an electoral college within each constituency party was established in which individual members voted as a 60% bloc vote while affiliated members (overwhelmingly trade unionists) voted as a 40% bloc. "Now, for the first time, the individual had a right to participate in the choice of the party's parliamentary representative without respect to whether he or she had attended local party branch meetings or was a delegate to the general committee of the local constituency Labour party. The individual party member had at last been enfranchised." (Seyd in King et al,1993:87)   However, at the same time, the NEC was given the "power to intervene directly in the candidate selection process" through the exclusion of many candidates and providing "short lists" of candidates. (Seyd in King et al,1993:91) Seyd attributes the change to Kinnock's desire to limit trade union dominance at the local level. He was able to achieve this as a result of dissatisfaction within the party after the 1987 electoral defeat. These changes are interpreted as having a "canceling" effect on the coding value for the variable so that the value remains unchanged. [By Paul Sum]

Another dual change occurred in 1990. Seyd documents the shift to the practice whereby, "the selection and reselection of parliamentary candidates should be based solely on a ballot of individual members; the only role for affiliated trade unions would be in nominating candidates and "short-listing" candidates. The [1990] conference agreed that this should be the principle that would operate in the next election." However, as Seyd observes, "The NEC's powers were further extended in 1990 when it was given the right to remove the already selected candidate if the candidate...Not only did the NEC intervene to determine the choice of candidate in by-elections, but it intervened to protect certain Labour MP's from deselection." (Seyd in King et al,1993:91) It is this increased intervention by the national organization which the coding change reflects. Seyd describes this change as a continuation of Kinnock's pursuit of limiting unionist input on a local level. (Seyd in King et al,1993:88)   [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.04: Allocating Funds

1950-1990: 5

FUNDS WERE ALLOCATED AT ALL LEVELS OF PARTY

ORGANIZATION, ALTHOUGH THE LARGEST CONTRIBUTIONS WERE ALLOCATED DIRECTLY TO PARTY HEAD OFFICE BY THE TRADES UNIONS. AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, TRADES UNION CONTRIBUTIONS TO CLPS WERE SUPPLEMENTED BY SUPPORT OF TRADES UNION CANDIDATES WHEN THESE WERE CHOSEN FOR ELECTION. (JANDA, 1980: 205)

Janosik notes that over half of the Constituency Labour Parties funds came from gambling and social events, one-sixth from trade union affiliation fees, one-twelfth from individual membership dues and the rest from national organs. (Janosik,1968:72-3,n.16) [By Paul Sum]

The 1968 Annual Conference accepted an amendment to the party constitution making payment of all levies on affiliated organizations a condition of representation at Annual Conferences. (Lees, 1990, p60)   In addition, members must be 15 years of age(Lees, 1990, p17)

Norton notes that, "For its income, the party nationally is heavily dependent on the trade unions." Income generated by the CLPs varies considerably. However, the general flow of funds goes through the party central office for allocation. (Norton,1991:149)   [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy

1950-1963: 5
1964-1973: 6
1974-1990: 5

IN THEORY, RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FORMULATION OF POLICY LAY WITH THE MASS ORGANISATION OF THE PARTY IN CONFERENCE. IN PRACTICE, HOWEVER, IT GRAVITATED INCREASINGLY TOWARDS THE PLP IN GENERAL, AND THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE AND LEADER IN PARTICULAR. THE NET RESULT WAS THAT THE PARLIAMENTARY LEADERSHIP FOUND ITSELF UNABLE TO IMPOSE ITS POLICIES ON THE PARTY CONFERENCE WHILE REFUSING ON THE OTHER HAND TO ADOPT THE LATTER'S RESOLUTIONS. FIERCE STRUGGLES OVER ISSUES SUCH AS GERMAN REARMAMENT, THE RETENTION OF CLAUSE IV (NATIONALISATION) AS POLICY AND THE ATOMIC BOMB CREATED CONFUSION IN PARTY RANKS IN THIS PERIOD. INCREASING ACCEPTANCE OF A MORE INDEPENDENT LEADERSHIP, HOWEVER, GAVE THE ULTIMATE EDGE TO THE PARTY LEADER. WITHIN THE PLP STRONG VETO PRESSURE ON LEGISLATION COULD BE EXERTED BY THE SUBSTANTIAL BLOC OF THE TRADES UNION MPS. (JANDA, 1980: 205)

