Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

*First Form for Party*

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

**Party:** Center Democrats

**Party Founding Date:** 1973

**Long Record #:** D.CD.0

**Change #:** 0

A. Venue of Leadership

**Position(s) of Leadership involved:** Chair of the Party

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

**Leader A: Erhard Jakobsen**

Characteristics of Leader A **at time of leadership change**:

**Birthdate:** February 1917

(Former) **occupation:** University-trained economist; worked in taxation department; had been mayor for a number of years

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any):** None (founder of party)

**Other relevant information on the leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:** The charismatic person in Danish politics, very extroverted; gets along very well on TV; can make a difference during campaigns. Not dictatorial, but a strong leader.
Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Conservatives

Long Record #: D.C.1

Change #: 1

Date of Change: October, 1955

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of Leadership involved: Folketing Group Chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Ole Bjorn Kraft

(See Previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Aksel Moller

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: January, 1906

(Former) occupation: University trained economist; insurance business; more or less fulltime politician.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): A new generation taking over; a bit more center oriented.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He was very respected and well-liked. People saw him as the one who could raise the level of support for the party again.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

X Former leader resigned for other reason: (Non-political
personal reasons.) Retired voluntarily to work on his international work as part of "Oxford movement," "moral majority" religious movement.

___ Former leader lost leadership election
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
Yes: Definitely (age only).

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): Anticipated/ hoped for a more centrist orientation in the economics field (even had some sympathy for Keynes).
Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

*First Form for Party*

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

**Party:** Christian People's Party

**Party Founding Date:** 1970

**Long Record #:** D.KrF.0

**Change #:** 0

A. Venue of Leadership

**Position(s) of Leadership involved:** Extraparliamentary party chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

**Leader A:** Jacob Christensen

Characteristics of **Leader A at time of leadership change:**

**Birthdate:** Middle-aged (50s?)

**(Former) occupation:** Doctor of Medicine.

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any):** None

**Other relevant information on the leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:** One of the founding members of the party. It was expected that he was for "interim."
Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

**Party**: Christian People's Party

**Long Record #**: D.KrF.1

**Change #**: 1

**Date of Change**: March, 1973

A. **Venue of Leadership**

**Position(s) of leadership involved**: Extraparliamentary party chair.

B. **Identification/Characteristics of Leaders**

**Leader A**: Jacob Christensen

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

**Leader B**: Jens Moller

Characteristics of **Leader B at time of leadership change**:

**Birthdate**: January, 1921

**(Former) occupation**: Teacher; also trained in Catholic theology; had been missionary in India.

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any)**: Founding fathers were more inclined to see the party as social-liberal as well as Christian; he was from the "Christian party" wing.

**Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.**: Forthright, nothing special.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

**X** Former leader resigned for other reason: Lost within the
executive committee on a resolution dealing with the general
direction of the party. (Not forced to resign, just saw self in
the minority; a personal decision, but for political
considerations.)

___ Former leader lost leadership election

___ Forced rotation or term limitations

___ Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to
resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)

___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which
would
   lead to electoral failures in the future

___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses
   of power)

___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change: He was
not pressured.

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with)
change in dominant faction?
Yes: Founders sought to mix in a social liberal element, Moller
represented the "Christian purist" element.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a
generational shift?
No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g.,
change being made to result in different leadership style,
different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
None
Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Christian People's Party
Long Record #: D.KrF.2
Change #: 2
Date of Change: 1979

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Extraparliamentary party chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Jens Moller

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Christian Christensen

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: January, 1925

(Former) occupation: Teaching; headmaster of public school system in his county.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): He is on the social-liberal, "moderate" side rather than a purist on Christianity (i.e., he is not as "right wing" as Moller).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: None

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died
___ Former leader resigned due to ill health
X Former leader resigned for other reason: Personal, not
political; under pressure of too much work in the parliament, simply not enough time to do both.

___ Former leader lost leadership election
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
Yes: This involved a change in dominant tendency (also, see above and see Dominant Faction data book).

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): The new leader was more consensus oriented.
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Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Christian People's Party

Long Record #: D.KrF.3

Change #: 3

Date of Change: May, 1988

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Extraparliamentary party chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Christian Christensen

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Flemming Kofod-Svendsen

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: March, 1944

(Former) occupation: Lutheran priest.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Same as Christensen.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: None

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

__ Former leader died
___ Former leader resigned due to ill health
___ Former leader resigned for other reason:
___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations

___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)?

___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future?

___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

___ other clearly political reasons:

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
None
Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Christian People's Party

Long Record #: D.KrF.4

Change #: 4

Date of Change: May, 1990

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Extraparliamentary party chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Flemming Kofod-Svendsen

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Jann Sjursen

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: Very young (young 30s).

