

The Voting Rights Act's Legacy Is Under Threat

Sixty years after passage of the landmark *Voting Rights Act of 1965* (VRA), the United States finds itself once more facing down an attack on voting rights—the biggest since this crucial legislation was enacted.

The VRA addressed the discriminatory voting practices that many states put in place to suppress voting by Black people, as well as women and non-English language speakers, such as literacy tests,¹ poll taxes,² and discriminatory voting districts.³ The law allowed the Department of Justice (DOJ) and private citizens to bring suit when their voting rights are impacted by discriminatory restrictions. Critically, it also prevented future anti-voter laws and policies by requiring states and localities that had a history of discriminatory voting practices and low Black voting rates to receive approval before any laws affecting voting or elections could go into effect.

By most measures, the VRA has been a success. Over decades, it's worked to end the majority of discriminatory voting practices arrayed against Black voters, which has helped to bring up Black voters' participation rates to near parity with other groups. But opponents of voting rights have turned the VRA's success against it, suggesting the need for it has passed because, as the U.S. Supreme Court said in 2013 striking down the pre-approval requirements of the VRA, "Nearly 50 years later, things have changed dramatically."⁴

More than a decade after that fateful pronouncement, things have indeed changed dramatically, and not for the better. As many predicted, states that were previously restrained by the VRA have since churned out one discriminatory voting restraint after another. In just a few years, the gap in turnout between Black and white voters has increased by about 10%.

All of this is especially concerning in the context of our current authoritarian president, a man deeply skeptical of both elections and civil rights. Trump's Department of Justice has abandoned enforcement of the VRA, instead spending its resources to pursue election conspiracies and weaponize federal law to target election officials and political enemies.⁵

These attacks on voting rights are reflected in the radicalization of politics in many states, resulting in rampant legislative attacks on gender justice and civil rights. Efforts to undermine voting rights harm everyone, but they are especially dangerous for women and LGBTQIA+ people, whose reproductive freedoms, access to health care, and programmatic supports are increasingly threatened.⁶ By stripping women and communities of color of their voting rights, lawmakers can ignore their constituents, escape accountability for defunding popular social programs, and pass destructive anti-woman, anti-family policies. And over the last decade, we have seen the result in the waves of negative state legislation targeting women, LGBTQIA+ people, education, and essential social programs across the country.

A strong democracy that is responsive to the needs and votes of the people is crucial to protecting the rights of women and families. Voters do not want abortion bans, cuts to schools and education, or cuts to social services that support women and families. And yet, 25 states have significant restrictions or bans on abortion, Trump is destroying the Department of Education, and hundreds of millions of dollars have been cut from essential social programs. Why this disparity? The answer lies, at least in part, in voter suppression and the weakening of the VRA.

For voting rights, we are at a turning point, and so it is critical to understand the history behind the siege on our rights, the current threats to American democracy, and what we can do about it. This report will discuss the consequences of the U.S. Supreme Court's efforts to undermine the VRA, the wave of anti-voter legislation this has unleashed in the states, and recommendations to restore the VRA and strengthen voting rights and American democracy for the next 60 years.

State-Level Attacks on Voting Rights After *Shelby County v. Holder*

The U.S. Supreme Court's harmful 2013 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder* marked a new era of increasing skepticism toward voting right protections that threatens the core of the VRA.⁷ In this case, Shelby County, Alabama, sought a declaration that the preclearance requirements of the VRA were unconstitutional because they interfered with state sovereignty, and the "extraordinary circumstances" that had justified these remedial measures in 1965 were no longer applicable in 2013. The preclearance requirements were originally put in place to prevent discrimination by states and localities with particularly low rates of Black

voter participation or that had been found to employ discriminatory voting practices. They required these states and localities to seek approval from a D.C. federal court or a waiver from the Department of Justice (DOJ) whenever they passed an election-related law. However, the Court struck down the formula that determined which states and counties were subject to VRA preclearance requirements, essentially freeing those states and localities to pass laws that affect voting without further scrutiny. And they wasted no time in doing so.

