

# North Carolina

June 2000

Issue #25

# DataNet

## Historical Perspectives on NC Politics

### Turnout in NC's Gubernatorial Primaries

Ferrel Guillory (UNC-CH Program on Media, Southern Politics and Public Life, School of Journalism and Mass Communications)

Despite competitive races in both the Democratic and Republican parties, North Carolina's gubernatorial primaries brought forth wails of lament over "all-time low" voter turnout. Indeed, the turnout was very low, but that's not the whole story. The accompanying table "First Primary Turnout as a Measure of Party Strength" (page 2) points to several trends that form a more nearly complete picture.

As North Carolina has become increasingly a state of two-party competition since 1972, there has been a steady drop in turnout (i.e., total vote as a percentage of registered voters), in party primaries for governor and U.S. senator. During much of the twentieth century, when North Carolina was a one-party state, the battle for the governor's mansion took place within the Democratic Party. Turnout was relatively high in the primaries, because citizens who wanted to help decide who became governor knew that they had to take part in the Democratic primary. Now, more than twice as many voters cast ballots in the general election as in party primaries.

In total voters who show up to cast ballots, Democratic Party turnout still exceeds GOP turnout. But Republican Party participation has expanded since the early '70s. Republican vote-count hit a peak in 2000, though it still fell more than a quarter of a million votes below the Democratic total. Democratic primary votes peaked in 1984, and stabilized in the mid-500,000 range in the 1990s.

Over the past eight years, North Carolina has had an astounding 1.1 million increase in the raw number of registered voters: registration climbed from 3.8 million in 1992 to 4.9 million in 2000. On the surface, it appears that voter registration out-paced population growth in the 1990s. What happened? It is that North Carolina has dramatically felt the effects of the 1993 federal law, popularly known as "motor-voter."

This law made it easier for people to register to vote, whether through the department of motor vehicles, mail-in registration, or social services agencies. What's more, the law put limits on the purging of voter rolls. The staff of the State Board of Elections estimates that the current voter registration total is inflated by 500,000 "inactive" voters, including people who have moved away or who have not voted in recent elections but whose names cannot be purged under the law until 2001. The two-party vote total in 2000 was just about the same as in 1996, but the turnout percentage was lower because the total registration figure was significantly larger.

(continued on page 2)

*This will be the last issue of North Carolina DataNet published by the Odum Institute for Research in Social Science. See page 14 for details on our new home. ♦*

### NC DataNet

June 2000  
Issue #25

♦  
Thad Beyle, editor  
(beyle@email.unc.edu)  
Jennifer Drolet,  
managing editor  
(jdrolet@irss.unc.edu)

♦  
*North Carolina DataNet* is  
a quarterly newsletter  
published by the  
Odum Institute  
for Research in  
Social Science,  
University of North Carolina  
at Chapel Hill.

♦  
To join our mailing list, please  
contact Thad Beyle, Dept. of  
Political Science, CB #3265,  
University of North Carolina,  
Chapel Hill, NC, 27599-3265.

♦  
*850 copies of this public document  
were printed at a cost of \$475.*

## First Primary Turnout as a Measure of Party Strength

	Democrat	Republican	Total Votes	Reg. Voters	% Turnout
1960	643,060- G	-----	643,060	N/A	N/A
1972	808,105- G	107,583- G	915,688	2,280,000	40.2
1984	955,799- G 845,946- S	148,574- S 140,354- G	1,104,373	3,271,000	33.8
1992	701,606- G	270,568- S	972,174	3,817,000	25.5
1996	588,926- S	279,610- G	867,536	4,331,000	20.0
1998	540,031- S	265,288- S	705,319	4,740,000	14.9
2000	553,794- G	312,529- G	865,323	4,930,000	17.5

**G** = Gubernatorial primary      **S** = Senatorial primary      **Source:** NC State Board of Elections

Another factor probably has contributed to lower turnout percentages in the 1990s than in the '70s and '80s. Presidential contests usually draw more voters to the polls than statewide races. When the General Assembly decided to schedule all first primaries in May, it had the effect of putting North Carolina late in the presidential nominating lineup. With the national nominations practically decided before North Carolinians have voted for three consecutive primary elections, presidential races have not served as a draw to higher turnout in gubernatorial and senatorial primaries.

In effect, North Carolina now has two distinct electorates: 1) a core of partisan voters—Republicans as well as Democrats—who decide party nominations, and 2) a much larger general-election group that includes party loyalists, independents, and swing voters. ♦

### NC Voters' Party Registration: 1966-April 2000

Year	% Dem.	% Rep.	% Ind.
1966	79.7	17.8	(not avail.)
1968	75.5	21.6	2.5
1970	75.3	21.9	2.5
1972	73.4	22.9	3.7
1974	72.6	23.6	3.8
1976	72.5	23.5	4.0
1978	72.6	23.3	4.1
1980	72.4	23.5	4.1
1982	71.9	24.0	4.1
1984	70.0	25.6	4.4
1986	68.6	27.2	4.2
1988	65.6	29.6	4.9
1990	63.7	30.8	5.5
1992	60.6	31.9	7.5
1994	58.6	32.8	8.7
1996	54.4	33.7	11.9
1998	52.7	33.9	13.4
2000 (April)	50.6	33.9	15.4

**Sources:** NC Center for Public Policy Research, "The Two Party System in NC," (Raleigh, Dec 1987); NC Free, Sep 1998; and NC State Board of Elections.

### NC Party Registration: 1966-2000

Thad Beyle (UNC-CH Political Science)

Over the past one-third of a century there have been some significant shifts in how North Carolina voters view themselves when registering to vote. (See "NC Voters' Party Registration" table (below left).

In the mid-1960s, registered Democrats outnumbered registered Republicans by a 4.5 to 1 ratio. Since then, there has been a consistent decline in the percentage of voters registered as Democrats, from nearly 80% to just above 50%. Between 1966 and 1972 the decline averaged 2.1 percentage points each two-year period. Between 1972 and 1984 the decline slowed to an average of only a half a percentage point each two-year period. Then, since 1984 the decline has averaged about 2.5 percentage points each two-year period. By April of this year, the Democratic-Republican registration ratio was only 1.5 to 1.

Over the same period, Republican registration has increased from just below 18% in 1966 to nearly 34% this past April. But that increase has been at a slower pace, averaging less than a percentage point gain each two-year period. The periods of greatest gain were in the mid 1960s and 1980s. However, since 1996 that growth has leveled off at about one-third of the registered voters.

One of the most interesting shifts over the period is the growth of Independent or non-affiliated voters in the state. At only 2.5% of the registered voters in 1968, their percentage has risen to 15.4% by this April—a six-fold increase. For most of the period that growth was by very small increments each two-year period. But over the 1990s the increments have become greater, rising from 5.5% of the registered voters in 1990 to 15.4% in April 2000.

