

Gerrymandering the States

State legislatures are tasked with drawing state and federal districts and administering election law, among many other responsibilities. Yet state legislatures are themselves gerrymandered. This book examines how, why, and with what consequences, drawing on an original dataset of ninety-five state legislative maps from before and after 2011 redistricting. Identifying the institutional, political, and geographic determinants of gerrymandering, the authors find that Republican gerrymandering increased dramatically after the 2011 redistricting and bias was most extreme in states with racial segregation where Republicans drew the maps. This bias has had long-term consequences. For instance, states with the most extreme Republican gerrymandering were more likely to pass laws that restricted voting rights and undermined public health, and they were less likely to respond to COVID-19. The authors examine the implications for American democracy and for the balance of power between federal and state governments; they also offer empirically grounded recommendations for reform.

Alex Keena is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Michael Latner is Professor of Political Science at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, and Senior Fellow at the Union of Concerned Scientists' Center for Science and Democracy in Washington, DC.

Anthony J. McGann is Professor of Government and Public Policy at the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.

Charles Anthony Smith is Professor in Political Science and Law at the University of California, Irvine.





Gerrymandering the States

Partisanship, Race, and the Transformation of American Federalism

ALEX KEENA

Virginia Commonwealth University

MICHAEL LATNER

California Polytechnic State University

ANTHONY J. MCGANN

University of Strathclyde

CHARLES ANTHONY SMITH

University of California, Irvine





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05-06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781316518120 DOI: 10.1017/9781108995849

© James Alexander Keena, Michael Steven Latner, Anthony J. McGann and Charles Anthony Smith 2021

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2021

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-1-316-51812-0 Hardback ISBN 978-1-108-99545-0 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



Contents

List	t of Figures	page 1x
List	t of Tables	xi
Ack	knowledgments	xiii
I	Redistricting Wars in the US States	I
	1.1 Opening the Redistricting "Blackbox"	2
	1.2 The "Great Gerrymander of 2012"	3
	1.3 A Study of State Legislative Redistricting	8
	1.4 Objectives of the Book	9
	1.5 Key Findings	ΙI
	1.6 The Plan of the Book	12
2	What Happened in 2011? The Other "Great Gerrymander"	14
	2.1 What Is "Gerrymandering"?	16
	2.2 Measuring Partisan Gerrymandering	20
	2.3 How We Collected Our Data	43
	2.4 Findings	45
	2.5 Conclusion	48
3	When Politicians Draw the Maps	50
	3.1 How the States Delegate Redistricting Authority	52
	3.2 Who Actually Drew the Maps?	56
	3.3 Does Institutional Control Matter?	58
	3.4 How Politics Shapes Redistricting Outcomes	59
	3.5 How Politicians Draw Plans When One	
	Party Has Control	61
	3.6 Motive, Opportunity, and Bias	65
	3.7 How Politicians Draw Plans When Two	
	Parties Share Power	67



vi Contents

	3.8	Bipartisan Redistricting, Competition,	
		and Responsiveness	71
	3.9	How the Status Quo Shapes Redistricting Outcomes Conclusion	73 76
,	-	Political Geography Affects Bias	
4		Is Districting Bias "Unintentional"?	79 80
	4.I 4.2	Geography Cannot Explain Away Districting Bias	82
	4.2	Districting Is a Political Choice, but Geography	02
		Constrains Outcomes	86
	4.4	What District Shapes Can Explain about Gerrymandering	89
	4.5	The Trade-Off Between Bias and Compactness	92
	4.6	Conclusion	94
5	Racial	Geography, the Voting Rights Act, and Bias	96
	5.1	The Voting Rights Act and Majority-Minority Districting	97
	5.2	Does Minority Districting Cause Republican Bias?	100
	5.3	The Decline of Multimember Districts	110
	5.4	Conclusion	115
6	The Po	olicy and Social Consequences of State	
	Legisla	tive Gerrymandering	117
	6.1	What Did Voters Want in 2010?	118
	6.2	Partisan Bias and Polarization of the Cost of Voting	119
	6.3	Partisan Bias and Health Outcomes	123
	6.4	State Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic	129
	6.5	Conclusion	133
7	The D	emocratic Harms of Gerrymandering	135
	7.1	Rolling Back the Voting Rights Revolution	135
	7.2	The Harm of Gerrymandering at the State Level	138
	7.3	Who Is Harmed? The Entire People	142
	7.4	Gerrymandering and the Crisis of Democracy	145
8		the Courts Redistrict	148
	8.1	Racial Gerrymandering and the Federal Courts	149
	8.2	State Courts and Incrementalism in Redistricting	153
	8.3	When State Courts Redistrict as Contingency Authorities	158
	8.4	Conclusion	161
9		o Design Effective Anti-gerrymandering Reforms	163
	9.1	Redistricting Reforms: Rules vs. Processes	166
	9.2	Do Redistricting Criteria Work?	168
	9.3	Procedural Reforms: The Promise of	
		Citizen Commissions	175
	9.4	Conclusion	183
	Conclu		185
	Eval	uating Reforms in Virginia	188



