

2-2013

President Obama's Victories in Illinois: 2012 Compared to 2008

John S. Jackson

Southern Illinois University Carbondale, jsjacson@siu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/ppi_papers

This is paper #34.

Recommended Citation

Jackson, John S., "President Obama's Victories in Illinois: 2012 Compared to 2008" (2013). *The Simon Review (Occasional Papers of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute)*. Paper 34.

http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/ppi_papers/34

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Simon Review (Occasional Papers of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute) by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

THE SIMON REVIEW

**President Obama's Victories in Illinois:
2012 Compared to 2008**

By: John S. Jackson

Paper #34

February 2013

A Publication of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute

Author's Note: The author would like to thank Cary Bryant, Ashley Rippentrop, Shanara Bush, and David Lynch for their invaluable assistance in the research for this paper.

President Obama's Victories in Illinois: 2012 Compared to 2008

By: John S. Jackson

Paul Simon Public Policy Institute

Abstract: This paper describes and analyzes President Obama's 2012 election victory in Illinois and compares it to his earlier victory in 2008 in his home state. It also extends the analysis back through the 2004 and 2000 presidential elections and shows how those results were similar and where they differed. It primarily relies on the county and county election returns supplemented by U. S. Census data as the unit of analysis. The paper sets Illinois into a national electoral context describing what is happening in an era of deep partisan polarization coupled with the prospects for a partisan realignment.

Introduction

Barack Obama is the first President elected directly from Illinois since both Abraham Lincoln and Ulysses S. Grant won two elections each during the Civil War and its immediate aftermath in the 1860s and 1870s. Other candidates from Illinois have run and been a factor in the presidential sweepstakes such as Adlai E. Stevenson, II who ran twice and was twice defeated by the same man, Dwight Eisenhower, in 1952 and 1956. We have also produced several viable candidates who sought their party's nomination unsuccessfully including John Anderson, Paul Simon, and Phillip Crane. Adlai E. Stevenson was Cleveland's Vice President in 1892 and John A. Logan was James G. Blaine's Vice Presidential running mate in 1884. However, Barack Obama is the first candidate from Illinois to actually win the nomination, twice, and win the general election, twice, since the Civil War era. As a producer of presidents Illinois is now somewhat behind the three leaders, Virginia, New York, and Ohio but equal with Texas in the second tier of states which have produced multiple presidents and who have had their careers shaped by their state's politics before climbing to national fame (Stanley and Niemi, 2010, 233-237).

Paul Simon's influential book, Lincoln's Preparation for Greatness, showed just how important Lincoln's experience in Illinois politics, especially his time in the Illinois General Assembly was in shaping his views and values and his approach to governing in Washington (Simon, 1971). A similar work on Obama would also conclude that his service in the Illinois General Assembly was an important factor in shaping his views and political style and values. That period also produced some indicators of how he might approach being president especially through the seeking of bipartisan solutions to difficult problems and courting cooperation across the aisle.

His record in Illinois indicates that Obama is by nature a conciliator, a consensus seeker and coalition builder and that was his major forte during his time in the Illinois legislature. It was also his initial approach to the presidency although that changed as time went on and experience with the Congress in a highly polarized and partisan era changed him by the beginning of his second term. Likewise studying Obama's three statewide victories in Illinois

politics provides some worthwhile clues as to where he had the most and least electoral appeal in 2008 and 2012 and how he approached the very political task of building an electoral majority in a large and diverse state like Illinois.

In 2006 I wrote a Simon Review paper documenting the rise of Barack Obama to a position of power in Illinois politics via his winning the U. S. Senate seat in 2004 (Jackson, 2006). Later I extended this analysis to Obama's victory in Illinois in his first quest for the presidency (Jackson, 2009). Obama's 2008 presidential nomination and subsequent election victory, one of nearly landslide proportion in the Electoral College, was almost unprecedented for a candidate who was as young and unknown on the national stage as he was at the time, and it was absolutely unprecedented for a candidate with his racial identity to ascend to the White House while defeating two of the most experienced and respected recent candidates, Hillary Clinton and John McCain, one Democrat and one Republican, in the process.

The current paper is a continuation of that series documenting how Obama fared in his presidential re-election race of 2012. At that point Obama was certainly no longer unknown and his record in the management of the government, especially in regard to his management of the economy, was the central point of contention in the 2012 general election. In addition, the polarized state of American politics has been the major fact of political life in Washington recently, especially after the gains of the Republican Party and its Tea Party faction in the 2010 mid-term elections (Levendusky, 2009; Fiorina, 2005; White, 2003).

When the Democrats lost control of the U. S. House and suffered reduced numbers in the Senate after 2010, bipartisanship and conciliation largely became things of the past in the Obama Administration, and it became much more difficult for the president to get any of his major legislative priorities enacted in such a divided Congress. Partisan and ideological gridlock and stalemate became much more the norm during the second half of Obama's first term.

The national election was certainly a referendum on Obama's stewardship of his office and of the government, and the same was true in Illinois. This paper details how he did in Illinois in 2012 and how this election compared with his electoral record from 2008. Illinois has been a typical state for national politics for a long time. One study based on U. S. Census data ranked Illinois as "the most average state" in the union (Ohlemacher, 2007). **Indeed, despite its reputation as a leading blue or pro-Democratic state currently (Green, 2003; Green 2007), Illinois is still one where either party can win statewide depending on the candidate and the circumstances of the moment (Jackson, 2011).**

In creating this longitudinal electoral record I hope to shed some light on the larger patterns of both continuity and change in Illinois and national politics as illustrated by the Obama elections. Obama's record has been written in less than a decade since he first appeared on the state and

then the national scene and went on to achieve the kind of success only realized by a handful of presidents who have been elected to two terms. **In fact, of the 43 presidents we have had in the United States prior to Obama, only seventeen, or less than half, have been elected to a second term.** So, Obama has already joined select company from a very small universe which begins with George Washington at the founding of the Republic in 1789 and extends through George W. Bush who prevailed in the first two elections of the 21st Century (Stanley and Niemi, 2010, 17-21).

Illinois certainly played a crucial role in shaping the political values and the career of the young Barack Obama, not only providing him his first home and profession as a new college graduate and later a new law school graduate, but also providing him the political base to move from South Side Chicago community organizer and constitutional law professor at the University of Chicago, to the Illinois State Senate, and then to the United States Senate, all before he had reached his 45th birthday. For all the controversy which seemed to never die over his birthplace, no one ever doubted that his political home was firmly planted in Illinois. That grounding in Illinois was topped by an overwhelming popular election victory in 2008, both nationally and in the state, and then confirmed by another popular vote victory, by a smaller but still convincing margin in 2012.

On a common sense or conventional wisdom basis, one might think initially that there was nothing at all unusual about a presidential candidate winning his home state. That is the most common outcome in American presidential elections; and if a candidate is not carrying his home state, preferably by a wide margin, then he is probably in some trouble nationally. While carrying the home state is the norm, it is by no means a confirmed law of politics. There are several recent examples of presidential candidates not carrying their home states. Al Gore was elected U. S. Senator from Tennessee first in 1984 and then again by a larger margin in 1990 and he had been a four term Congressman before then. Yet in 2000 Gore failed to carry his own state and thus lost the election to George W. Bush in a much disputed outcome involving a 537 official vote margin in Florida and the 5:4 vote of the U. S. Supreme Court. However, Gore would not have even needed Florida if he had just carried Tennessee, which was not out of the question since he and Bill Clinton together had carried both Tennessee and Arkansas in 1992 and 1996.

Or consider the case of Mitt Romney who lost the state he had served as Governor, Massachusetts, which Obama won by a 63.20 percent margin in 2012. In addition, Romney lost his native state, Michigan, the state where he was born and raised, and the state his father had served as Governor, by a similar margin in 2012 when Obama carried Michigan by a 58.37 percent margin. Romney also had a second home in New Hampshire, which he repaired to frequently to escape the rigors of the campaign trail during the 2012 election, and he also lost

New Hampshire by a narrow but still decisive 54.87 percent Obama margin. He also lost California, another state where he had a home, by a wide margin. In summary, Mitt Romney did not have a place where he could claim a home state advantage unless it was Utah where he scored his biggest victory of the 2012 election with an overwhelming 74 percent of the popular vote (David Wasserman, Redistricting web site, accessed Nov. 21, 2012, unofficial and partially incomplete returns).

Going back in history, Adlai E. Stevenson, II ran twice against Dwight Eisenhower in both 1952 and 1956, and he lost Illinois both times. Illinois was Stevenson's home state, the place he had served as Governor, the place where he had built his political reputation and base, and he lost it twice. Making it remarkably evident how much our politics have changed, it is even more notable now to consider that Adlai Stevenson carried all of the states of the Deep South, while losing Texas, Virginia, Florida and Tennessee, in both 1952 and 1956, and only losing the Deep South's Louisiana in 1956. The South was the Democratic base in that era. But Stevenson lost Illinois both times. Times have certainly changed with the Deep South and the peripheral South now forming the virtually unassailable bedrock of the Republican presidential core.

In 2012, Obama's victory in Illinois was sizable although it was not greater than in his native state of Hawaii or the District of Columbia and several other Northeastern and Midwestern states which exceeded the percentage Obama gained in Illinois. These states are the latest markers in the party realignment which has seen the Northeast and parts of the industrial Midwest transformed from solidly favoring the Republicans in presidential elections to providing the most promising base for Democrats in our current presidential politics.

For most of the 20th century Illinois was one of the most typical states from an overall demographic and political perspective. Illinois almost always reflects the national vote and in the 20th Century; it only went against the national winner in 1916 when the state voted for Charles Evans Hughes over the Democratic incumbent, Woodrow Wilson, and in 1976 Illinois again swam against the national tide and voted for Gerald Ford over Jimmy Carter. Those were the only two instances in the entire 20th Century when Illinois voted against the presidential winner. More recently, in the 1980s Illinois voted for Reagan twice and for George H. W. Bush in 1988. That was four consecutive wins for the Republicans. So, for that century, Illinois was a competitive state where either party could win which both reflected and helped lead the national trends in presidential politics.

In many important ways, Illinois politics are indicative of larger trends in national politics. In a realigning era, Illinois has trended more and more firmly toward the Democratic Party and the Republicans have lost significant ground in this state over the past two decades of presidential and statewide elections. Since 1992 when Illinois went for Clinton, Illinois has been one of the leading and most dependable components of any Democratic presidential candidate's core

strength. Clinton won twice. Then Gore won Illinois in 2000; John Kerry won in 2004, and Obama won in 2008 and 2012. While this is a consistently pro-Democratic victory outcome, it is also worth noting that except for 2004, Illinois voted for the winner of the national popular vote in every election since 1976 and in that respect can be considered “typical”. The contours of Obama’s victory map illustrate that transition from Republican victories under Reagan and George H. W. Bush to Democratic victories under Clinton and Obama.