No wonder both major political parties have opened up their primaries to these unaffiliated voters. If you can get them to vote in your party's primary, you will probably get their vote in the November election—or so the theory goes. ♦

## NC Voter Registration & Turnout in General Elections: 1960-2000

Year	Total NC Voting-Age Population	Total NC Registered Voters	NC Turnout			Party of Winner		
			# of Voters	% of Reg. Voters	% of Voting-Age Pop.	Pres.	Sen.	Gov.
1960	2,585,000	N/A	1,368,556	--	52.9	D	D	D
1962	2,647,000	N/A	813,155 (senate)	--	30.7	--	D	--
1964	2,723,000	N/A	1,424,983	--	52.3	D	--	D
1966	2,798,000	1,933,763	901,978	46.6	32.2	--	D	--
1968	2,921,000	2,077,538	1,587,493	76.4	54.4	D	D	D
1970	3,043,000	1,945,187	932,948	63.9	30.7	--	--	--
1972	3,541,399	2,357,645	1,518,612	64.4	42.9	R	R	R
1974	3,725,037	2,279,646	1,020,367 (senate)	44.8	27.4	--	D	--
1976	3,884,477	2,553,717	1,677,906	65.7	43.2	D	--	D
1978	4,053,977	2,430,306	1,135,814 (senate)	46.7	28.0	--	R	--
1980	4,222,654	2,774,844	1,855,833	66.9	43.9	R	R	D
1982	4,416,444	2,674,787	1,330,630	49.7	30.1	--	--	--
1984	4,585,788	3,270,933	2,239,051	68.5	47.4	R	R	R
1986	4,738,687	3,080,990	1,591,330 (senate)	51.6	33.6	--	D	--
1988	4,887,358	3,432,042	2,134,370	62.2	43.7	R	--	R
1990	5,016,747	3,347,635	2,068,904 (senate)	61.8	41.2	--	R	--
1992	5,182,321	3,817,380	2,611,850	68.4	50.4	R	R	D
1994	5,359,333	3,635,875	1,533,728	42.2	28.6	--	--	--
1996	5,499,000	4,330,657	2,618,326	60.5	47.6	R	R	D
1998	5,620,000	4,740,272	2,012,143	42.4	35.8	--	D	--
2000 (April)		4,930,319				??	--	??

**Sources:** Michael Barone and Grant Ujifusa, *The Almanac of the United States* (Washington, DC: National Journal, 1972-1998); US Department of Commerce, *Statistical Abstract of the United States* (various years); Federal Elections Commission; Office of the Secretary of State, *North Carolina Manual* (Raleigh: Department of State, since 1966); NC State Board of Elections, "General Voter Registration and Election Statistics," NC Center for Public Policy Research, *North Carolina Focus* (1989) and "The Two Party System in North Carolina," (Raleigh, Dec 1987); and Curtis Gans, Committee for the Study of the American Electorate.

## Largest Vote-Getters in Major Statewide Office Races: 1980-1998

	Candidate	Status	Race	Year	Total Votes	NC Outcome
<b>Democrats</b>	Jim Hunt	incumbent	NC Governor	1996	1,436,638	won
	Jim Hunt	open seat	NC Governor	1992	1,368,246	won
	Terry Sanford	incumbent	US Senator	1992	1,194,015	lost
	Harvey Gantt	challenging inc.	US Senator	1996	1,173,875	lost
	Jim Hunt	incumbent	NC Governor	1980	1,143,143	won
	Bill Clinton	challenging inc.	President	1992	1,114,042	lost
	Bill Clinton	incumbent	President	1996	1,107,849	lost
	Jim Hunt	challenging inc.	US Senator	1984	1,070,488	lost
	John Edwards	challenging inc.	US Senator	1998	1,029,237	won
	Rufus Edmisten	open seat	NC Governor	1984	1,011,209	lost
	Harvey Gantt	challenging inc.	US Senator	1990	981,573	lost
	Bob Jordan	challenging inc.	NC Governor	1988	957,687	lost
	Michael Dukakis	open seat	President	1988	890,167	lost
	Robert Morgan	incumbent	US Senator	1980	887,653	lost
	Jimmy Carter	incumbent	President	1980	875,635	lost
	Walter Mondale	challenging inc.	President	1984	824,287	lost
	Terry Sanford	challenging inc.	US Senator	1986	823,662	won
<b>Republicans</b>	Ronald Reagan	incumbent	President	1984	1,346,481	won
	Jesse Helms	incumbent	US Senator	1996	1,345,833	won
	Lauch Faircloth	challenging inc.	US Senator	1992	1,297,892	won
	George Bush	open seat	President	1988	1,237,258	won
	Bob Dole	challenging inc.	President	1996	1,225,938	won
	Jim Martin	incumbent	NC Governor	1988	1,222,338	won
	Jim Martin	open seat	NC Governor	1984	1,208,167	won
	Jesse Helms	incumbent	US Senator	1984	1,156,768	won
	George Bush	incumbent	President	1992	1,134,661	won
	Jim Gardner	open seat	NC Governor	1992	1,121,955	lost
	Robin Hayes	challenging inc.	NC Governor	1996	1,097,053	lost
	Jesse Helms	incumbent	US Senator	1990	1,088,331	won
	Lauch Faircloth	incumbent	US Senator	1998	945,943	lost
	Ronald Reagan	challenging inc.	President	1980	915,018	won
	John East	challenging inc.	US Senator	1980	898,064	won
	James Broyhill	incumbent	US Senator	1986	767,668	lost
	I. Beverly Lake, Jr.	challenging inc.	NC Governor	1980	691,449	lost

**Source:** *Almanac of American Politics*, 1982-2000

## Cost of Gubernatorial Elections

Thad Beyle (UNC-CH Political Science)

The cost of running for office seems to be getting higher and candidates' need to raise money is as important as their need to gain voting support. Nowhere does this seem more true than in this state's gubernatorial elections since 1968. If we look at how much the candidates reported spending over the last eight gubernatorial elections, we see an increase from \$2.2 million in 1968 to \$18 million in 1996. (See "Total Spending Reported" column in table below.)

