

Maciej Turek

The United States 2010 reapportioned: electoral college for a new decade*

In spring 2010, the U.S. Census Bureau conducted its decennial duty of counting the United States population. While the findings of this extensive operation influence many important socio-economic decisions of the authorities, among the first visible results have been those in the federal electoral politics area. As the number of states' seats in the U.S. House of Representatives has been determined by each state population, it also affects the number of electors the states have appointed to elect the President of the United States. Thus every ten years, along with apportioning states' representatives in the U.S. House, the landscape of presidential electoral politics is altered, too. In this paper, basing on the several variables and the number of state electors in presidential elections 2012–2020, I assess whether the two major American political parties can claim net gains in the aftermath of the apportionment, conducted after the 2010 Census. I will argue it is Republican Party will benefit, while the Democratic Party will lose a few electoral votes to its core base in the three presidential election cycles, to be conducted in the next decade. I will focus on the analysis of 2010 Census on the reapportionment and its relation to Electoral College votes, while issues related to congressional redistricting and House elections are beyond the scope of the article.

The number of representatives each state has in the U.S. House is determined proportionally to state's population, as regulated by Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States. Yet this number changes every ten years, in the aftermath of the decennial counting of American citizens, conducted by the Census Bureau. The decennial census and reapportionment procedures were established as the aftermath of the debate on the proper rule of the representation that the Founding Fathers discussed during the Constitutional Convention. They concluded that „the Legislature of the United States shall be authorized from time to time to apportion the number of representatives”¹, basing on the number provided by the Census Bureau.

*This article was supported by funding from the Jagiellonian University within the SET project. The project is co-financed by the European Union.

¹ *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*, ed. M. Farrand, New Haven 1966, vol. II, p. 13

Once the Bureau has done the counting, the numbers are sent to the House of Representatives, which reapportions the states' seats accordingly.

This alteration has also important implications for the process of presidential elections. As it is widely known, Americans choose their president not in popular elections, but indirectly. The Founding Fathers established unique system of state-appointed electors who are responsible for choosing America's chief executive. The number of electors is in turn determined by each state's representation in federal Congress, simply by combining amount of the U.S. House members and two U.S. Senators from each state. Therefore changes in the House membership after apportionments also imply shifts in number of the electors.

As eighteen states have experienced changes in the representation in the House as a result of the 2010 Census, my aim is to investigate whether and how the reapportionment process changes Electoral College landscape, and thus presidential election contests, for the next three presidential cycles that these changes will be in place, 2012-2020. In order to achieve this, the number of electors in only those eighteen states, where gains or loses in House representation occurred, will be considered. Relying on variables of historical presidential elections results, outcomes of statewide contests, demography within the states, and candidates strategies in the last few presidential cycles, I will determine which of the eighteen states can be classified as Democratic, Republican, and which as swing states. Then I hypothesize how many electoral votes Democrats and Republicans will add to or subtract from its electoral college base. The hypothesis will also include amount of swing votes, increased or decreased in the result of the 2010 Census. To test the hypothesis, I will then confront it with the results of presidential election vote in reapportioned states in the 2012 cycle. By doing so, I will be able to answer the main research question of – whether there are Democrats or Republicans to acquire net gains in the Electoral College in the aftermath of 2010 Census.

2010 Census

The census data gathered on April 1, 2010, which was the National Census Day, showed that within a decade the U.S. population increased by 9.7%. While there was 308,745,538 of American citizens, the most populous state was California (37,253,956 inhabitants), and least populous Wyoming had population of 563,256².

But for the purpose of this article, we are interested in numbers needed for the apportionment process, and those are a little bit different. In case of U.S. population, the Census provides two kinds of information on data: American citizens being the United States residents and those U.S. military and civilian employees, who live

²K. D. Burnett, *Congressional Apportionment. 2010 Census Briefs*, <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-08.pdf>, accessed 25.05.2012, p. 2.

overseas. For apportionment reasons, the more important is the amount of the latter „(and their dependents living with them) allocated to their home states, as reported by the employing federal agencies”³. In addition, federal District of Columbia, which since the ratification of the 23rd Constitutional Amendment has appointed three electors, is excluded from the apportionment process, as not having its representation in the U.S. House.

The number of Americans in the apportionment data is thus different – 309,183,463. As noted earlier, compared to the data from 2000 Census, the number of U.S. population increased by 9.7%, from 281,421,906. Breaking it down to the state data, population increased in 49 states, with Michigan being the only state where number of inhabitants slightly decreased within the last decade. While apportioning the U.S House seats to states on proportion of the population of about 30,000 per seat around 1790, it accordingly was translated into 106 House members. With the admission of new states to the Union and the growth in the United States population, the population seat quota increased progressively, along with number of representatives in the U.S. House. But in 1911, the number of representatives was fixed permanently at 435. At those times, the quota was 210,238⁴. In the aftermath of the 2010 Census, the average district size will be 710,767, but „the state with the largest district size will be Montana (994,416), and the smallest average districts at 527,624 will be Rhode Island”⁵.

Table 1 indicates the eighteen states, where changes in population were so significant, that it resulted in changes of the House seats. The contemporary apportionment rules, established in the 1950s, led to the change of 14 House seats in the aftermath of the 2010 Census. According to David Butler and Bruce Cain, the apportionment procedure has allocated 435 seats „by giving each state one seat and the awarding the remaining 385 in succession, under a priority numbers formula, based on division of each state’s population by $n(n-1)$, n being the number of seats given so far to the state”⁶. Following the above procedure, House membership for the next decade will be altered in 18 states, with 8 states gaining and 10 states losing their seats in the U.S House of Representatives. Table 2 depicts those 18 states with the amount of their gains and losses.

³ Ibidem.

⁴ D. Butler, B. Cain, *Congressional Redistricting. Comparative and Theoretical Perspectives*, New York 1992, pp. 17-41; G. C. Jacobson, *The Politics of Congressional Elections*, 6th ed., New York 2004, pp. 6-8.

⁵ K. D. Burnett, op. cit., p. 1.

⁶ D. Butler, B. Cain, op. cit., p. 19.

