

Program on Southern  
Politics, Media and  
Public Life

School of Journalism  
and Mass  
Communication

The University  
of North Carolina  
at Chapel Hill

JANUARY 2003 • NUMBER 4

WWW.SOUTHNOW.ORG

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

John Quintero  
Managing Editor & Assistant Director  
jq@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

- 2 Is Alabama about to Enter the New South?
- 3 The Democratic Heart of Arkansas
- 4 Mixed Messages in Florida
- 5 Georgia Braces for the Aftershocks
- 5 Louisiana Begins Life After Edwards
- 6 Governor's Troubles, President's Standing Spur GOP Shift in Kentucky
- 7 Metropolitan Success Equals Election Success in North Carolina
- 8 Elephants Stomp Through Mississippi
- 10 Oklahoma Coach Sends Star to the Shower
- 11 Building a Republican Legacy in South Carolina
- 12 Taking the Moderate-to-Conservative Victory Path in Tennessee
- 13 Ozzie and Harriet Stuff Texas "Dream Team"
- 14 Virginia Isn't for Lovers of Taxes
- 15 The Factions in West Virginia Politics

# SOUTH NOW

## 2002 Spotlights the South

FERREL GUILLORY, director, Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life

The 2002 elections and their aftermath cast an intense spotlight on the South's political landscape — and on the South's role in shaping the nation's politics.

Republican victories in an array of Southern gubernatorial and U.S. Senate races contributed to the party's better-than-expected showing in a non-presidential-year election. Republican success can be attributed, in large part, to President Bush, a former Texas governor who retains high popularity among the South's voters.

The Trent Lott episode, meanwhile, served as a refresher course in the history of regional political change — that Republicans cracked the old solid Democratic South as white conservatives switched their party allegiance in response to the dissolution of racial segregation laws. President Bush denounced segregation, as debate broke out about his party's definition in a region that has become bedrock of national GOP strength.

The decision by former Vice President Al Gore of Tennessee not to seek the presidency in the 2004 election reshaped the race for the Democratic nomination and, in doing so, brought renewed attention to the fact that Democrats have won the presidency — since John Kennedy's 1960 election — only when they have nominated a Southerner.

This issue of *SouthNow* attempts to look beyond the broad trends and to consider the politics of the South, state-by-state. In each state, a university scholar or a journalist was invited to contribute an essay reflecting on the 2002 elections and what they suggest about the near-term future. Out of these essays, several findings emerge:

- ◆ That the Republican Party continues to expand its influence in the South's legislatures, governor's offices and representation in the U.S. Congress. Republicans maintained their hold on the governor's offices of the mega-states of Texas and Florida, while capturing Georgia for the first time and winning back South Carolina and Alabama.
- ◆ That the Democratic Party remains resilient. Despite the party's buffeting in 2002, Democrats

won the governorship in Tennessee and Oklahoma, and U.S. Senator Mary Landrieu's re-election in the Louisiana runoff showed that Democrats could withstand Bush's popularity.

- ◆ That, while candidates continue to rely on large doses of TV advertising, much of it with a hard edge, both parties have learned the need to compete in get-out-the-vote techniques. In nearly every Southern state, voter-turnout grew substantially in 2002 over 1998. Significant growth in GOP turnout fueled the party's gubernatorial triumphs in Georgia and Florida, and the Republican Senate victory in North Carolina demonstrated the clout of the burgeoning metropolitan South.
- ◆ That Southern states will face at least another year of budget shortfalls, leaving them in weakened fiscal condition to address education and other issues arising from population growth and lingering pockets of economic distress. With Republicans having extended their reach in governor's office and legislatures, the next two years will serve as a testing time for Republican governance.
- ◆ That, even amid widespread budget cutting, the Southern electorate shows great reluctance to support major tax increases. Florida Governor Jeb Bush won re-election as he questioned the cost of reducing the size of public school classes, while his state's voters approved a referendum to cut class size. Democrats won the Tennessee governorship as a result of the outgoing Republican governor having advocated an income tax. Meanwhile, Tennessee voters also approved a state lottery, the alternative advanced by Southern Democrats to broad-based tax increases.
- ◆ That the power of personality remains a potent force in the South. The Republican candidate for governor of Oklahoma, a former football star, lost in an upset to a Democrat, who campaigned alongside a popular former college football coach. In Louisiana, the imprisonment of former Governor Edwin Edwards served as a defining moment for that state in 2002. ■

# Is Alabama about to Enter the New South?

FRANCES COLEMAN, *editorial page editor*, Mobile (Ala.) Register

Down in the “Heart of Dixie,” as Alabama bills itself, Election 2002 sent a couple of unmistakable messages and raised an important question.

The most significant message was that neither Democrats nor Republicans can take anybody or anything for granted anymore. Exhibit A is the governor’s race, in which former U.S. Representative Bob Riley, a Republican, beat the incumbent Governor Don Siegelman by a scant 3,100 votes.

In the old days, Alabama was solidly Democratic, meaning that races were settled in the Democratic primary, the winner of which faced a barely known Republican in the general election. In 1986, however, a nasty squabble among Democrats so thoroughly disgusted voters that they elected Alabama’s first Republican governor since Reconstruction.

Having broken the ice, it wasn’t until 1998 that voters returned a Democrat — Siegelman — to the governor’s mansion. When ensuing accusations of corruption dogged the Siegelman administration and guaranteed a close race in 2002, Democratic Party leaders hoped they could count on traditional support from black Alabamians to keep the incumbent in office.

As it turned out, they could not. Although political scientists in the region could not cite firm statistics on the black turnout, they predicted that the numbers eventually will confirm their belief that Riley pulled a larger percentage of the minority vote than anyone had expected.

Lest Republicans conclude that Alabamians have converted to the Grand Old Party, the same voters who replaced Siegelman with the Republican Riley gave the lieutenant governor’s office to Lucy Baxley, a Democrat and the first woman to hold the office.

Moral: It’s a new day in Alabama, one in which politicians cannot ignore any group of voters, and in which residents increasingly pride themselves on voting “for the person, not the party.”

The second most significant message to emerge from the 2002 election in Alabama is that voters finally may be willing to raise taxes, even if only by a modest amount. In a state where people hated taxes long before former President Bush coined “read my lips, no new taxes,” no viable candidate has dared

to raise the discussion, much less taxes. Indeed, one of the keys to the late Governor George Wallace’s political success was his willingness to raise revenue by floating bond issues, not by boosting taxes.

Now, though, Governor-elect Riley is hinting that new taxes may be among the tactics he uses to stave off an unprecedented financial crisis — and traditional anti-tax groups are reacting in surprisingly restrained fashion.

Perhaps they see the handwriting on the wall. Indeed, who wouldn’t? The state chief justice says the court system needs an additional \$7.3 million to get through the budget year. A federal judge has levied millions of dollars in fines against the state because its prisons are overcrowded. The state’s general and education fund budgets this year were built on more than \$100 million — each — in one-time money. State workers’ pension and health-care costs are rising. And state troopers are too few in number to adequately patrol Alabama highways.

Yet despite a clear need for more money to support necessary social services, the Public Affairs Research Council of Alabama reports that Alabama’s state and local tax revenues are the lowest in the nation, when measured on a per-capita basis.

Until now, Alabamians have taken much pride in their last-place status. But the message of 2002 may turn out to be that they have come to realize that you do indeed “get what you pay for” and that they haven’t been paying enough.

Which leads one to wonder if the 2002 election may turn out to be the year in which Alabama elected its first “New South governor.”

Never mind that other Southern states have elected so many New South governors that the term has lost its cachet. Never mind that they’ve enacted education reform, budget reform, tax reform and constitutional reform. Alabama remained mired in the politics of the past, in which voters and politicians alike reflexively said “no” to anything that reeked of progress.

If Bob Riley can change the public’s attitudes about the kind of state Alabama can become, and — especially — if he convince other politicians to take a chance on progress, then 2002 may go down as one of the most important years in state history. ■

# The Democratic Heart of Arkansas

ROBERT McCORD, columnist, Arkansas Times; 50-year veteran of the Arkansas Democrat and the Arkansas Gazette

Arkansans still vote for more Democrats than other Southerners. As of November, the state has fewer Republican office holders than any other Southern state — the governor, the lieutenant governor, one of four congressional members and 38 of the 135 seats in the state legislature. In 26 out of 35 Presidential elections, Arkansans have voted for the Democratic candidate.