(Former) occupation: Missing. (Lars Bille thinks he was probably a teacher.)

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): A modernizer (see below) as opposed to the traditionalists.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: None

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

___ Former leader resigned for other reason:
___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations

X Other*: The result of an organizational change to reduce the work of the parliamentary group and to make the extraparliamentary organization more active and visible. The organizational change formally separated the two, so that the extraparliamentary chair could not be a parliamentary group leader also.

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
___ pressure to resign because of political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change: Elections had nothing to do with it.

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
Yes: Traditionalists had been in power. The new leader was selected because he would be a modernizer.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
Yes: Reinterpretation of Christianity in terms of social engagement, environment, etc. Revitalization of Christianity.

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): As he promised in a contested election against a traditionalist, he built on a strong youth organization within the party, and emphasized extraparliamentary party organization.
Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

First Form for Party

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Conservatives

Party Founding Date: pre-1950

Long Record #: D.C.0

Change #: 0

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of Leadership involved: Foreign Minister/ Folketing Group Chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Ole Bjorn Kraft

Characteristics of Leader A at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: December, 1893

(Former) occupation: No formal education; journalist; professional politician.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): From conservative side of Conservative Peoples' Party; more so than previous leader had been.

Other relevant information on the leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Used a different strategy than predecessor who had seen the party as a competitor of the Social Democrats for "people" oriented votes. Kraft was more of a traditional conservative.
Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Conservatives

Long Record #: D.C.1

Change #: 1

Date of Change: October, 1955

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Folketing Group Chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Ole Bjorn Kraft

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Aksel Moller

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: January, 1906

(Former) occupation: University trained economist; insurance business; more or less fulltime politician.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): A new generation taking over; a bit more center oriented.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He was very respected and well-liked. People saw him as the one who could raise the level of support for the party again.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

___ Former leader resigned for other reason: (Non-political
personal reasons.) Retired voluntarily to work on his international work as part of "Oxford movement," "moral majority" religious movement.

___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)?
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future?
___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ other clearly political reasons:

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
Yes, definitely (age only).

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
Anticipated/ hoped for a more centrist orientation in the economics field (even had some sympathy for Keynes).
Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Conservatives
Long Record #: D.C.2
Change #: 2
Date of Change: March, 1958

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Folketing Group Chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Aksel Moller

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Paul Sorenson

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: June, 1904

(Former) occupation: Union, private sector businesses, General Secretary for the party.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): None

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Became known as a "party owner" within a few years; was in complete control of party. A "political animal;" characterized as very introverted.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

__X Former leader died
___ Former leader resigned due to ill health
___ Former leader resigned for other reason:
Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)?

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future?

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons:

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?

Not as compared to Aksel Moller (they were of the same breed).

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

Tactical/ strategic/ organizational genius. (Paul Moller provided more of the "public face.") Took party more toward "people" and away from "conservative." Built up the organization, away from cartel, towards mass party.
Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94, 5/18/99)

Party: Conservatives

Long Record #: D.C.3

Change #: 3

Date of Change: June, 1969

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Sorensen had first been selected as parliamentary group chair, but then was in the cabinet. Moller was first selected as parliamentary group spokesperson, but was in the cabinet when designated as the true party leader.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Paul Sorenson

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Poul Moller

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: October, 1919

(Former) occupation: Journalist

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): None

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: None

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

_X_ Former leader died: heart (date of death: June 29, 1969)

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

___ Former leader resigned for other reason:
__ Former leader lost leadership election*
__ Forced rotation or term limitations
__ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," was this due to

__ electoral failure(s)
__ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
__ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
__ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?  
No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?  
No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):  
None
Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94, 5/18/99)

Party: Conservatives

Long Record #: D.C.4

Change #: 4

Date of Change: October, 1971

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: From someone who was first selected as spokesperson but was now in the cabinet (Moller) to Folketing Group Chair (Ninn-Hansen)

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Poul Moller

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Erik Ninn-Hansen

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: April, 1922

(Former) occupation: Lawyer

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): At this time, clear, informal factions. Definitely conservative (in stark opposition to Haunstrup Clemmenson, who was the alternative leader at this time, who was "people" oriented; wanted to cooperate with Social Democrats.) [Note: We treat Ninn-Hansen rather than Clemmenson as the leader, since by tradition the parliamentary group chair is the party leader.]

