Garrow, David J., ***Black Voting in South Carolina, 1970-1976*** , Review of Black Political Economy, 9:1 (1978:Fall) p.60

BLACK VOTING IN SOUTH CAROLINA, 1970-1976

David J. Garrow

In 1973 Lester M. Salamon and Stephen Van Evera put forward a persuasive quantitative model for explaining variations in black voter turnout among Mississippi black-majority counties.[1] Since that time, no published efforts have been made to apply Salamon's and Van Evera's constructs to any setting other than Mississippi, and only limited efforts have been made to examine changes in the explanatory power of the model over time.[2] These are the two tasks which this paper undertakes.

The analysis presented here will focus on the heavily black counties of South Carolina, a state whose 30.5 percent black population makes it the second most heavily black state in the American South, behind only Mississippi. Since Salamon and Van Evera have asserted that their model can be applied successfully to other locales which resemble the black-majority areas of Mississippi,[3] South Carolina's heavily black counties are clearly a most appropriate test of it.

Furthermore, this analysis will consider five elections held over a six-year period, a greater number and duration then were covered by Salamon's and Van Evera's analysis of Mississippi. This more extensive analysis will enable us to evaluate and cast very substantial doubt upon Salamon's and Van Evera's claim that their model makes possible the empirical measurement of changes in Southern political life over time.[4]

The explanation of variations in black political participation, that Salamon and Van Evera have advanced, depends most centrally on the concept of "fear." While admitting that "fear" is "an exceptionally difficult phenomenon to measure," the two authors have gone on to argue that "fear" is the result of a general condition of vulnerability, a black vulnerability to economic coercion and intimidation by whites.[5] Students of black politics in the South have long known that such pressure and retaliation often are visited upon politically active Blacks by whites who fear for their own political dominance. While black fear is thus presumed to

stem from vulnerability, that vulnerability in turn stems from economic dependence. The heart of Salamon's and Van Evera's thesis lies in the contention, which most students of Southern politics would endorse, that "blacks in the Deep South are likely to be less fearful to the extent that they are not economically dependent on local whites and are therefore able to withstand at least a modicum of economic pressure." According to this hypothesis, "black voter turnout would be lower in counties where blacks are most vulnerable to economic intimidation" by whites and higher in counties where black citizens are less vulnerable and hence less fearful of the possible consequences of electoral participation.[6] Expert testimony that the economic dependence of Blacks on whites has hindered and restricted the open political participation of those black citizens exists not only for past decades, but also for quite recent times.[7]

The key to economic dependence, and hence to vulnerability and fear, Salamon and Van Evera reasoned, is the source of a Southern Black's income. Thus, "the larger the proportion of blacks in a county who receive their incomes from sources relatively independent of local white control, presumably the greater the black political participation rate" in that county will be.[8]

With that hypothesis formulated, Salamon and Van Evera proceeded to divide their Mississippi counties' black citizens into those whose incomes were dependent upon their employment by local whites and those whose incomes came from sources not easily controlled by local whites. They then went on to compare the varying percentages yielded by that process with the different rates of electoral participation registered by the black citizenries of the different Mississippi counties. In the regression analysis that followed, the counties' turnout rates—the percentage of a county's black citizens of voting age who actually turned out to vote—were the dependent variable, and the explanation for variations in those percentages was sought in the percentages of "dependent" and "independent" black workers in those counties, which thus served as the independent variables.

In the South Carolina replication and extension of the Salamon-Van Evera analysis, obtaining reliable values for the dependent variable was considerably easier than had been the case in Mississippi. While Salamon and Van Evera had been forced to make a number of untestable and potentially dubious assumptions about the voting preferences of Mississippians in order to derive approximate racial turnout data from the vote totals secured by certain candidates, in South Carolina, precise statistics on the number of citizens of each race who actually turn out to vote are collected by the State Election Commission and made public.[9] Thus, the percentage of each county's voting age black citizens who actually turn out can be

TABLE 1
Index of Black Voter Turnout by County

County and % Black, 1970		1970GE	1972GE	1974PR	1974GE	1976GE
Clarendon	62.1%	41%	44%	36%	34%	53%
Williamsburg	61.0	40	55	48	47	67
Calhoun	60.5	31	37	24	32	45
McCormick	60.4	37	36	35	33	45
Allendale	60.1	33	44	58	46	58
Lee	59.9	36	38	43	45	54
Fairfield	59.4	35	41	32	31	47
Jasper	57.1	26	38	43	28	57
Orangeburg	55.0	35	37	29	33	49
Bamberg	54.8	32	34	30	32	46
Edgefield	51.7	33	31	37	30	47
Marion	50.7	26	32	20	25	44
Hampton	49.0	35	54	58	32	64
Georgetown	48.5	44	53	43	44	62
Colleton	47.2	31	39	32	31	46
Marlboro	43.8	22	29	41	21	35
Dillon*	42.4	26	27	23	23	40
Sumter	42.3	26	32	23	22	40
Barnwell	41.3	34	39	32	44	58
Dorchester	35.6	53	56	55	42	67
Beaufort	33.8	27	33	27	24	42
Berkeley	30.5	53	52	66	40	62

