

---

## **#401-United States: Democratic Party**

---

*\*Note: All code justifications which appear in ALL CAPS were part of the original ICPP project (Janda, 1980). All code justifications which appear in ALL ITALICS were provided by Everita Salina. All other code justifications were provided by Melissa K. Bradley unless otherwise noted in brackets following the contributed information.*

### **Variables 9.01: Nationalization of Structure**

#### **1950-1990: 3**

THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, LIKE ITS REPUBLICAN COUNTERPART, CONSISTS OF REPRESENTATIVES OF STATE PARTY ORGANIZATIONS AND WOULD APPEAR TO STAND AT THE PEAK OF AN ORGANIZATIONAL HIERARCHY. BUT THE NATIONAL COMMITTEEMEN SELDOM COMMAND THEIR OWN STATE ORGANIZATIONS, HAVING BEEN CHOSEN MAINLY FOR STATUS IN THE PARTY AND FREQUENTLY FOR FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF THE PARTY. AS A RESULT, MEMBERSHIP OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE CONNOTES PRESTIGE RATHER THAN POWER. DURING OUR TIME PERIOD AT LEAST, STATE PARTY ORGANIZATIONS OPERATED VIRTUALLY AUTONOMOUSLY OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, MUCH LESS THE HOUSE AND SENATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES. DECISIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY CONVENTIONS IN 1952 AND 1956 SOUGHT TO ENACT A "LOYALTY OATH" WHICH PLEDGED DELEGATES TO PLACE THE CONVENTION'S NOMINEE ON THE BALLOT IN THEIR STATES AS THE CANDIDATE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, RATHER THAN APPROPRIATE THE PARTY LABEL FOR THEIR OWN FAVORITE CANDIDATES.

"The party organizations responded more slowly to these nationalizing forces. But since the 1970s there have been striking signs of new life in the national committees. Their resources and staffs have grown. They have taken on new roles, new activities, and new influence. They have been able to limit the autonomy of state and local organizations in their one collective function—the selection of delegates to the national conventions. . . . There are even some signs of centralization in the major parties. Thus although the state and local pull remains strong, the trend toward an increasing presence for the national party organizations is now clear." (Beck and Hershey, 2001, p. 75).

Although the party seemed to be moving in the direction of centralization, the state and local party organs were still predominantly autonomous with influence at the national level in the forms of elected officials and candidates, convention delegates, and national committee members. Our study's measuring instrument was not sensitive enough to reflect the change in the coding.

## **Variables 9.02: Selecting the National Leader**

**1950-1990: 3**

FOR OUR PURPOSES, THE PARTY LEADER IS TAKEN TO BE THE PARTY'S PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE RATHER THAN THE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, WHO IS USUALLY IN FACT APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE. THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE IS NAMED BY AN ELABORATE AND TUMULTUOUS CONVENTION PROCESS INVOLVING THOUSANDS OF DELEGATES REPRESENTING STATE PARTY ORGANIZATIONS. EXCEPTING THE SITUATION WHICH ARISES WHEN AN INCUMBENT PRESIDENT SEEKS RE-ELECTION, THERE ARE SPIRITED CONTESTS FOR THE PARTY'S NOMINATION, AND THE CHOICE IS THE SUBJECT OF SPECULATION FOR MONTHS IN ADVANCE. THIS SITUATION HOLDS TRUE FOR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY ALSO.

Janda's reasoning still holds true for this extension of the study. The only changes involved states' methods in selecting their delegates; however, this did not change the general structure used for selecting the party's national leader.

## **Variables 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates**

**1950-1990: 1**

THE NATIONAL PARTY ORGANIZATIONS HAVE NO ROLE TO PLAY IN THE DETERMINATION OF PARTY CANDIDATES, WHO ARE TYPICALLY NAMED IN DIRECT PRIMARY ELECTIONS USUALLY OPEN TO ALL VOTERS WHO PROFESS TO SUPPORT THE PARTY.

