

April 1984

Book Reviews: Government in the Palmetto State and The Legislative Veto: Congressional Control of Regulation

Steven K. Smith

William Lasser

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



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Smith, Steven K. and Lasser, William (1984) "Book Reviews: Government in the Palmetto State and The Legislative Veto: Congressional Control of Regulation," *Journal of Political Science*: Vol. 11 : No. 2 , Article 8.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops/vol11/iss2/8>

This Book Review 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.

Government in the Palmetto State, edited by Luther F. Carter and David S. Mann. (Columbia, S.C.: Bureau of Governmental Research and Service, University of South Carolina. 1983, pp. v, 184. \$15.00, paper).

The goal of Luther F. Carter and David S. Mann in *Government in the Palmetto State* was to "remedy the dearth of collected material on South Carolina politics" (p. i). This collection of essays goes a long way in accomplishing this goal. In addition to an introduction, the book contains 10 chapters addressing the major institutions and actors in South Carolina politics. The first two essays, "Regionalism in South Carolina Politics" by Laurence W. Moreland, *et. al.* and "The Constitution of South Carolina: Historical and Political Perspectives" by Susan Bowler and Frank Petrusak do a fine job in setting the stage for the reader to better understand the political, demographic, and institutional uniqueness of South Carolina state politics. Moreland, *et. al.* intimate that the process of urbanization may be softening the edges of previously sharp regional differences in the state's cultures and politics. Following this discussion of regionalism Bowler and Petrusak chart out the Constitutional framework for South Carolina government. While they discuss the historical traditions of racism and paternalism which influenced the document, they remain optimistic concerning the state constitution's capacity to meet future needs; "although appearing jerry-built in form, the Constitution proves flexible enough to accommodate such new forces as a genuine two-party system and the emergence of blacks as political actors" (p. 43).

William Moore in his chapter "Parties and Electoral Politics in South Carolina" traces the dynamics of electoral politics at the presidential, congressional, and state house levels since World War II. Moore concludes that this era has experienced the rise of the Republican party, more pronounced at the presidential level, and the injection of blacks into the Democratic party changing the calculus of South Carolina electoral strategies.

The general theme of the chapters concerning the institutions of state government serve to reinforce the well-known problems of a legislature dominated state. This thrust is clearly exemplified by Harold B. Birch in his chapter "South Carolina State Government Administrative Organization: The Orthodox Theory of Administration Reexamined." The myriad of boards and commissions governing the majority of South Carolina's administrative agencies serve to restrict executive authority. This entangling arrangement also serves to confuse "the lines of responsibility for agency behavior, and contributes to fragmentation of state government" (p. 131). Birch feels that this situation exists at the expense of "public accountability" (p. 132).

In conclusion, it appears that most of the authors agree that the institutions and politics of South Carolina have changed over the past several decades and in all probability will continue to evolve as new pressures and problems, internal and external, present themselves.

Steven K. Smith
Winthrop College

Barbara Hinkson Craig, *The Legislative Veto: Congressional Control of Regulation* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1983). 176 + xvii pp. \$16.00.

When the United States Supreme Court declared the legislative veto unconstitutional last year in *Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Chada*, it took away one of Congress's favorite tools for supervision of the administrative agencies. In this monograph, Barbara Hinkson Craig explores Congress's use of the legislative veto before *Chada* and analyzes the implications of the procedure for the substance of policy. Her analysis makes it appear that the demise of the legislative veto may be less of a disaster than many critics of the Court's decision have assumed.

A legislative veto subjects agency rules and decisions to review—and possible disapproval—by Congress; in its most common form, either or both houses of Congress can overturn an agency decision by a simple or concurrent resolution. In striking down the legislative veto, the Supreme Court held that the procedure violates the constitutional requirement that all laws be presented to the president for his approval or disapproval.

Supporters of the legislative veto have touted it for years as a way of ensuring democratic control over the executive agencies by making sure that ultimate governmental decisions are made in the sunshine of Congress rather than in the dark recesses of the bureaucracy. In reality, says Craig, the legislative veto has had precisely the opposite effect. Rather than subjecting agency decisions to democratic congressional debate, the legislative veto resulted in "a more closed process best characterized by the distributive arenas of subgovernmental politics" (124). The legislative veto has also been defended as a way of facilitating the resolution of policy conflicts within the halls of Congress; Craig argues instead that the veto is more likely to be used by Congress "as a means to avoid or postpone decisions" (135).

For the most part, Craig's argument is clear and lucid, and she raises several interesting questions. What is missing from this book is a more detailed and explicit treatment of what the demise of the legislative veto might mean for the future. Craig has included an epilogue on the *Chada* case and on possible alternatives to the legislative veto, but these remarks are no substitute for the kind of detailed consideration she gives to the issues that make up the bulk of the book. Of course, it is not Craig's fault that the Supreme Court's sweeping decision in *Chada* came, it appears, between the writing of the original manuscript and the publication of the book itself. One only hopes that she will publish a sequel.

William Lasser
Clemson University

Bruce E. Altschuler is an assistant professor of political science at the state University of New York at Oswego and chairs the interdisciplinary Public Justice Department. His book, *Keeping a Finger on the Public Pulse: Private Polling and Presidential Nominations*, was published by Greenwood Press in 1982. Professor Altschuler's articles and book reviews have appeared in the *American Political Science Review*, *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, and *State Government*. He is currently at work on a study of political polling during the Johnson Administration.

Gideon Doron is an associate professor of political science at Tel Aviv University. He is the author of *The Smoking Paradox: Public Regulation of the Cigarette Industry* which was published in 1979 by Abt Books. He has contributed articles to American, British, and Israeli professional journals in the areas of public policy, public administration, political economy, and coalition and voting behavior.

Steven D. Ealy is an assistant professor of political science at Armstrong State University. His publications include *Communication, Speech, and Politics: Habermas and Political Analysis*, published in 1981 by University Press of America and articles and book reviews in the *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *American Political Science Review*, *Southeastern Political reviews*, and *Journal of Asian-Pacific and World Perspectives*.

Giora Goldberg is a recent recipient of the doctoral degree in political science from Hebrew University. He has been a post-doctoral fellow at Yale University and is currently a lecturer in political science at Bar-Ilan University. His previous articles and book chapters have concentrated on Israeli politics. Additional fields of interest include legislative politics and voting behavior.

Charles M. Lamb is an associate professor of political science at the State University of New York at Buffalo. He has co-edited and contributed chapters to *Supreme Court Activism and Restraint*, published in 1982 by Lexington Books and *Implementation of Civil Rights Policy*, published in 1984 by Brooks/Cole. A forthcoming book, *Judicial Conflict and Consensus: Behavioral Essays on American Appellate Courts* will be published in 1985 by the University of Kentucky Press.

Peter Augustine Lawler is an associate professor of political science at Berry College. His numerous publications include articles in the *Claremont Review*, *International Philosophy Quarterly*, *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *Southeastern Political Review*, and *Teaching Political Science*.

Uri On is a lecturer in political science at Tel Aviv University. He has contributed articles and chapters in the areas of policy evaluation, organization theory, information and weapon development systems, and political behavior to journals and books in English and Hebrew.

H. G. Peter Wallach is an associate professor of political science at Central Connecticut State University. He is the co-editor of the forthcom-

ing volume, *West German Politics in the Mid-Eighties: Crisis and Continuity*. He is completing a text on political leadership and has written widely on comparative judicial behavior, the presidency, and the West German economy.