

November 1995

Forgotten But Not Gone: Mountain Republicans and Contemporary Southern Party Politics

Robert P. Steed

Tod A. Baker

Laurence W. Moreland

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Steed, Robert P.; Baker, Tod A.; and Moreland, Laurence W. (1995) "Forgotten But Not Gone: Mountain Republicans and Contemporary Southern Party Politics," *Journal of Political Science*: Vol. 23 : No. 1 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops/vol23/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Politics at CCU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Political Science by an authorized editor of CCU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact commons@coastal.edu.

FORGOTTEN BUT NOT GONE: MOUNTAIN REPUBLICANS AND CONTEMPORARY SOUTHERN PARTY POLITICS

Robert P. Steed, The Citadel

Tod A. Baker, The Citadel

Laurence W. Moreland, The Citadel

Introduction

During the period of Democratic Party dominance of southern politics, Republicans were found mainly in the mountainous areas of western Virginia, western North Carolina, and eastern Tennessee and in a few other counties (e.g., the German counties of east central Texas) scattered sparsely in the region. Never strong enough to control statewide elections, Republicans in these areas were competitive locally, frequently succeeding in winning local offices.¹

As southern politics changed dramatically during the post-World War II period, research on the region's parties understandably focused on the growth of Republican support and organizational development in those geographic areas and electoral arenas historically characterized by Democratic control. Special attention was given to Republican development in urban and suburban areas and in presidential elections, especially those such as 1964 which were marked by Republican breakthroughs.²

While mountain Republicans have not been totally ignored over the past two to three decades, they have received relatively little attention and have normally been shunted to the back of the stage. This is illustrated by the various recent studies of state elections and politics in the South wherein the mountain areas continue to be set apart in the analyses as significant and separate regions, but they are seldom

spotlighted for special examination.³ More general examinations of Republican growth in the South have also mentioned, but not focused on, the continuing role of mountain Republicans.⁴

The relative inattention to mountain Republicans over the past two decades raises some interesting questions about their place in the contemporary southern party system. In this article we are particularly interested in exploring their role within the Republican Party by examining data comparing them in selected ways with non-mountain Republicans.

Earlier research suggested that there were some key differences between the mountain Republicans (both activists and organizations) and the new breed of urban/suburban Republicans. For example, in contrast to relatively affluent, middle class conservatives responsible for Republican growth in areas formerly dominated by the Democrats, the mountain Republicans tended to be less affluent, less well educated, and less conservative (even liberal on some issues such as the role of the national government in the economy). They were also less likely to have come into the party by way of a switch in party loyalties, and they were less likely to be non-southerners who had migrated into the region bringing their Republican identification with them. Similarly, reflecting the longer history of Republican organizational effort in the mountain areas, these Republican activists were more likely than the urban/suburban Republicans to have been recruited through some party or political mechanism. In the same vein, their activities varied from those of their partisan colleagues in the areas of new Republican development since both the organizational and electoral circumstances were so different (e.g., more attention to organizational maintenance activities than to organizational development activities).⁵

It is possible, of course, that the various changes which have swept the South over the past few decades have diminished or even eliminated these differences. Certainly, the once isolated mountain areas have become less so with advances in the technology of communication and improved transportation. Similarly, economic development in the South has not completely bypassed the mountains, and these areas, too, have experienced varying levels of population change, urbanization, and the like. It is also possible that the influence

of the non-mountain Republicans within the party has now become so significant that the mountain Republicans have been pulled along in their wake in such a way as to erode intra-party differences. On the other hand, the mountain Republicans, at least in Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee, may still constitute a clearly different component of the southern Republican Party. These are aspects of southern party development which have been largely neglected and which should be examined in the interest of a more complete understanding of southern party politics.

