

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 6/24/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

First Form for Party

Party: Democrats

Party Founding Date: pre-1950 (1800)

Long Record #: US.D.0

Change #: 0

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Chair of the Democratic National Committee

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: J. Howard McGrath

Characteristics of **Leader A** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1903

(Former) occupation: According to Maisel (1991), "From 1930 to 1952 he continuously held public office."

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Was generally a liberal, but no evidence that he was identified with a particular faction.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Was a builder of party structure as national chair.

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/2/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.1

Change #: 1

Date of Change: August, 1949

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee
National Chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: J. Howard McGrath

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: William M. Boyle, Jr.

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1902

(Former) occupation: Lawyer

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Truman picked him in
1949 (*New York Times*, August 5, 1951, p. 51)

Other relevant information on the new leader's character,
orientation, leadership style, etc.:

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: McGrath resigned to
take a position in Truman's cabinet (Maisel, 1991).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/2/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.2

Change #: 2

Date of Change: 1951

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee Chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: William J. Boyle

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Frank E. McKinney

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: June, 1904

(Former) occupation: Vice President of U.S. Pipeline Company, Banker, President of Fidelity Trust Company (Maisel, 1991, p. 620)

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "A vocal leader of the pro-Truman faction in the Indiana Democratic Party" (Maisel, 1991, p. 620).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Wealthy and skillful fundraiser: "Because of the negative image surrounding Boyle's resignation" McKinney made it clear he would run a headquarters that was "clean" and free of "influence peddling" (Maisel, 1991, p. 620). He asked to serve without a salary (*New York Times*, November 1, 1952, p. 1).

In his acceptance speech, McKinney promised to revamp the party machinery such that it would be more responsive to the wishes of

Democrats everywhere. Those with "hands not clean" would be dismissed (*New York Times*, November 1, 1951, p. 1).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: Boyle cited ill-health but really forced to resign due to political scandal. In August, 1951, a St. Louis Newspaper charged Boyle with embezzling. A Senate investigation turned up evidence of possible influence peddling in the 1940s and 1950s (Maisel, 1991, p. 82). Congressional members were calling for his resignation and he had revealed earlier that he was planning to stay until 1952 (*New York Times*, November 1, 1951, p. 1).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power): (See above.)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

New York Times, December 1, 1950, p. 17: Boyle denies rumors that he is quitting.

New York Times, August 3, 1951, p. 9: Questions arise about Boyle's tenure as chairman and vice-chair and influence peddling with a loan that he gave to a company he was retained by.

New York Times, August 5, 1951, p. 51: Boyle denies he was involved in granting the loan.

New York Times, August 7, 1951, p. 32: "Announces that he does not intend to resign and will serve out his full-term which expires after '52 nominating convention."

New York Times, March 28, 1954, p. 11: "Mr. Boyle ultimately resigned, disclaiming any wrongdoing. Congressional committee

evidence showed that he had intervened on behalf of successful applicants for loans... One loan was made to a printing company from which Mr. Boyle received fees."

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/2/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.3

Change #: 3

Date of Change: 1952

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee Chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Frank E. McKinney

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Stephen A. Mitchell

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1903

(Former) occupation: Lawyer

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Mitchell reacted to criticism from conservatives that the Democratic party was too closely linked to the Americans for Democratic Action. He minimized the group's significance, saying candidates could get along without its endorsement (*Political Profiles*, Volume 1, p. 435). In leaving he sought a successor who was a liberal and able to hold the center of the party, i.e., Paul Butler. Mitchell became one of the postwar generation of politicians known as "Stevenson Democrats" - urbane, upper middle-class, reformers not schooled in ways of "political clubhouse." Mitchell's most important task was maintaining Democratic Party unity while dissociating Stevenson from the Truman Administration. He tried to prevent a leftward drift (*Political Profiles*, Volume 1, 1978, p. 435).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: A "harmonizer", "clean amateur" who hoped " to placate warring factions" (Maisel, 1991, p. 661).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason

Former leader lost leadership election: Though he didn't technically lose an "election," the fact is that he was not "selected" to remain in the post by Stevenson.

Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic nominee for president, chose Mitchell instead of McKinney because he was not associated with Truman (*Political Profiles*, Volume 1, p. 435). In July, 1951, when asked if he would keep McKinney throughout the campaign, he said a problem was "not yet resolved", and that McKinney was there on a temporary basis (*New York Times*, July 31, 1951, p. 9).

"...there was never really a chance that Mr. McKinney would stay on. From the moment Gov. Stevenson was nominated he intended to put new men in charge of his campaign and preferably men he knew personally" (*New York Times*, August 9, 1952, p. 1).

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

(not selected) for other clearly political reasons: Stevenson, "hoping to counter Republican charges of Democratic corruption...appointed Mitchell." The choice was based on Mitchell's connection with the investigation of the Justice Department and the fact that "he was not associated with the Truman faction." (*Political Profiles*, Volume 1, 1978, p. 435).

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

(see below)

He was viewed as a "political amateur" and a personal choice by Stevenson, a move away from tradition. He had very little to do with the national camp, and was not a professional. Stevenson defended the choice by saying that Mitchell represented a "change." Ever since the first presidential election campaign by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Democratic National Committee chair had been a professional politician (*New York Times*, August 9, 1952, p. 1).

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/2/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.4

Change #: 4

Date of Change: December, 1954

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee Chair.

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Stephen A. Mitchell

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Paul M. Butler

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: June 15, 1905

(Former) occupation: Lawyer

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Butler's predecessor Mitchell, chose him because he wanted "...a liberal able to hold the center of the party" (Political Profiles, Vol.1: p. 435). Truman opposed him, but he was supported by Stevenson (Maisel, 1991, p. 112).

He was opposed by Truman, and supported by "a coalition of Southern, Far Western, Mountain, and Midwestern states. It represented, to a degree, a desire of the less populous states to avoid domination of the Democratic party by states with big urban populations in the East and North" (*New York Times*, December 5, 1954, p. 1). Butler failed to get the solid support of any state with a large urban population.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: "As chair, Butler stressed

party loyalty, especially support of national Democratic nominees. He also sought to regularize and coordinate the relationship between the Democratic congressional leaders and the party itself. ...Butler sought to organize policy and strategy at all levels of the party through a Democratic advisory council." However, congressional leaders chose not to participate so eventually it became the voice of the liberal wing of the party. Because a Democrat did not win the presidency Butler turned the National Comm. into "an instrument of national party leadership...[he] pushed for the adoption of a clear-cut liberal national platform." He urged for civil rights and desegregation. Southern leaders didn't like him, he was a "northern liberal" (Political Profiles, Vol. 2: p. 87)

"The national chairman of a political party can be any one of a number of things. He can be a power center in the party, setting himself up as the spokesman for a particular faction or point of view, as did Paul Butler during the Eisenhower years when he challenged the dominance of congressional leaders" (*New York Times*, March 8, 1970, Section IV, p. 2).

Butler described as a "political innovator". He fought with congressional leaders to establish the Democratic Advisory Council, the organ of party policy between conventions. A fierce partisan with the Indiana conception of politics: "...a hard, twenty-four-hour-a-day, 365-day-a-year struggle that is played for keeps" (*New York Times*, July 12, 1960, p. 20).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: (unforced) "...the party's leadership resented the Stevenson-Mitchell approach." Chairman Mitchell resigned immediately after the 1954 midterm elections (Maisel, 1991, p. 661).

Mitchell was continually bedeviled by the problem of promoting an effective opposition to an administration led by a president "...[l]iked by Democrats and Republicans." He attacked Eisenhower personally. He was publicly denounced in the *New York Times* for one attack on Eisenhower's "cronyism" in the financial dealings of the Tennessee Valley Authority (*Political Profiles*, Vol. 1, 1978, p. 435).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)

___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change: From the *New York Times* (May 7, 1954, p. 14): Mitchell says he has plans to step down after the November elections. There was some dissent about Mitchell's style: too independent - did not consult committee enough (withdrew party backing from a candidate charged with adultery without consulting the party).

In November, he announces that he will quit before the end of the year, said it was always his intent to step down after the 1954 election. "Win or lose, I am eager to wind up my chairmanship and go home to my family and law practice from which I have been away for two years" (*New York Times*, November 3, 1954, p. 14).

Mitchell had been chosen by Stevenson who had lost the presidential election - a belief in the Democratic Party that a new chair be appointed in the new year (*New York Times*, November 21, 1954, p. 1).

Mitchell reveals he plans to "to stay on the job...indefinitely" despite rumors that there was pressure on him to return to his law firm (*New York Times*, November 26, 1954, p. 14).

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/2/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.5

Change #: 5

Date of Change: December, 1960

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee Chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Paul M. Butler

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Henry "Scoop" M. Jackson

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: May 31, 1912

(Former) occupation: Congressman (1941-1952) and Senator (since 1953)

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "Liberal on social issues but conservative on defense and military..." (Maisel, 1991, p. 512). A supporter of organized labor, civil rights, military preparedness, and the survival of Israel. Jackson is described as a Westerner belonging to the "moderate liberal wing of the Democratic party," and an "earnest plodder" not a "zealous crusader" (*New York Times*, July 16, 1960, p. 1).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: It is reported that Jackson is scheduled to take over as chair. "The change is designed to reinforce the liberal cast of the campaign and candidates" but Jackson was concerned about Senate re-election and said will quit January 1st after election is over and not accept salary (*New York*

Times, July 16, 1960, pp. 1, 6).

