
The Politics of the Smaller
European Democracies
*An outline of "common core"
elements to be treated in
individual country studies*
Stein Rokkan

This revised check list is based on the discussion of doc. SED/C/64/3 at the First Working Conference at Bellagio in September, 1964, and is organized in conformity with the new Chapter Outline circulated as doc. SED/C/64/6.

Two lists have been established for each country: one for *Priority* tables (P.1.3., ...), the other for *Optional* tables (Q.1.1.,)

The P-tables are those which, at least to this Editor, seem essential features of each volume. They may prove difficult to establish for some of the countries but at least a serious effort should be made to get them for all countries. Selections of P-tables for Norway and, it is hoped, a couple of other countries will be circulated during the summer of 1965 and should be studied by each SED-participant with an eye to the possibilities of establishing similarly conceived tables for his country. This, of course, does not mean that they have to be built up exactly alike. All it means is that there should be some attempt to relate tables to each other across countries and to discuss difficulties of comparison.

O-tables will vary much more from country to country whether they are to be included will depend on such factors as the availability of decent data, the amount of work involved in assembling the data, the importance of the information for the presentation and the interpretation of the peculiarities of the given country. At worst, a country volume might well prove adequate with P-tables only but we at least urge each Country Author to *consider* the possibilities of tabular presentations at each of the points proposed; this may not only help the reader and add valuable information on the given nation but also facilitate comparisons.

To ensure frequent consultation in the preparation of tables for each Country Volume the following procedure is suggested:

- (1) on the basis of the examples prepared for Norway, each Country Author prepares during 1965 a draft set of P-tables for his volume as well as selection of particularly pertinent O-tables and sends these to the Chrstian Michelsen Institute at Bergen: this can be done in several steps as the tables get ready, not necessarily in one batch;
- (2) the CMI edits the tables, adds queries for the Country Author and circulates them to others SED participants for comments;
- (3) a revised set is prepared by the Country Author and circulated before 1 April, 1966, in time for the Second Working Conference.

Even if you cannot comply with (1) right away I would urge you all to go through the lists for each chapter and make up an *inventory of potential sources of data or tabulations at each point*. Such inventories might in fact be very useful items for general distribution to Country Authors.

Several of you will no doubt have assembled interesting tables about the politics of your country for other publications (DAALDER, LORWIN and I all have a number of tables in our chapter for R.A. DAHL *ed. Political Oppositions in Western Democracies*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1965 but these I believe you have all seen). If any such sets are available please send them to me and I shall do what I can to get them circulated.

In addition to the Norwegian tables I have added to this document a few *comparative tables* based on the RUSSETT *Handbook*. Some of these comparisons are highly problematic and will need detailed footnoting for interpretation. I hope to prepare a collection of such tables as we go along but will be concerned to add brief qualifying texts to make sure that the tables are not misinterpreted. I shall depend very much on your help in this and hope to have your detailed comments.

Chapter I: The Development of the Present Nation-State

Priority tables

Table P.1.1. *Changes in population size:* time series for all censuses, or, if too infrequent, at least estimates for 6-8 points since 1800. Give totals for nation (footnotes re boundaries) and traditionally delimited regions: these regions should as far as possible be the same in all tables, cf. Tables 0.1.1., 0.1.2., P. 3.2., P.4.4.

Table P.1.2. *Rural-urban balance:* population by type of administrative unit or by size of community plus share of national population in

specified major cities. Note: for the 20th century the most comparable estimates have been established in the UN *Demographic Yearbook* (population in localities over and under 2000).

Table P.1.3. *Changes in occupational structures 1850-1960:* percent of active population in primary, secondary and tertiary sectors (Colin CLARK's definitions), possibly. with specifications of numbers in agriculture forestry and fisheries (primary), crafts and manufacturing (secondary), public and private (tertiary). These tables to be checked with economists working on comparative economic growth (KUZNETS group?)

Table P.1.4. *Compositon of GNP:* current data for share of each economic sector in G.N.P. OECD publications to be checked. Cf. J.F. DEWHURST *et al. Europe's Needs and Resources.* New York, 1961, Chapter 4.

Table P.1.5. *Assessed income:* medians for urban and rural areas, for capital vs. other cities,percentage distributions of all tax payers on 4-5 income tax poket (if possible distinguish incomes before and after deduction of direct taxes).

Table P.1.6. *Governmental and public employees:* times series for absolute numbers and per cent of active population in central civil service, provincial and local administration, armed forces, police, public corporations. (the more distinctions within the "public sector" total, the better, of. Table ***)

Table P.1.7. *Public expenditure:* time series data for size of total governmental, provincial and local expenditures, in standardized currency (1914 = 100 ?) and in per capita or per cent of GNP terms (whichever figures are available). Details in DEWHURST op. oit. Chapters 10 (Education), 11 (Health), 12 (Social Security), 13 (Government Expenditures and Operations). Cf. the appended table SED/R.3.

Table P.1.8. *Cultural and religious divisions:* time series data for the distribution of the population by principal linguistic identifications (Belgium, Finland, Ireland, Netherlands (Frisian ?), Norway, Switzerland) and by denomination (Lutheran countries: per cent dissenters). For *Switzerland* it will clearly be of major interest to offer details of *combined* distributions (Alemanic-Protestant, Alemanic-Catholic, French-speaking-Catholic): this might be done for the Federal population as a whole as well through classifications of cantons.

Table P.1.9. *The structure of the school system:* time series data for per cent of school children (teachers ?) in public vs. confessional vs. other private schools.

Optional tables

Table O.1.1. *Regional imbalances:* current data for differences among major regions in the distribution of economically active in the three sectors of the economy. Here some of the tables from the ECE studies of regional development may be used, cf. also L. NEUENDORFER. *Atlas sozialökonomischer Regionen Euroas*, Baden-Baden, Lutzeyer, 1964-65 ("regions" here = roughly 500,000 inhab.)