Methods and Data

This paper utilizes data from the Southern Grassroots Party Activists Project (SGPAP). This project, funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation and directed by Lewis Bowman and Charles D. Hadley, involved mail surveys of party precinct officials and county chairs in the 11 states of the South. Response rates varied by state and ranged from a low of 40% (for Louisiana Republicans) to a high of 68% (for North Carolina Republicans). The overall response rate was 51% with a total of 10,458 respondents.⁶

In the analysis presented here, we are using only the data on Republicans in Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee to make the comparisons of mountain and non-mountain Republicans. In each state we identified those counties (and, in the case of Virginia, independent cities) traditionally considered the home of mountain Republicanism as the basis for making the appropriate division of activists.⁷ A preliminary analysis done state-by-state revealed few significant state-by-state variations in the pattern, so here the data will be combined for all three states.

Background Characteristics

A brief description of the demographic characteristics of these local Republican officials will help clarify whether the traditional background differences between mountain Republicans and non-

mountain Republicans persist into the 1990s. As shown in Table 1, the main aggregate differences are on age, education, income, state of childhood, and time lived in the state. Mountain Republicans tend to be somewhat older (smaller percentages under 50 years of age and larger percentages over 60 years of age), less well educated, and slightly less affluent. Similarly, mountain Republicans are more likely than non-mountain Republicans to come from the South and to be longer-term residents of their current home state (although majorities of both groups have lived in their current states 20 years or more).

On the other variables listed in Table 1, there are virtually no differences. All the Republicans are overwhelmingly white and Protestant, and more males than females are local party officials. Only with regard to religion do slight differences emerge with the mountain Republicans being a little more likely to consider themselves to be "Born Again" and to attend church more frequently. In short, the key differences between the mountain Republicans and the non-mountain Republicans relate to socioeconomic variables and residential variables which suggest, at least mildly, that the mountain regions of Tennessee, North Carolina, and Virginia have not been transformed by changes in the South in such a way as to homogenize the Republican Party in those states.

This conclusion receives some further support from data on these activists' political backgrounds. (See Table 2.) While essentially no inter-group differences appear on a number of variables—other political positions held, importance of committee membership, presidential vote in 1988, and intention to run for public office—there are a few notable differences on years of previous political activity, party switching, political activity by parents or other relatives, and recruitment patterns. Perhaps reflecting the age differences noted earlier and/or the longer record of local party activity, the mountain Republicans tend to have been politically active longer than the non-mountain Republicans. They are also more likely to have come from politically active families. In addition, they are less likely to have come into the party by way of a switch from the Democratic Party; this is undoubtedly an indication of the importance of party switching to the development of the southern Republican Party outside the mountain areas over the past few decades, but it also suggests that mountain

Table I
Personal Background Characteristics of Local
Republican Activists (in percent)

<u>Background Characteristic</u>	<u>Mt. Republicans</u>	<u>Other Republicans</u>
<u>Age</u>		
Under 40	20	27
40-49	23	25
50-59	19	22
60 and over	<u>38</u>	<u>26</u>
	100	100
N =	(181)	(641)
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	60	63
Female	<u>40</u>	<u>37</u>
	100	100
N =	(179)	(632)
<u>Race</u>		
White	97	94
African American	0	4
Native American	2	1
Other	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100
N =	(180)	(626)
<u>Education</u>		
High school or less	24	12
Some college	32	32
College Graduate	20	30
Graduate degree	<u>24</u>	<u>26</u>
	100	100
N =	(181)	(637)
<u>Family Income</u>		
\$20,000 or less	12	5
\$20-29,000	13	11
\$30-39,000	14	17
\$40-49,000	15	14
\$50-59,000	15	15
\$60,000 and over	<u>31</u>	<u>38</u>
	100	100
N =	(170)	(612)

Table 1 (Continued)

