


JUNE 2026


Social Justice Brief

Mel Wilson, MBA, LCSW

Senior Policy Advisor
National Association of Social Workers



Voting Rights Crisis – Louisiana v. Callais




The primary mission of the social work profession is to enhance human well-being and help meet the basic human needs of all people, with particular attention to the needs and empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty.



750 First Street NE, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20002-4241
SocialWorkers.org

The National Association of Social Workers (NASW) is the largest membership organization of professional social workers in the United States. NASW works to enhance the professional growth and development of its members, to create and maintain professional standards, and to advance sound social policies.



Voting Rights Crisis – Louisiana v. Callais

On April 29, 2026, the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) voted 6-3 to greatly narrow Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act (1965). By now, this decision has been widely discussed and debated. There is a building consensus that the Louisiana v. Callais ruling significantly reshapes the limitations of race (and ethnicity) in considering redistricting.

The immediate impact of this ruling is that Louisiana 2024 congressional map—containing a second majority-Black district—was an unconstitutional racial gerrymandering thereby relieving the state of the requirement to establish the new majority Black district. However, the long-term impact goes well beyond the basic Court ruling on the case. During the first week after SCOTUS action, it became clear that without a doubt, the SCOTUS ruling in Louisiana v. Callais represents one of the most consequential setbacks to voting-rights protections since VRA was passed.

Moreover, civil-rights, legal scholars, and the pro-democracy community warn that the decision will disenfranchise Black and Brown voters by weakening the voting protections formerly included in Section 2 of VRA. These experts also warn that redistricting—using the modified Section 2 parameters—will dilute the power of existing majority-minority districts to choose candidates that they feel are best for responding to their community's needs. Prior to Callais, the VRA affirmed the right of the Department of Justice to require states to create majority-minority districts to ensure fair elections and representation for a

people—primarily African Americans—that had been unjustly deprived of the right to vote.

With that in mind, there is unease that the Court's Louisiana v. Callais action created a permission structure that has led to a new wave of aggressive racial gerrymandering reminiscent of the post-Reconstruction Jim Crow era where Deep South states systematically denied African Americans political power through voter suppression and voter intimidation. Analysts warn that the expected onslaught of redistricting—driven by the Callais decision—has the potential to reverse decades of progress in minority political representation achieved since the civil-rights movement.

The SCOTUS majority opinion Louisiana v. Callais hints at a conscious disregard for the ensuing racial flashpoint that they surely knew—or should have known—would occur once the majority mindset was made public. This was because the Court's majority opinion interpreted Section 2 in such a way that would inevitably provoke the civil and voting rights community—who indeed quickly expressed their alarm.

In addition to their deep disappointment with the decision overall, many advocates perceive a historical and moral incongruity in the majority's interpretation. The incongruity is tied to the fact that the Court's majority based its opinion on the proposition that the second majority Black district (under the authority of Section 2) effectively denies non-Black voters fair electoral representation—resulting in unconstitutional racial gerrymandering. However, at the same time, several credible experts support the idea that partisan gerrymandering is no more justifiable than racial gerrymandering .

It seems that the Court—without directly saying it—applied reasoning that is closely akin to beliefs that are aligned with a "colorblind-society" philosophy, which assumes that explicit use of race as a remedy to address past racism is unconstitutional, even when used to remedy racial inequality.

With that in mind, the Court's reasoning and ultimately its remedy turns history on its head. Their remedy for the perceived wrong of creating a second majority Black district—as required by Section 2—was to outright disallow that district. However, to justify its prohibition to racial gerrymandering remedy, the majority grabbed onto the rationale that "non-Black voters"—a term that the plaintiff euphemistically use to refer to white people—will potentially be discriminated against due to their race.


Yet, the Court appears to ignore the historical harmful realities of Jim Crow era voting suppression tactics and the present day realities that—without voting protection from VRA—African Americans will continue to suffer actual voting rights inequities. All of


which seems to justify upholding Section 2 of VRA instead of gutting it.

