# The One-Man One-Vote Myth:

The Impact of Non-Voting Populations on

# Congressional Apportionment

December 20th, 2007

Orlando J. Rodriguez, M.A. Manager/Connecticut State Data Center College of Liberal Arts and Sciences University of Connecticut – Storrs http://ctsdc.uconn.edu



The U.S. Constitution is often viewed as an infallible document which should not be altered. This view was not held by the Founding Fathers, who established a mechanism for amending the Constitution. They expected rules for Congressional representation might need revising:

If we can't agree on a rule that will be just at this time, how can we expect to find one that will be just in all times to come. Surely those who come after us will judge better of things present, than we can of things future<sup>a</sup>.



**Gouverneur Morris** Founding Father who produced the final draft of the U.S. Constitution July 11<sup>th</sup>, 1787 Constitutional Convention Philadelphia, PA



i

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> (Hall, The Debate over Slavery and Representation in the Constitution, June-July 1787, 1992)

## **Table of Contents**

Historical Overview	
Population-Count Apportionment: Polarizing America's Political Landscape	<b>3</b>
Voter Participation	
Older Populations	
America's Divergent Demographic Future	5
Vote-Count Apportionment: Rebalancing Congressional Representation	
Redistributing Seats from Over-Represented to Under-Represented States	
Voter Representation: 2004 Presidential Election	
Mitigating the Rise of "Super States"	9
Vote-Count Apportionment:Politically Neutral	
2004 Presidential Election: Bush vs. Kerry	
2000 Presidential Election: Bush vs. Gore	
1960 Presidential Election: Kennedy vs. Nixon	
Intangible Benefits of Vote-Count Apportionment	
Timely Congressional Representation	
Accurate Congressional Apportionment	
An End to Voter Disenfranchisement	
The 88% Solution: A Constitutional Convention	
Conclusion:Fulfilling the Promise of "One Man, One Vote"	
Appendix: Statistics by State	
Works Cited	

### Maps

Map 1: Voter Participation in the 2004 Presidential Election	4
Map 2: 2004 Median Age	5
Map 3: Current Apportionment Based on Census 2000 Population	7
Map 4: Vote-Count Apportionment Based on 2000 Election Presidential Votes	7
Map 5: Redistributing Seats from Over-Represented to Under-Represented States	7
Map 6: 2004 Voter Representation: Census 2000 Apportionment	8
Map 7: 2004 Voter Representation: Vote-Count Apportionment	9

### **Charts**

Chart 1: Components of the Non-Voting Population in 2004	3
Chart 2: Statistical Comparison of Apportionment Scenarios	6
Chart 3: 2004 Voter Representation: Over-Represented vs. Under-Represented States	8
Chart 4: The Rise of "Super States"	9
Chart 5: Vote-Count vs. Population-Count: 2004 Bush vs. Kerry	10
Chart 6: Vote-Count vs. Population-Count: 2000 Bush vs. Gore	11
Chart 7: Vote-Count vs. Population-Count: 1960 Kennedy vs. Nixon	11

Suggested Citation:

Rodriguez, Orlando. 2007. The One-Man One-Vote Myth: The Impact of Non-Voting Populations on Congressional Apportionment. Connecticut State Data Center, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut.

ii

### **Historical Overview**

The geographic distribution of the country's total population determines the allocation of seats in the House of Representatives (U.S. House of Representatives). This implies that Congressional Representatives speak for everyone in their respective Districts. This belief is neither politically nor historically genuine.

Realistically, elected officials are most beholden to those voters that put them into office. Furthermore, the two-year election cycle for Congressional Representatives forces these politicians to remain focused on issues of importance to their voter base. This is as the Founding Fathers intended (The Missouri Bar, 2006).

Historically, delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, in the summer of 1787, intensely debated the method for determining Congressional representation. The core issue was to establish how to measure a state's wealth for purposes of taxation and representation (Hall, The Debate over Slavery and Representation in the Constitution, June-July 1787, 1992). Article I, Section 2, of the Constitution (Morris & Madison, 1787) was the original solution:

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons.

The Founding Fathers established that a state's wealth would be measured by the number of its residents – with some conditions. Untaxed Indians would be excluded from the population count. Slaves would be counted as "three-fifths" of a person. This was a necessary conciliation, a devil's bargain, for Southern slave-holding colonies to join the Union (Montagna, 2007).