Table 1. Population changes in states reapportioned after the 2010 Census

State	Population change as indicated in 2010 Census	
	Total number change	Percent change
Arizona	+ 1,261,385	+ 24,6%
Florida	+ 2,818,932	+ 17,6%
Georgia	+ 1,501,200	+ 18,3%
Illinois	+ 411,339	+ 3,3%
Iowa	+ 120,031	+ 4,1%
Louisiana	+ 64,396	+ 1,4%
Massachusetts	+ 198,532	+ 3,1%
Michigan	- 54,804	- 0,6%
Missouri	+ 393,716	+ 7,0%
Nevada	+ 702,294	+ 35,1%
New Jersey	+ 377,544	+ 4,5%
New York	+ 401,645	+ 2,1%
Ohio	+ 181,364	+ 1,6%
Pennsylvania	+ 421,325	+ 3,4%
South Carolina	+ 613,352	+ 15,3%
Texas	+ 4,293,741	+ 20,6%
Utah	+ 530,716	+ 23,8%
Washington	+ 830,419	+ 14,1%

Source: Compiled by the Author from *Resident Population Data*,
<http://2010.census.gov/2010census/data/apportionment-pop-text.php>

Table 2. Gains and losses in the U.S. House seats' after the 2010 reapportioned states

+4	+2	+1	-1	-2
Texas	Florida	Arizona Georgia Nevada South Carolina Utah Washington	Illinois Iowa Louisiana Massachusetts Michigan Missouri New Jersey Pennsylvania	New York Ohio

Source: Author's compilation from the 2010 Census data,
http://2010.census.gov/news/pdf/apport2010_table1.pdf

As can be seen, Texas has benefited most in the U.S. House representation after 2010 reapportionment, while Florida gained two House seats. On the opposite side, New York and Ohio will lose two House members. Six states have gained one seat,

while one representative is to be lost by eight states. Breaking it down to regional representation, the Northeast states lost 5 seats; the Midwest lost 6 seats; The South East lost one, but gained 4, so the net result is +3; the Southwest gained 5 seats, and the West gained 3 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives, and also in the Electoral College. While we can observe some regional patterns by reviewing historical results of the U.S. presidential elections, it will be more reasonable to assess those patterns, along with other variables, in each states of the eighteen reapportioned. Therefore in the next paragraph, it will be determined whether those states can be classified as red, blue, or swing.

Reapportioned states: red, blue, or swing?

Presidential campaign before general Election Day has always been an extensive operation with large amount of visible and invisible factors that determine its outcome. While on the methodological ground it would be unwise to claim that this or that single variable was decisive in winning or losing the presidency, there are several rituals that every campaign perform in order to appeal to voters. Yet beside the campaign organizations decide what is to be done, equally if not more important, is to analyze where it needs to be done.

Clearly, in a country with system of two major political parties, that the United States is, on the basic level there are only three groups of voters: those who no matter what will vote for the one candidate, those who no matter what will vote for the opposite candidate, and those that are uncommitted, undecided or independent, varying how one decides to call them. This triangle classification of for-against-undecided voters can be also applied to the states. The president is chosen by electors, and these vote – with the exception of district system in Maine and Nebraska – on winner-take-all basis. Therefore the most reasonable option would be to put all the campaign resources to eleven richest in electoral votes states, win all of them, and with 270 electoral votes claim the presidency⁷. Yet the world is not that simple, and whatever resources used, some states might never vote Democrat, while some might never vote Republican. Campaign strategists know that, thus while preparing strategies for general presidential elections, they draw a map with safe states, lost states, and these where result is open. This last category is terrain where the most resources is pulled: most money is spend, candidates visit most frequently, most campaign bureaus is opened. Those states that are safe or lost are mainly ignored⁸. The results is that, for instance,

⁷ After 2010 Census, the eleven states with greatest number of electoral votes are: California (55), Texas (38), New York (29), Florida (29), Illinois (20), Pennsylvania (20), Ohio (18), Georgia (16), Michigan (16), North Carolina (15) and New Jersey (14). Carrying those eleven states would give 270 electoral votes, minimal number to win the presidency.

⁸ L. S. Maisel, K. M. Buckley, *Parties and Elections in America. The Electoral Process*, 4th edition, Lanham 2005, p. 335.

during the 1960 cycle, “74% of time candidates spent in 24 states; in 1976, 11 states received no visits from the candidates, while 12 states were visited only once”⁹. From the presidential campaign perspective, putting resources into safe or lost states means simply their waste, so they should be used elsewhere. Thus in many states presidential campaign can be experienced only through the printed or electronic media.

I will now turn to the analysis of the political sympathies in the 2010 reapportioned eighteen states. In several tables that can be seen in the appendix I present historical voting patterns in presidential and statewide elections. In assessing how the states might vote in presidential elections, I also use the data on resource allocation in several last presidential election cycles and campaign managers’ insights on the electoral college strategies. In addition, I rely on analysis performed by Alan I. Abramowitz¹⁰, as well as report prepared by Ruy Teixeira and John Halpin¹¹, who assessed constituents’ sympathies in every U.S. state, basing on the demographic data. All these will help to classify the eighteen reapportioned states three-dimensionally: as Democratic, Republican or swing. After examining how citizens of those eighteen states might vote in presidential elections, I will be able to tell whether Democrats or Republicans have and how many votes gained to their advantage in the electoral college strategy.

Texas

In the aftermath of 2010 reapportionment process, Texas gained four seats in the U.S. House of Representatives, which translates into four electoral votes more than in previous decade. Both Teixeira and Halpin, as well as Abramowitz¹², put Texas in the Republican column, and there is shortage of arguments to challenge that view. Once a home state of such Democratic Party giants as Sam Rayburn or Lyndon Johnson, Texas has been solid red since the 1970s. Last time Texas voted Democrat in presidential elections was 1976. After Lloyd Bentsen’s retirement in 1993, both U.S. Senators from Texas are Republicans. Moreover, in 1994 George W. Bush defeated sitting Democratic governor, Ann Richards, and ever since The Lone Star State’s chief executive has been Republican, and there are no indicators that this pattern wo-

⁹ W. G. Mayer, E. H. Buell, Jr., J. E. Campbell, M. Joslyn, *The Electoral College and Campaign Strategy*, [in:] *Choosing a President: the Electoral College and Beyond*, ed. P. D. Schumaker, B. A. Loomis, New York 2002, p. 103; L. M. Bartels, *Resource Allocation in a Presidential Campaign*, “The Journal of Politics” 1985, vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 928-936.

¹⁰ A. I. Abramowitz, *The Electoral College: Democrat’s Friend?*, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/aia2011082502/>, accessed 25.05.2012.

¹¹ R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, *The Path to 270. Demographics versus Economics in the 2012 Presidential Election*, 2011, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/11/pdf/path_to_270.pdf, accessed 25.05.2012.

¹² *Ibidem*, p. 15; A. I. Abramowitz, *op. cit.*

uld be overturned. Therefore four votes that Texas received in the aftermath of 2010 reapportionment process, can be put in the Republican column. **Republican: +4.**

Florida

The significance of Florida to the Electoral College strategy will probably never be demonstrated so clearly as in 2000, when the whole nation and world held its breath, awaiting the 36-day recount drama that was to decide Florida's electoral vote, and thus the presidency¹³. Since the 1970s, the Sunshine State has been almost perfect swing state, splitting its statewide vote almost evenly between Democratic and Republican Party candidates. In 15 elections for U.S. Senate, to be held between 1974 and 2010, Democrats and Republicans won 10 and 5 races, respectively. Since 1974, in ten gubernatorial elections, both Democrats and Republicans won 5 times. Finally, in presidential elections since 1972, Republicans carried the state seven times, and Democrats three times.

