

Program on Southern
Politics, Media and
Public Life

School of Journalism
and Mass
Communication

The University
of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill

JUNE 2001 • NUMBER 1

Thad Beyle
Editor & Associate Director
beyle@email.unc.edu

Ryan Thornburg
Managing Editor & Assistant Director
thornburg@unc.edu

Ferrel Guillory
Publisher & Director
guillory@unc.edu

SouthNow is a semi-annual publica-
tion of the Program on Southern
Politics, Media and Public Life in
the School of Journalism and Mass
Communication at The University
of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

To receive an electronic version
of future issues, send your name
and e-mail address to
SouthNow@unc.edu.

To subscribe to a printed version,
call (919) 843-8174 or e-mail
SouthNow@unc.edu.

In This Issue

- 1 White Males Key for Bush
- 2 Fla., Ga. Lead U.S. in Election
Law Changes
- 3 Presidential Voter Turnout
- 4 Changes to the Electoral
College Wouldn't Have Helped
Gore in the South
- 6 Clinton Approval Ratings
Matched Presidential
Battleground States
- 7 Index of State Economic
Momentum
- 8 Gubernatorial Approval
Ratings
- 9 Costs of Va. Gubernatorial
Races
- 10 State Power Splits
- 11 Presidential Odds

SOUTH NOW

White Males Key to Bush's Southern Sweep

FERREL GUILLORY, Director

Nothing explains George W. Bush's sweep of the South's electoral votes more than his super-majority among white men in the region.

According to the Voter News Service exit poll, the Republican president out-pollied Democratic candidate Al Gore by a 70 percent to 27 percent margin among white males who voted in Southern states in the November election.

It has been a rule of thumb in presidential politics that a Republican presidential candidate needs at least 60 percent of the white male vote nationally to win. Bush, in fact, just hit 60 percent, according to the national exit poll. Thus, his showing in the South put him a full 10 percentage points above his national showing among white men.

An analysis of white male voters in the exit poll of the Southern region shows that Bush scored strong margins among younger men, among men who have gone to college and among voters in the \$50,000-to-\$70,000 income range as well as among the wealthiest of white men.

Gore kept Bush's vote below 70 percent among white men over the age of 60 and among those who earn less than \$30,000 a year.

Here are a few notable results from the 2000 presidential exit poll of Southern voters:

* Black voters represented a substantially larger share of the Southern electorate than of the national electorate – 17 percent in the South, 10

percent in the U.S. Gore got nine out of 10 votes of blacks in both the region and the nation.

* Two-thirds of the South's voters said that they were married, and Bush out-ran Gore among these voters 60-39 percent. The Democratic candidate led among the one-third of voters who are unmarried by 52-45 percent.

* Forty-six percent of Southern voters told the exit poll takers that they attend religious services one

or more times a week (42 percent nationally). Six out of 10 regular church-goers voted for Bush. Of Southern white voters, 17 percent described themselves as adherents to the movement known as the religious right, and Bush out-pollied Gore among them by an 82-17 percent margin.

* Though Bush's sweep put all the South's electoral votes in the Republican column, neither major political party has a majority in the way voters identify themselves in partisan terms. Four in 10 Southern voters identify themselves as Democrats, and about four in 10 as Republicans, with more than one in five calling themselves independents. Gore won a huge majority among Democrats, and Bush won an even more whopping majority among Republicans. Bush won a greater share of Democrats

than Gore won of Republicans. Moreover, independents went for Bush over Gore by a 59-36 percent margin.

* The electorate – meaning those citizens who turned out to vote — had a greater share of college-educated voters than the adult population as a whole. About four out of 10 voters told the exit

SEE EXIT POLL ON PAGE 9 →

White Male Southern Voters

	GORE %	BUSH %
BY AGE		
18-29	20	74
30-44	24	73
45-59	27	71
60+	35	64
BY INCOME		
< \$15,000	42	57
\$15-30,000	33	64
\$30-50,000	26	70
\$50-75,000	21	76
\$75-100,000	26	72
\$100,000+	23	77
BY EDUCATION		
NO HS	49	49
HS GRAD	28	71
SOME COL	22	74
COL GRAD	20	77
POST GRAD	25	71

Editor's Note: Results were drawn from the VNS exit poll of presidential voters in the South. A computer analysis isolated white male voters by a age, income and education. Subsample: 1,431 respondents.

Fl., Ga. Lead in Election Law Changes

RYAN THORNBURG, Assistant Director

Following the disputed 2000 presidential election, more than 1,500 election reform bills – not including campaign finance and ballot initiative measures – have been introduced in the 50 state legislatures. If there is any doubt about the impetus for this legislative interest, look no further than the title of Tennessee's HB155 – "The 2000 Presidential Election Debacle Reform Bill of 2001."

sticking point as states consider if and how to upgrade and standardize their voting systems is determining whether local governments, the state, or the federal government should pay for it.

Disputed Elections (9 states) — There was much confusion in Florida about just how a disputed election should be handled.

Which ballots should be counted? Who would finally certify the results? Florida and Virginia are the only Southern states to have passed a law clarifying their procedures. Texas is considering a bill that would allow the governor to call a special legislative session to declare presidential electors if the dispute could not be resolved.

Electoral College (8 states) — The nation focused its attention on Florida and the 25 electoral votes it carried. Several states are considering whether to eliminate the ability of a candidate to win all of a state's electoral votes simply by coming out one vote ahead in the popular vote. They would do this by copying Maine and Nebraska, states that allocate most of their electoral votes by congressional district. However, such measures appear to be losing traction. A successful Virginia bill reaffirmed the commonwealth's commitment to the Electoral College as it now exists. Virginia lawmakers passed another measure that is being considered in several states that would reduce the freedom of presidential electors, despite the questionable constitutionality of such laws.

Election Officials (7 states) — These might be called Katherine's Laws, after Florida Secretary of State Katherine Harris, who upset many Democrats by her partisan support of Republican George W. Bush. These laws aim to clarify how involved state and local election officials can be in political campaigns.

Felons (7 states) — Although a tangential issue in the Florida outcome, African-American political leaders have parlayed their allegations of black disenfranchisement in Florida into a crusade to restore voting rights to felons who have served their sentences. SEE **ELECTION LAWS** ON PAGE 7 →

Soon after the election there was much talk in Congress and in the state capitals about changing election laws to prevent the confusion that happened in Florida. By mid-May, Florida and Georgia were the only two states in the nation to pass sweeping changes to their election laws.

In the South, Florida, Mississippi, Texas and Virginia all have more than 50 election law bills before the legislature. However, the bills are meeting with mixed success. In Mississippi, the legislature passed only four of the 67 bills it considered. Virginia, on the other hand, passed 36 of its 84 bills. In states where the legislatures are still in session, most election bills are still pending.

