

No. _____

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

ROY HARNESS; KAMAL KARRIEM,
Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL WATSON, SECRETARY OF THE STATE OF
MISSISSIPPI,
Respondent.

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ROBERT B. MCDUFF
MISSISSIPPI CENTER FOR JUSTICE
767 North Congress Street
Jackson, MS 39202
(601) 259-8484
rmcduff@mscenterforjustice.org

MICA L. MOORE
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
350 S. Grand Avenue, 50th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 683-9524

DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR.
Counsel of Record
GINGER D. ANDERS
ELAINE J. GOLDENBERG
XIAONAN APRIL HU
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
601 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Suite 500E
Washington, DC 20001-5369
(202) 220-1100
Donald.Verrilli@mtm.com

Counsel for Petitioners

(Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page)

QUESTION PRESENTED

Petitioners are African-American citizens of Mississippi who are disfranchised by a provision of Mississippi's Constitution that was adopted in 1890 for the express purpose of "obstruct[ing] the exercise of the franchise by the negro race." *Ratliff v. Beale*, 20 So. 865, 868 (Miss. 1896). This Court struck down a materially identical provision of Alabama's 1901 constitution in *Hunter v. Underwood*, 471 U.S. 222 (1985). Yet in this case, the Fifth Circuit, in a deeply divided en banc decision, upheld Mississippi's 1890 disfranchisement provision on the ground that voters, in approving minor amendments to the provision in 1950 and 1968 that left most of the provision untouched and in its original form, cleansed the original provision of its racially discriminatory taint.

The question presented is:

Whether any amendment to a law originally adopted for an impermissible racially discriminatory purpose, no matter how minor the amendment and no matter the historical context, cleanses the law of its racist origins for Fourteenth Amendment purposes unless the party challenging the law can prove that the amendment itself was motivated by racial discrimination.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Petitioner Roy Harness was Plaintiff in the district court and Plaintiff-Appellant in the court of appeals.

Petitioner Kamal Karriem was Plaintiff in the district court and Plaintiff-Appellant in the court of appeals.

Respondent Michael Watson, Secretary of the State of Mississippi was Defendant in the district court and Defendant-Appellee in the court of appeals.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

The following proceedings are directly related to this case within the meaning of Rule 14.1(b)(iii):

Harness v. Watson, No. 19-60632 (5th Cir. Aug. 24, 2022)

Harness, et al. v. Hosemann, No. 3:17-cv-791 (S.D. Miss. Aug. 7, 2019)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS	ii
RELATED PROCEEDINGS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vi
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI.....	1
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
RELEVANT CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	1
INTRODUCTION	3
STATEMENT.....	7
A. Section 241 and the 1890 Convention.....	7
B. The 1950 and 1968 Amendments to Section 241	11
C. Procedural History	15
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	20
A. The Fifth Circuit’s Decision Conflicts With <i>Hunter v.</i> <i>Underwood</i>	22
B. The Eleventh and Second Circuit Decisions on which the En Banc Majority Relied Do Not Support its Reasoning	27

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
C. The En Banc Majority Erred in Relying on Legislative Inaction to Purge Discriminatory Intent	29
D. Disparate Impact Evidence Is Unnecessary When Direct Evidence Establishes Discriminatory Intent, But In Any Event, the Record Establishes Disparate Impact.....	31
E. The Question Presented Is of Enormous Importance.....	33
CONCLUSION	34
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: En Banc Opinion of The United States Court of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit (August 24, 2022).....	1a
Appendix B: Opinion of The United States Court of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit (February 23, 2021)	91a
Appendix C: Order of The United States District Court For The Southern District of Mississippi (August 7, 2019)	99a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>Abbott v. Perez</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2305 (2018)	passim
<i>American Tradition P’ship v. Bullock</i> , 567 U.S. 516 (2012)	23
<i>Batson v. Kentucky</i> , 476 U.S. 79 (1986)	32
<i>Citizens United v. Federal Election Monnission</i> , 558 U.S. 310 (2010)	23
<i>Cotton v. Fordice</i> , 157 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 1998)	passim
<i>Flowers v. Mississippi</i> , 139 S. Ct. 2228 (2019)	20
<i>Foster v. Chatman</i> , 578 U.S. 488 (2016)	21
<i>Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections</i> , 383 U.S. 663 (1966)	10
<i>Hayden v. Paterson</i> , 594 F.3d 150 (2d Cir. 2010).....	18, 27, 28
<i>Helvering v. Hallock</i> , 309 U.S. 106 (1940)	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Hunter v. Underwood</i> , 471 U.S. 222 (1985)	passim
<i>Johnson v. Governor of Fla.</i> , 405 F.3d 1214 (11th Cir. 2005)	18, 27, 28
<i>Johnson v. Transp. Agency</i> , 480 U.S. 616 (1987)	30
<i>Perkins v. Matthews</i> , 400 U.S. 379 (1971)	14
<i>Ramos v. Louisiana</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1390 (2020)	7, 10, 21
<i>Rapanos v. United States</i> , 547 U.S. 715 (2006)	30
<i>Underwood v. Hunter</i> , 730 F.2d 614 (11th Cir. 1984)	32
<i>United States v. City of Jackson</i> , 318 F.2d 1 (5th Cir. 1963)	14
<i>United States v. Mississippi</i> , 380 U.S. 128 (1965)	14
<i>United States v. Mississippi</i> , No. 3791 (S.D. Miss. Mar. 31, 1966)	10
<i>Vill. of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Dev. Corp.</i> , 429 U.S. 252 (1977)	31, 33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Washington v. Davis</i> , 426 U.S. 229 (1976)	33
 STATE CASES	
<i>Ratliff v. Beale</i> , 20 So. 865 (Miss. 1896).....	3, 10, 23
 CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	
Miss. Const. art. XII, § 241 (1890)	passim
Miss. Const. art. XII, § 243 (1890)	10
Miss. Const. art. XII, § 244 (1890)	10
Miss. Const. art. XV, § 273 (1890).....	11
Miss. Const. art. XII, § 241.....	passim
 FEDERAL STATUTES	
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)	1
 STATE STATUTES	
Miss. Code Ann. § 4211 (1942).....	11
Miss. Laws 1948 Ch. 282, H.B. 459	14
Miss. Laws 1948 Ch. 429, H.B. 268	14
Miss. Laws 1948 Ch. 498, H.B. 528	14
Miss. Laws 1950 Ch. 195, S.B. 497	14

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)**

	Page(s)
Miss. Laws 1950 Ch. 253, H.B. 321	14
Miss. Laws 1950 Ch. 385, S.B. 501	14
Miss. Laws 1950 Ch. 386, S.B. 503	14
Miss. Laws 1975 Ch. 523	10
Miss. Laws 1975 Ch. 524	10
 OTHER AUTHORITIES	
S. Shapiro et. al, Supreme Court Practice § 4.5 (11th ed. 2019)	22

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioners Roy Harness and Kamal Karriem respectfully petition for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the en banc court of appeals (Pet. App., *infra*, 1a-90a) is reported at 47 F.4th 296. The panel opinion of the court of appeals (Pet. App., *infra*, 91a-98a) is reported at 988 F.3d 818. The opinion of the district court (Pet. App., *infra*, 99a-131a) is unreported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on September 15, 2022. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

RELEVANT CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Section 1, clause 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution states:

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Article XII, section 241 of the Mississippi Constitution states:

Every inhabitant of this state, except idiots and insane persons, who is a citizen of the United States of America, eighteen (18) years old and upward, who has been a resident of this state for one (1) year, and for one (1) year in the county in which he

offers to vote, and for six (6) months in the election precinct or in the incorporated city or town in which he offers to vote, and who is duly registered as provided in this article, and who has never been convicted of murder, rape, bribery, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement or bigamy, is declared to be a qualified elector, except that he shall be qualified to vote for President and Vice President of the United States if he meets the requirements established by Congress therefor and is otherwise a qualified elector.

INTRODUCTION

In *Hunter v. Underwood*, 471 U.S. 222 (1985), this Court invalidated a provision of the Alabama Constitution, enacted at the 1901 Alabama constitutional convention, that disfranchised people convicted of crimes “involving moral turpitude.” *Id.* at 226, 232-33. This Court explained that “[t]he Alabama Constitutional Convention of 1901 was part of a movement that swept the post-Reconstruction South to disenfranchise blacks.” *Id.* at 229. Based on conclusive evidence that the “crimes selected for inclusion” in the provision at issue “were believed by the delegates” to that convention “to be more frequently committed by blacks,” the Court unanimously held that the provision “was enacted with the intent of disenfranchising blacks” in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Id.* at 227, 229.

The first of the post-Reconstruction southern constitutional conventions occurred eleven years earlier in Mississippi. That convention, too, adopted a felon disfranchisement provision. See Miss. Const. art. XII, § 241 (“Section 241”). Just as in Alabama, in Mississippi the offenses set forth in the 1890 Constitution were those that the drafters believed were disproportionately committed by African Americans. Indeed, the Mississippi Supreme Court confirmed six years later that the 1890 convention “swept the circle of expedients to obstruct the exercise of the franchise by the negro race” by targeting “the offenses to which its weaker members were prone.” *Ratliff v. Beale*, 20 So. 865, 868 (Miss. 1896). The disqualifying crimes listed in Section 241 in 1890 were “bribery, burglary, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement [and] bigamy.” Miss. Const. art. XII, § 241.

Burglary was removed from Section 241 in 1950 by constitutional amendment, and murder and rape were added to the provision in 1968. In all other respects Section 241 has remained unchanged since 1890.

Petitioners brought this suit to enjoin the continued enforcement of the list of eight remaining disfranchising crimes adopted in 1890.¹ That list is unconstitutional for the same reason the Alabama provision struck down in *Hunter v. Underwood* was unconstitutional: Section 241 was enacted in 1890 “with the intent [to] disenfranchis[e] blacks,” 471 U.S. at 229, and the eight disqualifying crimes adopted in 1890 that still remain in Section 241 continue to disproportionately disfranchise African Americans to this day. No one denies that those provisions have exactly the same racist provenance as the Alabama provision this Court declared unconstitutional in *Hunter*.

A deeply divided en banc Fifth Circuit nevertheless upheld the 1890 Mississippi provisions. Following the reasoning of a 1998 Fifth Circuit panel decision (in a case brought by pro se prisoners who introduced no historical evidence), the majority purported to distinguish *Hunter* on the theory that Mississippi’s voters purged the provisions of their racist taint when amending Section 241 in 1950 (to remove burglary from the list of disfranchising crimes) and again in 1968 (to add murder and rape). Pet. App. 24a-25a (following *Cotton v. Fordice*, 157 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 1998)). The majority described the 1950 and 1968 amendments as “reenactment[s]” of the entirety of Section 241 that occurred in the absence of any indication that

¹ The 1968 inclusion of rape and murder is not challenged in this case.

the amendments were adopted for discriminatory reasons. Pet. App. 11a, 24a.

But that rationale rests on a clear error of historical fact. In both 1950 and 1968, Mississippi’s voters were offered only the option to vote for or against the amendment—not to reenact or reject Section 241 as a whole. Whichever way they voted on the amendments, the remainder of the original 1890 version of Section 241 would remain in place and unaffected. As Judge Haynes observed in dissent, the original 1890 list of disfranchising crimes was not “reenacted’ via amendment in 1950 or 1968” because “[a]t no point did the Mississippi electorate have the option of striking the entirety of § 241’s disenfranchisement provision.” Pet. App. 38a (Haynes, J., dissenting). Judge Elrod made the same point in her dissent, Pet. App. 36a, as did Judge Graves in his dissent for five members of the court. Pet. App. 39a.

Thus, just as in *Hunter*, where this Court rejected the argument that the subsequent excision of some of the most blatantly racist features of Alabama’s disenfranchisement law removed the discriminatory taint of the remaining provisions, nothing occurred here to “alter the intent with which the [original] article, *including the parts that remained*, had been adopted.” *Abbott v. Perez*, 138 S. Ct. 2305 (2018) (explaining *Hunter*’s holding that subsequent changes to Alabama’s felon disenfranchisement law did not expurgate the unconstitutional taint of its remaining original provisions) (emphasis added). As this Court’s decisions in *Hunter* and *Abbott* make clear, the intent of those who voted on the 1950 and 1968 amendments to Section 241 is irrelevant. Because those voters were not given the option to reenact or repeal the eight 1890

disqualifying offenses at issue here—bribery theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement and bigamy—approval of the 1950 and 1968 amendments cannot have altered the discriminatory intent that infected the original adoption of that list of offenses. It was only by mischaracterizing the 1950 and 1968 amendments as “reenactments” of the entirety of Section 241 that the majority was able to uphold it as free of discriminatory intent.

The majority’s rationale is also impossible to square with the broader historical context. In 1950, Mississippi’s legislature was all-White, and in 1968 it had only one African American member. The era was characterized by massive resistance to all forms of racial integration in Mississippi. See pp. 14-15 *infra*. Given the tenor of the times, it is implausible that the 1950 and 1968 amendments to Section 241 were adopted in order to “cure” the discrimination that infected the original 1890 provision by substituting a race-neutral justification for the originally unconstitutional one.

The Fifth Circuit’s decision is thus egregiously wrong. It conflicts directly with *Hunter*, and cannot be defended on the basis of the majority’s fallacious effort to distinguish this Court’s unanimous ruling in that case. The unconstitutional 1890 list of disfranchising crimes in Section 241 that the court of appeals left in place has stripped the right to vote from many thousands of Mississippi citizens for more than a century and, if left undisturbed, will disfranchise many more in the years to come.

Review by this Court is thus at least as warranted as it was in *Hunter*. By granting review in *Hunter*, this Court recognized both the concrete importance of

ending the disfranchisement of thousands of voters for discriminatory reasons, as well as the symbolic importance of repudiating such practices as antithetical to our most fundamental constitutional commitments. If anything, the need for review in this case is more acute. The Fifth Circuit has now reaffirmed its 1998 refusal to give controlling effect to *Hunter*, and has done so on the basis of an insupportable interpretation of straightforward historical facts. Section 241’s 1890 list of disfranchising crimes is the sole “trapping[] of the Jim Crow era” remaining from Mississippi’s infamous 1890 Constitution. See *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 140 S. Ct. 1390, 1394 (2020); see p. 10 *infra*. That this list has remained on the books for over 130 years and for nearly forty years since *Hunter* was decided is a continuing injustice against thousands of Mississippi citizens that should not be tolerated any longer, especially given the fundamental importance of the right to vote. As importantly, it is a stain on our Constitution that this Court should remove.

STATEMENT

A. Section 241 and the 1890 Convention

In 1890, Mississippi held a constitutional convention for the purpose of stripping all electoral power from African Americans in the State.

The convention was a direct response to African Americans’ increasing political influence. In 1867, African Americans comprised 66.9% of registered voters in Mississippi. For a time White Mississippians managed, through intimidation and fraud, to keep many African Americans from voting. Record On Appeal (ROA) 1249, 1279. But in the 1880s, Mississippi’s African Americans experienced a political resurgence, buoyed by the Reconstruction era’s reforms.

ROA.1250. African Americans began to organize, joining groups such as the Colored Farmers Alliance, which advocated for political and economic reforms. *Id.* By 1889, all but 60 of the 254 delegates to the State's Republican Convention were African American. *Id.*

Mississippi's White leaders called for a new constitutional convention to re-establish their power and suppress that of African Americans. The convention's supporters hoped to replace the existing extralegal system of violent suppression with a "legal" disfranchisement policy, which would guarantee the long-term stability of White political power while reducing the risk of federal intervention. The State's senior senator, James Z. George (a former Confederate colonel), who was later credited as an architect of the disfranchisement provisions, explained that the convention's "first duty" would be to "devise such measures" that would ensure "a home government, under the control of the white people of the State." ROA.1250-1251 & n.9. The convention's president, Judge Solomon Saladin Calhoun (a former Confederate Lieutenant Colonel) was equally blunt: "Let's tell the truth if it bursts the bottom of the universe. We came here to exclude the Negro. Nothing short of this will answer." Pet. App. 40a, ROA.1405.

Such views predominated at the convention. A Bolivar County delegate submitted draft constitutional provisions declaring that it was "the manifest intention of th[e] Convention to secure to the State of Mississippi 'white supremacy.'" ROA.1255. A Kemper County delegate declared that Mississippi's government should be "for all time in the control of the white race—the only race fit to govern in this country." *Id.*

An Oktibbeha County delegate declared that he attended “to assist in making a constitution that would give the power of the State into the hands of the white people, and there it should be lodged.” *Id.*

To implement that overwhelming sentiment among Mississippi’s White leaders, the convention adopted a constitution designed to disfranchise African American citizens. Section 241 was an important piece of the scheme. As adopted, it stated:

Every male inhabitant of this State, except idiots, insane persons and Indians not taxed, who is a citizen of the United States, twenty-one years old and upwards, who has resided in this State two years, and one year in the election district, or in the incorporated city or town, in which he offers to vote, and who is duly registered as provided in this article, *and who has never been convicted of bribery, burglary, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretenses, perjury, forgery, embezzlement or bigamy*, and who has paid, on or before the first day of February of the year in which he shall offer to vote, all taxes which may have been legally required of him, and which he has had an opportunity of paying according to law, for the two preceding years, and who shall produce to the officers holding the election satisfactory evidence that he has paid said taxes, is declared to be a qualified elector; but any minister of the gospel in charge of an organized church shall be entitled to vote after six months residence in the election district, if otherwise qualified.

Miss. Const. art. XII, § 241 (1890) (emphasis added).

As the Mississippi Supreme Court confirmed six years later, this otherwise strange collection of disfranchising crimes—burglary, bribery, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement and bigamy—was based on the delegates’ belief that “the negro race . . . and its criminal members [were] given rather to furtive offenses than to the robust crimes of the whites,” and that this list “swept the circle of expedients to obstruct the exercise of the franchise by the negro race” by targeting “the offenses to which its weaker members were prone.” *Ratliff*, 20 So. at 868.

The 1890 Constitution also included other provisions designed to prevent African Americans from voting. For example, Section 243 required payment of a poll tax, which would eventually be recognized as a distinctive “trapping[] of the Jim Crow era.” *Ramos*, 140 S. Ct. at 1394.² And Section 244 imposed a literacy and understanding clause.³

Those provisions effectively ended African American political participation in Mississippi. To hasten the amendments’ effect, Section 244 required all voters to re-register before the next election following January 1, 1892, ensuring that no African Americans would be grandfathered onto the voting rolls. ROA.1279. The African American share of the registered voter population plummeted from 66.9% in 1867

² That poll tax requirement was later invalidated in *United States v. Mississippi*, No. 3791 (S.D. Miss. Mar. 31, 1966), which applied this Court’s decision in *Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663 (1966), and the provision was not formally repealed until 1975. Miss. Laws 1975 Ch. 524.

³ Section 244 was nullified by the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965. It also was not formally repealed until 1975. Miss. Laws 1975 Ch. 523.

to 5.7% in 1892. ROA.1279. It was not until the enactment and enforcement of the Voting Rights Act three quarters of a century later that African Americans were able to vote in substantial numbers in Mississippi. And although the Voting Rights Act eliminated most vestiges of the 1890 Constitution's disfranchising plan, the provisions of Section 241 enacted in 1890 continue to disproportionately disfranchise African American voters to this day. See *infra* p. 33.

B. The 1950 and 1968 Amendments to Section 241

In 1950 and again in 1968, Mississippi's voters considered whether to amend Section 241 by adding to or subtracting from the original disqualifying crimes selected by the delegates at the 1890 convention. In Mississippi, a constitutional amendment requires approval by two-thirds of each house of the legislature and a majority of voters. Miss. Const. art. XV, § 273. At the relevant times, if the legislature approved a proposed amendment, then the Mississippi Secretary of State would publish a full text version of the provision, as it would appear if the amendment were adopted, within two weeks before voters went to the polls. Miss. Code Ann. § 4211 (1942). Although voters were presented with the full text of the amended Section 241, the only option before them was whether to approve or reject the proposed amendments. Voters therefore had no opportunity to decide whether to approve or repeal the entirety of Section 241 or the collection of crimes included in it.

In 1950, the Mississippi legislature passed a resolution to amend Section 241 for multiple purposes, including removing burglary from the list of disqualifying crimes. The first paragraph of the resolution stated: "A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION to amend

section 241 of the Mississippi constitution of 1890 so as to provide the qualifications of electors, and amending by providing that the wife of a minister of the gospel legally residing with him shall be qualified to vote after a residence of six months in the election district, or incorporated city or town, if otherwise qualified.” ROA.2639. The resolution then stated that the Legislature resolved “[t]hat the following amendment to the Constitution of the State of Mississippi be submitted to the qualified voters of the state for ratification or rejection . . . viz: Amend section 241 of the constitution of the State of Mississippi, so that it shall read as follows” ROA.2639-2640. The text of the proposed Section 241 was listed, with the crime of burglary omitted and additional language regarding electors and the residency requirements for ministers’ wives. ROA.2640.

The ballot contained the exact same language as the resolution and was followed by two options from which the voter could select: “For Amendment” or “Against Amendment.” It did not offer voters the option of choosing to retain or repeal the remainder of the original 1890 list of disqualifying crimes. Voters could vote only on the amendment. ROA.2641-2642. A majority voted “For Amendment.”

Events unfolded similarly in 1968, when the Mississippi legislature passed a resolution to amend Section 241 for multiple purposes, including adding murder and rape as disqualifying crimes. The first paragraph of the resolution stated: “A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION to amend Section 241, Mississippi Constitution of 1890, to provide for one-year residency within the State and County and a six-month residency within the election precinct to be a qualified elector; to delete certain improper parts of the Section;

and for related purposes.” ROA.2643. The resolution then stated that the Legislature resolved “[t]hat the following amendment to the Constitution of the State of Mississippi be submitted to the qualified electors of the State for ratification or rejection . . . viz: Amend Section 241, Mississippi Constitution of 1890, so that it will read as follows: . . .” ROA.2643. The text of the proposed Section 241 was then set forth in a form identical to the original 1890 version (except for the omission of burglary) with the addition of murder and rape. ROA.2643-2644.

As in 1950, the 1968 ballot contained the same language as the resolution and was followed by two options from which the voter could select: “For the Amendment” or “Against the Amendment.” ROA.2645. And as in 1950, the ballot again did not afford voters the option to decide whether to retain or repeal the other crimes on the list, which were part of the original 1890 provision. ROA.2645. The voters’ only option was to approve or reject “the Amendment[s].” A majority voted “For the Amendment.”

No historical evidence suggests that either the Mississippi legislature or the State’s citizenry ever gave any thought to whether the provisions of Section 241 challenged in this case should be re-enacted or removed from the State’s Constitution—presumably because neither the legislature nor the citizenry was ever asked to vote on the issue. The journals of the Mississippi House and Senate chambers give no indication that any such deliberations occurred. And press coverage of the amendments focused exclusively on provisions having nothing to do with felon disfranchisement. ROA.2614-2616 (expert report of Dr. Robert Lockett).

Nor does the historical context suggest that eliminating the discriminatory taint of the originally enacted Section 241 was an object of either of the amendments. Racial animus in Mississippi did not end with the 1890 convention. It is schoolbook history that the 1950s and 1960s were a notorious period of opposition throughout the south to the advances of the civil rights movement, nowhere more so than in Mississippi. The tenor of these times was reflected in the Fifth Circuit's observation in 1963 that "Mississippi has a steel-hard, inflexible, undeviating official policy of segregation. The policy is stated in its laws. It is rooted in custom." *United States v. City of Jackson*, 318 F.2d 1, 5 (5th Cir. 1963).

The all-White 1950 legislature (which was elected in 1947 and held sessions in 1948 and 1950) enacted laws to fortify segregation in secondary education, higher education, prisons, reform schools, and 4-H clubs for young people. Miss. Laws 1948 Ch. 282, H.B. 459; Ch. 429, H.B. 268; Ch. 498, H.B. 528; Miss. Laws 1950 Ch. 195, S.B. 497; Ch. 253, H.B. 321; Ch. 385, S.B. 501; Ch. 386, S.B. 503. The 1960s were defined by "blatant defiance of federal civil rights decrees," including the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and redoubled legislative efforts to prevent African American voters from exercising electoral power within the State. Pet. App. 58a; see *Perkins v. Matthews*, 400 U.S. 379, 389 (1971) (stating that the legislatures and political party committees in Mississippi had "adopted laws or rules since the passage of the [Voting Rights Act] which have had the purpose or effect of diluting the votes of newly enfranchised Negro voters"); *United States v. Mississippi*, 380 U.S. 128, 133-135 (1965).

The 1968 legislature had only one African American member. It maintained discriminatory voting provisions designed to limit the effect of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Miss. Laws 1968 Ch. 394, H.B. 260; Ch. 564, H.B. 102. It increased tuition assistance to private school students, Miss. Laws 1968 Ch. 393, H.B. 1114—a law later struck down because “[t]he statute, as amended, encourages, facilitates, and supports the establishment of a system of private schools operated on a racially segregated basis as an alternative available to white students seeking to avoid desegregated public schools.” *Coffey v. State Educational Finance Commission*, 296 F. Supp. 1389, 1392 (S.D. Miss. 1969) (three-judge court). And it funded the notorious Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, which since 1956 had served as Mississippi’s official watchdog, harassment, and propaganda agency for the promotion of segregation. Miss. Laws 1968 Ch. 214, H.B. 1195; *Sovereignty Commission Online*, Miss. Department of Archives & History, (https://www.mdah.ms.gov/arrec/digital_archives/sovcom/scagencycase-history.php).

There is, in short, nothing in the historical record suggesting that those same legislative bodies sought to extinguish the discriminatory taint that infected Section 241 in its original form.

C. Procedural History

1. Petitioners are African American citizens of Mississippi who have been disfranchised under Section 241’s original list of crimes. Roy Harness was convicted of forgery in 1986. Kamal Karriem, a former city council member in Columbus, was convicted of embezzlement in 2005. Both have completed their sentences. ROA.538, 2754-2755, 2763-2764, 2765-2766.

2. In 2017, petitioners filed this suit against the Mississippi Secretary of State. Petitioners did not challenge the inclusion of murder or rape in the list of disqualifying offenses in 1968, but contended that disfranchisement based on the original list of crimes selected by the 1890 constitutional convention violates the Fourteenth Amendment because those crimes were selected for a racially discriminatory purpose. ROA.29, ROA.30, ROA.46. Petitioners requested declaratory and injunctive relief. ROA.137-138.⁴

The district court granted respondent’s motion for summary judgment. The court concluded that it was bound by the Fifth Circuit’s holding in *Cotton v. Fordice*, 157 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 1998), that Mississippi had “removed the discriminatory taint associated with the original version” when it amended Section 241 to remove burglary in 1950 and to add rape and murder as disfranchising crimes in 1968. Pet. App. 95a (citing *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391).⁵ The *Cotton* panel asserted that in both 1950 and 1968 “a majority of the voters had to approve the entire provision” in order to amend it, and that neither purported “re-enactment” was shown to have been motivated by any discriminatory animus, thereby redeeming Section 241 from its unconstitutional provenance. 157 F.3d at 391.

The district court also concluded that, even apart from the purported cleansing effect of the 1950 and

⁴ The district court consolidated petitioners’ case with *Hopkins v. Harness*, a case raising distinct challenges to section 241.

⁵ The *Cotton* panel raised the issue of Section 241’s constitutionality *sua sponte* in a *pro se* case brought by two incarcerated individuals, who—having never raised the issue themselves—introduced no historical evidence regarding the 1950 or 1968 amendments.

1968 amendments, evidence established that “the state would have passed section 241 as is without racial motivation” in the 1980s. Pet. App. 119a. As support, the district court cited the Mississippi legislature’s failure in 1986 to alter or repeal Section 241 after convening a “multi-year, biracial, bipartisan” Election Law Reform Task Force to review the State’s election laws. ROA.4326, ROA.4328.

3. A panel of the Fifth Circuit affirmed. The panel concluded that it was bound by *Cotton*. Pet. App. 95a-96a. The panel rejected petitioners’ arguments that *Cotton* should not be deemed controlling because the evidentiary record developed in this case refuted the essential factual premise of the prior panel’s decision—*i.e.*, that the 1950 and 1968 amendments to Section 241 provided occasions for the State’s voters to reenact Section 241 in its entirety for nondiscriminatory reasons. Pet. App. 96a.

4. Petitioners sought en banc rehearing, which the court of appeals granted. The en banc court affirmed the district court in a per curiam opinion, with seven judges dissenting.

i. The ten-judge en banc majority acknowledged that Mississippi’s 1890 constitutional convention was “steeped in racism” and that the “state was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks” in adopting the 1890 constitution, Pet. App. 2a. The majority also acknowledged that Section 241, in particular, was a “device that the convention exploited to deny the franchise to blacks.” *Id.* at 2a. Nonetheless, the majority held that petitioners had failed to prove discriminatory intent, because any taint associated with Section 241 “ha[d] been cured.” *Id.* at 9a.

Adopting almost word-for-word the reasoning of the 1998 panel decision in *Cotton*, the majority asserted that the offending provision had been “not only reenacted, but reenacted *twice* according to Mississippi state procedures.” Pet. App. 15a. Finding the 1968 amendment most relevant because it established the version of Section 241 that remains operative today, the majority concluded that the record lacked evidence that the amendment was motivated by a discriminatory purpose. *Id.* at 5a.

The majority asserted that what it described as the “reenactment” of Section 241 distinguished the present case from *Hunter v. Underwood*, because *Hunter* had left open whether a discriminatory provision could be redeemed if later reenacted without any impermissible motivation. See Pet. App. 16a (stating that the provision at issue in *Hunter* had remained “virtually intact . . . from the time of its patently racist enactment”). The majority also stated that its decision was consistent with decisions of two other courts of appeals. Pet. App. 11a. Both of those courts ruled that enactment of a new criminal disfranchisement provision can cleanse the discriminatory taint of a prior provision. See *Johnson v. Governor of Fla.*, 405 F.3d 1214 (11th Cir. 2005) (en banc); *Hayden v. Paterson*, 594 F.3d 150 (2d Cir. 2010).

The majority rejected petitioners’ argument that passage of the 1968 amendment could not have “reenacted” Section 241 because the amendment process did not give voters the option of either ratifying or repealing the provision, but rather only asked them whether murder and rape should be added to the original list of disfranchising crimes. Pet. App. 14a. The majority described petitioners’ argument as a “radically prescriptive” one that “would require the revision of state

amendment processes, supplanting those provisions with some kind of constitutional plebiscite.” *Id.* at 18a. The majority found it sufficient that the amendments were “enacted in compliance with state law,” and that the ballots presented voters with “the full text of Section 241 as amended.” *Id.* at 19a-20a.

