New York Office
40 Rector Street, 5th Fl.
New York, NY 10006-1738
T 212.965.2200 / F 212.226.7592
www.naacpldf.org

LDF
DEFEND EDUCATE EMPOWER

Washington, D.C. Office
1444 Eye St., NW, 10th Fl.
Washington, D.C. 20005
T 202.682.1300 / F
202.682.1312

Key Points: *Evenwel v. Abbott*

The Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution states: "No State shall … deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." More than 50 years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Equal Protection Clause requires that legislative districts be equal in population (*Reynolds v. Sims* 1964).

- For a half-century in an unbroken line of cases, the "one person, one vote" rule has helped realize the constitutional promise of inclusion and equal access to our nation's representative bodies. This bedrock principle guards against discrimination and ensures that everyone is counted when legislative districts are redrawn.

- Creating legislative districts with equal populations fosters access to electoral representation and constituent services regardless of race, class, religion, or other characteristics. Courts have repeatedly approved of dividing districts by total population.

- Using total population allows everyone -- including children who are not old enough to vote, individuals who are not yet registered to vote, people on the path to citizenship, people rendered ineligible to vote by felon disfranchisement laws, people with mental disabilities, and others -- to be represented in state and local legislative bodies.

- The use of total population in redistricting has been called "the de facto policy" in all states because it is used universally. The redistricting process isn't broken and doesn't need to be fixed.

The Court's long-standing, inclusive understanding of electoral democracy is a response to our country's history of excluding people of color at the polls.

- Prior to *Reynolds* and the Voting Rights Act, states used literacy tests, poll taxes, and outright prohibitions on suffrage to exclude Black people from the political process. As a result, elected officials often ignored racial minorities in the making of important policy decisions that impacted their daily lives.

- It is only through the Civil War, key constitutional amendments, years of litigation, and other advocacy that our country has begun to overcome these obstacles to equal access to representation. We should not turn the clock back by creating two classes of people: those who count for purposes of redistricting and those who do not.

- There is no reason to return to the days before *Reynolds* when legislative districts in many states were "little more than crazy quilts, completely lacking in rationality." For example, in 1960, districts in Connecticut's state house varied in population from 191 to 81,089. In Nevada, state senate districts varied from 568 to 127,016.

Key Points: *Evenwel v. Abbott*

Plaintiffs' undefined standard of "eligible voters" would treat millions of people as invisible during legislative redistricting and make them outsiders for purposes of democratic representation.

- This case recalls *Gomillion v. Lightfoot* (1960), which LDF litigated. There, the Court reviewed a challenge to the City of Tuskegee's borders, which had been redrawn to exclude all but four or five (out of 400) Black voters, while not removing a single white resident or voter. The Court unanimously rejected the new boundaries and warned against manipulating rights out of existence.

- In this case, plaintiffs do not offer a definition of "eligible voters." The process of defining the term would create abundant opportunities for political manipulation and the exclusion of people of color and others from civic participation.

- Indeed, under an "eligible voter" measure for state redistricting, more than 20 million Black people – children, non-citizens, individuals not yet registered to vote, disfranchised persons, and others – would be denied representation.

- Taking even one of these categories of people out of the redistricting count would be devastating. For example, children under the age of 18 are 23% (or 75 million) of the total U.S. population, the majority of whom are citizens, and concentrated in certain areas across all 50 states.

- By contrast, total population is easy to define and can be readily qualified by Census data. The Constitution requires that congressional districts be drawn based on total populations as determined by the Census. We don't need inconsistent redistricting standards, one for state redistricting and one for federal.

- As the amicus brief of Stanford Law Professor Nathaniel Persily and other experts on the Census agree: "Rarely can one say of a constitutional argument that it is not only wrong, but it is impossible … A national database of eligible voters does not exist and will not exist in the foreseeable future."

The Court should reaffirm the constitutionality of States' established use of total population figures when drawing legislative districts.

- There is no reason to depart from settled law and longstanding practice. The changes that plaintiffs suggest would fence millions of people out of American political life and

reverse the Court's advances to make democratic institutions more open, inclusive, and representative.

When redistricting is discussed, we often hear of one party or the other seeking to draw lines for political advantage. Given this context, it is important to note that using total population for redistricting has overwhelming, bipartisan support among state and local governments.

- As the friend of the court brief filed on behalf of 21 states recognized: "Relying on the Census ensures that States have accurate, useful, and *neutral* total-population counts on which to base redistricting." (emphasis added)

- The governors of the states signing this brief are almost perfectly balanced between Democrats (11) and Republicans (10). We should not force states to abandon a redistricting practice proven through decades of experience to be fair, effective, and administrable.

- Likewise, various cities across this country filed briefs supporting the "Constitution's promise that all persons—not merely voters—are entitled to equal protection of the laws."

###

Case Background Information:

The Texas Legislature reapportioned its state senate districts following the 2010 Census. As states have done for 50 years, Texas divided its senate districts based on total population so that each district contains a substantially equal number of people (within the +/-10% deviation norm for state legislative redistricting).

Two plaintiffs sued Texas, arguing that the State should use the undefined standard of "eligible voters" instead of total population. Specifically, they claim that their votes are worth less than people in other districts (namely urban areas) because they live in districts (namely rural areas) that are comparatively overpopulated with voters, thereby diluting the impact of their individual vote.

A three-judge federal district court dismissed plaintiffs' claim and they appealed directly to the U.S. Supreme Court. On December 8, 2015, the Court will hear oral argument in this case,

Key Points: *Evenwel v. Abbott*

Evenwel v. Abbott. The primary question before the U.S. Supreme Court is whether a state legislative apportionment based on total population satisfies the Equal Protection Clause. It does.

###

The NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. http://www.naacpldf.org/ is America's premier legal organization fighting for racial justice. Through litigation, advocacy, and public education, LDF seeks structural changes to expand democracy, eliminate disparities, and achieve racial justice in a society that fulfills the promise of equality for all Americans. LDF also defends the gains and protections won over the past 75 years of civil rights struggle and works to improve the quality and diversity of judicial and executive appointments. Since its founding in 1940, LDF has been a pioneer in the struggle to secure and protect the voting rights of African-Americans. LDF has been involved in nearly all of the precedent-setting litigation relating to minority voting rights.