

A STUDY OF STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEES
WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON
THE LOUISIANA DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

A STUDY OF STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEES
WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON
THE LOUISIANA DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

TED H. ROBERTS

Bachelor of Arts

Northwestern State College

Natchitoches, Louisiana

1949

Submitted to the Department of Political Science

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

1950

MAY 9 1951

A STUDY OF STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEES
WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON
THE LOUISIANA DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

TED H. ROBERTS
MASTER OF ARTS

1950

THESIS APPROVED:

W. H. ...

Thesis Adviser

Rehners

Faculty Representative

W. H. ...

Head of the Department

D. G. ...

Dean of the Graduate School

PREFACE

Lord Bryce once wrote, "No government demands so much from the citizen as democracy and none gives back so much." Dayton McKean has recently written that, "All things considered, if parties be evils, they are the best evils that popular government can have."

Put with these two statements a conviction that only an educated citizenry can prevent political organization from tending toward oligarchy, and you have a thorough knowledge of what may be reflected, unconsciously, in what I have written here. Fortunately, the influence of my good friend and confidant Dr. R. R. Oglesby will likewise be noticed in this work. It was Dr. Oglesby who first taught me the importance of what he terms "scientific writing." If I have produced an impartial analysis of the Democratic State Central Committee in Louisiana, the principal credit belongs to him. If I have failed to be as unprejudiced as I know he would like for me to be, the fault is wholly mine.

In attempting to analyze the political committee system in Louisiana, this writer was faced with a dearth of material from which to extract facts.

Indeed, had it not been for Dr. C. G. Whitwell who first aroused in me a curiosity concerning this subject, and who convinced me of the need of such an analysis, I would probably never have attempted this study.

Very little emphasis has been placed on the details of party committees from a national viewpoint. Such material

of this sort which is included is intended to compare the Louisiana committee and its development with those of other states.

Viewing the results of the comparison the reader will find, I feel sure, that party committees in Louisiana are in many respects like Huey P. Long--sui generis.

Much credit is due those persons who were so kind as to allow me personal interviews. No individual acknowledgement of their assistance is made here due to their expressed desire for anonymity.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the aid given me, in putting together a final draft of this study, by my capable and painstaking typist, Mrs. Robert W. Jacob.

Ted H. Roberts

Stillwater, Oklahoma
July 14, 1950

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	RESUME OF COMMITTEES AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT . .	1
	A. Genesis and Growth of Party Com- mittees	
	B. Coverage of Committees by Law	
II	LEGAL COVERAGE OF THE LOUISIANA STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEES	24
	A. Early Coverage by Louisiana Law	
	B. Recent Modifications by Legislature	
III	SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE'S OPERATION IN RECENT YEARS .	47
	A. Leadership	
	B. Personnel	
	C. Conclusion	
	Appendices	70
	Bibliography	114

CHAPTER I

RESUME OF COMMITTEES AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT

A. Genesis and Growth of Party Committees.---The evolution of political organization has been a process of long duration. And, insofar as the United States is concerned, it is still in operation. From the very earliest times, one of the concomitants of popular government has been the problem of devising some method by which candidates may be selected previous to their formal election. It has been observed, for example, that "in the choice of the judges of Israel . . . 'parlor caucuses' were not unknown. . . ." ¹ Because a great amount of our political heritage lies in English practice and tradition, the fact that England used a system of self-nomination for a long while before allowing that method to be augmented by a "system of nomination by small cliques of wealthy landowners . . ." ² is important to an understanding of our own political heritage. Since the political methods of England were the ones with which the American colonists were familiar, it is only natural that they should form the basis for political organization in the United States. Indeed, these methods were the only ones in use by English-speaking people everywhere at that time. ³

As in any transposal of an accepted pattern of action,

¹Frederick W. Dallinger, Nominations for Elective Office in the United States (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1897), p. 3.

²Ibid. ³Ibid., p. 4.

some variations developed when the English techniques began to be widely used in the Colonies. A change in personnel applying the techniques, and in those to whom they were being applied, together with an overall change of political climate made these aberrations mandatory.

Likewise, within the Colonies, methods varied from section to section. It is known that in New England nominations were made almost exclusively through caucuses.⁴ During this early period in the area outside of New England, except for the South:

. . . nominations . . . appear to have been made by branches of the 'Sons of Liberty', by the Committee of Correspondence, or by a Conference Committee composed of delegates from these and kindred organizations.⁵

In the South and Southwest, however, "candidacies were, as a rule, self announced . . . and this method . . . often supplemented . . . by an agreement among the leading planters. . . ." ⁶

Some of the details of the operation and effect of this early political machinery is provided by this statement:

How completely this extra-legal organization had developed by 1774 we may judge from the statement that: "The revolutionary organization was by this time so complete that it mattered little whether or not the assemblies were in session; delegates were elected none the less in a regular and orderly manner throughout the colonies." The reason for this and the strength of the Association lay in the fact that there existed "a well constructed and powerful political machine, set up in each colony, in each county, in each town, and operated with as much skill and will and unscrupulousness as go into the operation of such machines in our own time. . . ." Of the Boston committee of correspondence, it has been written: "It provided for regular meetings,

⁴Ibid., p. 5.

⁵Ibid., p. 11.

⁶Ibid., p. 4.

consulted with other similar bodies in the vicinity, kept up a correspondence with them, prepared political matter for the press, circulated it in newspapers and broadsides, matured political matters, created and guided political sentiment. . . .⁷

This lucid description demonstrates beyond a reasonable doubt the fact that our modern state party committees began, in a crude form at least, at a very early point in American colonial development. The connection is made even clearer when we consider that:

. . . the Boston town meeting took the lead in banding together the Massachusetts town meetings by means of . . . committees of correspondence. Soon after, inter-colonial committees . . . were organized. . . . These committees are the lineal predecessors of our state central committees.⁸

Further investigation of this early period in the development of party organization in the colonies shows that:

Americans had developed the habit of almost spontaneous organization since early in the pre-Revolution controversy with the British ministry. Committees of Correspondence had sprung up in many communities as early as 1763, but became a continent-wide network on the eve of open hostilities. Township committees corresponded with one another, usually within the county. Members of the local committee formed a county committee, as is frequently the case today when the local precinct party committeemen collectively constitute the county central committee. Our present party organization is the lineal descendant of the Revolutionary committees of correspondence. The Revolutionary county committees of correspondence communicated with one another throughout the province and had provincial

⁷Edgar E. Robinson, The Evolution of American Political Parties (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914), pp. 33-34, quoting Herbert Freidenwald, M. C. Tyler and E. D. Collins, respectively.

⁸Henry J. Ford, The Rise and Growth of American Politics (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914), p. 8.

committees in touch with each other throughout the thirteen colonies. . . .⁹

Party organization, as distinguished from factional alignments, was introduced in the period from 1763 to 1769.¹⁰ The "germs of American extra-constitutional organization [i.e., party organization] are to be found in the clubs of the colonial period . . . ," writes one observer.¹¹ Thus, it may be seen that our present party organization owes much to a heritage beginning in part as far back as Biblical times.

It has been noted that "in 1800 there were party organizations which presented Adams and Jefferson as rival candidates."¹² It is known that in 1802 Alexander Hamilton elaborated a plan for a party mechanism for the United States that would have, among other things, set up a sub-directory party council in each state, consisting of twelve members and a vice-president, of whom four and the vice-president constituted a quorum.¹³ This mechanism was to diffuse information through debates and correspondence and to use "all careful means . . . to promote the election of fit men."¹⁴ The period from 1804 to 1824 was marked by the ascendancy of the legislative caucus as a nominating instrument for political candidates, particularly on the national scene.¹⁵ One observer has written that

⁹Wilfred E. Binkley, American Political Parties, Their Natural History (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947), pp. 67-68.

¹⁰Robinson, op. cit., p. 29.

¹¹M. Ostrogorski, Democracy and the Party System in the United States (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921), p. 3.

¹²Robinson, op. cit., p. 71. ¹³Ibid., p. 83. ¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Dallinger, op. cit., pp. 17-21.

"throughout this period [1804-1824] the party candidates for presidential electors in the different states were all nominated by a joint caucus of the party members of the legislature."¹⁶ Since 1824, the evolution of party organization has proceeded at a more rapid pace than previously; and it has been written that:

During the first few decades under the constitution nominees to high executive office were sometimes selected by the adherents of the respective parties in the legislative body. In the era when polite drawing rooms ceased to be important arenas for the making of party plans and when travel became easier, a notable transformation took place . . . choice of candidates for elective office and of interim committees was vested in representative conventions, rising pyramidlike from an original base in neighborhood meetings of party supporters caucuses or elections held for the choice of local delegates primaries¹⁷

The quotation above demonstrates rather well the change from the old caucus system to the convention system. The principle point of concern here, of course, is the effect that the rise of conventions had on state committees. In 1832, a national convention composed of "opponents of the Jackson administration" met at the call of a caucus of the National Republican or Whig members of the Maryland legislature and, on motion of Mr. Fairfax of Virginia, passed a resolution to the effect that:

. . . a central State Corresponding Committee be provisionally appointed in each state where none is now appointed, and that it be recommended to the several states to organize subordinate corresponding committees in each county and town

¹⁶Robinson, op. cit., p. 73.

¹⁷Arthur W. Macmahon, "Political Parties," Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, ed. Edwin R. A. Seligman, Vol. XI (1933).

in their several respective states.¹⁸

Thus, it appears that the transposal of committee organization to conventions had the effect of causing that machinery to become more elaborate and complex.¹⁹ It has recently been written that:

The evolution or growth of party organization in America has been a slow process. Neither political parties nor party organizations were provided for in the Constitution of the United States nor in the first state constitutions. No laws enacted by early legislatures formally created political parties and party organization. The use of conventions and committees developed as practical necessity demanded. . . .²⁰

A thorough description of one of the earlier conventions was given in 1897 when it was written that:

The call for a State convention of a party is issued by the State central committee. A printed copy of the call is sent to the chairman of each city and town committee, or of each county committee, in the state. This call states the time and place of meeting of the convention, and also the number of delegates to which each city, town, or county is entitled. . . . It is called to order by the chairman of the State committee, who usually asks the secretary of the committee to read the call for the convention. . . . Motions are made and carried for the appointment by the chair of a committee on credentials, a committee on permanent organization, and a committee on resolutions. It is customary for the delegate making the motion in each case to be named as chairman of the committee which he proposes; but his privilege of making such a motion has been determined beforehand by the all-powerful State committee. . . . Often no formal action is taken by way of temporary organization--the chairman and secretary of the State committee acting temporarily until the committee on permanent organization has made its report. After the reading of the resolutions, which are practically never altered or amended, the

¹⁸Dallinger, op. cit., p. 37. ¹⁹Ibid., p. 45.

²⁰Alden L. Powell, A Primer on Government in Louisiana (Baton Rouge: L. S. U. Press, 1946), p. 31.

convention settles down to its real business, the nomination of candidates for the various State offices. . . . [A] motion [is] made . . . for . . . [the] appointment by the chair of a committee to take charge of the balloting and to count the ballots after they have been cast. Thereupon the president gravely announces that 'the chair will appoint the following committee', and proceeds to read off a list of names agreed upon by the State committee weeks beforehand. . . . Up to this point [after nominations and speeches made] the entire proceedings have been prearranged by the State committee. . . .²¹

Particular attention should be given to the strategic and highly important duties given to the state central committee as described above. It is known that the misuse of such prerogatives was far from uncommon. For example, it has been written that:

In the course of the struggle between the members of political parties and factions to gain control of . . . offices, the use of unfair and dishonest means to win elections became a common practice. In the absence of legal regulations, immoral political leaders . . . packed conventions and paid henchmen to carry out their orders. . . . Voters had no direct share in the nomination of their party candidates. . . . Decisions on party policies were often made by politicians who were in no way responsible to the electorate.²²

Further elaboration upon this point is provided by the following statement:

Where the party machinery of the State has fallen into the hands of 'machine' men, the nomination of candidates on the State ticket is very largely dictated by the State committee. Wherever possible, the committee, through its influence on the district and local committees, secures the election of delegates to the State convention favorable to its own slate, in which case the proceedings of the convention are most harmonious. In case of a revolt against the

²¹Dallinger, op. cit., pp. 65-66.

²²Powell, op. cit., pp. 31-33.

machine, however, the committee, by its control of the organization of the convention, and consequently of the appointment of the committee on credentials, is able to unseat a sufficient number of the anti-machine delegates filling their places with its own friends to nominate whomsoever it pleases.²³

More proof of the abundance of improper action by the committees in control of conventions is provided in the statement that the "formation of . . . pre-arranged [plans] by state committees to influence nominations . . . is frequently the case, notably in New York and Pennsylvania. . . ." ²⁴ On the other hand, one should not gather from these facts that all was corrupt. For example, the same observer who cited the improper and corrupt procedure above, also stated that:

. . . in those States where the State committee does not abuse the power intrusted to it, and simply acts as the servant and not the master of the rank and file of the party, the latter nominate their candidates, in fact as well as in theory.²⁵

The poor conditions cited, however, began early since "from the outset . . . operation under party rules was attended by irregularities."²⁶

B. Coverage of Committees by Law.--One observer has written that "in most cases . . . party rules have preceded statutory regulation. . . ." ²⁷ It has also been noted that "not infrequently . . . many of the main features of [regulatory party rules] have been incorporated into subsequent statutes. . . ." ²⁸ It has been pointed out that "corrective state

²³Dallinger, op. cit., p. 69. ²⁴Ibid., p. 66.

²⁵Ibid., p. 69. ²⁶Macmahon, loc. cit.

²⁷Dallinger, op. cit., p. 142. ²⁸Ibid., p. 143.

legislation began in 1866."²⁹ Irregularities in the nomination process were not the only developments leading to legal regulation of party committees, however. One analysis stated that:

A more inherent characteristic than irregularity was indirection, accompanied by slight participation of the rank and file in the caucuses or primaries. . . . [It is] doubtful that the convention system would have been supplanted by a system of preliminary elections [direct primaries] for the choice of party nominees if it had not been for the concurrence of . . . circumstances. . . . The underlying cause was the prevalence in the north as well as in the south of areas in which the strength of the major parties was so disproportionate that nomination was equivalent to election. . . .³⁰

Something of the immediately impelling cause of party organization regulation is told in the statement that the immediate cause was:

. . . the widespread factional strife which accompanied the 'progressive' era. . . . In the space of a dozen years after 1903 laws were passed in all but a handful of states making it obligatory upon political parties . . . to nominate candidates directly in primary elections conducted under official auspices at public expense.³¹

The quotation above demonstrates the wide acceptance in a short period of time of regulatory measures applying to party nominations. The effect of all this on state committees was, of course, immediate. Since the committees were a major part of the nominating mechanism, they naturally were subject to a great amount of the new regulation. As early as 1897, one observer could write:

²⁹Macmahon, op. cit. ³⁰Ibid. ³¹Ibid.

The constitution and mode of election of the State committee differs in different States. In Massachusetts the State committee of both parties consists of one member from each of the forty senatorial districts, elected by the senatorial district convention at the same time that candidates for the State Senate are nominated. In many of the States the members are elected by the county conventions; but in New York the entire Democratic State committee is chosen by the State convention. In other states the two methods are combined.³²

From this description, we may assume that the change-over from a system subject to party rules alone, to a system subject to legal regulations was not too difficult. Given such an elaborate organization with which to begin, the task of providing legal organization must not have been extremely difficult.

In 1912, an observer noticed that state committees:

. . . may be composed of representatives from congressional districts . . . counties . . . state senatorial districts, or a number of persons named by the chief candidate nominated at the state convention.³³

New York led in the enactment of regulatory statutes aimed at insuring proper action of party mechanisms dealing in party nominations.³⁴ In July, 1896, it could be said that "only one State has no statutory regulation whatever relative to the nomination of candidates for elective office."³⁵ Something of the pattern this regulation followed in the South is indicated by a description of one of the earlier primary laws:

In the State of Mississippi, a law was passed in 1903, which provides for the nomination of all the important

³²Dallinger, op. cit., p. 64.

³³Jessee Macy, Party Organization and Machinery (New York: The Century Co., 1912), p. 107.

³⁴Dallinger, op. cit., p. 173. ³⁵Ibid.

candidates for whom the people of the Senate are empowered to vote, and also of candidates for the senate . . . at a party primary election. According to this statute, candidates whose names are printed on the official ballot, which the State provides, must be nominated at a party primary. In terms, the law is made applicable to all political parties alike; but only one party in the State has the machinery or can afford the expense of holding such an election. So it happens that the primary election, which, in legal form merely nominates Democratic candidates for office, is, from the standpoint of the voter, the real election whereby local, State, and congressional officers are placed in positions of responsibility and power. It is, in fact, the one election of importance . . . and the law leaves entirely to the decision of party officers the question who shall be considered qualified to cast a vote . . . thus making the voting privilege wholly a party matter. Party officials have entire charge of registration, the preparation of ballots, and the receiving and counting of votes. . . . In other States, the same object is attained by . . . party rules. . . .³⁶

The description above indicates that, in the South at least, the legal regulation of party organization did not always accomplish its original purpose. Even improper regulation appears to have aided the rank and file voter, however. Certainly it was no worse than the conditions in the unregulated state organizations described here:

In other States . . . party rules provide for the nomination of candidates at a primary election with as much detail as in the Mississippi statute; and this legislation by party convention or committee proves as effective in the government of the State as the acts of the legislature. The party organ itself assumes and exercises the prerogatives of a State government.³⁷

More evidence of the fact that improper manipulation of the party organs by corrupt leaders was the principle cause

³⁶Macy, op. cit., pp. 194-195. ³⁷Ibid.

for legal regulation is provided by the statement that:

The omnipotent and omnipresent party boss was, after the Civil War, everywhere gaining control of . . . the party caucus, the delegate convention and the party committee--which had before the war served as a uniting force in the nation and an effective means for expressing the popular choice of candidates for office. The party organs, . . . had in their later development been so wrested from their first purpose as to tend directly to the shutting out of the people from their rightful share in their own government. . . . In parts of the country, where the people felt with uneasiness that power was passing from their hands through secret manipulations on the part of those in control of the party forces, there was voluntary, sporadic and mainly ineffectual effort to retain their hold on the party organization by some modification of forms or methods in county, city or ward. . . .³⁸

That the new regulation came as legally regulated primary elections did not mean that it was aimed elsewhere than the party conventions and committees, for it has been noted that:

One of the most striking [of the changes brought on by the regulated primaries] is the placing of the political party definitely and clearly under the supervision and control of the State. . . .³⁹

It appears that there was "no deliberate intention to transfer party control to the State . . .", but that it "has come about by a gradual evolutionary process in the search for better and purer political methods . . ." is known.⁴⁰ In 1912, a summary of what has been done in the United States indicated that:

. . . party rules are enacted as state laws; party committees are chosen at elections or conventions held under state authority; the duties of party officers are prescribed by law, and . . . they become state . . . officers.⁴¹

³⁸Ibid., p. 208. ³⁹Ibid. ⁴⁰Ibid. ⁴¹Ibid.