The majority also concluded that, even if the 1968 amendment had not cured Section 241’s constitutional infirmity, Section 241 should be deemed constitutional because it would have been reenacted in the 1980s for race-neutral reasons. Pet. App. 22a-23a. Adopting the analysis of the district court, the en banc majority found it persuasive that Mississippi had convened a “multi-racial” Election Law Reform Task Force in the mid-1980s that deliberated over the State’s election laws, including “the broadening of disenfranchising crimes to include all felonies,” but ultimately left the law “as is.” Pet. App. 6a.

ii. Judge Ho concurred in part and concurred in the judgment. He would have ruled that petitioners were required to show not just that Section 241 was enacted with a discriminatory intent but also that its challenged provisions have ongoing disparate impact. He acknowledged petitioners’ showing that Section 241 disfranchises a far higher percentage of African Americans than of Whites. But he deemed that showing insufficient on the ground that Section 241 does not disfranchise a greater percentage of African Americans than would a blanket felon disfranchisement law, which he thought would be “indisputably constitutional.” Pet. App. 30a. In his view, a State can enforce a targeted disfranchisement provision for the purpose of discriminating on the basis of race so long as its ra-

cially disparate impact does not exceed that of a blanket ban. *Id.* at 30a (“logic would dictate that the greater power should include the lesser power.”).

iii. Seven judges dissented, in three separate opinions. All seven pointed out the implausibility of the majority’s conclusion that Mississippi had “reenacted” the entirety of Section 241 in 1950 and again in 1968. Judge Elrod would have held that Mississippi was “stuck with its discriminatory intent,” because voters “were never given the option to remove the racially tainted list.” Pet. App. 36a. Judge Haynes agreed that Section 241 was not reenacted in a manner that purged its discriminatory origins, because “[a]t no point did the Mississippi electorate have the option of striking the entirety of § 241’s disfranchisement provision.” Pet. App. 38a.

Judge Graves wrote the principal dissent, joined by Judges Stewart, Dennis, Higginson, and Costa. His dissent joined those of Judges Elrod and Haynes in pointing out that the historical foundation on which the majority opinion rests is wrong and therefore provides no basis for distinguishing *Hunter*. Judge Graves went on to situate this case in its proper historical context. He elaborated on just how central denial of the franchise was to Mississippi’s long and shameful history of denying African American citizens any semblance of equal citizenship and equal rights to participate in the political process, as well as economic and social life, that the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments guaranteed them. Pet. App. 53a-79a.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The right to vote, along with the right to serve on a jury, is “the most substantial opportunity that most citizens have to participate in the democratic process.” *Flowers v. Mississippi*, 139 S. Ct. 2228, 2238 (2019).

Time and again, this Court has intervened to protect those rights against derogation by States acting out of discriminatory racial animus, by removing “the trappings of the Jim Crow era.” *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 140 S. Ct. 1390, 1394 (2020); *id.* at 1419 (Kavanaugh, J. concurring in part) (*stare decisis* effect should not be afforded to precedent permitting non-unanimous jury verdicts because doing so would “tolerate[] and reinforce[] a practice that is thoroughly racist in its origins and has continuing racially discriminatory effects.”); *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 233; *Foster v. Chatman*, 578 U.S. 488, 514 (2016). In so doing, the Court has emphasized that the overriding importance of those civic rights requires particular vigilance against attempts to circumvent the Constitution’s guarantees, and that reviewing courts must not “blind” themselves to circumstances that bear on the “sensitive inquiry” into discriminatory intent. *Foster*, 570 U.S. at 501 (citation omitted).

In this case, the Fifth Circuit failed to honor this Court’s teachings. No one disputes that Section 241 was adopted with the exact same virulently racist motive as the Alabama provision struck down in *Hunter*. Yet the Fifth Circuit circumvented *Hunter* by purporting to find that Mississippi’s citizens, voting on segregation-era amendments to the provision, purged Section 241 of its discriminatory intent. The majority could reach that result only by blinding itself to the undisputed historical fact that the referenda did not permit voters to decide whether to reenact or repeal Section 241 in its entirety. The reality is that Section 241 was never reenacted at all, much less for race-neutral reasons; instead, the “original enactment,” which “was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks on account of race,” persists to this day in each of the original disfranchising crimes that remain in

Section 241, just as was true of the provision struck down in *Hunter*. 471 U.S. at 233. That petitioners did not establish that the 1950 and 1968 amendments were enacted for racially discriminatory reasons is therefore irrelevant to whether the eight disqualifying crimes enacted in 1890 are unconstitutional. In all events, it is difficult to imagine a race-neutral rationale that could justify reenacting the list of crimes from the 1890 Constitution—a list that omits such serious offenses as kidnapping, aggravated assault, and child molestation, while including such comparatively inconsequential offenses as bigamy.

Today, in 2022, many thousands of Mississippi’s African-American citizens are disfranchised by a provision that was enacted in 1890 to ensure “a home government under the control of the white people of the State.” ROA.1250-1251 & n.9. Mississippi voters have never had the opportunity to repeal or reenact that provision. The persistence of a disfranchisement provision enacted with discriminatory intent cannot be reconciled with either *Hunter* or the abiding promise of the Fourteenth Amendment. This Court should grant certiorari.

A. The Fifth Circuit’s Decision Conflicts With *Hunter v. Underwood*

The decision of the court of appeals conflicts with this Court’s decision in *Hunter v. Underwood*. See S. Ct. Rule 10; S. Shapiro et. al, Supreme Court Practice § 4.5, p. 20 (11th ed. 2019) (conflict with a decision of this Court is one of the “strongest possible grounds for securing the issuance of a writ of certiorari”). That the en banc majority had to rely on such a flimsy rationale to distinguish *Hunter*—*i.e.*, the false assertion that Section 241 was reenacted in its entirety in 1950 and again in 1968 without any discriminatory purpose—

makes it difficult to reach any other conclusion than that the majority was simply unwilling to follow Justice Rehnquist's opinion for a unanimous Court in *Hunter*. The refusal of an en banc court of appeals to follow a controlling decision of this Court, particularly in a case as important as this one, amply justifies a grant of certiorari. See *American Tradition P'ship v. Bullock*, 567 U.S. 516, 516-517 (2012) (granting certiorari and summarily reversing where a State's "arguments in support of the judgment below either were already rejected in *Citizens United* [558 U.S. 310 (2010)], or fail to meaningfully distinguish that case.").

In *Hunter*, this Court held that a 1901 Alabama disfranchisement provision violated the Fourteenth Amendment because the "crimes selected for inclusion . . . were believed by the delegates to be more frequently committed by blacks," and the "evidence . . . demonstrate[d] conclusively that [the provision] was enacted with the intent of disenfranchising blacks." 471 U.S. at 227, 229. The exact same thing is true here. The original list of crimes in Mississippi's 1890 Constitution was selected for the specific purpose of disenfranchising African Americans. As the Mississippi Supreme Court confirmed just six years later, the 1890 convention "swept the circle of expedients to obstruct the exercise of the franchise by the negro race." *Ratliff*, 20 So. at 868. This case is therefore on all fours with *Hunter*, and the court of appeals had no choice but to follow that decision.

The majority purported to distinguish *Hunter* on the ground that Mississippi reenacted the offending provisions of Section 241 for race-neutral reasons, and thereby cleansed the 1890 enactment of its unconstitutional taint, when the State's citizens voted on amendments to the provision in 1950 and 1968. The

majority reiterated the conclusion of the prior Fifth Circuit decision in *Cotton* that “a majority of the voters had to approve the *entire provision*” in order to amend it, thereby redeeming Section 241. Pet. App. at 18a (quoting *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391) (emphasis added).

But saying that voters of Mississippi approved “the entire provision” in 1950 and 1968 does not make it so—as the seven judges who dissented from the ruling all recognized. In fact, no part of the original 1890 provision was ever reenacted. The only choice ever put to voters was to approve or reject amendments that added or subtracted from the original list of disenfranchising crimes. In 1950, voters were asked to consider whether to subtract one of the original nine offenses (burglary), and in 1968, whether to add two crimes to the list (murder or rape). Both votes presupposed that each one of the original disenfranchising crimes chosen in 1890 (save for burglary after 1950) would remain in the Constitution regardless how the vote turned out. The amendment votes are therefore no different than the judicial decisions described in *Hunter*, which struck down *some* portions of Alabama’s constitution but left others on the books until this Court invalidated them. 471 U.S. at 232-233.

That the amendments could not have removed Section 241’s discriminatory taint is therefore clear. The majority was able to conclude otherwise only by engaging in groundless speculation. The majority rejected petitioners’ contention in large part based on the puzzling assertions that accepting the contention would require a “revision of state amendment processes” or the holding of “some kind of constitutional plebiscite.” Pet. App. 18a. But nothing of the sort is true. Mississippi’s voters could easily have been given an actual

opportunity to vote to retain or reject the unconstitutional 1890 list. No change to Mississippi's existing procedures for amending the state constitution would be necessary to give the voters such an option, and the majority's suggestion that "some kind of a constitutional plebiscite" would be needed to do so is fanciful.

What the majority appears to suggest in making those assertions is that the votes in 1950 and 1968 can be deemed reenactments of the original provisions of Section 241 because the voters had before them the complete text of what Section 241 would look like if the amendment passed. In other words, the majority appears to believe that the voters might have thought that they were being asked to reenact Section 241 in its entirety because the full text of the provision was included in the materials given to them before they voted. Pet. App. 19a-20a (noting that the ballots presented voters with "the full text of Section 241, as amended").

Any such rationale would, of course, be baseless. The voters were given clear instructions to vote "For Amendment" or "Against Amendment." ROA.2641-2642, 2645. No one would have thought that a vote against the amendment was a vote for wholesale repeal of Section 241. Nothing in the materials provided to the voters suggests such a thing, and the voters were never asked whether they wanted to repeal the offending list of disfranchising crimes in its entirety. Moreover, what matters is the operative legal significance of the votes cast by the citizens of the State, not speculation about what voters might or might not have thought they were doing when they voted. The simple fact is that Mississippi's voters have never been given the opportunity to repeal or reenact

the original 1890 provisions of Section 241. Unfounded speculation about what voters might have been thinking cannot change that.

Indeed, the implausibility of the majority's speculation runs deeper still. It is inconceivable that the all-White legislature in 1950 or the virtually all-White legislature in 1968 (or the overwhelmingly White electorate of that era of massive resistance) would have affirmatively acted to cure the 1890 discrimination by "reenacting" eight of the nine original crimes listed in Section 241 for some unknown nonracial reason. And it is equally difficult to conceive of any race-neutral justification—in 1950, 1968 or at any other time—for reenacting the strange list of disfranchising crimes set forth in the 1890 constitution. That list, after all, denies the vote to citizens who commit bigamy or forgery but retains the franchise for those convicted of kidnapping, aggravated assault, child molestation and other serious offenses that bear directly on the character of the persons who commit them. After years of litigation, Mississippi has never been able to articulate a race-neutral explanation for this list, either before or after the 1950 and 1968 amendments. That is doubtless because no such explanation is possible.

Any doubt that the present case is indistinguishable from *Hunter* is dispelled by this Court's subsequent explanation of *Hunter* in *Abbott v. Perez*, 138 S. Ct. 2305 (2018). In *Abbott*, this Court considered whether the Texas Legislature had acted with discriminatory intent in implementing a redistricting plan after an identical prior plan (which never went into effect) was found to be discriminatory. The district court had invalidated the new plan on the ground that it was tainted by the discriminatory intent of the legislature that passed the prior plan. In reversing, this Court

distinguished the situation before it—a new legislature enacting a new redistricting plan—from *Hunter*, where the original discriminatory law was “never repealed, but over the years, the list of disqualifying offenses had been pruned.” *Id.* at 2324-2325. The Court concluded that in the first situation, only the new legislature’s intent would matter. But where (as here and in *Hunter*) “the amendments did not alter the intent with which the article, *including the parts that remained* had been adopted,” the original discriminatory intent would control. *Id.* (emphasis added).

As in this case, then, Alabama’s disfranchisement provision had been changed in subsequent years to remove some of its discriminatory provisions. But those changes did not—indeed they could not—remove the discriminatory taint from the “parts that remained” unchanged from the original 1890 enactment. Thus, even with respect to the question of subsequent amendments to Section 241, this case remains on all fours with *Hunter*.

B. The Eleventh and Second Circuit Decisions on which the En Banc Majority Relied Do Not Support its Reasoning

The decisions of the Eleventh and Second Circuit on which the Fifth Circuit relied to support the conclusion that Section 241 had been purged of its discriminatory taint in fact highlight the amendments’ inadequacy in that regard. Pet. App. 11a-12a (citing *Johnson v. Governor of Fla.*, 405 F.3d 1214 (11th Cir. 2005) (en banc), and *Hayden v. Paterson*, 594 F.3d 150 (2d Cir. 2010)). Those courts considered intervening enactments adopted after a process that gave legislators and voters the opportunity to vote to replace an offending provision in toto—the precise opportunity that Mississippi did not give its voters here.

In *Johnson*, the Eleventh Circuit considered an equal protection challenge to the criminal disfranchisement provision in Florida's Constitution. 405 F.3d at 1218. The court assumed that "racial animus motivated the adoption of" the original disfranchisement provision in Florida's 1868 Constitution. *Id.* at 1223. A century later, Florida held a new constitutional convention, which considered removing the 1868 disfranchisement provision *entirely*, but ultimately adopted a modified version disfranchising only those convicted of a felony. The new constitution was then approved by both houses of the legislature and ratified by Florida voters. *Id.* at 1224. The Eleventh Circuit concluded that any animus infecting the 1868 disfranchisement provision had been purged when the provision was "substantively altered and reenacted in 1968 in the absence of any evidence of racial bias" through the convention. *Id.* at 1225. Thus, in *Johnson*, the voters did more than make minor alterations to the original provision. The Florida legislature and Florida's citizenry voted to adopt an entirely new constitution, including a new and different disfranchisement provision.

The circumstances were essentially the same in the Second Circuit's *Hayden* decision. 594 F.3d at 154. There, the plaintiff challenged various iterations of New York's felon disfranchisement law, but the complaint "include[d] no specific factual allegations of discriminatory intent that post-date[d] 1874." *Id.* at 159. That omission was determinative, because in 1894 New York convened a constitutional convention that adopted numerous changes to the State's constitution, including a new iteration of the disfranchisement provision. New York voters then ratified the new constitution, including the new disfranchisement provision. *Id.* at 167. Given that history, the plaintiff's failure to

allege “discriminatory intent reasonably contemporaneous with the challenged decision” in 1894 was fatal to the equal protection challenge. *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

In vivid contrast to the actions taken by citizens that *Johnson* and *Hayden* considered, Mississippi’s citizens did *not* vote to adopt an entirely new constitution in 1950 or in 1968. Nor did they vote to adopt an entirely new criminal disfranchisement provision. As the seven dissenting here recognized, the only option before the voters in 1950 was to adopt or reject an amendment removing burglary from Section 241’s list of disfranchising crimes. And voters’ only option in 1968 was to vote for or against an amendment adding rape and murder to the list of disfranchising crimes. Neither vote gave the State’s citizens the opportunity to reject or reenact the offending provisions of the original Section 241.

Indeed, when considered in light of the accurate historical record, the decision of the Fifth Circuit in this case *conflicts* with *Johnson* and *Hayden*. The very thing that was determinative of the equal protection question in those cases—an up or down vote on the entirety of the challenged constitutional provision—is what never occurred in this case.

C. The En Banc Majority Erred in Relying on Legislative Inaction to Purge Discriminatory Intent

The en banc majority also based its decision that the original Section 241 had been purged of its discriminatory taint on the actions—or more precisely the *inaction*—of an Election Law Reform Task Force convened in the mid-1980s, combined with the absence of any legislative action to repeal or alter Section 241 in response to the Task Force. The majority found it

persuasive that the Task Force “considered all aspects of voting in Mississippi” and after “much discussion concerning the broadening of disenfranchising crimes to include all felonies,” left Section 241 “as is.” Pet. App. 23a. According to the majority, decisions by the Task Force and the legislature in the 1980s to do nothing proved that Mississippi’s voters would, if given the chance, have reenacted for race-neutral reasons the original list of disfranchising crimes in the 1890 Constitution. Pet. App. 22a, *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 228.

One problem with the majority’s reasoning is that there is no actual evidence to support it. Neither the respondent nor the court of appeals identified any evidence indicating that the inaction of the legislature amounted to a silent affirmance of Section 241, and no such evidence exists.

The majority thus based its decision on precisely the sort of negative inference from legislative inaction that this Court has repeatedly rejected as notoriously unreliable. See e.g., *Rapanos v. United States*, 547 U.S. 715, 749-750 (2006) (Scalia, J.) (explaining the Court’s “oft-expressed skepticism toward reading the tea leaves of congressional inaction”). Mississippi’s apparent decision not to alter or repeal Section 241 could accommodate a range of inferences, including “approval of the status quo,” “inability to agree upon how to alter the status quo” or “indifference to the status quo.” *Johnson v. Transp. Agency*, 480 U.S. 616, 672 (1987) (Scalia, J. dissenting). For that reason, a court “walk[s] on quicksand” when it grounds a controlling principle in the “absence of corrective legislation.” *Helvering v. Hallock*, 309 U.S. 106, 121 (1940).

Inferring intent from legislative inaction is particularly inappropriate in this context. The issue this

Court left open in *Hunter* was whether a discriminatory provision could be valid if “enacted today without any impermissible motivation.” 471 U.S. at 233 (emphasis added). Here, of course, the only reason for this bizarre list of crimes in the 1890 Constitution is that those who adopted the list believed that African Americans were more likely to commit those particular crimes. It is hard to conceive of any race-neutral justification for reenacting it today. In all events, no such reenactment occurred. If anything, the legislature’s inaction in the 1980s reinforces *petitioners’* contention. Because neither the legislature nor the voters took any action that could be interpreted as a race-neutral reenactment of the original provisions of Section 241, nothing occurred in 1986 that could have “alter[ed] the intent with which the [original] article, including the parts that remained, had been adopted.” *Abbott*, 138 S. Ct. at 2325.

D. Disparate Impact Evidence Is Unnecessary When Direct Evidence Establishes Discriminatory Intent, But In Any Event, the Record Establishes Disparate Impact

Contrary to the suggestion in Judge Ho’s concurring opinion, the decision below cannot be upheld on the alternative ground that petitioners failed to show a disparate impact. Pet. App. 28a.

To begin with, discriminatory impact is not invariably required to prove a Fourteenth Amendment violation. To be sure, proof of discriminatory impact may well provide a basis for inferring such intent when direct proof of such intent is lacking. See *Vill. of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Dev. Corp.*, 429 U.S. 252, 266 (1977) (“Determining whether invidious discriminatory purpose was a motivating factor demands a sensitive inquiry into such circumstantial

and direct evidence of intent as may be available . . . [t]he impact of the official action . . . may provide an important starting point.”). But where, as here, direct proof of discriminatory intent is overwhelming, there is no need for a plaintiff to prove discriminatory impact as a window into a defendant’s motivations. See *Batson v. Kentucky*, 476 U.S. 79 (1986) (no disparate impact showing needed when peremptory challenges are used for racially discriminatory reasons); *Abbott v. Perez*, 138 S. Ct. 2305 (2018), (no disparate impact showing needed when direct evidence of racial gerrymander exists). Requiring proof of disparate impact in a case such as this one would, among other things, produce the exceedingly odd consequence that a provision adopted for discriminatory reasons could fluctuate in and out of unconstitutionality depending on what impact it was having at any given time.

The Court need not decide whether disparate impact is invariably required, however, because disparate impact exists here in exactly the same form as it did in *Hunter v. Underwood*. Although in *Hunter* the Court did not hold that such evidence is *necessary*, the Court noted that the Eleventh Circuit had “implicitly found the evidence of discriminatory impact indisputable.” 471 U.S. at 227. The Court quoted the Eleventh Circuit: “This disparate effect persists today. In Jefferson and Montgomery Counties[,] blacks are by even the most modest estimates at least 1.7 times as likely as whites to suffer disfranchisement under Section 182 for the commission of nonprison offenses.” *Underwood v. Hunter*, 730 F.2d 614, 620 (11th Cir. 1984).

The statewide discriminatory impact proven in this case is far greater than the impact found in *Hunter*. African Americans constitute 36% of Mississippi’s vot-

ing age population, but 59% of its disfranchised individuals. African American adults are thus 2.7 times more likely than white adults to have been convicted of a disfranchising crime. ROA.2737-2738.

Judge Ho found this evidence inadequate on the ground that it does not show disparities exceeding the disparities that would exist if Mississippi instead disfranchised all felons. He contends that such a showing is required, because the power to adopt Section 241 is only a “lesser power” included within the authority to enact a blanket felon disfranchisement provision, which he presumed would be constitutional. Pet. App. 30a. The concurrence cites no authority to support those remarkable propositions, nor could it. A measure is unconstitutional when it is motivated by a discriminatory intent to inflict an adverse impact based on race. *Arlington Heights*, 429 U.S. at 265. Such an intent may be present even if a State could cause the same numerical impact for constitutional reasons, as impact is “not the sole touchstone of an invidious racial discrimination forbidden by the Constitution.” *Washington v. Davis*, 426 U.S. 229, 242 (1976). Indeed, under Judge Ho’s reasoning, a government would have carte blanche to discriminate intentionally so long as some, hypothetical non-racist policy would have a similar effect on the population being discriminated against.

E. The Question Presented Is of Enormous Importance

The same reasons that supported the grant of certiorari in *Hunter* support review here with even greater force. Nearly 50,000 individuals have been disfranchised in Mississippi between 1994 and 2017, including nearly 29,000 African Americans.

ROA.3055. This group includes 14,000 African Americans under the age of 45, who have already served the entirety of their criminal sentences but will be denied the right to vote in the decades to come. ROA.3055, 3059. They cannot vote because the attendees to Mississippi's 1890 Constitutional Convention conspired to eliminate African American voting and thereby cement white political power in the State, and because Mississippi has taken no action in the intervening years to separate the disfranchisement provision from the delegates' invidious plan. The court of appeals grievously erred when it carried forward this injustice into the present day. It could reach that result only by flouting undisputed historical fact, and applying reasoning that is contradicted by this Court's unanimous decision in *Hunter*. This Court has never hesitated to step in when lower courts have failed to enforce this Court's Fourteenth Amendment precedents guaranteeing critical rights of civic participation. It should not hesitate now.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT B. McDUFF
MISSISSIPPI CENTER FOR JUSTICE
767 North Congress Street
Jackson, MS 39202
(601) 259-8484
rmcduff@mscenterforjustice.org

FRED L. BANKS JR
PHELPS DUNBAR
P.O. Box 16114
Jackson, MS 39236-6114
(601) 352-2300
fred.banks@phelps.com

DAVID M. LIPMAN
THE LIPMAN LAW FIRM
5915 Ponce de Leon Blvd.
Suite 44
Coral Gables, Florida 33146
(305) 662-2600
dmipman@aol.com

DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR.
Counsel of Record
GINGER D. ANDERS
ELAINE J. GOLDENBERG
XIAONAN APRIL HU
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON
LLP
601 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Suite 500E
Washington, DC 20001-5369
(202) 220-1100
Donald.Verrilli@mt.com

MICA L. MOORE
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON
LLP
350 S. Grand Avenue,
50th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 683-9524

ARMAND DERFNER
DERFNER & ALTMAN
575 King Street, Suite B
Charleston, SC 29403
(804) 723-9804
aderfner@derfneraltman.com

Counsel for Petitioners

October 28, 2022

APPENDIX

APPENDICES

Appendix A: En Banc Opinion of The United States Court of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit (August 24, 2022).....	1a
Appendix B: Opinion of The United States Court of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit (February 23, 2021)	91a
Appendix C: Order of The United States District Court For The Southern District of Mississippi (August 7, 2019)	99a

1a

APPENDIX A

No. 19-60632

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

ROY HARNESS; KAMAL KARRIEM,
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

MICHAEL WATSON, SECRETARY OF STATE OF
MISSISSIPPI, *Defendant-Appellee.*

[Filed] August 24, 2022

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Mississippi USDC
No. 3:17-CV-791

Before RICHMAN, *Chief Judge*, and JONES, SMITH,
STEWART, DENNIS, ELROD, SOUTHWICK, HAYNES,
GRAVES, HIGGINSON, COSTA, WILLETT, HO, DUNCAN,
ENGELHARDT, OLDHAM, and WILSON, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:

The issue before the en banc court is whether the current version of Miss. Const. art. 12, § 241 violates the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution. This provision was upheld in *Cotton v. Ford-ice*, 157 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 1998), which was binding on the district court and the panel decision here, but the court voted to reconsider *Cotton* en banc. Having done so, and with the benefit of considerable additional briefing on behalf of plaintiffs, we continue to find that *Cotton*'s result is consistent with the seminal Supreme Court decision in *Hunter v. Underwood*, 471 U.S. 222, 105 S. Ct. 1916 (1985). The district court's judgment is AFFIRMED.

BACKGROUND

I. Mississippi Constitution art. 12, § 241

A historical review of the challenged constitutional provision's evolution is necessary to further discussion. In its current form, the Mississippi Constitution denies the vote to any person “convicted of murder, rape, bribery, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement or bigamy.” Miss. Const. art. 12, § 241. State statutes incorporate the Section 241 list by reference.¹ Miss. Code §§ 23-15-11, 23-15-19.

The original version of Section 241 was adopted as part of the Mississippi Constitution of 1890. It is uncontroverted that the state constitutional convention was steeped in racism and that “the state was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks” when the 1890 Constitution was adopted. *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391. Shortly afterward, the state Supreme Court even emphasized this point. *See Ratliff v. Beale*, 20 So. 865, 868 (Miss. 1896) (acknowledging the “consistent, controlling[,] directing purpose governing the [1890] convention[:] . . . to obstruct the exercise of the franchise by the negro race”). One device that the convention exploited to deny the franchise to blacks was the alteration of a pre-existing felon disenfranchisement law.² Accordingly, Section 241 was reconfigured in the

¹ Mississippi law provides a procedure for disenfranchised felons' voting rights to be restored. Miss. Const. art. 5, § 124, art. 12, § 253; Miss. Code §§ 47-7-31, 47-7-41. These provisions were not argued by the parties or considered by this court.

² It is uncontested that a state may disenfranchise convicted felons. Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution allows states to revoke voting privileges to anyone engaged in “rebellion, or other crime.” *See Richardson v. Ramirez*, 418 U.S. 24, 54, 94 S. Ct. 2655, 2671 (1974) (“[T]he exclusion of

1890 Constitution to eliminate voter disenfranchisement for crimes thought to be “white crimes” and by adding crimes thought to be “black crimes.” If Section 241 had never been amended, the provision would violate the Equal Protection Clause pursuant to *Hunter*. 471 U.S. at 227–28, 105 S. Ct. at 1920. Critically, however, it has been amended.

Since its invidious inception, Section 241 has been reenacted twice according to the state’s procedures for enacting constitutional amendments. Those procedures require, first, that the legislature propose an amendment, and second, that the people ratify it. Only upon an affirmative popular ratification vote does the amendment take effect. Miss. Const. art. 3, §§ 5, 6; art. 15, § 273. The 1950 amendment removed “burglary” from Section 241’s list of disenfranchising crimes.³ In

felons from the vote has an affirmative sanction in § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment.”).

³ The 1950 amendment went to the voters in its entirety, rewriting Section 241 as follows:

Every inhabitant of this state, except idiots, insane persons and Indians not taxed, who is a citizen of the United States of America, twenty-one years old and upwards, who has resided in this state for two years, and one year in the election district, or in the incorporated city or town in which he offers to vote, and who is duly registered as provided in this article, and who has never been convicted of bribery, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement or bigamy, and who has paid on or before the first day of February of the year in which he shall offer to vote, all poll taxes which may have been legally required of him, and which he has had an opportunity of paying according to law, for the two preceding years, and who shall produce to the officers holding the election satisfactory evidence that he has paid such taxes, is declared to be a qualified elector, but any minister of the gospel in charge of an organized church, or his wife legally residing with him, shall be entitled to vote

1968, several significant changes were made to Section 241, including the addition of “rape” and “murder” as crimes resulting in denial of the franchise.⁴

A multi-stage process led to the ratification of both successive versions of Section 241. The deliberative process behind the amendments was consequential. First, each house of the state legislature agreed to the proposed amendments by a two-thirds majority. Next, the entirety of Section 241 as amended was published two weeks before the popular elections. Then the amendments were presented to the public for a majority vote. The ballots presented the voters with two options—to vote “For Amendment” or “Against Amendment”—and the ballots printed out the entire provision as amended. The ballots did not disclose Section 241’s then-existing language, and thus from the face of

after six months residence in the election district, incorporated city or town, if otherwise qualified.

The amendment was enacted by a 66,077 to 14,362 vote. 1952 Miss. Off. & Stat. Reg. 466.

⁴ The 1968 amendments went to the voters in its entirety, rewriting Section 241 as follows:

Every inhabitant of this State, except idiots and insane persons, who is a citizen of the United States of America, twenty-one (21) years old and upwards, who has resided in this State for one (1) year, and for one (1) year in the county in which he offers to vote, and for six (6) months in the election precinct or in the incorporated city or town in which he offers to vote, and who is duly registered as provided in this article, and who has never been convicted of murder, rape, bribery, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement or bigamy, is declared to be a qualified elector.

The amendments were enacted by a 136,846 to 59,888 vote. 1968-72 Miss. Off. & Stat. Reg. 356-57.

the ballot alone, the voters would not know what Section 241 would entail if they voted “Against Amendment.”

The version of Section 241 enacted in 1968 is most relevant because it remains operative today.⁵ In 1965, a federal Civil Rights Commission had issued a detailed report condemning Mississippi’s widespread racist voting practices and denouncing remnants of the 1890 convention’s racist drafting. Specifically, the Commission criticized the various methods the convention used to “accomplish the same result” that “an express denial of the franchise” to black Americans would have accomplished.⁶ Among these devices were residency provisions and poll tax requirements.⁷ Additionally, the Commission took issue with the fact that the “disfranchising crimes were those to which Negroes were thought to be particularly prone” and that the “more serious felonies of murder, rape, or assault were not included.”⁸

The Mississippi legislature responded to these objections in what became the constitutional amendment revising Section 241. In 1968, the Mississippi legislature introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 5 (“H.C.R. No. 5”), which, among other changes, modified the residency requirements, deleted the poll tax requirements, and added the supposed “non-black”

⁵ As a result, we need not address the motivation behind the 1950 amendment.

⁶ Voting in Mississippi, A Report of the United States Commission for Civil Rights, at 3–4 (1965).

⁷ *Id.* at 4–6. The Commission stated that “[t]he requirement of long residency, two years in the State and one year in the election district, was aimed at the supposed ‘disposition of young Negroes . . . to change their homes and precincts every year.’” *Id.* at 6.

⁸ *Id.*

crimes of “murder” and “rape” to the disenfranchising crimes in Section 241. One of the explicit purposes of H.R. No. 5 was “to delete certain improper parts of the section.” These changes were approved by popular vote, as required by the state constitution, and resulted in the reenactment of Section 241 as it stands today.⁹

Post-reenactment information is also instructive. In 1984, Mississippi’s election scheme was scrutinized by a multi-racial Election Law Reform Task Force, led by Democrat Secretary of State Dick Molpus. The Task Force held public hearings throughout the state and met with voting rights lawyers from the U.S. Department of Justice. The Task Force included members of the legislature, executive branch officials, circuit clerks, local election commissioners, and members of the public. Over the course of seven months, the Task Force accepted public comments and deliberated over the state’s election laws. The Task Force contemplated, *inter alia*, whether to amend Section 241 by expanding the list of disenfranchising felonies. For example, the Task Force’s meeting with the U.S. Department of Justice involved “much discussion concerning the broadening of disenfranchising crimes to include all felonies.” Ultimately, however, the members resolved to leave the law “as is.”