<u>Background Characteristic</u>	<u>Mt. Republicans</u>	<u>Other Republicans</u>
<u>State of Childhood</u>		
South	85	74
Non-South	<u>15</u>	<u>26</u>
	100	100
N =	(181)	(641)
<u>Number of Years in State</u>		
0-5 years	6	7
6-10 years	4	7
11-20 years	6	13
Over 20 years	<u>84</u>	<u>74</u>
	100	101
N =	(181)	(641)
<u>Religious Affiliation</u>		
Protestant	96	92
Roman Catholic	1	4
Jewish	1	1
Non-Believer	3	2
Other	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
	101	100
N =	(181)	(632)
<u>Church Attendance</u>		
Once a week	53	46
Almost every week	13	19
Once a month	12	12
Few times a year	18	18
Never	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	100	100
N =	(178)	(632)
<u>Religious Identification*</u>		
Charismatic	6	7
Fundamentalist	10	15
Born Again	40	30
Evangelical	9	16
None of these	41	50

* Percentages indicating that they would describe themselves religiously in these terms.

Source: Southern Grassroots Party Activists Project

Republicans are still largely untouched by this phenomenon and that they still mainly populate their local party committees from the ranks of life-long Republicans. In the same vein, mountain Republicans are much more likely than non-mountain Republicans to indicate that they came into party work through the efforts of other party committee members or elected officials; non-mountain Republicans, on the other hand, are more likely to have come into party work on their own initiative.

In sum, the data reviewed here suggest that the mountain Republican activists in these three states retain background characteristics which continue to set them apart from their partisan colleagues in other parts of the respective states. Of more interest and importance, of course, is whether differences on such matters as ideological and issue positions, political activities, and orientations toward the party remain as well.

Ideologies and Issues

With regard to self-professed political philosophy, there are virtually no differences between mountain Republicans and non-mountain Republicans. (See Table 3.) Displaying a remarkable, but not necessarily surprising, ideological homogeneity, both groups of local Republican officials are overwhelmingly conservative (86% and 83% respectively). Inasmuch as earlier studies found some more distinctive ideological divisions between mountain Republicans (less conservative) and urban/suburban Republicans (more conservative), the patterns reported above suggest some change in the direction of less intra-party diversity.

This notion is modified somewhat by the data on these local officials' positions on a number of specific issues which were salient during the time of the survey. As indicated in Table 4, there are some notable differences between the mountain Republicans and the non-mountain Republicans on these issues. In general, the mountain Republicans tend to be more liberal, especially with regard to those issues on which the differences are largest, than the non-mountain Republicans. More specifically, of the 14 issues listed in Table

Table 2
 Political Background Characteristics of
 Local Republican Party Activists (in percent)

<u>Background Characteristic</u>	<u>Mt. Republicans</u>	<u>Other Republicans</u>
<u>Years Politically Active</u>		
10 years or less	32	40
11-20 years	28	31
21-30 years	20	20
More than 30 years	<u>19</u>	<u>10</u>
	99	101
N =	(181)	(641)
<u>Other Political Positions Held</u>		
Party position	52	46
Elective position	27	20
Appointive position	39	34
N =	(142)*	(540)*
<u>Importance of County Committee Membership</u>		
Very Important	47	41
Somewhat Important	41	41
Not Very Important	10	14
Not Important At All	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
	100	100
N =	(175)	(622)
<u>Party Switcher?</u>		
Yes	9	30
No	<u>91</u>	<u>70</u>
	100	100
N =	(175)	(629)
<u>1988 Presidential Vote</u>		
Bush	99	98
Dukakis	0	1
Other	1	1
Did Not Vote	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	100	100
N =	(180)	(635)

Table 2 (Continued)

<u>Background Characteristic</u>	<u>Mt. Republicans</u>	<u>Other Republicans</u>
<u>Parents or Relatives</u>		
<u>Active?</u>		
Yes	57	47
No	<u>43</u>	<u>53</u>
	100	100
N=	(171)	(623)
<u>Recruitment By:**</u>		
Party Committee Member	64	47
County Chair	45	33
Elected Official	34	12
Candidate for Office	15	11
Decided on Own	46	52
	(130)*	(504)*
<u>Most Important</u>		
<u>Recruitment Factor</u>		
Committee Member	30	26
County Chair	22	19
Elected Official	11	5
Candidate	3	5
On My Own	<u>34</u>	<u>44</u>
	100	99
N=	(138)	(537)
<u>Plan to Run for</u>		
<u>Public Office</u>		
Yes	16	18
No	57	50
Undecided	<u>27</u>	<u>32</u>
	100	100
N=	(178)	(636)

* Minimum N on these separate questions.