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He was in continual dispute with Haunstrup Clemmenson. He was very much cartel-oriented (i.e., closed inner circle). (Should note: the battle between Hannstrup and Ninn-Hansen was not clearly decided in either one's favor.)
C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:
___ Former leader died
X Former leader resigned due to ill health: heart
___ Former leader resigned for other reason:
___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to
___ electoral failure(s)
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No: The whole period was a fight between two tendencies, led by Clemmenson and Ninn-Hansen.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
Not at this point (comes with P. Schluter).

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
A more rightist orientation was anticipated, but because of the stalemate caused by the factional rivalry, this did not result.
Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Conservatives

Long Record #: D.C.5

Change #: 5

Date of Change: January, 1974

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Folketing Group Chair (Ninn-Hansen), P.M., Extra-parliamentary party chair (Schluter).

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Erik Ninn-Hansen

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Poul Schluter

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: April 1929

(Former) occupation: Lawyer

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Compromise candidate between "people" oriented and "conservatives" (i.e., Ninn-Hansen and Haunstrup Clemmenson) but with right wing or "conservative" tendency.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Put more emphasis on conservative/right wing values. Leadership style: extroverted. Gave sense of being a listener and compromiser. Managed to unite the party. A "perfume salesman" according to opposition.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died
___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

X Former leader resigned for other reason:
___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations

X Other*:
Was pressured to resign to end the civil war, a matter of survival for the party. So did Haunstrup Clemmenson, who left politics.

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

X electoral failure(s): (the #1 reason)

X fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

X other clearly political reasons: Related to the two above, the ongoing civil war within the party "had to stop."

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
A minor victory for the right wing (but eventually turned other way around).

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
Yes

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
None of these
Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

First Form for Party

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Liberals

Party Founding Date: pre-1950

Long Record #: D.V.0

Change #: 0

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of Leadership involved: Extraparlamentary party chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Erik Eriksen

Characteristics of Leader A at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: November, 1902

(Former) occupation: Farmer. Had been chairman of youth organization; posts within farming association.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): None, but considered a "new generation" in 1950.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Had great authority within the party, was the undisputed leader.
Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

**Party**: Liberals  
**Long Record #:** D.V.1  
**Change #:** 1  
**Date of Change**: September, 1965

A. Venue of Leadership  
**Position(s) of leadership involved**: Extraparliamentary party chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders  
**Leader A**: Erik Eriksen  
(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)  
**Leader B**: Paul Hartling

Characteristics of **Leader B at time of leadership change**:

**Birthdate**: August, 1914  
**(Former) occupation**: Lutheran priest, headmaster of school where public school teachers are taught.

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any)**: Was seen as someone who would move the party away from Conservatives, but was not part of the group formally organized to push for that.

**Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.**: Pro-education, firm leadership style.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:  
___ Former leader died  
___ Former leader resigned due to ill health
Former leader resigned for other reason:
(Political reasons.) Because of opposition to his proposal to merge with Conservatives; had tired of politics; resigned without pressure to resign. No one would probably have run against him if he had chosen to run for leadership again.

Former leader lost leadership election*

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)?

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future?

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons: Chose to resign for political reasons, but was not forced to do so.

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
Yes: See above, but not so much with respect to programs. The shift is one of strategy.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
Yes: In a way, but not dramatic (i.e., a "natural" one).

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
Hartling differed from Eriksen in Hartling’s willingness to invite Socialist Liberals to talks about government, thus manifesting some independence for the Liberals from the Conservatives. This was different from the party’s approach under Eriksen. Was seen as a major shift in Danish party politics.
Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

**Party:** Liberals

**Long Record #:** D.V.2

**Change #:** 2

**Date of Change:** December, 1977

**A. Venue of Leadership**

**Position(s) of Leadership involved:** Extraparliamentary party chair.

**B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders**

**Leader A:** Paul Hartling

(See Previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

**Leader B:** Henning Christophersen

Characteristics of **Leader B at time of leadership change:**

**Birthdate:** November, 1939

**(Former) occupation:** University trained economist. Economic advisor to various organizations, wrote for newspapers, vice-chair to national party organization.

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any):** None

**Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:** None

**C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:**

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

**X** Former leader resigned for other reason:

(Voluntary.) Wanted to get out of Danish politics; not really
pressured to resign. Resigned to take a UN High Commissioner job.

___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," was this due to

___ pressure following electoral failure(s)?
___ pressure to resign because of fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future?
___ pressure to resign because of political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ pressure to resign for other clearly political reasons:

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:
Was not pressured to quit due to bad elections, but the electoral results played a role in his own personal decision to quit in 1977.