In response to the Task Force’s work, both chambers of the 1985 Mississippi legislature formed committees that also studied these issues and considered the Task Force recommendations. One joint committee memorandum recommended expanding Section 241 to include all felony convictions except for tax evasion and

⁹ For the sake of completeness, a further amendment of Section 241 was approved by popular vote in 1972, lowering the voting age from 21 to 18 and reenacting the provision again in its entirety.

manslaughter. A senate bill was introduced to that effect. Ultimately, the Mississippi legislature followed the recommendation of the Task Force and declined to expand the Section 241 list of disenfranchising crimes. Instead, the state's election statutes were amended by, among other things, adding two direct references to the Section 241 list of disenfranchising crimes. The amended statutes took effect after being precleared by the U.S. Department of Justice.¹⁰

II. Current Proceedings

Plaintiffs-Appellants, Roy Harness and Kamal Kariem, are black men in Mississippi who were convicted, respectively, of forgery and embezzlement. Both are disenfranchised under current Mississippi law because of their convictions. They filed suit against the Mississippi Secretary of State under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments seeking declaratory and injunctive relief to restore the voting rights of convicted felons in Mississippi. They contend that the crimes that “remain” in Section 241 from the 1890 Constitution are still tainted by the racial animus with which they were originally enacted. Plaintiffs do not challenge murder and rape in Section 241, which were not part of the 1890 list but were added in 1968.

The district court's thorough and carefully reasoned opinion granted the Secretary's motion for summary judgment. The court acknowledged the precedential effect of this court's holding in *Cotton* that the 1950 and 1968 amendments to Section 241 cleansed the current provision of its previous discriminatory taint. The district court went further to explain that the additional public and legislative deliberations in 1984–86 “show[] the state would have passed section 241 as is

¹⁰ 1986 Miss. Laws, ch. 492. A recent change added voter fraud to the list of disenfranchising crimes. 2021 Miss. Laws, ch. 517.

without racial motivation.” Plaintiffs appealed, and a panel of this court affirmed on similar grounds. See *Harness v. Hosemann*, 988 F.3d 818, 821–23 (5th Cir.), *reh’g en banc granted, opinion vacated*, 2 F.4th 501 (5th Cir. 2021). This court granted plaintiffs’ subsequent request for rehearing en banc.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

A grant of summary judgment is reviewed *de novo* on appeal. *Petro Harvester Operating Co., L.L.C. v. Keith*, 954 F.3d 686, 691 (5th Cir. 2020). All “evidence and inferences from the summary judgment record are viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmovant.” *Tradewinds Env’t Restoration, Inc. v. St. Tammany Park, LLC*, 578 F.3d 255, 258 (5th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Minter v. Great Am. Ins. Co. of N.Y.*, 423 F.3d 460, 465 (5th Cir. 2005)). Summary judgment is appropriate “when the pleadings and evidence demonstrate that no genuine issue of material fact exists and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

DISCUSSION

Plaintiffs, along with the principal dissent, principally argue that, because Section 241 was originally enacted with racial animus in 1890, it cannot survive scrutiny under the Equal Protection Clause. “Because this case is indistinguishable from *Hunter*,” they contend, “the eight originally-listed crimes in Section 241 must be invalidated as unconstitutional.” Further, they assert that *Cotton* was erroneously decided because, when voting on the subsequent reenactments of Section 241, Mississippi voters were never given the opportunity to vote up or down on each specifically listed crime in Section 241. And in any event, they assert, ongoing pervasive racial discrimination in both

1950 and 1968 “render[ed] implausible” the intentional removal of discriminatory intent from Section 241.

After careful consideration of the record and applicable precedents, we reconfirm that Section 241 in its current form does not violate the Equal Protection Clause. Plaintiffs failed to meet their burden of showing that the current version of Section 241 was motivated by discriminatory intent. In addition, Mississippi has conclusively shown that any taint associated with Section 241 has been cured.

I.

All of plaintiffs’ and the principal dissent’s claims derive from *Hunter*, in which the Supreme Court held unconstitutional a provision of the 1901 Alabama Constitution that was adopted in part to disenfranchise blacks convicted of certain misdemeanor offenses. 471 U.S. at 227, 105 S. Ct. at 1919. The Supreme Court affirmed that the *Arlington Heights* standard should be applied to laws, like felon disenfranchisement provisions, that are facially neutral but have racially disproportionate effects.¹¹ According to this standard, “[p]roof of racially discriminatory intent or purpose is required to show a violation of the Equal Protection Clause.” *Vill. of Arlington Heights v. Metro. Hous. Dev. Corp.*, 429 U.S. 252, 265, 97 S. Ct. 555, 563 (1977).¹²

¹¹ The parties present different theories regarding whether and at what point in the analysis *Hunter* requires evidence of unconstitutional effects as well as motive. *Cf. Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 392 n.9. The Supreme Court noted that the existence of ongoing unconstitutional effects had not been challenged by the state of Alabama. *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 227, 105 S. Ct. at 1919–20. We need not reach these questions because plaintiffs fail to make the threshold showing of discriminatory intent.

¹² Pursuant to *Arlington Heights*, evidence of discriminatory

Arlington Heights adopted a two-stage process, which *Hunter* followed. The first stage (“*Hunter* step one”) places the burden on plaintiffs to prove by an evidentiary preponderance that racial discrimination was a substantial or motivating factor in enacting the challenged provision. *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 227–28, 105 S. Ct. at 1920. If the plaintiffs were to succeed on that point, at the second stage (“*Hunter* step two”), the burden shifts to the state to demonstrate that the provision would have been enacted without an impermissible purpose. *Id.* at 228, 105 S. Ct. at 1920 (citing *Mt. Healthy City Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. Doyle*, 429 U.S. 274, 287, 97 S. Ct. 568, 576 (1977)).

The *Hunter* Court acknowledged that proving the motivation for official actions may be a “problematic undertaking.” *Id.* However, the plaintiffs had satisfied *Hunter*’s first step with a wealth of historical evidence that the “zeal for white supremacy ran rampant at the convention,” including specifically the drafting of the disenfranchisement provision. *Id.* at 229, 105 S. Ct. at 1921. Moreover, the Court concluded, the disenfranchisement provision “certainly would not have been adopted by the convention or ratified by the electorate in the absence of the racially discriminatory motivation.” *Id.* at 231, 105 S. Ct. at 1922.

The Court also rejected the state’s position that the

intent may include: (i) whether “a clear pattern, unexplainable on grounds other than race, emerges from the effect of the state action,” (ii) consideration of the “historical background of the decision . . . particularly if it reveals a series of official actions taken for invidious purposes,” and (iii) “the legislative or administrative history,” which “may be highly relevant, especially where there are contemporary statements by members of the decision making body, minutes of its meetings, or reports.” 429 U.S. at 265–68, 97 S. Ct. at 564–65.

provision had been shorn of its original unconstitutional motive by events in the ensuing eighty years, specifically the judicial pruning of criminal miscegenation and a few others considered blatantly racist. *Id.* at 233, 105 S. Ct. at 1922. But the Court added a provocative qualification to this point:

Without deciding whether § 182 would be valid if enacted today without any impermissible motivation, we simply observe that its original enactment was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks on account of race and the section continues to this day to have that effect.

Id. (emphasis added). The *Hunter* Court thus left open the question whether later reenactments would have rendered the provision valid. *See also Abbott v. Perez*, 138 S. Ct. 2305, 2325 (2018).

Three circuit courts, including this one, have answered the Court's hypothetical in the affirmative. *Cotton*, 157 F.3d 388; *Johnson v. Governor of Fla.*, 405 F.3d 1214 (11th Cir. 2005) (en banc); *Hayden v. Paterson*, 594 F.3d 150 (2d Cir. 2010). Their considered exposition of *Hunter* presents a further basis for our conclusions.

In *Cotton*, this court confronted whether the 1950 and 1968 reenactments of Section 241 sufficiently demonstrated that Section 241 in its current form was enacted for race-neutral reasons. *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391–92. As this court noted, "*Hunter* . . . left open the possibility that by amendment, a facially neutral provision like § 241 might overcome its odious origin." *Id.* at 391. It then concluded "[t]hat is what has happened here." *Id.* Emphasizing the "deliberative process" that resulted in the amendments, the court determined that "each amendment superseded the previous provision." *Id.* It also noted that the plaintiff had not offered

any proof of discriminatory intent regarding the current version of Section 241, but rather he relied “exclusively on the Mississippi Supreme Court’s now-irrelevant admission in *Ratliff*” that the 1890 convention enacted Section 241 with impermissible motives. *Id.* at 392. The panel ultimately held that, “[b]ecause the motives of Mississippi’s legislature and voters when § 241 was re-enacted are not impugned, . . . *Hunter* does not condemn § 241.” *Id.*

The two other circuit courts called on to address *Hunter*’s unanswered hypothetical have adopted the *Cotton* approach. In *Johnson*, the Eleventh Circuit’s en banc court considered, *inter alia*, an 1868 voter disenfranchisement provision in the Florida Constitution that was revised as part of a new constitution in 1968. 405 F.3d at 1218–19. The 1868 provision included some enumerated misdemeanors, but the 1968 version only included felonies. *Id.* at 1221. Applying *Hunter*, the court assumed without deciding that there was discriminatory intent behind the 1868 version of the law, but concluded that any racist taint had been eliminated by the subsequent reenactment in 1968. *Id.* at 1223–24. The court emphasized that the *Hunter* Court “did not hold that intervening *legislative* changes to the policy would have been legally insufficient to remove an earlier discriminatory intent.” *Id.* at 1223 n.20. It considered determinative the multistep constitutional revision process, which included approval by the voters as the last step. *Id.* at 1224. The court concluded that “[t]he state has met its burden as a matter of law by substantively reenacting the law for race-neutral reasons.” *Id.* The *Johnson* court cited and relied on *Cotton* throughout its opinion. *Id.* (“Thus, as in *Cotton v. Fordice*, Florida’s 1968 reenactment eliminated any taint from the allegedly discriminatory 1868 provision . . .”).

The Second Circuit employed similar reasoning to analyze a series of felon disenfranchisement provisions contained in three versions of the New York Constitution, all dated in the nineteenth century. *Hayden*, 594 F.3d at 155–56.¹³ New York’s constitutional provisions authorized the legislature to enact disenfranchisement laws for those convicted of “any infamous crime.” *Id.* An earlier constitutional provision *required* the passage of such laws, but the provision was later revised and reenacted to be *permissive*. The most recent amendment, approved in 1894 and still in force, made the disenfranchisement laws *mandatory* again. *Id.* at 156.

The plaintiffs did not allege racist motivation behind the 1894 amendment. *Id.* at 159. Because of this, the court concluded that they failed to establish discriminatory intent, and moreover, any discriminatory taint of the earlier iterations had been cured. *Id.* at 165–67. The Second Circuit agreed with *Johnson* and *Cotton*, concluding that *Hunter* allowed the court independently to consider the intent of the 1894 amendment. *Id.* at 166–67. The Second Circuit addressed but rejected any concern that the changes made to the provision following the tainted enactments were essentially pretextual. *Id.* at 167. The court made clear that (i) no bad faith had been alleged on behalf of the 1894 delegates; (ii) the amendment was substantive in scope, in addition to being deliberative; and (iii) no allegations were made as to the discriminatory intent of the 1894 delegates. *Id.*

II.

Despite the uniform approach of these authorities,

¹³ The plaintiffs separately challenged a state law concerning felon disenfranchisement, but the court’s discussion of that law is inapposite to the present case.

and others,¹⁴ plaintiffs here still contend that *Hunter* is dispositive because the original racist motivation behind eight of the crimes currently listed in Section 241 has not been purged. On its face, this “sins of the father” contention fails. This case is not analogous to

¹⁴ See also *United States v. Johnson*, 40 F.3d 436, 440 (D.C. Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 514 U.S. 1041, 115 S. Ct. 1412 (1995) (asserting, in the context of an Equal Protection challenge to a 1986 federal drug statute, that “the undeniable racism that animated legislative debate leading to the passage of a 1914 statute criminalizing cocaine trafficking generally, long before the crack/powder distinction was contemplated,” is “of no relevance to our inquiry into the motives of the Congress that passed the 1986 Act” (citing *McCleskey v. Kemp*, 481 U.S. 279, 298 n.20, 107 S. Ct. 1756, 1770 n. 20 (1987))). The district courts that have considered this question have also looked to the last enacting legislature’s intent. See *Thompson v. Merrill*, 505 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1255, 1261 (M.D. Ala. 2020) (looking for evidence of continuing discriminatory intent or discriminatory intent of the last enacting legislature); *United States v. Gallegos-Aparicio*, No. 19-CR-2637-GPC, 2020 WL 7318124, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2020) (holding that the defendant’s claim failed because he did not establish that the reenacting Congress was motivated by discrimination); *United States v. Rios-Montano*, No. 19-CR-2123-GPC, 2020 WL 7226441, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 2020) (“Although Mr. Rios-Montano argues that the intent of the prior Congress remains legally operative until a future Congress makes an affirmative contrary showing, other courts that have considered the issue in the context of felon disenfranchisement provisions have rejected this approach.”); *United States v. Novondo-Ceballos*, No. 21-CR-383 RB, 2021 WL 3570229, at *5 (D.N.M. Aug. 12, 2021) (“Even if the Court did not find that Congress purged the racial animus . . . with its later enactment of the INA, . . . other courts have rejected the notion that prior congressional intent remains operative until a future Congress makes an affirmative contrary showing.”); *Lynch by Lynch v. Alabama*, No. CV 08-S-450- NE, 2011 WL 13186739, at *334 (N.D. Ala. Nov. 7, 2011), *aff’d in part, vacated in part on other grounds, I.L. v. Alabama*, 739 F.3d 1273 (11th Cir. 2014) (holding that the plaintiffs had not met their burden of showing the amended provisions were reenacted with discriminatory intent, but that the plaintiffs had met this burden as to the provisions that were never amended).

Hunter because the provision has been, not only reenacted, but reenacted *twice* according to Mississippi state procedures. The qualification in *Hunter* as to subsequent enactments has been understood in multiple decisions in addition to *Cotton* to mean that the decisive legal question is the intent of the legislature that enacted the most recent version of an originally tainted law.¹⁵

That courts must look to the most recent enactment of the challenged provision, not the original tainted version, is fortified, if not fully ratified, by the Supreme Court’s decision in *Abbott v. Perez*, 138 S. Ct. 2305 (2018). *Abbott* reversed a three-judge district court decision that had wrongfully placed the burden on Texas to show that a 2013 redistricting plan had purged the discriminatory “taint” of a previous plan (that had never become effective). *Id.* at 2324. In reaching that result, the Court held that the intent of the enacting legislature (2013) was paramount. The Court was emphatic that “[t]he allocation of the burden of proof and the presumption of legislative good faith are not changed by a finding of past discrimination.” *Id.* “Past discrimination cannot, in the manner of original sin, condemn governmental action that is not itself unlawful.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted). The Court added, “we have never suggested that past discrimination flips the evidentiary burden on its head.” *Id.* at 2325.

¹⁵ See *Johnson*, 405 F.3d at 1223 (“[W]e are concerned here with the validity of the 1968 provision, not the 1868 provision and the plaintiffs conceded that the 1968 provision was not enacted with discriminatory intent”); *Hayden*, 594 F.3d at 162 (plaintiffs’ failure to allege “this invidious purpose motivated the enactment” of the latest constitutional provision was “fatal to plaintiffs’ intentional discrimination claim”).

To be sure, the Court distinguished *Hunter* as involving a “very different situation” and explained that Alabama’s discriminatory provision had never been changed, only “pruned.” *Id.* Culminating its explanation, the Court noted that *Hunter* “specifically declined to address the question whether the then-existing version would have been valid if reenacted today.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted). *Hunter* was expressly different from *Abbott* because the Texas legislature, rather than simply adopting an earlier legislative redistricting plan, had largely modelled a plan developed by a state court during protracted litigation. *Id.* What mattered in *Abbott*, as the Court stated, was thus the intent behind that 2013 legislative act.

In sum, notwithstanding the potential impact of past discrimination on reenacted laws, *Abbott* stands for three propositions. *First*, it squarely placed the burden of proof of intentional discrimination on the law’s challenger. *Second*, the most recent enactment is the one that must be evaluated under the Equal Protection Clause. *Third*, the presumption of legislative good faith persists. *Hunter* stands out because the provision at issue there had remained virtually intact for eighty years, untouched by the legislature, from the time of its patently racist enactment. But the Court noted in *Abbott* that it had no occasion to address the precise question reserved by *Hunter*. *Id.*

For these reasons, we remain confident, contrary to plaintiffs’ principal assertion, that the critical issue here is not the intent behind Mississippi’s 1890 Constitution, but whether the reenactment of Section 241 in 1968 was free of intentional racial discrimination.

III.

As an alternative to asserting that *Hunter* is on all fours with this case, plaintiffs do not even allege that

the 1968 amendment was enacted with discriminatory intent. They concede that they have provided no evidence that the amendment passed with invidious motives in 1968 because they do not believe it necessary. As they put it, “the determinative issue...is not whether the amendments resulted from discrimination (*there is little reason to think that they did*)” (emphasis added). They explain, “[b]ecause [plaintiffs] do not challenge murder and rape, they have no obligation to prove that the 1950 and 1968 amendments were motivated by discrimination.” But this contention, standing alone, perpetuates the “sins of the fathers” discounting of the amendment process, and flips the burden of proof and presumption of legislative good faith contrary to both *Abbott* and *Hunter*.

Instead, plaintiffs and the principal dissent approach *Hunter*’s first step by arguing that the reenactments of Section 241 cannot purge the racially discriminatory taint of the 1890 constitution’s list of disenfranchising crimes. They rest on two propositions: (i) that the state constitutional amendment process did not give voters an opportunity to consider eliminating either in their entirety or individually the bulk of the crimes tainted by racial animus, instead only asking in 1950 whether to remove burglary and in 1968 whether to add rape and murder to the original list; and (ii) that the “extensive hostility of the legislature and much of the white populace to equal rights in 1950 and 1968[] render[] implausible” the assertion that the amendments were made to remove discriminatory taint. The first argument has no support in applicable law, and the second perverts the burden of proof, contrary to *Hunter* and *Abbott*.

Plaintiffs first assert that the more complete historical evidence they offer corrects *Cotton*’s erroneous

conclusion that in the successive amendments of Section 241, a “majority of voters had to approve the entire provision.” 157 F.3d at 391. Plaintiffs also deride *Cotton*’s reliance on the state’s “deliberative process” for constitutional amendments. *Id.* As plaintiffs and the principal dissent would have it, the original discriminatory motivation for the crimes listed in 1890 persists unless the voters were asked to approve or reject every crime tainted in the original version of Section 241.

This principle, if adopted, would extend far beyond *Hunter*’s query about legislative reenactments and would in effect federalize special requirements for purging long-ago discrimination from revised or reenacted state laws. Under *Arlington Heights*, the indicia to evaluate lawmakers’ discriminatory purpose are found in circumstantial evidence such as legislative history, legislators’ public comments, a “clear pattern” of otherwise inexplicable racial impacts, and a “series” of invidious actions.¹⁶ *Hunter*, applying the *Arlington Heights* methodology, says nothing about what it takes for a state legislature to revise its laws and obviate Equal Protection challenges based on decades-old versions.¹⁷ Plaintiffs’ proposal that a state constitutional amendment must be voted on word for word to avoid any vestigial racial taint is radically prescriptive. It would require the revision of state amendment processes, supplanting those provisions with some kind of constitutional plebiscite. *Cotton*, like other courts, interpreted *Hunter* to authorize federal courts only to

¹⁶ See *Arlington Heights* criteria, *supra* n.12

¹⁷ *Hunter* rejected the sufficiency of judicial “pruning,” of course, but that is distinct from prescribing an approved reenactment procedure for states to effectively purge original discriminatory taint.

discern legislative intent¹⁸ according to *Arlington Heights*'s methodology. No subsequent case law supports plaintiffs' novel, judicially crafted political theory of public consent.¹⁹

Not only is plaintiffs' and the principal dissent's overarching theory deficient, but it also mischaracterizes the regularity and legal effect of the state's subsequent amendments of Section 241. That the state conformed to its procedural requirements is fully explained earlier in this opinion and need not be restated. There is no dispute that the amendments were enacted in compliance with state law. As further shown above, the voters had to approve the full text of

¹⁸ The term "legislative intent" is used here as shorthand for the process by which a statute *or* constitutional amendment is enacted. *Arlington Heights* canvassed indicia of "legislative intent" because an ordinance was at issue there, while in *Hunter* the Court had to determine the intent behind a state constitutional amendment. In the instant case, Mississippi's amendment process is not complete until the voters have ratified the legislature's proposed amendment. Plaintiffs here have disclaimed discriminatory intent by the legislature or voters in the 1968 amendment process.

¹⁹ Plaintiffs and the principal dissent erroneously contend that *Abbott* expanded *Hunter*. They repeatedly reference this quotation: "[T]he [judicial] amendments [in *Hunter*] did not alter the intent with which the article, including the *parts that remained*, had been adopted." *Abbott*, 138 S. Ct. at 2325 (emphasis added). Plaintiffs claim that any part of the original provision that remains and was not individually voted on in the later amendments must fail under *Abbott*'s interpretation of *Hunter*. They read too much into this merely descriptive statement about what happened in *Hunter*. The Court would hardly adopt a major analytical change while distinguishing *Hunter*'s facts. And indeed, in the next sentence, *Abbott* reaffirms *Hunter*'s qualification, stating, "[b]ut the Court [in *Hunter*] specifically declined to address the question whether the then-existing version would have been valid if reenacted today." *Id.* (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted).

Section 241 as amended, not merely bare propositions regarding whether to delete burglary or add murder and rape. Also in 1968, the amendment significantly altered residency requirements and the poll tax, both of which had been originally infected by racial animus. The 1968 amendment process bears no hint of subterfuge to covertly maintain racial discrimination.²⁰ Contrary to plaintiffs' and the principal dissent's word-by-word approach, the process used in 1968 was sufficient to reenact Section 241 in its entirety. Finally, under Mississippi law, constitutional amendments "overrule[] the prior interpretation[s], which become[] for all practical purposes relegated to history" and "cease[] to exist." *State ex rel. Moore v. Molpus*, 578 So. 2d 624, 639 (Miss. 1991). Section 241 as it existed in 1890 "ceased to exist," rendering the discriminatory intent behind its original enactment irrelevant here and purging the original taint by reenactments of the whole provision.²¹

Plaintiffs' second argument about the amendment process is that *Cotton* failed to examine the "historical context" in which the 1950 and 1968 amendments were passed, that is, the state's ongoing racism throughout that period. We are not blind to the state's

²⁰ *Cf. Hayden*, 594 F.3d at 167 (expressing concern about subterfuge).

²¹ At oral argument, plaintiffs' counsel asserted that Section 241 was *void ab initio* because it was invalid as enacted in 1890. *See Med. Ctr. Pharmacy v. Mukasey*, 536 F.3d 383, 401 (5th Cir. 2008). They ask the court to conclude both that "it is as though [the legislature] had not acted at all" and also that the discriminatory taint from this legislative "nonaction" persists today. *See id.* But that is a non sequitur. No matter what happened in 1890, all plaintiffs establish is that Section 241 was *de novo* reenacted in 1968. And they have no evidence of discriminatory motive in connection with that process.

deplorable history of racial discrimination, or its delayed response to the end of de jure segregation, or its attempts to suppress black voter participation during that period. But the overall social and political climate in Mississippi in the 1950s and 1960s fails to carry plaintiffs' burden to prove that the 1968 amendment intentionally discriminated against black voters.

Similarly, half of the principal dissenting opinion recounts racism in Mississippi during this period, but none of this history appears in the record before the district court or this court. None of this history refers to or bears on the 1968 amendments to all of Section 241. Equally important, the dissent's attempt to create a fact issue is at odds with plaintiffs' concession that "there is little reason to think" racial discrimination motivated the amendments.

Not only does the legislative history of the 1968 amendment lack evidence of discriminatory intent in regard to the list of disenfranchising crimes, but if anything, it tends to support the opposite proposition. The legislature was trying to eliminate several objections contained in the then-recent findings of the Civil Rights Commission. Thus, the amendment of Section 241 included adding supposedly "non-black" crimes to the disenfranchising list, modifying voter residency requirements, and deleting the poll tax. All such changes had been sought by the Commission and indicate an intent to, at a minimum, avoid a challenge to the law, or to win in court if there were such a challenge.²²

²² Further, as this court has noted, the fact that an amendment seeks to alleviate constitutional concerns does not alone constitute evidence of unconstitutional motivation. *See Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Tex. Alcoholic Bev. Comm'n.*, 945 F.3d 206, 216 (5th Cir. 2019) (that the drafter "sought to create a law that would

Accordingly, as a matter of law, plaintiffs have not demonstrated that Section 241 as it currently stands was motivated by discriminatory intent or that any other approach to demonstrating the provision's unconstitutionality is viable.

IV.

Because of plaintiffs' failure to show discriminatory intent, the burden never shifted to the Secretary under *Hunter's* second step. Pursuant to the second step, courts seek to determine whether the current provision would still have been enacted without discriminatory intent. 471 U.S. at 228, 105 S. Ct. at 1920 (citing *Mt. Healthy*, 429 U.S. at 287, 97 S. Ct. at 576). As discussed, the two later constitutional amendments had the effect of reenacting Section 241 in its entirety.²³ But even if there remained a question of discriminatory intent arising from the 1968 amendment, plaintiffs' claims would still fail because Mississippi produced additional evidence that eliminated any taint from Section 241.²⁴

The 1984–86 discussions involving the public, those

survive a constitutional challenge is not evidence of a discriminatory legislative purpose”).

²³ Judge Graves has disavowed in the dissent what he wrote a few years ago: “The passage of time and the actions of intervening parties cut that thread of intent in *Cotton*: two legislatures, acting eighteen years apart (with the first acting sixty years after the offending constitutional provision was enacted) approved the amendments by two-thirds majorities, and then the entire sections—not just the amendments—were subject to statewide votes in favor of full reenactment.” *Veasey v. Abbott*, 888 F.3d 792, 822 (5th Cir. 2018) (Graves, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part).

²⁴ The dissent fails to acknowledge the impact of subsequent public deliberations concerning felon disenfranchisement.

in the Task Force, and the Mississippi legislative committees illustrate that Section 241 in its current form reflects purposeful and race-neutral contemplation. To be sure, legislative inaction is generally unreliable when used to interpret statutes or regulations. *See Rapanos v. United States*, 547 U.S. 715, 749, 126 S. Ct. 2208, 2231 (2006). But here, the court is not tasked with interpreting Section 241. Rather, the inquiry is one of motivation: whether Section 241 would have been enacted in its current form absent racial discrimination. *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 228, 105 S. Ct. at 1920. Later events—even if they ultimately result in legislative inaction—are not irrelevant to demonstrating intent. In this case, subsequent legislative attention to Mississippi’s election laws indicates that Section 241 was carefully evaluated before the legislature opted to leave it unchanged.

The Task Force recommendations and legislative process bespeak the nondiscriminatory motivations of the public and the legislature. The Task Force considered all aspects of voting in Mississippi, including the impact of any proposed revisions on minority communities. It met with the U.S. Department of Justice to discuss the conformity of its proposals with the Voting Rights Act. In this meeting, there was “much discussion concerning the broadening of disenfranchising crimes to include all felonies, and it was decided that additional review was necessary.” The Task Force ultimately resolved to recommend leaving Section 241 “as is.”

Later, a legislative joint committee considered the Task Force’s recommendations and conducted another independent investigation.²⁵ The committee recommended expanding the list of disenfranchising felonies

²⁵ In the report, the committee took issue with the fact that “some twenty-nine (29) statutes that are presently on the books, and

to include all felonies²⁶ (other than manslaughter and tax-related felonies). Ultimately, the legislature opted to maintain the shorter list of disenfranchising crimes rather than expand it. In addition, the legislature amended existing state statutes, incorporating Section 241 by reference in two code provisions. These changes were precleared by the U.S. Department of Justice.

In total, the 1968 legislature, the 1968 general electorate of the state of Mississippi, the Task Force, and to some extent, the U.S. Department of Justice all considered Section 241 and approved it in its current form. It is hard to imagine a stronger showing that Section 241 would have been passed in its current form without racial motivation. *See Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 227–28, 105 S. Ct. at 1920.

CONCLUSION

We reaffirm that the current version of Section 241 superseded the previous provisions and removed the discriminatory taint associated with the provision adopted in 1890. *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391–92. Plaintiffs fail to establish the 1968 reenactment of Section 241 was motivated by racism. The judgment of the district

presumably being followed, have never been submitted to the U.S. Justice Department as required by the Voting Rights Act of 1965.” It then noted that “[t]he committee decided to proceed by taking the present set of laws and attempting to clarify them; to conform the statutes with judicial decisions and regulations; to repeal sections which have never been submitted or have been disapproved by the U.S. Justice Department” Notably, for instance, the committee recommended repealing the anti-single shot provision, partially because “courts . . . have declared them in violation of the 14th Amendment . . . and of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.”

²⁶ This would naturally have included the felonies listed in the current version of Section 241.

25a

court is AFFIRMED.

JAMES C. HO, *Circuit Judge*, concurring in part and concurring in the judgment:

Nothing in the Constitution forbids states from disqualifying felons from voting. To the contrary, Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment expressly contemplates that states may disenfranchise felons. It specifically provides that a state shall be apportioned fewer members of the House of Representatives if it denies the franchise to any citizens over the age of twenty-one for any reason “*except for participation in rebellion, or other crime.*” U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 2 (emphasis added).

So “the exclusion of felons from the vote has an affirmative sanction in § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment.” *Richardson v. Ramirez*, 418 U.S. 24, 54 (1974). This conclusion derives not only from the text of Section 2, but also “the understanding of those who framed and ratified the Fourteenth Amendment.” *Id.* at 48. After all, “at the time of the adoption of the Amendment, 29 States had provisions in their constitution which prohibited, or authorized the legislature to prohibit, exercise of the franchise by persons convicted of felonies.” *Id.*

At the same time, States may not pick and choose which felons to disenfranchise in a manner that contravenes other provisions of the Constitution. For example, States could not disenfranchise felons based on their political party or religious beliefs. That would presumably violate the First and Fourteenth Amendments. *See Hand v. Scott*, 888 F.3d 1206, 1211–12 (11th Cir. 2018). Likewise, States could not disenfranchise felons based on their race. That would violate the Equal Protection Clause of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment. *See Hunter v. Underwood*, 471 U.S. 222 (1985).

As the court today rightly observes, the history of felon disenfranchisement in the State of Mississippi is indisputably tainted by racism. But as the court also correctly concludes, the Mississippi law in effect today does not violate the Equal Protection Clause. It certainly does not classify felons based on race. Moreover, as the court amply demonstrates, there is every indication that Mississippi would re-enact precisely the same law today for reasons wholly unmotivated by race. *See ante*, at 20–22. So under governing Supreme Court precedent, Mississippi law cannot be held unconstitutional on grounds of discriminatory intent.

I write separately to offer a separate and distinct reason why the court is right to uphold Mississippi law—namely, the absence of any discriminatory effect as well as intent. After all, Mississippi law does not disproportionately disenfranchise African-American voters at a higher rate than would a blanket felon disenfranchisement law. And Plaintiffs do not contend otherwise.