Yet when it comes to presidential election strategy, as late as 1988 Florida was considered strong Republican territory, to become leaning Republican in 1992 and 1996¹⁴. Its transformation into swing state was widely demonstrated in 2000, 2004 and 2008 presidential races, as Florida was among three states to receive most campaign resources: candidates' and surrogates' visits, money spent and TV ads buys¹⁵. Its importance is somehow confirmed by current state electoral reforms, as efforts by Florida's executive and legislative bodies, dominated by Republican Party officials, aiming at introducing stricter voting registration and ID rules, are widely perceived as discriminating minority voters¹⁶, traditionally thought to be Democratic Party base. How these initiatives will affect electoral laws of Florida time will tell, yet in terms of electoral strategy in presidential elections, Florida should remain swing state. Thus two additional electoral votes that the Sunshine State gained I put in the swing column, and predict they will be up for grabs by either party. **Swing: +2.**

¹³ D. Brinkley, *36 Days: the Complete Chronicle of the 2000 Presidential Election Crisis*, New York 2000.

¹⁴ D. R. Shaw, *The Method behind the Madness: Presidential Electoral College Strategies, 1988-1996*, "The Journal of Politics" 1999, vol. 61, No. 4, pp. 893-913.

¹⁵ *Who Picks the President?* A Report by FairVote – The Center for Voting and Democracy's Presidential Election Reform Program, http://www.fairvote.org/media/research/who_picks_president.pdf, accessed 25.05.2012, pp. 13-14; D. A. Hopkins, D. J. Goux, *The Electoral College and Candidate Strategy in the 2008 Election*, paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, Seattle, WA, September 1-4, 2011.

¹⁶ T. Mak, *Florida voter restrictions challenged*, February 29, 2012, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0212/73453.html>, accessed 25.05.2012; E. L. Wood, *Florida. How Soon We Forget*, April 5, 2012, <http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/05/florida-how-quickly-we-forget/>, accessed 25.05.2012.

Arizona

Arizona gained one electoral vote for the 2012, 2016 and 2020 presidential cycle, and that one vote will be put in the Republican column. It was done also by Teixeira and Halpin, as well as Alan Abramowitz¹⁷. More importantly, Arizona has not elected Democrat as U.S. Senator since 1988, and 1996 was the only time in past ten electoral cycles that the Grand Canyon State voted Democrat for president. For the record, Arizona elected Democrat Janet Napolitano for governor in 2002 and 2006, but both cycles happened to be in midterm election years, so it can be also attributed to the pattern of president's party losing in those kinds of elections, both in national and state level¹⁸. In 2010, also midterm year, Arizona again voted against the president, electing Republican governor. **Republican: +1.**

Georgia

Also to Republican column should be added one vote that in the aftermath of 2010 reapportionment was gained by a state of Georgia, though this should be attributed to the very recent rather than historical voting trend. In last 14 senatorial elections, Republicans and Democrats split the results evenly, both winning seven races. Democrats also won last seven out of ten gubernatorial contests, though last time in 1998, with election of 2002, 2006 and 2010 losing to Republican candidates. When it comes to last ten presidential elections cycles, Democrats won only three of them, and the state was carried only by candidates with Southern roots. In 1976 and 1980 Georgia was carried by its former governor Jimmy Carter, while in 1992 Bill Clinton received plurality of votes there.

All in all, Democrat has not won statewide vote here since 1996 in U.S. Senate elections, since 1998 in governor contest, and since 1992 in presidential vote, therefore I consider Georgia a Republican state. This view is also shared by Teixeira and Halpin, and more importantly with Abramowitz¹⁹, who has been affiliated with Emory University in Atlanta since 1987. Also political strategists gave consideration to the Empire State of the South as solid or leaning Republican at least since 1988 (with possible exception of 1992), not receiving any campaign efforts in the past three electoral cycles²⁰. **Republican: +1.**

Nevada

Another state that we are interested in is Nevada, that will also gain one electoral college vote in the next three presidential election cycles. However, in this typology

¹⁷ R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit., p. 15; A. I. Abramowitz, op. cit.

¹⁸ A. E. Busch, *Horses in Midstream. U.S. Midterm Elections and Their Consequences, 1894-1998*, Pittsburgh 1999.

¹⁹ R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit., p. 15; A. I. Abramowitz, op. cit.

²⁰ D. A. Hopkins, D. J. Goux, op. cit.

Nevada will be classified as another swing state. It is done so by Teixeira and Halpin, along with Abramowitz²¹. Why is it so? Assessing Nevada voting history of the past thirteen U.S. Senate electoral contests, Democrats won eight and Republicans five of them. Of the past ten governor races, both of the two major parties carried them five times each. Of the last ten presidential cycles, Republicans won Nevada seven times, and Democrats three times.

But if we take a closer look on those years and their voting history, electoral politics in Nevada gets even more interesting. For instance, if we narrow down presidential vote to five last cycles, it turns out that Democrats won four of five contests. At the same time, though, citizens of the Silver State significantly split their vote: in 2000 they voted for Democrat for president and Republican for Senate; in 2004, voting Republican for president and Democrat for U.S. Senate, they did the opposite (they did so in 1988, too). Another point is that even if Democrats, with the exception of 2004, carried the state in every presidential election since 1992, the state governors have been Republicans since 1992. Though this last pattern might be also a bias, as election for governor in Nevada occur in midterm years. Yet in presidential elections, Nevada has been considered battleground since at least 1996²². This reflection has been confirmed by campaign resources allocation in 2000, 2004 and 2008 presidential contests²³. With four electoral votes to win, Nevada was not a theatre of air and ground wars the way the states richer in electoral votes. Yet in 2008, \$7,1 million was spent and 13 visits paid by both campaigns there²⁴. With its five electoral votes for grabs through the next decade, Nevada should also remain at the position of small, nevertheless battleground, state. **Swing: +1.**

South Carolina

If Nevada will be campaigned hardly by both camps, it is not so much with South Carolina. After Abramowitz and Teixeira and Halpin²⁵, I classify it as voting Republican in presidential elections, as The Palmetto State has done so since 1980. Also, in the 21st century the statewide elections have not been won by a Democrat: last time South Carolina voted blue was 1998, when Democrats won both U.S. Senate and state governor seats. After that, state has been voting consistently Republican. Thus another additional electoral college vote we put in the column of the Grand Old Party. **Republican: +1.**

²¹ R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit., pp. 40-42; A. I. Abramowitz, op. cit.

²² D. R. Shaw, op. cit., pp. 899, 901, 903.

²³ *Who Picks the President?*, pp. 7-15; D. A. Hopkins, D. J. Goux, op. cit.

²⁴ D. A. Hopkins, D. J. Goux, op. cit.

²⁵ A. I. Abramowitz, op. cit.; R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit., p. 15.