Table O.1.2. *Variations in farm size and land tenure:* information by region on total no. of agricultural units owner-operated or run by tenants, share-croppers, etc., as well as total no. of units by major size brackets, cf. Folke DOVRING. *Land and Labor in Europe 1900-1950*, 2nd ed. The Hague, Nijhoff, 1960, Table 24-25, pp. 150-152; and RUSSETT, *Handbook*. Tables 69. Distribution of Agricultural Land, and 70. Farms and Rented Land as Percentage of Total Farms.

Table O.1.3. *Employees by size of enterprises* (company, corporation). Probably conveniently tabulated by the OECD already, cf. the FORTUNE rankings for European companies.

Table O.1.4. *The significance of religious practice.* Survey data, if available, on extent of religious participation by denomination (preferably measured by per cent of population reported to be regular churchgoers: twice a month or more frequently). Data seem likely to be available for 5-6 countries. SR will check with Roper Center and LIPSET-GLOCK at the University of California at Berkeley.

Concluding note: This chapter will clearly have to rely heavily on the work of economic and social historians, sociologists and educationists. To make sure that we make no blunders in assembling background materials it will be essential to consult a few selected specialists, both on within-country data and on comparative analysis. For the 1950s the DEWHURST *et al.* volume on *Europe's Needs and Resources* happily provides an excellent source of evaluated statistics. The RUSSETT *et al.* Handbook offers possibilities of comparison between SED countries and other European countries, see the appended examples. To initiate a broader process of consultations SR hopes to establish a first collation of the relevant ECE and UNESCO OECD sources during 1965 and to circulate this for comment to a group of economic and ecological experts as well as to the Country Responsibles.

Chapter II: The Evolution of Democracy and the Growth of the Electorate

Priority tables

Table P.2.1. *Size and composition of the electorate:* time series data for the numbers enfranchised by sex and urban-rural residence (if possible) in per cent of all adults (or only adult men until the enfranchisement of women).

Table P.2.2. *Mobilization rates before and after the extension of the suffrage:* data on turnout at the elections before and after the major expansions of the electorate. For the rationale of such tables see S. ROKKAN & H. VALEN “The Mobilization of the Periphery” (in S. ROKKAN ed. *Approaches to the Study of Political Participation*. Bergen, 1962) and S. ROKKAN “Electoral Mobilization, Party Competition and National Integration”, draft of chapter for J. LaPALOMBARA & M. WEINER eds. *Political Parties and Political Development*. Princeton University Press, 1965. Examples of such tables will be circulated to SED participants with the MS of S. ROKKAN “Geography, religion and social class”, a chapter for the forthcoming volume edited by S. M. LIPSET and S. ROKKAN. *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*. New York, Free Press, 1965.

Optional tables

Table O.2.1. *Occupational composition of the electorate before and after major extensions:* An example for Norway will be circulated with S. ROKKAN “Geography, religion and social class” *op. cit.*

Table O.2.2. *Variations in turnout:* time series for rural-urban, men-women, peripheral-central differences in electoral participation since universal suffrage. This table is of course of little interest in countries (or for provinces) practicing compulsory voting.

Chapter III: The main cleavages in society and their structural consequences.

Priority tables

Table P.3.1. *The electoral strength of the major parties:* detailed time series data for all election results since the emergence of national parties. For an example see the *appended table for Norway*. Whenever possible the parties should be ordered along some “left-right” dimension even if this is problematic and has to be explained in footnotes. Votes for each party should be expressed in absolute figures, in per cent of valid votes

and, if at all possible, also in per cent of the electorate = the total enfranchised. Note: tables of this type will in any case be published with the pertinent country chapter in vol. I of S. ROKKAN & J. MEYRIAT eds. *International Guide to Electoral Statistics*. Paris, Mouton, 1965. Photocopies of these tables will be made available to Country Responsibles before they are printed.

Table P.3.2. *Regional variations in party strength:* give strength of each major party for the urban and the rural areas of each region, as defined for Table P.1.1. Shorter time series than for Table P.3.1.

Optional tables

Table O.3.1. *Differences in stands on major issues:* among followers of different parties or within different groups or strata.

An example of such a table will be found in the ROKKAN chapter for the DAHL volume. An effort will be made to explore the possibilities of producing similar tables for the countries for which extensive political survey data are available (Finland, Sweden, the Netherlands, Austria?)

Note: In practice the tables listed for chapter III will be of equal relevance for Ch. IV: the essential difference is that Ch. III will focus on the *historical development* of party oppositions while Ch. IV will deal with the current situation in each major party.

Chapter IV: Political Parties

Priority tables

Table P.4.1. *Party membership:* totals for each party, specifying whether individual dues-paying or collective (union) affiliation. For an example see S. ROKKAN and H. VALEN "The mobilization of the periphery", *op. cit.* Table 3.1.

Table P.4.2. *The local entrenchment of the national parties:* time series or current data for the numbers of local elections fought on non-partisan vs. strictly partisan lines. For such analyses of "politicization" see ROKKAN-VALEN *op. cit.* Because of the great variations in local political arrangements this table will have to be adjusted to fit the country-specific constellations. Cf. the specification for Table P.12.1.

Table P.4.3. *The socio-economic basis of party strength:* estimates, from surveys or ecological analyses, of the per cent voting for each major party (or abstaining) within major occupational groups in rural vs. urban districts (use occupation of head of household and control for sex). For details of such presentations see the paper by S. ROKKAN & H. VALEN

“Regional; Contrasts in Norwegian Politics” in E. ALLARDT & Y. LITTUNEN eds. *Cleavages, Ideologies and Party Systems*. Helsinki, Westermarck Society, 1964.

For the countries in which survey data are not currently available, it may be possible to work out estimates (“guesstimates”?) on the basis of ecological analyses of local variations in the vote, but such figures probably need not be presented in tabular form.

Table P.4.4. *Cultural and religious bases of party strength*: survey data, if available, for region or linguistic identity x denomination x party, controlled for occupation and sex. If the “denomination” is much too heterogeneous in religious orientation (Lutherans in Scandinavia, the *Hervormde Kerk* in the Netherland) differentiations by membership in specified religious associations, or by frequency of churchgoing, may be worth looking into. For examples of Norwegian tabulations see ROKKAN & VALEN “Regional contrasts ...” *op. cit.*

Optional tables

Table O.4.1. *Organizations and parties*: survey data for the party distributions of members in different unions and occupational organizations, see the appended tables from the nation-wide survey carried out in Norway in 1957 and from two later stratum specific surveys.

