

2-1-1950

SOUTHERN POLITICS IN STATE AND NATION. By V. O. Key, Jr. with Alexander Heard. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1949.

Thomas J. Wood

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.miami.edu/umlr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Thomas J. Wood, *SOUTHERN POLITICS IN STATE AND NATION. By V. O. Key, Jr. with Alexander Heard. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1949.*, 4 U. Miami L. Rev. 267 (1950)
Available at: <https://repository.law.miami.edu/umlr/vol4/iss2/23>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at University of Miami School of Law Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Miami Law Review by an authorized editor of University of Miami School of Law Institutional Repository. For more information, please contact library@law.miami.edu.

cedures in bringing the corporation into being. It is this writer's belief that the author could well have devoted more space to this important portion of his treatise. Slightly over twenty-three pages are not sufficient for an adequate treatment of the vital matters confronting incorporators in their functions. Of course, other more exhaustive treatises covering this matter are available, and possibly the author can justify his procedure on the ground that he did not care to duplicate materials already available. It also must be borne in mind that the author's object was to have his single volume serve more as an elementary introductory treatment suitable for businessman and commercial attorney alike.

Approximately one-fourth of the book is contained in the appendix. Much valuable materials in the way of forms and comparative tables on matters of taxation, etc., are included in the appendix. There is but one major objection to the book and that is the form of type. The publishers have employed photo-offset rather than the usual easy-reading booktype. This difficulty in reading detracts from its form. But, in spite of this, the book will serve as a valuable contribution to this field of information so sorely neglected in the past.

FLOYD A. WRIGHT

PROFESSOR OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

SOUTHERN POLITICS IN STATE AND NATION. By V. O. Key, Jr. with Alexander Heard. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1949. Pp. x, 675. \$6.00.

FOR many years we have lacked a scientific analysis of the political phenomena of our Southern states. Efforts to meet this need have too often been theoretical in approach and based on principles rather than upon research and facts. As a result, we have lacked an adequate understanding of the political system of almost one quarter of our states, a section which has been almost uniformly successful in exerting a disproportionately large influence in national affairs by reason of its solid front.

Plans for a thorough study of politics in the South originated in the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of Alabama some ten years ago and the project was made possible through a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Professor Key, then of Johns Hopkins and now of Yale, was chosen to direct it. Based primarily on several years of field work and interviews with more than 500 southern politicians, editors, business and labor leaders and others active in public life, this study constitutes an indispensable reference work for all persons interested in the American political scene, the political practitioner as well as the student of government. A great wealth of hitherto unavailable material on the working of the political system of the

South is presented in the well written text and in nearly 150 maps, charts and tables.

The most lively reading is found in the survey of the eleven individual states (selected because of their consistent adherence to the Democratic party nationally and to a one-party system locally) showing how the political forces, practices and organizations vary from state to state. In Virginia, North Carolina and Tennessee politics are the most unsouthern; here we find the beginnings of a two-party system and in Virginia and Tennessee definite and long-lived political machines (those of Byrd and Crump) have dominated the political life of the states. At the other end of the scale is Arkansas where the one-party system exists "in its most undefiled and unpolluted form." Between these extremes lie the other states, although the differences among them are significant. Fairly well defined factions of the Democratic party have developed in Georgia and Louisiana, while in Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, Alabama and Florida the many factions competing for control of the state are small, ill-defined and impermanent. The chapter on Florida is aptly entitled "Every Man For Himself."

The obvious common denominator of the eleven variants of the one party system is the Negro; in Professor Key's words—"in the last analysis the major peculiarities of southern politics go back to the Negro." Alternatively it might be said that the problem of southern politics is that of a minority—the white minority in the counties where the Negroes form a majority of the population. That these whites have been able to persuade the other whites in the South to conform to the pattern of politics which they—the minority whites—conceive to be essential to their welfare is a tribute to their political skill and determination. It is this group which has succeeded in fastening onto the South the one-party system because it realized that a two-party system with its attendant competition for votes would be fatal to its status in the black belt.

The story of the disfranchisement of the Negro and of the recent steps toward his "refranchisement" brought about by a changing public opinion spurred by Supreme Court decisions is particularly well handled. Professor Key avoids moral judgments on this delicate problem although I suspect that he is not unaware of the effect of some very notable understatements. The examination of the process of eliminating the Negro as a voter destroys several long-cherished preconceptions. Formal disfranchisement measures merely confirmed a state of affairs which had been otherwise achieved. Disfranchisement did not come uniformly as a reactionary scheme; whether Bourbons or Populists were in control they acted in the same way to entrench themselves. Most important, although Professor Key is not in a position to prove it statistically, all the legal disfranchising devices are no more effective in minimizing the size of the southern electorate than the lack of meaning and interest in one-party politics.

