COUNTDOWN TO RENEWAL

A Wuffle

Associate to Professor School of Social Sciences University of California, Irvine

With footnote annotations by Bernard Grofman Center for the Study of Democracy University of California, Irvine

5 The Number of the Section

Five is the number of the Section to <u>renew;</u> five is also the minimal number of the justices whose agreement renewers must <u>woo</u>.

4

Key Issues for the Civil Rights Community to Resolve

First, just as Roy Rogers had his <u>Trigger</u>, so voting rights advocates must <u>figure</u> their own way to <u>choose</u> which jurisdictions, if any, to <u>lose</u>.

In my view, the new VRA should be not bigger and better, but smaller and keener.

Nine states are now covered in whole.

Let these states be the max.

At the state level, neither multiply, divide nor add, just subtract.

[1]

Second, though the new Section 5 make leak like a <u>sieve</u>, still it must be decided whether easier bailout provisions to <u>give</u>.

4

Key Issues for the Civil Rights Community to Resolve (cont.)

Third, Georgia v. Ashcroft Section 5 did completely redo, so we must decide if this decision Congress must now undo. There are arguments pro and there are arguments con, that make my poor head ache, [2] so little help can I offer on Georgia as to which road we should take. On the other hand, if discriminatory purpose, does not a Section 5 violation make, what could 5 possibly mean? So here, failing to reverse Bossier II makes Section 5 much too lean.

Fourth, and finally, shall the VRA be "updated" to deal with new issues like vote machine technology? My view on this is simple, VRA was intended for racial problems quite special, not every pathology.

For problems like Florida, let's give it to HAVA.

Three is the number of empirical misconceptions by the Supreme Court we need to <u>correct</u>

The first is that racially polarized voting is something with which we no longer <u>meet</u>. But alas, RBV is well, and lives on, in primaries and open <u>seats</u>.

The second misconception is that a legislator's party or color are of no <u>account</u>, once the number of minorities in the district we do precisely <u>count</u>.

Alas, 'tis false. Southern Republicans can win without black votes, and thus need pay minorities in their district no mind; and even among Democrats,

Epstein's and O'Halloran's (2006) review of floor votes <u>notwithstanding</u>, when we do analyses more <u>demanding</u>, difference by race of legislator we do still <u>find</u>.

Third, and relatedly, minority influence occurs at no number <u>magic</u>, to believe the contrary as does former Justice Sandra.

is to invite outcomes quite tragic.[1]

And, as for minority electability, can there be minority electoral success under 50,may ask Stella <u>Dallas</u>?

But minority population enow to control the Democratic primary is as close as <u>I</u> can come to finding the holy chalice.

There are 2 kinds of 2's

The first twosome I spy is the two wings of each party whose views don't <u>agree</u>.

Color blind Republicans and Southern Democratic who would like to say *non*;

Republican Machiavellian and minority Democrats who enthusiastically say <u>oui</u>.

For Republicans pragmatists (like Rove) holding the South forever Republican is the name of the <u>game</u>; for Southern Democrats, the Voting Rights Act is that which to blame.

The second twosome I will focus on is the two fists of fury: the 2 and the $\underline{5}$. In the old days, together they kept minority voting rights alive. Think of Section 2 and Section 5 as boxing's one-two punch. Section 2 to lay them out; Section 5 to keep them permanently out to Lunch. Now 2 + 5 = 7, and that's a prime number, and the year of an itch, but a 7 year renewal is also my pitch -- long enough to put out 2010's fires; short enough not to raise fears of Supreme Court ire.

Finally, like Hamlet we must resolve doubt: Section 5 – to <u>be</u> or not to <u>be</u>. [1]

If <u>Georgia v. Ashcroft</u> remains the law of the land, are we faced with a Schiavoian choice between retaining Section 5 more dead than alive, under *Georgia's* standards <u>murky</u>, or letting it die now, before it becomes just a leftover <u>turkey</u>.

One perspective to bind us is to see renewal as a two-stage game—the strongest renewal that can get through Congress, yet one that the Supreme Court won't shoot down in flames.[2]

^{[1].} Wuffle grew up on Walter Farley's <u>The Black Stallion</u>. Farley kept writing sequels to his 1948 classic. Shortly before his death, Farley wrote the last in the series. In that one Alec, in his mid-20s who had been a jockey for a while, was suffering from advanced arthritis in his hands. Some sequels are best left unwritten.

^[2] See Grofman (2006 forthcoming).

Zero is my toast to a Voting Rights Section now gone. To paraphrase <u>Villon:</u>
"Ou sont les D. O. J. <u>d'antan</u>?"

Long gone are the Hebert, the Posner and such; but it's the last year or <u>so</u> that's the tale of true <u>woe</u>. Gone Becker, gone Kengle, gone, too, are others of the <u>best</u>; even Mighty Joe Rich[1] was forcibly put out to <u>rest</u>.[2]

So verily, the Voting Rights Section of <u>yore</u>—platonic guardians to the <u>core</u>—Quoth the Raven, alas is, no <u>more</u>.

In control firm of DOJ now we <u>see</u>, the Bush political <u>appointee</u>,

^[1] Rich was Chief of the Voting Rights Section.

^[2] They made him a retirement offer he couldn't refuse.