An early study of state central committees indicates that:

The various units on which representation is based are the congressional district, the county, the legislative district, representative or senatorial, the judicial district, and the town. There is also a mixed or composite basis. The prevailing practice is to use either the congressional district or the county as the unit of representation. . . . In some cases a mixed system is found, combining several methods. . . . Which of these various methods shall be employed is determined by geographical rather than party considerations. The county system is employed almost exclusively in the far West, and to a considerable extent in the Northeast and in the South. The congressional district is employed in all of the Central states, except in the Democratic committee of Minnesota; to a considerable extent in the south; but nowhere in the East, except in the Republican committee in New York. The legislative district system has no particular habitat. . . .⁴²

The same study told something of the size of the various committees as follows:

The size of the committee varies greatly in the different states. The largest . . . 12⁴ members . . . [while] the . . . committees of Virginia and of Iowa are each composed of only eleven members; and in many other states the committees are little larger.⁴³

In 190⁴, the term of service of state committeemen varied from one to four years, with a two year term being the most common.⁴⁴ At that time many different methods of election were used for the state committeemen, as indicated in this statement:

The election of members to the committee follows a general but not unvarying rule. In most cases the delegates to the state convention from the area to be represented, whether this be the congressional district, the county or some other area, choose their

⁴²C. E. Merriam, "State Central Committees," Political Science Quarterly, XIX (June, 190⁴), 225-226.

⁴³Merriam, op. cit., pp. 226-227. ⁴⁴Ibid., p. 227.

quota of members. For this purpose they caucus separately. The choice of the caucus is usually final, but in some cases the state convention has the right to reject the members selected. In some states, however, the members of the central committee are not selected in the state convention, but by the local authorities in the counties. . . . Still another method of selection is that employed in Florida, where, under the new primary law, the members of the central committee are chosen by direct vote of the party in the several districts. In Minnesota the members of the Republican state committee are selected by the chairman of the state convention on the nomination or suggestion of the candidates for state office in the ensuing campaign. In Tennessee, eight of the . . . members of the Democratic state committee are appointed by the nominee for the office of governor. In states where the committee is partly composed of members at large, these members are selected by the state convention or by the chairman of the convention. A unique method of choosing the state committee is that provided for in the Wisconsin primary law . . . [where] after the primaries . . . party nominees for state office together with . . . candidates for the legislature shall meet and choose the state committee. In Mississippi . . . [the] state convention still assembles every four years, and at that time selects the state central committee.⁴⁵

Vacancies in state committees were generally filled by the remaining members in 1904, although there were a number of exceptions to this stipulation.⁴⁶ An interesting comment of the same date noted that:

The officers of a state committee are few in number. There is a chairman, a secretary, a treasurer, and sometimes, in addition to these, a vice-chairman and a sergeant-at-arms. These functionaries are generally elected by the committee itself; but they need not be, and frequently are not, members of the committee. In most of the organizations there are sub-committees, of which the most important is the executive or campaign committee. This is usually composed of from three to nine members and is the most active part of the state organization. Another important committee is that on finance, and in many state organizations there is a separate auditing committee. A speaker's bureau or literary bureau or both are frequently

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 227-228. ⁴⁶Ibid., p. 228.

found. Of all the officers the chairman and the secretary of the whole committee are the most important. . . .⁴⁷

In 1904, the powers of state central committees were "seldom clearly defined, either by the written or by the unwritten constitution of the party."⁴⁸ At that early date, it was already known that the state committee:

. . . can scarcely be said to govern and guide the party in the formulation and execution of policies, for as a rule this is a matter altogether outside its jurisdiction. The informal steering or managing committee . . . really determines the policy. . . . The important powers and duties of a state committee . . . center in the conduct of the campaign. Given the candidates and the platform, it is the function of the state committee to see that these . . . persons and principles are endorsed by the voters. . . .⁴⁹

In brief, the state committee of that day was "the managing board entrusted with the conduct of the state campaign . . . [and] expected to practice all the arts known to politicians to bring about . . . success. . . ."⁵⁰

Something of the effect of the early legal regulation on the state committees is told in the statement that:

The adoption of the Australian ballot system has involved a legal recognition of the political party as sponsor for nominations to appear on the ballot under the party emblem or with the party name. The convention was declared the official representative of the party in the first instance, but it was found necessary to make further provision for vacancies caused by the death or disability of candidates for state office. The laws of most states accordingly authorize the state central committee of the party to fill vacancies occurring on the ticket. In some of these laws this power is granted only in case there is not time to reconvene the convention; in others there is no such limitation. It is sometimes further

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 229. ⁴⁸Ibid. ⁴⁹Ibid., p. 230. ⁵⁰Ibid.

provided that the substituted name must be that of a member of the party in question.⁵¹

The same observer, writing a decade or so later, could state that:

In recent years the party committee has become a subject of legal regulation, and many of its features are now determined by statute. . . . With the process of legal regulation and particularly with the advent of the direct primary, the number, terms and to some extent the powers of the party committees have been defined by statute and are no longer left to the option of the party. This legislation was due to the desire of the rank and file of the party voters to control the organization by choosing the officers directly.⁵²

Merriam points out that:

. . . nowhere has the power of party organization been greater than in the United States and nowhere has there been a more vigorous attempt to restrict and control the party organization than here.⁵³

In 1922, the size of state central committees varied from eleven in Iowa to approximately 460 in California, but averaged thirty or forty.⁵⁴ At that time, it was noted that recently made rules or customs provided for placing women voters on the official committees.⁵⁵ Also, it was written that there was, at the time, a tendency to increase the length of terms of committeemen to give greater stability to the party organization. Another tendency then noted was one of choosing members directly by party voters in the primary.⁵⁶ Merriam observed that such functionaries as the chairman,

⁵¹Ibid., p. 230.

⁵²C. E. Merriam, The American Party System (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1922), p. 77.

⁵³Ibid., p. 101. ⁵⁴Ibid., p. 64. ⁵⁵Ibid. ⁵⁶Ibid.

secretary, treasurer or vice-chairman were usually selected by the committee itself, though not always from among its members. In fact, he pointed out that they frequently were not members of the committee.⁵⁷ Of particular significance is the statement that:

In some states the central committee is still entrusted with a wide range of authority over the local organization, and generally speaking in the Southern states the power of the party committees is larger than elsewhere. These committees are as a rule given a wider range of power both in determination of the qualifications of party membership and in the regulation of the details of primaries and . . . party management.⁵⁸

In a recent analysis of state committees, it was written that "the initiation of regulation of nominating methods in the United States has almost invariably been associated with popular protest against oligarchial rule."⁵⁹ The same observer who made that statement said that "in the one-party states the party organization is apt to be a congeries of factions, and in some states party organization is practically nonexistent. . . ."⁶⁰ These recent statements force the observer to the conclusion that the committees have not changed appreciably since 1922. This observation seems to be borne out by the facts as stated by Key when he noticed that:

In most states the composition, method of selection, and duties of the state committees are determined by law, in contrast with the national committee, which is created by and receives its powers from the

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 65. ⁵⁸Ibid., p. 67.

⁵⁹V. O. Key, Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1947), p. 341.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 300.

national convention, an extralegal agency. The members of the state central committees represent various electoral units of the state. In some states each congressional district is represented by one or more members of the state . . . committee; in other states each county has one or more members; in still others, judicial districts and state legislative districts are the basis of representation. Or there may be a combination of such areas. . . . [The] method of selection of the state committee . . . varies from state to state. In some states selection is by direct primary; in others, by state conventions; in others by county or district conventions. . . . At times county chairman or committeemen from some other subdivision of the state collectively compose the state committee. . . . Committee organization as it appears on paper has little or no relation to the organization as it actually functions. . . . The "real" chairman may be someone other than the titular chairman. . . . The hierarchy in fact often does not coincide in many respects with the formal organization as outlined in the laws and regulations.⁶¹

In one of the most recent studies made on the subject of state central committees, it was pointed out that state committees now vary in size from a membership of a dozen to several hundred, with an average membership of thirty to forty, that the congressional district and the county are the most common units of representation, that many states now have committees made up of both men and women on an equal basis numerically, and that the length of terms of committeemen usually is four years (although it is sometimes two, and is three in New Jersey).⁶² According to the same study, a recent analysis of committee chairmen showed that fifty percent were lawyers, twenty percent held some governmental position, about twelve

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 287-289.

⁶²C. E. Merriam and H. F. Gosnell, The American Party System (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949), p. 171.

percent were employed in private industry and one was a farmer.⁶³ Merriam's study also pointed out that there is a tendency of late to select younger men as state chairmen.⁶⁴ He noted further that state laws now provide for the organization and powers of state committees in most instances. Another observation was that the committees often serve merely as a front for a "federal crowd," "state crowd," "city-county combination crowd," or some similar group.⁶⁵

Perhaps the best recent description of the unofficial side of state central committees was given by Zink when he noted that the influence and responsibility of a committee is directly proportional to the independence of its members. In other words, if a large group of influential politicians are members, committee deliberations and decisions are important. If the committee is simply a front for a "boss" its deliberations are of little importance.⁶⁶ The same observer also indicated that the aggressiveness and resourcefulness of the committee chairman can usually be taken as a thermometer of the committee's activity. A cautious chairman leans heavier on a committee than does a chairman who considers himself the state party leader.⁶⁷ The state committee does on a state-wide scale what a local committee does on a lesser scale.⁶⁸

⁶³Merriam and Gosnell, op. cit., p. 172.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 173. ⁶⁵Ibid., p. 174.

⁶⁶Harold Zink, Government and Politics in the United States (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947), p. 154.

⁶⁷Ibid. ⁶⁸Ibid.

A description of a state party headquarters given by Zink indicates that the principal functionaries of the state committee usually play an important role in its successful operation.⁶⁹

In speaking of the size of committees an observer recently noted that "committees . . . increased since the advent of woman suffrage, half of them still have less than fifty members; a third, less than thirty . . . [and] a third . . . over a hundred members."⁷⁰ He then added that "when the size becomes unmanageable . . . [the] real conduct of business falls into the hands of the chairman and an executive committee which is usually made up of the actual party leaders."⁷¹ Committees are often given the power to purge disloyal members, and sometimes to control lesser committees.⁷² An example of this type of action is provided by a newspaper account of the removal from a primary ballot of a candidate in Texas' Democratic primary. The account follows:

The state Democratic executive committee voted unanimously Monday to strike agriculture commissioner J. E. McDonald's name from the July 22 primary ballot. . . . A resolution adopted by voice vote without dissent said McDonald has "repeatedly fought the Democratic party and its office holders and nominees." . . . McDonald, a candidate for an eleventh term, said he would bring court action to force the committee to certify his name. . . . Notified of the committee's action, McDonald burst into its meeting room during a recess and told state chairman John C.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 155.

⁷⁰Edward M. Sait, American Parties and Elections, ed. Howard R. Penniman (New York: Appelton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1948), p. 351.

⁷¹Ibid. ⁷²Ibid.

Calhoun: "I'm not going to take that. The people of Texas are not going to take it. This is still a democracy." . . . The resolution barring McDonald made a four-point accusation against the tall, grey-haired commissioner of agriculture. . . . It said that in 1940, 1944 and 1948 "in spite of having pledged himself to support the Democratic nominees as a prerequisite for getting his name on the Democratic primary ballot McDonald did publicly announce that he was supporting the Republican candidates for president and vice-president." . . . The resolution charged also that in April, 1940, McDonald visited the panhandle in Texas and "gave aid and comfort to the Republican candidate for congress." This referred to Ben Guill, who was elected as the first Republican congressman from Texas in 20 years.⁷³

The state central committees in the South are usually given more power over primaries and conventions than committees in other sections of the nation.⁷⁴ One of the most recent accounts of this phase of committee organization stated that:

The state committee . . . and the state chairman top the party structure in each commonwealth. . . . Committees vary in number from eleven . . . to six hundred [members]. In some states members are elected at primaries or conventions from counties, congressional districts, or other areas. In other states the county chairmen compose the state committee.⁷⁵

Although superficially a hierarchy, the structure of American parties is, in actuality, a loose league or confederation in which "authority . . . does not flow from one level to another, either up or down."⁷⁶ All these facts seem to lend credence to the observation, made relatively

⁷³The Daily Oklahoman, June 13, 1950, p. 1.

⁷⁴Sait, op. cit.

⁷⁵Dayton D. McKean, Party and Pressure Politics (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1949), p. 207.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 211.

early in American political development, that "in America the great moving forces are the parties . . . and the fewer have become their principles . . . the more perfect has become their organization."⁷⁷ It has been noticed recently that outside of the "Solid South" there is a definite trend toward regulation of party organizations in more and more detail. This regulation comes by means of the state election laws since each state legislature controls the form of party organization in that state.⁷⁸

⁷⁷James Bryce, The American Commonwealth (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1891), II, 5.

⁷⁸McKean, op. cit., p. 200.

CHAPTER II

LEGAL COVERAGE OF THE LOUISIANA STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEES

A. Early Coverage by Louisiana Law.--Louisiana has had a turbulent and variegated history. Even before statehood, the area which now comprises the state had already changed hands six times. One observer has written that:

Louisiana passed from the King of France to Crozat in 1712, from Crozat to the Western Company in 1717, from the Western Company back to the King of France in 1731, from Louis XV to Spain in 1762, from Spain back to France in 1801, and from France to the United States in 1803.¹

From 1812, when Louisiana gained statehood, to 1921, when the present state constitution was adopted, Louisiana citizens had their activities regulated by nine separate constitutions.² This frequent shift from one body of fundamental law for the state to another may partially explain the fact that the state holds the rather dubious distinction of possessing the longest constitution of any of the forty-eight states. Containing eighty-five thousand words, this constitution has been amended two hundred and fifty-seven times since 1921.³ Another factor in Louisiana's political uniqueness was indicated in a recent analysis of politics in the state, when it was noted that:

¹R. L. Carleton, Local Government and Administration in Louisiana (Baton Rouge: L. S. U. Press, 1935), p. 13.

²Ibid., p. 311.

³Robert S. Allen (ed.), Our Sovereign State (New York: The Vanguard Press, Inc., 1949), p. 254.

Quite a few reminders of the rule of France and Spain survive. One is the use of the word "parish" instead of "county." This came about through the Spaniards, who used the nineteen religious parishes of the Roman Catholic Church as their chief political subdivisions in South Louisiana. When the Americans sought to recarve these into twelve Anglo-Saxon counties, the citizenry balked. They feared that the land obtained through French and Spanish grants might be lost in boundary shuffles. As a result, Louisiana is the only State in the Union which terms its political subdivisions parishes. It has sixty-four.⁴

It has also been pointed out that:

The State . . . has a unique code of civil law. It is based upon the Code Napoleon of France. Property owners demurred about accepting the English common law because it was largely unwritten. The American authorities gave in on the civil law but did succeed in imposing the common law, with its vital assumption of innocence for defendants, on the State's criminal jurisprudence.⁵

In order to understand Louisiana's political situation, relative to state-wide elections, it should be clearly understood that:

Modern Louisiana has . . . inherited a Hatfield-McCoy feud between Protestant North Louisiana and the Catholic South. Strait-laced pioneers of Anglo-Saxon origin poured into the northern part after the Louisiana Purchase. They still distrust the easy-going Latin mixtures in the south and the feeling has always been mutual. It is a political axiom that no Catholic can become Governor of Louisiana, nor a Protestant, Mayor New Orleans.⁶

In July, 1896, Louisiana was the only state of forty-five then comprising the United States which had "no statutory regulation whatever relative to the nomination of candidates for elective office."⁷ As early as 1904, it was written that

⁴Ibid., p. 247. ⁵Ibid. ⁶Ibid., pp. 247-248.

⁷Frederick W. Dallinger, Nominations for Elective Office in the United States (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1897), p. 173.

"in the Louisiana Democratic committee, thirty-five [members are appointed at large] . . . in the Louisiana Republican committee, twenty. . . ." ⁸ At that time it was stated that the Louisiana Democratic committee contained a total of 111 members. ⁹ In 1904, members of the Louisiana Democratic committee were selected on a basis of "two for each of the parishes and thirty-five-at-large." ¹⁰ In both the Republican and Democratic committees of that time, members served four year terms. ¹¹ Apparently, the members-at-large of these committees were selected by the state convention or by the chairman of the convention, while vacancies in the Democratic committee were filled by the parish committees. ¹²

Something of the manner in which the electoral process was misused in the United States in the last decade or so of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth has been pointed out in an earlier chapter. ¹³ It has been noted that:

Partially to correct such abuses, the legislature enacted Louisiana's first complete primary election law in 1906. Its aim was to guarantee, if possible, fair and honest party nominations and to insure some measure of popular control over party committees and conventions. ¹⁴

Further legislation of this type was added in 1922 when

⁸C. E. Merriam, "State Central Committees," Political Science Quarterly, XIX (June, 1904), 225.

⁹Ibid., p. 227. ¹⁰Ibid. ¹¹Ibid., p. 228. ¹²Ibid.

¹³See particularly pp. 6-7 supra.

¹⁴Alden L. Powell, A Primer on Government in Louisiana (Baton Rouge: L. S. U. Press, 1946), p. 33.

"a second primary law was adopted, in accordance with provisions of the new constitution of 1921."¹⁵ That constitution made reference to party organization as follows:

The Legislature shall enact laws to secure fairness in party primary elections, conventions, or other methods of naming party candidates. No person shall vote at any primary election or in any convention or other political assembly held for the purpose of nominating any candidate for public office, unless he is at the time a registered voter, and have such other and additional qualifications as may be prescribed by the party of which candidates for public office are to be nominated. And in all political conventions in this State the apportionment of representation shall be on the basis of population.¹⁶

It has recently been written that "a third primary law was enacted in 1940 to correct certain evil practices which had developed and flourished under the old law."¹⁷

Since 1940, regulation of party primaries and committees has remained under the basic acts establishing the primary law of that year, except for certain amendments.¹⁸

In 1935, "party policies and the administration of party activities [were] carried out in their entirety by a system of committees."¹⁹ At that time the state central committee of each party consisted of "one member from each parish . . . and one member from each ward of . . . New Orleans . . . together with twenty-four members from the state at large. . . ." ²⁰

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Constitution of Louisiana, Article VIII, Section 4.

¹⁷Powell, op. cit., p. 33.

¹⁸Letter from Mr. Val C. Mogensen, Executive Director, Louisiana Bureau of Governmental Research, October 17, 1949.

¹⁹Carleton, op. cit., p. 163. ²⁰Ibid.