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
One of the young "liberal lions"; represented an urban liberal (academic) orientation, rather than rural.

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
No particular expectations of change.
DENMARK

Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Liberals

Long Record #: D.V.3

Change #: 3

Date of Change: September, 1984

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of Leadership involved: Extraparliamentary party chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Henning Christophersen

(See Previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Uffe Ellemann-Jensen

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: November 1941

(Former) occupation: University trained economist; journalist; short-term member of party, no previous party offices.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Not really an ideological faction, but represented the urban wing of party (increasingly important in 1970s and 1980s). It was a contested leader election, where his opponent represented the old rural base of the party.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: A very charismatic person. His training as journalist made him quick with a punchline. Seeks confrontations in the sense of being very clear in his positions/ statements; opposes consensus style of Danish politics, but nevertheless is able to cooperate. Very extroverted.
C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died
___ Former leader resigned due to ill health
___ Former leader resigned for other reason: Got job in EC.
___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," was this due to

___ pressure following electoral failure(s)?
___ pressure to resign because of fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future?
___ pressure to resign because of political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ pressure to resign for other clearly political reasons:
Reduced to being second fiddle (in 1982) to Conservative party prime minister in 1982. This element played a role in election of Ellemann-Jensen as someone who could "sell tickets."

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
Not really.

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
Had TV appeal. Because of his training as TV journalist, it was
expected that he could appeal better to voters on television; he had created his career through media rather than the party. This entailed a change of campaign skills/ approach.
Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

First Form for Party

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Progress

Party Founding Date: 1972

Long Record #: D.FrP.0

Change #: 0

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of Leadership involved: Kampagneleader (self invented title).

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Mogens Glistrup

Characteristics of Leader A at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: May 1926

(Former) occupation: Tax Lawyer

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Initially, none. Was founder of the party.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Very charismatic; dictatorial leadership style. Controversial, extremist, no compromises, pure protest.
Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94, 5/99)

Party: Progress

Long Record #: D.FrP.1

Change #: 1

Date of Change: October, 1984

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: From founder and Kampagneleader (Glistrup) to Folketing Group Chair (Dohrmann)

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Mogens Glistrup

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Helge Dohrmann

(Actually, Dohrmann and Kjaersgaard shared leadership during the period after Glistrup was jailed. Because Kjaersgaard was brand new to her position, however, it is reasonable to treat Dohrmann as #1 for the first few years, up to the 1987 election.)

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: March 22, 1939

(Former) occupation: Entrepreneur; owner of a small company that rented machines used in construction (bulldozers, etc.)

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): the more moderate wing

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: None

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died
__ Former leader resigned due to ill health
_X Former leader resigned for other reason: went to prison
__ Former leader lost leadership election*
__ Forced rotation or term limitations
__ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

__ electoral failure(s)
__ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
__ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
__ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No, not yet.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): None
Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94, 5/99)

Party: Progress
Long Record #: D.FrP.2
Change #: 2
Date of Change: September, 1987

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: From Folketing Group Chair to Folketing spokesperson.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Helge Dohrmann
(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Pia Kjaersgaard

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: February 1947

(Former) occupation: Cared for homebound people, clerk in an insurance/advertising office. Political experience all in this party.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): More moderate wing; "cooperative strategy" strongly opposed to pure protest line.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: More normal and more open leadership style than Glistrup; seen by other parties as more reasonable negotiator (more willing to compromise) than Glistrup; was seen both inside and outside as highly competent.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died
Former leader resigned due to ill health
Former leader resigned for other reason:
Former leader lost leadership election*
Forced rotation or term limitations

Other*: In effect, Dohrmann was simply “replaced” as #1 when the party experienced a very good electoral performance in 1987, which was largely credited to the campaigning by Kjaersgaard. The two continued, though, to share leadership until Dohrmann died in 1989. Kjaersgaard’s retention of leadership (in presence of Glistrup's return to parliament in the 1987 election) was due in part to the attribution of the party’s electoral success to Kjaersgaard; she had turned a downward trend into an upward one.