Table O.4.2. *The recruitment of active citizens*: survey data, if available, for the educational characteristics of the more active (articulate, knowledgeable) and the more passive of the voters for the major parties. For an example see ROKKAN and CAMPBELL article on Norway and the U.S. in *Int. Soc. Sci. J.* 12(1) 1960, 69-99.

Chapter V: Interest groups and popular movements

Priority tables

Table P.5.1. *Memberships in trade unions*: time series for each federation (Communist, Socialist, Catholic, other confessional, etc.), if possible broken down by sectors (agriculture, forestry, manufacturing, services).

Table P.5.2. *Membership in farmers’ organizations, consumer co-operatives, other bodies*: if possible time series data.

Table P.5.3. *Country-specific: growth of memberships* in selected associations of political significance (religious movements, teetotalers, politically divided sports associations, etc.)

Optional tables

Table O.5.1. *Extent of unionization by categories of workers and employees:* if at all possible, break down by branch of economic activity, size of enterprise, public vs. private ownership.

For example, see appended tables from two Norwegian surveys. Direct comparisons between union memberships figures and official labour force statistics can also be carried out, of the tables in A.M. ROSS and P.T. HARTMAN. *Changing Patterns of Industrial Conflict*. New York, Wiley, 1960.

Table O.5.2. *Statistics of industrial conflict:* time series for man-day lost through strikes or lockouts, cf. ROSS and HARTMAN pp. 141-145, 161-162.

Chapter VI: Public Opinion and the Mass Media*Priority table*

Table P.6.1. *The national press:* circulation figures for major newspapers (specify) and for each party press as a whole (contrasted with each party's voting strength). For an example of an analysis of the political role of the press see the article by S. ROKKAN and Per TORSVIK "DerWahler, der Leser und die Parteipresse". *Kolner Zs. Soziol.*, 12(2) 1960: 278-301. SR has recently prepared a plan for an *International Guide to Mass Media Statistics*: this will be circulated to SED participants. If work on this *Guide* is financed by UNESCO, SED volumes may possibly benefit.

Table P.6.2. *The spread of radio and TV:* time series data for sets per 1000 population.

Optional table

Table O.6.1. *Newspaper choice and political allegiance:* Survey data for newspaper reading and party preferences. See the tables in ROKKAN and TORSVIK (English language versions will be circulated later).

Chapter VII: Elections and representation*Priority tables*

Table P.7.1. *Electoral constituencies:* time series for numbers and sizes of constituencies and for regional variations in size: smallest vs. largest.

Table P.7.2 *Electoral computation procedures:* country-specific illustration of procedures in an actual constituency.

Table P.7.3 *Votes and seats*: data for selected elections for the average number of votes per seat for each major party, cf. Tables P.3.1. and P.8.1.

Optional tables:

Table O.7.1. *Electoral mobility*. Survey tables, if available, for the extent of uncertainty and mobility in the electorate. Depending on the character of the available data this table can take a variety of forms, see the appended examples from Norwegian surveys.

Methodological note on chapters IV, VI and VII

A major source of information on the behaviour of the electorates are the *archives of data from sample surveys* now under development, see the articles in the recent issue of "Data in Comparative Research" of the *International Social Science Journal* vol. XVI, 1964, and the SR report on the Second Conference on Data Archives held in Paris in Sept., 1964, forthcoming in *Soc. Sci. Infor.* 4(1), 1965. SR hopes to contact the major centres to get up-to-date information on the contents of surveys so far archived for the SED countries. Some of these surveys may contain data on relevance and should be analyzed if and when possible.

Chapter VIII: Parliament

Priority tables

Table P.8.1. *Composition of Parliament (or each House) by party or groupement*: time series from earliest possible date. For Norway such information has been built into the general table for election results (appended), but it will clearly be better to present information on *voting* in Ch. III, on *vote: seat ratios* in Ch. VII (Table P.7.3) and on *the distribution of seats* in this Ch. VIII. Where the total no. of seats in Parliaments has changed over time the distributions should be expressed both in absolute figures and in percentages of the total *Graphic* presentation may be worth considering, cf. the attempt in the ROKKAN chapter on Norway for the DAHL *Opposition* volume.

Table P.8.2. *The recruitment of parliamentary personnel:* time series for each major party for the sex, age (at entrance), education and occupation (before entrance) of the representatives. Educational and occupational differentiations must of necessity vary from nation to nation. For education a primary, secondary, university differentiation might prove generally applicable, but in several countries further differentiations might be relevant, thus for the Scandinavian countries it will no doubt be of great interest to know about changes in the rates of recruitment of parliamentarians trained in *Folk High Schools*. For occupation it will clearly be of interest to distinguish *officials* (Beamten), local government representatives, professors, various types of lawyers, other professions, teachers, farmers, trade union functionaries, workers, but given the difficulties of reconciling the variety of classifications used, this part of the table must of necessity be handled differently from nation to nation. Irrespective of the nuances of classification it should still be possible to characterize parliaments as predominantly dominated by lawyers and/or academics or not and to gauge the amount of change brought about in the recruitment pattern through the extension of the suffrage and the rise of Socialist parties..

Optional tables

Table O.8.1. *Parliamentary turn-over rates:* times series for the proportion of new entrants and of re-elected (distinguish 3-4 groups according to length of earlier service), if possible by party or party group.

Table O.8.2. *Parliamentary committees:* specify major committees (since WW II?), no. of members and average years of parliamentary service of the members (if this is a good indicator of the importance of seniority in filling prestigious committees – to be discussed in text).

Table O.8.3. *Origins of bills in Parliament:* percentage of Government propositions vs. members' bills. This table will have to be worked out differently in each national case, depending on the established legislative procedures. For an example of a possible solution see Nils ANDREN. *Modern Swedish Government*. Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell, 1961, p. 80.

