## U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, JULY 16, 2010

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Room 540 at 624 Ninth Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C., at 9:30 a.m., Gerald A. Reynolds, Chairman, presiding.

## PRESENT:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, Chairman
ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice Chairman
TODD F. GAZIANO, Commissioner
GAIL L. HERIOT, Commissioner
PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner
ARLAN D. MELENDEZ, Commissioner (via telephone)
ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., Commissioner
MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner

MARTIN DANNENFELSER, Staff Director

### STAFF PRESENT:

DAVID BLACKWOOD, General Counsel, OGC
CHRISTOPHER BYRNES
DEMITRIA DEAS
LILLIAN DUNLAP
PAMELA A. DUNSTON, Chief, ASCD
PETER MINARIK, Chief, RPCU
LENORE OSTROWSKY
JOHN RATCLIFFE, Chief, Budget and Finance
EILEEN RUDERT
AUDREY WRIGHT

# COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

NICHOLAS COLTEN
ALEC DEULL
TIM FAY
DOMINIQUE LUDVIGSON
JOHN MARTIN
ALISON SCHMAUCH
KIMBERLY SCHULD

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Approval of Agenda	5
II.	Program Planning	8
III.	State Advisory Committee Issues	143
IV.	Management and Operations	
V.	Approval of March 12, April 16, May 14, May 28, and June 11 Meeting Minutes	148
VI.	Announcements	
VII.	Staff Director's Report	
VIII.	Adjourn	154

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:34 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: This meeting will come to order. Please put your mics on. This is a meeting of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

It is 9:30 Eastern Standard Time on July 16, 2010.

All Commissioners are present at 624 Ninth Street, Northwest, Room 540, Washington, D.C., where the meeting is being held, except for Commissioner Melendez, who is participating by phone.

Commissioner Melendez, please confirm that you are still on. Commissioner Melendez?

(No response.)

Okay. Before we begin, I would like to note that this month on July 2nd the Civil Rights Act of 1964 celebrated its 46th birthday. This landmark law signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson prohibits racial discrimination in public accommodations, publicly-owned or operated facilities, employment, and union membership, as well as voter registration.

The Commission's early efforts led the predicate for the Act, which has played an important role in transforming the nation. I would also like to

note the passing earlier this month of former Commission General Counsel and Staff Director William Taylor, a highly successful desegregation lawyer who litigated cases for the NAACP, Legal Defense Fund, and Education Fund, following the Supreme Court's landmark decision in Brown v. Board of Ed, for which he wrote one of the briefs.

As the General Counsel, and later Staff Director, of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Mr. Taylor directed investigations and research efforts that laid the foundation for the passage of a Civil Rights Act and other major civil rights legislation.

He was also the founder and Chairman of the Citizen's Commission on Civil Rights and the Vice Chairman of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. In later years, and most recently, he worked on education reform legislation to advance opportunities for poor and minority children. He received the D.C. Bar's first Thurgood Marshall Award in 1993 and taught law at Georgetown Law School.

#### I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. I move that we approve the agenda. Is there a second?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?

2

1

(No response.)

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

Okay. I would like to amend the agenda in the following manner. I would like to move a of discussion the New Black Panther Party investigation to appear at the first item under our discussion of Program Planning. I would also like to table our 2012 budget discussion until our next meeting.

Ι would like Furthermore, to delete discussion of the concept paper on South Philadelphia School Racial Violence, because High it will covered in our discussion on the enforcement report 2011, and also delete Item 4 regarding Announcements. Finally, I would like to amend the agenda to add consideration of the Texas SAC, right after consideration of the Florida SAC, onto agenda.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Could you just, then, now tell me the first will be the New Black Panther Party, then we move to -- what is the second item now going to be?

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It would be the STEM
2	report. We have to finish up the recommendations.
3	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. And then,
4	on the Philadelphia concept paper, what you're saying
5	is
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That will be folded
7	into the discussion of the 2011 enforcement report.
8	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Right. Okay,
9	fine.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. What is the
12	rationale for moving the New Black Panther Party
13	enforcement thing to the first part of the agenda? Is
14	it simply to accommodate the press who is here?
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oversight on my part.
16	I should have taken care of that when I prepared the
17	agenda originally.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Really.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Other questions?
20	(No response.)
21	All in favor please say aye.
22	(Chorus of ayes.)
23	Objections?
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I object.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Abstentions?
	NEAL D. CDOCC

1 (No response.) 2 Commissioner Melendez, are you phone? 3 4 (No response.) 5 Okay. Let the record reflect that we have 6 one vote against the motion. The motion passes. 7 PROGRAM PLANNING II. 8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: General Counsel 9 Blackwood, please provide us with an update on the 10 developments in our investigation of 11 Department of Justice's mishandling of the New Black 12 Panther Party case. 13 Before you start, Commissioner Melendez, 14 is that you? 15 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Welcome back. 17 Mr. Blackwood? 18 MR. BLACKWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 19 As you are aware, this Tuesday we had scheduled the 20 deposition of Malik Zulu Shabazz, the head of the New 21 Black Panther Party, and self-styled attorney at war. 22 Unfortunately, the day before, he filed a motion to 23 That will be addressed in the U.S. District

are working with the Assistant U.S.

Court.

We

Attorneys assigned to that case, but it will take a while before it is resolved.

At this time, I would note that Mr. Shabazz did -- was served on July 2nd. He had several days to raise this issue. He did not. He waited until 3:00 the night before.

That said, I would also point out that he was available to give a national television interview as late as Friday, the 9th, and at this point I think there was -- it's important also to note that on the 9th, Friday, a video got public currency. It's a broadcast of a speech Malik Zulu Shabazz gave on December 2009 at a Dallas convention of the party.

And we have a compilation video that has been -- we found on YouTube, and at this time I'd like to show that to the Commission, because specifically there are admissions against interests and statements that directly contradict what Mr. Shabazz has said publicly before about the incident.

(Whereupon, the aforementioned YouTube compilation video was shown.)

MR. BLACKWOOD: Now, I will point out that this is only a snippet of a very long video that addresses a variety of matters that Mr. Shabazz talked about. We were -- it is available, at least at the

the Black Panther website 1 moment, on under the 2 convention in Dallas for December 2009. We are also tracking down a video that we 3 4 have found just recently as well where King Samir 5 Shabazz, the gentleman who was allegedly suspended, is 6 giving a speech in April of this year before a Black 7 Panther convention in Atlanta at which he urges 8 Panthers to be armed and resist the police. 9 We are attempting to find that video for 10 the whole speech, but at this time we have only found 11 it on YouTube, and it's a short clip. But we will be 12 trying to find that, and when we do I will notify 13 everyone where they can find that. 14 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Mr. Chairman, can I 15 ask that -- just a clarification -- that the entire 16 video will be put in our record, even though only a 17 portion of it was played today? 18 MR. BLACKWOOD: Absolutely. Absolutely. 19 Lastly, have said just the as Ι 20 couple of days, we have received three statements from 21 members of the public regarding the matter. Three of 22 them -- all three of them are former employees of the 23 Department of Justice. 24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Before you go on --25 and I would encourage the public, to the extent you

1	have experience at the Civil Rights Division at the
2	Department of Justice, if you have knowledge of any of
3	the matters that we have covered in the investigation,
4	please send your statements to the Commission.
5	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Can I just
6	again, this was a convention of the Panther Party?
7	What was it is
8	MR. BLACKWOOD: It was a Panther
9	convention. You're referring to the video.
10	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Right.
11	MR. BLACKWOOD: That took place in
12	December 2009. As I say, it's about an hour-long
13	speech, and those were snippets from that.
14	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I see. Okay. And
15	do we have any sense of the size of this convention?
16	I mean
17	MR. BLACKWOOD: No.
18	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm just
19	curious.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: Absolutely not. It was
21	limited to party members. We have information
22	advertising it, etcetera, but it is limited to party
23	members.
24	Lastly, as you all are aware, this
25	Wednesday the Chair sent a letter to Mr. Perez with

1 regard to our request that Mr. Coates be freed to 2 As you all are aware, Mr. Adams' testimony 3 indicated, to a large extent, that Mr. Coates was 4 actually the party that was participating in many of 5 the conversations that have become so controversial. 6 So we are asking that Mr. Perez release 7 Mr. Coates, so he can testify before the Commission on 8 the matters, both with regard to the New Black Panther 9 as well as the topics about race-neutral 10 enforcement of the civil rights laws. And that's all 11 I have. 12 Ouestions? CHATRMAN REYNOLDS: 13 Commissioner Gaziano, then Commissioner Yaki. 14 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I, first of all, 15 assume that the statements are going to be released to 16 the public at this time? 17 think MR. BLACKWOOD: Ι the 18 appropriate time. The question is: at what point do 19 we want to put -- assuming that we continue to get 20 them, are we going to put them up on a rolling basis? 21 And, frankly, since we got them just yesterday, I 22 haven't had a chance to contemplate that. 23 Well, my -- I move COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: 24 that we make them available to the public and on our 25 website as soon as reasonable. This is -- these

1 obviously aren't subpoenaed material, so they are not 2 covered by our other rules. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I would prefer, 3 4 if you would allow me to exercise discretion, I don't 5 know what is going to come through the door. I don't 6 know what's credible. 7 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Obviously, if it's 8 a racist screed or something --9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. 10 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: -- then hopefully 11 that would be withheld. 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki? 13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, I have several 14 questions. Number one, the letter from you, 15 Chair, to Assistant Attorney General Perez did not 16 seem to indicate that it came on behalf of 17 Commission or an individual Commissioner. It simply 18 seemed to emanate. 19 The question is: under our administrative 20 regulations, did you accurately identify it as either 21 coming on behalf of the Commission or on behalf of 22 yourself as an individual Commissioner? Because I 23 could not tell from the opening paragraph of that letter exactly in what capacity that letter was being 24

sent.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It was sent in my capacity as the Chairman.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. I don't think that letter so identified. I think it simply said "I," and just kept on rolling from there. Number one.