** Entry indicates the percentage of each group saying that this was a "very important" consideration in their decision to become active in party committee work.

Source: Southern Grassroots Party Activists Project

Table 3
Ideological Positions of Local Republican
Party Officials (in percent)

<u>Ideology</u>	<u>Mt. Republicans</u>	<u>Other Republicans</u>
Very liberal	1	1
Somewhat liberal	2	2
Moderate	12	14
Somewhat conservative	55	46
Very conservative	<u>31</u>	<u>37</u>
	101	100
N =	(181)	(632)

Source: Southern Grassroots Party Activists Project.

4, the mountain Republicans are more liberal in the aggregate than the non-mountain Republicans on ten while the reverse is true for only two. Moreover, on all the issues with fairly large differences—governmental assistance for women, fewer government services to cut government spending, and government assistance in health care—the mountain Republicans are consistently the more liberal of the two groups.⁸

Again, we advance any conclusions regarding these data with appropriate caution, given the insignificant differences on most of these issues, but the consistency of the pattern does suggest that the mountain Republicans still differ from the newer Republicans at least in some issue areas. This is especially the case on such issues as cutting government services and government health care assistance, but it also shows up to a lesser degree on a number of other issues (e.g., environmental protection, government job assistance, continued cooperation with Russia).

Table 4
Local Republican Party Officials' Positions
on Selected Issues
(in percent liberal responses)

<u>Issues</u>	Mt. Republicans	Other Republicans
<u>Social Issues</u>		
Assistance for women	61	51
Personal choice for abortion	43	45
School prayer	10	10
Environmental protection	69	62
Government aid for blacks/ minorities	40	34
Support women's equality	88	83
Affirmative action	6	4
<u>Economic Issues</u>		
Fewer services to cut government spending	39	25
Constitutional amendment to balance budget	11	14
State tax increase for financial crisis	10	7
Government aid in jobs and living standards	20	14
Government health care assistance	67	51
<u>Foreign Policy/Defense</u>		
<u>Issues</u>		
Increase defense spending	45	45
Continue cooperation with Russia	89	81

Source: Southern Grassroots Party Activists Project.

Political Activities and Party Orientations

In examining levels of participation in various activities, at least three possibilities exist for Republicans in these three states. One possibility is that Republicans in the non-mountain areas will be more active than the mountain Republicans inasmuch as they must work to build organizational and electoral strength to overcome the initial weakness which existed in these areas prior to the 1960s while the mountain Republicans, enjoying the benefits of historical strength, are free from such pressures. The second possibility is that the mountain Republicans, long accustomed to engaging vigorously in a highly competitive political subsystem, will be more active than non-mountain Republican officials who have fewer (and weaker) habits of activity and socialization to draw upon; that is, starting from a base of organizational and electoral weakness may be a continuing drag on levels of political activity even after the party's competitive situation has appreciably improved. The third possibility is that the Republicans in both the mountain areas and the non-mountain areas will be about equally active, but for logically different reasons.

Of the three possibilities, the second seems most likely from the data presented in Table 5. In a general sense, the mountain Republicans demonstrate higher levels of activity than the non-mountain Republicans. For example, of the 26 activities listed, the mountain Republicans are more active on 20. This is especially the case for the first 13 activities listed which relate more to efforts of an individual nature (as compared to the final 13 which relate more to activities occurring within an organizational context). While a qualification is in order, however, inasmuch as the inter-group differences on many of these activities are quite small and insignificant, the pattern is still striking.