Minkin notes that prior to 1960, "The voice of the Conference delegates

was held to be supreme in determining the policy of the Party. It was the fountain of authority-it was the Party's sovereign body." (Minkin,1978:273) [By Paul Sum]

Minkin observes that in 1960 Party Leader Gaitskell challenged the authority of Conference policy making. "Successful confrontation shattered the psychological bonds of the traditional view of Conference authority." (Minkin,1978:287) However, policy continued to be debated and ratified within the Conference. The change is more a shift of power toward the Parliamentary members within Conference guidelines. Therefore, a numerical coding change did not occur. [By Paul Sum]

Until 1959 Labour Party Research Department showed little initiative. The NEC was content with ad hoc documents to develop policy. After the 1959 defeat, Peter Shore persuaded NEC that a comprehensive policy document was required. Therefore, he drafted *Labour in the Sixties* for the 1960 Conference. It was accepted by NEC with changes as *Signpost for the Sixties*. It was adopted in 1961 and made into the party manifesto in 1964.(Finer, 1980 p96) [By Kelli Haynes]

The coding change in 1964 documents the shift of policy formation from the Conference to the Wilson government. "The authority of the Conference sunk to a new low as the Government carried out a range of policies diametrically opposed to Conference decisions. Defeats for Government policy at Conference were as repetitive as they were ineffectual." (Minkin,1978:290) Finer echoes this by noting that, "from 1960 onward the conference passed a number of resolutions against the wishes of the parliamentary leadership, but with the parliamentary party in office (1964-1970) Prime Minister Wilson simply ignored these." (Finer,1980:93) The change stems from a demographic change in party membership away from "manual workers" (Minkin,1978:275) and the new leadership of Wilson within the context of government. [By Paul Sum]

The Labour Party introduced the "In Place of Strife" in 1969, which brought about legal regulation of the unions and provided for curbing of wildcat (unofficial) strikes by court action. The opposition in the parliamentary party forced the government to withdraw the bill.(Finer, 1980, p15)   This shows how the real strength of the party is in the PLP, not the Conference. [By Kelli Haynes]

The Labour Party is predominantly a federal organization. The Annual Conference is regarded as the party's "parliament" where policy is made. It has 4 main functions: debate and make policy; consider the report of the parliamentary party; elect a NEC to direct and administer the national party in between conferences; and consider the report of the NEC. (Finer, 1980 p75)   Labour Party Conference formulates model standing orders for organization of party groups on local councils and specialists were appointed to the staff at party headquarters for help in formulation of their policies.(Lees, 1990, p148)   Despite the close connection with the Trade Unions, the Annual Conference defines the Labour Party's decision-making process, not the TUC.(Lees, 1990, p185) [By Kelli Haynes]

The change in 1974 stems from policy formation being once again channeled through the party Conference. This shift resulted from party activists challenging Parliamentary policy formation as anti-democratic. "The existence of two leadership committees [the NEC and the Liaison Committee] feeding initiatives into the Conference was a new feature of policy-making during a period when Labour was in Government." (Minkin,1978:351) [By Paul Sum]

The Conference continued to be subject to challenges by the Parliamentary leadership. Finer notes that 1979, Prime Minister Callaghan vetoed proposals and modified policies sent by the National Executive Committee. (Finer,1980:92) However, most policy continued to be channeled through the party Conference. [By Paul Sum]

In 1990 the NEC adopted a proposal to create a new "policy forum" group to generate policy. The group would be consist of regional representatives. However, the role of the NEC and party Conference was to remain the same and interact with the new body to obtain final party positions. The new group was not to go into effect until after the next elections. (Seyd in King et al, 1993:90) No coding change was assessed since this does not deviate from the parameters set by the given coding value. [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications

1950-1961: 5
1962-1963: 0
1964-1968: 5
1969-1990: 0

PARTY CONTROL OF COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA WAS CONCENTRATED AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL AND SUCH COMMUNICATIONS WERE INFLUENTIAL WITHIN THE PARTY. A CONSIDERABLE QUANTITY OF PRINTED MATTER WAS DISSEMINATED FROM THE PARTY HEAD OFFICE BUT THE CENTRAL PRESS AND PUBLICITY DEPARTMENT ALSO ASSISTED THE CLPS TO FINANCE AND PRODUCE THEIR OWN PUBLICATIONS. PRESS RELEASES FROM REGIONAL PUBLICITY OFFICERS AS WELL AS HEAD OFFICE REACHED THE INDEPENDENT NATIONAL AND LOCAL PRESS REGULARLY. (JANDA, 1980: 205)

Finer states that the only Labour publication during this period was the nationally run *Daily Herald*, however, after 1945 it rapidly lost readers and would not be regarded as influential. (Finer,1980:137) [By Paul Sum]

Finer notes that in 1962, the *Daily Herald* was taken over by the International Press Company and folded that same year. (Finer,1980:137) [By Paul

Sum]

Finer observes that in 1964 the *Daily Herald* was relaunched as The *Sun* and still retained a party connection. (Finer,1980:137) [By Paul Sum]

Finer notes that in 1969, the *Sun* was bought by Robert Murdoch and ceased to retain any party connection. (Finer,1980:137) [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline

1950-1990: 4

THE NEC, ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE PARTY LEADERSHIP IMPOSED SEVERE DISCIPLINARY MEASURES IN THIS PERIOD. DEFIANCE OF THE WHIPS ELECTED BY THE PLP RESULTED IN A VOTE BY THAT BODY TO WITHDRAW THE WHIP. WHEN IN GOVERNMENT THE PARTY LEADER COULD REPROVE HIS CABINET COLLEAGUES AT WILL BUT WHEN IN OPPOSITION HE WAS FORCED TO WORK IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ELECTED BY THE PLP. (JANDA, 1980: 205)

In 1950 Labour Party stressed the need for party discipline. The Labour formula is impregnated with the principle of sanctity of a majority decision that is characteristic of the Socialist Movement.(Lees, 1990, p150) [By Kelli Haynes]

Janosik notes the existence of party discipline within the Parliamentary Labour Party (PLP). However, he concludes that, "There is also a question regarding the so-called discipline of the [PLP], not in voting behaviour in the House of Commons, but in activities actions outside the House of Commons." Furthermore, MP's engaged in conflicts with party leadership rely upon their constituency party to support their position. (Janosik,1968:4) [By Paul Sum]

Concerning the effectiveness of NEC imposed discipline, Finer notes that, "for the period of 1945-1970, it is correct that on whipped votes in divisions the votes normally reflect complete intra-party solidarity." (Finer,1980:27) [By Paul Sum]

"The National Executive Committee directs the party organization. It enforces party discipline by (*in extremis*) expelling individuals or disaffiliating organizations." (Finer,1980:75) [By Paul Sum]

The national level of party discipline continued; however, in 1987, rules for expulsion from the party were changed to simplify and hasten the process. This included expulsion for "anyone deemed to be involved in conduct prejudicial to the party. This new rule gave the NEC wide enough powers to control any activity it pleased." (Seyd in King et al,1993:91) [By Paul Sum]

Group discipline sprang more from personalities than from direct rules (Lees, 1990, p150). If a member cast a vote contrary to a group decision, he could be expelled from the party (Lees, 1990, p151-2). NEC directs the party organization and enforces party discipline by expelling individuals or disaffiliating organizations (Finer, 1980 p78). The disciplinary measures consisted of the following: 1)Reprimand may be given by the Chief Whip in writing and reported to the liaison committee, 2) Suspension from the privileges of membership of the PLP on recommendation of the Chief Whip. A suspended Member may not attend any general meetings of the PLP or its Area or Subject Group Meetings. The chief Whip ends the period of suspension. The NEC will be notified of the suspension. 3) Withdrawal of the Whip (expulsion from the PLP) may be decided upon at Party Meetings. This shall also be reported to the NEC. 4) The accused Member has the right to be heard before the proposal is voted upon and will be given 3 days notice. 5) Minutes of meetings of the Parliamentary Party shall be available for inspection by any Member (Lees, 1990, p139-40).

Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration

1950-1990: 3

TRADITIONS OF DECENTRALISED AND COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP COMBINED WITH THE GROWING EFFECTIVE POWER OF THE LEADERSHIP MADE THE ASSIGNMENT OF THE ACTUAL LOCUS OF POWER DIFFICULT IN THIS PERIOD (1950-1962). HAVING LONG DOMINATED THE NEC, THE PARLIAMENTARY LEADERSHIP INCREASINGLY PROPOGATED THE THEORIES OF ITS INDEPENDENCE OF THE LOWER ECHELONS OF THE PARTY AND ITS RIGHT TO MAKE DECISIONS. THE MASS ORGANIZATIONS OF THE PARTY, HOWEVER, AIDED BY FACTIONAL STRUGGLE WITHIN THE PLP CONTINUED TO INSIST THAT THE PARLIAMENTARY PARTY WAS MERELY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT IN THE LEGISLATURE. WHILE THE LEADERSHIP GROUP SEEMED TO MAINTAIN AN EDGE IN THIS STRUGGLE, THE LEADERSHIP REMAINED COLLECTIVE WITH THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE AS ITS CHIEF LOCUS, DESPITE THE GREAT PRESTIGE AND INFLUENCE OF THE LEADER. (JANDA, 1980: 205)

However, it is important to note the incompleteness of the leader's control of the party: the NEC is independent of the leader, the party machine is independent of the leader and, as in the issue of maintaining an incomes policy in 1978, the conference may be hostile to the leader, too.(Finer, 1980, p79) [By Kelli Haynes]

Finer observes that leadership is collectively concentrated within the National Executive Committee. This group is made up of 18 members. Although these members are supposed to be proportionally representing the make-up of party membership, trade unionists are limited to only 12 of the 18 positions even though their numbers within the party represented 9.57 to 1 of total party members. (Finer,1980:78)

[By Paul Sum]

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 those credited after said justification.

Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure

1950-1990: 4

Finer observes that the organization and parliamentary party have continually had strained relations. Both possess a base of support from which to operate. He adds that in 1969, the Standing Committee was established as a national organ with the purpose of facilitating communication and compromise between these competing organs. He concludes that this purpose has largely failed. (Finer,1980:82) [By Paul Sum]

Kavanagh concludes that a model of "power-sharing" accurately describes the Liberal party. Competing sources of power reside in the Assembly, the LPO and the MPs. Additionally, local organs retain their own (limited) source of power, especially concerning the selection of parliamentary candidates. (Kavanagh,1983:140-1) [By Paul Sum]

Denver observes that throughout merger negotiations, the Liberal party fought to preserve the decentralized national structure, allowing power to reside in a number of national organs. However, the relative power of these national organs was retained over local and regional organs. (Denver,1993:110) [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader

1950-1975: 7
1976-1980: 3
1981-1990: 2

Norton observes that after 1935 the party leader was selected by vote among Liberal MPs. There has been no ratifying power given to other party members. New leaders were selected only after the current leader retired. (Norton,1983:145) [By Paul Sum]

"In 1976, a Special Assembly agreed to a new system under which candidates for leadership had to be nominated by at least five other MPs or a fifth of the total, and be elected by constituency members whose electoral weight was related to Liberal support at the previous general election." (Kavanagh,1983:140) The source of

changes seems to be due to dissatisfaction with Thorpe in unilaterally deciding to enter into coalition negotiations with Heath in 1974. [By Paul Sum]

The change in 1981 documents the change of selecting the party leader by popular vote of the party's mass membership. An annual election can be forced on the initiative of at least fifty associations. The change stems from a successful regional challenge to the central structure. (Kavanagh,1983:140) [By Paul Sum]

The process of selecting the national leader remained unchanged as evidenced in the 1988 election of Ashdown through a general election by party members. Ashdown was the first selected leader of the Liberal Democrats. (Denver,1993:117) [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates

1950-1990: 3

The selection process is left to the constituency parties. The selection is made by local leaders and ratified by party members. However, Kavanagh notes that, "The traditional shortage of suitable Liberal candidates for Parliament has meant that the reality in the constituencies was less one of making selections than of taking what was on offer. In turn this has meant that the scrutiny of candidates for approval has often been perfunctionary." This varies however according to the competitiveness of the seat. He further adds that, "The Liberal party has a list of 'approved' candidates but no requirement that the adoption be confirmed [by the national organs of the party]." (Kavanagh,1983:129-30) [By Paul Sum]

The selection of parliamentary candidates remained a choice made by the constituency associations. They assumed the additional power to decide whether a Liberal or SDP candidate would run. (Denver,1993:103) Therefore, this change is a result of the merger of Alliance constituency associations but falls within the coding value's parameters. [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.04: Allocating Funds

1950-1990: 5

Finer notes that, "The sources of party income have not materially altered since 1945." (Finer,1980:106) Funds are collected at all levels of the party. For instance, the LPO (party headquarters) accepts the public Rowntree funds, the Liberal Central Association collects funds for Liberal MP's, and the regional offices and constituency parties are expected to raise their own funds and contribute a significant

portion of these to the LPO who are responsible for allocating funds primarily towards "winnable" constituencies. Kavanagh observes that although the many funds run through the LPO, a considerable amount bypasses it, making the LPO financially dependent on regional and constituency funds. (Kavanagh,1983:133-4) [By Paul Sum]

The Wainwright report of 1975 evaluated the structure of the party financial organization, concluding that it provided a "disincentive to raising money". As a result, Rowntree funds and other financial sources were directed away from the LPO and into other national organs. This has placed a greater burden upon constituencies to fund the LPO. Kavanagh observes that constituency contributions averaged £1,000 in 1970 and £39,000 by 1979. This change falls within the parameters of the coding value identified. [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy

1950-1990: 6

Kavanagh notes that, "On the issues of political strategy and declaring party policy, the parliamentary leaders have made decisions independent of the party outside." (Kavanagh,1983:136) However, he notes that the Assembly does put certain limits on this power. Therefore, the initiative for policy comes from the MP's but the Assembly has limited ratifying powers. Resolutions passed by the Assembly are not binding on the MP's. (Kavanagh,1983:138-9) [By Paul Sum]

Party policy continued to be made by MPs and ratified by the Assembly. However, policy making within the Alliance remained strained the SDP generating its own policy. This forced consensus, which at times was not reached within the Alliance, acts as a constraint upon policy formulation. (Denver,1993:106) However, this falls within the coding value parameters and does not warrant a change. [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications

1950-1990: 0

Denver notes that the Liberal News is published approximately ten times per year but does not constitute a "mass media" publication. The party relied heavily on the independent media. (Denver,1993:116) [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline

1950-1990: 0

Concerning the lack of formal disciplinary measures within the Liberal party, Kavanagh notes that, "The party leader lacks important sanctions and incentives; he has to accommodate and make concessions because he needs support of members and local leaders who have their own bases of support." (Kavanagh,1983:141) Norton adds that the Chief Whip advises on voting measures in the House but has no formal power to enforce the vote or attendance of Liberal MPs. (Norton,1983:146) [By Paul Sum]

Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration

1950-1990: 2

Leadership within the party is exercised primarily by the party leader. However, decisions made by the leader are not binding upon the party. Power remains highly decentralized among the many national organs. Kavanagh notes that, "The Liberal party prides itself on its commitment to a decentralization of government from Westminster and Whitehall but also on decentralization in the party." (Kavanagh,1982:129) [By Paul Sum]

The Alliance (1983) did not affect the decentralized structure within the Liberal party. However, a second national leader emerged from the SDP leadership during the Alliance. This situation characterized the Alliance as "the two-headed beast". (Denver,1993:106) However, this change falls within the coding parameters set forth and does not warrant a value change. [By Paul Sum]

The establishment of the Liberal Democrats in 1988 ended the dual leadership within the Alliance. However, the Liberal Democrat's structure remained highly decentralized and largely unchanged from the "old" Liberal party. (Denver,1993:126) [By Paul Sum]