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)
fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
Yes: While Glistrup was in prison, Dohrmann and particularly Kjaersgaard established themselves as more moderate, compromise-oriented leaders. In the aftermath of Kjaersgaard’s good election in 1987, which marks her ascendance to clearly being the party’s #1 leader, it is reasonable to think that Kjaersgaard and her followers were bent on leading the party in a significantly different direction from the “purely protest” one established by Glistrup at the party’s founding.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No: Her allies cut across age lines; it was generational only in that she was not there from the beginning.
Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): Kjaersgaard was not necessarily different from Dohrmann (who tended to stay more “behind the scenes” than Kjaersgaard) in leadership style, though there were certainly some quite obvious differences from Glistrup.
DENMARK

Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

First Form for Party

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Radical Liberals

Party Founding Date: pre-1950

Long Record #: D.RV.0

Change #: 0

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of Leadership involved: Folketing Group chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Jorgen Jorgensen

Characteristics of Leader A at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: May 1888

(Former) occupation: Trained as farmer, was farmer, in politics since 1920s

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): No factions.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He was the "public face" of the party and its "concept" person, but we should note that he shared power with Dahlgaard who was more of the organization man and tactician.
DENMARK

Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Radical Liberals

Long Record #: D.RV.1

Change #: 1

Date of Change: October, 1964

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: From a former parliamentary group chair and then Cabinet member, to a parliamentary group chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Jorgen Jorgensen

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Karl Skytte

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: March, 1908

(Former) occupation: Farmer.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): None.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Nothing special; very respected/ well liked, a "farmer's farmer."

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

X Former leader resigned for other reason: Personal, old age. Completely voluntary, not pressured. There had been talk of the
time for him to retire, but he was not forced to do so.

___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No: Not really, except technically. The new leader was younger, but this was not reflected in orientation or tactics or positions. "Business as usual" continued.

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
None
DENMARK

Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Radical Liberals

Long Record #: D.RV.2

Change #: 2

Date of Change: January, 1968

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: From Folketing Group Chair (Skytte) to Cabinet minister (Baunsgaard).

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Karl Skytte

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Hilmar Baunsgaard

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: February, 1920

(Former) occupation: Salesman, commercial trades; had been chair of youth organization.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Tactical faction/tendency; Baunsgaard wanted cooperation with liberals and conservatives. (Skytte wanted cooperation with Social Democrats).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Extrovert. Very popular, with ability to talk with people via TV; had media appeal. Was not a strong Prime Minister, a man of compromise.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health
Former leader resigned for other reason: Voluntary (political reasons). Disagreement between Baunsgaard and Skytte over which parties to cooperate with. Skytte resigned to resolve the ongoing battle.

Former leader lost leadership election*

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
Yes: New tactical tendency; Baunsgaard's group's approach won out (i.e., to cooperate with liberals and conservatives).

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): Tactical change; cooperation with liberals and conservatives. Was seen as some one who could move the party away from Social Democrats and make it an independent center party that could deal either way.
Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

**Party:** Radical Liberals

**Long Record #:** D.RV.3

**Change #:** 3

**Date of Change:** May, 1977

A. **Venue of Leadership**

**Position(s) of leadership involved:** Folketing Group Chair.

B. **Identification/Characteristics of Leaders**

**Leader A: Hilmar Baunsgaard**

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

**Leader B: Svend Haugaard**

Characteristics of **Leader B at time of leadership change:**

**Birthdate:** April 1913

**(Former) occupation:** Farmer, theorist in farming; headmaster of high school for very small farmers (smallholders).

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any):** Left wing tendency; opposed military budgets; peace movement-oriented; pacifist wing of party; opposed right wing cooperation.

**Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:**

C. **Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:**

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

**X** Former leader resigned for other reason: Retired voluntarily; for personal reasons only; partly because of feeling lack of
loyalty; always had to fight for his tactical position and "got tired of it."

___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ other clearly political reasons:

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
He represents a different faction, personally, but was selected in spite of that, not because of it. There was simply no other candidate for the job.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): Seen primarily as a transitional figure; no great expectations of change.
Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Radical Liberals

Long Record #: D.RV.4

Change #: 4

Date of Change: October, 1978

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Folketing Group Chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Svend Haugaard

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Niels Petersen

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: January, 1939

(Former) occupation: Law-educated; career politician; never practiced law.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Said the only reasonable cooperation would be with Social Democrats.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Definitely not a media person. Respected as a good tactician, father and mother were both politicians.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

X Former leader resigned for other reason: Was transitional
figure and knew it from the beginning. When Petersen decided to return to politics, Haugaard simply stepped aside to let him become leader.

___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to
___ electoral failure(s)
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
___ political scandal (e.g., over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?  
Yes, but note:
Haugaard was originally chosen as Baunsgaard’s replacement, with Haugaard effectively being the “only one available” at the time. However, Haugaard was only considered to be a caretaker. If Petersen, who replaced Haugaard after just a year, is compared to Baunsgaard (rather than Haugaard) this is a shift in tactical orientation (toward cooperation with the left). We therefore feel justified in coding this as a change of leader associated with a change in dominant tendency (see Dominant Faction data set).