All things considered, in order to reach its conclusions, the majority's reasoning implies that race-conscious protections are no longer justified because racial discrimination in voting is no longer sufficiently present in America. By espousing that position, wittingly or unwittingly, SCOTUS embraced a widely-held the point of view shared by most leaders from Deep South governors—that VRA is a relic of the past. In truth, that viewpoint is an active part of the post-Callais redistricting decision making as exemplified by following—quote from an Alabama government official:

"It's not our responsibility to create a minority party district so that somehow or another their voices can be heard," He added that "Alabama's legacy of slavery and racial discrimination, the issues that made it necessary to have a Voting Rights Act in the first place, are " no longer in play."

Suggesting that VRA is "no longer in play" exposes an underlying justification for the rush to redraw voting maps belief among far-right factions that—in the aftermath of Callais—provable racial gerrymandering is a myth. That justification is fortified by the open secret that conservatives on the Supreme Court have long been sympathetic to the argument that VRA was unnecessary and unfair to Deep South states. Relatedly, there is Chief Justice John Roberts's opinion—in the majority decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*—that the South had changed enough to render VRA's protections such as SECTION 2 and SECTION 5 no longer justified.





Deep South States Capitalizing on SCOTUS Callias Decision

Armed with those weapons, Deep South states formed a loose consensus to initiate drawing revised Congressional maps for their respective states aimed at diluting and/or eliminating Black political power. This unofficial state-to-state collaboration on ways to maximize the apparent opportunities arising from the Callias ruling had a role in the following near immediate redistricting actions of key states:

States Immediately Announce Redistricting Plans

Even before the Callias decision, 2026 midterm and 2028 presidential election Republican election strategists had anticipated a favorable SCOTUS redistricting ruling and encouraged key governors to draft plans foredrawing their election maps. One such state, (Florida) was well ahead of the pack with its redistricting plan. Several others reacted shortly after Callias was decided. The following briefly describe their actions:

Florida—Governor Ron DeSantis, without hesitation, Florida moved forward with its uncompromising redrawn congressional map. DeSantis advanced a map that redrew 21 of its 28 congressional districts and signed it into law. The governor’s timing was not coincidental. He undoubtedly anticipated and planned for a favorable ruling well before official presenting his re-drawn map. Republican Governors—primarily in southern states—were not far behind Florida in their rapid response to the Court’s ruling. Egged on by President Trump and far-right activists, several key Republican states took action. Details of the redistricting strategies of these states are as follows:

Tennessee has received a great deal of media attention because of its almost instantaneous and very public statement of its plan to redistrict in the aftermath of the Callias ruling. First and foremost, the Tennessee’s post-Callias redistricting plan suggests a calculated strategy to dismantle the state’s only majority Black congressional district. This will be achieved by splitting (heavily minority and Democratic) Memphis and Shelby County into multiple Republican-leaning districts. This gerrymandering tactic nearly guarantees a 9–0 Republican congressional delegation, and targets Rep. Steve Cohen, a longtime progressive Memphis Democrat who, after redistricting, is likely to lose his seat. As an update, the state’s redistricting map was approved by its legislature on May 7, 2026.

Further hindering Black access to the ballot, Tennessee Republicans removed a provision requiring voters to be alerted about changes to their designated polling places. This rule change is a voting suppression tactic that triggered when voters may show up to a location where they have voted for 20 years and are informed on Election Day they are no longer allowed to vote there. At best, voters will only be inconvenienced but still be able to vote in time, but there is also a high probability that many voters will become discouraged and not vote at all.

Alabama—Alabama’s governor called a special legislative session within days of the ruling to pursue a new congressional map. State leaders signaled they would use the weakened VRA standard to justify reducing or eliminating majority-minority districts, aiming to secure additional Republican-leaning seats. Please note that initially Alabama’s

redistricting effort suffered a setback after lower courts rejected the state relief from an earlier order which restricts state lawmakers from redistricting until the next Census in 2030. However, very recently the Supreme Court overturned the lower court meaning that the district maps the state sought to adopt in 2023 now go into effect. In an early May 2026 decision, Scotus allowed Alabama to use a congressional map that a lower courts previously ruled had intentionally discriminated against Black voters. As a remedy, the lower court ordered the state to create a second majority Black district. However, in overruling the lower court, SCOTUS negated the order for a second Black congressional district. SCOTUS based its decision on its highly contentious rationale articulated in Louisiana v. Callais opinion.

