

# DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS

Aivars Liepiņš

Researcher

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6860369>

Published Date: 19-July-2022

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### The Democratic Party

It is one of the two main political forces in the United States of America. It is currently the main opposition party to the government of President George W. Bush. Since 1874 its symbol is an ass, or donkey, (that of its rivals in the Republican Party is an elephant). The color blue is used to identify states that have a Democratic majority (as opposed to the red that identifies Republicans); and by extension it is the color of the party.

The neutrality of this section is in doubt. Please see the talk page for this article

Defining the trend of the current Democratic Party is quite difficult. Broadly speaking, it can be said to represent social democracy in the United States. At least in economic policy, they are more centrist than Republicans, always willing to dismantle the welfare state. John Kerry, a candidate in the last presidential election, had focused his speech on an economic policy favorable to domestic industry.

Like the modern social democrats of Europe, democrats are not opposed to the free market economy; and on the contrary they believe that market capitalism is the only economic system that can generate growth and prosperity. But they think that the state must intervene to reduce social imbalances, better distribute income and ensure equal opportunities; and thus create a "capitalism with a human face." That is why they are enthusiastic advocates of the welfare state.

Democrats do not necessarily oppose tax cuts for citizens and private businesses; but they are far less enthusiastic about these tax cuts than Republicans, as they say their rivals are exaggerating to benefit the rich. They also advocate greater public spending on social policy.

Due to the great freedom of conscience that exists in the American parties and the non-existent party discipline, the parties are very heterogeneous. And the Democratic Party is the most heterogeneous of the big parties in the United States.

There has traditionally been talk of an ideological divide between Conservative Democrats, Moderate Democrats and Liberal Democrats.

Conservative Democrats are in favor of a more liberal economy; they are more willing to cut taxes, lower public spending (including social spending) and deregulate the market than most of their party colleagues. They are also more conservative on social issues (same-sex marriage, abortion, etc.). They are said to look more like Republicans and not Democrats; many of them are from the south of the country.

Liberal Democrats are the most centrist, they are the most statist in economic matters and the most liberal in social matters. They want high public spending, very high taxes (even confiscatory) that hit hard on the profits of companies and especially the "rich"; and strong state intervention in the economy with regulations. They extend bureaucracy and state aid.

Moderate Democrats try to be the center between those extremes; they try to moderate the positions of liberals and conservatives, and to take intermediate measures between the proposals of one and the other.

In recent years, political analysts have established a new classification of the internal factions of the Democratic Party. Such factions would be the following:

**New Democrats:** They are the right-wing faction of the party and could identify with what were previously called moderate Democrats. They emerged strongly from the government of Bill Clinton, who is the most influential and prestigious of the party's right-wing leaders. Right-wing Democrats recognize the shortcomings of the Welfare State and agree that public spending on social programs needs to be streamlined and in some cases reduced, because many people benefiting from these programs had lost the incentive to work and preferred to live on state aid. ; in addition, that spending was an unsustainable burden for public coffers, forcing them to increase taxes and public debt. However, they do not agree with what they consider to be excessive cuts in social spending pushed by Republicans to the detriment of the poorest.

Right-wing Democrats also agree to reduce taxes on individuals and businesses; but their tax cuts are smaller than those proposed by Republicans, and they are also aimed (according to them) at benefiting more middle-class taxpayers than the rich, putting conditions on companies to benefit (as if they generate more jobs in the United States than abroad). Right-wing Democrats often ally with moderate Republicans to defend some measures. In short, right-wingers are trying to find a compromise between the party's traditional positions and the demands of today's globalized world. Right-wingers express their ideas through the powerful Democratic Leadership Council (DLC); an institution founded in 1985. This institution struggles to distance the party from its more centrist traditional positions and to bring it to the right of the political spectrum; but his critics within the party accuse him of being funded by large private companies trying to fund Democrats in favor of his corporate interests.

**Progressive Democrats:** Many Democrats emerged in the 1960s in college and academia, with their heyday in the pacifist struggle against the Vietnam War. As this movement declined, some of its members founded small Maoist and other communist parties; but many moderated their ideas and ended up joining the Democratic Party. They are radically opposed to the Iraq War, and to conservative economic policy (what progressives in other countries contemptuously call neoliberal); they also criticize the excessive influence of corporations (large private companies) in American politics. Progressives want to maintain higher taxes and increase rather than reduce spending on social programs.