Sports fans know that there is a definite home court advantage in basketball, baseball, hockey and other sports, and ordinarily that analogy carries over to politics as well but not always. So it is worthwhile to analyze how and where Obama fashioned his adopted home state victory in both 2008 and in 2012 and what important trends in American politics are indicated by those victories. That is the objective of this paper.

The Data Analysis

Let us begin by examining the size and scope of President Obama’s victory both nationally and in Illinois. On the national level, Obama won a majority of the popular vote with approximately 51.03 percent of the total compared to 47.19 percent for Romney. This resulted from Obama’s approximately 65,899,583 total votes to Romney’s 60,931,966 - a margin of almost five million (<http://www.uselectionatlas.org/RESULTS/national.php?year=2012>, accessed Jan. 11, 2013).

While the popular vote was somewhat close, the Electoral College vote was almost a blow out for Obama. He beat Romney by a 332 to 206 vote margin, or a 62 percent Electoral College victory. Obama carried 26 states, plus the District of Columbia, compared to 24 for Romney. This provided only a narrow net state advantage to Obama; however, the president carried far more of the larger states and he carried eight out of ten of the states originally considered to be the most competitive, or “battleground” states which either candidate could have won and where both candidates spent an extraordinary amount of time campaigning personally. For all the enormous amount of time, energy and resources the Romney campaign poured into the battleground states, he ultimately emerged with victories in only North Carolina and Indiana as two take-away states from the 2008 Obama Electoral College margin of 365 to 173 over John McCain.

This map illustrates the way the Electoral College normally works. That is, a fairly narrow victory in the popular vote, especially if it exceeds a majority at 50 to 51 percent, usually translates into a much larger Electoral College victory. The 2012 election provided another case reinforcing that general rule. Supporters of the Electoral College contend that this Electoral College magnification of the majority is good for the system. They argue that it is effective in bestowing a sense of legitimacy and claiming rights on an electoral mandate if the Electoral


favor in 2008 had less positive impact for him in 2012 even though it was probably overall still a net positive, narrowly, according to the polls.

In some respects the geographical totals were mirrored at the state level if you use the county as the unit of analysis. The analogy is not entirely apt since the counties are not constitutionally or legally the same thing as the states in the Electoral College. Ultimately it does not matter much how many counties a candidate carries, but it does matter critically how many states, and which states, the candidate for president carries. Nevertheless, counties are important units of local government and they are key party organizational building blocks and political rallying points as well. The county court houses usually are filled with officials who are the backbone of their local party organizations (Jackson, 2011). In this sense, the counties are an effective window onto the world of local politics. They represent grassroots leaders and average voters down at a level where most people live and receive governmental services and where they pay significant amounts of their local taxes.

In addition, most counties are embedded in and reflect their own particular political culture. In most states, certainly in Illinois, there are counties which are well known as Democratic or Republican strongholds where the candidates at the top of the ticket do not seem to matter much as these counties vote routinely for their traditional party favorite no matter what the national or statewide trends may be at the time. There are others which can be relied on as marginal or swing counties where the results change from election to election and immediately reflect the political tides of the moment and which are also potentially involved in longer term transitions from one political party to another. If you are going to capture the picture of long term secular changes in American politics, county level voting returns are a very good place to document those processes in action. For all those reasons, the counties are important units of analysis for any election, including the presidential elections.

Map 2

2012 Illinois Presidential Election Results by County



	# of Votes	% of Votes	Counties Carried
Romney	2,135,216	40.73%	■ - Romney N=79
Obama	3,019,512	57.60%	■ - Obama N=23

Source: Basic data taken from Illinois State Board of Elections
Official Vote, November 6, 2012, 5.

Map 2 provides the results by county for the 2012 presidential election in Illinois. It is immediately evident from this table that Obama carried only 23 counties compared to 79 for Romney. Obama carried northeastern Illinois, northwestern Illinois, and a smattering of other counties. Thus, in terms of sheer geography, the map of Illinois had far more red territory than blue showing on it on Tuesday night, November 6th. **Appendix A** provides the complete 2012 voting returns for the two major parties for each Illinois county.

Table 1 displays the 2012 election return data divided into the traditional three major geographical sections of the state, i.e. Chicago and Cook County, the five Collar Counties which form the suburban ring around Chicago, and the remaining 96 counties which are routinely referred to as “Downstate.”

Cook County accounts for 40 percent of the total population in the state. Obviously it is the major prize in any statewide contest no matter which year and what candidates are involved. In 2012 Cook County provided a large vote total margin of 1,488,537 for Obama and 495,542 for Romney (Illinois State Board of Elections, website, accessed, January 9, 2013). Obviously, Cook County and Chicago were absolutely essential keys to the size of the statewide victory for Obama. However, contrary to popular belief in Downstate Illinois, they were certainly not the whole story. The popular vote total for Obama from Cook County was 49.30 percent of his statewide popular vote margin. In other words, with 40 percent of the state’s population, Cook County provided almost half of Obama’s total votes in Illinois.

The additional Obama margin of victory in the popular vote came especially and notably from the five Collar Counties. Obama carried four of those five, losing only McHenry narrowly. In those five counties combined Obama scored a 647,575 to 613,712 popular vote margin victory over Romney or a 33,863 Obama vote margin. This margin was certainly one of the major explanations for the Obama victory in his home state in 2012. No Republican candidate can afford a net loss in the five Collar Counties, much less coming out of the collars with an almost 34,000 vote deficit. In order to be a viable statewide candidate, a Republican needs to win the Collar Counties, and even win by a comfortable margin, in order to have a chance against the Democrats.

Table 1

The five Collar Counties, Cook County, and Downstate Contributions

	Obama votes	Percent of Obama's Total	Romney votes	Percent of Romney's Total
Cook County	1,488,537	49.30	495,542	23.21
Five Collar Counties	647,575	21.45	613,712	28.74
Downstate	883,400	29.26	1,025,962	48.05
Total	3,019,512	100.00	2,135,216	100.00

The "Collar Counties" are Lake, McHenry, Kane, DuPage, and Will.

Source; U.S. Census. 2010. <http://quickfacts.census.gov/gfd/states/17/17001.html>

Accessed: Dec. 20, 2012

So, Obama won Cook County by a very wide margin of almost one million votes. He then took the Collar Counties with almost 34,000 vote margin. This left only Downstate where Romney ran much better; however, he did not have enough total votes out of Downstate to come anywhere close to winning statewide. As **Table 1** indicates, Romney took an aggregate of 1,026,596 total votes from Downstate compared to 883,400 for Obama. This is an advantage of 142,562 votes for Romney provided by Downstate. Ordinarily this would not be a bad vote margin from Downstate for a Republican candidate. However, Romney's Downstate advantage was more than counterbalanced by the 1,026,858 vote advantage Obama enjoyed over Romney in Cook and the suburban counties. As **Table 1** shows, Romney received 48.28 percent of his statewide total from Downstate while Obama received only 29.26 percent of his total vote from Downstate. Realistically there are just not enough votes in the 96 Downstate Counties for any Republican to make up the deficits Romney sustained in Cook and the five Collar Counties.

Table 2 expands the scope of the inquiry to the fifteen most populated counties in Illinois. As the summary statistics on the table indicate, these fifteen topmost counties are where most of the people live in Illinois. They account for, in total, 10,168,148 of the total of 12,830,632 people who were counted by the U. S. Census in 2010. Thus, 79.24 percent of all the Prairie

State's people are found in only fifteen of its one hundred and two total counties. Of those top fifteen, Obama carried ten counties and Romney carried only five. The behemoth is Cook County which accounts for 5,194,675 of the total of almost thirteen million people in the state. However, even if one leaves Cook County out of the equation, Obama still enjoyed a 4 to 1 ratio over Romney in the fifteen most populated counties (Data taken from U. S. Census, 2010; <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/17/17007.html>, accessed December 18, 2012).

Table 2
Top Fifteen Largest Counties in Illinois

	2010 Population	2012 Presidential vote	Obama Vote	Romney Vote
Cook	5,194,675	Obama	1,488,537	495,542
* DuPage	916,924	Obama	199,460	195,046
* Lake	703,462	Obama	153,757	129,764
* Will	677,560	Obama	144,229	128,969
* Kane	515,269	Obama	90,332	88,335
* McHenry	308,760	Romney	59,797	71,598
Winnebago	295,266	Obama	61,732	55,138
St. Clair	270,056	Obama	67,285	50,125
Madison	269,282	Romney	58,922	60,608
Champaign	201,081	Obama	40,831	35,312
Sangamon	197,465	Romney	42,107	50,225
Peoria	186,494	Obama	40,209	36,774
McLean	169,572	Romney	31,883	39,947
Rock Island	147,546	Obama	39,157	24,934
Kendall	114,736	Romney	22,471	24,047
Total:	10,168,148		2,540,709	1,486,364
Population Obama Counties		9,108,333		
Population Romney Counties		1,059,815		

* Designates "Collar Counties"

As the table indicates, the ten counties which Obama carried in 2012 account for a total of 9,108,333 people while the Romney counties only accounted for 1,059,815 people. In summary, approximately ninety percent of the total population in the urban counties lived in Obama counties while only ten percent of the population of the urban counties was in the

predominantly Romney territory. You have to descend to the sixth largest county, McHenry, to get to the first and largest Romney County, and it is the only one of the Collar Counties to go for the Republican. Next largest is Madison County in the Metro-East area around St. Louis and then Sangamon County, home of the state capital, both of which are counties in the circa 200,000 to 300,000 population range which also provided Romney with a victory. Finally there were McLean County in Central Illinois and Kendall County an exurb county in Northeastern Illinois which fell into the Romney column and both of these counties were well under 200,000 in population.

Table 2 focuses on the fifteen largest counties and details just how severe Romney's disadvantages were in those big counties in Illinois. The larger counties, outside Cook and the Collar Counties voted for Obama by 404,597 compared to 377,110 for Romney, or a 27,487 total advantage to Obama. When coupled with Obama's margin in the Cook and the Collar Counties displayed in **Table 1**, you get a popular vote total of 2,540,709 for Obama compared to 1,486,364 for Romney. Thus, the fifteen largest counties in Illinois provided a net margin of 1,054,345 for Obama's total large county vote victory in Illinois in 2012.

Obviously then, Romney had a major problem in the urban areas although one could argue that Obama, likewise, had a problem in the rural areas. In the presidential sweepstakes, however, it is votes and population which ultimately count and the numbers are in the larger cities and counties. **The die was cast in the urban counties and there was virtually no way the remaining 87 smaller and more rural counties could have overcome that margin which favored Obama so heavily no matter how overwhelmingly they voted for Romney.**

In recognition of the fact that Romney won far more counties, and more congressional districts that Obama did in 2012, some Republican leaders in states where they control the governor's office and both houses of the legislature are now pushing a plan to allocate that state's Electoral College votes on basis of the congressional district winner. This is currently the law in Maine and Nebraska. If this were done in large states like Florida, Virginia and Michigan, it could significantly tilt the playing field in favor of future Republican presidential candidates.