Why is that? It's not because of the black vote, although most blacks in Arkansas support Democrats, just as they do in other states. But there are fewer blacks in Arkansas than in most Southern states.

Democrats are favored by Arkansans because most of them are descendants of the people who settled this land in the early 1800s. Two-thirds of the people now living in Arkansas were born here. Their ancestors were poor, independent people moving away from the civilized states to find open spaces with little authority. They couldn't go any farther than Arkansas because Mexico was to the south and Indians to the west.

Arkansas is the smallest state west of the Mississippi River, and its population is the smallest among the Southern states. It's a poor state, and a majority of Arkansans still believe that rich people not very interested in Arkansas dominate the Republican Party. So Arkansas voters usually have supported Democrats.

Of course, there are exceptions. Arkansans in 2000 didn't like Al Gore and voted for President Bush. And like most Americans they also voted for Bush's father once and even for Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan instead of George McGovern, Jimmy Carter, Michael Dukakis and Walter Mondale. And, as true Southerners, they voted once for George Wallace.

The late Diane Blair, a professor at the University of Arkansas, used to say that it was good that Arkansas never had rich planters or robber barons because it allowed the very talented to move up fast regardless of whether they had money. She called it a land of opportunity, which used to be the state's motto.

Consider some nationally respected politicians who grew up with little money in little Arkansas towns — President Bill Clinton, Congressman Wilbur Mills and Senators John McClellan, William Fulbright and Dale Bumpers. Also businessmen. Witt Stephens, who left high school to sell fancy belt buckles

in Kansas, founded Stephens, Inc., America's biggest off-Wall Street investment house. Sam Walton started Wal-Mart in an Arkansas five-and-dime store. Don Tyson turned his dad's Ozark Mountain chicken business into one of the biggest food producers in the nation.

The Republican Party seems to think that Arkansans are changing because they have elected two Republican governors and a Republican U.S. senator. President Bush made four trips to Arkansas this year to support U.S. Senator Tim Hutchinson's bid for a second term, but Mark Pryor, a son of a popular former senator, David Pryor, defeated him. The first Republican governor, Winthrop Rockefeller, was elected because he boosted the state with his money and contacts and because the people were sick of Democrat Orval Faubus, who had harmed the state's image by using troops to stop school desegregation. Rockefeller's son, Winthrop Paul Rockefeller, has served as lieutenant governor since 1997.

The second and present Republican governor, Mike Huckabee, who was just elected for a second term, is a Baptist preacher and a good speaker and storyteller warmly received in rural Arkansas. Also, people voted for him because they were disappointed in Democrats like President Clinton and Governor Jim Guy Tucker, who was forced to resign because of a minor Clinton connection exposed in Clinton's impeachment investigation. Huckabee was then the lieutenant governor

and automatically (and diplomatically) stepped into the governor's office and served until he was elected governor in his own right.

But the real reason for Huckabee's success is that he isn't a typical Republican. He opposes school vouchers, advocates some higher taxes, raises more money for teachers and supports government-paid health insurance. In contrast, Hutchinson, the Republican senator the voters just defeated, had a 95 percent record for voting Republican. Huckabee's worse setback to date was that his wife, Janet, lost the Secretary of State race to a Democrat, 69 to 31 percent.

Certainly there is some Republican growth in Arkansas. Many Republicans have moved from other states into northwest Arkansas where Wal-Mart and other big businesses are situated. The conservative editorial writers on the *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, the state's largest newspaper, are constantly criticizing Bill Clinton as a way to turn Democrats into Republicans.

But based on last month's election returns, it doesn't seem to be working. Some Arkansans hate Clinton because of his behavior with a young White House aide. But most of them seem to feel much like a recent Rotary Club speaker — Edward J. Flynn, a veteran political campaigner. "Clinton is the best politician of this century," he said. "Unfortunately, he had a loose zipper." ■

## Composition of Southern Congressional Delegation by State

State	# Seats 2002	+/- 2000 Seats	# Republicans	# Democrats	+/- from 2000
AL	7	—	5	2	—
AR	4	—	1	3	—
FL	25	2	18	7	+3 R; -1 D
GA	13	2	8	5	+1 R; +1 D
KY	6	—	5	1	—
LA	7	—	4	3	-1 R; +1 D
MS	4	(1)	2	2	-1 D
NC	13	1	7	6	+1 D
OK	5	(1)	4	1	-1R
SC	6	—	4	2	—
TN	9	1	4	5	-1 R; +1 D
TX	32	2	15	17	+2 R
VA	11	—	8	3	—
WV	3	—	1	2	—
<b>Totals</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>+1 R; +2 D</b>

SOURCE: Center for Voting & Democracy (<http://www.fairvote.org/2002/data.htm>)

# Mixed Messages in Florida

ROBERT FRIEDMAN, deputy editor of editorials, St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times

Florida Governor Jeb Bush won November's main event, breezing to re-election over Democrat Bill McBride in a race that had been considered close just a few weeks earlier. But Governor Bush lost a couple of hard-fought contests on the Election Day undercard that will complicate his life over the next four years.

On one level, Republicans hardly could have fared better in November. Florida's reconstituted Cabinet is all-Republican, and the GOP added to its overwhelming advantages in the state's congressional delegation and both houses of the Florida Legislature. At the same time, however, voters approved two constitutional amendments bitterly opposed by Bush and the rest of the state's Republican establishment. One amendment mandates lower public school class sizes — gradual reductions at all levels that will lead to no more than 18 students per class in the earliest grades after eight years. The other amendment reverses Bush's sweeping reorganization of the state's universities. The amendment re-establishes a system-wide governing board that, at least in theory, will give the universities a layer of protection from politics.

Florida's financial support for public education is skimpy even by Southern standards, but the state Republican leadership insisted until Election Day that no new money was needed. As Bush became more confident about his own race, he spent more time campaigning against the class-size amendment. He warned that its costs would "block out the sun." Education Secretary Jim Horne, a Bush appointee, called the amendment the "Armageddon of funding." They and other opponents backed up their apocalyptic rhetoric with inflated cost estimates that went as high as \$28 billion over the next eight years.

But voters approved the amendment anyway, and Bush and Republican legislative leaders are stuck with the tab. Florida already was facing a significant budget shortfall, even before the costs of the class size amendment (and another amendment, ultimately supported by Bush, instituting a voluntary statewide pre-kindergarten program) are factored in.

In the state capital, Democrats are so marginalized and demoralized that the only interesting tensions will continue to be among a triumphalist governor who describes himself as a "gladiator for change," the generally conservative and compliant House Republicans, and the more moderate and independent

Senate Republicans. They already are engaged in a dance over whether, and how, to find new money to pay for the class-size amendment. They may wind up using the amendment as an excuse for the tough tax and spending choices the budget shortfall would have necessitated anyway.

Bush's early reaction has been encouraging, meeting with supporters of the class-size amendment and leaving all funding options on the table. New Senate President Jim King, a gregarious moderate, is likely to enjoy better relations with Bush and the House leadership than his predecessor, John McKay, did. McKay led an unsuccessful effort to broaden the state's tax base by eliminating dozens of dubious sales tax exemptions. Bush and House Republicans crushed McKay's effort, but a similar plan may be revived this year — minus McKay's polarizing personality.

New House Speaker Johnnie Byrd is known for his doctrinaire opposition to any and all new taxes, but even he has sounded more flexible since Election Day. Bush and Byrd have gingerly floated the possibility of allowing video gambling at the state's racetracks as a possible new revenue source. King has long supported expanded gambling, even without wrapping it in education.

Early in last fall's campaign, Bush was even more adamant in his opposition to the university governance amendment, which was championed by Democratic U.S. Senator Bob Graham. During his two terms as governor, Graham built a stronger and more independent state university system, and he took Bush's dismantling of the system personally. Bush eventually muted his criticism of the amendment, perhaps because he retains exclusive appointment powers under the new system. However, approval of the Graham amendment was a symbolic vote of no confidence in Bush's higher education agenda. If Bush appoints the same cast of developers and Republican fund-raisers to the new higher education posts, this controversy could be rekindled in a new form.

Florida faces other pressing issues, including a dangerously dysfunctional child welfare system. Still, the Legislature's next session is likely to be defined by the same education issues that dominated the fall campaign, as the governor and House Republican leaders try to reconcile their anti-tax rhetoric with the unavoidable need for new spending in education and social services. ■

# Georgia Braces for the Aftershocks

MICHAEL BRUCE BINFORD, *associate professor, Department of Political Science, Georgia State University*

The 2002 elections in Georgia were an earthquake with aftershocks that will reverberate into the future. For the first time since Reconstruction, a Republican candidate won a gubernatorial election. With this Republican breakthrough, Georgia now resembles other Southern states with competitive two-party politics at all levels of government.

