

Index

- Abbott, Evenwel v.*, 235
- Abrams v. Johnson*, 123
- Adjudication, Constitutional basis for, 1–2, 12, 14, 30, 41–44, 47–52, 196–198, 228–229
- Alabama
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 - classification by partisan bias, 74
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
 - Mobile, 34
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - Tuskegee, 29–30
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
 - winner-take-all districting, 76, 77
- Alabama Democratic Conference v. Alabama*, 233–234
- Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama*, 233–234
- Alaska
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- Altman, M., 107–113, 125, 134, 135
- Apportionment Act of 1841, 82
- Apportionment Act of 1842, 24–25, 184
- Apportionment Act of 1872, 24–25, 184
- Apportionment Act of 1901, 28
- Apportionment Act of 1911, 24–25, 26–27
- Apportionment Act of 1929, 26–27
- Arizona
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)

- Arizona (*cont.*)
 responsiveness in, 91, 94
 state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 symmetry measures, 88, 92
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Arizona State Legislature *v.* Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, 234
- Arkansas
 bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 compactness/bias relationships, 85
 gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 responsiveness in, 91, 94
 state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 symmetry measures, 88, 92
 urban concentration hypothesis, 113–115, 117
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Ashcroft, Georgia *v.*, 207–208
- Baker *v.* Carr, 7, 17–18, 19–20, 22–23, 30–32, 42–43, 50, 51, 54–55, 178, 185–186, 200–201, 228–229
- Balance of power, 5–7, 175, 177–179, 204–205, 228–232
- Bandemer, Davis *v.* See Davis *v.* Bandemer
- Bishop, B., 117–118
- Black, Hugo, 28, 32–33, 187
- Bolden, Mobile *v.*, 34
- Boundary drawing technology, 133–135, 139
- Brennan, William J., 35, 40, 185–186
- Breyer, Stephen, 207, 233–234
- Brooks, Mississippi Republican Executive Committee *v.*, 35
- Broom, Wood *v.*, 26–27, 82
- Bush *v.* Vera, 37
- Butler, D., 16, 41
- Cain, B. E., 16, 41
- California
 bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 compactness/bias relationships, 85
 gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 Los Angeles, 103–107, 227
 majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 226–227
 majority-minority districts effects, 124–127
 partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 proportional districting in, 78, 79
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 responsiveness in, 91, 94
 state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 symmetry measures, 88, 92
 urban concentration hypothesis, 103–107
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Cantor *v.* Personhuballah, 234
- Chen, J., 100, 109–111, 126
- Chicago, IL, 103–107, 227. *See also* Illinois
- Colegrove *v.* Green, 27–28, 29–30, 50, 185–186, 228–229
- Colorado
 bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 compactness/bias relationships, 85
 gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 responsiveness in, 91, 94

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)

Index

249

- state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- symmetry measures, 88, 92
- voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Committee for a Fair and Balanced Map v. Illinois State Board of Elections*, 105–107
- Congressional election 2014, 232–233
- Connecticut
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Constitutional implications
 - adjudication, Constitutional basis for, 1–2, 12, 14, 30, 41–44, 47–52, 196–198, 228–229
 - apportionment, 182–186, 189, 190
 - balance of power, 5–7, 175, 177–179, 204–205, 228–232
 - cloture rule reforms, 183–184
 - districting, 182–186, 189, 190
 - equal protection, 30–33, 41–44, 48–49, 183, 199–200, 203, 206–207
 - one person one vote principle, 39–41, 178, 200, 202, 223–224, 228–232
 - overview, 3, 21, 177–179, 193–195
 - responsiveness, 191–192
 - transparency, 192–193
 - voter participation, 190–191
 - voter representation, 191
- Cox, G. W., 18
- Cromartie, Easley v.*, 38
- Cromartie, Hunt v.*, 38
- Cummings, Gaffney v.*, 39–40
- Cushing, R. G., 117–118
- Daggett, Karcher v.*, 40, 45–46, 82
- Dahl, R., 197
- Dave's Redistricting App, 111
- Davis v. Bandemer*, 1–2, 6–7, 12, 15, 19–20, 23, 38, 41–44, 45, 46, 48, 49–50, 51, 54–55, 163, 178, 189, 194, 201–202, 222
- DeGrandy, Johnson v.*, 123
- Delaware
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Detzner, Romo v.*, 109–110, 126
- Dickson v. Rucho*, 234
- DistrictBuilder, 135
- Douglas, William O., 29–30
- Easley v. Cromartie*, 38
- Elbridge Gerry's Salamander* (Cox/Katz), 17–18
- Electoral consequences, 3–4, 5, 108, 225–226
- Electoral Registration and Administration Act of 2013, 144
- Empirical effects. *See* Partisan bias measurement
- The End of Inequality* (Ansolabehere/Snyder), 17–18
- Equal Protection Clause, Fourteenth Amendment, 30–33, 36–37, 41–44, 48–49
- Equal protection standard, 30–33, 41–44, 48–49, 183, 199–200, 203, 206–207
- Erikson, R. S., 18
- Evenwel v. Abbott*, 235
- Federalist 10, 197
- Federalist 39, 181, 206
- Federalist 52, 181, 206
- Federalist 59, 183
- Federalist 62, 180
- Fifteenth Amendment, 29–30, 34
- Florida
 - alternative plans for unbiased districts, 107–113, 125–126
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)