For these reasons, I agree with the court that Mississippi law is “affirmative[ly] sanction[ed]” by Section 2, *Richardson*, 418 U.S. at 54, and that accordingly we must affirm.

I.

The 1890 Mississippi Constitution contained a felon disenfranchisement provision. MISS. CONST. art. 12, § 241. As originally enacted, Section 241 did not categorically disenfranchise all felons, but instead targeted certain felonies for disenfranchisement—namely, bribery, burglary, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretenses, perjury, forgery, embezzlement, and bigamy. *Id.* In 1950, Section 241 was amended to remove burglary from the list. In 1968, murder and rape were added.

On its face, Section 241 does not disenfranchise any person based on race. But the Supreme Court has made clear that a facially neutral felon disenfranchisement law violates the Equal Protection Clause if (1) the law is motivated by a desire to discriminate on the basis of race, and (2) it continues to have that effect to this day. *See, e.g., Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 233 (holding Alabama felon disenfranchisement law unconstitutional because it “was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks on account of race and the section continues to this day to have that effect”).

So Plaintiffs must establish both discriminatory intent and effect. As *Hunter* explains, and other courts have repeatedly reaffirmed, “[a] successful equal protection claim under the Fourteenth Amendment requires proof of *both* an intent to discriminate and actual discriminatory effect.” *Greater Birmingham Ministries v. Secretary of State*, 992 F.3d 1299, 1321 (11th Cir. 2021) (collecting cases). *See also, e.g., Hand*, 888 F.3d at 1209 (“in *Hunter*, . . . a state’s method for re-enfranchising a convicted felon would violate equal protection if the scheme had both the purpose and effect of invidious discrimination”); *Hayden v. Cty. of Nassau*, 180 F.3d 42, 48 (2nd Cir. 1999) (“[A] facially neutral statute violates equal protection if it was motivated by discriminatory animus and its application results in a discriminatory effect.”). I have found no governing precedent holding a law unconstitutional based on discriminatory intent alone, in the absence of discriminatory effect. And Plaintiffs do not cite any.¹

¹ The dissent contends that I have misconstrued *Hunter*, and that under a proper reading of that decision, “Plaintiffs do not need to establish discriminatory impact” to state a viable constitutional claim under *Hunter*. *Post*, at _ n.5. But that is contradicted by the various post-*Hunter* precedents that I discuss above. The dissent does not confront any of these authorities. Nor does it offer any

As a historical matter, it is undisputed that the original drafters of Section 241 cherry-picked felonies in 1890 with the deliberate, explicit, and noxious purpose of suppressing the African-American vote. *See, e.g., Cotton v. Fordice*, 157 F.3d 388, 391 (5th Cir. 1998) (“The state defendants do not dispute that § 241 was enacted in an era when southern states discriminated against blacks by disenfranchising convicts for crimes that, it was thought, were committed primarily by blacks.”).²

But the parties disagree as to whether the amendments enacted in 1950 and 1968 served to cleanse Section 241 of its original racist intent. Our court today presents the strongest available arguments and authorities for upholding Section 241 in light of those amendments. I am particularly persuaded by the ample evidence marshaled by the court that Mississippi would enact the same law today for reasons wholly unrelated to race. *See ante*, at 20–21 (“[E]ven if there remained a question of discriminatory intent arising from the 1968 amendment, plaintiffs’ claims would still fail because Mississippi produced additional evidence” that “Section 241 would have been enacted in its current form absent racial discrimination”).

I write separately to address the issue expressly reserved by our court today—whether Section 241 presents “ongoing unconstitutional effects” of racial discrimination. *See ante*, at 9 n.11. I conclude that, even

authority that interprets *Hunter* as it suggests.

² The original 1890 Mississippi Constitution also required racially segregated schools, Miss. Const. art. 8, § 207, and prohibited interracial marriage, Miss. Const. art. 14, § 263. Those provisions were not repealed until 1978 and 1987, respectively, notwithstanding *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), and *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967).

if one were to assume the continued taint of discriminatory intent, Plaintiffs cannot show that Section 241 is racially discriminatory in effect, as both Supreme Court and circuit precedent require. *Cf. Tex. Democratic Party v Abbott*, 961 F.3d 389, 416 (5th Cir. 2020) (Ho, J., concurring) (writing separately to explain why preliminary injunction against Texas election law is flawed “even if one were to assume that Texas law violates the Twenty-Sixth Amendment”).

II.

Plaintiffs cannot satisfy the discriminatory effect element for one simple reason: Section 241 does not disproportionately disenfranchise a greater percentage of African-Americans today than would a blanket felon disenfranchisement law. Indeed, Plaintiffs acknowledged as much during oral argument. And that admission is fatal to Plaintiffs’ case.

Blanket felon disenfranchisement laws are indisputably constitutional under Section 2. *See, e.g., Richardson*, 418 U.S. at 54; *see also id.* at 72 (Marshall, J., dissenting) (“The Court construes § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment as an express authorization for the States to disenfranchise former felons.”); LAURENCE H. TRIBE, *AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW* 1094 (2nd ed. 1988) (same).

So if a blanket felon disenfranchisement law is permissible, then it’s hard to see how a narrower, more selective law would be unconstitutional. After all, it’s undisputed that the racial composition of the disenfranchised population is substantially the same either way. In the absence of any racial disparity between the two approaches, logic would dictate that the greater power should include the lesser power.

Moreover, the reasoning behind Plaintiffs’ contrary approach is difficult to understand. Under Plaintiffs’

theory, Section 241 would avoid constitutional infirmity if the State *expanded* it to cover *all* felonies. It is a peculiar theory of equal protection that teaches States to avoid liability for discriminating against people of a particular race by disenfranchising *more* individuals of that race.

III.

Plaintiffs respond by invoking *Hunter*. But nothing in that decision supports their logic.

To begin with, *Hunter* acknowledges the “implicit authorization of § 2 to deny the vote to citizens “for participation in rebellion, or other crime,” as the Court recognized in *Richardson. Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 233 (citing *Richardson*). This is unsurprising, considering that both *Hunter* and *Richardson* were authored by then-Justice Rehnquist. More importantly, it means that blanket felon disenfranchisement laws are constitutional—and that we cannot construe *Hunter* to suggest otherwise.

In addition, it was conceded in *Hunter* that Alabama law disproportionately suppressed the African-American vote by cherry-picking offenses to exclude a greater percentage of African-Americans than would a blanket felon disenfranchisement law. And that concession was critical to proving both the discriminatory intent and disproportionate effect required to establish an equal protection violation.

To begin with, the Court found discriminatory intent because “the crimes selected for inclusion . . . were believed by the delegates to be *more frequently committed by blacks*” than other crimes. *Id.* at 227 (emphasis added). The drafters of the Alabama disenfranchisement law specifically “selected such crimes . . . that were thought to be *more commonly committed by blacks.*” *Id.* at 232 (emphasis added).

Second, Alabama conceded that this cherry-picking worked—that it caused a discriminatory effect on African-American voters. As the Court noted, the racially discriminatory “impact . . . of the provision *has not been contested.*” *Id.* at 227 (emphasis added). Moreover, the Court referred explicitly to the findings of the Court of Appeals. *Id.* That is notable because, according to the Court of Appeals, the State of Alabama never even bothered to suggest that its disenfranchisement law excluded African-Americans in “similarly disproportionate numbers” as the general felon population and therefore presented no discriminatory effect. *Underwood v. Hunter*, 730 F.2d 614, 620 n.11 (11th Cir. 1984) (emphasis added).

So the plaintiffs in *Hunter* demonstrated both discriminatory intent and effect. This case, by contrast, presents neither element. Mississippi vigorously maintains that its disenfranchisement law results in no racial disparity compared to the general felon population. And Plaintiffs do not contend otherwise.

For their part, Plaintiffs theorize that we should compare the racial effects of Section 241, not to the general felon population, but to the entire population of Mississippi. But that is not the proper comparator for determining whether Section 241 indeed has a discriminatory effect.

When a party challenges the racial composition of a jury as discriminatory in violation of the Sixth Amendment, the relevant baseline is not the general population, but the population of eligible jurors. *See, e.g., Berghuis v. Smith*, 559 U.S. 314, 323 (2010) (“‘Absolute disparity’ is determined by subtracting the percentage of African–Americans in the jury pool . . . from the percentage of African–Americans in the local, jury-eligible population.”). When a party contests the use of peremptory strikes as racially biased in violation of the

Equal Protection Clause, the relevant baseline is not the general population, but the jury pool. *See, e.g., Seals v. Vannoy*, 1 F.4th 362, 366 (5th Cir. 2021) (examining “the number of strikes in comparison to the number of people in the jury pool who were black”). When a party objects to the racial composition of a particular workforce as the product of racism in contravention of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the relevant baseline is not the general population, but the universe of workers who are actually qualified to do the job in that particular labor market. *See, e.g., City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.*, 488 U.S. 469, 501–02 (1989) (“[T]he relevant statistical pool for purposes of demonstrating discriminatory exclusion must be the number of minorities qualified to undertake the particular task.”).

And so too here. The relevant baseline in this case is not the general population, but the population of felons subject to disenfranchisement under Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment. And Plaintiffs fail to present any such racial disparity as compared to the general felon population in Mississippi.³

Finally, Plaintiffs suggested during oral argument that it should not matter that Section 241 causes the

³ The dissent claims that, at a minimum, “there is a factual dispute about discriminatory impact” that necessitates remand. *Post*, at _ n.5. But I don’t see a material fact dispute here. No one denies that there’s a meaningful disparity between the disenfranchised population and the entire population of Mississippi. But no one claims that there’s a meaningful disparity between the disenfranchised population and the felon population of Mississippi. Where we part company is deciding which comparison is determinative: Do we compare the disenfranchised population to the general felon population—or to the citizenry at large? As explained, I say it’s the former. The dissent says it’s the latter. Whoever is right, it’s surely a legal dispute and not a factual one.

same racial disparities as a blanket felon disenfranchisement law would. They theorize in essence that, because racial disparities exist across the entire criminal justice system in Mississippi, Section 241 should go down with the ship.

It should go without saying that, if there is racial discrimination anywhere in the criminal justice system in Mississippi—whether within police departments, among prosecutors, or in the courtroom—we must eliminate it, root and branch. “Nothing is more corrosive to public confidence in our criminal justice system than the perception that there are two different legal standards.” *Gomez v. Galman*, 18 F.4th 769, 783 (5th Cir. 2021) (Ho, J., concurring) (quotations omitted) (collecting cases alleging racism by police officers).

But if there is indeed such discrimination at work here, it is entirely exogenous to Section 241. Imagine the following hypothetical: An employer holds a job fair on a particular date. A racist group of police officers, unbeknownst to the employer, blocks the roads and highways so that a particular racial group cannot attend the job fair. The police officers are plainly guilty of racial discrimination. But the employer is not—even though there is now racial disparity at the job fair.

* * *

Plaintiffs no doubt present sincere concerns that Section 241 not only comes to us with a troubling provenance—it also operates today to disproportionately disenfranchise African-Americans.

But disparity alone does not prove discrimination. *See, e.g., Milliken v. Bradley*, 433 U.S. 267, 280 n.14 (1977) (“[T]he Court has consistently held that the Constitution is not violated by racial imbalance . . . without more.”). And in this case, there is not even a

relevant disparity. Section 241 does not disenfranchise African-American voters at a greater rate than other felon disenfranchisement laws. So if there is racism in Mississippi's criminal justice system, it is upstream from Section 241. And holding Section 241 unconstitutional based on flawed metrics would not cure it.

What's more, applying the wrong numerical analysis is not just a matter of statistical imprecision. It also confounds our country's fundamental commitments.

The Constitution promises equality of treatment, not equality of outcome. It does not ask whether we have too many people of a particular race, whether in a prison, at a workplace, or on a college campus. Rather, it asks only whether the law governs every citizen in the same manner, regardless of their race. The Equal Protection Clause enshrines color-blindness, not critical race theory. *See, e.g., Rollerson v. Brazos River Harbor Navigation Dist.*, 6 F.4th 633, 647–50 (5th Cir. 2021) (Ho, J., concurring in part and concurring in the judgment); *Veasey v. Abbott*, 13 F.4th 362, 371–79 (5th Cir. 2021) (Ho, J., concurring).

I agree that we should affirm.

JENNIFER WALKER ELROD, *Circuit Judge*, dissenting:

As the majority acknowledges and the dissenters explain, it is undisputed that the enactment of § 241 was “steeped in racism.” *Ante* at 2. Only six years after its enactment, the Supreme Court of Mississippi explained the motive and selection criteria for § 241’s nine disenfranchising crimes. “Restrained by the federal constitution from discriminating against the negro race, the convention discriminated against its characteristics and the offenses to which its weaker members were prone.” *Ratliff v. Beale*, 20 So. 865, 868 (Miss. 1896). While recognizing its invidious origins, the majority concludes that subsequent amendments to § 241 have cured the racial animus and legitimated—for equal protection purposes—the remaining crimes originally listed in the Mississippi Constitution of 1890.

I am not so sure. If Mississippi had subsequently reenacted § 241 in the absence of discriminatory intent, § 241 would pose no equal protection problem. But as Judge Graves’s dissenting opinion points out, the Mississippi electorate has never been asked to either remove or approve of eight of the nine original crimes. When burglary was removed in 1950, and when rape and murder were added in 1968, Mississippians were given only an “up or down” option to approve § 241 as amended—not to approve § 241 as it then existed. *Post* at 45–48 (Graves, J., dissenting). Because Mississippians were never given the option to remove the racially tainted list, as I understand *Hunter v. Underwood*—which binds us—I am not satisfied that the relevant parts of § 241 have been ‘reenacted.’ *See* 471 U.S. 222, 233 (1985). Having failed to reenact it, the State is stuck with its discriminatory intent.

Under *Hunter*, the burden then shifts to the State

to show that § 241 would have been enacted in the absence of the illicit intent. 471 U.S. at 228. Even assuming that (1) the relevant time period for this inquiry is not 1890, and (2) the State does not conclusively fail to carry its burden as of 1890, I agree with Judge Graves’s dissenting opinion that—at the very least—there are fact issues on this question that preclude summary judgment.

That being said, separate and apart from questions of intent, I agree with Judge Ho’s concurring opinion that the plaintiffs must further show that § 241 continues to have a discriminatory effect. *Ante* at 25 (Ho, J., concurring in part and concurring in the judgment) (citing, *e.g.*, *Greater Birmingham Ministries v. Sec’y of State for Ala.*, 992 F.3d 1299, 1321 (11th Cir. 2021) (“A successful equal protection claim under the Fourteenth Amendment requires proof of *both* an intent to discriminate and actual discriminatory effect.”)); *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 233 (“[The] original enactment [of § 182] was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks on account of race and the section continues to this day to have that effect.”). Because the district court may address intent and effect in either order, the absence of an ongoing discriminatory effect may alone be dispositive in this case. But as Judge Graves’s dissenting opinion notes, the district court did not analyze the parties’ conflicting arguments or evidence about discriminatory effect. *Post* at 44 n.5 (Graves, J., dissenting). For this reason, I would remand for the district court to address whether plaintiffs have demonstrated § 241’s discriminatory effect in the first instance. *Montano v. Texas*, 867 F.3d 540, 546 (5th Cir. 2017) (“[W]e are a court of review, not first view.” (quotation omitted)).

HAYNES, *Circuit Judge*, dissenting:

I agree with the conclusion reached in Judge Graves's dissenting opinion as to what the decision in this case should be. In my view, the bottom line as to the relevant issues is that § 241 was enacted with discriminatory intent (which no one disputes), that it continues to have discriminatory impact, and that the provision was not "reenacted" via amendment in 1950 or 1968. At no point did the Mississippi electorate have the option of striking the entirety of § 241's disenfranchisement provision. This court's decision in *Cotton v. Fordice*, 157 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 1998), was wrong to conclude that § 241's subsequent amendments were enacted through a "deliberative process" capable of cleansing the discriminatory taint of 1890. *See id.* at 392. Because I disagree with the majority opinion's judgment to the contrary, I respectfully dissent.

JAMES E. GRAVES, JR., *Circuit Judge*, joined by STEWART, DENNIS, HIGGINSON, and COSTA, *Circuit Judges*, dissenting:

*“There is no use to equivocate or lie about the matter . . . Mississippi’s constitutional convention of 1890 was held for no other purpose than to eliminate the nigger from politics In Mississippi we have in our constitution legislated against the racial peculiarities of the Negro When that device fails, we will resort to something else.”*¹

This is the intent behind the law the en banc court upholds today. In 1890, Mississippi held a constitutional convention with the express aim of enshrining white supremacy. The 1890 Convention was a backlash against Reconstruction-era efforts to remedy centuries of chattel slavery and violence against Black people. The Convention was successful. The new constitution erased racial progress in Mississippi primarily through disenfranchising Black voters, formally beginning the Jim Crow era of the American South. Today the en banc majority upholds a provision enacted in 1890 that was expressly aimed at preventing Black Mississippians from voting. And it does so by concluding that a virtually all-white electorate and legislature, otherwise engaged in massive and violent resistance to the Civil Rights Movement, “cleansed” that provision in 1968. Handed an opportunity to right a 130-year-old wrong, the majority instead upholds it. I respectfully dissent.

¹ Statement in 1890 of James K. Vardaman. Statements like these would win Vardaman a seat as Mississippi’ state representative, 1890-96; Speaker of Mississippi’s House of Representatives, 1894-96; Mississippi’s Governor, 1904-08; and Mississippi’s U.S. Senator, 1913-19. NEIL R. McMILLEN, *DARK JOURNEY: BLACK MISSISSIPPIANS IN THE AGE OF JIM CROW* 43 (1990).

I.

A.

The Reconstruction Act of 1867 allowed Black Mississippians to vote for the first time in the State's history. UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, VOTING IN MISSISSIPPI 1 (1965). In 1867 Blacks made up a majority of the state's population. Their voter participation skyrocketed, producing several Black elected officials, including a Black United States Senator. *Id.* at 2. Mississippi is currently home to the highest percentage of Black Americans of any state in the Union. And yet, Mississippi has not elected a Black person to statewide office since, unsurprisingly, 1890.

No one disputes that the chief aim of Mississippi's 1890 Convention was white supremacy. Nor could anyone do so in good faith, as the delegates themselves readily declared their intentions: "Our chief duty when we meet in Convention is to devise such measures . . . as will enable us to maintain a home government, under the control of the white people of the State." McMillen, *supra*, at 41. "The plan," said U.S. Senator James Zacariah George, "is to invest permanently the powers of government in the hands of the people who ought to have them—the white people." *Id.* The Convention's President similarly avowed its blatantly racist purpose: "Let's tell the truth if it bursts the bottom of the Universe. We came here to exclude the Negro. Nothing short of this will answer." *Id.* (statement of Solomon Saladin "S.S." Calhoun) (cleaned up)). Of course, all of the 1890 Convention's 134 delegates were white Democrats, save just one African-American Republican. A white Republican named Marsh Cook had campaigned for a seat vowing to protect the rights of Black Freedmen. But a few weeks before the convention, his bullet-riddled corpse was found on a rural road in Jasper

County. “*Another White Man Murdered in Mississippi*,” CLEVELAND GAZETTE, Aug. 2, 1890, at 2.

The Convention’s intent was plain. Its primary method? Disenfranchisement.² According to a unanimous Mississippi Supreme Court in 1896, the 1890 Convention’s purpose was “to obstruct the exercise of the franchise by the Negro race.” *Ratliff v. Beale*, 20 So. 865, 868 (Miss. 1896). One of the key provisions enacted in 1890, and at the heart of this case, disenfranchised voters who committed certain crimes. MISS. CONST. art. XII, § 241 (1890). The crimes the legislature settled on were those thought to be more likely

² Of course, the 1890 Convention enacted several other racist provisions:

- “The marriage of a white person with a negro or mulatto, or person who shall have one-eighth or more of negro blood, shall be unlawful and void.” MISS. CONST. art. XIV, § 263 (1890).
- “Separate schools shall be maintained for children of the white and colored races.” MISS. CONST. art. VIII, § 207 (1890).
- “[The legislature] may provide for the commutation of the sentence of convicts for good behavior, and for the constant separation of the sexes, and for the separation of the white and black convicts as far as practicable.” MISS. CONST. art. VIII, § 225 (1890).
- As opposed to previous state constitutions’ extending the right to bear arms to “all persons,” MISS. CONST. art. I, § 15 (1868), the 1890 constitution gave that right only to “every citizen,” enabling the legislature to “regulate or forbid carrying concealed weapons,” MISS. CONST. art. VIII, § 12 (1890). These provisions, of course, were intended to prevent Black Mississippians from arming. *See Ward v. Colom*, 253 So. 3d 265, 279 (Miss. 2018) (King, J., dissenting) (explaining that these alterations were “craftily designed to obstruct or deny certain rights to African Americans” (quoting WESTLEY F. BUSBEE, JR., MISSISSIPPI: A HISTORY 178 (2d ed. 2015)); Clayton E. Cramer, *The Racist Roots of Gun Control*, 4 Kan. J. L. & Pub. Pol’y 17 (1994)).

committed by Black people, a “patient, docile people . . . given rather to furtive offenses than to the robust crimes of the whites.” *Ratliff*, 20 So. 865 at 868 (listing “[b]urglary, theft, arson, and obtaining money under false pretenses” as the furtive offenses to which Blacks were thought to be “prone,” as opposed to “robbery and murder and other crimes in which violence was the principal ingredient,” which were viewed as “crimes of the whites”); *see also* MCMILLEN, *supra*, at 43. When enacted in 1890, § 241 listed nine disenfranchising offenses: bribery, burglary, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement, and bigamy. MISS. CONST. art. XII, § 241 (1890).

Section 241 has been amended only twice since 1890. In 1950, voters approved an amendment to remove burglary. In 1968, voters approved an amendment to add rape and murder. In both instances, voters voted yes or no on removing burglary or adding rape and murder, respectively. As for the other eight crimes listed in § 241, however, Mississippi voters have not spoken on them since 1890. So those eight crimes, that the 1890 Convention listed with express racist intent, remain on the books entirely unchanged and continue to disenfranchise Mississippians today.

B.

Plaintiffs are two Black Mississippians who are disenfranchised by § 241. Roy Harness was convicted of forgery in 1986. He has since completed his sentence. In 2018, he completed his baccalaureate degree in social work from Jackson State University and was awarded a scholarship towards a master’s degree—all at the age of 62. Due to his 1986 conviction and the operation of § 241, however, Harness is unable to vote. Kamal Karriem was convicted of embezzlement in 2005 and has also completed his sentence. Karreim is

a former city council member, a pastor, and business owner. Like Harness, Karreim is unable to vote because embezzlement is a disenfranchising offense under § 241.

Plaintiffs sued Mississippi and raised equal protection claims under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments.

II.

A law prohibiting the right to vote is unconstitutional if “its original enactment was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks on account of race[.]” *Hunter v. Underwood*, 471 U.S. 222, 233 (1985). “Once racial discrimination is shown to have been a ‘substantial’ or ‘motivating’ factor behind enactment of the law, the burden shifts to the law’s defenders to demonstrate that the law would have been enacted without this factor.” *Id.* at 228 (citing *Mt. Healthy City Bd. of Ed. v. Doyle*, 429 U.S. 274, 287 (1977)). The original discriminatory taint on the law may be “cleansed” by striking down the inseverable, tainted portions of the law. Amendment, however, cleanses a discriminatory law *only* when it “alter[s] the *intent* with which the article, including the parts that remained, had been adopted.” *Abbott v. Perez*, 138 S. Ct. 2305, 2325 (2018) (emphasis added).

The case on point here is *Hunter v. Underwood*, 471 U.S. 222 (1985). *Hunter* involved an Alabama constitutional provision modeled after Mississippi’s § 241. The Alabama law disenfranchised voters for committing crimes “thought to be more commonly committed by blacks,” defined as “any crime involving moral turpitude.” *Id.* at 223, 232. Just as with § 241, there were ample contemporaneous statements by Alabama legislators showing the provision’s racist purpose. Like § 241, the Alabama provision had been “pruned” over

the years. *Perez*, 138 S. Ct. at 2325 (discussing *Hunter*).

A unanimous Supreme Court held the law was unconstitutional despite the law's revisions. *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 228–32. The Court rejected Alabama's argument that the law was legitimized by subsequent changes over the intervening 80 years. *See id.* at 232–33. Specifically, even though judicial decisions had “struck down” some of the more “blatantly discriminatory” inclusions in the list of crimes, such as “assault and battery on the wife and miscegenation,” and left only offenses that “are acceptable [race-neutral] bases for denying the franchise,” the Court determined the provision violated equal protection. *Id.* at 233. The Court noted only that the law's “original enactment was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks on account of race and the section continue[d] . . . to have that effect.” *Id.*

In this case, we must apply *Hunter* to the eight remaining crimes in § 241. So we must decide whether anything has happened since 1890 that has “alter[ed] the intent with which the article, *including the parts that remain[]*, [was] adopted.” *Perez*, 138 S. Ct. at 2325 (emphasis added).

This court first addressed this issue 24 years ago in *Cotton v. Fordice*, 157 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 1998). In *Cotton*, the court discussed the similarities between § 241 and the Alabama law in *Hunter*:

The state defendants do not dispute that § 241 was enacted in an era when southern states discriminated against blacks by disenfranchising convicts for crimes that, it was thought, were committed primarily by blacks Mississippi's complicity in this practice was recognized by its

Supreme Court six years after the original adoption of § 241 Although § 241 was facially neutral and technically in compliance with the Fourteenth Amendment, the state was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks.

Id. at 391 (citations omitted). Despite these similarities, the court upheld § 241 based on the conclusion that amendments in 1950 and 1968 “removed the discriminatory taint associated with the original version.” *Id.*

Cotton rests on the conclusion that Mississippi “reenact[ed]” § 241 each time it amended it. *Id.* at 390. Because the amendment process required approval by both houses of the legislature, the Secretary of State, and voters, the court determined “§ 241 as it presently exists is unconstitutional only if the *amendments* were adopted out of a desire to discriminate against blacks.” *Id.* at 392 (emphasis added). The pro se plaintiff in *Cotton*, however, failed to meet this burden of establishing discriminatory intent behind the amendments. *See id.*

Plaintiffs argue that the crimes that were originally enacted in 1890, and that remain in § 241 today, were selected with discriminatory intent and therefore are unconstitutional. Mississippi moved for summary judgment and relied on *Cotton* to argue that any discriminatory taint was removed when § 241 was amended in 1950 and 1968. Bound by *Cotton*, the district court granted summary judgment to the State and a panel of this court affirmed. *Harness v. Hosemann*, 988 F.3d 818, 823 (5th Cir. 2021), *reh’g granted and vacated*, 2 F.4th 501 (2021).

III.

Cotton was wrongly decided. And the en banc majority compounds that mistake by reaffirming it today.

In my view, the discriminatory intent behind the eight crimes that were first placed in § 241 in 1890 remains today. That is because since 1890, Mississippi voters have not touched them in any meaningful way so as to alter the intent. Contrary to *Cotton*, the 1968 amendment did not reenact § 241.³ So it is sufficient in

³ *Cotton* is wrong because it concluded the 1950 and 1968 amendments were reenactments, but its errors do not end there. Jarvis Cotton and Keith Brown, the two plaintiffs in *Cotton*, proceeded pro se before our court, without the benefit of *any* detailed factual record on the amendment processes that resulted in the current version of § 241. See Gabriel J. Chin, *Rehabilitating Unconstitutional Statutes: An Analysis of Cotton v. Fordice*, 157 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 1998), 71 U. CIN. L. REV. 421, 422-23 (2002) (observing that the court “neither appointed counsel nor sought the views of an *amicus curiae* who could have made an adversary presentation on this important issue”). For example, there is no evidence that the court in *Cotton* considered whether the 1950 and 1968 amendments were enacted by legislators “with awareness of [the law’s] initial unconstitutionality.” *Id.* at 439 (“[T]here is no suggestion in the court’s opinion in *Cotton* that the unfortunate origins of section 241 were specifically identified at any point in 1950 and 1968.”).

And the panel missed an opportunity to dispose of the case on a nonconstitutional basis. See *id.* at 432. The panel in *Cotton* was presented with two challenges to § 241: an as-applied challenge and a facial challenge. For the as-applied challenge, the plaintiff argued his conviction for armed robbery did not fall within the word “theft” as used in § 241. The panel, however, dismissed this argument. Robbery is not mentioned in § 241, but in a series of opinions not mentioned in *Cotton*—by the parties or the court—the Attorney General of Mississippi determined robbery is not a disenfranchising offense. See Op. Miss. Att’y Gen., Aug. 29, 1990, 1990 WL 547896; Op. Miss. Att’y Gen., Mar. 3, 1982, 1982 WL 44073. These opinions suggest robbery does not necessarily fall within the meaning of theft under Mississippi law because the taking of property need not be successful to sustain a robbery conviction. See *Harris v. State*, 445 So. 2d 1369, 1370 (Miss. 1984) (stating the taking of property need not be completed to count as robbery).

this case to look at the intent in 1890, and in doing so Plaintiffs have met their burden to establish discriminatory intent. And when the burden shifts to the State under *Hunter*, there is no evidence that in 1890, § 241 would have been enacted, or the original eight crimes selected, absent the consideration of race. Section 241 is therefore unconstitutional because it violates the Equal Protection Clause.

The majority, however, concludes § 241 was “reenacted” in 1968 and only the intent at that time matters.⁴ Even if we engage with this faulty “reenactment” theory, a cursory look at Mississippi’s well-known history establishes a factual dispute on whether the legislature and electorate acted with discriminatory intent in 1968. This same history sufficiently creates a factual dispute on whether § 241 would have been enacted absent the consideration of race when the inquiry is expanded to 1968 and after. Therefore, even under the majority’s theory, there are fact disputes that require the reversal of summary judgment to the State.

A.

Application of *Hunter* requires us to overrule *Cotton*’s conclusion that there is no evidence of discriminatory intent behind § 241. There is no dispute that § 241 was enacted, and the crimes therein were selected, with a discriminatory purpose. Without belaboring the racist origins of the 1890 Convention, the only conclusion here is that § 241 “was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks on account of race.”

⁴ Like the majority, I focus on the 1968 amendment. *Ante*, at 5 n.5. All that needs to be said about the 1950 amendment is that, despite being enacted 80 years after the Fifteenth Amendment’s ratification, virtually no Black people had the right to vote on that amendment.

Hunter, 471 U.S. at 233. That provision continues to have a discriminatory impact.⁵ Racial discrimination

⁵ Contrary to JUDGE HO's concurrence, Plaintiffs do not need to establish discriminatory impact. The test from *Hunter* was adopted from *Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development Corp.*, 429 U.S. 252 (1977). That test focuses on discriminatory purpose because that is what the Equal Protection Clause prohibits. Discriminatory impact, however, is relevant as *evidence* of discriminatory purpose. As the Supreme Court stated in *Washington v. Davis*, 426 U.S. 229, 242 (1976): "Disproportionate impact is not irrelevant, but it is not the sole touchstone of an invidious racial discrimination forbidden by the Constitution." The Court's statement in *Hunter* about continuing discriminatory impact, then, meant that only if the law were "enacted today" would evidence of impact be relevant, as the plaintiffs would have lacked the abundant historical evidence of the initial animus motivating the law. 471 U.S. at 233. But § 241 was initially enacted with discriminatory intent, and because § 241 has not been reenacted since, evidence of discriminatory impact is unnecessary.