"The use of conventions for nominating candidates has faded in the face of the primary's democratic appeal. Decline has not meant death, however; conventions are still used to nominate candidates in a few states and most conspicuously in the contest for the presidency. . . All fifty states now use primaries in some fashion to nominate statewide officials and thirty-eight of them (plus the District of Columbia) use this method exclusively." (Beck and Hershey, 2001, p.173-74).

According to L. Sandy Maisel, the transformation to direct primaries has occurred in two surges. The first movement occurred toward the end of the Reconstruction era of the Civil War, and then the second occurred in the early twentieth century due to the influence of the Progressive party (Maisel, 1999, p. 193).

Since the *Book of the States* reports that the majority of states used direct primaries rather than caucuses for selecting Congressional candidates, the variable receives a code score of 1 for the entire study period.

## **Variable 9.04: Allocation of Funds**

**1950-1980: 2**

**1981-1990: 5**

ENORMOUS SUMS ARE REQUIRED TO FINANCE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGNS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES. SORAUF'S COMPILATION OF THE TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES DURING THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS OF 1952 THROUGH 1960 SHOWS A GROWTH FROM 140 MILLION DOLLARS TO 175 MILLION (P. 311). EVEN IN NON-ELECTION YEARS, HOWEVER, THE COSTS MAY RUN FROM 5 TO 10 MILLION DOLLARS (BONE, P. 393). IN PART BECAUSE OF THE HATCH ACT OF 1940, WHICH LIMITS INCOME OR EXPENDITURES OF ANY SINGLE INTERSTATE COMMITTEE TO 3 MILLION DOLLARS PER YEAR, FINANCING HAS NOT BEEN CENTRALIZED WITHIN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY. SEVERAL NATIONAL-LEVEL COMMITTEES, OF VARYING DEGREES OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, EXIST OR ARE CREATED ANEW TO SHARE IN THE RAISING AND DISPENSING OF CAMPAIGN FUNDS. BEGINNING IN 1953, HOWEVER, STATE PARTY ORGANIZATIONS WERE ASSIGNED QUOTAS TO HELP SHARE THE OPERATING COSTS OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE. STATE PERFORMANCE IN MEETING THESE QUOTAS WAS VERY IRREGULAR, INDICATING AGAIN THE DECENTRALIZED NATURE OF FUND RAISING WITHIN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY (COTTER AND HENNESSY, PP. 180-184).

According to Reichley, The Democrat National Committee did not respond to the Republicans' use of direct-mail fund-raising tactics until 1981, when the Democrats began losing their position as the party with the most supporters in the electorate. Charles Manatt, who became the DNC chairman in 1981, led the Democrats down the path already-proving successful for the Republicans. Manatt's main objectives were increasing fund-raising and refinancing the party's debt. The Democratic Congressional committees followed the national committee, and experienced increased fund-raising success in the 1983-1984 election period. Their objective was to raise more funds to better finance Democratic Congressional candidates, especially those in challenger and open seat positions. With the Republicans becoming increasingly powerful during the early and mid 1980s, there also was a push for Democratic incumbent candidates to use their war chests for assisting Democratic challenger and open seat candidates (Reichley, 1992, p. 364).

"Three sources (major events, direct mail, and large contributions) are relied on heavily by the state parties. Insignificant proportions of their budgets are derived from contributions from non-party organizations, the national party, and member dues. Most of these parties have well diversified sources of funds." (Cotter, *et al.*, 1989, p. 20).

Prior to 1981, when the DNC began focusing its efforts on direct-mail fund-raising, state

parties were largely relied upon to financially support the national organization. However, following 1981, the state parties have acquired more of a beneficiary role, receiving more funds and assistance from a financially mature national party organization.