The federal government would count the majority of the population for purposes of representation and taxation, but neither slaves, women, nor Indians could vote. Ironically, this population of slaves and women, who could not vote, enhanced the political power of the few who could vote – land owning white males. Other males including Catholics, Jews, and Quakers were also barred from voting (American Civil Liberties Union and the ACLU Foundation).

In 1787, the Constitution established the basis for state representation in the federal government but did not address voting rights (Roche, 1992). The Founding Fathers, via apportionment, reinforced the dominance of one group (landed white males) over others and thereby deviated from the principles espoused in the Declaration of Independence (Jefferson, 1776).

In subsequent centuries, the 15<sup>th</sup> (1870) and 19<sup>th</sup> (1920) Amendments (U.S. Congress) established voting rights that were originally excluded from the Constitution. However, America's current demographic geography now frustrates our ability to obtain equal representation and "One Man, One Vote" remains an illusion.

1

The political influence of each vote varies significantly between the fifty states due to varying levels of voter participation and the size of non-voting populations. This variability in representation among the voting population can be reduced without diluting the state-to-federal level of representation. This report proposes that apportionment be based on the number of voters participating in presidential elections. The result is a rebalancing of the geographic distribution of Congressional seats and more even voter representation among the fifty states.

America's demography is creating a geographic and generational divide among constituents (Cohn, 2007). This report illustrates how population-count apportionment disproportionately benefits younger populations at the expense of older populations. Vote-Count apportionment would rein in this political polarization and bolster our representative democracy.

### Population-Count Apportionment: Polarizing America's Political Landscape

Section 2 of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the United States Constitution (Morris & Madison, 1787) establishes the basis for current Congressional Apportionment:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed.

This appears to be an innocuous method for distributing political representation, in the federal government, among the fifty states. What could be the harm from such a straight-forward method?

In retrospect, and with some foresight, representation based on population size has contributed to, and will intensify, political polarization among the fifty states. The fundamental problem is that states are given federal representation based on who resides in the state – not who votes. Consequently, the unique demographics of each state effectively work to over-represent, or under-represent, residents in **all** states.

A previous CtSDC study *Impact of Undocumented Populations on 2010 Congressional Reapportionment* (Rodriguez, 2007) forecast that Wyoming may become the most over-represented state (2010 Reapportionment) with one Representative for 514,839 legal residents. Conversely, Montana might be the most under-represented state with one Representative for 975,897 legal residents. In Arizona, representation could vary from one Representative for every 643,223 to one Representative for every 714,692 legal residents depending upon whether undocumented residents are included or excluded in the 2010 census population count.

### Non-Voting Population

The undocumented population is only one component of the non-voting population as shown in Chart 1 (data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2004).



A larger impact is made by children, citizens who do not registered to vote, and registered voters who do not cast a ballot. The size of the *entire non-voting* population affects the relative influence of a single vote. In 2004, only 15.5% of California's population were non-citizens while in Texas it was 10.4%.

The influence of a single vote becomes increasingly dispropotionate as the size of the corresponding non-voting population increases. In short, the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment concentrates the political influence of a state's entire population in the relatively smaller number of residents who cast a ballot.

The Connecticut State Data Center | The One-Man One-Vote Myth: The Impact of Non-Voting Populations on Congressional Apportionment 3

### Voter Participation

Map 1 shows the level of voter participation in the 2004 Presidential election (U.S. Government Office of the Federal Register). Voter participation is measured as the percentage of the voting age population (i.e. this includes foreign, undocumented, and citizens) that cast a ballot. As a region, Southwestern states had the lowest level of voter participation. The five states with the lowest rate of voter participation were HI, TX, CA, NV, and AZ. As a region, Midwestern states had the highest rate of voter participation. The five states with the highest voter participation. The five states were MN, ME, WI, NH, and SD.

*Impact of Undocumented Populations on 2010 Congressional Reapportionment* showed that the undocumented population in AZ and TX would give these states additional Congressional seats in 2010 at the expense of NY, MI, OH, IL, and MO. Map 1 clearly illustrates that AZ and TX have lower voter partipation rates than any of the states forecast to lose seats (MI, IL, MO, OH, NY) in 2010.

