

Introduction: The Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics

Branwell D. Kapeluck, Robert P. Steed, and Laurence W. Moreland, Editors

This issue of *The American Review of Politics* consists of six articles originally presented at the 2004 Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics, held in Charleston every two years since 1978. The two-day meeting attracted 79 paper presenters and discussants, and the program included over 40 paper presentations, grouped into thirteen panels. While the overriding theme of the conference was southern politics, the topics were quite diverse. Subjects included redistricting, political culture and religion, race and partisanship, the Confederate Flag and symbolic politics, state legislative behavior, southern representation in Congress, historical surveys of southern politics, demographic evolution of the region and public policy in the South.

In addition to paper presentations, the symposium hosted two special roundtables. One was devoted to a discussion with David Woodard and Earl Black, authors of recent works analyzing political change in the South. The second roundtable focused on the 2004 elections and the role of the South with particular emphasis on the importance of having a southern vice-presidential nominee. This year's keynote speaker was Charles S. Bullock III, the Richard B. Russell Professor of Political Science at the University of Georgia. Bullock, a long time student of redistricting, spoke on the interplay of race and electoral politics in the redrawing of state legislative districts.

Past issues of *The American Review of Politics* dedicated to publication of symposium papers have, on occasion, followed a thematic approach. However, the wide variety of topics addressed during this year's symposium and the quality of the papers presented made developing a theme for this edition difficult. However, of the six papers included here, the first four do deal with interesting changes in southern culture and partisan institutions. The region's steady political transformation over the past several decades and the importance of the region in national-level politics make this an enduring subject. The remaining two papers, each of which employ data with a southern context, are certain to be of interest to political scientists outside the southern politics subfield. The six papers included in this special issue

BRANWELL D. KAPELUCK is an assistant professor of political science at The Citadel. ROBERT P. STEED is professor of political science at The Citadel. LAURENCE W. MORELAND is professor of political science at The Citadel.

The American Review of Politics, Vol. 25, Spring, 2004: 1-3
©2004 The American Review of Politics

were selected and lightly edited by the three codirectors of the 2004 Citadel Symposium.

In the first article, “Civil Rights, Culture Wars, Voting and the Downfall of the Democratic Party in the South,” James L. Baumgardner provides a broad longitudinal overview of the historical and cultural bases for Democratic success and failure in the South. Baumgardner argues that while initially the white flight from the Democratic Party was race-based, contemporary white opposition to the party no longer must resort to such base appeals. Drawing evidence from the rhetoric of fundamentalist Christian organizations (e.g., Southern Baptist Convention), he illustrates how support for the Republican Party may now be justified for moral reasons, thus immunizing white Southern Republicans from charges of racism.

Christopher A. Cooper and H. Gibbs Knotts, in “Defining Dixie: A State-Level Measure of the Modern Political South,” observe that the question of what states are southern and which are not is still a matter of debate. Typically understood as the eleven states of the Confederacy, some studies have included Kentucky and Oklahoma. The U.S. census adds a number of other border states. What makes a state southern? Cooper and Knotts ask whether the South is truly a distinct region. Rather than assume that the South is different, Cooper and Knotts employ a series of partisan, ideological, and demographic measures to tap into any underlying differences between southern and nonsouthern states. Their analysis suggests that conventional classifications of the South should be reevaluated.

In the third article, “The Structure of Party Competition in the South: The Case of Florida,” Jonathan Knuckey utilizes county-level data to discern whether the voting structure in Florida is better characterized as dealignment or realignment. The increasing competitiveness of Florida at the national level coupled with Republican dominance at the local level has led many to argue that partisanship has become less of a factor in voting. Knuckey is particularly interested in identifying whether there is an identifiable structure that prevails in elections at different levels. Using factor analysis, he provides evidence suggesting that the structure of partisanship among Florida voters may best be described as realignment. This article adds another piece to the puzzle of the shape of the ongoing partisan change in the South.

The last article dealing with southern culture and partisanship is “Race and the Ideological Transformation of the Democratic Party: Evidence from the Bayou State,” by M.V. Hood III. Hood is concerned with changes in the ideological cast of the Democratic Party in the South since the Civil Rights Era. In particular, he questions the common belief that the increasing liberalization of the southern Democratic Party is due to the influx of black voters following the Voting Rights Act of 1965. An alternate but not opposing hypothesis is that this liberalization is due to conservative whites abandoning

the party. His primary goal in this article is to provide a quantifiable measure of how far the southern Democratic Party has moved to the left and to identify any racial linkages in this liberal shift.

The fifth article, “Is it Better to Join the Majority? The Electoral Effects of Party Switching by Incumbent Southern State Legislators, 1972 to 2000,” is a detailed investigation of the fortunes of officeholders who are party switchers. This topic has received a great deal of attention recently, and Christian R. Grose’s sizable sample of southern state legislative elections yields a broad test of party switching models. Grose concentrates on the short-term and long-term costs associated with defection. Moreover, his analysis of the interplay of switching to the majority party within the state legislative chamber advances current theoretical understanding of party switching. Finally, Grose’s findings raise important questions regarding whether realignment is elite-driven or finds its origins among the electorate.

The last paper asks whether southern Jews differ ideologically from their nonsouthern counterparts. Kenneth D. Wald and Ted G. Jelen, in “Religion and Political Socialization in Context: A Regional Comparison of the Political Attitudes of American Jews,” test two hypotheses against one another. First, is liberalism (defined as a concern for social justice) something inherent in the Jewish religion? Or, do Jews simply reflect the political culture in which they find themselves? Analysis of southern Jews is almost nonexistent, which is not surprising since they are only one percent of the South’s population. However, Wald and Jelen make the case that this minority status helps in understanding the interaction of political culture and outsider status.

We believe each of these six articles provides a unique perspective on the politics and culture of the South. Together, they present a broad spectrum of southern politics research and remind us of the distinctiveness of the region.