The first non-Roman Catholic party chief in 32 years (*New York Times*, July 17, 1960, p. 34).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: In 1960 the uneasy truce between Truman and Butler was broken when the former president charged Butler with rigging the National Convention in favor of John F. Kennedy. Following Kennedy's nomination, Butler said he would not seek another term (*Political Profiles, Eisenhower Years*, p. 87)

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

pressure to resign for other clearly political reasons: "[P]rime political blunder" committed by Butler during a debate. He referred to the wives and children of the bandsmen that had died in an airplane crash over Brazil as being Eisenhower's responsibility since they were going to play for Eisenhower at the embassy there. This came at a time when he was "under fire" from Southern Democrats asking if he would resign, but he said he had no intention to before the July convention but that he would not run again (*New York Times*, March 8, 1960, p. 1).

An editorial published was critical of Butler for predicting John F. Kennedy's victory at the convention and saying a "highly placed" Democratic source gave him the information (i.e., himself). This caused dissension within the ranks of the Democrats between John F. Kennedy supporters and non-Kennedy people (*New York Times*, March 18, 1960, p. 24).

At convention, Butler says he will not run for chairmanship again,

a decision welcomed by "a sizeable" number of Democrats "because he has steered a course of party action that aroused...many public conflicts" (*New York Times*, July 12, 1960, p. 20).

He was charged with rigging the nomination of John F. Kennedy and "warred" with congressional leaders, and members from the South and big states. But he enjoyed strong support from the Democratic National Committee itself - he had already staved off one attempt in 1956 by Stevenson to dismiss him. He is called a "political innovator" and "one of the Democrats' most controversial figures" (*New York Times*, July 12, 1960, p. 23).

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/2/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.6

Change #: 6

Date of Change: January, 1961

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Henry M. Jackson

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: John Bailey

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: November, 1904

(Former) occupation: Chair, Connecticut Democratic Party

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): He was chosen by Kennedy. He was a "key" member of the Kennedy campaign team in 1960 and played a key role in Lyndon B. Johnson's campaign (Maisel, 1991, p. 53). He was very supportive of the administration's proposals and "progressive policies." "He appeared representative of the 'old politics' to the party's anti-war forces, supporting the candidacies of Senators McCarthy and Robert F. Kennedy" (*Political Profiles, Kennedy/ Johnson Years*, 1976, p. 27).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: "More of a campaign strategist than an orator or ideologue" (*Political Profiles*, *ibid*, p. 26). He had a "reputation for effective personal leadership" in Connecticut, "never an autocratic party boss, he was very willing to compromise in order to be victorious." Also a legislative

leader, "serving as a critical link between Democratic governors and Democrats in the legislature". As a senator he had a very "cohesive" voting record (Maisel, 1991, p. 53).

"Bailey described his role at the DNC as a housekeeping job" doing voter registration drives, and aiding congressional candidates. Lyndon B. Johnson "had significantly cut back the role of the DNC after his bid for the presidency in 1964 and continued to keep it that way" (*Political Profiles*, p. 26).

He was selected by John F. Kennedy by a unanimous vote. "Big city committee members generally expressed satisfaction with Mr. Bailey," i.e., unlike with Paul M. Butler who they expressed bitterness toward (*New York Times*, January 22, 1961, pp. 1, 41).

"He can be nothing more than a liaison man between the president and the leaders of his party around the country as was John Bailey for Lyndon B. Johnson" (*New York Times*, March 8, 1970, Section IV, p. 2).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: Jackson had "reluctantly accepted the position" of chair and found John F. Kennedy to be the real director of the election effort. "Jackson was unable to prevent Richard M. Nixon from carrying Washington" (his own state). He resigned as soon as the election was over (*Political Profiles, Eisenhower Years*, 1977, p. 306).

Jackson said that he did not intend to serve beyond January 1st, 1961 (*New York Times*, July 16, 1960, p. 1).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/2/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.7

Change #: 7

Date of Change: August, 1968

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: John M. Bailey

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Lawrence O'Brien

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: July 17, 1917

(Former) occupation: Wall Street broker (*Political Profiles, Nixon/Ford Years*, p. 481); Campaign Director for John F. Kennedy in 1952; Postmaster General.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "...frequently viewed as a member of the old guard, a front for the power brokers" (Maisel, 1991, p. 710). He was urged by Hubert Humphrey to accept the chairmanship in 1968.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: "[F]oremost political campaign strategist and organizer of his time..." (Maisel, 1991, p. 710). Focuses on organization and campaigns. O'Brien ran a number of important Democratic campaigns in the 1950s and 1960s. He served as a highly effective lobbyist under John F. Kennedy. He reluctantly took the job and was expected to leave it soon after the presidential election (*New York Times*, August 31, 1968, p. 1).

The *New York Times* notes that he is regarded as one of the most effective lobbyists on Capitol Hill in recent memory (*New York Times*, August 31, 1968, p. 10).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

- Former leader died
- Former leader resigned due to ill health
- Former leader resigned for other reason
- Former leader lost leadership election
- Forced rotation or term limitations
- Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

- electoral failure(s)
- fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
- political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
- other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change: "Poor showings in the 1966 elections had led to calls by state Democratic officials to remove Bailey" but Johnson ignored these. Bailey retired immediately after August 1968 (*Political Profiles, Kennedy/Johnson Years*, p. 27). Hubert Humphrey was now the Democratic nominee and appointed O'Brien (*New York Times*, August 31, 1968, p. 1).

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g.,

change being made to result in different leadership style,
different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/5/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.8

Change #: 8

Date of Change: January, 1969

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Lawrence F. O'Brien

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Fred R. Harris

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: November, 1930

(Former) occupation: Senator

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "[L]oyal Johnson supporter." Following Nixon's victory he moved further to the left (*Political Profiles, Nixon Years*, p. 279). His politics were radicalized by his work on the 1967 Presidential Committee on Urban Violence. It concluded that it was a result of "white racism and black despair." He took increasingly "liberal stands" (Maisel, 1991, p. 472).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He played a part in initiating the reforms for the 1972 convention, opening up participation opportunities (*Political Profiles, Kennedy/ Nixon Years*, p. 279). Harris saw the Democratic National Committee's task as ideological and operational. The party must offer "constructive alternatives" on the three great moral issues of our time, peace, race, and

poverty, and reinvigorate the organization. He proposed the Democratic Advisory Council (*New York Times*, January 15, 1969, p. 22).

He came in at a time when the Democrats are "riven by the strains of the 1968 campaign with its profound factional and ideological disputes" (*New York Times*, January 16, 1968, p. 40).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: To work with a New York investment firm (Maisel, 1991, p. 710). O'Brien had planned to leave after the presidential election (*New York Times*, August 31, 1968, p. 1). He said that he had an "outstanding" business opportunity (*New York Times*, January 8, 1969, p. 28).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

Yes: Effectively co-occurs with beginning of a dominant faction change. (See *Dominant Faction* data book, 1970 change.)

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/5/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.9

Change #: 9

Date of Change: 1970

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Fred R. Harris

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Lawrence F. O'Brien

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: July 17, 1917

(Former) occupation: Wall Street broker (*Political Profiles, Nixon/Ford Years*, 1976, p. 481); Campaign Director for John F. Kennedy in 1952; Postmaster General.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "...frequently viewed as a member of the old guard, a front for the power brokers" (Maisel, 1991, p. 710). He was urged by Hubert Humphrey to accept the chairmanship in 1968.

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He returned to head the Democratic National Committee in 1970 when the party was in disarray over Vietnam. He reluctantly reassumed the position. He introduced reforms which later caused great conflict at the 1972 Democratic convention with quotas for youth, minorities and women. The reforms also gave the national party greater control over the state parties. He attempted to avoid antagonizing any element of

the party and forged a strategy to thwart what seemed like a potential emerging Republican majority by becoming a spokesman on many social issues (*Political Profiles, Nixon/ Ford Years, 1976, p. 481*).

He was offered the post but turned it down citing "a lack of clear consensus." The Governors Association and organized labor did not want his return (*New York Times, February 27, 1970, p. 23*).

In holding out for their support he is seen as trying to win the election on his own merits, not as Hubert Humphrey's man (*New York Times, March 6, 1970, p. 24*).

Upon being asked a second time, he accepts the nomination for chair and wins, the southern Democrats drop their opposition as do labor in a bid to unify. He is compared to Ray C. Bliss of the Republican Party, "calm, thorough, basic, non-ideological...", and is seen as a "campaign manager" type of chairman (*New York Times, March 8, 1970, Section IV, p. 2*).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: (under pressure)

Harris "left the job after a stern lesson in the resistance to innovation", i.e., he was an innovator but was too different (*New York Times, March 8, 1970, Section IV, p. 2*).

Harris had revealed that he planned to step down (*New York Times, February 27, 1970, p. 23*).

Reforms in the state delegation selection process gave more control to the national party and were begun under Harris. It was said of O'Brien's tenure: "...never before has a political party so totally changed its way of doing business in such a short period of time," but this was initiated under Harris (*Political Profiles, Nixon/ Ford Years, 1976, p. 482*).

Harris' reasons for not seeking re-election in 1972 when O'Brien steps down for the second time have some bearing here: "...he decided not to seek re-election because of his fear that his liberal stands had doomed his chances" (*Political Profiles, Nixon/ Ford Years, p. 279*).

Harris resigns "unexpectedly" saying he wanted to be free of the constraints of the job. The party was still plagued by factionalism, and \$8 million debt. "He rebuilt the Washington staff of the committee and articulated party positions on major issues, but he was unable to solve many of the Democrats' long range problems" (*New York Times, February 7, 1970, p. 1*).