A more telling figure relates to those activities in each state where the inter-group differences are ten percentage points or more. While there are only five of these, with regard to each the mountain Republicans again demonstrate higher activity levels. In short, then, the data suggest that the mountain Republicans tend to be more active than the non-mountain Republicans.

Table 5
Political Activities of Local Republican Party
Activists (in percent performing the listed
activities)

Activities	Mt. Republicans	Other Republicans
Contacting voters	89	88
Raising money	68	59
Voter registration	86	83
Campaigning	82	82
Public relations	83	75
Contacting new voters	80	78
Party meetings/business	90	87
Recruiting/organizing workers	78	75
County party organization work	83	75
Increasing pol. info for others	73	78
Policy formulation	67	60
Recruit cand. for local office	79	64
Other nominating activities	61	49
Organized door-to-door canvassing	34	29
Organized campaign events	54	43
Arranged fund raising	48	38
Organized mailings	51	50
Distributed campaign literature	72	74
Organized telephone campaigns	44	49
Purchased billboard space	10	7
Distributed posters and lawn signs	67	72
Conducted registration drives	36	31
Used public opinion surveys	14	15
Dealt with campaign media	34	31
Candidate consultation (before announcing)	83	67
Suggested candidate run	87	81

Source: Southern Grassroots Party Activists Project

This conclusion receives some limited support from the data in Table 6 on levels of activity in different types of elections. Although there are virtually no differences between the mountain Republicans and the non-mountain Republicans in state and national elections, the mountain Republicans do report higher levels of activity in local elections. This is not surprising inasmuch as non-mountain Republican electoral success has been greatest at the national level over the past few decades and least at the local level. As Republican support begins to increase in downticket elections, as it has begun to do in recent elections, this disparity will probably tend to disappear.

Overall, even considering the variations and exceptions noted above, the data in Tables 5 and 6 suggest that mountain Republicans are more active than non-mountain Republicans. We can speculate that the longer history of competitiveness and organizational activity in these areas contribute to this pattern of continuing differentiation between these two groups of Republicans.

The final part of the analysis focuses on these local party activists' orientations toward the party and its proper role in the political system. Two points in particular are examined. The first relates to indications of professional versus amateur orientations toward the party. The second relates to the activists' perceptions of the appropriate relationship between the various levels of the party organization.

With regard to the first of these points, the mountain Republicans generally demonstrate a more professional view of the party and its candidates than do the non-mountain Republicans. (See Table 7.) For example, mountain Republican activists are more likely than their non-mountain colleagues to agree that good party workers support candidates with whom they disagree (56% to 43%), that party unity is more important than free discussion of divisive issues (47% to 33%), that controversial issues should be avoided to promote party unity (56% to 43%), and that good party workers should remain neutral in primaries (67% to 47%). Only on the issue of candidates compromising their values to win votes did the mountain Republicans not differ much from the non-mountain Republicans; each group overwhelmingly opposed such compromising of values (94% and 90% respectively).

Table 6
Campaign Activity Levels of Local Republican
Party Activists (in percent)

	Mt. Republicans	Other Republicans
<u>Local Elections</u>		
Very active	71	57
Somewhat active	20	26
Not very active	8	13
Not active at all	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
	101	100
N=	(179)	(635)
<u>State Elections</u>		
Very active	59	57
Somewhat active	33	33
Not very active	7	7
Not active at all	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
	100	100
N=	(180)	(634)
<u>National Elections</u>		
Very active	56	56
Somewhat active	31	31
Not very active	11	9
Not active at all	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
	100	100
N=	(180)	(633)

Source: Southern Grassroots Party Activists Project

Table 7
Local Republican Party Activists' Views on
Party Activities and Organization
(in percent)