Table O.8.4. *Party discipline in Parliament:* if at all feasible and relevant for the given Parliament, examples should be given of role-call analyses of party divisions on given issues.

Chapter IX: The Government

Priority tables

Table P.9.1. *List of cabinets:* specify names of Premier, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of Finance (others?), no. of months in power, total number of members, and the parties represented.

Table P.9.2. *Parties in government vs. parties in opposition:* follow-up from Table P.9.1.

A good model is Table II in DAALDER's chapter on the Netherlands for the DAHL *Opposition* volume. This gives for each cabinet.

- (a) the total voting strength of the parties represented in the Cabinet;
- (b) the voting strength of other supporting parties without direct representation in the Cabinet;
- (c) the strength of the parties not in the Government.

This might be followed up by a *summary* table for months of exposure to government responsibility vs. months of direct opposition, cf. Table O.9.1. If individual parties are frequently divided for and against the Cabinet, a table of *major votes* may be worth considering, of the way this can be handled for France by Philip WILLIAMS. *Politics in Post-War France*. London, 1955, Appendix IX, pp. 438-439 and the *graph* used by Maurice DUVERGER. *Droit constitutionnel et institutions politiques*. Paris, 1955, pp. 610-611.

Table P.9.3. *Differentiations within the Cabinet:* specify for each cabinet the portfolios and indicate changes. For an example, of Hans DAALDER *Cabinet Reform in Britain 1914-1963*. Stanford, 1963, Appendix pp. 341-353.

Optional tables

Table O.9.1. *Total party experience of government, coalition or opposition:* give for 3-4 major periods of parliamentary history and for each party the total no. of months of full government responsibility, coalition experience and direct opposition. A good model is Table VII. In LORWIN's chapter on Belgium for the DAHL *Opposition* volume.

Table O.9.2. *Educational and occupational origin of Cabinet members:* time series if possible, cf. the specifications for Table P.8.2.

Chapter X: The Role of the Bureaucracy

Priority tables

Table P.10.1. *Maning table for public sector:* specify for a recent year total no. of employed at different levels of responsibility (distinctions to

be explained in text or in footnotes) within (a) ministerial departments, (b) external public directorates, (c) public enterprises.

Table P.10.2. *Educational and occupational origins of higher officials:* preferably for three points in time, specifying lawyers, other academics, non-academics, also central administration vs. “outer” organs of government.

Table P.10.3. *Major categories of public expenditure:* give the accounts for at least three different points in time specifying per cent of totals spent on armed forces, transportation and public works, education, social services, other categories? DEWHURST *et al. Europe’s Need and Resources* gives p. 1059 a breakdown for all SED countries (except Iceland) by defence vs. civil expenditures and on pp. 1062-63 for Austria, Belgium Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland the distributions of expenditures on (a) health and social security, (b) national defence, (c) education and cultures, (d) justice and police, (e) general administration, (f) transport and communications, (g) subsidies, (h) housing. See also the append tables from the RUSSETT *Handbook*.

Table P.10.4. *Major categories of governmental income:* also for at least three points in time, specify direct taxes on income, property, inheritance vs. indirect taxes, customs duties, etc. Cf. DEWHURST *et al.* p. 453.

Optional table

Table O.10.1. *Levels of direct taxation:* for different income brackets and for different numbers of dependents. For an example of a comparative presentation, see the table in footnote 32 of the ROKKAN chapter on Norway for the DAHL *Opposition volume*.

Chapter XI: Control over the Administration and Redress of Grievances

No tables suggested?

Chapter XII: Local Government and Local Politics

Priority tables

Table P.12.1. *Turnout and partisan voting at local elections:* show differences in turnout in local vs. national elections and extent of partisan vs. non-partisan voting by size of community. While Table P.4.2. is to present information on the numbers of local elections fought by *each* party, this table is designed to give the basic data on the *distinctiveness of*

local elections: the level of turnout and the extent of non-partisan voting (irrespective of which national parties take part). For examples of such analyses see the ROKKAN-VALEN papers cited earlier.

Table P.12.2. *Local vs. central expenditures*: time series data for relative sizes of local, provincial and central budgets with specifications of major sources of income.

Optional table

Table O.12.1. *Local government experience as a factor of parliamentary recruitment*: specify by party the numbers of elected legislators who have been mayors, local councilors, etc. The classic article on this local-central recruitment channel is W.J.M. MacKENZIE “Local Government Experience of Legislators” *Public Administration* 32, 1954: 409-423. Henry VALEN has carried out a detailed analysis both for candidates and elected members in Norway: tables from this study will be circulated later to SED participants.

Chapter XIII: The Impact of External Forces

Priority tables

Table P.13.1. *Foreign trade as per cent of GNP*: DEWHURST *et al.* p. 637 and Appendix 20-2, p.1144, rank the SED countries as follows for 1955:

Commodity and Invisible Trade		
	Credits	Debits
	(in p.c. of GNP)	
Norway	42.0	46.2
Iceland	41.6	46.1
Netherlands	46.4	43.1
Ireland	34.1	42.7
Belgium – Lux	36.2	33.3
Denmark	33.4	32.8
Switzerland	31.6	28.5
Sweden	26.9	27.1
Finland	26.7	25.5
Austria	22.8	25.5

It is characteristic that all the SED countries rank higher than the larger European powers:

U.K.	22.0	22.2
France	16.9	16.8
Germany	17.6	16.0
Italy	12.8	13.8

SED participants are asked to check national sources for further estimates, both for longer time spans and for major commodity groups (*e.g.*: how dependent is the country on imports of Food and Foodstuff and of Fuels?). SR will check through OECD sources for more recent figures.

Table P.13.2. *Major trading partners*: specify for 3-4 points in time (starting before WWI) the rank order of trading partners (separately for exports and imports) on the basis of their percentage shares of total exports and total imports.