He made up his mind on January 28th to quit. He was "weary of the factional sniping with conservative Democrats" who attacked his attitude as too far left and militants who called him too conservative, says the reporter. Also, he was irritated by claims

that he was using the position to advance his own candidacy for the presidency in 1972 (*New York Times*, February 7, 1970, p. 13). Over the last month there had been rumors among Democrats on Capitol Hill that Harris would be ousted. Problems facing the chair at this time: debt, factions (pro/anti-Vietnam, Northern and Southern, liberal and conservative), no clear-cut Democratic leader.

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

pressure to resign because of political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons: (see above)

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

Yes: Coincided with a dominant faction change which occurred around 1970. (See *Dominant Faction* data book.)

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/5/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.10

Change #: 10

Date of Change: July, 1972

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Lawrence F. O'Brien

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Jean Westwood

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1923

(Former) occupation: Freelance writer/ partner in mink ranch.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "In her tenure on the Democratic National Committee, Westwood served as a key strategist and leader of the liberal forces during the early years of party reform" (Maisel, 1991, p. 198).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: She was the choice of McGovern and elected after the 1972 convention (*Political Profiles, Nixon/Ford Years*, p. 482).

When McGovern brought the news to his staff that O'Brien had decided to step down, several were suspicious that O'Brien would try to organize a fall campaign. They argued that the chair should be a woman. She was elected without opposition. She is a Mormon and described as very driven (*New York Times*, July 15, 1972, p. 1). Described as an enthusiastic backer of reforms to involve more

blacks, women, and youth at the 1972 convention (*New York Times*, December 4, 1972).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: McGovern (presidential nominee) announced that O'Brien "reached a judgement that he will not stay on for another term." Mr. O'Brien "...was said by intimates to be irritated that Mr. McGovern would push so hard to persuade him to stay without first settling matters with his aides." He wanted O'Brien because he saw him as able to provide the necessary party unity for winning the presidential election. He is still holding out the hope that O'Brien can be persuaded to lead the campaign (*New York Times*, July 15, 1972, p. 1).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
First woman to hold the post

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/5/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.11

Change #: 11

Date of Change: 1972

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Jean Westwood

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Robert Strauss

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1918

(Former) occupation: Federal Bureau of Investigation Special Agent; Lawyer with own firm.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): The Governors' Conference commits to Strauss. He has strong support from labor and northern liberals. This represents a "symbolic shift of direction" (*New York Times*, December 4, 1972, p. 11).

In his acceptance speech, Strauss stresses that he belongs to no man or organization. "I am a centrist...a putter together..." Strauss had the supporter of labor leaders, southerners, and anti-McGovern forces (*New York Times*, December 10, 1972, p. 1).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: "Powerful Democratic behind the scenes political mover and shaker." "Since the late 1960s, Strauss has been a significant figure in the behind-the-scenes world of Washington politics. His friendships are bipartisan...He

has the reputation of being able to express unwelcome truths with charm and persuasiveness." Mix of "high-minded idealism" and "down home, good old boy rhetoric" (Maisel, 1991, p. 1083).

He is described as having "Texas scale energy," combativeness, persuasive skill and personal charm. He tried to portray himself as a friend of blacks and in favor of party reforms, in response to Westwood critics. People are trying to pin a reactionary label on him (*New York Times*, December 11, 1972, p. 28).

Strauss, who was Lyndon B. Johnson's nominee, arrives after a five-year factional fight since the 1967 McCarthy campaign (*New York Times*, December 12, 1972, p. 25).

His chairmanship marks the end of the McGovern era, although the National Committee is stacked with McGovernites. The liberal forces could not rally themselves.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: (under pressure)

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s): There are reports of "mounting efforts to oust her in the wake of the party's crushing defeat in the presidential election" (*New York Times*, November 10, 1972, p. 1). Westwood fighting against organized labor, conservative and moderate Democrats. They want a change because they believe Westwood would be unable to raise the necessary funds to unify the party and build for the future.

Westwood sees herself as a scape-goat and refuses to quit.

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons: "Westwood was challenged by Robert Strauss after the McGovern defeat. Westwood won re-election to the DNC chair in December, 1972 by three votes under an

agreement with four of those voting that she would then resign" (Maisel, 1991, p. 119).

Critics say she makes the party appear too radical, she was handpicked by McGovern and appeared very liberal (*New York Times*, November 10, 1972, p. 1).

Five Democratic governors make a move to replace Westwood and give the party a new sense of direction. They want to put the party back together and purge the "new politics" associated with McGovern (*New York Times*, November 14, 1972, p. 1).

Southern and Western governors aligned to commit to Robert Strauss at the Democratic National Committee election the following week. The Democratic Governors Conference voted to ask Westwood to resign (*New York Times*, December 4, 1972, p. 11).

A motion made to declare the chair "vacant" was defeated but some of those votes given to allow her to step aside. Westwood supported by California, New York and the industrial Northeast - opposed by the South, West and Midwest (*New York Times*, December 10, 1972, p. 1).

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No: It's true that this marked the end of the McGovern era (see above), but it was effectively a shift from one faction being dominant to no faction being dominant.

Also, for the first time in memory, a fund-raiser has assumed chairmanship; this is considered "undignified" to some Democrats.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/5/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.12

Change #: 12

Date of Change: 1977

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Robert Strauss

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Kenneth M. Curtis

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1931

(Former) occupation: Governor of Maine

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): None. Curtis was asked by Carter to be chair after the presidential election in 1976 (Maisel, 1991, p. 223).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: As governor of Maine "...his political style was new..." He was charismatic and willing to "confront controversial social and environmental issues." He is strongly anti-Vietnam, an "advocate of social welfare programs" but able to work closely with the Republicans to pass legislation (Maisel, 1991, p. 223).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: "Robert S. Strauss...told [reporters] that he assumed that Jimmy Carter or any other Democratic nominee would want to put his own political advisors in charge of the party machinery for the general election." He plans to resign when the Convention is over. He becomes Special Trade Representative for Carter in 1977 (*New York Times*, May 19, 1976, p. 47).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/7/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.13

Change #: 13

Date of Change: 1977

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Kenneth M. Curtis

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: John C. White

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1925

(Former) occupation: Commissioner of Agriculture for 14 terms in Texas, and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in national government.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "...a moderate from Texas...[he was] attractive because of his history of party loyalty and his lack of enemies" (Maisel, 1991, p. 1204).

One of the few Texans to support George McGovern in the 1972 presidential election (*New York Times*, December 28).

White is "...a politician in the mold of the former chairman, Robert S. Strauss of Texas who recommended him for the post." He has ties to the farm vote (*New York Times*, December 29, Section IV, p. 4).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: "[S]erved less than a year as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. (Curtis had resigned because of troubles with Carter over the party's direction and other party matters)" (Maisel, 1991, p. 1204).

Carter worked outside of the Democratic National Committee in his presidential election campaign, and set up the "Carter network," a rival to the Democratic National Committee. Curtis points to this dual structure as a problem, i.e., two groups of Democrats, "Carter" and traditional Democrats (*New York Times*, December 11, Section IV, p. 3).

"Our job has been to try to marry these two groups politically as much as we could." However, the president ignored the Democratic National Committee in office.

Mr Curtis' "relaxed stewardship" resulted in White House staff criticism: "...he has been reduced to a technician whose principal function is to keep the creaking party machinery oiled and if possible, quiet."

After ten months of strained relations, the White House staff is dissatisfied with the way that Curtis is running the National Committee. He did not make any bid to mold the "competing constituencies" within the party "into an effective, unified political apparatus" (*New York Times*, December 8, 1977, p. 19).

"He was just too decent, too democratic for the Democrats in the White House," says Democratic National Committee staff member.

Curtis acknowledged certain White House people were not happy with him and that he never intended to be a "career party chairman." His decision to resign was prompted by what was seen as a watered down resolution supporting Carter over the Panama Canal treaties. In this "strained atmosphere" he called Carter to say he would step down in early 1978. Carter accepted.

Curtis denies that the White House forced him to quit, although he concedes that it was a lousy job under a Democratic president, after being asked that by a reporter. He said it wasn't the sort of job you would lay down in the street and bleed to keep. He was viewed as weak and indecisive by top aides to Carter (*New York Times*, December 9, p. 12).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to

resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)

___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/7/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.14

Change #: 14

Date of Change: 1981

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: John C. White

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Charles T. Manatt

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1936

(Former) occupation: Lawyer, bank chairman.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Left-right ideological quarrels did not play "...a significant role in the campaign for the chairmanship" (*New York Times*, February 28, 1981, p. 7).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He displayed "energetic leadership". Under his direction "...the Democratic party assiduously pursued the course of insisting on centralized regulation of state parties in the presidential nominating process, spending many thousands of dollars to establish in the federal courts the right of the national party to override the enactments of state legislatures in the matters of the procedures of delegate selection." That is, he centralized power within the party. He raised lots of money (Maisel, 1991, p. 639).

Manatt promises to revamp the party organization with technology

for fund raising (direct mail, etc.), and institute a party policy council to produce political ideas. He had wanted the job for many years. His selection was not dogged by left-right ideological struggles. He would take no salary, instead being paid by his Los Angeles law firm (*New York Times*, February 28, 1981, p. 7).

He tends toward the "small-town boosterism" of Midwest America. He says of the 1980 election: "We have been out-organized, out-televised, out-coordinated, out-financed and out-worked." His goal is to establish a party policy council, direct mail campaigns focusing on small contributors, and training academies of party workers.

The election of Manatt signifies the dawning of the computer era within the Democratic party (*New York Times*, March 1, 1981, Section IV, p. 2).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons: White "...lost his chairmanship in 1980 as a direct result of Carter's defeat. He had been a strong supporter of Carter throughout the 1980 nominating primaries, a partisanship that put him into disfavor with other powerful Democrats who then called for his resignation." He was "ousted" after the 1980 election (Maisel, 1991, p. 1204).