But when the inflation of the dollar over the period is factored in, a somewhat different picture emerges. To control for inflation in the expenditures for each of the eight elections, the actual dollars spent were converted into May 2000 dollar equivalents (see "Converting Campaign Expenditures" box on page 6). Those results are presented in the table below in the "Total Spending (in 2000\$ Equivalent)" column. Here is what our analysis reveals:

- ◆ The most expensive gubernatorial race over the period was in 1972, when ten candidates sought the governorship and both parties had to go to a second primary to choose their candidates. Nearly four out of every five dollars spent was by a Democratic candidate. By 51.3% to 48.7% margin, Jim Holshouser beat Democrat Hargrove "Skipper" Bowles and became the first Republican to win the governor's chair in the twentieth century. The total spent for that race was \$33.6 million in 2000\$, an average of \$22.29 for each general election voter!
- ◆ The second most expensive race was the 1984 to succeed then two-term Democratic Governor Jim Hunt. A total of fourteen candidates spent the 2000\$ equivalent \$23.1 million in their quest for the governorship. Again, Democratic candidates spent nearly four out of every five dollars in the campaign (in good part because there were ten Democratic candidates running and they needed a second primary to select their candidate, Attorney General Rufus Edmisten). Congressman Jim Martin cruised through

### Cost of Gubernatorial Elections: 1968-1996

#### A. Campaign Expenditures per Election Year

Year	Total Spending Reported	Total Spending (in 2000\$ Equivalent)	Total # of Votes Cast	Cost per Vote (in 2000\$)
1968	\$2,190,136	\$10,735,961	1,558,308	\$6.89
1972	\$8,201,585	\$33,613,053	1,507,785	\$22.29
1976	\$4,428,910	\$13,340,090	1,658,999	\$8.04
1980	\$3,818,190	\$7,938,025	1,884,543	\$4.21
1984	\$14,048,311	\$23,143,840	2,226,727	\$10.39
1988	\$12,513,720	\$18,109,580	2,180,025	\$8.31
1992	\$13,353,473	\$16,284,723	2,595,184	\$6.27
1996	\$18,021,728	\$20,024,142	2,566,185	\$7.80
Total		\$142,754,106	16,177,756	\$8.82
Avg.		\$17,844,263	2,022,220	\$8.82

#### B. Type of Election

Year	Status	Candidates	Contested Primary?		Margin of Victory	Dem \$	Rep \$
			Dem.	Rep.			
1968	Open Seat	5	Y	Y	+6 D	55.7%	44.3%
1972	Open Seat	10	YY	YY	+3 R	78.4%	21.6%
1976	Open Seat	9	Y	YY	+32 D	90.2%	9.8%
1980	Incumbent	7	Y	Y	+25 D	90.1%	9.9%
1984	Open Seat	14	YY	Y	+9 R	78.2%	21.8%
1988	Incumbent	6	Y	N	+12 R	53.9%	46.1%
1992	Open Seat	9	Y	Y	+10 D	54.5%	42.5%
1996	Incumbent	9	N	Y	+13 D	50.3%	49.7%

**Note:** Two "total spending" figures are listed for each year: "Total Spending Reported" is the total of the actual amounts reported by all candidates; "Total Spending in 2000\$" is the reported amount converted to May 2000 dollar equivalents to control for the effect of inflation. (See box on page 6 for details on conversion method.)

**Contested Primary?** Listed by party; Y = yes; YY = second primary

**Dem \$/Rep \$** = percent of total election expenditures spent by Democratic versus Republican candidates.

his party's primary and then defeated Edmisten 54% to 45% to become North Carolina's second Republican governor in the century. The amount spent was equal to \$10.39 per general election voter.

- ◆ Next is the 1996 election, the third most expensive race. Democrat Jim Hunt won his fourth term over Republican Robin Hayes by a 56% to 43% margin. The nine candidates spent \$20 million in 2000\$ in this race, or about \$7.80 per general election vote. The least expensive race was Hunt's 1980 second term victory. The seven candidates only spent \$7.9 million in 2000\$ or \$4.21 per general election vote.
- ◆ Looking at how much the candidates spent per vote cast in the general election, we see that while the races in 1972 (\$22.29 per general election voter) and 1984 (\$10.39) were the priciest, they were followed by the 1988 race (\$8.31), the 1976 race (\$8.04), and then the 1996 race (\$7.80). Over the eight-election period the average amount spent per voter was \$8.82. The five races for an open seat (1968, 1972, 1976, 1984, 1992) were more expensive on a \$10.17

cost per voter basis than were the three incumbent reelection races (1980, 1988, 1996) on a \$6.95 cost per voter basis.

- ◆ Note also the increasing parity in candidate spending between the two parties. From 1972 to 1984, Democratic candidates considerably outspent their Republican counterparts. There was a 9 to 1 Democratic advantage in Jim Hunt's first two elections (1976, 1980) and a 4 to 1 ratio in the 1972 and 1984 elections as noted above. Since the 1984 election, Republican spending has steadily closed in on Democratic spending: the margin difference in 1996 was a mere 0.6%.

Several things stand out in terms of spending by individual candidates in these eight elections (see table below):

- ◆ In five of the eight races, the winning candidate spent more than the losing candidate. In 1976 Jim Hunt outspent his opponent by a 6 to 1 ratio and then followed that up by outspending his 1980 opponent by a 8.5 to 1 ratio.

## Winners' and Losers' Spending in NC Gubernatorial Elections: 1968-1996

Campaign Spending by Winning Gubernatorial Candidates						
Year	Candidate	Party	Total Spending Reported	Total Spending (in 2000\$)	Total # of Votes Cast	Cost per Vote (in 2000\$)
1968	Bob Scott	D	\$623,487	\$3,056,309	821,233	\$3.72
1972	Jim Holshouser	R	\$962,289	\$3,943,807	767,470	\$5.14
1976	Jim Hunt	D	\$1,665,913	\$5,017,810	1,081,293	\$4.64
1980	Jim Hunt	D	\$3,199,316	\$6,651,385	1,143,145	\$5.82
1984	Jim Martin	R	\$3,051,498	\$5,027,180	1,208,167	\$4.16
1988	Jim Martin	R	\$5,770,785	\$8,351,353	1,222,338	\$6.83
1992	Jim Hunt	D	\$6,978,623	\$8,510,516	1,368,246	\$6.22
1996	Jim Hunt	D	\$9,063,854	\$10,070,949	1,436,638	\$7.01
Total				\$50,629,309	9,048,530	
Average				\$6,328,664	1,131,066	\$5.06
Campaign Spending by Losing Gubernatorial Candidates						
1968	Jim Gardner	R	\$651,351	\$3,192,897	737,075	\$4.33
1972	"Skipper" Bowles	D	\$4,507,264	\$18,472,393	729,104	\$25.34
1976	David Flaherty	R	\$277,045	\$834,473	564,102	\$1.48
1980	I. Beverly Lake, Jr.	R	\$373,113	\$786,098	691,449	\$1.14
1984	Rufus Edmisten	D	\$2,402,984	\$3,958,787	1,011,209	\$3.91
1988	Bob Jordan III	D	\$6,738,168	\$9,751,329	957,687	\$10.18
1992	Jim Gardner	R	\$5,655,013	\$6,896,357	1,121,955	\$6.15
1996	Robin Hayes	R	\$6,953,236	\$7,725,818	1,097,053	\$7.04
Total				\$51,618,152	6,909,634	
Average				\$6,452,269	863,704	\$7.47
Average (without 1972)				\$4,735,108	882,293	\$5.36

**Note:** Two "total spending" figures are listed for each year: "Total Spending Reported" is the total of the actual amounts reported by all candidates; "Total Spending in 2000\$" is the reported amount converted to May 2000 dollar equivalents to control for the effect of inflation. (See box on page 6 for details on conversion method.)