Karl DEUTSCH *et al.* have stimulated a great deal of work on the development of economic interdependence as measured by trade figures. A “sociometric” table from a recent paper by Bruce RUSSETT (“Some Prospects for Regional Integration and Stress”, Oct. 1964) may be of interest as an illustration:

“Northwest Europe”: trade data for 1954

	Norway	Iceland	Denmark	Sweden	Finland	Spain	Portugal	Netherlands	West Germany	Ireland	Israel	Brazil
To:												
From:	.74	.79	.65	.65	.67	.63	.54	.35	.31	.43	.44	.45
Norway	X	6	1	2	4	5	11		8		*	9
.80		6	1	1	5	10	x		*		11	7
Iceland	3		6	*	2	4	1		*	9	5	10
.79	2	*	5	*	2	4	1		*	5	4	10
Denmark	2	1		3	6				5			8
.71	3	3	*	2	9				8			11
Sweden	1	4	2		3	*	*	11	5			8
.70	1	5	2	*	7	*	*	10	*	11		8
Finland	*	1	3	*		10		*	11	7	6	*
.59	*	1	6	*	*	*		*	*	4	6	*
Spain	7	1	*	*	8				6	*		*
.58	10	2	*	9	10	*			10	9		*
Portugal	11			9		3			7	10	4	
.43	*			*		9	*		*	8	7	
Netherlands	5	9	6	2	3	*	*		4			
.45	8	7	8	4	8	*	*	*	7	10		
West Germany	10	*	6	4	*	*	11	*			3	*
.41	4	8	4	3	*	*	6	5	*		5	*
Ireland				10	3	2	11		8	x		
.33												
Israel	6	4	11	11	2							
.39	5	4	*	10	1						*	
Brazil	*	*	10	9	3	7			6			*
.37	*	9	10	6	4	11			*			*

Legend

- (1) the figures in the margins are measures of the dependence of the given country *within* the 12-nation cluster: the closer the “loading” is to unity the more the country concentrate its exports or imports within the cluster;
- (2) the *upper* line of figures in each row refers to exports from the given country and ranks its partners from 1 to 11 (some of these

11 do not belong in the cluster – this explains the gaps in the series);

- (3) the *lower* line figures in each row refer to imports to the country in each column and are to be read downwards as a rank ordering of countries from which commodities are received.

Pairs of countries trading more than “expected” with each other as measured by their shares in total world trade are marked by *asterisks*. Blank cells indicate *less* trade than expected.

Comment

Of the SED countries the five Nordic nations all trade heavily with each other: Norway most, Finland least. Finland in fact also has a fair loading in another artificial “cluster”, “Eastern Mediterranean” but this looks suspiciously like an error of computation. In this cluster we also find Austria (heavy loadings) and Switzerland (mainly imports). Belgium and the Netherlands do not fit so clearly into any cluster: they spread their trade more than the other SED countries (Belgium in fact gets shunted into the margins of a “middle East” cluster). Ireland finally has weak loadings in the “Northwest Europe” cluster, but does not appear in the “Commonwealth” cluster. It is regrettable that similar analyses are not available for the years since the EEC and EFTA started their tariff reduction: all RUSSETT’s figures are for 1954. SR will inquire into further studies of this type.

Optional tables

Table O.13.1. *Dependence on foreign investments:* post-1945 time series for foreign investments as per cent of total investments. Can probably be derived without great difficulty from EEC and OECD publications: SR will check. DEWHURST et al. pp. 665-673 gives a table for net balances on donations and capital accounts but their figures must be converted to a common base.

Chapter XIV: The Policy Process

No tables?

Chapter XV: Concluding Chapter

Possibly nation-specific survey tables on apathy, alienation, preference for own vs. foreign style of life, etc. – if at all available.

Table 1

Results of elections to the Storting 1882-1961:
registered, valid votes cast, votes and seats gained by each party.

Specifications for each election:

- (1) Registered and votes in absolute numbers
- (2) Valid votes and votes for each party in p.c. of registered
- (3) Votes for each party in p.c. of valid votes
- (4) Seats: Total and for each party.

A. Indirect elections 1882 – 1903

					PARTIES NOTE 1				
	(1) (4)	Registered Total seats	(1) (2)	Valid votes Turnout	LAB	LEFT	MOD.	NAT. LTB.	RIGHT
1882	(1)	99,501		71,304		44,803			26,501
	(2)			71.7		45.0			26.6
	(3)					62.8			37.2
	(4)	114				83			31
1885	(1)	122,952		90,697		57,683			33,284
	(2)			74.0		46.9			27.1
	(3)					63.4			36.6
	(4)	114				84			30
1888	(1)	128,368		89,329		37,320	17,445		34,564
	(2)			69,6		29.1	13.6		26.9
	(3)					41.8	19.5		38.7
	(4)	114				39	24		51
1891	(1)	139,690		101,839		51,780	<i>Note 2</i>		50,059
	(2)			72.9		37.1			35.8
	(3)					50.8			49.2
	(4)	114				63	(16)		51 (35)
1894	(1)	184,124		165,147	520	83,165	<i>Note 2</i>		81,462
	(2)			89.7	0.3	45.2			44.2
	(3)				0.3	50.4			49.3
	(4)	114			-	59	(15)		55 (40)
1897	(1)	195,956		166,177	947	87,548	<i>Note 2</i>		77,682
	(2)			84.8	0.5	44.7			39.7
	(3)				0.6	52.7			46.7
	(4)	114			-	79	(10)		35(25)
1900	(1)	415,902		235,410	7,013	127,142	<i>Note 2</i>		96,092
	(2)			56.5	1.7	30.5			23.1
	(3)				5.2	54.0			40.8
	(4)	114			-	77	(6)		37(31)
1903	(1)	433,273		236,641	22,948	101,142	<i>Note 2</i>	<i>Note 3</i>	106,042
	(2)			54.6	5.3	23.3			24.5
	(3)				12.1	43.0			44.9
	(4)	117			4	50	(11)	(5)	63(47)

Table 1 (Contd.)