The members at large were selected by the elected members "at their first meeting, three from each of the eight congressional districts of the state."²¹ The elected members, from the parishes and the wards of New Orleans, were elected "in the general primary every four years. . . ." ²² Of the lesser committees, it is known that:

. . . district committees (judicial, congressional, and public service) consist of the members of the state . . . committee from the parishes contained in those districts, together with the members at large from those areas."²³

The parish committees were then regulated by the state central committees.²⁴

Something of the powers and duties of the state central committees of 1935 is told in the statement that:

The state central committee of each party, and its subordinate committees, are legal entities and are the governing authorities of their political parties. They are authorized to make any rules and regulations for their government and organization not in conflict with the regulatory legislation. The real control over parties is vested in their state central committees, for they provide for and direct the manner in which all subordinate and local committees are organized and constituted, fix their number, regulate their terms in office (for not more than four years), and the time of their election; but they may not interfere in matters not authorized by statute. It has been held that the state central committee . . . might add the qualification of "white."²⁵

Further elaboration upon this point was provided in the statement that:

Party committeemen are public officers, committees of political parties are instrumentalities of the

²¹Ibid. ²²Ibid. ²³Ibid. ²⁴Ibid. ²⁵Ibid.

state, and their members and duties are of a public character. All members of committees required to be elected are selected at the primary election of each party every four years. Vacancies are filled at the discretion of the particular committees. Candidates for committees required to be selected are selected at the primary election of each party every four years. Vacancies are filled at the discretion of the particular committees. Candidates for committee membership must be qualified voters of the areas from which they are candidates, and they must be affiliated through registration with the party holding the primary. All committee members may act through proxies.²⁶

The manner in which committees of that time were activated is illustrated in the statement that:

On the first Tuesday of October preceding the general state election, the state central committee meets and issues a call for a primary election to be held on the third Tuesday of January following the call. Not more than twenty days later district and parish committees meet and order primaries for district, parish and ward offices on the same day as that set by the state central committee. Primaries for the nomination of candidates for the United States Senate and Congress, and for other state, judicial and local offices, which are filled in the "off-year" elections held in November every other year, are ordered for the second Tuesday in September. This action is likewise followed by the necessary activities of district, parish, and municipal committees. . . . These calls for primary elections are a duty imposed by law upon party committees, and acts of this character may be compelled by a court of proper jurisdiction.²⁷

In 1935, candidates who filed in the primary had to make a deposit with an appropriate committee chairman.²⁸ Primary voters of that day had to possess the same qualifications "as those required by the constitution and laws of the state . . . in general elections, and the further qualifications prescribed

²⁶Ibid., pp. 164-165. ²⁷Ibid., p. 165.

²⁸Ibid.

by the state central committees."²⁹ The power which the committee held over individual candidates is at least partially illustrated by this statement:

The qualifications of voters and of candidates alike in primary elections are the same as those required by the constitution and laws of the state for voters in general elections, and the further qualifications prescribed by the state central committees. Objections to the qualifications of candidates must be filed by a committee member or by a candidate within five days after the last day upon which notifications of candidacy can be filed. Within forty-eight hours after receiving the objection the proper committee meets, and must decide the question within the next twenty-four hours. If it decides the candidate is qualified its decision is final. If it decides against the candidate, appeal to the district court is the proper procedure for the disqualified candidate. The committee may pass only on qualifications which it may have prescribed. Where opposition to a candidate is sustained, his deposit fee is returned to him.³⁰

The manner in which the expenses of the committees were met is partially illustrated when it is noted that "expenses of the party committees [were] defrayed by committee assessments against the individual candidates."³¹

The power of the committees in regard to vacancies is indicated in the statement that:

When a vacancy occurs in the office of a party candidate, the appropriate committee calls a special election to take place not less than ten days after the call is issued to fill the vacancy. In case there is not sufficient time for a special primary before the general election, the appropriate committee names a candidate to complete the party ticket.³²

Additional powers held by the committees in 1935 are itemized in the statement that:

²⁹Ibid., p. 166. ³⁰Ibid., p. 166. ³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid., p. 168.

At the time a person announces his intention to become a candidate for nomination to public office, he is required to file with the proper party committee the names of at least one and not more than five individuals selected to receive, spend, disburse, and audit all funds contributed, donated, or subscribed, to aid in his nomination or election. . . . Within five days after the primary, or within twenty days after the general election . . . he must file an itemized report of all contributions and expenditures of amounts of five dollars or more, together with the names of donors or sources and the names of those receiving payments, with the proper party or election committee.³³

The important role played by a powerful committee in a southern primary is pointed out in the statement that "it is natural . . . in a southern state [that the] primary plays a more important role than does the election. . . ." ³⁴ That the primaries, and hence the committees as well, were subject to a fairly close regulation is evinced in the statement that "the subject of nominations is almost entirely a legislative product, subject to immediate change by the legislature in special session, if necessary. . . ." ³⁵ It was further pointed out that at this same time, 1935, "in keeping with the same tendency found in other southern states, great potential power is found to exist in the organs of party government. . . ." ³⁶

In 1940, before the primary election law of that year, it was pointed out that:

Each political party has a state central committee and other subordinate or local committees. The state central committee consists of one member from each parish and one member from each ward of the Parish of Orleans, and twenty-four members at large. The

³³Ibid., p. 173. ³⁴Ibid., p. 179. ³⁵Ibid., p. 155.

³⁶Ibid.

members from the several parishes and wards of the Parish of Orleans are elected for terms of four years at the state-wide primary election for state and local officers. The members elected from the parishes and wards of each congressional district elect three committeemen at large from the congressional district, provided that not more than one member at large may be elected from any one parish or ward of the Parish of Orleans. There are eight congressional districts and they furnish the twenty-four members at large of the state central committee.³⁷

At that same time something of the manner in which the committee was organized was told in the statement that:

After the election of the members of the state central committee from the several parishes and wards of the Parish of Orleans and the members at large from the several congressional districts, the state central committee meets and organizes by electing a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary, assistant secretary, and a sergeant-at-arms.³⁸

It was further provided that:

Members of the state central committee and of all subordinate and local committees may act through proxies at any meeting. The appointment of proxies is governed by such rules and regulations as the committees may adopt. The committees are authorized to adopt such other rules and regulations as they may choose for their government provided they are not in conflict with any provision of the Constitution and laws of the State.³⁹

The manner in which district executive committees were set up in 1940 is told in the statement that:

The members of the state central committee from the parishes and from the wards of the Parish of Orleans which comprise a supreme court district, a court of appeal district, a public service commission district, or a congressional district, constitute the executive committee of the political party of which they are members for such several districts. This includes the members at large of the state central

³⁷Coleman Lindsey, Elections in Louisiana (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Department of Education, 1940), pp. 31-33.

³⁸Ibid., p. 33. ³⁹Ibid.

committee residing within the particular district. The chairman of the state central committee is authorized to appoint one member of each district committee as chairman and one member as secretary thereof, and these officers have full power to act until the district committee selects its chairman and secretary under the rules and regulations of the state central committee.⁴⁰

It has been stated that, in 1940:

Other district and parish committees are organized and constituted under the orders and direction of the state central committee which fixes the number of members for each committee, their term of office, and the time of their election, provided they shall not be elected for a longer term than four years, and provided further all members of such committees, except members at large, shall be elected in a direct primary. Any vacancy in the membership of any committee is filled by the committee except a vacancy in the membership at large of the state central committee, which is filled by the members of the state central committee from the congressional district in which the vacancy occurs.⁴¹

An example of the type of resolution that the state central committee may pass is provided in the statement that:

The Democratic State Central Committee has provided by resolution that the members of the executive committees for senatorial and judicial districts shall be composed of the members of the state central committee from the parishes of the district, together with the chairman of each parish committee of the parishes within the district, except in the Parish of Orleans where the Orleans Parish Democratic Committee exercises full power.⁴²

Also in 1940 it was noted that:

It is also provided by a resolution of the Democratic State Central Committee that parish committees shall be composed of as many members from each ward as there are police jurors in such wards, and five members from the parish at large, except in the Parish of Orleans, where the Orleans Parish Democratic Committee is composed of two members from each ward.

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 33-34. ⁴¹Ibid., p. 34. ⁴²Ibid., p. 35.

Each parish committee is authorized to make its own regulations relative to the use of proxies and to determine its own quorum.⁴³

An interesting comment on resolutions by the Democratic State Central Committee is provided in the statement that:

The Democratic State Central committee has provided by resolution that any member at large of that committee may grant his proxy to any resident of the state. Proxies of members from parishes or from the wards of the Parish of Orleans may be granted to any resident of the parish or the ward which the member represents. A proxy may be granted by any member of the committee to any other member of the committee. Any person holding the proxy of a member of the committee has the right to cast the vote of that member of the committee on all questions voted upon by the committee at the meeting mentioned in the proxy. A person may hold the proxies of more than one member of the committee.⁴⁴

B. Recent Modifications by Legislature.--At the present time, in the state of Louisiana, "the law provides for the organization of a series of party committees that govern the affairs of the party and perform the function of that party."⁴⁵ The primary law of 1940 stipulated that "all primary elections held by political parties shall be conducted and held under, and in compliance with, the provisions of [the primary law]. . . ."⁴⁶ According to the primary law, a political party is:

. . . a party that has cast at least five per cent of the entire vote cast in the last preceding gubernatorial election, or at least five per cent of the entire vote cast for presidential electors at the

⁴³Ibid. ⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵Charles G. Whitwell, A Manual of Louisiana Government (Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1949), p. 3.

⁴⁶Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 3.

last preceding election.⁴⁷

The primary law requires that:

All political parties shall make all nominations of candidates for the United States Senate, Members of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, all state, district, parochial, and ward officers, members of the Senate and house of representatives of the state, and all city and ward officers in all cities of more than five thousand, by direct primary elections held under, and in compliance with, the provisions of [the primary law].⁴⁸

Currently, political parties in Louisiana are controlled and directed by the following committees:

A state central committee consisting of as many members from each parish, and each ward in the City of New Orleans, as such subdivisions have members in the lower house of the legislature. . . .

A supreme court district committee for each of the supreme court districts in the state, composed of the members of the state central committee elected from each of the parishes comprising the district. . . .

A court of appeal district committee for each of the court of appeal districts in the state, composed of the members of the state central committee elected from each of the parishes comprising the district. . . .

A public service commission district committee for each of the public service districts of the state, composed of the members of the state central committee elected from each of the parishes comprising the district. . . .

A congressional district committee for each of the congressional districts of the state, composed of the members of the state central committee elected from each of the parishes comprising the district. . . .

A senatorial district committee composed of the members of the state central committee elected from the respective parishes in the senatorial district. In any senatorial district containing only two parishes

⁴⁷Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 3.

⁴⁸Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 2.

and having only two members on the state central committee, the state central committee shall appoint from either of the parishes comprising the district another member so as to make a committee of three members. . . .

A judicial district committee composed of the members of the state central committee elected from the respective parishes in the judicial district. In any judicial district containing only two parishes and having only two members on the state central committee, the state central committee shall appoint from either of the parishes comprising the district another member so as to make a committee of three members. . . . Whenever a senatorial district or a judicial district is composed of only one parish, the parish committee of the district has sole jurisdiction to order and conduct primary elections for the nomination of senatorial or judicial officers for that district. . . .

A parish committee for each of the parishes of the state, composed of as many ward members as there are members of the governing authority of the parish provided for in the parish and five members at large, all of which members shall be elected in the same manner as members of the state central committee. However, in the Parish of Orleans the parish committee shall consist of two members from each ward in the parish. . . .

A municipal committee for each of the municipalities in the state, composed of one member elected in the same manner as members of the state central committee from each of the wards of the municipalities. In municipalities in which there are less than three wards three members shall be elected. . . . In the Parish of Orleans the parish committee has charge of the calling and holding of all primary elections to nominate parochial or municipal officers of the parish, members of the legislature, from any of the wards or senatorial districts within the City of New Orleans, and the judges of the criminal or civil district courts for the Parish of Orleans or city wards of the City of New Orleans.⁴⁹

The law stipulates that all vacancies in the state central committee "shall be filled by temporary selections made by the parish committee of the parish in which the vacancy

⁴⁹Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 5.

occurs. . . ."50 These temporary appointees remain in office "until the next primary held in the parish."51

In the event that the committee finds it necessary, additional committees may be created by the state central committee for the purpose of carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of the primary law.⁵² Likewise, when "it is necessary by law to elect or select a party nominee for any of the recognized political parties and [the primary law] does not make provision therefor, the state central committee may provide for the election or selection of the nominee."⁵³

The initial organizing period of the state central committee comes at a time "not later than fifteen days after their election. . . ."54 One of the objects of this organizational meeting, of course, is the selection of officers. The officers of the state central committee are a chairman, a vice-chairman, a secretary, an assistant secretary, a sergeant-at-arms, and a treasurer, plus "such other officers as the committee, by resolution, creates."⁵⁵ The first meeting of committee members after their election, within the fifteen day period mentioned above, is held "at the capitol,

⁵⁰Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 5.

⁵¹Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 5.

⁵²Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 8.

⁵³Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 7.

⁵⁴Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 12.

⁵⁵Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 13.

Cf. Louisiana Statutes, 1944, Act No. 274, Section 1.

in the City of Baton Rouge, at 2:30 P. M. . . ."⁵⁶ The officers of the state central committee "are elected at the first meeting, by a majority vote of the members . . . in person or by proxy, serve at the pleasure of the committee, and [in the case of the chairman and treasurer] without compensation."⁵⁷

The state central committee "may, by resolution, fix the salary of the secretary, assistant secretary, and sergeant-at-arms, and may employ all assistants necessary and fix their compensation."⁵⁸ The committee members, however, have adopted "only a few resolutions passed from time to time concerning elections and rules adopted by the committee for specific elections."⁵⁹ This is true, in spite of the fact that the committee is authorized to:

. . . adopt for its government and for the government of any committee [in the primary law] authorized to be created, any rules and regulations not inconsistent with the constitution and laws of the state or of the United States. It may provide the conditions under which its members may vote by proxy, and provide for the payment of the expenses of its officers and employees.⁶⁰

The committee members may at any meeting "act through proxies, appointed in such manner and from such class of persons as

⁵⁶Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 12.

⁵⁷Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 13.
Cf. Louisiana Statutes, 1944, Act No. 274, Section 1.

⁵⁸Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 13.
Cf. Louisiana Statutes, 1944, Act No. 274, Section 1.

⁵⁹Letter from Scallan E. Walsh, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer of the Louisiana State Democratic Central Committee, November 17, 1949.

⁶⁰Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 14.

[they] determines [sic] by rule or regulation."⁶¹ That the state central committee possesses a great amount of potential power over lesser committees is shown in the statement that:

Every committee created [by primary law] may adopt all necessary rules and regulations for its government, including the right of its members to vote by proxy, not inconsistent with the rules and regulations adopted by the state central committee and not inconsistent with the constitution and laws of the United States or of Louisiana. . . . They meet at the times fixed [by primary law] and at such other times as they fix or as are fixed by the state central committee.⁶²

In the case of the state central committee, and the lesser committees, a majority of the members constitute a quorum.⁶³ Another evidence of the state committee's power over the lesser committees is seen in the statement that:

The chairman of the state central committee shall select and appoint the chairman and secretary of every committee created [by the primary law], with the exception of the state central committee, parish committees, and municipal committees. The chairman and secretaries of these latter committees serve only until the committees select their own chairmen and secretaries.⁶⁴

Louisiana law stipulates that when a candidate for membership on the state central committee is unopposed "the [state central committee] shall declare that candidate elected, without the necessity of an election."⁶⁵ The state committee members are elected in the state primaries, serve without

⁶¹Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 14.
Cf. Louisiana Statutes, 1944, Act No. 274, Section 1.

⁶²Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 18.

⁶³Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 6.

⁶⁴Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 9.

⁶⁵Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 17.

pay, and are not considered officers or employees of the state or any of its subdivisions.⁶⁶ In order to become a duly recognized candidate for membership on the committee, a prospective candidate must file written notification of his candidacy within the period and in the manner provided for parish and ward officers, except "he need not post a deposit as evidence of good faith, . . ." he must be a legally qualified elector from the subdivision of the state in which he is seeking election, and in addition he must have "been registered continuously for a period of five years as affiliated with the party on whose committee he desires to become a member."⁶⁷ The law requires that the state central committee declare nominated any duly filed and unopposed candidate, any candidate polling more votes than the next highest contender where there is more than one candidate, either candidate it sees fit to nominate in the case of a tie.⁶⁸ In no case is a second primary election held to determine membership on a political committee.⁶⁹

The state committee is authorized to arrange offices on the ballot as they choose, and they are required to "select a party device and certify it to the Secretary of State. . . ."⁷⁰

⁶⁶Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 10.

⁶⁷Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 10.

⁶⁸Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 11.

⁶⁹Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 11.

⁷⁰Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 36.
Cf. Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 224, Section 50.

Likewise, the committee is required to place after the name of the last candidate on the ballot in a primary election, the following:

By casting this ballot I pledge myself to abide by the result of this primary election and to aid and support all the nominees thereof in the ensuing general election.⁷¹

Members of the state central committee serve for "four years and until their successors are elected."⁷²

The state central committee may choose and nominate presidential electors in any manner it may determine by resolution.⁷³ The law sets down a rigid pattern, however, for the calling of primaries for other officers; it states:

On the first Tuesday in October next preceding the date of the general state election for governor and for all other state officials, the state central committee of the political parties . . . shall meet and issue a call for a primary election to nominate candidates for governor or other state officers. The date of the primary shall be the third Tuesday of January following the date of the meeting of the state central committee. . . . In any year in which a United States Senator is to be elected, at the same time that the members of the House of Representatives . . . are to be elected . . . the state central committees of the parties . . . shall meet on the second Friday of July preceding the congressional election and issue a call for a primary to nominate a candidate for the United States Senate. The date for the holding of the primary shall be the last Tuesday of August following the date of the meeting of the state central committee.⁷⁴

⁷¹Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 41.

⁷²Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 10.

⁷³Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 224, Section 48.

⁷⁴Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 20.
Cf. Louisiana Statutes, 1946, Act No. 243, Section 1;
Louisiana Statutes, 1948, Act No. 49, Section 1.

In the case of special elections "held to fill a vacancy for an unexpired term caused by death, resignation, or otherwise of an officer, . . ." the state central committee (if it is a state office) "may fix the date at which a primary shall be held to nominate candidates in the special election, which date shall not be less than ten days after . . . the order for the special election."⁷⁵ The committee is empowered to "fix the last day and hour on which candidates shall qualify, . . ." along with:

. . . the date and hour within which list of proposed commissioners shall be filed, the date and hour at which the committee shall meet and draw the commissioners, the date and hour at which the committee shall meet to declare the results and fix the date for a second primary, if necessary . . . in fixing the dates and hours the committee shall grant as much time for the performance of the acts required as is reasonably practicable.⁷⁶

Voters in the primary elections must possess the same qualifications as are necessary to vote in the general elections "and the further qualifications prescribed by the state central committee of the respective political parties. . . ."⁷⁷

The manner in which objections to candidacies in primary elections is handled is shown in the legal requirement that:

Any person who has filed his application to become a

⁷⁵Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 26.
Cf. Louisiana Statutes, 1946, Act No. 351, Section 3.

⁷⁶Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 26.
Cf. Louisiana Statutes, 1946, Act No. 351, Section 3.