	Mt. Republicans	Other Republicans
<u>Good party workers</u>		
<u>support candidate with</u>		
<u>whom they disagree</u>		
Strongly agree	14	10
Agree	42	33
Disagree	36	42
Strongly disagree	<u>8</u>	<u>15</u>
	100	100
N =	(177)	(629)
<u>Party unity is more important</u>		
<u>than free discussion of</u>		
<u>divisive issues</u>		
Strongly agree	19	9
Agree	28	24
Disagree	43	52
Strongly disagree	<u>10</u>	<u>15</u>
	100	100
N =	(176)	(623)
<u>Candidates should not</u>		
<u>compromise values even</u>		
<u>if necessary to win office</u>		
Strongly agree	55	51
Agree	39	39
Disagree	5	8
Strongly disagree	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	99
N =	(177)	(632)
<u>Avoid controversial issues</u>		
<u>to ensure party unity</u>		
Strongly agree	16	7
Agree	40	36
Disagree	37	44
Strongly disagree	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>
	100	100
N =	(176)	(622)

Table 7 (Continued)

	Mt. Republicans	Other Republicans
<u>Good party workers should remain neutral in primaries</u>		
Strongly agree	30	18
Agree	37	29
Disagree	29	42
Strongly disagree	4	11
	100	100
N=	(176)	(629)
<u>No state party direction of local party activity</u>		
Strongly agree	20	16
Agree	44	40
Disagree	32	40
Strongly disagree	4	4
	100	100
N=	(176)	(620)
<u>No national party direction of state party activity</u>		
Strongly agree	16	15
Agree	45	40
Disagree	36	41
Strongly disagree	4	4
	101	100
N=	(172)	(609)

Source: Southern Grassroots Party Activists Project

Finally, mountain Republicans are slightly more in favor of the autonomy of lower organizational levels from control by upper organizational levels. While the differences are not very striking, the mountain Republicans more than the non-mountain Republicans tend to oppose both state control of local party organizations and national control of state party organizations. Majorities of all local Republican activists favor organizational federalism, but the strong strain of independence which has long characterized the mountain Republicans continues to be a differentiating feature.

Discussion

The data reviewed above suggest that the traditional mountain Republicans, while not so sharply different from their non-mountain counterparts as they once were, have not completely lost their distinctive identity in the wave of change that has swept the South since the 1950s. In the three states examined here, the mountain Republicans are drawn from somewhat different segments of the population (perhaps reflecting still differing populations in the mountains) than are the non-mountain Republicans. Older, less well educated, more deeply rooted in the South and in the home state, less affluent, and a bit more likely to attend church frequently and to consider themselves to be born again, these mountain Republican activists continue to display in only slightly modified form the characteristics which earlier set their partisan forebears apart from the activists working to develop the Republican Party in other parts of the South.

This differentiation applies as well to a number of political background characteristics. The mountain Republicans tend to be much less likely to be party switchers, they tend more to be long term activists, they are more likely to come from families with a history of party activity, and they display recruitment patterns which reflect the historical establishment of the Republican Party in these areas. With regard to issues and ideology, the differences between mountain Republicans and non-mountain Republicans are less dramatic, but there are still some variations with the mountain Republicans exhibiting somewhat more liberalism than the non-mountain Republicans. The

key attitudinal differences, however, relate to these Republican activists' respective views on the party organization. Here, the mountain Republicans generally display a greater professional orientation than the non-mountain Republicans, and they also tend to have a somewhat higher level of concern for organizational independence from central direction than the non-mountain Republicans.

Finally, with regard to their political activities, the mountain Republican activists, as compared with the non-mountain Republican activists, are generally more active both in terms of a broad range of specific activities and in terms of levels of electoral activity in local elections. We speculate that this reflects the importance of a long tradition of political competitiveness in these areas as compared with the relatively shorter period of electoral competitiveness in the non-mountain areas.