At the top of the ticket, Republican gubernatorial candidate Sonny Perdue handily defeated incumbent Democrat Roy Barnes, while Republican U.S. Representative Saxby Chambliss' victory over Democratic Senator Max Cleland helped Republicans gain a majority in the U.S. Senate.

Republicans also posted gains in the state Legislature. Though the Republicans failed to win a majority of seats in the Senate, the quick conversion of four Democratic senators — including two who had just defeated Republican opponents — to the GOP provided the party with a majority. Democratic Lieutenant Governor Mark Taylor will continue to preside over the chamber, but it is unclear how much influence he will wield. Meanwhile, Democrats maintained a majority in the House, but the defeat of Tom Murphy, the longest-serving House speaker in

the country, means that Democrats will need to find a new leader.

In the gubernatorial race, incumbent Barnes raised more money than challenger Perdue — \$19 million versus \$3.1 million. Such aggressive fund-raising on Barnes' part prompted Emory University political scientist Merle Black to remark that Barnes was "draining the swamp." Despite the financial advantage, support from all segments of Georgia's business community, and extensive advertising, Barnes lost to Perdue 51 percent to 46 percent. Barnes fared well in urban and black belt counties, while the remaining rural vote went strongly to Perdue.

Observers credit three sources for Barnes' defeat: angry schoolteachers, an intensive Republican get-out-the-vote effort, and conservative white voters angry over the change in the state flag. In an attempt to solidify his support, Perdue already has reached out to the business community and stated that a flag referendum is not his top priority. Perdue also has asked for the resignation of unelected state department heads.

National analysts characterized one-term U.S. Senator Cleland as vulnerable throughout

the campaign. Chambliss capitalized on this weakness by questioning Cleland's commitment to homeland security and by running ads suggesting that he, rather than Cleland, was closer to the state's other senator, Democrat Zell Miller. Though Miller strongly endorsed Cleland, Cleland won 45.9 percent of the vote compared to Chambliss' 52.7 percent.

Congressional races in Georgia also were eventful. Two controversial incumbents — Republican Bob Barr and Democrat Cynthia McKinney — lost in the primaries, and Democrats believed they could win a majority of the state's 13 seats. Democrats did win one of Georgia's two new districts, but Republicans maintained control of eight seats.

As the election tremors continue to ripple, the biggest unanswered question in Georgia politics is: Can the Republicans govern? Relegated to the outside for years, they now find themselves in charge with many obstacles ahead, including the flag controversy, low test scores, and a budget shortfall. While anxious to take charge, Republicans may have a difficult time leading the state through turbulent times. ■

---

## Louisiana Begins Life after Edwards

LANNY KELLER, *editorial writer, The (Baton Rouge) Advocate*

For the first time in more than 30 years, the subtle, creative and corrupt political hand of Inmate 03128-095 was not felt in Louisiana's statewide elections. The U.S. Bureau of Prison's facility in Fort Worth is just not the electoral platform that Edwin W. Edwards, a four-term Louisiana governor, is used to.

Did his absence make a difference? Directly, probably not. A master at motivating African-Americans to vote, Edwards had a long-standing antipathy to Mary Landrieu. He would not have lifted a finger to help the Democratic senator in a difficult runoff election.

Landrieu ultimately was re-elected in a December runoff that showed that Louisiana — the only state that has never elected a Republican senator by popular vote — remains a winnable state for Democrats in the Deep South.

Landrieu took her playbook from her enormously popular senior colleague, John Breaux, and positioned herself as a Louisiana voice — and called Republican Suzanne Haik Terrell a pawn of GOP leaders.

This clever political jujitsu made every big-name GOP endorsement a way to reiterate Landrieu's campaign theme. In their battle of surrogates, Breaux bested his friend George W. Bush handily.

Terrell's race gave her strong name recognition if she were to run for governor or other statewide office in 2003, but Louisianians play with Senate races. The real game is the governorship. For that reason, the trial, appeals and jailing of Edwin Edwards was a much closer-watched political story for most of 2002.

Locking up the glib Cajun ringmaster of the political circus on federal racketeering charges may have more significant repercussions than the Senate vote, because Louisiana continues to struggle with the legacy of decades of entertaining but economically and socially destructive populist politics.

Oil revenues eventually dried up, and direct taxation to replace them was unpopular, but Edwards' charisma blocked more than fitful efforts at reform. Because of Edwards, first elected in 1972 and only leaving office in 1996, populism gained a new lease on life in Louisiana. Other states in the South — many of them now significantly outperforming Louisiana in important measures — sobered up and paid property and sales taxes to invest in quality schools and colleges. Louisiana was late to the table in both policies and funding, and corruption undermined faith in government.

An archaic tax system basically removed the property tax from the table for education and local government, and governors — Republican and Democrat — emulated the Longs by concentrating power in the state capital. With the closing of the prison bars on Edwin, as he is universally known, is Louisiana at last on the brink of change?

The answer may lie in the 2003 governor's race, when two-term Republican Mike Foster — himself a former Edwards ally in the Louisiana Senate — leaves office. While the often imperious Foster has asserted gubernatorial power as much as any of his predecessors, he pushed far-reaching high-stakes tests in schools and championed higher education funding. It's a policy record that potential successors are more likely to embrace than criticize.

One straw in the November wind: By 51 percent, voters approved a constitutional amendment raising income taxes and cutting a regressive sales tax on food and residential utilities. The drive for the tax reform amendment crossed party and ideological lines and defied the conventional wisdom of political pundits.

A tentative sign, but one that isn't likely to be ignored in the 2003 campaign. ■

# Governor's Troubles, President's Standing Spur GOP Shift in Kentucky

AL CROSS, *political writer*, The (Louisville) Courier-Journal

Kentucky's nine-year Republican shift continued in 2002, in large measure because Democratic Governor Paul Patton became mired in a sex scandal and President Bush campaigned hard for an imperiled congressional incumbent.

The results give Republicans even more reason to hope that they will capture the governorship in the 2003 state election, after a hiatus of 36 years — which will be the longest Republican drought in any state, once the new governors of Georgia and Hawaii take office.

The biggest GOP victory was that of U.S. Senator Mitch McConnell, who set a record for a Republican running statewide by getting 64.7 percent of the vote against Lois Combs Weinberg, who never recovered from a whisker-thin victory in a Democratic primary that was not supposed to be close.

Republicans' chief gain was a seat in the state Senate, giving them a 21-16 edge with a vacancy to be filled in a special election, probably in January. One seat may not seem like much, but the election removed all doubts about the legitimacy of Republicans' hold on the chamber and left them in a good position to continue it in 2004.

Republicans gained their first state Senate majority with two party switches in 1999 and held that 20-18 advantage through the 2000 elections. That allowed them to control redistricting, which was a key to re-electing one of the switchers and created the opportunity to gain another seat in the special election.

Senate Republicans had blocked a Patton package of tax reforms and increases in 2000, and blocked passage of a state budget in 2002 by refusing to fund Kentucky's 10-year-old system of generous public subsidies for gubernatorial candidates who observe a spending limit.

Republicans hammered on "welfare for politicians" through the spring and summer, but as fall began the issue was not gaining much traction. Democrats were hopeful because they had a good war chest, good candidates and a popular governor.

That all changed in mid-September, when Patton admitted an affair with Tina Conner, a Western Kentucky businesswoman who claimed she had received official rewards during the relationship and official retribution after it ended. Patton denied abusing his power to help or hurt Conner, but took himself out of

politics, including the 2004 U.S. Senate race.

Republican ads didn't mention the scandal directly, but referred to "the mess in Frankfort" and used Patton's name as a virtual epithet. The scandal put Democratic candidates on the defensive, demoralized their electoral base, denied them the fund-raising and organizational assets of the governorship and turned off "values voters," most importantly conservative Democrats who have been trending Republican for many years and were alienated from the party by former President Clinton's scandals.

The Democratic candidate hurt most was Third Congressional District nominee Jack Conway, whose experience consisted mainly of working for Patton. Conway battled back, but the combination of scandal and his early errors left him 3.2 percentage points short of Representative Anne Northup.

