Interest Groups in South Carolina
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Daniel Elazar argues that in states where the traditionalistic political culture dominates, a cohesive elite is dominant.¹ Historically, South Carolina would be an archetypal illustration of this pattern. In fact, Cole Blease Graham and William V. Moore describe South Carolina as the original model for the traditionalistic political system.²

When V. O. Key published Southern Politics in State and Nation in 1949, this elite consisted of the textile and planter interests.³ This elite however, has been replaced as the South and South Carolina undergo economic change. For example, as early as 1964, Leslie Danbar noted that southern governors were "de facto executive directors of state Chambers of Commerce."⁴ In South Carolina, Dunbar's statement is even more correct today than it was 30 years ago. An examination of the state's interest groups illustrates how the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce has become the institutional mechanism by which the business community has become dominant in the state in the contemporary era.

Interest Groups in South Carolina: An Overview

While there are numerous interest groups in South Carolina, interests outside the business community can generally be described as Lilliputians facing mighty Gulliver with few resources and limited means. Antibusiness political organizations are regarded as having some influence in certain situations, but the argument advanced by Schattschneider⁵ 30 years ago and more recently affirmed by Scholzman and Tierney⁶ that business dominates the pressure system appears to be true in South Carolina. An examination of business' opponents illustrates this.
Unions are politically insignificant in South Carolina and the working class is poorly represented. The legislative black caucus, however, is sympathetic to working class concerns. In 1909, former Senator Herbert Fielding said, "There has been a perception among blacks and other minorities of exclusion from full participation in the economic renewal of the state." Blacks identify with labor because they share a sense of relative deprivation. He added, "Business is as happy as a pig in a puddle of mud because they can get pretty much what they want. And this has been true for 40 or 50 years." Blacks, by contrast, are not as pleased with the system's political outputs.

The black community has yet to emerge as a central player in South Carolina politics despite its size. The weakness of the black community is reflected in the underrepresentation of blacks in the state legislature. Six black senators and 25 black representatives (18 percent of the membership of the General Assembly) served in 1996. Senator Kay Patterson illustrated the bitter frustration of the black caucus in 1993 when it unsuccessfully resisted an effort to restructure state government. Said Patterson: "When you get the governor and all them white so-called Democrats together and the Republicans and cut deals and they get all their candy, it's hard to beat that. It's hard to beat that when there ain't but 25 of us in the General Assembly." Because 30 percent of the population is black, 51 of the legislators would be black if their proportion of the population were accurately represented in the state legislature. Still, the black caucus has grown steadily through the years. If it retains its liberalism and if this growth continues, there is a possibility that the black caucus could serve as a surrogate for unions for the working class.

Citizens' lobbies generally fail to excite much enthusiasm among citizens in the Palmetto State. The Sierra Club is the only citizens' lobby in the state with a full-time lobbyist in Columbia. This group is weak, but it is not powerless. The Sierra Club's PAC would only be important if, as director Nancy Vinson put it, "we would first decide which bank to rob." But Vinson and her 4,000 members have adroitly used the media on several occasions. For example, the South Carolina Coastal League helped the Sierra Club defeat in 1992 a "takings" bill that would have required the state to compensate landowners whose property values declined by 50 percent as a result of
state regulation. The 2,000 members of the League feared that this would damage the state's environmental protection program. The environmental community lost, however, on a proposal by the state Chamber that required cost-benefit analysis of environmental regulation.

The South Carolina Trial Lawyers Association (SCTLA), which has 1,100 members and seven full-time staff, is one adversary of business with a measure of effectiveness. Most of the points of sharpest contention between business and another interest in South Carolina involve the lawyers. Workers' compensation and the legal liability of employers for injuries suffered by their employees are two continuing battles that pit lawyers and business against one another. Business lobbying efforts, spearheaded by the Chamber of Commerce, have never managed to "win" any of these skirmishes, at least not to their full satisfaction. As SCTLA director Linda Franklin observed, "I can't say we've had any legislative setbacks, but it's been a real struggle."¹⁰