Labor Democrats: are the unionized workers and their leaders. The unions in the United States are controlled by Democrats and their leaders have a great weight in the party. They are more concerned with defending the union's own demands: a better minimum wage, higher pensions, and laws that require employers to fund most of their employees' health insurance. Progressives and liberals are generally more inclined than right-wingers; but they collaborate with the latter when necessary to defend their interests.

Liberal Democrats: They have a lot in common with the progressives, but they are less radical than they are. They are protectionists in international trade (although they say they only advocate "Fair Trade"); they are more statist in economic policy than right-wingers and therefore more opposed to conservative economic policies. Higher taxes and more public spending seemed to be among his goals. They are less militaristic in foreign policy and get along better with human rights NGOs

The Republican Party of the United States is one of the two most important political parties in the United States (the only two parties that have held power in that country in the last 145 years). The President of the United States from 2001 to January 2009 is George W. Bush belongs to the Republican Party, and also the Senate and the House of Representatives have Republican majorities.

The Republican Party is also known as the "Grand Old Party" or the acronym for this nickname (GOP); since 1874 its symbol is an Elephant (while that of its Democratic rivals is an Ass). Red is the color that identifies states where there is a Republican majority, and by extension could be categorized as the color of the party (although throughout the world red is often used as the color of Communism and not the Right embodied by Republicans).

#### Present and Future of the Republican Party

(to the Conquest of the Latin and African American Vote)

American society has traditionally been very conservative, and there is a boom in conservatism today; this gives the Republican Party an important advantage over its rival, the Democratic Party (especially when the Democrat leans far to the left, moving away from the center; which sometimes happens). But the relatively advantageous position of Republicans is seriously threatened by the demographic reality of the United States.

Most Republicans belong to the ethnic group of whites of European descent (who are differentiated in official statistics from Hispanic or Latino whites), and many of them are from the so-called WASP (Anglo-Saxon and Protestant Whites,

according to their acronym) the racial and religious type that has long been the most powerful in the United States. Whites of European descent are still the majority of the American population; but they are gradually shrinking in size as ethnic minorities increase.

As we have already seen, the Republican Party had the sympathies of black Americans until the 1960s; but when in that decade Democratic Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson succeeded in imposing a series of legal reforms that made the norms of the Constitution that guaranteed the equality of blacks and whites, the whites of the South (enemies of blacks) ) felt betrayed by the Democratic Party they always voted for, and many of them began voting for Republicans. The Democratic South became the Republican South; but this resulted in the Republican Party ceasing to defend the rights of blacks, and for blacks to become Democrats.

The African American black minority (so called, among other reasons, to differentiate it from Hispanic or Latino blacks in official statistics); it is the most committed ethnic group to a single party. In all elections, especially in the presidential elections; more than 90% of African Americans vote for Democratic Party candidates. Republican African Americans, therefore, are an almost insignificant minority within their racial group.

President George W. Bush has set out to change this situation, and in fact has surrounded himself with black African-American collaborators. Bush named the first African-American Secretary of State in the country's history (Colin Powell) and the first African-American woman to hold the same position (Condoleezza Rice), who had previously also been the first to serve as National Security Adviser. Rice is President Bush's top adviser. And many analysts estimate that this is the Federal Government with the most African Americans in important positions in history.

Prior to all this, Colin Powell had been the most popular person in the polls to be the Republican presidential candidate in the 1996 election (when Bill Clinton was seeking re-election); but that year Powell did not want to run for president (he may have been the first African-American president of the United States).

But the fact that more and more African Americans are becoming important leaders of the Republican Party has failed to bring most blacks closer to the party; to the point that according to opinion polls, if a black person were the presidential candidate of the Republicans (like Powell), most African Americans would not vote for him (or her) but for the Democrat (even if he was a white person). But Bush remains committed to making conciliatory gestures toward this minority.

The case of Hispanics or Latinos is more important to Republicans. Within a few years the Hispanic or Latino population will be (according to demographic projections) the largest and most important minority in the country, so to win the election a party requires the support of that group.