Just hours after the Supreme Court announced its decision, Texas implemented a controversial voter ID law that would significantly impact Black and Hispanic voters.⁸ This law was eventually struck down after it was challenged under Section 2 of the VRA⁹ by the U.S. Attorney General and voting rights advocates.¹⁰ Texas quickly passed an amended version of the law that was upheld by the 5th Circuit in 2018.¹¹ This example shows why the preclearance component of the VRA was both so powerful and necessary. By effectively removing the preclearance requirement, the Supreme Court placed the burden on individuals whose rights have been violated, voting rights organizations, or the U.S. attorney general to challenge state laws they believe have a discriminatory effect on voting, rather than putting the onus on impacted states and counties to construct nondiscriminatory voting rules that would meet court scrutiny. As a result, there has been a proliferation of restrictive voting laws with potentially discriminatory impacts that voting rights advocates must tackle one by one, at great expense and with limited success. Further, even if the plaintiffs ultimately win, court proceedings can take so long that the discriminatory rule remains in place for one or more election cycles.

Overall, since the flawed *Shelby County* decision in 2013, states have passed more than 100 restrictive voter laws,¹² including voter ID bills, bills that make voter registration more difficult, and bills that limit access to voting by closing polling places, restricting mail voting, and limiting early voting. The racially discriminatory effect of these laws has become starkly evident, as the gap between white voter turnout and Black voter turnout has increased from -2.0% in 2012 to 8.3% in 2020.¹³ In 2020, this gap was equivalent to approximately 1.7 million fewer Black voters participating in the election.¹⁴

Attacks on Voter Access

Since 2013, a growing number of states have passed laws that restrict voter access by eliminating polling places,

requiring specific types of ID to vote, cutting back on early voting, and restricting voting by mail. For example, from 2013 to 2018, in the states formerly subject to preclearance under the VRA, about 1,688 polling stations were closed, many of which were in communities with large Black or Hispanic populations.¹⁵ Poll closure can be a form of voter suppression as, especially in urban districts with many voters, individuals can be required to stand in line for hours to vote. For example, in Georgia, during the 2020 June primary election, an analysis found an average wait time of 51 minutes in polling places that were 90% or more nonwhite, but only six minutes in polling places that were 90% white.¹⁶ Georgia purposefully exacerbated this problem in 2021 by passing a law that prevented the distribution of food or water to voters waiting in line.¹⁷

After the flawed *Shelby County* decision, one of the most prevalent voting restrictions passed by states was the imposition of voter ID requirements, which require voters to present specific types of ID at the poll in order to vote. These laws are often targeted to prevent certain types of constituencies from voting, such as refusing to accept student IDs in order to limit the electoral impact of younger voters. While some of these laws have been struck down under Section 2 of the VRA, such as the North Carolina law, which the 4th Circuit found “target[ed] African Americans with almost surgical precision,”¹⁸ most have been allowed to remain in effect.¹⁹

The Covid-19 pandemic in 2020 caused a massive increase in the use of voting by mail, as states changed their rules in order to safely permit voting. However, after President Biden won the 2020 election, voting by mail became particularly contentious, as President Trump publicly attacked this form of voting, saying, “We have to get rid of mail-in ballots because once you have mail-in ballots, you have crooked elections.”²⁰ Subsequently, numerous states restricted or limited voting by mail, including eight states that previously required VRA preclearance.²¹

In some cases, voters have challenged restrictions that impact voting access based on Section 2 of the VRA, arguing that they have a discriminatory intent and effect against minority voters. For example, voters challenged Arizona laws that require election officials to discard the ballots of individuals who vote outside of their precinct, even if they are eligible to vote, and that restrict the collection and delivery of another person’s ballot. In the 2016 *Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee* decision, the U.S. Supreme Court further weakened the VRA by

deciding that Section 2 of the VRA does not prevent these types of facially neutral time, place, and manner restrictions on voting.²² The Court said that these laws were acceptable because they had only small impacts on voting by minority voters and the state had legitimate interests for these rules. Arizona, like other states that have passed laws that restrict voter access, defended its laws by claiming that they were intended to prevent voter fraud, despite the fact that no voter fraud had been found to occur in Arizona. Further, the Court said that states have a “compelling interest in preserving the integrity of [their] election process,” which includes taking action to prevent election fraud without waiting for it to occur.²³