The South Carolina Education Association (SCEA) is business's other formidable adversary. The South Carolina Education Association is clearly in the top tier of interest groups in the Palmetto State. In fact, teachers were second only to the Chamber in terms of interest groups which were powerful in the state. They were mentioned by 36 percent of the 42 legislators interviewed when they were asked to cite the five most powerful interest groups in the state. Its total staff of 30, its budget of $2 million annually, and its 17,000 educated members give the SCEA important organizational resources comparable to those possessed by the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce. Business leaders have distrusted the organization because they believe the teachers want to improve their salaries at the expense of taxpayers. This perception has strained SCEA-business relations in the past, although they apparently became more amicable in the 1990s. For example, the SCEA worked with the Chamber in 1994 and 1995 to preserve the residential property tax as a revenue source for education.¹¹

Other groups cited by legislators as being powerful groups include doctors, the South Carolina electric cooperatives, higher education, local governments, and the Baptist Church. However, in the
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final rankings none was in the top five groups cited most frequently by the legislators interviewed. These results differ somewhat from an earlier study by Robert Botsch. Botsch found banks, the Chamber, higher education, textiles and insurance as the top ranked groups. In part, these differences may reflect the increasing importance of the Chamber as a political actor relative to other interests.

Business Interests in South Carolina Today

There are a number of business and trade associations active in South Carolina today besides the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce. In fact, in addition to the Chamber there are two other business associations. One group is the Palmetto Business Forum. This group consists of 35 chief executives of the state's largest corporations. As one corporate lobbyist remarked, "You won't find them in the phonebook." Springs Industries' Vice-President Robert Thompson observes, "The Forum tries not to be visible because big business is not always perceived as a champion."

The Business and Industry Political Education Committee (BIPEC) is a second group that represents the general interests of employers in Columbia. BIPEC, which was created in 1985, has 300 members, two staff members, and $160,000 at its disposal. Still, former Executive Vice-President Jim Carpenter did not regard his job as difficult because "we have one of the most probusiness legislatures in the country." Many legislators believe that the Chamber actually pulls BIPEC's strings. Former Republican House leader T. Moffatt Burriss (who later became BIPEC Vice-President) thought of BIPEC as a "subsidiary" of the Chamber.

Dozens of trade associations are also active in Columbia. One group, the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association (SCTMA), comes closest to being a rival organizational voice for business in South Carolina. SCTMA was created one year before the Chamber, on July 20, 1939, as the Cotton Manufacturers Association of South Carolina. The organization changed its name to SCTMA in 1961. The Chamber was first incorporated as Organized Business, Inc. on August 5, 1940. The nearly simultaneous creation of South
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Carolina's most powerful business lobbies reflects the fear of labor that employers felt in the 1930s. The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) of 1938, in particular, "...jolted southern manufacturers into concerted and united action." Southern employers resented the wages and hours regulations of the FSLA, and they organized to protect their low-wage economy.

The Textile Manufacturers Association has historically been extremely powerful in South Carolina, and all but a few small textile firms are members. Robert Botsch argues that textile manufacturers are stronger in South Carolina than in North Carolina because South Carolina has a less diverse economy. The power of the textile sector is reinforced by members of the General Assembly. Textile manufacturers were mentioned 33 percent of the time as one of the five most powerful interest groups in the state. Overall, this ranked textile manufactures third. But textile employment has been declining and total textile employment fell below 100,000 for the first time since World War II in 1991. This should presage a decline in the SCTMA's influence as its share of the state's employment base diminishes.

The SCTMA has a narrower agenda than the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce. Its 77 member firms simply want state government to leave them alone. Textile companies want a docile workforce, and they want state taxation and regulation kept to a minimum. Textiles are the core of the "Old South" that Botsch and Luebke believe are beginning to yield to a "New South" that favors modern, sophisticated industry.

