
Supplementary Notes on U.K. Liberal Party

[NOTE: Our sources cover only the period from 1895 through early 1976, and hence we don't yet know whether there were any changes in dominant coalition from 1975 through 1987, when the merger took place.]

As far as we can tell from Douglas' The History of the Liberal Party 1895-1970 (1971) and Cook (cited below), there was no change of dominant coalition from 1950 until the 1970s.

According to Cook's A Short History of the Liberal Party 1900-1976 (1976), a radical, left-oriented, "Young Liberals" group began to make itself known in the mid 1960s, and became a major factor in the direction of the manifesto, in upper level party posts, plus in candidacies for parliament, by the early 1970s.

According to Cook (p 148), already by 1966:

"Among Thorpe's many difficulties within the party, the growing radical militancy of the Young Liberals was perhaps the most pronounced."

They evidently tried to take control of the party in 1966, or at least have an impact on its direction, but failed. After that, the Young Liberals and the "party hierarchy" grew even further apart, with "virtual civil war" occurring in very early in 1970, largely over tactics (i.e., willingness to accept responsibility for actions of "sabotage" of cricket facilities.)

Later in 1970, after a change of Young Liberal leadership, the emphasis on "community politics" -- which began in the Young Liberals a few years earlier, became even more clear, and now the party's conference adopted "a radical Young Liberal resolution which proposed that the party should start campaigning and working on a community level." Though the YL's were now having an impact, it seems too early -- given the limited nature of the effect thus far -- to claim that there had been a dramatic shift in the dominant coalition. It is clear that the effect of the group, such as it was, was primarily strategic/tactical at this point.

It is also clear that by this time (i.e. 1970), the Young Liberals can be thought of as an organized faction within the party.

"The new radicals constituted almost a separate entity within the party. The "Radical Bulletin" group (as they called themselves) held their own seminars, published their own journal and helped secure election to key posts within the party." (151)

Then

"By autumn 1972, "community politics" was to score its second major victory. At the Margate Assembly, Trevor Jones, the radicals' new standard-bearer, was elected President of the Party, defeating the leadership's candidate." (p 152)

In addition,

"The group was to produce the famous Liberal names of the 1972-3 revival; ..."

There is nothing in Cook to suggest that the reason for the ascendancy of the Young Liberals was due to anything other than their new approach to strategy/tactics. But then, once in positions of authority, these party "radicals" saw their ideological stamp placed on the party's election manifesto.

Cook characterizes the manifesto adopted at the 1973 conference as a "wide-ranging policy program having a strong radical flavour" (p 155). It included such things as: "statutory minimum earnings level; profit-sharing in industry; a credit income tax to replace means tests and existing allowances, ..., a Bill of Rights, ..." (p 155).

In addition,

"The Liberal standard bearers in the February 1974 election provided interesting evidence on the type of person attracted to the 'New Liberalism.' ... (p 155)

[For one thing, the average age, 37, was clearly younger than had been the case traditionally.]

But though all of these indicators point in the direction of the younger faction gaining a position of great influence within the party, the parliamentary group itself (after some disappointing

election results) was not to reflect the more radical group's importance in other dimensions of party activity.

"... the composition of the Parliamentary Liberal Party would stay markedly to the Right of the Liberal activists in the country - particularly of Trevor Jones and the Young Liberal radicals." (p 157)

And that even the impact on the manifesto was to prove less than total or permanent, Cook notes that the 1975 conference left unresolved the party's ideological identity.

"'Is it a party of the left or the right? Should it ally with the Conservatives, in an anti-Labour coalition, or hope for a breakup of the Labour party to form a new radical alternative to the Conservatives?'" (Cook, page 164, quoting from Sunday Telegraph)

Supplementary Information for Democratic Party -- 1970

There can be little doubt that the McGovern candidacy in 1972 symbolized the strengthened position of the leftwing element of the party, especially relative to the southern, conservative wing. Though some might see the McGovern candidacy as a fluke, resulting from party "outsiders" gaining temporary control of the nominating processes, a convincing argument can be made that the McGovern nomination actually resulted in part from an earlier shift in power among the party's main tendencies.

Caroline Arden (in Getting the Donkey out of the Ditch) notes that the process of substantial party reform (in ways that we see as consistent with values and interests of the party's left wing) actually began in the aftermath of the 1964 convention. The first of a series of reform committees/commissions was established at that time to assure more adequate representation of minorities in party meetings and decision processes. That first commission was then followed, after 1968, by two new commissions (including the McGovern-Fraser Commission) which furthered the reform efforts. The 1972 McGovern nomination can be seen as one highly symbolic, logical consequence of those efforts.

In the aftermath of the 1968 defeat, Rutland (1979) says, "a real power vacuum existed in the Democratic party."

The old machine bosses were dead or dying; their organizations were crumbling under the exigencies of black unrest, urban sprawl, and generously conceived welfare programs. (p 224)

"Between 1968 and 1972," he goes on, "the Democrats offered only the shadow of opposition."

In these discouraging days the Democrats turned the party reins over to theoreticians who convinced the leadership that the old courthouse gangs and city bosses were to blame for many of the nation's problems. In a search for scapegoats the theorists found them in the old-fashioned state central committees, which were dominated by white, middle-aged, and middle-class males. Without consulting the rank and file, a stamp of disavowal was placed on machines already creaking and groaning... With the best of intentions the Democratic party chieftains permitted a drastic revision of the rules governing the selection of national convention delegates. (p 225)

So, Rutland says that sometime "between 1968 and 1972," the party was turned over to "the theoreticians."

Rather than date the shift toward the dominant role played by a

leftwing-dominated coalition at 1972, or at 1969 (the beginning date for the McGovern-Fraser Commission's work), we prefer to date the change at the point where the Commission's proposals were made party policy, i.e. when they were adopted and, perhaps more importantly, implemented. This dating clearly indicates our impression that the internal power shift had already occurred prior to McGovern's nomination in 1972.

But this begs the question of when the reforms actually were adopted and/or implemented. Several things are clear.

(1) The "coalition pressing for change" (Sullivan, Pressman, and Arterton, 1976, p 8) in 1968 failed to nominate its choice for candidate, but did prevail in getting the national convention that year to address its concerns over delegate selection procedures.