Examples of voter fraud remain remarkably rare in U.S. elections, and it is effectively impossible for it to occur at a level sufficient to impact the outcome of an election.²⁴ Despite this fact, justifications regarding prevention of voter fraud have been used to support numerous restrictions on voting, from elimination on voting by mail and collection of ballots, to restrictions on voter registration, imposition of voter ID requirements, and others.

Attacks on Voter Registration

Another avenue that states have used to attack voting rights is placing significant burdens on voter registration. This is frequently paired with efforts to deregister eligible voters with little justification or notice. For example, five states that had previously been subject to VRA preclearance passed laws that automatically unenroll voters who do not vote in one general election, or after four to five years of not voting.²⁵ Similarly, voter purges by election officials have increased markedly over the past 20 years, with over 19 million voter registrations purged from 2020–22.²⁶ Unlike automatic de-registration, voter purges are conducted manually by election officials to remove individuals who have moved, died, or are otherwise unable to vote, based on cross-reference to other lists. However, this can be discriminatory, especially when officials use unreliable data or target specific districts or communities. Increasingly, election deniers and activists are making efforts to challenge thousands of voters in key districts, often with a high percentage of Black and Hispanic voters, by relying on dubious data and novel legal theories.²⁷

A growing number of states have also considered or passed laws or constitutional amendments that require voters to present documentary proof of citizenship in order to register to vote.²⁸ Generally, these laws require the presentation of a birth certificate or passport to prove

one's citizenship, which is particularly burdensome for voters, many of whom do not have or are unable to obtain these documents.²⁹ After such a law was passed in New Hampshire,³⁰ many eligible voters were turned away at the polls, some having to make multiple trips to bring required documents.³¹ These laws are justified by their proponents as necessary to prevent noncitizens from voting, but in fact, it is already illegal for noncitizens to vote in federal elections,³² and illegal voting by noncitizens is extraordinarily rare.³³

Felony Disenfranchisement

The practice of stripping the ability to vote from those convicted of a felony has a long history in the United States, in some cases dating back to the early 1800s. However, during the Reconstruction Era, many states broadened their felony disenfranchisement laws (as well as targeted criminal laws) with the goal of disenfranchising newly freed Black voters. Although felony disenfranchisement has been challenged under Section 2 of the VRA, this has not yet resulted in overturning a state law. Today, although laws vary widely by state, it is estimated that 4.5% of eligible Black citizens are currently disenfranchised due to a felony conviction, and in five states, more than 10% of eligible Black citizens have been disenfranchised.³⁴ While several states have undertaken reforms that decrease the number of individuals that qualify for disenfranchisement or streamline processes to enable the restoration of voting rights, other states have further politicized this issue in disturbing ways. For example, in 2022, Florida Governor Ron DeSantis publicized the arrest of 20 individuals for allegedly voting despite felony convictions, in some cases after they received notice from the state that they were eligible to vote.³⁵

Discriminatory Voting Districts

There is a long history of U.S. lawmakers drawing the boundaries of voting districts in ways that politically advantage themselves or disadvantage their opponents (a process often known as “gerrymandering”). However, districting has often been used in racially discriminatory ways, particularly as Black citizens gained more political power following the passage of the VRA. For example, lawmakers may set up district maps to “crack” Black communities into several districts to reduce their voting power or to “pack” Black voters into as few districts as possible to reduce the number of their preferred leaders who can be elected.³⁶

