



February 24, 2021

Sent via email

Senate Ethics Committee
Georgia Senate
324-A Coverdell Legislative Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Re: Opposition to House Bill 241

Dear Chair Burns and Committee Members:

The NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (“LDF”) and SPLC Action Fund (“SPLC Action”) write to express in the strongest possible terms our opposition to (i) various provisions in Senate (“S.B.”) 241,¹ (ii) the timing of this bill on the heels of ever-growing participation by Georgians in elections, and (iii) the process for how this Committee is considering this bill. We are deeply concerned the enactment of S.B. 241 will create unnecessary barriers and burdens on voters that disproportionately impact racial minority, low-income, elderly, rural, disabled, and student voters and may violate federal laws, including the First, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Americans with Disabilities Act. For these reasons and those detailed below, we urge you to vote no on S.B. 241 and immediately withdraw it.

As nonprofit, nonpartisan civil rights and racial justice organizations, our aim is to ensure that all voters, particularly Black voters and other voters of color, have full, meaningful, and non-burdensome access to the one fundamental right that is preservative of all other rights: the right of citizens to access the ballot box and elect candidates of their choice. In this way, the vote is both a tangible measure of what we are and aspire to be as a nation. For these reasons, we, along with other voting rights and pro-democracy groups, have enthusiastically supported the expansion of equitable voting options, including absentee and advance voting, in Georgia.

Equitable voting options have been critical to ensuring Georgia voters can safely, securely, and freely participate in our democracy. They also reflect the

¹ Senate Bill 241 (LC 28 0244), Georgia Senate (Feb. 24, 2021), <https://www.legis.ga.gov/legislation/60009>.

straightforward understanding that increasing voting access builds a healthier and more inclusive democracy. The availability of equitable voting options made it possible for Georgia voters to turn out in historic numbers for the November 3, 2020 general election and January 5, 2021 runoff election.² To ensure the endurance and stability of this historic turnout, the Georgia Legislature should be considering measures that would preserve and expand voting rights and voting access.

Yet S.B. 241 is written to undermine significant progress to expand voting rights and ballot access in Georgia, especially for voters of color. Although the process by which this bill is being heard has not afforded sufficient—let alone meaningful—opportunities to assess and review this elections bill, we draw your attention to Sections 4, 7, and 12 for now.³ For the reasons detailed below, we urge you to vote no on S.B. 241 and withdraw it from any further committee hearings.

I. Section 4 – Multistate Voter Registration System Participation

Section 4 will require Georgia to participate in a “multistate voter registration system” in order to “cross-check” the eligibility of Georgia voters. Although the bill does not specify which particular “cross-check” system the state would be forced to join, it creates a significant risk that Georgia could participate in a highly flawed ballot maintenance process that would disproportionately disenfranchise voters of color. Under a multistate system contemplated in S.B. 241, Georgia would be required to use a program to try and determine whether voters have changed residence outside of Georgia and then undertake processes of using data obtained through the program to identify voters who should be removed from the state’s voter registration rolls. But these programs routinely produce inconsistent, inaccurate, and in some cases, discriminatory results. These issues occur because the underlying data in these programs concerning another states’ voter files is often incomplete or inaccurate. In addition to errors in states’ voter files that could lead to false flags, many states describe the “date of registration” for their voters in different ways—for example, some states may use when the voter first registered, while other states may use the last time a voter updated his or her voter registration information. These problematic issues forced the Interstate Voter Registration Crosscheck Program (“Crosscheck”) to be disbanded and discredited.⁴

² Brittany Gibson, *Record Turnout in Georgia, but Mostly Before Election Day*, The American Prospect (Jan. 5, 2021), <https://prospect.org/politics/record-turnout-in-georgia-but-mostly-before-election-day/>; Adam Edelman, *It’s Too Important Now: Record Turnout, Black Voters Fuel Democratic Hopes in Georgia*, NBC News (Nov. 1, 2020), <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2020-election/it-s-too-important-now-record-turnout-black-voters-fuel-n1245416>.

³ LDF and SPLC Action plan to supplement our written testimony as we review S.B. 241 more closely, as well as after any amendments or substitutes are introduced.