"By a narrow margin, the delegates approved a liberal minority report of the convention's Rules Committee. That report specified that the 1972 Convention Call would declare: 'It is understood that a State Democratic Party, in selecting and certifying delegates to the National Convention, thereby undertakes a process in which all Democratic voters have had full and timely opportunity to participate.'" (Sullivan et al, p 8)

(2) The commission that would later be called the "McGovern Fraser Commission" was formed in February of 1969 by the DNC chair, and in that year the rules would be "promulgated." (Ranney, in Fishel, ed., 1978, p 220; also Crotty, 1983, p 50.) Ranney seems to imply that the rules had an immediate impact (even before being officially adopted, perhaps?):

"After our guidelines were promulgated in 1969 no fewer than eight states newly adopted presidential primaries,..." (p 220)

[It was not until November 19-20 of 1969 that the Commission adopted its own final set of recommendations. In early December, it distributed them to the states. This is according to Crotty, 1983, p 50, who goes on to say that "by the end of its first year, the committee's substantive work had been completed."]

(3) The actual Report of the Commission was "produced" and published in April of 1970. (See Sullivan et al, p 15, fn 9.)

(4) The Commission chose not to go to the DNC for formal acceptance of its recommendations, and instead **assumed** that it had the authority (under the stipulations of the 1968 convention's rule to establish the Commission) to work with the states in implementing its guidelines, so that the states would be in compliance by the time of selecting the 1972 delegates.

(Crotty, 1983, p 54) For the most part, the state parties did comply (probably indicating that many of the state parties themselves were under control of "reformers").

(5) The "Rules" were already being enforced (as evidenced by the need for further interpretation in a letter to the DNC chair from the Commission chair) by November of 1971.

[It should be remembered, though, that Fred Harris, a "reformer," was replaced by the "regular" Larry O'Brien as DNC chair in spring of 1970. In spite of the concerns of reformers that this could signal problems ahead, however, O'Brien effectively allowed the reforms to go forward.]

Though the "recommendations" were adopted and circulated at the very end of 1969, we chose 1970 as the date of this "dominant coalition change" since it was in that year that implementation actually took place, with a high degree of success. The "reformers" (or "theorists") were clearly making their mark by 1970.

As for the McGovern supporters being "outsiders," it is certainly the case that many of them were more ideologically- than party-oriented. Nevertheless, there was clearly an intention to take over the party, and to stamp it indelibly with the markings of the leftist (albeit a somewhat "new" leftist) tendency.

Has there been a later change in dominant faction, returning the party to its conservative or moderate elements? We think not, or at least not dramatically so. The departure of a substantial portion of the party's rightwing element since the early 1970s can be seen not only as a reaction to the impression that the liberal element remained dominant, but also as a contributor to that dominance. (I.e., the rightwing element is a substantially smaller proportion of the party today).

Supplementary Information on Republican Party -- 1964 & 1980

For the Republicans, we argue that there have been two changes of dominant coalition, BOTH involving development of new rightwing "elements" and both resulting in shifts of power to the right wing. The first occurred in the early 1960s, and was symbolized in the nomination of Barry Goldwater. The second occurred by 1980, symbolized in the nomination and election of Ronald Reagan.

As for the first, Huebner (in Schlesinger, Volume IV, 3003) says:

The convention of 1960 evidenced that a new Republican left and anew Republican right were already jockeying for position... Goldwater and Rockefeller represented new forces in the party, and their differences from the Taft and Eisenhower factions were as important as their similarities.

In 1964,

Neither was able to win the confidence of the broad center of the party -- much less of his ideological opponents. As a result, the Republican party flew through the 1964 election with only one wing. (3008)

As a "new conservative," though, "Goldwater was not the direct descendant of Taft." (3011) In fact,

White points out that the great burst of Goldwater enthusiasm at the 1960 Republican convention did not originate among heartland conservative delegates, who were solid for Nixon, but among the more intense and more youthful delegations from South Carolina and other southern states... (3011)

The same point has been emphasized by White's close associate, William Rusher, the publisher of the National Review. It was Rusher who first came to White in 1961 with the important realization that the old Taft wing was virtually dead, that the old pros were "dreadfully out of condition" ..., and that the closeknit Young Republican group of "old friends" -- in which Rusher, White, and Representative John Ashbrook of Ohio were the principal

movers and shakers -- was now "about the third or fourth largest faction" in the party. (3011)

Though this group apparently was more "conservative" than "Republican," and was willing to consider a "third force" strategy, Huebner adds that

When White, Rusher, and Ashbrook and nineteen other highly trusted old friends gathered ... on October 8, 1961, in the Avenue Motel in Chicago, their aim was not to restore a displaced faction but to capture and revolutionize a political party.

and

While the young intellectuals who supported Goldwater often complicated his relationship with the Republican party, it was their inspiring creed and sense of purpose which gave the Goldwater movement much of its power in the 1960s. They provided a resource which moderates and liberals in the party sorely lacked... In the Republican party, with no incumbent president and only sixteen incumbent governors, the prospects for revolution were particularly ripe...

The Goldwater movement was supported by a vast grassroots army of dedicated volunteers who regarded the effort as a crusade to save the country. (3012)

That the "movement" succeeded, and then apparently continued to play a dominant role after the 1964 election, is alleged in this quote from Huebner:

The Goldwater people regarded 1964 not as the end of the road but as the beginning. Their fundraising successes, coupled with the decision to cut spending in the campaign's final hopeless days, had even produced a surplus in the treasury of the party -- whose machinery they still controlled. As for conservative citizen groups, just three weeks after the election, a front page headline in the New York Times announced that the "Rightists" had been "bought by the elections" and were opening "new drives." Twenty-seven million Americans could not be wrong.

Some conservatives even thought about another Goldwater race, and their spirits were lifted when the Arizonan's presidential poll ratings went from eleven percent to nineteen percent during the Spring of 1965... (3023)

Though it can be argued that by the time of Nixon's second term, the moderate forces were once again in charge of the Republican party (and clearly remained so through the Ford years), we have not found it possible to identify a particular time point (or even discrete period) when that shift occurred. Instead, we view that change as a more gradual one, occurring slowly over many years. Also, it is not clear that what the right had accomplished by 1964 was completely undone in the later years. The 1964 triumph of the rightwing of the party was, after all, based on a rather tentative hold over a loosely knit coalition of support. Even though the tenuous hold gave way to more moderate elements within the coalition, the right may still have continued after that election to be stronger than it had been previously. Hence, we do not code a dramatic change "back" from the right after 1964, even though we do note another discrete shift "to" the right by the 1980s.

Though we will code the second change as occurring in 1980, in advance of the nomination of Ronald Reagan, we do not mean to imply that the change was complete by that election. After all, even the Reagan of 1980 was packaged more moderately than he would be four years later. Part of the earlier timidity may have been due to calculations of what it would take to win in November, but another part was probably due to concerns that "the party" itself was not yet fully behind Reagan and his conservative supporters, who -- after all -- were conservative not only in the traditional, economic sense, but also socially.