250

Index

Florida (*cont.*)

- compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
 - majority-minority districts effects, 124–127
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting litigation in, 234–235
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Forest, B., 134
- Fourteenth Amendment, 30–33, 36–37, 41–44, 186, 199–200, 203
- Frankfurter, Felix, 6–7, 19–20, 27, 29–32, 42–43, 50, 185, 189, 190, 200–201, 228–229

Gaffney v. Cummings, 39–40

Gelman, A., 18, 65–66, 191, 196–197, 203, 216, 218–219, 224

Geographical information systems, 133–135, 139

Georgia. *See also* *Wesberry v. Sanders*

- bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
- bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
- classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
- compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
- gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- incumbent protection gerrymandering, 75–76
- majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
- majority-minority districts effects, 124–127
- partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158

- redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Georgia v. Ashcroft*, 207–208
- Gerry, Elbridge, 183
- Gimpel, J. G., 117–118
- Gingles, Thornburg v.*, 35, 127, 133, 138
- Ginsberg, Ruth Bader, 50, 222
- Goedert, N., 68–69
- Gomillion v. Lightfoot*, 29–30
- Gray v. Sanders*, 186
- Great Compromise, 3, 6, 178, 179–180, 182, 187, 206–207
- Green, Colegrove v.*, 27–28, 29–30, 50, 185–186, 228–229
- Grofman, B., 35–36, 166, 203, 216, 221–222

Hamilton, Alexander, 180, 183

Handley, L., 35–36

Hastie, R., 218–219

Hawaii

- gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - majority-minority districts in, 127
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- Holder, Shelby County v.*, 38–39
- Holm, Smiley v.*, 27–28
- House of Representatives
- as collective body, 205–206, 207
 - congressional election 2014, 232–233
 - direct representation principle, 229–230
 - Great Compromise, 3, 6, 178, 179–180, 182, 187, 206–207
 - malapportionment, population growth and, 25, 26
 - partisan nature of, 208–209
 - proportional representation, 39–41, 178, 200, 202, 223–224, 228–232

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)

Index

251

- seat apportionment regulations, 24–25, 203
- Hout, E. van der, 204, 210, 212–213
- Hui, I. S., 117–118
- Hunt v. Cromartie*, 38
- Idaho
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Illinois
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - Chicago, 103–107, 227
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 124–128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 226–227
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - proportional representation in, 27–28
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - urban concentration hypothesis, 103–107, 113–115, 117
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Illinois State Board of Elections, Committee for a Fair and Balanced Map v.*, 105–107
- Illinois State Board of Elections, Radogno v.*, 105
- Incumbent protection gerrymandering, 63–64, 75–76
- Incumbent protection plans, 60–61, 67, 78, 79
- Independent Bipartisan Redistricting Commission, 108–109
- Indiana. *See also* *Davis v. Bandemer*
 - alternative plans in bias creation, 111–113
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
 - equal protection standard in, 41–44
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Iowa
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Johnson, Abrams v.*, 123
- Johnson, Miller v.*, 36–37
- Johnson v. DeGrandy*, 123
- Jurisprudence of districting. *See also* *specific cases by name*
 - Constitutional mandates, 24–25
 - equal protection standard, 30–33, 41–44, 48–49, 183, 199–200, 203, 206–207

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)