### **Variables 9.05: Formulating Policy**

**1950-1955: 5**

**1956-1960: 6**

**1960-1990: 5**

POLICY FORMULATION IS NOT THE MAJOR FUNCTION OF AMERICAN NATIONAL PARTIES. EVERY FOUR YEARS, THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION DOES ADOPT A PARTY PLATFORM PRIOR TO NOMINATING THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE FOR THE PRESIDENCY. THE NOMINEE, HOWEVER, IS FREE TO INTERPRET THE PLATFORM TO SUIT HIS CAMPAIGN, SELECTIVELY EMPHASIZING AND NEGLECTING PLATFORM POLICIES AS HE CHOOSES. AN INCUMBENT PRESIDENT WHO SEEKS RENOMINATION, MOREOVER, CAN GUIDE THE PLATFORM FORMULATION ACCORDING TO HIS INTERESTS. NEVERTHELESS, PARTY ACTIVISTS WORK FOR THE ADOPTION OF ACCEPTABLE POLICIES WITHIN THE PLATFORM AND MAY BOLT THE PARTY IF THEIR INTERESTS ARE NOT SERVED. FOR EXAMPLE, SOME SOUTHERN DELEGATES WALKED OUT OF THE CONVENTION IN 1948 WHEN THE PARTY ADOPTED A STRONG CIVIL RIGHTS POLICY. THROUGH 1956, ONLY THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION COULD BE IDENTIFIED AS THE SOURCE OF PARTY POLICY AS EMBODIED IN THE PARTY PLATFORM. ALTHOUGH THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE MAY HAVE HAD IN THEORY THE POWER TO MAKE PARTY POLICY, IT HAD NOT ATTEMPTED TO DO IT. BUT IN LATE 1956, DNC CHAIRMAN PAUL BUTLER ESTABLISHED A DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR THIS PURPOSE. ALTHOUGH THE PARTY'S LEADERS IN CONGRESS REFUSED TO SERVE ON IT, THE COUNCIL DID TAKE POLICY STANDS IN THE NAME OF THE PARTY. MOREOVER, SUNDQUIST'S ANALYSIS OF MAJOR LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS THAT BECAME INCORPORATED INTO THE 1960 PARTY PLATFORM FINDS THAT THE COUNCIL HAD ADOPTED HALF OF THE TEN AS PARTY MEASURES BEFOREHAND, (PP. 409-413). BUT WITH THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE KENNEDY WINNING THE PRESIDENCY IN 1960, THE DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL TERMINATED EARLY IN 1961, AS PARTY POLICY BECAME OVERSHADOWED BY PRESIDENTIAL POLICY.

With the dissolution of the Democratic Advisory Council in 1961, policy formulation within the party resorted back to being dominated by the party's national convention. The party's presidential nominee still maintains much influence in shaping the party platform as does the President if he is a member of the Democratic Party.

## **Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications**

**1950-1990: 3**

THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE PUBLISHED A MAGAZINE CALLED THE "DEMOCRATIC DIGEST," BUT THIS CANNOT BE CONSIDERED TO BE AN IMPORTANT MEANS OF COMMUNICATION WITHIN THE PARTY.

"Prior to 1992, the main focus of the national committee was regional communication and the election of more Democrats; efforts were organized around geographical and regional lines." (Berkowitz and Lilienthal, 1996, p. 282).

"It is relatively rare to find a contemporary state party that does not publish a newsletter of some sort. Only one-fifth of the parties do not issue newsletters, and even in the early 1960s they were published by two-thirds of the parties." (Cotter, *et al.*, 1989, p. 21).

During the time period being studied, the national Democratic Party did not have an influential newsletter or magazine of its own. Internal party communication, in the form of a newsletter or magazine, occurred mostly at the state party level.

## **Variables 9.07: Administering Discipline**

**1950-1964: 0**

**1965-1983: 3**

**1984-1990: 0**

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY HAS VIRTUALLY NO MEANS TO DISCIPLINE THOSE WHO DEVIATE FROM PARTY POLICY. SENATORS OR REPRESENTATIVES WHO BUCK PARTY POLICY IN VOTING WITHIN THE CONGRESS SUFFER NO PARTY REPRIMAND. NO CONGRESSMAN DURING OUR TIME PERIOD WAS EXPELLED FROM THE PARTY OR EVEN THREATENED WITH EXPULSION. THE DISCIPLINARY POWER OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ITSELF DOES NOT EXTEND BEYOND SEATING ITS OWN MEMBERS.