Number two, if you are doing it in the capacity as the Chair, then I also think it needs to be clear that you are not speaking on behalf of the entire Commission, especially this Commissioner, number one.

Number two, as for putting some of these statements on the website, I am going to object strongly to that simply for very simple reasons, namely that if this is -- first of all, the time -- the fact of the matter is is that the people who sent these statements also sent it out to their friends in the right-wing press the same day.

So it's all over the blogosphere already. So the idea that we are somehow putting it into the public domain is ridiculous, because they themselves have already put it in the public domain as it is. And, again, if anyone wants any further confirmation that this is simply a conservative right-wing attack on the Justice Department, the mere fact that so-called, you know, very important public testimony that

we have to consider whether to put on our website or not is already on every single conservative blog that you can count. Right now, this morning, when I did a search, in fact, I think some of the timing of them is before we even got it is, you know, quite suspect.

Number two, if we are going to be putting documents into the public record, as I have said all along, and have continued to say, that the -- and, by the way, the remark that the General Counsel made about Mr. Shabazz giving an interview, showing his availability, speaks to my point about why we could not schedule Adams' deposition hearing at a time when I could attend and Commissioner Melendez could attend, because certainly we could see Mr. Adams all over the news during that entire week.

But somehow or another we couldn't find a single day between then and now to have -- to do it in a way that I could attend, number one.

Number two, now we're talking about issuing subpoenas that will take it beyond the discovery date of today, which then vitiates the entire rationale for why we were trying to compress it within these two days. So that's another thing.

Number three, the point I have continued to make, and will continue every single time we talk

about this fiasco, this farce, this complete Star
Chamber proceeding, is this. We are talking about a
single one-off case. And I have said before, and I'll
say it again, if we were talking about something
and you even threaten it in your letter, Mr. Chair,
about the unequal administration of justice I would
argue, and have continued to argue, that there are
cases involving political and voter intimidation that
Mr. Perez testified went up to the Assistant Attorney
General level during the Bush administration, cases
involving people who did not have nightsticks but who
had guns, people who did not wear black uniforms but
wore fake badges, people who did not stand in front of
an overwhelmingly African-American precinct but went
into people's homes with questionnaires questioning
whether or not they really had the right to vote or
not.
Those were not pursued by the Justice
Department during that period of time, and those
things were not put in there. So I am going to
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. You know
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would like to say,

if we are going to do that --

	17
1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I am going to
3	ask
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, I
5	have been patient. We have all been patient. I have
6	tried not to
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm sorry. You guys
8	had a hearing
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: interrupt you.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: which I could not
11	participate in. I think I have a right to speak.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Are you trying to cut
14	me off?
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You do not have
16	yes.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Do you want to
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: the folks over
20	here
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, yes.
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: that you have no
23	ability
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, yes.
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: no right?

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You do not have an
2	unfettered right to speak. You don't.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I really oh, do you
4	mean as a Commissioner I don't
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You don't.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: have an unfettered
7	right to speak?
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: As a Commissioner,
9	none of us have
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: About an important
11	issue that five of you have decided is
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No Commissioner
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: somehow the most
14	important issue
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: has an unfettered
16	issue
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: in America today
18	when we are ignoring racism in
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: our schools, when
21	we are
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: ignoring racism on
24	our college campuses.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?

	19
1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: When we are
2	ignoring
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: voter intimidation
5	elsewhere?
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I am going to submit
8	for the record the
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: investigation of
11	allegations
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: a politicized
14	hiring and other improper personal actions.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I move to suspend your
16	
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: in the Civil Rights
18	Division
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: July 2, 2008, for
21	the record
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Blackwood is
23	before us right now.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: This will help to deal
25	with the fact that we are dealing with the fact of

1	testimony from individuals who come from this Civil
2	Rights Division
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: May I have a second?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: and I am going to
5	put this into the record.
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Do you want a
7	second? You've got a second.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. Do we need
9	to discuss this?
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Sure. I have a right
11	to discuss it. You are trying to
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm talking about
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: You are trying
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: the motion that
15	just received a second.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And I can speak on
17	that motion.
18	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: May I ask
19	Commissioner Yaki a question?
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.
21	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: How much longer did
22	you want to
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I was finishing up.
24	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: speak? I
25	thought you might be, and I was

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I was finishing up, but apparently Mr. Reynolds has a very short attention span.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Could I just ask that we not proceed on the motion to censor and just allow -- if he needs another two minutes, and then -- CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Gaziano, for you, anything.

(Laughter.)

The floor is yours.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: As I was saying, I am going to enter into the record, as is my right as a Commissioner, the Office of Inspector General and the Office of Professional Responsibility report, July 2, 2008, regarding the conclusions — the investigation and conclusions about the improper politicization of the Civil Rights Division and the Department of Justice during the Bush administration, which talks about the hiring and the environment in the Civil Rights Division to contradict many of these so-called statements from the people who are hired to do exactly what Bradley Schlozman wanted to do, which was to completely eradicate the Voting Rights Division in the Justice Department.

1 I am going to put that into the record, because we need -- how should I put it? We need to be 2 3 fair and balanced. 4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I --5 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Mr. Chair, may I --6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ι would like t.o 7 respond to a few of the things that were just said. The fact that it is a so-called one-off incident is 8 9 not -- it's not a consideration under the law. 10 law does not require multiple violations before the Justice Department has an obligation to defend a 11 12 fundamental right. 13 surprised that And I amanyone 14 suggest that we require something more than what is 15 contained in the statute. We can't rewrite the 16 The statute gives the Justice Department the 17 power to move in reaction to a single incident --18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: True. -- and has done so. 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Was I talking about 21 the Civil Rights Division? No. I was talking about 22 us. 23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki? 24 Let me finish.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just want -- you're mischaracterizing what I was saying, so I just wanted to correct it for the record.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sure you believe that's not the first time.

And as for the testimony of Mr. Adams, the date was not convenient to anyone. People had to interrupt vacations. I had to make a sacrifice myself. That is what we do as Commissioners. And, you know, to the extent anyone could not make it because they were unable to change their schedules, that's unfortunate. But we have important business to conduct here, and it does not -- it cannot require that we have unanimity on our schedules in order to proceed. If that were the case, very little would get done here.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: But bipartisanship would be a good idea.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Mr. Chairman, may I? First of all, I have I think three points in response. First of all, I do not think that individual Commissioners have the right to insert whatever they want into the record individually, but I think that they ought to be given wide latitude by the rest of us. And I -- so I endorse the receipt into

the record of whatever Commissioner Yaki argues is relevant.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Would you consider that a display of bipartisanship?

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Maybe.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: And I thought we ought to, going forward, provide wide latitude to fellow Commissioners in that regard.

I wanted to explain the point that you just went over that I think we covered somewhat extensively in the hearing where we had former Acting Associate Attorney General Katsas. This case may have been corrosive of the rule of law, even as a single incident. because it was viewed by millions Americans. Whenever millions of Americans watching the enforcement of justice, and they think an injustice is done, it is more corrosive than if the rest of the public isn't aware of it.

I think we all agree that it became even more in-famous, or infamous, when the Justice Department not only dismissed it after a default judgment, which involved no further resources on the Department, but also when the Department gave excuses that are more damaging to the rule of law, namely that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the facts and circumstances that millions of Americans had seen did not constitute voter intimidation, and, quite frankly, it has been the Justice Department's response that has made this so crucial a case for this Commission to investigate. And that was our understanding when we began this investigation.

But at this point, this investigation is far more important, and what's far more important is the sworn testimony under oath that the Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Holder Justice Department, Julie Fernandes, has instructed the chief of the voting section, Chris Coates, that he shall never -- or that the voting section will never bring another lawsuit against a black or other national minority.

If we don't continue the investigation, or don't try to continue the investigation, then we, as a Commission, should be disbanded. If the Justice Department doesn't answer those charges, it is a grave indictment of them. If they don't allow us to interview the witnesses to that alleged conversation, then it speaks volumes.

So whether we had a disagreement about the importance of the implications of the Justice

1 Department's dismissal of this infamous suit, I think 2 we are at a very different point right now. And regarding the letter that the Chairman 3 4 sent to Assistant Attorney General Perez, I move at 5 this time that the Commission adopt and endorse the 6 letter the chair sent to Assistant Attorney General 7 Perez on July 14, 2010, so that there is no confusion 8 that it -- I think it will garner a majority vote, and 9 think the Department should know that 10 supported by a majority of the Commission. 11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry, Vice Chair. 12 Commissioner Kirsanow was next. VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Sure. 13 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Is there a second 14 15 on my motion? 16 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would second the 17 motion. 18 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? 20 (No response.) 21 All in favor say aye. 22 (Chorus of ayes.) 23 Objections? 24 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Absolutely not.