The relationship between South Carolina's two strongest business interest groups is rarely tense. Indeed, most SCTMA members also belong to the state Chamber. SCTMA Executive Director Jerry Beasley, who has been lobbying for the SCTMA since 1972, observed that his organization's "closest alliance" is with the state Chamber of Commerce. The SCTMA is a key player in South Carolina, and its role deserves to be emphasized, but it would appear doubtful that the SCTMA undermines the Chamber's role as a representative of the general interests of Palmetto employers. The SCTMA represents a narrower constituency than the Chamber does, and its interests coincide more often than they diverge.
The South Carolina Bankers Association (SCBA) is a second powerful trade group, in part, because all 81 commercial banks in the state are members. Its top priorities in 1993 included successful drives to keep a community reinvestment act bottled up in a legislative committee and to eliminate a legal requirement that real estate worth more than $100,000 be professionally appraised. SCBA lobbyist, Sally Tibshrany, reported that her group cooperates most often with insurers and the savings and loan industry. Representative Thomas Alexander reported that the "bankers want higher rates of interest, and this may hurt the rest of business." Approximately 21 percent of the legislators mentioned bankers as one of the five most powerful interest groups in the state. This ranking was the fifth highest of groups mentioned.

Another business group is the 750 member South Carolina Merchant Federation. This group is represented by James Hatchell, a lobbyist since 1968. At least 10,000 state businesses have retail licenses, so the Federation has a small segment of the total market. Hatchell's top issue in 1994 was to establish civil procedures for merchants to recover some of the $300 million they lose each year to shoplifters and to closely regulate flea markets which sell stolen goods. The black caucus in the Senate gutted Hatchell's bill in 1993, but he succeeded in 1994. Hatchell generally does not work with the state Chamber. "Their membership doesn't reflect our interests, and they have gone south on us a few times on tax issues." But the Merchants Federation still work with the Chamber on workers compensation issues.

The South Carolina Soft Drink Association is still another business Association; however, it generally has a much lower profile. All of the state's 15 soft drink distributors belong. Jay Hicks, who is the group's lobbyist, said, "We generally go under the Chamber's umbrella. We let the state Chamber do most of the lobbying. I used to lobby for the banks, and they generally let the Chamber take the lead on workers compensation and other general business issues."

SCANA, which contains South Carolina Electric & Gas, is regarded by a number of observers as the most politically active of the state's three public utilities. In fact, SCANA was mentioned by 29 percent of the 42 legislators interviewed as one of the five most
powerful interest groups. This ranked SCANA fourth in frequency of identification.

SCANA Vice-President Kathy Novinger has been highly visible on education issues. SCANA's 4,000 employees make it one of Columbia's largest corporations. Novinger's two lobbyists are active on health care, workers compensation, worker safety, tax, and environmental regulation issues. SCANA recently took an active role in defeating legislation that would have required that the "fairness" of an eminent domain action be demonstrated. This bill would have made it difficult for utilities to install new facilities. Novinger regards the state Chamber as a useful ally because "it brings a network." Carolina Power and Light and Duke Power are headquartered in North Carolina and are thought by legislators to be less active in Columbia than SCANA.

Springs Industries, which has 21,000 employees nationwide, is the largest corporation headquartered in South Carolina. Springs belongs to the SCTMA, the SCCC, and the Palmetto business Forum. The company also has a contract lobbyist who monitors the state political scene. "Phase 1" of government restructuring was Spring's top priority of 1993. The company wants to protect state tax exemptions for the purchase of new machinery used to control water and air pollution if the residential property tax is phased out as the source of education funding.

These companies represent some of the major business interests in the state. In some cases they may work through the Chamber and in other situations they may act independently of the Chamber. As Dr. Jesse Coles, former director of the Budget and Control Board, observed in 1989, "Individual corporations that comprise the Chamber can be inside players in South Carolina's decentralized system of boards and commissions." 27

The State Chamber of Commerce: An Assessment

It is clear, however, that despite the ideological, regional and industrial diversity of business in the state, the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce is the premier organizational representative of the state's
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strongest interest: business. It is also equally evident that the state Chamber is nonetheless able to make a credible claim to be the voice of Palmetto business. Nearly 80 percent of the legislators interviewed for this study cited the South Carolina Chamber as one of the five most powerful interest groups in state politics. No other interest was cited more than 36 percent of the time.