According to Desmond King (1987):

The conservatism of Ronald Reagan's Presidential candidacy provided a unifying theme for Republican Party candidates in 1980. Reagan's conservative electoral programme -- particularly the objectives of reducing the federal government's role in welfare and the economy, cutting taxes, strengthening defence and his stated social conservatism -- constituted an appealing platform for Republican Congressional candidates. The agreement between the Presidential candidate and the congressional party candidates was not absolute but in that the Reagan programme accurately predicated the prevailing mood amongst the electorate, Republican candidates were only too pleased to be associated with it... This unity was manifested by the joint appearance of presidential candidate Reagan with 285 Republican congressional candidates at Capitol Hill before the election, and promulgated in the "Capitol Compact"... This programme embodied New Right liberal policy objectives, though not social conservative aims; these latter had to

wait until the 1984 Presidential election to be included in the official Republican Party statement.

Pomper (1981) clearly alludes to a conservative takeover by 1980 in his statements that

... [Reagan] embodied the conservative ideology that was dominant among both party leaders and members...

and

The most significant aspect of the Republicans' victory in 1980, in the long run, may be precisely that it was a Republican victory rather than the triumph of particular individuals. While Reagan won his nomination as an individual factional leader, he did represent the core of the party. While Reagan won the election as an individual challenger to a particular incumbent, he did campaign as a Republican spokesman, unlike Eisenhower and Nixon. For the first time in fifty years, a President has been elected who admits he is a Republican.

and

Unlike 1964, when Barry Goldwater had called for a right-wing direction for the party, the newly dominant conservative faction [in 1980] was not strident in its ideology. (p 17)

On the other hand, he also stresses the latter caveat, i.e. that the conservatives were not "strident" in their ideology. In fact, as he then notes (on pages 18 and 19),

The moderate and effective national chairman, Bill Brock, was kept in office.

and

The most obvious effort to unify the party came in the vice-presidential nomination.

In their review of the 1980 Republican national convention, Congressional Quarterly (in National Party Conventions 1831-1988, page 137) reports that:

The Republican Party's 1980 platform was more a blueprint for victory in November than a definitive statement of party views. Rather than slug it out over specifics, the party's

moderate and conservative wings agreed to blur their differences to appear united, to broaden the party's appeal and to smooth Reagan's way to the White House.

... For the most part, they managed to fashion a policy statement that pleased no party faction entirely but with which all could live reasonably.

... Reagan, in a gesture to moderates, suggested that the platform not take a position on the [ERA] issue...

But in their review of the 1984 convention, they say (p 153) that:

Behind the cheering and display of party unity ... ran a current of dissent: Moderates who were greatly outnumbered, voiced unhappiness with the party's direction and its platform.

... Earlier, after spirited debate, the 106-member platform committee adopted a 1984 campaign document that conformed in virtually all respects to the themes Reagan had sounded during his first term in office. The convention itself ratified the 30,000 word platform with no debate August 21. On almost every aspect of public policy, the document stood in stark contrast to the platform the Democrats had adopted in San Francisco.

In spite of the numerous references to changes between 1980 and 1984, and particularly to the greater willingness to compromise in 1980, it is clear that these are differences of degree, and the more significant difference in kind had been largely installed by 1980.

In a book on the 1980 elections, published within months of the election, the Washington Post's William Greider asks the question

And what was the nature of this conservative movement that [Reagan] led on its stubborn, 20-year crusade to win the soul of the Grand Old Party? (p 160)

Importantly for our purposes, Greider's question seems to assume that the crusade had accomplished its goal. Later, he says

Some commentators, dreaming of the discord of 1964, listened to the ramblings from Rev. Falwell and others and concluded that a mean-spirited authoritarianism dominated the convention. They saw a frightening reactionary movement

being born and offered cheap comparisons with the rise of Fascism. They missed the evident joy of the event and the rather important ideological realignment which was underway in the Republican Party, accompanying the social theme but dwarfing them in importance. (166)

Rather than seeing concessions to moderates as evidence that the right wing was not yet dominant, Greider seems content to see such moves as efforts to solidify a winning coalition.

In 1964, having captured the nomination for Goldwater, they took splenetic delight in driving away the moderates of their own party and offending virtually every voter group identified as Democratic.

....

The Reaganites had learned something from defeat. It was as though they had studied the election disaster of 1964 ... (162-163).

Having decided to code the change in dominant coalition as having taken place prior to the 1980 election, there is still the question of whether it took place in 1980 or in some earlier year.

First, it can be safely assumed that the party was not yet in the control of the new right wing in 1976, though the process of change may have been underway already. Given no compelling reason for coding the change as taking place in 1978 or 1979, we chose the more "conservative" approach of saying that a significant change had definitely taken place by the time of Reagan's nomination in 1980.

Finally, we should note that there is an important parallel between the 1964 and 1980 changes, beyond the obvious fact that both involved shifts to the right. And that is that both also involved the presence of new rightwing elements -- which perhaps can be seen then as new elements of right-dominated coalitions -- within the party. In 1964, it was the "Young Republicans;" in 1980 it was the religious right. In both cases, the new elements were added to existing rightwing groups (i.e., without significant loss from what existed previously). Hence, the addition of the "new conservatives" in 1964 may have established a beachhead, but the addition of the religious right in 1980 finally allowed the rightwing to more fully consolidate its gains.

Initial Coding Information for German CDU/CSU (Reformers)

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: Germany

Party: CDU/CSU

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 28 July 93

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

Reformers

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? Yes No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

Kai-Uwe von Hassel (Minister-President of Schleswig-Holstein) (Pridham 1977: 117).

4. Is this primarily seen as a parliamentary faction, an extraparliamentary faction, or both?

Extra-parliamentary faction. This is composed of reformers among the CDU Land chairmen. "The regional 'party barons' nevertheless comprised the largest single element in both party organs and could in effect exercise much influence if united on the national party leadership. Kai-Uwe von Hassel, the young and ambitious Minister-President of Schleswig-Holstein, now emerged as

the spokesman of the reformers among the CDU Land chairmen." (Pridham 1977: 117).

6. When did this faction first become evident/established?

1959. "The initiative for the discussion of reform in 1959 was taken, within a few weeks of the Adenauer-Erhard public quarrel over the former's presidential candidacy, at a conference of the CDU Land chairmen held in Berlin at the beginning of July." (Pridham 1977: 116).