1 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm sorry, I was 2 thinking about something else. What is the motion, 3 that we --4 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Endorse -- adopt 5 and endorse the letter that --6 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I do not have the 7 letter in front of me. I can't possibly vote on a 8 letter that I am not reading. 9 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Did you read it? 10 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, yes, but I -- you know, I would need to see it again. 11 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do you abstain 13 object? VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I abstain. 14 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez? 16 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I object. 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We have two 18 objections, one abstention. The motion passes. 19 Commissioner Kirsanow, you were up next. 20 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, 21 Chairman. Actually, Commissioner Gaziano stated much 22 of what I was about to say, but I would add one other 23 To the extent this investigation began with 24 respect to the dismissal of the New Black Panther case 25 by the Department of Justice, it is clear it has since

evolved significantly beyond that, particularly because of the testimony of Mr. Adams about 10 days ago, but I would add one other component to that testimony that goes beyond also the testimony related to an extant policy at DOJ not to enforce certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act against minority defendants or on behalf of white victims, but also the testimony that DOJ will not enforce Section 8 of the motor voter law, the MVRA.

That's of extreme significance in this particular case. We are charged with, among other things, not just matters with respect to racial discrimination, but voting rights, and that is a significant component of the voting regime in this country.

So to the extent anyone wants to continue "Well, the New Black Panther case is just a lunatic fringe issue, not a biq deal, have testimony would like to introduce that we more evidence on, but, unfortunately, we are being stymied in our effort to do so, but we have testimony that is uncontroverted thus far --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, could you --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: -- uncontroverted thus far that we have the policy within the division that is charged with enforcing federal civil rights laws that they will do so on an unequal basis.

Now, to the extent that it is not

Now, to the extent that it is not rebutted, I think that impels us -- compels us to continue the investigation and to try to adduce testimony to either controvert it or corroborate it.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I question -
first, a question for the General Counsel. I don't

think there is any dissent among Commissioners on the

fact that the New Black Panther Party is not a very

appealing group, to say the least.

And I wonder whether -- I wonder what the video tells us that we don't already know. They are an ugly group. They're -- you know, their website is full of ugly language, and so forth. I'm just -- I mean, it seems to me our job here is not to prove that the New Black Panther Party is unappealing. Our mission is something other than that, and I'm not sure how this advances our mission.

MR. BLACKWOOD: Well, it does, and it's relevant to the investigation, because of the term

"admission against interest," which can be done at any time before or after an event.

To say the least, Malik Zulu Shabazz has given a variety of different statements. Previously, at the hearing I believe of April 23rd, we put on an interview he gave to Fox News three days I believe after the election in which he said aryan nation members and nazis were at the polling place. There is no indication that that was true.

There are public statements that they posted on their website that they were putting King Samir Shabazz, the gentleman with the nightstick, on — he was being suspended.

The clip we just showed -- one, we had the President laughing about a baton -- syke -- mocking the seriousness of the event. He admitted that they sent people to the polling places.

bluntly, it sounds like And, was acknowledging also that he knew that people were going there armed. Now, that's subject to interpretation. I will say if someone watches the whole video, he explicitly acknowledges at one point in time that we did a bunch of things to get this thing removed, that also would be some kind of admission as far as we gave multiple stories. Ι mean, Ι showed the video,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

because, one, I think it is -- openly he gave admissions against his interest, but it is still necessary to talk to him.

Under oath, for once, give us a version under oath about what the party did, what it organized, did it condone, did it plan. acknowledged that there were plans, and he said "policies." What were those plans? What were the policies?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay.

MR. BLACKWOOD: He may well give us an explanation that will satisfy all.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. Second, the Assistant Attorney General Perez, Tom Perez, did insist under repeated questioning by Commissioner Gaziano when Mr. Perez appeared here that he was not distinguishing between white and black victims, and so it's not quite correct to say that there has been, you know, no response to that allegation. You may not believe Mr. Perez. That is another --

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: There has been no response to the allegation that Julie Fernandes, his deputy -- he may not have known about it at the time, but there has been no response to the allegation that Julie Fernandes, his deputy -- maybe unknowingly --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

instructed the voting section that they would not, shall not, file any more cases against blacks or other national minorities. And that is at the heart of the Civil Right's Division's responsibility.

I am waiting. If he denies it, then we should interview the witnesses under oath, and that would be news. If he admits it, that would be news, and I want to know what he is going to do about it and what we should do about it. If he says nothing, that is news as far as I'm concerned.

But we should press for an answer to whether these statements that Perez said he didn't believe -- in his testimony he said, "I don't believe anyone in my division has that attitude, that the civil rights law should be enforced in a race -- not a race-neutral way." And I said, "I hope so." But that's what we need to get at.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, the question would not be, I would hope, whether there is a single person in the entire division that believes that, but whether that is -- whether somebody important --

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: But you would admit that his deputy, who is the senior person in charge of voting rights, giving an instruction is more significant than --

1	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: a paralegal.
3	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes, I would agree
4	with that.
5	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: His right-hand
6	person for voting rights.
7	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes. And if we
8	have hard evidence to
9	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: You have sworn
10	testimony.
11	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's just an
13	allegation. Vice Chair Thernstrom, would you agree
14	that we have an allegation on the table that we should
15	try to confirm it or
16	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I am delighted to
17	get at the facts. As I keep saying to members of the
18	media who ask me about this, look, I'm an evidence
19	girl. All I want is evidence, and so, you know, fine.
20	At the point at which we have it, I am going to be
21	really happy.
22	Then, the last thing is, I would like this
23	Commission to be members of this Commission to be
24	very careful this is related to the previous point
25	very careful about charging any member of the

1 administration -- basically, calling them a racist or 2 implicitly calling them a racist. It is the ugliest 3 term in American politics. 4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Has that occurred? 5 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, I think --6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Which Commissioner 7 made that allegation? 8 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Isn't that the 9 implication of the charge? 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Which Commissioner 11 statement that you --I mean, you have 12 inferred, based on a comment made by a particular 13 Commissioner, that --14 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Isn't that the 15 implication of the charge, that there are racial 16 double standards that are driving --17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The charge 18 allegation that has been made, and the allegation that 19 we are looking into, is that a senior person in the 20 Justice Department has issued a rule that a portion of 21 the Voting Rights Act will not be enforced against 22 minority defendants. That is the allegation. That is 23 what we are looking into.

1 I do not see how you conclude that -- from 2 that set of facts that we are accusing anyone of being 3 a racist. 4 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, certainly, 5 if you are engaging in double racial standards, 6 enforcing the law against one group racially defined 7 and not the other, it seems to me there is 8 implication. 9 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Would you have us 10 not examine it? I don't know how we can examine it 11 without --12 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No, I don't. Ι 13 just want -- all I'm saying is I want us to be very 14 careful in exactly how we frame the allegations, 15 because, as you know --COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Consistent with --16 17 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Can I just finish? 18 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: -- what you've 19 said, I have tried to be. I have only repeated the 20 I don't exact allegation. know whether you're 21 referring to me or someone else. 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The allegation was 23 framed by Mr. Adams. 24 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Right.

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Adams threw it on 2 Now, whether the accusation is table. 3 that's what we're trying to find out. 4 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: And three or four 5 other incidents, maybe as many as eight other 6 And now we have affidavits sworn under incidents. 7 oath as well that corroborate Mr. Adams' statement 8 the general culture of supervising about some 9 attorneys in the division, which, again, may or may 10 not -- Mr. Perez may not have known about, but some of 11 those were in the press. And if you remember, I asked 12 Mr. Perez, "Did you ever investigate?" They said, 13 "Well, I don't believe anyone really had those views." We now have more direct evidence of that. 14 15 And so I hope the Department investigates, but we need 16 to investigate as well. 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Okay. 18 Kirsanow is up next, then Commissioner Yaki. 19 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I just wanted to 20 augment something that the General Counsel said in 21 response to Vice Chair Thernstrom's question as to the 22 relevance or significance of the video. 23 throughout There has been, 24 investigation, this kind of subtext of this is all 25 about the New Black Panther party, or something of

that nature, and trying to highlight inflammatory aspects or that we are somehow trying to highlight inflammatory aspects of the party or their rhetoric.

think what this video goes to is Assistant Attorney General Perez's testimony as to why the New Black Panther Party was dismissed out of the case, that there was no evidence of any agency by the party of the actions the Black Panthers in discrete two front the Philadelphia polling station.

What this video tends to show is that in fact they did support that, were aware of it, and in fact were possibly complicit in doing so. So it is just a component or a piece of evidence that tends to show that, in fact, agency or endorsement did exist sufficient to maintain the actions against the New Whether or not this Commission Black Panther Party. ultimately determines that after all evidence adduced, received into the record, is wholly different issue.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just want to follow up on a point that Commissioner Thernstrom made about characterization of folks in the Justice Department. But I actually wanted to take it a step back in terms

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of characterization of the testimony that we have received.