While these are only Illinois data, this pattern existed all across the nation. As a matter of gross geographic analysis, the central cities and the surrounding metropolitan areas, with some exceptions in the suburban South, tended to vote heavily for Obama while the more rural the area the more likely it was to vote for Romney. This urban-rural divide is large and has been growing ever since the South broke from the Democratic Party starting in the 1960s and 1970s and realigned itself with the Republicans. This pattern already existed in many parts of the Midwest and the West contributing to and reinforcing the national's partisan and ideological polarization trends which have been on the increase for the past two decades.

Thus, the rural areas of Illinois provided their votes disproportionately to Governor Romney just as they did nationally. This was not, however, a new voting pattern in Illinois. In many of the rural counties they have been voting for the Republicans and even before that for the Whigs since before the Civil War when Abraham Lincoln was still running as a Whig and then running as the standard-bearer for the new Republican Party in 1860 and 1864. The red counties on **Map 2** are where the bedrock strength of the Republican Party has always been in Illinois and there is voting continuity going back for generations which is very rarely broken in national or state election returns (Key, 1966, chapter 8). This pattern, too, is a part of the historic voting pattern for much of the Midwest which was once a crucial part of the backbone of the Republican Party. These counties provide the foundation for the political continuity which is so evident in much of American electoral politics, and particularly in the more rural areas.

Providing the voting returns at the county level, as **Map 2** and **Tables 1 and 2** do, helps to make the point more graphically. The data are reported to the State Board of Elections by County Clerks and other election officials and are readily available for analysis. However, the point goes beyond analytical convenience. A part of the thesis of this paper is that the counties are important political units in Illinois and they constitute a slice of the larger regional political culture where the habits and patterns of voting exhibit a high level of consistency and continuity from election to election and even generation to generation.

In fact, counties themselves also have distinct political cultures and histories and these political norms make it much more likely that their aggregate voting returns will resemble one another across time and elections. However, there is also room for change especially if they are dynamic economically and there is marked in and out migration in the counties and if their demographics are changing significantly. It is also true that a strong statewide or national candidate can come along occasionally and help disrupt the established voting patterns at the county and regional levels especially in high stimulus and high turnout elections.

Importantly for the future of both parties in Illinois, Obama made serious inroads in suburban Cook County and the traditionally Republican Collar Counties around Chicago in 2008 and he solidified those gains in 2012. Obama carried Cook County handily and four of the five traditional Collar Counties in 2012 even when his statewide totals declined. From his 2008 Collar County coalition in 2012 Obama only lost McHenry, which is the far northwest of the Collar Counties and home of the exurban voters who have reliably voted Republican even though 2008 was an exception when Obama also carried McHenry County. If the Collar Counties are trending more Democratic, and these results as well as earlier research published in **The Simon Review** indicate they are, this is an important emerging political development for Illinois (Jackson, 2004; Jackson and Gottemoller, 2007).

As Colby and Green argued in 1986, Downstate Illinois used to be the key to Illinois as the suburbs voted reliably for the Republicans and Central City Chicago voted heavily for the Democrats (Colby and Green, 1986). Today, suburban Cook and the Collar Counties are where statewide candidates make it or get broken in Illinois politics. The Collar Counties are growing; Central City Chicago has declined as a proportion of the statewide total; and Downstate has both growing and declining counties, but on balance it has remained stable as a percentage of the total state population. The suburbs are where most of the growth is and the balance of power now resides there in Illinois politics. They have also become more diverse, especially because of the influx of new Hispanic residents and other ethnic groups as well.

Recently the Democrats have made steady gains in those areas. In 2010 they were the keys to the split decision realized by Republican Mark Kirk running for the U. S. Senate and for Democrat Pat Quinn running for Governor (Jackson, 2011). Both Senator Kirk and Governor Quinn's victories statewide depended notably on their appeal to the suburbs. Those split decisions were especially powered by the more moderate and Independent and split-ticket voters in the Collar Counties. Those areas also significantly boosted the totals for Obama in both 2008 and 2012.

It is evident that the northern and especially the northeastern counties, particularly Cook and the Collar Counties, were the backbone of the Obama victory in Illinois because of their size. He also carried some counties in the more urban and small city areas, such as Peoria, Rockford, and the Quad Cities. These are areas where labor unions still maintain some political strength and some are near to Iowa which was a battleground state with massive television spending not present in Illinois otherwise.

Obama also ran well in St. Clair County which is an urban county in the Metro-East area around St. Louis. There were only two counties in deep southern Illinois, Jackson and Alexander, which voted for Obama. Jackson is the home of Southern Illinois University and Alexander has a large African-American population. Those two deep southern counties have been long time bastions of strength for the Democratic Party and they did not change their stripes for Romney.

Otherwise, the other southern Illinois results indicate quite a marked change since this area used to be a stronghold for the Democratic Party and very dependable in voting for the Democratic candidate for president as well as in statewide offices such as Governor (Leonard, 2010; Jackson and Leonard, 2011). Those counties, with the exception of Jackson and Alexander, now have gone the same way as the once Solid South. They are still dependable counties for the Democrats in some of the court house offices, but they routinely support Republicans for Governor and for President.

This bifurcation of party allegiance or “split level” party identification is the same phenomenon which was exhibited in the South before its transition into a predominantly one party region over the past two decades or so. That is, the formerly loyal white Democrats voted massively for the Democrats; then they migrated to be Independent and split-ticket voters, and then changed fully into deeply loyal Republican voters, especially in national and state-wide elections.

Elazar’s emphasis on the American South as the home to a “traditionalistic” political culture, where deference to established social hierarchy and authority keep the social order stable and in power is applicable here and is a part of the dominant political culture in the southern sections of the state (Elazar, 1972). Southern Illinois is becoming more like its neighbors to the south rather than transitioning into the recent voting habits typical of the Midwest or its neighbors to the north (Jackson and Leonard, 2011).

Interestingly this emerging affinity for Republican candidates and preference for cultural conservatism over labor union loyalty and bread-and-butter economic issues now marks many of the counties in southern Illinois just as it is the defining characteristics of politics in the Deep South of the old Confederacy. Culturally much of southern Illinois is now more southern than Midwestern in its values and voting habits as much of our public opinion polling data show (Leonard, 2010; Jackson and Leonard, 2011). The partisan realignment of much of southern Illinois in its presidential and statewide office voting patterns now resembles the realignment of the once Solid South from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party which took place in the 1980s and 1990s and which is now so important in the national Republican Party’s coalition.

This trend is counterbalanced by the realignment of suburban Cook and the Collar Counties which has favored the Democrats. Those areas, which were once much homogeneous on race, class and ethnic grounds are being transformed by the movement of new people, often especially Hispanics and other minorities, into those formerly predominantly white suburbs. As that movement has grown, the prospects for the state’s Democratic Party to win in those more diverse areas have also grown.

Comparisons of 2012 to 2008


In **Map 3** we examine the 2008 results and then in **Map 4** we provide the comparisons by county for the Obama versus McCain battle in 2008 and the Obama versus Romney contest in 2012. There is both considerable continuity and significant change evident from the comparisons of the presidential election results for these two years.

Map 3 provides the color coded chart of the county by county returns for Obama versus McCain in 2008 (Jackson, 2009). **It shows that Obama carried 46 counties out of the total of 102 counties, or in other words, Obama carried slightly under half of the counties in Illinois that year.** This map shows the 2008 results were much more evenly divided geographically between the red and blue counties with almost half of the total geography of the state in either camp. This is more like what one would expect if the home court advantage was especially working to Obama's advantage in 2008 as it was. In general most Illinois voters of all persuasions were proud of their native son and proud of the state for offering the nation the potential to elect the first African-American to the lofty position of president of the United States. Undoubtedly there was the familiar partisan division here with the Democrats voting very heavily for Obama, and the Republicans voting for their own nominee, John McCain, with the Independents split but leaning disproportionately toward Obama. However, even those who did not vote for him tended to think well of Obama in 2008 and the state could proud of its history of racial tolerance in its voting habits. For example, Illinois is the only state in the modern era to have elected two African Americans, Barack Obama and Carol Mosley Braun to be United States Senators with a third, Roland Burris, appointed to that position to fill Obama's remaining term.

Map 4

Illinois Counties won by Obama in 2008, but lost in 2012



 = Illinois Counties won by Obama in 2008, but lost in 2012

By 2012, this situation had changed. The party lines were more prominent and the racial divide was overlaid with ideological and geographical divisions. The old familiar Illinois regionalism had returned, and the partisan and ideological polarization had hardened in the fires of political conflict which marked Obama's first term in the White House. While Illinois by a sizable majority stayed in the Obama column, **Map 4** shows the geographical distribution of the vote for Obama versus Romney and then provides an overlay of the Obama versus McCain results.

As is evident from Map 4, Obama only carried a total of 23 counties in 2012 as compared to 46 in 2008. In other words in 2012 he lost half of the counties, or 23 counties he had carried in 2008. Map 4 documents those counties graphically. In general most of them are in central and northern Illinois. Two of the Obama losses also were in the traditional Democratic strongholds of Gallatin and Pulaski in southern Illinois. Those counties where Obama lost the presidential race in his home state in 2012 are mostly the competitive or swing counties and some are traditionally Republican counties which he was able to attract temporarily in 2008 but was not able to hold onto in 2012. Undoubtedly this loss was due in large part to the impact the Great Recession had on Illinois as a state and to the toll it took on the president's support and job approval in Illinois and the nation after almost four years in office.

Nevertheless, although Obama lost ground, he obviously did not lose the overall election in Illinois in 2012. **Indeed, he won rather handily taking 58.57 percent of the Illinois two-party vote. Clearly geography is less important than population, and the larger the county in population the more likely they were to vote for Obama in Illinois and nationally.** Of course, the reciprocal of that relationship is also true with **the smaller and more rural the county, the more likely it was to vote for Mitt Romney in 2012.** That population based correlation has been true in every election of the 21st Century starting with Bush versus Gore in 2000 and extending through Bush versus Kerry in 2008 and Obama versus McCain in 2008.

This is not an entirely new phenomenon, but it is one of relatively recent origins extending only as far back as the recent realignment of our national political alliances. This correlation between the rural/urban division in this country and its aggregate voting behavior has been true in presidential politics ever since the nation underwent a partisan realignment that started in the 1950s and 1960s and intensified in the 1970s and 1980s. This was when the South left its traditional home in the Democratic Party and over the course of about two decades migrated into becoming as dependable a part of the Republican Party's core constituency as the Solid South had been for the Democrats from the Civil War era until the 1970s. This is one of the most important changes in American politics in the last 150 years since the Republicans were founded in the period of 1854 through 1860.