Initial Coding Information for German CSU

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: Germany

Party: CDU/CSU

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 28 July 1993

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

(Harmel, Tan)

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

Christian Social Union

2. On what dimension(s) is this faction identifiable?

Ideology. Ian Derbyshire (1987) describes the CSU as a "right-wing Catholic off-shoot in Bavaria" (p.13)

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? Yes No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

Hanns Seidel (Kolinsky 1984); Franz-Josef Strauss (Pridham 1977)

4. Is this primarily seen as a parliamentary faction, an extraparliamentary faction, or both?

Both. The CSU is actually an independent party within the Christian Democratic camp. It has its own organization, party conferences, leadership structure, membership, and headquarters. However, the CSU is politically affiliated to the CDU as attested by the CDU/CSU common Fraktion in the parliament (Pridham 1977). The CSU has secured absolute majority in Bavaria that it is able to claim more influence within the Christian Democratic camp (Kolinsky 1984: 129).

7. Evidence pertaining to whether this is a faction or a tendency. (I.e., indicators of self-consciousness and resulting formalization.)

a. Are there "formal" positions of leadership within the faction? If so, identify the positions.

Yes. Since the CSU is a party within a party, it has a chairman, a leadership structure that is independent of the CDU. The position of general secretary was created in 1955 (Kolinsky 1984).

c. Internal Communications. Are they formalized (e.g., with faction newsletter, newspaper, etc.)?

"The weekly Bayernkurier is the CSU membership paper." (Kolinsky 1984: 130).

References:

Derbyshire, Ian. 1987. Politics in West Germany: From Schmidt to Kohl. Cambridge: W&R Chambers Ltd.

Kolinsky, Eva. 1984. Parties, Opposition and Society in West Germany. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Pridham, Geoffrey. 1977. Christian Democracy in Western Germany: The CDU/CSU in Government and Opposition, 1945-1960. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Initial Coding Information for German Greens (Fundis)

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: Germany

Party: German Greens

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 10 September 1993

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

Fundis

2. On what dimension(s) is this faction identifiable?

Primary goal. This faction is made up of the ecologists and the fundamental oppositionists. Mewes (1983) describes this group as stating that the Greens are an "anti-party party." This group prefers the party to stay small and exclusive. In the view of its leaders the party is not to engage in party politics, and coalition-building until other parties have come completely to accept the views of the Greens. (Mewes 1983)

The primary goal of the party is "not to get into parliament but to introduce changes" (Papadakis 1984: 166)

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? Yes No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

Rudolf Bahro, Petra Kelly, Rainer Trampert, Thomas Ebermann,

Jutta Dittfurth, Dieter Burgmann (Cohen and Arato 1984; Mewes 1983; Hulsberg 1988; Poguntke 1992; Papadakis 1984)

4. Is this primarily seen as a parliamentary faction, an extraparliamentary faction, or both?

Both. Leaders of the faction in the parliament overlaps with the extraparliamentary leadership. Factions within the Greens originated in the extraparliamentary party and reflected itself in the parliament (Poguntke 1992)

5. What is the relative size of this faction, relative to the rest of the party, and/or to other major factions?

Is this considered to be the dominant faction (or part of the dominant coalition)?

Yes. The fundis from the period 1980-1990 can be considered as the dominant faction within the Greens (Papadakis 1984; Poguntke 1992).

6. When did this faction first become evident/established?

1980. The formation of the Greens in 1980 saw the congregation of very diverse groups of social movements. After the initial party convention at Saarbruecken, the integration of the diverse continuum of opinion/positions into a coherent party program proved to be a daunting task. Frankland (1989) notes that the conservatives wanted to focus only on environmental issues while the leftists wanted a full range of radical policies including foreign and domestic issues.

8. Subdivisions (over time)

a. On what dimension(s)? (Include identification information here as well.)

Ideology and strategy. Within the fundis we can see two general types - the ecologist and the leftist. The ecological/fundamental oppositionists is best represented by Kelly and Bahro. The leftist are represented by Rainer Trampert, Jurgen Reents, and Thomas Ebermann. While sharing the same primary goals, there are differences as far as strategy and ideology is concerned. In the area of strategy, the ecologists insist that there should

be no participation in any coalition. The leftists on the other hand wants a coalition with the Social Democrats. (Capra and Spretnak 1984; Mewes 1983).

In ideology, the ecologists are New Politics activists espousing no-growth economic reforms and the exclusion of unions. The leftists see the Greens struggle along the lines of class conflict. (Capra and Spretnak 1984).

III. Dominant Faction(s) Over Time

1. Which faction (or coalition of factions) is dominant? (over time)

1980-1990 Fundis
1990-present Realos and Centrist
(Poguntke 1992)

2. For each change of dominant faction/coalition:

a. When did it occur? (year or period)

1990. "The fact that several previously very controversial statutory reforms were approved by the 1991 Neumunster party congress indicates that an alliance of Realists and Centrists and the undogmatic Left have now come to dominate the Green Party (Poguntke 1992)

b. Relevant dimension affected by the change:

Primary goal. "It is certainly true that the 1991 reform represents a significant reorientation of the dominant organizational philosophy inside the party" (Poguntke 1992b).

c. Why did the change of dominant faction/coalition occur?

Fundis lost in the final power struggle partly by leaving the party. It was also attributed to the fact that the disastrous results of the December 1990 elections.

Initial Coding Information for German Greens (Realos)

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: Germany

Party: German Greens

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 10 September 1993

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

(Harmel, Tan)

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

Realos

2. On what dimension(s) is this faction identifiable?

Primary goals. Winning more electoral votes (twenty percent or more) and not simply overcoming the five-percent hurdle and having direct say in policy are the primary goals. In other words getting into government at all costs (Capra and Spretnak 1984; Frankland 1989)

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? Yes No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

Antje Vollmer, Joshcka Fischer, Otto Schilly, Jo Muller, Olaf

Dinne (Capra and Spretnak 1984; Mewes 1983; Frankland 1989; Poguntke 1992)

4. Is this primarily seen as a parliamentary faction, an extraparliamentary faction, or both?

5. What is the relative size of this faction, relative to the rest of the party, and/or to other major factions?

Is this considered to be the dominant faction (or part of the dominant coalition)?

This faction became the dominant faction only after December 1990. (Poguntke 1992)

6. When did this faction first become evident/established?

1980.

7. Evidence pertaining to whether this is a faction or a tendency. (I.e., indicators of self-consciousness and resulting formalization.)

c. Internal Communications. Are they formalized (e.g., with faction newsletter, newspaper, etc.)?

"The weekly Bayernkurier is the CSU membership paper."
(Kolinsky 1984: 130).