Traditionally, the vast majority of Mexicans (the largest Latinos in the United States), Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, and other Latino groups always vote for Democrats. Only Cubans vote overwhelmingly for Republicans. The result is that an overwhelming majority of Latinos voted Democrat.

But George W. Bush has managed to change that. Already in his time as Governor of Texas he achieved a feat, getting 49% of the Hispanic or Latino vote in his re-election to the Governorate (in a state where most Hispanics are Mexican). And as President he has been very popular among broad Latino sectors; setting another record by getting about 40% of Hispanic votes nationwide in his 2004 re-election to the presidency (an unimaginable fact for a Republican just a few years ago).

Although there is no Hispanic figure like Rice in his government, there have been some Latin American Secretaries (Ministers). Some as important as the current Secretary of Justice Alberto Gonzales. And another of them, the Cuban-American Mel Martínez (Former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development), is now a Senator in the United States Congress (the first Latino Republican to be elected Senator).

There are more and more elected officials (federal and state representatives, state senators, councilors, etc.) of the Republican Party who are of Latino descent; especially in states with a strong Hispanic presence such as Florida, California and Texas. President Bush and other Republican leaders know that it is absolutely necessary to win the support of Hispanics or Latinos to secure the future of the party; and they think that republican ideals can be very attractive to this ethnic group.

Republicans' traditional and conservative moral values (the so-called "family values") are very popular among people like Latinos who come from relatively conservative and very religious societies; instead, Democrats' "excess" of tolerance is perceived as "immoral debauchery" by many of these people (especially on issues such as abortion and homosexuality). In addition, Hispanics can also identify with the "hard hand" of many Republicans in the face of crime. And although the reduction of money for some social programs (always raised by Republicans) may be unpopular among many Latinos who

depend on these state aids; many other Hispanics may sympathize with an economic policy that guarantees them jobs and prosperity (unlike their countries of origin where excessive state intervention in the economy has brought them poverty and unemployment). Not to mention that the Republican tax cuts benefit them like the rest of the citizens.

The main obstacle to the efforts of Bush and other leaders to attract Latino militants and sympathizers to the Republican Party is the strongly anti-immigrant discourse of several radical and influential Republicans. The measures that these politicians intend to take against undocumented foreigners (mostly from Latin America); they make them win votes among some sectors (those of American citizens who have been so for several generations and who believe that immigrants only cause problems), but they drive Hispanics away from the party. In fact, some Republican electoral defeats in state and local elections have been largely due to Latinos' anger with Republican politicians who have taken demagogic anti-immigrant measures.

Other ethnic minorities (Jews, Asians, etc.) are also mostly Democrats.

President Bush and most of the Republican leadership are passionately fighting for their party to become a party of "inclusion," not "exclusion"; so that it is also a "minority party" (a role that has so far been monopolized by the Democratic Party), without renouncing the support of its traditional allies and maintaining its status as a "conservative force." The fate of the Republican Party depends on them achieving this goal.

#### THE MATCH INSIDE

#### FRACTIONS, FACTIONS AND TRENDS

The party is seen as the major unit of analysis but this is incomplete if one does not explore how those subunits intervene in the party and modify it; according to Eldersveld the party is a miniature political system. It has an authority structure, a representative process, an electoral system and sub-processes for recruiting leaders, defining objectives and resolving internal conflicts in the system.

There are two forms of research into the internal democracy of parties and the organizational approach; the first date of the bronze law of the oligarchy, by Michels (And it has to do with democracy to one who is not what really matters to the author); The second is started by Duverger and takes the study of parties to the general sphere of the theory of organizations and has to do with democracy.

The party is a system whose parts are subunits of the party, but what are those parts; but first we will address the difficulties in designating party subunits, these due to the lack of established terminology, American political scientists have been left with the term faction the author does not agree with them as historically factions are what are not the parties. The faction is a term of evaluation in addition to being neutral.

Huntington speaks of factionalism with reference to groups of short duration and no structure, or that they are usually individual projections.

(Giovanni Sartori, p 97).

The factions are still alive, while the parties replace them as the new and broader unit, these are subunits of the party.