In this instance, the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment rewards states with the lowest voter participation rates while penalizing states with higher voter participation rates. The 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment enhances federal representation to states with growing populations even when the population of these same states includes significant numbers of non-voters.



### Older Populations

Map 2, page 5, shows the median age of the population for each state in 2004 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). As a region, based on median age, Southwestern states had the youngest populations. The median age ranged from a low of 28 years, in Utah, to a high of 40.7 years, in Maine.

Utah and Maine have much different age structures to their populations as a result of cultural and historical factors – not only foreign residents. In Maine, 22.1% of the population is under 18 years (not eligible to vote) while in Utah it is 31.3%.

Using only population counts, the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment enhances voter representation in younger populations such as Utah. The 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment discounts Maine's higher voter participation which is due, in part, to Maine's older population. It is important to note that voter participation increases with voter age (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005).

#### Map 2: 2004 Median Age



### America's Divergent Demographic Future

The Population Reference Bureau reports (Cohn, 2007):

The United States is in the midst of a major realignment of its population as the baby-boom generation ages into retirement and a smaller, strikingly different younger generation prepares to take over .

Unlike earlier demographic change .... this one brings the potential for conflict between the generations because of their divergent racial, ethnic, and nativity profiles—the older mainly white, the younger heavily minority and immigrant.

The following section shows that population-count methodlogy favors states with young, ethnic populations (eg. CA, AZ, TX) at the expense of predomintately white states with older populations (eg. ME, MN, WI). Herein lies the potential for population-based apportionment to polarize the United States along ethnic and generational divides. These differing political constituentcies will place often divergent, perhaps incompatible, demands upon federal government.

### Vote-Count Apportionment: Rebalancing Congressional Representation

The 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment intensifies the variation in voter representation between states. What is the alternative? How could a 28<sup>th</sup> Amendment rebalance representation?

Basing apportionment on the presidential vote-count from each state would result in more even voter representation among the fifty states. Each state would be apportioned seats using the existing formula (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001). However, the number of total votes cast for all presidential candidates would replace the state's decennial population count.

### Redistributing Seats from Over-Represented to Under-Represented States

Chart 2 provides an objective statistical comparison revealing the disparity between population-count and vote-count distributions<sup>b</sup>. Using the vote-count basis, the maximum number of seats assigned to a single state drops from 53 to 45 - reducing the impact of "Super States". Correspondingly, the range between the lowest and highest seat assignments drops from 52 to 44. The median number of seats remains 6 in both scenarios. However, the population-count scenario has only two states with 6 seats while the vote-count scenario has five states. Vote-count methodology creates an expanded "middle-class" of states.

Additional metrics (i.e. Skewness, Kurtosis, Sample Variance, and Standard Deviation) further indicate that vote-count apportionment results in less variation in the distribution of seats among the fifty states.



Map 3, page 7, shows the current distribution of Congressional seats based on the population count from Census 2000 (Mills, 2001). Map 4 shows the distribution of Congressional seats if they were allocated based on votes cast in the 2000 Presidential election (U.S. Government Office of the Federal Register). The total number of seats is 435 in both scenarios. Map 5 shows the change in seat assignments that would result if vote-count apportionment replaced population-count.

The most significant impact of adopting vote-count apportionment would be the loss of seats in CA and TX, which currently have the largest allocation of seats. CA would lose 8 seats and TX would lose 5 seats. This loss also reflects the current degree of over-representation in CA and TX. Corresponding gains in seats would be concentrated in Midwestern and Northern states with older populations and higher rates of voter participation. Northwestern states would also gain a portion of the redistributed seats.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Microsoft® Office Excel® 2007 Data Analysis

The Connecticut State Data Center The One-Man One-Vote Myth: The Impact of Non-Voting Populations on Congressional Apportionment 6

Nineteen seats would be reassigned from six states (CA, AZ, TX, GA, NC, and NY) to thirteen states (MN, WI, MI, OH, PA, IL, MO, CT, MA, ME, WA, OR, and MT). States losing seats are currently *over-represented* (i.e. each vote has greater relative influence) whereas states gaining seats are currently *under-represented* (i.e. each vote has lesser relative influence).



Map 4: Vote-Count Apportionment Based on 2000 Election Presidential Votes



Map 5: Redistributing Seats from Over-Represented to Under-Represented States



7

### Voter Representation: 2004 Presidential Election

Chart 3 illustrates the current sharp divergence in voter representation among the nineteen states that would be impacted if vote-count apportionment were adopted. States losing seats are *over-represented* whereas states gaining seats are *under-represented*.

