# Background to Coding

| | |
|---|---|
| Australia (AUL) | ***General information*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | Gulf War: We do not count votes for the 1991 Gulf War vote in the House because, formally, there was no division (vote count). One representative formally declared his opposition by asking for a division but on APH rules there must be more than one MP to trigger a division (counting) of votes.<br><br>Iraq War Senate vote 2003: The motion introduced by the government was amended by opposition senator Bartlett (AD) and ultimately aimed at withdrawing ADF personnel from the intervention starting that day. Because the motion no longer reflects the original government position in favor of intervention, we code it as withdrawal vote. The vote also included two pairs of senators not voting to offset absence/illness. These votes are mentioned in the Hansard but by parliamentary procedure they do not count into the official voting record. Hence, we do not count them here as abstentions, either. |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | National Party: Although it also favors more redistributive positions in agricultural policy, we recode the National Party as chriscon because it usually coalesces with the Liberals as a conservative social force with strongholds in the countryside.<br><br>Australian Democrats: There is debate whether AD is a liberal or a social-democratic party. Although its personal and political origins are liberal and so was its behavior as a middle-ground political force between ALP and LIB, it incorporated socially progressive elements (see Ghazarian 2017). We go with CMP and code the party as social-democratic.<br><br>Country Liberal Party: We code the CLP as conservative because it is the regional liberal party of the Northern Territory. Liberal Party does not compete in NT.<br><br>The Greens Western Australia became part of the Australian Greens in October 2008 but we code it as a separate party here because the GWA voting point in the dataset is from 1991. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | Campbell Sharman from the University of British Columbia has been very helpful in dealing with particularities of the Australian parliamentary system. |
| Belgium (BEL) | ***General information*** |
| | There is a considerable difference between government and legislative terms due to the sometimes extremely long government formation periods in Belgium. Leterme III is actually the continuation of the Leterme II cabinet in the long caretaker period since Leterme's resignation (26/04/2010), new elections (13/06/2010) and the formation of Di Rupo I (06/12/2011). Formally, there were no two Di Rupo governments, but the Di Rupo government was still in charge as caretaker government at the time of the Iraq/IS vote, labeled here as Di Rupo II in accordance with ParlGov rules. To be precise, elections took place on 25/05/2014, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | giving rise to a new parliamentary term from 19/06/2014 onwards (i.e the current one). Only on 11/10/2014 the current Michel-government swore office.<br><br>Both the Leterme II government and the Di Rupo II government were in a caretaker status at the time of voting for the Libyan and IS intervention, requiring prior approval by parliament. At the time of the vote for the Mali intervention, the Di Rupo I government was in full powers. Importantly, the parliamentary vote for the Mali intervention took place after the actual decision by the government's Inner Cabinet.<br><br>The wording of the parliamentary resolution on EUTM Mali reflects that the Mali decision-making was not an episode of prior parliamentary approval, nor consultation, but rather an ex post legitimization of a decision that was al-ready taken by the government. Even more remarkable is that several members of parliament urged to include in the resolution that mandate extension from 1 March 2013 onwards would be subjected to parliamentary consultation as well, yet this proposal did not get accepted. In other words, the government already took the decision and parliament considered itself in a situation of information sharing, rather than co-decision or prior approval. |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | For the Leterme III caretaker government, in deviation from ParlGov, we include Open Vld as government party, as their ministers remained part of the government despite their party retiring from Leterme II, then causing the anticipated elections in June 2010.<br><br>While the party LD/LDD does not feature in CHES, based on de ParlGov database, we have labelled it as liberal. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Canada (CAN) | ***General information*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | Not until the 38th Parliament in 2005 were votes recorded with party breakdowns in parliamentary records (https://www.ourcommons.ca/members/en/votes#).<br><br>Votes in the 37th Paliament going backwards are recorded in books that were then photocopied (searchable) and uploaded to the internet. (http://parl.canadiana.ca/browse?show=eng_c_cproc)<br>These entries break votes down by yay and nay rather than by party votes. |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Croatia (CRO) | ***General information*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | For data entries before 2014, the Croatian Parliament did not use electronic voting. MPs voted by a show of hands. Hence, no votes of individual MPs or party votes have been recorded before 2014. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | The DC party is not included as a distinctive party in CMP but is part of a HSLS coalition that is classified as "electoral coalition of diverse origin without dominant party". We code DC as chriscon, also because the alliance has observer status in the European Parliament's EPP faction. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Czech Republic (CZE) | ***General information*** |
| | There were no mission votes between the 1996 SFOR Bosnia vote and the 1999 Eagle Eye (Kosovo). |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | The difference in the amount of Senate votes coded and the House of Deputies votes coded is due to two main factors. The legislative system of the Czech Republic allows the Senate to combine multiple votes in one, effectively reducing the number of votes taken by the Senate. Second, the archive system used for the Senate voting history is making the coherent coding of its votes almost impossible. Therefore, for the moment, we only include those Senate votes that could be counted clearly and which correspond to missions voted in the House of Deputies.<br><br>There are no data concerning voting by individual parties available for the period between 1993 and 1995. However, we included the parliamentary totals for these votes (n=5) in the House of Deputies into the dataset. |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | It is misleading that MARPOR codes KDU-CSL-US-DEU as single party. KDU-CSL-US-DEU was an ad hoc coalition for one election only. US(-DEU) and KDU-CSL were stand-alone parties for all other purposes and we retain them as such.<br><br>ODA is not included in CHES. We coded the party as “liberal”.<br><br>SPR-RSC is not included in CHES. We coded the party as “radical-right”.<br><br>US is not included in CHES. We coded the party as “liberal”. We also code DEU (Demokraticka unie/ Democration Union) lawmakers as US, because the two parties soon merged. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Denmark (DEN) | ***General information*** |