	Contents	vii
Appendix		191
А.1	State House Symmetry 2012	191
A.2	State House Symmetry 2016	192
A.3	State Senate Symmetry 2012–14	194
A.4	State Senate Symmetry 2014–16	195
A. 5	State House Responsiveness 2012 (see A.1 for details)	197
A.6	State House Responsiveness 2016 (see A.2 for details)	198
A.7	State Senate Responsiveness 2012–14 (see A.3 for details)	199
A.8	State Senate Responsiveness 2014–16 (see A.4 for details)	200
A.9	State House Symmetry, Remedial Maps	202
A.10	State Senate Symmetry, Remedial Maps	202
А.11	State House Responsiveness, Remedial Maps	202
A.12	State Senate Responsiveness, Remedial Maps	202
A.13	State House Symmetry 2008	202
A.14	State Senate Symmetry 2008–10	204
A.15	State House Responsiveness 2008 (see A.13 for details)	205
A.16	State Senate Responsiveness 2008 (see A.14 for details)	206
References		209
Index		227





Figures

2.1	How gerrymandering is achieved through district shapes	page	18
2.2	A symmetric distribution of districts		22
2.3	A symmetric distribution of districts where		
	Party A is dominant		23
2.4	Symmetric distribution of districts with very high and very		
	low responsiveness		24
2.5	Distribution of districts that produce result		
	that is proportional, as well as symmetric		25
2.6	An asymmetric, biased distribution of districts		26
2.7	A very modestly asymmetric distribution of districts		26
2.8	Distribution of districts in the US House of		
	Representative for Pennsylvania 2012		27
2.9	Calculating partisan symmetry from seats-votes function		29
2.10	Calculating simple symmetry measure from histogram		32
2.11	How efficiency gap applied to Maryland US House		
	districts 2018		35
2.12	How efficiency gap finds bias in three completely		
	unbiased districting plans		36
2.13	Distribution of symmetry scores, before and after		
	2011 redistricting		46
3.1	Partisan control and change in partisan symmetry		
	after redistricting		75
4.1	Geography helps Republicans draw bias		90
4.2	How Democratic clustering impacts bias and compactness		93
5.1	Black, Latinx populations, and bias	I	02
<i>5</i> 2	Hypothetical distribution of Black and white voters	т	0.4



X	List of Figures	
5.3	Marginal effects of racial segregation on districting bias	109
5.4	How the average district magnitude (M) affects	
	the potential for redistricting bias	112
6.1	Partisan symmetry and change in cost of voting 2008-16	121
6.2	Republican gerrymandering and public health policy	125
6.3	Republican gerrymandering and infant mortality	127
6.4	Republican gerrymandering and health	
	response to COVID-19	130
6.5	Republican gerrymandering and ballot access	
	during COVID-19 pandemic	132
9.1(A)	Bias when courts and commissions redistrict	180
9.T(B)	Responsiveness when courts and commissions redistrict	т8т