Of the areas of election law brought to light during the Florida ballot counting, outdated voting systems and the rules governing disputed votes are the most common plans before Southern legislatures.

Voting Systems (9 states) — People will forever remember the 2000 election by their memories of county officials holding ballots up to the light to look for hanging chads. Virginia passed a law clarifying which chads should be counted. A similar measure is being considered in Tennessee. A common

Status of Election Reform Bills in Southern States

	DISPUTES	VOTING SYSTEMS	ELECTORAL COLLEGE	ELECTION OFFICIALS	FELONS	EARLY CALLS	BALLOT DESIGN	INTERNET/MAIL
AL	-	-	P	P	P	-	F	P
AR	-	-	-	-	E*	-	-	-
FL	P	P	-	P	P	-	P	-
GA	F	E	-	P	E*	F	P	-
KY	F	F	-	-	E	F	F	-
LA	-	-	-	P	-	P	-	-
MS	F	F	-	F	F	F	F	-
NC	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	-
OK	-	-	P	P	-	-	-	-
SC	P	-	P	-	P	-	-	-
TN	P	P	P	P	-	P	-	P
TX	P	P	P	-	-	-	-	-
VA	E	E	E/F**	-	F	F	-	F

KEY — p = approve; exg = excellent, good; expg = excellent, pretty good; g = good. P=pending, E=enacted, V=vetoed, F=failed; * - Measures would restrict, rather than ease, felons' ability to vote.; **-Enacted a measure binding presidential electors. Failed a bill to change electoral college vote.

Presidential Voter Turnout in Southern States, 1960-2000

THAD BEYLE, Thomas J. Pearsall Professor of Political Science, UNC-Chapel Hill & FERREL GUILLORY, Director

In the four decades since John F. Kennedy was elected president, national voter turnout has dropped by nearly 15 percentage points. But voter turnout in the South has increased by slightly more than four percentage points in the period from 1960 to 2000.

The difference between the South and the nation has narrowed from more than 21 percentage points in 1960 to only a 2.4-percentage point gap in 2000. The gap began closing in the 1960s, and it continued to narrow into the 1980s, with a leveling off over the last three presidential elections.

Within the South, the gap between states with the highest and lowest turnout rates has also closed. There was a spread of 40 percentage points in 1960 between West Virginia and Mississippi. The turnout spread has leveled off to about 8 percentage points in the last two presidential elections – in both, Louisiana had the highest turnout rate, Texas the lowest.

In this article and the accompanying charts, the turnout rate is presented in terms of voters who cast ballots as a percentage of the voting-age population (VAP). Such a calculation allows for more uniformity of measurement across the years and among the states than the number of actual voters as a percentage of registered voters.

Significant change in the South's pool of potential voters and turnout rates resulted from major developments in federal law. In 1965, Congress passed the Voting Rights Act, which opened the curtains of the voting booths to black citizens. In the five months following its enactment, black registration shot up 40 percent in the five-state region of

Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina. In addition, the adoption in 1971 of the 26th Amendment to the Constitution reduced the minimum voting age from 21 to 18.

dential-election years but rather in odd-numbered years.

In comparison to the 1996 election, voter turnout rose in most Southern states in the 2000 presidential election. But the region as

Southern Voter Turnout Summary

	1960	1964	1968	1972	1976	1980	1984	1988	1992	1996	2000
U.S.	66.1	61.9	60.8	55.2	53.6	52.6	53.1	50.1	55.1	49.1	51.2
SOUTH	44.7	48.8	53.5	46.2	47.9	48.2	49.2	45.8	52.3	46.6	48.8
DIFF.	-21.4	-13.1	-7.3	-9.0	-5.7	-4.4	-3.9	-4.3	-2.8	-2.5	-2.4
HIGH	77.9	75.5	71.1	62.5	57.2	53.1	54.6	51.3	59.8	57.0	54.2
LOW	25.3	33.9	43.9	37.3	40.3	40.4	40.7	38.9	45.0	41.3	43.2
SPREAD	40.8	28.0	16.9	17.9	13.3	12.2	12.4	11.2	10.1	7.8	8.0

KEY —
 SS avg. = average for the 14 Southern States listed in the table below.
 Diff. = difference from the Total U.S. turnout percent and the SS avg.
 High = the highest turnout rate among the 14 Southern states
 Low = the lowest turnout rate among the 14 Southern states
 Spread = the point spread between the highest and lowest turnout rates among the 14 Southern states.

The voting rights law contributed to the rise in turnout rates that had been exceptionally low in deep South states in the 1960s and before. The lowering of the voting age, however, has not resulted in higher turnout rates in the South or the nation – typically young adults vote as a significantly lower rate than adults 30 years of age and older.

Within the South, some interesting shifts have taken place. West Virginia, long one of the leaders in voter turnout, began to slide down in the mid-1980s and is now among the lowest in turnout. Louisiana, long seen in the middle of Southern states in terms of voter turnout, has become the Southern state with the highest presidential turnout rates since 1980. This has happened even though Louisiana does not elect its governor in presi-

a whole continued to fall below the nation in its voter participation rate.

Nationally, 51.2 percent of Americans of voting age cast a presidential-election ballot last November. Only three Southern states: Louisiana (54.2 percent), Virginia (52 percent) and Kentucky (51.6 percent) exceeded U.S. turnout.

Eleven states in the South had voter turnout below the national rate, calculated as a percentage of the voting age population.

Still, voter turnout in most states in the region was higher in 2000 than in 1996. Florida, where the struggle for the presidency dragged on beyond election day and was