B. Elections in single-member constituencies 1906-1918

PARTIES NOTE 1

	(1) (4)	Registered Total seats	(1) (2)	Valid votes Turnout	LAB	WK.D.	LEFT	AGR	NAT. LIB.	RIGHT	OTHER	
1906	(1)	446,705		269,271	43,134	12,819	121,562			88,323		
	(2)			60.3	9.7	2.9	27.2			19.8		
	(3)				16.0	4.8	46.4			32.8		
	(4)	123		10	4	73				36		
1909	(1)	760,277		422,684	91,268	15,550	128,367		Note 3	175,388	12,033	
	(2)			55.6	12.0	2.0	16.9			23.1	1.6	
	(3)				21.6	3.7	30.4			41.5	2.8	
	(4)	123			11	2	46		(23)	64(41)	-	
1912	(1)	809,582		488,903	128,455		195,526		Note 3	162,074	2,812	
	(2)			60.4	15.9		24.2			20.0	0.3	
	(3)				26.3		40.0			33.2	0.6	
	(4)	123			23	6	70		(4)	24(20)	2	INE
1915	(1)	1,086,657		617,670	198,11	25,658	204,243	6,351	Note 3	179,028	4,233	
	(2)			56.9	18.2	2.4	18.8	0.6		16.5	0.4	
	(3)				32.1	4.2	33.1	1.0		29.0	0.7	
	(4)	123			19	6	74	1	(1)	21(20)	2	INE
1918	(1)	1,186,602		662,521	209,560	21,980	187,657	30,925	Note 3	201,325	11,039	
	(2)			55.9	17.7	1.9	15.8	2.6		17.0	0.9	
	(3)				31.6	3.3	28.3	4.7		30.4	1.7	
	(4)	126			18	3	51	3	(10)	50(40)	1	INE

Table 1 (Contd.)

C. Elections under d'HONDT PR list system

PARTIES NOTE 1

	(1) (4)	Registered Total seats	(1) (2)	Valid votes Turnout	CP	LAB.	SOC.D.	WK.D.	LEFT	AGR.	NAT.	RIGHT	OTHER
1921	(1)	1,351,183		904,699		192,616	83,629	22,970	181,989	18,657	Note 3	301,372	2,811
	(2)			66.9		14.3	6.2	1.7	13.5	8.8		22.5	0.2
	(3)					21.3	9.2	2.5	20.1	13.1		33.3	0.3
	(4)	150				29	8	2	37	17	(14)	57(43)	-
1924	(1)	1,412,441		973,941	59,401	179,567	85,743	17,144	180,979	131,706	Note 3	316,846	2,555
	(2)			69.0	4.2	12.7	6.1	1.2	12.8	9.3		22.4	0.2
	(3)				6.1	18.4	8.8	1.8	18.6	13.5		32.5	0.3
	(4)	150			6	24	8	2	34	22	(11)	54(11)	-
1927	(1)	1,484,409		999,297	40,075	368,106		13,459	172,568	149,026	14,439	240,091	1,5333
	(2)			67.3	2.7	24.8		0.9	11.6	10.0	1.0	16.2	0.1
	(3)				4.0	36.8		1.3	17.3	14.9	1.4	24.0	0.2
	(4)	150			3	59		1	30	26	1	30	-
1930	(1)	1,550,077		1,194,755	20,351	374,854		9,228	241,355	190,220	31,003	327,731	
	(2)			77.1	1.3	24.2		0.6	15.6	12.3	2.0	21.1	
	(3)				1.7	31.4		0.8	20.2	15.9	2.6	27.4	
	(4)	150			-	47		1	33	25	3	41	

Table 1 (Contd.)

PARTIES NOTE 1

	(1) (4)	Registered Total seats	(1) (2)	Valid v. Turnout	CP.	LAB.	WK.D	LIB.	CHR.	AGR.	NAT. LIB.	CONS.	NAT. SOC.	OTHER: SPECIFIED	
1933	(1)	1,643,498		1,248,686	22,773	500,526	6,858	213,153	10,272	173,634	20,184	252,506	27,850	20,916	(COM'W.18,786)
	(2)			76.0	1.4	30.5	0.4	13.0	0.6	10.6	1.2	15.4	1.7	1.3	
	(3)				1.8	40.1	0.5	17.1	0.8	13.9	1.6	20.2	2.2	1.7	
	(4)	150			-	69	1	24	1	23	1	30	-	1	COM'W.
1936	(1)	1,741,905		1,455,238	4,376	618,616	6,407	232,784	19,612	168,038	19,236	310,324	26,577	49,241	(COM'W.45,109)
	(2)			83.5	0.3	35.5	0.4	13.4	1.1	9.6	1.1	17.8	1.5	2.8	
	(3)				0.3	42.5	0.4	16.0	1.4	11.6	1.3	21.3	1.8	3.4	
	(4)	150			-	70	-	23	2	18	-	36	-	1	COM'W.
1945	(1)	1,961,977		1,485,225	176,535	609,348		204,852	117,813	119,362		252,608		4,654	(COM'W.1,845)
	(2)			75.7	9.0	31.1		10.4	6.0	6.1		12.9		0.2	
	(3)				11.9	41.0		13.8	7.9	8.0		17.0		0.3	
	(4)				11	76		20	8	10		25		-	
1949	(1)	2,159,065		1,758,366	102,722	803,471		235,876	148,340	143,020		311,819		13,088	(COM'W.)
	(2)			81.4	4.8	37.2		10.9	6.9	6.6		14.4		0.6	
	(3)				5.8	45.7		13.4	8.4	8.1		17.7		0.7	
	(4)	150			-	85		21	9	12		23		-	

Table 1 (Contd.)

