



“Challenging People to Shape a Better Future Now”

BERNIE FOSTER
Founder/Publisher

BOBBIE DORE FOSTER
Executive Editor

TED BANKS
Advertising Manager

JERRY FOSTER
Account Executive

LISA LOVING
News Editor

HELEN SILVIS
Multimedia Editor

BRUCE POINSETTE
Reporter

DAVID KIDD
Graphic Designer

MONICA J. FOSTER
Seattle Office Coordinator

JULIE KEEFE
SUSAN FRIED
Photographers



The Skanner Newspaper, established in October 1975, is a weekly publication, published each Wednesday by IMM Publications Inc., 415 N. Killingsworth St., P.O. Box 5455, Portland, OR 97228. Telephone (503) 285-5555. E-mail: info@theskanner.com World Wide Web site: <http://www.theskanner.com> Fax: (503) 285-2900

The Skanner is a member of the National Newspaper Publishers Association and West Coast Black Publishers Association.

All photos submitted become the property of *The Skanner*. We are not responsible for lost or damaged photos either solicited or unsolicited.

© 2012 *The Skanner*. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. REPRODUCTION IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT PERMISSION PROHIBITED.

To see *The Skanner News* on your smart phone go to theskannermobile.com or scan this QR code with your app.



- Local news
- Opinions
- Jobs, Bids
- Sports
- Entertainment
- Music reviews
- Bulletin board
- RSS feeds

Race and the Supreme Court

In its latest affirmative action ruling, *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*, the Supreme Court, ruled the same way it had in its *Bakke* decision in 1978 and a pair of University of Michigan affirmative action rulings in 2003 – one upholding the law school admissions program (*Grutter v. Bollinger*) and one striking down the undergraduate admissions process (*Gratz v. Bollinger*). In each case, the court declared that state universities have a compelling interest that could justify the consideration of race in college admissions because of the benefits that flow to all students from having a diverse student body.

However, all of the court’s decision on affirmative action in higher education were consistent with Justice Anthony Kennedy’s opinion in *Fisher*, when he wrote for the 7-1 majority: “...Strict scrutiny imposes on the university the ultimate burden of demonstrating before turning to racial classifications, that available, workable race-neutral alternatives do not suffice.”

In other words, universities are free to consider race only after seeking solutions that do not involve race.

In his concurring opinion in *Bakke*, Justice Harry Blackmun noted the absurdity of that approach.

“I suspect that it would be impossible to arrange an affirmative action program in a racially neutral way and have it successful. To ask that this be so is to demand the impossible,” he wrote in words that ring true today. “In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race. There is no

THE CURRY REPORT

George E. Curry



other way. And in order to treat some persons equally, we must treat them differently. We cannot – we dare not – let the Equal Protection Clause perpetuate racial supremacy.”

But that is precisely what has taken place. Right-wing groups have used the Equal Protection

undergraduate admissions process. Race is not itself assigned a numerical value for each applicant...”

For those not admitted as part of the top 10 percent of their high school graduating class, the university looks at such factors as leadership, extracurricular activities, work experience, socio-economic status, whether there was only one parent in the home, race and whether English was the primary language spoken in the home. Of all of those factors, *Fisher* sued on racial grounds.

Justice Blackmun observed how differently race is treated in college admissions.

“It is somewhat ironic to have us

law.

Strangely, the National Black Chamber of Commerce submitted a friend of the court brief supporting the termination of the Section 5 preclearance provision of the Voting Rights Act. In his weekly NNPA News Service column, President Harry C. Alford said, “Section 5 needs to be removed as it is antiquated and drags down the importance of the Voting Rights Act.”

However, organizations representing Black elected officials strongly disagree.

For example, Joe Armstrong, president of the National Black Caucus of State Legislators, said, “The Supreme Court has turned the clock back on civil rights in the United States. In recent years, this nation has seen an incredible uptick in state and local laws solely intended to suppress and disenfranchise voters. But, instead of ruling to protect all voters, justices have acted to undermine safeguards that are key to our democracy. This is clearly a step in the wrong direction.”

In her dissent, Ruth Bader Ginsburg stated, “True, conditions in the South have impressively improved since passage of the Voting Rights Act. Congress noted this improvement and found that the VRA was the driving force behind it...Congress also found that voting discrimination had evolved into subtler, second-generation barriers, and that eliminating preclearance would risk loss of the gains that have been made.”

George E. Curry, former editor-in-chief of Emerge magazine, is editor-in-chief of the NNPA.

In other words, universities are free to consider race only after seeking solutions that do not involve race

Clause of the 14th Amendment, which was specifically passed to protect former slaves from mistreatment, to assert that Whites are victims of the major victims of racism.

In its “Brief of Opposition,” the university said: “The undisputed evidence demonstrated that *Fisher* would not have been offered fall admission in 2008 even if she had scored a perfect ‘6’ on her PAI – the portion of the admissions process where race is considered as ‘a factor of a factor.’”

As Justice Kennedy noted in his majority opinion, “The University of Texas at Austin considers race as one of various factors in its

so deeply disturbed over a program where race is an element of consciousness, and yet to be aware of the fact, as we are, that institutions of higher learning, albeit more on the undergraduate than the graduate level, have given conceded preferences up to a point to those possessed of athletic skills, to the children of alumni, to the affluent who may bestow their largess on the institutions, and to those having connections with celebrities, the famous, and the powerful,” he said.

In another decision with racial overtones, the Supreme Court struck down a key provision of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, citing progress made since passage of the

‘I Recall Having to Pay a Poll Tax’

NNPA GUEST COLUMNIST

Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson

discrimination will not enact voting methods and procedures that will deny a very significant right and duty.

Prior to that time nine states, mostly located in the southern United States, had to receive clear-

Section 5, and allow states to amend voting procedures and practices as they see fit without fear of federal intervention.

Those who advocated for radical changes in the Voting Rights Act said that increasing numbers of racial minorities participated in state and national elections. They even pointed to the election of President Barack Obama as a reason for the elimination of federal oversight and intervention.

Last summer, a federal court in Washington stated that a redistricting map enacted by the Republican controlled legislature was ‘purposefully discriminatory’

ance or prior approval from the Justice Department or a federal court before they could institute changes in voting methods or engage in redistricting.

In its ruling, the court did not alter Section 5. Instead, it ruled that the formula, detailed in Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act, used to determine which states should be covered by Section 5, went beyond constitutional limits and used data that was outdated. The effect of that ruling is to mute

The reality is that since 2010, eight southern states passed laws designed to make voting more cumbersome for racial minorities. Various civil rights organizations and entities such as the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus have consistently opposed the elimination of federal involvement in local elections.

Recently, a U.S. Court of Appeals judge said that without Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act minority voters would suffer.

Efforts to lessen the impact of the minority vote in Texas have been egregious. Last summer, a federal court in Washington stated that a redistricting map enacted by the Republican controlled legislature was “purposefully discriminatory.”

In the spring of 2012, the Texas NAACP and Mexican American Legislative Caucus of the Texas House of Representatives went to federal court to stop the state from requiring a photo ID in state elections. A federal court agreed, finding that the law violated Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

Now, the Texas Attorney General says he is going go to the photo ID requirement in place.

Bipartisan coalitions of members of both the House and Senate have historically supported the Voting Rights Act and its provisions. In 2006, the Act was renewed for 25 years. The vote in the House was 390 to 30, while the vote in the Senate was 98 to zero. President George W. Bush signed the measure.

Simply stated, the Voting Rights Act is the perpetuation of our democracy. We are a great country because all of our citizens have the right to exercise the right to vote without fear of intimidation.

Read the rest online at www.theskanner.com