SEE **TURNOUT** ON PAGE 10 →

Voter Turnout Percentages in Each Southern State, 1960-2000

1960	1964	1968	1972	1976	1980	1984	1988	1992	1996	2000
WV-77.9	WV-75.5	WV-71.1	WV-62.5	WV-57.2	LA-53.1	LA-54.6	LA-51.3	LA-59.8	LA-57	LA-54.2
OK-63.1	OK-63.4	OK-61.2	OK-56.7	OK-54.9	WV-52.7	U.S.-53.1	U.S.-50.1	OK-59.7	OK-49.7	VA-52
U.S.-66.1	U.S.-61.9	U.S.-60.8	U.S.-55.2	U.S.-53.6	U.S.-52.6	MS-52.2	MS-49.9	AL-55.3	U.S.-49.1	KY-51.6
KY-57.7	KY-53.3	LA-54.8	FL-48.6	AR-51.1	OK-52.1	OK-52.2	OK-48.7	U.S.-55.1	GA-48	U.S.-51.2
NC-52.9	NC-52.3	NC-54.4	AR-48.1	FL-49.2	MS-51.8	AR-51.8	KY-48.2	KY-53.7	AL-47.7	FL-50.7
TN-49.9	TN-51.7	AR-54.2	KY-48	LA-48.7	AR-51.5	WV-51.7	VA-48.2	AR-53.6	NC-47.6	NC-50.3
FL-48.6	FL-51.2	TN-53.7	TX-45	TN-48.7	KY-49.9	KY-50.8	AR-47.3	MS-52.8	KY-47.4	AL-49.9
LA-44.6	AR-50.6	MS-53.3	VA-44.7	KY-48	AL-48.7	VA-50.7	WV-46.7	VA-52.8	VA-47.4	TN-49.2
TX-41.2	LA-47.3	FL-53.1	MS-44.2	MS-48	FL-48.7	AL-49.9	AL-45.8	TN-52.4	AR-47.2	OK-48.8
AR-40.9	TX-44.6	AL-52.7	LA-44	VA-47	TN-48.7	TN-49.1	NC-44.6	FL-51	TN-46.9	MS-48.6
VA-32.8	GA-43.3	KY-51.2	TN-43.5	AL-46.3	VA-47.5	FL-48.3	FL-44.7	NC-50.4	MS-45.4	AR-47.8
AL-30.8	VA-41.1	VA-50.1	AR-43.3	TX-46.3	TX-44.8	NC-47.4	TN-44.5	WV-50.1	WV-44.9	SC-46.5
SC-30.4	SC-39.4	TX-48.7	NC-42.9	NC-43.2	NC-43.9	TX-47.2	TX-44.2	TX-49.1	FL-42.4	WV-45.8
GA-29.3	AL-35.6	SC-46.7	SC-38.3	GA-42	GA-41.3	GA-42.1	GA-39.4	GA-46.2	SC-41.6	GA-44
MS-25.3	MS-33.9	GA-43.9	GA-37.3	SC-40.3	SC-40.4	SC-40.7	SC-38.9	SC-45	TX-41.3	TX-43.2

If Electoral College Changed, South Would Still Be Solid

Bush Won 24 Democratic Congressional Districts

THAD BEYLE, Thomas J. Pearsall Professor of Political Science, UNC-Chapel Hill

As of May 1, twenty-seven state legislatures have seen bills introduced having to do with the way we select our presidents — through the Electoral College [EC] voting system. These bills were stimulated by the 2000 presidential election and in most part the situation in Florida over that state's EC votes.

Eleven states have been considering legislation that would bind the vote of the individual EC electors and not allow them to make their own decisions. Only Virginia's bill "requiring" electors to vote as the general election vote indicated they should has passed. Three other states have defeated such legislation — Arizona, Idaho, West Virginia.

Two states defeated legislation that would change the existing statewide "winner take all" rule to a proportional rule where the EC votes would be in direct proportion to the statewide popular vote. Such a change is still pending in Alabama but has been defeated in Washington and West Virginia. Vermont is working on a formula approach to determine how its EC votes are determined, which is too complex to discuss here.

Twenty-four state legislatures have been considering the District System approach already being used in Maine and Nebraska. Under our current EC voting system, each state gets the number of EC votes equivalent to their Congressional representation — two votes for their two U.S. senators and one vote for each of their members of the U.S. House of Representatives. So, whoever wins the statewide popular vote gets all of the state's EC votes — except in Maine and Nebraska.

Maine and Nebraska changed this to have only two of the EC votes determined by the statewide vote — those tied to their U.S. senators. The remaining EC votes are determined by which presidential candidate wins the vote in each congressional district. Interestingly, there is a bill pending in the Nebraska unicameral legislature calling for the abolition of the District System and a return to the statewide "winner-take-all" system.

Of the five states addressing the very existence of the EC, three passed legislation in support of keeping it — Idaho, South Dakota, Virginia — while the legislation is still pending in Vermont. Only Connecticut has a resolution pending to ask Congress to take steps to abolish it.

2000 Congressional and Presidential Wins, by District

	NATIONAL		SOUTH	
	#	%	#	%
SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL WINS				
REPUBLICAN MEMBERS	221	50.8	82	58.6
DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS	212	48.7	57	40.7
INDEPENDENT MEMBERS	2	0.5	1	0.7
SUMMARY OF PRESIDENTIAL WINS				
BUSH DISTRICTS	228	52.4	102	72.9
GORE DISTRICTS	207	47.6	38	27.1
SUMMARY FOR REPUBLICAN MEMBERS				
BUSH DISTRICTS	181	81.9	77	93.9
GORE DISTRICTS	40	18.1	5	6.1
SUMMARY FOR DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS				
BUSH DISTRICTS	46	21.7	24	42.1
GORE DISTRICTS	166	78.3	33	57.9
BREAKDOWN FOR BUSH DISTRICTS				
BUSH REPUBLICANS	181	79.4	77	75.5
BUSH DEMOCRATS	46	20.2	24	23.5
BUSH INDEPENDENTS	1	0.4	1	1.0
BREAKDOWN FOR GORE DISTRICTS				
GORE REPUBLICANS	40	19.3	5	13.2
GORE DEMOCRATS	166	80.2	33	86.8
GORE INDEPENDENTS	1	0.5	---	----
BREAKDOWN FOR DOLE 1996 DISTRICTS				
DOLE 1996, BUSH 2000	154	100	75	100
DOLE 1996, GORE 2000	0	---	---	0
BREAKDOWN FOR CLINTON 1996 DISTRICTS				
CLINTON 1996, GORE 2000	207	73.7	38	58.5
CLINTON 1996, BUSH 2000	74	26.3	27	41.5

Source: Clark Bensen, "Much Ado About Nothing? Presidential Results by Congressional Districts," *Cook Political Report* [April 10, 2001]: 69-77.

The district system breaks with the original theory of the EC, — the political elite meeting in state capitals to determine the next president. As our society has grown more diverse and increased its voter participation, we need to think how this can be best manifested in the EC. Some legislators in those states feel this approach is a step in that direction.

What would happen in a state under such a change? First, would be the end of the statewide "winner-take-all" rule guiding all but Maine and Nebraska's choice of individual electors. And, there would be the opportunity for the state's EC vote to be split between the candidates.

Probably the most important reason for making such a change is to reduce the impact of the exit polls and the media's need to report who will be the winner.

Currently, exit polls are taken on a statewide basis through a sampling process that project results representative of what the final statewide vote count will be. That will still work in those states with only one congressional seat and it might also work in those states with only two congressional seats. But, once the number of congressional seats in a state gets beyond three or more, the costs of conducting exit polls will become much greater and there will probably be quite a few congressional district EC votes that are "too close to call."

These early exit poll driven calls in the Eastern and Mid-Western time-zone states have been a problem over many of the recent presidential elections. Once it becomes clear that the states in those two time zones have elected the next president, voting becomes less of a need in the Western time-zone states. While the media has tried to control for this impact, we still saw the Florida vote "called" early for Gore before the polls had closed in the western Panhandle counties of that state. Besides being wrong as the election in that state was too close to call, it violated the unwritten rule against calling the election in a state before the polls close.