252

Index

- Jurisprudence of districting (*cont.*)
 malapportionment, population growth and, 25, 26
 overview, 19–20, 22–23, 54–55
 population equality, 30–33
 population equality evolution, 39–41
 redistricting, early challenges in, 26–30
 Justiciability issue, 1–2, 12, 14, 30, 41–44, 47–52, 196–198, 228–229
- Kansas
 bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 compactness/bias relationships, 85
 gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 responsiveness in, 91, 94
 state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 symmetry measures, 88, 92
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Karcher v. Daggett*, 40, 45–46, 82
- Katz, J. N., 18, 203, 216
- Kennedy, Anthony, 1–2, 36, 49–50, 52, 53–54, 196, 215–216, 221, 222
- Kentucky
 bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
 partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 responsiveness in, 91, 94
 symmetry measures, 88, 92
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- King, G., 18, 65–66, 191, 196–197, 203, 216, 218–219, 221–222, 224
- Kirkpatrick v. Preisler*, 39–40
- The League of Women Voters of Florida etc. et al. v. Ken Detzner et al.*, 234–235
- Levendusky, M. S., 117–118
- Lightfoot, Gomillion v.*, 29–30
- Los Angeles, CA, 103–107, 227. *See also* California
- Louisiana
 bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 classification by partisan bias, 74
 classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
 majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
 partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 responsiveness in, 91, 94
 symmetry measures, 88, 92
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- LULAC v. Perry*, 8, 14, 21, 52–54, 57, 123, 202–203, 216, 221, 222–223
- Madison, James, 6, 179, 180–181, 183, 197, 229–230
- Maine
 gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Majority-minority districts requirement, 4–5, 9–10, 18, 33–39, 122–124, 227
- Majority rule principle
 balance of power, 5–7, 175, 177–179, 204–205, 228–232
 cancellation property, 214–215
 constitutional discoverability, 202, 215–216
 district based representation, 208

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)

Index

253

- equal protection relationship to, 30–33, 41–44, 48–49, 183, 199–200, 203, 206–207
- Great Compromise, 3, 6, 178, 179–180, 182, 187, 206–207
- group rights derivation, 198–203
- House, partisan nature of, 208–209
- House as collective body, 205–206, 207
- individual rights derivation, 204–206, 212, 213, 214, 215
- intents prong, 222
- multiple vote systems, 211–212
- nonnegative responsiveness, 211–212, 215
- one person one vote principle, 39–41, 178, 200, 202, 223–224, 228–232
- overview, 8, 21, 196–198, 223–224
- plurality standard, 48, 51, 201–202
- political question doctrine, 50–52, 200–201
- proportional representation, 39–41, 178, 200, 202, 223–224, 228–232
- Scalia's challenge to, 198–203
- seat allocation function, 210–211
- symmetry standard, 53–54, 203, 215–219, 220, 222, 223
- weak plurality ranking property, 212–213, 214, 215
- Malapportionment
 - equal protection, 30–33, 41–44, 48–49, 183, 199–200, 203, 206–207
 - as group right violation, 7–8
 - historical background, 2, 183
 - judicial challenges to, 32–33
 - jurisprudence background, 19–20, 22–23, 194
 - justiciability of, 200
 - population growth effects on, 25, 26
 - proportional representation, 39–41, 178, 200, 202, 223–224, 228–232
- Maptitude, 135
- Maryland
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
- partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
- redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
- responsiveness in, 91, 94
- state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- symmetry measures, 88, 92
- urban concentration hypothesis, 113–115, 117
- voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Massachusetts
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting, political effects of, 149–150
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - unbiased winner take all districting, 76–77
 - urban concentration hypothesis, 113–115, 117
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- McDonald, K., 107–113, 125, 135
- McDonald, M. P., 14, 103, 107, 148
- McGann, A. J., 204, 210, 212–213
- McGee, E. M., 69–70
- McKee, S. C., 117–118
- Michigan
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)Michigan (*cont.*)

compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
 gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
 partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 responsiveness in, 91, 94
 state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 symmetry measures, 88, 92
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121

Miller v. Johnson, 36–37

Minnesota

bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 compactness/bias relationships, 85
 gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 responsiveness in, 91, 94
 state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 symmetry measures, 88, 92
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121

Mississippi

bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 classification by partisan bias, 74
 classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
 majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
 partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158

redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 redistricting requirements in, 26–27
 responsiveness in, 91, 94
 symmetry measures, 88, 92
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121

Mississippi Republican Executive Committee v. Brooks, 35

Missouri

alternative plans in bias creation, 111–113
 bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 classification by partisan bias, 74
 classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
 partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 responsiveness in, 91, 94
 symmetry measures, 88, 92
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121