It is disturbing to me to see how we characterize testimony that right now we haven't even released, but which is available on the blogosphere, so-called sworn affidavits from involving individuals who were political appointees of the prior administration, who do not have any information on this particular case, who were part of a culture and a regime where their boss talked about the need to "scream with a blood-curdling cry" at some commi person, subordinate, i.e., most of the voting section staff.

I think that we have to be very careful about saying that somehow these so-called sworn affidavits have anything whatsoever to do with the charges made by Mr. Adams, because in fact they do not. They support a very small portion of his characterization of his tenure -- during his time there, but their time limits did not extend anywhere into the new administration.

They have no personal knowledge of that, and it is absolutely a disservice to say anything that would imply that those affidavits supported a single allegation specifically made by Mr. Adams. They do

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

not. And the people who make those statements know they do not.

They know those people left well beforehand. They know they did not have personal knowledge. And to the extent that they have any knowledge whatsoever, and perhaps, you know, I don't know how Mr. Kirsanow feels about this, but I am very reluctant to allow rank hearsay as part of any of the evidentiary matters that we will consider.

But even those aside, the fact of the matter is those affidavits have nothing whatsoever to do with the so-called charges leveled by Christian Adams. And I do understand what Commissioner Gaziano said about how, in his mind, it has moved to another — to a different level. I understand that.

But it moves to the same level that I have been trying to make the point at all before, which is, what exactly does go on in the voting rights decision on these types of cases? Why are they treated differently in some administrations versus others?

That to me is worthy -- is just as worthy of exploration, because if indeed we have a report by two different entities within Justice that talk about inappropriate behavior in terms of the leadership in the prior administration, we know that there is

testimony regarding decisions made at that level intimidation involving regarding voter cases individuals openly wearing guns, openly wearing fake badges, what have you, that to me is more appropriate inquiry rather than simply turning into a let's go get Eric Holder thing, which to me is exactly what this has become.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, you said some things that I agree with. When we started this conversation about the affidavits, I suggested some discomfort with the notion of putting all affidavits up. I haven't seen these affidavits. I don't know what level of credibility they have, and I think that what -- in my capacity as Chairman, I want to take a look at it before making a decision what goes up.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's one thing.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I would urge the same wide latitude that we have -- I have asked to be extended to Commissioner Yaki's evidence for --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, we're making a different point. We're not talking about what goes on the record. I am talking about what goes up on the website.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In any event, you also -- well, on several occasions you have mentioned things that have gone on, or at least you made allegations about things that have gone on during the Bush administration. If I entertain -- for purposes of our conversation, just grant you that all of your allegations are true, don't think that that speaks to whether investigation into the current administration should go forward. I don't think -- I hope you're not saying that while they refused to enforce the law during the Bush administration, so we have to even the score by

giving the current administration a pass.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, to the contrary.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Good. Good.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: But my point is that that's not the focus of this investigation.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And I don't even disagree with your point that it is legitimate to look the Bush administration or into any other administration. My small point is that that is not the decision that was made. You disagree with it. You have always disagreed with it. But it is the majority that rules this Commission.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: For now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That is correct. We 2 took a different approach, and --3 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Well, I want 4 support Commissioner Yaki's point, if I might 5 allowed, in one way. Because he and Vice Chair 6 Thernstrom were not present, I -- and I don't know if 7 they carefully read -- had a chance to carefully read 8 the transcript, but that I spent some time, or at 9 least a little bit of time with Christian Adams, since 10 he was the only witness from the voting section the 11 Department has allowed us, whether he was --12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Did he say that the 13 Justice Department allowed folks to --VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: He had left the 14 15 Justice Department by then. 16 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: No, no. I'm just 17 saying because he was the only one who was able to 18 testify, whether he had personal knowledge of some of 19 these other cases that Commissioner Yaki and Mr. Perez 20 brought before us, he said he didn't and he identified 21 the individual. 22 Mr. Coates is the person who was involved 23 in all of those, and I wanted to remind the Commission 24 -- and I'm mentioning to them right now that that was 25 always a part of the plan of investigation that we

adopted at the Commission is to compare. The primary focus is going to be on the dismissal of this New Black Panther case and whether we agreed with it, whether we thought it was supported, but also to try to compare and contrast it to others.

And I am renewing today my interest in hearing Chris Coates not only testify about the New Black Panther case, but also Mr. Coates to talk about the Pima, Arizona matter, and several of the other

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Which occurred under the Bush administration.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: That's absolutely right. So I have always supported that, and I renewed that request. And that's another reason why the Justice Department should allow the chief of the voting section during that period to testify.

And Commissioner Yaki and anyone else on this Commission can ask as many questions as are relevant.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, just as a friendly amendment to that, since Assistant Attorney General Perez identified that the decisionmaking on those particular cases was made at the Assistant AG

matters.

1	level, why are we not extending the subpoena to that
2	individual as well?
3	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, let's
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I was just asking. I
6	will
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I've been going in
8	turn, and actually
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I apologize, but I
10	just wanted to follow it up.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Please respond, and
12	then we are going to get back in order. It is
13	Commissioner Kirsanow, Vice Chair Thernstrom, and then
14	Commissioner Taylor.
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Just a very
16	discrete point.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But let's respond
18	to
19	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Well, I think that
20	the chair as I understand the evidence, the voting
21	section chief has the let me yield to Commissioner
22	Taylor.
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: If I may not
24	respond, but actually agree with what Commissioner
25	Yaki has said. If the suggestion is what we really

1 need to do is have the decisionmakers testify, I think 2 is a very good idea. What I don't want to 3 happen, though, is I don't want them to be able to 4 cherrypick the people who testify. 5 Ιf they want the Assistant 6 General to testify, then I would also like Mr. Coates 7 testify, particularly since Mr. Adams, in 8 testimony -- and I point you to page 55 -- said that 9 Mr. Coates will testify that there are statements that 10 you made earlier that until blacks and whites achieve 11 economic parity in Mississippi, we had no business 12 cases like this. That bringing is the type 13 testimony that I would like him to either confirm or 14 deny. 15 So it --I would agree with your 16 suggestion. If the decisionmakers -- if you think 17 it's good to have --18 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Well, Ι think 19 Commissioner Yaki was asking for --20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, hold on, hold --21 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: -- prior Assistant 22 Attorney General. We have already had the testimony 23 from this -- the current Assistant Attorney General. 24 And with regard to prior -- if their testimony is

really very helpful, I wouldn't object if the -- to

having them, but there were two or three acting and confirmed. And, you know, Mr. Acosta, as I know, is a law dean, and I don't know where Grace Becker -- what cases she might be involved with.

And that's why I suspect Chris Coates would be the most relevant single witness. But if hearing from him it became clear that the testimony of Ralph Boyd or Grace Becker or Alex Acosta was important or reasonably relevant, then I would support it. But I just think that's one step ahead of where we need to be.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I need to ask -something that Mr. Taylor said, I need to ask the
General Counsel something about. Commissioner Taylor
talked about an incident involving someone speaking
with someone about an issue regarding a case, which, I
might add, was actually brought to trial and won by
the Justice Department.

So one has to question whether or not what someone may have felt in terms of how -- what their role was actually interfered in the pursuit of their duties is I think a legitimate -- is a legitimate point to make rather than simply, by innuendo -- and this is my concern -- by innuendo attempting to

1 disparage the character of someone on a decision like 2 this. 3 And this goes, again, to the affidavits 4 and stuff in terms of defame, degrade, other things 5 like that that we need to -- I think we need to be 6 very concerned about, because even in the testimony by 7 Mr. Adams you have to wonder whether or not there have 8 been instances wherein the innuendo of the 9 conversation is such that it doesn't jive with the end The Justice Department 10 That was Noxubee. result. brought Noxubee. They won Noxubee. 11 12 So whether or not this person felt 13 uncomfortable doing it or not begs the question of 14 whether or not -- it doesn't beg the question whether 15 he did or -- --GAZIANO: 16 COMMISSIONER There is an 17 allegation of fraudulent tampering to 18 Noxubee case. 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let him finish. 20 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I thought he was. 21 There is an allegation of fraudulent tampering. 22 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chair, I would 23 move that everyone be recognized before they speak. 24 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes, I think that 25 would be a very good idea.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You're right, you're right, you're right.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I mean, there are some of us who have been waiting to speak here.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: One point and one question. There has -- at various points in our investigation of this issue, the point has come up that only three cases in the 45 years since the passage of the Voting Rights Act have -- only three cases under Section 11(b) of the statute have been won by the government, and that there have been a lot of other cases that, you know, in which -- that failed, in which they prosecution just -- the evidence wasn't there to pursue them.

I would actually like some information on -- I don't even know the names of the three cases in which the government did prevail, and I would like some information about those, and which they did not.

MR. BLACKWOOD: There is information in the answers to interrogatories supplied by the Department of Justice. And I can provide that later on. But they did address -- that was one of the questions we had, "Identify all 11(b) cases," and they did provide a list.