That realignment is complete at the national level and its contours are now evident in the Illinois presidential voting returns presented in **Map 3** and **Map 4** just as they are in the national

returns available in other sources. That is, the Republican candidate won handily all across southern Illinois in both 2008 and 2012. In 2012 Romney won heavily in the rural areas of central and northern Illinois where Republicans had always been strong although some of those counties had strayed over to vote for Obama instead of McCain in 2008.

Indeed, this national realignment may reflect a larger and almost universal political norm. That is, the rural areas in virtually all developed nations, and often even underdeveloped areas, are usually more traditional, more conservative, more parochial, and more likely to support the parties of the right or the more conservative political parties than the urban areas are (Almond and Verba, 1965; Almond and Coleman, 1960; Bishop, 2008). Thus, what is true in the United States in the first part of the 21st Century is also true and has been for generations in other nations where people have been given the right to vote for their leaders in free elections.

One of the objectives of this paper is to unravel some of the important explanation for the geographic differences which have been quite evident in American presidential politics. These differences are a fundamental part of what divides politics in Illinois and they are also endemic to the divisive and polarized politics now faced routinely in the nation as a whole. In **Table 3** we explore some of the possible independent variables which differentiate the typically Republican counties from the typically Democratic counties and differentiate both from the swing counties which provide the potential for change from election to election. These variables include: the 2010 population of the county, the percent white, percent Black, percent Hispanic, median home value, per capita income, median house-hold income, and percent below the poverty rate for each county.

The post-mortems on the 2012 presidential election featured demographic variables and demographic changes and trends prominently as important popular explanations for why Obama was re-elected and how he was able to fashion a comfortable victory which was apparently very surprising to many political analysts, as well as to the Romney campaign itself. Most prominently featured was the changing racial and ethnic make-up of the United States. The day after the election analysts started focusing more intently on the reduced size of the white electorate, the importance of growth in the Hispanic population, and the unexpectedly large rate of turnout for African-American and younger voters. All of these are typically important explanations for voting behavior which go all the way back to the classic American Voter research from the early 1950s (Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes, 1956) and to the classic Columbia University research team's results from the early and mid-1940s (Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee 1954). So, journalists and scholars alike have been using the major demographic categories as personal characteristic explanations, or at least significant correlates of the vote for the many decades since.

However, this is largely an individual level of analysis explanation. We are using a somewhat different approach when we utilize the county as the unit of analysis and we have to be careful not to over interpret the demographic correlations. However, the basic argument of this paper, like many others in this tradition, is that the county, or any other aggregate data level of analysis, can provide important indicators of the geographic milieu and the political culture context in which individual voters live and work. This argument is spelled out in an earlier work in more detail and with significant data provided on the partisanship of county level officials for the period of 1975 through 2010 (Jackson, 2011). Thus, this voting behavior tradition, which goes all the way back to the seminal work of V. O. Key, is also an important adjunct to our understanding of our state or the nation's politics (Key, 1949, 1955, 1966). That is the approach taken in **Table 3**.

Table 3

Demographics of Presidential Vote by County Political Reward

	2010 Population	Percent White	Percent Black	Percent Hispanic	Median Home Value	Per Capita Income	Median Household Income	Percent below Poverty
Counties Won by Obama in 2012 also won by Obama in 2008	415,933	85.8	9.4	8.9	\$143,987	\$ 25,993	\$ 51,519	14.0
Counties Carried by Obama in 2008 and Lost by Obama in 2012	82,111	93.2	6.6	5.8	\$117,448	\$ 24,605	\$ 49,732	14.1
Counties won by Romney in 2012 and by McCain in 2008	24,653	93.7	2.9	2.2	\$ 92,470	\$ 22,932	\$ 46,696	12.5

Scholars and political analysts have been predicting an ideological and partisan realignment of American politics for generations (Key, 1955; Burnham, 1975; Phillips, 1969; Judis and Teixeira, 2002). Partisan realignments are constituted by both individual and aggregate, or cohort group changes which in total constitute a net shift from one political party to the other. Or alternatively, there is a net shift which leaves the same party in the majority; however, it is a new and differently constituted majority coalition. That is the short hand version of the shift in voting allegiance that took place in recent American politics.

Table 3 starts with the racial and ethnic compositions of the Illinois counties as they are divided into the three types of election results provided by the 2008 versus 2010 presidential results.

First, and most importantly, the consistently loyal Democratic counties were the large counties with an average 2010 population of 415,933, while the consistently loyal Republican counties, that is, those which voted for both McCain in 2008 and Romney in 2012 were the smaller counties with an average population of only 24,653 people. The swing or more marginal counties which voted for Obama in 2008 and for Romney in 2012 fit neatly in-between with an average population of 82,111.

As expected the Obama counties in 2008 and 2010 are much more diverse racially and ethnically than the Romney and McCain counties are. That is, those consistently loyal Democratic counties which voted for Obama in both 2012 and 2008 were 85.8 percent white, 9.4 percent black, and 8.9 percent Hispanic. Those which were consistently Republican, voting for both John McCain and Mitt Romney were also much more homogeneous with 93.7 percent white, 2.9 percent black, and only 2.2 percent Hispanic. Those which split between voting for Obama in 2008 but voting for Romney in 2012 again fell neatly in between. They were 93.2 percent white, 6.6 percent black, and 5.8 percent Hispanic. In the social sciences one rarely encounters empirical data where the pattern is clearer than that found in **Table 3**.

These aggregate level demographic results were certainly consonant with the national picture and the analysis provided from the exit poll data provided by the national news organizations (See for example: The Economist , November 10, 2012, 27-29; The Washington Post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/special/politics/2012-exit-polls/> accessed, January 18, 2013). Those post-mortems stressed the racial and ethnic diversity of the Obama coalition and how much his victory depended on the votes of those who in the past typically turned out at lower rates and how well he ran among the black and brown voters while losing white voters by a substantial margin. The turnout rate and the much vaunted Obama ground game were given widespread credit for mobilizing the vote at historic levels among these populations in 2008 and then matching and in some states exceeding those levels again in 2012.

Another set of important demographic and socio-economic variables are those provided by income, housing stock, and poverty rate data. These too are provided for the 2012 and 2008 results in **Table 3**. **It is quite clear here that the median home value is highest in the consistently Obama counties, second highest in the counties Obama carried only in 2008, and lowest in the Romney counties. Likewise, median household income and per capita income exhibited the same pattern. The affluent counties were also the Obama Counties, and the next most affluent counties were the swing counties.** The least prosperous counties, as measured by median home value, per capita income and median household income, were also the most loyal Republican Counties. **(See Appendix B, C, and D for the data on each county).**

The only minor variation on this overall pattern was in the percent below the poverty level which was highest (at 14.1 percent) in the 2008 to 2012 swing counties, then next highest in the

consistently Democratic Counties (at 14.0 percent) and lowest (at 12.5 percent) in the consistently Republican Counties. These differences are not great on the percent below poverty indicator; however, as an overview they may indicate that consistently Republican counties also have fewer people at the very lower end of the socio-economic scale, i.e. below the poverty line. It may also suggest that the most affluent counties are also those with the greatest income gaps (what the economists call the gini coefficient) and counter-intuitively they are also the areas most likely to vote for the Democrats at the aggregate level (McCarty, Poole and Rosenthal, 2006). That is certainly the case with Cook and some of the Collar Counties.

To recap, the richer and better housed counties and those with the highest per capita incomes and highest median household income levels were also more likely to vote for Obama, and the opposite is true for the Republican counties in both 2008 and 2012. Of course, this does not fit the popular stereotypes that the Democrats are the party of the dependent populations, and the Republicans are the party of the more prosperous and the wealthier people and areas.

This stereotype was reinforced somewhat during the presidential campaign when Romney in a speech to an affluent audience at a \$50,000 per ticket fundraiser in an up-scale enclave in Florida talked about the “47%” who were dependent of governmental programs and not persuadable to vote for him. This perspective is often capsulized in some of the media as “the makers and the takers” who are supposed to mark the differences between the Republican and the Democratic Party, but that is a vastly over stretched stereotype.

In addition, there are certainly predominantly rich areas and poor areas of the nation as well as in the state of Illinois and those geographic differences have implications for public policy making. It tends to be also true in Illinois that the rich areas disproportionately support the state’s activities and public services which are more often needed and utilized in the poorer areas.

As Gelman’s research at the national level shows, this transfer of income and wealth results from the formula used in various governmental programs which tend to emphasize need and ability to pay. This results in a national transfer of payments from what is generally called the “blue states” to the “red states” which tend to be poorer at the aggregate level and filled with more poor people individually. Gelman says the following in terms of his national findings:

At the state level, Democrats’ willingness to tax high earners and Republicans’ motivation to spend in poor states combine to yield large transfers from mostly Democratic states in the Northeast, Midwest, and West Coast to mostly Republican states in the South and middle of the country. According to the Tax Foundation, the poorest ten states (all of which George W. Bush carried in 2004) receive an average of \$1.60 in federal spending for every \$1.00 they spend in federal taxes, while the richest

ten states (nine of which were won by John Kerry) receive only \$0.80 on average (Gelman, 2008, 62).

Other studies have consistently shown the same disparities in tax raising and spending patterns. What is true nationally is also true of transfers from the rich to the poorer areas in Illinois whether those poorer areas are on the south side of Chicago or in southern Illinois (Legislative Research Unit, 1989). **Thus, what is happening in the suburban parts of Cook County and the five Collar Counties is particularly important in explaining Illinois politics.**

Part of untangling the puzzle of the findings presented in **Table 3** is rooted in the use of aggregate versus individual level data. The analyst must be careful to avoid what statisticians call the “ecological fallacy” or the inferring of individual level data from aggregate results (Kramer, 1983). However, there is plenty of individual level survey and poll data to confirm the correlation between socio-economic factors and voting. The basic generalization is that the higher the socio-economic class, the more likely one is to vote Republican. Individual level voting data consistently show that there are clearly tens of millions of poor, working class and middle class people who vote for the Democrats; however, although they are not as numerous there are also millions of the same categories who vote for the Republicans. There are millions of comfortable and even rich Democrats just as is also true for the Republicans.

However, the argument of this paper and any analysis which takes advantage of aggregate data is that the geographic context also matters to voters. If you take the aggregate level of analysis provided by the county level of data, it is also clear that the geographic location and the demographic characteristics of their communities are important in providing the context of where the voters live, work and recreate. This life-style context is also important for their politics influencing who their neighbors are, where they work, where they go for recreation and go to church and their views on a wide variety of political and social issues. In general like-minded people and those with similar economic status tend to cluster together geographically (Brooks,2004; Bishop,2008).