The Chamber uses several methods to try to secure policy consensus among its diverse constituency. Even though South Carolina has a relatively simple economy, the Chamber of Commerce draws membership from many types of businesses. Although legislators in the 1990s are impressed by the Chamber and its 2,400 members, T. Moffatt Burris, former House Republican leader, reported that the Chamber "got really active only seven years ago" because "business is more harassed."28 Republican Senator Larry Martin, who was first elected in 1978 and whose background is in textiles, remarked, "There has been a rise in the Chamber’s influence. The Chamber of Commerce has gotten more active in the last decade because government affects business more."29 Longtime former Labor Commissioner Edgar McGowan agreed: "The influence of the Chamber of Commerce has increased terrifically. In 1978, the Chamber was not viable. Textiles have always been there."30

Eight policy committees are run by member volunteers and address a variety of business-related issues such as environmental regulation and taxation. These committees play a crucial role in the organizational life and effectiveness of the Chamber because they resolve disagreements within the membership. Former Vice-President (and chief staff officer) Ken Oilschlager remarked, "I balance the committees. There is often a wide ideological spectrum both within and between committees. When the Education Improvement Act was debated, the Education Committee was willing to accept taxes for better education, but the Tax Committee didn’t like it so we didn’t take a position."31

Good information is especially important for effective lobbying since the adoption of ethics reforms after the FBI sting Operation Lost Trust in 1990. These reforms force lobbyists to be more circumspect.32 Chamber members and others who try to influence the legislature must rely on useful information now that contributions and
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legislative contracts are more closely scrutinized. This works to the advantage of the Chamber because its policy committees have the resources to do meaningful research.

Still, divergence in the interests and perspectives of the membership make disagreement and conflict a constant threat and prevent the Chamber from shaping its identity and destiny in just the way the staff would like. "They can't make up their minds," Senator Phil Leventis remarked. In his view, the Chamber's difficulty in sustaining organizational harmony has hampered its effectiveness in the General Assembly.

A systematic examination of the outcome of the Chamber's lobbying efforts in the 1993-94 legislative session confirms legislators' belief that this is the state's most formidable group. The Chamber identified 50 bills or administrative decisions on which it took positions in its "The Session in Review" for the 1993-94 session. The Chamber prevailed on 67 percent of these bills, lost on 21 percent, and compromised on another 6 percent. These summary statistics alone are, of course, not sufficient to assess the political power of the group. We must select a few illustrative examples of specific governmental decisions. The examples offered here are representative of the range of issues the Chamber addressed in the 1993-94 legislative session. The Chamber claimed victories on environmental regulation, workers compensation, health care, education, state governance, and taxation.

Of course, the Chamber does not win every battle. For example, the Chamber failed to prevent the state Department of Health and Environmental Control from developing solid waste regulation more stringent than federal regulations. The Chamber also failed to stop a bill promoted by pharmacists that ensures an employee's right to choose the pharmacy of his choice even though this makes it difficult to promote managed health care. Similarly, the Chamber failed to convince the legislature to shorten its session and to adopt a continuous assessment program for grades K through 3. The Chamber's most significant and painful defeat in 1995 occurred when it failed to defeat Governor David Beasley's promotion of a $100,000 homestead exemption on the property tax.

Numerous triumphs can be contrasted with these defeats. The Chamber successfully promoted a bill imposing criminal penalties for
people committing workers compensation fraud against self-insurers. The role of physician assistants was extended in many health insurance programs in other legislation. The Chamber’s "School-to-Work Transition" bill, which passed in 1994, divides high school education into two distinct tracts, one for technically-oriented students and the other for college bound students. The Chamber also convinced the legislature to set statutory limits on fees for environmental permitting.

The Chamber also excels at stopping unwelcome legislation. The Chamber defeated a bill promoted by the environmental community that would have required any company that discharges any waste in the state to post conspicuous and legible signs including the company’s name and the names of the pollutants. The Chamber also defeated a bill that would have allowed employees to "opt out" of a company’s health care network. Finally, the Chamber defeated a bill that would have allowed public employees to retire after 25 years of employment. These examples serve as proof that the Chamber is able to have a significant impact on many of the most important issues currently facing the Palmetto State.

The South Carolina Chamber has just one lobbyist. This individual must be prepared to discuss labor relations, health care, education, environmental regulation, taxation, and governance. As former Chamber lobbyist Larry Marchant remarked, "It’s hard to keep everything straight." The top Chamber priority in 1993 was the streamlining of state government that Governor Carroll Campbell (1987-1995) considered his most important success. Jim Bradford, Director of the Governor’s Office of Research, said, "The Chamber was instrumental in helping push for restructuring." Marchant helped Governor Campbell overcome resistance from the legislature and state agencies.