| | One chamber system: Folketinget<br><br>Be aware that Danish parties 'clear' each other so that not every MP needs to be present, yet the quorum of 90 should be fulfilled.<br><br>There are regional parties in the Danish parliament elected in the autonomous parts of the Danish realm: Faroe Islands and Greenland. These parties often do not vote but they are entitled to vote on any issue. Furthermore, foreign affairs and defence are matters for the realm as whole. |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | There's no party or group-specific voting data from 1989/90 to 1996/97. Therefore, only total votes have been coded until 1998. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 07/05/1998: Svend Erik Hovmand (V) voted against by mistake. Coded as a vote 'for' (yes-vote).<br>10/04/14: Pernille Skipper (EL) accidentally voted on behalf of Jeppe Kofod (S). Jeppe Kofods no-vote is therefore coded as a yes-vote.<br><br>Since 2015: There is a new party in parliament not mentioned in the CHES dataset: The Alternative (Alternativet in Danish). Coded as a green party. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| France<br>(FRN) | ***General information*** |
| | The five extension votes on 28 January 2009 have only been held by show of hands or acclamation in the Assemblée nationale, whereas the Sénat took role calls.<br><br>There have not been any votes since 25 November 2015, neither in the 14th legislature (largely corresponding to the Hollande presidency), nor in the 15th (Macron presidency). |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | For the 1991 vote on Iraq under Michel Rocard, in deviation from ParlGov, we classify CDS and M/PRG as in government because of their group's consistent support for the government (and the additional presence of ministers in cabinet). This results in an indeterminate gov/opp status of the liberal group for the Rocard II cabinet<br><br>For Fillon II and III, in deviation from ParlGov, we code AC (next to NC) as being in government.<br><br>In deviation from ParlGov, we mention M/PRG as governmental party for the 1991 vote on Iraq/ Rocard II cabinet. (See also explanations below.) |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | The French party system is highly fragmented. Parliamentary groups do not always and fully correspond to political parties and individual memberships. Therefore, to make the French case comparable with the others, an extensive recoding has been conducted.<br>- The votes of attached members to the group ((r)attachés) were excluded.<br>- For the two huge parliamentary groups in each chamber, the Conservatives and the Socialists (pre-Macron election/ 15th legislature), no data on individual party membership was available. However, given the size of these groups, individual non-party members do not have statistical significance.<br>- PRG and PCF lawmakers have been recoded to one radical-left group in accordance with the CHES families, and<br>- the Greens have been consistently recoded as one group.<br>- For the Liberals, party affiliation data has been extremely limited, especially in the Sénat.<br>Precise coding data can be obtained from the coder.<br>Precise party memberships were often communicated from the group secretariats. Further cross-time classifications of lawmakers have been deducted from this data, and if necessary been completed by other sources and a culturally informed coder.<br><br>In the Assemblée nationale, Liberals include NC, AC, and MoDem lawmakers, which mostly belong to the UDI group. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | In the Sénat, we calculate liberal votes by taking the whole UDI group minus rattachés/apparentés, as we cannot obtain reliable data on membership for all senators.<br><br>The radical-left family consist of PCF, PRG members from GDR(P) and GDR groups. In accordance with CHES and MARPOR, we code M/PRG as radical-left.<br>For the 1990 vote, we can't say for sure where the nine M/PRG representatives belonged. We use parliamentary group-level data for this vote, anyway, and therefore the 26 communist group votes have been labeled as opposition votes.<br><br>We do not code members of coded parties that belong to another parliamentary group than their party. The only three exceptions are<br>- the Greens, who for some time did not form an own group but belonged to the Socialist one. There, we deducted the scores from the other groups and formed an own one throughout time.<br>- The second exception is the Mouvement/Parti radical de gauche, whose members we recoded into the radical-left family to abide by the family-coding of CHES and MARPOR.<br>- The third exception is MoDem, whose members we recode from all groups for the Assemblée nationale (for the Senate, liberal group is used as a whole, anyway, for lack of reliable data on most senators). |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Germany (GMY) | ***General information*** |
| | Deployment decisions that were taken by the so-called "simplified procedure" without a vote were not included. According to article 4 of the German deployment law, a simplified procedure is possible for missions of low importance. A respective motion is sent to the representatives of all parties in the foreign affairs and in the defense committee as well as to the heads of the parliamentary party groups. The motion is considered accepted unless a political group or 5% of MPs demand a decision of the Bundestag. |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | Because the 2001 vote on Operation Enduring Freedom in the Bundestag was linked to a vote of confidence in the red/green government, we excluded it from the calculation of averageno. |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | AfD is coded as radical-right.<br><br>In 1990, the West German *Greens* and the East German *Bündnis 90* ran separately with separate manifestos (the Greens ran in the Western states, Bündnis 90 in the Eastern states). Whereas the West German Greens failed to reach the 5% threshold, 8 candidates of Bündnis 90 were elected into the Bundestag and their voting behavior is included in our dataset. For the 1990 election, MARPOR's dataset does not include Bündnis 90 but only the Western Greens. For this reason, no CMP code is assigned to Bündnis 90. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Ireland (IRE) | ***General information*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | Chamber - the lower house of elected members is called Dáil Éireann, members are referred to as TD's or 'Teachta Dála'. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | The Upper house 'An Seanad' has no role in deployment votes.<br><br>Under Dáil Éireann standing orders a division is only required at the request of at least 10 members of the House, if fewer than 10 members request a division a motion can be carried by assent without a formal vote, these votes are recorded but no numbers on them are generally available.<br><br>The first vote for EUFOR Chad was on the deployment of the Operational Commander, the number fell below the required threshold for mandatory Dáil approval so this is coded as 0<br><br>The MINURCAT vote was proposed as a redeployment of Irish forces serving under EUFOR-Althea, it might therefore be considered an extension vote rather than a new mission, renewals are not normally voted on.