Northup and other Republicans were boosted by a presidential visit the Friday before the election — Bush's second trip to Louisville for Northup in as many months — and a turnout effort aimed at voters who cast ballots for Bush in 2000 but did not vote in the previous mid-term election, in 1998.

Other congressional Republicans faced weak foes and won easily, most notably Ernie Fletcher of Lexington, now in the GOP primary for governor with a former McConnell aide as his running mate.

The only Democrat in Kentucky's congressional delegation, Fourth District Representative Ken Lucas, eked out a 3.6-point win over political newcomer Geoff Davis. In late November, Lucas, one of Bush's best Democratic allies, spurned yet another plea from Speaker Dennis Hastert to switch parties. Lucas has said he won't run in 2004, and if he does not, Democrats will be hard pressed to keep the seat.

Reading the election results, Democrats in the Legislature abandoned public financing, creating a mad rush for money in time for the May 20 primaries for governor. Emergency legislation is pending to raise the contribution limit to \$2,000 from \$1,000, and to repeal the never-invoked 1992 law that requires a runoff if no candidate gets 40 percent of the vote. Kentucky, which has only one major media market wholly within the state, may again have one of the nation's most expensive races for governor. ■

# Metropolitan Success Equals Election Success in North Carolina

JOHN QUINTERNO, assistant director, Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life

Though Elizabeth Dole led in the polls throughout the U.S. Senate campaign, the size of her victory startled North Carolina's Democrats. While some Democrats have wondered in retrospect what they did wrong, the real 2002 election story is not so much that the Democrats lost, but that the Republicans won.

Indeed, Democrat Erskine Bowles received 18,796 more votes than Democratic U.S. Senator John Edwards did in 1998. Yet Edwards won, and Bowles lost. Why?

Dole received approximately 302,000 more votes than former Republican U.S. Senator Lauch Faircloth did in 1998. Of the roughly 320,000 additional voters who turned out in 2002, most opted to vote Republican.

Wake County illustrates this development. Bowles won 8,000 more votes in Wake than Edwards, but Dole out-pollled Faircloth by 37,000. Similar results occurred in three of the state's other four largest metropolitan counties — Mecklenburg, Guilford and Durham.

Most of the additional votes that Dole received compared to Faircloth came from metropolitan counties. Twenty-three percent of Dole's additional votes came from Wake and Mecklenburg. A full third came from those counties plus Guilford, Cabarrus and New Hanover.

Dole's performance shows how critical metropolitan areas are for success in a statewide campaign. Fifty percent of the total votes cast in 2002, and approximately half of Dole's total votes, came from 15 counties. Dole won 12 of

these counties and improved upon Faircloth's 1998 performance even in the ones she lost.

Bowles bettered Edwards' totals in eight of these 15 counties. But those gains were offset by losses in seven of the big 15 and in 44 other counties. Dole scored victories in 52 mostly rural counties across the state.

Without exit polls, it is difficult to understand who voted and why, but a post-election poll of voters conducted by Elon University unearthed two interesting findings. First, 41 percent of respondents said that such concerns as job creation and providing prescription drug benefits for seniors drove their choices. Second, 59 percent of respondents claimed to have chosen a general election candidate before the September primaries. This meant that the candidates spent the actual campaign vying for a plurality of later-deciding and swing voters.

The dynamic that contributed to Dole's victory fueled statewide Republican successes. For example, Republican candidates for the state's Supreme Court and Court of Appeals won seats previously controlled by Democrats, and six of the seven justices on the Supreme Court now are Republicans.

Republicans posted gains in both houses of the General Assembly. After several recounts in close House races, the Republicans netted three seats and

assumed majority status by a slim margin of 61 to 59. A Republican net gain of seven seats in the Senate, meanwhile, narrowed the Democratic majority to a margin of 28 to 22.

Majorities in both chambers hinged on successes in swing districts. The Republicans won 12 of the 19 House districts rated as "swing" by NCFREE, a pro-business research organization, while Democrats won four of the Senate's six swing districts.

The next legislative session must tackle difficult tax and spending issues and return to the redistricting challenge. Results depend in part on the ability and willingness of the two parties to establish a working relationship and on the success of Governor Mike Easley, a Democrat facing re-election in 2004, in crafting an agenda capable of rallying the public, as well as legislators.

The Republican Party's success in 2002 highlights anew the fact that North Carolina has become a two-party state where Republicans are capable of regularly winning and defending a variety of offices. Still, Democrats have retained their competitiveness. Dole's victory shows that candidates capable of attracting sizable support in metropolitan areas put themselves in a position to win convincingly. ■

## North Carolina Senate Race Results, 1998 vs. 2002

	1998	2002	Difference
Total Votes	2,012,093	2,330,412	+318,319
Turnout (as % of voting age population)	35.3	38.5	—
Democratic Votes	1,029,187	1,047,983	+ 18,796
Democratic %	51	45	—
Republican Votes	945,943	1,248,664	+302,721
Republican %	47	54	—

SOURCE: NC State Board of Elections (www.sboe.state.nc.us)

## 15 Counties Accounting for 50% of Total Votes Cast in US Senate Race, 2002

County	Bowles Votes	Dole Votes	Dole Margin
Wake	100,371	122,445	+ 22,074
Mecklenburg	98,332	100,762	+ 2,430
Guilford	64,050	64,997	+ 947
Forsyth	42,696	50,867	+ 8,171
Durham	42,350	23,841	- 18,509
Buncombe	31,359	31,360	+ 1
Cumberland	29,417	27,941	- 1,476
New Hanover	22,641	29,478	+ 6,837
Davidson	15,992	27,277	+ 11,285
Gaston	14,976	27,176	+ 12,200
Cabarrus	13,657	25,434	+ 11,777
Catawba	13,436	25,318	+ 11,882
Orange	25,401	13,629	- 11,772
Union	12,059	24,032	+ 11,973
Johnston	12,722	22,719	+ 9,997
<b>15 County Total</b>	<b>539,459</b>	<b>617,276</b>	<b>+ 77,817</b>

SOURCE: NC State Board of Elections (www.sboe.state.nc.us)

# Elephants Stomp through Mississippi

RONNIE AGNEW, *executive editor*, The (Jackson) Clarion-Ledger

My father would be at a loss to explain how this happened.

A lifelong Democrat, he could never find the right words to describe what happened to his beloved party, the party he feels gives African-American people the fairest shot today, just as it did in the 1960s when JFK's economic plan opened up the nation's factories for black folk.

If my father had been reading the tea leaves correctly, he would have seen this Republican steamroll coming. And, if he had seen what momentum this pachyderm had gathered, perhaps he would have found a better way to brace himself from suffering continued disappointment.

Mississippi is now Republican territory, particularly in national politics. The Democrats who do manage to hang on to their jobs should feel indebted to a public that doesn't like change and to minority districts carved to ensure African-American representation in Congress.

There's no better example than the elections of 2002.

Longtime Republican U.S. Senator Thad Cochran ran a relaxed campaign, totally absent of any drama or suspense. Cochran had it made, more so than even a respected senator such as himself probably deserved.

He faced a little-known, perennial opponent with no financial backing and a long record of political defeats. If this was his path back to Washington, this senior Mississippi legislator surely had never had an easier road to travel. He cut a quick TV spot to keep his face before the people, talked to the local Rotary clubs and rolled on to victory without having to break into his piggybank.

His young colleague in the U.S. House of Representatives would not have it so easy. Congressman Chip Pickering would go on to win a second term in Congress, but not before a vicious struggle with fellow incumbent Ronnie Shows, who painted his young opponent as a President Bush and Senator Trent Lott crony incapable of developing an original thought of his own.

The candidates were forced to face each other when their once-separate congressional districts were combined, the result of U.S. Census data showing Mississippi had not grown at the rate of some other states. The state lost a congressional seat, and Shows and Pickering engaged in one of the most heated, and expensive, political skirmishes Mississippi has seen.

The results were the same, however. Mississippi's national shift to Republican politics and ideology held firm.

With the exception of longtime Democratic Congressmen Gene Taylor and Bennie Thompson, Mississippi voters have become quite adept at pulling the voting lever for Republican candidates. What will be interesting to watch is whether Mississippi's Republican gains on the national level will lead to more GOP victories at home in state politics, where Democrats still claim most of the seats in the Legislature.

In November 2003, Mississippi voters will choose a governor and lieutenant governor. Beyond those heavyweight battles, several legislators who have enjoyed long rides at the public trough will have to face the voters again.