This legislation consolidated 76 state agencies into 19 departments and allowed the governor to appoint the directors of 14 of these departments. Marchant argued that the governor needed more control and that the bureaucrats, who were unelected, were too autonomous. "Mac" McIlroy, general manager of the Chamber, added, "We wanted a more complete cabinet form of government than we got, so this is not a final effort. But we did reduce the number of boards and commissions. This makes the governor responsible for developing
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a budget as well as for hiring and firing agency heads. "36 Chamber staff contend that these changes will make government more accountable. The Chamber’s confidence that no governor unacceptable to business stands much chance of being elected in South Carolina undoubtedly helps explain Marchant’s enthusiasm for the restructuring.

Education issues have absorbed much of the Chamber’s attention in recent years. The Chamber hired Ellen Hayden, who had been Governor Riley’s liaison to the business community, to be its Vice-President for Education in 1989. Chamber literature explains that the South Carolina Business Center for Excellence in Education "serves as the Chamber’s vehicle for influencing continuous improvement of public education through action-oriented research, policy options, clearinghouse capabilities, and a voice for business on education issues." Such leading business figures as Lawrence Gressette, CEO of SCANA Corporation, and Walter Elisha, CEO of Springs Industries, Inc., serve on the Center’s advisory board.

Hayden explains, "It was obvious in 1989 that the South Carolina Chamber should create an education department because it’s the largest business group. The Chamber is strongly positioned in the reform arena."37 Dr. Valerie Truesdale, Senior Executive Assistant for Policy in the state’s Department of Education, agrees that the Chamber has a uniquely high profile among business groups in education policy. "Local Chambers cultivate partnerships, but they generally don’t pursue broader policy goals. Groups like the textile manufacturers do not have a global perspective. They just want to be sure money is not wasted."38 Truesdale never hears from the bankers, a powerful state interest.

The Chamber has also called for a number of changes in education. The Chamber successfully advocated a sales tax on mail order items whose revenues would be devoted to education. The Chamber has also introduced a bill requiring that all local school boards be elected. The Chamber’s ongoing policy goals include rigorous graduation standards, a redeployment of funds from remedial compensatory programs that are not cost effective to early education programs, and intradistrict choice for students and their families. Ms. Hayden and her staff meet regularly with local Chambers, education leaders, and School Superintendent Barbara Neilson.
The Chamber did not address tort reform in 1994. As Marchant explained, "We got some limited tort reform in the late 1980s—a shortened statute of limitations. But it was such a bloody battle that I don't know if anybody here has the stomach to fight it again." 39 One might expect the Chamber to address this issue later in the 1990s, perhaps with the assistance of the South Carolina Medical Association.

In education, labor relations, environmental regulation, health care, and related state policy issues, the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce has continuous input into the policy process. Current Chamber lobbyist Todd Atwater and Ellen Hayden are the key points of contact, but the staff also use their membership to achieve their policy goals. No other business interest group has as broad a membership as the Chamber. The Chamber frequently uses its grassroots, and its network of local Chambers can organize most of the state's employers. If a consensus can be reached, this group can be an effective participant in the political process.

In addition to the state Chamber, local Chambers of Commerce may also be active participants on the political scene. Former Vice President Ken Oilschlager (1989) said, "We're reevaluating our state and local Chamber relationships. We are creating a South Carolina Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives to establish more regular relationships." 40 This network of local Chambers can organize most of the state's employers.

The Greenville Chamber of Commerce, which has 2,500 members, has been one of the most active local Chambers of Commerce in state politics. This group frequently promotes interests specific to the upcountry. Director of Government Affairs Vicki Clarke's top priority in 1993 was to end the C Funds programs which reserved a fraction of the state highway funds for rural areas. Clarke remarks, "I am down there (in Columbia) to get more money back to Greenville." 41 The state Chamber could not get involved in this debate, but Clarke worked with the state Chamber on workers compensation reform in 1994.