How would this look in the South? First, the table "Growth of Southern Electoral College Votes, by state 1952-2004" presents the number of votes that each of the 14 states were allocated following the 1950 through 2000 Censuses. The data indicate that between 1952 and 2004, the 14 southern states share

Southern States and the Electoral College, 2000

	ACTUAL 2000 ECVOTE	CHANGE TO CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT SYSTEM			
		SW VOTE	CONG. DIST.		TOTAL EC VOTE
		B	G	B	G
TEXAS	B- 32	B-21	10	22	10
FLORIDA	B- 25	B- 0	13	15	10
NORTH CAROLINA	B- 14	B-13	9	3	11
GEORGIA	B- 13	B-12	9	2	11
VIRGINIA	B- 13	B- 7	8	3	10
TENNESSEE	B- 11	B- 3	7	2	9
ALABAMA	B- 9	B-15	6	1	8
LOUISIANA	B- 9	B- 8	6	1	8
KENTUCKY	B- 8	B-16	5	1	7
OKLAHOMA	B- 8	B-22	6	0	8
SOUTH CAROLINA	B- 8	B-16	5	1	7
MISSISSIPPI	B- 7	B-15	4	1	6
ARKANSAS	B- 6	B- 6	2	2	4
WEST VIRGINIA	B- 5	B- 6	2	1	4
TOTALS	B-168	B-28	102	38	130
					38

of the EC vote will have risen by 19 votes or from 29% to 32% of the total EC votes. Another major shift noted in this table is the shift in how the electors actually voted. In 1952, Republican candidate Dwight Eisenhower received 42% of the EC votes. In 1992, Republican President George H.W. Bush received 69% of the 168 EC votes. In 2004, the Republicans hope to repeat Republican George W. Bush's sweep of these states' EC votes.

The table, "Southern States and the Electoral College, 2000", tests what might have happened in the 14 Southern states had there been a District System in place in each of the states for the last presidential election.

Growth of Southern Electoral College Votes, by state 1952-2004

	1952	1964	1972	1984	1992	2004
AL	11	10	9	9	9	9
AR	8	6	6	6	6	6
FL	10	14	17	21	25	27
GA	12	12	12	12	13	15
KY	10	9	9	9	8	8
LA	10	10	10	10	9	9
MS	8	7	7	7	7	6
NC	14	13	13	13	14	15
OK	8	8	8	8	8	7
SC	8	8	8	8	8	8
TN	11	11	10	11	11	11
TX	24	25	26	29	32	34
VA	12	12	12	12	13	13
WV	8	7	6	6	5	5

Clearly, Gore would have been advantaged by gaining 38 EC votes from the Congressional District vote in these states. But, that would have been more than offset by the 55 additional EC votes that Bush would have won in the non-Southern states had the District Plan been in place in those states. ■

Clinton Approval Ratings Matched Presidential Battleground States

THAD BEYLE, Thomas J. Pearsall Professor of Political Science, UNC-Chapel Hill

The specter of Bill Clinton hung over both major parties during this past presidential contest. His foibles while in office hurt the Democrats, while the Republicans' unsuccessful attempts to thwart and even impeach him left many voters with bitter feelings toward the Republican Party.

Democratic candidate and Clinton's Vice President Al Gore wanted to run as his "own man," free of the negatives associated with

the Republican-controlled Congress walked out of D.C. to force the issue of who really governed, only to find they were being blamed for the governmental impasse. They impeached him in the U.S. House only to lose the vote to convict in the U.S. Senate. Then they tried to wrap Clinton misdeeds around the necks of other Democratic candidates in 1998, only to see the Democrats pick up seats in the House. This led to one of their most outspoken leaders, House Speaker Newt Gingrich, resigning and leaving the D.C. battleground. Hence, the campaign of Texas Gov. George W. Bush was noticeably devoid of an anti-Clinton tone.

President Clinton was an important factor in the 2000 election. Why? Because of his positive performance as president. He entered the last three months of his eight-year tenure with job approval ratings equal to the other two post-World War II presidents who served two full terms.

In a late October 2000 Gallup Poll, 57% of the respondents approved of the job Clinton was doing as president. By comparison, in a mid-October 1960 Gallup Poll, Dwight Eisenhower received a 58% positive job approval rating, and in a mid-October 1988 Gallup Poll, 51% gave Ronald Reagan a positive job rating. Voter News Service exit polls, taken at polling places on Election Day 2000, indicated Clinton's positive job performance ratings nationally among actual voters was also 57%.

Variations across the country

However, the Clinton VNS exit poll job approval ratings did vary considerably across the country. As can be seen in the table, his approval ratings were highest in the Northeast [61% job approval rating] and lowest in the South [49%]. In New England, Clinton's ratings ranged from a 72% high in Rhode Island to a 56% low in New Hampshire. In the South, the range was from Florida's high of 58% to a 45% low in Bush's home state of Texas. Seven Southern states

clustered around a 50% positive Clinton job rating. On the Pacific Rim, the range was from Hawaii's high of 65% to a low of 44% in Alaska.

Differences across the individual 50 states and the District of Columbia also tell an interesting story. They ranged from an 87% high in D.C. to a 39% low in Wyoming, home of GOP vice-presidential candidate Dick Cheney.

Gore won 17 of the 18 states, including D.C., where Clinton's job rating was at the national average of 57% or more. Which state didn't fit this pattern? No surprise. Florida [where Clinton's voters' positive rating was 58%] was the one state that Gore didn't "carry" when voters' rating of Clinton's job performance was at or above the national 57% average.

Bush won 29 of the 33 states where the voters' ratings of Clinton's job performance were below the national 57% average. The other four states that Gore was able to win had Clinton job performance ratings just below the national average: Iowa and Wisconsin [56%], Oregon [55%] and New Mexico [52%].

Another way to view how Clinton's job approval ratings and the election results

→ ELECTION LAWS FROM PAGE 2

However, Georgia and Arkansas have enacted legislation that actually makes it more difficult for felons to regain their voting rights.

Early Calls (7 states) — Confusion on election night stemmed not only from the close vote in Florida, but also from national news organizations that wrongly declared the winner — twice. Although these bills have met with a high failure rate, several states still tried to enact legislation that would hinder exit polling and prevent results from being reported until after the polls closed.

Ballot Design (6 states) — Some Florida voters complained that they could not determine which candidate for whom they were voting on Palm Beach County's two-sided butterfly ballot. However, half the Southern states that have considered clarifying and standardizing their ballot systems have rejected the idea.