Unlike parties in the United Kingdom, the United States parties did not have the power to dismiss elected officials from the party. Instead, the parties tried to maintain party unity through other incentives such as committee assignments. In the mid-1960s, the Democratic Party began using committee chair assignments as a means to keep party members, particularly senior party members, in line. Following the 1964 and 1968 presidential elections, three (two following 1964 and one following 1968) senior House Democrats were denied their seniority status when making committee assignments because they voted for the Republican nominees. In 1983, Representative Phil Gramm experienced a similar fate for his participation on the Reagan budget committee when he

was stripped of his chairmanship position on the House Budget Committee. Although committee assignments served as a major reason for party members to at least pacify the party organization in government, Beck and Hershey acknowledge that these were “weak sticks” as disciplinary action and that incentives were preferred by the party organization (Beck and Hershey, 2001, p. 266). Furthermore, the change experienced most visibly between 1964 and 1965 was an informal change not explicit within the party rules.

### **Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration**

#### **1950-1990: 2**

*When the party holds the presidency, the president is considered the main leader of the party. When the party does not hold the presidency, the leadership position may be split between several people. Beck notes that the defeated presidential candidate may achieve an important voice in the party, or a vigorous national chairperson may help to fill the void in national leadership, or most commonly leadership falls to its leaders in Congress—the Speaker being most influential and outspoken individual (Beck, 1997, p. 102).*

Our study’s measuring instrument is not sensitive enough to reflect the change in leadership concentration between when the party does and does not have control of the Presidency.

---

## **#402-United States: Republican Party**

---

*\*Note: All code justifications which appear in ALL CAPS were part of the original ICPP project (Janda, 1980). All code justifications which appear in ALL ITALICS were provided by Everita Salina. All other code justifications were provided by Melissa K. Bradley unless otherwise noted in brackets following the contributed information.*

### **Variable 9.01: Nationalization of Structure**

#### **1950-1990: 3**

THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE, LIKE ITS DEMOCRATIC COUNTERPART, CONSISTS OF REPRESENTATIVES OF STATE PARTY ORGANIZATIONS AND WOULD APPEAR TO STAND AT THE PEAK OF AN ORGANIZATION HIERARCHY. BUT THE NATIONAL COMMITTEEMEN SELDOM COMMAND THEIR OWN STATE ORGANIZATION, HAVING BEEN CHOSEN MAINLY FOR STATUS IN THE PARTY AND FREQUENTLY FOR FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF THE PARTY. AS A RESULT, MEMBERSHIP ON THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE CONNOTES PRESTIGE RATHER THAN POWER. DURING OUR TIME PERIOD AT LEAST, STATE PARTY ORGANIZATIONS OPERATED VIRTUALLY AUTONOMOUSLY OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, AND THEY WERE CERTAINLY INDEPENDENT OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES. EVEN DECISIONS OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION WERE FREQUENTLY FLAUNTED BY STATE PARTY ORGANIZATIONS, SOME OF WHOM ENACTED STATE PLATFORMS SUBSEQUENT TO THAT OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION AND ESPOUSED CONTRADICTIONARY POLICIES.

“The party organizations responded more slowly to these nationalizing forces. But since the 1970s there have been striking signs of new life in the national committees. Their resources and staffs have grown. They have taken on new roles, new activities, and new influence. They have been able to limit the autonomy of state and local organizations in their one collective function—the selection of delegates to the national conventions. . . . There are even some signs of centralization in the major parties. Thus although the state and local pull remains strong, the trend toward an increasing presence for the national party organizations is now clear.” (Beck and Hershey, 2001, p. 75).

Although the party seemed to be moving in the direction of centralization, the state and local party organs were still predominantly autonomous with influence at the national level in the forms of elected officials and candidates, convention delegates, and national committee members. Our study’s measuring instrument was not sensitive enough to reflect the change in the coding.