Tables

2.1	2011 state legislative redistricting plans with	
	extreme partisan bias (+/-10%)	page 47
3.1	State legislative districting authorities (2011 cycle)	53
3.2	Who drew the plans? How redistricting institutions	
	shaped outcomes	58
3.3	Who actually drew the maps?	60
3.4	Motive, opportunity, and partisan bias	67
3.5	Mean responsiveness in state legislative plans adopted	
	after 2011	72
4. I	Predicting the effects of political geography on bias	
	after redistricting	89
5.1	The dive "dimensions" of segregation, according	
	to Massey and Denton (1988)	104
5.2	Predicting asymmetry in newly enacted plans	113
8.1	When courts redressed racial gerrymandering	152
8.2	Court-mandated redistricting in Alaska and Florida	157
8.3	When courts controlled redistricting	159
9. T	Citizen commissions, state legislative redistricting, 2011	т78





Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to many people and organizations for input and advice, not only for this project but also for our earlier book on gerry-mandering. We all owe an enormous debt to Rein Taagepera for shaping how each of us thinks about politics. He has had a profound influence on each of us and we are grateful for the opportunity to have learned from him. We also are thankful to Bernie Grofman for his insight and guidance, on redistricting and many other topics and problems. We are fortunate to have had terrific discussants and co-panelists at many conferences, including the Midwest Political Science Association, American Political Science Association, and Southern Political Science Association, among others. We are grateful for the advice and support of Jack Santucci and for the data and research projects of Carl Klarner, Justin Levitt, Stephen Wolf, and others whose work we rely on.

The team at Cambridge University Press and the anonymous reviewers have improved the manuscript in both large and small ways. We concluded that the reviews were likely the most constructive any of us had ever seen, and we are very thankful for the careful, thoughtful, and thorough approach taken by the anonymous reviewers. We are also grateful to Common Cause for the input we received at their 2016 redistricting conference and to Emmett Bondurant, who shared terrific insights and fascinating war stories.

We also want to make individual acknowledgments to others who helped us.

Alex Keena: Thank you to my wife, Jessie, and daughters, Marlowe and Jolene, for their never-ending support and patience; my grandmother, Janet Keena; Brad, Heather, Larry, Shirley, and Renee (my parents);



xiv

Acknowledgments

Mike, Tony, and Tony; my research assistants, Taieba Kohistany, Capriana Phillips, and Adam Santiago. Special thanks are owed to Knight-Finley; Dierdre Condit, Judy Twigg, and Ravi Perry for helpful comments; to the discussants and co-panelists at SPSA 2019; to John Curiel and Tyler Steelman; to Elliot Fullmer, Hank Chambers, Nicholas Goedert, Rebecca Green, Michael D. Gilbert, Deborah Hellman, and A. E. Dick Howard; to Nakeina E. Douglas-Genn, and the Minority Political Leadership Institute at VCU; and to Brian Cannon.

Michael Latner: In addition to this amazing team, I wish to thank Frank, Shirley, and Brian, for early investment; Christina and my kids Violet and Chase, for all the love they bring; my best friend Sean Sanner, for saving my life; Russ Dalton and Pedro Hernandez for countless hours of advice and expertise; and the team at the Union of Concerned Scientists' Center for Science and Democracy, who supported this work through a Kendall Science Fellowship and many lasting friendships.

Anthony J. McGann: I would like to thank Jack Nagle and Rogers Smith for organizing a conference at University of Pennsylvania back in 2008 that turned out to be instrumental in getting this project going. I would like to thank so many people who have provided inspiration and support, including John Nagle, Keith Forsyth, Don Saari, and Bill Batchelder. And, in this uncertain hour, I would particularly like to thank the people who campaign for fair elections at Union of Concerned Scientists, Common Cause, and Fair Districts PA, and many other organizations.

Charles A. Smith: I am grateful to my husband, Julio Rodriguez. His insight, humor, and tenacity have made my life wonderful and have also made my work better. I'm also grateful for his tolerance of the very weird world of the academy! I also owe my coauthors on this and other projects an enormous debt. I am lucky to work with so many amazing scholars.