In any event, § 241 continues to have a disparate impact on Black Mississippians. African Americans comprise some 36% of Mississippi's population yet make up over half of those disenfranchised for embezzlement. Accordingly, Black Mississippians are more likely to be disenfranchised for embezzlement than are non-Black Mississippians despite comprising a minority of the state's population. In Mississippi, 235,152 people, or almost 11% of the state's voting age population, have lost their right to vote. Mississippi has the third highest percentage of disenfranchised Black residents of any state in the nation: 130,501 Black Mississippians, or 16% of voting-age African Americans. Almost a third of all African American men in Mississippi are disenfranchised. Chris Uggen et al., *Estimates of People Denied Voting Rights Due to a Felony Conviction*, THE SENTENCING PROJECT (Oct. 30, 2020), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Locked-Out-2020.pdf>. Of the nearly 50,000 individuals convicted of disenfranchising offenses in Mississippi state courts between 1994 and 2017, almost 60% are Black and 38% are white. Similarly, of the approximately 29,000 individuals who have completed their sentences for the convictions of disenfranchising offenses between 1994 and 2017, 58% are Black while only 36% are white. African American adults in Mississippi are thus

was a motivating factor behind the enactment of § 241 and the eight discriminatory-chosen crimes. Under *Hunter*, the burden has shifted to the State to demonstrate that the law would have been enacted without this factor.

Despite *Hunter*'s clear application here, the majority relies on a caveat to uphold § 241 and reaffirm *Cotton*. In *Hunter*, the Court declined to decide “whether [the discriminatory provision] would be valid if enacted today without any impermissible motivation.” *Id.* (emphasis added). The majority takes the position that a later reenactment of a facially neutral yet originally discriminatory law can overcome the odious origins. *Ante*, at 11; see also *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391–92. But even if “reenactment” can have this effect, that is not what happened in Mississippi in 1968.

The Session Laws through which § 241 was changed refer to “Amendment,” and not to repeal, supersession, or reenactment. See H.R. Con. Res. 5, 1968 Reg. Sess. Ch. 614 (MISS. LAWS 1968) (titled “A concurrent resolution to amend Section 241” and stating “Be it resolved . . . That the following amendment to the Constitution of the State of Mississippi be submitted to the qualified electors[.]”). The legislature therefore saw itself amending § 241, rather than replacing or reenacting it. The legislature accordingly framed the ballot as

2.7 times more likely than white adults to be disenfranchised by § 241. *Id.*; cf. *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 227 (“Jefferson and Montgomery Counties blacks are by even the most modest estimates at least 1.7 times as likely as whites to suffer dis[en]franchisement under Section 182 for the commission of nonprison offenses.” (citation omitted)).

Thus, even if JUDGE HO is correct, there is a factual dispute about discriminatory impact. And because the district court did not address this issue below, Plaintiffs are at least entitled to present impact evidence before the district court.

“For *Amendment*” or “Against *Amendment*,” meaning the vote presented to the electorate referred to amendment and not reenactment. Voters could only amend § 241, they could not reenact it.

The electorate was given only an up or down vote *on an amendment*. If the amendment passed, the remainder of the existing list would persist just as it would if the amendment had failed. In other words, the amendment votes *had no effect* on the undisputedly racist list of disenfranchising crimes originally enacted in 1890. The votes “for amendment” allowed murder and rape to be added to § 241. The votes “against amendment” allowed § 241 to remain unchanged—i.e., for the provision to not include murder and rape. These votes, either for or against amendment, gave no say on the other crimes listed in § 241, importantly, the crimes that were enacted in 1890. The “for amendment” votes did not influence the inclusion or exclusion of bigamy or embezzlement. The “against amendment” votes did not have the effect of revoking theft or bribery from the list. Regardless of the outcome of the vote, the eight crimes that were enacted in 1890 would remain. Because the public vote had no effect on those discriminatory-chosen crimes, the vote also had no effect on allegedly altering the intent behind those crimes. *See Perez*, 138 S. Ct. at 2325 (noting that discriminatory taint of law is not eliminated unless an amendment “*alter[s] the intent* with which the article . . . had been adopted.” (emphasis added)); *Veasey v. Abbott*, 888 F.3d 792, 822 (5th Cir. 2018) (Graves, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (“Nothing cuts the thread of [discriminatory] intent here.”).⁶

⁶ I recognize that I have, in a previous opinion, endorsed *Cotton* as a case where the discriminatory intent of § 241 was eliminated by reenactment. *See Veasey*, 888 F.3d at 822 (Graves, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part). But it is now clear that *Cotton*

This is particularly important in this case because only the *people*, through a direct exercise of popular sovereignty, can amend a constitution, and it follows that only the people through the amendment process can cleanse a racist constitutional provision of its discriminatory purpose. See MISS. CONST. art. XV, § 273(2); cf. U.S. CONST. art. 5. Mississippians have not had a say on the eight crimes originally enacted in 1890 *since* 1890. Those crimes were not on the table in 1968. So there is no basis to conclude Mississippians ratified or reenacted § 241 or the eight crimes from 1890. And the Supreme Court has explained that while “[p]ast discrimination cannot, in the manner of original sin, condemn governmental action that is not itself unlawful,” *Hunter’s* burden-shifting framework applies in cases where a law has been “pruned” but “never repealed,” as long as the discriminatory law’s “amendments did not alter the intent with which the [law], including the parts that remained, had been adopted.” *Perez*, 138 S. Ct. at 2324-25. Because § 241 was merely “pruned” in 1968, not “repealed” or “reenacted,” the burden has shifted to the State.

Consider an analogy: a city council votes to build a wall. Years later, it offers the city’s voters a choice on whether to make the wall a foot shorter. The voters in this scenario can vote only on whether to change the wall; they are given no opportunity to get rid of it. Regardless of the vote’s result, it expresses no information on voters’ views of the wall itself, only on the (modest) change to the wall’s height. So too here. The

is built on a faulty premise that the amendments wholly “reenacted” § 241. Instead, this case is like *Veasey* where there was “no reenactment” at all. *Id.* And the inability of the 1968 votes to affect the original eight crimes shows that as a practical matter, nothing has cut the thread of discriminatory intent that originated in 1890. *Id.*

1968 vote reflects the voters' views only on the addition or subtraction of three crimes in the original § 241 list. Those votes did not touch, in any way, the eight original crimes from 1890 that remain in § 241 to this day. *Cf. Veasey*, 888 F.3d at 822 (Graves, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (“The new legislation just *added new provisions to the discriminatory framework* of the former legislation—modifications which . . . continue to burden the franchise of poor and minority voters. The old legislation ‘remain[s] on the books’ and is still the law.” (emphasis added)).

Although it is unclear whether reenactment can cure a discriminatory law, *see Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 233, there is no basis to conclude § 241 has been reenacted since 1890. So we need only look to the intent behind the original enactment in 1890. *See Veasey*, 888 F.3d at 822 (Graves, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (stating there is no need to consider “the state of mind of the reenacting body” when “[t]here was no reenactment”). *Hunter* clearly holds that “[o]nce racial discrimination is shown to have been a ‘substantial’ or ‘motivating’ factor behind enactment of the law, the burden shifts to the law’s defenders to demonstrate that the law would have been enacted without this factor.” 471 U.S. at 228. And because racial discrimination was undisputedly a motivating factor behind the enactment of § 241, Plaintiffs have met their burden under *Hunter*.

B.

But according to the majority, the explicitly racist intent behind the 1890 constitution is irrelevant. Instead, because the majority erroneously concludes the provision was reenacted in 1968, what matters is whether there was discriminatory intent behind the 1968 amendment. *See Abbott*, 138 S. Ct. at 2324 (“Whenever a challenger claims that a state law was

enacted with discriminatory intent, the burden of proof lies with the challenger.” (citation omitted)). The majority thus makes this case about Mississippi in the 1960s. In doing so, the majority ironically fails to acknowledge the relevant and well-known historical evidence of Mississippi in the 1960s that creates a factual dispute about whether the 1968 amendment was motivated by discriminatory intent. And while the majority contends “the overall social and political climate in Mississippi in the 1950s and 1960s fails to carry plaintiffs’ burden,” *ante*, at 19, I must disagree.

Even a cursory review of Mississippi history leading up to 1968 demonstrates that life for Black Mississippians in this era was little better than it had been for their grandparents in 1890. As John Dittmer describes:

For generations, in the treatment of its African-American citizens, Mississippi had been, as Roy Wilkins bluntly put it, “the worst state.” In no other southern state was the use of terror against the black population so systematic and pervasive. Both the Citizens’ Council and the Ku Klux Klan made a mockery of the law, employing economic sanctions, intimidation, and violence to maintain white supremacy. Elected officials and business leaders had either cooperated with these extremists or stood by hoping that somehow calm would return, with the racial status quo maintained. Mississippi had no racially enlightened white political leadership, no locally influential voices of moderation in the media, no white ministerial associations pleading for racial justice.

JOHN DITTMER, *LOCAL PEOPLE: THE STRUGGLE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS IN MISSISSIPPI* 423 (1994). So entrenched was racial apartheid in Mississippi that white South

African politicians made several research trips to the state in the mid-20th Century to learn how best to keep their own Black population disempowered and impoverished in perpetuity, and Nazi intellectuals found in Mississippi a model for their Aryan ethno-state, with Adolph Hitler proclaiming that the Volga region would be “our Mississippi.” See PRUDENCE L. CARTER, *STUBBORN ROOTS: RACE, CULTURE, AND INEQUALITY IN U.S. AND SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS* 19 (2012); Joanna L. Grisinger, “*South Africa is the Mississippi of the world*”: *Anti-Apartheid Activism through Domestic Civil Rights Law*, 38 *LAW & HIST. REV.* 843 (2019); Ira Katznelson, “What America Taught the Nazis,” *THE ATLANTIC* (Nov. 2017) <http://tinyurl.com/mryap3kd>; Alex Ross, “How American Racism Influenced Hitler,” *THE NEW YORKER* (April 30, 2018), <http://tinyurl.com/3csryjnc>.

The history of the struggle for civil rights in Mississippi in the 1960s reveals three themes. First, most white Mississippians in the 1960s strongly and overtly opposed the civil rights movement that sought to place Black Mississippians as equals in the state. An examination of Mississippi society in the 1960s—specifically its endemic white supremacy and reactionary backlash to the Civil Rights Movement—makes it implausible to think the electorate acted without discriminatory intent in voting on the § 241 amendment in 1968. Second, the actions of the legislature reveal consistent racist motives behind its legislative proposals. Particularly, the legislature and state leaders often acted to keep Black Mississippians as second-class citizens, undermine desegregation demands, and dilute the Black vote. Third, the federal government’s role in the civil rights struggle in Mississippi was oftentimes characterized by inaction at best, and collusion with white supremacists at worst. This relationship between Mississippi and the federal government throughout this

time and in response to the Civil Rights Act, Voting Rights Act, and *Brown v. Board of Education*, show just how little Mississippi was willing to comply with federal mandates, debunking the majority's contention that Mississippi responded to a report from the Civil Rights Commission in amending § 241.

1. Mississippians' Hostility to Civil Rights

*"A desert state sweltering in the heat of injustice and oppression."*⁷

As Historian Neil McMillen has noted, Mississippi in the early 1950s saw an "atmosphere of unremitting hostility to social change in any form, where law was the servant of white supremacy," and, with the law on their side, "white supremacists had little need for lawlessness." McMillen, *remarks at Freedom Summer Reviewed conference, Jackson and Tougaloo, MS*, Oct. 30-Nov. 1, 1979 (quoted in DITTMER, *supra*, at 46). But that all changed with the prospect of court-ordered desegregation, grassroots civil rights activism, and federal legislation. Around this time Mississippi "plung[ed] into a period of violent interracial conflict unmatched since the bloody years of the 1870s." DITTMER, *supra*, at 34. As Reverend George W. Lee said at a small rally for voter registration in 1955, "Pray not for your mom and pop. They've gone to heaven. Pray you can make it through this hell."⁸ *Id.* at 53.

⁷ Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., "I Have a Dream," Lincoln Memorial Address on August 28, 1963.

⁸ Weeks later Rev. Lee would die of gunshot wounds to the face from white segregationist vigilantes in a drive-by shooting. The local newspaper reported only that Rev. Lee died in a "bizarre" car accident. DITTMER, *supra*, at 53.

Opposition to the civil rights movements was a society-wide campaign. Whites took a keen interest in curricula at white schools, banning books deemed too friendly to civil rights. *Id.* at 60–61. In 1956, the Mississippi House passed a bill requiring the State library commission to buy books advancing white supremacy. One purchased book, promoted in schools throughout the state, was Judge Tom Brady’s *Black Monday*, a diatribe against *Brown*, that featured the following passage: “You can dress a chimpanzee, housebreak him, and teach him to use a knife and fork, but it will take countless generations of evolutionary development, if ever, before you can convince him that a caterpillar or cockroach is not a delicacy. Likewise the social, economic, and religious preferences of the Negro remain close to the caterpillar and the cockroach.” *Id.* at 60–61. Brady was appointed to the Mississippi Supreme Court in 1963, a position he would hold until his death in 1973.

Banks rescinded credit and declined mortgages for any Black person too interested in desegregation, the IRS took a sudden interest in civil rights leaders, local mail carriers publicized the names of NAACP mail recipients, and death threats were made against civil rights workers and sympathizers. *Id.* at 48–50. Through much of the 1960s, it was not uncommon for white county registrars to call the police whenever Black people tried to register to vote, even though they almost always failed the state’s subjective and impossible literacy tests. *Id.* at 132. Police chiefs would physically block Black people from registering to vote. State law required local newspapers to publish the names of Black people who tried to register to vote. *Id.* at 137. White employers fired any individual with connections to the Black suffrage movement, however tenuous, while local mayors and sheriffs shuttered Black-owned

businesses or revoked Black churches' tax-exempt statuses on trumped-up violations. Municipalities voted to shut off utilities or rescind entitlement to federal benefits like food surplus programs to whole swaths of Black communities deemed too friendly to civil rights causes. When Delta towns tried to *starve* Black communities by withholding access to a federal food surplus program, volunteers from around the country sent tons of food to the Delta, much of which was seized by police as contraband or set ablaze by white supremacists. *Id.* at 144-47. Black leaders who complained of these reprisals were arrested for "public utterances designed to incite breach of the peace." *Id.* Four years after *Brown*, Clennon King, a Black man, applied for admission to Ole Miss. The State responded by having King involuntarily committed to an asylum, because according to the State, only an insane person would presume so much. TAYLOR BRANCH, PARTING THE WATERS: AMERICA IN THE KING YEARS, 1954-63 253 (1988).

When the government's tactics to stunt Black voter registration failed, "night riders went into action," engaging in a terror campaign throughout the state in which dozens of Black people, including children, were murdered by white vigilantes. DITTMER, *supra*, at 137. Such violence almost never resulted in any punishment for the perpetrators. In 1955, Emmett Till was lynched for speaking too warmly to a white woman. The defendants' attorney closed the trial expressing confidence that "every last Anglo-Saxon one of you has the courage to" acquit the two defendants. After an hour's deliberation, the jury did just that. The next year, both men would gleefully admit that they had indeed tortured and murdered the 14-year-old Till. *Id.* at 57. In 2008, a memorial sign was placed at the spot where Till's body was pulled from the Tallahatchie River. *In 2019*, local officials had to install a new bulletproof sign memorializing the lynching, as previous

memorials were either stolen or shot up. Kayla Epstein, “*This Emmett Till memorial was vandalized again. And Again. And Again. Now, it’s bulletproof,*” THE WASH. POST (Oct. 20, 2019), <http://tinyurl.com/2ncbw473>.

Examples of similar violence abound during the period leading up to 1968. In 1961, Mississippi *state legislator* E.H. Hurst murdered Herbert Lee, a Black farmer, father of nine children, and member of the Amite County NAACP branch. What did Lee do to provoke the murder? He assisted in a voter registration drive that yielded only half a dozen new registrants. The Justice Department declined to offer protection to a witness to the murder, reasoning that it did not matter “what he testified [because] Hurst would be found innocent.” DITTMER, *supra*, at 109. The witness was himself murdered two years later for the crime of speaking with Justice Department investigators. *Id.* at 215. So common were these acquittals that one white man told a local newspaper in 1956: “There’s open season on the Negroes now. They’ve got no protection, and any peckerwood who wants can go out and shoot himself one, and we’ll free him.” David Halberstam, “*Tallahatchie County Acquits a Peckerwood,*” THE REPORTER, Apr. 19, 1956, at 25-30 (quote on 28).

This period is also characterized by blatant defiance of federal civil rights decrees. This defiance was often met with timid indifference by the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson Administrations. In 1961, the federal government banned segregation in bus terminals. A group of six activists from the Congress of Racial Equality, seeking to test this ruling, visited a bus station in McComb. They were severely beaten by a white mob. Although the police station was less than a block from the bus station, police declined to intervene. DITTMER, *supra*, at 114. Segregationist county clerks

in Mississippi routinely defied injunctions from this court and from the Supreme Court throughout the 1960s. *E.g.*, JACK BASS, UNLIKELY HEROES 218-20 (1981). In July 1963, this court upheld a judgment against the Forrest County clerk and issued a civil contempt order for the clerk's continued refusal to allow Blacks to register to vote in Hattiesburg. DITTMER, *supra*, at 184. Even after the Supreme Court upheld that order in 1964, the clerk continued to refuse to register Black voters. *Id.*

Mississippi officials from top to bottom took pride in blatantly violating federal civil rights decrees. When this court ordered Ole Miss to immediately enroll James Meredith, *Meredith v. Fair*, 305 F.2d 343 (5th Cir. 1962), Mississippi Governor Ross Barnett claimed, on television, that "no school will be integrated in Mississippi while I am your governor," and demanded that all officials be prepared to suffer imprisonment for the cause of segregation: "We will not drink from the cup of this genocide." DITTMER, *supra*, at 139. Barnett's Lieutenant Governor, Paul Johnson, Jr., would later personally block Meredith from entering the Ole Miss campus, setting off a race riot in which two people were killed and 160 U.S. Marshals injured. Barnett's and Johnson's actions were met with near-unanimous praise from Mississippi's white establishment: "the leaders of nearly every community, bankers, lawyers, businessmen and workers went on an orgy of rebellion against constituted authority and the federal government." *Id.* Johnson would be elected governor the next year, and a reservoir and some government buildings are named after Barnett to this day in Mississippi. After Meredith began attending Ole Miss, enrollment at the university plummeted. The "few students who befriended Meredith were targets of crude reprisals": one friend had a fire set in his room and several other friends returned

to find their rooms “smeared with excrement.” *Id.* at 142.

So staunch was Mississippi’s adherence to white supremacy that the Kennedy Administration was “convinced that strong federal support for civil rights activists would bring on another civil war in Mississippi, with dire consequences for the South and the nation.” *Id.* at 94. Citing “federalism,” the nascent Kennedy Administration declined to intervene against rampant civil rights violations in Mississippi. *Id.* at 94.

When the federal government did intervene, it often did so only tepidly and as a last resort. In Leflore County, after years of police repeatedly and routinely beating and arresting Black people who merely walked to the county courthouse to register to vote, the Justice Department filed a daring civil rights lawsuit against the City of Greenwood in 1963. The suit was quickly withdrawn amid pressure from Mississippi’s (white) congressional delegation. *Id.* at 154–55. Greenwood and Leflore County officials boasted that they had defeated the Washington bureaucrats. Rather than white Mississippians fearing federal reprisal, it was the other way around. The Kennedy Administration withdrew the suit because it “feared a race war in Greenwood” in the event it obtained an injunction to release those who were arrested. *Id.* at 156. Journalists at the time observed that white supremacists in Greenwood “route[d] the federal government in a showdown on the most basic right of American citizenship.” *Id.* at 157.

With federal civil rights legislation on the horizon, Mississippi yet again redoubled its suppression tactics in the mid-1960s. In summer of 1963, a group of NAACP activists left Greenwood by bus. At the Winona bus stop, local police arrested and tortured each activist who left the bus, for the crime of having

protested in Greenwood for civil rights. *Id.* at 171; BRANCH, *supra*, at 819. When the SNCC sent a delegation to Winona to arrange bail for the jailed protestors, they too were arrested and beaten. DITTMER, *supra*, at 172. In response, the Justice Department brought a rare prosecution against several law enforcement officials involved in the arrests. A federal jury of local white men acquitted the defendants on all counts. *Id.* at 173.

That same summer, Medgar Evers was assassinated days after he helped organize the Jackson Woolworth sit-in, at which dozens of angry white supremacists assaulted a handful of activists sitting at a “whites only” counter of the Woolworth department store. Despite national attention of the sit-in and murder, and thousands of angry Black Americans threatening mass protest and boycott, the Kennedy Administration could cajole out of Jackson’s mayor only the promise to hire a handful of Black employees for inconsequential city government positions. *Id.* at 167–69.

As bad as life was for Mississippi Blacks in the early 1960s, it generally worsened *after* the enactment of federal civil rights legislation in 1964 and 1965. The Klan was reborn. In February 1964, two hundred Klansmen gathered in Brookhaven to establish the White Knights as a statewide organization. They drafted a 40-page constitution laying out a four-phase plan of attack, with the final phase simply labeled “extermination.” *Id.* at 217. On one May evening in 1964, crosses burned in 64 Mississippi counties. “Cross burnings announced the Klan presence in an area . . . followed by bullets and bombs.” *Id.* at 215. Klansmen abducted voter registration organizers across the state; if those organizers were lucky, they would only be stripped and whipped, invoking the same torture endured by their enslaved ancestors. For the dozens who

were not so lucky, they would be found mutilated and murdered. Arrests for these crimes, much less prosecutions, were exceedingly rare, as law enforcement worked hand-in-hand with Klan vigilantes. *Id.* at 217. “Klan infiltration into law enforcement agencies was widespread, with police officers and members of the Mississippi State Highway Patrol on the Klan’s secret membership rolls.” *Id.* at 218. That summer saw 35 shootings, and 65 bombings—35 occurred at churches—by Klansmen. This explosion of violence coincided with Mississippi law enforcement arresting well over a thousand civil rights organizers. *Id.* at 251.

Klan violence was rampant and often proceeded under express sanction by local law enforcement. On June 21, 1964, civil rights organizers Andrew Goodman, James Chaney, and Michael Schwerner were arrested by a Neshoba County Sheriff’s deputy, who turned the three over to Klansmen for execution. *Id.* at 247. FBI agents in the area waited almost 24 hours before searching for the three students, who by then were already dead. Several months earlier, Mississippi’s State Sovereignty Commission had given the Neshoba County Sheriff’s Department a description of Schwerner, his car, and his license plate number, even though Schwerner was not wanted for any crime. *Id.* at 251. The Schwerner family’s wish that their son be buried next to James Chaney (a Black man) in Mississippi was denied; even the state’s cemeteries were segregated. *Id.*

Once the Civil Rights Act of 1964 took effect, racist oppression only continued to worsen. Mississippi’s powerful “Citizens’ Council”—a kind of reactionary civic association of white-supremacist community leaders—called for mass defiance, urging whites to boycott any business that served Black people. Mississippi’s Governor similarly urged noncompliance, while

Mississippi's all-white Democratic delegation denounced the Civil Rights Act, supported withdrawing the United States from the U.N., demanded a "purge" of the Supreme Court, and called for "separation of the races in all phases of our society." *Id.* at 273. Businesses that followed the new federal law endured reprisals from white supremacists. The Black people who patronized those businesses were beaten or pelted with trash, harassed by police for trumped-up infractions, or abducted and tortured by vigilante groups. *Id.* at 276-78. Black voting participation actually *declined* in 1964 largely due to an eruption of violence and harassment against Blacks. *Id.* at 323.

Despite the enactment of federal civil rights legislation, the Lyndon B. Johnson Administration remained unsupportive of Mississippi's civil rights workers. At the Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City in 1964, President Johnson called a sham press conference in the middle of Fannie Lou Hamer's televised testimony so as to distract from her harrowing, firsthand accounts of Mississippi's apartheid. *Id.* at 288. When Black civil rights activists tried to be seated as electors instead of Mississippi's white, unpledged electors—who would later go on to support the Republican nominee—the FBI spied on the activists. *Id.* at 292; *Intelligence Activities and the Rights of Americans, Book II: Final Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations*, U.S. Senate, 117 (1976). After the 1964 election, civil rights organizers mounted a challenge to Mississippi's all-white Congressional delegation, noting that these representatives won sham elections in which Black voters were systematically excluded.

The reign of terror against Black Mississippians continued. On August 27, 1964, Klansmen in McComb bombed the home of a Black woman who had recently

tried to register to vote. The town of 12,000 had seen over a dozen such bombings in the previous two months alone. *Id.* at 303–04. Yet when an FBI agent arrived at the scene of the explosion with McComb’s chief of police, the agent accused the homeowner of planting the bomb herself—just outside the room where her toddler children were sleeping—and pressured her to take a lie detector test. When she refused, her husband was arrested for running an unlicensed mechanic operation in his garage. The next day, he was tried without a lawyer and coerced into pleading guilty. He was fined \$600 and sentenced to nine months in jail. Despite the slew of bombings in the area, the FBI reduced its force in the town by more than half, and the police chief would later proudly tell the Civil Rights Commission that he had worked arm in arm with FBI agents in making arrests such as these. *Id.* at 306–07.

After the FBI withdrew from McComb, the Klan continued bombing Black-owned businesses and assaulting civil rights workers with impunity. Though local law enforcement almost certainly knew who the main Klan bombers were, it took a threat to send in over a thousand federal troops to McComb for police to finally make a handful of arrests. *Id.* at 310. But when the Klansmen-arsonists pled guilty to crimes whose maximum penalty was death, the state judge overseeing the proceedings gave the defendants suspended sentences and ordered their immediate release. When asked to justify this leniency, the judge declared that the defendants had been “unduly provoked” by Black civil rights workers who “are people of low morality and unhygienic,” while the bombers hailed from “good families” and “deserve a second chance.” *Id.* That same afternoon, another McComb judge ordered 13 civil rights workers jailed without bond for serving food in the local freedom house without a license. When the

local newspaper decried these injustices, the newspaper's office was shot up and bombed, and a burning cross placed in front of the editor's home. *Id.* at 312. That November, several McComb businesses served Black customers—under the protection of dozens of federal agents and surrounded by news cameras. But when the FBI and reporters left, most of the businesses resumed segregation. In 1965, only one McComb business catered to both Blacks and whites. *Id.*

In 1966 (12 years after *Brown*), a federal judge ordered Grenada to desegregate its schools. On Monday, September 12, 1966, about 150 Black students arrived at school and “entered unchallenged.” *Id.* at 404. But upon leaving at the end of the day, the children were attacked by a mob of white men “with ax handles, pipes, and chains.” *Id.* at 405. A reporter arrived to find “a black boy lying on the sidewalk, his ankle injured and his hands covering his bloody head. Further down the sidewalk, ‘some husky young men were whipping a little Negro girl with pigtailed. She was running. The men chased after her, whooping and leaping up and down like animals.’” *Id.* A 12-year-old boy named Richard Sigh was tripped by a white woman and, on the ground, was beaten by a crowd with clubs. The mob broke Sigh's leg and, later that day, his father was fired from his job. *Id.* All this happened while the local sheriff and several FBI agents looked on. In June 1967, a handful of the attackers were tried in federal court. An all-white jury acquitted each man.

This recount only skims the surface of life in Mississippi during the relevant time period. The racial climate in Mississippi leading up to 1968, the year that the legislature and electorate allegedly acted race neutral as to § 241, was characterized by a society-wide crusade to keep Black people as second-class citizens.

Any step forward to improve civil rights was followed swiftly by massive public resistance. While in my view Mississippi voters have not had a say on the eight original disenfranchising crimes in § 241, a brief consideration of Mississippi history calls into question whether the electorate acted with discriminatory intent in 1968. *See Stewart v. Waller*, 404 F. Supp. 206, 214 (N.D. Miss. 1975) (considering “the realities of Mississippi political life in 1962” and “the historical context in which” legislative action occurred to determine intent). Mississippi and its citizens were as firmly committed to Mississippi’s historical apartheid as ever. It is hard to imagine an electorate so relentlessly active in its resistance to racial equality was somehow suddenly race neutral in their handling of a racially motivated provision in its constitution.

To the extent 1968 is the relevant time period for analyzing discriminatory intent, there is at least a fact dispute that requires the reversal of summary judgment for the State.

2. The Mississippi Legislature and State Leaders

In Mississippi, only the people, the voters, can amend the state constitution. *See* MISS. CONST. art. XV, § 273(2) (requiring constitutional amendments to be “submitted in such manner and form that the people may vote for or against each amendment separately”). But *Cotton*, the majority, and the State rely on the “deliberative process” and actions of the Mississippi *legislature* to conclude there is no evidence of discriminatory intent behind the 1968 amendment to § 241. *See Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391; *ante*, at 11, 17. This reliance is misplaced because the Mississippi legislature cannot amend or alter the *voters’* intent behind the eight crimes that they originally enacted with discriminatory intent. Regardless, if the legislature’s and

state leaders' actions matter, they are also telling. *Cf. Perez*, 138 S. Ct. at 2325 (stating historical background is an evidentiary source relevant to intent).

Responding to *Brown*, Mississippi's U.S. Senator James Eastland promised that the state "will not abide by nor obey this legislative decision of a political court. . . . We will take whatever steps are necessary to retain segregation in education. . . . We are about to embark on a great crusade to restore Americanism." DITTMER, *supra*, at 37. The state's attorney general asked every white Mississippi lawyer to sign up as a "Special Assistant Attorney General" to defend local school districts against potential lawsuits from Black students. *Id.* at 38. This would not be necessary because white Mississippians' ensuing opposition to desegregation was so fierce, and federal pressure so lackluster, that the national NAACP "dropp[ed] Mississippi like a hot potato" from its civil rights work in 1955. *Id.* at 52. Another eight years would pass before the NAACP filed its first desegregation suit against Mississippi public schools, and then only after persistent finagling by Medgar Evers, who knew that the courts' assistance was needed to overcome a political process deliberately stacked against racial progress. *Id.* at 52.

In the mid-1950s, Mississippi's legislature began a decades-long campaign to kill the civil rights movement by any means necessary. "Books were banned, speakers censored, network television programs cut off in midsentence." DITTMER, *supra*, at 58. To ensure civil rights organizations gained no foothold in the state, the legislature created the State Sovereignty Commission, which maintained a secret police force dedicated wholly to stemming the tide of racial progress. The Commission infiltrated civil rights groups with spies, publicized the names of civil rights organizers, and de-

manded advance copies of articles from local newspapers relating to race. Articles deemed too progressive were killed, often to be replaced by Commission-produced propaganda. *Id.*

In 1956, the legislature passed a resolution of interposition, declaring *Brown* to be “invalid, unconstitutional, and of not lawful effect.” The resolution passed 136 to 0. *Id.* at 59. Mississippi also passed a law in 1954 requiring registration applicants to provide a “reasonable interpretation of a section of the state constitution selected by the county registrar, who would judge the “reasonableness” of the answer. *Id.* at 53. This closed a loophole in the 1890 Constitution requiring that applicants only be able to read a portion of the constitution. The referendum passed by nearly five to one. With new laws such as these, Black registration actually *decreased* precipitously in the late 1950s.