⁷⁷Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 27.

candidate, a qualified elector, or a member of any committee calling a primary election may object to the candidacy of any other person. The objection shall be in writing and shall contain, in detail, the reasons for the objection. . . . The objection shall be filed with the chairman or the secretary of the committee within five days after the last day upon which notification of intention to become a candidate may be filed. . . . At the time of the filing the party making the objection shall file a certificate with the chairman or the secretary, in which he shall specifically declare that he has served or caused to be served upon the person whose candidacy he is objecting to an exact copy of the protest or objection, and shall state the time and the place such service was made. The service of the objections and protests shall be personal or domicillary. . . . The person whose candidacy is thus objected to has forty-eight hours within which to file his answer. . . . Within seventy-two hours after the answer has been filed the committee shall convene and hear the evidence offered by any of the parties or their counsel, and within twenty-four hours after the hearing is closed shall render its opinion. Each party may appeal to any court of competent jurisdiction for relief. If suit is filed by either party to have the decision or ruling of the committee annulled or set aside, the committee is a necessary party, and service of a copy of the petition and copy of all other court proceedings shall be made upon its chairman or the secretary. The jurisdiction of the court, the time within which suit must be filed, the delay for answering, the method of procedure and trial, the time within which an appeal may be taken and prosecuted, and the time within which the appellate court must render a decision, shall, as far as practicable, as is . . . provided for contesting elections [under primary law].⁷⁸

Thus, it may readily be seen that the committee is left very little discretionary power in this instance.

All candidates must file notification of candidacy with the proper committees. The state central committee accepts such notifications for state-wide offices along with a

⁷⁸Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 28.
 Cf. Louisiana Statutes, 1946, Act No. 351, Section 4.

deposit of one hundred dollars made by the candidate as evidence of good faith.⁷⁹ These deposits are received by the chairman of the committee who delivers them to the secretary of state, from which point they are relayed to the state treasurer who credits the amount to the general fund of the state.⁸⁰ Deposits of disqualified candidates are returned to those candidates.⁸¹ All such deposits, notifications, protests, lists of commissioners, or any other paper "shall be filed with the chairman of the proper committee."⁸²

Another instance of rigid regulation of a member of the committee is provided in the section of the primary law stating:

If the chairman is not available, absents himself, cannot be found, or for any reason refuses to accept the paper or deposit, it may be filed with the secretary. If the secretary is not available, or refuses to accept the paper or deposit, or cannot be found, it may be deposited in the U. S. mail, at some point in Louisiana, in an envelope properly registered, stamped, and addressed to the chairman, which deposit in the mail constitutes a proper filing as of that date. . . . Failure of the chairman to receive the paper or deposit does not prejudice or deprive a person of any rights given him under [primary law] if the above conditions are complied with.⁸³

An example of the official duties of the state central committees in a primary election is provided in the statement that:

. . . the respective committee shall send to the

⁷⁹Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 31.

⁸⁰Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 31.

⁸¹Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 31.

⁸²Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 33.

⁸³Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 33.

commissioners of each voting place before the opening of the polls on the day of election cards of instructions, tally sheets, blank forms, and the set of ballots, as sealed and marked [by the Secretary of State].

The committee then secures a receipt of delivery from the commissioners present.⁸⁴ That the committee is not without discretionary authority in some instances is illustrated by the statement that:

If the ballots to be furnished to any voting place in accordance with the provisions [of primary law] should for any reason fail to be delivered, or if after delivery they are destroyed or stolen, or should substantial errors or omissions occur in them, the chairman of the parish committee shall cause other ballots and cards of instructions to be prepared substantially in the form and to the number of the ballots wanting and to be furnished, and upon receipt of these ballots from him, accompanied by a statement under oath that the ballots have been so prepared and furnished by him, and that the original ballots have failed to be received or have been destroyed or stolen, or that they contain errors or omissions, the commissioners shall cause the ballots substituted to be used in lieu of the ballots wanting.⁸⁵

Of course, the committee is not directly involved here, but one of its subsidiary committees is. And, as has been pointed out already, these lesser committees are subject to close supervision and control by the state and central committee.

In special instances other than those pointed out above, the committees are authorized to prepare ballots for use in the primary elections.⁸⁶

The respective committees are authorized by law to appoint special deputies to deliver election supplies, and serve as

⁸⁴Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 45.

⁸⁵Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 46.

⁸⁶Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 51.

special deputy sheriffs. In New Orleans, however, the special deputies are limited to delivering election supplies and have no official status after they have done so. In fact, the law specifically states that "they shall immediately leave the polling places and have no authority whatsoever of any kind at the election."⁸⁷

When the state central committee calls a primary election under its jurisdiction, it is obligated to "preserve . . . for six months [one tally sheet of an original four duplicates] and keep them available for public inspection. . . ." ⁸⁸ Triplicate lists of primary voters are kept, one of which "must be sent by the commissioners to the chairmen of the respective committees calling the primary. . . ." ⁸⁹

The certification of primary election results by the state central committee is essentially perfunctory and the manner in which this is done is set down in detail by law.⁹⁰ All tabulations retained by the committees must be kept safely for six months during which time "these documents are public records and are open to inspection by anyone."⁹¹

One clause usually considered unique by political observers outside of Louisiana is the stipulation that:

⁸⁷Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 52.

⁸⁸Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 75.
Cf. Louisiana Statutes, 1946, Act No. 366, Section 2;
Louisiana Statutes, 1948, Act No. 503, Section 1.

⁸⁹Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 68.

⁹⁰Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 76.

⁹¹Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 76.

When a candidate for membership on a party committee . . . is unopposed, he shall be declared elected without the necessity of having his name printed on the ballot and of being voted for.⁹²

In the event that no candidate files, or "in any other event wherein the party has no nominee . . . the committee having jurisdiction . . . shall select the nominee . . . and may certify the name as the nominee of the party."⁹³

Thus, it may readily be seen that the composition, method of selection, and duties of state committees are determined by law in Louisiana.

In summary, it may be noted that the Louisiana law provides that the state central committee be composed of as many members from each parish as that subdivision has members in the lower house of the state legislature. At the present time, the total membership of the lower house and hence of the state central committee is 100.⁹⁴ We have noted that members of the state committee are selected by direct balloting in the state primary elections each four years. The duties of the Louisiana state central committees seem to be approximately in line with other Southern committees in that they provide more regulation than is customarily found for such committees in a two-party state.⁹⁵

⁹²Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 83.
Cf. Louisiana Statutes, 1946, Act No. 351, Section 15.

⁹³Louisiana Statutes, 1940, Act No. 46, Section 85.

⁹⁴Whitwell, op. cit., p. 3.

⁹⁵Edward M. Sait, American Parties and Elections, ed. Howard R. Penniman (New York: Appelton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1948), p. 351.

CHAPTER III

SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE'S OPERATION IN RECENT YEARS

A. Leadership.--It will be noted that the title of this chapter mentions the state central committee of the Democratic Party exclusively. That the heading is thus constructed is due primarily to the fact that the Republican Party in Louisiana, as far as the election of state officials is concerned, is defunct.¹ At the present time, the failure of the Republicans to participate in the primary elections is partially due to the extensive legal regulation which makes it extremely difficult for a minority party to establish the required party machinery. Also, the constant success of the Democratic Party over the years has tended to create a situation in which "factional 'tickets' approximate party 'tickets' in two-party states."² In fact, few astute political observers would deny that many Louisiana Democrats are actually Democrats only for the sake of expediency.

Thus, it may safely be assumed the leadership in the Democratic Party in the state is concomitantly political leadership for all the people of the state. It is clear that little, if any, opportunity exists for the people to obtain

¹Louisiana has not elected a single state official of Republican affiliation since the termination of post-Civil War Reconstruction. However, in spite of the apparently hopeless situation, 72,657 voters cast Republican ballots in the 1948 presidential election.

²V. O. Key, Jr., Southern Politics in State and Nation (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949), p. 169.

leadership elsewhere. That such leadership ought to be of a high quality would appear to be a fact above question. Particularly is this true if we accept the statement that:

Whether we are to have good government or bad government depends upon how the party--especially the dominant party--is conducted. . . . If the people are to rule under party government, the party organization and its action must be brought under popular control. . . .³

When one carefully considers the extensive powers and duties of the state central committee in Louisiana, he is forced to conclude that it would be extremely difficult to bring party government and organization under popular control without first having the Democratic state committee under such control.

From 1912 to 1920, Martin Behrman, the mayor of New Orleans at the time, "literally ran Louisiana's Statehouse in Baton Rouge from his office in the City Hall in New Orleans."⁴ He "eventually gained political control of the entire State."⁵ There is no evident reason to believe that he did not control the State Central Democratic Committee as well. However, there is little documentary evidence to prove that he used the committee for his own purposes. This, of course, could be due to the fact that no writer chose to point out the commonplace. Surely, it is only logical to assume that opposition to Behrman

³James A. Woodburn, Political Parties and Party Problems in the United States (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924), p. 480.

⁴Robert S. Allen (ed.), Our Sovereign State (New York: The Vanguard Press, Inc., 1949), p. 252.

⁵Ibid.

in the committee would have created a furor that would have been documented. Then too, Behrman's control of the legislature would have given him, in effect, control of the Democratic State Central Committee which owed its very existence to the whim of that lawmaking body.

Behrman's political demise has been described as follows:

But despite his all-powerful organization, curiously enough Behrman was unseated largely as a result of an accident. Four of his policemen made the mistake of being caught red-handed in a graft shakedown in the far-famed bawdyhouse section. The Times-Picayune exposed the scandal.⁶

The Boston Club, the New Orleans equivalent of the Union League in Philadelphia, "hurriedly shook its skirts clean and joined in the anvil chorus of denunciation of the 'Ring'."⁷ The club then announced its support for a member, John M. Parker, who was a wealthy cotton broker. Parker was elected Governor, and a year later Behrman was "kicked out of City Hall."⁸ Parker's favoritism toward the large state corporations such as Standard Oil of New Jersey caused many of his original backers to leave his fold. Among these recalcitrants was Huey P. Long, who distributed a circular "charging that Parker had sold out to Wall Street."⁹ As a result, Huey P. Long was sued, convicted and fined for criminal libel. Thus did he get his start in politics as a "crusader against big business."¹⁰

The effect of Huey's entry into the 1924 Governor's race

⁶Ibid., p. 253. ⁷Ibid. ⁸Ibid. ⁹Ibid., p. 255.

¹⁰Ibid.

has been described as follows:

. . . he retaliated by running as an independent candidate. . . . Huey got nowhere in that race, but he left an indelible imprint. He split the rural vote so deeply that Parker's hand-picked choice lost, and Boss Behrman was able to make a resounding comeback and elect his gubernatorial candidate.¹¹

Thus Parker's reign was over.

In 1928, Long ran again. This time he "shrewdly organized the courthouse rings as they had never been before."¹² He won handily. His subsequent political rise has since become fable. Called everything from "Dictator of the Delta" to the "Kingfish," he whipped into existence one of the most efficient political machines known to the United States.¹³ Even after he had been elevated to the Senate of the United States, Long kept a close control over the state through his hand-picked stooge, Governor O. K. Allen.¹⁴

Long's relations with the Democratic State Central Committee were comparable to his dealings with the state legislature. He had undisputed control of the committee. An attempt by a delegation of Louisiana citizens headed by former Governors John M. Parker, Jared Y. Sanders and Ruffin G. Pleasant to get official recognition in the Democratic national convention in 1932 in the place of Long's delegation, which had been selected by the state central committee, failed. A

¹¹Ibid. ¹²Ibid., p. 256.

¹³Peter H. Odegard and E. Allen Helms, A Study in Political Dynamics (2d ed.; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), pp. 429-439.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 180.

newspaper article of that year points out the methods Long used in getting his delegation seated and describes something of the manner in which he dominated the committee:

When the National Democratic Committee meets Friday it must begin action to determine whether a delegation nominated by Senator Huey P. Long or a delegation headed by [several former Governors] . . . shall cast Louisiana's twenty votes on the floor of the convention. . . . [The] contesting delegation headed by the trio of former Governors charges that the Long delegation was hand-picked by the Senator; that its members are mouthpieces of Long. They contend that they represent the majority of the Democrats of the State and that they were elected by a convention participated in by delegates from every parish, city and town in the State. . . . [The] Long delegation was named at a meeting of the Democratic State Central Committee in which Senator Long pointed out, 102 of the 104 members voted for the delegation of which he is the head. . . . Both the Long and the contesting delegation are unpledged, but Senator Long announced today that his delegation would vote for Roosevelt. Tonight there appears little question but that the committee-named delegation, headed by Long will be seated.¹⁵

It would appear that Long's announcement that his delegation would back Roosevelt was, if not a brilliant political maneuver, at least an opportune move as far as the fate of his delegation was involved.¹⁶ However, the dispute was taken to the floor of the convention in spite of the efforts of Long and his partisans to settle it in the Committee. There, on the convention floor, a lively debate took place. It was described as follows:

In the most important contest, that affecting the seating of a delegation from Louisiana headed by Senator Long, the Roosevelt forces won by a vote of 638 3/4

¹⁵The New York Times, June 22, 1932, p. 8.

¹⁶This was before Long broke with Roosevelt to start his own political movement based on a "Share the Wealth" slogan.

to 514 1/4, one delegate being absent. . . . The Louisiana [contest] hinged on the legality of the methods used in electing the delegates. Senator Long's delegation had been picked by the Democratic Central Committee of the State. . . . [The] contesting delegation had been elected by a state convention. The latter had on it such notable Louisiana Democrats as former Governors Jared Y. Sanders and John M. Parker. . . . Senator Long took the rostrum, a picturesque figure who was liberally hissed and booed, and cited from the Louisiana law to show that the central committee had been well within its powers in picking the delegation headed by him. He referred to the convention called by Frank J. Looney of Shreveport, at which the contestants were picked, as a "rump convention." Mr. Lucas read the minority report, setting out the view that the contesting group was selected by the only State convention held in Louisiana; that this "regularly selected" delegation had been precluded from redress in the courts by the veto by Senator Long, when Governor, of an act requiring sanction of the national convention representatives in the State convention and that delegates in Louisiana had been selected by State conventions for fifty years until the 1928 convention. It held that the Sanders-Parker convention was regularly called by four of the state central committee and was so legally constituted. . . . Lucas denounced the "high handed" methods by which he charged the Long delegation had been selected. "It is unfortunate," he said, "that a United States Senator is involved in this case. . . . I ask members of this convention to say to the people of Louisiana that the . . . principles of democracy shall prevail. . . ." He said that the evidence showed that on forty-eight hour notice thirty-nine members of the Louisiana State Central Committee met and selected delegates to the national convention. He related that a similar procedure had been followed in 1928 and had been so condemned in the Houston convention that the delegates went back home with a virtual mandate to pass a law to prevent recurrence of the episode. An attempt was made to pass such a law, Mr. Lucas said, but it was vetoed by . . . Long. "Not even a majority of the State Central Committee were present when the delegates were selected" . . . Lucas said, "the methods used were in direct contravention of the principles of the party. . . . It was dictatorial, illegal and unwarranted. . . ."17

The discrepancy between Mr. Long's statement that 102

¹⁷The New York Times, June 29, 1932, p. 24.

of the committee members voted, and Mr. Lucas' statement that only thirty-nine were present is difficult to reconcile. Either one of the speakers was inaccurate in his testimony, or a considerable number of the members voted by proxy.

Something of a tacit threat to the convention seems to be included in Long's statement that "this is a contest as to whether or not you are to have Democratic electors on the ballot in Louisiana in November, as the Louisiana law gives all the party power to the . . . Committee." He went on to point out that "the State of Louisiana has done away with the convention system, except where delegates to the convention are elected by the people." Then he informed the convention delegates that "the State committee, with 104 members, is elected by the people in every parish." He concluded by saying that:

Under the Louisiana law the State Central Committee and other committees are recognized as the legal and governing bodies of all parties and are authorized to make any rules. This convention has no right to change the Louisiana law, because we are all in favor of State rights. . . .¹⁸

According to the newspaper account:

Long said that the Louisiana law and Constitution gave any person dissatisfied with the action of the State committee the right to appeal to the courts. . . . Long asserted that there were eight Representatives, two United States Senators, the Governor, the retiring Governor, the Mayor of New Orleans and the head of the Louisiana Federation of Women Voters on the ticket.¹⁹

One experienced Louisiana observer has described the entire affair as follows:

¹⁸Ibid. ¹⁹Ibid.

He [Huey] cracked down and broke a rule, even before he took office. The time approached for a state convention to name representatives to the Democratic National Convention. Louisiana traditionally selected its delegates by this method. By common consent, the choice was on the basis of strength of various factions in the Legislature. Huey, unfortunately, lacked a majority there. The regular ring of New Orleans had, as usual, a sizable bloc. In the past it would inevitably have dominated under these circumstances. It sent word that it was willing to give the Governor a fair deal, on its terms. Huey didn't reply. He looked into the law, found that the Constitution did not specifically require a convention. Hurriedly he summoned the State Democratic Central Committee. He dispensed with the state convention, named the delegates to the national meeting, and left out completely the City Ring and the country opposition. The Long organization controlled 101 per cent. The extra per cent was for Huey.²⁰

That Long was not in complete control in 1932 is seen in the statement that:

In the second Public Service Commission district nine pro-Long candidates admitted they were "dummies" and did not expect to make a serious campaign. When the first parish committee refused to recognize them, Senator Long carried the case to the courts, the fact is that seven parishes do not recognize their master's voice.²¹

One of the most flagrant attempts to misuse the party committee system in Louisiana came in 1933 when Governor O. K. Allen, Huey Long's personal stooge, attempted to take advantage of the death of Bolivar Kemp (6th District Democratic Nominee) in the following manner:

. . . Bolivar died. Huey knew that he could not elect a candidate of his own, so he decided to get a Congressman by strategy in spite of the electorate. Under the law, the Governor must call an election in

²⁰Harnett T. Kane, Louisiana Hayride (New York: William Morrow & Co., 1941), pp. 62-63.

²¹The New York Times, September 11, 1932, II, p. 6.

circumstances such as these. Huey would not let "O. K." issue the call. Weeks passed. Thousands of petitions went to Allen, unheeded. A mass meeting was announced, with an ultimatum. Unless the call came by a certain date, a "citizen's election" would be held. On the day before the scheduled meeting, Allen called the general election--one week hence. The Long majority of the district committee, possibly by coincidence, was in New Orleans that day and, learning of Allen's actions, possibly by reading a newspaper, it held a meeting then and there, outside the district. It resolved that, since there was so little time before the general election, it would make everything easy for everybody by doing away with the Democratic Primary and declaring the widow of the Congressman to be the nominee.²²

One newspaper, enraged at this arbitrary action by Allen and Long urged open revolt and "shotgun" justice. A citizen's election was called and Jared Y. Sanders was elected to the office of Congressman for the sixth district. The outcome of the affair has been described in its initial stages as follows:

The House tonight looked forward to several hours of heated debate when Mrs. Bolivar E. Kemp and Jared Y. Sanders, Jr. present their rival claims tomorrow for the Sixth Louisiana District seat, left vacant by the death of Mrs. Kemp's husband. . . . Mrs. Kemp was elected on December 5 to succeed her late husband, and has presented credentials to the Clerk of the House. They were properly signed by the Governor and Secretary of State, but she will be challenged on the ground that her election was illegal and that she was chosen as a candidate by State Election Commissioners contrary to law. . . . Mr. Sanders was elected in a "revolt" election, called by a citizens' committee. He received more than three times as many votes as Mrs. Kemp and has offered an election certificate signed by the citizens' committee. . . . Actually the fight revolves around Sen. Long, who sponsored the candidacy of Mrs. Kemp.²³

²²Kane, op. cit., p. 102.