Mobile, AL, 34. *See also* Alabama*Mobile v. Bolden*, 34

Montana

redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121

Motive, opportunity, 147, 155–156, 157, 158, 228

Nebraska

bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
 gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)*Index*

255

- responsiveness in, 91, 94
- state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- symmetry measures, 88, 92
- voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Nevada
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- New Hampshire
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- New Jersey
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - incumbent protection plans, 78
 - majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 226–227
 - majority-minority districts effects, 124–127
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- New Mexico
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- New York
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 226–227
 - majority-minority districts effects, 124–127
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)

256

*Index*New York (*cont.*)

responsiveness in, 91, 94

state *vs.* federal level competitiveness,
165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171,
172, 173, 175

symmetry measures, 88, 92

urban concentration hypothesis, 103–107
voter concentration/bias relationships,

117–119, 120, 121

New York City, 103–107, 227

Nir, D., 95

North Carolina

bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93

bias increase over time, 158–160, 161,
165

classification by partisan bias, 74

classification by partisan bias and

responsiveness, 79, 80

compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86

majority-minority districts as contributor
to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147,
155–156, 157, 158racial discrimination in redistricting, 35,
37redistricting process control in, 151–153,
154, 155, 172

responsiveness in, 91, 94

symmetry measures, 88, 92

urban concentration hypothesis,

113–115, 117, 227

voter concentration/bias relationships,

117–119, 120, 121

North Dakota

redistricting process control in, 151–153,
154, 155, 172voter concentration/bias relationships,
117–119, 120, 121O'Connor, Sandra Day, 1–2, 7, 42–43,
228–229

Ohio

alternative plans for unbiased districts,
107–113

bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93

bias increase over time, 158–160, 161,
165

classification by partisan bias, 74

classification by partisan bias and
responsiveness, 79, 80

compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86

gubernatorial elections, voter

participation in, 165–166, 167, 168,
169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175majority-minority districts as contributor
to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147,
155–156, 157, 158redistricting process control in, 151–153,
154, 155, 172

responsiveness in, 91

state *vs.* federal level competitiveness,
165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171,
172, 173, 175

symmetry measures, 88, 92

voter concentration/bias relationships,
117–119, 120, 121

Oklahoma

bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93

bias increase over time, 158–160, 161,
165classification by partisan bias and
responsiveness, 79, 80

compactness/bias relationships, 85

gubernatorial elections, voter

participation in, 165–166, 167, 168,
169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147,
155–156, 157, 158redistricting process control in, 151–153,
154, 155, 172

responsiveness in, 91

state *vs.* federal level competitiveness,
165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171,
172, 173, 175

symmetry measures, 88, 92

voter concentration/bias relationships,
117–119, 120, 121One person one vote principle, 39–41, 178,
200, 202, 223–224, 228–232Opportunity, motive, 147, 155–156, 157,
158, 228

Oregon

bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93

bias increase over time, 158–160, 161,
165classification by partisan bias and
responsiveness, 79, 80

compactness/bias relationships, 85

gubernatorial elections, voter

participation in, 165–166, 167, 168,
169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)*Index*