Utah

The same can be said of the state of Utah, even if its electoral history has been even more consistent of voting red than South Carolina's. Since 1972, the first election when the U.S. citizens had been not discriminated due to their age, in accordance with the 26th constitutional amendment, Utah have voted Republican in every presidential and U.S. Senate elections. The last Democratic governor of the Beehive State was elected in 1980, but since 1984, when Norman H. Bangerter was elected governor, in every statewide race Utah has gone Republican. Thus, since Utah voting history has been probably the most consistent of the eighteen states analyzed, one additional electoral vote the Beehive State will gain, is to be put in the Republican column. **Republican: +1.**

Washington

The Evergreen State is the last of the eight states that gained seats in their congressional representation for the next decade. It is also the only state gained seat and will be classified as Democratic, after five that are thought to vote Republican and two to be battleground. Campaign strategists classified Washington as swing or leaning Republican in 1988 presidential cycle, to affirm its shift toward lean Democratic and base Democratic in the following two presidential races²⁶. When it comes to voting history, the last time it has gone Republican was 1984, when Walter Mondale carried only Minnesota and District of Columbia against Ronald Reagan. In other statewide races, Washington has been electing Democratic governor since 1984, while 1994 was the last time it elected Republican for the U.S. Senate seat. Since then, the Evergreen State has been widely considered strong Democratic base. Therefore, as Teixeira and Halpin and Abramowitz²⁷ also share this view, I put Washington in Democratic column as well. **Democratic: +1.**

Massachusetts

Massachusetts is first of ten states to lose its seats in the U.S. Congress in the next decade, and this one electoral college vote is one less in the Democratic base. Even though Massachusetts had Republican governor from 1991 to 2007, their U.S. Senate representation has been Democratic since 1979 to 2010, when Scott Brown won special election to fill two years of service after Edward Kennedy had died. Only twice in last ten presidential elections the Bay Staters voted red, both times for Ronald Reagan in 1980 and 1984. As it is considered safe Democratic territory, there is almost none of presidential campaign activity to occur in the state. Therefore, the one seat less for Massachusetts implies one electoral college vote short for Democratic Party. **Democratic: -1.**

²⁶ D. R. Shaw, op. cit., pp. 899, 901, 903.

²⁷ A. I. Abramowitz, op. cit.; R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit., p. 15.

Illinois

Another state to hold one seat less in the U.S. House of Representatives in the next decade is the Land of Lincoln. Illinois has been crucial Midwest state in a Democratic Party coalition in the past several cycles, voting blue in each presidential election since 1992. Since 2002, also three consecutive gubernatorial races were won by the Democratic Party candidates. However, even though if of the last 14 elections to the U.S. Senate, Republicans won only three times in Illinois, the last time it happened was 2010. Despite this recent development, I claim Illinois is safe blue state in the upcoming three presidential cycles. It is not good news for Democrats, though – as Illinois will lose one House seat, which implies one less safe electoral vote in the Democratic Party base. That view is also confirmed by Abramowitz and Teixeira and Halpin²⁸, as well as campaign strategists: the last time Illinois was considered to be in play was 1988, when Michael Dukakis campaign thought of Land of Lincoln as battleground territory²⁹. And this view seemed correct, considering Democrats actually lost that year's electors' votes from Illinois. Since then, the Prairie State is widely considered as blue. **Democratic: -1.**

Iowa

While Iowa is eleventh state assessed here, it is only the third one to be put in the swing column. And this battleground status was earned by the Hawkeye State only few cycles ago. Between 1988 and 1996 it was considered as safe blue³⁰, to become the one in play in 2004 and 2008³¹. Abramowitz and Teixeira and Halpin consider it battleground³², too, and that seems to be acknowledged by state's recent voting history. In 2004 Iowa was carried by George W. Bush, and in 2008 by Barack Obama. For two U.S. Senators, Iowans elect one Republican since 1980 and one Democrat since 1984. While state's chief executive office was held by Democrat between 1999 and 2011, Republican Terry Brandstad was sworn as governor in January 2011. Thus, one swing electoral vote less of Iowa will be to win by either major candidate party through the next decade. **Swing: -1.**

Louisiana

According to the forecast performed by Abramowitz, as well as Teixeira and Halpin³³, Louisiana is strong Republican base. This view seems to be confirmed by

²⁸ Ibidem.

²⁹ D. R. Shaw, op. cit., pp. 899, 901, 903.

³⁰ Ibidem.

³¹ *Who Picks the President?*, pp. 7-15; D. A. Hopkins, D. J. Goux, op. cit.

³² A. I. Abramowitz, op. cit.; R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit., pp. 32-34.

³³ A. I. Abramowitz, op. cit.; R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit., p. 15.

historical voting pattern: during the last ten presidential cycles Louisiana electors voted red seven times. Three times the Pelican State voted Democrats when the standard bearers were Southerners, as was in the case of Jimmy Carter in 1976, and Bill Clinton both in 1992 and 1996. It is the Southern factor that made Louisiana to be considered battleground or marginal Democratic state in the latter two cycles. What is interesting here, though, is that while in presidential elections Louisiana is solid Republican, it is not so much in the other statewide races. On the U.S. Senate level, for instance, it elected Republican only twice, in 2004 and 2010 elections, out of last fourteen races. This means that in 1972, 1980, 1984 and 2008 Pelican State inhabitants split their Senate and presidential votes. On the other hand, in election for governor, Republican won five times between 1991 and 2011, losing only in 2003. Thus the one electoral vote that Louisiana is about to lose in the aftermath of 2010 apportionment, shall be taken out from the GOP column. **Republican: -1.**

Michigan

Michigan is another Midwest state that historically lies in the heart of Democratic coalition. Even though Teixeira and Halpin consider it swing, Abramowitz classifies it as lean Democratic³⁴. From the statewide voting history, we shall consider it Democratic, too. Between 1972 and 2008 the only time it voted Republican for the U.S. Senate, was 1994, the midterm election that was spectacularly won by the GOP. However, since 2010, in another pattern of the midterm sweep, the Great Lake State elected Republican Rick Snyder to the state's chief executive office. On the other hand, Michigan was considered as lean Democratic by political campaign advisers in 1988 and 1996, and battleground in 1992³⁵.

It also had swing status in 2004 and 2008³⁶. Therefore, since I apply a three-dimensional typology, I will put Michigan in the swing column. Thus, as the Wolverine State will have one U.S. House seat less in the next decade, it will be one swing vote less up for grabs by two campaigns. **Swing: -1.**

Missouri

Assessing whether Missouri shall be classified as red, blue, or swing state by relying only on Abramowitz and Teixeira and Halpin³⁷, one might be confused. While the former claims the Show Me State to be leaning Democratic, the latter argue it will vote Republican. Thus I argue that Missouri, being very interesting state from the perspective of this study, shall be actually put in the swing column. Why is it so? Political strategists considered it battleground or leaning Democratic between 1988

³⁴ Ibidem.

³⁵ D. R. Shaw, op. cit., pp. 899, 901, 903.

³⁶ *Who Picks the President?*, pp. 7-15; D. A. Hopkins, D. J. Goux, op. cit.

³⁷ R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit., pp. 24-27; A. I. Abramowitz, op. cit.

and 1996³⁸, to put it pure swing state from 2000 to 2008³⁹. However, the results of statewide and presidential races seem to be not much helpful here, as well. Even though of the last 13 U.S. Senate races, Republicans won nine, and Democrats only four, Republican Peter Kinder is the current United States Senator from Missouri, the other one being Jay Nixon, Democrat. Also in the last five gubernatorial races, Democrats won four of them. When it comes to presidential contests, Republican candidates carried the Show Me State electoral votes 7 out of 10 times, again allowing Democrats to win only in cases of the Southerners: Jimmy Carter once and twice Bill Clinton. What is making Missouri particularly important here, however, is that the state elects its governor every four years in the very same day the U.S. citizens choose their chief executive. And there were several instances when Missouri inhabitants split their statewide votes significantly. In 1976 they wanted Democrat for president and governor, but Republican for U.S. Senator. In 1980, they wished president and governor from Republican Party, but senator from Democratic. In 1992 they voted blue in presidential and gubernatorial contests, but red in Senate race, while in 2000 they trusted George W. Bush for president, but Democrats for governor and senator. 1988 was the only time in past four decades, the Show Me State voted for one party in three statewide races. Therefore, it seems almost impossible to forecast how will it come next cycles. The one less presidential elector for Missouri, though, is clearly less to win up, and will be put in the swing column. **Swing: -1.**

New Jersey

While there might be some confusion over Missouri, there is almost none when it comes to New Jersey. Garden State voted Democrat for president in last five presidential cycles, and is forecasted to do so also during elections to be held during next decade. The last elected Republican to represent New Jersey in the U.S. Senate was Clifford P. Case, and it was between 1973 and 1979. There have been more shifts in the gubernatorial office, as in the last four decades either party's official had not filled office for more than two consecutive terms. Strongly Democratic status of New Jersey is also acknowledged by Abramowitz and Teixeira and Halpin⁴⁰, though between 1988 and 1996 was considered as leaning red or swing, as well as leaning blue by campaign strategists⁴¹. Since 2000, however, the Garden State has not witnessed much of presidential campaign⁴². Thus, the one electoral vote less for New Jersey implies one less in the Democratic Party base. **Democrats: -1.**

³⁸ D. R. Shaw, op. cit., pp. 899, 901, 903.

³⁹ *Who Picks the President?*, pp. 7-15; D. A. Hopkins, D. J. Goux, op. cit.

⁴⁰ R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit., p. 15; A. I. Abramowitz, op. cit.

⁴¹ *Who Picks the President?*, pp. 7-15; D. A. Hopkins, D. J. Goux, op. cit.

⁴² *Ibidem.*

Pennsylvania

As I argued elsewhere⁴³, the Keystone State has been one of the most crucial swing states, even though it might not be reflected in the presidential voting history. The Keystone State voted blue in last few cycles, yet in all these races Pennsylvania had been considered either leaning blue or battleground, with particular emphasis on the latter one. For instance, in gubernatorial elections since 1978, Democrats and Republicans held the office two terms each, to let another party to have it for next eight years. When electing U.S. Senators, Pennsylvania has been surprisingly consistent, in 2006 electing Democrat Bob Casey, Jr., for the first time since May 1991, when Harris Wofford won special U.S. Senate elections.

Yet in every presidential election since 1988⁴⁴, the Keystone State is among top swing states, along with Florida and Ohio. Most money is spent there and most TV ads bought and aired; it is one with the highest number of campaign visits with the most hardly fought ground war. For instance, in 2004 and 2008, respectively, Pennsylvania received 23 and 54 visits by both candidates, also 36,8 and 24,9 million dollars was spent there⁴⁵.

Therefore, while the importance of Pennsylvania swing status is quite smaller in this decade, due to decreasing numbers of electoral votes (from 27 electors in three cycles starting with 1972, to 20 from the 2012 cycle on), with its 20 electors in the next three presidential cycles, it will still be crucial battleground territory. And one less U.S. House seat translates into one electoral college vote less in the swing column. **Swing: -1.**

New York

For four decades now, the state of New York has been voting consistently blue in presidential elections, with the exceptions being elections of 1972, 1980 and 1984, that also happened to be Republican landslides. Besides, New York has not elected Republican for its U.S. Senator since 1992, when Alfonso D'Amato won the Senate race last time. The Empire State actually had Republican governor between 1995 and 2007, but is still widely considered – including Abramowitz and Teixeira and Halpin⁴⁶ – as strong Democratic base in presidential voting. Thus two electoral college votes that New York is about to lose starting 2012 cycle, translates into two less in the Democratic column. **Democrats: -2.**

⁴³ M. Turek, *2008 Presidential Primaries in the United States from the Pennsylvania Perspective*, “AdAmericam. Journal of American Studies” 2009, vol. 10, pp. 89-99.

⁴⁴ D. R. Shaw, op. cit., pp. 899, 901, 903; *Who Picks the President?*; D. A. Hopkins, D. J. Goux, op. cit.

⁴⁵ *Who Picks the President?*, pp. 7-15; D. A. Hopkins, D. J. Goux, op. cit.

⁴⁶ A. I. Abramowitz, op. cit.; R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit., p. 15.

Ohio

Ohio is also the state to lose two seats in the U.S. House, and it also happens to be the last of the eighteen that are being taken into examination. As already mentioned, along with Florida and Pennsylvania, Ohio is one of the three most important swing states in the recent cycles, and it seems it will remain so in next few contests. Not only is it reflected also by Abramowitz and Teixeira and Halpin⁴⁷, but also by the recent presidential campaign history. Political strategists have considered Ohio as swing state since at least 1988⁴⁸, and it was confirmed by the hard data in the last two cycles, 2004 and 2008. Respectively, 47,2 and 16,8 million dollars was spent here, and both major parties' presidential and vice presidential candidates visited the state 48 and 78 times⁴⁹. Yet statewide voting history seems to favor Republicans. In the U.S. Senate elections, in 13 elections since 1974 GOP candidates triumphed 5 times, but all these five wins occurred in last 6 contests. In Buckeye State chief executive elections, Republicans won in 7 out last 10 races. However, in presidential elections the voting record has been closer considering since 1972, Republicans carried the states' vote 4 and Democrats 6 times. Considering that in the majority of this cases Ohio witnessed extensive media and ground effort from both major camps, I put the Buckeye State in the swing column. **Swing: -2.**

The Electoral College for a new decade: the hypothesis and the test

The aim of the article is to investigate how the 2010 census, congressional apportionment and Electoral College numbers shift might influence the presidential elections in the United States in three cycles, 2012, 2016, and 2020. To do so, the political sympathies in the eighteen reapportioned states were investigated and I assessed which states could be classified as being safe Democratic, safe Republican, or swing, and why. The summary of the analysis can be found in Table 3, which is an illustration of the hypothesis: I hypothesize that as a sole result of the 2010 Census and the following reapportionment, the Democrats might lose 4 electoral votes to its base, while Republicans might gain 7 votes. The number of swing votes will decrease by 3. I believe this is an important issue, as the shifts in number of electors cannot be underestimated from the perspective of campaign strategy or maybe even election results. The simple math indicates that had the past three presidential elections, that is those of 2000, 2004, and 2008, been held under the apportionment of 2012-2020, the results would have been slightly different. Considering the first number is Democrats gains in electoral votes, and second Republicans gains, instead of 266-271 in 2000, 251-286 in 2004, and 365-173 in 2008, the outcome would have been, re-

⁴⁷ R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit., pp. 20-24.

⁴⁸ D. R. Shaw, op. cit., pp. 899, 901, 903.

⁴⁹ *Who Picks the President?*, pp. 7-15; D. A. Hopkins, D. J. Goux, op. cit.

spectively, 253–285, 246–292, and 359–179. This would of course happen only if in the mentioned elections the citizens of the 50 states and DC had voted the way they actually did. But it is not that much certain they would have done so.

Table 3. Reapportioned states: blue, red, or swing?

Democratic		Swing		Republican	
Washington	(+1)	Florida	(+2)	Texas	(+4)
Massachusetts	(-1)	Nevada	(+1)	Arizona	(+1)
Illinois	(-1)	Iowa	(-1)	Georgia	(+1)
New Jersey	(-1)	Michigan	(-1)	South Carolina	(+1)
New York	(-2)	Missouri	(-1)	Utah	(+1)
		Pennsylvania	(-1)	Louisiana	(-1)
		Ohio	(-2)		
Net: -4		Net: -3		Net: +7	

To test the hypothesis – although at this point it can be done only in relation to the 2012 presidential cycle – I will now confront a forecast from Table 3 with presidential results in the states from November 6, 2012.

The hypothesis is valid in relation to reapportioned states classified, as Democratic and Republican. In 2012, Barack Obama carried Washington, Massachusetts, Illinois, New Jersey and New York by a landslide margin. So did Mitt Romney in Texas, South Carolina, Utah, and Louisiana, while solidly winning in Arizona and Georgia. Of the seven states reapportioned and hypothesized as swing, Obama lost only Missouri, carrying Florida, Nevada, Iowa, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Ohio⁵⁰. Yet the point with these states is not who was awarded the electoral votes, as someone had to be a winner, but whether they witnessed the air and ground wars in 2012. To measure that I will employ data from major U.S. political media outlets, as well as from the states.

Shortly before the election, *Politico* indicated swing states to be Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin⁵¹. *The New York Times* identified them as Colorado, Florida, Iowa, New Hampshire, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin. In April 2012, Chris Cillizza of *The Washington Post* set at Colorado, Florida, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia

⁵⁰ *Statistics of the Presidential and Congressional Election of November 6, 2012*, Office of the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, <http://history.house.gov/Institution/Election-Statistics/Election-Statistics/>, accessed 10.03.2012.

⁵¹ *Swing-State Map, List & Polls*, “Politico.com”, <http://www.politico.com/2012-election/swing-state/>, accessed 04.11.2012.

and Wisconsin⁵², to take off Iowa and Nevada from this list at the end of October⁵³. *CNN* argued swings were Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin⁵⁴, while *RealClearPolitics* added Michigan, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania to that list⁵⁵.

Table 4. Reapportioned hypothesized swing states and whether they were considered swing by media outlets

Reapportioned swing states	Politico	The New York Times	The Washington Post	CNN	RealClearPolitics
Florida	+	+	+	+	+
Iowa	+	+		+	+
Michigan					+
Missouri					
Nevada	+			+	+
Ohio	+	+	+	+	+
Pennsylvania					+

Source: Author's compilation, see Notes 50-55

Table 5.1 Resource allocation in reapportioned hypothesized swing states

Reapportioned swing states	visits	money spent (in million \$)
Florida	57	111,5
Iowa	34	34,5
Michigan	10	0,39
Missouri	3	0
Nevada	19	33,6
Ohio	73	92,1
Pennsylvania	22	10,15

Source: Author's compilation, see Note 56

⁵² Ch. Cillizza, *The 9 Swing States of 2012*, April 16, 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/post/the-9-swing-states-of-2012/2012/04/16/gIQABuXaLT_blog.html, accessed 04.11.2012.

⁵³ Ch. Cillizza, *The 5 Closest Swing States*, October 31, 2012, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/10/31/the-5-closest-swing-states/>, accessed 04.11.2012.

⁵⁴ *CNN Electoral Map*, "CNN.com", <http://www.cnn.com/election/2012/ecalculator#?battleground>, accessed 04.11.2012.

⁵⁵ *RealClearPolitics – 2012 Election Maps – Electoral Map*, "RealClearPolitics.com", http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2012/president/2012_elections_electoral_college_map.html, accessed 04.11.2012.

Table 5.2 Resource allocation in reapportioned hypothesized swing states

Reapportioned swing states	number of ads	money spent (in million \$)
Florida	201,002	173
Iowa	136,532	57
Michigan	17,264	33
Missouri	7,316	0
Nevada	95,379	55
Ohio	219,404	150
Pennsylvania	40,926	31

Source: Author's compilation, see Note 56

To this information we can add data on number of visits, number of ads, and amount of money that was spent on those ads in the reapportioned states I classified as swing. Even though data provided by *CNN* and *The Washington Post* differ⁵⁶ (which might be confusing, as both these sources claim data was calculated after April 10-11, 2012, i.e. when Rick Santorum withdrawn his presidential bid, and Mitt Romney's nomination was inevitable), certain patterns are visible.

Data demonstrates that Florida, Iowa, Nevada, and Ohio had swing state status in 2012 presidential elections. As it was so during the past several presidential cycles, and there are no visible signs that this status might be changed in the following years, those four states will certainly be in play again in 2016 and 2020.

When it comes to next state in the swing column, Missouri, it certainly had not a battleground status. According to *CNN*, it received no single candidate visit as well as no money was spent there on campaign ads⁵⁷. *The Washington Post* provides data whereas Missouri inhabitants were actually able to watch more than 7,000 TV ads (that cost more than \$1,5 million), yet it should be attributed more to the fact that sometimes media markets cross the state borders, as in the case of markets of Kansas City, Paducah, Quincy, and Ottumwa⁵⁸. Moreover, Missouri was not considered swing by Obama advisers, as early in the race they focused on 9 other states⁵⁹. They might have been right, as the state was carried by Mitt Romney with a solid margin (more than 9% of popular vote).

⁵⁶ *The 2012 Presidential Race: Ads, Money, and Travel*, "CNN.com", <http://edition.cnn.com/election/2012/campaign-tracker/>, accessed 10.03.2013; *Mad Money: TV Ads in the 2012 Presidential Campaign*, "The Washington Post", <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/special/politics/track-presidential-campaign-ads-2012/>, accessed 10.03.2013.

⁵⁷ *The 2012 Presidential Race*, op. cit.

⁵⁸ *Mad Money: TV Ads in the 2012 Presidential Campaign*, op. cit.

⁵⁹ Those were Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia, Wisconsin; see G. Thrush, J. Martin, *The End of Line: Romney v. Obama: the 34 Days that Decided the Election*, E-Book, Random House 2012, p. 17-19.

Similar story might be said of Michigan, with the exception that it went solidly Democratic in 2012. While the candidates, according to CNN, visited the state 10 times, the last excursion was that of Mitt Romney, occurring in August 2012. *The Washington Post* also reported that considerable amount of money was spent in the Wolverine State, it might be attributed to the last-minute efforts by Mitt Romney campaign to put his home state in play⁶⁰. Moreover, Michigan was not considered swing by Obama advisers, as early in the race they focused on 9 other states⁶¹. If it was so, Michigan was actually considered as safe blue state for 2012, which means that the core Democratic base lost another vote from its core base.

The final state to be considered here is Pennsylvania, which also received a considerable attention from both campaigns, as measured by candidates visits, number of ads aired and money spent on ads. At the same time, however, Pennsylvania was considered swing only by one of five media outlets (*Real Clear Politics*), that estimation was employed in this study. Also, it was not considered battleground by Obama campaign – president’s last visit in the state occurred in July⁶², as early on it was considered safe blue⁶³. Just as in Michigan, Romney campaign tried to transform Pennsylvania into swing state late in the race⁶⁴, albeit unsuccessfully.

All in all, the illustration of the hypothesis verification can be seen in Table 6. Adding Michigan and Pennsylvania to the Democratic column, and Missouri to the Republican column, and measuring them as both parties’ voting base, in the aftermath of 2010 congressional reapportionment, in 2012 presidential election Democrats lost 6 electoral votes from its core base, which 6 votes were gained by Republicans. Swing states net results were without a change.

⁶⁰ *As Romney Attempts to Expand Map, Michigan in Focus*, “CBSNews.com”, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57543122/as-romney-attempts-to-expand-map-michigan-in-focus/, accessed 10.03.2013.

⁶¹ Those were Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia, Wisconsin; see G. Thrush, J. Martin, *The End of Line: Romney v. Obama: the 34 Days that Decided the Election*, E-Book, Random House 2012, p. 17-19.

⁶² *The 2012 Presidential Race*, op. cit.

⁶³ G. Thrush, J. Martin, *The End of Line*, op. cit., p. 17-19.

⁶⁴ N. Silver, *Romney’s Reason to Play for Pennsylvania*, “FiveThirtyEight Blog”, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/11/04/nov-3-romneys-reason-to-play-for-pennsylvania/>, accessed 10.03.2013.

50 states⁶⁷. Besides, a decade is long time enough for states to change their status in the Democratic-swing-Republican typology. As Shaw demonstrated⁶⁸, several states shifted their sympathies considerably during the relatively short period of time, between 1988 and 1996, at least in the assessment of campaign advisers. At the same time, however, as I argued above, the shift in electors' numbers every decade is also something election strategists should pay a lot of attention to.

The final arguments, and probably most important ones, are politics and demography. While President's Obama reelection was assured after a solid win, it should be attributed more to his campaign strategy than his presidential record. Knowing that electoral context – not impressive presidential approval ratings and the economy not recovered to the levels it had been expected – was favoring a challenger, Obama strategists decided to employ negative campaign against Mitt Romney⁶⁹, which proved successful. However, if the President does not find a path to country's visibly better economic performance in his second term, it might seriously affect Democratic Party chances as early as in 2014 midterm elections, not mentioning following presidential races.

On the other hand, Republican Party is already in trouble, as majority of Americans consider it either 'too extreme,'⁷⁰ or simply 'too old, too white, and too male'⁷¹. It seems that GOP leadership has recognized this problem, and shaping the immigration reform that takes place in the newly inaugurated House, is thought to be one of solutions. In the Senate, one of the major sponsors of the immigration bill is Marco Rubio (R-Fl.) who might serve as a bridge for a Republican Party in both political and demographical terms in the following years. Considering Rubio would find a way to receiving GOP nomination, either on presidential or vice presidential spot, he might increase the party's stance with Latino voters overnight. In addition, it would certainly affect turnout among Hispanics, as it happened with African Americans and Barack Obama.

⁶⁷ M. Turek, *Projekt 'Houdini': nowe media a działania profrekwencyjne w prezydenckiej kampanii Baracka Obamy* [w:] *Polityczne aspekty nowych mediów*, red. M. Jeziński, W. Peszyński, A. Seklecka, Toruń 2010, pp. 23-34.

⁶⁸ D. R. Shaw, op. cit., pp. 899, 901, 903.

⁶⁹ G. Thrush, J. Martin, *The End of Line*, op. cit.

⁷⁰ A. Edwards-Levy, *Republican Party Too Extreme, Majority of American Say: Poll*, "The Huffington Post," December 21, 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/12/20/republican-poll_n_2337757.html, accessed 15.01.2013.

⁷¹ J. Martin, *Election Aftermath: GOP Soul-Searching: 'Too old, too white, too male'?*, "Politico.com," November 7, 2012, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1112/83472.html>, accessed 15.01.2013; *What's the Future for the GOP?*, "The Wall Street Journal," February 4, 2013, <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2013/02/04/new-journal-series-focuses-on-future-of-the-gop/>, accessed 05.02.2013.

These demographic issues seem to be crucial for the future electoral developments. The picture that emerges from the 2010 Census is that of society that is growing old, with simultaneously increasing number of immigrants and the U.S. citizens whose mother tongue is not English. Increasing number of voters with Hispanic or Latino ancestry might implicate unforeseeable results for the future elections⁷². Republican strategists are already aware of this threat, and argue that they just ‘must do better with Hispanic voters’⁷³. The time will tell whether they will respond by employing different campaign tools, or by forcing party in government to shift their policy positions, and how will the Democrats respond.

Nevertheless, the hypothesis articulated in this paper will be re-tested after 2016 and 2020 presidential elections, and the interplay of demography and politics might be the factors to make it valid (partly, but still) only in relation to the 2012 presidential cycle.

APPENDIX

Table A.1 Electoral College votes in the 2010 reapportioned states, 1972–2008

State	1972	1976	1980	1984	1988	1992	1996	2000	2004	2008
Arizona	R	R	R	R	R	R	D	R	R	R
Florida	R	D	R	R	R	R	D	R	R	D
Georgia	R	D	D	R	R	D	R	R	R	R
Illinois	R	R	R	R	R	D	D	D	D	D
Iowa	R	R	R	R	D	D	D	D	R	D
Louisiana	R	D	R	R	R	D	D	R	R	R
Massachusetts	D	D	R	R	D	D	D	D	D	D
Michigan	R	R	R	R	R	D	D	D	D	D
Missouri	R	D	R	R	R	D	D	R	R	R
Nevada	R	R	R	R	R	D	D	R	R	D
New Jersey	R	R	R	R	R	D	D	D	D	D
New York	R	D	R	R	D	D	D	D	D	D
Ohio	R	D	R	R	R	D	D	R	R	D
Pennsylvania	R	D	R	R	R	D	D	D	D	D
South Carolina	R	D	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Texas	R	D	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R

⁷² A. Bartnik, *Electoral Power of Latino Voters*, paper presented during international conference „2012 Presidential Elections in the United States: Challenges and Expectations” Jagiellonian University, October 26–27, 2012.