Charleston's 2,083 members employ Virginia Novell as Director of Public Affairs. The Charleston business community has become more active in Columbia not so much to help the state Chamber promote the general interests of business as to ensure that the
interests of the coastal area are not neglected. For example, Novell's members want her to secure more funding for bridges in the area, approval of riverboat gambling, and state promotion of tourism. Novell works with both a Coastal Chambers Coalition and an Urban Chambers Coalition. "Rural and urban Chambers are often at each other's throats. Urban counties have been outvoted throughout this century. But urban Chambers generate jobs." The Charleston Chamber is generally content to leave the representation of the general interests of business to the state Chamber. Novell observed, "Larry Marchant (former state Chamber lobbyist) and I talk a lot even though we don't always agree. They're much better on general issues." 

The Columbia Chamber of Commerce, which has 1,800 members, is a third local Chamber which has been active in state politics. Laura Copeland, Vice-President of the Chamber, reports that her group has "a definite local focus." She has worked hard to consolidate Richland County and the city of Columbia, but the black community has successfully resisted the Chamber's efforts. The Columbia Chamber also failed to convince Richland County to adopt a local option sales tax. Copeland received no help from the state Chamber in her attempt to get the local option sales tax. In general, however, "Larry Marchant and I work closely together. We can endorse 80 percent of the state Chamber's issues." 

Smaller local Chambers such as the Aiken Chamber, which has 870 members, rely more completely on the state Chamber to monitor state political developments. The Aiken Chamber's central issue in 1993, President Lee Murphy recalled, was a local sign ordinance. The Aiken "City Council asked us for our membership's views," but her members "split 50/50. Some employers wanted to maintain the old town, historical beauty of Aiken and others wanted to advertise." On state issues, "We belong to the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce which keeps us informed. We rely on the state organization." Overall, however, between the state organization and local groups, the Chamber of Commerce has become the dominant actor in the interest group arena in the eyes of legislators.
Conclusion

The strength of South Carolina's principal business interest groups has grown despite unmistakable evidence of rapid political change and increased diversity within the business community. Several factors strengthening the hand of the Palmetto Chamber are unique to South Carolina. First, the hegemonic position of the textile industry has been eroded. In earlier decades, the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association was probably a more important political force in the state than the state Chamber. The Chamber, with its more diverse membership, can now make a stronger claim than the SCTMA to represent the broader interests of an increasingly diverse business community. As former contract lobbyist Donald Fowler argued, "The Chamber is very active and influential generally, but the textile manufacturers have been losing ground in the last 20 years." 47

Second, the election of Republican governor Carroll Campbell in 1986 greatly enhanced the Chamber's political influence. Governor Campbell and his staff kept in close contact with Chamber officials throughout the eight years of Campbell's governorship. The Chamber staff was generally quite enthusiastic about Campbell. Republican Governor Beasley, who took office in 1995, has tried to be equally receptive to the Chamber's political agenda.

Third, the strengthening of the office of the governor that occurred in 1993 will encourage employers to rely on their leading interest group. The governor was given greater control over the state bureaucracy. Governmental centralization will lead to interest group centralization.

Fourth, the historic Republican seizure of control of the state House of Representatives after the election of 1994 created a more sympathetic legislature. Republicans held 68 seats in the 124 member House and 21 out of 46 state Senate seats in 1996. The Chamber's prospects will improve even more if voters give Republicans control of the state Senate in the 1996 elections.

A fifth factor contributing to the efficacy of the Chamber is present in many southern states. The traditionalistic culture tends to discourage challenges to the business elite. Business's peak association is powerful in South Carolina, in part, because it can integrate this
elite. For all of these reasons, political competition in the South is still biased in favor of the affluent.

Thus the influence of the state’s general business interest group, the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce, has grown despite the increasing complexity of South Carolina’s economy. This growing diversity in South Carolina has not in fact seriously hampered the ability of the state’s umbrella business group to shape policy in the state. This finding portends continued frustration for liberal interests in the state even after the advent of the New South. As we have seen, a few interests are able to offer some competition, but rapid economic change has not translated into political pluralism. To borrow an old cliche, the more things change, the more they stay the same.

William DeSoto is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Southwest Texas State University
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