While advocates have had success in challenging racially discriminatory gerrymandering through Section 2 of the VRA, it is a complex and shifting area of law. For example, when voters in Mobile, Alabama, challenged the election of city commissioners through at-large voting, which diluted the voting power of Black citizens, the U.S. Supreme Court found that these districting changes were only impermissible if they were motivated by a discriminatory intent.³⁷ In response, Congress amended Section 2 of the VRA in 1982 to effectively reverse this decision, clarifying courts should look at a “totality of the circumstances” to determine if a class of citizens “have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice.”³⁸ Soon after, the Court again looked at racially discriminatory districting, finding a violation of this amended Section 2 where the impact of North Carolina’s redistricting, which split politically cohesive groups of Black voters into districts of white voters, would be to consistently defeat Black candidates.³⁹

As recently as 2023, the Supreme Court, by a narrow majority, applied Section 2 of the VRA to require a state to redraw voting district maps that dilute the votes of Black citizens.⁴⁰ However, the Court is currently considering another case that has the potential to undermine use of the VRA in this way. In *Louisiana v. Callais*, the Court will consider whether a revised redistricting map that Louisiana created after being sued under Section 2 of the VRA⁴¹ violates the rights of a group of self-described “non-African American voters.”⁴² If the Court finds that the new map is an unconstitutional racial gerrymander under the Fourteenth Amendment, it will make it more difficult for courts and legislatures to draw acceptable, nondiscriminatory district maps, which may significantly impede enforcement of Section 2 of the VRA as applied to racially discriminatory districting.

Federal Attacks on Voting Rights

In addition to state efforts to undermine voting rights, under the Trump administration, the federal government has increasingly taken positions that negatively impact voters and conflict with the VRA. Notably, the Department of Justice (DOJ) plays a critical role in enforcement of the VRA—indeed, there are provisions of the VRA that only the U.S. attorney general may enforce. However, under Trump, the DOJ’s Voting Section has dismissed numerous VRA enforcement actions and made clear that its focus will be on preventing voting fraud, a negligible problem in U.S.

elections.⁴³ Trump's DOJ has contacted numerous states, demanding data to ascertain whether election officials have not been aggressive enough, in its view, in purging invalid voter registrations.⁴⁴ DOJ is purportedly even considering whether it can bring criminal charges against election officials for not doing enough to stop fraud and illegal voting.⁴⁵

That's why we're so troubled by another recent development. In 2021, Native American tribes challenged a North Dakota legislative district map, which limited the power of their voters. However, the 8th Circuit ruled against the tribes, finding that neither Section 2 of the VRA nor 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which allows individuals to sue state and local government officials for violating their constitutional rights, allows the tribes to bring an enforcement claim under the VRA—instead saying that enforcement claims may only be brought by DOJ.⁴⁶ While the 8th Circuit⁴⁷ is the only appellate court that has banned private enforcement of the VRA, several U.S. Supreme Court justices have written to suggest it is an open question.⁴⁸ The Court has now taken up this issue and will consider whether individuals have a private right of action to enforce their rights under the VRA. This is an issue of critical importance to voting rights in our country, particularly since the Court already neutered the other primary enforcement mechanism of the VRA in the harmful *Shelby County* decision, and the DOJ is conspicuously uninterested in enforcement.

Another concerning development is the national push for documentary proof of citizenship laws, embodied in legislation such as the *Safeguard American Voter Eligibility (SAVE) Act*⁴⁹ currently under consideration by Congress. Under the SAVE Act, in order to register to vote, eligible individuals would be required to show documentary proof of citizenship in person by presenting a birth certificate that matches their ID, a state ID that shows place of birth (most do not), or a valid passport. Not only would this eliminate registration by mail and be extraordinarily expensive for local election offices, but providing these documents would also be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for millions of eligible voters. The SAVE Act would be especially harmful for people who have changed their legal name, including the approximately 69 million married women in the United States who have taken their husband's surname.⁵⁰ Similarly, while the bill would allow using passports to prove citizenship, it would have a disproportionately negative impact on the 50% of people in the country who do not have one. People with lower incomes or less education are far less likely to have a valid passport or the means to obtain

one, so this requirement would especially impact people of color and women, who face higher rates of poverty.