**Source:** NC State Board of Elections

- ◆ In two of the three exceptions to this winner spending more than losers pattern, Republican candidates defeated their opponents in winning the election (1972, 1988). The other exception was in 1968 when Lieutenant Governor Bob Scott bested Congressman Jim Gardner by a six-point margin despite being slightly outspent by Gardner.
- ◆ The most expensive campaign over the eight-election period was in 1972 when Democratic candidate Hargrove "Skipper" Bowles' lost to Republican Jim Holshouser even though spending \$18.5 million in 2000\$ in the race! His nearly 5 to 1 spending ratio against Holshouser still saw him lose by 3 percentage points. I once asked Terry Sanford why Bowles lost the 1972 race despite spending so much on his campaign. His answer was quick and short: "It wasn't his turn!" Bowles had bested Lt. Governor Pat Taylor in a tough second primary and it was "Taylor's turn" to be governor. So, he lost support among Democrats in the General Election.
- ◆ It may seem like an old saw, but every governor elected since 1972 has been named Jim. And in 1968, the losing candidate was named Jim, and that same Jim tried to come back in 1992 only to be bested by another Jim, Hunt that is.

In this current 2000 election year, we may see the Republican candidates outspend their Democratic counterparts for the first time ever. Will that yield them their third GOP governor since the turn of the last century? Could be, and since the race is for an open seat it will be expensive no matter who wins. And since there are no Jims in the race, the results are not as easy to predict. ◆

### Converting Campaign Expenditures to May 2000\$ Equivalent

Campaign expenditures were converted into May 2000 dollar equivalents in order to compare across years and control for inflation.

May 2000 dollar equivalents were created from the Consumer Price Index-Urban, using 1982-84 as the base years [= 1.000]. The May 2000 CPI-U index value was 1.713. To determine each year's 2000\$ value, that year's CPI-U was divided by the May 2000 1.713 value. The 1968 CPI-U was .349 on the 1982-84 base; this divided by the 1.713 May 2000 CPI-U equaled .204. Other years are:

1972 = .418 [.244]	1974 = .493 [.288]
1976 = .569 [.332]	1978 = .652 [.381]
1980 = .824 [.481]	1984 = 1.039 [.607]
1986 = 1.096 [.640]	1988 = 1.183 [.691]
1990 = 1.307 [.763]	1992 = 1.403 [.819]
1996 = 1.569 [.920]	1998 = 1.630 [.952]

### Cost of U.S. Senatorial Elections

Thad Beyle (UNC-CH Political Science)

The political history of North Carolina's two U.S. Senate seats is a tale of contrasts over the past 130 years.

The seat currently occupied by Jesse Helms was held by a total of eleven individuals between 1872 and 1973, with an average term of service of more than nine years. Between 1872 and 1946, only four individuals held this seat, averaging nearly nineteen years of service each. Then between 1946 and 1973, seven men averaged under four years of service each.

Among the seat's notable alumni were Furnifold Simmons, who helped create and run the first Democratic political machine over the first quarter of the twentieth century; UNC System president Frank Porter Graham, who was appointed by Governor Kerr Scott in 1950 to fill a vacancy; and Governor Scott himself. By the 1970s, it had become a seat of fairly rapid turnover.

The John Edwards seat was held by a total of nine individuals between 1873 and 1975, with an average term of service of more than eleven years. Between 1932 to 1974, only three men served, for an average of fourteen years each.

Notables holding this seat included Governor Zebulon Vance in the late nineteenth century; Governors Cameron Morrison of the 1920s and Clyde Hoey of the pre-World War II era; and Sam Ervin, the star of the Senate Watergate hearings. This seat was relatively stable, especially between the Depression era and the 1970s.

However, since the 1972 and 1974 elections, the political history of these seats has diverged considerably. Jesse Helms was elected in 1972, has served since 1973, and may seek yet another term in 2002. Meanwhile, the other seat has had six different occupants since "Senator Sam" retired in 1974: Robert Morgan (D), John Porter East (R), Jim Broyhill (R), Terry Sanford (D), Lauch Faircloth (R), and John Edwards (D).

Despite the relative stability of Helms' seat and the great instability of the Edwards revolving door seat, it is the campaign costs for Helms' seat that have been by far the higher of the two (see "Cost of US Senate Elections" table on page 7). The five Helms races have cost candidates a total of \$92 million (in 2000 dollar equivalents) compared to the total of \$48 million for the five revolving door races. A single race for the Helms seat has averaged (in 2000 dollar equivalents), \$18.4 million, while a single race for the revolving door seat has averaged \$9.7 million (in 2000 dollar equivalents). Some analysts argue that the Helms seat is stable precisely *because* the Senator has been able to raise and spend so much money in his campaigns, while there are many reasons for the instability in the revolving door seat.

We will have to wait and see whether Helms seeks to extend his hold in 2002. If he doesn't run, will the campaign expenditures be considerably less in that race? And in 2004, will Edwards be able to break the three-decade jinx of the revolving door by being reelected? ♦

## Cost of US Senate Elections: 1972-1998

### Campaign Expenditures per Election Year

Year	Total Spending Reported	Total Spending (in 2000\$ Equivalent)	Total # of Votes Cast	Cost per Vote (in \$2000)
1972	\$1,124,339	\$4,607,947	1,472,541	\$3.13
1974	\$1,166,728	\$4,051,139	1,011,393	\$4.01
1978	\$8,387,293	\$22,013,892	1,135,814	\$19.38
1980	\$2,124,084	\$4,415,975	1,785,717	\$2.47
1984	\$26,379,483	\$43,458,785	2,227,256	\$19.51
1986	\$9,356,753	\$14,619,926	1,591,330	\$9.19
1990	\$25,572,829	\$33,516,158	2,069,904	\$16.19
1992	\$5,438,482	\$6,640,393	2,577,891	\$2.58
1996	\$22,582,246	\$24,545,919	2,556,456	\$9.60
1998	\$17,707,153	\$18,599,950	2,012,143	\$9.24
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$176,470,084</b>	<b>18,440,445</b>	<b>\$9.58</b>

### Type of Election

Year	Status	Contested Primary?		Margin of Victory	Dem \$	Rep \$
		Dem.	Rep.			
1972	Open Seat	YY	Y	+ 8 R	43.0%	57.0%
1974	Open Seat	Y	Y	+26 D	67.0	33.0
1978	Incumbent	YY	N	+10 R	3.1	96.9
1980	Incumbent	N	N	+ 1 R	44.6	55.4
1984	Incumbent	Y	Y	+ 4 R	35.9	64.1
1986	Appointee	Y	Y	+ 4 D	44.7	55.4
1990	Incumbent	YY	Y	+ 6 R	30.5	69.5
1992	Incumbent	N	Y	+ 4 R	45.7	54.3
1996	Incumbent	Y	N	+ 7 R	35.4	64.6
1998	Incumbent	Y	N	+ 4 D	47.1	52.9

**Note:** Two "total spending" figures are listed for each year: "Total Spending Reported" is the total of the actual amounts reported by all candidates; "Total Spending in 2000\$" is the reported amount converted to May 2000 dollar equivalents to control for the effect of inflation. (See box on page 6 for details on conversion method.)