They likely will have some explaining to do this time around. Unlike in prior years, they'll probably face questioning on why Mississippi finally passed watered-down versions of a tort reform bill, and why lawmakers had to spend well over \$1.5 million in a months-long special session wrestling with the issue.

They'll have to explain why Mississippi's budget is in the tank, despite reaping billions from the settlement with tobacco companies and the promise of stuffed tax coffers from casinos, which now rival Las Vegas and Atlantic City in number.

The gubernatorial race promises to be a doozy.

Former national Republican Committee chairman Haley Barbour has publicly acknowledged he is considering challenging Democratic incumbent Ronnie Musgrove, which may give Mississippi a repeat of the race in 2000, when the contest was so tight, it took a Democratic majority in the House to break the tie.

The question folks are asking these days is, will Musgrove be so lucky this time? Or, will Mississippi's fascination and support of national Republican candidates trickle down to the state level?

It already has entered the lieutenant governor's office, where incumbent Amy Tuck, a lifelong Democrat, ended 2002 with a bang by switching to the GOP, with a smiling array of Republican U.S. senators and congressmen on hand as a backdrop. Dissed Democrats, who had long supported Mississippi's highest-ranking female politician during her rise through the ranks, promise revenge in this year's election.

I expect that if my 75-year-old father took a closer look at his Democratic Party, even he would be forced to realize that times have changed. The party he feels has given him the chance at a better life has now found itself at the end of a forked road, a road where those pachyderms are lying in wait with mischievous grins on their faces. ■

## 2002 Southern Election Results — Gubernatorial and U.S. Senate Races

### GUBERNATORIAL RACES

State	Democrat & Occupation	Votes	%	Republican & Occupation	Votes	%
FL	Bill McBride, l	2,201,427	43.2	Jeb Bush, inc	2,856,845	56.0
TX	Tony Sanchez, b	1,809,915	40.1	Rick Perry, inc	2,617,106	57.8
GA	Roy Barnes, inc	937,335	46.2	Sonny Perdue, fss	1,042,221	51.4
TN	Phil Bredesen, fm	837,280	50.6	Van Hilleary, cn	786,863	47.6 <sup>i</sup>
AL	Don Siegelman, inc	669,105	48.9	Bob Riley, cn	672,225	49.2
SC	Jim Hodges, inc	518,288	47.1	Mark Sanford, fcn	580,459	52.8
OK	Brad Henry, ss	448,143	43.3	Steve Largent, cn	441,277	42.6 <sup>ii</sup>
AR	Jimmy Lou Fisher, st	378,303	46.9	Mike Huckabee, inc	427,189	53.0
Totals		7,799,796	44.3		9,424,185	53.5
	Other candidates and write-ins	392,953	2.2			

### U.S. SENATE RACES

State	Democrat	Votes	%	Republican	Votes	%
TX	Ron Kirk, fm	1,955,758	44.3	John Cornyn, ag	2,497,243	55.2
NC	Erskine Bowles, fwhcos	1,047,983	45.0	Elizabeth Dole, fpc	1,248,664	53.6
GA	Max Cleland, inc	932,422	45.9	Saxby Chambliss, cn	1,071,352	52.7
TN	Bob Clement, cn	728,232	44.3	Lamar Alexander, fg	891,498	54.3
VA	no candidate	-0-	-0-	John Warner, inc	1,229,894	82.6
AL	Susan Parker, sa	538,878	39.8	Jeff Sessions, inc	792,561	58.6
LA	Mary Landrieu, inc	638,654	51.7	Suzanne Haik Terrell, elc	596,642	48.3
KY	Lois Combs Weinberg, dfg	399,634	35.3	Mitch McConnell, inc	731,679	64.7
SC	Alex Sanders, up/fss	484,422	44.2	Lindsay Graham, cn	595,218	54.4
OK	David Walters, fg	369,789	36.3	Jim Inhofe, inc	583,579	57.3
AR	Mark Pryor, ag	433,386	53.9	Tim Hutchinson, inc	370,735	46.1
MS	no candidate	-0-	-0-	Thad Cochran, inc	533,269	84.6
WV	Jay Rockefeller, inc	266,192	63.1	Jay Wolfe	155,922	36.9
Totals		7,795,350	39.4		11,298,256	57.1
	Other candidates and write-ins	703,214	3.6			

OCCUPATION KEY: ag=state attorney general; b=businessman; cn=congressman; dfg=daughter of former governor; elc=state elections commissioner; fcn=former congressman; fg=former governor; fm=former mayor; fpc=former presidential candidate; fss=former state senator; fwhcos=former White House Chief of Staff; inc=incumbent; l=lawyer; sa=state auditor; ss=state senator; st=state treasurer; up=university president

<sup>i</sup> 14 Independent or write-in candidates received 29,079 votes (1.8%).

<sup>ii</sup> Independent candidate Gary Richardson received 146,200 votes (14.1%).

## Percentage Difference Between Personal Income Tax Collections and Original Estimates, FY 2002<sup>i</sup>

Rank	State	Percent
2	LA	- 0.8
3	WV	- 1.3
4	AL	- 2.5
8	AR	- 6.9
9	OK	- 7.0
10	GA	- 7.5
17	KY	- 9.8
29	NC	-12.8
	US Average	-12.8
30	MS	-12.9
34	VA	-15.9
38	SC	-18.4
42	TN	-29.3
	FL	N/A
	TX	N/A

<sup>i</sup> SOURCE: National Association of State Budget Officers, "2002 Fiscal Survey of the States," reported in "The Tip of the Iceberg - Oops," *State Policy Reports* 20:19 (October 2002), 8.

# Oklahoma Coach Sends Star to the Shower

ROBERT KERR, *assistant professor, Gaylord College of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Oklahoma*

As 2003 unfolds, Oklahoma Democrats may find themselves wondering whether it was good news or bad news that they won the governor's office in November.

Brad Henry, a 39-year-old, small-town lawyer and barely known state senator, pulled off one of the biggest upsets in Oklahoma gubernatorial history when he edged Steve Largent. The Republican Largent was much better funded and had statewide name recognition as a three-term congressman and former University of Tulsa and NFL football star. His campaign featured visits by President George W. Bush and other national GOP headliners.

Yet in the final weeks of the campaign, Henry — who wasn't even favored in the Democratic primary — came from behind and eked out a win. Now voters are wondering how their new governor is going to show them the money. Lately, there is less in state coffers every time anyone checks.

Henry must confront a budget crisis with a shaky mandate. A winner by fewer than 7,000 votes, Henry's upset benefited from an unlikely convergence of events. Well-funded independent candidate Gary Richardson spent \$2.3 million of his own money and attacked Largent, thereby damaging the favorite and freeing Henry to use his meager funds to promote a lottery-for-education proposal.

Additionally, opposition to a ballot initiative banning cockfighting generated a heavy turnout in southeast Oklahoma, the Democrats' stronghold. Former University of Oklahoma football coach Barry Switzer, a longtime friend of Henry's, also helped by campaigning vigorously.

In the end, Richardson managed to win 14 percent of the vote, leaving Henry and Largent each with 43 percent. Henry's tiny margin of victory — 6,866 votes — equaled 0.66 percent of the total votes cast in the race.

A poll taken a few days after the election by Wilson Research Strategies found that Switzer's support was instrumental to Henry's success. One in six voters reported that Switzer's endorsement influenced their vote for Henry. Switzer's involvement in the campaign proved more important than even Richardson's ads and the big turnout among Democrats opposed to the cockfighting ban.

Whether Henry can find a solution to an economic crisis that is turning into Oklahoma's worst since petroleum prices collapsed in the early 1980s, he can find plenty of irony in his situation. Outgoing Republican Governor Frank Keating spent most of his eight years in office with a Democratic presidential administration and a booming national economy. Now, Henry must govern with a popular Republican president in office and a slumping economy.

Oklahoma already was facing serious budget shortfalls before the election, and immediately afterward, new revenue figures showed that the state government was running even deeper in the red than publicly had been revealed, with revenue running almost \$300 million below forecasts. Two weeks after the elections, fiscal officials with the Legislature announced a projected \$800 million shortfall for the next fiscal year.

In response to the economic crisis of the 1980s, Oklahoma lawmakers raised taxes, but doing something similar this time is probably politically impossible. Henry campaigned on a platform of no tax increases, though he said after the election that he reserves "the right to change my mind."

Education leaders are pressing for a sales-tax increase to help meet a state Department of Education budget shortfall that had reached almost \$160 million by late 2002. The president of the Oklahoma Education Association estimated that at least 1,000 public-school employees have lost their jobs since state revenues began declining in 2001 and predicted that hundreds more would lose their jobs without financial relief from the state.