Lastly, in March 2025, President Trump issued an executive order entitled, "Preserving and Protecting the Integrity of American Elections,"⁵¹ which would allow the federal government to seize power and influence over U.S. elections.⁵² First, this order would impose documentary proof of citizenship requirements, similar to the SAVE Act, on individuals using federal voter registration forms as well as overseas military personnel. Second, it would decertify all voting machines and force recertification under new standards, costing states billions of dollars. Also, it would penalize the 17 states that count mailed ballots that are sent before Election Day but arrive after. Finally, it would use federal funding to coerce states to share election data with DOJ, ostensibly to prosecute election crimes. While this executive order is being challenged,⁵³ if permitted to go into effect, it could significantly rebalance control over elections in the United States and grant President Trump much greater influence over election administration.

Recommendations

Sixty years after passage of the *Voting Rights Act of 1965*, harmful court precedents have weakened the law even as challenges to the voting rights of Black citizens, women, and others escalate. Action must be taken in order to protect every American's voting rights for years to come.

1. Congress should pass the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.⁵⁴

This critical legislation would update Section 4 of the VRA in order to provide clear criteria for when preclearance of election laws is required, restoring one of the primary enforcement mechanisms of the VRA. The bill would codify important Supreme Court precedents regarding vote dilution, ensure that non-English speaking voters are protected, and provide guidance to courts regarding application of the VRA. For example, this language would clarify that a voting restriction may not be justified merely by claiming it will address unsubstantiated criminal activity, like voter fraud. Further, the bill would add new transparency requirements to help ensure that voters are made aware when election rules are changed, including the impact on demographics when voting districts are changed. This legislation would both clarify that individuals may bring lawsuits to enforce their rights and set clear standards that allow courts to prohibit discriminatory election practices prior to elections. In short, the *John*

R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act is a vital piece of legislation that would update the VRA and eliminate many of the ways that hostile states and courts have evaded or weakened voting rights over time.

2. Congress should pass the *Freedom to Vote Act*.⁵⁵

This important pro-voter legislation would strengthen our democracy, prevent state efforts to restrict voting, and help address discriminatory voting practices. The bill would establish Election Day as a federal holiday, prohibit felony disenfranchisement, expand voter registration and access, and limit voter purges. Further, the bill would set criteria for congressional redistricting that would end partisan gerrymandering. Finally, it would address several campaign finance issues, such as increasing required disclosures.

3. Congress should fully fund election support for states and localities.

Over the years, Congress has provided inconsistent funding for state and local election officials, making it difficult for them to plan, replace aging voting infrastructure, and deal with increasing threats and voter disinformation. Lack of federal funding can impair voter access, particularly in low-income communities, through closed polling places and fewer voter outreach and education programs.⁵⁶ These programs are especially important as election disinformation campaigns become more frequent and increasingly target voters of color.⁵⁷

4. Congress should use its oversight power to ensure that the U.S. Department of Justice performs its critical mission to protect voting rights and enforce the VRA.

The VRA requires and depends upon effective enforcement by DOJ. Yet the Trump administration has shown little interest in protecting voting rights, instead developing new theories to weaponize voting laws and pursue President Trump's fallacious voting conspiracies. Congress must use its oversight role to demand that DOJ enforce federal law and use the VRA to challenge illegal discriminatory voting practices.

5. Congress should not pass the *SAVE Act* or similar legislation that would compromise voting rights.

Proponents of the *SAVE Act* contend that its massive expense and negative impact on voting access are necessary to protect against noncitizens voting. However, noncitizens voting in federal elections is vanishingly rare and already illegal. There is no need for Congress to pass this destructive, anti-voter legislation.