Following crushing defeats for the Democrats, the future of John C. White became the "focus" of the party. Some were critical of him for supporting Carter too vociferously in the primaries. A new power bloc was emerging composed of Ted Kennedy and Walter Mondale.

They were the most likely candidates for the presidential nomination. So, it was most likely that they would pick the new chair. The party needed a "good spokesman, skilled in fund raising, who would help congressional and state candidates and would be neutral with regard to Kennedy and Mondale." A possible plan suggested was that White continue and then resign to have Manatt elected (*New York Times*, November 12, 1980, p. 1).

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/7/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.15

Change #: 15

Date of Change: 1985

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Charles T. Manatt

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Paul G. Kirk, Jr.

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1938

(Former) occupation: Lawyer, Assistant District Attorney in Massachusetts, aide to Edward Kennedy, former national party treasurer.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "Kirk was generally perceived to be little more than a Kennedy satellite" in the beginning. But he carved out his own niche (Maisel, 1991, p. 547). Kirk had served on Kennedy's senate staff but Kirk purposely avoided relying on Kennedy for the nomination (*New York Times*, January 13, 1985, Section IV, p. 4). Many Southern and Western Democrats had feared that his election would send the wrong message. The need was expressed for a "fresher, more conservative party" (*New York Times*, February 2, 1985, p. 6).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He was concerned with

structural reform. He "promptly undid a number of the more egregious mistakes made by his predecessors. He disestablished those special interest caucuses that had brought the severe fragmentation of the Democratic party into the organization of the national committee itself." He made peace with the Wisconsin state party which had held open primaries. "His management of party affairs coincided with encouraged retreat from the self-destructiveness that had plagued the Democratic Party from 1968-88" (Maisel, 1991, p. 547).

"Something is going on out there that we're not connecting with as a national party," he said. "If we don't change we're going to basically let ourselves dissipate as a party" (*New York Times*, January 13, 1985, Section IV, p. 4).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: Preceding the Democratic national convention, Walter Mondale made a concerted effort to remove Manatt. Mondale went so far as to tell Manatt that he would be replaced as the Democratic National Committee chair election during the convention. However, this leads to speculation that Bert Lance, a trusted political advisor to Mondale, will replace him, and Lance was tainted by a banking fraud charge when he was Office of Management and Budget director (*New York Times*, July 15, 1984, p. 1).

Mondale is forced to back down "by an outpouring of protests from party leaders" - organized labor leaders, Jesse Jackson, Gary Hart, Tip O'Neill. He is criticized for not consulting first. The move came, the reporter speculates, to show that Mondale was in full control of the party (*New York Times*, July 16, 1984, p. 1).

Manatt argues that Mondale's actions have not reduced his power but that he does not plan to serve beyond this term. He is supported by both business and labor (*New York Times*, July 17, 1984, p. 20).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which

would lead to electoral failures in the future

___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/7/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.16

Change #: 16

Date of Change: 1989

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Paul G. Kirk, Jr.

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Ron H. Brown

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1941

(Former) occupation: Lawyer

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Congressional Quarterly calls him "the successful chairman of the DNC" (*Congressional Quarterly Almanac*: Vol. XLVIII: p. 150-A). The first black to serve in the position. He worked for liberals like Ted Kennedy and Jesse Jackson "but as DNC chairman he was part of the effort to increase the party's mainstream appeal" (ibid).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: At at least two conventions "...his skills and contacts had made him a bridge between party factions" (*Congressional Quarterly Almanac*: Vol. XLVIII: p. 150-A). He faced a badly fractured party after the 1988 defeat of Dukakis (*New York Times*, January 16, 1993, p. 7).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: Kirk seems to have resigned for personal reasons. Kirk announced on December 5, 1988 that he would not seek a second term. "Mr. Kirk, who was urged by Democratic leaders from all wings of the party but the Reverend Jesse Jackson's, said at a Washington news conference that personal factors involving family and career led to his decision" (*New York Times*, December 6, 1988, Section II, p. 12). "Democratic National Committee chairman Paul Kirk is being taken at his word when he says that he is stepping down for personal reasons. Virtually the whole party hierarchy had hoped he would stay for a second term" (*Christian Science Monitor*, December 9, 1988, p. 17). Although he did oversee the disastrous 1988 Dukakis presidential election, "party members do not hold Mr. Kirk responsible for Mr. Dukakis' defeat, and many credit him with helping to unite the party by the time of the July convention in Atlanta" (*New York Times*, December 6, 1988, Section II, p. 12). After Kirk stepped down, he was widely praised for his term: "All five candidates are open in their praise for Paul G. Kirk, Jr., the outgoing chairman who sought to beef up the committee's fund-raising and technical apparatus after years of lagging far behind the Republicans in the areas" (*New York Times*, December 25, 1988, Section IV, p. 5). However, note that Kirk originally seems to have been in the running for the post, and only later withdrew from the contest. Also, Ron Brown, his eventual successor, as well as the other challengers, had already announced their intentions to seek the chairmanship before Kirk decided to step down. Note also that the ensuing election for the post of chair was very tense, with five candidates running. The contest also exposed racial and other tensions within the party (see the *St. Petersburg Times*, December 14, 1988, p. 3).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses

of power)

___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No: But note that he was the first black to be elected as chairman of the national party.

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/7/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Democrats

Long Record #: US.D.17

Change #: 17

Date of Change: 1993

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Democratic National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Ron H. Brown

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: David Wilhelm

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1957

(Former) occupation: "political operative" (*New York Times*, January 16, 1993, p. 1).

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "In naming David Wilhelm...to run the Democratic national committee, president-elect, Bill Clinton is signaling his intention to use the party to reach beyond the political confines of Washington." Wilhelm is a midwesterner and can reach beyond the Beltway. In this way he is different from Ron Brown. "The job is now for a technician who understands the Clinton task coalition, who will use that coalition to help elect other Democrats," said Democratic National Committee member Jim Ruvdo (*New York Times*, January 16, 1993, p. 7).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Wilhelm is termed a "Chicago political veteran." He is only 36 years old, however. His youthfulness has party veterans fearing that they will become

peripheral influences in the party (*New York Times*, January 22, 1993, p. 13).

He plans to attend daily staff briefings at the White House, and be involved in presidential politics.

He is seen as a "contrast to Ron Brown" by one unnamed Democratic National Committee member.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: Brown was appointed Secretary of Commerce by Clinton.

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No: Not really, though Wilhelm was the youngest person since 1961 to hold the post in the Democratic Party.

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style,

different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):
None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 6/24/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

First Form for Party

Party: Republicans

Party Founding Date: pre-1950 (1854)

Long Record #: US.R.0

Change #: 0

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Chair of the Republican National Committee

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Hugh D. Scott

Characteristics of **Leader A** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1900

(Former) occupation: According to Maisel (1991), he was first elected to the House in 1940 and after naval service, returned to the House again.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Yes, Maisel (1991, p 996) identifies him as a "GOP urban liberal," who in 1964 "spearhead[ed] the unsuccessful 'Stop Goldwater' movement in the GOP."

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 6/25/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.1

Change #: 1

Date of Change: 1949

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Hugh D. Scott

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Guy George Gabrielson

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1891

(Former) occupation: Lawyer

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): He is identified with the Taft side of the party, not the Dewey side (Maisel, 1991, p. 419).

He "sought to unify the liberal and conservative wings of the GOP." He issued a statement of principles in 1950 which was "aggressively anti-communist and defensive of free-market capitalism" (*Political Profiles, Vol.1, Truman Years, 1978, p. 1983*).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He "...promptly authorized the preparation of an organizational study to put the GOP national headquarters on a 'business-like basis'." He opposed "socialism in government" as it was called. He was charged with financial impropriety but survived this. "In his final year in the chairmanship, he tried to consolidate House and Senate campaign

committees that were consolidated with the national committee" (Maisel, 1991, p. 1983).

Gabrielson was considered "controversial and dynamic" because of the technology he had employed in the 1950 congressional elections. He had instituted schools for national and state party workers, studied voter registration lists. He targeted minorities, young people, and set up task forces to help unseat Democratic incumbents (*New York Times*, November 17, 1950, p. 23).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other: (see below)

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s): "Following Thomas E. Dewey's defeat in the 1948 presidential election, supporters of Senator Robert A. Taft and former Governor Harold Stassen sought to retire national chairman Hugh D. Scott, Jr., a Dewey associate" (Maisel, 1991, p. 419).

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 6/25/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.2

Change #: 2

Date of Change: 1952

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Guy George Gabrielson

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Arthur E. Summerfield

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1899

(Former) occupation: Businessman

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): He was Eisenhower's choice. Immediately following the election, "...he successfully unified the party split by the primary fight between Taft and Eisenhower," "...he was considered a middle-of-the-roader" in the Robert Taft - Thomas Dewey competition (Maisel, 1991, p. 1086).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: "Summerfield accepted the national party chairmanship for the duration of the election campaign only. During this brief tenure, he was able to establish a coordinating board to guide the work of the two congressional campaign committees and the national committee" (Maisel, 1991, p. 1086). (That is, he was continuing the organizational work of Gabrielson.)

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

- Former leader died
- Former leader resigned due to ill health
- Former leader resigned for other reason: (see below)
- Former leader lost leadership election
- Forced rotation or term limitations
- Other: see below

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

- electoral failure(s)
- fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
- political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
- other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change: Gabrielson had been dogged by charges of financial impropriety; he had been cleared but had been called on to resign from the Republican National Committee in 1952. The RNC rejected this and a vote of confidence was passed.

