

If the Data Exists, the Door Can Be Built

Local draft preview from editorial/work/if-the-data-exists-the-door-can-be-built.

2026.05.17 00:07 DENNIS HEDEGREEN BUILD V1.0

[HTTPS://HEDEGREENRESEARCH.COM/ARTICLES/IF-THE-DATA-EXISTS-THE-DOOR-CAN-BE-BUILT/](https://hedegreenresearch.com/articles/if-the-data-exists-the-door-can-be-built/)

Politics used to enter the room through opinion first.

You said what you believed. Then people decided what kind of person you were. Then, sometimes, the data arrived late enough to be used as ammunition.

That order has never worked very well for me.

I do have political instincts. Everyone does. I have guesses, irritations, sympathies, and things I notice before I can fully defend them. But that is exactly why I do not want a public politics tool to begin with mine. I want the first sentence to belong to the data, the second sentence to the boundary, and only much later to interpretation.

That is the point of the politics-data tools.

They are not built to explain elections. They are built to make public election data readable enough that explanations have to become more honest.

Denmark was the first proof. Could a national election result be brought down to a municipal layer and compared with local indicators without pretending the result had explained itself? Could a reader pick a party, choose a year, and see where the pattern was strong or weak without being pushed into a conclusion?

Sweden made it a framework. The same basic question could survive another country, another election system, another public-data shape, and another set of local statistics. Not perfectly. Not automatically. But enough to show that the door was not a one-off.

The Netherlands made the pattern harder to dismiss. It has its own source problems, its own municipal boundaries, and its own political landscape. The preview is still deliberately bounded. It is not a cross-country claim. It is not a full public launch statement about Dutch politics. It is a country-specific public preview built from the data that could survive the first pass.

[Denmark Folketing data across municipalities Open Danish Politics Data \(https://danish-politics-data-nrfnkg3zsm4jmhamxszay.streamlit.app/\)](https://danish-politics-data-nrfnkg3zsm4jmhamxszay.streamlit.app/), [Sweden Riksdag data across municipalities Open Swedish Politics Data \(https://swedish-politics-data-s7o3pezehv8somxirp8pde.streamlit.app/\)](https://swedish-politics-data-s7o3pezehv8somxirp8pde.streamlit.app/), [Netherlands Tweede Kamer public preview Open Dutch Politics Data \(https://netherlands-politics-data-djf4pmghx6wa4r6ft5z9xx.streamlit.app/\)](https://netherlands-politics-data-djf4pmghx6wa4r6ft5z9xx.streamlit.app/)

Those three doors are not a world dashboard. They are three separate public surfaces that happen to share a method family.

That matters because the next country is not a concept. It is a source question.

If your country publishes election results in a usable form, if the local geography can be handled honestly, if structural indicators exist at the same or a defensible related level, if the licenses and public boundaries are clear enough, then the door can be built.

That sentence is both ambitious and narrow.

It does not mean every country can be added this week. It does not mean the same factors mean the same thing everywhere. It does not mean a correlation in one place becomes a law in another. It means something simpler and more useful: public data should not stay locked inside files that only specialists, insiders, or very patient people can read.

There is a strange personal reversal inside this work.

Before, if I wanted to talk about politics, I had to speak first. I had to say the position. That made the conversation about me almost immediately. People could agree with the sentence, reject the sentence, or attach motives to the sentence before we had even looked at what was public.

Now the risk has changed.

Because I build the surface, people can assign me a position even faster. They can look at a chart, a party, a factor, or a country and decide what they think I must be trying to say. In one sense, the projection problem gets easier for them.

But the goal is the opposite.

The tool is an attempt to make the projection hit something solid. If someone says the work is pushing a story, the source boundary is visible. If someone says the pattern proves too much, the method note is there to push back. If someone wants to turn a correlation into a cause, the tool should make that move harder, not easier.

This is why I do not want one grand world-politics dashboard pretending everything is cleanly comparable.

The internal work can be multi-country. The engine can learn from one country and help with another. But the public surface has to be more careful. Denmark is Denmark. Sweden is Sweden. The Netherlands is the Netherlands. A country door should be honest before it is impressive.

That is also why the tools need boring boundaries.

- No hidden login.
- No public claim beyond the source.
- No cross-country ranking unless the method can carry it.
- No factor just because it would make a good story.
- No pretending that a municipality is a person.
- No pretending that a pattern is an explanation.

The useful thing is not that a tool can produce a surprising chart. The useful thing is that the reader can ask where the chart came from, what it leaves out, and whether the pattern survives another party, another year, or another municipality.

That is a different kind of public work than opinion writing.

It is still not neutral in the naive sense. Choices are everywhere. Which sources count. Which geography is safe. Which factors are too weak. Which warnings have to be shown in the interface instead of buried in a footnote. A tool does not escape responsibility by calling itself data.

But it can make responsibility easier to inspect.

That is what I want from the politics tools. I want a reader to be able to enter through a country, a year, a party, or a municipality and see enough to form a better question. I want journalists to move faster without having to trust me. I want researchers to see the boundary quickly. I want citizens to see their own municipality in a national result without needing to download a file and write code first.

So the offer has to stay simple and conditional:

If your country has the data, I can try to build the door.

Not because the same story is waiting everywhere. Because the same public problem is waiting everywhere. Public data exists, but the public often does not have a usable entrance.

That is where the work begins.

Denmark proved the first entrance could be useful. Sweden showed the approach could move. The Netherlands showed that a third country can become a public preview without pretending to be finished.

The next door will not be chosen by a slogan, a map color, or a wish to look international.

It will be chosen by the sources.

If the data exists, the door can be built.

RELATION MEMORY

MATURES FROM [One Country Was Never the Framework](#) · Turns the multi-country data framework into a general rule: public data needs country-specific doors.

RETURNS TO [A Pattern Is Not an Explanation](#) · Returns to the first politics-data method boundary with a stronger source-first publishing rule.

NEARBY [Download Was the Wrong Door](#) · Both articles argue that data and tools need a legible public interface, not a generic file doorway.