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No: Age only; no sense of "new generation taking over."

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): None
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Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Radical Liberals

Long Record #: D.RV.5

Change #: 5

Date of Change: June, 1991

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Folketing Group Chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Niels Petersen

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Marianne Jelved

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: September 1943

(Former) occupation: Public school teacher; member of party's national executive.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): None.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Firm leader, not particularly extroverted, no particular media expertise, well-informed, studious.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

___ Former leader resigned for other reason:
___ Former leader lost leadership election*  
___ Forced rotation or term limitations  

X Other*: Petersen lost cabinet position in 1990 election, and was blamed for the party's defeat. Jelved continued as Folketing Group Chair and Petersen was no longer the leader. Party lost 3 seats and cabinet status in December 1990 election; was seen as defeat for Petersen (who was seen as government architect). Petersen was not really "forced" to resign, though, but instead just allowed Jelved to take over. This did follow an electoral failure for which Petersen was blamed, but it would not be appropriate to code this as a "1" since the departure was neither due to losing re-election nor due to forced resignation.  

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to  

___ electoral failure(s)  
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future?  
___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)  
___ other clearly political reasons  

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:  

D. Character of the Change:  

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?  
No  

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?  
No  

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): None
Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

First Form for Party

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Social Democrats

Party Founding Date: pre-1950

Long Record #: D.SD.0

Change #: 0

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of Leadership involved: Extraparliamentary Party Chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Hans Hedtoft

Characteristics of Leader A at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1903

(Former) occupation: Printer (laborer); but professional politician in labor movement from early age.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): None, but he was the first of the new generation of leaders taking over after WWII. The new generation was pro-west, pro NATO, and created the basis of the welfare state, compromising with rather than fighting the working class.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:
Data on **Party Leadership Change**

*(from Leader A to Leader B)*

*(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)*

**Party:** Social Democrats

**Long Record #:** D.SD.1

**Change #:** 1

**Date of Change:** February, 1955

A. **Venue of Leadership**

**Position(s) of leadership involved:** Extraparliamentary party chair

B. **Identification/Characteristics of Leaders**

**Leader A: Hans Hedtoft**

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

**Leader B: H. C. Hansen**

Characteristics of **Leader B at time of leadership change:**

**Birthdate:** November 8, 1906

**(Former) occupation:** Typesetter, profession politician since youth; party secretary; cabinet minister (foreign service)

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any):** None ("twin" of Hedtoft, no rivalry between them).

**Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:** Very respected, well liked; maintained tight control of the party.

C. **Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:**

   _X_ Former leader died
   
   ___ Former leader resigned due to ill health
   
   ___ Former leader resigned for other reason:
Former leader lost leadership election*

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change: There was never an issue over who would follow Hedtoft.

Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None of the above, "business as usual."
Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Social Democrats

Long Record #: D.SD.2

Change #: 2

Date of Change: February, 1960

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Extraparliamentary party chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: H.C. Hansen

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Viggo Kampmann

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: July, 1910

(Former) occupation: Government economist and statistician; minister for finance.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Argument was made that "academics" (theoreticians) now took over the party from the blue collar workers.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Up until now, all leaders were directly from the working class. This was the first academic leader. He was more "modern" in style; had an affair which turned into a scandal.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

X Former leader died: Heart attack
Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason:

Former leader lost leadership election*

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
Yes: Kampmann was the spokesperson for Keynesianism, which reflected a shift within the Social Democratic party to the new-thinking academics, trained at the universities.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No: Not so much along generational lines.

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
None
Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

**Party:** Social Democrats

**Long Record #:** D.SD.3

**Change #:** 3

**Date of Change:** September, 1962

A. Venue of Leadership

**Position(s) of leadership involved:** Extraparliamentary party chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

**Leader A:** Viggo Kampmann

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

**Leader B:** J.O. Krag

**Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:**

**Birthdate:** September, 1914

**(Former) occupation:** University-trained economist; employed in the ministry for commerce.

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any):** Same as Kampmann

**Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:** Became known as a tough leader, didn't have the popular appeal of Hedtoft or Hansen, which was a problem as a Social Democratic party. Some considered him cynical (no regard for personal considerations).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

**X** Former leader resigned due to ill health: Heart attack.
___ Former leader resigned for other reason:
___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to
___ electoral failure(s)
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No: He was from the same tendency as Kampmann.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): Nothing was anticipated when he was selected.
Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Social Democrats

Long Record #: D.SD.4

Change #: 4

Date of Change: 1972

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Extraparliamentary party chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: J.O. Kragg

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Erling Dinesen

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: Feb, 1910

(Former) occupation: Shop salesman/clerk; employed in cooperative firms of the labor union movement.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Closest companion to Kragg.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Only a brief internship; a gap-filler in 1972.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

__X__ Former leader resigned for other reason: (See “Other” below.)
Former leader lost leadership election*  
Forced rotation or term limitations  
X Other*: Kragg did not run again for personal reasons, was tired of politics and wanted to try something else; was under no pressure to resign. We use the “resigned for other reason” category on the short form since that is the category that comes closest to this situation.