**Appointee** = incumbent had been appointed to the seat, and was now seeking election in his own right

**Contested Primary?** Listed by party; Y = yes; YY =second primary

**Sources:** *Almanac of American Politics, 1974-2000*; NC State Board of Elections

## Helms/Hunt Political Money

Thad Beyle (UNC-CH Political Science)

Over the last three decades, two major political figures have dominated our state's politics: Senator Jesse Helms and Governor Jim Hunt. According to the analysis in the table below, their initial elections have turned out to be their least expensive races. Helms spent "only" \$2.7 million in his 1972 win and Hunt spent "only" \$5 million in his 1976 win (in 2000 dollar equivalents). Since those elections, the cost of winning their elections has increased considerably, especially for Helms.

Not only have they continued to win their elections, they were involved in the "Great 1984 Train Wreck" when they did battle over who would hold Helms' U.S. Senate seat come 1985. The 1984 race was a train wreck in that these two political figures were on the same track moving at high speed toward each other. Once Hunt won reelection in 1980 and would be leaving office in 1985, it was fairly apparent that if he was to go further in the state's politics, that U.S. Senate seat was the option.

And an expensive train wreck it was, with the candidates spending (in 2000 dollar equivalents), \$43.5 million, making it probably the most expensive statewide political race in North Carolina history. To hold on to the seat, Helms outspent Hunt by a 1.8 to 1 ratio (in 2000 dollar equivalents, that would be \$27.9 million to \$15.6 million).

But Helms has consistently spent more money on his campaigns than has Hunt. The former spent \$92 million in his five U.S. Senate races compared to the \$45.6 million Hunt has spent on his four gubernatorial and one senatorial races—a 2 to 1 ratio. And this was even true in their 1996 reelection races, where (in 2000 dollar equivalents), Helms outspent Hunt \$16.9 million to \$9.9 million, or a 1.7 to 1 ratio. ♦

### Campaign Spending by Jesse Helms and Jim Hunt

Year	Total Spending Reported	Total Spending (in 2000\$ Equivalent)	Total # of Votes Cast	Cost per Vote (in 2000\$)
<b>Jesse Helms</b>				
1972	\$654,246	\$2,681,366	795,248	\$3.37
1978	\$8,123,205	\$21,320,748	619,151	\$34.44
1984	\$16,917,559	\$27,870,772	1,156,768	\$24.09
1990	\$17,761,579	\$23,278,609	1,088,331	\$21.39
1996	\$14,589,266	\$16,870,103	1,345,833	\$12.54
Total		\$92,021,598	5,005,331	\$18.38
Average per election		\$18,404,319	1,001,006	\$18.38
<b>Jim Hunt</b>				
1976	\$1,665,913	\$5,017,810	1,081,293	\$4.64
1980	\$3,199,316	\$6,651,385	1,143,145	\$5.82
1984*	\$9,461,924	\$15,588,013	1,070,488	\$14.56
1992	\$6,978,623	\$8,520,907	1,368,246	\$6.22
1996	\$9,063,854	\$9,852,015	1,436,638	\$7.01
Total		\$45,630,130	6,099,810	\$7.48
Average per election		\$9,126,026	1,219,962	\$7.48

**Note:** Two "total spending" figures are listed for each year: "Total Spending Reported" is the actual amount reported; "Total Spending in 2000\$" is the reported amount converted to May 2000 dollar equivalents to control for the effect of inflation. (See box on page 6 for details on conversion method.)

**1984\*** Hunt's US Senate race. All Helms' races were for the US Senate.

**Sources:** *Almanac of American Politics, 1974-2000*; NC State Board of Elections



## A State Lottery for NC?

Thad Beyle (Note: A version of this article appeared in the June 2, 2000 issue of the *Chapel Hill News*).

This past spring, the two leading Democratic candidates for governor agreed on one major issue: that North Carolina should establish a state lottery and use the proceeds for education. Mike Easley and Dennis Wicker disagreed on exactly what part of education should receive these funds, but many observers were surprised at their insistence that the state get into the lottery business.

Why should the lottery suddenly become a major issue in this year's gubernatorial race? There are several reasons: money, media, policy, and politics.

- ◆ Money: adjoining states have lotteries and they have been attracting North Carolina money to them. Why shouldn't we get a lottery so we keep those funds here in our state? And we do need more revenues for the state budget, especially in education.
- ◆ Media: not only do we see TV programs like *Who Wants to Be a Millionaire?* flourishing, but there is close coverage of people who win major lotteries across the country. Who wouldn't be enticed by pictures of happy new millionaires holding oversized checks with their winnings?
- ◆ Policy: Georgia has successfully used lottery receipts to subsidize college education through its Hope Scholarships, making the state a bright beacon for what a well conceived lottery can achieve to help education within a state. More Georgians are going on to college and are staying in the state.
- ◆ Politics: the 1998 gubernatorial elections in Alabama and South Carolina saw two incumbent anti-gaming Republican governors unseated by Democratic challengers who advocated a state lottery. If the issue can win elections, use it.

Of course there are reasons not to get into the lottery business. These include serious religious objections over the lottery as a moral issue. Others worry about a lottery encouraging citizens to gamble, creating false hopes of winning a lot of money, and assisting them in becoming gambling addicts. Others see a lottery as a not so hidden tax, and a very regressive tax at that.

What are the prospects of North Carolina adopting a state lottery? The first step is to get a lottery-supporting candidate elected as governor. Without a governor in the lead, a state lottery is dead in the water in this state. The next step is to get the newly elected legislature to agree with the new governor's lottery proposal and put the proposition out to the public for a referendum vote. State legislative candidates can expect some serious questions this year about their stance on a possible state lottery.

How would North Carolinians vote on this proposition? They would support it, according to the series of seven Carolina Polls taken between 1983 and 1999 which asked respondents about a state lottery (see "Trends in Lottery Support" table, below). Support has generally ranged from a 2 to 1 positive ratio to a 4 to 1 positive ratio, depending on how the question was worded. The recent fall 1999 Carolina Poll found a 62% support to 31% oppose ratio (see "Populations Likely to Support or Oppose" table, next page).