The Court's three liberal justices dissented—arguing that the majority was enabling racially discriminatory maps and undermining the Voting Rights Act. Nonetheless, despite Justice Sotomayor's passionate dissent, the state's Black citizens will lose one of its two existing Black members of Congress.

Louisiana—As the state directly affected by Callais, Louisiana suspended its May 16 House primaries the day after the ruling and began preparing a new congressional map. The Supreme Court struck down its map for creating two majority-Black districts, ruling it an unconstitutional racial gerrymander. Lawmakers were urged to redraw lines under the new, narrower interpretation of the Voting Rights Act.


Mississippi—Mississippi is facing intense political pressure to redraw its four U.S. House districts ahead of the 2026 midterms.


Reports indicate the White House is pressuring state lawmakers to redraw the map in a way that would eliminate Rep. Bennie Thompson's district. In response to the White House urgings, the state is considering redrawing its congressional map in 2026. However, no new map has been finalized—the timeline for such a map is unclear. As of now, Mississippi continues to operate using its existing four-district congressional map—which they adopted after the 2020 Census. A more recent update indicates that the governor appeared to downplay the prospect of redistricting in time for the 2026 midterms by saying he saw "no need" for the state to redraw its House maps.

The blow of the Supreme Court decision will undoubtedly have an impact the state and local level. This is because the SCOTUS decision significantly limits how courts can require states to account for race in redistricting—in Mississippi and in other Deep South states, race and party identity are inseparable.

South Carolina—Even though the Callais decision opens the door for South Carolina to redraw its voting map, as of now, they have not finalized approval of a new map. While there are elements in the state's legislature that seek redistricting, the South Carolina Senate voted 29–17 in opposition to going forward with changing the voting map ahead of the 2026 elections. Five Republican senators joined Democrats to block the resolution to redistrict—meaning that there is paused for the time being.

Regardless, the Republican-led legislature had been gearing up to—one way or another—draw up and approve a map that conforms





with *Louisiana v. Callais* before the 2026 midterms. This was in spite of the fact that a Callais-based map would have assuredly eliminate the House seat held by the venerable Jim Clyburn, the state's only Democratic member of Congress and—by default—its only Black member of Congress.

In a turn of events, South Carolina lawmakers surprisingly chose not to pursue new congressional redistricting before the 2026 midterms. This was because, according to reports, the Republican-led legislature disagreed about extending the legislative session which would be required to adopt a new map. There were also divisions within the majority party about the timing and possible electoral risks of redistricting at this time. This is despite pressure from national GOP figures, including President Trump including President Trump to immediately redraw the congressional map.

Georgia—The Georgia governor recently signed a proclamation convening the state's General Assembly for a special session—on June 17—to address redistricting in the wake of a landmark U.S. Supreme Court ruling. The ruling is expected to require changes to Georgia's electoral maps before the 2028 election cycle. The lawmakers will be limited to two specific purposes during the special session. (1) to consider enacting, revising, repealing or amending state law for creating congressional districts and (2) agreeing that any changes in the maps to take effect for the 2028 election cycle—as opposed to the 2026 midterms.

Black Georgia legislators—and the Black community in general—strongly object to the special session. The Democratic Party of

Georgia called the move a “brazen attempt to take away the voting power of Black Georgians.” He further stated that attempts to strip Georgians of their access to fair representation will galvanize Georgia Black voters to resist new congressional maps.