* Not a Black Majority county in 1950

calculated very easily, and those percentages, the dependent variable values for all the analysis that follows, are reported in Table 1 for 22 South Carolina counties. Those 22 counties, as the divisions in Table 1 indicate, constitute four important groups: (1) the 12 counties which possessed black population majorities in 1970, (2) the 15 counties—the first 12, plus three additional ones—which had black-majority populations in 1960 and whose populations were more than 45 percent black in 1970, (3) the group of 19 counties whose populations were more than 40 percent black in 1970, and

TABLE 2
Occupations of Non-White Labor Force Arranged According to Vulnerability to White Economic Pressure

Salamon's and Van Evera's Mississippi Categories

Least Vulnerable	Most Vulnerable	Uncertain
Farmowners	Farm laborers	Craftsmen
Professionals	Sharecroppers & tenants	Operatives
Manufacturing workers	Household Service workers	Sales workers
Non-Farm proprietors	Unemployed	Clerical workers
Workers employed outside county of residence		Non-Household Service workers

'Salamon's and Van Evera's' South Carolina Categories

Least Vulnerable[a]	Most Vulnerable[b]	Uncertain
Farmowners	Farm laborers & foremen	Craftsmen
Professionals	Household Service workers	Operatives
Manufacturing workers	Unemployed	Sales workers
		Clerical workers
		Non-Household Service workers

Garrow's South Carolina Categories

Least Vulnerable	Most Vulnerable
Farmowners	Farm laborers & foremen
Professionals except teachers[c]	Household Service workers
Manufacturing workers	Unemployed
Farm part-owners[d]	Sales workers
Managers & Administrators	Clerical workers
Craftsmen	Teachers
Operatives	Non-Household Service workers
	Non-Farm laborers[e]

NOTES: a--Workers employed outside county of residence, and Non-Farm proprietors, are not reported as occupational categories in the 1970 Census of Population.
b--Salamon and Van Evera do not report their source for 'Sharecroppers & Tenants' in the 1960 Census. The category is not reported in the 1970 Census of Population.
c--The categories in the 1970 Census allow teachers to be separated from other professionals, which was not done in 1960.
d--Salamon and Van Evera consistently ignore this category.
e--A new category first reported in the 1970 Census.

(4) the group of 21 counties that possessed black population majorities in 1950.[10] Analysis of these four important groups of counties will allow for the consideration of more extensive results in regard to South Carolina than was in the case in the Mississippi analysis, where Salamon and Van Evera limited themselves to the 29 counties that had possessed black-majority populations in 1960.

TABLE 3-1
Correlations Between Three Indices of Black Economic Dependence and Black Turnout

	1967-8 Mississippi 29	1970GE South Carolina 12	15	19	21	1972GE South Carolina 12	15	19	21
% of nonwhite labor force in most dependent occupations	-.538	-.211	-.184	-.031	-.146	-.217	-.181	-.060	-.097
		-.264	-.190	-.112	-.145	+.225	+.189	+.212	+.208
	p.05	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS
% of nonwhite labor force in least dependent occupations	+.518	+.597	+.558	+.420	+.396	+.301	+.276	+.176	+.295
		+.709	+.609	+.493	+.527	+.131	+.105	+.054	+.162
	p.05	05/01	05/05	NS/05	NS/05	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS
% of nonwhite families who own their homes	+.414	+.637	+.621	+.639	+.564	-.322	-.258	-.159	-.206
	p.05	p.05	p.05	p.01	p.01	NS	NS	NS	NS

NOTE: Salamon and Van Evera report a correlation of -.863 between percent of nonwhite labor force in the most dependent occupations and percent of nonwhites owning their homes. For South Carolina, using the Salamon and Van Evera measure of "most dependent" occupations, the correlations are -.261 for 12 counties, -.253 for 15, -.072 for 19, and -.032 for 21. Using the Garrow listing of "most dependent" occupations, the four respective correlations are -.456, -.411, -.381, and -.365.

TABLE 3-2
Correlations Between Three Indices of Black Economic Dependence and Black Turnout

	1974PR South Carolina 12	15	19	21	1974GE South Carolina 12	15	19	21	1976GE South Carolina 12	15	19	21
% of nonwhite labor force in most dependent occupations	-.076	-.086	-.127	-.164	+.332	+.272	+.186	+.251	+.121	+.056	+.012	+.020
	-.022	-.055	-.068	+.043	-.016	+.094	+.120	+.258	+.238	+.203	+.219	+.293
	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS
% of nonwhite labor force in least dependent occupations	-.050	-.013	+.176	+.078	-.284	-.315	-.085	-.038	-.324	-.266	-.094	-.087
	-.134	-.056	+.116	+.271	-.260	-.313	-.076	+.011	-.457	-.352	-.133	-.014
	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS	NS/NS
% of nonwhite families who own their homes	+.268	+.158	+.094	-.059	+.077	+.081	+.145	+.098	-.192	-.214	-.096	-.148
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Having defined the values of the dependent variables, the "fear" model proceeds to employ U.S. Census figures for determining the values of the independent variables, the percentages of each county's black population who are either dependent on or largely independent of local whites. Occupations are categorized into those whose occupants presumably will be least vulnerable to white economic pressure and those in which workers supposedly will be most vulnerable to such economic intimidation. Listed in Table 2 are the occupational divisions employed by Salamon and Van Evera for Mississippi and two slightly different categorizations that this writer employed in conducting the more extensive South Carolina analysis.[11] After the number of workers in each category for each county is

calculated, those two totals then are divided by each county's non-white labor force total, producing the percentages of each county's black workers who are "least vulnerable" and "most vulnerable" to economic intimidation by local whites.[12] It is these percentages which then are employed along with the county-level turnout percentages in the simple regression analysis that follows.

Using this construction of the fear model, Salamon and Van Evera discovered that it explained substantial and significant amounts of the variation in turnout rates among Mississippi's 29 black-majority counties. As Table 3 shows, they obtained a strong negative correlation between counties' black turnout rates and the percentage of those counties' black workers who were in the "most vulnerable" and dependent occupations, and an almost equally strong positive correlation between turnout rates and the percentage of the non-white labor force which worked in the "least vulnerable" occupations. Additionally, they also obtained a significant positive correlation between turnout rates and the percentage of black families who owned their homes, a figure which, they theorized, was another measure of a black community's degree of invulnerability to economic intimidation and coercion by whites.[13]

Table 3 also reports the correlations registered by the "fear" model when it is applied to the turnout rates for the four groups of South Carolina counties in the five elections from 1970 to 1976. For the two indices which employ the occupational categorizations, Table 3 reports the r values for both the "Salamon and Van Evera" and "Garrow" occupational listings, as outlined in Table 2, with the "Salamon and Van Evera" r values listed just above the matching values which are obtained when the revised "Garrow" categorizations are used instead. For the 1970 South Carolina general election, the correlation coefficients are in the expected direction for all three of the fear model's indices. Moreover, in two of the three cases, the r values for the most heavily black South Carolina counties are even greater than those which Salamon and Van Evera obtained in their initial analysis of black-belt Mississippi. These very substantial 1970 correlations, however, contrast sharply with the very mixed r values obtained when the analysis is performed upon the 1972, 1974, and 1976 turnout rates. While some correlations remain in the "correct" direction for the 1972 and 1974 elections, the r values for the 1976 application of the model are all in the direction opposite from that which the Salamon-Van Evera fear model predicts. In fact, for the four elections subsequent to 1970, only one correlation coefficient out of 80 is both in the expected direction and higher than .3 in magnitude. Even it, at +.301, is statistically insignificant.

These results are notable in two ways. First is the extremely strong showing which the fear model registers when applied to the 1970 election. Second, and especially in contrast to that 1970 showing, is the complete inability of the model to explain any significant amount of the variation in turnout rates in any of the following four elections. While, as noted previously, Salamon and Van Evera asserted that their model would make it possible to measure the decline in black "fear" of white economic intimidation over time, the dramatic decline registered in these South Carolina results places that claim in a very dubious light.

Having completed the simple regression application of the fear model to Mississippi's black-majority counties, Salamon and Van Evera, building upon the strong r values produced by that initial analysis, proceeded to construct what they termed the "expanded" fear model. "Economic independence," they wrote, "may be a *necessary* condition for black participation, but it is not sufficient," for it explains only a limited, though albeit significant, amount of the variation in black turnout percentages. To explain an additional mount of that variation, Salamon and Van Evera theorized, each county's development or lack of development of a "grass-roots black political organization" would have to be measured and entered into the analysis as an additional independent variable. Such an organization, they argued, enables individual black citizens to "manage" and reduce their fear and their individual vulnerability to intimidation by means of the 'safety of numbers' that the organized group provides.[14]

Salamon and Van Evera then confronted the necessity of devising some means of measuring each county's level of black organizational development. After admitting that an "intensive organizational analysis" of each county would be "practically impossible," the two writers proceeded to articulate three 'indirect' measures of organizational development, measures which they asserted indicated key "facilitators" of black organizational growth.

The first of these facilitators, they claimed, was the absolute size of a county's non-white voting age population. Among black-majority counties, Salamon and Van Evera believed, turnout rates would be higher in smaller counties than in larger onces, for "it is naturally easier to organize a county if there are fewer people to reach."[15] The second indirect measure was the percentage of a county's voting age population that was non-white. The greater the percentage of Blacks, Salamon and Van Evera wrote, the easier it is "to inspire confidence and induce people to take risks" by engaging in political activity.[16] The third facilitator which they chose to employ was a measure of the degree of "outside assistance" that each county's black community had received from civil rights activists between

TABLE 4
"Expanded Fear Model"
Multiple Regression Analysis, Variables' Inclusion Order Specified

	1967-8 Mississippi 29		1970 South Carolina 12	15	19	21
Black Economic Dependence (% of nonwhite labor force in most dependent occupations)*	28.9%[b]	Black Economic Independence (% of nonwhite labor force in least dependent occupations)**	50.3%[b]	37.1%[c]	24.3%[c]	27.8%[c]
Nonwhite Voting Age Population	0.6%[b]	Nonwhite Voting Age Population	0.7%[c]	0.7%	6.4%	5.2%
Percentage of Voting Age Population Nonwhite	17.0%[b]	Percentage of Voting Age Population Nonwhite	9.2%	2.1%	0.2%	0.5%
			60.2%	40.0%	30.9%	33.5%
	/46.5%/[b]	Multiple R^2	/51.0%/[c]	/37.8%/[c]	/24.3%/[c]	/33.0%/[c]
Outside Assistance	22.1%[b]					
Multiple R^2	68.6%[b]					

b--p. less than .01
c--p. less than .05
*--Obtained from $(-.528)^2$ in Table 3-1
**--Obtained from $(+.709)^2$, $(+.609)^2$, etc., in Table 3-1

1960 and 1968. That measure was the average score accorded each county by eight Mississippi movement observers who were asked to rank each county's degree of outside assistance on a five-point scale.[17]

Salamon and Van Evera then proceeded to employ these three measures in a multiple regression analysis, so as to determine how much of the variation in black turnout rates beyond that explained by black economic dependence could be accounted for by an "expansion" of the initial "simple" fear model. Their results for Mississippi's 29 black-majority counties are indicated in r^2 values in the left-hand column of Table 4. As those figures show, two of the three additional measures were able to account for substantial portions of the initially unexplained variation and enabled the expanded fear model to account for 68.6 percent of the variation in Mississippi black turnout rates. More than 22 percent of that figure, or almost one-third, was accounted for by the "outside assistance" measure.

In the South Carolina analysis, it has proved impossible to obtain any similar "outside assistance" scores from movement observers, and hence, the 'expansion' of the fear model has been limited in the South Carolina analysis to the two other additional measures which Salamon and Van Evera employed.[18] Since those two writers failed to state explicitly whether

TABLE 5
"Expanded Fear Model"
Multiple Regression Analysis, Variables' Inclusion Order Unspecified

1970 South Carolina

12		15		19		21	
Black Economic Independence (% of nonwhite labor force in least dependent occupations)	50.3%[b]	37.1%[c]	Nonwhite Voting Age Population*	25.5%[c]	Black Economic Independence (% of nonwhite labor force in least dependent occupations)	27.8%[c]	
Percentage of Voting Age Population Nonwhite	9.8%[c]	2.2%[c]	Black Economic Independence	5.2%	Nonwhite Voting Age Population	5.2%	
Nonwhite Voting Age Population	0.1%	0.7%	Percentage of Voting Age Population Nonwhite	0.2%	Percentage of Voting Age Population Nonwhite	0.5%	
Multiple R^2	60.2% /60.1%/[c]	40.0% /39.3%/[c]	Multiple R^2	30.9% /25.5%/[c]	Multiple R^2	33.5% /33.0%/[c]	

b--p. less than .01
c--p. less than .05

*NOTE: The visible implication that a substantial amount of explanatory overlap exists between the "Economic Independence" and "Nonwhite Voting Age Population" variables is confirmed by correlations of -.629, -.635, -.625, and -.573 between the two measures for the four respective groups of counties.

they conducted their multiple regression analysis with a specified or unspecified inclusion order for the independent variables, both methods were employed in the South Carolina replication, and the results are reported in Tables 4 and 5.[19]

As the first column of Table 5 indicates, a statistically significant multiple R^2 of 60.1 percent was obtained for South Carolina black majority counties in 1970 even without the inclusion of the "outside assistance" measure in the expanded fear model. That value is more than 13 points greater than the equivalent figure obtained by Salamon and Van Evera for Mississippi and comes within some eight points of the entire Multiple R^2 which was yielded by the expanded analysis of the Mississippi counties. These figures, like the simple correlation coefficients reported in Table 3, again emphasize the fact that the 1970 South Carolina application of the fear model, in both its "simple" and "expanded" versions, produces results which are even more substantial than those which Salamon and Van Evera obtained from their applications of the model to black-majority Mississippi counties. Once again, though, this notable strength additionally serves to heighten the contrast between those 1970 South Carolina results and the very insubstantial figures which were generated when the "simple" version of the model was applied to four later elections.

TABLE 6-1
Correlations Between Two Measures of Discrimination and Black Turnout

	1967-8 Mississippi	1970GE South Carolina				1972GE South Carolina			
	29	12	15	19	21	12	15	19	21
Nonwhite Median Family Income as a % of White Median Family Income	-.102	+.225	+.103	-.048	+.012	+.089	-.042	-.122	-.049
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Nonwhite Median Education as a % of White Median Education	+.362*	+.174	+.195	-.145	-.109	-.215	-.159	-.285	-.127
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

*--should theoretically be negative

TABLE 6-2
Correlations Between Two Measures of Discrimination and Black Turnout

	1974PR South Carolina				1974GE South Carolina				1976GE South Carolina			
	12	15	19	21	12	15	19	21	12	15	19	21
Nonwhite Median Family Income as a % of White Median Family Income	-.224	+.005	+.119	+.044	+.001	+.080	+.083	+.096	-.465	-.156	-.106	-.143
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Nonwhite Median Education as a % of White Median Education	+.354	+.271	+.286	+.023	+.015	+.101	-.063	+.088	+.266	+.168	-.091	-.290
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Although they focused upon the substantial explanatory power that their "fear" model had in the Mississippi analysis, Salamon and Van Evera also put forward two other quantitative models, which supposedly embodied two additional possible explanations for variations in black turnout rates among heavily black counties. The first of these, the "discrimination" model, "contends that variations in black political participation are the result of variations in the degree of discrimination Blacks experience locally. The greater the discrimination, the model suggests, the greater the political participation."[20]

Salamon and Van Evera then proceeded to develop two county-level measures of discrimination against Blacks, measures which would indicate "the degree of deprivation a county's black citizens experience vis-à-vis the white citizens of the same county." The two measures are, respectively, the percentage of white median family income that black median family income is and the percentage of white median education that black median education represents. According to the "discrimination" model, Salamon and Van Evera stated, strong negative correlations should exist between each of those two variables and black turnout rates. "Black participation," they wrote, "should be highest in those counties where

discrimination is greatest (i.e., where income and education levels of blacks are lowest relative to those of local whites)."[21]

As the left-hand column of Table 6 shows, the predicted strong negative correlations failed to materialize in the Mississippi analysis, indicating that the "discrimination" model was inapplicable to variations in county-level black turnout rates there, just as Salamon and Van Evera had expected. The South Carolina results for the discrimination model, also presented in Table 6, likewise fail to provide any confirmation of the "discrimination" theory. A majority of the correlation coefficients are in the 'wrong' direction and only one of those in the predicted direction, − .465, exceeds .3 in absolute magnitude. Thus, as Salamon and Van Evera observed, "discrimination, at least as measured by these two factors, adds little to our understanding of the reasons for variations in black political participation" among heavily black counties in the Deep South.[22]

The second of the two possible competitors to the "fear" model that Salamon and Van Evera put forward is what they term the "apathy" model. The apathy thesis, they remark, "assumes that people fail to participate in politics chiefly because they do not think it is worth the time or because they fail to understand what is at stake." Many studies of political participation, Salamon and Van Evera note, have concluded "that participation is lowest (because apathy is highest) among the poor and less well educated."[23]

The apathy explanation generally is composed of two major ingredients—low income and low education—and a third somewhat less central one—low social status. Assertions that black political participation in the South would be higher were it not for such income and education-based apathy are not difficult to find.[24] Salamon and Van Evera thus proceeded to test the applicability and explanatory power of the "apathy" model by constructing a number of measures of black income, education, and social status levels.[25] If the apathy model was applicable, the higher a county's level of black income, black education, or black social status, the higher its black voter turnout should be.

Five different measures of black income levels failed to generate any significant correlation coefficients when applied to Mississippi's black-majority counties (See Table 7). It has been possible to apply four of those five measures to the South Carolina turnout rates, and, in general, the resulting correlation coefficients are not what the "apathy" thesis would have predicted them to be. Only in three instances, one in 1970 and two in 1972, did the income measures generate r values in the expected direction and in excess of .3. Even these failed to attain statistical significance, and the coefficients for the three subsequent elections generally turned sharply

TABLE 7-1
Correlations Between Four Measures of Income and Black Turnout

	1967-8 Mississippi	1970GE South Carolina				1972GE South Carolina			
	29	12	15	19	21	12	15	19	21
Nonwhite Median Family Income	+.011	+.312	+.211	+.056	+.194	+.062	-.038	-.153	-.080
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Percentage of Nonwhite Families with Income Under $1000	+.055*	-.153	-.121	-.076	-.058	-.365	-.343	-.277	-.275
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Percentage of Nonwhite Families with Income Under $2000	-.191	-.137	-.081	+.015	-.078	-.083	-.027	+.083	+.022
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Percentage of Nonwhite Families with Income Over $4000**	+.152	+.285	+.218	+.096	+.246	+.118	+.067	-.051	+.035
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Nonwhite Median Individual Income***	+.274	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	NS								

*--should theoretically be negative
**--$5000 for South Carolina
***--not reported by the 1970 Census

TABLE 7-2
Correlations Between Four Measures of Income and Black Turnout

	1974PR South Carolina				1974GE South Carolina				1976GE South Carolina			
	12	15	19	21	12	15	19	21	12	15	19	21
Nonwhite Median Family Income	-.121	+.013	+.080	+.125	-.269	-.165	-.096	-.107	-.466	-.190	-.122	-.047
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Percentage of Nonwhite Families with Income Under $1000	+.226	+.237	+.172	+.274	+.389	+.277	+.167	+.130	+.466	+.370	+.250	+.207
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Percentage of Nonwhite Families with Income Under $2000	+.441	+.326	+.261	+.248	+.401	+.273	+.148	+.171	+.622	+.393	+.251	+.208
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	c	NS	NS	NS
Percentage of Nonwhite Families with Income Over $5000	+.020	+.023	+.119	+.165	-.293	-.131	-.007	-.041	-.327	-.163	-.049	+.001
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

c--p. less than .05

TABLE 8-1
Correlations Between Four Measures of Education and Black Turnout

	1967-8 Mississippi	1970GE South Carolina				1972GE South Carolina			
	29	12	15	19	21	12	15	19	21
Percent of Nonwhite Population 25 or older with no school	-.331	-.186	-.197	-.037	+.046	+.281	+.070	+.039	+.104
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Percent of Nonwhite Population 25 or older with 0-4 years of school	-.414	+.134	+.032	+.149	+.172	+.028	-.114	-.062	-.020
	c	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Percent of Nonwhite Population 25 or older with some college	+.332	-.343	-.328	-.418	-.387	-.199	-.193	-.293	-.239
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Nonwhite Median Education	+.401	+.229	+.237	-.169	-.109	-.334	-.263	-.392	-.228
	c	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

c--p. less than .05

NOTE: For black-majority Mississippi counties, Salamon and Van Evera found a strong negative correlation of -.773 between nonwhite median education and percent of a county's nonwhite labor force in the "most dependent" occupations. For South Carolina's four groups of counties, the respective correlations are +.067, +.045, -.183, and +.063. Using the 'Garrow' categorization of occupations, the four are +.199, +.283, +.062, and +.187.

TABLE 8-2
Correlations Between Four Measures of Education and Black Turnout

	1974PR South Carolina				1974GE South Carolina				1976GE South Carolina			
	12	15	19	21	12	15	19	21	12	15	19	21
Percent of Nonwhite Population 25 or older with no school	+.400	+.508	+.444	+.430	+.162	+.067	+.336	+.302	+.550	+.557	+.603	+.558
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	c	b	b
Percent of Nonwhite Population 25 or older with 0-4 years of school	+.668	+.685	+.622	+.548	+.477	+.463	+.528	+.536	+.589	+.653	+.619	+.613
	c	b	b	c	NS	NS	c	b	c	b	b	b
Percent of Nonwhite Population 25 or older with some college	+.033	+.020	-.042	-.228	+.127	+.161	+.041	-.121	+.196	+.179	+.088	-.091
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Nonwhite Median Education	+.300	+.258	+.248	-.047	+.438	+.261	-.015	-.239	+.257	+.181	-.036	-.308
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

b--p. less than .01
c--p. less than .05

in the direction opposite that predicted by the apathy model (See Table 7). The figures indicate that by 1976 black participation was significantly higher in counties where black income was relatively low, rather than in counties where it was higher, at least as reported by the 1970 Census. Hence, it clearly appears, as Salamon and Van Evera remarked, that poverty is not a substantial cause of black nonparticipation in politics.[26]

Having experienced no success with the income component of the "apathy" explanation, Salamon and Van Evera then turned to four measures of black educational levels. As the figures reported in the left-hand column of Table 8 indicate, the educational measures, when applied to Mississippi, generated correlation coefficients that were considerably more substantial than those registered by the income measures. Low education correlated negatively with black turnout rates, while greater formal training correlated positively.

When applied to South Carolina, the four education measures produce no substantial correlations in the expected directions for the 1970 and 1972 elections. Furthermore, in the three later elections of 1974–1976 (see Table 8), the r values for two of the four measures turn sharply and significantly in the direction opposite that predicted by the apathy model. While a third measure, indicating the incidence of collegiate training, produces weak and erratic r values for the three later elections, the fourth educational measure, non-white median education, produces two 'correct' r values that are .3 or greater for the group of 12 black-majority counties in the 1974 elections. While these two correlations may lend some very limited support to Kernell's claim that education is an important independent variable in regard to black participation rates,[27] they are more than counterbalanced by the stronger and more numerous coefficients generated by the first two education measures, coefficients which, for the 1974–1976 elections, indicate that lower black education correlates positively—and significantly—with higher black turnout at the county level. The upshot of all these results taken together is that the education measures fail to indicate that the educational portion of the "apathy" thesis has any notable explanatory power in regard to variations in county-level black turnout rates in South Carolina for 1970–1976. That failure, along with the inapplicability of the income portion, signifies that "apathy," at least as measured by these presumed causes of it, has not served to restrict black political participation in heavily black areas of the South.

Once they had applied all three of these models to their Mississippi data, Salamon and Van Evera concluded that the results, summarized as r^2 values in the left-hand column of Table 9, indicated that it was fear, and not discrimination or apathy, that accounted for the substantial variations in

TABLE 9
Comparison of the Three Models' Explanatory Powers for Black-Majority Counties

	Mississippi	South Carolina				
	1967–8	1970GE	1972GE	1974PR	1974GE	1976GE
Expanded Fear Model*	68.6%[b] /46.5%/[b]	/60.1%/[c]	/9.1%/	****	****	****
Discrimination Model**	2.1%	****	****	5.0%	****	21.6%
Apathy Model***	16.0%[c]	5.2%	****	9.0%	19.2%	6.6%

*--From Tables 4, 5, and item two, Table 3
**--From item one, Table 6
***--From item four, Table 8
****--Simple correlation coefficients are in the direction opposite of that predicted by the model

b--p. less than .01
c--p. less than .05

black turnout rates among Mississippi's black-majority counties. If the South Carolina replication of that analysis had been restricted to the 1970 general election, their conclusion could have been endorsed, for the fear model proved extremely powerful in that one application. More importantly, though, the utility of the fear model all but disappears when it is applied to four subsequent South Carolina elections, and that decline is not accompanied by any significant increase in the explanatory power of either of the two competing models that Salamon and Van Evera suggested. While Salamon and Van Evera predicted on the basis of their later analyses of Mississippi data that the power of the fear model may well decline as the Southern political system "opens" and Blacks' fear of economic retaliation from whites for political activity wanes, no decline as precipitous as that reflected by the South Carolina data was expected.[28] Since it is highly unlikely that the environment surrounding black political activity in South Carolina changed as much between 1970 and 1972 as the Salamon and Van Evera model ostensibly indicates, the accuracy and sensitivity of that "fear" model has been placed very much in question.

While none of the three models put forward by Salamon and Van Evera has demonstrated any applicability to the four South Carolina elections of 1972–1976, why the utility of the fear model all but disappears between 1970 and 1972 is far from clear and not immediately ascertainable. Great shifts in the overall magnitude of black voter turnout in South Carolina do not appear to be the reason. As the turnout scores reported in Table 1 and the statewide totals summarized in Table 10 both indicate, the only marked

TABLE 10
Statewide Black Electoral Participation

	1970GE	1972GE	1974PR	1974GE	1976GE
Black Turnout	111,550	152,546	112,899	120,799	192,170
Black Registration	221,450	260,749	250,211	261,110	284,926
Percentage of Registered Blacks Turning Out	50.4%	58.5%	45.1%	46.3%	67.4%
Percentage of Black Voting Age Population Registered*	51.5%	60.7%	58.2%	60.8%	66.3%
Percentage of Black Voting Age Population Turning Out*	26.0%	35.5%	26.3%	28.1%	44.7%

*--Based on the 1970 total of 429,598 black citizens eighteen years of age or older

variations in overall black voter participation have been the substantial increases which occurred in the 1972 and 1976 general elections. As Table 10 indicates, the 1972 increase was not sustained in either the 1974 primary or the 1974 general election, as the black turnout rate returned to approximately what it had been in the 1970 general election. These figures fly in the face of some impressions held by observers of South Carolina politics, observers who believe that the two races most likely to draw black voter interest over this six-year span were the 1970 general election contest, between gubernatorial candidates John C. West and Albert Watson, and the 1974 Democratic primary gubernatorial clash between Charles D. Ravenel and W.J. Bryan Dorn. As the figures in Table 10 indicate, these two elections drew fewer black voters than any of the other three, though the 1974 primary did stimulate marked increases in black turnout in a few selected counties, such as Allendale, Berkeley, and Marlboro (See Table 1). With Ravenel not on the 1974 general election ballot, black turnout rates in several counties declined precipitously from what they had been in the 1974 primary. Those counties, however, were the exception rather than the rule, and the Ravenel phenomenon appears to have had no detectable influence upon the inability of the "fear model" to register any success in the post-1970 years.

Though no apparent explanation for the extremely fast decline of the fear model's power can be found on the dependent variable side of the equation,

there is a good possibility that one exists in the time bound values of the independent variables. Those values, which form the bases of all three models, are from the 1970 census. Although these data are relatively predictive of general election turnout rates in 1970, they may be out-of-date for 1972, 1974, and 1976. The possibility that changes in the characteristics of rural black southerners have been so rapid in the past eight years as to make the 1970 figures highly misleading is substantial in light of recent reports highlighting the marked demographic changes that have occurred in the rural South since 1970.[29]

It is unlikely that any test of that supposition will be possible until more up-to-date Census Bureau figures are compiled. Likewise, as Kernell has suggested, further inquiries into the variations in black political participation rates in the South would benefit from a closer, though necessarily costly, examination of the degree to which specific election campaigns and voter mobilization efforts cause variations in turnout rates from county to county and from election to election.[30] Until the time when such further inquiries will be possible, the validity of the Salamon-Van Evera "fear" model must remain in question, for this extensive application of it to South Carolina has indicated that it does not have the applicability and sensitivity that its creators have claimed for it.

NOTES

1. Lester M. Salamon and Stephen Van Evera, "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination: A Test of Three Explanations of Political Participation," *American Political Science Review* 67 (December 1973), pp. 1288–1306. Also see Sam Kernell, "Comment: A Re-evaluation of Black Voting in Mississippi," *American Political Science Review* 67 (December 1973), pp. 1307–18 and Salamon and Van Evera, "Fear Revisited: Rejoinder to 'Comment' by Sam Kernell," *American Political Science Review* 67 (December 1973), pp. 1319–26.
2. See Kernell, "Comment" and Salamon and Van Evera, "Fear Revisited."
3. See Salamon and Van Evera, "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," p. 1306.
4. See Salamon and Van Evera, "Fear Revisited," pp. 1324 and 1326.
5. Salamon and Van Evera, "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," pp. 1293 and 1295.
6. "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," pp. 1295-6.
7. See, e.g., U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Voting: 1961 Commission on Civil Rights Report* (Washington: USGPO, 1961), p. 197; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Political Participation* (Washington: USGPO, 1968), p. 127; Charles V. Hamilton, *The Bench and The Ballot: Southern Federal Judges and Black Voters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 247; and *New York Times*, 24 January 1975, p. 37. On South Carolina, in particular, see James T. McCain, "The Negro Voter in South Carolina," *Journal of Negro Education* 26 (Summer 1957), pp. 359–61, at 361; Wesley Wright, "Change and Challenge in South Carolina," *Focus* 2 (August 1974), p. 3; the respective comments of Frank B. Robinson and Dr. Oscar P. Butler, Jr., in *The Southern Patriot* 18 (December 1960), p. 3; and U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, *Extension of the Voting Rights Act—Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights*, 94th congress, 1st session, 1975, pp. 585 and 587–8.

8. "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," p. 1295.

9. Two well-informed writers on Southern politics recently have reported that "South Carolina is the only state in which precise data are available on turnout by race." Jack Bass and Walter DeVries, *The Transformation of Southern Politics* (New York: Basic Books, 1976), p. 272. The State Election Commission, located in Columbia, publishes its reports biennially.

10. On the groupings, see Chester W. Bain, "South Carolina: Partisan Prelude," in William C. Havard, ed., *The Changing Politics of the South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1972), p. 591; Margaret Price, *The Negro and the Ballot in the South* (Atlanta: Southern Regional Council, 1959), pp. 72–3; and, more generally, V.O. Key, *Southern Politics* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949), pp. 540 and 666–7; Donald R. Matthews and James W. Prothro, *Negroes and the New Southern Politics* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966), pp. 115–20 and 133–5; McCain, "The Negro Voter," p. 360; and Neal R. Peirce, *The Deep South States of America* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1974), p. 395.