Yet even if Henry decides to support higher taxes and is able to convince legislative leaders to join him on it, enacting any tax increase will require a three-fourths majority in the Legislature or approval by a statewide vote, thanks to a 1990 law. This is problematic since Democrats now hold only a slim majority in the Legislature.

Budget cuts also will be difficult, given how lean the state budget already is. Oklahoma ranks last among all states in the amount spent on state government, and Henry said shortly after the election that education would

SEE OKLAHOMA COACH ON PAGE 11 →

# Building a Republican Legacy in South Carolina

JOHN MONK, news columnist, *The (Columbia) State*

When Republican Mark Sanford ousted Democrat Governor Jim Hodges in November, Sanford completed a process almost 40 years in the making: the Republicanization of the legislative and executive branches of South Carolina's government.

The state house now reflects much of the state's 69 percent white majority electorate — conservative and wary of taxes, liberals and big government.

No single cause defeated one-term Governor Hodges, who lost 53–47 percent. On paper, it looked like Hodges might win. Although Sanford successfully demonized Hodges as an untrustworthy liberal and for poor leadership, Hodges had accomplishments he could claim to be proud of.

Those accomplishments included the banning of video poker (a \$3 billion-a-year, highly addictive gambling industry), the adoption of a state lottery whose proceeds went to education, and small but measurable improvements in the state's public education system (a top voter concern).

Hodges also reached out to South Carolina's blacks, who make up about 30 percent of the voters and who vote overwhelmingly Democratic. In 2001, Hodges went to Orangeburg, the site of a 1968 incident where state troopers shot three unarmed civil rights protesters to death. Hodges was the

---

→ OKLAHOMA COACH FROM PAGE 10

probably have to "tighten some belts" further.

Meanwhile, record prison crowding is straining the state's penitentiary system, and furloughs were scheduled to begin in November as part of budget cuts. The Legislature met in special session and emptied state reserves to come up with the money to keep prison workers on the payroll full-time until spring. Legislators say the state must now consider releasing nonviolent offenders early to ease the financial burden.

While the race for governor captured considerable attention, it was not the only statewide race in Oklahoma. Republican U.S. Senator James Inhofe, who was completing his first full-term, easily met a re-election challenge from former Democratic governor David Walters. Inhofe won by 213,000 votes and captured 57 percent of the vote, thereby keeping both of Oklahoma's U.S. Senate seats in Republican hands. ■

first governor to visit the scene, a historic black college, and express regret.

And yet, Hodges' efforts weren't enough to stem a rising tide of Republicanism, stoked by repeated visits to the state by Democrat-bashing President Bush. Bush campaigned for Republican Representative Lindsay Graham, who beat Democrat Alex Sanders in the race to replace retiring Republican Senator Strom Thurmond. Sanford, who attended the rallies, was a beneficiary.

Hodges' campaign also made a strategic error. In the past, Democrats got the vote out in black communities by paying "hauling money" to established local leaders. This time, Democrats spent \$3 million on a sophisticated high-tech telephone and media campaign targeting blacks. In bypassing local leaders, Hodges' Democrats offended black politicians and local activists throughout the state.

The resulting black turnout was down 10 to 20 percent from four years ago, a sampling of black precincts showed. Without a heavy black turnout, Hodges simply could not win.

Sanford, 42, also offered a youthful contrast to Hodges. With his thatch of thick black hair, a toothy smile, an attractive wife and four preteen children, the Republican looked far fresher than Hodges. The Democrat, although only four years older, has — with his bald head and pasty complexion — the appearance of being much older.

Whether Sanford lives up to his image is the big question. He already has sent conflicting signals of whether he'll be a populist or an elitist. On one hand, Sanford announced that barbecue will be served at his inauguration ball and that tuxes won't be required. But Sanford — a supporter of vouchers in the public schools — also announced he'll send his four children to one of the state's snootiest and most expensive private schools, Columbia's Heathwood Hall.

Sanford is a kind of libertarian Republican, who made his mark in Congress by voting against many traditional government programs, even those that helped his own district. As such, Sanford is a different breed of Republican from the two Republicans with whom he'll share power. House Speaker David Wilkins represents the party's moderate-to-

conservative pro-business wing. Senate President Pro Tem Glenn McConnell personifies the ultra-conservative, neo-Confederate wing. One of McConnell's priorities is a \$40 million museum for a sunken Confederate submarine.

The biggest problem facing Sanford involves the huge revenue shortfalls that bedevil most states. In the past, arguments over shortfalls have been characterized by feuding and name-calling between the parties. Now, Republicans will have to sort things out among themselves.

The shortfalls were created not only by the economic downturn but in large part by the Republican-dominated legislature. During the boom years of the 1990s, it passed tax cuts that reduced state revenues by almost \$500 million a year.

Recent Democratic proposals to raise some taxes have gone nowhere. Hodges, sensing Republicans would use the issue against him, opposed any tax hikes. However, with many state agencies, including public education, now cutting back on basic services, tax increases might be the only solution.

During the campaign, Sanford proposed a gas tax increase as part of a package in which he would do away with income taxes. He has not said "no" to a cigarette tax. (The state's gas and cigarette taxes are among the nation's lowest.)

Without tax hikes, South Carolina's financial situation may worsen. Meanwhile, a lawsuit to force the state to spend more money on public education in poor (mostly black) counties is working its way through the courts.

The impact of budget cuts on state agencies was illustrated by a recent incident in which a judge ordered a mentally ill patient to be treated in the state mental hospital. When a deputy brought the patient to the facility, it refused to accept him. Whereupon the deputy left the patient handcuffed to a fence. The agency said budget cuts had caused it to slash 800 workers from its 6,000-person staff since January 2001.

As Sanford takes office, many agencies are in similar near-crisis modes. Many Republicans still insist they will not raise taxes. How Republicans handle this will be their legacy. ■

# Taking the Moderate-to-Conservative Victory Path in Tennessee

WILLIAM LYONS, *professor of political science, University of Tennessee*

At first glance it might seem that the Democratic Party in Tennessee fared somewhat better than the national party. Democrats maintained control of both houses of the General Assembly, captured the governor's seat after an eight-year hiatus and picked up a fifth seat to gain a majority in the nine-member congressional delegation. However, Lamar Alexander easily defeated Democrat Bob Clement to keep both U.S. Senate seats in Republican hands. These results clearly placed the electoral center of gravity at the moderate-to-conservative spot that both statewide victors enjoyed.

The results show that Democrats can succeed in Tennessee. This success can be attributed to the moderate-to-conservative postures struck by their candidates. Democrat Lincoln Davis enjoyed a relatively narrow victory in the redistricted Fourth Congressional District formerly represented by unsuccessful Republican gubernatorial candidate Van Hilleary. However, Davis' campaign stressed such conservative themes that he will almost certainly be among the most conservative members of Congress once in office.

Phil Bredesen's election as governor was the pinnacle of Democratic success in Tennessee in 2002. Bredesen had been defeated eight years earlier by Republican Don Sundquist. He entered the general election campaign as a clear favorite after easily winning the Democratic primary while Hilleary waged a tough primary campaign against state Representative Jim Henry.

The campaign tone had been set by the events in Tennessee politics during the previous three years. Shortly following his election to his second term, Governor Sundquist surprised just about all observers by announcing his support for tax reform, including the possibility of an income tax, long anathema in the state. After a three-year struggle that included a shutdown of state government in July 2002, and culminated in a subsequent sales tax increase, many would have thought that the income tax would be a non-issue in the campaign. Both Hilleary and Bredesen repeatedly had stressed their opposition to the tax during the legislative session. Both reiterated this opposition during the primaries.

Hilleary decided to make his absolute opposition to the tax a cornerstone of the general election campaign, and the issue proved to have life when Bredesen did not unequivocally rule out the possibility of an income tax in a second gubernatorial term. As the campaign wore on, Bredesen was able to shift the terms of the discussion and the ad war to his resume

that featured executive experience in both the private and public sectors, the latter as mayor of Nashville.

Bredesen and Hilleary also clashed over a statewide ballot initiative to end the state's constitutional ban on lotteries. Hilleary wanted to preserve the ban, while Bredesen opposed it. Ultimately, sixty-one percent of voters supported the repeal, thereby opening the door to the creation of a Georgia-style lottery with revenues marked for college scholarships.