“Red State” Redistricting Outside of Deep South States

Such aggressive redistricting is not limited to the states discussed above. Perhaps more ominous is that other “red” states will view the Callais decision as a “greenlight” to redraw their maps in such a way to dilute the vote of racial groups under the pretext that they are creating a partisan map without consideration of race. A concrete example of this line of thinking is the state of Arizona is seriously considering suing to redraw its voting map on the premise that Arizona's current map was drawn with consideration of race. State officials argue that because of the Callais decision, Arizona should be allowed to redraw its current map. If the courts agree with Arizona's argument, it is likely that other “red” states will follow suit.

Disparate Impact on Black and other Voters of Color

A Third of the Congressional Black Caucus Could Lose Seats Amid Redistricting Fight

There are fears that nearly a third of the membership of the Congressional Black Caucus—19 of its 62 members—are at risk of losing their seats from now through the 2028 election cycle. This projection includes Black members of Congress outside the traditional Deep South states. The “19 of 62 members” estimate references a much broader national set of potentially vulnerable districts, including Black representatives in Midwestern and border states, not just

Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina.

A cruel irony to the price that Black and, to some degree, Hispanic politicians pay in the form of greatly diminished political power directly attributable to the Callais decision, is that national Republican leaders project a sense of righteousness about the spate of redistricting. For example, Speaker of the House Mike Johnson—when asked about the perceived impact of the SCOTUS ruling on Black members of Congress—made the following statement:

“The Supreme Court issued a long-awaited opinion, and I think it was long overdue, and they stated the obvious, that drawing congressional lines must be fair,” Johnson said. “You cannot draw lines on the basis of race, and that’s what was done in Louisiana.” This is a statement by one of the nation’s highest ranking political officials who— ironically—represents a state (Louisiana) that has maintained political power through racial gerrymandering since the 1870s.

To fully understand the impact of post-Louisiana v. Callais redistricting efforts in Deep South states, it is important to recognize that many of the districts targeted for elimination, fragmentation, or significant alteration are located in majority-Black areas. As has been mentioned, multiple states—including Alabama, Tennessee, and Louisiana—have pursued or enacted maps that either reduce the number of majority-Black districts or divide Black population centers in ways that weaken their electoral influence.


Racial Gerrymandering Will be Bolstered by Other Election Disruption Tools


This fact becomes more startling when we look at the percentage of Black residents in these states—followed by looking at the number of Black people representing the respective states in Congress. What we immediately see are the unmistakable disparities in political power of Blacks in relation to their percentage of the states’ overall population. To make this point clearer, 2020 census data for the deep south states currently committed to immediate to redistricting reveal the following:

- » Alabama—26.8% Black:
1 Black House of Representative;
- » Louisiana—31.4% Black:
1 Black House of Representative;
- » Mississippi—38% Black:
1 Black House of Representative
- » Tennessee—15% Black:
0 Black House of Representative; and
- » South Carolina—25% Black:
1 Black House of Representatives.

Likewise, currently there are only two Black senators elected in Deep South states that have high Black populations—South Carolina—25% Black and Georgia—33% Black.

These data show the degree to which Black people are currently underrepresented as compared to their percentage of the respective states’ populations. The disparate impact of renewed redistricting is that these woeful numbers—with respect to proportionate political power—will get even worse once redistricting is complete.





To take the analogy a step further, when we combine Black and Hispanic populations (of the targeted deep south states) in comparison to white political power, we find that population of those states (combined) are communities of color. Yet, of the 48 members of Congress (includes senators) from the deep south states, 12 are Black—0 are Hispanic. This disparity is frequently cited as evidence of continued underrepresentation relative to demographic population strength in much the deep south.

However, it would be a grave mistake to focus solely on Republican gerrymandering driven by the Callais outcome. The reality is that Trump and MAGA adherents are committed to using any means necessary—including completely undermining fair and free elections—to maintain power.

A case in point is that recently, the Republican National Committee (RNC) announced it would be deploying “poll watchers” and “election observers” to at least 17 states. Purportedly, this action is associated with the RNC “election integrity” program. Detractors are skeptical that “election integrity” is nothing more than a voter suppression and election subversion strategy. Like the voter intimidators who came before them, they are trying to control who votes so they can control the outcome of the election.