1 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. And do I 2 have that list? 3 MR. BLACKWOOD: You should, yes. 4 is in a great deal of paper that they provided. 5 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. I would 6 like that, because I think it is extremely relevant. 7 I mean, as I have said before, look, I have written 8 two books on the Voting Rights Act, and in neither one 9 did I even mention Section 11(b), because it was -- it 10 was such a minor section with, you know, only these 11 cases, and these three cases provided 12 any future allegations quidelines as to handle 13 voter intimidation. And so I just left the whole 14 topic alone, but I would like to see that list again. 15 And, look, in terms of receiving 16 testimony, one of my objections to this topic from the 17 very beginning was that we were going to be dependent 18 on the Justice Department to enforce subpoenas. And, 19 therefore, our hands were going to be tied. 20 You know, in answering the central 21 question posed, why did the Justice that was 22 Department not pursue this case further, our hands 23 were going to be tied. 24 Now, and, therefore, I didn't want to make 25 it our statutory report. I never had any objections

1 to making -- just simply having a briefing, a normal 2 briefing, on this topic. But to make it our year-long 3 statutory report, I thought we are not going to get at 4 the evidence that we need. 5 That remains a problem today. You are 6 talking about trying to get testimony from people who 7 would need to be subpoenaed and whom the Justice 8 Department and -- and being dependent on the Justice 9 Department to enforce those subpoenas. So --10 CHAIRMAN **REYNOLDS:** So, Vice Chair 11 Thernstrom, you believe that we should not 12 undertaken this investigation, because the Department 13 of Justice -- you believe the Department of Justice 14 would not cooperate in our investigation. 15 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Ι thought 16 should not make it a big, year-long statutory report, 17 because our ability to acquire the evidence we would 18 need to answer the central question, and in fact at 19 that time the only question, was so very limited. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And it's limited 21 because? 22 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Because we were 23 unlikely to get the Justice Department to enforce the

subpoenas that to --

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But even before we get
2	to the issuance of subpoenas, the cooperation, did you
3	doubt cooperation from the Justice Department?
4	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, it would
5	depend on your definition of "cooperation," but I
6	thought
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Complying with the
8	law. We under the law, we have the right to
9	investigate matters within our jurisdiction.
LO	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes.
L1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: This issue before us,
L2	would you agree, is within our jurisdiction
L3	allegations of voter intimidation?
L4	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes, I would agree
L5	that the general topic is within our jurisdiction.
L 6	Yes. I am still having a hard time with the notion
L7	that we have got evidence of actual voter intimidation
L8	here. You know, I haven't seen it yet.
L 9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And you also would
20	agree that our ability to investigate has not been
21	restricted by Congress, so that the Justice Department
22	is exempt.
23	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Oh, I agree with
24	that.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So

1 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: But, you know, I 2 live in the real world, and so do you. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 3 And in the real 4 world, I don't run from fights. In my world, because 5 it is going to be a difficult investigation does not 6 mean I throw up my hands and I say, "It's not worth 7 it." We are talking about a fundamental right. 8 are talking about voting rights, an area where you 9 significant have spent а amount of your time 10 researching. 11 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Too much time. 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It seems to me that --13 I agree with you. It has been difficult. But that is 14 no reason not to move forward with that -- to decide 15 to investigate and to continue with the investigation. 16 There have been many agencies throughout 17 stonewalled administrations that have manv 18 investigations. 19 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It is not new. 21 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Mr. Chairman, my 22 only point from the very beginning was -- I objected 23 to making this our statutory report and consuming our 24 year, really, because, you know, I felt the evidence 25

were going to get was going to be

extremely

1	limited, and it has turned out so far to be extremely
2	limited.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow?
4	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr.
5	Chair. In response to Vice Chair Thernstrom, first, I
6	would say that if in fact she objected initially to
7	this being the statutory
8	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I did.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: report because
10	of this one incident, I would disagree with that. But
11	since the onset of our investigation, we have adduced
12	evidence that is truly extraordinary, if it is true.
13	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: If it is true.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: If it is true.
15	You would agree with that.
16	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Oh, again, I'm
17	just
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: If we have
19	evidence
20	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm just an
21	evidence girl.
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: at the
23	Department of Justice, then we should pursue the
24	evidence, and not simply wash our hands, turn a blind
25	eye, and say, "The agency charge with enforcing our

subpoenas is going to stonewall us, despite the fact that that very agency is the" --

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Look, I'm not --

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: -- "top agency in the country" --

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: -- washing my hands.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: -- "in the entire country to ensure that federal civil rights laws are enforced equally." And we have testimony that is unrebutted, uncontroverted, that shows or suggests at least very strongly by an individual who actually left the Justice Department after having been promoted, and he testifies that we have a bifurcated justice system. If that is true, that is something that should involve not just our statutory report but an ongoing report to determine whether or not that in fact is true. That's extraordinary.

Second is going to the issue of whether or not we are going to get testimony on the discrete issue, again, of the New Black Panther dismissal. We have been confronted with privileges asserted by the Department of Justice that a number of very credible and experienced experts have said are spurious privileges.

I have been a litigator for 30 years. Some of these privileges I have never seen. Maybe I'm not the best litigator in the world. Maybe I haven't read all of the texts in the world. But some of these privileges are astonishing.

But take that aside, let's grant them that there may be privileges attached to the deliberative process related to New Black Panther Party dismissal. This case has now morphed far beyond that. New Black Panther, compared to what has been alleged, is a minor matter now. Now MVRA is minor in comparison to a systemic practice on the part of DOJ, which has been alleged, that they discriminate on the basis of race in the enforcement of our civil rights laws.

If in fact that is the case, there is no privilege that attaches to evidence or statements we could get from current Justice Department attorneys, either corroborating or abutting that. It has nothing to do with the deliberative process. We could get the testimony of a whole raft of witnesses who have been identified who say they heard this policy statement being made by a political appointee.

If that policy statement was made, there is nothing privileged about that, and we should get that testimony, and I would move -- by the way, Mr.

1 Chairman, I am going to make a separate motion that we 2 append to the letter that you sent to Mr. Perez a 3 couple of days ago, a request that he produce just 4 those witnesses. 5 There are no privileges that attach. All 6 we want to know is: were those statements made 7 unrelated to New Black Panther dismissal? Were the 8 statements with respect to Section 8 made? Because 9 that's extraordinary. That could invite massive voter 10 fraud, could invite massive voter fraud. 11 That is the charge of the Commission. 12 the extent, again, this was ever a minor case -- and I 13 disagree that it was -- it has now evolved far beyond 14 that into a major, major issue precisely within the charter of this Commission. 15 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: We have known each 16 17 other now for about eight years, and you know that 18 neither I, and I don't think anybody else on this indifferent 19 Commission, would be to Justice а 20 Department that was discriminating on the basis of 21 race. And so, you know, I hope you're not --22 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: But you don't 23 want --24 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: -- implying that 25 anybody here --

1 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Vice Chair 2 Thernstrom, I'm not implying that you have no interest 3 in pursuing voting rights. I'm simply saying --4 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Or --5 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: disagreeing 6 with your characterization of this as not something we 7 should be pursuing. I would disagree with that 8 assessment, because I can't countenance it at all. 9 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm perfectly 10 happy for you to try to get at the answer to the 11 questions you are posing. I am only objecting to the 12 notion that I would be indifferent to actual findings 13 of discrimination on the basis of race within the 14 Department. Of course Ι wouldn't be Justice 15 indifferent to that. 16 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The only manner in 17 which we can get to whether or not that in fact is 18 true is by pursuing the investigation, and apparently 19 you do not want to. That's what is extraordinary. 20 Whatever this started out to be, it strikes me as 21 being clear that it is now something quite different. 22 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Now, if you can 23 pursue that, I applaud. You've got my applause. Ιf

you can come up with evidence, I'm not --

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Will you support us 1 2 now in doing so? 3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Assistance would be 4 nice, as opposed to a characterization of the issue 5 being small potatoes. 6 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, I think the 7 issue of the -- the original issue that we started out 8 with and that we were supposed to be investigating, 9 which was that particular -- one incident of two Black 10 Panthers standing in front of the polling place, I 11 think is small potatoes. I'm sorry. 12 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Will you support us 13 now? VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: It depends on what 14 15 you are talking about, Mr. Gaziano. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 17 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: But I am certainly 18 interested in whether you've got evidence, and whether 19 there is evidence, that there is a racial double 20 standard within the Justice Department. 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We're going to have to 22 work for it. We're going to have to work for it. 23 It's not going to be easy. 24 Commissioner Yaki?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I thought I had made clear about how characterizing this framework that actually makes some logical sense something that I think we should all strive toward. But when my colleague starts going from the unsubstantiated allegations of one person into "massive voter fraud" is completely ridiculous only serving to try and fan unfounded hysteria about an issue that there is no factual evidence on.

It is a far cry -- if someone made that -- let me just say this for the record. If someone made that statement within the Department of Justice, that person should be fired. That person should be tossed out on their ear in two seconds flat. Number one.

But, number two, there is a far cry from that to saying there is going to be massive voter fraud in November, and playing scare tactics like that, which is just irresponsible on the part of this Commission.

And when I think about this, when I think about -- whenever I try and give the benefit of the doubt to anything that goes on in this crazy one-sided investigation, it comes back to this. This Commission sat on its hands -- sat on its hands -- running up the 2008 election, as voter rolls were being purged

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

throughout this country, as there were allegations about -- and there were allegations in 2004 and 2006 regarding voter intimidation, involving people who had a gun.