Gabrielson "...was shown to have appealed for loans for a company of which he was an officer. He, too, protested that there was nothing wrong with his activities and he remained as national party chair until after the RNC convention when the parties normally select a new chairman" (*New York Times*, March 28, 1953, p. 1).

Gabrielson backed Taft for president; when Eisenhower won he chose Summerfield as party leader. Gabrielson had tried a rules maneuver at the convention that had favored Taft supporters (*Political Profiles, Vol. 1, Truman Years*, 1978, p. 184)

The convention's vote was a sign that Gabrielson had no future in that job. An almost complete turnover of the committee took place. There were mutterings about the "passing out of the old Guard" (*New York Times*, July 13, 1952, p. 1).

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction?**

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 6/25/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.3

Change #: 3

Date of Change: January, 1953

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Arthur E. Summerfield

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Wesley Roberts

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1903

(Former) occupation: Co-editor/ co-publisher of three weekly newspapers; manager of a gubernatorial campaign.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Roberts had the strong approval of Eisenhower and Taft supporters (*New York Times*, January 17, 1953, p. 9).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He was recruited by Summerfield in 1952 as a director of organization. Only Roberts was considered as a replacement because "...he was a leading Republican in nominee Dwight Eisenhower's home state," i.e., no others were considered for the post. His selection was overwhelmingly approved (*Political Profiles, Vol. 2, Eisenhower Years, 1977, p. 515*).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

- Former leader died
- Former leader resigned due to ill health
- Former leader resigned for other reason: (see "Other" below)
- Former leader lost leadership election
- Forced rotation or term limitations

Other: "After the November victory, President Elect Eisenhower announced that Summerfield would become Postmaster General...He surprised many when he announced that he would resign as National Chairman to devote his attention to the Postal Service" (*Political Profiles, Vol. 1, Truman Years*, p. 592). Summerfield designated Roberts as his successor (*Political Profiles, Vol. 2, Eisenhower Years*, p. 515).

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

- electoral failure(s)
- fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future
- political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)
- other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 6/25/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.4

Change #: 4

Date of Change: April, 1953

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: C. Wesley Roberts

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Leonard W. Hall

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1900

(Former) occupation: lawyer, sheriff, New York state assemblyman, U.S. House member.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): None

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: forced due to scandal

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power): "Within a month of his election as national chairman, a group of hostile Kansas state legislators brought charges against Roberts for evading the Kansas Lobbying Act. Roberts resigned from the chairmanship and returned to his newspaper and insurance businesses." (Maisel, 1991, p. 972)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 6/25/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.5

Change #: 5

Date of Change: January, 1957

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Leonard W. Hall

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Hugh Meade Alcorn, Jr.

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1907

(Former) occupation: Family law firm; state attorney (Political Profiles, Vol. 2, p. 10)

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "[L]iberal Eisenhower supporter." In a 1957 news conference Eisenhower said Alcorn represented "modern Republicanism." Alcorn described it as "enlightened conservatism." He favored government services without encroachment on individual freedoms (*Political Profiles, Vol. 2, Eisenhower Years, 1977, p. 10*).

Alcorn was the personal choice of Eisenhower and was the subject of some right-wing discontent. ...some conservatives...would have preferred a man not so firmly committed to the "modern Republicanism" espoused by President and his closest followers." This represented a minority of the committee but one congressional conservative Republican said, "the conservative wing...has been liquidated and is about to be buried" (*New York Times, January 23, 1957, p. 1*).

"Mr. Alcorn is a liberal Republican who...rose through the organizational ranks" (*New York Times*, January 27, 1957, Section IV, p. 2).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Upon becoming chair, "...sensing a rightward drift, Alcorn attempted to focus attention on charges that the Democrats had been the party of corruption and treason during the late 1940s and early 1950s." However, this backfired when Republican appointees were accused of taking bribes and gifts. Contributions to the party decreased. He had two strategies. The first was to focus on organizing Republican seniors' clubs to involve older people. The second, "Operation Dixie," was designed to woo southern whites (*Political Profiles, Vol. 2, Eisenhower Years, 1977, p. 10*).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: to run for New York governor (Maisel, 1991, p. 464).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other: Hall is expected to resign after Eisenhower is sworn in (*New York Times*, January 3, 1957, p. 18).

He announces he will quit on January 19th. "Running the national committee, particularly in an election year, is an extremely exacting assignment and Mr. Hall is pictured as feeling he has had about all he can take." The article discusses Hall's potential plans to run for the New York governorship or get a government assignment (*New York Times*, January 10, 1957, p. 21). Soon after, Eisenhower "reluctantly" accepts Hall's resignation (*New York Times*, January 12, 1957, p. 1).

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change: "In 1955 and 1956 Hall became enmeshed in scandals involving the General Services Administration (GSA)." He was charged with giving contracts to upgrade a United States owned nickel plant, according to political considerations, i.e., there were no Democrats in executive positions within the company. He was invited to refute the charges but never did. He resigned as GOP chair in January 1957 and returned to his private law practice (*Political Profiles, Vol. 2, Eisenhower Years, 1977, p. 246*).

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 6/25/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.6

Change #: 6

Date of Change: April, 1957

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Hugh Meade Alcorn, Jr.

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Thruston B. Morton

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1907

(Former) occupation: Businessman (family grain and milling farm), congressman. Appointed by Eisenhower as Assistant Secretary of State for congressional relations.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): In Congress he "aligned himself with the liberal and internationalist wing of his party."

He was an advocate of federal aid to education and foreign aid programs (*Political Profiles, Vol. 2, Eisenhower Years, 1977, p. 442*).

He was opposed to McCarthy, pro-Eisenhower, pro-racial integration and civil rights (*ibid., p. 443*).

Morton "is a middle ground Republican who claims neither the liberal nor conservative label..." (*New York Times, April 1, 1959, p. 1*).

Morton is the choice of the White House, is counted as a Nixon supporter. He is considered a Senate liberal, although he refused to be involved in the January, 1959 efforts to unseat Senate "old

guard" Republican leaders (*New York Times*, April 2, 1959, p. 14). "Old guard Republican leaders on Capitol Hill opened a fight today to block Senator Thruston B. Morton of Kentucky from becoming the next Republican National Chairman." The predicament of the party is described as so "grave" that it needs a full-time chairman. Morton has made it clear that he would not resign his Senate seat. Morton said that if he were elected he would not serve beyond the 1960 presidential elections because the re-election campaign would need his attention for 1962 (*New York Times*, April 4, 1959, p. 22). He is criticized as a "stop-gap" chairman; critics feel that he will not be able to rebuild the party properly. Morton pledges absolute neutrality (p. 46). He calls himself a "middle of the roader" with a strong record of support for Eisenhower's programs (*New York Times*, April 12, 1959, p. 1).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He "subscribed to the liberal and internationalist Republican viewpoint." He worked with Northern liberals on civil rights legislation (Maisel, 1991, p. 668). He "...continued Alcorn's modern Republican positions." After Kennedy's close victory over Nixon, Morton accused the Democrats of massive vote fraud and sought an investigation (Maisel, 1991, p. 669).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: He cited reasons not connected with politics. There were requests that he remain but Alcorn said that serving without salary was placing additional burdens on his Hartford law partners (Maisel, 1991, p. 21). (See below also.)

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change: The elections of 1958 had seen big losses for the Republicans: 47 seats in the House and 13 in the Senate. They hadn't been that bad since the 1930s. Alcorn resigns in April, 1959 (*Political Profiles, Vol. 2, Eisenhower Years, 1977, p. 10*)

"It was understood that personal reasons motivated Mr. Alcorn's decision to quit." His "...decision...came as something of a surprise...due to denials over the last few weeks that he was planning to resign." He had suggested that financial pressure would not allow him to stay in the job forever. The party had suffered big losses in the 1958 elections, however, the Democrats having increasingly controlled congressional since 1954 (*New York Times, April 1, 1959, p. 1*).

He resigned "...for compelling personal reasons unconnected with politics" (p. 14). "On the record, he would not go beyond the statement that his long absence from his Hartford law firm, 'has resulted in a growing burden to my law partners'." He served without salary, but professional and personal obligations required he step down, he said (*New York Times, April 2, 1959, p. 1*).

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction?**

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift?**

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 6/25/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.7

Change #: 7

Date of Change: 1961

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Thruston B. Morton

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: William E. Miller

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1914

(Former) occupation: Lawyer, Assistant prosecutor at the Nuremberg war crime trials; member of Congress.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "Miller's voting record matched his reactionary rhetoric." His Americans for Constitutional Action rating was 92%. He worked closely with Goldwater for the 1964 nomination and was chosen as his vice-presidential candidate (Maisel, 1991, p. 652). He was a sharp critic of the Kennedy administration (*Political Profiles, Vol. 2, Eisenhower Years*, 1977, pp. 358-59).