<br><br>The EUFOR Althea vote involved the transfer of forces from SFOR so it might therefore be considered an extension vote<br><br>The UNDOF vote was conducted under the FG-Lab government, Independts have been included here as a single group. Further work needed to classify these under CMP - for the other two votes independents will be grouped between government and opposition |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | party family coding Sinn Fein: unclear why CMP and CHES code SF as "regionalist" as they have nation-wide representation in Ireland (although not in the UK). Because they sit in the GUE-NGL group in the EP, we code them as radical left |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Italy<br>(ITA) | ***General information*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | The Italian government was defeated only once in these votes. On 21 February 2007, the Senate voted against the refinancing of the ISAF mission in Afghanistan and the expansion of a US Military base near Venice proposed by the centre-left executive of the time, led by Romano Prodi. The government lost its slight majority in that chamber due to defections of a couple of radical-left MPs. |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | Radical Left:<br>- PCI is the communist party.<br>- The successors of the Italian Communist Party (PCI), the Democratic Party of the Left (PDS) and the Democrats of the Left (DS) are classified as socialist parties. Therefore, PCI/PDS/DS occurs twice. For reasons of consistency with MARPOR codes, referring to the parties as a single one, we constantly use the abbreviation PCI/PDS/DS.<br>- PRC is the hardline faction that emerged from the split in 1991. PRC saw the exit of PdCI in 1998. - SEL is the union of radical-left and ecologist parties.<br><br>Socialists:<br>- Articolo 1: classified as social democratic (Liberi e Uguali's successor, same label). |

| | |
|---|---|
| | - PDS is the social-democratic evolution of PCI. Changed name to DS (1998) and finally to PD (2007). PSI and PSDI are socialist parties that were often part of the coalition government with DC and lost importance after 1994.<br><br>Liberals:<br>- PLI and PRI were small centrist parties that supported DC in government. They almost disappeared after 1994.<br>- RiL was a small party founded by Lamberto Dini to support the first Prodi government.<br>- IdV was a party founded by the former attorney Antonio Di Pietro.<br>- Civici e Innovatori: liberal (successor of Scelta Civica)<br><br>Conservatives:<br>- FI is Berlusconi's party. Changed name to PdL between 2009 and 2013.<br>- Alleanza Popolare - Nuovo Centrodestra: coded as conservative (generated from PdL that is conservative).<br><br>Christian Democrats:<br>- DC is the former Christian-democrat party, always in government from the end of WWII until 1994. All the other parties in this category emerged from its ashes.<br>- PPI changed name and became Mar in 2002 and the union of CCD and CDU gave life to UDC in 2002.<br><br>Radical Right:<br>- The post-fascist MSI transformed into the more moderate AN in 1994.<br>- Fratelli d'Italia: family change from conservative —> nationalist (The leaders come from AN, which is labelled as nationalist. In his platform for 2018 parliamentary elections, several references to the nation and strong anti-immigrants massages. Strong similarities with Matteo Salvini's Lega Nord).<br>- LN is a populist and regionalist party that in the last years turned into a radical-right party.<br><br>Greens:<br>- The Green Party (FdV) is the only party included.<br><br>5 Star Movement does not belong to any party family (Bordignon and Ceccarini 2015; Coticchia and Vignoli 2020; Manucci and Amsler 2020; Mosca and Tronconi 2019).<br><br>The Italian parliament has a 'mixed group' uniting a variety of independent and small-party MPs. Votes have been extracted for the Radical Left (RC and PdCI) and for the Greens (FdV). A further average of 5% of individual votes are not accounted for.<br><br>For Prodi I, D'Alema I & II, and Amato I, in deviation from ParlGov, we do not code the supporting PpP list (Populari per Prodi), but the main composite party of that list, PPI.<br><br>For Prodi II, in deviation from ParlGov, we do not code the supporting Unione list, but the composite parties of that list, DS, Mar, FdV and IdV. DS and Mar merged |

| | |
|---|---|
| | during the term to create the PD, which is used as single denominator for this term. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Japan (JPN) | ***General information*** |
| | While its constitution prohibits use of force abroad, the SDP has been sent to foreign countries and the high seas. The Diet (parliament) can vote if a bill is submitted and in some cases, the SDF has been sent without any vote at the Diet (in 27 December 2019, Prime Minister Abe made a decision to send SDF off the coast of Yemen for "investigation and research", which does not require Abe to obtain approval from the Diet). Therefore, we could not include a case as such, which the government did not submit a bill to the Diet. |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | For the Lower House (衆議院: Shugiin), we could not use the official record to code the data. This is due to the fact that the official record does not state the voting record other than the overall outcome information such as "the bill was adopted by the majority". We thus used multiple sources to estimate the voting behavior of the parliamentarians. First, national major newspaper articles on the evening or next morning of the day of voting usually report voting outcomes at the Lower House. The newspaper reporters in the chamber usually take a picture of the "standing-up" (i.e, yes vote) during the voting process and count the number of parliamentarians supporting/opposing the bill. Second, there is an independent researcher's website called Tohyo-kodo ("voting behavior" in Japanese) at https://投票行動.com/cgi-bin/cmp.cgi?house=衆議院&names=政党. We relied on the information provided there (the website informs us which party was supprting and oppising the bill). To determine the number of the parliamentarians for each political party, we used the official record by the House (http://www.shugiin.go.jp/internet/itdb_annai.nsf/html/statics/ugoki/ugoki.htm). Unfortunately, we could not obtain the voting record for the independent parliamentarians (usually they are less than 10 votes), and we excluded them from our count.<br><br>For the Upper House (参議院: Sangiin), we used the official record since they have a push-button system to count the parliamentarians' voting behavior. The official record information's web link is listed in the section "vote_parl_document_ID_URL". |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Lithuania | ***General information*** |
| | Party votes are available only since 1999. |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | Mission LITPLA-1 (UNPROFOR) was organised as part of the Danish Peacekeeping Batalion which participated in the international peacekeeping mission in Croatia.<br><br>In many original documents, there are no specific international mission names mentioned. Thus, we treat votes on NATO operations in former Yugoslavia and NATO operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina (first vote 14/01/1997) as separate missions (IFOR/ SFOR). Lithuanians participated within a Danish batallion. Only the vote on 06/04/1999 mentions that it is an extension of the SFOR mission. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | NATO humanitarian mission to Albania (vote on 22/04/1999) is treated as a new mission (coded 0).<br><br>Similarly, a specific mission to Kosovo (vote on 29/06/1999) is also treated as a new mission.<br><br>Voting on 29/06/1999 is officially named as decision on participation in international mission in Kosovo. Article 1 specifies a platoon to be sent to Kosovo, Article 2 states that soldiers sent to Albania by the decision on 22/04/1999 will be re-deployed from July on to Kosovo.