257

- partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
- redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
- responsiveness in, 91
- state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- symmetry measures, 88, 92
- voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Packed districting, 62
- Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act of 2011, 141, 143–144
- Partisan bias
 - demographics, geography in, 135–139, 227–228
 - geographical information systems, 133–135, 139
 - motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158, 228
- Partisan bias measurement
 - aggregate seats-votes function estimation, 67–68
 - compactness, 81–83, 85, 87
 - efficiency gap measure, 69
 - incumbent protection gerrymandering, 63–64, 75–76
 - incumbent protection plans, 60–61, 67, 78, 79
 - methodology, 65–67, 95, 96
 - minimum bounding polygon measure, 84
 - national level, 70–71, 72, 73
 - overview, 56–57, 87–88, 90, 91, 92, 93
 - packed districting, 62
 - Polsby/Popper measure, 83–84
 - predefined seats-votes function distance, 68–70
 - proportional districting, 61, 75, 78, 79
 - redistricting principles, 58–59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64
 - Reock measure, 84
 - responsiveness, 66–67, 94
 - Schwartzberg measure, 83–84
 - seats maximizing districting, 63
 - state level, 73–74, 75, 79, 81
 - symmetry measures, 56–57, 65–66, 88, 92, 218–219, 220
 - unbiased winner take all districting, 76–77
 - uniform partisan swing, 58–59, 60
 - winner take all districting, 58–59, 60, 76, 77, 79
- Partisan gerrymandering
 - constitutionality of, 6–7, 21, 194
 - district shapes, 13–14
 - effects of, 226
 - as inevitable, 226–227
 - intents prong, 222
 - justiciability of, 1–2, 12, 14, 30, 41–44, 47–52, 196–198, 228–229
 - majority rule principle (*See* Majority rule principle)
 - malapportionment (*See* Malapportionment)
 - partisan advantage in, 14, 15, 18, 19
 - as permitted practice, 2, 23
 - plurality standard, 48, 51, 201–202
 - proportional representation, 39–41, 178, 200, 202, 223–224, 228–232
 - racial discrimination, 33–39
 - as self-limiting, 226
 - symmetry standard, 53–54, 203, 215–219, 220, 222, 223
 - vote dilution, 22–23, 33–39, 41–44
- Pennsylvania
 - alternative plans for unbiased districts, 107–113
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 - classification by partisan bias, 74
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - partisan gerrymandering in generally, 9–10, 12, 13, 14, 45
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 80, 91, 94
 - seats/vote function in, 75

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)

258

Index

- Pennsylvania (*cont.*)
 state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 symmetry measures, 88, 92, 220
 urban concentration in, 100–101, 102
 voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Percival, G. L., 167
- Perkins, A., 111
- Personhuballah, Cantor v.*, 234
- Peters, South v.*, 29
- Plurality standard, 48, 51, 201–202
- Political fairness principle, 39–41
- Political motivations
 balance of power, 5–7, 175, 177–179, 204–205, 228–232
 bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158, 228
 overview, 5, 20–21, 146–148, 173–175
 racial discrimination, 33–39
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 state legislatures, post-*Vieth*, 23, 147
 states, single party control in, 148–150, 151, 174
 state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- Political question doctrine, 50–52, 200–201
- Poole, K. T., 164
- Preisler, Kirkpatrick v.*, 39–40
- Proportional districting, 61, 75, 78, 79
- Proportional representation, 39–41, 178, 200, 202, 223–224, 228–232
- Racial discrimination, 33–39
- Radogno v. Illinois State Board of Elections*, 105
- Reapportionment Revolution, 22–23, 186
- Redistricting
 alternative plans for unbiased districts, 107–113
 boundary drawing technology, 133–135, 139
 Butler and Cain study, 16
 constitutional implications, 182–186, 189, 190
 demographics, geography in bias, 135–139
 early challenges in, 26–30
 empirical effects of, 20 (*See also* Partisan bias measurement)
 incumbency advantage, 18
 jurisprudence of (*See* Jurisprudence of districting)
 litigation (*See specific cases*)
 principles, 58–59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64
 veto points, 148
 voters, geographical distribution of (*See* Urban concentration hypothesis)
- Redistricting 2010
 bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, 103–107
 outcomes by state, 155
 Republicans, bias in favor of, 3–4, 5, 108, 225–226
- Regester, White v.*, 189
- Rehnquist, William, 1–2
- Reif, K., 167
- Republican principle. *See* Majority rule principle
- Republicans, bias in favor of, 3–4, 5, 108, 225–226
- Reynolds v. Sims*, 19–20, 22–23, 32–33, 42–43, 50, 54–55, 188, 199–200, 228–229
- Rhode Island
 gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- Rodden, J., 100, 109–111, 126
- Romo v. Detzner*, 109–110, 126
- Rosenthal, H., 164
- Rucho, Dickson v.*, 234
- Rutledge, Wiley Blount, 27–28

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)