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to 
__ electoral failure(s)
__ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
__ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
__ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): From the beginning, he was seen only as temporary, he never expected to be leader for long.
Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

**Party**: Social Democrats

**Long Record #**: D.SD.5

**Change #**: 5

**Date of Change**: September, 1973

A. Venue of Leadership

**Position(s) of leadership involved**: Extraparliamentary party chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

**Leader A**: Erling Dinesen

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

**Leader B**: Anker Jorgensen

**Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change**:

**Birthdate**: July, 1922

**(Former) occupation**: He was a trade unionist all his life; unskilled worker; trade union officer.

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any)**: Left wing of the party, a controversial shift away from the academics.

**Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.**: Leadership for next 3 or 4 years quite unstable; there had been disagreement within the party over his selection; some thought he was too leftist. His selection was a shock to everyone except Kragg, who picked him as the permanent successor. Kragg thought the workers needed a worker as chair, at a time when there was increasing support for communists and left wing socialists.

C. **Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time**:
Former leader died
Former leader resigned due to ill health
Former leader resigned for other reason: (See “Other” below.)
Former leader lost leadership election*
Forced rotation or term limitations

Other*: Dinesen was only temporary, so the real shift is Kragg to Jorgensen, for personal reasons only. On the short form we use the “resigned for other reasons” code since it comes closest to this particular situation.

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
Kragg hoped Jorgensen could combine the new leftist elements with the old ones.
9/20/93 (Final alterations: 6/11/99)

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from **Leader A** to **Leader B**)  

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

**Party:** Social Democrats

**Long Record #:** D.SD.6

**Change #:** 6

**Date of Change:** October, 1987

**A. Venue of Leadership**

**Position(s) of leadership involved:** Extraparliamentary party chairs

**B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders**

**Leader A:** Anker Jorgensen  
(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

**Leader B:** Svend Auken

**Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:**

**Birthdate:** May, 1943

**(Former) occupation:** Political scientist at Aarhus; he had been policy spokesperson for the party.

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any):** Generational shift; also member of one of the "coffee clubs" going on at this time, slightly left wing.

**Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:**

**C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:**

__ Former leader died

__ Former leader resigned due to ill health

**X** Former leader resigned for other reason: He was forced out
for two reasons: 1) the party was out of the government and blamed Jorgensen, and 2) the election results were negative.

___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:
The change was made particularly because the party was out of office and showed no signs of getting back in. This was the first time since 1920 they had been out of office for more than one election period.

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
Yes: It resulted in one. Auken was seen as someone who could appeal to the new generation of voters. It was seen as a modernization of the party.

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): He tried to break with the old "stable" image, he tried to make things more "colorful." He was vivid, novel and spontaneous in his approach to politics; not a traditional Social Democrat in terms of his background, but he had good relations with the trade unions. It was not intentional to shed the worker image by electing the academic.
Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Social Democrats
Long Record #: D.SD.7
Change #: 7
Date of Change: April, 1992

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Extraparliamentary party chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Svend Auken
(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Poul Nyrup Rasmussen

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: June, 1943

(Former) occupation: University trained economist, employed as chief economist, federation of the trade unions.
Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Center-oriented.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Seen as more willing to compromise with center parties, which was necessary to get back into government. He could "talk out of both sides of his mouth at the same time." Auken was born into an academic family, Rasmussen was born into a working class family.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:
   ___ Former leader died
   ___ Former leader resigned due to ill health
__ Former leader resigned for other reason:

X Former leader lost leadership election: The first ever to be defeated in open election in Social Democrat history- a major media event. The party won a major election victory in 1990; center parties, though, had no confidence in Auken, so party had to change its chair to get back into government.

__ Forced rotation or term limitations

__ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

__ electoral failure(s)

__ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

__ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

X other clearly political reasons: Yes - see above.

Other relevant information on the reason for the change: Auken's personality was such that the center parties wouldn't trust him. It was not that he was actually too purist to compromise.