We must note, of course, that in spite of these intra-party differences, the mountain Republicans and the non-mountain Republicans are quite similar in a number of ways (e.g., they tend to be ideologically conservative). Additionally, on some of the variables there are variations among the mountain Republicans in the different states which are masked to some degree by our combination of the data. For example, in analyses not reported here, we find that, in sharp contrast to the patterns in North Carolina and Tennessee, mountain Republicans in Virginia are essentially undifferentiated from non-mountain Republicans on the professional-amateur dimension (and suggesting, thereby, a possible fruitful line for further inquiry).⁹

In spite of these qualifications, however, the central thrust of this analysis is that mountain Republicans, long virtually forgotten, are not gone. They remain a part of the landscape which deserves continuing attention in our efforts to understand the southern party system. Certainly, it would seem wise for anyone studying state politics or examining specific elections in at least the three states included in this paper to be alert to the role of the mountain Republican activists (and voters). Simply lumping them together with all other Republicans, these data suggest, runs a serious risk of masking some important variations or nuances which might well help clarify recent developments in the southern party system. Certainly, there is some

potential for geographically based intra-party cleavages which might surface under certain conditions. Finally, these data serve as clear reminders that in our understandable interest in investigating the ways the southern political system has changed, we must not forget that there are still some elements of that system which have not changed so dramatically; elements of continuity as well as elements of change deserve our attention.

Robert P. Steed (Ph.D., University of Virginia) is professor of political science at The Citadel. He is a codirector of The Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics, has codirected surveys of state convention delegates and party officials, and has coedited nine books dealing with southern politics. He has published on southern politics, party politics, the presidency, political socialization, and South Carolina politics, and is currently involved in research on local party activists in the South.

Tod A. Baker (Ph.D., University of Tennessee) is professor of political science at The Citadel. He has conducted numerous surveys of political activists and is a codirector of The Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics. He has been involved in the development of a number of professional papers and publications in the areas of urban politics, southern politics, and party activists, and has coedited nine books on various aspects of southern politics. He is currently continuing his work on southern politics with special attention to the role of religion in the region.

Laurence W. Moreland (M.A., Duke University) is professor of political science at The Citadel. He is a codirector of The Citadel Symposium on Southern Politics and has conducted research on political party activists, southern politics, and elections. In addition to authoring a number of publications and professional papers, he has coedited nine books. He is currently engaged in analyzing data from surveys on local party activists in the South.

Endnotes

1. V. O. Key, Jr., *Southern Politics in State and Nation* New York: Alfred A. Knopf 1949, pp. 277-297; and Alexander Heard, *A Two-Party South?* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1952, pp. 37-73.
2. Within a large literature, the following are illustrative: Donald S. Strong, "The Presidential Election in the South, 1952," *The Journal of Politics* 17 (1955): 343-389; Donald S. Strong, "Durable Republicanism in the South, " in Alan P. Sindler ed., *Change in the Contemporary South* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1963, pp. 174-194; Donald S. Strong, *Urban Republicanism in the South* Birmingham: Birmingham Printing Co., 1964; Philip E. Converse, "A Major Political Realignment in the South?" in Sindler, *Change in the Contemporary South*, pp. 195-222; Philip E. Converse, "On the Possibility of Major Political Realignment in the South," in Angus Campbell, *et al.*, *Elections and the Political Order* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966, pp. 212-242; Bernard Cosman, "Presidential Republicanism in the South, 1962," *Journal of Politics* 24 (1962): pp. 303-322; Samuel DuBois Cook, "Political Movements and Organizations," *Journal of Politics* 26 (1964): 130-153; Bernard Cosman, *The Case of the Goldwater Delegates: Deep South Republican Leadership* University, Alabama: University of Alabama Bureau of Public Administration, 1966; Bernard Cosman, *Five States for Goldwater* University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1966; Bernard Cosman, "Deep South Republicans: Profiles and Positions," in Bernard Cosman and Robert J. Huckshorn eds., *Republican Politics* New York: Praeger, 1968, pp. 76-112; Kevin Phillips, *The Emerging Republican Majority* New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1969; William C. Havard, *The Changing Politics of the South* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1972; and Numan V. Bartley and Hugh D. Graham, *Southern Politics and the Second Reconstruction* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.