Gelman describes the seemingly paradoxical nature of the individual versus aggregate level results in the following terms:

Rich people in rich states are socially and economically more liberal than rich people in poor states....What’s new is polarization- the increasingly ideological nature of politics...the paradox is that polarization is going in one direction for voters and the other direction for states. The resolution of the paradox is that the more polarized playing field has driven rich conservative voters in poor states toward the Republicans and rich liberals in rich states toward the Democrats, thus turning the South red and New England and the West Coast blue and setting up a national map that is divided by

culture rather than class, with blue-collar West Virginia moving from solidly Democratic...to safely Republican and suburban Connecticut going the other way (Gelman, 2008, 4).

The dynamic Gelman describes derived from state level data also persists when the focus is shifted to the county level in Illinois, and it illustrates some of the same party realigning trends at the local level. Why is that cultural context so important and so much a part of the every-day world of average voters?

Rural communities are just intrinsically different, in many ways that are politically important, from the urban areas. People live in close proximity in the cities, and they tend to rub elbows much more frequently and much more closely than those in the rural areas. They see public services and public servants on a more up close and personal basis. The urbanite is more likely to be aware of the dependence they have on governmental goods and services and to see those services around them daily. Everything from keeping law and order on the streets, to clearing the snow when the blizzards come, to operating the elevated or underground mass transit systems on which millions depend to get to work or school are pretty clearly provided by the government, and the supporting revenues have to be raised to pay for them.

Rural communities and their inhabitants almost live in a different world from their urban counterparts. Sometimes it seems that the two populations may inhabit different political planets. Rural dwellers are much more likely to take the concept of American individualism and "American Exceptionalism" more personally (Kingdon, 1999). They are more likely to believe themselves to be dependent on no one and to be more isolated from the trends and intrusions of the global economy and the modern culture.

This may not be objectively true, as they and their jobs may well be dependent on the tides of the global economy which beset workers universally today no matter where they live; however, the rural resident is likely to believe that they are more independent and they do not have to stand on the metro subway platform before taking the train to work each day. Driving a pickup truck alone twenty five miles to work each day is a different experience. The path may be over city, county, or state roads and highways, but the lesson of dependence on the government for this service is not as direct or obvious. Going duck or quail hunting or fishing in a stock pond is different from enjoying nature in the confines of Chicago's Grant Park or walking along Lake Michigan's shore line. The cultural context is constantly reinforced by daily contacts and personal interactions with peers, family and friends which tend to lead in a more conservative direction.

Studies show that issues related to guns and gun control are particularly salient in the rural and small town areas of the U. S. Rural dwellers are much more likely to value their guns and to


regard proposals for gun control to be anathema to them and to be something that urban legislators are trying to unfairly foist off on a resistive rural population. This has been particularly true in Illinois recently where the politics of gun control is a decidedly geographically based fight. The rural residents and their representatives in the General Assembly and in the Congress are staunch, even vehement advocates for the Second Amendment and resist fiercely the various gun control measures which tend to emanate from Chicago and which receive significant support from the legislators who represent suburban Chicago. The battle over “concealed carry”, which found Illinois as the last holdout against making concealed carry legal until a recent federal appellate court decision ordered the General Assembly to fashion a change to the law, divides the state regionally and geographically more than perhaps any other issue.

In addition, religion also divides the state and the nation in basic ways which are important politically and which add to the ideological and partisan polarization which has developed in the past two decades. It is well known in voting behavior that religious identification, and especially frequency of church attendance, are important independent variables explaining voting behavior (Flanigan and Zingale, 2006, 113-115). While there are certainly “mega-churches” in the cities, the kinds of religious fervor and fundamentalism which have become important components of the Republican coalition are more often found in rural and small town America than in the cities (Putnam and Campbell, 2010). Conversely, the secularism and cosmopolitan religious values and world views more often found in the cities are much more likely to mark people who vote for the Democrats than for the Republicans (Wilcox, 2000; Gelman, 2008, 78-79).

This is why the kinds of diversity documented in **Table 3** is important in unraveling what is taking place in the geographical, socio-economic and demographic polarization of American politics and this case study of Illinois provides some important indicators of those larger national trends (Hetherington, 2001).

Map 5

Most Loyal Democratic, Republican and Swing Counties Vote for Party's Presidential Nominee 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012



Map 5 extends the analysis back in time through the 2004 and 2000 presidential elections and offers a comparison between those first two elections in the 21st century with the 2008 and 2012 results presented in **Map 4**. These longitudinal results provide a picture of mostly stability at the county level; however, it also allows us to identify the most competitive counties where change from election to election is evident and to note where perhaps more permanent realignment could be taking place in these swing counties.

As is evident from **Map 5** there are only 13 counties that consistently voted for the Democratic candidate for president in all four elections between 2000 and 2012. Cook County, again, is by far the biggest and most important of these loyal Democratic counties. Three of the deep blue counties are in southern Illinois and the metro East area and the rest are in northwestern Illinois, near the Iowa border and notably also include Champaign County in central Illinois, the home of the state's largest public university. There are 54 counties which have voted consistently for the Republicans extending from George W. Bush in 2000 through Mitt Romney in 2012. These counties extend across much of central Illinois, much of southeastern and southwestern Illinois and to deep southern Illinois, and included an island of Ogle and Lee Counties in far northern Illinois. In addition, the swing counties, which were mostly Republican except for the Obama aberration in 2008, were mostly concentrated in northern and central Illinois.

This is by far the larger geographic region of the state taken as a whole and would appear to be a problem for the Democrats if one takes the county level and its importance for party building seriously, as I do. In addition, these counties constitute the most fertile ground for electing state legislators. These are the counties where you frequently find the Republicans controlling the State Senate and State House seats for generations no matter who they run. However, on statewide election returns, as we have already seen above, the prospects for the Republicans are not so promising. **The loyal Democratic Counties include Cook and some of the other bigger counties with a total population of 6,246,565. Even without Cook County, the loyal Democratic Counties have a total population of 1,051,890. See Appendix E.**

The 54 consistently loyal Republican counties include most of the smaller counties in Illinois as well as a few medium sized ones; however, Tazwell (Pekin) is the only county over 100,000 in population in the group. The next largest are Adams (Quincy) and Williamson (Marion) at 67 and 66 thousand respectively. The total population of the loyal Republican counties comes to 1,318,134. **See Appendix F.** Thus, the population differentials leave the Democrats in a clearly advantageous position among the most loyal counties when the statewide election returns are counted. When one examines the most competitive or the "swing counties" which include all the Collar Counties, that is where the great majority of the state's population, outside Cook County lives, as we have already stressed in the earlier population data. **While the Collar**

Counties have been very Republican historically, they are becoming more diverse and sometimes provide a majority vote for statewide Democratic candidates or help swing the election for them. Again the real balance of power now resides in suburban Cook and the Collar Counties as noted earlier.

There was one additional county, Madison, where the Democrats won the first three presidential elections of this century; however, it changed from Obama in 2008 to Romney in 2012. It is the only county in the state with this particular record. Madison County is a county in the Metro-East area and has been growing as something of a bedroom community for St. Louis and St. Louis County which is just across the Mississippi River, and it has become an “exurban” county for metropolitan St. Louis. Perhaps not surprisingly it resembles other outer ring suburban counties in its movement toward the Republicans and away from Obama in 2012.

The other two deviant cases are Franklin and Perry County in deep southern Illinois. They both voted for Al Gore in 2000, and then that was the end of their loyalty to the national Democrats. These two counties were formerly strongholds of the Democratic Party and had been a part of the southern Illinois bedrock for the Democrats virtually since the Civil War. However, as was explored above, parts of southern Illinois are in a realigning process which will be explored in more detail in the next section of this paper. These two counties still have some Democrats left at the Court House; however, they have not voted for the party’s national standard bearer since Al Gore ran in 2000 and they did not vote for the Democrat for Governor in 2010. This is very similar to what has happened in the southern states which make up the Old Confederacy.

Implications for Realignment

The New Deal Coalition which originally was glued together by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the wake of the Great Depression dominated American politics from the 1930s easily into the 1960s, and arguably there were echoes of it being still intact and supporting the election of Jimmy Carter in 1976. However, the old New Deal Coalition was inherently unstable. It contained almost equal parts of the liberal base in the Northeastern, Midwestern and Western cities aligned with the most conservative elements in the nation found in the South, and especially in the rural South. It contained union members and union bosses who had to live with and a find modus vivendi with what V. O. Key called “the big mules” of southern politics, the planters, business owners and extractive industries owners and operators who were virulently anti-union and pro Right-to-Work laws (Key, 1949).

Beginning in the 1950s and 1960s this coalition contained the inchoate and increasingly assertive civil rights movement, originally grounded in the black churches and in such liberal unions as the United Auto Workers, the United Mine Workers, the Laborers, and the

Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. These unions and the civil rights leaders increasingly faced off against the most segregationist public officials, especially the southern Governors like Orval Faubus, Ross Barnett, Lester Maddox, and especially George Wallace who were both racists and vehemently opposed to unions and protective of their state's Right-to-Work laws all of which constituted a coherent public policy package for these governors and their allies in the state legislatures.

These were inherent contradictions in Roosevelt's New Deal coalition which could no longer be papered over and contained. As the civil right leaders and their foot soldiers in the field demonstrated, marched and attacked the very structure of state supported segregation, the walls of American apartheid began to give way and later fell. Along with that fall, the New Deal Coalition crumbled and had to be reassembled with different components, and the whole American party structure went through a fundamental transition that culminated in the partisan realignment and the deep partisan polarization that undergirds all of American politics, and especially American presidential and congressional politics in the second decade of the 21st Century.

The Obama Coalition (or it could be termed the "Clinton-Obama" coalition since it started with Bill Clinton's presidency) has some of the key elements of the old Roosevelt Coalition, i.e. a base in the cities and the unions, the "symbol specialists" who work in the media and the creative arts, and many upper-middle and upper-class people who work in knowledge based jobs in what Judis and Teixeria call the "ideopolis" (Judis and Teixeria, 2002). In their provocative book, The Emerging Democratic Majority, published just over a decade ago Judis and Teixeira applied their concept to Illinois in the following geographic terms:

Across the entire state, the Democrats' gains in Illinois are almost exclusively in the state's ideopolises....Fortunately for the Democrats, the state's growth has been concentrated in the ideopolis counties. The greatest increases in population during the 1990s came (in this order) in the four ideopolis counties of Cook, DuPage, Lake, and Will. If this continues, the Democrats' hold over bellwether Illinois looks secure for the early twenty-first century (Judis and Teixeria, 2002, 103).

The demographic and political developments in Illinois during the first twelve years of the 21st Century clearly support their thesis. The two presidential victories for Obama in 2008 and 2012 also seem to support their predictions for national politics. Only the continued Republican control of the U. S. House of Representatives points in the opposite direction. The House is particularly defined by the distribution of the population, and gives a structural edge to the Republicans which coupled with the Republican victories in the state legislatures in 2010 gave them a real advantage in the redistricting process attendant the 2010 Census.