The momentous blow to steady advancement of voting rights (thanks to VRA) notwithstanding, leaders of voting rights and voter protection groups fully understand the urgency and immediacy of the situation. With the 2026 midterm elections being close to six months away, there is no time for prolonged debates

over the Court’s action. A hopeful saving grace is that the leading voting rights and civil rights organizations have been in an adversarial relationship with Trumpism since the first Trump administration. Consequently, these leaders have been studying, organizing, and preparing for not only a fight against racial gerrymandering, but also against comprehensive voter suppression practices that the far-right is certain to use.

Strategy for Countering Disenfranchising Redistricting Emergency Mobilization of Voting and Civil Rights Coalitions

It is evident that within a few days in the aftermath of SCOTUS’s ruling on Louisiana v. Callais the social justice outcry has intensified and has become much more volatile. To a significant degree, the precipitating event for the increased tensions was the near-malicious actions led by Tennessee governor and the state’s legislature who were bent on immediately redrawing the state’s voting map. Activists were alarmed by what they perceived as overt racism in the redistricting process, design and intent.

This generated a national conversation within and between voting rights, civil rights, and racial justice coalitions calling for a unified response to Callais. The unifying message is that deep south states—such as Tennessee—are using the Callais ruling not only to undermine the Voting Rights Act, but to reverse civil rights gains to the pre-1964 Jim Crow era. The call to action that ensued included the following action plans and mobilization efforts by multiple concerned entities: NAACP Legal Defense Fund Voting Rights Initiative is working to “protect voting rights

and support Black political engagement” through litigation, advocacy, and voter mobilization. Likewise, a broader cohort of national civil and voting rights advocates—coalitions and partnerships—have publicly stated that they are in the process of “relocating” the fight from federal courts toward state legislatures, state constitutions, local organizing, and community mobilization efforts.

Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (LCCHR) and many of its coalition partners—including the National Association of Social Workers (NASW)—are pursuing a multi-front strategy in response to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Louisiana v. Callais*. The LCCHR coalition mobilizations are following these tenets:

Aggressive litigation and legal coordination

Organizations such as the [NAACP Legal Defense Fund](#), [ACLU](#), [Brennan Center for Justice](#), and state-based voting-rights groups are (collaboratively or individually) legally challenging state legislative maps that dilute Black and Brown people’s voting strength. Moreover, because VRA’s protections were so weakened due to *Callais*, voting rights advocates will [litigate using state constitutions and state voting-rights statutes](#) to challenge voting rights abuses.

Large-scale voter mobilization and protection operations

Coalition partners are expanding voter-registration drives, election-protection hotlines, poll-monitoring operations, transportation-to-the-polls programs, multilingual outreach, and community organizing in heavily impacted Black and Latino communities. Many organizations

argue that if courts become less willing to intervene, turnout and grassroots civic participation become even more important strategic defenses.

Public messaging and democracy framing


LCCHR and its member organizations is framing the *Callais* ruling not simply as a technical redistricting dispute, but as part of a broader attack on post-1965 civil and voting rights protections. Coalition members view the *Callais* decision and the subsequent rush to redistrict as being akin to the pre-Voting Rights Act South. Because of this concern, they will share the warning that the decision may accelerate dismantling of majority-Black districts throughout the South, with a national audience of mobilized advocates.


Coalition-expansion and rapid-response infrastructure

LCCHR historically functions as an umbrella coordinating body for more than 200 civil-rights, labor, faith, disability-rights, and democracy organizations. In the wake of *Callais*, that infrastructure is being used to synchronize litigation, media strategy, lobbying, grassroots mobilization, and election monitoring across multiple states simultaneously.

Counter Redistricting by Democrats

The main option for offsetting the gains Republicans may have through redistricting is for Democrat-led states to consider redistricting for their states. This option is, of course, being discussed formally and informally both by advocates and political leaders alike. At least four Democratic-led states are publicly reported to be weighing or exploring the possibility of redistricting in the wake of the Supreme Court’s *Louisiana v.*





Callais ruling—but only one (New York) has clearly taken steps in that direction. The “blue” states that have either initiated redoing their voting maps or are contemplating doing so include:

1. New York—actively redistricting
New York Democrats have openly stated they are redrawing their congressional map because of the Callais ruling and the redistricting moves by Republican-led states.