In *Jefferson Davis County*, officials conducted a “re-registration campaign,” subjecting previously registered Black voters to the new, more restrictive laws, reducing the number of registered Black voters from 1,221 to 70. *Id.* at 71. “In Sunflower County, where only 114 of 18,949 eligible blacks were [registered to vote], the registrar simply turned away black applicants. The sheriff’s office in Tallahatchie County, two-thirds black and with no Negro voters, refused to accept the poll tax payment from blacks. A black principal in Tallahatchie County who attempted to register lost his job, and a Forrest County minister with two degrees from Columbia University failed the [literacy] test twice. When pressed for an explanation, the registrar stated that the minister’s membership in the NAACP made him unfit to vote.” *Id.* at 53.

Mississippi officials also openly defied the Voting Rights Act of 1965, with minimal response from the federal government. In 1966, faced with the prospect

of Black Mississippians newly empowered by federal statute with the right to vote, two state senators introduced legislation that would forcibly relocate Blacks out of Mississippi. *Id.* at 387. Most Mississippi counties in 1968 saw less than 25% registration rates among eligible Black voters, who feared reprisal from white vigilantes and state officials alike. STEVEN F. LAWSON, *IN PURSUIT OF POWER: SOUTHERN BLACKS AND ELECTORAL POLITICS, 1965-1982*, 14-15 (1985). It was not until 1967 that a Black person was elected to the state legislature for the first time since Reconstruction, in a district with a population 72% Black. DITTMER, *supra*, at 416.

Mississippi also waited until the late 1960s to abandon these overt discrimination tactics for “more subtle strategies to dilute and cancel the black vote.”⁹ FRANK R. PARKER, *BLACK VOTES COUNT: POLITICAL EMPOWERMENT IN MISSISSIPPI AFTER 1965*, 34-37 (1990). The legislature would enact several other measures to stifle Black Mississippians and continue to skew the political process against Black electoral power.

As is well-known, the Mississippi legislature in 1966 (a majority of whom served in 1968), enacted several laws to limit the voting power of Black Mississip-

⁹ Although Mississippi slowly abandoned outright suppression for subterfuge, sober observers saw through the ruse:

. . . it would be naive to believe that the naturally foreseeable consequences of a statute commanding at-large elections for all aldermanic offices, and then only by a majority vote, would be anything other than to make more difficult the election of blacks to those offices. The legislative history, the inevitable and foreseeable effect of the statute’s provisions, and the historical context in which the Act was passed permit no other conclusion.

Stewart v. Waller, 404 F. Supp. at 214.

pians. It redrew Mississippi's five congressional districts, dividing voters in the Black majority Delta among three different districts. It also created multi-member at-large districts for state and county officers, giving the edge to white majorities. *See, e.g.*, 1968 MISS. LAWS H.B. 260; H.B. 102; H.B. 1114; *Connor v. Johnson*, 279 F. Supp. 619 (S.D. Miss. 1966), *aff'd*, 386 U.S. 483 (1967); *see also Allen v. State Bd. of Elections*, 393 U.S. 544, 550 (1969); *Stewart v. Waller*, 404 F. Supp. 206, 214 (N.D. Miss. 1975) ("In view of that circumstance and with an awareness of the history of race relations in Mississippi, this court, in determining the purpose for which Sec. 21-3-7 was enacted, is not free to overlook the context giving rise to its enactment."). In at least 11 counties, school superintendents were changed to an appointment system rather than determined by elections. *See* Miss. Code Ann. § 6271 (1966); *Allen*, 393 U.S. at 550–51. The 1968 legislature also continued funding the notorious Sovereignty Commission suggesting it still had an interest in investigating individuals and organizations that challenged the racial status quo. *See* 1968 MISS. LAWS H.B. 1195.

If 1968 is the relevant inquiry, and the Mississippi legislature's, not the people's, intent is relevant to determining discriminatory intent, then there is a factual dispute that requires reversal of the grant of summary judgment to the State.

3. Mississippi's Response to Federal Oversight

The majority relies on Mississippi allegedly responding to the Civil Rights Commission's report on its voting practices to support its threadbare conclusion that the Mississippi legislature acted race neutrally in proposing the 1968 amendment. *See ante*, at 20. This reliance is misplaced because a review of the

Mississippi legislature's actions during the relevant time period reveals a different picture of how Mississippi responds to "outside agitators."

True to its familiar history, Mississippi does not yield to outside pressure. At the turn of the 20th Century, Mississippi quickly retreated from Reconstruction ideals. Instead, it embraced the establishment of Jim Crow and Black disenfranchisement. At this same time, Mississippi established its dual school system, segregating schools by race. The history of this system is all too familiar and ultimately led to immense disparities in the education system. Mississippi did all it could to embody living proof that "separate" is not equal. Although *Brown v. Board of Education* appeared to put an end to school segregation in 1954, Mississippians resisted efforts to desegregate and appealed to the legislature to find ways around it.¹⁰ See CHARLES C. BOLTON, *THE HARDEST DEAL OF ALL: THE BATTLE OVER SCHOOL INTEGRATION IN MISSISSIPPI, 1870–1980* 65–66 (2005).

In the decade after *Brown*, Mississippi made almost no progress on the desegregation front. Mississippi's leaders largely ignored *Brown* and took no affirmative steps to dismantle its segregated school system in response. Rather, Mississippi adopted an "equalization" plan to improve Black schools in the hopes of convincing Black Mississippians that the status quo of segregated schools was best for everyone. *See id.* at 77.

¹⁰ And "[a]t a special session of the legislature called in November 1953 to deal with the educational budget, the Mississippi House passed a constitutional amendment permitting the abolition of the public school system if the U.S. Supreme Court required desegregation." DITTMER, *supra*, at 36. For Mississippi whites, *Brown* served as a "wake-up call, and preserving the southern way of life soon assumed all the trappings of a holy crusade." *Id.* at 41.

Only in 1964 did the state see its first signs of desegregation. This came at a time when the state was still unwilling to cede an inch to federal oversight on desegregation. But due to an increase in desegregation lawsuits, the governor called the legislature into a special session to craft measures to blunt the impact of any forthcoming desegregation orders. *See id.* at 105. During this 1964 special session, the legislature drafted laws to separate students by sex and to award tuition grants for students to attend private schools. *See, e.g., Student Grants Set In Mississippi; Legislature Votes Escape Hatch on Integration*, N.Y. TIMES (July 16, 1964), <http://tinyurl.com/2s42u6bp>. The bill to separate the sexes was premised on the continuing fear of miscegenation. *See Miss. Legislature Report* (June 1964) (“Many lawmakers say privately they feel there would be less danger from integration if white girls were not forced to go to school with Negro boys.”); BOLTON, *supra*, at 105. The bill on tuition grants was premised on creating a system of publicly funded yet “private” schools for white students only. *See id.* These proposals were explicitly intended to avoid integration. *See id.*

Then Mississippi adopted its “freedom of choice” plan to “desegregate.” Despite the plan’s label as a desegregation tactic, freedom of choice allowed Mississippi segregationists “to bend their devotion to racial segregation just enough to satisfy federal laws and black demands while preserving as much of their dual school system as possible.” *Id.* at 117. And as the federal government began actively enforcing compliance with the *Brown* mandate and other desegregation initiatives, Mississippi intensely resisted.

In response to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited racial discrimination in any program that received federal funding and required

school districts to submit desegregation plans, Mississippi school districts largely committed to the freedom of choice plan. *See id.* at 117. The federal government quickly realized this plan was a farce and continued to submit stringent guidelines for compliance with desegregation requirements. *See id.* at 119, 121. But even so, the federal government often gave Mississippi leaders leeway on these stringent requirements or Mississippi found ways to undermine them. *See id.* at 125, 127.

While Mississippi was “complying” with desegregation demands, its legislature was passing laws designed to suppress Black students’ enrollment in white schools. In 1965, the legislature passed a law that mandated a nonresident tuition fee for school enrollment. Of the children affected by the law, 85% were Black.¹¹ *See* Gene Roberts, *Mississippi Law Bars Hundreds from Schools*, N.Y. TIMES (Sept. 11, 1965), <http://tinyurl.com/2p8zfhkk>.

In 1966, the Civil Rights Commission issued a report on the status of desegregation in the Southern states for 1965 and 1966. *See Survey of School Desegregation in the Southern and Border States 1965–66*, A Report of the United States Commission for Civil Rights (1966). In that report, Mississippi was mentioned numerous times for being out of compliance while touting freedom of choice plans. The report stated freedom of choice did not work due, in large part, to white Mississippians’ intimidation and harassment of Black Mississippians. *See id.* at 35–42. Mississippi was called out, again and again, for its opposition to desegregation displayed through violence, sometimes including Klan violence, against Black students

¹¹ This law was repealed the following year after civil rights attorneys threatened a lawsuit over the tuition measure.

wishing to attend white schools. And importantly, the report notes state and local leaders' refusal to intervene or punish such cruel and racist conduct. *See id.* at 35 (discussing Webster County and instances of Klan gatherings, cross burnings, and gun violence after a freedom of choice plan was adopted); *id.* at 37 (discussing the Klan threats to parents, students, and the superintendents, cross burnings, and violence in Calhoun, Madison, and Scott Counties). This report issued new guidelines to ensure compliance with desegregation initiatives, but they did little to advance the cause in Mississippi.

This court and the Supreme Court would go on to question the efficacy behind freedom of choice and whether the plan was just a paper tiger. *See United States v. Jefferson Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, 372 F.2d 836, 888–89 (5th Cir. 1966), *on reh'g*, 380 F.2d 385 (5th Cir. 1967) (“[Freedom of choice] is better suited than any other to preserve the essentials of the dual school system while giving paper compliance with the duty to desegregate.”); *Green v. Cnty. Sch. Bd. of New Kent Cnty.*, 391 U.S. 430, 440 (1968). Yet these decisions did not scare Mississippi into compliance. In fact, the state maintained its freedom of choice plan despite its ineffectiveness (and court orders saying so). So another federal court decision would direct Mississippi to begin serious desegregation efforts. *See, e.g., United States v. Hinds Cnty. Sch. Bd.*, 417 F.2d 852, 856 (5th Cir.), *supplemented*, 423 F.2d 1264 (5th Cir. 1969). In as late as 1969, in the face of criticism from a civil rights commission and the federal courts hovering over its desegregation efforts, Mississippi was in no hurry to comply.¹² “In actual operation, freedom of choice was just

¹² Mississippi leaders pressured the new Nixon administration to delay implementation of a Fifth Circuit decision requiring integration by the fall of 1969. *See Stennis Linked to Desegregation*

another effective manifestation of [Mississippi's] massive resistance." BOLTON, *supra*, at 140. The resistance was none other than racially motivated.

At the end of the decade, the Supreme Court finally said enough is enough. In *Alexander v. Holmes County Board of Education*, Mississippi was told that the time (15 years) for "all deliberate speed" was over. 396 U.S. 19 (1969). Mississippi school districts were ordered to desegregate by the end of the year. *See id.* While this decision moved integration along, it still did little to stamp out the continued presence of white supremacy, and its thrust behind Mississippi leaders' and the public's ongoing resistance to desegregation.

In 1969 in Tunica County, for instance, in the face of impending court-ordered integration, white flight ensued, school leaders directed white students to take their books home over the holiday break to use at whatever private institution they would inevitably attend, and white seniors were declared complete with their studies and graduated a semester early to avoid attending a desegregated school. *See* BOLTON, *supra*, at 167–8. White teachers who were assigned to formerly Black schools were permitted to resign but were still compensated through the end of the 1969–70 school year. *See id.* at 168. Many white students attended church schools whose teachers were the same ones who had resigned from public schools and retained their salaries. *See id.* (citing Tr. of hearing in *United States v. Tunica Cnty. Sch. Bd.*, Nos. 6718, 7013 (N.D. Miss. May 21, 1970)). In 1970, many white Mississippians viewed Black people as so inferior that

Delay, N.Y. TIMES (Sept. 19, 1969). The delay was approved by the courts but whatever the reason, it was clear that Mississippi's resistance to integration, and creative tactics to avoid it, was still prominent in 1969. *See Where Jim Crow is Alive and Well*, TIME (Sept. 19, 1969).

they placed their students in makeshift private schools or in no school at all. *See id.* The Tunica County superintendent and school board president each gave insight on their thoughts about Black people in early 1970, stating “whites did not want their children going to school with black children,” and “black teachers were not qualified to teach white children,” respectively. *Id.*

After *Alexander*, Mississippi leaders relied on the same old tactics to avoid desegregation. The white private school movement renewed its steam. From 1966 to 1970, the number of private schools rose from 161 to 236 schools, 61 of which arose in the year after *Alexander*. *See id.* at 173. State officials tried to aid the movement and proposed several measures to promote the private school system. The legislature revived the private school tuition grants as “loans” in 1969—a practice that a federal court declared invalid just earlier that same year. *See id.* at 175; *Coffey v. State Educ. Fin. Comm’n*, 296 F. Supp. 1389, 1392 (S.D. Miss. 1969). This measure would show up again in 1970. BOLTON, *supra*, at 175. No one concealed the use of public funds to support a private *white* education. *See* BOLTON, *supra*, at 173–75.

Some school districts responded to *Alexander* by adopting sex segregation plans as they did in the early 1960s. *See, e.g., United States v. Carroll Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, Civil No. GC 6541-K (N.D. Miss. 1969); BOLTON, *supra*, at 180. These plans, again, were expressly adopted with race in mind—the superintendent in *Carroll County* testified the sex segregation plan was primarily designed “to keep the black teenage boys away from the white girls.” *See* BOLTON, *supra*, at 180.

In districts where these integration evasion tactics were not used for whatever reason, white parents just overtly protested the idea of desegregated schools. *See*

id. at 181. They formed the Citizens for Local Control of Education (CLCE). *Id.* In January 1970, CLCE and its following of white parents marched in downtown Hattiesburg to oppose desegregation with Confederate flags, banners, and placards that read “Down with HEW” and “Bury the HEW in Mississippi Mud.”¹³ *Id.* State officials praised CLCE for its members’ “personal courage” and “love of liberty and freedom.” *See id.*; *see also The End of An Era*, TIME (Jan. 19, 1970).

After the initial backlash from *Alexander*, most white Mississippians and leaders accepted the decision as, “if not defeat, [then] at least the reality of binding law.” *The End of An Era*, *supra*. Desegregation continued on a slow but less hostile trajectory.¹⁴ Issues that arose thereon were those that affected other areas of the nation, too. *See, e.g., Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenberg Bd. of Educ.*, 402 U.S. 1, 22–32 (1971). Still, school segregation in Mississippi officially ended in 1970, a decade and a half after *Brown*. And Mississippi only released its grip on school segregation, an understood symptom of white racism, under duress. So insofar as Mississippi’s leaders and public no longer had *de jure* school segregation, there is simply no evidence that the underlying racism was also washed away by

¹³ The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was often referred to as “HEW.”

¹⁴ This is not to say that all race discrimination simply fizzled away. With integrated schools on the rise, Black students faced new challenges with teachers and peers labeling them as inferior, regular hostilities and punishments, and the exclusion of Black leaders or representatives on school committees and boards to assist with the new normal. *See BOLTON, supra*, at 193–95 (School Integration: A Pyrrhic Victory). Black teachers would also face inequality and discrimination. *See id.* at 212–15. Of course, this is generally historic evidence that Mississippians were not race neutral when it came to many aspects of life in 1970 and after. But I leave discussion of these injustices for another day.

court order.

The takeaway from this stretch of history and siphoned social issue is two-fold.¹⁵ First, for as much as the majority relies on Mississippi's response to a report from the Civil Rights Commission, relevant historical evidence shows that Mississippi, its legislature, state leaders, and citizens, have never responded to outside criticism or court orders with any sort of speed or vigilance. There is no basis to conclude the Mississippi legislature proposed the 1968 amendment to § 241 "to eliminate several objections contained in the then-recent findings of the Civil Rights Commission."¹⁶ *Ante*, at 20. Second, it is doubtful that the legislature, which enacted several racially-motivated policies for continuing the unconstitutional practice of segregation, and the electorate, made up of a vast majority of white voters who opposed treating Black Mississippians as equals for educational purposes and engaged in violence and harassment of Black children and parents dating well into the late 1960s, acted neu-

¹⁵ I should be clear that education and voting issues are not isolated or discrete social issues. One all-too-common example of the crossover occurred when a Black school principal, Eddie Lucas, participated in voter registration drives and worked on a campaign for the first Black supervisor in Bolivar County. In 1967, the Sovereignty Commission investigated his activities and by the end of the school year, Lucas's contract was not renewed. *See* BOLTON, *supra*, at 163.

¹⁶ The majority also relies on a statement in the legislative record to show that the Mississippi legislature acted "to delete certain improper parts of the section." *Ante*, at 5. Interestingly enough, the 1968 amendment did not *delete* anything from the list of crimes in § 241. It added rape and murder. So to the extent this statement is relevant, it says nothing about the intent behind the *addition* of crimes to the already-discriminatory list of crimes in § 241.

trally regarding race when voting on the § 241 amendment in 1968. Contrary to the majority's conclusion that "as a matter of law, plaintiffs have not demonstrated that Section 241 as it currently stands was motivated by discriminatory intent," *ante*, at 20, there is at least a fact dispute on whether the 1968 legislature and electorate acted with discriminatory intent, which requires reversal of the grant of summary judgment for the State.

Here is the bottom line: Mississippi defied a *constitutional amendment* for nearly a century. It resisted a landmark *Supreme Court order* for 20 years. It ignored sweeping *federal legislation* for almost a decade. And the majority today opines that Mississippi wasted no time in responding to an *advisory commission's report!* Inconceivable.

C.

Plaintiffs have met their burden on discriminatory intent behind § 241. That is, in summary, that the 1890 enactment was indisputably enacted with discriminatory intent and if 1968 matters, Plaintiffs have sufficiently created a fact issue on discriminatory intent based on relevant historical evidence. The burden has therefore shifted to the State to prove the provision "would have resulted had the impermissible purpose not been considered." *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 225 (citation omitted). I would conclude that the State cannot meet this burden and § 241's original eight crimes should be struck down as unconstitutional.

1. Section 241 would not have been enacted without the consideration of race

The State cannot meet its burden to demonstrate that § 241 would have been enacted, or the eight original crimes would have been selected, without racial discrimination as a factor. *See Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 228

(citing *Mt. Healthy*, 429 U.S. at 287). That is because in my view, the State’s burden is confined to demonstrating the actual enactment of § 241 would have occurred absent the consideration of race—which occurred in 1890.

Hunter makes clear that the State’s burden is “to demonstrate that the law would have been enacted without [an impermissible] factor.” 471 U.S. at 228. This can only mean whether the law would have been enacted, at the only time that it *was* enacted. I discern no reason to conclude it may be analyzed outside of the timeframe of the original enactment. *See ante*, at 21 (stating without authority that “[l]ater events . . . are not irrelevant to demonstrating intent). And there has been no enactment since 1890.¹⁷

The relevant question is therefore whether the law that was actually enacted, i.e., § 241 in 1890, would have been enacted *at that time* without the consideration of racial discrimination. *See Mt. Healthy*, 429 U.S. at 287 (stating defendant had burden to show that it would have reached the same decision, to not rehire the plaintiff, absent consideration of impermissible motive); *City of South Miami v. DeSantis*, 561 F. Supp. 3d 1211, 1283–84 (S.D. Fla. 2021) (concluding evidence of legislative action before the relevant enactment was

¹⁷ The State and majority contend the question is whether the law “would have been enacted *in its current form* absent the consideration of race.” *Ante*, at 21 (emphasis added). But that is not what *Hunter* says. *Hunter* says the question is whether the law would have been enacted without consideration of the impermissible factor. 471 U.S. at 228. This language suggests the question is not whether the same law enacted for racially discriminatory reasons could, in some hypothetical universe or later period of time, i.e., 1986, be enacted absent the consideration of race. The question is whether the law that exists would have been enacted in the same way at the same time without the purpose of discrimination.

irrelevant to the defenders' burden at *Hunter* step two); *cf. N. Miss. Commc'ns, Inc. v. Jones*, 951 F.2d 652, 656–57 (5th Cir. 1992) (explaining the relevant timeframe for analyzing the defenders' burden is “ at the time of the decision”); *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Ctr.*, 473 U.S. 432, 464–54 n.17 (1985) (Marshall, J. concurring in the judgment in part and dissenting in part) (“[L]aws originally motivated by a discriminatory purpose continue to violate the Equal Protection Clause, even if they would be permissible were they *reenacted* without a discriminatory motive.” (citing *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 223) (emphasis added)). The answer is a resounding no. And notably, the State has not identified any nondiscriminatory reason to support its selection of the otherwise random list of crimes that result in disenfranchisement.

Section 241's “original enactment was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks on account of race. . . .” *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 233. The State has failed to meet its burden to show it would have been enacted absent the consideration of race. “As such, it violates equal protection” *Id.* It follows that the eight crimes selected in 1890 and that remain in § 241 today must be struck down as unconstitutional. I would accordingly reverse the grant of summary judgment to the State and grant summary judgment in favor of Plaintiffs.

2. There is, at a minimum, a triable issue on the State's burden

Notwithstanding my conclusion above, there is undoubtedly sufficient evidence to reverse the grant of summary judgment to the State and remand for fact-finding. The State attempts to establish “as a matter of law” that § 241 would have been enacted without consideration of race in 1986, by relying on evidence of legislative inaction. As explained, I see no reason why

evidence of action or intent outside of 1890, legislative inaction or otherwise, is relevant to understanding whether § 241 would have been enacted or “reenacted” in 1968 or 1986, *ante*, at 21, absent the consideration of race. But even if evidence of later legislative inaction is relevant to the State’s burden, we must recognize that understanding motivation behind historical laws is a complex issue, particularly so in the context of which § 241 has operated—in Mississippi through a deeply rooted and concerning history.

And if we do consider the State’s evidence of legislative inaction from the 1980s, that evidence still reveals nothing about the electorate or whether the people would have enacted a provision without the consideration of race. *See supra* III.A (“[O]nly the *people*, through a direct exercise of popular sovereignty, can amend a constitution, and it follows that only the people can cleanse a racist constitutional provision of its discriminatory intent.”). So when looking at the motives of the *people*, history shows there is still, at a minimum, a factual dispute as to whether a law like § 241 would be enacted without consideration of race in 1968, or as recently as this century.

The noxious motives and racist animus from 1890 have disintegrated over time, but they have not disappeared. A simple glance at Mississippi’s notorious history from the last two decades confirms this. As recently as 2001, Mississippians voted overwhelmingly, in a nearly 2-1 margin, to retain the state flag that bore the Confederate emblem.

In 1894, just four years after the disenfranchisement of virtually all Black Mississippians, the Mississippi legislature adopted a flag with a canton that contained the Confederate Battle emblem. At the time, there was no ambiguity—the emblem was a means of demonstrating power, it sent the message to powerless

Black Mississippians that white men are dominant. The all-white legislature, with the recommendation of the governor, adopted the intimidating symbol without much attention, and informed the public through a single sentence in a newspaper. That sentence did not describe the design or the symbolism it embodied. See Stephanie R. Rolph, *The History of Mississippi's State Flag*, MISS. HISTORY NOW (Feb. 2013). But no doubt, the flag was rooted in upholding Confederate ideology in the end of the Reconstruction. Particularly, the governor at the time sought to repeal laws that permitted Black male voting, calling those laws “a menace to the South.” *Id.* Ultimately, the flag’s connection to—or rather embracement of—slavery and racial oppression could never be denied.

That flag would go on to fly above Mississippi government buildings and public places for 126 years. Over that time, the symbolism of that flag endured. And day after day, Black Mississippians saw it at their schools, at their jobs, at their parks. It might even show up in their neighbors’ front yards. Knowing what the flag meant and what it stood for, Mississippi’s adherence to the flag was more than odd. It was a subtle yet overt inaction that kept Black Mississippians intimidated as long as it waved in the wind.

Efforts to change the flag would come. They would go. Lawsuits would fail. Legislative bills would dissolve.¹⁸ Other states would change. Mississippi would not. Any effort to change the flag would be blocked or derided. Defenders would insist the flag had nothing

¹⁸ Mississippi Representative Aaron Henry introduced bills to remove the Confederate emblem in 1988, 1990, 1992, and 1993. None of which made it to the House floor for a vote. See Constance Curry, *Aaron Henry: A Civil Rights Leader of the 20th Century*, MISS. HISTORY NOW (Feb. 2011).

to do with race. Others would disagree. So would history.

After Georgia shed some of its Confederate imagery in 2001, there was a possibility that Mississippi would do the same.¹⁹ Mississippi then conducted a statewide special election to let the voters decide.²⁰ *See* 2001 MISS. LAWS, HB No. 524. In the two months before the election, defense of the 1894 flag and its Confederate origins was rampant. Although Black and white proponents of change spoke out about the flag's undeniable connection to slavery, the Jim Crow era, and the coded emblem of racism, the voters were not inclined to reconcile this troubled past. By a vote of 64.4%, Mississippi voters decided to keep the 1894 flag.²¹ And so the flag stayed.

The failed referendum revealed a harsh truth: a majority of Mississippi voters decided against righting the wrongs of the 1894 Mississippi legislature. This was just 21 years ago.

Holding onto the Confederate legacy did not continue quietly. In June 2015, a white gunman with an affinity for the Confederate flag massacred nine Black church members at worship services in Charleston, South Carolina. Although many towns and counties

¹⁹ For completeness, I also note that this change was prompted in part by the Mississippi Supreme Court's determination that there was no official state flag because lawmakers inadvertently failed to add it to the state code in 1906. *See Miss. Div. of United Sons of Confederate Veterans v. Miss. State Conf. of NAACP Branches*, 774 So. 2d 388, 391 (Miss. 2000) (concluding use of the flag was by custom only and permitting State to continue its usage).

²⁰ Notably, the legislature would have voted to keep the flag.

²¹ The outcome ran along racial lines with the percentage of eligible white voters at the time being 64.8%.

began removing the 1894 flag in response to this tragedy, and South Carolina decided it had gone long enough waving the flag above its capitol, official change remained elusive in Mississippi. At the start of the legislative session the following January, 19 new bills related to the flag were on the agenda. By the end of the month, all were dead.

Almost five years later, in 2020, the high-profile deaths of Black Americans across the nation prompted a renewed call for change. The national conversation about racism was at its peak. And Mississippi's continued endorsement of the Confederate emblem was unsurprisingly magnified. Only after facing insurmountable pressure and recognizing the pain Confederate symbolism causes nearly half its population, did the 1894 flag get appropriately retired to a museum. Without consulting the voters, and for the first time with all deliberate speed, the Mississippi legislature voted to remove the 1894 flag and create a commission to design a new state flag. *See* 2020 MISS. LAWS, HB No. 1796.

Even after this monumental step, in which Mississippi was *forced* to reckon with its past, more than vestiges of that past remain. Since then, year after year without fail, the State recognizes and declares April as Confederate Heritage Month. Mississippi is the only state to devote an entire month towards the Confederacy—whose position was “thoroughly identified with the institution of slavery—the greatest material interest of the world.” AN ADDRESS: SETTING FORTH THE DECLARATION OF THE IMMEDIATE CAUSES WHICH INDUCE AND JUSTIFY THE SECESSION OF MISSISSIPPI FROM THE FEDERAL UNION AND THE ORDINANCE OF SECESSION (1861). And every January, on the day the rest of the nation celebrates the life of Dr. King, Mississippi celebrates the life and work of Robert E. Lee.

My point is this: in 2001, Mississippi voters' interest in racial reconciliation was not strong enough to compel a vote to remove the most pervasive and recognizable symbol of slavery, oppression, and Jim Crow. Consideration of recent history raises profound doubt whether the 1968 Mississippi legislature or voters acted (or could have acted) neutrally regarding race, i.e., enacted § 241 or selected the original eight crimes absent the consideration of race. And even more so suggests the 1968 Mississippi legislature, responsible for its fair share of passing discriminatory laws, is in no way entitled to the presumption of good faith. *Perez*, 138 S. Ct. at 2324 (stating the good faith of the legislature must be presumed but the ultimate question is whether there is discriminatory intent). So, in my view, historical evidence alone creates a dispute on whether the 1968 amendment would have passed absent the consideration of race. This fact dispute requires the reversal of summary judgment for the State and a remand for factfinding on this issue.

IV.

Recounting Mississippi's history forces me to relive my experiences growing up in the Jim Crow era. While I do not rely on those experiences in deciding this case, I would be less than candid if I did not admit that I recall them. Vividly.

So, I confess that I remember in 1963 a cross was burned on my grandmother's lawn, two doors down from where I grew up.

In December of 1969, I left my all-Black high school for Christmas break. It was after the *Alexander* decision where the Supreme Court declared Mississippi could no longer delay desegregation. As a result, I returned to my "desegregated" high school in January of 1970. I was disheartened. Many of the best Black

teachers at my high school had been transferred to a predominantly white school and many of the worst white teachers had been transferred to my school. Not a single white student enrolled at my school.

In 1991, I was appointed to serve as a state trial judge. Undoubtedly, my appointment was evidence of progress in the struggle for racial equality in Mississippi. But in the courtroom where I sat, the bench was flanked on one side by the United States flag and on the other side by the Mississippi flag and its Confederate emblem. My inclination was to ceremoniously remove it from the courtroom. But there were others who were working to change the flag. They assured me that change was imminent. They were wrong.

Ten years later I was appointed to serve on the Mississippi Supreme Court. There, the 1894 flag flew above the court, flanked the bench, and nestled in my chambers. And ten years later, when I began my service on this court, there again was the ever-present reminder of Mississippi's sordid history. It is a testament to the greatness of this country and state that I have been selected to serve in the judicial branch of government. But no matter where I went, the 1894 flag was already there—a haunting reminder that a wrong never righted touches us all.

I recount these events, as a native Mississippian, only to highlight the importance of making the right decision in this case.

V.

Harness and Karriem are Black Mississippians who are disenfranchised and deprived of a right that is the cornerstone of our democracy. They are deprived of that right because of § 241—a constitutional provision enacted for the purpose of discriminating against them and their ancestors on the basis of their race. Eight of

the crimes selected in 1890 and that remain in § 241 today, including the two crimes that disenfranchise Plaintiffs, were selected with a discriminatory purpose. They were selected by a racist and nearly all-white legislature and approved by a racist and nearly all-white electorate to oppress Black Mississippians. Since then, Mississippi voters have not spoken on those eight crimes. They have not voted on or applied their intentions to those crimes.²² So the discriminatory taint behind those eight crimes has lingered for over a century and still stands today. Because *Cotton* wrongly decided this issue, I would overrule it.

The burden has therefore shifted to the State to demonstrate § 241 would have been enacted in 1890 absent the consideration of race. It is undisputed that the State has not and cannot meet this burden. Section 241, and its eight original crimes from 1890, therefore violate the Equal Protection Clause. I would accordingly strike down the original eight crimes as unconstitutional and grant summary judgment to Plaintiffs.