D. Election SAINTE-LAGUE PR list system

PARTIES NOTE 1

1953	(1) (4)	Registered Total seats	(1) (2)	Valid v. Turnout	CP	SP	LAB.	LIB.	CHR.	AGR.	CONS.	OTHER
1953	(1)	2,256,799		1,779,831	90,422		830,448	177,662	186,627	160,583	344,067	
	(2)			78.8	4.0		36.8	7.9	8.3	7.1	14.8	
	(3)				5.1		46.7	10.0	10.5	9.0	18.8	
	(4)	150			3		77	15	14	14	27	-
1957	(1)	2,298,376		1,791,128	60,060		865,675	173,525	183,243	166,757	338,651	3,209
	(2)			77.9	2.6		37.7	7.5	8.0	7.3	14.7	0.1
	(3)				3.4		48.3	9.7	10.2	9.3	18.9	0.2
	(4)	150			1		78	15	12	15	29	-
1960	(1)	2,340,495		1,840,206	53,678	43,996	860,526	163,246	176,896	170,645	368,340	2,888
	(2)			79.1	2.3	1.9	36.8	7.0	7.6	7.3	15.7	0.1
	(3)				2.9	2.4	46.8	8.9	9.6	9.3	20.0	0.2
	(4)	150			-	2	74	14	15	16	29	-

Table 1

NOTES:

1. Parties and party designations 1882-1961:

<i>Norwegian term</i>	<i>Elections</i>	<i>English translation</i>	<i>Abbreviation</i>
<i>Norges Kommunistiske Parti</i>	1924-	Communist Party	CP
<i>Sosialistisk Folke-parti</i>	1961	Socialist People's party	SP
<i>Det Norske Arbeider-parti</i>	1894	Labour Party	Lab.
<i>Norges Social-demokratiske Arbeider-parti</i>	1921-24	Social Democrats	Soc. D.
<i>Arbeiderdemokratene</i>	1906-18	Worker Democrats	Wk.D.
<i>Radikale Folkeparti</i>	1921-36		
<i>Venstre</i>	1882-	Left 1882-1924 Liberals 1927	Left Lib.
<i>Moderate</i>	1888-1903	Moderates	Mod.
<i>Kristelig Folkeparti</i>	1933-	Christian People's party	Chr.
<i>Samfunnspartiet</i>	1933-49	Commonwealth party	Com'W
<i>Landmandsforbundet</i>	1915-18	Agrarians	Agr.
<i>Bondepartiet</i>	1921-53		
<i>Senterpartiet</i>	1957-		
<i>Frisinnede Venstre</i>	1909-30	National Liberals	Nat. Lib.
<i>Frisinnede Folkeparti</i>	1933-36		
<i>Hoire (Hoyre)</i>	1882-	Right 1882-1924 Conservatives 1927	Right Cons.
<i>Nasjonal Samling</i>	1933-36	National Socialists	Nat. Soc.

This ordering of the parties from a working-class "left" to a nationalist-elitist "extreme right" is not based on any detailed analysis of the dimensions of policy disagreements and the likelihood of coalitions. In its basic structure this ordering has been confirmed through analyses of differences in attitudes towards Labour policies (of. Angus CAMPBELL and H.VALEN: "Party identification in Norway and the United States". *Public Opinion Quarterly* 25(4) 1961: 519) but the placement of some of the minor parties in the middle range of the spectrum is questionable and should not be interpreted to reflect detailed research on the "dimensionalities" of Norwegian politics.

2. Separate figures for Moderates and Right votes have only been established for 1888, see *Indstilling S. XX* 1890. For the subsequent elections through 1903 the total votes cast for the two groups have been given in the "Right" column while the divisions of seats have been given in parentheses in the separate columns.
3. Separate figures for the National Liberals and the Right are not given in the statistics. The totals for the two parties have been entered in the "Right" column while the divisions of seats have been given in parentheses in the separate columns.
4. The votes cast for *joint lists* have been divided among the constituent parties on the basis of their ratios of local strength in the preceding election.

**Intended vote by occupation and union membership:
Workers and salaried employees only.**

Data from nation-wide survey 1957.

Intended vota 1957:

<i>Occupation of head</i>	<i>N = 100%</i>	<i>Socialist (CP or Lab.)</i>	<i>Non-socialist</i>	<i>Undertain, refuse</i>	<i>Non-voter, unclear</i>
<i>Worker, manufacturing</i>	209	68%	13	7	12
LO member	136	75%	7	7	11
Not member	73	56%	23	7	14
<i>Worker, other</i>	320	54%	23	7	16
LO member	117	76%	8	7	9
Not member	203	41%	32.5	7.5	19
<i>Salaried</i>	243	26%	50	14	10
LO member	52	52%	33	6	9
Other union	55	16%	60	15	9
Not member	136	21%	52	16	11
<i>All employees</i>	772	49%	29	9	13
LO member	305	72%	12	7	9
Not member	467	34%	40	11	15

LO = Norwegian Federation of Labour

Table O.4.1.-II.

**Party preference by occupation and union membership:
workers, lower civil servants and salaried employees.**

Data from two parallel surveys from 1961:

Men only.

<i>Own occupation</i>		<i>Party preference</i>		
	<i>N = 100%</i>	<i>Socialist (CP, SF or Lab.)</i>	<i>Non-Socialist</i>	<i>Non-voter, refuse, unclear</i>
<i>Worker</i>				
LO member	948	80%	7.5	12.5
Not member	324	48%	30	22
<i>Lower civil servant or salaried (excl. professions)</i>				
LO member	534	73%	16	11
Other union	184	34%	58	14
Not member	403	35%	44	21

Sources: worker data recomputed unpublished study by S. LYSGAARD; data for lower civil servants (tjenestemenn) and non-professional salaried employees recomputed from tables 3.10 and 4.8 in E. FIVELSDAL. *Funkjonarenes syn pa faglige og politiske sporsmal.* Oslo, Universitets-forlaget, 1964.

Table O.5.1.

**Estimates of unionization by
occupation, size of enterprise and sector of the economy:
data from two Norwegian surveys carried out in 1961.**

Men 21 years and over.