<br><br>Decision 28/03/2000 has two articles: Article 1 specifies a group of up to five persons to participate in Polish and Nordic battlegroups for the period of April-September 2000, and article 2 a group of up to 90 soldiers to participate August 2000-January 2001.<br><br>Decision 21/11/2000 has two articles: Article 1 a group of up to 90 soldiers for the period February-March 2001, Article 2 a group of up to 5 soldiers for the period April-September 2001.<br><br>Decision 27/03/2001 is on military aircraft with 5 staff soldiers and 2 support soldiers on the ground to participate in an international missions in Kosovo and Bosnia and Herzegovina. A similar vote has been taken on 13/09/2001. This mission was extended by voting on 22/01/2002.<br><br>Decision 17/01/2002 is partly changing and amending the decision of 12/04/2001. Article 1 extends the participation of up to 5 soldiers in the mission till 1 February 2001, Article 2 sends up to 105 soldiers for the period of February-August 2002.<br><br>13.04.2004: Voting changed the original document of 16 Oct 2003 (no. IX-1788) by changing a number of soldiers and civilians deployed for the mission (from 4 to 15).<br><br>09.06.2005: Change of maximum numbers allowed and extension of dates to missions to Balkans, Central and East Asia and Persian Gulf, original document of 29 Sept 2004, Nr. IX-2468.<br><br>19/03/2002 voting on mission on Enduring Freedom in Kyrgyzstan is coded as multilateral. Although it was a US-led mission, I found indications that several countries supported it. Similarly, later votings on Enduring Freedom in South and East Asia are treated as multilateral.<br><br>08/04/2003 decision is officially named as NATO mission in Serbia and Montenegro, Kosovo province but it is treated as an extension of NATO's Kosovo mission.<br><br>29/05/2003 voting on US-led international mission in Persian Gulf is treated as multilateral.<br><br>Voting on 20/01/2005 concerns a decision on the NATO Response Force: In this case, the North Atlantic Council takes the decision to use these forces and / or |

| | |
|---|---|
| | command structures to send up to 75 soldiers and civilians to participate in that mission. The decision is valid through 30/09/2006.<br><br>13/04/2004 voting partly changed (Art. 1) the earlier decision made on 16/10/2003 by increasing the number of soldiers in the NATO mission from 4 to 15.<br><br>Voting on 09/06/2005 partly changed (Art.1) the decision made 29/09/2004 by establishing general maximum amount of soldiers and civilians participating in the enumerated missions: up to 350 till 31/12/2005 and up to 420 for the period of 01/01/2006 till 31/12/2007<br><br>Voting on 14/06/2007 is on several international missions, establishing a general maximum number of soldiers and civilian staff that can participate. Among three mission that were extended, a new one - to South Caucasus is mentioned, but the mission in general is treated as an extention to previous missions<br><br>Voting on 26/06/2008 is on the decision that in case the North Atlantic Council decides to use NRF or EU Council decides to use EU Battlegroups, up to 100 soldiers and civilian staff could be used till 31/12/2009 and up to 800 soldiers and civilians in 2010 in those missions. Similar decision taken on 17/06/2010 allowing up to 255 soldiers and civilian staff to be used in 01/01/2011-31/12/2012, as well as on 22/05/2012. Similar voting on 11/12/2014 allowed the use of forces after such decision is taken in 2015 and 2016 with different maximum numbers.<br><br>Voting on 18/03/2014 is on multiple missions. Out of four missions three are extensions. Thus, the voting is treated as extension in general<br><br>Voting on 22/12/2015: next to NATO missions to Afghanistan, Kosovo, EU mission Atalanta, UN mission in Mali and EUNAVFOR MED operation SOPHIA for the first time is mentioned. In general, voting is treated as an extension of previous missions.<br><br>Voting on 29/06/2016 partly changed a previous decision 22/12/2015 by increasing a number of soldiers participating in EUNAVFOR MED operation SOPHIA up to 20, and adding a new - training mission of Iraqi forces as part of US-lead coalition Operation Inherent Resolve.<br><br>Voting on 29/06/2016 allowing to use soldiers and civilians for the missions when there is a decision of North Atlantic Council, EU Council to use forces - up to 490 in 2017, up to 450 in 2018, and up to 190 soldiers belonging to the Joint expeditionary forces to be used for UN, NATO or EU missions in territories of NATO or EU countries if there were such a decision. Similar decision is on 06/11/2018 for the years 2019-2020.<br><br>27/06/2017 is an amendment to previous decision XII-2232 by adding a training mission of Ukrainian forces. Lithuania had several training missions to Ukraine, unilateral and multilateral ones (together with US, Canada and other countries). It is not clear from accompanying documents whether this was a unilateral or multilateral mission. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Voting on 19/12/2017 parly changed decision XII-2542 by increasing a maximum possible number of soldiers and civilians to participate in international missions when there is North Atlantic Council or EU Council decisions. |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | Column G: I provide the Latin version of native name of party groups, i.e. factions. In brackets, there is an original Lithuanian spelling provided (where they differ from Latin), omitting the word "frakcija" (=faction). In addition, I provide explanations for each party group which party(-ies) they represented in the parliament.<br><br>Frakcija "Socialdemokratija - 2000-ieji" (Socialdemocracy-2000): a party group formed in December 1999 when several MPs elected as representatives of the Lithuanian Socialdemocratic Party formed a separate party group.<br><br>Nuosaikiuju (konservatoriu) frakcija (Moderate Conservatives) was formed in March 2000 when several MPs elected as representatives of Homeland Union formed a separate party group.<br><br>Socialdemokratines koalicijos frakcija is an abbreviation of "Socialdemokratinės koalicijos (LDDP-LSDP-LRS) frakciija", a joint party group/ electoral coalition of several parties: Lietuvos demokratine darbo partija, Lietuvos socialdemokratu partija (the two parties merged in 2001) and Lietuvos rusu sajunga (Lithuanian Russian union).<br><br>Homeland Union party group in 1996-2000 Seimas was called Homeland Union - Lithuanian Conservatives but the official party name according to CMP is presented in database (the party participated in the elections under the name Homeland Union (Lithuanian conservatives)).<br><br>Lithuanian Centre Union (native name: Lietuvos Centro Sąjunga, LCS) was represented by Centro frakcija in 1996-2000.<br><br>Jungtine frakcija in 1996-2000 Seimas' term was formed from MPs representing the following parties: Christian Democratic Union, Lithuanian National Party "Young Lithuania", Peasants' Party, Lithuanian National Democratic Party<br><br>In 2000-2004 the Jungtine frakcija (Jungtinė Centro sąjungos, Moderniųjų krikščionių demokratų sąjungos ir Lietuvos lenkų rinkimų akcijos frakcija) was established. - MPs elected from Centre Union, Modern Christian Democratic Union and Electoral Action of Lithuanian Poles formed it.