²³The New York Times, January 3, 1934, p. 8.

The report of the House committee which investigated the charges has been described as follows:

The committee declared that the citizens' "revolt" was "not surprising, in view of the action of the State officials. . . ." "It was the duty of the Governor of the State of La. when a vacancy occurred in the office of Representative in Congress to make, by Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, and by Section 6 of the General Election Law of the State of Louisiana, a proclamation and cause an election to be held according to law to fill said vacancy. The time of this notice is fixed by statute in La. at not less than thirty days for a general election. It might be well insisted that this time of notice of thirty days should apply to a special election. In all events, since the Governor of La. knew, or should have known, that when a special election is held to fill a vacancy in Congress there should be such notice thereof as to give the voters opportunity to know that an election has been called and to give the Democratic Executive Committee of the district an opportunity to call a primary 'within not less than ten days after the special election has been called.' This was mandatory under Section 9 of the Primary Law. It is undisputed that from immediately after the death of Bolivar E. Kemp in June, 1933, until November 27, 1933, the Governor of La. was petitioned by thousands of voters of the Sixth Congressional District to issue his proclamation and give the voters an opportunity as provided by law to fill this vacancy. He declined to do so, and more than five months elapsed, until the 27th day of November, 1933, there was delivered to the district committee in the City of New Orleans--outside the Sixth Congressional District--a proclamation calling for an election to be held within eight days; namely on the 5th day of December, 1933. This, in the opinion of your committee, was in violation of the primary laws of the State of Louisiana, which the Governor had made impossible of fulfillment on account of insufficient notice of the election which he had proclaimed. And this district committee sitting in the City of New Orleans undertook and did name Mrs. Kemp as the candidate to be voted for at the December 5 election, called by the Governor."²⁴

Following this report by the committee to the House of

²⁴The New York Times, January 21, 1934.

Representatives "the House by a viva voce vote . . . declared the seat vacant and authorized Speaker Rainey so to notify the Governor of Louisiana."²⁵

In May, 1934, Sanders was "formally elected" to Congress by "about 9,000 votes in a general election. . . ." ²⁶ And so the matter was closed. The fact that Long and his henchman failed to put their hand-picked choice in office without an election, however, was not due to a lack of control over the party committee.

A rather complete description of how Huey P. Long personally dominated party committees during his reign is shown in the newspaper account which states that:

In the little town of Crowley, some 175 miles from New Orleans, the Democratic Executive Committee of the Third Supreme Court District was meeting this morning to certify the nomination of Judge Thomas F. Porter for the Supreme Court bench. . . . The death of Justice Winston Overton, brother of United States Senator John H. Overton, had left the anti-Long candidate unopposed. T. Arthur Edwards, the committee chairman, had announced that in accordance with the primary law the committee would certify the nomination of Judge Porter. But Mr. Long is a resourceful politician. He was in no mood to let a place on the Supreme Court go by default.

Just as the committee was going into session, the Senator and two of his aides, Lieut. Gov. John Fournet and Attorney General Gaston L. Portorrie, descended upon the committee.

Mr. Long read the riot act. In a few hours the committee chairman and Dr. Claude Martin, its secretary, had been ousted and replaced by henchmen of the Senator, J. Cleveland Fruge, Long leader in Evangeline Parish, and L. B. Debellevue of Acadia, where the political organization is a cog in the machine of the Senator.

Under the new leadership the committee saw the

²⁵Ibid., January 30, 1934, p. 3.

²⁶Ibid., May 3, 1934, p. 6.

error of its chairman's way, declared the nomination of Judge Porter void and ordered a special election to be held Oct. 9. Judge Porter now has the choice of contesting the committee's action in the courts or accepting the ruling with as good grace as he can muster.²⁷

When Judge Porter later told the Democratic executive committee that he would carry his case to the courts, Long told him that he would call the Legislature in session to keep him from going to the Supreme Court bench.²⁸

The fact that Governor O. K. Allen, Long's hand-picked Governor, was the chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee should remove any doubts that might still be entertained concerning Long's domination of that committee.²⁹

Leadership of the state central committee remained completely in the Long group's hands after Huey's assassination. The manner in which Allen controlled the committee is illustrated in the statement that:

Governor O. K. Allen stirred State politicians today by disclosing that he had secretly qualified himself as a candidate for United States Senator and one of his political associates, Louis L. Morgan, general counsel for the Louisiana Highway Commission, for Governor in the January Democratic primary.

The qualifications were entered secretly shortly before midnight Monday, the hour the Democratic candidates' books were closed. The Governor declined to say why he and Mr. Morgan had qualified. He has left the politicians to guess the significance of the step.

It was easy to keep the move a secret since Governor Allen, in his capacity as chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee, receives applications of all candidates. He simply filed his own name and that of Mr. Morgan with himself.

²⁷The New York Times, September 16, 1934, p. 3. ²⁸Ibid.

²⁹The New York Times, October 24, 1935, p. 2.

Until the Allen-Morgan qualifications became known, it was believed the the former Huey P. Long machine stood solidly behind the ticket headed by Judge Richard W. Leche for Governor, and Allen Ellender, Speaker of the State House of Representatives, for Senator.

Spokesmen for the Allen administration group said that Mr. Allen had acted to protect the administration's political interests in the event of the death, illness or withdrawal of Messrs. Leche or Ellender.³⁰

The manner in which the Committee operated in this period is shown in the statement that:

As the Democratic State Central Committee met and set January 21 as the date of a primary to name a successor for Senator Long's unexpired term, for which Governor Allen has announced himself as a candidate, it became known that the Governor was thinking of resigning immediately if nominated in order to take his seat without delay. . . . The State committee set the primary to coincide with the general State primary after Governor Allen, earlier in the day, had proclaimed April 21 as the date of a general special election for Senator for the short term. [Vacancy caused by Long's assassination]

The proclamation followed upon an agreement, reached after a turbulent conference of State administration leaders, whereby Allen J. Ellender, Speaker of the House, will run for the full Senate term, beginning in January, 1937, and Governor Allen for the short term.

Prior to the conference Ellender and Allen were both candidates for the full term and the plan was to appoint Wade O. Martin, Public Service Commissioner, for the short term.

The Committee set Nov. 12 as the last date for filing intentions of candidacy in the short-term race.³¹

Much of the power of the State Central Democratic Committee was placed elsewhere during the administration of Sam Houston Jones, reform Governor elected in 1940. For example, delegates to the national convention were selected by a meeting of the first state convention to be held in Louisiana in sixteen

³⁰Ibid. ³¹The New York Times, November 8, 1935, p. 2.

years. There were no conventions during Huey P. Long's rule.

An account of the convention follows:

Louisiana Democrats refused to approve third-term support for President Roosevelt and with boos and hisses forced Senator Allen J. Ellender to leave the platform at their first State convention in sixteen years last night.

The convention voted to send delegates to the Democratic National Convention at Chicago uninstructed and directed them to cast the State's twenty votes as a unit.

The action came after the convention had howled Mr. Ellender's attempt to have the delegates instructed to support President Roosevelt for renomination.

A resolution, adopted later, said that the unfavorable reception, "was not to be construed as any reflection on Pres. Roosevelt." Mr. Ellender formerly was aligned with the forces of the late Huey P. Long, which recently were defeated by Governor Sam Jones.

In addition to stopping Mr. Ellender as he attempted to speak in behalf of his resolution, the convention reprimanded him and Senator Overton for their recommendation of former Governor Leche for a federal judgeship.³²

The evidence seems to indicate that during the administration of James H. Davis, hillbilly crooner, control of the state central committee reverted to certain members who had been close friends and ardent supporters of the Long administration. This may have been due to neglect on the part of the Governor who spent a great deal of his time in Hollywood and elsewhere. It has been pointed out that Davis was away from the state so often and for such long periods of time that the fund set up by the legislature to provide the Lieutenant-Governor an increased salary for such periods had to be twice supplemented by special appropriations.³³ Among

³²Ibid., June 6, 1940, p. 18. ³³Allen, op. cit., p. 264.

these former Long acolytes was Leander H. Perez who hailed from a village named Dalcour in Plaquemines Parish.³⁴

In the 1948 elections, the Long dynasty returned to power in Louisiana with the election of Earl K. Long as Governor. Shortly thereafter, Huey's son, Russell B. Long, was elected to fill a United States Senate seat vacancy created by the death of Senator John H. Overton.³⁵ Influential in getting the Longs elected and an "inside" man at the present time is Leander H. Perez, who probably did more than anyone else toward making the Long campaign a success.³⁶ The "Kingfish of the Dixiecrats" as he has recently been labeled, Perez is a member of the State Central Democratic Committee and is the chairman of his Democratic Parish Executive Committee.³⁷ As the latter, Perez makes it extremely difficult for any but those in complete agreement with him even to become candidates for a local office.³⁸

Perez's influence over the committee is evident in the following statement:

A New Orleans manufacturer, John U. Barr, was wrestling

³⁴See Appendix A.

³⁵Allen, op. cit., pp. 269-270.

³⁶Ibid., pp. 264-275. Cf. Velie, Lester. "Kingfish of the Dixiecrats." Collier's, CXXIV, no. 24 (December 17, 1949), 9-11, 71, 73; Velie, Lester. "Democracy in the Deep Delta." Collier's, CXXIV, no. 26 (December 24, 1949), 21, 42, 44.

³⁷See Appendices B and L.

³⁸Velie, Lester. "Democracy in the Deep Delta." Collier's, CXXIV, no. 26 (December 24, 1949), 21, 42, 44.

with this problem [of how to throw the votes elsewhere than the Democrats] as chairman of Louisiana's Dixiecrats when Perez cannily gave him the solution. The Democratic State Central Committee, top-heavy with Long machine followers, met to draw up the party ticket for the presidential election. With Perez as ringmaster, the Committee voted unanimously to throw out the Truman-Barkley ticket and substitute instead the Dixiecrat slate in the Democratic column. It was a gross and lawless act, but wholly in keeping with the temper and motivations of the Dixiecrats and their masters.³⁹

However, Earl Long outwardly backtracked when national Democratic officials protested this action. It has been noted that he "hurriedly convened a special session and passed a bill putting Truman and Barkley back on the ballot in a separate column."⁴⁰ As the same observer noted, however, Long "allowed the berserk Dixiecrats to appropriate the familiar Democratic rooster and Truman had to run under a donkey emblem."⁴¹ One weekly news magazine described the Long position as "teetering on the wire."⁴²

Whether Perez will exert his influence on the committee again in 1952 remains to be seen. Not in question, however, is his power to do so.

B. Personnel.--The membership of the Louisiana Democratic State Central Committee has been analyzed by the author through questionnaires mailed to each of the committee members and factual data garnered from the answers. This survey, however, may not be accurate. Fifty-two of the members queried failed to respond in any manner. Those who failed to respond were

³⁹Allen, op. cit., p. 274. ⁴⁰Ibid. ⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²"Long and the Dixiecrats," Newsweek, XXXII (October 4, 1948), 25.

probably, as a rule, the older members in term of service. Several are immediately conspicuous: Leander H. Perez, erstwhile friend of Huey P. Long who once rescued him from impeachment; Earl K. Long, present Governor of the state; Dudley J. LeBlanc, President pro tempore of the Louisiana Senate, late of Hadacol fame; Henry G. Sevier, former national committeeman and present State Chairman; and Wade O. Martin, Sr., longtime friend of Huey Long, father of the present Secretary of State of Louisiana, and member of the Public Service Commission.

Of the forty-eight members of the committee who did answer the questionnaire, the following facts are known:

1. Twenty-two are serving their first term (six of these were elected without opposition),
2. Nine (none of whom are new members) have never been opposed,
3. Six have been opposed, but not at the last election,
4. Eleven were opposed at the last election.

Thus, it may be seen that only twenty-seven of the forty-eight members who reported were opposed at the last election for committee members, even if the newly elected members are included in the count.

The fact that more than forty percent of the membership reporting was unopposed at the last election seems to bear out the conclusions of a recent "spot survey" by the author which indicated that, outside of the legal profession, only a very small percentage of citizens are aware of the State

Democratic Central Committee's existence.⁴³

Of those members who answered the query sent to them:

1. Nine listed their "Profession or Trade" as attorney,
2. Six listed their "Profession or Trade" as public official,
3. Seven said that they were attorneys and also held public office (these were separate from those who simply stated that they were attorneys),
4. Four stated that they were in the medical profession (this included two pharmacists, a dentist and a physician),
5. Four were in the insurance business,
6. Two were laborers (an ironworker and a barber, the latter being a member of the Labor Steering Committee in Alexandria),
7. Three were in agriculture (a planter, a plantation operator and an artificial breeder of dairy cattle),
8. Three listed finance as their occupation (a banker, an investment dealer and a loan agent),
9. Two were merchants (a "merchant" and a "merchant and contractor"),
10. Two were clerks (a bookkeeper and a clerk),
11. Three were businessmen (one in lumber, one in sheet-metal and one in the distribution of petroleum products),
12. One was a salesman.

The preponderant majority of the members, it may be noted, were members of the legal profession--some sixteen in all. This would, perhaps, indicate that the lawyers are either more adept at handling the type of work a committee member must do, that

⁴³In questioning twenty-seven persons not in the legal profession in Baton Rouge, Louisiana's State Capitol, the author found two persons who knew that the Committee existed, and only one who professed to remember having voted for such a candidate.

they are the only ones who know of the committee's existence, or that they consider it a likely spot in which to gain political prestige or recognition. It may be that the six public officials who were not lawyers were attempting to look after their own interests.

The questionnaires sent out to the members also asked for information concerning the number of years that the individual had been a member of the committee. The results shown when these facts were tabulated were:

1. One member had served for thirty years, another for twenty-six, another for twenty-four and still another for twenty,
2. Twelve members had served for more than ten years,
3. Nineteen of the twenty-six had served for eight or more years,
4. The average term of the twenty-six was slightly less than twelve years.

This would indicate that outside of deaths, resignations, or removals there is little cause for a member to worry about losing his position.

In 1944, the Democratic State Central Committee selected the following men as its officers.

1. John Fred Odom, Chairman, Baton Rouge (member)
2. E. Wayles Browne, Vice Chairman, Shreveport (member)
3. Francis J. Whitehead, Secretary, Port Allen (non-member)
4. J. Clyde Pearce, Assistant Secretary, Baton Rouge (non-member)
5. Lee L. Laycock, Sergeant-at-Arms, Baton Rouge (non-member)⁴⁴

It may be noted that the committee followed the general

⁴⁴Information Relative to Democratic Primary Election to be Held January 20, 1948 (Baton Rouge: Department of State), p. 7.

practice of similar committees in other states of selecting its lesser officers from outside of its membership.

In 1948, the committee selected the following officers:

1. Henry G. Sevier, Chairman, Tallulah (member),
2. E. Wayles Browne, Vice-Chairman, Shreveport (member),
3. Jesse L. Webb, Secretary, Baton Rouge (non-member),
4. Scallan E. Walsh, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Baton Rouge (non-member),
5. Lee L. Laycock, Sergeant-at-Arms, Baton Rouge (non-member).⁴⁵

The only salaried officers of the committee are as follows:

1. Secretary \$50.00 per month,
2. Assistant Secretary-Treasurer . . . \$50.00 per month;⁴⁶
3. Sergeant-at-Arms. \$25.00 per month.

It should be noted that none of the salaried officers are committee members. This practice coincides with the national pattern.

C. Conclusion.--There seems to be little room for doubt of the fact that the state central committee exerts a powerful influence in Louisiana's political life, in view of the evidence which has been presented. That a great deal of this influence is due to the fact that the legislature can completely control the committee is a fact bordering on the obvious. Control by the legislature can only mean, in turn, control by the Governor, since a tradition of executive leadership has become firmly established in the state. Unfortunately, it appears that the Governor often is susceptible to considerable suggestion from

⁴⁵Letter from Scallan E. Walsh, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Democratic State Central Committee of Louisiana, July 14, 1950.

⁴⁶Ibid.

an individual or a group outside of his official family.⁴⁷

One observer commented upon the committee's power in the following manner:

It names the presidential electors that appear on the ballot in the presidential elections. Perhaps one of the most important, and least understood duties of this group is the selection of, and instruction of delegates, to the party's national convention that is to nominate the party's candidate for president and vice-president. This power in effect, allows the 100 members of the State Central Committee to decide who the next president of the United States will be, insofar as the voters in Louisiana are concerned. Except in an unusual circumstance like exists in 1948, the voter in a one-party state like Louisiana must rubber-stamp the Democratic party's nominee or vote the Republican ticket in the presidential election. In the former case he is voting for a candidate that he has had no voice in choosing, and in the latter he is wasting his vote.⁴⁸

An additional power of the committee not mentioned previously is the power to select national committeemen. It has been noticed that, in practice, the committee exercises such power in the state.⁴⁹

An officer of the committee has stated that:

The Democratic State Central Committee of Louisiana does not have a constitution or by-laws. . . . The state central committee has only a few resolutions passed from time to time concerning elections and rules adopted by the committee for specific elections.⁵⁰

⁴⁷E. g.: Parker and the "Boston Club," Allen and Huey Long, and perhaps Earl Long and Perez.

⁴⁸Charles G. Whitwell, A Manual of Louisiana Government (Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1949), p. 4.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Letter from Scallan E. Walsh, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer of the Democratic State Central Committee, November 17, 1949.

Apparently, one of the resolutions mentioned above instructed the Secretary of State of Louisiana to include the stipulation, "no one shall be permitted to vote at the . . . Democratic Primary election except electors of the White Race . . ." in its pamphlet showing sample forms to be used by the committee in calling primary elections.⁵¹ Such instructions would hardly have come from the Department of State without specific instructions from someone to include them, since the direction directly contravenes several recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.⁵² For the sake of fairness, however, it should be noted that the "latest registration opened in 1949 and parish registrars reported Negroes signing up in greater numbers than ever before."⁵³ Under the Supreme Court decisions making it possible for Negroes to vote, 27,930 were eligible in Louisiana.⁵⁴ As one observer has noted, "prejudice is still so virulent that only zealots are brave enough to register. But when they register, they vote."⁵⁵

A writer recently noticed that:

As Louisiana enters the second half of the twentieth century, democracy in the State is still weak and puny. Neither the tweedledee of the Long machine nor the tweedledum of the Boston Club offers much hope for enlightened government. Similarly, there appears little hope at present for the development

⁵¹Information Relative to Democratic Primary Election, op. cit., p. 25.

⁵²E. g., United States v. Classic, 313 U. S. 299 (1941). Smith v. Allwright, 321 U. S. 649 (1944).

⁵³Allen, op. cit., p. 276. ⁵⁴Allen, op. cit., p. 275.

⁵⁵Ibid.

of better leaders. No matter how well intentioned they may be when they take office, Louisiana politicians soon become afraid. They all tend to build up personal political machines.

But there are a few hopeful signs.