Internet/Mail Voting (4 states) — With all the uncertainty surrounding traditional ballots, many observers thought that Internet and mail voting would begin to appear as equally secure alternatives. However, few states are even considering such measures.

Partisan battles and the cost of buying new voting equipment amid the South's budget crunches reduced some of the momentum

interplayed is that every state with Clinton ratings of 60% or more went to Gore. Every state with Clinton job ratings 51% or lower went to Bush. The election was decided in states where Clinton's job ratings ranged from 52% to 59%. These 18 states split, with 11 going to Bush to seven going to Gore.

Had Gore called upon Clinton to campaign for the Democratic ticket in some of these states, the results might have been different. Remember that it would have taken only one of the Bush states to go for Gore to change the results of the 2000 election. Here are two examples:

* New Hampshire, where voters supported the Clinton-Gore team in 1992 with a very close one-point victory spread and in 1996 with a considerably wider ten-point spread. Clinton's 56% job approval rating in the 2000 New Hampshire exit poll suggest such an effort might have made a difference in how

that state's four Electoral College votes were cast, especially as the Bush-Cheney team won narrowly by just over 7,200 votes, a 1-point spread. Democratic Governor Jeanne Shaheen was re-elected by nearly a 5.1-point spread in the only other statewide race.

*Clinton's home state of Arkansas, where voters had supported him in five of his six statewide races, and where the Clinton-Gore team won in 1992 by a 17.9-point spread and in 1996 by a 16.9-point spread. Clinton's 53% job approval rating in the 2000 Arkansas exit

poll also suggests such an effort might have made a difference in the outcome in 2000 when the Bush-Cheney team won with a slightly more than a 5.4-point spread.

The point of this exercise is to show that an incumbent president's job performance is significant, as perceived by those in the broader population and hence in the voting booths. ■

outdated voting systems.

To track the most recent updates on state election law changes, visit the Web site of the National Council of State Legislators at <http://www.ncsl.org> ■

Clinton's Job Approval Ratings in the 2000 VNS Exit Polls

STATE	STRONG 60% OR MORE [14 STATES]		STATE	GOOD 50-59% [24 STATES]		STATE	FAIR TO GOOD 35%-50% [13 STATES]	
	JOB RATING [%]	WINNING MARGIN [PTS]		JOB RATING [%]	WINNING MARGIN [PTS]		JOB RATING [%]	WINNING MARGIN [PTS]
DC	87	G-77	FL	58	B- 0	MS	49	B-15
RI	72	G-29	WA	58	G- 5	KY	49	B-16
MA	69	G-27	MI	58	G- 4	IN	48	B-16
NY	66	G-25	U.S.	57	G- .4*	ND	48	B-28
NJ	66	G-15	PA	57	G- 4	AL	47	B-15
HI	65	G-18	IA	56	G- 1	OK	46	B-22
DE	64	G-13	WI	56	G- 1	TX	45	B-21
IL	64	G-12	NH	56	B- 1	AK	44	B-31
VT	64	G-10	NV	56	B- 3	MT	43	B-24
MN	64	G- 2	OH	56	B- 4	NE	42	B-30
CT	63	G-17	OR	55	G- 0	ID	40	B-41
MD	63	G-17	MO	55	B- 4	UT	40	B-41
CA	62	G-12	WV	55	B- 6	WY	39	B-41
ME	60	G- 5	VA	55	B- 7			
			AR	53	B- 6			
			CO	53	B- 9			
			NM	52	G- 0			
			AZ	52	B- 6			
			SD	52	B-22			
			GA	51	B-12			
			TN	50	B- 3			
			LA	50	B- 8			
			NC	50	B-13			
			SC	50	B-16			
			KS	50	B-21			

*Gore's percentage of the two major party candidates' vote was 50.2% to Bush's 49.8%

Source: Thad Beyle, "Running With, Or From, the President's Coattails?," *The Polling Report* 17:1 [January 15, 2001]: 1, 8.

Clinton's tenure as president. So, he ran a distinctly Clinton-free campaign with Connecticut Senator Joe Lieberman at his side.

Republicans learned the hard way in several political battles that Clinton was not easy to best in a political contest. In the budget bat-

Index of State Economic Momentum, December 2000

RANK	STATE	PERCENT	CPI	CEG	UER
* 1	NEVADA	2.35	6TH 8.2	1ST 4.5	38TH 4.4
* 7	TEXAS	0.94	8TH 7.8	7TH 2.7	34TH 4.2
* 9	GEORGIA	0.69	7TH 8.0	29TH 1.5	15TH 3.0
*12	FLORIDA	0.46	29TH 5.7	2ND 3.7	21ST 3.6
*13	S. CAROLINA	0.18	21ST 6.3	10TH 2.4	10TH 2.8
*14	VIRGINIA	0.13	17TH 6.5	14TH 2.1	3RD 2.1
	U.S. AVERAGE	—	— 6.7	— 1.8	— 4.0
*20	N. CAROLINA	-0.14	14TH 6.8	39TH 0.8	26TH 3.8
*24	KENTUCKY	-0.37	25TH 5.8	21ST 1.8	30TH 3.9
*26	TENNESSEE	-0.39	18TH 6.4	36TH 0.9	33RD 4.1
*32	ARKANSAS	-0.61	41ST 4.8	11TH 2.3	34TH 4.2
*37	OKLAHOMA	-0.78	41ST 4.8	25TH 1.7	13TH 2.9
*44	WEST VIRGINIA	-1.37	46TH 4.4	34TH 1.2	47TH 5.9
*47	LOUISIANA	-1.58	49TH 3.9	44TH 0.5	9TH 6.0
*48	ALABAMA	-1.61	49TH 3.9	46TH 0.3	41ST 4.7
*49	MISSISSIPPI	-1.79	47TH 4.3	49TH -0.9	47TH 5.9
*50	NORTH DAKOTA	-1.82	41ST 4.8	48TH -0.2	13TH 2.9

SOURCE — *State Policy Reports* 18:24 [December 2000]: 2-8. The Index is based on the states most recent performance in three key areas of economic development: population growth, personal income growth and employment growth. Measures of the three components are averaged and the national average is set at zero. Each state's average is then expressed as a percentage above or below the national average.

KEY — CPI = Change in personal income, Q#2 1999 → Q#2 2000. [Bureau of Economic Analysis

<<http://www.bea.doc.gov>>]

CEG = Change in economic growth, November, 1999 → November 2000. [Bureau of Economic Statistics

<<http://stats.bis.gov>>

UER = Unemployment rate, November, 2000. Bureau of Economic Statistics <<http://www.ofheo.gov/house/>>

Gubernatorial Approval Ratings

THAD BEYLE, Thomas J. Pearsall Professor of Political Science, UNC-Chapel Hill

Public figures such as governors get graded just as students do in school. However, governors face the prospect of having considerably more people grading them.