6. States should examine ways to increase access to voting and repeal laws that unnecessarily impede voting.

States have passed more than 100 restrictive election laws since the U.S. Supreme Court's harmful *Shelby County v. Holder* decision in 2013.⁵⁸ It is critical that state lawmakers across the country consider what they can do to roll back laws that restrict voter registration or access to voting, including voter ID requirements, limits on voting by mail, and aggressive voter purging practices. At the same time, states can increase voter access by creating flexible vote by mail systems, easing voter registration requirements, and eliminating felony disenfranchisement. Several states have even passed state-level versions of the VRA.⁵⁹ The Brennan Center for Justice tracks passage of both restrictive state laws and laws that promote voter access, available at <https://www.brennancenter.org/issues/ensure-every-american-can-vote/voting-reform/state-voting-laws>.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Authored by Alison Gill, Director for Nominations & Democracy. The author would like to thank Angel Padilla, Sydney Petersen, Margie Delao, Ruwarashe Mukwada, and Hilary Woodward for their review and Sofia Hay for design.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Before they were found to be unconstitutional, many states required eligible voters to pass literacy tests in order to vote. At first, these tests were only applied to Black voters, and they often used convoluted and purposefully vague language in order to intentionally suppress Black voters. Over time, they were required to be applied to all voters, and they had a disproportionate impact on people with lower levels of education and non-English language speakers.
- 2 Prior to passage of the VRA, numerous states required fees called poll taxes in order to vote. This disproportionately suppressed Black voters because of existing social and economic racial disparities in the Jim Crow South, as well as women, who were often unable to work or access money without their spouse's consent.
- 3 To reduce the political power of Black voters, lawmakers in some states set up district maps that dilute their influence among many districts or pack Black voters into as few districts as possible.
- 4 *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529, 545 (2013).
- 5 Matt Cohen, *Election Officials Have Been Under Attack for Years. Now the DOJ Wants to Criminally Charge Them*, Democracy Docket (July 12, 2025), <https://www.democracydocket.com/analysis/election-officials-have-been-under-attack-for-years-now-the-doj-wants-to-criminally-charge-them/>.
- 6 History shows that lawmakers are responsive to populations with expanded voting rights. For example, after the 19th Amendment, which granted women the right to vote, was ratified in 1920, Congress quickly passed the Sheppard-Towner Act, which provided federal funding for maternity and childcare and was the first significant piece of federal social welfare legislation.
- 7 *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013).
- 8 See Texas Secretary of State (June 25, 2013), <https://www.sos.state.tx.us/about/newsreleases/2013/062513.shtml>.
- 9 Section 2 of the VRA allows discriminatory voting practices to be challenged in court by individuals, organizations, and the Department of Justice.
- 10 *Veasey v. Abbott*, 830 F.3d 216 (5th Cir. 2016) (en banc).
- 11 *Veasey v. Abbott*, 888 F.3d 792 (5th Cir. 2018).
- 12 Jasleen Singh & Sara Carter, *States Have Added Nearly 100 Restrictive Laws Since SCOTUS Gutted the Voting Rights Act 10 Years Ago*, Brennan Center for Justice (June 23, 2023), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/states-have-added-nearly-100-restrictive-laws-scotus-gutted-voting-rights>.
- 13 Kevin Morris & Coryn Grange, *Large Racial Turnout Gap Persisted in 2020*, Brennan Center for Justice (Aug 6, 2021), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/large-racial-turnout-gap-persisted-2020-election>.
- 14 See U.S. Census Bureau, *Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2020* (April 2021), <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/voting-and-registration/p20-585.html>.
- 15 The Leadership Council on Civil and Human Rights, *Democracy Diverted: Polling Place Closures and the Right to Vote* (2019), <https://civilrights.org/democracy-diverted/Democracy-Diverted.pdf>.