The Supreme Court decision outlawing the basing point price system may have profound economic and political impact. The wartime expansion of Louisiana industry has already had a tremendous effect. Development of the chemical empire, that got a toehold along the Gulf of Mexico during the war, will stir new forces and leaders. So will the organizing drives of the AFL and CIO.

Finally, there is genuine hope in the Negro, both for himself and the whites. Once Negroes can make themselves felt at the polls they may help all the underprivileged to better their lot.⁵⁶

⁵⁶Allen, op. cit., pp. 276-277.

APPENDICES

TABLE OF APPENDICES

- A Roll of the Democratic State Central Committee of Louisiana, elected in 1944
- B Chairmen and Secretaries of the Louisiana Parish Democratic Executive Committees, elected in 1944
- C Form for Calling Primary Election
- D Form Used by Democratic State Central Committee in Canvassing Returns of First Primary for all Offices Appearing on the State Ballot
- E Form for Canvassing Returns of First Primary for District, Parochial, Ward and Municipal Officers
- F Candidate's Filing Form to be Used for State Offices
- G Candidate's Filing Form to be Used for District Offices
- H Candidate's Filing Form to be Used for Parish and Ward Offices
- I Louisiana Governors Since Statehood
- J Louisiana Constitutions Since Statehood with a List of Constitutional Authorization Acts
- K Members of Democratic State Central Committee Elected at Primary of January 20, 1948
- L Chairmen and Secretaries of Parish Executive Committees of Louisiana Elected at Primary of January 20, 1948.

APPENDIX A

ROLL OF THE DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF LOUISIANA, ELECTED IN 1944¹

OFFICERS

John Fred Odom, Chairman, Baton Rouge, La.
 E. Wayles Browne, Vice Chairman, Shreveport, La.
 Francis J. Whitehead, Secretary, Port Allen, La.
 J. Clyde Pearce, Ass't. Secretary, Baton Rouge, La.
 Lee L. Laycock, Sergeant-at-Arms, Baton Rouge, La.

ACADIA

Denis T. Canan, Crowley
 N. S. Hoffpauir, Esterwood

ALLEN

W. S. Kingrey, Kinder

ASCENSION

Frank S. Noel, Donaldsonville

ASSUMPTION

Clarence J. Savoie, Belle Rose

AVOYELLES

James H. Bordelon, Marksville
 A. L. Brisolara, Bunkie

BEAUREGARD

H. M. Bennett, DeRidder

BIENVILLE

Robert L. Williams, Arcadia

BOSSIER

A. M. Wallace, Benton

CADDO

T. R. Hughes, Shreveport
 E. Wayles Browne, Shreveport
 Frank J. Looney, Shreveport
 B. A. Hardey, Shreveport

CALCASIEU

Ambrose LeBleu, Lake Charles
 Mads L. Christensen, Lake Charles

¹Information Relative to Democratic Primary Election to be Held January 20, 1948 (Baton Rouge: Department of State), pp. 7-9.

CALDWELL
Vinson M. Mouser, Columbia

CAMERON
John B. Daigle, Cameron

CATAHOULA
O. R. Wurster, Jonesville

CLAIBORNE
Lamont Seals, Homer

CONCORDIA
Joe Pasternack, Ferriday

DESOTO
David B. Means, Gloster

EAST BATON ROUGE
Fred A. Blanche, Baton Rouge
John Fred Odom, Baton Rouge

EAST CARROLL
Dr. T. G. Biggs, Lake Providence

EAST FELICIANA
C. S. Kilbourne, Clinton

EVANGELINE
J. Cleveland Fruge, Ville Platte

FRANKLIN
B. S. Landis, Winnsboro

GRANT
George A. Foster, Pollock

IBERIA
P. Armand Viator, New Iberia

IBERVILLE
Joseph J. LePlace, Sr., St. Gabriel

JACKSON
Travis E. Pardue, Jonesboro

JEFFERSON
Frank J. Clancy, Gretna

JEFFERSON DAVIS
J. L. McHugh, Jennings

LAFAYETTE
Alex Duhon, Lafayette
Robley A. Richard, Carencro

LAFOURCHE

Dr. Charles J. Barker, Thibodaux
David J. Robichaux, Raceland

LASALLE

Q. T. Hardtner, Urania

LINCOLN

Norman L. Moncrief, Ruston

LIVINGSTON

L. B. Harris, Sr., Denham Springs

MADISON

Henry C. Sevier, Tallulah

MOREHOUSE

Edward L. Gladney, Bastrop

NATCHITOCHE

H. Lester Hughes, Natchitoches
Arthur C. Watson, Natchitoches

ORLEANS

Ward 1

Edward A. Haggerty
1419 Constance St.

Ward 2

Edward Burke
1029 S. Genois St.

Ward 3

James Dempsey
617 Hennessy St.
Charles A. Byrne (Deceased)
3732 Canal St.

Ward 4

Claude Mauberret
4627 Iberville St.

Ward 5

John H. Galway, Sr.
3603 Delgado St.

Ward 6

Dudley Desmare
2637 Ursuline Ave.

Ward 7

Louis Knop, Jr.
627 Frenchmen St.
Charles G. Hammer
1303 Frenchmen St.

Ward 8
William P. Hickey
4478 Venus St.

Ward 9
Joseph Peyton
3124 Burgundy St.

Ward 10
Robert J. Skinner
2021 Chestnut St.

Ward 11
John Quartana
626 Washington Ave.
Michael J. Kelly
450 Sixth St.

Ward 12
Louis A. Heyd, Sr.
707 Napoleon Ave.

Ward 13
Gus Pique
1924 Valence St.

Ward 14
Walter E. Douglas
5534 So. Liberty St.

Ward 15
Jos. P. Skelly
217 Delaronde St.

Ward 16
Anthony Herrle
618 Short St.

Ward 17
Henry F. Heaton
8923 Nelson St.

OUACHITA

Robert C. Ervin, West Monroe
D. Y. Smith, Sterlington

PLAQUEMINES

L. H. Perez, Dalcour

POINTE COUPEE

Henry A. Rougon, Oscar

RAPIDES

J. L. Pitts, Sr., Alexandria
T. Wynn Holloman, Alexandria
Homer H. Harris, Sr., Alexandria

RED RIVER

A. H. Perry, Coushatta

RICHLAND

George K. Anding, Delhi

SABINE

Thomas W. Hardee, Jr., Pleasant Hill

ST. BERNARD

Thos. S. Serpas, Arabi

ST. CHARLES

Julius B. Sellers, Ama

ST. HELENA

John Butler, Greensburg

ST. JAMES

Fred P. Arras, Gramercy

ST. JOHN

Dr. J. R. Fernandez, Wallace

ST. LANDRY

Isom J. Guillory, Eunice

Kenneth Boagni, Opelousas

A. V. Pavy, Opelousas

ST. MARTIN

Wade O. Martin, Sr., St. Martinville

ST. MARY

John M. Caffery, Franklin

W. B. Roder, Berwick

ST. TAMMANY

Bryan D. Burns, Covington

TANGIPAHOA

Dr. J. H. McClendon, Amite

Dedric H. Gill, Amite

TENSAS

E. D. Coleman, Highland

TERREBONNE

Dr. H. P. St. Martin, Houma

UNION

Doyle Smith, Farmerville

VERMILION

Dudley J. LeBlanc, Abbeville

VERNON

Emmette Cavanaugh, Leesville

WASHINGTON

H. H. Richardson, Bogalusa

WEBSTER

Leslie N. Johnson, Minden

WEST BATON ROUGE

Francis J. Whitehead, Port Allen

WEST CARROLL

John R. McIntosh, Oak Grove

WEST FELICIANA

D. I. Norwood, Angola

WINN

Earl K. Long, Winnfield

APPENDIX B

CHAIRMEN AND SECRETARIES OF THE LOUISIANA PARISH DEMOCRATIC
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES, ELECTED IN 1942

ACADIA

Chairman: J. A. Barrouse, Crowley
Secretary: William A. Lyons, Crowley

ALLEN

Chairman: J. T. Christian, Oberlin
Secretary: Grace A. Rhorer, Oberlin

ASCENSION

Chairman: C. Earl Dixon, Donaldsonville
Secretary: Louis L. LeBlanc, Donaldsonville

ASSUMPTION

Chairman: Aubert L. Talbot, Napoleonville
Secretary: Clifton B. Dolese, Napoleonville

AVOYELLES

Chairman: A. J. Bordelon, Marksville
Secretary: Mrs. Esther de Nux, Marksville

BEAUREGARD

Chairman: C. C. Davis, DeRidder
Secretary: W. E. Kilman, DeRidder

BIENVILLE

Chairman: A. L. Mosley, Ringgold
Secretary: Lloyd C. Stewart, Arcadia

BOSSIER

Chairman: A. M. Wallace, Benton
Secretary: L. G. Campbell, Benton

CADDO

Chairman: E. Wayles Browne, Shreveport
Secretary: J. H. Mayfield, Shreveport

CALCASIEU

Chairman: Amos J. Vincent, Lake Charles
Secretary: Van M. Andrus, Lake Charles

CALDWELL

Chairman: A. J. Coates, Columbia
Secretary: A. A. Webb, Columbia

²Ibid., pp. 10-12.

CAMERON

Chairman: S. D. Broussard, Cameron
 Secretary: Lionel A. Theriot, Cameron

CATAHOULA

Chairman: R. R. Reeves, Harrisonburg
 Secretary: Jesse C. McGee, Harrisonburg

CLAIBORNE

Chairman: T. H. McEachern, Homer
 Secretary: Lamont Seals, Homer

CONCORDIA

Chairman: John Dale, Vidalia
 Secretary: J. D. Cross, Vidalia

DESOTO

Chairman: Green Rives, Mansfield
 Secretary: Frank S. Craig, Mansfield

EAST BATON ROUGE

Chairman: J. Russell Doiron, Baton Rouge
 Secretary: Mrs. Kenneth M. Purdy, Baton Rouge

EAST CARROLL

Chairman: Dr. T. G. Biggs, Lake Providence
 Secretary: Sue M. Abernathy, Lake Providence

EAST FELICIANA

Chairman: Chas. S. Kilbourne, Clinton
 Secretary: H. H. Forrester, Clinton

EVANGELINE

Chairman: J. Cleveland Fruge, Ville Platte
 Secretary: Gilbert Aucoin, Ville Platte

FRANKLIN

Chairman: E. B. Moore, Winnsboro
 Secretary: J. R. Donnell, Winnsboro

GRANT

Chairman: T. Lee Dean, Montgomery
 Secretary: T. L. McNeely, Colfax

IBERIA

Chairman: O. J. Mestayer, New Iberia
 Secretary: Gene Fortier, New Iberia

IBERVILLE

Chairman: H. J. Levy, Plaquemine
 Secretary: Chas. A. Griffon, Jr., Plaquemine

JACKSON

Chairman: Ansley H. Colvin, Jr., Jonesboro
 Secretary: A. H. Colvin, Sr., Jonesboro

JEFFERSON

Chairman: Frank J. Clancy, Kenner
 Secretary: Andrew H. Thalheim, Marrero

JEFFERSON DAVIS

Chairman: Azenor Buller, Jennings
 Secretary: A. J. Bourgeois, Jennings

LAFAYETTE

Chairman: A. J. Alpha, Lafayette
 Secretary: A. W. Billeaud, Lafayette

LAFOURCHE

Chairman: Alfred P. Richard, Thibodaux
 Secretary: R. O. Moncla, Thibodaux

LASALLE

Chairman: J. M. Henagan, Jena
 Secretary: R. E. Hudnall, Jena

LINCOLN

Chairman: John L. Bodie, Ruston
 Secretary: Ragan D. Madden, Ruston

LIVINGSTON

Chairman: E. P. Guitreau, Livingston
 Secretary: C. R. Sullivan, Livingston

MADISON

Chairman: W. H. Hewes, Tallulah (RFD)
 Secretary: Ira Baxter, Tallulah

MOREHOUSE

Chairman: James Madison, Bastrop
 Secretary: J. W. Gillen, Bastrop

NATCHITOCHEs

Chairman: Chas. R. Yarbrough, Robeline
 Secretary: E. O. Payne, Natchitoches

ORLEANS

Chairman: William F. Conkerton, New Orleans
 Secretary: Clement F. Pershcall, New Orleans

OUACHITA

Chairman: Alden T. Shotwell, Monroe
 Secretary: Carl H. McHenry, Monroe

PLAQUEMINES

Chairman: L. H. Perez, Dalcour
 Secretary: Rudolph H. McBride, Pointe-a-la-Hache

POINTE COUPEE

Chairman: F. E. Decuir, New Roads
 Secretary: A. K. Smith, New Roads

RAPIDES

Chairman: Lamar Polk, Alexandria
 Secretary: T. H. Williams, Alexandria

RED RIVER

Chairman: O. P. Ogilvie, Coushatta
 Secretary: J. H. Pace, Hanna

RICHLAND

Chairman: H. A. Mangham, Rayville
 Secretary: Roy L. Binion, Rayville

SABINE

Chairman: Edwin M. Frazer, Many
 Secretary: Gasway German, Many

ST. BERNARD

Chairman: Leon A. Meraux, Meraux
 Secretary: Anthony B. Nunez, Violet

ST. CHARLES

Chairman: T. B. Sellers, Hahnville
 Secretary: I. T. Baudoin, Hahnville

ST. HELENA

Chairman: M. E. Easley, Liverpool
 Secretary: Chas. C. Reeves, Greensburg

ST. JAMES

Chairman: Jos. B. Dornier, Convent
 Secretary: Gaston Brignac, Convent

ST. JOHN

Chairman: P. D. Hebert, Wallace
 Secretary: A. L. Brou, Edgard

ST. LANDRY

Chairman: Milton Halphen, Opelousas
 Secretary: Alcee Dejean, Opelousas

ST. MARTIN

Chairman: E. L. Resweber, St. Martinville
 Secretary: E. L. Guidry, St. Martinville

ST. MARY

Chairman: E. J. Champagne, Franklin
 Secretary: F. D. Winchester, Franklin

ST. TAMMANY

Chairman: H. K. Goodwyn, Covington
 Secretary: Walter G. Jones, Covington

TANGIPAHOA

Chairman: Leon Ford, Hammond
 Secretary: Charles Sinagra, Independence

TENSAS

Chairman: G. C. Goldman, Waterproof
Secretary: V. C. Rives, St. Joseph

TERREBONNE

Chairman: J. Louis Watkins, Houma
Secretary: H. C. Wurzlow, Houma

UNION

Chairman: K. D. Langford, Haile
Secretary: B. K. Watson, Marion

VERMILION

Chairman: C. H. Brookshire, Kaplan
Secretary: R. J. Labauve, Abbeville

VERNON

Chairman: O. E. Morris, Leesville
Secretary: G. W. Bass, Rosepine

WASHINGTON

Chairman: W. R. Mitchell, Bogalusa
Secretary: Lacy Richardson, Bogalusa

WEBSTER

Chairman: M. H. Sandlin, Minden
Secretary: John T. Campbell, Minden

WEST BATON ROUGE

Chairman: J. Clay Cazes, Port Allen
Secretary: S. R. Templet, Port Allen

WEST CARROLL

Chairman: C. H. Koerner, Oak Grove
Secretary: Charles P. Vining, Oak Grove

WEST FELICIANA

Chairman: Jas. H. Kilbourne, St. Francisville
Secretary: F. B. Harelson, St. Francisville

WINN

Chairman: H. B. Bozeman, Winnfield
Secretary: D. A. Forrest, Winnfield

APPENDIX C

FORM FOR CALLING PRIMARY ELECTION³

_____, La., _____, 1947.

MINUTES of a meeting of the Democratic Executive Committee of the _____

The Democratic Executive Committee of the _____

_____,
State of Louisiana, met in accordance with law on this date at the above place. There were present in person the following members:

The following members were represented by proxies in due form, which have been filed with the records of this committee:

RESOLUTION By Mr. _____

WHEREAS, Act No. 46 of 1940, requires that the Democratic Executive Committee of the _____

State of Louisiana, shall meet and issue a call for a primary election for the purpose of selecting a Democratic candidate for the office of _____

for the ensuing term.

³Ibid., pp. 24-25.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Democratic Executive Committee of the _____

that Tuesday, January 20, 1948, be fixed as the date for the holding of said primary election of the Democratic party for said nomination; that any one desiring to become a candidate for the Democratic nomination for

for the ensuing term, shall on or before 5 o'clock P. M. (Central Standard Time) of _____

1947, file with _____,

Chairman of this Committee, in the form prescribed by law, his notification of candidacy, setting forth that he is a duly qualified elector under the Constitution and laws of Louisiana, and that he is a member of the Democratic Party and shall accompany his said written notification of candidacy with his affidavit setting forth that he possesses all of the qualifications prescribed by the resolutions of the State Central Committee of the Democratic Party.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That no one shall be permitted to vote at the said Democratic Primary election except electors of the White Race.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That all candidates for said nomination shall deposit with the Chairman of this Committee, to be remitted to the Secretary of State,

the sum of \$ _____ required by Section 32 of Act 46 of 1940, as amended and shall in addition at the same time deposit for incidentals and other expenses of this Committee the sum of

\$ _____ and also the sum of \$ _____, to be remitted to the Secretary of the Democratic State Central Committee in accordance with its resolutions.

There being no further business, the meeting duly adjourned.

Chairman.

Secretary.

APPENDIX D

FORM USED BY DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE IN
 CANVASSING RETURNS OF FIRST PRIMARY
 FOR ALL OFFICES APPEARING ON THE STATE BALLOT⁴

_____, La., _____, 1948

MINUTES of a meeting of the Democratic Executive Committee
 of the _____

The Democratic Executive Committee of the _____

 State of Louisiana, met in accordance with law on this date at
 the above place. There were present in person the following
 members:

 The following members were represented by proxies in due
 form, which have been filed with the records of this committee:

 The Chairman of the Committee placed before it the returns
 as shown by certification by the Secretary of State as follows:

(Copy certification of Secretary of State)

It was thereupon moved and duly seconded that the follow-
 ing resolution be adopted:

WHEREAS, the Secretary of State having tabulated and com-
 piled the returns of the Democratic Primary Election held
 throughout the _____
 of Louisiana on January 20, 1948, for nomination of a Democratic
 candidate for the office of _____

⁴Ibid., pp. 26-28.

to be voted for in the general election to be held on the first Tuesday next following the third Monday in April, 1948, and having furnished a certified copy thereof to the Chairman of this Committee in accordance with Section 76 of Act 46 of 1940, and it appearing from the said returns that at said primary election the candidates received votes as follows:

and that therefore _____
 received a majority of _____ votes in said primary election.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Democratic Executive Committee of _____,

- 1.* of the State of Louisiana that _____,
 having received a majority of the votes cast at the said primary election on January 20, 1948, be declared the nominee of the Democratic Party for the office of _____,

to be voted for in the general election to be held on the first Tuesday next following the third Monday in April, 1948, and that the Secretary of State be requested to place his name upon the official ballot in the manner provided by law.

- 2.* and that therefore no candidate received a majority of the votes cast for said office, a second primary shall be held on February 24, 1948, at the same places as the first primary election was held, at which the following candidates, being the two persons who received the highest number of votes for said office in said first primary shall be voted upon:
-
-

*1. If any one candidate received a majority of the votes cast in the first primary, use (1).