<br><br>Lithuanian Liberal Union (Lietuvos liberalu sajunga, LLS) was represented in several party groups in 2000-2004 Seimas: Liberalu frakcija in 2000-2002, later by Nepriklausoma frakcija (re-named as Liberaldemokratu frakcija later), Jungtine ir liberalu frakcija, Liberalu ir centro frakcija. The latter was named after the newly established Liberal and Centre Union (LiCS), when the Lithuanian Liberal Union, Lithuanian Centre Union and Modern Christian democrats merged in May 2003. MPs from Liberaldemokratu frakcija (majority of them elected from LLS) in 2002-2003 became members of newly established Liberalu demokratu partija. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Liberaldemokratu frakcija was formed in 2003 when several MPs of Liberalu frakcija formed a new party group in parliament, and later Liberal Democratic party (Liberalu demokratu partija, LDP) was established. In 2006 party was renamed as Order and Justice. Some MPs in this party group (2002-2004) were elected as representatives of other parties: New Union, Modern Christian democrats, Lithuanian Centre Union, the Poles.<br><br>A party currently known as Valstieciu ir zaliuju sajunga (LVZS) functioned as Lietuvos valstieciu partija (Lithuanian Peasants party, LVP) in 1994-2001, in 2001-2005 as Valstieciu ir Naujosios demokratijos partiju sajunga (Peasants and New Democracy party union), 2005-2012- as Lietuvos valstieciu liaudininku sajunga. The party group of 'Valstieciu ir Naujosios demokratijos partiju frakcija' in 2000-2004 Seimas was formed by MPs elected from Lithuanian Peasants party, New Democracy Party, A. Brazauskas Social Democratic Coalition, Christian Democratic Union, Lithuanian Liberal Union, and indepedent MPs.<br><br>Party group "Lietuvos gerovei" was established in autumn 2019 after several MPs elected as representatives of Order and Justice formed a separate party group, they were also joined by one former Social Democrat.<br><br>In 2004 elections, the Coalition of Rolandas Paksas 'For Order and Justice' participated and a majority of elected MPs formed a party group that changed its title several times: Liberalu demokratu frakcija (2004-11-15–2006-05-22); "Tvarka ir Teisingumas (liberalai demokratai)" frakcija (2006-05-23–2008-03-09); Frakcija "Tvarka ir teisingumas" (2008-03-10–2008-11-16).<br><br>In the 2004 elections, the Union of Peasants and New Democracy Party participated in the elections and a majority of eleceted MPs formed a party group that changed its title several times (two representatives of Poles and several MPs of the Labour Party group later joined, too): Valstieciu ir Naujosios demokratijos frakcija (2004-11-15–2005-12-12); Valstieciu liaudininku frakcija (2005-12-13–2007-05-07); Valstiecių liaudininku frakcija (2008-01-17–2008-11-17).<br><br>In the 2004 elections, Liberal and Centre Union participated in the elections and formed a party group. During the parliamentary term, the party split - Liberal Movement was established, thus, there were several liberal party groups later on: Liberalu ir centro frakcija (2004-11-15–2005-10-19); Liberalu frakcija (2005-10-20–2006-04-19); Liberalu sąjudzio frakcija (2006-04-20–2008-11-16); Liberalu ir centro sajungos frakcija (2005-10-13–2008-11-16). Liberalu sajudzio frakcija is marked as representing a new party - Liberal Movement (LRLS) since 2006 while Liberalu ir centro sajungos frakcija as representing Liberal and Centre Union according to majority of its MPs.<br><br>In 2008-2012, the party Order and Justice was represented by "Frakcija "Tvarka ir teisingumas". Four MPs from Election Action of Lithuania's Poles have also joined this party group.<br><br>The National Resurrection Party participated in 2008 elections. During the term, the party group split, thus existed:Tautos prisikelimo partijos frakcija (2008-11-17–2009-09-09); Frakcija "Viena Lietuva" (2009-09-10–2010-02-10); Krikscionių partijos frakcija (2010-02-11–2012-11-16) |

| | |
|---|---|
| | In the 2008 elections, Coalition Labour Party and Youth participated and formed Darbo partijos frakcija (Labour Party group). We classify as DP anyway.<br><br>Liberalu sajudzio frakcija (Liberal Movement) in 2008-2012 was joined later by one MP elected as a representative of National Resurrection Party after the latter's split.<br><br>Liberal and Centre Union was represented by Liberalu ir centro frakcija in 2008-2012, however, several MPs from the National Resurrection Party joined this party group in 2010 after the latter's split.<br><br>Lithuanian Social Democratic Labour Party was established in 2018 when the Lithuanian Social Democratic party (and its party group in Seimas) split.<br><br>In the 2016 elections, Election Action of Lithuania's Poles participated as Lietuvos lenku rinkimu akcija-Krikscionisku seimu sajunga and formed a party group accordingly.<br><br>22/04/1999 - members of LDDP did not participate in the voting [we could not find the verbatim records and cannot verify the reasons].<br><br>Votings of Misri grupe (MG) are not included in party-votes.<br><br>21/11/2000 - No data on party-voting available<br><br>2005-01-20 - no data on voting by party groups available<br><br>2008 - change of party group names: VLF, TTF |
| | **Miscellaneous notes** |
| | |
| Nether-lands (NTH) | ***General information*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | We specified a few of the motion numbers in the vote_parl_document_ID column by adding Roman letters. The Roman letters indicate that a motion was filed in the context of the annual debate over ministerial budgets (appropriations), and the specific Roman letter |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | 50PLUS: *Special Interest Party (CMP) = no family (PDVD)*.<br>- Party can be seen as leftist due to their strong care for social issues such as welfare and pensions. On the other hand, it is a member of the EPP group and individual members who have left the party at times join CDA or VVD. All things considered it is best to leave 50plus as indeterminate (no family).<br><br>Forum for Democracy (FvD): *Nationalist party (CMP) = Radical right (PDVD).*<br>- Party can be identified as conservative, but its ideology varies fundamentally from other chriscon parties while sharing similarities with other rightist parties, particularly on nationalist issues, anti-EU and anti-immigration. In Parliament, FvD generally votes along with other radical-right parties, particularly PVV.<br><br>Liveable Netherlands (LN): Liberal party (CMP) = Radical right (PDVD). |

| | |
|---|---|
| | - Party can be identified as conservative, much like FvD, but its economic liberalism is trumped by its strongly rightist positions on nationalist culture, anti-immigration and anti-establishment. Party continues to exist on a municipal level, where during elections, it competes with other rightist parties - notably VVD and PVV - for the same votes.<br><br>List Pim Fortuyn (LPF): Nationalist (CMP) = Radical right (PDVD).<br>- Frontman Pim Fortuyn was once designated to lead the Liveable Netherlands party, but was forced to leave the party due to strong anti-Islamic statements. He then founded his own party and, in Parliament, was far more successful than Liveable Netherlands until his murder in May 2002. The party ceased to exist a few years later<br><br>Party for Freedom (PVV): *Nationalist (CMP) = Radical right (PDVD)*.<br>- Frontman Geert Wilders left the Liberal Party (PVV) in 2006 due to internal disagreement over the VVD's immigration line. Then founded the PVV, which has been the most radical right party in the Netherlands since.<br><br>Reformed Political Party (SGP): Special Issue Party (CMP) = Christian-conservative party (PDVD)<br>- Party is an outright conservative party with a strongly Christian signature. Economically liberal and culturally conservative, it appeals mostly to staunchly Christian voters. However, it does not solely promote Christian issues, but constructively engages in parliamentary cooperation on a variety of issues. It can therefore best be categorized as chriscon rather than radical-right.<br><br>Socialist Party (SP): Socialist Party (CMP) = Radical Left (PDVD)<br>- Party is significantly more leftist than other social-democratic parties such as the Labour Party (PvdA), particularly on economic issues. On cultural issues, it is rather more conservative. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Romania (ROM) | ***General information*** |