Initial Coding Information for German SPD (Left)

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: Germany

Party: Social Democratic Party

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 8 April 1993

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

SPD Left

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? Yes No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

Erhard Eppler (Paterson 1977)

4. Is this primarily seen as a parliamentary faction, an extraparliamentary faction, or both?

Both. "In the Bundestagfraktion the Left remain a small and isolated minority of approximately thirty adherents...It has links with the Frankfurter Kreis which attempted to co-ordinate the left in the Party as a whole" (Paterson 1977, p.190).

5. What is the relative size of this faction, relative to the

rest of the party, and/or to other major factions?

Paterson (1977) suggests that this group is small at least within the Bundestag. "(T)he Left remain a small and isolated minority of approximately thirty adherents" (Paterson 1977, p.190).

Together with the Young Socialist, the Left were unable to attract a strong following within the electorate and the party membership. "The narrow middle-class social basis and the overwhelming academic orientation of the Young Socialists has tended to cut them off from other members of the party...(T)he trade unionists in the party have taken an explicitly hostile line and the Jusos have never established a successful industrial base" (Paterson 1977, p.190)

Is this considered to be the dominant faction (or part of the dominant coalition)?

No. The Left is both a minority within the Bundestag and the party (Paterson 1977)

7. Evidence pertaining to whether this is a faction or a tendency. (I.e., indicators of self-consciousness and resulting formalization.)

b. What is the frequency and nature of meetings (with emphasis on whether they are "formalized" or not; e.g., is there evidence that meetings are planned and announced in advance)?

"They meet on a regular but informal basis in the so-called Leverkusenet Kreis. It has links with the Frankfurter Kreis which attempted to co-ordinate the left in the Party as a whole but which, despite meeting regularly every two or three months over a number of years, has failed to exercise any very marked influence" (Paterson 1977, p.190).

Initial Coding Information for German SPD (Right)

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: Germany

Party: Social Democratic Party

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 8 April 1993

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

SPD Right

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? Yes No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

Helmut Schmidt, von Donhanyi, H.J. Vogel and H. Ehrenberg
(Paterson 1977)

4. Is this primarily seen as a parliamentary faction, an extraparliamentary faction, or both?

Both. "Given its position of strength in the cabinet and parliamentary party the right sees little need to organize at the level of the Bundestagfraktion... (H)owever a so-called Lahnsteuner Kreis which attempts to ensure that the Party remains true to a Right-wing interpretation of the Godesberg Programme" (Paterson 1977, p.190).

5. What is the relative size of this faction, relative to the rest of the party, and/or to other major factions?

Is this considered to be the dominant faction (or part of the dominant coalition)?

Yes. "In this its leaders have been able to resist the demands of their left-wingers for radical social and economic reforms, claiming that their Liberal coalition partners would never accept such policies. Thus for the dominant right wing of the SPD, the FDP is not only a necessary ally in government but a welcome justification for the party's centrist image so vital in winning support amongst moderate, unaligned voters of the middle and skilled working classes" (Burkett 1979, p.101)

"Given its position of strength in the cabinet and parliamentary party the right sees little need to organize at the level of the Bundestagfraktion" (Paterson 1977, p.190)

7. Evidence pertaining to whether this is a faction or a tendency. (I.e., indicators of self-consciousness and resulting formalization.)

b. What is the frequency and nature of meetings (with emphasis on whether they are "formalized" or not; e.g., is there evidence that meetings are planned and announced in advance)?

The Lahnsteier Kreis is considered as a meeting or a discussion circle. The frequency of the meetings are not specified. (Paterson 1977).

c. Internal Communications. Are they formalized (e.g., with faction newsletter, newspaper, etc.)?

The Lahnsteiner Kreis published an important pamphlet *Godesberg und die Gegenwart* in 1974.

III. Dominant Faction(s) Over Time

1. Which faction (or coalition of factions) is dominant? (over time)

The SPD Right is the dominant faction within the SPD. "In this its leaders have been able to resist the demands of their left-wingers for radical social and economic reforms, claiming that their Liberal coalition partners would never accept such policies. Thus for the dominant right wing of the SPD, the FDP is not only a necessary ally in government but a welcome justification for the party's centrist image so vital in winning support amongst moderate, unaligned voters of the middle and skilled working classes" (Burkett 1979, p.101)

Initial Coding Information for German SPD (Young Soc.)

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: Germany

Party: Social Democratic Party

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 28 June 1993; 6 July 1993

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

Young Socialists

2. On what dimension(s) is this faction identifiable?

Ideology. The Young Socialists were highly critical of the SPD increasingly being unable to represent working-class interest. After the 1969 conference, the Young Socialists increasingly press for the implementation of the imperative mandate which will require the elected to be controlled by the electors. "(T)hey (the Young Socialists) pressed for the operation of 'the imperative mandate'. This would have meant a situation in which delegates to any of the higher Party bodies and to parliament would be controlled by those who elected them. If they wanted to diverge from a position that they had been mandated to represent, they would have to get a new mandate from 'the basis'. Such a notion, while clearly close to the ideas of participation implicit in the organizational structure of the SPD, was equally clearly unwelcome to the Party leadership." (Paterson 1977, p.188).

Issues. "In their conference at Munich in December 1969 they passed resolutions which, while applauding the concept of European integration, sought to give it a different content. They wished to alter the direction of the Community's efforts towards coordinating the European labour movement and controlling multinational companies" (Paterson 1977, p.201)

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? Yes No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

Karsten Voigt (1969-?) (Paterson 1977)

5. What is the relative size of this faction, relative to the rest of the party, and/or to other major factions?

Technically the Young Socialists includes all party members under the age of thirty-five. According to Paterson (1977), at the height of Young Socialist activity only about one-fifth of SPD members under thirty-five actively participated in its activities. Paterson (1977) notes that the number of those who claim to be Young Socialists rose from 54.6% in 1969 to 65.6% in 1971 (p.187). In this case active members of the Young Socialists is estimated to be approximately 10% of the SPD membership at its peak.

Is this considered to be the dominant faction (or part of the dominant coalition)?

No. The Young Socialists were initially being coopted by the party leadership into becoming party functionaries. However, by 1973, there have been increasing demands from other members of the party to expel the Young Socialists from the party. (Paterson 1977, p.189).

"Thus the party Fraktion, the executive and powerful Land-based politicians wield most influence in the SPD, which are usually able to stifle agitation for more left-wing policies, especially those voiced by its youth section. The Young Socialists (Junge Sozialisten) are an almost permanent source of trouble to the leaders of the party who, anxious to emphasize the pragmatic orientations the SPD now stands for, are subject to frequent embarrassing demands for more socialism" (Burkett 1979, p.100).