Of interest here is which populations are most likely to support or oppose a state lottery. The sub-groups most likely to support a state lottery included respondents ages 18 to 24 years old, respondents who never attend church or attend church infrequently, respondents who have never married, respondents in the coastal region of the state, and respondents at the lowest end of the income scale. The sub-groups most likely to oppose a state lottery were respondents who attend church at least once a week, respondents age 65 or older, respondents in the mountain region, and respondents at the highest end of the income scale. The key differences here revolve around age, income, and religion.

But as samples of adult North Carolinians, these polls can be misleading come election day. How would a sample of registered voters differ? More importantly,

### Trends in Lottery Support: 1983-99

Poll Date	Question*	% Positive	% Negative
April 1983	a	59 G	28 B
October 1989	b	66 S	25 O
October 1990	b	61 S	24 O
March 1994	c	72 Y	21 N
March 1997	b	61 S	30 O
March 1998	d	69 F	16 O
October 1999	b	62 S	31 O

#### \*Question wording and response options:

**a** "Do you think a state lottery would be a good idea or a bad idea?" G = good, B = bad

**b** "Do you support or oppose a state lottery for North Carolina?" S = support, O = oppose

**c** "Do you think North Carolina lawmakers should consider starting a lottery to help our schools?" Y = yes, N = no

**d** "Some people favor a state lottery to raise revenue for the NC educational system. Other people oppose a lottery on moral or economic grounds." F = favor, O = oppose (Split sample; see note in "Populations Likely to Support or Oppose a NC Lottery" table, page 10)

**Sources:** Various years of the Carolina Poll (<http://www.irss.unc.edu/irss/researchdeservices/researchdeslinks/cpollreports.htm>).

how would a poll of “likely voters” differ? My guess is that the lottery issue is much tighter than it first appears once we get down to people who would actually have the interest and take the time to vote. And with the issues and perspectives involved, it would be a very tough campaign.

One last point on how even those in politics can misread public sentiment from election results. Newly elected Alabama Governor Don Siegelman took immediate steps to implement his pro lottery stance. It passed the state legislature and then went out to the voters for their concurrence. They didn’t concur, defeating the proposal with a 55% “no” vote! This was the same electorate that had elected the pro state lottery Siegelman only a year earlier by 58%. What happened? In retrospect, the media and other analysts now believe what happened in that election was the voters were more interested in evicting incumbent Governor Fob James than in getting a state lottery. So, read those public opinion polls and the votes in the poll booth very carefully. ♦

### Populations Likely to Support or Oppose a NC Lottery: Oct 1999

#### Sub-Groups More Likely to Favor a Lottery

(total sample)	62%
18-24 years old	81
Never attend church	80
Attend church less than once a month	77
Never married	76
Attend church 1-3 times a month	72
Live in coastal region	70
Earn less than \$10,000 per year	69

#### Sub-Groups More Likely to Oppose a Lottery

(total sample)	31%
Attend church at least once a week	47
65 years or older	45
Live in mountain region	41
Republican	37
Earn \$80,000 or more a year	37

**Note:** Question wording was: “Some people favor a state lottery to raise revenue for the NC educational system. Other people oppose a lottery on moral or economic grounds. Do you strongly favor, favor, oppose, or strongly oppose a state lottery with the revenue used to support education?” The sample was split for this question, with half the respondents asked the question as worded as above and half asked the question with sentences 1 and 2 reversed. The responses were not appreciably different and the results were merged for presentation here. Also, the “strongly favor” and “favor” responses were combined, as were the “oppose” and “strongly oppose” responses.

**Source:** Fall 1999 Carolina Poll, October 23-30, 1999, 717 adult NC residents.

## Presidential Voting and NC Voters

Christine A. Kelleher and Thad Beyle  
(UNC-CH Political Science)

In its February 21, 2000 issue, *USA Today* released a ranking of the best to worst U.S. presidents. All forty-one men who ever held the office were ranked according to the quality of their performance by a survey of fifty-eight presidential historians (see “*USA Today’s* Presidential Rankings versus NC’s Voting History” table on page 12). While it is interesting to explore where all of the different presidents fall in a national historical framework, an equally interesting question explores how the voters in North Carolina measured up in voting for our presidents. Did they support those at the top of the ranking more than those further down the rankings? Or is there no distinct pattern of North Carolina voters being able to discern the potential quality of performance?

The top presidents, ranked in order from one to ten, were Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, George Washington, Theodore Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Woodrow Wilson, Thomas Jefferson, John F. Kennedy, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Lyndon B. Johnson. There is a clear twentieth century bias in the top ten ranking, with only three—Lincoln, Washington, and Jefferson—nineteenth century mentions. The top presidents’ service in office generally coincided with major events in the history of our country: the Revolutionary War, the creation of the new Union, the Civil War, World War I, the Great Depression, World War II, the Cold War, and the Civil Rights era.

The ten top presidents ran in nineteen presidential elections, winning eighteen of them nationally. They won a majority of North Carolina’s Electoral College (EC)<sup>1</sup> votes in twelve (63%) of these races. The seven exceptions are of interest. Two exceptions were tied to the fact that North Carolina was not in the Union when the election occurred. In 1789 (George Washington’s first election), North Carolina had not yet ratified the Constitution, having led the fight to have a Bill of Rights attached before ratifying it. In 1864 (Lincoln’s second election), North Carolina was part of the Confederacy, having seceded from the Union. Another exception was in 1860 (Lincoln’s first election), when the Civil War loomed on the horizon. Two other exceptions were tied to Teddy Roosevelt, who in 1904 was an “accidental President” seeking to win the office in his own right and who in 1912 was a former president trying to regain the office as the candidate of the Progressive Party. The final two exceptions were the two Eisenhower elections in the 1950s. While Ike didn’t carry North Carolina, his two presidential campaigns had much to do in helping Republicans become a greater force in the state.

## Presidential Elections in NC

First, let's look at the fifty-three presidential elections North Carolina held between 1789 and 1996. Overall, in the fifty-one presidential elections in which the state's EC votes counted, the winner nationally also won in the state thirty-four times (67%). But there have been four rather distinct patterns over the two centuries in the results of these elections in North Carolina.

- ◆ In the eighteen presidential elections in the pre-Civil War period, the state's EC vote went to the winning candidate fourteen times (78%). The only presidents not winning the state's EC votes during this period were John Adams (1796), John Quincy Adams (1824) and James Polk (1844). The other election was the 1789 noted above.
- ◆ In the ten presidential elections between 1860 and 1900, there was considerable deviation between the vote in the nation and the vote in the state, as the Civil War and its aftermath were being felt. Only four presidents won the state's EC vote in this period: Ulysses S. Grant (1868 and 1872) and Grover Cleveland (1884 and 1892). This was a 44% winning rate, discounting the 1864 election noted above.
- ◆ In the seventeen presidential elections between the McKinley election of 1900 and the Johnson election of 1964, the state was safely Democratic. The only Republican presidential candidate to carry the state was Herbert Hoover in 1928. Many of the state's Democratic voters just couldn't buy the Democratic candidate, New York Governor Al Smith, a Catholic and a Prohibition-Era "wet." The state's EC vote went to the winner in ten of these contests, a 59% winning rate.
- ◆ In the eight presidential elections since 1968, North Carolinians' votes went to the Republican candidate in all but the 1976 Jimmy Carter victory. North Carolina's vote went to the winner in seven of these eight elections (88%).