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction? No, just a personality shift.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift? No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.): The new leader had a more modest and statesmanlike leadership style.

(See Lars Bille's article from the Madrid European Consortium for Political Research workshop.)
Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

*First Form for Party*

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

**Party:** Socialist People's Party

**Party Founding Date:** 1959

**Long Record #:** D.SP.0

**Change #:** 0

A. Venue of Leadership

**Position(s) of Leadership involved:** Party Founder, Extraparliamentary Party Chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

**Leader A: Aksel Larsen**

(See Previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Characteristics of **Leader A at time of leadership change:**

**Birthdate:** August, 1897

**(Former) occupation:** Steelworker/ laborer; chairman of Communist Party from 1932 until expelled in 1958.

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any):** None

**Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:**

Founder of the party, former Communist party chair. Had tried to make Danish Communist party more moderate/ cooperative than USSR party.
Data on Party Leadership Change
(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Socialist People's Party

Long Record #: D.SP.1

Change #: 1

Date of Change: November, 1968

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Extraparliamentary party chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Aksel Larsen

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Sigurd Omann

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: August, 1923

(Former) occupation: Trained as a lawyer; worked in taxation department, secretary in tax court of appeals.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Non-Marxist oriented faction. (Marxist faction split to form Left Socialists.) Omann wanted to cooperate with the Social Democrat party.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Not a strong leader.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

X Former leader resigned for other reason: Forced to resign due
to the split and resulting deal with those remaining in the Socialist People's Party.

___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

X other clearly political reasons: Pressure following a party split; split occurred over cooperation with Social Democrats to form majority government. Split meant that the government fell, Socialist People's Party lost half its seats in the next election, but split was key. The split, in 1967, resulted in the formation of the Left Socialist party.

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:
Generational shift.

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No: Larsen and Omann were from the same wing (i.e., cooperative).

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
Yes: Aksel Larsen had been there from the beginning of the party and now wanted shift to new generation.

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
Was elected in a deal after the Left Socialist split; Aksel Larsen had to resign some posts.
Data on Party Leadership Change

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

Party: Socialist People's Party

Long Record #: D.SP.2

Change #: 2

Date of Change: May, 1974

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Extraparliamentary party chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Sigurd Omann

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Gert Petersen

Characteristics of Leader B at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: August, 1927

(Former) occupation: Journalist.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Left wing, "movement" oriented (more left wing than Omann); at peak of student movement, etc. A leftist who stayed in the Socialist People's Party even after split occurred.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health

__X__ Former leader resigned for other reason: Pressured to resign
because of factional split; party wanted someone who could make room for the movement within the party.

___ Former leader lost leadership election*
___ Forced rotation or term limitations
___ Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)
___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

X pressure to resign for other clearly political reasons:
Cooperation with Left Socialists played a role in this, but could be seem more as an effort to define an ideological home for leftist movements in Danish politics.

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
Yes: Petersen was of the Left wing, which was "movement" oriented; wanted to cooperate with Communists, but not with Social Democrats.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
No: Not fundamentally, though there was a generational dimension to the change from the founding generation to a leader who could appeal to new blood. It should be noted, though, that Petersen himself had been there from the start.

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
Party tried to incorporate "movement" during his leadership. Used intellectual approach to dealing with movement types.
Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

(Information source: Lars Bille, in person (w/RH), 8/94)

**Party**: Socialist People's Party

**Long Record #**: D.SP.3

**Change #**: 3

**Date of Change**: April, 1991

A. Venue of Leadership

**Position(s) of leadership involved**: Extraparliamentary party chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

**Leader A**: Gert Petersen

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

**Leader B**: Holger K. Nielsen

Characteristics of **Leader B at time of leadership change**:

**Birthdate**: April, 1950

(Former) **occupation**: Political scientist (never in an academic job); was chair of youth organization of party (professional politician).

**Faction/tendency identified with (if any)**: None; factionalism was disappearing.

**Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.**: Open leadership style. Maintaining party's tradition of open debates. Has kept party together while moving it to more of a pro-European Union stance.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

___ Former leader resigned due to ill health
Former leader resigned for other reason: Timing tied to electoral defeat, but here had been talk that it was time for Petersen to make way for a new generation of leadership for some time.

Former leader lost leadership election*

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other*:

*If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

pressure to resign for other clearly political reasons: Generational (see below).

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) change in dominant faction?
No: But only because the factionalism has disappeared.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a generational shift?
Yes: Age-wise in particular. Intellectually, this was a marked shift back from a leftist, ideological orientation to a more practical approach to politics.

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
None