This advantage, in turn, helped the Republicans continue their control of a majority of the House in 2012 in spite of it being a very good year for the Democrats overall and a year in which they won more popular votes in total than the Republicans did. It also should be noted that the Democrats gained a net of four new House seats in Illinois in the 2012 elections, and this resulted from the advantage the Illinois Democrats enjoyed in 2011 of controlling the redistricting process just as the Republicans did in some thirty of the other states. So, in this sense, the Democrats in Illinois were isolated from the national trends by their locally and geographically based strength in the state's General Assembly which translated into a marked Democratic advantage in the Illinois House delegation.

So, in 2012 the Democrats and Barack Obama prospered nationally and nowhere was that prosperity more evident than in Obama's home state of Illinois. Obama put together a national coalition which carried him to a resounding electoral victory in 2008 which was then reaffirmed with his re-election, albeit by a narrower margin, in 2012. In the wake of the 2012 results which were so disappointing from a Republican perspective, there was much soul-searching and much analysis devoted to trying to redirect the party's future and map a path back to a more competitive electoral strategy. The Democrats were making their own long term strategic plans, and a part of it had to be based in geography and driven by changing demographics (Rothenberg, 2012).

In national terms the Clinton-Obama Coalition has lost a key element of the old Roosevelt Coalition, the white South, which made it so unwieldy and so internally contradictory from its inception. In other words, the new Democratic Coalition, assembled first by Bill Clinton, and then mobilized and re-energized by Barack Obama is much more stable and more coherent ideologically and issue-wise than the New Deal Coalition was. The same is true of the modern Republican Coalition which opposes it. The two adversarial coalitions are now deeply entrenched, and ideological and geographical polarization is what marks 21st Century American politics (Gelman, 2008; Levensdusky, 2009; McCarthy, Poole, and Rosenthal, 2008; Fiorina, 2005).

Illinois has been in the forefront of that transition, providing significant leadership and serving as a proving ground for some of its major policy initiatives. Illinois, like the nation as a whole is now divided and deeply polarized. The state epitomizes much of what has happened and is happening in American politics at the grassroots level. This study, especially grounded in the basic electoral maps of Illinois shows the contours of those changes, and the underlying continuity which conditions and shapes those changes as graphically as any other state in the union could. The fact that Illinois is also the home state of President Barack Obama simply makes the story even more interesting and compelling as our state history is a microcosm of the nation's history since the turn of the century.

Conclusion

At the end of the 2009 paper on Barack Obama's victory in the presidential election of 2008, I wrote the following words about the trends in Illinois and nationally. The same words seem even more apt now in the wake of a 2012 presidential election where the demographics of a changing America seemed to be the major theoretical explanation for why Obama won more handily than many observers thought possible and why the Democrats were able to expand their margins in the U. S. Senate, and pick up a net of eight seats in the House even though that level of Democratic success seemed quite improbable going into the election.

Part of the thesis of this paper is that the changes in the electoral map may be the wave of the future for Illinois politics and they may also be a metaphor for the larger demographic and political trends which mark the transitions underway in the nation at large. Most notably for this thesis, the whole segment of northeastern Illinois is where most of the people in the state live. It is the fastest growing section of Illinois, and it all went for the Democratic presidential candidate in 2008. This conversion of the Collar Counties has been underway for some time now in Illinois politics; however, it has been reinforced and accelerated by the 2008 election. As the suburban counties, along with Cook County outside the city become more and more heterogeneous, they are also becoming more Democratic. Those fast growing metropolitan areas, like the rest of urban America, are now the home of a much more racially and ethnically mixed population and they make their livings in a wide variety of ways not always associated with the traditional economic base of the older more homogeneous and more prosperous view of the suburbs left over from the 1950s and 1960s. Consequently, the suburban ring around Chicago is no longer the predictably deliverable base of the statewide Republican Party that it was [previously] (Jackson, 2009, 11-12).

We now have the advantage of four more years of observation and two state elections and two national elections to provide additional perspective since those words were written. We also have the advantage of the data provided by the 2010 U. S. Census. All the demographic trends, both nationally and in Illinois, are in the same direction presaged by the observations written in 2009. That is, the diversity of the United States, and of the State of Illinois, continues to grow. Racial and ethnic minorities made up a larger proportion, and white voters made up a smaller proportion of the 2012 electorate than at any time in history.

To be sure, white voters still constituted 72 percent of the national total and they voted for Romney over Obama by a 59 to 39 percent margin. However, that vastly disproportionate racial margin was not enough and the combination of African-Americans (93% Obama); Hispanic Americans (71 percent Obama), Asian-Americans (73 percent Obama), young voters, 18-29 (60 percent Obama), and women voters (55 percent Obama) was just too much for

Romney and the Republicans to overcome in spite of the fact that the kind of advantage they enjoyed among white voters would have been sufficient for a comfortable national victory in past elections (The Economist, using CNN exit poll, November 10, 2012, 27-29; Washington Post, <http://washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/special/politics/2012-exit-polls/> accessed January 18, 2013).

This, of course, has led to a lot of soul-searching on the part of the Republican Party with regard to what they should do about losing the presidential election and the U. S. Senate in face of their very high and very genuine expectations that they were going to win (For just one of many examples see: Rothenberg, December 19, 2012). This unexpected loss was doubly hard to take for many of their supporters and their interest group base since the total spent to defeat Obama alone is projected to reach approximately one billion dollars. So, one might well ask, and many Republican donors are asking, what did they get for their investment of tens of millions of dollars in these campaigns? Will they be as ready next time to spring into action with major campaign funds for whoever the Republican nominee turns out to be? In addition, the 2014 mid-term elections are looming and the candidates for both parties will be almost completely settled by the end of 2013. Which party will have the better talking points as they try to convince first-tier candidates to run for the competitive and open seats in Congress, a decision which has to be made by December of 2013 in most states.

The electoral clock on politics in the United States and in Illinois never stops. A sterling victory, like the one scored by Obama and the Senate Democrats on November 6th, 2012 is enough to give the Democrats something to build on for 2014 and 2016. However, the Republicans still control the U. S. House by a 234 to 201 margin. Since part of that margin is due to the fact that growing out of their 2010 mid-term election victories the Republicans controlled the remap process in 30 states and thus were able to ensure friendly Republican maps for much of the next decade and they also control 30 out of the 50 Governorships.

Those are firm foundations for a Republican renaissance in either 2014 or 2016. They can also take comfort in the fact that the party which holds the White House almost always loses some seats in the Congress in the midterm elections, and this trend is more marked in the second term of a sitting president than in the first term. However, the Republicans must sort out some of the basic questions about their message, the audience they plan to court, their most important policy positions and their perceived appeal to the more reactionary elements of American society especially those located in the South and in some of the more rural areas of the country. In order to broaden their base the Republicans cannot continue to narrow their focus to the loyal core that carried George W. Bush to the White House, narrowly, in 2000 and 2004. To do so invites continued electoral losses.

Demographics may not be destiny entirely in American politics, but it goes a long way toward charting the political course for the nation's future. Contrary to some of the post-election commentary, it is not stylistic matters that dog the Republican Party among the groups they lost so badly in 2008 and 2012. Speaking to the voters more gently and more diplomatically is not enough to change their voting proclivities although some style points among some of the more unenlightened members of the Republican Party also hurt their cause in several crucial Senate races.

However, those candidates expressing their retrograde views were mostly reflecting issue and values-based positions they genuinely and fervently advocated. It is primarily substance and policy rather than cosmetics that really matters. This is the major challenge the Republicans have to deal with as they try to chart both their immediate future heading into the 2014 mid-term elections and as they inevitably start to handicap their various presidential nomination favorites for 2016.

The pendulum usually swings, and in time the out party becomes the in-party. That cycle may also hold true for 2016. It is widely recognized that it is very difficult for one party to win three presidential elections consecutively in the United States, and the Republicans will have an advantage in 2016; however, such an electoral swing is not inevitable. Nothing in politics ever is. It takes rational thought and strategic planning, something both parties will need to engage in assiduously if they are going to solidify their base and reach out to independents and attract new supporters in the near future. It is a planning effort devoted to building their future and trying to ensure their party's success and continuity that should occupy most of the attention of the leaders of both parties, in Illinois and nationally, and that planning is reinforced best by winning elections. That is why 2012 was so important for the Democrats and Republicans alike, and why they will need to plan very strategically for the party building and party branding steps they take in preparation for 2014 and 2016.

Bibliography

Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba. 1965. The Civic Culture. Boston, Little, Brown and Co.

Almond, Gabriel A. and James S. Coleman. 1960. The Politics of the Developing Areas. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Berelson, Benard R, and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. 1954. Voting. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bishop, Bill. 2008. The Big Sort: Why the Clustering of Like-Minded America is Tearing Us Apart. New York, N. Y.: Houghton-Mifflin Harcourt.

Brooks, David. 2004. "Age of Political Segregation." New York Times. June 29, 1.

Burnham, Walter Dean. 1970. Critical Elections and the Mainsprings of American Politics. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Burnham, Walter Dean. 1975. "Party Systems and the Political Process," in The American Party System. Edited by William Nisbet Chambers and Walter Dean Burnham. New York: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, Angus, Phillip Converse, Warren Miller, and Donald Stokes. 1966. The American Voter. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Colby, Peter W. and Paul M. Green. 1986. "Downstate Holds the Key to Victory." In Illinois Elections, 3rd edition, edited by Paul M. Green, David H. Everson, Peter W. Colby and Joan A. Parker. Springfield, Illinois: Sangamon State University, 2-7.

Economist, November. 2012. "The Remaking of the President," November 10, 27-29.

Flanigan, William H. and Nancy H. Zingale, 2008. Political Behavior of the American Electorate. 11th edition. Washington, D. C.: CQ Press.

Elazar, Daniel. 1972. American Federalism; A View from the States. 2nd ed. New York; Thomas Crowell Company.

Fiorina, Morris P. with Samuel J. Abrams and Jeremy C. Pope. 2005. Culture War? The Myth of a Polarized America. New York; Pearson.

Gelman, Andrew. 2008. Red State, Blue State, Rich State, Poor State: Why American Vote the way They Do. Princeton, N. J. : Princeton University Press.

Green, Donald, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 2002. Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identifier of Voters. New haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Green, Paul M. 2003. "Illinois Governor: It was More than the Ryan Name." in Midterm Madness: The Elections of 2002. Edited by Larry J. Sabato. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 209-217.

Hetherington, Marc. 2001. "Resurgent Mass Partisanship: The Role of Elite Polarization." American Political Science Review 95, (3): 619-631.

Jackson, John S. 2004. Illinois Politics in the 21st Century: Bellwether, Leading Edge, or Lagging Indicator. Carbondale, Illinois: An Occasional Paper of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute. Southern Illinois University.