This brings me to the part of the book which most impressed me—the analysis of the effects of the one-party system. Politics, according to Professor Key, is “the South’s number one problem” in that the political system devised by these eleven states does not and cannot provide the leadership and organization necessary to cope with its problems. Government by two-party competition has assuredly not produced Utopia in the other states, but it has made possible a degree of leadership, responsibility and efficiency unknown in most of the area under study. The discontinuous factions which compete for the control of most of the Southern states cannot be identified by the average voter from one election to the next. If dissatisfied with the administration, he cannot with his vote throw out the “ins” because the new candidates are at least on the surface representative only of themselves. Moreover, the voter is seldom given a meaningful choice because the disorganized politics of the South inhibit the raising of substantial issues. Those acquainted with the average gubernatorial campaign in Florida must agree with the statement that “in those states with loose and short-lived factions campaigns are often the emptiest sorts of debates over personalities, over means for the achievement of what everybody agrees upon.”

Although conceding that the problem of obtaining the necessary information is often difficult and that the question of publishing it may be delicate, I regret that Professor Key did not illustrate by more concrete examples his penetrating examination of “the significant question—who profits from political disorganization”? In the discussion of the individual states a few rays of light are thrown on this matter, but in the main he has dealt with this on a fairly abstract level. His conclusion, however, is worth noting.

Politics generally comes down . . . to a conflict between those who have and those who have less. In state politics the crucial issues tend to turn around taxation and expenditure. . . . It follows that the grand objective of the haves is obstruction, at least of the haves who take a short term view. Organization is not always necessary to obstruct; it is essential, however, for the promotion of a sustained program in behalf of the have-nots. . . . It follows that over the long run the have-nots lose in disorganized politics. They have no mechanism through which they can act and their wishes find expression in fitful rebellions led by transient demagogues who often have neither the technical competence nor the necessary stable base of political power to effectuate a program.

Arnold Toynbee in a recent article on Russia and the Western World has written of the Russian “catfish” in a tank of western “herrings”; he asserts the catfish snapping at the herrings will prevent them from becoming sluggish and complacent. It seems to me that an equally good case can be made for a “catfish” in the South and that only with the stimulus of permanently organized competition can the South develop a political system adequate to meet the needs of her people. Already the states in which the Republican party is

strongest tend to be the most progressive; North Carolina is the best example. This state with Virginia and Tennessee will be first to develop a real two-party system followed by Texas and Florida. As for the states in the heart of the South there is apparently less hope in the near future for here the problem of the Negro is greatest and it appears unlikely that political progress can be made until the race issue becomes less acute as it has in the five less typically Southern states. Perhaps Professor Key with his insight into southern ways gained from the writing of this book can in another kind of volume indicate the way out.

THOMAS J. WOOD

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF GOVERNMENT
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, A HISTORY OF ITS ORGANIZATION, PROCEDURE, AND PERSONNEL. By Graham H. Stuart. New York, Macmillan, 1949. Pp. 517. \$7.50.

DR. STUART, Professor of Political Science at Stanford University, has followed the development of our foreign affairs office from the initial Committee of Secret Correspondence, created by the Continental Congress in 1775, through the administration of each Secretary of State up to the present revitalized Department of State. He has described the experiment with the parliamentary system at the beginning, and has shown how the personality of one strong Secretary for Foreign Affairs, John Jay, was largely responsible for giving independent authority to the foreign affairs office, and was instrumental in turning our line of development away from the parliamentary system to the presidential system.

Prof. Stuart has called attention to the differences in the prestige and functions of the Department when a Secretary of State labored under a president who preferred to conduct foreign affairs himself, as Jefferson under Washington, and Bryan under Wilson, and when the Secretary of State was left to conduct foreign affairs much as he wished, as John Quincy Adams under Monroe, Hughes under Harding, and Stimson under Hoover.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the book is the great mass of administrative details which the author has unearthed and arranged chronologically. For the early years, before the Department became unwieldy in size, he has recorded the names, duties, salaries, tenure, etc., even of minor clerks; when the Department moved from one building to another, how much floor space it occupied, what the rent was, etc.; how careless this Secretary was about recording letters; what filing system that Secretary used, and the like. The reader and researcher have spread before them a wealth of details about the routines of the State Department and who held what job when. The index