"Mr. Rockefeller approved the selection of Mr. Miller as Republican national chairman in mid-1961 on the theory that a conservative New Yorker would be better than a conservative Mid-westerner" (*New York Times*, July 17, 1964, p. 11).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: "Miller hoped to strengthen

GOP organization and win control of the House for the party in the 1962 election." He needed to also eliminate a big debt from the 1960 campaign. "Moderate and liberal Republicans criticized Miller for spending national committee funds on "Operation Dixie" (see the information for Leonard Hall [Long Record #US.R.4]). "...a partisan Republican," although he did vote for the civil rights bill (*Political Profiles, Vol. 2, Eisenhower Years, 1977, pp. 358-59*).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: The following appear to be personal political reasons. Morton, in accepting the position (see information for Thruston B. Morton), said he would need to step down to handle his 1962 Senate election. This is seen as the reason behind his resignation (New York Times, January 8, p. 41). Also, "many party leaders credited Miller [the new leader] with the party's house victories in 1960" (*Political Profiles, Vol. 3, Kennedy/ Johnson Years, 1976, p. 358*).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other: see below

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction?**

Yes: In the *Dominant Faction* data book, we code a change of dominant faction as having taken place sometime between 1961 and 1964. Our best guess is that the shift from Morton to Miller somehow "contributed to" the overall dominant faction change from the more moderate wing to the right wing.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 6/25/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.8

Change #: 8

Date of Change: July, 1961

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: William E. Miller

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Dean Burch

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1927

(Former) occupation: Lawyer

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Goldwater appointed him after he was selected as the Republican presidential nominee in 1964. Burch was very young and basically unknown. He had never served in a national campaign and knew very little about the Republican National Committee. Goldwater wanted him because he would "keep the party's national organization in conservative hands even if the Republicans lost in November" (*Political Profiles, Vol. 3, Kennedy/ Johnson Years, 1976, p. 80*).

He is described as having "moderate views." He "may be able to calm the fears of Republican liberals that the party is to be turned into a harshly conservative body..." as he will promote "...regular Republicanism" (*New York Times, July 17, 1964, p. 11*).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: In handling Goldwater's

campaign, Burch proved inept. "Burch also failed in his most basic task, that of actually running the RNC organization." Burch was opposed by the liberal-moderate wing of the party. He removed them from the executive committee of the Republican National Committee. He was very suspicious of his subordinates, he ignored committee reports and "sapped morale" among the Republican National Committee's permanent employees (*Political Profiles, Vol. 3, Kennedy/ Johnson Years, 1977, pp. 80-81*).

Burch brought in several Goldwater committee staff and thus offended many veteran employees who resigned (Maisel, 1991, p. 107).

Burch is described as a "36 year old protege" and the choice of Goldwater. He was "relatively unknown in national politics" and was put in to serve a 4 year term (*New York Times, July 17, 1964, p. 1*).

The essential function of the chair, as he sees it, is as an organizer, a fund raiser, spokesman and technician. This is mentioned when defending himself against moves to unseat him because of his ties to Goldwater's presidential nomination (*New York Times, January 3, 1965, p. 20*).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: In the beginning of 1964, Miller had announced that he "would step down as party chairman following the RNC convention in July" (*Political Profiles, Vol. 3, Kennedy/ Johnson Years, 1977, p. 421*).

Miller becomes the vice-presidential nominee for Goldwater (*New York Times, July 17, 1964, p. 1*).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction?**

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift?**

No: But note that Burch was 36 years old. Observers had expected Goldwater to pick a veteran like Ray Bliss, who did become chair after Burch (*Political Profiles, Vol. 3, Kennedy/ Johnson Years, 1976, p. 80*).

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 6/25/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.9

Change #: 9

Date of Change: January, 1965

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Dean Burch

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Ray C. Bliss

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1907

(Former) occupation: Insurance executive

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): He saw himself as a "nuts and bolts" guy, tending toward organizational issues, not policy. He did recognize the importance of developing substantive issues for the party profile. He devoted significant resources to the Republican coordinating committee which was a policy developing body composed of prominent party leaders (Maisel, 1991, p. 74). He is described as "non-ideological" and that is why he was considered such a suitable replacement for Ray Bliss (*Political Profiles, Vol. 3, Kennedy/ Johnson Years*, 1976, p. 81). Many Republican leaders hail it as the bringing of unity "to their badly beaten and seriously divided party." It meant the end of Goldwater forces' control of the national (Washington, D.C.) offices, and Goldwater finally acceded to and then promoted the change (*New York Times*, January 13, 1965, p. 38).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: "As national chair, he has been credited with rebuilding the party organization after its 1964 electoral disaster and with developing the organizational framework and strategy used by his successors to create a strong national party organization." When he headed the Ohio party organization, he "stressed organizational development, fundraising, professional headquarter's staffing, candidate recruitment" and the latest technology. He applied this to the Republican National Committee. He expanded direct mail into "a highly effective fundraising program..., training programs for 20,000 state party leaders, staff personnel, candidates and volunteers." He focused on "public relations, campaign management, fund-raising, computer technology, and big-city operations." (Maisel, 1991, p. 74).

Bliss' reforms were designed to revitalize a party badly divided by internal factionalism. The Republican Coordinating Committee was set up to issue position papers "couched in language bland enough to please Republicans of all persuasions" (*Political Profiles, Vol.4, Kennedy/ Johnson Years, 1976, p. 50*).

Bliss "agreed" to take over with the blessing of Goldwater. (cont'd. p.38) As Ohio state chairman he had "built one of the best oiled political organizations in the nation. The secret of his political pre-eminence is that he readily accepts new techniques..." but held to old-fashioned values like keeping his word (*New York Times, January 13, 1965, p. 1*).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: under pressure (see below)

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s): "Following Goldwater's defeat, GOP moderates demanded Burch's removal..." He was determined to keep his office. Goldwater still supported him but Nixon and Republican National Committee heavyweights favored the "non-ideological" Ray Bliss. They persuaded Goldwater to abandon Burch. Burch withdrew his candidacy in January, 1965 (*Political Profiles, Vol. 3, Kennedy*

Years, 1976, p. 81).

"Burch became a scapegoat for the party regulars..." once Goldwater lost (Maisel, 1991, p. 107). "Soon after the election liberal-moderate leaders...demanded the resignation of RNC chairman Dean Burch...as retribution for [their] poor showing in the November election" (*Political Profiles, Vol. 4, Johnson Years, 1976, p. 50*). Basically Burch was forced out because of his ties to Goldwater, post-1964 presidential loss. "Mr. Burch has been under fire from GOP progressives who contend his actions in 'excluding' them from party operations contributed to the Republican defeat of November 3rd." Goldwater "has been waging a stiff fight to keep him on the job." Burch sent a letter to committee members explaining why he should remain. A vote of confidence was planned for the next meeting (*New York Times, January 1, 1965, p. 8*).

In his letter, Burch wrote that, "My resignation has been called for...on the grounds that I am a symbol of Senator Goldwater and of the so-called 'conservative faction of the Republican party'." He says he will not do so because he feels that that would breed conflict and repudiate the conservative voters that support him. A major criticism of Burch is that he is said to have encouraged exclusion in the party (*New York Times, January 3, 1965, p. 1*). Burch announces his resignation "to avoid a party-splitting fight." After extensive polling it was concluded that Burch could win a vote of no confidence but that his "...margin would be insufficient to constitute a clear mandate." Burch sees that his "effectiveness would be impaired" if he won on a forced vote (continuation, p.38) (*New York Times, January 13, 1965, p. 1*).

___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction?**

No: Though this was viewed as the end of the Goldwater conservative era, Bliss did not represent a move to the left, but a move to a non-ideological, organizational manager for the party (see above). Therefore, while one faction may have "lost dominance" at about this time, it is hard to argue that a different faction became dominant.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a

generational shift?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/1/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.10

Change #: 10

Date of Change: 1969

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Ray C. Bliss

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Rogers C. Morton

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1914

(Former) occupation: Business man (helped run the family milling firm), member of Congress.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): He was selected by Nixon and was loyal to his policies: "his voting record in the House was moderately conservative..." He supported the Civil Rights Act (Maisel, 1991, p. 668). "His voting record reflected the conservativeness of his Maryland district and a strict adherence to Republican policies" (*Political Profiles, Vol. 5, Nixon/ Ford Years, 1979, p. 452*).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Served as chair while in Congress, with no salary) (*Political Profiles, Vol. 5, Nixon/ Ford Years, 1979, p. 452*).

He says he will serve unsalaried as chair, unlike Bliss. He has agreed to continue through to the 1972 presidential campaign. His

task is to regain Republican control of Congress in the 1970 mid-term elections and be part-time since he would remain in Congress (*New York Times*, February 27, 1969, p. 19).

After the Goldwater loss of 1964, Morton began stumping across the country, berating the Republicans for writing off important groups, a move that had led to the electoral loss. His own voting record was conservative.

"...[A] whole new approach to the party leadership's handling of major political issues. For four previous years, Ray C. Bliss had never taken a public position on an issue, preferring to confine himself strictly to party organization. That era was clearly at an end. Morton represented 'a stronger, younger, personality'" (*New York Times*, April 15, 1969, p. 26).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: (see below)

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

pressure to resign for other clearly political reasons: "Bliss was forced out of the national chairmanship in February 1969 after president-elect Richard Nixon sought to restructure the RNC in a manner that would have undermined Bliss' status and independence" (Maisel, 1991, p. 74).

"Preferring a loyal spokesman over a party technician and mindful of Bliss' refusal to provide him with a plane in the 1966 campaign, Richard Nixon removed Bliss as national chairman in February, 1969" (*Political Profiles, Vol. 4, Johnson Years*, 1976, p. 50).

"There has been a discernible shift in attitude toward Mr. Bliss in the Nixon campaign. A month or two ago, campaign aides were openly

advocating the chairman's ouster; now they advocate caution..." Word is out that Nixon is contemplating replacing Bliss. He wants a chairman "...who could relieve the White House of virtually all public responsibility for party affairs," i.e., Nixon wanted to avoid "political activity" to be a national leader. Bliss' skills are organizing and unifying, not being a political speaker. Some Republican leaders see Nixon's stance as "ingratitude" (*New York Times*, January 3, 1969, p. 10).

Nixon silenced reports that he would like a "more charismatic, articulate, and impassioned" committee chair. For the first time publicly he said he wanted Bliss to stay. The article reports the criteria he considered necessary for a party chair - television presence, forceful delivery, sharp quotable thrust (*New York Times*, January 18, 1969, p. 13).