3. See, for example, the chapters on Tennessee, North Carolina, and Virginia in the following: Robert P. Steed, Laurence W. Moreland, and Tod A. Baker eds., *The 1984 Presidential Election in the South: Patterns of Southern Party Politics* New York: Praeger, 1986; Robert H. Swansbrough and David M. Brodsky eds., *The South's New Politics: Realignment and Dealignment* Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1988; Laurence W. Moreland, Robert P. Steed, and Tod A. Baker eds., *The 1988 Presidential Election in the South: Continuity Amidst Change in Southern Party Politics* New York: Praeger, 1991; and Robert P. Steed, Laurence W. Moreland, and Tod A. Baker eds., *The 1992 Presidential Election in the South: Current Patterns of Southern Party and Electoral Politics* Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1994.

4. For example, Louis M. Seagull, *Southern Republicanism* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975; Alexander P. Lamis, *The Two-Party South* New York: Oxford University Press, 1984; and Earl Black and Merle Black, *Politics and Society in the South* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

5. This paragraph is based on extracting separate discussions of urban/suburban Republicans and mountain Republicans in Key, *Southern Politics*; Heard, *A Two-Party South?*; Strong, "The Presidential Election in the South, 1952"; Strong, "Durable Republicanism in the South"; Strong, *Urban Republicanism in the South*; Cook, "Political Organizations and Movements"; Cosman, "Presidential Republicanism in the South"; and comparative discussions in Robert P. Steed, "Republican Organizations in Three Locales in Virginia" Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1969; and Robert P. Steed, "Southern Republican Leadership: A Selective Comparison of Urban and Mountain Republican Committeemen in Three Virginia Locales" Paper presented at the 1969 annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, Georgia, November, 1969.

6. The Southern Grassroots Party Activists Project is a collaborative effort funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation under Grant SES-9009846 and administered through the University of New Orleans. The government has certain rights to these data. Any opinions, research findings, conclusions, or recommendations reported from this project are those of the authors and do necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

7. The mountain counties and independent cities are as follows. For Tennessee: Anderson, Bledsoe, Blount, Bradley, Campbell, Carter, Claiborne, Cocke, Cumberland, Grainer, Greene, Hamblen, Hamilton, Hancock, Hawkins, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Loudon, McMinn, Meigs, Monroe, Morgan, Polk, Rhea, Roane, Scott, Sevier, Sullivan, Unicoi, Union, Washington. For North Carolina: Alleghany, Ashe, Avery, Buncombe, Cherokee, Clay, Graham, Haywood, Henderson, Jackson, Macon, Madison, Mitchell, Swain, Transylvania, Watauga, Yancey. For Virginia: Alleghany, Augusta, Bath, Bland, Botetourt, Buchanan, Clarke, Craig, Dickenson, Frederick, Giles, Highland, Lee, Montgomery, Page, Pulaski, Roanoke (county), Rockbridge, Rockingham, Russell, Scott, Shenandoah, Smyth, Tazewell, Warren, Washington, Wise, Wythe, Bristol, Buena Vista, Clifton Forge, Covington, Galax, Harrisonburg, Lexington, Norton, Radford, Roanoke (city), Salem, South Boston, Waynesboro, Winchester.

8. Further support of these issue differences is provided by an examination of the issue positions in individual states. In each of the three states, the patterns hold as described for the three states combined.

9. See Robert P. Steed, Tod A. Baker, and Laurence W. Moreland, "Mountain Republicans in the Contemporary Southern Party System" Paper presented at the 1994 annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, Georgia, November, 1994.