## **Variable 9.02: Selecting the National Leader**

**1950-1990: 3**

FOR OUR PURPOSES, THE PARTY LEADER IS TAKEN TO BE THE PARTY'S PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE RATHER THAN THE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, WHO IS USUALLY IN FACT APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE. THE REPUBLICAN PARTY'S PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE IS NAMED BY AN ELABORATE AND TUMULTUOUS CONVENTION PROCESS INVOLVING THOUSANDS OF DELEGATES REPRESENTING STATE PARTY ORGANIZATIONS. EXCEPTING THE SITUATION WHICH ARISES WHEN AN INCUMBENT PRESIDENT SEEKS RE-ELECTION, THERE ARE SPIRITED CONTESTS FOR THE PARTY'S NOMINATION, AND THE CHOICE IS THE SUBJECT OF SPECULATION FOR MONTHS IN ADVANCE. THIS SITUATION HOLDS TRUE FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY ALSO.

Janda's reasoning still holds true for this extension of the study. The only changes involve states' methods for selecting their delegates; however, this does not change the general structure used for selecting the party's national leader.

## **Variable 9.03: Selecting Parliamentary Candidates**

**1950-1990: 1**

THE NATIONAL PARTY ORGANIZATIONS HAVE NO ROLE TO PLAY IN THE DETERMINATION OF PARTY CANDIDATES, WHO ARE TYPICALLY NAMED IN DIRECT PRIMARY ELECTIONS USUALLY OPEN TO ALL VOTERS WHO PROFESS TO SUPPORT THE PARTY.

"The use of conventions for nominating candidates has faded in the face of the primary's democratic appeal. Decline has not meant death, however; conventions are still used to nominate candidates in a few states and most conspicuously in the contest for the presidency. . . All fifty states now use primaries in some fashion to nominate statewide officials and thirty-eight of them (plus the District of Columbia) use this method exclusively." (Beck and Hershey, 2001, p.173-74).

According to L. Sandy Maisel, the transformation to direct primaries has occurred in two surges. The first movement occurred toward the end of the Reconstruction era of the Civil War, and then the second occurred in the early twentieth century due to the influence of the Progressive party (Maisel, 1999, p. 193).

Since the *Book of the States* reports that the majority of states used direct primaries rather than caucuses for selecting Congressional candidates, the variable receives a code score of 1 for the entire study period.



#### **Variable 9.04: Allocation of Funds**

**1950-1964: 3**

**1965-1976: 4**

**1977-1990: 5**

ENORMOUS SUMS ARE REQUIRED TO FINANCE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGNS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES. SORAUF'S COMPILATION OF THE TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES DURING THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS OF 1952 THROUGH 1960 SHOWS A GROWTH FROM 140 MILLION DOLLARS TO 175 MILLION (P. 311). EVEN IN NON-ELECTION YEARS, HOWEVER, THE COSTS MAY RUN FROM 5 TO 10 MILLION DOLLARS (BONE, P. 393). THE REPUBLICANS HAVE CIRCUMVENTED THE PROVISIONS OF THE HATCH ACT OF 1940, WHICH LIMITS INCOME OR EXPENDITURES OF ANY SINGLE INTERSTATE COMMISSION TO \$3 MILLION PER YEAR, WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A REPUBLICAN FINANCE COMMITTEE, WHICH COORDINATES FUND RAISING FOR THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE AND THE HOUSE AND SENATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES. AS IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, STATE QUOTAS WERE ASSESSED DURING OUR TIME PERIOD TO RAISE FUNDS FOR THE OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE. BUT BECAUSE OF THE COORDINATING ROLE OF THE REPUBLICAN FINANCE COMMITTEE, THE ALLOCATION AND DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS WITHIN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WERE JUDGED TO BE SOMEWHAT MORE CENTRALIZED. DEPARTING FROM THE STRICT OPERATIONALIZATION OF THIS VARIABLE, WE ARE COUNTING THE FINANCE COMMITTEE AS AN INTERMEDIATE "REGIONAL" COMMITTEE IN OUR SCORING.