The surprise resignation of Bliss was announced by the White House. The move is said to be: "designed to inject more glitter into the leadership. The party needs a leader with a "smooth television and platform manners" (*New York Times*, February 19, 1969, p. 27).

"Informed sources here are agreed that the resignation was virtually forced on Mr. Bliss by the president's decisions to divide the chair's responsibilities between a spokesman, speechmaker, and a headquarters chief of staff for operations" (*New York Times*, February 20, 1969, p. 21).

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/1/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.11

Change #: 11

Date of Change: 1971

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Rogers C. Morton

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Robert J. Dole

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1923

(Former) occupation: County Attorney; member of Congress and Senate

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "A conservative on most issues...", very supportive of Nixon. His selection "...angered a number of moderates..." But he found he was shut out of any "decision-making vote" in the 1972 presidential campaign (*Political Profile, Vol. 5, Nixon/ Ford Years, 1979, p. 1974*).

"...[A] conservative with a reputation as a tough politician and legislative infights, [he] had actively sought the post..." since R.C. Morton was renominated in November, 1970. "The selection of Mr. Dole...is expected to generate considerable resentment among some of his colleagues on Capitol Hill and could be a disruptive element in the party." Republican liberals are nervous. Also note that Dole is very abrasive and ambitious and will not be full-time (*New York Times, January 6, 1971, p. 1*).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character,

orientation, leadership style, etc.: It was "hard for him to delegate authority... Dole sought to broaden the GOP's voter appeal, but Nixon's re-election committee kept Dole from having much effect." (Maisel, 1991, p. 268).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: see below

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s): "After a poor Republican showing in the 1970 elections, Morton resigned the RNC chairmanship" (*Political Profiles, Vol. 5, Nixon/ Ford Years, 1979, p. 452*).

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/1/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.12

Change #: 12

Date of Change: 1973

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Robert J. Dole

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: George H. Bush

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1924

(Former) occupation: Oilfield supply salesman, founder of contract oil drilling firm; member of Congress.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Received a 77% rating from the Americans for Constitutional Action. He was appointed by Nixon. Favored right-to-work laws but also civil rights and Johnson "open-housing" legislation in 1968 and strong environmental legislation (*Political Profiles, Vol. 5, Nixon/ Ford Years, 1979, pp. 101-102*). He is described as a "middle-of-the-road" Republican senator (Maisel, 1991, p. 109).

"Bush left his fingerprints on none of these jobs [the ones he was appointed to by Nixon/ Ford]. This was notably the case with respect to the RNC, which he led during the height of the Watergate scandal...without insulating the party from the ill effects of the scandal" (Maisel, 1991, p. 109).

His voting record tended to be "conservative" but he is also described as a "frequent critic of extreme right-wingers." He

would be a full-time paid chairman. He does not intend to be "some kind of ideological spokesman..." This is suggestive of a further contrast with Mr. Dole, a fiery critic of president Nixon's Democratic opposition (*New York Times*, December 12, 1972, p. 24).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: "Bush sought to translate the Republican 'new majority' of 1972 into greater Republican congressional power by broadening the party base to include workers and ethnic groups." Watergate led to decreasing financial contribution and also big losses in 1974 election (*Political Profiles, Vol. 5, Nixon/ Ford Years, 1979, p. 102*).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: pressured (see below)

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other: see below

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s): Dole resigned. He denied leaving under presidential pressure, although until the last minute he had said he would stay. "Rumors that Senator Dole might be forced out of the chairmanship that he has held since January 1971 began to stir soon after Election Day when it became clear that President Nixon's overwhelming victory had not meant a parallel gain for the party in Congress." Dole says he never planned to stay beyond 1973 because of his re-election bid to the Senate in 1974. He is reported as having told this to Nixon before the 1972 election (*New York Times*, December 12, 1972, pp. 1, 24).

Mr. Bush pledged to win congressional/state seats "as his predecessor Robert J. Dole was unable to do last year" (*New York Times*, January 20, 1973, p. 21).

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

X other clearly political reasons: Relations between Dole and Nixon had deteriorated during the 1972 campaign when Dole was shut out from decision-making by the White House. "Following the president's re-election, Dole's relationship with the White House staff was so strained that he resigned in January 1973" (*Political Profiles, Vol. 5, Nixon/ Ford Years, 1979, p. 174*).

"Nixon's re-election committee kept Dole from having much effect. In 1973 he resigned as party chairman" (Maisel, 1991, p. 268).

"Senator Dole, who was nudged out of the party leadership sooner than he had expected, mocked the job." The Committee to re-elect the President took away National Committee duties. Dole made some parting shots about the lack of consultation by the White house (*New York Times, January 20, 1973, p. 21*).

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction?**

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift?**

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/1/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.13

Change #: 13

Date of Change: 1974

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: George H. Bush

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Mary Louise Smith

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1914

(Former) occupation: Social worker

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "Associated with the Gerald Ford wing of the GOP, Smith was known primarily as a party loyalist" (Maisel, 1991, p. 1022).

She was nominated by Ford in 1974. "Mrs. Smith represents the moderate wing" as opposed to the conservative wing headed by Ronald Reagan (*New York Times*, November 28, 1976, Section IV, p. 4).

"Party professionals around the country viewed the selection of Mrs. Smith as a holding action, designed to grant George Bush his wish to escape from the job without committing Mr. Ford for the long term." Ford is expected to put a new person in in November to manage the re-election campaign in 1976. Smith says she does not consider herself to be holding it as "just an interim job" (*New York Times*, September 5, 1974, pp. 1, 26).

Party professionals say that she has a lot of grass roots experience but is "far too unschooled in national political

operations to run a presidential campaign or to undertake the major reorganization that many of them believe the party needs." Republican campaign adviser says that: "clearly she is expendable. She'll be blamed when things go badly, but it won't be her fault of course."

Mrs. Smith, a Midwesterner, calls herself a "moderate conservative" but is not known as an ideologue.

"I'm not a doctrinaire ideologue...sometimes I cross over to the liberal rights side" (*New York Times*, September 17, 1974, p. 40).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: She "...sought to rebuild the party after the Watergate scandal with grass roots seminars and the appointment of more women." Her activities outside the Republican National Committee have involved being on several "reform" committees for the party. She joined the Republican Mainstream Committee, a "progressive organization." She was involved in political organizations for women and on the board of Iowa Planned Parenthood. A self-described feminist. Outspoken on civil rights. She enjoys bipartisan respect and was put on a number of bipartisan committees to study convention financing and European political parties (Maisel, 1991, p. 1022).

(See also *New York Times*, September 5, 1974, p. 1).

She was the first woman to head the Republican National Committee.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: There is no indication of a forced resignation. "In September 1974 President Ford appointed Bush to head the U.S. Liaison Office in Peking" (*Political Profiles, Vol. 5, Nixon/ Ford Years*, 1979, p. 102). Bush is appointed to head the U.S. mission to China; he had expected to be nominated as the vice presidential nominee (*New York Times*, September 5, 1974, p. 1).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction?**

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift?**

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/1/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.14

Change #: 14

Date of Change: 1977

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Mary Louise Smith

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: William E. Brock

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1930

(Former) occupation: Member of Congress

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "Brock...made the national committee a prime instrument of the party's revival." Post-Watergate, the party's share of national and state seats had dropped significantly. He instituted direct mail to find contributors and was very successful. He put out generic Republican television advertisements to promote the party, and developed data processing services and advisory councils to promote the "new ideas." "Largely because of Brock, the national party organizations have changed from sleepy irrelevancies to major suppliers of campaign resources" (Maisel, 1991, p. 92). He is described as a 46 year old conservative. The choice of Brock would mean the Republican party would remain "under firm, conservative control" and that the moderate and liberal wings would be deprived of influence (*New York Times*, January 15, 1977, p. 9). Upon Brock's re-election for another year, there was talk about

replacing him because Reagan had won the presidential nomination and been advised to do so in 1979. A "wide range of Republican leaders (moderates and conservatives) strongly urged Mr. Reagan not to dump Mr. Brock, arguing that to do so would have promoted narrow divisiveness and alienated less conservative elements of the party" (*New York Times*, July 19, 1980, p. 6).

Brock was kept because he won praise from all Republican factions for helping the party broaden its appeal (*New York Times*, January 16, 1981, Section II, p. 5).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: (unforced)

"[T]he chairman of the Republican National Committee has decided to resign, instead of completing two more years of her term, to let the party get the fighting over with long before the next national elections.

Mrs. Smith apparently decided to resign because she felt that the leadership issue should be resolved as soon as possible so that the party could begin preparing for the 1978 congressional elections and 1980 presidential election" (*New York Times*, November 28, 1976, Section IV, p. 4).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/1/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.15

Change #: 15

Date of Change: January, 1981

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: William E. Brock

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Richard Richards

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1932

(Former) occupation: "Enrolled in College of Law at the University of Utah" and worked in Utah Republican politics (Maisel, 1991, p. 967).

Faction/tendency identified with (if any):

Although identified with Reagan, Richards warned right-wing organizations "not to exaggerate their role in getting Ronald Reagan elected or try to tell him what to do when in office." His focus was on organizational problems, field-work, and winning elections (*New York Times*, January 18, 1981, p. 18).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: Richards got involved with the Republican party at college. He became Utah party chair. "During these years of working in the Republican party, Richards gained recognition for his organizational capacity and for the emphasis and importance he placed upon grass-roots politics." As Republican

National Committee chair, he "...demonstrated a talent for raising money for Republican candidates...doubling the record amount of dollars for a non-election year in his first year of office" (*New York Times*, January 18, 1981, p. 18).