⁴ *Common Cause v. Lawson*, 327 F. Supp. 3d 1139, 1143 (S.D. Ind. 2018) (holding that Indiana could not rely on information gleaned from the Interstate Voter Registration Crosscheck Program, alone, to cancel voter registrations because “statewide voter registration data does not provide the dates of registration in Indiana and other states to assist in determining what state

Crosscheck was widely criticized for disenfranchising eligible voters through its notoriously flawed matching software.⁵ Numerous states, including Florida, Washington, and Oregon, left the Crosscheck system after concluding that the data was unacceptably error-ridden.⁶ Academic scholarship analyzing the program found that over 99% of so-called matches identified by these programs had nothing to do with voter fraud.⁷ In December 2019, Crosscheck was suspended indefinitely as part of a settlement concerning allegations that the platform used by the Kansas Secretary of State's Office mistakenly exposed sensitive and personal voter information.⁸ Georgia should not enact a law mandating its participation in a flawed program like Crosscheck.

Mandated participation in a multistate program to identify and ultimately purge voters who may have moved is especially concerning because it could result in unlawful and racially discriminatory voter roll purges. According to one analysis of Crosscheck data, names associated with white voters were underrepresented in match lists by 8 percent, while names associated with Black voters were overrepresented on such lists by 45 percent.⁹ Georgia should not mandate participation in a system that will improperly flag voters, cannot provide the Georgia Secretary of State's Office with enough information to identify which registration came later in time, and that is widely known to lead to severe racial disparities in the voters who are flagged as double-registered and who are ultimately purged from the state voter rolls.

registration occurred first. . . . [e]ven if dates of registration information was provided, this information is not complete or consistent because states . . . do not always populate the registration date field, and they have different policies in how they determine which date to use, so there is no uniform practice among states.”).

⁵ Jonathan Brater, Kevin Morris, Myrna Pérez, and Christopher Deluzio, *Purges: A Growing Threat to the Right to Voter*, Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law (Aug. 2019), https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/2019-08/Report_Purges_Growing_Threat.pdf.

⁶ Peggy Lowe, *Kansans Caught In Crosscheck System Singled Out For Kobach's Voter Fraud Campaign*, KCUR (Feb. 7, 2017), <https://www.kcur.org/politics-elections-and-government/2017-02-07/kansans-caught-in-crosscheck-system-singled-out-for-kobachs-voter-fraud-campaign#stream/0>.

⁷ Christopher Ingraham, *This Anti-Voter-Fraud Program Gets it Wrong Over 99 Percent of the Time. The GOP Wants to Take it Nationwide*, Washington Post (July 20, 2017), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2017/07/20/this-anti-voter-fraud-program-gets-it-wrong-over-99-of-the-time-the-gop-wants-to-take-it-nationwide/>.

⁸ Roxana Hegeman, *Multistate Voter Database Suspended in Lawsuit Settlement*, AP, (Dec. 10, 2019), <https://www.aclukansas.org/en/press-releases/aclu-kansas-settlement-puts-crosscheck-out-commission-foreseeable-future-program>.

⁹ Lauren Harmon, Charles Posner, Michele Jawando, and Matt Dhaiti, *The Health of State Democracies*, Center for American Progress Action Fund (July 2015), <https://cdn.americanprogressaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/HSD-report-FINAL.pdf>.

These disparities are driven in part because nonwhite communities share surnames more commonly than white communities, leading to a greater number of flagged potential double voters. *Id.*

II. Section 7 – Photo Identification (“ID”) Requirement for Absentee Ballot Applications

Absentee ballots have been critical to ensuring that voters have equitable and safe access to the ballot box, especially for elections during the COVID 19 pandemic, which has had a particularly dire impact on Black and other communities of color. Absentee vote-by-mail voting, for example, set records for the November 3, 2020 general election.¹⁰ Yet the absentee ballot application photo ID requirement will dramatically limit absentee ballot access by imposing discriminatory and unnecessary burdens on voters.