*2. If it is necessary to hold a second primary, use (2).

The above resolution having been put to a vote, the same was unanimously adopted. There being no further business before the Committee, upon motion duly seconded, it adjourned sine die.

Chairman.

Secretary.

If not necessary to hold second primary on account of withdrawal of candidates, use (1), and add at an appropriate place

" _____, the

person receiving the next highest number of votes having withdrawn," and change the words "majority" to read "highest number". If no second primary is necessary for any other reason, make appropriate changes and additions to the form.

The above form may be used, for the second primary, with necessary changes, by referring to the "returns of the second primary election held on February 24, 1948," changing January 20, 1948, where it appears to read "February 24, 1948," and using the first part of the resolution and the part (1).

APPENDIX E

FORM FOR CANVASSING RETURNS OF FIRST PRIMARY FOR DISTRICT,
PAROCHIAL, WARD AND MUNICIPAL OFFICERS⁵

_____, La., _____, 1948.

MINUTES of a meeting of the Democratic Executive Committee of the _____

The Democratic Executive Committee of the _____, of the State of Louisiana, met in accordance with law on this date at the above place. There were present in person the following members:

The following members were represented by proxies in due form, which have been filed with the records of this Committee:

The Chairman of the Committee stated that he had compiled the returns and placed before the Committee a tabulated statement showing the result of the primary election held January 20, 1948, which resulted as follows:

It was thereupon moved and duly seconded that the following resolution be adopted:

WHEREAS, this Committee having received from its Chairman the tabulated and compiled statement showing the result, and the original returns, of the Democratic Primary Election held

⁵Ibid., pp. 29-31.

throughout the _____

of Louisiana on January 20, 1948, for nomination of a Democratic candidate for the office of _____

to be voted for in the general election to be held April 20, 1948, and it appearing from the said returns that at said primary election the candidates received votes as follows:

and that therefore _____ received a majority of _____ votes in said primary election.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Democratic Executive Committee of _____,

- 1.* of the State of Louisiana that _____, having received a majority of the votes cast at the said primary election held on January 20, 1948, be declared the nominee of the Democratic Party for the office of

to be voted for in the general election to be held April 20, 1948, and that the Secretary of State be requested to place his name upon the official ballot in the manner provided by law.

and that therefore no candidate received a majority of the votes cast for said office, a second primary shall be held on February 24, 1948, at the same places as the first primary election was held, at which the following candidates, being the two persons who received the highest number of votes for said office in said first primary

2.* shall be voted upon:

*1. If any one candidate received a majority of the votes cast in the first primary, use (1).

*2. If it is necessary to hold a second primary, use (2).

The above resolution having been put to a vote, the same was unanimously adopted. There being no further business before the Committee, upon motion duly seconded, it adjourned sine die.

Chairman.

Secretary.

If not necessary to hold second primary on account of withdrawal of candidates, use (1), and add at an appropriate place

" _____, the

person receiving the next highest number of votes having withdrawn," and change the words "majority" to read "highest number". If no second primary is necessary for any other reason, make appropriate changes and additions to the form.

The above form may be used, for the second primary, with necessary changes, by referring to the "returns of the second primary election held on February 24, 1948," changing January 20, 1948, where it appears to read "February 24, 1948," and using the first part of the resolution and the part (1).

APPENDIX F

CANDIDATE'S FILING FORM TO BE USED FOR STATE OFFICES⁶

_____ Louisiana, _____ 1947.

To the Chairman of the
Democratic State Central Committee
of the State of Louisiana.

Sir:

I, _____, hereby notify
(Print Name Here)

you that I will be a candidate in the Democratic Primary Election to be held throughout the State of Louisiana on January 20th, 1948, for nomination as a candidate of the Democratic Party for the office of

(Name of Office)

of the State of Louisiana.

I declare that I am a duly qualified elector under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Louisiana; that I am a member of the Democratic Party calling said Primary Election and that I possess the qualifications fixed by the Democratic State Central Committee of the State of Louisiana.

I enclose cash _____ for the sum of \$ _____, this
certified check

being the deposit in the amount of \$ _____ required by the Primary Election Law of the State of Louisiana, the deposit in the amount of \$ _____ required by resolution of the Democratic State Central Committee.

Respectfully,

⁶Ibid., pp. 32-33.

 (Name)

 (Street Number)

 (Town)

State of Louisiana,

Parish of _____.

Before me, the undersigned legal authority, personally came and appeared

who, being by me first duly sworn, deposes and says that to the best of his knowledge and belief:

1. That he is a candidate in the Democratic Primary Election to be held in the State of Louisiana on January 20th, 1948, for the nomination as a candidate of the Democratic Party for the office of

of the State of Louisiana.

2. That he is a duly qualified elector under the Constitution and Laws of this State of the _____ Precinct of the _____ Ward of _____ Parish of the State of Louisiana.

3. That he possesses all of the qualifications of residence and all other qualifications required by the Democratic State Central Committee.

4. That he is a registered voter as required by the Constitution and Laws of the State of Louisiana.

5. That he is a member of the Democratic Party and is not associated with or an adherent of any organization, association or party opposed to the Democratic Party, or which teaches any doctrines inconsistent with those of the Democratic Party or inimical to the Constitution of the United States or of the State of Louisiana.

6. That he is a bona fide and not a dummy candidate for said office.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this _____
day of _____ 1947.

(Notary Public)

APPENDIX G

CANDIDATE'S FILING FORM TO BE USED FOR DISTRICT OFFICES⁷

_____ Louisiana, _____ 1947.

To the Chairman of the

Democratic Executive Committee of the _____
(Name of District)

Sir:

I, _____, hereby notify
(Print Name Here)

you that I will be a candidate in the Democratic Primary Election to be held in the _____ on January 20th, 1948, for nomination as candidate of the Democratic Party for the office of _____
(Name of Office)

_____ of the State of Louisiana.
(Name of District)

I declare that I am a duly qualified elector under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Louisiana; that I am a member of the Democratic Party calling said Primary Election and that I possess the qualifications fixed by the Democratic State Central Committee of the State of Louisiana.

I enclose _____ cash
_____ certified check for the sum of \$ _____, this

being the deposit in the amount of \$ _____ required by the Primary Election Law of the State of Louisiana, the deposit

in the amount of \$ _____ required by resolution of the Democratic State Central Committee and deposit in the amount of \$ _____ required by resolution of the Democratic

Executive Committee of the _____.
(Name of District)

Respectfully,

⁷Ibid., pp. 34-35.

(Name)

(Street Number)

(Town)

State of Louisiana,

Parish of _____.

Before me, the undersigned legal authority, personally came and appeared

who, being by me first duly sworn, deposes and says that to the best of his knowledge and belief:

1. That he is a candidate in the Democratic Primary Election to be held in the State of Louisiana on January 20th, 1948, for the nomination as a candidate of the Democratic Party for the office of

of _____ of the State of Louisiana.
(Name of District)

2. That he is a duly qualified elector under the Constitution and Laws of this State of the _____ Precinct of the _____ Ward of _____ Parish of the State of Louisiana.

3. That he possesses all of the qualifications of residence and all other qualifications required by the Democratic State Central Committee.

4. That he is a registered voter as required by the Constitution and Laws of the State of Louisiana.

5. That he is a member of the Democratic Party and is not associated with or an adherent of any organization, association or party opposed to the Democratic Party, or which teaches any doctrines inconsistent with those of the Democratic Party or inimical to the Constitution of the United States or of the State of Louisiana.

6. That he is a bona fide and not a dummy candidate for said office.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this _____
day of _____ 1947.

(Notary Public)

APPENDIX H

CANDIDATE'S FILING FORM TO BE USED FOR
PARISH AND WARD OFFICES⁸

_____ Louisiana, _____ 1947.

To the Chairman of the _____
Parish Democratic Executive Committee of the State of Louisiana.

Sir:

I, _____, hereby notify
(Print Name Here)

you that I will be a candidate in the Democratic Primary Election to be held in the State of Louisiana on January 20th, 1948, for the nomination as candidate of the Democratic Party for the office of

_____ of _____ Parish of the State of Louisiana.

I declare that I am a duly qualified elector under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Louisiana; that I am a member of the Democratic Party calling said Primary Election and that I possess the qualifications fixed by the Democratic State Central Committee of the State of Louisiana.

I enclose _____ cash
_____ certified check for the sum of \$ _____, this

being the deposit in the amount of \$ _____ required by the Primary Election Law of the State of Louisiana, the deposit

in the amount of \$ _____ required by resolution of the Democratic State Central Committee and deposit in the amount

of \$ _____ required by resolution of the _____ Parish Democratic Executive Committee.

Respectfully,

(Name)

(Street Number)

⁸ Ibid., pp. 36-37.

 (Town)

State of Louisiana,

Parish of _____.

Before me, the undersigned legal authority, personally came and appeared

who, being by me first duly sworn, deposes and says that to the best of his knowledge and belief:

1. That he is a candidate in the Democratic Primary Election to be held in the State of Louisiana on January 20th, 1948, for the nomination as a candidate of the Democratic Party for the office of

of _____ Parish of the State of Louisiana.

2. That he is a duly qualified elector under the Constitution and Laws of this State of the _____ Precinct of the _____ Ward of _____ Parish of the State of Louisiana.

3. That he possesses all of the qualifications of residence and all other qualifications required by the Democratic State Central Committee.

4. That he is a registered voter as required by the Constitution and Laws of the State of Louisiana.

5. That he is a member of the Democratic Party and is not associated with or an adherent of any organization, association or party opposed to the Democratic Party, or which teaches any doctrines inconsistent with those of the Democratic Party or inimical to the Constitution of the United States or of the State of Louisiana.

6. That he is a bona fide and not a dummy candidate for said office.

7. That his entrance fee or deposit, as prescribed by the authorities calling said primary, is, and has been paid out of his own personal, individual funds, and has not been furnished or provided by any other person, organization or faction, and that no promise, agreement or understanding exists between him and any other person, organization or faction, to refund or to return to him, in any event or at any

time, the fee so paid and deposited by him.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this _____
day of _____ 1947.

(Notary Public)

APPENDIX I

LOUISIANA GOVERNORS⁹

1812-16	W. C. C. Claiborne
1816-20	J. P. Villere
1820-22	T. B. Robertson
1822-24	H. S. Thibodaux (Acting)
1824-28	H. S. Johnson
1828-29	Pierre Derbigny
1829-30	Armand Beauvais (Acting)
1830-31	Jacques Dupre (Acting)
1831-35	A. B. Roman
1835-39	E. D. White
1839-43	A. B. Roman
1843-46	Alexander Mouton
1846-50	Isaac Johnson
1850-53	J. M. Walker
1853-56	P. O. Hebert
1856-60	R. C. Wickliffe
1860-64	T. O. Moore (Confederate Governor)
1862-64	C. F. Shepley (Military Governor)
1864-65	H. W. Allen (Confederate Governor)
1864-65	Michael Hahn (Union Governor)
1865-67	J. M. Wells
1867	B. F. Flanders

⁹This information supplied by Wade O. Martin, Jr., Secretary of State of Louisiana.

1868 Joshua Baker (January-July 13, 1868)
1868-72 H. C. Warmoth
1872-73 P. B. S. Pinchback
1873-77 W. P. Kellogg
1877 S. B. Packard
1877-80 F. T. Nicholls
1880-81 L. A. Wiltz
1881-88 S. D. McEnery
1888-92 F. T. Nicholls
1892-00 M. J. Foster
1900-04 W. W. Heard
1904-08 N. C. Blanchard
1908-12 J. V. Sanders
1912-16 L. E. Hall
1916-20 R. G. Pleasant
1920-24 J. M. Parker
1924-26 H. L. Fuqua
1926-28 O. H. Simpson
1928-31 H. P. Long
1931-32 A. O. King
1932-36 O. K. Allen
1936 J. A. Noe
1936-39 R. W. Leche
1939-40 E. K. Long
1940-44 S. H. Jones
1944-48 J. H. Davis
1948-52 E. K. Long

APPENDIX J

LOUISIANA CONSTITUTIONS SINCE STATEHOOD WITH A LIST OF
CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORIZATION ACTS¹⁰

- 1812--Convention of the Territory of Orleans called under an enabling act of Congress approved February, 1811. Constitution adopted January 22, 1812.
- 1845--Convention called under Act 64, 1844; met at Jackson for a few days, then reconvened in New Orleans January, 1845. Constitution adopted May 14, 1845.
- 1852--Act 73, 1852 called an election to decide on a new Constitutional Convention. Constitution adopted in July, 1852.
- 1861--Convention met in January, 1861 to pass secession ordinance and change wording of Constitution to make it conform to the new Confederate Government.
- 1864--Convention held under the auspices of Federal troops in New Orleans. Constitution adopted July 23, 1864.
- 1868--Convention called in 1867 under Congressional reconstruction acts. Constitution adopted March 7, 1868.
- 1879--Enabling Act 3, 1879. Constitution adopted in July, 1879.
- 1898--Enabling Act 52, 1896. Convention met in February, 1898. Constitution adopted May 12, 1898.
- 1913--Act 1, extra-Session of 1913. Constitution adopted November 3, 1913.
- 1921--Act 180, 1920. Constitution adopted July 18, 1921.
- 195?--By Act 52, 1946, the Louisiana State Law Institute was directed and authorized to prepare a draft of a new Constitution to be submitted to the State Legislature.

¹⁰This information supplied by Wade O. Martin, Jr., Secretary of State of Louisiana.

APPENDIX K

MEMBERS OF DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE ELECTED
AT PRIMARY OF JANUARY 20, 1948¹¹

ACADIA

Denis T. Canan, Crowley, La.
N. Smith Hoffpauir, Estherwood, La.

ALLEN

J. T. Christian, Sr., Kinder, La.

ASCENSION

C. Earl Dixon, Prairieville, La.

ASSUMPTION

Clarence J. Savoie, Belle Rose, La.

AVOYELLES

James H. Bordelon, Marksville, La.
James J. Villemarette, Marksville, La.

BEAUREGARD

H. M. Bennett, DeRidder, La.

BIENVILLE

Robert L. Williams, Arcadia, La.

BOSSIER

George E. Beckcom, Plain Dealing, La.

CADDO

John T. Carpenter, Shreveport, La.
N. B. Carstarphen, Shreveport, La.
Frank J. Looney, Shreveport, La.
Frank W. Middleton, Shreveport, La.

CALCASIEU

Darrell H. Blair, Lake Charles, La.
Athan Coe, Lake Charles, La.

CALDWELL

George Wear, Columbia, La.

CAMERON

L. R. Henry, Cameron, La.

CATAHOULA

Oscar R. Wurster, Jonesville, La.

¹¹This information supplied by Wade O. Martin, Jr., Secretary of State of Louisiana.

CLAIBORNE

Lamont Seals, Homer, La.

CONCORDIA

A. B. Hagle, Ferriday, La.

DESOTO

David B. Means, Jr., Gloster, La.

E. BATON ROUGE

Fred Blanche, Baton Rouge, La.

John Fred Odom, Baton Rouge, La.

EAST CARROLL

Thomas G. Biggs, Lake Providence, La.

EAST FELICIANA

Charles S. Kilbourne, Clinton, La.

EVANGELINE

J. Cleveland Fruge, Ville Platte, La.

FRANKLIN

D. J. Anders, Sr., Winnsboro, La.

GRANT

George A. Foster, Pollock, La.

IBERIA

P. Armand Viator, New Iberia, La.

IBERVILLE

Joseph J. LaPlace, Sr., St. Gabriel, La.

JACKSON

Lamoyn G. Jones, Jonesboro, La.

JEFFERSON

Frank J. Clancy, Kenner, La.

JEFFERSON DAVIS

P. B. Manouvrier, Jennings, La.

LAFAYETTE

J. Frank Ard, Lafayette, La.

Rufus C. Smith, Ridge, La.

LAFOURCHE

Leo J. Kerne, Thibodaux, La.

Leonard J. Toups, Thibodaux, La.

LASALLE

A. D. Flowers, Jena, La.

LINCOLN

L. M. Hinton, Ruston, La.

LIVINGSTON

P. R. Erwin, Watson, La.

MADISON

Henry G. Sevier, Tallulah, La.

MOREHOUSE

Edward L. Gladney, Jr., Bastrop, La.

NATCHITOCHE

H. Lester Hughes, Natchitoches, La.

Arthur G. Watson, Natchitoches, La.

ORLEANS

Ward 1

Edward A. Haggerty
1419 Constance St.

Ward 2

Edward Burke
1040 So. Genois

Ward 3

James Dempsey
617 So. Hennessey
George Van Kuren
4236 D'Hennecourt

Ward 4

Claude Mauberret, Sr.
4627 Iberville St.

Ward 5

Roger Simons
4301 Dumaine St.

Ward 6

Dudley Desmare
2637 Ursuline Ave.

Ward 7

Hamilton Camos
2318 Republic St.
Charles G. Hammer
1302 Frenchmen St.

Ward 8

Hugh W. Stewart
4441 Painters St.

Ward 9

Charles R. Morel
1919 Gallier St.

- Ward 10
James J. McIntyre
2318 Laurel St.
- Ward 11
Richard Burke
3103 Chippewa St.
Joseph D. Howell
2915 St. Thomas St.
- Ward 12
Louis A. Heyd, Sr.
716 Gen. Pershing
- Ward 13
Clyde F. Bel, Sr.
4518 Magazine St.
- Ward 14
Ambrose M. Smith
5925 Feret St.
- Ward 15
Joseph P. Skelly
217 Delaronde
- Ward 16
James L. Dilworth
917 So. Carrollton Ave.
- Ward 17
William G. Gravlin
8931 Olive St.

OUACHITA

- G. C. Bel, Jr., West Monroe, La.
S. L. Digby, Monroe, La.

PLAQUEMINES

- Leander H. Perez, Dalcour, La.

POINTE COUPEE

- Henry A. Rougon, Oscar, La.

RAPIDES

- C. F. Gravel, Jr., Alexandria, La.
Rollo C. Lawrence, Pineville, La.
Grove Stafford, Alexandria, La.

RED RIVER

- M. A. Conly, Coushatta, La.

RICHLAND

- T. J. Coenen, Jr., Rayville, La.

SABINE

L. B. Moffett, Many, La.

ST. BERNARD

Thomas W. Serpas, Arabi, La.

ST. CHARLES

Joseph H. Kadak, Boutte, La.

ST. HELENA

John Butler, Greensburg, La.

ST. JAMES

L. G. Peytavin, Gramercy, La.

ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Julius R. Fernandez, Wallace, La.

ST. LANDRY

Alex L. Andrus, Opelousas, La.
Lessley P. Gardiner, Opelousas, La.
Isom J. Guillory, Eunice, La.

ST. MARTIN

Wade O. Martin, Sr., St. Martinville, La.

ST. MARY

Wilbur P. Kramer, Franklin, La.
Leonard C. Wise, Morgan City, La.

ST. TAMMANY

Bryan D. Burns, Covington, La.