- 16 Stephen Fowler, *Why Do Nonwhite Georgia Voters Have to Wait In Line for Hours? Too Few Polling Places*, NPR (Oct. 17, 2020), <https://www.npr.org/2020/10/17/924527679/why-do-nonwhite-georgia-voters-have-to-wait-in-line-for-hours-too-few-polling-pl>.
- 17 GA Code § 21-2-414(a).
- 18 *North Carolina NAACP v. McCrory*, 831 F.3d 204, 214 (4th Cir. 2016).
- 19 See, e.g., NCSL, *Voter ID Laws* (July 2, 2025), <https://www.ncsl.org/elections-and-campaigns/voter-id>.
- 20 Olivia Rinaldi, *How Trump changed his stance on absentee and mail voting—which he used to blame for election fraud*, CBS News (Apr. 27, 2024), <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/trump-absentee-mail-voting/>.
- 21 See Catherine Silvestri & Connie Wu, *State-by-State Guide to Restrictive Changes to Voter ID, Mail Voting, and Ballot Collection Requirements*, Brennan Center for Justice (Oct. 22, 2024), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/state-state-guide-restrictive-changes-voter-id-mail-voting-and-ballot>.
- 22 *Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee*, 594 U.S. __ (2021).
- 23 *Id.* at *32-4.
- 24 Brennan Center for Justice, *Debunking the Voter Fraud Myth* (Jan. 31, 2017), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/debunking-voter-fraud-myth>.
- 25 See Voting Rights Lab, *Voter List Maintenance & Removals* (2025), https://tracker.votingrightslab.org/issues/voter-list-maintenance-and-removals#issues_map.
- 26 See Brennan Center for Justice, *Voter Purges* (2025), <https://www.brennancenter.org/issues/ensure-every-american-can-vote/vote-suppression/voter-purges>.
- 27 Alexandra Berzon and Nick Corasaniti, *Trump's Allies Ramp Up Campaign Targeting Voter Rolls*, New York Times (Mar. 6, 2024), <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/03/03/us/politics/trump-voter-rolls.html>.
- 28 Movement Advancement Project, *Democracy 101: Understanding Proof of Citizenship Requirements for Voter Registration* (Mar. 2025), <http://www.mapresearch.org/2025-democracy-101-proof-of-citizenship>.
- 29 These laws can also have a disparate impact on people who have changed their names, including married women and trans people. See discussion of the SAVE Act on page 5.
- 30 New Hampshire, House Bill 1569 (2024), <https://legiscan.com/NH/text/HB1569/2024>.
- 31 Todd Bookman & Josh Rogers, *NH's new ID requirements send some would-be voters home to grab passports, birth certificates*, NHPR (Mar. 11, 2025), <https://www.nhpr.org/nh-news/2025-03-11/nhs-new-id-requirements-send-some-would-be-voters-home-to-grab-passports-birth-certificates>.
- 32 See 18 U.S.C. § 611.
- 33 David Lieb, *Data indicates voting by noncitizens is rare. Republicans are pressing measures to make sure of it*, AP (Sept. 9, 2024), <https://apnews.com/article/noncitizens-voting-republicans-election-2024-immigration-09b86e6768f755fd875f3c51b0e8ea70>.
- 34 Christopher Uggen, et al., *Locked Out 2024: Four Million Denied Voting Rights Due to a Felony Conviction*, The Sentencing Project (Oct. 10, 2024), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/reports/locked-out-2024-four-million-denied-voting-rights-due-to-a-felony-conviction/>.
- 35 Ashley Lopez, *20 were charged for voter fraud in Florida. Advocates say a broken system is to blame*, NPR (Aug. 27, 2022), <https://www.npr.org/2022/08/27/1119750187/florida-voter-fraud-charges-desantis-felon-rights>.
- 36 Julia Kirschenbaum & Michael Li, *Gerrymandering Explained*, Brennan Center for Justice (June 9, 2023), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/gerrymandering-explained>.
- 37 See *City of Mobile v. Bolden*, 446 U.S. 55 (1980).
- 38 52 U.S.C. § 10301(b).
- 39 *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 20 (1986).
- 40 *Allen v. Milligan*, 599 U.S. __ (2023).
- 41 *Robinson v. Ardoyn*, 37 F.4th 208 (5th Cir. 2022); *Robinson v. Ardoyn*, 86 F.4th 574 (5th Cir. 2023).
- 42 See Legal Defense Fund, *Supreme Court Order Re-Argument of Louisiana Redistricting Case for Next Term* (June 27, 2025), <https://www.naacpldf.org/press-release/supreme-court-orders-re-argument-of-louisiana-redistricting-case-for-next-term/>.
- 43 Matt Cohen, *Trump's DOJ to Focus on Voter Fraud, Not Voting Rights*, Democracy Docket (Apr. 30, 2025), <https://www.democracydocket.com/news-alerts/trumps-doj-to-focus-on-voter-fraud-not-voting-rights/>.
- 44 Matt Cohen, *All the States Where DOJ is Demanding Voting Data*, Democracy Docket (July 18, 2025), <https://www.democracydocket.com/news-alerts/all-the-states-where-doj-is-demanding-voting-data/>.