The purported justifications for this photo ID requirement are pretextual. Proponents have argued that it is necessary to protect against voter fraud. But vote-by-mail is a safe, secure, reliable, and accessible method of voting that has been used by members of our military since the Civil War.¹¹ Five states currently conduct all elections entirely by mail, and at least 21 other states allow certain smaller elections to be held entirely by mail.¹² Forty-seven states hold elections with vote-by-mail procedures that do not include a photo ID requirement. Since 2000, more than 250 million votes have been cast via mail ballots in all 50 states.¹³ Notwithstanding false claims to the contrary, fraud rates are infinitesimally small.¹⁴ The same is true in Georgia. According to multiple statements by Governor Kemp,¹⁵ Lieutenant Governor Duncan,¹⁶ Secretary of State Raffensperger,¹⁷ and Georgia Voting Systems Manager

¹⁰ *Record Amount of Absentee Ballots Requested for Georgia Runoff Elections*, WSB-TV (Nov. 23, 2020), <https://www.wsbtv.com/news/local/record-amount-absentee-ballots-requested-georgia-runoff-elections/6Q3C72ADE5CXVDDMIXV5TGJLAA/>.

¹¹ Alex Seitz-Wald, *How Do You Know Voting by Mail Works? The U.S. Military’s Done it Since the Civil War*, NBC News (Apr. 19, 2020), <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2020-election/how-do-you-know-voting-mail-works-u-s-military-n1186926>.

¹² *Colorado, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington and Utah Conduct Elections Entirely by Mail*. AllMail Elections (aka Vote-By-Mail), National Conference of State Legislatures (Mar. 24, 2020) <https://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/all-mail-elections.aspx>; *Preparing Your State for an Election Under Pandemic Conditions*, Brennan Center for Justice (last updated Jun. 29, 2020) <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/preparing-your-state-election-under-pandemic-conditions#t3>.

¹³ Wendy R. Weiser and Harold Ekeh, *The False Narrative of Vote-by-Mail Fraud*, Brennan Center for Justice (Apr. 10, 2020), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/false-narrative-vote-mail-fraud>.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ Katherine Fung, *Gov. Kemp Says Ga. Fraud Claims ‘Have Left the Barn,’ After Trump Calls for His Resignation*, Newsweek (Dec. 30, 2020), <https://www.newsweek.com/gov-kemp-says-ga-fraud-claims-have-left-barn-after-trump-calls-his-resignation-1558140>.

¹⁶ Greg Bluestein, *Duncan Pushes Back on False Voter Fraud Claims: ‘We’re Better Than This,’ Atlanta Journal-Constitution* (Dec. 1, 2020), <https://www.ajc.com/politics/politics-blog/duncan-pushes-back-on-false-voter-fraud-claims-were-better-than-this/GSNRMYELPBBADHZ5RQ7LDTVHCE/>.

¹⁷ Quinn Scannlan, *‘We’ve Never Found Systemic Voter Fraud, Not Enough to Overturn the Election:’ Georgia Secretary of State Raffensperger Says*, ABC News (Dec. 6, 2020),

Gabriel Sterling,¹⁸ there was no evidence of widespread vote-by-mail fraud in Georgia, nor has there ever been.¹⁹ These statements and findings underscore why Georgia's vote-by-mail laws and procedures remain safe, secure, and reliable.

False allegations of voter fraud harken back to debunked conspiracy theories and corrosive myths.²⁰ It should therefore come as no surprise that S.B. 241's proponents have failed to identify or offer concrete facts and data to corroborate vague claims that the process for requesting an absentee ballot in Georgia is not secure. Georgia has relied on vote-by-mail procedures for decades. Equally telling, the motivations behind this bill are suspect because it was introduced immediately *after* Georgia voters generally—and especially Georgia voters of color—dramatically increased their use of absentee voting in the November 2020 general election and January 2021 runoff elections. Simply put, the photo ID requirement is a solution in search of a problem.

What is clear, however, is how the absentee ballot application photo ID requirement would create new and unwarranted burdens, if not outright barriers, for many voters. S.B. 241 would, for example, require voters to provide a Georgia driver's license or acceptable state ID card number when *applying* for an absentee ballot. Likewise, first-time voters who mailed in their voter registration without a copy of their ID must also submit a photocopy of ID when *applying* for their absentee ballot request. So even with a driver's license or state ID, a first-time voter who seeks to cast an absentee ballot must provide a photocopy of their ID at least once—either

<https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/weve-found-systemic-fraud-overturn-election-georgia-secretary/story?id=74560956>.

¹⁸ Miles Parks, *Georgia Election Official: Don't Let Misinformation 'Suppress Your Own Vote,'* NPR (Jan. 4, 2020), <https://www.npr.org/2021/01/04/953321408/georgia-election-official-dont-let-misinformation-suppress-your-own-vote>.