"The minority position of the Young Socialists in the Party was one in which they needed support from other groups to get their

views accepted as Party policy. This was not forthcoming and even if it had been it is difficult to see how it would have constrained the party leadership" (Paterson 1977, p.201)

6. When did this faction first become evident/established?

The Young Socialists were established earlier as a organization for SPD members that are below the age of thirty-five. However, by 1969 the Young Socialists increasingly challenge the party leadership on issues of intra-party democracy and ideological purity. "The challenge from the Young Socialists first became apparent at their 1969 conference in Munich where the radical Karsten Voigt was elected chairman" (Paterson 1977, p.187).

7. Evidence pertaining to whether this is a faction or a tendency. (I.e., indicators of self-consciousness and resulting formalization.)

a. Are there "formal" positions of leadership within the faction? If so, identify the positions.
Yes. The Young Socialists elects a chairman (Paterson 1977)

Are there formalized procedures for selection of the leaders? If yes, what are they, briefly?

Yes. The chairman of the Young Socialists is elected during their own conference.

e. Membership requirements/obligations. First, are there requirements for becoming a member of the faction? If yes, give examples (e.g., pledge, dues).

Members of the Young Socialists should be SPD members under the age of thirty-five. (Paterson 1977).

Initial Coding Information for U.K. Conservatives (Monday C.)

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: United Kingdom

Party: Conservative Party

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 6/8/1993

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

Monday Club

2. On what dimension(s) is this faction identifiable?

Issue. "The raison d'etre of the Monday Club was the failure of successive British governments to grapple with the so-called Wind of Change in Africa. The Club was founded to fight a rearguard action to preserve the Central African Federation and to maintain British presence in Southern Africa" (Seyd 1972, p.468)

"(T)he Club's intention has been to develop a research programme over a wide field of affairs" (Seyd 1972, p.479)

"Since 1964, the Club has formed study groups on such matters as economic policy, taxation, social services, education, housing, defence, aviation, Rhodesia and the machinery of government" (Seyd 1972, p.479).

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? _X_Yes ___No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

"Paul Bristol, a twenty-four year old shipbroker, was the Club's first chairman" (Seyd 1972, p.469)

"Lord Salisbury who became the first patron of the Club early in 1962" (Seyd 1972, p.469)

4. Is this primarily seen as a parliamentary faction, an extraparliamentary faction, or both?

Both. Monday Club members can be found among the Conservative MPs, members of the Conservative party, sympathizers of the party, students, businessmen.

In 1971, the Monday Club could claim to have 30 members who are MPs of which six were members of the ruling conservative administration (Seyd 1972, p.471).

"(T)he main criterion should be that the person is a supporter of the Conservative Party though not necessarily a member, but that he should not belong to a rival political organization" (Seyd 1972, p.473).

5. What is the relative size of this faction, relative to the rest of the party, and/or to other major factions?

"Between 1965 and 1969 membership increased annually and by 1971 the chairman of the Club could claim in his annual report a national membership of 'around 10,000' and the existence of thirty branches throughout Great Britain" (Seyd 1972, p.471).

However, Seyd's (1972) own calculation based on membership subscription reveals a much lower number than the 10,000 cited by the Club chairman. Based on subscriptions in 1970, individual membership is between 1,600 and 2,500.

In the parliamentary party, Monday Club members are about 10% of the total number of conservative MPs (Seyd 1972).

Is this considered to be the dominant faction (or part of the dominant coalition)?

No.

6. When did this faction first become evident/established?

1961. "The Monday Club was formed in 1961 as a 'ginger group' to force local party associations to discuss and debate party policy" (Seyd 1972, p.467)

7. Evidence pertaining to whether this is a faction or a tendency. (I.e., indicators of self-consciousness and resulting formalization.)

a. Are there "formal" positions of leadership within the faction? If so, identify the positions.

Yes, there is a chairman and an executive council whose members are elected during annual meetings. There is also a permanent bureaucracy that handles the day-to-day administration of the Club. The executive council is responsible for approving new memberships. (Seyd 1972).

Are there formalized procedures for selection of the leaders? If yes, what are they, briefly?

Yes. "(A)n annual meeting is held at which members of an Executive Council and the officers of the Club are elected." (Seyd 1972, p.472).

b. What is the frequency and nature of meetings (with emphasis on whether they are "formalized" or not; e.g., is there evidence that meetings are planned and announced in advance)?

"This body (the Executive Council) meets monthly to discuss Club affairs. The Executive Council is answerable to the annual meeting of the Club, in the sense that members are elected by this meeting which takes place in April. At this yearly meeting the activities of the Club are discussed, the financial accounts are presented, the election of officers and executive takes place, and finally Club policy is discussed" (Seyd 1972, p.478).

c. Internal Communications. Are they formalized (e.g., with faction newsletter, newspaper, etc.)?

The Monday Club publishes a quarterly journal called the Monday World and circulates a monthly newsletter to its members. The circulation of the Monday World is about 2,500 (Seyd 1972).

d. External Communications. Are they formalized (e.g., with a press officer, etc.)

The Club has a full-time director and assistant director

and an office headquarters in the Westminster area (Seyd 1972).

e. Membership requirements/obligations. First, are there requirements for becoming a member of the faction? If yes, give examples (e.g., pledge, dues).

"Membership of the Club is not automatic on application; rather the applicant has to undergo a vetting process. The Executive Council is responsible for approving membership and the usual procedure is for some of the officers of the Club to interview the applicant and then make recommendations to the Executive. In the case of applicants not living in London the Executive will ask a Club member residing in the same area as the applicant, or the local Conservative party agent if he or she is known to be sympathetic to the Club, to vet the applicant. IN the circular sent to the assessor the director states that the main criterion should be that the person is a supporter of the Conservative Party though not necessarily a member, but that he should not belong to a rival political organization. Apart from political views the Club is also concerned that any personal characteristics which might militate against the election of the applicant should be stated by the assessor. Then at the monthly Executive meeting a list of applicants to be approved is submitted by the membership sub-committee" (Seyd 1972, p.473).

"Monday Club subscriptions were raised in October 1965 from two to three guineas for full membership, from one to two guineas for those under the age of twnty-five, and a student subscription of one guinea was introduced" (Seyd 1972, p.471 footnote 23).

Second, are there rules of conduct, enforced by disciplinary procedures (e.g. expulsion)?