## How Individual Presidents Have Fared in NC

Now, we turn to see how individual presidents have fared in presidential elections in NC. In this discussion, "presidents" are individuals who either won the presidency, ran for reelection, or sought to regain the office. Election attempts prior to their initial presidential win (e.g., Nixon in 1960) are not included. (See "Total Number of Presidential Elections" table, below.)

- ◆ These forty-one presidents were involved in sixty-three separate presidential elections and won fifty-three of them nationally (84%). They won the state's EC vote in thirty-six of the sixty-three races (57%).
- ◆ The top twenty presidents in the rankings were involved in more presidential elections (38) than those in the bottom half (25), a 1.5 to 1 ratio. Part of this disparity is tied to those presidents in the lower half who either died in their first and only term (Garfield, Harding, W. H. Harrison, Taylor), or as vice presidents succeeded to the presidency and only served out that term following the death of the elected president (Arthur, Filmore, Ford, A. Johnson, Tyler).
- ◆ The twenty presidents in the top half of the rankings won thirty-four of their thirty-eight races nationally (89%), and won North Carolina's EC vote in twenty-five of these races (66%).
- ◆ The twenty-one presidents in the bottom half of the rankings won nineteen of their twenty-five races nationally (76%) and won North Carolina's EC vote in eleven of these races (44%).
- ◆ Nineteen presidents won every one of their elections in North Carolina: Buchanan, Bush (2 races), Cleveland (3 races), Grant (2), W.H. Harrison, Jackson (2), Jefferson (2), L. Johnson, Kennedy, Madison (2), Monroe (2), Nixon (2), Pierce, Reagan (2), F. Roosevelt (4), Taylor, Truman, Washington, Wilson (2)

## Total Number of Presidential Elections

USA Today Quartile Ranking	Won-US			Lost-US			Total # of Elections
	Total	W-NC	L-NC	Total	W-NC	L-NC	
#1 through #10	18	12	4 [2]*	1	0	1	19
#11 through #20	16	11	5	3	2	1	19
#21 through #30	11	5	6	4	0	4	15
#31 through #41	8	6	2	2	0	2	10
Total	53	34	17	10	2	8	63

**Note:** Table includes all presidential elections in which a president was elected, an incumbent president sought another term, or a former president sought to return to the White House.

**Won/Lost-US:** Total = national elections won/lost; W-NC = NC elections won; L-NC = NC elections lost

\*Two elections occurred when NC was not part of the Union (Washington's in 1789 and Lincoln's in 1864).

## USA Today's Presidential Rankings versus NC's Voting History

Rank	President	Year	NC Outcome		Rank	President	Year	NC Outcome	
			Won?	Vote %				Won?	Vote %
1	Abraham Lincoln	W 1860	N	3%	21	Bill Clinton	W 1992	N	43%
		W 1864*	Not in Union				W 1996	N	44%
2	Franklin Roosevelt	W 1932	Y	70%	22	Jimmy Carter	W 1976	Y	55%
		W 1936	Y	73%			1980	N	47%
		W 1940	Y	74%	23	Gerald Ford	1974*	VP	
		W 1944	Y	67%			1976	N	44%
3	George Washington	W 1789	Not in Union		24	William H. Taft	W 1908		N46%
		W 1792	Y	12/12 EC			1912	N	12%
4	Theodore Roosevelt	1900*	VP		25	Richard M. Nixon	W 1968	Y	40%
		W 1904	N	40%			W 1972	Y	70%
		1912	N	28%	26	Rutherford Hayes	W 1876	N	46%
5	Harry Truman	1944*	VP		27	Calvin Coolidge	1920	VP	
		W 1948	Y	58%			W 1924	N	40%
6	Woodrow Wilson	W 1912	Y	59%	28	Zachary Taylor	W 1848		Y55%
		W 1916	Y	58%	29	James Garfield	W 1880	N	48%
7	Thomas Jefferson	W 1800	Y	58%	30	Martin Van Buren	W 1836	Y	53%
		W 1804	Y	14/14 EC			1840	N	42%
8	John Kennedy	W 1960	Y	52%	31	Benjamin Harrison	W 1888	N	48%
9	Dwight Eisenhower	W 1952	N	46%			1892	N	36%
		W 1956	N	49%	32	Chester Arthur	1880	VP	
10	Lyndon Johnson	1960*	VP		33	Ulysses S. Grant	W 1868	Y	53%
		W 1964	Y	56%			W 1872		Y57%
11	Ronald Reagan	W 1980	Y	49%	34	Herbert Hoover	W 1928	Y	55%
		W 1984	Y	61%			1932	N	29%
12	James Polk	W 1844	N	48%	35	Millard Filmore	1852*	VP	
13	Andrew Jackson	W 1828	Y	73%	36	John Tyler	1840*	VP	
		W 1832	Y	85%	37	William H. Harrison	W 1840		Y58%
14	James Monroe	W 1816	Y	97%	38	Warren Harding	W 1920		N43%
		W 1820	Y	96%	39	Franklin Pierce	W 1852	Y	50.4%
15	William McKinley	W 1896	N	47%	40	Andrew Johnson	1865*	VP	
		W 1900	N	46%	41	James Buchanan	W 1856*	Y	57%
16	John Adams	W 1796	N	1/24 EC					
17	Grover Cleveland	W 1884	Y	53%					
		1888	Y	52%					
		W 1892	Y	48%					
18	James Madison	W 1808	Y	48%					
		W 1812	Y	15/15 EC					
19	John Q. Adams	W 1824	N	36%					
		1828	N	27%					
20	George Bush	W 1988	Y	58%					
		1992	Y	44%					

**Rank** = USA Today ranking (See "Presidential Voting" article, page 10)

**Year:** W = won national election for president

**NC Outcome: Won in NC?** = Yes/No; **Vote %** = % of the NC popular vote (for elections prior to 1816, the # of Electoral College votes won out of # possible are listed in lieu of actual returns).

**VP** = vice-president, succeeded after death of president

\* = See the "Notes for Presidential Rankings Table" (page 13) for details on particular years.

**Sources:** Seth B. Hinshaw, *North Carolina Election Returns 1790-1866: Covering the Races for President, Governor and US House* (Stockport, OH: S.B. Hinshaw, 1992); John L. Chaney, Jr., ed., *North Carolina Government, 1585-1974*, (Raleigh: Secretary of State's Office, 1975); *CQ's Guide to US Elections*, (Washington, D.C. CQ Press, 1975), and Venessa Goodman and Jack Betts, *Growth of a Two-Party System in North Carolina* (Raleigh: North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research, 1987).