Jackson, John S. 2006. The Making of a Senator: Barack Obama and the 2004 Illinois Senate Race. Carbondale, Illinois: An Occasional Paper of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute. Southern Illinois University.

Jackson, John S. and Paul Gottemoller. 2007. Party Competition in Illinois: Republican Prospects in a Blue State. Carbondale, Illinois: An Occasional Paper of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute. Southern Illinois University.

Jackson, John S. and Charles W. Leonard. 2011. "The Climate of Opinion in Southern Illinois Continuity and Change". The Simon Review. Paper #25, April. Carbondale, Illinois: The Paul Simon Public Policy Institute. Southern Illinois University.

Jackson, John S. 2011. "Friends and Neighbors Government: Partisanship in County Government in Illinois 1975-2010". The Simon Review. Paper #26. August. Carbondale, Illinois: The Paul Simon Public Policy Institute. Southern Illinois University.

Jackson, John S. 2012. "The Illinois Presidential primary: How Romney Won and what It Meant". The Simon Review. Paper #32. August. Carbondale, Illinois: The Paul Simon Public Policy Institute. Southern Illinois University.

Judis, John B. and Ruy Teixeira. 2002. The Emerging Democratic Majority. New York: Scribner.

Key, V. O. Jr. 1966. American State Politics: An Introduction. New York: A. A. Knopf.

Key, V. O. Jr. 1955. "A Theory of Critical Elections," Journal of Politics. 17: 3-18.

Key, V. O. Jr. 1949. Southern Politics in State and Nation. New York; A. A. Knopf.

- Kingdon, John W. 1999. America the Unusual. New York, N. Y.: Worth Publishers.
- Kramer, Gerald. 1983. "The Ecological Fallacy Revisited: Aggregate-versus Individual-level Findings on Economics and Elections, and Sociotropic Voting." American Political Science Review. Vol. 77. , No. 1, March, 92-111.
- Levendusky, Matthew. 2009. The Partisan Sort. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Legislative Research Unit. 1989. "Taxes and Distributions by Region of the State". Research Response Report. Springfield Illinois. Illinois General Assembly.
- Leonard, Charles W. 2010. "Results and Analysis of the Inaugural Southern Illinois Poll". The Simon Review. Paper #20, June. Carbondale, Illinois: The Paul Simon Public Policy Institute, Southern Illinois University.
- McCarthy, Nolan, Keith T. Poole, and Howard Rosenthal. 2008. Polarized America: The Dance of Ideology and Unequal Riches. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Ohlemacher, Stephen. 2007. "Analysis Ranks Illinois Most Average State." Carbondale, Illinois: The Southern Illinoisian. May 17, 1.
- Phillips, Kevin. 1969. The Emerging Republican Majority. New York: Arlington House.
- Putnam, Robert D, and David E. Campbell. 2010. American Grace: How Religion Divides Us. Simon and Schuster.
- Rothenberg, Stuart, 2012. "The New Year Can't Come Soon Enough for the GOP". Roll Call, December 19, 1-3. http://www.rollcall.com/news/the_new_year_cant_come_soon_enough, accessed December 19, 2012.
- Simon, Paul. 1971. Lincoln's Preparation for Greatness: The Illinois Legislature Years. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Stanley, Harold W. and Richard G. Niemi. 2010. Vital Statistics on American Politics 2009-2010. Washington, D. C.: C. Q. Press.
- White, John K. 2003. The Values Divide. New York: Chatham House Publishers.
- Wilcox, Clyde. 2000. Onward Christian Soldiers?: The Religious Right in American Politics. 2nd edition. Boulder, CO: The Westview Press.

Appendix A

Illinois Counties Votes for President in 2012

	Votes for Obama	Votes for Romney	Percent for Obama	Percent for Romney
Adams	9,648	20,416	31.5	66.7
Alexander	1,965	1,487	56.1	42.5
Bond	3,020	4,095	41.2	55.8
Boone	9,883	11,096	46.3	51.9
Brown	787	1,513	33.3	64.0
Bureau	8,134	8,164	48.9	49.1
Calhoun	1,080	1,440	41.9	55.9
Carroll	3,665	3,555	49.6	48.1
Cass	2,053	2,707	42.2	55.7
Champaign	40,831	35,312	51.9	44.9
Christian	5,494	8,885	37.3	60.3
Clark	2,591	5,144	33.0	65.4
Clay	1,584	4,190	26.8	70.9
Clinton	5,596	10,524	34.0	63.9
Coles	9,262	11,631	43.4	54.5
Cook	1,488,537	495,542	74.0	24.6
Crawford	2,858	5,585	33.1	64.7
Cumberland	1,641	3,509	31.0	66.3
DeKalb	21,207	18,934	51.6	46.1
De Witt	2,601	4,579	35.4	62.3
Douglas	2,430	5,334	30.8	67.5
DuPage	199,460	195,046	49.7	48.6
Edgar	2,565	5,132	32.8	65.6
Edwards	754	2,405	23.4	74.5
Effingham	3,861	12,501	23.2	75.2
Fayette	2,853	5,951	31.7	66.0
Ford	1,656	4,229	27.5	70.2
Franklin	7,254	10,267	40.5	57.3
Fulton	8,328	6,632	54.2	43.2
Gallatin	1,029	1,492	40.0	58.0
Greene	2,023	3,451	36.0	61.4
Grundy	9,451	11,343	44.5	53.4
Hamilton	1,269	2,566	32.2	65.1
Hancock	3,650	5,271	40.1	57.9
Hardin	742	1,535	31.8	65.9
Henderson	1,978	1,541	55.4	43.2
Henry	12,332	11,583	50.5	47.5
Iroquois	3,413	9,120	26.7	71.3

Jackson	13,319	9,864	55.5	41.1
Jasper	1,436	3,514	28.5	69.7
Jefferson	6,089	9,811	37.3	60.1
Jersey	3,667	6,039	36.8	60.6
Jo Daviess	5,667	5,534	49.6	48.4
Johnson	1,572	3,963	27.7	69.9
Kane	90,332	88,335	49.7	48.6
Kankakee	21,595	23,136	47.3	50.7
Kendall	22,471	24,047	47.4	50.7
Knox	13,451	9,408	57.6	40.3
Lake	153,757	129,764	53.5	45.1
LaSalle	23,073	23,256	48.8	49.2
Lawrence	2,011	3,857	33.6	64.4
Lee	6,937	8,059	45.2	52.5
Livingston	5,020	9,753	33.4	64.9
Logan	3,978	7,844	33.0	65.1
McDonough	5,967	6,147	47.9	49.4
McHenry	59,797	71,598	44.5	53.3
McLean	31,883	39,947	43.4	54.4
Macon	22,780	25,309	46.6	51.8
Macoupin	9,464	10,946	45.0	52.1
Madison	58,922	60,608	48.1	49.5
Marion	6,225	9,248	39.3	58.5
Marshall	2,455	3,290	41.8	56.1
Mason	2,867	3,265	45.5	51.9
Massac	2,092	4,278	32.2	65.9
Menard	2,100	3,948	34.1	64.2
Mercer	4,507	3,876	52.6	45.2
Monroe	6,215	10,888	35.5	62.3
Montgomery	5,058	6,776	41.7	55.8
Morgan	5,806	7,972	41.2	56.6
Moultrie	2,144	3,784	35.4	62.5
Ogle	9,514	13,422	40.7	57.4
Peoria	40,209	36,774	51.3	46.9
Perry	3,819	5,507	39.8	57.5
Piatt	3,090	5,413	35.5	62.2
Pike	2,278	4,860	31.3	66.7
Pope	650	1,512	29.3	68.0
Pulaski	1,389	1,564	46.1	51.9
Putnam	1,559	1,502	49.7	47.9
Randolph	5,759	8,290	39.9	57.4
Richland	2,362	4,756	32.4	65.3
Rock Island	39,157	24,934	60.2	38.4

St. Clair	67,285	50,125	56.2	41.8
Saline	3,701	6,806	34.5	63.5
Sangamon	42,107	50,225	44.7	53.3
Schuyler	1,727	2,069	44.4	53.2
Scott	910	1,587	35.6	62.1
Shelby	3,342	6,843	32.2	65.8
Stark	1,095	1,528	41.1	57.4
Stephenson	10,165	10,512	48.1	49.8
Tazewell	24,438	35,335	40.0	57.9
Union	3,137	4,957	37.7	59.6
Vermillion	12,878	16,892	42.5	55.7
Wabash	1,590	3,478	31.0	67.7
Warren	4,044	3,618	51.9	46.4
Washington	2,450	4,792	33.0	64.5
Wayne	1,514	5,988	19.7	77.8
White	2,188	4,731	31.0	67.0
Whiteside	14,833	10,448	57.6	40.5
Will	144,229	128,969	52.0	46.5
Williamson	10,647	17,909	36.4	61.2
Winnebago	61,732	55,138	51.9	46.3
Woodford	5,572	12,961	29.5	68.7
Total	3,019,512	2,135,216		

Source: <http://uselectionatlas.org/RESULTS/>

Appendix B

Counties Carried by Obama in 2008 and Lost by Obama in 2012

		2010 Population	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	Median Home Value	Per Capita Income	Median Household Income	% below Poverty
1	Alexander	8,238	61.6	35.8	2.0	56,300	14,617	27,727	25.8
2	Carroll	15,387	97.2	1.0	3.1	102,500	26,196	45,433	13.1
3	Champaign	201,081	74.9	12.7	5.5	147,800	\$25,226	44,462	21.8
4	Cook	5,194,675	66.0	25.0	24.4	256,900	29,920	54,598	15.8
5	Dekalb	105,160	88.3	6.8	10.5	188,100	24,547	54,436	15.9
6	DuPage	916,924	82.3	5.1	13.6	309,800	38,405	77,598	6.2
7	Fulton	37,069	94.3	3.8	2.5	80,800	21,071	42,963	13.7
8	Henderson	7,331	98.1	0.3	1.2	82,900	23,237	47,944	11.4
9	Henry	50,486	96.3	1.8	4.9	109,900	25,931	50,698	10.2
10	Jackson	60,218	78.5	14.7	4.3	95,100	19,619	32,896	29.1
11	Jo Daviess	22,678	97.8	0.6	2.8	142,200	28,659	52,487	8.5
12	Kane	515,269	87.4	6.1	31.1	241,600	29,864	69,496	10.1
13	Knox	52,919	89.1	7.6	4.9	80,700	21,336	40,112	17.2
14	Lake	703,462	83.2	7.4	20.3	280,900	38,512	79,666	8.2
15	Mercer	16,434	98.4	0.4	1.9	98,200	25,878	51,216	9.5
16	Peoria	186,494	75.7	17.9	4.0	121,900	28,743	50,689	15.4
17	Putnam	6,006	97.8	0.8	4.3	126,800	25,510	52,409	11.6
18	Rock Island	147,546	85.9	9.3	11.9	113,100	25,609	46,726	12.4
19	St. Clair	270,056	65.8	30.5	3.4	126,300	25,475	50,109	16.3
20	Warren	17,707	95.3	2.1	8.9	84,700	20,373	42,773	14.5