*In 1962 the RNC had established the sustaining membership program for small contributions, prior to that the money to operate the RNC was paid by state parties under a quota system (Huckshorn, ed, 1994. p. 37). In 1965 Ray Bliss became the RNC chair and immediately set about to increase the party's direct-mail fund-raising program. Huckshorn reports that Bliss appointed retired General Lucius Clay as the chairman of the Republican National Finance Committee, the arm of the national party devoted to raising operating and campaign money (Huckshorn in Green, ed., 1994. p. 42). One of the goals of Bliss and Clay was to attempt to unify fund-raising apparatuses of the RNC, RNCC and RNSC (Huckshorn in Green, ed., 1994. p. 42). Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 imposed limits on the amounts that individuals, political action committees, and parties could give to candidates for the House and Senate. Despite that the amount of contributions that the RNC has provided to its candidates has increased steadily.*

*Chairman William Brock continued the development of party's fund-raising capabilities when he assumed the leadership of RNC in 1977. Four regional finance directors were appointed to work with state party organizations and the two Hill committees (Price, 1984.Pp. 40). The new Local Election Campaign Division at the*

*RNC worked with state parties and organizational directors to identify marginal districts and seek candidates to run in them (Huckshorn in Green, ed, 1994. p. 44). Price reports that the RNC estimated the value of its cash and in-kind support for Republican candidates in the 1980 election at \$6.2 million, plus \$4.6 million, the maximum allowable, for the presidential campaign. The NRCC added \$3.2 million and the NRSC added \$5.4 million (Price, 1984. p. 41). The contributions made by the two Hill committees had been increasing considerably as well. After the 1980s, the NRCC moved quickly to giving more money to close non-incumbents and decreasing its allocations to marginal incumbents (Dwyre in Green and Shea, eds, 1994. p. 181). This allowed for a more efficient distribution of resources. Beck notes that by the mid-1980s both parties were providing unprecedented levels of assistance to candidates and state parties (Beck, 1997, p. 97).*

“Three sources (major events, direct mail, and large contributions) are relied on heavily by the state parties. Insignificant proportions of their budgets are derived from contributions from non-party organizations, the national party, and member dues. Most of these parties have well diversified sources of funds.” (Cotter, *et al.*, 1989, p. 20).

Prior to 1977, when the RNC began focusing its efforts on direct-mail fund-raising, state parties were largely relied upon to financially support the national organization. However, following 1977, the state parties have acquired more of a beneficiary role, receiving more funds and assistance from a financially mature national party organization.

## **Variable 9.05: Formulating Policy**

### **1950-1990: 5**

POLICY-MAKING WITHIN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, AS IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, IS CLEARLY SUBORDINATE TO THE TASK OF SELECTING THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE. EVERY FOUR YEARS, THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION DOES ADOPT A PARTY PLATFORM PRIOR TO NOMINATING A CANDIDATE, BUT THE NOMINEE IS FREE TO INTERPRET THE PLATFORM TO SUIT HIS CAMPAIGN, SELECTIVELY EMPHASIZING AND NEGLECTING PLATFORM POLICIES. AN INCUMBENT PRESIDENT WHO SEEKS RENOMINATION, MOREOVER, CAN GUIDE THE PLATFORM FORMULATION ACCORDING TO HIS INTERESTS. NEVERTHELESS, PARTY ACTIVISTS WORK FOR THE ADOPTION OF ACCEPTABLE POLICIES WITHIN THE PLATFORM AND MAY NOT SUPPORT THE CANDIDATE IF THEIR INTERESTS ARE NOT SERVED. THUS, NIXON'S CONCERN OVER ROCKEFELLER'S DISLIKE OF THE CONSERVATIVE PLATFORM BEING FORMULATED IN 1960 LED NIXON TO INFLUENCE ITS REVISION TO GAIN ROCKEFELLER'S SUPPORT. THROUGHOUT OUR TIME PERIOD, ONLY THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION CAN BE IDENTIFIED AS THE AUTHORITATIVE VOICE OF PARTY POLICY—AS DISTINGUISHED FROM PRESIDENTIAL POLICY MADE BY THE REPUBLICAN EISENHOWER FROM 1953 THROUGH 1960. A REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM AND PROGRESS WAS