- ◆ Fifteen presidents never won any of their twenty-two races in North Carolina: J. Adams, J.Q. Adams (2 races), Clinton (2), Coolidge, Eisenhower (2), Ford, Garfield, Harding, B. Harrison, Hayes, Lincoln, McKinley (2), Polk, T. Roosevelt (2), Taft (2).

ardless of their political positions, however, they have undoubtedly demonstrated that their voice is an important one, revealing much about the nature and course of both North Carolina as a state as well as the more general notions surrounding American history and tradition.

<sup>1</sup>Regarding North Carolina's treatment of Electoral College (EC) votes, presidential electors were chosen by the state legislature in 1792; in the 1796 to 1808 elections, electors were selected in districts by popular vote; in 1812, electors were selected by the state legislature; and since 1816, electors have been selected by statewide popular vote. ◆

### Summary

The panel of fifty-eight presidential historians voted last winter on who they thought were the country's best and worst presidents. North Carolina voters and electors have been casting their votes on presidents for over the past two centuries. There are parallels and deviations between these two sets of votes. Not only is it the president's job performance while in office that has counted in these votes, but the times in which they served: wars, good times and bad times, terms shortened by death, and being an "accidental president" serving out the terms of those who died or left office.

A general conclusion might be that North Carolina voters are both leaders and followers. They have followed national trends as well as deviated from them. Re-

### Notes for Presidential Rankings Table (page 12)

- 1789 NC did not vote, since it had not yet ratified the U.S. Constitution.
- 1840 John Tyler ran as William Henry Harrison's vice president in 1840 and succeeded to the presidency when Harrison died one month after the inauguration. Both major parties spurned any bid by Tyler to be nominated as their presidential candidate in 1844.
- 1852 Millard Fillmore ran as Zachary Taylor's vice president in 1848 and succeeded to the presidency following Taylor's death in 1850. Fillmore lost his bid for the Whig nomination for president in 1852.
- 1856 James Buchanan did not seek reelection in 1860, nor would either wing of his splintered party have considered him as a candidate.
- 1864 NC did not vote, since it had seceded from the Union.
- 1865 Andrew Johnson ran as Abraham Lincoln's vice president in 1864 and succeeded to the presidency following Lincoln's assassination in April 1865. Johnson survived an impeachment attempt in 1868, but the Democratic Party selected New York Governor Horatio Seymour as its candidate.
- 1880 Chester Arthur ran as James Garfield's vice president in 1880 and succeeded to the presidency following Garfield's assassination in 1881. Declining health prevented Arthur from running in 1884.
- 1900 Theodore Roosevelt ran as William McKinley's vice president in 1900 and succeeded to the presidency following McKinley's assassination in 1901.
- 1912 Woodrow Wilson beat Taft and Theodore Roosevelt
- 1920 Calvin Coolidge ran as Warren Harding's vice president in 1920 and succeeded to the presidency following Harding's death in 1923.
- 1944 Harry Truman ran as Franklin Roosevelt's vice president in 1944 and succeeded to the presidency following Roosevelt's death in 1945.
- 1960 Lyndon Johnson ran as John Kennedy's vice president in 1960 and succeeded to the presidency following Kennedy's assassination in 1963.
- 1968 Nixon defeated Hubert Humphrey (who received 29% of NC vote) and George Wallace (31%).
- 1974 Gerald Ford was appointed vice president by Richard Nixon after Spiro Agnew resigned in October 1973. Ford succeeded to the presidency following Nixon's resignation in August 1974.

## **NC DataNet's New Home**

Ferrel Guillory (UNC-CH Program on Media,  
Southern Politics and Public Life,  
School of Journalism and Mass Communications)

The Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life seeks to enhance the public service mission of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill by serving as a vehicle for the university to assert its scholarly strength and civic tradition in the region. Its principal goals are to create on campus a common-ground meeting place for civic, business, journalistic and political leaders and to enrich research and learning opportunities for faculty and students.

It is in keeping with the program's efforts to make the work of scholars and their students more accessible that the program has become the publishing home of *North Carolina DataNet*. This is a quarterly newsletter of government and political data, edited by UNC-CH Political Science Professor Thad Beyle, and published, until now, by the Odom Institute for Research in Social Science (IRSS). As a result of recent administrative changes, the Odom Institute can no longer publish *North Carolina DataNet*. Because of the value of this publication—as an outlet for faculty research and student projects—the Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life agreed to become its new publisher. The newsletter's audience includes faculty in political science and the humanities, state legislators, journalists, opinion leaders, and others with an interest in politics in this state.

In addition to publishing *North Carolina DataNet*, the Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life has the following line-up of projects:

### **Executive Seminars for State Legislators**

This project, conducted in collaboration with the UNC-CH Program on the Humanities and Human Values, gives lawmakers, with a special emphasis on emerging leaders, an opportunity to read, think, and talk about big issues of our time. The second seminar in this series is scheduled for November 12-15, 2000, in Chapel Hill. The first seminar last year attracted eighteen state legislators from seven states. Presenters included former

Governor William Winter of Mississippi, former Governor James Holshouser of North Carolina, historians John Hope Franklin and William Leuchtenburg, UNC-CH Public Health Dean William Roper, UNC-CH Education Dean Madeleine Grumet, and former UNC System President William Friday.

### **Southern Journalists Roundtables**

Once a semester, the program gathers a roundtable of columnists, editorial writers, and state capital correspondents, along with UNC faculty and graduate students, to consider emerging and enduring issues in the Southern states. The fifth roundtable will take place following the 2000 general election.

### **Election 2000 Project**

The Program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life joined as a "state partner" to the Alliance for Better Campaigns, a Pew-funded organization working to expand candidate-centered discourse on television. The program has two roles: a) to encourage television stations in North Carolina to devote five minutes a day to campaign coverage in the thirty days prior to an election, as recommended by the federal Advisory Commission on the Public Interest Obligations of Digital Broadcasters; and b) to monitor TV coverage of the gubernatorial race in North Carolina. Jim Goodmon, the chief executive of Capitol Broadcasting Co., who served on the Advisory Commission, took the lead among state broadcasters in offering two-minute messages from major-party candidates for governor three times a day for the thirty days prior to the May 2 primaries on four of its TV stations, including WRAL-TV. In addition, WBTV-TV in Charlotte aired a nightly report on primary campaigns throughout the month of April.

### **Campaign 2000 Commentary**

The program has joined with WUNC-FM radio in an effort to bolster the station's attention to and commentary on this year's election campaigns. I will be a regular commentator for the station during its local segments in the Friday afternoon *All Things Considered* time period. ♦

---

**NC DataNet**  
**Odum Institute for Research in Social Science**  
**CB# 3355**  
**University of North Carolina**  
**Chapel Hill NC 27599-3355**