⁷³ N. McCleskey, *The Hispanic Vote: Challenging Our Assumptions*, “Opinion Poll Strategies”, December 3, 2012, <http://pos.org/2012/12/the-hispanic-vote-challenging-our-assumptions/>, accessed 15.01.2013.

Utah	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Washington	R	R	R	R	D	D	D	D	D	D

Source: Compiled by the Author, *National Archives. Historical Election Results*, http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/electoral-college/votes/votes_by_state.html

Table A.2 Gubernatorial votes in the 2010 reapportioned states, 1972-2008

State	1974	1978	1982	1986	1990	1994	1998	2002	2006	2010
Arizona	D	D	D	R	R	R	R	D	D	R
Florida	D	D	D	R	D	D	R	R	R	R
Georgia	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	R	R	R
Illinois	D	R	R	R	R	R	R	D	D	D
Iowa	R	R	R	R	R	R	D	D	D	R
Massachusetts	D	D	D	D	R	R	R	R	D	D
Michigan	R	R	D	D	R	R	R	D	D	R
Nevada	D	R	D	D	D	D	R	R	R	R
New York	D	D	D	D	D	R	R	R	D	D
Ohio	R	R	D	D	R	R	R	R	D	R
Pennsylvania	D	R	R	D	D	R	R	D	D	R
South Carolina	R	D	D	R	R	R	D	R	R	R
Texas	D	R	D	R	D	R	R	R	R	R

State	1972	1976	1980	1984	1988	1992	1996	2000	2004	2008
Missouri	R	D	R	R	R	D	D	D	R	D
Utah	D	D	D	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Washington	R	D	R	D	D	D	D	D	D	D

State	1975	1979	1983	1987	1991	1995	1999	2003	2007	2011
Louisiana	D	R	D	D	R	R	R	D	R	R

State	1973	1977	1981	1985	1989	1993	1997	2001	2005	2009
New Jersey	D	D	R	R	D	R	R	D	D	R

Source: Compiled by the Author from H. W. Stanley, R. G. Niemi, *Vital Statistics on American Politics 2011-2012*, Washington, D.C. 2011.

Table A.3 U.S. Senate votes in the 2010 reapportioned states, Class 1, 1976-2006

State	1976	1982	1988	1994	2000	2006
Arizona	D	D	D	R	R	R
Florida	D	D	R	R	D	D

Massachusetts	D	D	D	D	D	D
Michigan	D	D	D	R	D	D
Missouri	R	R	R	R	D	D
Nevada	D	R	D	D	R	R
New Jersey	D	D	D	D	D	D
New York	D	D	D	D	D	D
Ohio	D	D	D	R	R	D
Pennsylvania	R	R	R	R	R	D
Texas	D	D	D	R	R	R
Utah	R	R	R	R	R	R
Washington	D	D	R	R	D	D

Source: Compiled by the Author from H. W. Stanley, R. G. Niemi, op. cit.

Table A.4 U.S. Senate votes in the 2010 reapportioned states, Class 2, 1972-2008

State	1972	1978	1984	1990	1996	2002	2008
Georgia	D	D	D	D	D	R	R
Illinois	R	R	D	D	D	D	D
Iowa	D	R	D	D	D	D	D
Louisiana	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
Massachusetts	R	D	D	D	D	D	D
Michigan	R	D	D	D	D	D	D
New Jersey	R	D	D	D	D	D	D
South Carolina	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Texas	R	R	R	R	R	R	R

Source: Compiled by the Author from H. W. Stanley, R. G. Niemi, op. cit.

Table A.5 U.S. Senate votes in the 2010 reapportioned states, Class 3, 1974-2010

State	1974	1980	1986	1992	1998	2004	2010
Arizona	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Florida	D	R	D	D	D	R	R
Georgia	D	R	D	R	R	R	R
Illinois	D	D	D	D	R	D	R
Iowa	D	R	R	R	R	R	R
Louisiana	D	D	D	D	D	R	R
Missouri	D	D	R	R	R	R	R
Nevada	R	R	D	D	D	D	D
New York	R	R	R	R	D	D	D
Ohio	D	D	D	D	R	R	R

Pennsylvania	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
South Carolina	D	D	D	D	D	R	R
Utah	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Washington	D	R	D	D	D	D	D

Source: Compiled by the Author from H. W. Stanley, R. G. Niemi, op. cit.

Table A.6 Electoral College vote forecast in the 2010 reapportioned states by Teixeira and Halpin 2011

Democratic	Swing	Republican
Illinois Massachusetts New Jersey New York Washington	Florida Iowa Michigan Nevada Ohio Pennsylvania	Arizona Georgia Louisiana Missouri South Carolina Texas Utah

Source: Author's compilation from R. Teixeira, J. Halpin, op. cit.

Table A.7 Electoral College vote forecast in the 2010 reapportioned states by Abramowitz 2011

Strong Democratic	Lean Democratic	Swing	Lean Republican	Strong Republican
Illinois Massachusetts New Jersey New York Washington	Michigan Missouri Pennsylvania	Florida Iowa Nevada Ohio	-	Arizona Georgia Louisiana South Carolina Texas Utah

Source: Author's compilation from A. I. Abramowitz, op. cit.

Słowa kluczowe:

system polityczny USA,
system wyborczy USA,
wybory prezydenckie w USA,
Kolegium Elektorów,
strategia wyborcza.

Keywords:

U.S. political system,
U.S. electoral system,
presidential elections in the United States,
Electoral College,
campaign strategy.

Spis ludności 2010 a wybory prezydenckie w USA: Kolegium Elektorów na nową dekadę

Wiosną 2010 przeprowadzono w Stanach Zjednoczonych odbywający się co 10 lat spis ludności. Wnioski z badania mają zawsze istotne znaczenie dla społeczno-ekonomicznych decyzji władz amerykańskich na poziomie federalnym, stanowym i lokalnym. Jednakże pierwszy widoczny efekt spisu odnosi się zazwyczaj do obszaru kampanii wyborczych i wyborów na stanowiska w federalnej legislatywie i egzekutywie. Ilość przedstawicieli, jakie dany stan posiada w Izbie Reprezentantów jest ustalany proporcjonalnie do liczby ludności. Ma to też znaczenie dla ilości elektorów, których wyznacza dany stan by dokonać wyboru prezydenta USA. Stąd też co dekadę, wraz ze zmianami w liczbie kongresmanów reprezentujących dany stan, zmianie ulega również „krajobraz” wyborów prezydenckich. Opierając się na kilku zmiennych oraz liczbie elektorów, przypisanych do danego stanu w latach 2012-2020, Autor stawia sobie za cel odpowiedź na pytanie, co dwie wielkie amerykańskie partie polityczne zyskały, a co straciły w kontekście spisu ludności 2010 oraz prezydenckich cykli wyborczych 2012-2020. Autor dochodzi do wniosku, że Partia Republikańska może dodać do swej bazy kilka głosów elektorskich, podczas gdy Partia Demokratyczna kilka głosów utraciła.