He cited Ray Bliss' strategy of finding good candidates, developing favorable issues, raising funds, and building organization. He has a "...national reputation as one of the leading organization minds in the Republican party." A nuts and bolts grass roots politician.

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: "In 1981 President Ronald Reagan appointed Brock U.S. Trade Representative" (Maisel, 1991, p. 92). See also *New York Times*, January 16, 1981, Section II, p. 5.

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

Yes: Though it is difficult if not impossible to attribute causality, this change in party leadership, to someone who was clearly identified as a Ronald Reagan conservative, effectively coincided with Reagan and his conservative wing taking control of the party.

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/1/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.16

Change #: 16

Date of Change: January, 1983

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Richard Richards

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Frank J. Fahrenkopf

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1939

(Former) occupation: Attorney

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): Recommended by Senator Paul Laxalt who would not stand for election to Republican National Committee when asked by Ronald Reagan. "In 1983, another Nevadan, Senator Paul Laxalt, was President Ronald Reagan's personal choice to head the national party. However, Laxalt did not want to leave the Senate and rules required a full-time party chair. He recommended Fahrenkopf" (Maisel, 1991, p. 347).

He describes himself as a "grassroots" organizational man, a conservative Reaganite. Transportation Secretary Drew Lewis said of him: "Unless the chairman is an insider, he's not going to be heard. Dick Richards had that problem." He says he intends to give more responsibility to regional directors (*New York Times*, January 29, 1983, p. 10).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character,

orientation, leadership style, etc.: He is the first national chair to rise up through party ranks according to Roger Stone, a political consultant. Plans to only serve 1-2 years.

"Under Fahrenkopf, the RNC stressed grass roots party building. Regional political operatives supplied local party officials with funds, technology, and training. In 1984 the RNC's telemarketing effort helped to register 4 million new Republican voters" (Maisel, 1991, p. 347). During the 1984 campaign, the Republican National Committee also mounted a very sophisticated research effort, \$1.1 million dollars being spent on researching prominent Democratic presidential candidates. After Iran contra, the funds dwindled (Maisel, 1991, p. 347).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: pressured (see below)

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other: see below

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons: Richards resigned denying that he had been pushed out. He said he would leave in January when his term expired. "The decision was mine" but he acknowledges that he had not been urged to stay by the White House (*New York Times*, October 5, 1982, p. 24).

There had been speculation in the media that he would be "dumped". A party source insisting on anonymity said that Richards was told he was leaving because he was seen as an ineffective spokesman.

"I told President Reagan, I couldn't afford to stay on in the Administration, that I wanted to get out and make some money". He had \$300,000 in loans to pay.

Republican leaders were facing mid-term elections and were fearing big losses, the implication being that Richards did not prepare the party well enough.

Richards said the reason he was resigning now, before the January meeting, was because of press speculation.

See also Richards interview in Harmel, ed., 1984.

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/1/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.17

Change #: 17

Date of Change: 1989

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Frank J. Fahrenkopf

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Harvey Lee Atwater

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1951

(Former) occupation: Political consultant

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): None

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He was the "architect of the Republican ascendancy." He managed Bush's 1988 campaign, which was highly negative. In doing so he "changed the tone of political dialogue." He subscribed to the "big tent" theory which opened the party to pro-choicers. He focused on bringing the Democratic South into the Republican camp and was quite successful.

"He was the principal architect of the post-Nixon southern strategy" (a quote from David Broder, *Washington Post* columnist). "...[H]e played into some of the traditional populist issues...": patriotism, national defense, family values and racial resentment. A co-worker on the Bush campaign, J. Graham Tew, said of him that he had "...intellectual knowledge of politics and yet he was a

great political operative..." Charles Black, a political consultant commented, "If there was one thing Lee understood, it was the Southern, white, conservative middle-class vote."

"As head of the party, Atwater sought to tighten his grip on the Southern vote..." Operation Outreach was started "to woo minorities, especially blacks, away from the Democrats" (*American Way*, January 1st, 1992 [Vol. 25, No.1], p. 58).

This was the "first time a political consultant had headed a major party." He was a celebrity and appeared on talk shows and had a prominent association with the music/movie industry (*American Way*, January 1st, 1992 [Vol. 25, No.1], p. 58).

Atwater is described as a political campaigner and manager. He views "government" as what happens after he has done his job (*New York Times*, November 18, 1988, Section D, p. 19).

Atwater describes his job as winning congressional elections for the party. Bush is expected to use the committee for political advice more so than any other president since Eisenhower relied on Leonard Hall (*New York Times*, January 19, 1989, p. 20).

Bush said, "He will be my political eyes and ears..." He is seen as combative in comparison to the "lower-key" Frank Fahrenkopf.

Atwater in the Op-Ed section of the *New York Times* writes: "The function of the RNC will be reconsidered and its programs will be made to conform to these simple criteria: Do they increase outreach? Do they build a broader Republican coalition? Do they help us become the majority party?" (*New York Times*, February 26, 1989, Section IV, p. 24).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: Fahrenkopf was the longest serving Republican National Committee chair, lasting for seven years. No specific reasons are cited for his departure. Bush, being the president-elect in November, 1988, selects his political operative Atwater (*New York Times*, November 18, 1988, Section D, p. 19).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

___ electoral failure(s)

___ fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

___ political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

___ other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

Yes: Atwater was described as a "baby boomer." He was also criticized during the 1988 campaign as being all style and no substance and for bringing politics to a new low in terms of negative campaigning (*American Way*, January 1st, 1992 [Vol. 25, No.1], p. 58)

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/1/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.18

Change #: 18

Date of Change: 1991

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Harvey Lee Atwater

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Clayton K. Yeutter

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1931

(Former) occupation: Agriculture Secretary, U.S. Trade Representative. (Has a Ph.D.)

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): "...[A] safe choice who would be palatable to all factions of the party..." (*New York Times*, January 5, 1991, p. 5).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: The leadership selection after Atwater is described as "bungled," i.e., there was no clear choice for the president, he was seen as fishing around for someone (*New York Times*, January 5, 1991, p. 5).

He is seen as "signaling a far different style of leadership" than Atwater. He was unanimously elected. Before becoming chair he was Secretary of Agriculture. However, he is not widely known. He introduced himself to the committee as a "very substantive person." He saw that the American public wanted more "issue oriented"

campaigns. He is considered a "sharp contrast to the razor's edge politics of Mr. Atwater." He is 60 years old and considered "a different personality" (*New York Times*, January 26, 1991, p. 11).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

Former leader died: Atwater died from brain cancer. He experienced "continual deterioration" and thus "forced the party to name a new director" (*American Way*, January 1st, 1992 [Volume 25, No. 1], p. 86).

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.19

Change #: 19

Date of Change: 1992

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Clayton K. Yeutter

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Richard N. Bond

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1951

(Former) occupation: Deputy campaign manager for the 1988 Bush election; deputy chief of staff.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): He was handpicked by Bush (*New York Times*, January 30, 1993, p. 10).

Bond is described as a "flame thrower" by an anonymous party official, in the style of Atwater. He wanted to reinvigorate the party. His appointment in 1991, after Atwater stepped down, was blocked by John Sununu (*New York Times*, February 2, 1992, p. 25).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.:

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other: "Yeutter was appointed to a "newly created White House post with cabinet rank to oversee economic and domestic policy." He helped with the president's re-election plan. Also, Bush is said to have wanted a more dynamic party spokesman (*New York Times*, February 2, 1992, p. 25).

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," this was due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None

4/19/93 (Final alterations: 7/1/99)

UNITED STATES

Data on **Party Leadership Change**

(from Leader A to Leader B)

Country: United States

Party: Republicans

Long Record #: US.R.20

Change #: 20

Date of Change: 1993

A. Venue of Leadership

Position(s) of leadership involved: Republican National Committee chair

B. Identification/Characteristics of Leaders

Leader A: Richard Bond

(See previous record for detailed information on Leader A)

Leader B: Haley Barbour

Characteristics of **Leader B** at time of leadership change:

Birthdate: 1948

(Former) occupation: Lawyer; lobbyist.

Faction/tendency identified with (if any): He favored the "big tent" philosophy of Atwater. He is described as a "good ol' boy" (and as being anti-abortion). His task is equated to that of Brock after Carter was elected in 1976 (*New York Times*, January 30, 1993, p. 10).

Other relevant information on the new leader's character, orientation, leadership style, etc.: He is not well known nationally, is a "party insider." The election focused on "issues of leadership not ideology" (*New York Times*, January 30, 1993, p. 10).

C. Reason(s) for the Change of Leader at This Time:

___ Former leader died

Former leader resigned due to ill health

Former leader resigned for other reason: "Richard Bond did not go gently into retirement. His swan song as chairman of the RNC criticized his party's rightward drift in general and its opposition to abortion in particular." He attacked "zealotry masquerading as principle." He criticized the evangelical right although he didn't do so during the 1992 convention (*New York Times*, February 2, 1993, p. 18).

He made a bid for the Republicans to recognize diversity and move with the times (*New York Times*, January 30, 1993, p. 1).

Former leader lost leadership election

Forced rotation or term limitations

Other

If the leader lost re-election to the position, or was "forced to resign," was this due to

electoral failure(s)

fears that the party is/was "falling behind," etc., which would lead to electoral failures in the future

political scandal (e.g. over misuse of public funds or abuses of power)

other clearly political reasons

Other relevant information on the reason for the change:

D. Character of the Change:

Did the change of leader result from/in (or simply coincide with) **change in dominant faction**?

No

Was the change in leadership seen as resulting from/in a **generational shift**?

No

Other characteristics/expected consequences of this change (e.g., change being made to result in different leadership style, different orientation to organization or campaigning, etc.):

None