2. Illinois—Weighing the option
Illinois Democrats have been mentioned in political reporting as considering whether to revisit their congressional map, especially if GOP gains in the Deep South accelerate their redistricting.

3. Maryland—Weighing the option
Maryland Democrats are reported as potentially exploring a redraw, though no formal process has begun. Maryland’s governor is strongly pushing for the state to re-write its map. However, the Democratic President Maryland’s Senate is opposed. Currently, there is a standoff. The state has a history of aggressive map-drawing, making it likely they will do so.

4. Colorado—Early discussions
Colorado appears in political commentary as a state Democrats might look to, though its independent redistricting commission makes actual action unlikely. Still, it is being discussed in the political community. We should be reminded that the whole notion of redistricting—for both Democrats and Republicans—is focused on the 2026 midterm elections and the 2028 presidential election. Therefore, it is very possible that state governors and legislators will forgo

redistricting in time for the midterms but will do so targeting the 2028 presidential elections.

All Roads Lead to the South

The All Roads Lead to the South movement is a prime example of the urgency message that is being broadcast in the wake of the Calais ruling. The movement brought together civil rights groups, faith leaders, voting-rights advocates, and community organizations to oppose what they described as a coordinated assault on Black voting power, especially through redistricting and state-level voting restrictions. Participants framed the South as the historic and current battleground for voting rights, emphasizing that new tactics—economic pressure, political organizing, community action, culture, and faith—are needed to protect democracy today.

More than 5,000 demonstrators marched in Selma and Montgomery alone, making it one of the largest voting-rights protests in the South in recent years. Speakers emphasized that the dismantling of the Voting Rights Act represents unfinished business and called for a renewed generation of activism.

Conclusion

The Supreme Court’s (SCOTUS) decision on the redistricting case of *Louisiana v. Calais* will be essentially completely discussed for decades as a seminal event in American history. Many voting and civil rights leaders were not necessarily surprised that the Court gutted the Voting Rights Act. However, they were shocked by the Court’s majority opinion that disregarded historical and current racism in the U.S. voting system—while at the same time stating that non-Black citizens would be victims of race-based discrimination if a

majority Black district were allowed to go forward.

The descriptive term identifying the plaintiff (Bert Callais) as a “non-Black” voter stands out as a red flag. According to Democracy Docket, Callais is an election denier and an active participant in the Jan. 6 Capitol riot. This fact is important here because it strongly suggests “cultural war” motives for bring the suit in the first place. While there is no direct connection between Mr. Callais and SCOTUS, the Court adopted reverse discrimination language favored by the far right is troubling.

When we couple SCOTUS’ decision with the enthusiastic manner in which the state of Tennessee took when it eliminated the state’s only Black voting district, we must conclude that racial gerrymandering is not as illegal as the Court would have us believe. This fact confirms a concern among voting and civil rights organizations that under the cover of the Callais ruling Deep Southern states will increasingly disguise what is clear racial gerrymandering as being “partisan” redistricting. Because Black voters are overwhelmingly registered as Democrats, state such as Tennessee can claim that they are targeting the political party not the race. Civil-rights advocates argue this subterfuge will enable the dismantling of majority-minority districts across southern states.


Pro-democracy activists and political leaders who embrace free and fair elections will be confronted with major challenges over coming months and years. These challenges basically reflect two areas: (1) The full-throated attack not only on voting rights but also attempts to return the U.S. to a pre-Civil Rights Act Jim


Crow America, and (2) Maintaining the capacity to sustain an organized and energized national mobilization operation that integrates voting rights, civil rights, and social justice coalitions as partners.

With respect to point number 1 above, there is little doubt that the Trump administration, Deep South governors, and far-right advocates will intensify their forceful attacks on voting rights and voter protections. These groups have unlimited financial resources, professional level mobilization skills, and a strong network of partners. Therefore, it is expected that they will be fully engaged up to and past the 2026 presidential elections. With respect to maintaining a high level of mobilization, national organizations who represent marginalized and vulnerable populations—such as NASW—must commit to remain engaged in voting rights and voting protection activities. In so doing, it is important to work in close partnership with voting and civil rights coalitions. Additionally, because redistricting is primarily a state responsibility, national membership organizations should encourage their individual members to become engaged with state-level voting and civil rights organizations.

Callais Decision Impact on Vulnerable and Marginalized People

The Callais decision harms marginalized and vulnerable communities because it now makes it very difficult to challenge racially discriminatory voting maps. The strict proof of discrimination language in the ruling is a requirement that has almost never been met in redistricting cases. In addition to reducing the number of majority-minority districts, this SCOTUS requirement is likely to result in





diminished political influence, fewer elected Black and Brown officials and—ultimately—greatly weaken their ability to protect their socio-economic interests. These are harms that will impact—for generations—many millions of Americans who already face major daily living difficulties.

Voting Protection Legislation

An additional counter measure that voting rights activists can pursue to fight against the threats to democracy is through legislation. Even though SCOTUS deemed key sections of the Voting Rights Act, Congress can still fashion voter protection legislation that circumvents the concerns raised in the Court's majority opinion in *Louisiana v. Callias*. In fact there are two legislative fixes that have already been introduced, they are:

John Lewis Voting Rights Act—The bill would modernize and revitalize the Voting Rights Act of 1965, strengthening legal protections against discriminatory voting policies and practices.

The Freedom to Vote Act—The bill would bolster our democracy by protecting voting rights, ending partisan gerrymandering, improving campaign finance, and safeguarding the electoral process.

There is a pre-existing mobilization to pass these bills into law. Given that there is cautious optimism that the Democrats have a reasonable chance to capture both houses of Congress after the 2026 midterms, the strategy is to target collaborative resources in an all-out effort to achieve a legislative fix.

These bills would also bolster our democracy by protecting voting rights, ending partisan gerrymandering, improving campaign finance, and safeguarding the electoral process.

Resources

All Roads Lead to the South

[The dismantling of the Voting Rights Act is a reminder that we have unfinished business. This fight is ours—and we are going to finish it. Join us in building what comes next.](#)

Black Enterprise

[The Voting Rights Act is a Black business issue](#)

Brennan Center

[Supreme Court Sets Off Gerrymandering Frenzy](#)

Democracy Docket

[Voting rights groups accuse Tennessee GOP of racially targeting Black voters in latest gerrymander lawsuit](#)

Declaration for American Democracy

Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights

[Civil Rights Leaders Respond to Supreme Court Decision in Louisiana v. Callias](#)

Legal Defense Fund

[Voting Rights Groups Vehemently Denounce Supreme Court Order Reinstating Intentionally Discriminatory Alabama Congressional Map and Seek Emergency Relief](#)

NAACP

[Defending Black Voter Power](#)

National Association of Social Workers

[The Ominous Cloud of Gerrymandering Hovering Over the 2024 Election](#)

SCOTUS Blog

[Fighting back after the gutting of the Voting Rights Act](#)



NASW Resources

NASW » [SocialWorkers.org](https://www.socialworkers.org)

NASW Foundation » [NASWFoundation.org](https://www.naswfoundation.org)

NASW Press » [NASWPress.org](https://www.naswpress.org)

NASW Assurance Services, Inc. » [NASWAssurance.org](https://www.naswassurance.org)

Find A Social Worker » [HelpStartsHere.org](https://www.helpstartshere.org)

Social Work Blog » [SocialWorkBlog.org](https://www.socialworkblog.org)

NASW Research and Data » [SocialWorkers.org/News](https://www.socialworkers.org/news)

Social Work Advocacy » [SocialWorkers.org/Advocacy](https://www.socialworkers.org/advocacy)



©2026 National Association of Social Workers. All Rights Reserved.



750 First Street NE, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20002-4241
[SocialWorkers.org](https://www.socialworkers.org)