And we sit here and we start crying about massive voter fraud, because one person who was part of a politically-charged -- who was a politically-charged hire of a politically-charged apartment, that it was concluded by two independent investigations within DOJ and made these allegations. Maybe he heard it right.

And, if so, that person and those people should be gone. But to somehow bootstrap that into a system-wide attack on the Obama administration to say, "There's going to be massive voter fraud," is just completely 100 percent fear-mongering, irresponsible, and out of line, completely out of line. It is politics by fear. It is exactly what we are trying not to do in this Commission.

Again, someone says this stuff -- and I will say this for the record. I change my vote. I will -- I don't exactly agree with the tone of the letter, but if there are people who made those statements, they should be produced or something should be done about that. Fine, I agree with that.

1	But I cannot, and will not, countenance this idea that
2	somehow there is this vast conspiracy for voter fraud
3	that there are no facts alleged anywhere, unlike
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner?
5	Commissioner Yaki?
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: instances that we
7	had in the past.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, I
9	suspect that Commissioner Kirsanow would like to
LO	respond. I could be wrong.
L1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, I would
L2	commend Mr. Yaki for Commissioner Yaki for agreeing
L3	with our letter. I'm very happy about that.
L4	Number two is I made no allegation that
L5	there was going to be massive voter fraud.
L6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: You used the words
L7	"massive voter fraud."
L 8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I did. And listen
L9	to how I use the words, listen to how I use them, talk
20	about the politics of
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But you know the
22	power of words. You know what it is they are looking
23	at

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki? 2 Commissioner Yaki? He showed you a little respect of listening to you. 3 4 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I apologize. I'11 5 take it back. 6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I was responding 7 to Commissioner Thernstrom's characterization of the 8 nature of this investigation as being small potatoes, 9 and I said it morphed into something bigger than that. 10 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Than the nature of the incident. 11 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Could you let him 13 talk? 14 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Not. the 15 investigation. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom, 17 let him speak. 18 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It morphed into 19 something far larger than that, something that which, 20 if the allegation is true, yes, it is unsubstantiated, 21 that's why we want to pursue it. One person said it 22 -- standing alone, it's evidence. I want to know, 23 allegation, the nature of the 24 extraordinary, whether it's true.

That's why Ι wanted Commissioner Thernstrom's agreement that should we pursue investigation, because it is an extraordinary statement. If in fact Section 8 is not being enforced, that very well could lead to massive voter We don't know. That's why we need to pursue That's why we can't shut this down.

In addition to that, with respect to any types of incidence of voter intimidation that were or were not pursued in the Bush administration, and the fact that this Commission didn't pursue those, I was not aware of them, and Commissioner Yaki or anyone else who was aware of them could have brought them up. Had they been brought up, I would have supported an investigation.

I don't recall at any time when any of those incidents occurred or allegedly occurred anyone on this Commission saying, "We're not going to investigate it." I don't recall anyone on this Commission saying, "We should investigate it." It, to my knowledge -- and I would like to read the record -- was never raised. This incident was raised, and we should be pursuing it.

If Pima, Arizona, or some of the other incidents you have raised in fact were discussed at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 some point, I would have said, "Let's take a look at 2 whether or not it merits an investigation." Nothing 3 prevented you, Mr. Yaki, from introducing that for our 4 consideration. 5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki? 6 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, Commissioner 7 Kirsanow, with all due respect, the mere fact that 8 today there was an acknowledgement by the chair that 9 we are not going to look at that confirms what I have 10 always believed for the last three to four years while 11 I have been on this Commission, which is it doesn't 12 No, you said we weren't going to look at 13 You said we chose not to go into that. 14 said that. 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I said that we took a 16 particular approach that you disagree with. 17 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Right, which was to 18 expand it to these other --19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And --20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- and to compare and 21 contrast was always part of it. 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But hold on. You do 23 raise an important point. The original concept paper 24 was broad enough to encompass the issues that you

that you have discussed several times

mentioned,

1 today. Commissioner Gaziano's discussion of the 2 concept paper jogged my memory. We were supposed to 3 look at other cases to compare and contrast how cases 4 were handled, and there was no restriction on -- there 5 was no restriction on time limits. So --6 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: We actually have 7 received some information from the Department on those 8 other matters as well. completely We are not like we are 9 stonewalled on those, on the central 10 points in the New Black Panther Party. 11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. 12 May I clarify one COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: 13 other point? CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm acknowledging the 14 15 correction that was delivered by Commissioner Yaki. 16 believe he is right. 17 COMMISSIONER YAKI: So just -- and just to 18 make this point, I don't agree with the letter. 19 agree with the fact that if there are people who made 20 those statements, they should be questioned either by 21 the Assistant Attorney General and made available to 22 us in one fashion or another. 23 I am not for stonewalling the truth by 24 anyone, Democrat or Republican. And anyone who says

-- who says anything as onerous as, "We are only going

to enforce the rights of one group versus another," is dead wrong. Just dead wrong.

But I am not going to join in the hysterical, for lack of a better words, red baiting mania that has gone on about what Christian Adams said, because to me still he is not a credible witness. He is one individual who is part of -- who is part of the politicization of the Civil Rights Division where the atmosphere of the people who were brought in was contemptuous of the people who were there at that time.

And to pose an alternate theory of the case, which I will, I don't say I subscribe to it, but I will, the fact is is that I know for a fact that Mr. Adams has been -- talked to several of our colleagues about this whole case, this whole incident. As far as I can tell, it was not until he showed up at a time and place when I could not make it that these other allegations started to mushroom out.

And was it -- to me, you know, as an alternate theory of the case, did it come about at a time when it was clear that, as Commissioner Thernstrom has said, the small potatoes nature of that New Black Panther Party was getting very little traction despite the fact that some members of the

media were flogging it every single day? I don't
know.

But I will say this: I am not going to condemn an entire department so easily based allegations of a single individual, and where in an his bolster credibility the only attempt to affidavits, which had no relationship to the allegations that he made, came from people who were of the politicization of the prior Justice That, to me, is very -- makes it very --Department. weakens the credibility of what he said during that That is my opinion. testimony, to me.

And so that is why I will not -- and refuse to join, you know, the hue and cry that somehow this is a horrendous chapter in American voting rights history, because, aside from this one individual, we have no proof, we have no cases, we have no people who say they brought issues up that have been denied, we have no people who have come forward.

And, believe me, we know they would. We know they would. They would be on YouTube yesterday if they had brought something to Justice saying that this had happened, and they had been denied. So, you know, I just want to -- I am very concerned about the level of rhetoric and hysteria around this, around --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, when you say 2 "hysteria," is it here, or is it on the internet? 3 Just so --4 COMMISSIONER YAKI: It's both. 5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 6 COMMISSIONER YAKI: It's both. From 7 everything that I've read, from interviews given by 8 people and a number of different things, and it is --9 and I think that it --10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I mean, we have testy 11 exchanges from time to time. 12 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, you and I have 13 testy exchanges all the time. 14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, no. 15 COMMISSIONER YAKI: We're okay. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: From time to time. 17 But I don't think that there has been any hysteria 18 around the table. I think that when we can put our 19 pistols down there are moments where we can actually 20 find some common ground and agree. That has been 21 demonstrated today. But at the end of the day, a lot 22 of this goes away if we have cooperation. 23 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Chairman, Mr. 24 want to --

1 COMMISSIONER YAKI: But, Mr. Chair -- I'm 2 sorry, I hadn't finished, because the last point I was 3 going to make is --VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: And I have my hand 4 5 up. 6 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- but I still --7 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I had my hand up 8 earlier. 9 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- if the Assistant 10 Attorney General produced individuals who said flatly 11 that Christian Adams is lying, I am not under any 12 illusion that this investigation would end. I think 13 it would simply then just turn into a 14 said/she said, she said/he said, he/he whatever said" 15 kind of game, and we would still be screaming about 16 this and yelling about this and arguing about it and 17 talking to the blogs and everything like that, 18 know, tomorrow, even if they came in. 19 So, I mean, I'm under no -- if there is --20 I don't think there is anything to hide, and I believe that there is nothing to hide. But, if not, they 21 22 someone should be knocked out of their 23 But I am not sure that if someone came in 24 and denied it that would still be the end of this

investigation.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, when this issue was brought up as our statutory report by Commissioner Gaziano, it was not one of my favorite — of the choices that we had, it was not my favorite. My assumption was that a mistake had occurred at DOJ, there would be a quick investigation at DOJ, and they would fix this, and there would be no need for us to spend time and resources on this issue.

Unfortunately, that did not happen. There are times where I will, out of comity, support investigations or topics that are not near and dear to my heart. And I've got to tell you, this was one of them. But I am glad I did.

There is no reason why the Department of Justice should not have cooperated in our investigation. The Department of Justice can make this case -- this case should not have dragged on this long. they had just presented the evidence, Ιf presented the witnesses, that we wanted to talk to, I believe that this would have been wrapped up quite some time ago.

Instead of cooperation, we have been -- we face a formidable resistance. So on a certain level,

I agree with them -- those Commissioners and those critics who believe that we shouldn't have spent time

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

on this matter. We shouldn't have had to spend time on this matter. Either fix it or send the people here, allow us to conduct our investigation, then it's over.

To the extent that there is a controversy, it is a direct result of the resistance that we faced at the Department of Justice. I wish that someone from the Department of Justice would approach us and say, "Hey, let's sit down and talk about a path where we can resolve this." But to date that has not happened. And to the extent that you have any influence in the Holder Justice Department, please let them know I am more than willing to sit down and try to find a path where we can wrap up our investigation.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I just want to say that I really do have a problem with some of the charges against me this morning. I have never been for stonewalling the truth. I have never been for shutting this investigation down. I have the same doubts that the chair just expressed at the outset. I think those were legitimate doubts about making this our year-long statutory report.

And I am not opposed to trying to gather information. Of course I'm not opposed to trying to

gather information about whether there are racial double standards operating within the Justice Department, and operating in such a way as to affect their actions and policies, not one, you know, minor career attorney here or there, but people who actually are shaping the policies of the Justice Department.

So, you know, any notion that I have ever refused to cooperate with you, or are doing so now, is just not correct. I have raised legitimate questions about this investigation. I still think they are legitimate questions, and I think we ought to have the civility to hear -- to agree to disagree on certain matters.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I agree with that point, Vice Chair Thernstrom. I think it has been perfectly clear from the record and the articles that you have written that you have not been --

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: One article.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: -- statements that you have made in writing and at the hearing that you are not supportive of our undertaking, and that is your privilege. You need not be supportive of this investigation or anything else that is done by -- you know, if you are uncomfortable with a particular

1	topic, or for whatever reason, you don't have to
2	support it.
3	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No, I agree with
4	that. But I have had questions about the
5	characterization of the incident. That is what I have
6	had characteristics with. That is what the small
7	potatoes was about.
8	I have had questions about our having
9	this as our year-long, big statutory report.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: This is a big issue.
11	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Mr. Chairman?
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, it
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's a big issue, and
14	it is
15	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: As you just
16	agreed, when we started out, even you did not think
17	this was a big issue.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Because I thought they
19	would fix it or that they would cooperate in our
20	investigation, and we would be able to reach a
21	conclusion based on the evidence. That hasn't
22	happened, and
23	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: There are other
24	problems that, I mean, 11(b)
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You have to

1 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: is 2 problematic provision in the Voting Rights Act. 3 is why -- in part why it is not a big issue. 4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You're right. 5 Commissioner Gaziano? You're right. You're next, 6 then Commissioner Heriot is next. 7 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Thank you. Ιt 8 sounds to me like Vice Chair Thernstrom, whatever her 9 prior disagreements may be enthusiastically, or what 10 -- the investigation as it is evolving, which is -- I 11 hope that is true, and I hope she reads -- rereads the 12 endorsed and letter that we have now that 13 expresses her endorsement for the central portion, 14 which is an insistence that Christopher Coates -- and 15 the importance of Christopher Coates testifying. But I wanted to address now some matters 16 17 that --18 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm happy to --19 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I want to address 20 some matters that Commissioner Yaki mentioned and 21 explain myself, in response to Vice Chair's point that 22 we should be very clear about what the allegations are 23 and not inadvertently mention some what seem to be

inflammatory claims.

Commissioner Yaki, if Ι heard him correctly, seemed to say that most statements actions prior to the current administration would be irrelevant to our investigation, and also that expressions by individual members that they hostile to the Noxubee case were relevant if they did their duty.

The allegation -- one of the allegations that has now been corroborated by two sworn witnesses to this Commission is that the then-voting section chief, Joe Rich, fraudulently altered a memorandum that went up to the front office deleting the recommendation of the career staff, but adding their name to it and implying that they supported his view that the Noxubee case should not be filed.

If his fraudulent actions were successful, that would have killed the investigation in its crib, which resulted in a Department of Justice victory, which the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed and praised the Department for bringing.

We have further sworn testimony that Joe Rich's fraudulent actions were discovered, and that he was reprimanded for that.

Now, why is that possibly relevant? There are people still in the -- it is relevant because

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 there are people still in the voting section who are 2 in the department who may have been involved in the discussions to dismiss the New Black Panther suit. 3 4 But the culture that exists in the Civil Rights 5 Division is certainly relevant for both us to examine, 6 and hopefully Assistant Attorney General Perez to look 7 into. 8 There were press reports of this kind of 9 matter, and I am disappointed --10 COMMISSIONER I'm YAKI: hearing Joe 11 McCarthy here. What is this? 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Hold on. Hold on. 13 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I'm disappointed --CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let Joe Finish. 14 15 (Laughter.) 16 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I'm disappointed --17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's a joke. 18 joke. 19 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: How do you know --20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's a joke. 21 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: It's relevant, 22 because the Assistant Attorney General didn't deny 23 that that kind of culture would be irrelevant. just that he denied that he investigated and he didn't 24 25 believe it existed.

1 Now that we have sworn evidence that that 2 culture may exist in his division, it is incumbent 3 upon us to investigate how -- whether that is true, 4 how deep that -- the tentacles of this caustic culture 5 might be if it does exist, whether employees are 6 currently in the division who have these views, and 7 is that certainly relevant to our ongoing 8 investigation. 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The order is 10 Commissioner Heriot, then Commissioner Yaki. 11 before we go, Commissioner Gaziano, I apologize for my 12 joke. Would you just state it? I fully support. From time to time, we have to lighten the mood here, 13 14 and I attempted to do so with a joke that apparently 15 did not go over well with you. 16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you. 17 Commissioner Heriot. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 18 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I thought it was 19 funny. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So did I. 21 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. I just want 22 to make a very, very brief point, and that is in 23 agreement with the Chairman about how I perceived this 24 project when we entered into it. I, too, thought that

there was a fairly -- I don't want to say that it was

likely, because I don't think likely was what I thinking, but a substantial chance that the project — the investigation would not lead to a full report, that it wouldn't pan out as a yearly project.

But I want to remind everybody that is why we picked two projects for this year. As it turned out, it is the other project that hasn't panned out for sad reasons, tragic reasons, and that is that the member of our staff who was in charge of that other project passed away during the year.

But it turns out -- and I do hope that project is going to pan out over the next few months, and I have every confidence that it will, but whether it will by September 30th, which is when we like to get these reports done, you know, that seems unlikely at this point.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: But it was never our statutory project, correct?

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It was adopted as an alternative enforcement report, yes, at the same time. That was a meeting that you left in the middle of, as I recall.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And was that because there was a concern -- I mean, I'd have to go back and

read the transcript, but was there a concern that this --

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: That either of them might not pan out. I think for the reasons that you are talking about that the Department of Justice could have, in the course of the year, simply said, "You know, we have looked back at this, and you're right, we shouldn't have done that."

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Had they done that, it would have made a very short report.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. Or to offer up a rationale that explained -- I mean, we all could have said, "Oh, we didn't know these facts," and so now it all makes sense to us.

Although, in fairness, at the time, you know, I thought that Mr. Adams' testimony was very interesting and very much a revelation. But, nevertheless, it wasn't that I wasn't thinking at the time that we heard about this case that there really weren't very many possible explanations based on the facts that we knew at that point why they might have decided to do what they did, and it was in the back of my mind

something like what Mr. Adams testified may turn out to be the case.

I wasn't confident that we were going to get someone to be able to testify that way, but we did. We now have evidence, sworn evidence, direct evidence, evidence of someone who actually was there and heard these statements, I think this evidence is very strong. Is it possible that Mr. Adams is a big fat liar? It's possible anyone is a big fat liar.

However, I don't see what his motivation would be under these circumstances. We now have affidavits that very much corroborate that testimony, and I think that we are in a position to where we need to insist that Christopher Coates be brought as a witness here. He is the obvious witness that we would want to talk to. He would be able to confirm or deny some of the things that Mr. Adams has said, and I think that's where we need to focus.

I think there are other witnesses that we are going to want to hear, but I think Coates is the one who is the linchpin at this point.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: You know, whenever I think that maybe I might agree with something that the majority is trying to do --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: They get close.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- something comes along and just pulls me right back. Just when I think -- the last two speakers basically summed up my problems with this investigation to date.

goes off Commissioner Gaziano conspiratorial, McCarthyesque tangent, that somehow -and I don't think he used the word "cabal," he used some other kind of word -- of career staff attorneys nefarious engaged а act of, what, who are in protecting voting rights and possibly ticking off Christian Adams.

I mean, let's -- the reason why I want to enter this into evidence is because the contemptuous attitude of the folks who were brought in by Schlozman and his gang into the Civil Rights Division is palpable.

The idea that these -- that career voting rights attorneys who were there to enforce the Voting lunatics, liberals, Rights Acts are partisans, all these words are in this document that was done by two independent investigative arms of the Department of Justice, under Republican administration no less. This is not done by the congressional Democrats. This is not done by а

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

committee. This is done by Mukasey, the last Attorney General under President Bush.

The idea that -- it seems to me that this is simply a continuation of that from the outside. And, you know, I hate to say this, but it is -- it is as if they are trying to continue the cleansing of the Voting Rights Division of the people who had been there for years and attempting to enforce the law, getting resistance from the political appointees during the prior administration, and subsequently being transferred, termed out, bypassed, and replaced by people like Mr. Adams, and, yes, later on by Mr. Coates.