The fraction suffers from some drawbacks as it has a special meaning in Marxist and Leninist language; in German the Fraktion is the parliamentary party. To study the highest strata or levels of the party and seen as the best way where the disadvantages are less than the advantages the fraction is neutral and less committed than the faction, in addition to this the different types of fractions influence the degree of cohesion and fragmentation, the forms and means of interactions and the internal dynamics of the parties which leads to the conclusion that the character of a party is in the character of its factions.

Rose suggests that we distinguish between faction and tendency; a faction is a consciously organized body, with a certain cohesion and consequent discipline and the trend is a stable set of attitudes, not a stable group of politicians.

Under a scheme of analysis a triple terminological articulation has been arrived at: the fraction as the general, unspecified category, the faction as the specific group of power, and the tendency as the established set of attitudes.

Therefore a party composed of pure factions will be a very divided party whose internal divisions will be very visible and prominent, while in a trend-only party it would be a party whose internal divisions have very little visibility so it is a party with little factionism.

There are two residual possibilities: non-aligned parties, ie independent members who identify with the party platform, with positions supported by the entire electoral party, rather than with factions or tendencies. The atomized party is fragmented leader by leader, with very small groups revolving around each leader, each of whom is usually a member of Parliament. Both the aligned and the atomized party can function as support groups in addition to playing a role in the balance between the majority and the minority of the party.

## 2. CONCLUSIONS

The anatomy of subheadings in four dimensions:

- The organizational dimension has so far been solidified to establish the distinction between party and faction, since the party is the organized body and the faction that lacks organization, to what extent a party is composed of subunits that maintain their own network of loyalties, hold their congresses, look for money for themselves, have their press and spokespersons, keep a relationship with quasi-sovereign groups with the party, the organization variable is the most reliable to assess the internal division of the party.
- The dimension of motivations, marks the distinction between factions by interest and factions by principle, according to Hume the first incorporate two distinguishable referents; the factions for power, that is, the power for power and the factions for spoils more oriented to obtain marginal payments than to power. While factions in principle distinguish two varieties the ideological groups and the groups of ideas or opinion. Interest factions are motivated by immediate and tangible compensations, factions in principle are promotion groups; the former are not declared as such as it is not necessary to say that the power struggle is a group, it can disguise itself from ideology in the sense of legitimacy, they are groups and clientele, the factions in principle base their recruitment on intellectual appeal or his belief proselytism.
- The ideological dimension seen as a motivating force and this goes from disinterest or the testimonial faction to selfishness or the faction for prebends. Ideology as useful and effective camouflage. This dimension points to a cultural factor.
- The left-right dimension seems to be the most detectable and constant way in which politics is perceived not only by the mass public, but by the elites; the left-right interpretation of politics can be designated to the dimensions of motivation and ideology, therefore we can say that the left can be combined with a motivation of mere pursuit of power and spoils, while the right can coincide with a sincere and idea-motivated group; in addition, the left can be very pragmatic and the right very ideological.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Gershtenson, J. (2003). Mobilization strategies of the Democrats and Republicans, 1956-2000. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(3), 293-308.
- [2] Rule, N. O., & Ambady, N. (2010). Democrats and Republicans can be differentiated from their faces. *PLoS one*, 5(1), e8733.
- [3] Schreiber, D., Fonzo, G., Simmons, A. N., Dawes, C. T., Flagan, T., Fowler, J. H., & Paulus, M. P. (2013). Red brain, blue brain: Evaluative processes differ in Democrats and Republicans. *PLoS one*, 8(2), e52970.
- [4] Sylwester, K., & Purver, M. (2015). Twitter language use reflects psychological differences between democrats and republicans. *PLoS one*, 10(9), e0137422.
- [5] Troitiño, D. R. (2008). De Gaulle and the European communities. *Proceedings of the Institute for European Studies. Tallinn University of Technology*, no, 4, 139-152.
- [6] Troitiño, D. R. (2009). Margaret Thatcher and the EU. *European Union: Current Political and Economic Issues. Tallinn: Tallinn University of Technology*.
- [7] Troitiño, D. R. (2013). The current economic crisis of the EU: genesis, analysis and solutions. *TalTech Journal of European Studies*, 3(1), 6-28.
- [8] Troitiño, D. R. (2014). Euopos Parlamentas: praeitis, dabartis ir ateitis. *Teisės apžvalga*, (1 (11)), 5-24.