Here is one set of grades of gubernatorial performance in 13 of 14 Southern states. These marks were given by citizens responding to state poll questions asking just how good a job their governor is doing. The type of citizens in each poll varies between all adults, registered voters, or likely voters. Despite the differences, the results of these polls equally get into the media and political actors' minds as some sort of "fact" about just how well the governor is doing.

In these 13 states for which there are gubernatorial job performance ratings, six are Democratic governors and seven are Republican. There have been no polls reported on the job performance of newly elected West Virginia Gov. Bob Wise (D). Five of these state polls were conducted this year, seven during the very political 2000 year, and one dates back to April 1998.

The range in citizen views of gubernatorial performance is from a high of 80 percent positive for Georgia Gov. Roy Barnes (D) in May 2000, to 40 percent positive for Alabama Gov. Don Siegelman (D) in April. Nationally,

of the 42 governors where such ratings are available, no governor has a higher positive rating than Barnes, but two have lower ratings than Siegelman — New Mexico Gov. Gary Johnson (R) at 35 percent and Illinois Gov. George Ryan (R) at 37 percent — both in March 2000 polls.

The average job approval rating for these 13 southern governors is 55.1 percent positive, with the seven Republican governors' average slightly higher than the Democratic, 56.7 percent to 53.2 percent. But things can change and the citizens' views of just how well their governor is performing can also change. As the governors and state legislatures wrestle with budget shortfalls, with some tax increases a potential solution, citizens might start taking a different view on just how well their governors are doing.

These may not be the most recent polls taken in the states asking this question — but they are the most recent polls that have been made public. If you know of newer polls, please let us know about them.

If you are interested in poll results such as these, you might want to check the Web site www.unc.edu/~beyle that has these results for governors and similar ratings for presidents and U.S. senators. ■

Job Approval Ratings of Current Southern Governors

STATE	GOVERNOR, PARTY	ELECTION	RANGE HI-LO	YEARS	MOST RECENT	DATE
GA	ROY BARNES, D	1998F	83-60	1999-2000	80	5/00
LA	MIKE FOSTER, D	1999R	82-54	1996-2000	69	4/00
AR	MIKE HUCKABEE, R	1998F	70-56	1996-2000	68	7/00
OK	FRANK KEATING, R	1998R	74-50	1995-1998	64	4/98
FL	JEB BUSH, R	1998F	63-52	1999-2001	56	4/01
KY	PAUL PATTON, D	1999R	71-45	1996-2000	56	1/00
VA	JIM GILMORE, R	1997F	76-32	1998-2001	52	3/01
MS	RONNIE MUSGROVE, D	1999F	51	2000	51	4/00
NC	MIKE EASLEY, D	2000F	50	2001	50	3/01
TX	RICK PERRY, R	2001S	47	2001	47	2/01
SC	JIM HODGES, D	1998F	42	2000	42	1/00
TN	DON SUNDQUIST, R	1998R	66-41	1995-2000	41	3/00
AL	DON SIEGELMAN, D	1998F	65-40	1999-2001	40	4/01
WV	BOB WISE, D	2000F	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Percentages shown are overall job ratings of "approve" or "excellent" plus "good." Data are from surveys by media organizations, academic research centers, and others.

Election — date of most recent election; F — first election; R — reelection; S — succeeded to office vacated by predecessor.

Years — years for which approval ratings are available.

Date — month and year most recent poll came out of the field.

The polling firms conducting these surveys were: AL — U. of So. Alabama-USA Polling Group; AR, SC, TN, VA — Mason-Dixon; FL — Florida Voter Poll; GA — Georgia St. U. Poll; KY — Bluegrass State Poll; LA — U. of New Orleans Poll; MS — Survey Research Center-Mississippi St. U. Poll; NC — Mellman Group Poll-D; OK — Sooner Poll; TX — Scripps-Howard Poll.

→ EXIT POLL FROM PAGE 1

poll takers that they had a bachelor's degree or above — 42 percent of voters nationally, 39 percent of voters in the South. Bush out-pollied Gore among college graduates in both the South and in the nation. Among post-graduates who voted, Bush led Gore in the South, but Gore out-pollied Bush in the nation. ■

Editor's Note: Thanks to Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism at UNC-Chapel Hill for assistance in analyzing the white male component of the exit poll and to Nadia Watts, Guillory's graduate assistant during the spring 2001 semester.

Portrait of a Sweep

ALL GORE BUSH

VOTE BY GENDER

47 MALE 38 60
53 FEMALE 47 51

BY RACE

74 WHITE 31 67
17 BLACK 91 8
7 HISPANIC 48 50

BY AGE

17 18-29 44 52
33 30-44 41 57
28 45-59 42 56
22 60+ 45 54

BY EDUCATION

6 NO HS 57 42
22 HS GRAD 44 55
33 SOME COL 40 58
24 COL GRAD 37 60
15 POST GRAD 43 54

BY INCOME

8 LESS \$15,000 56 42
17 \$15-30,000 54 43
25 \$30-50,000 44 54
25 \$50-75,000 37 61
12 \$75-100,000 36 62
12 \$100,000+ 30 69

BY MARITAL STATUS

66 MARRIED 39 60
34 UNMARRIED 52 45

BY PARTY

40 DEMOCRAT 82 17
38 REPUBLICAN 5 94
22 INDEPENDENT 36 59

WHITE RELIGIOUS RIGHT

17 YES 17 82
79 NO 50 48

ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES

19 > ONCE A WEEK 38 61
27 ONCE A WEEK 40 59
15 FEW TIMES/MONTH 48 51
23 FEW TIMES/YEAR 45 53
9 NEVER 47 46

Source: Voter News Service exit poll of Southern region in presidential election, 2000. Total respondents: 3,912.

Virginia Gubernatorial Elections, 1977-1997

A. CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES PER ELECTION YEAR

YEAR	TOTAL SPENDING REPORTED	TOTAL SPENDING [IN 2001\$] ¹	TOTAL # VOTES CAST	COST PER VOTE [IN 2001\$]
1977	4,250,600	12,320,580	1,250,597	9.85
1981	5,275,000	10,203,095	1,419,755	7.19
1985	8,133,357	13,289,799	1,343,090	9.89
1989	21,730,000	30,822,695	1,787,131	17.25
1993	13,507,697	16,432,721	1,781,644	9.22
1997	17,676,573	19,255,526	1,736,314	11.09

B. TYPE OF ELECTION ²

YEAR	# C ⁴	PRIMARY ³ D R	WINNER, PARTY, % AND MARGIN OF VICTORY ⁵	WINNER \$ PERCENT ⁶
1977	4	Y-3 N	JOHN DALTON, R, 56 +13	43.8
1981	2	N N	CHARLES ROBB, D, 54 +13	46.4
1985	4	N N	GERALD BALILES, D, 55 +10	51.7
1989	4	N Y-2	DOUG WILDER, D, 50 +2	31.6
1993	4	N N	GEORGE ALLEN, R, 58 +17	40.5
1997	3	N N	JIM GILMORE, R, 56 +13	58.5