Overall, Bredesen prevailed in the race, albeit by only three percentage points, by building a base of support in traditionally Republican East Tennessee, especially among the business leadership who were never comfortable with Hilleary, who ran some ads criticizing Bredesen as an "HMO Millionaire." Ironically, the Republican Hilleary built his base in rural areas with somewhat of a populist appeal that turned off some of the moderate Republican core in urban and suburban areas. Hilleary had one major advantage — his comfort with the national Republican Party and support from President Bush, who came to the state several times to campaign for Hilleary and Republican Senator-elect Lamar Alexander.

Alexander's road to election likewise ran through moderate-to-conservative territory. Alexander stressed his conservative bona fides during an aggressive primary campaign by Seventh District Congressman Ed Bryant who tried to paint Alexander as less than a true conservative. After reaching the general election, Alexander stressed his successful run as governor and his extensive resume, along with his commitment to the policies of President Bush. Bush's visits to the state underscored the national importance of this election. One of Alexander's most effective themes was that, upon election, Bob Clement would join the national Democrats in voting to organize the United States Senate.

Clement's campaign in many ways mirrored the failures of Democrats throughout the country. He was careful to mute criticism of the President and seemed to cast about for themes that would resonate with voters. Clement turned to fairly sharp attacks on Alexander, running some pointed negative ads painting Alexander as an insider who benefited financially from inside deals. In the end his discomfort with his national party ticket muted any policy messages that might have effectively distinguished his candidacy from Alexander's. ■

# Ozzie and Harriet Stuff Texas “Dream Team”

BILL BISHOP, *staff writer*, Austin American-Statesman

The Texas Democratic Party’s theory a year ago was simple, or perhaps simplistic.

The party recruited a “dream team,” an unfortunate description of the racially — and, more importantly, financially — correct ticket of a rich Hispanic for governor, the black mayor of Dallas for an open U.S. Senate seat and a white conservative for the powerful position of lieutenant governor.

Gubernatorial candidate Tony Sanchez would appeal to the state’s growing number of Hispanics. Dallas mayor Ron Kirk would attract support in the state’s huge urban centers. John Sharp could appeal to the “gimme cap” crowd in rural Texas and put the business lobby at ease in Austin.

The whole show would run on Sanchez’s money, and it would win on record Hispanic turnout.

It all worked, until the results rolled in, and the Democrats lost ... everything. Republicans won every race on the statewide ballot. Democrats lost ground in the state Senate and lost a majority in the House. Republicans now control the state Legislature for the first time since Reconstruction.

Tom Craddick, a representative from West Texas, gathered enough votes to win the speakership before Thanksgiving. Rick Perry, who won a full term as governor after taking over for George W. Bush in 2000, spent the holidays preparing for the next legislative session. John Cornyn has moved to Washington, D.C., to take the Senate seat left by retiring Phil Gramm.

Political columnists enjoyed repeating dog-catches-car stories in December. Republicans now fully own a state budget that will be \$5 billion to \$12 billion in the red next year. That makes Texas like every other state, and how the newly ascendant party will scrape through ’03 without a tax increase (they’ve all taken a blood oath) will be one of 50 similar stories.

Democrats, meanwhile, are left to interpret what became of the grand plan. Sanchez spent nearly \$60 million from his own account. That is about the same amount as Republicans spent on all statewide races combined.

Yet Democratic candidates did little better than they did in 1998, when Bush led an underfunded and lackluster ticket. It was 68–31 when Bush won in ’98.

The blame for this loss runs from the specifics of the campaign to the plan’s assumptions. Sanchez didn’t prove to be a powerful draw, even in heavily Hispanic South Texas. Turnout in some of those fast-growing cities barely nudged from 1998. Hispanics are increasing in Texas, but they are slow to naturalize, slow to register and slow to vote.

And there is what might be called Texas exceptionalism. The state’s party politics don’t work the way they do in other places. And the powerful demographic factors that are turning many large cities into Democratic bastions are, in Texas, working for Republicans.

James Gimpel, a University of Maryland political demographer, finds that the heart of the Texas Democratic Party is spread out across the rural portions of the state — in black East Texas and the Hispanic border area. The Republican strength is concentrating in the cities. All this is exactly opposite the way the parties are sorting themselves in other states, where Republicans claim the countryside and the suburbs and Democrats concentrate in the cities.

This is especially true in Texas’ fast-growing cities: Austin, Dallas and Houston. These cities are among the most innovative and high tech in the nation. Other cities in this group — Los Angeles, Portland, Seattle, New

York, Albuquerque, even San Diego — are turning more dependably Democratic as they fill with odd-ball tech workers, minorities and immigrants. (For details on this trend, go to: <http://www.austin360.com/aas/specialreports/citiesofideas/1222cities.html>)

Texas cities are especially attractive to white migrants, however. Austin was sixth among all U.S. cities in the increase of white residents in the 1990s. Dallas was eighth. The influx of white residents has worked to make the city more Republican.

The small city of Austin is still cantankerously Democratic — its city council recently formed a “keep Austin weird” committee as part of its economic development program — but the city-region grew by 54 percent in the 1990s. And the metro area now votes Republican in national elections.

Demographers conclude that the nation is sorting itself along social and political lines. Texas has become the home of choice for straight-laced tech workers. “The areas that attract ... the minorities and the techies will become Democratic,” said University of Michigan demographer William Frey. “But the Ozzie and Harriets are overlooked. It’s an important group, and it needs to be paid attention to. And these people are in Texas.”

Democrats learned in November that they vote here, too. ■

## Southern Power Splits — Governors vs. Legislatures

### POWER-SPLIT STATES

State	Governor	State House	State Senate
AL	R (Riley)	D +23 seats	D +15 seats
AR	R (Huckabee)	D +40 seats	D +19 seats
GA	R (Perdue)	D +33 seats	R +2 seats
KY	D (Patton)	D +30 seats	R +4 seats
LA	R (Foster)	D +37 seats	D +13 seats
NC	D (Easley)	R +2 seats	D +6 seats
VA	D (Warner)	R +32 seats	R +6 seats

### NON POWER-SPLIT STATES

State	Governor	State House	State Senate
FL	R (Bush)	R +42 seats	R +12 seats
MS	D (Musgrove)	D +53 seats	D +15 seats
OK	D (Henry)	D +5 seats	D +8 seats
SC	R (Sanford)	R +22 seats	R +4 seats
TN	D (Bredesen)	D +9 seats	D +3 seats
TX	R (Perry)	R +26 seats	R +7 seats
WV	D (Wise)	D +36 seats	D +14 seats

# Virginia Isn't for Lovers of Taxes

MARGARET EDDS, *associate editorial editor*, The Virginian-Pilot (Norfolk)

On Election Day 2002 Virginia voters sent a mixed message to Governor Mark Warner and the General Assembly.

The defeats of referenda that would have raised regional sales taxes in Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads to pay for transportation projects signaled strong anti-tax sentiment. Despite backing from Virginia's two Warners (Democratic Governor Mark and Republican U.S. Senator John), business and labor leaders, newspapers, other major institutional voices, and most local elected officials, Northern Virginians said "no" by a 55-45 split. In Hampton Roads, they said "hell, no," defeating the ballot measure by two-to-one.

On the other hand, widespread fear that anti-tax sentiment would also sink proposals for bond issues totaling more than \$1 billion for higher education and parks proved unfounded. The college and university bonds won support from 72 percent of voters statewide. The bonds for parks did almost as well.

With no statewide elections and no competitive U.S. House races on the ballot, the message leaders took from the tally was one of budgetary restraint. The conventional political wisdom is that, while Virginians probably prefer not to let essential services erode, they are in no mood for tax increases.

The upshot as the January 8 opening of the 2003 legislature approaches is widespread agreement that there will be no general tax increases and quite likely, none of any sort to help resolve a looming \$1 billion shortfall in the state's biennial budget.

Coming on the heels of \$858 million in budget reductions announced by Warner in October and \$2.3 billion chopped from the two-year \$24.7 billion budget last winter, the result is certain to be a contentious and painful 2003 session.

Earlier cuts resulted in tuition increases at most public colleges, reductions in mental health and mental retardation community services, the closings of a dozen Department of Motor Vehicle offices, shorter hours at libraries and state liquor stores, layoffs of 1,837 full and part-time workers, and a host of other economies.

In the earlier rounds of cuts, K-12 education, the social safety net for the poor, and most

law enforcement programs escaped the chopping block. But few expect that Warner can come up with an additional \$1 billion in savings without whittling funding for those previously exempt programs.