Initial Coding Information for U.K. Conservatives (Selsdon)

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: United Kingdom

Party: Conservative Party

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 7 June 1993

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

Selsdon Group

2. On what dimension(s) is this faction identifiable?

Ideology. "The Selsdon Group believes economic freedom is indispensable to political freedom" (Seyd 1980, p.235)

P. Seyd (1980) quoted the Selsdon Group Manifesto describing its basic ideology. "The basic principle upon which Conservative policies should rest is that what the public wants should be provided by the market and paid for by the people as consumers rather than taxpayers...The function of government should not be to provide services but to maintain the framework within which markets operate" (p.235-236)

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? Yes No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

"Only four back-benchers are members-Nicholas Ridley, Ronald

Bell, Richard Body, and Archie Hamilton-although Ian Gow, Rhodes Boyson, and John Biffen are sympathizers" (Seyd 1980, p.236-237).

4. Is this primarily seen as a parliamentary faction, an extraparliamentary faction, or both?

Initially, this was organized as a parliamentary group drawing membership from the Conservative back-benchers. However, the large membership size (about 250) seems to connote that it also has an extra-parliamentary dimension. Seyd (1980) seems to imply that the Selsdon group when he suggests that the "rebelliousness amongst back-benchers has reverberated outside the parliamentary party" (p.235).

5. What is the relative size of this faction, relative to the rest of the party, and/or to other major factions?

"It has an active membership of only 40 and a total membership of 250. It has remained a small group of activists with limited funds and no branch organization" (Seyd 1980, p.237).

Is this considered to be the dominant faction (or part of the dominant coalition)?

No. "Notwithstanding the support for the liberal tendency within the party leadership since Mrs. Thatcher's success in 1975, the influence and impact of the Selsdon Group appears limited." (Seyd 1980, p.236).

"A large number of back-benchers are hostile to the group, regarding members as 'ideological splitters' undermining the chances of a Conservative victory at the general election, and for this reason the group adopted a low public relations profile during 1978" (Seyd 1980, p.237).

6. When did this faction first become evident/established?

This faction was established in 1973.

"Dissatisfaction with the Heath government's increasing intervention in the economy stimulated the formation of the Selsdon Group in 1973" (Seyd 1980, p.235).

7. Evidence pertaining to whether this is a faction or a tendency. (I.e., indicators of self-consciousness and resulting

formalization.)

c. Internal Communications. Are they formalized (e.g., with faction newsletter, newspaper, etc.)?

"It relies on pamphlets, briefing documents and individual speaking engagements as its only means of pressure within the constituency associations" (Seyd 1980, p.237).

The group publishes a journal, the Salisbury Review, to "defend the neo-liberal cause in intellectual terms" (Ingle 1987, p.67).

Initial Coding Information for U.K. Conservatives (TRG)

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: United Kingdom

Party: Conservative Party

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 7 June 1993

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

Tory Reform Group

2. On what dimension(s) is this faction identifiable?

Strategy, issue, and leadership. "Clearly the group is opposed to Thatcher's stule of leadership, arguing that the party 'must stand back from stridency', and must reject the 'mouthing of catch-phrases about freedom'. On the issue of race it has directly attacked her by arguing that '...to pander to basic fears and instincts in the pre-election atmosphere, as Mrs. Thatcher is doing...is an old and ugly subtlety' " (Seyd 1980, p.239).

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? Yes No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

1975-1978. Peter Walker, Nick Scott, and David Knox (Seyd 1980, p.240).

1978-?????. Gerry Wade, chairman (Seyd 1980, p.240).

4. Is this primarily seen as a parliamentary faction, an extraparliamentary faction, or both?

Both. "Soon after its formation the group became relatively moribund and relied upon its parliamentary sympathizers to provide the group with publicity...The group has a dozen branches, primarily concentrated in university towns" (Seyd 1980, p. 240).

"The Tory Reform Group now relies on the support of certain sections of the party-the Federation of Conservative Students, the Young Conservatives, the Conservative Trade Unionists, and particular sections of Conservative Central Office" (Seyd 1980, p.240).

5. What is the relative size of this faction, relative to the rest of the party, and/or to other major factions?

"The group now has a dozen branches, primarily concentrated in university towns, and approximately 1000 members" (Seyd 1980, p.240).

Is this considered to be the dominant faction (or part of the dominant coalition)?

No, since the group was organized as a faction six months after Mrs. Thatcher's election primarily to oppose her leadership.

"(T)he group is clearly opposed to Thatcher's style of leadership" (Seyd 1980, p.239).

6. When did this faction first become evident/established?

The faction was established in 1975.

"Six months after Mrs. Thatcher's election as party leader, the Tory faction within the party reorganised; Pressure for Economic and Social Toryism, and two local groups-the Macleod Group based in the north-west of England, and the Social Tory Action Group based in southern England-amalgamated into the Tory Reform Group" (Seyd 1980, p.239).

7. Evidence pertaining to whether this is a faction or a

tendency. (I.e., indicators of self-consciousness and resulting formalization.)

a. Are there "formal" positions of leadership within the faction? If so, identify the positions.

Yes, there is a chairman.

"But in 1978 the group was revitalised by a new set of leaders, primarily university graduates in their thirties. Gerry WAde, ex-chairman of the Greater London Yound CONservatives and one of the leading figures in the campaign in the late 1960a to make the Conservative party more democratic, is the new chairman" (Seyd 1980, p.240).

c. Internal Communications. Are they formalized (e.g., with faction newsletter, newspaper, etc.)?

The Tory Reform Group publishes a journal called The Reformer to disseminate its ideas (Ingle 1987, p.67).

d. External Communications. Are they formalized (e.g., with a press officer, etc.)

The group will be doing research on several issues of importance to it. It is logical therefore to argue that some form of external communication will exist in order to disseminate information gathered in the research.

"Whereas the group has been rather better at making fine-sounding but rather banal statements than at making detailed policy proposals, Wade and his new executive are intent on remedying this defect by concentrating research, long-term rather than short-term on four areas: Europe, constitutional reform (especially electoral reform), industrial relations, and social welfare" (Seyd 1980, p.240).