Occupation	Sector Size of work place: no of employees		N = 100%	Per cent unionized	
				LO	Other union
<i>Manual workers</i>					
Primary economy		–	59	39%	–
Manufacturing		1-9	117	31%	–
		10-49	166	82%	–
		50-199	158	91%	–
		200+	218	93%	–
Construction:	private		147	71%	–
	public-		78	72%	–
Services:	private		162	64%	–
	public		142	87%	–
<i>Office employees</i>	private	1-15	34	12%	9
		16-49	43	14%	9
		50-499	50	16%	12
		500+	33	6%	61
	municipal		72	72%	
	State		79	66%	
<i>Sales employees</i>	private	1-15	69	14%	3
		16+	59	34%	2
<i>Foremen, technicians</i>	private	1-149	61	31%	8
		150+	71	22%	45
	municipal		32	86%	
	state		33	87%	
<i>Lower civil servants (in transport, police, defence, etc.)</i>	municipal		40	97%	
	state		239	93%	

Sources: data for workers from S.LYSGAARD "Organisasjonsgraden blant norske arbeidere" *Tss. F. samfunnsforsk.* 1964(1): 70-83, Table 5; for civil servants and salaried employees recomputed from E. FIVELSDAL *op.cit.* Tables 3.3. and 3.5. Breakdowns for LO vs. other union memberships cannot be derived from these tables for municipal and

state employees. The over all figures for all categories of *tjenestemenn* and *funksjonarer* are (Table 3.2.).

	<i>N = 100%</i>	<i>LO</i>	<i>Other union</i>
Private	469	21%	17
Co-operative	44	75%	9
Municipal	196	71%	9
State	344	70%	15

Table SED/R.1.

**COMPARATIVE RANKING OF
19 W. EUROPEAN COUNTIES
ON VARIABLES IN THE RUSSETT et al.
WORLD HANDBOOK:
POPULATION (1), AREA (40) AND DENSITY (41, and 42).**

	<i>Pop. 1961 (1000s)</i>	<i>Rank All 19</i>	<i>SED</i>	<i>Area (km²)</i>	<i>Bank All 19</i>	<i>SED</i>	<i>Density: standard measure (pop. per km²)</i>	<i>Rank All 19</i>	<i>SED</i>	<i>Density: "effective" (pop. per 1000 ha. Agricultural land)</i>	<i>Rank: All 19</i>	<i>SED</i>
<i>SED Counties:</i>												
Austria	7.080	12	4	83.849	13	5	84	10	6	1.720	9	6
Belgium	9.184	8	2	30.507	18	10	301	2	2	5.257	1	1
Denmark	4.617	14	6	43.042	15	7	107	8	8	1.434	11	9
Finland	4.467	15	7	337.009	5	2	13	17	9	1.512	12	8
Iceland	17.9	19	11	103.000	11	4	2	19	11	79	19	11
Ireland	2.815	17	9	70.283	14	6	40	14	7	598	17	10
Luxembourg	317	18	10	2.586	19	11	123	7	4	2.286	8	5

Netherlands	11.637	7	1	32.450	17	9	346	1	1	4.855	2	2
Norway	3.611	16	8	323.917	6	3	11	18	10	3.420	4	3
Sweden	7.520	11	3	449.682	4	1	17	16	8	1.705	10	7
Switzerland	5.496	13	5	41.288	16	8	133	6	3	2.320	7	4
<i>SED range</i>												
max	11.637	7		449.682	4		346	1		5.257	1	
min	17.9	19		2.586	19		2	19		79	19	
<i>Major European powers</i>												
France	45.960	4		551.208	2		83	11		1.288	14	
Germany F.R.	54.027	1		247.960	8		217	3		3.631	3	
Italy	49.455	3		301.226	7		164	5		2.323	6	
United Kingdom	52.925	2		244.016	9		217	4		2.677	5	
<i>"Major power" range</i>												
max	54.027	1		551.208	2		217	3		2.677	5	
min	45.960	4		244.016	9		83	11		1.288	14	

<i>Other "Western Bloc" countries</i>												
Greece	8.402	9		132.562	10		64	12		930	16	
Portugal	8.992	10		92.200	12		100	9		1.087	15	
Spain	30.559	5		503.486	3		61	13		1.347	13	
Turkey	28.602	6		780.576	1		37	15		483	18	

Source: B.M. RUSSETT *et al.* *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators*. New Haven, Yale university Press, 1964, Tables 1, 40, 41, and 42.

**COMPARATIVE RANKINGS OF
19. W. EUROPEAN COUNTRIES
ON VARIABLES IN THE RUSSETT et al.
WORLD HANDBOOK:**

**URBANIZATION (9). LABOUR FORCE IN PRIMARY ECONOMY (50)
GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT PER CAPITA (44).**

	<i>Pop. in Cities over 20,000 (p.c.)</i>	<i>Rank</i>		<i>P.c. of activities in primary sector (1950s)</i>	<i>Rank All 19 SED</i>		<i>G.N.P. 1957 per. cap (U.S.)</i>	<i>Rank</i>	
		<i>All 19.</i>	<i>SED</i>					<i>All 19</i>	<i>SED</i>
<i>SED Countries</i>									
Austria	39.8	8	5	32	7	3	670	12	9
Belgium	32.0	12	8	10	13	9	1.196	4	4
Denmark	48.5	4	2	23	10	5.5	1.057	7	6
Finland	31.2	13	9	46	5	1	794	11	8
Iceland	40.5	6	4	40	6	2.5	572	13	10
Ireland	35.6	10	6	40	6.5	2.5	550	14	11
Luxembourg	30.6	14	10	23	11	5.5	1.388	2	2

Netherlands	49.8	3	1	11	12	8	836	10	7
Norway	32.8	11	7	26	9.5	4	1.130	6	5
Sweden	40.8	5	3	13	13	6	1.380	3	3
Switzerland	29.9	16	11	12	14	7	1.428	1	1
<i>SED-range</i>									
max:	48.5	4		40	6		1.428	1	
min:	29.9	16		10	13		550	14	
<i>Major European Powers</i>									
France	29.9	17		26	9.5		943	8	
Germany F.R.	55.1	2		14	12		927	9	
Italy	30.3	15		29	8		516	15	
United Kingdom	66.9	1		5	14		1.189	5	
<i>“Major Power” range</i>									
max:	66.9	1		29	8		1.189	5	
min:	29.8	17		5	14		516	15	

<i>Other "Western Bloc" countries</i>									
Greece	38.4	9		48	4		340	16	
Portugal	15.5	19		48	3		224	18	
Spain	39.8	7		50	2		293	17	
Turkey	18.2	18		77	1		220	19	

Source: B.M. RUSSETT *et al.* *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1964. Tables 9, 44 and 50.