¹The reported amount converted to February 2001 dollar equivalents to control for the effect of inflation. Based on the Consumer Price Index-Urban with 1982-84 = 1.000, the February CPI-U = 1.758. To determine each year's 2001\$ value, that year's CPI-U was divided by the February 2001 1.758 value. 1977 CPI-U [606] in 2001\$ was .345; 1981 CPI-U [909] in 2001\$ was .517; 1985 CPI-U [1,076] in 2001\$ was .612; 1989 CPI-U [1,240] in 2001\$ was .705; 1993 CPI-U [1,445] in 2001\$ was .822; 1997 CPI-U [1,613] in 2001\$ was .918. Then, the amount spent in each year was divided by that year's 2001\$ CPI-U figure to get the 2001\$ equivalent spent.

²All Virginia gubernatorial elections are for an open seat as the governor is limited to a single term.

³Y = yes there was a primary and the winning point margin; N = no primary.

⁴Number of candidates in election process.

⁵After the winner's name and party affiliation is the percent of the total vote he received, and the victory margin.

⁶The amount of money spent by the winning candidate, expressed as a percentage of money spent by all candidates.

Gubernatorial Elections in the South

THAD BEYLE, Thomas J. Pearsall Professor of Political Science, UNC-Chapel Hill

One of the regular features of SouthNow will be coverage of recent gubernatorial elections in the 14 Southern states. These features will have a mid-1970s to the most recent election perspective and will include the nature of each election during the period, the margins of victory in the primaries and general election, and how much money was spent in the campaigns. We begin in the mid-1970s, when most states began to require reports on campaign fund-raising and spending.

Most states, in the South and the entire nation, hold their gubernatorial elections in years during which there is not a presidential race. While there were 10 gubernatorial elections in the presidential election year of 2000, only two of them were in Southern states — North Carolina and West Virginia.

New Hampshire and Vermont still have 2-year terms for their governors, so they have a gubernatorial election every even year. This year there are only two gubernatorial elections, one of which is in Virginia. In 2002, there will be 36 gubernatorial elec-

tions including eight in the 14 Southern states — Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee and Texas. In 2003, there will be three gubernatorial elections, all in Southern states — Kentucky, Louisiana and Mississippi.

In this first issue, we are pleased to present some political data on the Commonwealth of Virginia's gubernatorial elections from 1977 to 1997. As noted, Virginia is one of the two states with a gubernatorial election this year, along with New Jersey. In both cases there will be a new governor elected.

Virginia remains the only state in the Union to limit their governor to a single term. So the Virginia governorship is marked by constant turnover. The day that a new governor takes his or her oath of office, he also becomes a "lame duck."

If you want to examine these and more elections in more detail go to the following Web site: www.unc.edu/~beyle ■

Partisan Power-Split in the Statehouses

THAD BEYLE, Thomas J. Pearsall Professor of Political Science, UNC-Chapel Hill

Many voters across the country are becoming more independent in their voting choices often splitting their votes between party candidates. From the party politician's point of view, though, they are not becoming more independent, but rather are more unreliable. Whether caused by split ticket voting or just unreliable voting, the impact of this type of voting can be significant.

Helms, R-N.C., and Strom Thurmond, R-S.C.

Should anything happen to either of these two Republican U.S. senators, their state's Democratic governor – Mike Easley in North Carolina and Jim Hodges in South Carolina would choose their replacements.

It could be one of these Democratic governors who thus alters the political landscape

Control of the Governor's Office and Legislature

STATE	GOVERNOR	STATE HOUSE	STATE SENATE	CONTROL*
AL	D	D-68, R-37	D-24, R-11	D D D
AR	R	D-70, R-30	D-27, R- 8	R D D
FL	R	D-43, R-77	D-15, R-25	R R R
GA	D	D-105, R-75	D-32, R-24	D D D
KY	D	D-66, R-34	D-18, R-20	D D R
LA	R	D-72, R-33	D-25, R-14	R D D
MS	D	D-86, R-33**	D-34, R-18	D D D
NC	D	D-62, R-58	D-35, R-14	D D D
OK	R	D-53, R-48	D-30, R-18	R D D
SC	D	D-54, R-70	D-22, R-24	D R R
TN	R	D-58, R-41	D-18, R-15	R D D
TX	D	D-78, R-72	D-15, R-16	D D R
VA	R	D-47, R-52	D-18, R-22	R R R
WV	D	D-75, R-25	D-28, R- 6	D D D

Source: National Conference of State Legislatures website [ncsl.org], listing updated 4/2/01.
* Which party controls each of the three offices: Governor, State House and Senate
** MS — 3 Independents

One outcome of such voting is finding our governments with elected officials from opposite parties controlling parts of the same government.

At the national level following the 2000 elections, George W. Bush-R runs the executive branch, and there is a small Republican majority in control of the U.S. House of Representatives. The Senate was evenly divided until the recent defection of Vermont Sen. James Jeffords from the Republican Party. Jeffords is now an independent in a 50D-49R-11 Senate.

That political fact-of-life is the genesis of "The Carolinas' Watch." Party members and leaders, members of the media, and others interested in our national politics are carefully monitoring the health and appearance of the two Carolinas' senior, senior senators – Jesse

→ TURNOUT FROM PAGE 3

finally settled by a Supreme Court decision, had an especially dramatic increase in turnout – from 42.4 percent in 1996 to 50.7 percent in 2000. North Carolina and Virginia also had significant gains, with voter turnout

in Washington, which would be ironic. In 2000 it was the Republican governors across the nation who united behind one of their own to be the next president, George W. Bush of Texas.

Across the 50 states there is much the

same picture – a governor of one party facing the state legislature in which the opposition party controls one or both houses. In only 22 states does one party control the governor's chair and legislature – 14 Republican and 8 Democratic.

Two of the 14 Republican states are in the South – Florida and Virginia, and five of the 8 Democratic states are in the South – Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and West Virginia. The two Independent Party candidates in Maine and Minnesota face legislatures with everyone not a member of their party.

This is only one of the several reasons that state legislatures reapportionment is so important. This only adds to the political complexities involved in that process. ■

rising in each by nearly five percentage points. North Carolina had a highly competitive governor's race without an incumbent running, and Virginia had a major statewide contest for a U.S. Senate seat.

Turnout in only three states fell below 1996 levels: Georgia, Louisiana and Oklahoma. ■

Publisher's Note: Executive Seminars

The Executive Seminar for Southern Legislators began as an experiment in providing emerging state leaders with mid-career enrichment — as well as an effort to connect them to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The experiment appears to be working.