Index

259

- Sanders, Gray v.*, 186
- Scalia, Antonin, 1–2, 7–8, 9, 15, 21, 22–23, 47–52, 189–190, 228–229.
See also Majority rule principle
- Schmitt, H., 167
- Seats maximizing districting, 63
- Selb, P., 166
- Shaw v. Hunt (Shaw II)*, 37
- Shaw v. Reno (Shaw I)*, 36–37, 38
- Shelby County, AL, 38–39
- Shelby County v. Holder*, 38–39
- Smiley v. Holm*, 27–28
- Souter, David, 50, 222
- South Carolina
bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
classification by partisan bias, 74
classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
responsiveness in, 91, 94
state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
symmetry measures, 88, 92
voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- South Dakota
gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- South v. Peters*, 29
- State-level redistricting
balance of power, 5–7, 175, 177–179, 204–205, 228–232
Great Compromise, 3, 6, 178, 179–180, 182, 187, 206–207
partisan gerrymandering by, 23, 147
Republicans, bias in favor of, 3–4, 5, 108, 225–226
- Stephanopoulos, N. O., 69–70
- Stevens, John Paul, 50, 53, 221–223
- Stewart, Potter, 34
- Swart, H. de, 210
- Symmetry standard, 53–54, 203, 215–219, 220, 222, 223
- Taagepera, R., 166
- Tam Cho, W. K., 117–118
- Teigen, J. M., 117–118
- Tennessee
alternative plans in bias creation, 111–113
bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
classification by partisan bias, 74
classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
population equality in, 30–32
redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
responsiveness in, 91, 94
state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
symmetry measures, 88, 92
voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Texas
bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14325-8 - Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Anthony J. McGann, Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena

Index

[More information](#)

260

*Index*Texas (*cont.*)

- classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
 - majority-minority districts effects, 124–127
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - racial discrimination in redistricting, 37
 - redistricting, population deviances in, 40
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - Republican bias in redistricting, 108
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Thomas, Clarence, 1–2
- Thornburg v. Gingles*, 35, 127, 133, 138
- Thrasher, M., 139–145
- Tuskegee, AL, 29–30, 139–145. *See also* Alabama

United Kingdom, 139–145

Urban concentration hypothesis

- New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, 103–107, 227
- overview, 4–5, 9–10, 97–100, 136–138
- partisan bias as inevitable, 102
- principles, 100–101, 102
- skewness/bias relationships, 113–115, 117
- voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121

Utah

- bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
- bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
- classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
- compactness/bias relationships, 85
- partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158

- redistricting, political effects of, 149–150
- redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
- responsiveness in, 91, 94
- symmetry measures, 88, 92
- voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121

Veer, A. ter, 210

Vera, Bush v., 37

Vermont

- gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
- state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
- voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121

Vieth v. Jubelirer

- background, 11, 45–47
- challenges, strategies, 7–9, 21
- consequences of generally, 1, 7, 23, 82, 188–189, 193–195, 225, 228–232
- effects of as unnoticed, 14, 15, 18, 19
- equal protection standard, 30–33, 41–44, 48–49, 183, 199–200, 203, 206–207
- justiciability issue, 1–2, 12, 14, 30, 41–44, 47–52, 196–198, 228–229
- overview, 44–45
- political question doctrine, 50–52, 200–201

Virginia

- alternative plans for unbiased districts, 107–113, 125
- bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
- bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
- classification by partisan bias, 74
- classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
- compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
- majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133
- partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
- redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
- responsiveness in, 91, 94

- symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Virginia Plan, 179, 180–181
- Vote dilution, 22–23, 33–39, 41–44. *See also* One person one vote principle
- Voting Rights Act
 - majority-minority districts as contributor to bias, 127–128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 138–139, 226–227
 - majority-minority districts requirement, 4–5, 9–10, 18, 33–39, 122–124, 227
 - partisan bias as inevitable, 124–127
- Washington
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Weiser, *White v.*, 40
- Wesberry v. Sanders, 6–7, 17, 19–20, 22–23, 32–33, 39–40, 50, 54–55, 178, 181, 186–188, 189, 194, 197, 199, 206–207, 222, 223–224, 228–229
- West Virginia
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
- symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - urban concentration hypothesis, 113–115, 117
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- White, Byron, 39–40
- White v. Regester*, 189
- White v. Weiser*, 40
- Winner take all districting, 58–59, 60, 76, 77, 79
- Wisconsin
 - bias at 50% vote measure, 90, 93
 - bias increase over time, 158–160, 161, 165
 - classification by partisan bias and responsiveness, 79, 80
 - compactness/bias relationships, 85, 86
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - partisan bias motive, opportunity in, 147, 155–156, 157, 158
 - responsiveness in, 91, 94
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - symmetry measures, 88, 92
 - voter concentration/bias relationships, 117–119, 120, 121
- Wolf, S., 107–108, 111
- Wood v. Broom*, 26–27, 82
- Wyoming
 - gubernatorial elections, voter participation in, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175
 - redistricting process control in, 151–153, 154, 155, 172
 - state *vs.* federal level competitiveness, 165–166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175