11. Although results will be reported here for both South Carolina categorizations (see Table 3), they both produce rather similar r values and in fact correlate with each other at +.980 for "least dependent" occupations and +.978 for "most dependent" occupations when calculated on the basis of the census data for the 12 black-majority counties.

12. Salamon and Van Evera engender some confusion by reporting in the text of their article that the "black voting age population" for each county was used as the divisor, while stating in their Table 3 that "nonwhite labor force" played that role. See "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," pp. 1295 and 1297. Kernell, without acknowledging it, uses the labor force figure, and in their subsequent reply to Kernell, Salamon and Van Evera unsuccessfully attempt to defend their use of the voting age population figure, without making reference to their earlier and apparently misleading table. See Kernell, "Comment," p. 1317 and Salamon and Van Evera, "Fear Revisited," p. 1323. Since the Census Bureau calculates its occupational category totals on the basis of the labor force figures, those numbers, and not the voting age population totals, have been used as the divisors in this South Carolina analysis.

13. See "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," pp. 1295-6.

14. See "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," pp. 1297–8.

15. In fact, the correlation coefficients between the two variables, the black turnout rate, and the size of the non-white voting age population, are, for 1970, both substantial and negative, as one would expect. For the four respective groups of counties they are −.513, −.453, −.505, and −.489. In 1972 they decrease to −.365, −.309, −.341, and −.340, and in the 1974 primary they decline even further, to −.226, −.252, −.321, and −.277, respectively. In the two subsequent general elections, they become rather erratic. For 1974 they are +.027, +.069, −.146, and −.186, while for 1976 they are +.101, +.046, −.122, and −.146.

16. The substantial positive correlations between percent black and the black population's turnout rate that Salamon and Van Evera predict are not always realized. For 1970, the four respective scores are +.363, +.238, +.091, and +.026. For 1972, three of the four turn negative, with the values being −.343, −.070, −.122, and +.059. A negative value would indicate that Blacks in heavily black counties voted more lightly than did Blacks in counties where a greater percentage of the population was white. For the 1974 primary, the values are +.536, +.095, +.313, and −.127. For that year's general election, they are even more positive: +.574, +.275, +.418, and +.197. For 1976, they are +.521, +.043, +.326, and −.002.

17. Why Salamon and Van Evera did not ask these presumably well-informed observers simply to rank each county's level of black organizational development, rather than merely one presumed "facilitator" of it, is unclear.

18. Students of the civil rights movement in the South are well aware that South Carolina

experienced far, far less movement activity than did its four fellow Deep South states (Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana). As a result, even published discussions of "outside assistance" in South Carolina during the 1960s are extremely rare. See Pat Watters, "South Carolina," *Atlantic Monthly* 222 (September 1968), pp. 20–8, at 22; David Nolan, "The 'Movement' Finally Arrives," *Nation* 208 (26 May 1969), pp. 654–6, at 654; and Peirce, *Deep South States*, p. 392. The majority of students of the state's politics have attributed this relative quiescence to the more pacific, 'sedate,' and 'aristocratic' character of racism in South Carolina. See Jack Bass, *Porgy Comes Home: South Carolina After Three Hundred Years* (Columbia: R.L. Bryan Co., 1972), p. 37; George McMillan, "Integration with Dignity," *Saturday Evening Post* 236 (16 May 1963), pp. 15–21; Earl Black, *Southern Governors and Civil Rights* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), pp. 79–80; Bass and DeVries, *The Transformation of Southern Politics*, p. 252; Peirce, *Deep South States*, pp. 381 and 392–3; and the comments of James Felder, reported in *VEP News* 2 (February 1968), p. 4.

19. The implication of the Salamon and Van Evera piece is that a specified inclusion order *was* used (hence the construction of this article's Table 4), but in the absence of a clear explanation, both possibilities were explored in the South Carolina analysis. See "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," p. 1300.
20. "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," p. 1301.
21. "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," p. 1301.
22. "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," pp. 1301–2.
23. "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," p. 1288.
24. See, e.g., Matthews and Prothro, *Negroes and the New Southern Politics*, pp. 12 and 305 and *Wall Street Journal*, 17 October 1974, p. 1. On South Carolina, in particular, see McCain, "The Negro Voter in South Carolina," p. 360 and Donald L. Fowler, "Negro Voting—1966 S.C. Democratic Primary," *University of South Carolina Governmental Review* 8 (August 1966), pp. 1–4, at 4.
25. In the absence of a socioeconomic status (SES) index, the most common measure of social status for South Carolina, no replication of the social status portion of the apathy thesis has been possible.
26. See "Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination," p. 1303.
27. See Kernell, "Comment," p. 1311.
28. Some might say that fear no longer exists in regard to voting for Blacks in the South. They would be wrong, for it most certainly does. See, e.g., Warren Brown's story on Terrell County, Georgia, *Washington Post* 3 September 1977, pp. A1 and A12.
29. See, e.g., Robert Reinhold, *New York Times*, 15 April 1977, p. A14 and B. D. Ayres, Jr., *New York Times*, 8 May 1977, pp. 1 and 22.
30. See "Comment," p. 1315.