FORMED IN 1959, FOLLOWING THE REPUBLICAN DEFEAT IN THE 1958 CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS, TO APPLY REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES TO PROBLEMS OF THE DAY. IT ISSUED A POLICY STATEMENT LATER THAT YEAR, BUT THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS COMMITTEE AS A POLICY-MAKING BODY WAS FAR LESS THAN THAT OF THE DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL IN THE OTHER PARTY.

Despite the short existence of the Republican Committee on Program and Progress, policy formulation within the party has been dominated by the party's national convention. The party's presidential nominee still maintains much influence in shaping the party platform as does the President if he is a member of the Republican Party.

### **Variable 9.06: Controlling Communications**

**1950-1977: 3**

**1978-1990: 5**

THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE PUBLISHED A MAGAZINE CALLED "BATTLE LINE," BUT THIS CANNOT BE CONSIDERED TO BE AN IMPORTANT MEANS OF COMMUNICATION WITHIN THE PARTY. WHILE MOST OF THE NEWSPAPERS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES CAN BE SAID TO HAVE HAD A REPUBLICAN ORIENTATION, THIS WAS DUE TO THE PHILOSOPHICAL INCLINATIONS OF THEIR PUBLISHERS AND NOT TO ANY CONTROL EXERCISED BY THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

*Under RNC chairman Bill Brock, in the early 1980s, the RNC developed an extensive publication program (Price, 1984, p. 41). Particularly important in conveying the image of the GOP as the "party of ideas" was the publication of a high-quality quarterly, Commonsense (Price, 1984, p. 272). Among the other publications were First Monday, the monthly party magazine, and numerous items disseminating "opposition research," such as the "The Carter Record" and "Democratic Watch '80" (Price, 1984, p. 41). Commonsense was discontinued in the 1980s.*

"It is relatively rare to find a contemporary state party that does not publish a newsletter of some sort. Only one-fifth of the parties do not issue newsletters, and even in the early 1960s they were published by two-thirds of the parties. (Cotter, *et al.*, 1989, p. 21).

Although state party newsletters have been the predominant form of internal party communication during the period being studied, Bill Brock brought party publications to the national level shortly after becoming RNC chairman in 1977. During the time period studied, party newsletters have endured despite the appeal of newly developing media technologies including radio, television (especially cable television), and computers.

## **Variable 9.07: Administering Discipline**

**1950-1990: 0**

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY HAS VIRTUALLY NO MEANS TO DISCIPLINE THOSE WHO DEVIATE FROM PARTY POLICY. NO COMMITTEE WITHIN THE PARTY IS CHARGED WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR DISCIPLINING PARTY DEVIANCE, AND THE PARTY DEVIANCE, AND THE PARTY ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS STEER CLEAR OF REPRIMANDING MEMBERS FOR VOTING AGAINST THE MAJORITY OF THE PARTY.

Unlike parties in the United Kingdom, the United States parties do not have the power to dismiss elected officials from the party. Instead, the parties try to maintain party unity through other incentives such as committee assignments. In the mid-1960s, the Democratic Party began using committee chair assignments as a means to keep party members, particularly senior party members, in line. The Republicans did not adopt similar internal discipline measures during this time period.

## **Variable 9.08: Leadership Concentration**

**1950-1990: 2**

*When the party holds the presidency, the president is considered the main leader of the party. When the party does not hold the presidency, the leadership position may be split between several people. Beck notes that the defeated presidential candidate may achieve an important voice in the party, or a vigorous national chairperson may help to fill the void in national leadership, or most commonly leadership falls to its leaders in Congress—the Speaker being most influential and outspoken individual (Beck, 1997, p. 102).*

Our study's measuring instrument is not sensitive enough to reflect the change in leadership concentration between when the party does and does not have control of the Presidency.