| | Romania has a semi-presidential political system. As per constitutional provisions, the president is the commander in chief of the armed forces and of the Supreme Council for National Defence.<br><br>Until 2004, the participation of Romanian troops to international deployments was subject to parliamentary approval. With the adoption of the Law no. 42/2004 on the participation of armed forces to missions abroad (in place between 21.03.2004 and 19.06.2011, replaced on 19.06.2011 by Law no. 121/2011) in the context of Romania's accession to NATO, parliamentary approval became mandatory only for deployments to missions that are outside international treaties to which Romania is party. Thus, troop deployments for missions in the framework of international treaties to which Romania is party (EU, NATO, OSCE or UN membership) do not require parliamentary approval per se. Only missions that are outside an IO's multilateral institutional framework (e. g. the anti-ISIS coalition) require formal parliamentary approval (Art. 7.2 of Law 42/2004, respectively Law 121/2011) and are subject to vote during a common session of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies in the Parliament. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Art. 7.1 of the Law no. 42/2004, respectively Law no. 121/2011, stipulates the following mechanism for the approval of sending troops abroad:<br>(i) the prime-minister makes the formal proposal;<br>(ii) the proposal needs to be approved by the President after consultation with the Supreme Council for National Defence;<br>(iii) the President informs the Parliament about the decision within 5 days.<br><br>In the period 1991-2020, Romanian armed forces participated in over 65 international missions, with a total contingent of approx. 50,000 troops.<br><br>In this dataset, we do not code Independents or Minorities. Independents were part, however, of Ciorbea, Vasile, Isarescu, Dancila I, and Orban II cabinets.<br>Since 1990, minorities occupied between 12-18 seats in the Parliament in each legislative period. As per Art. 62.2 or the Romanian Constitution, "organizations of citizens belonging to national minorities, which fail to obtain the number of votes for representation in Parliament, have the right to one Deputy seat each".<br><br>In this dataset, we included police missions (IPTF, EUPM, UNMIK), given the importance of police in crisis prevention and as police reform is relevant in the security sector reform, see for example: https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/aussenpolitik/themen/krisenpraevention/-/231858. Since 1850, Romania has a system of gendarmerie in place, which is a military police force under the command of the land forces of the Romanian military. The deployment of civilian or military staff that officially belongs to the Romanian armed forces is regulated by the Law 42 of 2004.<br><br>Art. 35 of the Law 45 of 01 July 1994 stipulated that the participation of troops of the Romanian army in international missions requires parliamentary approval. This legislative provision was modified in 2004, see Background Note 2. Whether parliamentary approval for deployments to external missions was necessary prior to 01 July 1994 is yet to be determined. |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | In April 1991, there was another vote on UNIKOM but precise data on this vote could so far not be retrieved.<br><br>On 22 June 1994, there was a decision on UNAMIR but it is unclear whether it has been held in a joint session of parliament or in separate votes in each chamber. We code the vote only once and mention it as belonging to both chambers. |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | The Party of Social Democracy in Romania (PDSR) became PSD in 2001. The Romanian Social Democratic Party (PSDR) merged into PSD in 2001. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| South Korea (ROK) | ***General information*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | From the 13th (1998-1992) to the 15th (1996-2000) legislatures, there is no party vote record available. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | The Korean party system's volatility has led to the creation of many splinter parties that have merged into other, bigger parties later on. CMP does not always include splinters, nor does it always attribute separate party codes for them. We code splinter party votes as separate parties for the time of their existence.<br><br>We code NPAD as successor to UDP and attribute the same CMP code (113440), as NPAD is a direct successor to the UDP. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Slovakia (SLO) | ***General information*** |
| | Slovak vote coding starts in 1998 only because of accessibility of electronic documentation. |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | SDL was the leftover party of the Communist Party of Slovakia [formed after 1989], and later merged with SMER - coded 'Socialist'.<br><br>SOP was a liberal party, died after one term.<br><br>LS-NS is a neo-Nazi party - coded 'radical-right' in database.<br><br>SME RODINA is a new party formed in 2017. Consultation with the leading Slovak expert on parties led to 'radical-right' coding. Similar agenda to German AfD.<br><br>There are no RadRight (SNS) codings for 2001-10-17 (KFOR) and 2002-02-09 (SFOR) because the caucus fell apart. Members then voted as independents and were not counted.<br><br>There are no Lib (SAS) codings for 2014-03-19 (ISAF), 2014-12-11 (Resolute Support), 2015-11-12 (Res Support Training) and 2015-12-01 (EUTM Mali) because the caucus fell apart. Members then voted as independents and were not counted.<br><br>The regionalist party SMK has been coded as 'conservative'.<br><br>The conservative vote on UNPROFOR on 15 June 2000 relies uniquely on the regionalist party SMK's votes. Other conservative parties have not voted then. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Spain (SPN) | ***General information*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on parlamentary-level data*** |
| | Data for the ISAF vote on 11 May 2006 is no longer online and can be retrieved from the project. |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | On 30 May 2006, the Spanish parliament voted on the Spanish contribution to UNIFIL. This vote is not included in the party-level dataset because due to a technical problem, no record has been kept for the individual votes. We thus do not know how the various parties voted. The overall result, however, is known: Out of 308 votes cast, 306 were in favor and 2 abstained. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Coding of regional parties follows the European party group. It has to be noted though that the actual party ideology is not always fully matching this (e.g. PNV or CC would rather be CrisCon, but they are integrated in the European Liberal group - ALDE). |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| Turkey (TUR) | ***General information*** |
| | The research on the Coding of Parliamentary votes on Turkey's troop deployments has followed the following steps:<br><br>1. An exhaustive list of Turkey's participation in international peacekeeping missions has been obtained from the web-site of Turkish Armed Forces General Staff (https://www.tsk.tr/Sayfalar?viewName=BarisiDestekleme). This list has been checked against a comprehensive textbook on Turkish foreign policy after 1990 (Faruk Sönmezoğlu [2016] Son On Yıllarda Türk Dış Politikası (Turkish Foreign Policy in the Last Decades (1990-2015), İstanbul: Der Yayınları) to reach a comprehensive list of troop deployments that includes those which may not fall into the category of international peacekeeping missions. Also two interviews have been carried out with (Emeritus) Prof. Dr. Faruk Sönmezoğlu from Istanbul University on 3rd and 30th April 2020 in order not to leave out any potential votes from the list, and to reach explanation on cases where we know, by living memory, that Turkish soldiers were sent abroad but we do not see any votes in the parliament (e.g. presence of Turkish troops in Northern Iraq though 1990s). Once we discovered the reason why and therefore made sure that the research has not failed to find these votes, but ascertained that there were no votes, this explanation is not included here since the project is only concerned about votes that took place and not the ones that did not take place.<br><br>2. The web-site of the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TBMM- hereafter Turkish parliament) does not sort the voting results according to party affiliations of MPs. Only numbers of yes and no votes and abstentions are given, if numbers are given at all. (Sometimes the voting takes place by raising of hands, and no vote numbers are given. Where no numbers are given with respect to a specific deployment vote, this will be explained in the background notes to the specific vote.) Since votes are not sorted according parties, all minutes of parliamentary discussions preceding a vote have been read to determine party positions. Turkish political system functions on party discipline (except from 2003 Iraq votes where both deployment of Turkish troops to Iraq and deployment of US troops in Turkey were voted on together.) Due to strict party discipline, the party positions declared preceding the voting have been registered to enable allocation of yes and no votes cast to the relevant parties.<br><br>3. Therefore, while Coding sheet 2 on Party votes, the following registration principles have been adopted.<br><br>- If vote numbers are not given for yes and no votes cast, but we know the result of the vote as 'passed' or 'rejected', and we know the declared party positions by reading the meeting minutes preceding the vote, the vote numbers are coded as the number of seats that a party |

| | |
|---|---|
| | holds in parliament according to the yes/no position these parties have declared. Here we count on the fact that Turkish political parties have a strong party discipline, and therefore assume that all present members voted accordingly. We do not know how many absentees each party had during these votes.<br>- In cases where we know the number of yes/no votes cast, but the archiving system does not register the party affiliations of these votes formally, we again count on the fact that Turkish political parties have a strong party discipline. Then again the minutes of parliamentary discussions preceding the vote have been used to determine the positions of parties. Since we do not know which members from which party were absent in the vote, the number of yes votes have been proportionally distributed between the parties that voted yes according to the number of seats they have in parliament and the number of no votes have also been distributed proportionally between the parties that declared a no vote according to the number of seats they have in parliament. This is with exception to the Iraq vote held on 1 March 2003 where the parliament has only 2 parties. The opposition party had a strict position on voting 'no' and the government party decided not to apply party discipline and told its members to vote by their conscience and was split between 'no', 'yes' and 'abstention'. We do not know who voted how. So the number of 'no' votes was first allocated to the opposition party. The remaining number of 'no' votes were thus entered as those from the governing party. The yes votes were to be certainly from the government party as well as abstentions. There is a further background note for this vote below.<br><br>4. In each parliamentary period of 4 to 5 years, the number of MPs per political party have been registered according to general election results since 1987. The analysis of each of deployment vote starts with looking at in which parliamentary period the voting takes place. The number of MPs from the preceding general elections are taken as a given. The party positons determined from the minutes are then allocated to parties. Most of the time there is a difference between the number of votes cast (total and yes/no numbers) and the number of MPs registered. The most obvious reason is that not all MPs are present during a vote. Another potential reason is that after the elections, some MPs resign from their party and become independent MPs or they join another party within the parliament or form a new party group from scratch. In this way there are cases where we see a party in the parliament, even though it did not get elected into the parliament as a party in the preceding general election that formed that parliament. (This is the case for the presence of ANAP votes in the 2006 deployment vote in Lebanon [UNIFIL].) Such a switch of group of MPs from one party to the other is almost impossible to trace back without the living memory of those times. For this purpose, a phone conversation has been held on 29th April 2020 with Mr. Hikmet Uluğbay (former MP 1995-2002), who went through the minutes of the UNIFIL vote with me and explained how ANAP had a group position on this vote, although they did not gain seats in the parliament as a party in the preceding elections.<br><br>5. When this latter situation is the case, and it is possible to see in the minutes preceding a particular vote that such a party has declared a position, then this |

| | |
|---|---|
| | party and its voting position on that particular vote is reflected in the coding template.<br><br>6. In many votes there is one abstention vote. We do not know who cast this vote. So no mention is made of this one vote in the coding. Abstentions are coded in only when they are of a significant number and potentially attributable to any party group within the parliament, as in the case of 1st March 2003 Iraq vote.<br><br>7. In these two above cases 5&6, where it is found that no votes took place in the Turkish parliament, the vote search was carried out on the relevant years (starting from the year before the operation was initiated until the completion time of the operation) by both under the operation name and under the place of deployment under categories of both 'deployment votes' (tezkereler in Turkish) and 'votes' (oylamalar).<br><br>8. In 2017, Turkey voted adopted a change in Constitution, accoring to which the head of government is not the Prime minister any more, but the President. Therefore, the requests for deployment of troops abroad have not been coming from the Office of the Prime Minister, but from the Office of the President of the Republic from July 2018 on. |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | Turkey adopted in 1992 the deployment vote on Bosnia which allowed the Turkish government to deploy troops in any country which was formerly part of Yugoslavia as part of an international peacekeeping mission. This decision specified that this permission is granted to Turkish government without time limitations. We see then the following list of force contributions to the following operations did not get voted on in the Turkish parliament (but the Kosovo force contribution did get voted on in 1998 once before the initial intervention), despite the fact that web-site of Turkish armed forces states these as peacekeeping operations to which Turkey contributed forces:<br>- NATO&WEU Sharp Guard 1992-1996<br>- NATO IFOR/SFOR in Bosnia<br>- NATO KFOR in Kosovo<br>- NATO Essential Harvest 2001 in Kosovo<br>- NATO Amber Fox 2001-2002 in Kosovo<br>- NATO Allied Harmony 2002-2003<br>- EU Concordia 2003<br>- EUFOR ALTHEA 2004<br>- Georgia- UNOMIG 1993-2009 UN Observer Mission in Georgia<br>- Democratic Republic of Congo- MONUC UN Mission in DRC 1999<br>- East Timor- UNTAET/UNMISET (UN Missions in East Timor before and after independence, 1999/2002-2004)<br>- Sudan AMIS African Union Mission in Sudan 2005-2007<br>- NATO Training Mission (NTM) Iraq (2004-2011)<br>- Darfur UNAMID UN African union Mission in Darfur 2007<br>- Sudan- UNMIS (UN Mission in Sudan 2005-2010)<br>- Democratic Republic of Congo - MONUSCO UN Organization Stabilisation Mission in DRC 2010 |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Background note for 2003 Iraq vote on US Force deployments to Turkey and Turkish force deployments to Iraq: The parliamentary vote was cast in a closed session whose minutes and votes cast (except from the end result) are still secret today. So the numbers of votes per party have been deducted from the declarations made previously by party officials: CHP had announced they would vote 'no' and if a party decision has been taken, Turkish political parties have a strict party discipline. So all of the CHP votes have been coded as 'no'. But the number of 'no' votes were greater than the number of CHP seats. So some members of AKP must also have voted 'no'. Therefore the arithmetic calculation that the rest of the no votes are from AKP. The AKP government had asked for a yes vote, so all of the yes votes have been coded for AKP. There were also 19 abstentions. AKP had not adopted a party position and asked their MPs to vote according to their conscience. So the party was known to be split or at least undecided so the abstentions are also coded as being from AKP. However the parliament also had 9 'independent' members. Since we do not know how these MPs have voted, the votes of these 9 independent members have not been taken into consideration in this calculation. Despite the fact that the number of 'yes' votes are greater than number of 'no' votes, since the qualified majority required by the Turkish Constitution for deployment votes was not reached, this proposal by the government has not passed.<br><br>Background note on 2006 vote on Turkey's Force contribution to UNIFIL in Lebanon: As a result of 2002 general election Turkish parliament consisted of two major political parties only (AKP and CHP) and 9 independent MPs. However, in the 2006 UNIFIL vote for sending troops to Lebanon we see that votes have been cast under party positions of ANAP. This is the case where a certain number of MPs parted their ways from AKP and joined ANAP as a political party and formed a party group within parliament. This explanation was provided to me Mr. Hikmet Uluğbay (former MP 1995-2002), with whom I held a phone conversation on 29th April. He went through the minutes of the UNIFIL vote with me and explained how ANAP had a group position on this vote, although they had not gained a seat in the parliament as a party in the preceding elections. |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |
| | |
| United Kingdom (UKG) | ***General information*** |
| | In reporting the total number of votes, we follow the practice in the House of Commons. We thus exclude tellers and count technical abstentions twice. When reporting data for individual parties, however, we exclude tellers but report technical abstentions in separate columns to make the data comparable. |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | Party 'Respect' is coded as radical-left.<br><br>We also code as socialist Plaid Cymru, Scottish National Party, Social Democratic and Labour Party (Northern Ireland).<br><br>We also code as conservative the Democratic Unionist Party and the Ulster Unionist Party. |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |

| | |
|---|---|
| United States (USA) | ***General information*** |
| | For US data, we stick to presidential terms as coding units, as this is the more meaningful unit of analysis as cabinets.<br><br>Only votes on the authorization of the use of force and/or deployments have been included. To issue binding authorizations, both chambers of the U.S. Congress need to pass an identical version of the bill or resolution. Note that in the U.S. Congress, budget-related decisions, non-binding resolutions, and amendments might also significantly influence military interventions. To ensure comparability across countries in this dataset, we did not code these types of votes (see Congressional Research Service, U.S. Armed Forces Abroad: Selected Congressional Roll Call Votes Since 1982, RL31693, Updated January 9, 2020, Washington, D.C.).<br><br>For the House and the Senate, "non-voting" was not coded as "abstention".<br><br>Independent representatives and senators were coded according to the party with which they caucused at the time of the roll call. Accordingly, Bernie Sanders (Independent, Vermont; missions: Iraq 1991, Somalia 1993, Kosovo 1999, War on Terror 2001, Iraq 2002) and Jim Jeffords (Independent, Vermont; missions: War on Terror 2001, Iraq 2002) were coded as a Democrats, and Virgil Goode (Independent, Virginia; mission: War on Terror 2001) was coded as a Republican. |
| | ***Notes on parliamentary-level data*** |
| | In the House, only votes casted as "present" were coded as "abstention". In the Senate, abstention from votes rarely occurs as Senate rule XII commits a Senator to "declare his assent or dissent to the question, unless excused by the Senate". However, precedents exist where Senators have voted "present", even though Senate rules do not explicitly allow to do so (see Riddick's Senate Procedures, S. Doc. 101-29, 1992, 1398-1411). In the coded cases, neither "present" nor "excused by the Senate" was observed for the Senate.<br><br>Note that in the U.S. Congress, budget-related decisions, non-binding resolutions, and amendments might also effect military interventions (see Lisa Mages, U.S. Armed Forces Abroad: Selected Congressional Roll Call Votes Since 1982, Congressional Research Service, Washington, D.C. 2007).<br><br>In the case of Kosovo 1999, a concurrent resolution authorizing air strikes against Serbia passed the U.S. Senate (1999-3-23) but failed to win a majority in the House of Representatives (1999-4-28). A concurrent resolution authorizing the deployment of U.S. peacekeepers passed the House (1999-3-11) but was not taken up in the Senate.<br><br>The authorizing resolution in the case of Libya 2011 was defeated in the House (2011-6-24) and not considered in the Senate.<br><br>For the case of Somalia 1993, S.J.Res. 45 passed on February 4, 1993 on voice vote in the Senate and was therefore not included (this resolution passed the House amended on May 25, 1993 but was not reconsidered by the Senate). |
| | ***Notes on party-level data*** |
| | Following MARPOR, Republicans are coded as conservative (in PDVD families: chriscon) and Democrats as socialists (in PDVD: social-democratic family). |
| | ***Miscellaneous notes*** |

| | |
|---|---|