¹⁹ *3rd Strike Against Voter Fraud Claims Means They're Out After Signature Audit Finds No Fraud,* Secretary of State (Dec. 29, 2020), https://sos.ga.gov/index.php/elections/3rd_strike_against_voter_fraud_claims_means_theyre_out_after_signature_audit_finds_no_fraud.

²⁰ Alison Durkee, *'No Evidence' of Election Fraud in Battleground States, Statistical Analysis Finds as Trump Continues False Claims,* Forbes (Feb. 19, 2021), <https://www.forbes.com/sites/alisondurkee/2021/02/19/no-evidence-of-election-fraud-in-battleground-states-statistical-analysis-finds-as-trump-continues-false-claims/?sh=252533183315>; *The Myth of Voter Fraud,* Brennan Center for Justice (Feb. 2021), <https://www.brennancenter.org/issues/ensure-every-american-can-vote/vote-suppression/myth-voter-fraud>; Jonathan Raymond, *Georgia Sec. of State Issued Letter Refuting Fraud Claims Ahead of Electoral Vote Count,* 11Alive (Jan. 7, 2021), <https://www.11alive.com/article/news/politics/elections/brad-raffensperger-election-fraud-debunking-letter/85-753d4d72-df54-4019-a493-095f418050eb>; Hope Yen, Jeff Amy, and Michael Balsamo, *AP FACT CHECK: Trump's Made Up Claims of Fake Georgia Voters,* AP (Jan. 3, 2021), <https://apnews.com/article/ap-fact-check-donald-trump-georgia-elections-atlanta-c23d10e5299e14daee6109885f7dafa9>; Susan McCord, *Georgia Officials Debunk 'Secret Ballot Suitcase' Claim; To Recertify Results for Biden,* The August Chronicle (Dec. 7, 2020), <https://www.augustachronicle.com/story/news/politics/elections/presidential/2020/12/07/secret-suitcase-magic-ballots-actually-bag-ballots-packed/3858322001/>.

with their mail-in registration or with their vote-by-mail ballot application. This requirement creates a barrier for voters who do not have an acceptable photo ID and burdens voters who would need to obtain them to vote absentee. Moreover, voters who lack access to printers, scanners, copiers, or the Internet would have difficulty complying with this absentee voting requirement.

These harms would not be borne equally among voters. Indeed, enactment of S.B. 241 unduly burdens the fundamental right to vote of racial minority, low-income, elderly, rural, disabled, and student voters—all populations who disproportionately face challenges accessing DMV offices, a photocopier, and the ability to pay for photocopies, or a polling place to vote in-person. For instance, 16.6% of Georgia’s voting-age citizens who lack access to a vehicle live more than 10 miles from a state-ID issuing office.²¹ Almost all of these citizens live in rural areas where public transportation is unavailable.²² These areas also house high concentrations of people of color and people living in poverty.²³ The same groups of people would face similar challenges in accessing a photocopier to copy their ID, which S.B. 241 would require of voters without a driver’s license or state ID. For the elderly, people with disabilities, students, and others who cannot physically cast a ballot in-person and therefore rely on vote-by-mail, the burden of S.B. 241’s ID requirements on the right to vote is particularly acute. Such exacerbating factors and their impact on people of color and other historically disenfranchised groups have led stringent ID requirements adopted by other states to be invalidated as violating the U.S. Constitution or the Voting Rights Act of 1965.²⁴

III. Section 12 – Witness and Photo ID Requirements to Vote Absentee

Section 12 is another purported problem in search of a solution. As described above, whether requesting or casting an absentee ballot, Georgia’s vote-by-mail system is safe and secure. Without offering any specific facts or data, S.B. 241 proponents continue to rely on unfounded and corrosive voter fraud myths to limit absentee voting.²⁵ Under Section 12, casting an absentee ballot would require a witness requirement and photo ID requirement. Yet neither one of these requirements would serve a legitimate state interest.

²¹ Keesha Gaskins and Sundeep Iyer, *The Challenge of Obtaining Voter Identification*, Brennan Center for Justice (2012), at 4, https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/2019-08/Report_Challenge_of_Obtaining_Voter_ID.pdf.

²² *Id.* at 5.

²³ *Id.* at 1, 5.

²⁴ *See, e.g., North Carolina State Conf. of NAACP v. McCrory*, 831 F.3d 204, 222 (4th Cir. 2016) (finding North Carolina voter ID law was motivated by discriminatory racial intent, and noting “legislatures cannot restrict access to the franchise based on the desire to benefit a certain political party” (internal citations omitted)); *Veasey v. Abbott*, 830 F.3d 216 (5th Cir. 2016) (finding Texas voter ID law was racially discriminatory under the Voting Rights Act); *Veasey v. Abbott*, 249 F. Supp. 3d 868 (S.D. Tex. 2017) (finding Texas voter ID law was enacted with racially discriminatory purpose).

²⁵ *Supra* n. 20.

As described above, Georgia election officials have repeatedly affirmed there was no evidence of widespread vote-by-mail fraud in Georgia, nor has there ever been.²⁶ These findings and statements are consistent with national studies, judicial findings, and government investigations, including in Georgia.²⁷

For the same reasons that the ID requirement for the absentee ballot *application* under Section 7 raises severe concerns, a photo ID requirement for the absentee ballot itself imposes unnecessary barriers and burdens on absentee voting, especially for racial minority, low-income, elderly, rural, disabled, and student voters. Those discriminatory and unnecessary burdens do not serve a legitimate state interest. Nor do the burdens imposed by the witness requirement, especially during an ongoing pandemic, outweigh any purported state interests. And there is a witness requirement exception for certain categories of absentee voters under S.B. 241, which, again undermines the purported justification to deter voter fraud.

IV. Fiscal and Racial Impact Study

Any bill, particularly one as here, with such far reaching implications for the fundamental right to vote cannot be properly assessed and evaluated without understanding its full impact. As described above, the disproportionate burdens and impacts of photo ID requirements and a cross-check voter registration have been judicially recognized and well-documented. Moreover, the harms on the right to vote will be exacerbated by the interactions of multiple provisions that each limit voting options in different ways. The burdens placed on absentee ballots, for example, would increase voter demand for in-person advance voting. Yet this bill also restricts the placement of advance voting locations. Several of S.B. 241's provisions could also impose significant unfunded mandates on counties that faced budgetary difficulties in the 2020 election cycle.²⁸ All of these considerations underscore why a fiscal and racial impact analysis is necessary to understand how S.B. 241 will impact election administration and voters.

Yet LDF and SPLC Action have still not been made aware of any analysis conducted by this Committee or the Georgia General Assembly that S.B. 241 will not disproportionately harm voters of color and other voters or impose unfunded mandates on county election officials. Accordingly, before any Committee vote, either this Committee or the Georgia General Assembly must study, analyze, and publicly identify the fiscal and racial impact of S.B. 241.

²⁶ *Supra* n. 16–19.

²⁷ *Supra* n. 13.

²⁸ As one example, Voting Rights Lab recently conducted an analysis of the fiscal impact of certain election administration bills being considered by the Georgia General Assembly. *See Fiscal Impact of Certain Election Administration Bills Under Consideration in the Georgia General Assembly*, Voting Rights Lab (Feb. 22, 2021), <https://votingrightslab.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Fiscal-Impact-of-Georgia-Election-Bills.pdf>.

V. Legislative Process

The legislative environment in which S.B. 241 has been offered calls for the rejection of this bill because it is not open, transparent, or inclusive. The current iteration is twenty-five pages and was only available on the Georgia Senate's website this morning, February 24, 2021. Then, less than twenty-four hours later, this Committee plans to hold a hearing before all of its members at 7:30 a.m. tomorrow, February 25, 2021. Before this hearing, the Chair indicated public testimony via remote means, including Zoom, would not be available.

Under non-pandemic circumstances, it raises serious concerns to spring hearings on the public with effectively no notice, expect people to digest an omnibus bill seeking to change many of Georgia's election laws and procedures, and to provide limited means for participation. That stratagem, in the context of a pandemic, when people must prepare and consider safeguards to participate in-person or prepare to participate remotely is unacceptable. Both individually, and collectively, this reflects an effort to shroud these proceedings in secrecy and unduly influence the legislative record.

The scheduling of the hearings, particularly at 7:30 a.m. in the morning, combined with limited testimony options, will exclude community members who may not be able to attend in-person hearings because they do not live in or near Atlanta, are concerned about contracting COVID-19, and/or have family or work obligations that prevent them from attending a 7:30 a.m. or earlier hearing. It is imperative that you hear from and listen to *all* community members who desire to provide public testimony—either in-person or through remote means—during your Committee hearings. Equally important, this Committee must post clear guidelines for providing and receiving public input well in advance of any hearing.

For these reasons, we also request the Committee does *not* vote on S.B. 241 until the week of March 1.

VI. Federal Protections

It is likely that S.B. 241 violates various federal laws. The facts recited above, including the sequence of events (particularly the timing of the effort to impose this restriction on absentee voting), procedural departures from ordinary legislative processes (particularly the exclusion of public participation), the lack of any neutral justification for the proposals, and the foreseeable disparate impact on Black voters and other voters of color, suggest the provisions embodied in Sections 4, 7, and 12 of S.B. 241, individually and collectively raise serious concerns under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. *Vill. of Arlington Heights v. Metro. Hous. Dev. Corp.*, 429 U.S. 252 (1977); 52

U.S.C. 10301. These same provisions in Sections 4, 7, and 12 burden the right to vote without any legitimate state interest, which may also violate the First and Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.²⁹ Moreover, this Committee has not offered reasonable modifications necessary to ensure voters with disabilities will not be screened out from fully and equally participating in elections, which may violate Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act. 42 U.S.C. § 12131.

* * *

We agree that our elections must be safe and secure. But S.B. 241 does nothing to enhance either goal. Instead, this bill is calculated, in legislative process and substance, to attempt to minimize the participation of voters of color and other voters in our political life following the historical participation in recent elections, especially for Black voters and other voters of color. Its enactment would create unnecessary barriers, burdens, and disproportionately impact the voting rights of people of color, the elderly, people with disabilities, low-income people, rural residents, and students. It would also contravene popular mandate from recent elections and advocacy to expand voting rights in Georgia.

Our democracy requires free and open access to the sacred right to vote. As we prepare for elections this year and beyond, it is incumbent on this Committee and the Georgia Legislature to respond to the needs of its constituents. Those needs, as demonstrated through recent Georgia elections, are to preserve and expand, rather than restrict, access to the ballot box. That goal can only be accomplished by voting no on S.B. 241 and immediately withdrawing it.

Sincerely,

/s/ John S. Cusick

John S. Cusick, Litigation Fellow

Michael Pernick, Redistricting Counsel

Sam Spital, Director of Litigation

Leah C. Aden, Deputy Director of Litigation

NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc.

40 Rector Street, 5th Fl.

New York, NY 10006

(917) 858-2870

jcusick@naacpldf.org

²⁹ See *Burdick v. Takushi*, 504 U.S. 428 (1992) (“A court considering a challenge to a state election law must weigh ‘the character and magnitude of the asserted injury to the rights protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments that the plaintiffs seeks to vindicate’ against ‘the precise interest put forward by the State as justifications for the burden imposed by its rule,’ taking into consideration ‘the extent to which those interests make it necessary to burden the plaintiff’s rights.’”) (quoting *Anderson v. Celebrezze*, 460 U.S. 780, 789 (1983)).

/s/ Pichaya Poy Winichakul
Pichaya Poy Winichakul, Staff Attorney
Nancy G. Abudu, Deputy Legal Director
Voting Rights Practice Group
SPLC Action Fund
PO Box 1287
Decatur, GA 30031-1287
(470) 597-3010
nancy.abudu@splccenter.org
poy.winichakul@splcenter.org

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (“LDF”)

Since its founding in 1940, LDF has used litigation, policy advocacy, public education, and community organizing strategies to achieve racial justice and equity in education, economic justice, political participation, and criminal justice. Throughout its history, LDF has worked to enforce and promote laws and policies that increase access to the electoral process and prohibit voter discrimination, intimidation, and suppression. LDF has been fully separate from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (“NAACP”) since 1957, though LDF was originally founded by the NAACP and shares its commitment to equal rights.

SPLC Action Fund

SPLC Action Fund is a catalyst for racial justice in the South and beyond, working in partnership with communities to dismantle white supremacy, strengthen intersectional movements, and advance the human rights of all people. SPLC Action Fund is the 501(c)4 affiliate organization to the Southern Poverty Law Center. For more information, visit www.splcactionfund.org.