
#401 - United States: Democratic Party

CODING SHEET: Dominant Faction/Coalition Change

Country #: 4

Party #: 0 1 (U.S. Democrats)

Change # (for party): 1

YEAR OF CHANGE: 19 70 (missing: 99)

[See background sheets for the Democrats.]

Month of change: 99 (missing: 99)

A> Extent of dominant faction/coalition change

 complete change (100%)

 substantial/major change (involving 1/2 or more of coalition)

 x minor change (involving less than 1/2 of coalition)

[Though there is no question that more reform-minded, left-oriented identifiers were recruited into activism and even positions of some authority within the party, and though that element of the party now wielded significantly more influence over decision-making than had been the case previously, the reformers/theorists remained a numerical minority by themselves. So while there was clearly a significant impact on the makeup of the dominant coalition, it was hardly the case that this involved ascendance of a "new majority."]

B> Nature of factionalism affected

 x primarily ideological/issue

 primarily strategic/tactical

 primarily leadership/personality

[Though the initial targets of the reformers/theorists were procedural rules of the party, the rules changes can be seen as a means to the "end" of placing the left-oriented elements in stable control of the party. That is, the reforms of the delegate selection procedures would lead to more left-oriented delegates, who would choose more left-oriented national committee members and more left-oriented presidential candidates. So,

while the means were tactical, the desired ends were ideological.]

C> Factions or Tendencies involved?

factions
 tendencies

[Though some new "caucuses" and other organized interests were beginning to make their presence known within the party, the broader coalition of which these groups were parts was not an organized faction, per se.]

D> Coincides (or predates by few months) change of party's primary leader?

yes
 no

[The reformist DNC chair was replaced by a regular in the Spring of 1970.]

E> Intensity of factional/coalition rivalries (i.e. between -- not within -- dominant faction/coalition) [Code the situation that existed just prior to the change. Take both (a) the distance between the factions and (b) the competitiveness (i.e. relative sizes) into account.]

Strong
 Moderate
 Weak

[The intensity was at least "moderate." On the strictly ideological dimension, some of the new and more leftist leaning elements felt that they had been shut out of party decision making for too long, and some of those had been willing to violently demonstrate their frustrations on the streets of Chicago in 1968. By the 1970s, it was the more right wing elements of the party who would argue that it had effectively "left them," with some abandoning the party for either the Republican party or a third party alternative (as was already the case for some (who supported Wallace) in 1968). On the regular-reformist dimension, the feelings were also quite intense, as evidenced by Mayor Daley's treatment -- and consequent reaction - - in the 1972 convention/campaign.]

(altered as italicized, on 7-7-00 on the basis of Leader Change data)

#402 - United States: Republican Party**[#1 of 2 changes]**

CODING SHEET: Dominant Faction/Coalition ChangeCountry #: 4 Party #: 0 2 (U.S. Republicans)Change # (for party): 1 YEAR OF CHANGE: 19 63 (missing: 99)

[The "Young Republican" group, which according to Rusher was already the "third or fourth largest faction" by 1961, did not meet to plan strategy for taking over the party until October of 1961. Hence, 1961 would be too early for the change in dominant coalition.

On the other hand, it's clear that the change had already taken place by 1964.

If Goldwater's nomination was due to his supporters' control of delegate-selection apparati in many states, then it is likely that they gained that control prior to 1964. This leaves us with 1962 and 1963 as candidates, and we opt for being conservative and judging that "the change must have taken place by 1963."]

Month of change: 99 (missing: 99)A> Extent of dominant faction/coalition change complete change (100%) substantial/major change (involving 1/2 or more of coalition) x minor change (involving less than 1/2 of coalition)

B> Nature of factionalism affected

- primarily ideological/issue
 primarily strategic/tactical
 primarily leadership/personality

C> Factions or Tendencies involved?

- factions
 tendencies

[Given that the critical new element here is the "Young Republicans," who actually met to plan strategy for taking over the party, it seems reasonable to consider this change as involving "factions," at least to the extent that such exist in the American parties.]

D> Coincides (or predates by few months) change of party's primary leader?

- yes
 no

E> Intensity of factional/coalition rivalries (i.e. between -- not within -- dominant faction/coalition) [Code the situation that existed just prior to the change. Take both (a) the distance between the factions and (b) the competitiveness (i.e. relative sizes) into account.]

- Strong
 Moderate
 Weak

[Though the distance between the Republican "moderates" and right wing may not have been substantial, the fact is that the two wings (and especially the Rockefeller supporters) were not able to completely patch up their differences during the 1964 campaign. (See Huebner, 1980, pp 3003 and 3008.)]

#402 - United States: Republican Party**[#2 of 2 changes]**

CODING SHEET: Dominant Faction/Coalition ChangeCountry #: 4 Party #: 0 2 (U.S. Republican)Change # (for party): 2 YEAR OF CHANGE: 19 80 (missing: 99)

[See Republican party notes.]

Month of change: 99 (missing: 99)A> Extent of dominant faction/coalition change complete change (100%) substantial/major change (involving 1/2 or more of coalition) x minor change (involving less than 1/2 of coalition)

[The critical element of this change is the development of the religious right, and its addition to the existing rightwing elements within the party.]

B> Nature of factionalism affected x primarily ideological/issue primarily strategic/tactical primarily leadership/personalityC> Factions or Tendencies involved? x factions tendencies

[The "religious right."]

D> Coincides (or predates by few months) change of party's primary leader?

yes
 no

E> Intensity of factional/coalition rivalries (i.e. between -- not within -- dominant faction/coalition) [Code the situation that existed just prior to the change. Take both (a) the distance between the factions and (b) the competitiveness (i.e. relative sizes) into account.]

Strong
 Moderate
 Weak

[Reagan's insistence on compromising with the moderates -- even going so far as to keep Brock and pick Bush -- clearly indicates that the party's factions/tendencies were more consensual than conflictual in 1980.]