- 45 Matt Cohen, *Election Officials Have Been Under Attack for Years. Now the DOJ Wants to Criminally Charge Them*, Democracy Docket (July 12, 2025), <https://www.democracydocket.com/analysis/election-officials-have-been-under-attack-for-years-now-the-doj-wants-to-criminally-charge-them/>.
- 46 See *Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians v. Howe*, No. 23-3655 (8th Cir. 2025). Note that the 8th Circuit also determined that there is no private right of action to enforce Section 207 of the VRA, which permits individuals to receive voting assistance when they are unable to read or have disabilities. See *Arkansas United v. Oelschlaeger*, No. 22-2918, No. 23-1154 (8th Cir. 2025).
- 47 The 8th Circuit covers North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, and Arkansas.
- 48 See, e.g., *Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee*, 594 U.S. ____ (2021) (Justice Gorsuch concurrence).
- 49 SAVE Act, H.R.22, 119th Congress (2025–2026), <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/22/text>.
- 50 See National Women’s Law Center, *How the SAVE Act Could Disenfranchise Millions of Married Women and Trans Voters*, Blog Post (Mar. 27, 2025), <https://nwlc.org/how-the-save-act-could-disenfranchise-millions-of-married-women-and-trans-voters/>.
- 51 Executive Order 14248, Preserving and Protecting the Integrity of American Elections, 90 Fed. Reg. 14005 (Mar. 25, 2025), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/03/28/2025-05523/preserving-and-protecting-the-integrity-of-american-elections>.
- 52 Wendy Weiser, *The President’s Executive Order on Elections*, Brennan Center for Justice (Apr. 24, 2025), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/presidents-executive-order-elections-explained>.
- 53 Complaint, *League of Women Voters v. Trump*, Case 1:25-cv-00955 (D.D.C. Apr. 1, 2025), <https://www.brennancenter.org/media/13895/download/complaint-lwv-v-trump.pdf?inline=1>.
- 54 John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2025, H.R.14, 119th Congress (2025–2026), <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/14>.
- 55 Freedom to Vote Act, H.R.11, 118th Congress (2023–2024), <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/11>.
- 56 Mark Nichols, *Closed voting sites hit minority counties harder for busy midterm elections*, USA Today (October 30, 2018), <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2018/10/30/midterm-elections-closed-voting-sites-impactminority-voter-turnout/1774221002/>.
- 57 See, e.g., Christine Fernando, *Election disinformation campaigns targeted voters of color in 2020. Experts expect 2024 to be worse*, Associated Press (July 29, 2023), <https://apnews.com/article/elections-voting-misinformation-raceimmigration-712a5c5a9b72c1668b8c9b1eb6e0038a>.
- 58 Jasleen Singh & Sara Carter, *States Have Added Nearly 100 Restrictive Laws Since SCOTUS Gutted the Voting Rights Act 10 Years Ago*, Brennan Center for Justice (June 23, 2023), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/states-have-added-nearly-100-restrictive-laws-scotus-gutted-voting-rights>.
- 59 NCSL, *State Voting Rights Acts* (2025), <https://www.ncsl.org/elections-and-campaigns/state-voting-rights-acts>.