All six over-represented states (CA, AZ, TX, GA, NC, and NY) have a ratio of voter representation, or voter influence, that is below the fifty state median. A lower ratio indicates greater representation for each voter. Eleven of the under-represented states (MN, WI, MI, OH, PA, MO, CT, ME, WA, OR, and MT) have a higher ratio than the median. A higher ratio indicates lesser representation per voter. The difference between TX and MT is 218,848 voters per seat.



Map 6 shows the geographic variation in voter representation from the 2004 Presidential election. Voters in Hawaii were the most over-represented with 214,495 voters for each seat. In contrast, voters in Montana were the most under-represented with 450,434 voters for each seat. The median level of voter representation was 294,839 voters per seat.



Map 7, page 9, shows the hypothetical variation in voter representation in 2004 if vote-count apportionment had replaced the current population-count methodology. Hawaiians would remain the most represented constituency with 214,495 voters for each seat. However, South Dakotans would become the least represented constituency at 388,215 voters per seat. The median level of voter representation would drop to 281,620 voters per seat.

Map 7: 2004 Voter Representation: Vote-Count Apportionment



These maps clearly illustrate that vote-count apportionment results in less variability in voter representation among the fifty states. The result is that votes from different states become more equal in their potential to influence federal government legislation.

### Mitigating the Rise of "Super States"

An inadvertent consequence of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment has been the historically increasing concentration of representation in a handful of states as illustrated in Chart 4. In 1960, NY, CA, and PA accounted for 24.3% of the 435 Congressional seats (Mills, 2001). By 2000, CA, TX, and NY accounted for 26.3% of all seats. If this trend continues, in 2050, CA, TX, and FL might account for 36% of Congressional seats <sup>c</sup>.

In contrast, with apportionment based on vote-count, CA, NY, and TX would have accounted for a lower 22.9% of Congressional seats in 2000. If recent historical voting trends continue, in 2050, CA, FL, and TX might account for a lesser 31% of Congressional seats if the vote-count methodology were used.

Basing apportionment on total population exacerbates the concentration of representatives in "Super States". This is due to higher population growth in these states. Vote-Count apportionment mutes this effect, which results in a more balanced distribution of seats among the fifty states – assuming historical trends continue.



Chart 4: The Rise of "Super States"

<sup>°</sup> Trend analysis using Microsoft® Excel® "Forecast" formula based on apportionment counts from 1950 to 2000 and forecasted apportionment for 2010 (Rodriguez, 2007).

### Vote-Count Apportionment: Politically Neutral

Would it favor a particular political party to adopt vote-count apportionment? To address this concern, the outcomes from three Presidential elections are recalculated using vote-count methodology. The results show that vote-count apportionment would **not** have changed the outcomes of these elections. This is good evidence that changing to vote-count apportionment would be politically neutral. Both Democrats and Republicans would suffer, or benefit, equally. The net result would not favor either party.

However, vote-count apportionment would affect Congressional Redistricting (Wattson & Handley, 2006) in the nineteen states that either gain or lose seats. However, it is impossible to determine how this would impact the existing political balance in the House. Such an effort would require assumptions resulting in hypothetical scenarios that are impossible to confirm. It is reasonable to expect that both Democrats and Republicans would gain Districts in some states while losing Districts in others.

#### 2004 Presidential Election: Bush vs. Kerry

The 2004 Presidential election was a contest between George W. Bush and John Kerry. Bush won the popular vote with 62,039,073 votes to Kerry's 59,027,478 (U.S. Government Office of the Federal Register). The Electoral College gave Bush 286 votes to Kerry's 251 votes (Leip, 2004 Presidential Election Results, 2005).

Chart 5 compares the results from the Electoral College in 2004, left columns, with results had apportionment been done using the Presidential vote count. The vote-count scenario, right columns, would have moved two electoral votes from Bush to Kerry. Bush wins the election in either scenario.