The legislators' seminar rests on the premise that state lawmakers need an opportunity to retreat from hectic day-to-day schedules to think more clearly and creatively about their public and private goals. The seminar features exchanges among peers, as well as with university scholars. And legislators have indeed responded to the opportunity.

The second Executive Seminar for Southern Legislators attracted 18 legislators from seven states to the UNC campus for four days in November 2000, while the re-counting of presidential ballots in Florida was still in

progress. Initially the conversation focused on analysis of the election and the need for improved voting procedures.

As the seminar proceeded, lawmakers turned their attention to the State of the South report of MDC Inc., a nonprofit research firm in Chapel Hill, to the work of the N.C. Biotechnology Center and to lessons for other states in the passage of the North Carolina university bond issue.

In addition, lawmakers heard lectures and presentations by former Gov. James E. Holshouser Jr. of North Carolina, former Gov. William Winter of Mississippi, former N.C. House Speaker Dan Blue, UNC President Emeritus Bill Friday, UNC Board of Governors chairman Ben Ruffin, Dean of Arts and Sciences Risa Palm, novelist and UNC professor Doris Betts, UNC historian William Leuchtenburg, and Elizabeth Kiss of the

ethics program at Duke University.

Charles Haynes, a scholar at the First Amendment Center in Nashville, gave a powerful presentation on religion in public life that led to a lively discussion among the lawmakers. "This was worth the trip over here," one of the lawmakers said at the conclusion of Haynes' appearance.

Seminar sessions were held in the Freedom Forum Conference Center of the School of Journalism and Mass Communication in Carroll Hall, with dinners at the Carolina Inn and the Alumni Center. The schedule builds in time for participants to enjoy the campus, and the university setting clearly contributes to the attractiveness of the seminar.

The legislative seminar is the product of a collaboration between two UNC programs – the Program on the Humanities and Human Values and the Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life. As such, it is a blend, mixing readings and discussions drawn from the humanities with briefings on regional trends and issues.

A third Executive Seminar for Southern Legislators is planned for November 2001. Funding comes from the Roger M. and Mary Belle Penn Jones Fund of the Humanities Program and from the Z. Smith Reynolds grant to the Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life program, which also receives an appropriation from the N.C. General Assembly

— FERREL GUILLORY
Director, Program on Southern Politics,
Media and Public Life

Executive Seminar for Legislators, Attendees

Martha Alexander, North Carolina House	Mitchell Landrieu, Louisiana House
Viola Baskerville, Virginia House	Mary Sue McClurkin, Alabama House
Robert Brink, Virginia House	Kenneth Plum, Virginia House
Robert Buckingham, Kentucky House	Linda Puller, Virginia Senate
Videt Carmichael, Mississippi Senate	Anne Rhodes, Virginia House
Creigh Deeds, Virginia House	Charles Riddle, Louisiana House
Beverly Earle, North Carolina House	Horacena Tate, Georgia Senate
Dean Elliott, Arkansas House	Ken Upchurch, Kentucky House
Hillman Frazier, Mississippi Senate	Robert Wilkey, Kentucky House

Southerner Tops List of Democratic Presidential Hopefuls

Southerners have a long history of being the only Democrats who seem to be able to win the White House. The last three Democrats to hold the job were Arkansas's Bill Clinton, Georgia's Jimmy Carter, and Texas's Lyndon Johnson.

Congressional Quarterly's Political Oddsmaker, Ron Faucheux, is already looking ahead to 2004. He has ranked Gore as the most likely Democratic presiden-

tial nominee, with 4 to 3 odds.

North Carolina Sen. John Edwards is tied for fourth with 20 to 1 odds. Georgia Gov. Roy Barnes also made the list of 11, with 25 to 1 odds of being the Democratic nominee.

For much of the 1990s, Democrats controlled the House (Ga. Rep. Newt Gingrich), Senate (Miss. Sen. Trent Lott) and the White House (Clinton and Gore).

Democratic Presidential Candidate Odds for 2004

CANDIDATE	REGION	ODDS	% CHANGE
'00 CAND. AL GORE	SOUTH	4 TO 3	42.9
NY. SEN. HILLARY CLINTON	NE	8 TO 1	11.1
IN SEN. EVAN BAYH	MW	12 TO 1	7.7
MA SEN. JOHN KERRY	NE	12 TO 1	7.7
CT SEN. JOE LIEBERMAN	NE	20 TO 1	4.8
MO.REP. DICK GEPHARDT	MW	20 TO 1	4.8
NC SEN. JOHN EDWARDS	SOUTH	20 TO 1	4.8
GA GOV. ROY BARNES	SOUTH	25 TO 1	3.8
DE SEN. JOE BIDEN	MIDATL	30 TO 1	3.2
SD SEN. TOM DASCHLE	MW	40 TO 1	2.4
CA GOV. GRAY DAVIS	WEST	70 TO 1	3.2

Source: Ron Faucheux, "The Political Oddsmaker - Democrats in '04: An early Look," *Campaign Insider* [April 12, 2000]: 5.

Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life
School of Journalism and Mass Communications
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

CB #3365
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599-3365

Non-Profit Organization
U.S Postage
PAID
Permit No. 177
Chapel Hill, N.C.

SouthNow: A Beginning

FERREL GUILLORY, Director

Welcome to South Now, a new publication of the Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The program's principal goals are to create a common-ground meeting place for civic, business, journalistic and political leaders and to connect the work of scholars and their students to opinion leaders and decision makers. The audience for SouthNow includes faculty in political science and the humanities, elected and appointed officials, journalists, civic leaders and others with an interest in the South's political and public life.

SouthNow will come to you in several forms. Twice a year, we will publish a printed compendium of trends data and articles on Southern politics. If you wish, you may receive an electronic version of future issues – send your name and e-mail address to SouthNow@unc.edu.

Soon, we will have a SouthNow Web site at <http://www.SouthNow.org>, at which you can find information about the projects and activities of the Program on Southern Politics,

Media and Public Life, as well as an archive of political trends data. In addition, we plan to initiate a regular e-mail newsletter to highlight key developments and to point you toward scholarly writing, journalistic articles, survey research and information on the South.

Our editor is Dr. Thad Beyle, the Pearsall Professor of Political Science at UNC-Chapel Hill, who is the founder of the program's companion newsletter, North Carolina DataNet. The managing editor of all SouthNow formats is Ryan Thornburg, a former writer and editor at washingtonpost.com.

We invite your participation, not only as a regular reader but also as a contributor to the storehouse of information and research. Our purpose here is to knit together a network of Southerners interested in the practice of democracy in our region.

Support for the Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life comes from a grant of the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation and an appropriation by the North Carolina General Assembly. ■