Alternatively, if 1890 no longer matters and § 241 was “reenacted” in 1968, the relevant historical evidence shows there are fact disputes on whether Mississippi’s legislature and voters during the 1960s acted with discriminatory intent in amending § 241. The same historical evidence and fact disputes show the State has not met its burden at the summary judgment stage to demonstrate the same crimes would have been selected for § 241 absent the consideration of race. This allows *Harness* and *Karriem* to survive summary judgment. I would therefore, at a minimum, reverse

²² It is sadly ironic that although Mississippi and this court agree that § 241 was unconstitutionally adopted in 1890, they rely on votes governed by that provision—one that disproportionately disenfranchises Black Mississippians—to conclude that § 241 has been reenacted without a discriminatory purpose.

the district court's grant of summary judgment to the State and remand for factfinding consistent with the Supreme Court's unanimous decision in *Hunter*.

It is worth noting that § 241 stands virtually alone in its endurance against courts acting as protectors of constitutional rights. Mississippi's other facially neutral but invidiously motivated laws and constitutional provisions have almost all been invalidated or superseded.²³ Each of these provisions, like § 241, was enacted to maintain white supremacy in Mississippi. But

²³ These include: (i) § 241's two-year residency requirement, see *Graham v. Waller*, 343 F. Supp. 1, 3 (S.D. Miss. 1972); (ii) §§ 241 and 243's requirement of payment of a poll tax and disenfranchisement of those who failed to pay it or prove that they paid it, see *Harper v. Va. State Bd. of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663, 666 (1966); see also KIRK H. PORTER, A HISTORY OF SUFFRAGE IN THE UNITED STATES 209 (Greenwood Press Reprint 1977) (1918) ("It is impossible to tell the number of Negroes who are unable to vote in spite of the fact that their tax has been paid, simply because he does not save the receipts. The white man is seldom asked to exhibit his receipt, although of course he could be."); (iii) § 249's requirement that electors be registered and swear an oath before a state election official, see *United States v. Mississippi*, 256 F. Supp. 344, 347 (S.D. Miss. 1966); (iv) § 241-A, added in 1960, which required "good moral character" of all electors, see *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 333–34 (1966); (v) § 244, which imposed literacy tests; (vi) § 245, which laid the groundwork for a dual registration system, one for white, one for African Americans, see *Miss. Chapter, Operation Push v. Allain*, 674 F. Supp. 1245, 1269 (N.D. Miss. 1987); (vii) § 247, which provided that "the legislature shall enact laws to secure fairness in party primary elections," which the legislature used to enact a law allowing primary voters to challenge Black voters' eligibility (the Democratic Party's principles required support of segregation), see *United States v. Mississippi*, 229 F. Supp. 925, 989 (S.D. Miss. 1964) (three-judge court); *United States v. Mississippi*, 380 U.S. 128, 143–44 (1965); (viii) § 251's requirement of registration at least four months prior to an election, see *Ferguson v. Williams*, 343 F. Supp. 654, 657 (N.D. Miss. 1972) (three-judge court) (per curiam); and (ix) § 241's misdemeanor disenfranchisement provision, see *McLaughlin v.*

unlike § 241, these provisions were all struck down by federal judges upholding their oath to the Constitution.

On § 241, Mississippians have simply not been given the chance to right the wrongs of its racist origins. And this court, in failing to right its own wrongs, deprives Mississippians of this opportunity by upholding an unconstitutional law enacted for the purpose of discriminating against Black Mississippians on the basis of their race.

I dissent.

APPENDIX B

No. 19-60632

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

ROY HARNESS; KAMAL KARRIEM,
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

DELBERT HOSEMANN, SECRETARY OF STATE
MISSISSIPPI, *Defendant-Appellee.*

[Filed] February 23, 2021

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Mississippi No.
3:17-CV-791

Before SMITH, HIGGINSON, and ENGELHARDT, *Circuit Judges*. JERRY E. SMITH, *Circuit Judge*:

Roy Harness and Kamal Karriem lost the right to vote in Mississippi when they were convicted of crimes enumerated in § 241 of the Mississippi Constitution. They claim that list was enacted with racially discriminatory intent in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. But they are not the first to make that claim—over twenty years ago, we held that amendments to § 241 cured it of its discriminatory taint. Under the rule of orderliness, we are bound by that decision, so we affirm the summary judgment dismissing their claim.

I.

From the Civil War until 1890, Mississippi denied the franchise to those convicted of any crime punishable by imprisonment in the state penitentiary.¹ But in

¹ See THE REVISED CODE OF THE STATUTE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI 86, 618 (1871) (disenfranchising, through ch. 5, art. II, § 343, anyone convicted of “infamous crimes,” defined in ch. 59,

1890, Mississippi replaced its generic description of disenfranchising crimes with a list of specific disenfranchising crimes: “bribery, burglary, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretenses, perjury, forgery, embezzlement or bigamy.” MISS. CONST. art. XII, § 241 (1890). Its reason for doing so was discriminatory. The state made no secret of its motive: “Restrained by the federal constitution from discriminating against the negro race, the [1890 Mississippi constitutional] convention discriminated against its characteristics and the offenses to which its weaker members were prone.” *Ratliff v. Beale*, 20 So. 865, 868 (Miss. 1896). The convention believed that blacks were “given rather to furtive offenses than to the robust crimes of the whites,” so “[b]urglary, theft, arson, and obtaining money under false pretenses were declared to be disqualifications, while robbery and murder and other crimes in which violence was the principal ingredient were not.” *Id.*

Mississippi amended § 241 in 1950, removing burglary from the list, and again in 1968, adding murder and rape. 1950 Miss. Laws 959–60; 1968 Miss. Laws 1074–75. In both instances, § 241 was amended on two-thirds of both legislative houses’ agreeing on the newly worded section, and then approval of the new section by a simple majority of the whole electorate.

Harness and Karriem are black citizens of Mississippi who have lost their right to vote because they have been convicted of crimes enumerated in § 241. They sued Mississippi’s Secretary of State, contending

art. XIII, § 2855, as “offences punished with death, or confinement in the penitentiary”); THE REVISED CODE OF THE STATUTE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI 75, 796 (1880) (disenfranchising, through ch. 4, § 108, anyone convicted of “any felony,” defined in ch. 78, § 3104 as “offences punished with death, or confinement in the penitentiary”).

that § 241 violates the Fourteenth Amendment because it was enacted with a discriminatory purpose. The district court entered summary judgment for the Secretary of State, reasoning that, per *Cotton v. Fordice*, 157 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 1998), the discriminatory taint of the 1890 provision was removed by the amendment processes in 1950 and 1968.

II.

Before discussing the merits, “we must assure ourselves of our jurisdiction.” *Parents Involved in Cmty. Schs. v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1*, 551 U.S. 701, 718 (2007). The Secretary of State contends we lack jurisdiction on the basis of both standing and sovereign immunity.

A.

“To establish standing under Article III of the Constitution, a plaintiff must demonstrate (1) that he or she suffered an injury in fact that is concrete, particularized, and actual or imminent, (2) that the injury was caused by the defendant, and (3) that the injury would likely be redressed by the requested judicial relief.” *Thole v. U.S. Bank N.A.*, 140 S. Ct. 1615, 1618 (2020). The Secretary of State acknowledges the plaintiffs’ injury in fact, averring instead that their injury is traceable not to him but to the county officials responsible for maintaining voter rolls.

But that is not so. In Mississippi, “the ‘Statewide Elections Management System’ . . . constitute[s] the official record of registered voters in every county of the state.” MISS. CODE ANN. § 23-15-165(1). “The Office of the Secretary of State . . . develop[s] and implement[s] the Statewide Elections Management System so that the registrar and election commissioners of each county shall . . . [r]eceive regular reports of . . . convictions for disenfranchising crimes that apply to

voters registered in the county.” *Id.* § 23-15-165(2)(c). Thus, under Mississippi law, the office of the Secretary of State “ha[s] a role in” removing convicted felons from the voter rolls “and is in a position to redress it at least in part.”²

B.

For a similar reason, the Secretary of State’s objection that the suit is barred by sovereign immunity cannot be sustained. “Suits for injunctive or declaratory relief are allowed against a state official acting in violation of federal law if there is a sufficient connection to enforcing an allegedly unconstitutional law.” *Tex. Democratic Party*, 978 F.3d at 179 (quotation omitted). We have “not spoken with conviction about all relevant details of the ‘connection’ requirement,” but if there is a “a ‘special relationship’ between the state actor and the challenged statute,” there is certainly a sufficient connection. *Id.* That is the case here. The Secretary of State is charged by state law with “develop[ing] and implement[ing] the Statewide Elections Management System,” which serves as the “official record of registered voters in every county of the state.” MISS. CODE ANN. § 23-15-165(2), (1). County-level officials may also exercise control over voter rolls, but that does not reduce the Secretary of State’s connection to the enforcement of § 241.

III.

States are permitted to disenfranchise felons. U.S. CONST. amend XIV, § 2; *Richardson v. Ramirez*, 418 U.S. 24, 54 (1974). But the Constitution forbids such

² *Tex. Democratic Party v. Abbott*, 978 F.3d 168, 178 (5th Cir. 2020) (opining on Texas’s election law), *cert. denied*, 2021 WL 78479 (U.S. Jan. 11, 2021) (No. 19–1389).

provisions where their “original enactment was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks on account of race and the [provision] continues to this day to have that effect.”³ The plaintiffs contend that the portions of § 241 traceable to its original enactment in 1890⁴ are unconstitutional because they were enacted with that precise unconstitutional motive.

We do not write on a blank slate. In *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391, we held that amendments to § 241 in 1950 and 1968 “superseded the [1890] provision and removed the discriminatory taint associated with the original version.” We recognized that “§ 241 was enacted in an era when southern states discriminated against blacks by disenfranchising convicts for crimes that, it was thought, were committed primarily by blacks” and that Mississippi selected the crimes listed in § 241 for that reason. *Id.* On the other hand,

Section 241, as enacted in 1890, was amended in 1950, removing “burglary” from the list of disenfranchising crimes. Then, in 1968, the state broadened the provision by adding “murder” and “rape”—crimes historically excluded from the list because they were not considered “black” crimes. Amending § 241 was a deliberative process. Both houses of the state legislature had to approve the amendment by a two-thirds vote.

³ *Hunter v. Underwood*, 471 U.S. 222, 233 (1985); see also *United States v. Fordice*, 505 U.S. 717, 728 (1992) (requiring states to “eradicate[] policies and practices traceable to” their prior racially-motivated actions); *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 140 S. Ct. 1390, 1410 (2020) (Sotomayor, J., concurring) (noting that a statute’s legacy of racial animus may persist so long as the “States’ legislatures never truly grappled with the laws’ sordid history in reenacting them”).

⁴ That is, the crimes enumerated in § 241 besides rape and murder, which were added in 1968.

The Mississippi Secretary of State was then required to publish a full-text version of § 241, as revised, at least two weeks before the popular election. Finally, a majority of the voters had to approve the entire provision, including the revision. Because Mississippi's procedure resulted both in 1950 and in 1968 in a re-enactment of § 241, each amendment superseded the previous provision and removed the discriminatory taint associated with the original version.

Id. (footnote and citations omitted). In other words, as stated in *Cotton*, “by amendment, a facially neutral provision like § 241 might overcome its odious origin,” and § 241 did. *Id.*

The plaintiffs offer three reasons we are not bound by *Cotton*, but none works. First, the plaintiffs suggest that evidence of the actual ballots with which voters approved the 1950 and 1968 amendments, and introduced for the first time in this case demonstrate that voters did not have “the option of re-enacting or repealing the remainder of the original list of disqualifying crimes. Instead, their only options were to vote ‘For Amendment’ or ‘Against Amendment.’” But *Cotton* relied not on the particular options with which voters were presented but, instead, on the “deliberative process” used to amend § 241. *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391.⁵

⁵ Recently, *Cotton*'s reasoning was described as relying on the deliberative process:

Both [the 1950 and 1968] amendments involved, first, a *deliberative process* that required two-thirds votes of both houses of the state legislature and, second, assent of the majority of Mississippi voters to ‘the entire provision, including the revision.’ *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391–92. *In light of that process*, we explained that section 241 in its then-present form could be considered unconstitutional only if

Second, the plaintiffs maintain that because of the racial composition of the Mississippi legislatures and general resistance to desegregation in Mississippi at the times of the amendments, they “could not plausibly be considered steps taken to ‘remove[] the discriminatory taint associated with the original [1890] version.’” (quoting *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391). *Cotton* did leave open the possibility that § 241 would be unconstitutional “if the amendments were adopted out of a desire to discriminate against blacks.” *Id.* at 392. But the plaintiffs don’t offer any evidence that that was so besides general Mississippi history fully available to the *Cotton* court. And, despite that history, the *Cotton* panel was convinced that the 1968 amendment adding crimes that were excluded in 1890 because “they were not considered ‘black’ crimes” was sufficient to cure the discriminatory taint of the entire provision. *Id.* at 391.

Finally, the plaintiffs posit that *Cotton* was abrogated by *Abbott v. Perez*, 138 S. Ct. 2305 (2018), at least as to the parts of § 241 traceable to 1890. *Perez* described *Hunter* as rejecting the theory that, after certain discriminatory disenfranchising offenses were removed from Alabama’s constitution, “the parts that remained,” were cured of their taint, “because the amendments did not alter the intent with which the article, including the parts that remained, had been adopted.” *Id.* at 2325. But *Cotton* had already distinguished the process of constitutional change at issue in *Hunter*—courts’ declaring certain aspects of the provision unconstitutional—from the deliberative legislative amendments at issue here. *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391

the amendments were themselves adopted with discriminatory purpose.

Veasey v. Abbott, 888 F.3d 792, 821 (5th Cir. 2018) (Graves, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (emphasis added).

n.8. *Perez*' s phrase "the parts that remained" refers to the parts of the Alabama constitution that were still enforceable following judicial decisions, not to the parts of a provision that are historically traceable to an earlier enactment.

Under the rule of orderliness, "an intervening change in the law must be unequivocal, not a mere 'hint' of how the Court might rule in the future." *United States v. Tanksley*, 848 F.3d 347, 350 (5th Cir. 2017) (quoting *United States v. Alcantar*, 733 F.3d 143, 146 (5th Cir. 2013)). The statement in *Perez* is not enough.

AFFIRMED.

APPENDIX C

Nos. 17-CV-0791, 18-CV-0188

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
NORTHERN DIVISION

ROY HARNESS, ET AL., Plaintiffs

v.

DELBERT HOSEMANN, SECRETARY OF STATE
OF MISSISSIPPI, Defendant

CONSOLIDATED WITH

DENNIS HOPKINS, ET AL., Plaintiffs

v.

DELBERT HOSEMANN, SECRETARY OF
STATE OF MISSISSIPPI, Defendant

[Filed] August 7, 2019

ORDER

Plaintiffs seek an order restoring the voting rights of convicted felons in Mississippi. The parties have all moved for summary judgment, contending that there are no disputed facts. [63, 65, 66, 74]. As discussed more fully below, both the United States Supreme Court and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals have rejected Plaintiffs' pivotal legal arguments as to article XII, section 241 of the Mississippi Constitution. While those courts may be free to reassess their prior rulings, the precedent is binding at the district-court level. For that and other reasons, Plaintiffs' motions [65, 74] are denied and Defendant's motions [63, 66] are granted as to disenfranchisement under section 241. As to section 253, which restores the right to vote, the Court finds the relevant motions [65, 66] should be denied.

I. Facts and Procedural History

Two groups of convicted felons filed separate suits seeking to regain the right to vote. The lead plaintiffs in those cases were Roy Harness and Dennis Hopkins. The Court consolidated the cases on June 28, 2018, and then certified a class action on February 26, 2019.

Plaintiffs challenge two sections of article XII of the Mississippi Constitution—sections 241 and 253. Section 241 provides that individuals who have been “convicted of murder, rape, bribery, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement[,] or bigamy” are ineligible to vote. And section 253 allows the legislature to restore an individual’s suffrage by “a two-thirds vote of both houses, of all members elected.”

The Harness Plaintiffs focus their complaint on section 241, arguing that it violates the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments because the disenfranchising crimes that remain from the section’s 1890 version were adopted to suppress black voters. Harness Am. Compl. [19] at 19–20. They seek declaratory relief enjoining Secretary of State Delbert Hosemann from taking any steps that would prevent voting by Mississippians convicted of bribery, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement, and bigamy. *Id.* at 21.¹

The Hopkins Plaintiffs challenge both sections 241 and 253 and take a different approach. They say lifetime disenfranchisement (section 241) violates the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment and exceeds § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment, which allows states to merely “abridge” a felon’s voting rights. Hopkins Compl. [1] at 4–5 (filed

¹ The Harness Plaintiffs do not challenge disqualification based on murder and rape convictions. *Id.* at 2.

in 3:18-CV-188-DPJ-FKB). As to section 253 (the restoration provision), the Hopkins Plaintiffs argue that it violates both the First Amendment, by hampering political expression, and the Equal Protection Clause, because it is arbitrary and was enacted with discriminatory intent. *Id.*

II. Summary Judgment Standard

Each party seeks summary judgment. That relief is warranted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(a) when evidence reveals no genuine dispute regarding any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The rule “mandates the entry of summary judgment, after adequate time for discovery and upon motion, against a party who fails to make a showing sufficient to establish the existence of an element essential to that party’s case, and on which that party will bear the burden of proof at trial.” *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986).

The party moving for summary judgment “bears the initial responsibility of informing the district court of the basis for its motion, and identifying those portions of [the record] which it believes demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of material fact.” *Id.* at 323. The nonmoving party must then “go beyond the pleadings” and “designate ‘specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial.’” *Id.* at 324 (citation omitted). In reviewing the evidence, factual controversies are to be resolved in favor of the nonmovant, “but only when . . . both parties have submitted evidence of contradictory facts.” *Little v. Liquid Air Corp.*, 37 F.3d 1069, 1075 (5th Cir. 1994) (en banc). When such contradictory facts exist, the court may “not make credibility determinations or weigh the evidence.” *Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Prods., Inc.*, 530 U.S. 133, 150

(2000). Conclusory allegations, speculation, unsubstantiated assertions, and legalistic arguments have never constituted an adequate substitute for specific facts showing a genuine issue for trial. *TIG Ins. Co. v. Sedgwick James of Wash.*, 276 F.3d 754, 759 (5th Cir. 2002); *Little*, 37 F.3d at 1075; *SEC v. Recile*, 10 F.3d 1093, 1097 (5th Cir. 1993).

III. Article III Standing and Eleventh Amendment Immunity

In his motions for summary judgment, Hosemann first raises concerns over Article III standing and Eleventh Amendment immunity. Under both approaches, Hosemann questions his connection to sections 241 and 253. As to section 241, he insists that local election officials have the duty and authority to register, refuse, and purge voters. And as to section 253, he maintains that only the legislature can act to restore voting rights.²

A. Legal Standards

To establish an Article III case or controversy, Plaintiffs must show: (1) they have suffered an “injury in fact,” (2) there is a “causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of,” and (3) “the injury will be ‘redressed by a favorable decision.’” *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560–61 (1992) (quoting *Simon v. E. Ky. Welfare Rights Org.*, 426 U.S. 26, 38 (1976)). “The party invoking federal jurisdiction bears the burden of establishing these elements.” *Id.*

² While Article III standing and Eleventh Amendment immunity are distinct concepts, there is significant overlap. See Hopkins Resp. Mem. [78] at 20–21 (citing *Air Evac EMS, Inc. v. Tex., Dep’t of Ins., Div. of Workers’ Comp.*, 851 F.3d 507, 520 (5th Cir. 2017)); see also Def.’s Rebuttal [86] at 5 (stating “plaintiff’s [s]ection 241 claims against the Secretary fail under Article III and/or the Eleventh Amendment”).

at 561. Hosemann concedes that Plaintiffs meet the first element but says they cannot establish a causal connection or redressability. *See Rivera v. Wyeth-Ayerst Labs.*, 283 F.3d 315, 319 (5th Cir. 2002) (noting that a failure to establish any one element deprives the court of jurisdiction).

In addition, Hosemann asserts Eleventh Amendment immunity and argues that the *Ex parte Young* exception is inapplicable. 209 U.S. 123 (1908). Under *Ex parte Young*, a state officer can be sued in federal court despite the Eleventh Amendment, if that officer has “some connection with the enforcement of the act’ in question or [is] ‘specially charged with the duty to enforce the statute’ and [is] threatening to exercise that duty.” *Okpalobi v. Foster*, 244 F.3d 405, 414–15 (5th Cir. 2001) (quoting *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. at 157, 158). With these standards in mind, the Court considers sections 241 and 253 separately.

B. Section 241

Hosemann says he does not enforce section 241, does not investigate or prosecute violations of election laws, does not supervise local election officials, lacks the authority to prohibit felons from registering to vote, and has no duty to remove felons from the voter rolls. Def.’s Mem. [64] at 6. But Plaintiffs argue that Hosemann’s responsibilities under state law—particularly the administration of the computerized Statewide Elections Management System (“SEMS”)—and his designation as the state’s chief election officer under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (“NVRA”) provide enough basis for Article III standing and trigger the *Ex parte Young* exception to Eleventh Amendment immunity.

Under state statute, “[t]he circuit clerk of each county is authorized and directed to prepare and keep

in his or her office a full and complete list . . . of persons convicted of voter fraud or of any crime listed in Section 241, Mississippi Constitution of 1890.” Miss. Code § 23-15-151. But the statute goes on to provide that a list of persons convicted of a disenfranchising crime “shall also be entered into [SEMS] on a quarterly basis.” *Id.* SEMS is maintained by the Secretary of State and is considered “the official record of registered voters in every county of the state.” *Id.* § 23-15-165(1).

Hosemann explains that “the Administrative Office of Courts provides data regarding criminal convictions which is filtered to only include individuals with a conviction of a disenfranchising crime before being loaded into [SEMS].” Hosemann Resp. to Hopkins Interrogs. [63-1] at 44. Then SEMS “provides potential match reporting regarding individuals convicted of a disenfranchising crime and county election officials are trained to only take action upon review of a final sentencing order entered by a court.” *Id.* at 49. That training is provided by Hosemann. *See id.* at 48 (“The Secretary of State provides training annually to county election commissioners regarding voter roll maintenance in accordance with Mississippi law and the National Voter Registration Act.”); *see also* Miss. Code § 23-15-211(4) (stating Hosemann is responsible for conducting and sponsoring an “elections seminar” attended by county election commissioners). In other words, Hosemann receives information regarding disenfranchising convictions, adds that information to SEMS, and trains county officials on the next step.

In addition, Hosemann is Mississippi’s “chief election officer” for purposes of the NVRA, Miss. Code § 23-15-211.1(1), and has “the power and duty to gather sufficient information concerning voting in elections in this state,” *id.* § 23-15-211.1(2); *see also* 52 U.S.C. § 20509 (“Each State shall designate a State officer or

employee as the chief State election official to be responsible for coordination of State responsibilities under this chapter.”). And while this civil action is not rooted in the NVRA, several courts have held that the designation of “chief election officer” militates in favor of finding Article III standing in various election-law contexts. See *OCA-Greater Hous. v. Texas*, 867 F.3d 604, 613–14 (5th Cir. 2017) (finding Article III standing, noting that the statute at issue applied to every election, and observing that the Texas Secretary of State was the chief election officer of the state); *Scott v. Schedler*, 771 F.3d 831, 838–39 (5th Cir. 2014) (finding Article III standing and noting the Secretary of State was the chief election officer under the NVRA); *Voting for Am., Inc. v. Andrade*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 816, 828–29, 832 (S.D. Tex. 2012) (Costa, J.) (denying Secretary’s motion to dismiss for lack of standing and noting that her “argument is at odds with numerous cases in which plaintiffs have sued secretaries of state when challenging voter registration laws even though states commonly delegate voter registration responsibilities to county officials”), *rev’d on other grounds*, 732 F.3d 382; see also *United States v. Missouri*, 535 F.3d 844, 846 n.1 (8th Cir. 2008) (finding that the Missouri Secretary of State was the proper party to be sued under the NVRA even though enforcement power was delegated to local officials); *Madera v. Detzner*, 325 F. Supp. 3d 1269, 1276 (N.D. Fla. 2018) (noting the Secretary of State was Florida’s chief election officer and “[t]his statutory job description is not window dressing”).³

Based on these duties, Plaintiffs’ injuries are sufficiently traceable to and redressable by Hosemann to

³ Hosemann also serves on the three-person State Board of Election Commissioners alongside the Governor and the Attorney General. Miss. Code § 23-15-211(1).

establish Article III standing. While he may not be the only step in disenfranchising a voter, he certainly plays a crucial role in the process. *Compare K.P. v. LeBlanc*, 627 F.3d 115, 123 (5th Cir. 2010) (finding redressability was met even though the defendant was “far from the sole participant in the application of the challenged statute”), *with Okpalobi*, 244 F.3d at 427 (finding no standing where the state officers did not have “any duty or ability to do anything” in connection with the law at issue (emphasis added)).

Likewise, for purposes of Eleventh Amendment immunity, Hosemann has “some connection” with enforcement of section 241, particularly in his role as chief election officer and administrator of SEMS. *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. at 157; *see Mo. Prot. & Advocacy Servs., Inc. v. Carnahan*, 499 F.3d 803, 807 (8th Cir. 2007) (denying immunity in action challenging voter disqualification as “incapacitated” and noting that while local election officials had authority to register voters, the Secretary of State was charged with providing local officials of individuals deemed incapacitated); *Libertarian Party of Ky. v. Grimes*, 164 F. Supp. 3d 945, 950 (E.D. Ky. 2016) (finding *Ex parte Young* exception applied where Secretary of State provided training to county clerks and therefore had “some control over the perpetuation of the ballot access regime the [p]laintiffs challenge[d]”).⁴

⁴ Hosemann relies in part on *McLaughlin v. City of Canton*, where Judge Henry T. Wingate considered criminal disenfranchisement and held that the Secretary of State was “not a proper party.” 947 F. Supp. 954, 965 (S.D. Miss. 1995). But that case was decided before Mississippi revised its election laws and designated the Secretary of State as the chief election officer. *See* 2000 Miss. Laws 430 [77-13] (designating the Secretary of State as the chief election officer); 2004 Miss. Laws 305 [77-14] (implementing a statewide centralized voting system).

C. Section 253

Section 253 presents a much closer question. It provides: “The Legislature may, by a two-thirds vote of both houses, of all members elected, restore the right of suffrage to any person disqualified by reason of crime; but the reasons therefor shall be spread upon the journals, and the vote shall be by yeas and nays.” Miss. Const. art. XII, § 253. The Hopkins Plaintiffs ask the Court to “[i]ssue a class-wide judgment declaring that the inherently arbitrary and racially discriminatory legislative process for the restoration of voting rights established by the suffrage bill provision of the Mississippi Constitution violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, as well as the First Amendment.” Hopkins Compl. [1] at 47.

Hosemann says he has no connection to or role in the restoration process: he is not a member of the legislature, he does not introduce suffrage bills, and he does not vote on such bills. *See* Miss. Const. art. XII, § 253; *see also* Hopkins Compl. [1] at 20 (flow chart detailing restoration process); Hosemann Resp. to Hopkins Interrogs. [63-1] at 53. He therefore denies a causal connection or redressability.

But as noted above, Hosemann is the state’s chief election officer and maintains SEMS, which would presumably be involved in one of the final steps in returning a convicted felon to the voting rolls after he or she successfully files a section 253 petition. Though somewhat distinguishable, the Fifth Circuit faced a similar question in *OCA-Greater Houston*, holding:

unlike in *Okpalobi*, where the defendants had no “enforcement connection with the challenged statute,” the Texas Secretary of State is the chief election officer of the state and is instructed by statute to obtain and maintain uniformity in the

application, operation, and interpretation of this code and of the election laws outside this code. We are satisfied that OCA has met its burden under *Lujan* to show that its injury is fairly traceable to and redressable by the defendants.

867 F.3d at 613–14 (quoting *Okpalobi*, 244 F.3d at 427 n.5) (additional quotation marks and footnotes omitted). To be sure, Hosemann’s role in section 253 is slight, but he does have “some connection with the enforcement of the act’ in question.” *Morris v. Livingston*, 739 F.3d 740, 746 (5th Cir. 2014) (quoting *Okpalobi*, 244 F.3d at 414–15). The Hopkins Plaintiffs have minimally demonstrated standing and a basis for an *Ex parte Young* claim against Hosemann challenging section 253.

IV. Section 241 Merits Analysis

While both the Harness and Hopkins Plaintiffs challenge section 241, they pursue different theories. As such, the Court will consider the claims separately.

A. Harness Plaintiffs

Section 241 was adopted in 1890 and disenfranchised citizens found guilty of “bribery, burglary, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretenses, perjury, forgery, embezzlement[,] [and] bigamy.” *Harness Am. Compl.* [19] at 5. The section was amended in 1950 to remove burglary and again in 1968 to add rape and murder as disenfranchising crimes. *Id.* at 2. The Harness Plaintiffs take no issue with preventing convicted rapists and murderers from voting. *Id.* But they say disenfranchisement based on the other crimes carried forward from the 1890 version violates the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments because those crimes were selected to suppress black voters. *Id.* at 20.

To begin, the United States Supreme Court has expressly held that § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment affirmatively allows states to deny suffrage to convicted felons. *Richardson v. Ramirez*, 418 U.S. 24, 54 (1974). That does not, however, mean states are free to deny that right for discriminatory reasons. The Supreme Court considered that issue in *Hunter v. Underwood*, where the Court set out a burden-shifting test to determine whether Alabama’s felon- disenfranchisement laws violated the Equal Protection Clause. 471 U.S. 222, 227–28 (1985).

Under the *Hunter* test, a plaintiff must show that the law’s original enactment was motivated by race discrimination and that the law continues to have that effect. *Id.* at 233; *see also id.* at 227–28. If the plaintiff makes those showings, “the burden shifts to the law’s defenders to demonstrate that the law would have been enacted without” a racially discriminatory motive. *Id.* at 228.

But *Hunter* left a caveat when it declined to decide “whether [Alabama’s disenfranchisement law] would be valid if enacted today without any impermissible motivation” *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 233. Based on that language, the Fifth Circuit has held that “substantial, race-neutral alterations in an old unconstitutional law may remove the discriminatory taint.” *Veasey v. Abbott*, 888 F.3d 792, 802 (5th Cir. 2018) (citation omitted). And it has applied that rule to section 241.

In *Cotton v. Fordice*, the court observed that Mississippi twice re-enacted section 241 after original adoption:

Section 241, as enacted in 1890, was amended in 1950, removing “burglary” from the list of disenfranchising crimes. Then, in 1968, the state

broadened the provision by adding “murder” and “rape”—crimes historically excluded from the list because they were not considered “black” crimes. Amending § 241 was a deliberative process. Both houses of the state legislature had to approve the amendment by a two-thirds vote. The Mississippi Secretary of State was then required to publish a full-text version of § 241, as revised, at least two weeks before the popular election. *See* Miss. Code Ann. § 4211 (1942); H. Con. Res. 10 (Miss. 1950); H. Con. R. 5 (Miss. 1968). Finally, a majority of the voters had to approve the entire provision, including the revision. Because Mississippi’s procedure resulted both in 1950 and in 1968 in a re-enactment of § 241, each amendment superseded the previous provision and removed the discriminatory taint associated with the original version.