Chart 5: Vote-Count vs. Population-Count: 2004 Bush vs. Kerry

### 2000 Presidential Election: Bush vs. Gore

The 2000 Presidential election provided a wealth of controversy on America's presidential elections, state electoral procedures, the conduct of the Supreme Court, the role of the Electoral College, and more. Al Gore defeated George W. Bush in the popular vote. Gore captured 50,996,582 votes to Bush's 50,456,062 (U.S. Government Office of the Federal Register). However, Bush won the Electoral College, and thus the election, with 271 electoral votes, to Gore's 266 electoral votes (Leip, 2000 Presidential Election Results, 2005).

Chart 6 compares results from the Electoral College in 2000, left columns, with results had apportionment been done using the Presidential vote count. The vote-count scenario, right columns, moves one electoral vote from Gore to Bush, which enhances Bush's win.



#### Chart 6: Vote-Count vs. Population-Count: 2000 Bush vs. Gore

#### 1960 Presidential Election: Kennedy vs. Nixon

The outcome of the 1960 Presidential election surprised some when John Kennedy defeated Richard Nixon. Kennedy narrowly won the popular vote with 34,220,984 votes to Nixon's 34,108,175 (Leip, 1960 Presidential Election Results, 2005). However, Kennedy had a commanding lead in the Electoral College with 303 votes to Nixon's 219.

Chart 7 compares results from the Electoral College in 1960, left columns, with results had apportionment been done using the Presidential vote count. The vote-count scenario, right columns, gives 14 additional electoral votes to Nixon. Kennedy loses 9 votes. The discrepancy in votes gained to votes lost is due to the presence of other Presidential candidates. Kennedy still wins with a majoring of electoral votes.



#### Chart 7: Vote-Count vs. Population-Count: 1960 Kennedy vs. Nixon

### **Intangible Benefits of Vote-Count Apportionment**

This report provides tangible evidence that vote-count apportionment will result in more even voter representation. There are additional benefits from vote-count apportionment which cannot be quantified but which add legitimacy to our political system.

#### **Timely Congressional Representation**

Reapportionment occurs every ten years following the decennial census (e.g. 1980, 1990, and 2000). However, population shifts can be significant during a decade resulting in an Electoral College that reflects an outdated nationwide demographic geography.

The 1960 election was the first Presidential election that included fifty states (Leip, 1960 Presidential Election Results, 2005). However, the Electoral College in 1960 reflected America's population as it existed in 1950. This was before Alaska and Hawaii both gained statehood in 1959. More recently, the 2000 Presidential election had an Electoral College based on the 1990 Census. During the 1990's, the national median age rose 2.5 years aging from 32.8 to 35.3 (U.S. Census Bureau). During that decade, the nation's population increased nearly 33 million, or 13%. The Electoral College in the 2000 Presidential election did not reflect these demographic shifts.

Vote-Count methodology would allow Congressional Reapportionment to occur more frequently. Vote-Count reapportionment could coincide with each Presidential election, although this would be impractical given the time required for Congressional Redistricting. However, an eight-year cycle for reapportionment would be preferable to the current ten-year cycle.

#### Accurate Congressional Apportionment

The current basis for apportionment is the decennial census conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The 1990 census resulted in a nationwide population undercount of -2.1% and an undercount of -3.1% for African Americans (National Research Council, 2004). The 2000 census overcounted Whites by +1.1% and undercounted African Americans, -2.9%, and Hispanics, -1.8% (National Research Council, 2004). Both the 1990 and 2000 census population results spawned partisan Congressional efforts to "fix" the count statistically (National Research Council, 2004). Census 2010 will offer more justification to question the validity of the population count because of the unknown impact from a sizable undocumented immigrant population (Rodriguez, 2007).

Vote-Count methodology is based on those who vote – not on a questionable census population count. Consequently, vote-count apportionment will provide greater assurance of fairness, transparency, and accuracy when allocating seats to individual states.

#### An End to Voter Disenfranchisement

Voter disenfranchisement has been linked to Presidential elections as recently as 2004 (American Civil Liberties Union) and 2000 (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2001). The current method of basing apportionment on population-count does nothing to dissuade political parties from hindering voter participation among those likely to vote for opponents.

Vote-Count apportionment would create an incentive to end bureaucratic shenanigans associated with voter disenfranchisement. Vote-Count methodology inherently rewards states for increasing voter turnout as only votes cast would count towards apportionment. It would not be sufficient to become a registered voter yet never cast a ballot. This provides a disincentive for disenfranchisement as any uncast vote would translate into less Congressional representation – regardless of political inclination.

#### The 88% Solution: A Constitutional Convention

Article V of the U.S. Constitution (Morris & Madison, 1787) establishes the requirements for amending the Constitution.

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress;

Vote-Count apportionment will bring a greater degree of fairness to Congressional representation but it will require a 28<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the Constitution to make it a reality. This seems inherently unobtainable due to the stiff requirements imposed by the Constitution. But the numbers favor adoption of vote-count apportionment.

Adopting vote-count apportionment would reduce the Congressional representation of only six states (AZ, CA, GA, NC, NY, and TX). Thirteen states (CT, IL, MA, ME, MI, MN, MO, MT, OH, OR, PA, WA, WI) benefit by an increase in the number of allotted seats. The remaining thirty-one states are unaffected, although they do benefit because vote-count methodology reduces the influence of "Super States".

In summary, thirty-three states (66%) are required to convene a Constitutional Convention. Thirty-eight states (75%) are required to adopt an Amendment. In comparison, forty-four states (88%) benefit directly, indirectly, or are unaffected by vote-count apportionment. There are a sufficient number of states (44), which would benefit from vote-count apportionment, to make it a reality. Passage of a 28<sup>th</sup> Amendment is obtainable via a Constitutional Convention of states.

*Impact of Undocumented Populations on 2010 Congressional Reapportionment* shows that New York could lose two seats in the next reapportionment. New York might favor adopting vote-count apportionment and lose only one seat to forestall future additional losses in representation via population-count apportionment. This would raise the number of states supporting vote-count apportionment to 45, which is 90% of states.

### Conclusion: Fulfilling the Promise of "One Man, One Vote"

This analysis reveals drawbacks to our system of Congressional representation, which is based simply on population counts. Current Congressional Apportionment ignores the impact of the non-voting population and fails to remedy political actions that seek to limit the participation of some voters.

Representation in the House is allotted to states, not individuals. Complete fulfillment of "One Man, One Vote" is not possible due to this state-federal relationship established by the United States Constitution. However, adopting vote-count apportionment would significantly reduce the level of disparity currently seen in voter representation between states. It would bolster citizen participation in our political system, forestall political conflict between generations, and mute political partisanship.

The unchanged outcomes from Presidential elections suggest that vote-count apportionment would be a politically neutral Amendment. Furthermore, it would align the standard of apportionment with our belief in the importance of civic engagement and preserve, insofar as possible, the vote of every citizen on an equal basis.

The decennial census would continue to be used for calculating federal funding to states.

## Appendix: Statistics by State

				Apportionment		Apportionment		Voter Representation 2004 (Voters per Representative)			
		2004	2004	(Population-Count)			(Vote-Count)				
State	State	Voter	Median							2000	2004
C laite	Code	Participation	Age	1960	2000	2050	1960	2000	2050	Census	Presidential
			3-	1000	2000	2000	1000	2000	2000	Apportionment	Vote-Count
										Apportionment	Apportionment
Alabama	AL	55.4%	37.0	8	7	5	4	7	10	269,059	269,059
Alaska	AK	66.9%	33.4	1	1	1	1	1	1	311,808	311,808
Arizona	AZ	48.6%	34.1	3	8	14	3	6	11	251,573	287,512
Arkansas	AR	51.0%	36.6	4	4	3	3	4	5	263,424	263,424
California	CA	47.3%	34.2	38	53	72	40	45	50	234,337	282,269
Colorado	CO	62.1%	34.5	4	7	10	5	7	10	304,333	266,291
Connecticut	CT	59.4%	38.9	6	5	4	8	6	4	315,732	263,110
Delaware	DE	60.0%	37.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	375,190	375,190
Florida	FL	56.8%	39.3	12	25	42	10	25	44	304,392	281,845
Georgia	GA	50.8%	34.0	10	13	16	5	11	19	253,753	274,899
Hawaii	HI	44.0%	38.0	2	2	3	1	2	3	214,495	214,495
Idano		59.8%	34.3	2	2	2	2	2	2	298,631	298,631
Illinois	IL	56.3%	35.4	24	19	13	30	20	8	277,617	277,617
Indiana	IN	54.2%	35.7	11	9	/	13	9	5	274,222	274,222
lowa	IA	66.8%	38.0	/	5	2	8	5	2	301,163	301,163
Kansas	KS	58.5%	30.1	5	4	2	6	4	2	296,927	296,927
Kentucky	KY	57.5%	37.3	/	6	4	/	6	5	299,314	299,314
Louisiana		58.3%	35.2	8	/	5	5	/	9	277,587	277,587
Manuand		72.7%	40.7	2	2	1	3	3	3	370,374	246,916
Maagaabuaatta		57.0%	30.0	8	8	9	15	8	9	298,026	298,026
Massachusetts		59.1%	36.6	12	10	0	10	10	C 10	290,030	290,536
Minnocoto		04.0%	36.6	19	10	11	21	10	13	322,010	204,002
Minnesola		73.4%	34.0	0	0	/	10	10	10	<u>303,∠33</u>	282,387
Mississippi	MO	04.4%	37.3	0 10	4	3 6	2 12	4	0	200,030	200,030
Montana	MT	63.7%	39.6	10	1	1	12	10	0	450 434	275,130
Nobraska		60.2%	36.0	2	י ז	2	2	2	2	259 085	259.085
Nevada		47.9%	35.1	1	3	6	- 1	3	5	275 300	275 300
New Hampshire	NH	68.6%	39.2	2	2	2	2	2	2	338 114	338 114
New Jersey	NLI	55.4%	37.8	15	13	12	17	13	9	277 669	277 669
New Mexico	NM	51.1%	35.8	2	3	4	2	3	4	252 101	252 101
New York	NY	50.4%	37.3	41	29	15	45	28	6	256,837	286,472
North Carolina	NC	55.7%	36.0	11	13	14	.0	12	15	269,134	291,562
North Dakota	ND	64.5%	38.8	2	1	1	2	1	0	312.833	312.833
Ohio	OH	66.0%	37.5	24	18	11	26	20	13	312.661	281.395
Oklahoma	OK	55.3%	36.5	6	5	4	6	5	4	292,752	292,752
Oregon	OR	66.9%	37.0	4	5	6	5	6	8	365,565	261,118
Pennsylvania	PA	61.3%	39.3	27	19	9	31	20	9	303,461	274,560
Rhode Island	RI	52.3%	38.1	2	2	2	3	2	1	218,567	218,567
South Carolina	SC	51.2%	36.9	6	6	6	2	6	11	269,268	269,268
South Dakota	SD	68.5%	37.0	2	1	1	2	1	0	388,215	388,215
Tennessee	TN	54.4%	37.0	9	9	9	7	9	11	270,813	270,813
Texas	TX	46.2%	32.9	23	32	42	14	27	41	231,586	285,029
Utah	UT	57.3%	28.0	2	3	5	2	3	4	304,243	304,243
Vermont	VT	64.4%	40.4	1	1	1	1	1	1	312,309	312,309
Virginia	VA	56.6%	36.9	10	11	12	5	11	18	290,263	290,263
Washington	WA	61.0%	36.4	7	9	12	8	10	12	317,676	285,908
West Virginia	WV	53.8%	40.3	5	3	1	5	3	1	251,962	251,962
Wisconsin	WI	72.4%	37.5	10	8	7	11	11	11	374,626	272,455
Wyoming	WY	63.6%	38.4	1	1	1	1	1	1	242,948	242,948

The Connecticut State Data Center | The One-Man One-Vote Myth: The Impact of Non-Voting Populations on Congressional Apportionment 15

### **Works Cited**

American Civil Liberties Union and the ACLU Foundation. (n.d.). *Timeline 1776-1799*. Retrieved December 11, 2007, from ACLU Voting Rights: http://www.votingrights.org/timeline/?year=1700

American Civil Liberties Union. (n.d.). *Voting Rights*. Retrieved December 12, 2007, from American Civil Liberties Union: http://www.aclu.org/votingrights/index.html

Cohn, D. (2007, March). *The Divergent Paths of Baby Boomers and Immigrants - Population Reference Bureau*. Retrieved December 11, 2007, from Population Reference Bureau: http://www.prb.org/Articles/2007/DivergentPathsofBabyBoomersandImmigrants.aspx

(1992). The Debate over Establishing the Federal Legislature, May-June 1787. In K. L. Hall, *Major Problems in Constitutional History, Volume I: The Colonial Era Through Reconstrution* (pp. 127-133). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

(1992). The Debate over Slavery and Representation in the Constitution, June-July 1787. In K. L. Hall, *Major Problems in American Constitutional History, Volume I: The Colonial Era Through Reconstruction* (pp. 133 - 143). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Jefferson, T. (1776, June 28). *Delcaration of Independence*. Retrieved December 11, 2007, from National Archives and Records Administration: http://www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters/declaration.html

Leip, D. (2005). *1960 Presidential Election Results*. Retrieved November 2007, from Dave Leip's Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections: http://uselectionatlas.org/RESULTS/

Leip, D. (2005). 2000 Presidential Election Results. Retrieved November 2007, from Dave Leip's Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections: http://uselectionatlas.org/RESULTS/

Leip, D. (2005). 2004 Presidential Election Results. Retrieved November 2007, from Dave Leip's Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections.

Mills, K. M. (2001, July). *Census Bureau*. Retrieved September 2007, from Census 2000 Publications: http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-7.pdf

Montagna, J. A. (2007). *82.03.03 The United States Constitution*. Retrieved December 12, 2007, from The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute: http://www.yale.edu/ynhti/curriculum/units/1982/3/82.03.03.x.html

Morris, G., & Madison, J. (1787). *The U.S. Constitution*. Retrieved December 11, 2007, from National Constitution Center: http://www.constitutioncenter.org/explore/TheU.S.Constitution/index.shtml

National Research Council. (2004). 5-C.3 July 1991 Adjustment Decision. In N. R. Council, *The 2000 Census: Counting Under Adversity* (p. 168). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

National Research Council. (2004). Chapter 5 Coverage Evaluation: Methods and Backgrounds. In N. R. Council, *The 2000 Census: Counting Under Adversity* (p. 158). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

National Research Council. (2004). *The 2000 Census: Counting Under Adversity*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Roche, J. P. (1992). The Practical Democracy of the Framers. In K. L. Hall, *Major Problems in American Constitutional History Volume I: The Colonial Era Through Reconstruction* (p. 159). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Rodriguez, O. J. (2007). *Impact of Undocumented Populations on 2010 Congressional Reapportionment.* Storrs, CT: The Connecticut State Data Center, University of Connecticut.

The Missouri Bar. (2006). *The House of Representatives*. Retrieved December 11, 2007, from Civics Library Of The Missouri Bar: http://members.mobar.org/civics/House.htm

U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). *American Factfinder Decennial Data Sets*. Retrieved November 2007, from Census Bureau: http://factfinder.census.gov/

U.S. Census Bureau. (2001, February 21). *Computing Apportionment*. Retrieved September 2007, from Census Bureau: http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/apportionment/computing.html

U.S. Census Bureau. (2005, May 25). *Statistical Abstract Voting-Age Population and Voter Participation*. Retrieved November 2007, from Census Bureau:

http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/elections/votingage\_population\_and\_voter\_participation/

U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). *United States and States - R0101. Median Age*. Retrieved November 2007, from American Community Survey: http://factfinder.census.gov

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (2001, November). *THE 2000 VOTE AND ELECTION REFORM*. Retrieved December 12, 2007, from U.S. Commission on Civil Rights: http://www.usccr.gov/pubs/pubsndx.htm

U.S. Congress. (n.d.). *The U.S. Constitution*. Retrieved December 12, 2007, from National Constitution Center: http://www.constitutioncenter.org/explore/TheU.S.Constitution/index.shtml#Amendments

U.S. Government Office of the Federal Register. (n.d.). 2000 Presidential Election Popular Vote Totals. Retrieved November 2007, from National Archives and Records Administration: http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/electoral-college/2000/popular\_vote.html

U.S. Government Office of the Federal Register. (n.d.). 2004 Presidential Election Popular Vote Totals. Retrieved November 6, 2007, from NARA Federal Register U.S. Electoral College: http://www.archives.gov/federalregister/electoral-college/2004/popular\_vote.html

U.S. House of Representatives. (n.d.). *Congressional Apportionment*. Retrieved December 11, 2007, from Office of the Clerk: http://clerk.house.gov/art\_history/house\_history/congApp.html

Wattson, P., & Handley, L. (2006, April 25). *The United States of America Reapportionment and Redistricting*. Retrieved December 11, 2007, from ACE Electoral Knowledge Network: http://aceproject.org/aceen/topics/bd/bdy/bdy\_us/?searchterm=redistricting