21	Whiteside	58,498	95.8	1.7	11.2	99,700	24,370	46,444	11.7
22	Will	677,560	81.6	11.5	15.9	236,300	30,199	76,453	7.1
23	Winnebago	295,266	82.1	12.5	11.2	129,200	24,544	47,597	16.8
	Mean:	415,933	85.8	9.4	8.9	143,987	25,993	\$51,519	14.0

Appendix C

Counties which voted for Romney in 2012 and McCain in 2008

		2010 Population	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	Median Home Value	Per Capita Income	Median Household Income	% below Poverty
1	Adams	67,103	93.9	3.6	1.3	99,900	24,798	45,792	12.7
2	Bond	17,768	91.3	6.5	3.2	107,300	24,166	50,672	10.5
3	Brown	6,937	78.6	19.0	5.9	80,000	19,704	42,014	12.1
4	Christian	34,800	96.7	1.7	1.5	82,000	3,125	43,964	15.8
5	Clark	16,335	98.2	0.5	1.3	84,700	24,338	47,933	10.2
6	Clay	13,815	97.9	0.5	1.3	71,500	21,577	38,905	16.9
7	Clinton	37,762	94.3	3.8	2.9	125,200	26,380	57,246	8.0
8	Crawford	19,817	93.3	4.9	2.1	70,000	23,387	43,923	16.4
9	Cumberland	11,048	98.0	0.7	0.9	82,100	21,715	43,255	13.1
10	De Witt	16,561	97.5	0.7	2.2	104,400	25,914	48,750	7.9
11	Douglas	19,900	97.7	0.6	6.4	95,000	22,339	47,921	10.2
12	Edgar	18,576	98.3	0.6	1.2	72,400	23,897	42,947	14.9
13	Edwards	6,721	98.0	0.7	1.0	61,500	20,907	39,071	11.5
14	Effingham	34,242	98.2	0.4	1.9	108,100	25,566	50,938	10.7
15	Fayette	22,140	93.9	4.6	1.5	78,400	22,419	43,081	16.8
16	Ford	14,081	97.6	0.9	2.4	89,900	25,302	50,332	9.2
17	Franklin	39,561	97.7	0.5	1.4	63,200	19,668	36,383	18.5
18	Greene	13,886	97.8	1.1	0.9	71,800	22,366	42,193	12.8
19	Hamilton	8,457	98.1	0.6	1.4	74,100	22,471	39,000	10.0
20	Hancock	19,104	98.0	0.4	1.1	81,700	23,027	43,567	12.8
21	Hardin	4,320	97.5	0.5	1.4	65,700	18,749	30,875	23.8

22	Iroquois	29,718	97.2	1.0	5.7	99,400	24,563	48,248	11.5
23	Jasper	9,698	98.4	0.3	0.9	82,700	22,917	47,731	7.6
24	Jefferson	38,827	88.7	8.7	2.2	87,000	22,032	42,679	17.2
25	Jersey	22,985	97.5	0.5	1.1	120,800	24,940	54,469	8.9
26	Johnson	12,582	89.9	8.5	3.1	93,400	17,328	42,172	11.6
27	Lawrence	16,833	88.5	10.0	3.5	68,300	17,050	38,326	16.2
28	Lee	36,031	92.4	5.2	5.1	114,700	25,303	49,451	9.5
29	Livingston	38,950	92.8	5.2	4.1	105,600	23,530	52,835	10.7
30	Logan	30,305	89.8	7.9	3.1	95,700	22,136	48,714	11.1
31	Marion	39,437	93.5	4.1	1.5	71,300	21,418	40,097	16.5
32	Marshall	12,640	98.0	0.5	2.7	103,200	25,600	51,642	9.3
33	Massac	15,429	91.5	5.9	2.0	80,500	20,044	40,885	16.7
34	Menard	12,705	97.6	0.9	1.1	115,200	26,300	56,943	7.9
35	Monroe	32,957	98.1	0.4	1.4	201,300	31,570	69,291	5.6
36	Morgan	35,547	91.2	6.3	2.2	93,000	23,598	44,731	15.0
37	Moultrie	14,846	98.3	0.5	1.0	93,300	24,078	48,982	10.5
38	Ogle	53,497	9.8	1.1	9.1	153,400	25,803	57,094	10.3
39	Perry	22,350	88.9	8.8	2.8	76,600	18,469	41,333	17.0
40	Piatt	16,729	97.9	0.6	1.2	122,200	27,452	58,837	6.5
41	Pike	16,430	96.9	1.8	1.1	75,300	20,383	40,668	16.2
42	Pope	4,470	91.4	6.7	1.5	87,400	20,603	38,651	11.9
43	Randolph	33,476	88.4	10.0	2.7	88,700	21,442	46,148	12.4
44	Richland	16,233	97.3	0.7	1.4	76,000	23,922	42,305	13.4
45	Saline	24,913	93.0	4.3	1.6	69,400	21,626	36,083	17.0

46	Scott	5,355	98.6	0.2	0.9	83,100	27,955	50,702	8.0
47	Shelby	22,363	98.5	0.5	1.0	86,500	22,522	44,689	10.5
48	Stark	5,994	97.7	0.7	1.2	86,000	24,952	49,693	12.1
49	Tazewell	135,394	96.4	1.3	2.0	128,900	27,395	54,617	8.5
50	Union	17,808	96.4	1.1	5.1	88,200	20,138	40,696	20.5
51	Wabash	11,947	97.2	0.8	1.4	79,500	23,629	47,426	12.7
52	Washington	14,716	97.9	0.8	1.5	104,400	25,177	53,036	8.4
53	Wayne	16,760	98.0	0.5	1.1	69,300	22,319	40,654	13.6
54	White	14,665	98.0	0.6	1.3	67,800	23,398	43,639	15.1
55	Williamson	66,357	93.9	4.2	2.0	89,100	22,903	56,576	16.9
56	Woodford	38,664	97.4	0.7	1.5	152,200	29,886	66,198	7.2
	N=56								
	Average:	24,653	93.7	2.9	2.2	92,470	22,932	\$ 46,696	12.5

Appendix D

Counties Carried by Obama in 2008 and Lost by Obama in 2012

		2010 Populati on	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	Median Home Value	Per Capita Income	Median Household Income	% below Poverty
1	Boone	54,165	93.2	2.5	20.3	171,300	26,323	61,613	10.2
2	Bureau	34,978	96.8	0.8	7.9	103,800	25,344	48,046	10.7
3	Calhaun	5,089	99.0	0.1	1.1	109,400	24,643	48,958	12.4
4	Cass	13,642	94.2	3.8	17.3	76,900	19,947	41,139	15.5
5	Coles	58,873	93.0	4.2	2.3	93,100	21,669	38,294	22.1
6	Gallatin	5,589	98.0	0.4	1.3	58,700	22,674	38,577	18.2
7	Grundy	50,063	96.2	1.6	8.4	191,500	28,159	64,592	7.4
8	Kankakee	113,449	81.3	15.5	9.2	147,700	23,190	49,266	15.0
9	Kendall	114,736	88.4	6.1	15.9	239,300	31,325	82,649	3.8
10	La Salle	113,924	95.6	2.1	8.3	127,500	25,439	52,469	10.4
11	Macon	110,768	79.8	16.4	2.0	92,300	25,797	47,987	15.0
12	Macoupin	47,765	97.5	1.0	1.0	94,900	24,141	48,739	11.8
13	Madison	269,282	89.0	8.0	2.9	124,300	26,939	53,143	13.3
14	Mason	14,666	97.8	0.6	1.0	81,500	23,992	42,929	15.5
15	McDonough	32,612	90.4	5.4	2.8	87,000	18,854	34,186	23.0
16	McHenry	308,760	94.3	1.3	11.7	243,500	32,318	76,909	6.9
17	McLean	169,572	85.5	7.6	4.6	154,600	29,425	59,410	13.1
18	Montgomery	30,104	95.3	3.4	1.6	79,500	22,205	41,925	14.6
19	Pulaski	6,161	64.9	32.3	1.7	50,500	17,732	31,712	22.7
20	Sangamon	197,465	83.9	12.0	1.9	120,900	29,167	53,508	13.4

21	Schuyler Stephenso	7,544	95.6	3.2	1.6	72,500	22,215	43,902	15.2
22	n	47,711	87.5	9.3	3.1	104,500	23,413	43,410	14.7
23	Vermilion	81,625	83.6	13.3	4.4	76,100	21,000	40,463	18.8
	Mean:	82,111	93.2	6.6	5.8	117,448	24,605	49,732	14.1

Appendix E

The Most Loyal Democratic Counties

(Voted for the Party's Presidential Nominee 2000-2012)

	2010 Population
Alexander	8,238
Champaign	201,081
Cook	5,194,675
Fulton	37,069
Henderson	7,331
Jackson	60,218
Knox	52,919
Mercer	16,434
Peoria	186,494
Putnam	6,006
Rock Island	147,546
St. Clair	270,056
Whiteside	58,498
Total	6,246,565

Appendix F

The Most Loyal Republican Counties

(Voted for the Party's Presidential Nominee 2000-2012)

	2010 Population
1 Adams	67,103
2 Bond	17,768
3 Brown	6,937
4 Christian	34,800
5 Clark	16,335
6 Clay	13,815
7 Clinton	37,762
8 Crawford	19,817
9 Cumberland	11,048
10 Dewitt	16,561
11 Douglas	19,900
12 Edgar	18,576
13 Edwards	6,721
14 Effingham	34,242
15 Fayette	22,140
16 Ford	14,081
17 Greene	13,886
18 Hamilton	8,457
19 Hancock	19,104
20 Hardin	4,320
21 Iroquois	29,218
22 Jasper	9,698
23 Jefferson	38,827
24 Jersey	22,985
25 Johnson	12,582
26 Lawrence	16,833
27 Lee	36,031
28 Livingston	38,950
29 Logan	30,305
30 Marion	39,437
31 Marshall	12,640
32 Massac	15,429
33 Menard	12,705
34 Monroe	32,957
35 Morgan	35,547
36 Moutrie	14,846
37 Ogle	53,497
38 Piatt	16,729

39	Pike	16,430
40	Pope	4,470
41	Randolph	33,476
42	Richland	16,233
43	Saline	24,913
44	Scott	5,355
45	Shelby	22,363
46	Stark	5,994
47	Tazewell	135,394
48	Union	17,808
49	Wabash	11,947
50	Washington	14,716
51	Wayne	16,760
52	White	14,665
53	Williamson	66,357
54	Woodford	38,664

Total	1,318,134
--------------	------------------