157 F.3d 388, 391 (5th Cir. 1998). The Fifth Circuit concluded that these amendments fell within the exception *Hunter* “left open,” *id.* at 391, and therefore “*Hunter* does not condemn § 241,” *id.* at 392.

As discussed next, the Harness Plaintiffs urge the Court to ignore *Cotton* because—according to them—it was based on an incomplete record, was wrongly decided, and has been at least tacitly overruled by the United States Supreme Court.

1. The Record Evidence

According to the Harness Plaintiffs, the *pro se* plaintiffs in *Cotton* were ill-equipped to create a record regarding the votes in 1950 and 1968, so the Fifth Circuit failed to consider a complete picture. Pls.’ Mem. [82] at 14. They suggest, for instance, that the Fifth Circuit did not see the ballot language in 1950 and 1968. *Id.* As a result, Plaintiffs say the court failed to

consider that neither the legislature nor the electorate were allowed to “vote[] on whether to retain or remove the other crimes on the 1890 list. Thus, the voters in 1950 and 1968 did not have to approve the entire list of disenfranchising crimes in Section 241 and were not given the option to do so.” *Id.* at 13.

This argument goes only so far. True enough, the ballot language was not in the *Cotton* appellate record. But neither the *Cotton* plaintiffs nor the state mentioned the 1950 and 1968 votes in their appellate briefs. *See* Pls.’ Mem. [75] at 12–13. Instead, the Fifth Circuit raised those re-enactments *sua sponte*. And the only way the Fifth Circuit would have been aware of the 1950 and 1968 re-enactments is if it researched the legislative history on its own. Indeed *Cotton* cites that history. *See* 157 F.3d at 391.

Substantively, the Fifth Circuit’s description of what happened in those years shows that it read the ballot language Plaintiffs now cite. In 1950, the ballot removing burglary from the disenfranchising offenses read as follows:

Section 241. Every inhabitant of this state, except idiots, insane persons and Indians not taxed, who is a citizen of the United States of America, twenty-one years old and upwards, who has resided in this state for two years, and one year in the election district, or in the incorporated city or town in which he offers vote, and who is duly registered as provided in this article, and who has never been convicted of bribery, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement or bigamy, and who has paid on or before the first day of February of the year in which he shall offer to vote, all poll taxes which may have been legally required of him, and which he has

had an opportunity of paying according to law, for the two preceding years, and who shall produce to the officers holding the election satisfactory evidence that he has paid such taxes, is declared to be a qualified elector; but any minister of the gospel in charge of an organized church, or his wife legally residing with him, shall be entitled to vote after six months' residence in the election district, incorporated city or town, if otherwise qualified.

Adopted by the House of Representatives, January 26, 1950.

Adopted by the Senate, February 10, 1950.

For Amendment.....()

Against Amendment()

1950 Ballot [74-6] at 1. Similarly, the 1968 ballot that added rape and murder read, in relevant part, as follows:

Section 241. Every inhabitant of this State, except idiots and insane persons, who is a citizen of the United States of America, twenty-one (21) years old and upwards, who has resided in this State for one (1) year, and for one (1) year in the county in which he offers to vote, and for six (6) months in the election precinct or in the incorporated city or town in which he offers to vote, and who is duly registered as provided in this article, and who has never been convicted of murder, rape, bribery, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretense, perjury, forgery, embezzlement or bigamy, is declared to be a qualified elector."

ADOPTED BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: March 25, 1968.

ADOPTED BY SENATE: March 25, 1968.

For Amendment.....()

Against Amendment()

1968 Ballot [74-8] at 1.

This language mirrors the Fifth Circuit’s description of the ballots. As quoted more fully above, the court recognized that “a majority of the voters had to approve *the entire provision, including the revision.*” *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391 (emphasis added). There is simply no hint that the court mistakenly believed voters did anything other than vote up or down on “the entire provision.” *Id.* Nor does it appear that the court thought voters were asked to “vote[] on whether to retain or remove the other crimes on the 1890 list.” Pls.’ Mem. [82] at 13. Finally, the fact that the ballot language did not allow individual votes on the original crimes does not diminish *Cotton*’s conclusion that the final ballot language resulted from “a deliberative process.” *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391.

That does not, however, end the analysis because *Cotton* itself contains another caveat. While the Fifth Circuit found that the 1950 and 1968 amendments removed the racial taint from the 1890 enactment, it noted that the section would remain unconstitutional “if the [1950 and 1968] amendments were adopted out of a desire to discriminate against blacks.” *Id.* at 392. On this issue, Plaintiffs again say they have created a better record. Although they offer no direct proof of intent, they circumstantially note the racial demographics in 1950 and 1968; Mississippi’s sad history of racial strife, especially around those dates; and other unconstitutional legislation passed in or around those years. Pls.’ Mem. [82] at 16–17.

Although the Fifth Circuit did not mention this

well-known history in *Cotton*, the court was persuaded by the fact that both amendments made changes that cut against stereotypical notions about which disqualifying crimes would hinder black votes. *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391. The court found those facts sufficient to hold—as a matter of law—that the current version of section 241 comports with equal protection. *Id.* at 392.

The Fifth Circuit has not abandoned that holding. Just last year, the court cited *Cotton* in *Veasey v. Abbott*, a case upholding a Texas voting law. 888 F.3d 792, 802 (5th Cir. 2018). Though he dissented, Judge James E. Graves, Jr., explored *Cotton* in greater depth than the majority opinion, explaining why the 1950 and 1968 votes severed the original racist intent. *Id.* at 821 (Graves, J., dissenting). As he noted, the changes resulted from a “deliberative process”; the votes occurred “sixty and seventy-eight years, respectively, after [section 241] was first enacted”; and the amendments cut against notions of what were “commonly considered to be ‘black’ crimes.” *Id.*

While it is somewhat unusual for an appellate court to raise a factual issue *sua sponte* and then decide it as a matter of law, that is what happened in *Cotton*. The Court will not assume the Fifth Circuit failed to fully consider its holding. As a result, the Harness Plaintiffs are left arguing that *Cotton* got it wrong. But even if it did, “[i]t has been long established that a legally indistinguishable decision of [the Fifth Circuit] must be followed by . . . district courts unless overruled *en banc* or by the United States Supreme Court.” *Campbell v. Sonat Offshore Drilling, Inc.*, 979 F.2d 1115, 1121 n.8 (5th Cir. 1992).

2. Whether *Cotton* Was Overruled

The Fifth Circuit has not overruled *Cotton*, but the Harness Plaintiffs say the Supreme Court abrogated

the decision in *Abbott v. Perez*, 138 S. Ct. 2305 (2018). See Pl.’s Mem. [75] at 15. Succinctly stated, they believe the events in 1950 and 1968 failed to remove the discriminatory intent that existed in 1890 because the votes merely amended section 241 and did not re-enact it. *Id.*

In *Perez*, the plaintiffs argued that *Hunter* placed the burden on Texas to prove its interim redistricting plan was not discriminatory. The Supreme Court rejected that argument noting that *Hunter* “addressed a very different situation.” *Perez*, 138 S. Ct. at 2325. But in doing so, the Court offered the following synopsis of *Hunter*:

Hunter involved an equal protection challenge to an article of the Alabama Constitution adopted in 1901 at a constitutional convention avowedly dedicated to the establishment of white supremacy. The article disenfranchised anyone convicted of any crime on a long list that included many minor offenses. The court below found that the article had been adopted with discriminatory intent, and this Court accepted that conclusion. The article was never repealed, but over the years, the list of disqualifying offenses had been pruned, and the State argued that what remained was facially constitutional. This Court rejected that argument because the *amendments* did not alter the intent with which the article, including the parts that remained, had been adopted. *But the Court specifically declined to address the question whether the then-existing version would have been valid if “[re]enacted today.”*

Id. (internal citations omitted) (emphasis added).

From this quote, the Harness Plaintiffs say the

Court “drew a distinction between” re-enactments and “amendments that did not alter the intent.” Pls.’ Mem. [75] at 15 (quoting *Perez*, 138 S. Ct. at 2325). In other words, mere amendments cannot remove discriminatory taint, whereas re-enactments may. And because Plaintiffs describe the 1950 and 1968 votes as mere amendments rather than re-enactments, *Perez* abrogates *Cotton. Id.*

This argument has two flaws. First, Mississippians voted for the “entire provision,” as amended, leading the Fifth Circuit to conclude that section 241 was “re-enacted.” *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391–92); *see also Veasey*, 888 F.3d at 821 (Graves, J. dissenting). Second, and more substantively, when the *Perez* Court summarized *Hunter* and described “amendments” to Alabama’s disenfranchisement laws, it was not attempting to distinguish between voluntary amendments and re-enactments because there were no voluntary amendments in *Hunter*. 138 S. Ct. at 2325. Instead, the so-called “amendments” occurred when the offending Alabama statutes were “struck down by the courts.” *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 233. Significantly, *Cotton* references this very distinction when declining to follow *Hunter*. As the Fifth Circuit noted, “the voters of Mississippi willingly broadened [section] 241 through the constitutional amendment process” which made those changes “fundamentally different” from the judicial pruning that occurred in *Hunter*. *Cotton*, 157 F.3d at 391 n.8 (characterizing alterations by judicial process as “involuntary’ amendments”). And because *Perez* does not “directly conflict[]” with *Cotton*, *Cotton* still controls at the district-court level. *Alvarez v. City of Brownsville*, 904 F.3d 382, 398 (5th Cir. 2018).

3. The Election Law Reform Task Force

The history of section 241 does not stop in 1968. Even assuming Plaintiffs are correct as to the 1950

and 1968 votes, the state revisited section 241 in the mid-1980s. Starting in 1984, Secretary of State Dick Molpus, a democrat, assembled a bipartisan, biracial Election Law Reform Task Force (the “Task Force”) to review and revise the state’s election laws. The Task Force included members of the legislature, executive-branch officials, circuit clerks, local election commissioners, and members of the public. Def.’s Evidentiary Submissions [63-2] at 106–07 (outlining purpose); *id.* at 111–13 (listing members). And the Task Force held public hearings throughout the state, met with representatives of the United States Justice Department, and received written feedback from organizations and individuals. *Id.* at 114 (noting plans for public hearings); *id.* at 203 (noting meeting with members of the Voting Rights Section of the U.S. Department of Justice); *id.* at 115–95.

Significantly, the Task Force expressly considered criminal disenfranchisement and whether to expand the list of crimes, amend section 241, or leave the law “as is.” *Id.* at 212 (Election Law Reform Task Force-Summary of Action). In the final report, “[i]t was decided that [the] present law dealing with disenfranchisement of electors for the commission of certain crimes should be left as is. There was discussion as to the need for a constitutional amendment to change the law to include as disenfranchising crimes all felonies.” *Id.*

The state legislature responded to the report by forming its own committees, issuing reports, and proposing legislation. *Id.* at 216–57. Prior to the 1986 Regular Session, the House committee, in conjunction with its Senate counterpart, issued a formal report, which proposed changes to section 241 and an effectuating constitutional amendment. *Id.* at 216-51. Specif-

ically, as to disenfranchisement, the legislative committee recommended:

13. Disenfranchisement of felons

The committee recommends that any person convicted of any felony in this state, in another state or under federal statute, excluding the crim of manslaughter and felonious violations of the Internal Revenue Code, shall not be permitted to register to vote, or to vote; and if registered the felon's name shall be removed from the registration rolls. Upon completion of his prison sentence, including any probationary period, the felon will be eligible to register to vote upon presenting to his county registrar certifiable documentation that the sentence has been discharged.

Id. at 239–40.

Following the report, legislators introduced 1986 Senate Bill 2234 (“S.B. 2234”), which would have included the recommended language broadening section 241 to all felonies except manslaughter and tax violations. *Id.* at 255, 257 (Proposed House Amendment to Senate Bill No. 2234). But those changes did not survive the legislative process and were cut from the bill that passed the 1986 legislative session. *Id.* at 259–62. Instead, the legislature adopted the Task Force’s recommendation and opted to keep the original list of crimes from section 241 and amend the Mississippi Code to make it consistent with section 241. *Id.* at 260; *see also* Miss. Code § 23-15-11 (identifying qualified voters as those who have “never been convicted of vote fraud or of any crime listed in Section 241, Mississippi Constitution of 1890” (emphasis added)). The legislation passed 118-3 in the House and 51-1 in the Senate. Def.’s Evidentiary Submission [63-2] at 263. It was

then precleared by the Department of Justice under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

There is no argument or evidence that either the Task Force or the legislature was tainted with racial animus or by a desire to perpetuate a racially motivated voting scheme. So, according to Hosemann, *if* the burden shifts to him under *Hunter*, he has demonstrated that section 241 “would have been enacted without” racial animus. Def.’s Mem. [64] at 11 (citing *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 228).

The Harness Plaintiffs say Hosemann has not met that burden for two primary reasons. First, they say the Mississippi legislature merely amended the Mississippi Code “to conform the statute to the Constitution.” Pls.’ Mem. [82] at 22. In other words, it did not amend the offending constitutional provision, which therefore carries over the discriminatory intent. They also argue that even if the legislature considered amending section 241, there was no statewide vote. *Id.*

But as discussed already, the amendment to the Mississippi Code followed a multi-year, biracial, bipartisan review of Mississippi’s election laws that expressly considered criminal disenfranchisement and whether section 241 should be amended. At the end, an overwhelming majority of the legislature decided to leave section 241 alone and instead amend the other election laws to conform with it. This is not a case like *Hunter* where the state itself did nothing to cure the defect, nor was a constitutionally infirm statute “perpetuated into the future by neutral official action.” *Kirksey v. Bd. of Sup’rs of Hinds Cty.*, 554 F.2d 139, 148 (5th Cir. 1977). The unrebutted history shows the state would have passed section 241 as is without racial motivation. Finally, Plaintiffs cite no authority suggesting that a statewide vote—as opposed to this

thorough representative process—is necessary to remove the racist taint that attached to section 241 more than 100 years earlier.⁵

For all the reasons stated in this section, Defendant’s motion for summary judgment on the Harness Plaintiffs’ section 241 claims is granted.

B. Hopkins Plaintiffs

The Hopkins Plaintiffs challenge section 241 under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments.

1. Fourteenth Amendment Equal Protection

Unlike the Harness Plaintiffs, the Hopkins Plaintiffs offer a non-racial approach to their equal-protection claim. According to them, section 241 cannot survive strict scrutiny under § 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment because it is “not narrowly drawn to address a compelling state interest using the least drastic means.” Pls.’ Mem. [73] at 38 (citing *Dunn v. Blumstein*, 405 U.S. 330, 337, 342–43 (1972)).

The plaintiffs in *Richardson v. Ramirez* said the same thing. 418 U.S. at 27. There, three convicted felons alleged that California’s constitution—which “disenfranchised persons convicted of an ‘infamous crime’”—failed the strict-scrutiny test and therefore

⁵ Hosemann does not directly argue that these facts implicate the *Cotton* analysis, but perhaps he should have. *Cotton* was based on the observation in *Hunter* that the Court did not consider whether the law would be valid “if enacted today without any impermissible motivation.” *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 233. In this case, Mississippi voted to keep section 241 as is and codified the implementing statutes to conform with it. Thus, “[t]he passage of time and the actions of intervening parties [appears to have] cut that thread of [racist] intent.” *Veasey*, 888 F.3d at 821 (Graves, J., dissenting).

violated § 1's equal-protection guarantee. *Id.* The Supreme Court of California agreed, *id.* at 33–34, but the United States Supreme Court reversed. As the high Court noted, § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment acknowledges a state's right to exclude convicted felons from the franchise, *id.* at 55–56.

Section 2 provides a penalty when a state denies or abridges the right to vote. Edited for clarity, the section provides:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State . . . But when the right to vote at any election is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State . . . , or in any way abridged, *except for participation in rebellion, or other crime*, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 2 (emphasis added). The *Richardson* Court held that because § 2 “affirmative[ly] sanction[ed]” a state’s right to deny the franchise based on a criminal conviction, doing so cannot violate § 1 of that same amendment. 418 U.S. at 54.

Plaintiffs know *Richardson* is a problem and try to distinguish it by offering a different construction of § 2. According to them, the phrase “other crime” in § 2 modifies only the word “abridged” and not the word “denied.” Pls.’ Mem. [73] at 28. So construed, § 2 would recognize a state’s right to *abridge* the voting rights of someone who commits a crime—i.e., temporarily disenfranchise that person—but not the right to permanently *deny* the franchise. *Id.* Thus, Plaintiffs say

strict scrutiny applies to laws—like Mississippi’s section 241—that *deny* the franchise based on a criminal conviction.

Plaintiffs insist that *Richardson* is not binding because the Court never considered their textual argument. But even assuming the Supreme Court overlooked this alternative construction, its holding is squarely on point. “[T]he specific holding of the Court was that a state may deny the franchise to that group of ‘convicted felons who have completed their sentences and paroles.’” *Shepherd v. Trevino*, 575 F.2d 1110, 1114 (5th Cir. 1978) (quoting *Richardson*, 418 U.S. at 56).

That holding remains binding. And as the Fifth Circuit stated in *Cotton*, “Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment does not prohibit states from disenfranchising convicted felons.” 157 F.3d at 391 (citing *Richardson*, 418 U.S. at 24, 54). Other circuits have reached the same conclusion. *See Valenti v. Lawson*, 889 F.3d 427, 429 (7th Cir. 2018) (citing *Richardson* and stating “it is well established that Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment gives states the ‘affirmative sanction’ to exclude felons from the franchise”); *Hand v. Scott*, 888 F.3d 1206, 1209 (11th Cir. 2018) (noting the Supreme Court “has held that ‘the exclusion of felons from the vote has an affirmative sanction in § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment’” (quoting *Richardson*, 418 U.S. at 54)); *Hayden v. Pataki*, 449 F.3d 305, 315 (2d Cir. 2006) (“The Supreme Court has ruled that, as a result of [§ 2], felon disenfranchisement provisions are presumptively constitutional.”); *Johnson v. Governor of State of Fla.*, 405 F.3d 1214, 1225 (11th Cir. 2005) (listing cases, including *Richardson*, recognizing “the propriety of excluding felons from the franchise”); *Harvey v. Brewer*, 605 F.3d 1067, 1079 (9th Cir. 2010) (“That is, once a felon is properly disenfranchised a

state is at liberty to keep him in that status indefinitely and never revisit that determination.” (citing *Richardson*, 418 U.S. at 26–27)). Based on *Richardson* and *Cotton*, the Court must reject Plaintiffs’ argument.⁶

2. Eighth Amendment Cruel and Unusual Punishment

The Hopkins Plaintiffs also say section 241 violates the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment. While they offer a detailed analysis under that amendment, their argument again conflicts with § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment. Simply put, it would be internally inconsistent for the Eighth Amendment to prohibit criminal disenfranchisement while § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment permits it. As aptly stated by the district court in *Farakhan v. Locke*,

Plaintiffs also claim that Washington’s felon disenfranchisement law violates free speech, double jeopardy and the prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment under the First, Fifth, and Eighth Amendments to the Constitution. In order to uphold these claims against Defendants’ motion to dismiss, the Court would have to conclude that the same Constitution that recognizes felon disenfranchisement under § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment also prohibits disenfranchisement under other amendments. The Court is not inclined to interpret the Constitution in this internally inconsistent manner or to determine that the Supreme Court’s declaration of

⁶ Plaintiffs apparently anticipated this holding. See Pls.’ Mem. [73] at 43 (stating that if Court finds *Richardson* applicable, “Plaintiffs present these arguments to preserve the issue for appeal”).

the facial validity of felon disenfranchisement laws in *Richardson v. Ramirez* was based only on the fortuity that the plaintiffs therein did not make their arguments under different sections of the Constitution. While discussing the precedent leading up to its decision in *Richardson*, the Court wrote that “recently we have strongly suggested in dicta that exclusion of convicted felons from the franchise violates no constitutional provision.” *Richardson*, 418 U.S. at 53, 94 S. Ct. at 2670. This language in *Richardson* suggests that the facial validity of felon disenfranchisement may be absolute. The Court concurs with this application to the case at hand.

987 F. Supp. 1304, 1314 (E.D. Wash. 1997). Summary judgment is appropriate as to the Hopkins Plaintiffs’ Eight Amendment claim.⁷

V. Section 253

As noted earlier, section 253 provides a legislative process by which a convicted felon can regain the right to vote. Under that provision, “[t]he Legislature may, by a two-thirds vote of both houses, of all members elected, restore the right of suffrage to any person disqualified by reason of crime.” Miss. Const. art. XII, §

⁷ In *Graham v. Connor*, the United States Supreme Court held that claims related to search-and-seizure violations fall under the Fourth Amendment rather than the substantive-due-process provisions found in the Fourteenth Amendment. 490 U.S. 386, 395 (1989). It did so because “the Fourth Amendment provides an explicit textual source of constitutional protection against this sort of physically intrusive governmental conduct,” whereas the Fourteenth Amendment addressed “the more generalized notion of ‘substantive due process.’” *Id.* In a similar sense, § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment “affirmative[ly] sanction[s]” a state’s right to deny the franchise based on a criminal conviction whereas the Eight Amendment does not mention voting rights. *Richardson*, 418 U.S. at 54.

253.

The Hopkins Plaintiffs make three primary arguments for invalidating section 253: (1) it violates the First Amendment because legislators have unfettered discretion to prevent speech; (2) it violates equal protection because it includes no objective standards for determining who is entitled to relief; and (3) it was adopted for racist reasons and therefore violates equal protection as proscribed in *Hunter*. The Court will address each argument.

A. First Amendment

“[T]he First Amendment provides no greater protection for voting rights than is otherwise found in the Fourteenth Amendment.” *Hand*, 888 F.3d at 1211; *see also id.* at 1212 (“Every First Amendment challenge to a discretionary vote-restoration regime we’ve found has been summarily rebuffed.”). The Court therefore dismisses the First Amendment claim.⁸

B. Arbitrary Re-enfranchisement

Plaintiffs are correct that section 253 provides no “objective standards.” Pls.’ Mem. [73] at 44. Instead, the provision allows the legislature to consider petitions on a case-by-case basis, which Plaintiffs attack

⁸ Plaintiffs cite *Hand* to support their First Amendment claim, asserting “[t]he Eleventh Circuit expressly recognized that ‘a discretionary felon-reenfranchisement scheme that was facially or intentionally designed to discriminate . . . might violate the First Amendment.’” Pls.’ Mem. [78] at 18 (quoting *Hand*, 888 F.3d at 1211–12). But what Plaintiffs left out of that sentence makes all the difference. The court was addressing schemes “designed to discriminate *based on viewpoint*—say, for example, by barring *Democrats*.” *Hand*, 888 F.3d at 1211 (emphasis added to language deleted from Plaintiffs’ memorandum). Plaintiffs’ use of an ellipsis is at best suspect, and they never acknowledge that the *Hand* court rejected their argument. While *Hand* is not binding, it is persuasive.

on two grounds. First, they say “the Fifth Circuit has twice instructed that arbitrary disenfranchisement or re-enfranchisement of individuals convicted of disenfranchising offenses violates the Equal Protection Clause.” Pls.’ Mem. [73] at 43–44 (citing *Williams v. Taylor*, 677 F.2d 510 (5th Cir. 1982); *Shepherd*, 575 F.2d 1110). But neither case actually addresses Plaintiffs’ argument that standardless re-enfranchisement laws violate equal protection.

In *Shepherd v. Trevino*, the Fifth Circuit reviewed and upheld a Texas law that provided “for the re-enfranchisement of convicted state felons who satisfactorily complete the terms of their probation without providing a similar mechanism for the re-enfranchisement of successful federal probationers.” 575 F.2d at 1111. In doing so, the court made the unremarkable observation that re-enfranchisement laws may not discriminate based on race by, for example, “disenfranchis[ing] all felons and then re-enfranchis[ing] only those who are, say, white. Nor can we believe that [§] 2 would permit a state to make a completely arbitrary distinction between groups of felons with respect to the right to vote.” *Id.* at 1114. But *Shepherd* did not address standardless re-enfranchisement mechanisms as Plaintiffs suggest. *See* Pl.’s Mem. [73] at 44. Indeed the mechanism it approved gave courts discretion when restoring voting rights. *Shepherd*, 575 F.2d at 1115.

Williams v. Taylor is no better. There, a black voter challenged his disenfranchisement based on a prior conviction because white voters had not been disenfranchised. 677 F.2d at 514. To begin with, *Williams* was not a re-enfranchisement case. Nevertheless, Plaintiffs note that the court reversed summary judgment and allowed the plaintiff the “chance to prove his

claim of selective and arbitrary enforcement of the disenfranchisement procedure.” *Id.* at 517. In doing so, the Fifth Circuit held that the plaintiff had no right to vote, but that he did have “the right not to be the arbitrary target of the Board’s enforcement of the statute.” *Id.* at 517. As in *Shepherd*, the case asked whether the plaintiff had been treated differently, not whether the law violated equal protection for lack of objective standards.

Plaintiffs’ second argument likewise misses the mark. They say “[t]he Supreme Court has repeatedly struck down voter eligibility-related laws that are as ‘completely devoid of standards and restraints’ as Mississippi’s suffrage restoration provision.” Pls.’ Mem. [73] at 44. But they support that statement by citing only disenfranchisement cases, and there is a substantive difference. As the Supreme Court has noted, re-enfranchisement does not remove a protected interest but is instead a matter of clemency. *See, e.g., Conn. Bd. of Pardons v. Dumschat*, 452 U.S. 458, 465 (1981).

In the re-enfranchisement context, *Hand* is again helpful. There, the plaintiff disputed the lack of standards for pardon petitions on equal-protection grounds. 888 F.3d at 1208. But the Eleventh Circuit concluded that the Supreme Court foreclosed the argument in *Beacham v. Braterman*, 300 F. Supp. 182 (S.D. Fla. 1969), *aff’d* 396 U.S. 12 (1969). The *Hand* court also noted “[o]ther precedents confirm[ing] the broad discretion of the executive to grant and deny clemency,” often with “unfettered discretion.” 888 F.3d at 1209 (collecting cases). The Hopkins Plaintiffs understandably observe that these cases deal with the executive branch—though *Shepherd* dealt with similar discretion vested in the judicial branch. 575 F.2d at 1113. But Plaintiffs have not demonstrated that the legislative branch should be treated any differently.

Plaintiffs have also failed to satisfy their burden under the rational-basis test. *See Shepherd*, 575 F.2d at 1115. Plaintiffs say in their response to Hosemann’s motion that the Secretary of State has not shown section 253 is rationally related to a legitimate governmental interest. Pls.’ Mem. [78] at 46. To begin with, it is not enough for Plaintiffs to say the state failed to demonstrate a rational basis when it is Plaintiffs’ burden to make that showing. *Nat’l Rifle Ass’n of Am., Inc. v. McCraw*, 719 F.3d 338, 350 (5th Cir. 2013). Substantively, “[a] state properly has an interest in excluding from the franchise persons who have manifested a fundamental antipathy to the criminal laws of the state or of the nation by violating those laws sufficiently important to be classed as felonies.” *Shepherd*, 575 F.2d at 1115. And Plaintiffs offered no reply when Hosemann demonstrated that section 253 is rationally related to this legitimate governmental interest. *See* Def.’s Mem. [80] at 38.

In sum, Plaintiffs’ authority does not address stand-alone re-enfranchisement mechanisms under an equal-protection analysis, and they have otherwise failed to meet their burden under the rational-basis test. Plaintiffs’ cited authority does, however, address equal protection where a re-enfranchisement law is allegedly applied in a discriminatory way. *See Shepherd*, 575 F.2d at 1115. And that issue folds into Plaintiffs’ *Hunter* argument—whether section 253 was adopted with the intent to discriminate and has that effect. *Hunter*, 471 U.S. at 227.

C. *Hunter* Analysis

The parties dispute whether the Hopkins Plaintiffs presented sufficient record evidence of (1) discriminatory intent in 1890 and (2) racial impact—the first two prongs of the *Hunter* burden-shifting analysis. Unlike the section 241 analysis under *Cotton*, there is no Fifth

Circuit authority dictating the result of this claim. Moreover, both parties submit record evidence regarding Plaintiffs' required showing. That evidence must be viewed in the light most favorable to the non-movant on each cross motion, which produces questions of fact on whether Plaintiffs met their burden under *Hunter*.

That said, Hosemann also argues that the Task Force and legislative processes in the mid-1980s satisfy the third prong of the *Hunter* analysis as to section 253. Unlike section 241, the legislature did not pass any laws that impacted section 253. Re-enfranchisement was, however, considered. Primarily, both the House and Senate committees jointly recommended eliminating section 253 and allowing convicted felons to regain the right to vote after completing their sentences and probation. *See* Def.'s Evidentiary Submissions [63-2] at 239–41 (Election Law Reform Study Committee Recommendations). But by the time S.B. 2234 was filed, that recommendation was absent. *Id.* at 255 (Proposed House Amendment to Senate Bill No. 2334). The Court could not find in this record what happened to the suggested amendment or whether it was ever voted on by either chamber.

Hosemann does not suggest that these facts trigger the *Cotton* analysis. As for *Hunter*, the Hopkins Plaintiffs say that absent re-enactment, the Court must limit its review to what happened in 1890. Even assuming the evidence from the 1980s impacts Hosemann's final burden under *Hunter*, the record is not sufficient to hold—as a matter of law—that either party is entitled summary judgment on that factual issue. Moreover, both parties offer conflicting evidence as to the intent in 1890. Again, the evidence is viewed in the light most favorable to the non-movant, which precludes summary judgment as to original intent for

enacting section 253.

VI. Conclusion

The parties presented extensive briefing. And while not all arguments are reflected in this Order, all arguments raised were considered. Those not addressed would not have changed the outcome.

With respect to section 241, this Court is bound by the precedent set by the United States Supreme Court in *Richardson v. Ramirez* and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Cotton v. Fordice*. For that and the other stated reasons, Defendant's motion for summary judgment [63] as to the Harness Plaintiffs is granted; the Harness Plaintiffs' summary-judgment motion [74] is denied; and the Harness Complaint is severed and dismissed. A separate judgment will be entered in the severed Harness case in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58. Defendant's motion for summary judgment [66] as to the Hopkins Plaintiffs is granted in part and denied in part—granted as to section 241 and denied as to section 253; and the Hopkins Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment [74] is denied as to both sections 241 and 253.

Finally, the court certifies all holdings in the still open Hopkins case for interlocutory appeal. The Court believes this order involves several controlling questions of law as to which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1292. Moreover, an immediate appeal from the order may materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation. *Id.* As noted, the Harness and Hopkins plaintiffs made different arguments as to section 241, and if the Harness Plaintiffs appeal, then the Fifth Circuit should consider the Hopkins Plaintiffs' legal-construction arguments at the same time. Regarding section 253, Hosemann may elect to appeal the standing holding

and the holding regarding the implications of the 1986 committee reports recommending deletion of section 253. Likewise, plaintiffs may wish to appeal the holding that their claim raises no recognized equal-protection rights. Any one of these or the other issues would materially impact the trial of this matter, and the Court also wishes to avoid piecemeal appeals. For these reasons, all issues are certified.

Finally, the Court anticipates an appeal and therefore stays the Hopkins case until the appeal is concluded or the parties indicate that no appeal will be filed and request pre-trial conference.

SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED this the 7th day of August, 2019.

s/ Daniel P. Jordan III

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE