



June 5, 2026

VIA EMAIL TO:

Speaker Jason White
P.O. Box 246
West, MS 39192
jwhite@house.ms.gov

Lt. Gov. Delbert Hosemann
P.O. Box 1018
Jackson, MS, 39215
ltgov@senate.ms.gov

Re: Select Committees on Redistricting and Reapportionment

Dear Speaker White and Lt. Governor Hosemann:

In recent weeks, separate Select Committees have been appointed in the Senate and the House to examine possible mid-decade redistricting. We the undersigned agree there is no need for any mid-decade legislative or congressional redistricting, and the Supreme Court districts should only be redrawn to comply with Section 2 and one-person, one-vote principles. Beyond these substantive concerns, we also write to request that, as a procedural matter, any consideration of mid-decade redistricting by the Select Committees or any other body be subject to the highest standards of integrity and transparency. Mississippians deserve no less.

Redistricting is Unwarranted and Creates Serious Legal Risk

To be clear at the outset,¹ decade redistricting is unwarranted. Black voters remain underrepresented in the legislature, congress, and our courts. For example, Mississippi is 38% Black, but there is only 1 congressional district where Black voters have the opportunity to elect candidates of choice (25%) and 16 such State Senate districts (30%). Mississippi has only a single Black State Supreme Court Justice (11%).

¹ See generally Michael Goldberg & Taylor Vance, "Betrayal" or "Saving Our Country." *Mississippi Leaders React to Supreme Court Voting Rights Decision*, DeSoto Cnty. News (Peyton Taylor repub., April 29, 2026) https://desotocountynews.com/mississippi-news/betrayal-or-saving-our-country-mississippi-leaders-react-to-supreme-court-voting-rights-decision/#google_vignette

Going backwards and eliminating existing opportunity districts would be unlawful, creating serious legal risks and headaches for candidates, voters, and election officials—saddling the taxpayers with unnecessary legal bills. The Legislature cannot and should not revert to lines or schemes that have already been determined to dilute Black voting strength, which would constitute intentional discrimination.² Indeed, it does not need to draw new lines at all.

The U.S. Supreme Court's opinion in *Louisiana v. Callais*³ decision does not cast any doubt on existing Black opportunity districts, and indeed, it assumes their existence as its premise. The success of the Voting Rights Act thus far, including in the Legislature's efforts to adhere to Section 2 in redistricting in recent redistricting cycles, is precisely why Mississippi has something approaching a "full-blown two-party system" in the first place.⁴ Moreover, the Court in *Callais* affirmed the validity of Section 2,⁵ which still prohibits legislators from enacting discriminatory maps that result in Black voters not being able to select candidates of their choice. The Court refused to abandon the prior framework that had, for decades, defined Section 2's sweep.⁶ Instead, the Court stated it was merely "updating"⁷ that framework.

Redistricting plans that constitute racial vote dilution will (still) run headlong into that updated framework. No court order or legal principle requires the Legislature to redistrict now. While the U.S. Supreme Court did vacate the decision in *Bd. of Election Comm'rs v. NAACP* and remand for further consideration⁸ it did so without any comment on whether the three-judge panel might reach the same result on reconsideration, as a three-judge panel in Alabama did only recently.⁹ Simply put, there is no need to re-enter the thicket of redistricting at this point, and there are many reasons to avoid that course.

Any Exploration of Mid-Decade Redistricting Should Be Subject to the Highest Standards of Transparency

² *Allen v. Milligan*, 143 S. Ct. 1487, 1505 (2023) (Section II), *distinguished by Louisiana v. Callais*, 146 S. Ct. 1131, 1160 (2026) ("The decision in that case was based on the State of Alabama's specific argument that its 'race-neutral benchmark' was 'necessary in a redistricting case.'").

³ *Callais*, 146 S. Ct. at 1131.

⁴ *Id.* at 1158.

⁵ *Id.* at 1143 ("Correctly understood, § 2 does not impose liability at odds with the Constitution . . .").

⁶ *Id.* at 1157.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *State Bd. of Election Comm'rs v. Miss. State Conference of the NAACP*, No. 25-234, 2026 U.S. LEXIS 2144, 2026 WL 1377105, at *1 (May 18, 2026)

⁹ Kim Chandler & David A. Lieb, *Federal Court Blocks Alabama Plan for New Congressional Districts That Could Help Republicans*, Associated Press (May 26, 2026, 1:40 PM CDT), <https://apnews.com/article/redistricting-congress-alabama-voting-rights-trump-b67125657b36e9b915ea9bc5d587d08c>