Initial Coding Information for U.K. Labour (Left)

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: United Kingdom

Party: Labour

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 31 May 1993

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

Labour Left

2. On what dimension(s) is this faction identifiable?

Ideology. "The most important and consistent theme has been socialism, and the Left may be said to have included those in the Labour party who believed in socialism or those wanted a more rapid approach to socialism" (Pimlott 1980, p.163)

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? Yes No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

Aneurin Bevan (1951-mid 1960s), Harold Wilson (1950-1974), Richard Crossman (1950-1974), Michael Foot, Ian Mikardo (1950-early 1980s), Barbara Castle, Heffer, Skinner, Neil Kinnock, Frank Cousins, John Silkin (1966-1974), Jennie Lee, Tom Driberg. (source: Shaw 1988)

4. Is this primarily seen as a parliamentary faction, an extraparliamentary faction, or both?

Both. "Thereafter the seven member constituency section of the NEC, once a key instrument of right -wing domination, always contained a majority from the Left" (Pimlott 1980, p.164)

"The Labour Left displays a continuity of attitudes and causes which no other group with a major parliamentary backing in Britain has ever matched" (Pimlott 1980, p.164)

5. What is the relative size of this faction, relative to the rest of the party, and/or to other major factions?

The Labour Left during the 1950s and the early 1960s were a minority in the party. However, the later years of the Gaitskell leadership increasingly saw serious challenge from the Left. By the 1964, the Left has definitely gained more influence when Harold Wilson was elected as party leader.

"The pendulum on the NEC, having for so many years been stuck on the right, was already swinging to a left keen to ease Party discipline" (Shaw 1988, p.171).

"By the turn of the decade, the new, more tolerant, regime at Transport House was being acclaimed in left-wing circles. Hayward succeeded in liberalising discipline because his views matched those of the steadily growing contingent on the NEC" (Shaw 1988, p.172)

"The hold of such men (rightist) on the union movement had been snapped by the late 1960s" (Shaw 1988, p.175).

Is this considered to be the dominant faction (or part of the dominant coalition)?

During the 1950s to the 1960s the Labour Left was not necessarily considered the dominant faction. During the leadership of High Gaitskell in the 50s, Labour Right was considered the dominant faction. However, the trade unions increasingly came under the leadership of the Left which signaled the dominance of the Labour Left.

6. When did this faction first become evident/established?

The Labour Left faction traces its origin to the ILP. However, more recent factional conflict began at about 1951.

"Bevan's decision to resign from office in April 1951, accompanied by Harold Wilson and John Freeman, inaugurated a period of factional warfare of unprecedented bitterness whihc for a time seems likely to split the Party irrevocably" (Pimlott 1980, p.174).

7. Evidence pertaining to whether this is a faction or a tendency. (I.e., indicators of self-consciousness and resulting formalization.)

a. Are there "formal" positions of leadership within the faction?

If so, identify the positions.

Although the literature does not state the formal position of any of the recognize leaders of the faction, thee seems to be a formal spokesperson for the faction. During the 1950s, this spokesperson position was held by Aneurin Bevan until his death in 1960.

Pimlott (1980) pointed out the Bevanites in Parliament has an elected chairman. "(T)he Bevanites...organized themselves into a parliamentary group with an elected chairman (Wilson was the first)" (p.174)

b. What is the frequency and nature of meetings (with emphasis on whether they are "formalized" or not; e.g., is there evidence that meetings are planned and announced in advance)?

"After the 1951 election defeat the Bevanites, based on the remnants of the Keep Left, organised themselves into a parliamentary group with an elected chairman (Wilson was the first) and weekly meetings" (Pimlott 1980, p.174)

c. Internal Communications. Are they formalized (e.g., with faction newsletter, newspaper, etc.)?

"(T)he Bevanites...had produced the pamphlet *One Way Only* in 1951" (Pimlott 1980, p.174)

Pimlott (1980, p.176) nopted that in 1937 Cripps and G.R. Strauss founded the Tribune which is to be the house journal of the Labour Left.

d. External Communications. Are they formalized (e.g., with a press officer, etc.)

The Bevanites have a very organized propaganda machinery. Including the newspaper, Tribune, the Left has a 'foundation-like' organization called the Tribune Brains Trust.

"The 'Brains Trust' as one of their organisers later recalled were the 'core of the (Bevanite) campaign' in the country. Consisting of teams of Bevanites, they toured the constituency parties, presenting the left-wing case, a 'massive apparatus' for whihc the demand was 'insatiable'. They were regarded with particular suspicion by Labour right-wingers who saw behind them the devious hand of the Bevanite master-organiser, Ian Mikardo" (Shaw 1988, p.37)

III. Dominant Faction(s) Over Time

1. Which faction (or coalition of factions) is dominant? (over time)

"In Parliament the Bevanites were decisively defeated. On the NEC

Bevan's followers were a gagged and imprisoned minority. Unable to outmaneuver the Right in the PLP or the NEC, Bevan finally announced that he would henceforth campaign amongst the trade union for support, and aid them in their struggle against the right-wing union leaders. But this announcement, in late 1954, was too late to bring about a leftward shift in the Labour Party.

After the general election defeat of 1955, Atlee resigned and Gaitskell was elected as leader. This represented a notable shift to the Right (Hodgson 1981, pp.66-67).

2. For each change of dominant faction/coalition:

a. When did it occur? (year or period)

Labour Right became dominant with the assumption to party leadership by Hugh Gaitskell in 1955. "Atlee resigned and Gaitskell was elected as leader. This represented a notable shift to the Right (Hodgson 1981, p.67)

b. Relevant dimension affected by the change:

Ideology. "With Gaitskell, things were very different. As an architect of the new revisionism, his goal was not socialism but welfare state within a 'mixed economy'. i.e. state monopoly capitalism. In 1955 the new revisionism had its triumph, and for the first time the Labour leadership openly rejected the traditional goal of a socialist commonwealth" (Hodgson 1981, p.68)

Initial Coding Information for U.K. Labour (Right)

NSF, Party Change, 1993

Country: U.K.

Party: Labour Party

Primary Coder(s): Alexander Tan

Version (dates): 24 May 1993

Initial Coding Schema for

Factionalism

II. Major Faction (one set of information for each major faction)

1. Provide (perhaps on basis of literature) identifying label for this faction.

Labour Right

2. On what dimension(s) is this faction identifiable?

Ideology. "With Gaitskell things were different. As an architect of the new revisionism his goal was not socialism but welfare state within a 'mixed economy', i.e. state monopoly capitalism" (Hodgson 1981, p.68)

3. Are there clearly identifiable leaders? Yes No

If Yes, who are they? (Provide over-time information.)

1950-1963 Hugh Gaitskell. Other leaders mentioned as belonging to the Right (revisionist camp) includes Roy Jenkins, Anthony Crosland, and Douglas Jay (Taylor 1980, p.19)

Edith Summerskill, Arthur Deakin (Transport Union's leader)

5. What is the relative size of this faction, relative to the rest of the party, and/or to other major factions?

Is this considered to be the dominant faction (or part of the dominant coalition)?

Yes, especially during the 1950-early 1960. "Gaitskell was elected as leader. This represented a notable shift to the Right" (Hodgson 1981, pp.66-67)