TANGIPAHOA

J. H. McClendon, Amite, La.
Joseph A. Sims, Hammond, La.

TENSAS

Clyde V. Ratcliff, Newellton, La.

TERREBONNE

William N. Fakier (Resigned), Houma, La.

UNION

Doyle Smith, Farmerville, La.

VERMILION

Dudley J. LeBlanc, Abbeville, La.

VERNON

W. E. Reid, Leesville, La.

WASHINGTON

H. H. Richardson, Bogalusa, La.

WEBSTER

J. Frank Colbert, Minden, La.

W. BATON ROUGE

Francis J. Whitehead, Port Allen, La.

WEST CARROLL

John R. McIntosh, Oak Grove, La.

WEST FELICIANA

D. I. Norwood, Bains, La.

WINN

Earl K. Long, Winnfield, La.

APPENDIX L

CHAIRMEN AND SECRETARIES OF PARISH EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES
OF LOUISIANA ELECTED AT PRIMARY OF JANUARY 20, 1948¹²

ACADIA

Chairman: J. A. Barousse, Crowley
Secretary: William A. Lyons, Crowley

ALLEN

Chairman: J. T. Christian, Kinder
Secretary: Villery Mouton, Oberlin

ASCENSION

Chairman: Louis L. LeBlanc, Donaldsonville
Acting Secretary: Frank S. Noel, Donaldsonville

ASSUMPTION

Chairman: Aubert L. Talbot, Napoleonville
Secretary: Clifton B. Dolese, Napoleonville

AVOYELLES

Chairman: Huron J. Ducote, Cottonport
Secretary: Esther deNux, Marksville

BEAUREGARD

Chairman: C. C. Davis, DeRidder
Secretary: W. E. Hall, Jr., DeRidder

BIENVILLE

Chairman: W. W. Poole, Bienville
Secretary: Ira J. McConathy, Arcadia

BOSSIER

Chairman: A. M. Wallace, Benton
Secretary: L. G. Campbell, Benton

CADDO

Chairman: N. B. Carstarphen, Shreveport
Secretary: J. H. Mayfield, Shreveport

CALCASIEU

Chairman: Mark D. Wintz, Lake Charles
Secretary: Lucius L. Moss, Lake Charles

CALDWELL

Chairman: A. J. Coates, Sr., Columbia
Secretary: A. J. Coates, Jr., Columbia

¹²This information supplied by Wade O. Martin, Jr., Secretary of State of Louisiana.

CAMERON

Chairman: Joe P. Rutherford, Creole
 Secretary: Lionel A. Theriot, Grand Chenier

CATAHOULA

Chairman: R. R. Reeves, Harrisonburg
 Secretary: Jesse C. McGee, Harrisonburg

CLAIBORNE

Chairman: T. H. McEachern, Homer
 Secretary: Harry McKenzie, Homer

CONCORDIA

Chairman: John Dale, Vidalia
 Secretary: J. D. Cross, Vidalia

DESOTO

Chairman: Green Rives, Mansfield
 Secretary: Frank S. Craig, Mansfield

EAST BATON ROUGE

Chairman: J. Russell Doiron, Baton Rouge
 Secretary: Winthrop A. Fife, Baton Rouge

EAST CARROLL

Chairman: T. G. Biggs, Lake Providence
 Secretary: Zell Stockner, Lake Providence

EAST FELICIANA

Chairman: Chas. S. Kilbourne, Clinton
 Secretary: H. H. Forrester, Clinton

EVANGELINE

Chairman: J. Cleveland Fruge, Ville Platte
 Secretary: Gilbert Aucoin, Ville Platte

FRANKLIN

Chairman: E. B. Moore, Winnsboro
 Secretary: J. R. Donnell, Winnsboro

GRANT

Chairman: T. Lee Dean, Montgomery
 Secretary: T. L. McNeely, Colfax

IBERIA

Chairman: Dalton L. Babineaux, New Iberia
 Secretary:

IBERVILLE

Chairman: C. Ory Dupont, Plaquemine
 Secretary: C. A. Griffon, Jr., Plaquemine

JACKSON

Chairman: Ansley H. Colvin, Jr., Jonesboro
 Secretary: A. H. Colvin, Sr., Jonesboro

JEFFERSON

Chairman: Frank J. Clancy, Kenner
 Secretary: Frank Langridge, Gretna

JEFFERSON DAVIS

Chairman: A. J. Bourgeois, Jennings
 Secretary: J. W. Pitre, Jennings

LAFAYETTE

Chairman: L. A. Bourgeois, Lafayette
 Secretary: Cyr Boudreaux, Lafayette

LAFOURCHE

Chairman: Alfred P. Richard, Thibodaux
 Secretary: Paul G. Aucoin, Jr., Thibodaux

LASALLE

Chairman: J. M. Henagan, Jena
 Secretary:

LINCOLN

Chairman: F. E. Phillips, Simmsboro
 Secretary: Ragan D. Madden, Ruston

LIVINGSTON

Chairman: E. P. Guitreau, Livingston
 Secretary: Josephine S. Slocum, Livingston

MADISON

Chairman: W. H. Hewes, Tallulah
 Secretary: Ira Baxter, Tallulah

MOREHOUSE

Chairman: Mack E. Barham, Bastrop
 Secretary: Joe Rolfe White, Bastrop

NATCHITOCHEs

Acting Chairman: D. Crawford Young, Campti
 Secretary: E. O. Payne, Natchitoches

ORLEANS

Chairman: Charles H. Erickson, Sr., N. O.
 Secretary: Andrew Bacon, N. O.

OUACHITA

Chairman: Burt W. Sperry, Monroe
 Secretary: Guy P. Stubbs, Monroe

PLAQUEMINES

Chairman: L. H. Perez, Dalcour
 Secretary: Rudolph H. McBride, Pointe-a-la-Hache

POINTE COUPEE

Chairman: F. E. Decuir, New Roads
 Secretary: A. K. Smith, New Roads

RAPIDES

Chairman: Lamar Polk, Alexandria
 Secretary: George M. Foote, Alexandria

RED RIVER

Chairman: O. P. Ogilvie, Coushatta
 Secretary: Fred Lee, Coushatta

RICHLAND

Chairman: H. A. Mangham, Rayville
 Secretary: E. G. Brown, Rayville

SABINE

Chairman: A. M. Skinner, Florien
 Secretary: Gasway German, Many

ST. BERNARD

Chairman: C. F. Rowley, Arabi
 Secretary: Anthony B. Nunez, Chalmette

ST. CHARLES

Chairman: Sidney J. Simoneaux, Allemands
 Secretary: L. M. Granier, Luling

ST. HELENA

Chairman: M. E. Easley, Liverpool
 Secretary: Chas. C. Reeves, Greensburg

ST. JAMES

Chairman: Lloyd R. Himel, Litcher
 Secretary: E. J. Roussel, Litcher

ST. JOHN

Chairman: P. D. Hebert, Wallace
 Secretary: A. L. Brou, Edgard

ST. LANDRY

Chairman: David Hollier, Opelousas
 Secretary: Alcee Dejean, Opelousas

ST. MARTIN

Chairman: E. L. Resweber, St. Martinville
 Secretary: E. L. Guidry, St. Martinville

ST. MARY

Chairman: E. J. Champagne, Franklin
 Secretary: F. D. Winshester, Franklin

ST. TAMMANY

Chairman: John Leveson, Abita Springs
 Secretary: Dewitt Williams, Madisonville

TANGIPAHOA

Chairman: Charles Sinagra, Independence
 Secretary: V. G. Anderson, Hammond

TENSAS

Chairman: P. B. Hoye, Waterproof
Secretary: V. C. Rives, St. Joseph

TERREBONNE

Chairman: J. Louis Watkins, Houma
Secretary: Harold Bodin, Houma

UNION

Chairman: K. D. Langford, Haile
Secretary: B. K. Watson, Marion

VERMILION

Chairman: Lexie J. Belaire, Abbeville
Secretary: R. J. Labauve, Abbeville

VERNON

Chairman: O. E. Morris, Leesville
Secretary: G. W. Bass, Rosepine

WASHINGTON

Chairman: W. R. Mitchell, Bogalusa
Secretary: Irma Lee LeBlanc, Bogalusa

WEBSTER

Chairman: M. H. Sandlin, Minden
Secretary: John T. Campbell, Minden

WEST BATON ROUGE

Chairman: J. Clay Cazes, Port Allen
Secretary: S. R. Templet, Port Allen

WEST CARROLL

Chairman: C. H. Koerner, Oak Grove
Secretary: Charles P. Vining, Oak Grove

WEST FELICIANA

Chairman: Jas. H. Kilbourne, St. Francisville
Secretary: F. B. Harelson, St. Francisville

WINN

Chairman: George P. Eagles, Sr., Winnfield
Secretary: E. E. Prince, Winnfield

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Allen, Robert S. (ed.). Our Sovereign State. New York: The Vanguard Press, Inc., 1949.
- Binkley, Wilfred E. American Political Parties, Their Natural History. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947.
- Bryce, James. The American Commonwealth. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1891.
- Carleton, R. L. Local Government and Administration in Louisiana. Baton Rouge: L. S. U. Press, 1935.
- Dallinger, Frederick W. Nominations for Elective Office in the United States. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1897.
- Ford, Henry J. The Rise and Growth of American Politics. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914.
- Kane, Harnett T. Louisiana Hayride. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1941.
- Key, V. O., Jr. Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1947.
- Key, V. O., Jr. Southern Politics in State and Nation. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949.
- Lindsey, Coleman. Elections in Louisiana. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Department of Education, 1940.
- Macy, Jessee. Party Organization and Machinery. New York: The Century Co., 1912.
- McKean, Dayton D. Party and Pressure Politics. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1949.
- Merriam, C. E. The American Party System. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1922.
- Merriam, C. E., and Gosnell, H. F. The American Party System. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949.
- Odegard, Peter H., and Helms, E. Allen. A Study in Political Dynamics. 2d ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.
- Ostrogorski, M. Democracy and the Party System in the United States. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921.

- Powell, Alden L. A Primer on Government in Louisiana. Baton Rouge: L. S. U. Press, 1946.
- Robinson, Edgar E. The Evolution of American Political Parties. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914.
- Sait, Edward M. American Parties and Elections. Edited by Howard R. Penniman. New York: Appelton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1948.
- Whitwell, Charles G. A Manual of Louisiana Government. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown, Co., 1949.
- Woodburn, James A. Political Parties and Party Problems in the United States. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924.
- Zink, Harold. Government and Politics in the United States. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947.

LETTERS

- Letter from Mr. Val C. Mogensen, Executive Director, Louisiana Bureau of Governmental Research, October 17, 1949.
- Letter from Mr. Scallan E. Walsh, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer of the Louisiana State Democratic Central Committee, November 17, 1949.
- Letter from Mr. Scallan E. Walsh, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer of the Louisiana State Democratic Central Committee, July 14, 1950.

NEWSPAPERS

- The Daily Oklahoman, June 13, 1950.
- The New York Times, November 13, 1929, p. 30.
- The New York Times, June 23, 1930, p. 2.
- The New York Times, July 6, 1930, III, p. 8.
- The New York Times, June 5, 1931, p. 2.
- The New York Times, March 22, 1931, p. 6.
- The New York Times, March 26, 1931, p. 13.
- The New York Times, February 2, 1932, p. 24.
- The New York Times, June 22, 1932, p. 8.
- The New York Times, June 28, 1932, p. 12.

- The New York Times, June 29, 1932, p. 14.
- The New York Times, September 11, 1932, II, p. 6.
- The New York Times, February 9, 1933, p. 23.
- The New York Times, February 11, 1933, p. 6.
- The New York Times, December 1, 1933, p. 5.
- The New York Times, December 2, 1933, p. 3.
- The New York Times, December 4, 1933, p. 7.
- The New York Times, December 5, 1933, p. 9.
- The New York Times, December 6, 1933, p. 45.
- The New York Times, December 7, 1933, p. 24.
- The New York Times, December 17, 1933, p. 32.
- The New York Times, December 20, 1933, p. 17.
- The New York Times, January 3, 1934, p. 8.
- The New York Times, January 21, 1934, p. 18.
- The New York Times, January 30, 1934, p. 3.
- The New York Times, March 19, 1934, p. 4.
- The New York Times, May 3, 1934, p. 6.
- The New York Times, August 20, 1934, p. 1.
- The New York Times, September 3, 1934, p. 20.
- The New York Times, September 9, 1934, p. 33.
- The New York Times, September 16, 1934, p. 3.
- The New York Times, November 16, 1934, p. 6.
- The New York Times, January 10, 1935, p. 1.
- The New York Times, February 27, 1935, p. 7.
- The New York Times, April 16, 1935, p. 12.
- The New York Times, April 20, 1935, p. 2.
- The New York Times, April 21, 1935, IV, p. 6.
- The New York Times, September 19, 1935, p. 2.

- The New York Times, October 2, 1935, p. 16.
- The New York Times, October 24, 1935, p. 2.
- The New York Times, November 5, 1935, p. 29.
- The New York Times, November 8, 1935, p. 2.
- The New York Times, January 4, 1936, p. 8.
- The New York Times, February 1, 1936, p. 1.
- The New York Times, February 2, 1936, IV, p. 8.
- The New York Times, June 21, 1936, p. 28.
- The New York Times, February 6, 1937, p. 2.
- The New York Times, March 23, 1937, p. 18.
- The New York Times, July 31, 1938, p. 3.
- The New York Times, September 23, 1939, p. 36.
- The New York Times, June 6, 1940, p. 18.
- The New York Times, February 18, 1940, IV, p. 10.
- The New York Times, July 21, 1940, p. 2.
- The New York Times, October 15, 1942, p. 19.
- The New York Times, October 21, 1942, p. 20.
- The New York Times, September 11, 1942, p. 1.
- The New York Times, September 12, 1942, p. 37.
- The New York Times, February 26, 1949, p. 17.
- The New York Times, August 14, 1949, p. 32.

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

Constitutions

- Constitution of Louisiana, 1921.
- Constitution of the United States.

Court Cases

- Ex parte Virginia, 100 U. S. 303 (1879).

- Ex parte Yarbrough, 110 U. S. 651 (1884).
- Giles v. Harris, 189 U. S. 475 (1902).
- Grove v. Townsend, 295 U. S. 45 (1934).
- Guinn v. United States, 238 U. S. 347 (1915).
- Lane v. Wilson, 307 U. S. 268 (1939).
- Newberry v. United States, 256 U. S. 232 (1921).
- Nixon v. Condon, 286 U. S. 73 (1932).
- Nixon v. Herndon, 273 U. S. 536 (1927).
- Rice v. Elmore, 165 F. 2d 387 (1947), 68 S. Ct. 905 (1948).
- Smith v. Allwright, 321 U. S. 649 (1944).
- Strauder v. West Virginia, 100 U. S. 303 (1879).
- United States v. Classic, 313 U. S. 299 (1941).
- Williams v. Mississippi, 170 U. S. 213 (1898).

Pamphlets

- Information Relative to Democratic Primary Election to be Held January 20, 1948. Baton Rouge: Department of State.

Statutes

- Statutes of Louisiana, 1922. Baton Rouge: Department of State, 1922.
- Statutes of Louisiana, 1926. Baton Rouge: Department of State, 1926.
- Statutes of Louisiana, 1940. Baton Rouge: Department of State, 1940.
- Statutes of Louisiana, 1942. Baton Rouge: Department of State, 1942.
- Statutes of Louisiana, 1944. Baton Rouge: Department of State, 1944.
- Statutes of Louisiana, 1946. Baton Rouge: Department of State, 1946.
- Statutes of Louisiana, 1948. Baton Rouge: Department of State, 1948.

PERIODICALS

"Long and the Dixiecrats," Newsweek, XXXII (October 4, 1948).

Macmahon, Arthur W. "Political Parties," Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. Edited by Edwin R. A. Seligman. Vol XI, 1933.

Merriam, C. E. "State Central Committees," Political Science Quarterly, XIX (June, 1904).

Velie, Lester. "Kingfish of the Dixiecrats," Collier's, CXXIV, no. 24 (December 17, 1949).

Velie, Lester. "Democracy in the Deep Delta," Collier's, CXXIV, no. 26 (December 24, 1949).

ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY

The development and growth of party committees has been a rather lengthy and elaborate process. To know something of committees such as those that have been the center of attention here, one must examine the social precursors of those committees. This I have attempted to do only on a broad and general scale. An attempt to indulge in the ramifications of this subject would have produced a paper of great length and weight, but of little value. Limited probings did seem to indicate, however, that party committees in the United States developed as a natural outgrowth of a political system that had been evolving for centuries. That the actual development came as it did seems only natural when we consider that our society was early pregnant with the seeds of revolution and reform. Likewise, it seems well to note that the great mainstream of history is replete with examples that drive into any thinking person the conclusions that a society growing more complex requires more complex political forms to manage it.

If human beings had no faults, we would have little use for government. Unfortunately, they do. This was true during the time that state central committees in the United states were regulated only by agreement or casual party regulation. The record seems to indicate that a misuse of such loose control was the cause for regulation of the committees by the state legislatures of the various states. There is considerable evidence to warrant the conclusion that the advent of the so-called "Progressive Era" in United States politics has toned this

process. At any rate, it is known that New York led the way in regulating state committees and that Louisiana was the last to do so.

Generally, it may be concluded that the prestige, power and influence of a state central committee is directly proportional to the independence of its members. This criterion would not leave the Democratic State Central Committee of Louisiana in a very enviable position, to say the least.

Another characteristic that is readily accessible to the more than casual reader of political affairs is the fact that these committees generally tend to be more oligarchical as they become larger. In other words, increased membership has generally meant that fewer persons share in the actual management of party affairs. Louisiana's committee seems to be too large.

As has been noted, regulation came late to Louisiana's committee. To paraphrase a cliché, though, the regulation that was last in arriving, turned out to be far from least in potency.

It appears that the historically brief existence of the Louisiana committee has seen few markedly different changes. The changes that have occurred have been primarily evolutionary and of little fundamental importance.

In Louisiana the state central committee is more important than in some other states, first of all, because of the fact that the state lies in what has often been termed "the one-party South." A committee designed to deal with primaries naturally has more effect when there is no general election to dispute its regulations.

Louisiana has a series of party committees representing several different spheres of governmental authority; the state central committee stands at the apex of this hierarchy,

In general, the membership, length of service and functions of Louisiana's party committees are approximate to those of other states viewed from what might be termed a nebulous "average."

Finally, from this study, it seems safe to conclude that Louisiana's State Central Democratic Committee has been subject to considerable suggestion from external sources. Particularly has this been true insofar as the relationship of the committee and the governor are concerned.

THESIS TITLE: A STUDY OF STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEES WITH
PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON THE LOUISIANA
DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

NAME OF AUTHOR: TED H. ROBERTS

THESIS ADVISER: R. R. OGLESBY

The content and form have been checked and approved by the author and thesis adviser. "Instructions for Typing and Arranging the Thesis" are available in the Graduate School office. Changes or corrections in the thesis are not made by the Graduate School office or by any committee. The copies are sent to the bindery just as they are approved by the author and faculty adviser.

NAME OF TYPIST: MRS. ROBERT W. JACOB