The election results dampened any push for a tax increase to offset a revenue gap caused by three factors: a downturn in tax collections, mandatory spending increases, and an assortment of recent tax breaks. There seems to be no sentiment for backing off the car-tax reduction plan that elected former Governor Jim Gilmore, a Republican, in 1997.

Car-tax elimination, as advanced by Gilmore, is now 70 percent complete, and the drain on the biennial budget approaches \$1 billion — a far higher price tag than the former GOP governor suggested. Still, lawmakers remain convinced that any backing away would cost them in the 2003 fall elections.

While a few legislators are pushing an increase in Virginia's lowest-in-the-nation, 2.5-cent-per-pack cigarette tax, their prospects are doubtful unless a massive outcry develops over the final round of budget cuts.

The glum budgetary picture is a disappointment for Warner, the Democratic governor, who has been unable to fulfill almost any campaign promise that came with a price tag. With Republicans holding a 23-17 edge in the Virginia Senate and a 63-34 lead in the House (the GOP is expected to pick up a vacant seat, and two other slots are held by independents), his options are constrained.

A victory in the November road referenda might have created the momentum for a more aggressive revenue agenda, but that prospect is closed to Warner for now. With one quarter of his four-year term already behind him, he faces limited alternatives. Any legacy must somehow be carved out of managing the recession effectively, reorganizing state government to make it more efficient, and encouraging reforms on the cheap.

To that end, the governor intends to push for a constitutional amendment allowing Virginia governors to serve more than one successive term. Virginia is the only state with such a limit. The proposed change would apply only to Warner's successors. With the headaches Warner faces, he might think twice about seeking a second term, even if he could. ■

# The Factions in West Virginia Politics

ALLAN S. HAMMOCK, chair, Department of Political Science, West Virginia University

The 2002 election re-affirmed a pattern of West Virginia politics that has prevailed since 1932: West Virginia remained a “modified one-party Democratic state” with factional politics and candidate-centered elections.

Some 50 years ago, John H. Fenton, in *Politics in the Border States*, concluded that West Virginia had four political groupings, three within the Democratic Party and a fourth, the Republican Party. The three Democratic factions consisted of: (1) a “liberal” faction dominated by organized labor; (2) a traditional rural, conservative faction; and (3) a “Statehouse” faction made up of the various elected and appointed officials in the capitol and courthouses around the state.

Given this factional arrangement, the success of the Democratic Party always has depended on which candidate could best bring the factions together against a weak Republican Party. Conversely, the success of the Republican Party has depended on a divided Democratic Party and the nomination of candidates attractive enough to woo Democrats.

In 1968, for example, a severely divided Democratic Party lost to an attractive Republican, Governor Arch A. Moore Jr., who thereafter bested the Democratic Party time and time again because of his great political and leadership skills. Just as predictably, when the factions of the Democratic Party in 1988 coalesced around gubernatorial candidate Gaston Caperton, a “moderate” businessman, the party won easily. Absent a unifying candidate in 1996, when the labor-backed candidate for governor, Charlotte Pritt, won the Democratic primary but was unable to bring all the Democrats together in the general election, Republican Cecil Underwood (who had been elected governor once before, in 1956) won.

On the face of it, this pattern might be changing as West Virginia enters the new millennium. In 2000, Republican President George W. Bush beat his Democratic opponent, former Vice President Al Gore, in West Virginia. Bush and the Republicans pushed the right buttons to attract Democrat voters (coal, jobs and guns), and Gore could not move beyond his liberal, pro-environment, pro-labor base.

In the 2002 off-year elections, U.S. Representative Shelley Moore Capito, a moderate Republican with attractive personal qualities and political skills, defeated Democrat James Humphreys, a highly successful trial lawyer who lost to Capito in 2000. Capito easily won the rematch, 60 percent to 40 percent. Capito’s

victory, which was a significant improvement over her plurality win in 2000, testifies to candidate-centered politics in West Virginia. Humphreys was widely perceived as lacking endearing qualities and received the one-third liberal-labor vote of the Democratic Party and little more. The statehouse and conservative factions simply sat on their hands.

In the U.S. Senate contest, the Republican challenger, Jay Wolfe, a strongly pro-life, pro-gun advocate, lost to two-term incumbent John D. Rockefeller IV, 63 percent to 37 percent. In this instance, the Republican candidate lacked the personal qualities needed to overcome the three to one Democratic advantage enjoyed by Rockefeller.

Still, recent elections in West Virginia have given hope to the Republican Party. Riding on the successful presidential candidacy of

Bush and Capito’s 2000 victory, the state Republican Party made a much more concerted effort in 2002 to field candidates in state and local races. The result was a gain of seven seats in the House of Delegates and four in the Senate.

While this is progress for the Republican Party, it still has a considerable distance to go to break the Democratic stranglehold. Democrats now control two U.S. Senate seats, two of the three U.S. Representative seats, all statewide elected offices and Supreme Court judges, 68 percent of the House of Delegates and 70 percent of the state Senate. Contesting all these offices with attractive candidates is the key to the future success of the Republican Party. Until it does so, the GOP will remain West Virginia’s minority party. ■

## Vote Differences by Race and Party, 2002 vs. 1998 Off-Year Elections

State*	Race	Total Votes 2002 less 1998	Republican Votes 2002 less 1998	Democratic Votes 2002 less 1998
AL	Senator	38,898	(25,412)	64,310
	Governor	26,429	117,749	(91,050)
AR	Senator	122,373	74,865	47,508
	Governor	110,580	5,200	105,380
FL	Governor	1,093,113	664,740	428,373
GA	Senator	293,330	152,812	140,518
	Governor	249,554	253,295	(3,741)
KY	Senator	(1,555)	161,862	(163,417)
LA	Senator**	319,433	296,681	22,752
OK	Senator	113,788	12,897	100,891
	Governor	172,570***	(64,221)	90,591
NC	Senator	321,473	302,721	18,752
SC	Senator	28,127	107,001	(78,847)
	Governor	38,370	94,117	(55,747)
TN	Governor	666,420	116,890	549,530
TX	Governor	710,608	66,285	644,423

### NOTES:

\* This chart reflects only races that occurred in both 1998 and 2002. For example, the 2002 Mississippi Senate race is not reflected because no Senate race occurred in 1998.

\*\* LA differences are based on the 2002 run-off less the 1998 general election.

\*\*\* OK total votes reflects the 146,200 votes won by an independent candidate.

SOURCES: 2002 returns come from each state’s Board of Elections’ Internet site. 1998 data come from *The Almanac of American Politics 2002* by Michael Barone and Richard Cohen.

Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life  
School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
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.

## Publisher's Note

---

*FERREL GUILLORY, Director*

This issue of *SouthNow* marks the first published with the support of Progress Energy, the Raleigh-based holding company with electric utilities serving more than 2.7 million customers in the Carolinas and Florida.

We deeply appreciate Progress Energy's two-year, \$45,000 grant to the Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life. The grant will allow us to extend the reach of our printed and electronic newsletters — *NC DataNet* and *SouthNow* — that disseminate information and analysis of political trends in North Carolina and the South. These newsletters circulate to legislators, statewide elected officials, business leaders, lobbyists, journalists, political scientists, university trustees and administrators.

Our website, [SouthNow.org](http://SouthNow.org), contains archives of the newsletters, as well as the DataPack collection of statistics on state and regional politics. In addition, we send out an electronic SouthNow Update twice a month, summarizing recent developments in the region and pointing to books and articles of interest.

As a result of the Progress Energy grant, we welcome the opportunity to add names to the circulation lists for both the newsletters and email updates. We also welcome your comments.

The principal goals of the Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life are to create a common ground place of learning for civic, business, journalistic and political leaders and to connect the work of scholars and their students to opinion leaders and decision makers. In keeping with these goals, the Program has joined with the UNC Program on the Humanities and Human Values to provide state legislators with an enriching mid-career experience.

We recently completed the fourth annual Executive Seminar for Southern Legislators on the campus of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. About 70 lawmakers from 12 states have taken part in these four-day considerations of political history, Southern economic and social change, religion in public life and education trends.

Former Governor James Holshouser of North Carolina and former Governor William Winter of Mississippi have made presentations at all four legislative seminars. We owe a word of thanks to the National Humanities Center and its outgoing director, W. Robert Connor, for hosting a dinner for the legislators. We also express our continuing gratitude to the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation for its support for the legislative seminar and other initiatives of our Program. ■