And I think that's important to note, because if we are making these vague accusations that there is some sort of cabal going on, it is -- all we are doing is simply repeating what Schlozman and his gang were doing over that time period. And now we are trying to effectuate from the outside.

And I just want to point out that one of those affidavits, so-called substantial affidavits, two of those came from political hires of that cabal who were trying to get rid of the career staff of the Voting Rights Division in the Justice Department.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, this
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: This will just
3	briefly, I mean, at some point at some point, we
4	all have to stop blaming the Bush administration. At
5	some point, we have to own it.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I will

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'll own it.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let me --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: President Bush and the cabal, including myself, since I served the administration, they're gone. We have many -- we have several documents that were prepared by the career civil servants at the Department of Justice that were ignored.

We can start with the J memo. We can start with the document produced by the appellate section. The individuals who supported the course of action that Mr. Adams fought for, they didn't serve in the Bush administration. They are career civil servants. It is the -- if there is resistance to the recommendation by the career staff, it is not by a Bush appointee.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: But that's not the point I'm trying to make. The point I'm trying to

1	make is this. The complaints and the continued
2	outside agitation on this comes from
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, outside agitators.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, and you know what
5	I'm talking about.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I surely do.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Comes from
8	(Laughter.)
9	former Bush era appointees, both one
10	of whom recently exited the Department of Justice.
11	And then, when I hear statements made by Commissioners
12	that there is a continuing I mean, the fact is is
13	that we heard testimony from Mr. Perez that said that
14	there is a difference of opinion, an honest difference
15	of opinion, maybe a difference of opinion that, in
16	retrospect, maybe they would
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki,
18	you're an attorney. Do you think you would have had
19	difficulty succeeding when the defendants don't show
20	up?
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm not going to
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Wouldn't a first-year
23	
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I am not going to

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I mean, someone fresh
2	out of law school, that would have been a lay-up for
3	an individual fresh out of law school. There is no
4	fight. There was no resistance. The defendants
5	didn't show up. This was not this did not
6	require
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Then, let's also
8	stipulate that for one of the defendants who didn't
9	show up an injunction was issued, correct?
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's correct.
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Then, for the and
12	that defendant was the one
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm focusing on the
14	three
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: who was allegedly
16	carrying the nightstick, right?
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I am focusing on the
18	three
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And there were two
20	other defendants. You may decide to call it a lay-up.
21	I was not a party to that discussion. I was not part
22	of the transition team. I was not part of the regime
23	change. I don't have any contacts over at DOJ who I
24	speak to about this issue.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commission?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Nor would I want to.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, I apologize for taking up some of your time, but --continue, but give me an indication of how long you are going to go.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes, point of order. I don't know how much time other Commissioners have, but we do have other important agenda items to --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would like to say — look, I was not here for that hearing. I think we have beat this horse to death today. So I just want to finish by stating, though, things that I was not able to make as points during that time period, and that is we cannot — it is — I think it is simplistic to think of this as anything — I mean, I would say this. We have an important mission at the Commission — to investigate issues.

As this case started off, I thought this had nothing to do -- this had nothing to do with that mission. As this case has progressed, we have one individual who has attempted to elevate it to something that we would. And if I believe that person was credible, and had more credibility other than he

1	and other and someone else who was also part of
2	that of the remaining
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: If we had other people
4	to support his position
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But the fact of the
6	matter is
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: other witnesses
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: we don't.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: if other
10	witnesses
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We have corroboration
12	from people prior who didn't know
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: If other witnesses
14	were allowed to testify
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We didn't
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: for example, the
17	individual there is an allegation against an
18	individual, that she ordered folks not to
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is where I will
20	agree with you, Mr. Chair.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right, right.
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But I will say
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But she should not be
24	fired unless there is a thorough investigation of the
25	facts.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: But Ι would just conclude with this. The question I ask, and it is a rhetorical question, is if that person were to come here and state unequivocally that he or she did not say those things, then what? And I don't think for a illusion t.hat. this moment that Ι have no investigation would end. It would simply become what I have always thought it would be in the beginning --CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That is not the --COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- and in the end -- a partisan political fight, which does not befit this Commission and which --CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki? COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- wasting our time and resources. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, you are aware of the individuals we would like to speak to, I assume. And you are aware that that individual is not the only individual that we would like to speak And so if that individual shows up, answers our questions, if there is a categorical denial or if she makes an admission, you're right, the investigation There are other facts that we need to continues. understand before we can, you know, write this up.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: But I think that --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: With that
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: is a different
3	point. It reduces itself ultimately ultimately,
4	this is being reduced to and this is where I think
5	it is dangerous for the future of this Commission, it
6	is dangerous for the future of the discussion of civil
7	rights. We are simply engaged in a partisan political
8	crossfire, and we are the tool being used
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Why is it a crossfire?
10	Why is it a crossfire?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Because if the
12	administration comes in and denies it flat out
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. That
14	particular allegation
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: then we are just
16	going to be saying that
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: this allegation
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: which evidence is
19	better.
20	COURT REPORTER: One at a time.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have no illusion
22	no illusion where the majority is going to come out
23	on, and it is just going to be a partisan political
24	decision, and that is what I object have objected
25	from the beginning with this investigation. And where

1	it has progressed to only proves to me that it is.
2	That's all I'm
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor?
4	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I'm going to do
5	something dangerous
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Ask me a question.
7	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: which is ask you
8	a question and try to negotiate in open session, as a
9	member of the voting majority, to continue to ask
LO	questions in this matter.
L1	Commissioner Yaki, I tell you, if I
L2	think you are a man of your word, and I take you at
L3	your word. And I understand your point. Your point
L4	is that you feel comfortable moving forward, even on
L5	discrete witnesses, for fear that even if those
L6	witnesses come forward in denial of the allegations we
L7	will, nevertheless, continue the investigation and
L8	move forward. And I appreciate that.
L9	In response I would say if you if you
20	would agree
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think there are a
22	couple I think you I would
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I didn't accurately
24	state
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I am uncomfortable

1 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Right. You would be 2 uncomfortable moving --COMMISSIONER YAKI: I thought you said --3 4 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No. You would be 5 uncomfortable moving forward, because you 6 believe that even if those folks came forward and 7 denied the allegations that we would end this matter. 8 So I appreciate that. 9 I would say in response the flip side of 10 Would you agree to subpoena and ask that same coin. 11 for particular witnesses? If as a voting member of 12 the majority I said to you, "If they come forward and 13 categorically deny the allegations, I won't vote to 14 move forward anymore," could I get your support on 15 then subpoenaing those people? COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I don't know. 16 17 I --18 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: And I would point to 19 the particular people Adams identified. He identified 20 Deputy Assistant Attorney General Julie Fernandes, who 21 he quoted as saying, "We have no interest in enforcing 22 this section of the law." 23 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Coates. 24 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It has nothing to do 25 with increasing voter turnout. We are going to do it.

1 And Christopher Coates -- I would start with those 2 If you -- if your position is that they were to 3 come forward and categorically deny the allegations, 4 that would be the end of it, I would tend to agree. 5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, let me just say 6 this. I have no --7 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I would --8 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- I have no --9 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Ι want. t.o move 10 forward in a position of unanimity, if all 11 possible, and that --12 Well, you won't get it COMMISSIONER YAKI: 13 for one simple reason. I have no illusion, given the 14 tenor of Mr. Coates' -- Mr. Adams' testimony and the 15 fact that he acknowledged discussions with Mr. Coates, 16 that there is going to be a categorical denial from 17 Mr. Coates. And that is --18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry for doing 19 this, but could you restate that? 20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have no illusion 21 that there is going to be a categorical denial of the 22 statement made by Mr. Coates, given the fact that Mr. 23 Adams has discussed this and has admitted discussing 24 this with Coates in the media, and I believe in the

testimony today. I just -- you know, it would -- I am

1	not going to walk into something where, obviously, the
2	answer is going to be yes and no. It is going to be a
3	dispute. You are going to have you are going to
4	have one witness say "didn't do it," and the other
5	witness will say "yes" and we're
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I don't
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: then, once again
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: know any witness
9	that is going to say
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I am well, I am
11	guessing that that is how it might happen, and that
12	it goes to my discomfort with this in that ultimately
13	this is
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. His proposal
15	doesn't meet your standard.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do you have a counter?
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have to think about
19	it.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Fair enough.
21	Vice Chair Thernstrom?
22	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I just want to
23	restate something that I have stated before, but I
24	think really is important and hasn't come up this
25	morning. When Mr. Perez appeared before us, he said,

"Look, Section 11(b), which has barely been litigated, is a provision of the Voting Rights Act that is open to various legal interpretations, we interpret it one way, others can interpret it another way," and I thought fair enough.

And I would extend that statement to every provision in the Voting Rights Act, whether you are talking about Section 5, whether you are talking about Section 2. I mean, different attorneys and different scholars -- I'm not an attorney, I am a scholar -- read those provisions differently. They read the Supreme Court holdings on those provisions differently, on those sections of the Voting Rights Act differently.

And so, you know, at the end of the day, this really may come down to, how do you read that section of the Voting Rights Act in the light of -- in light of very limited precedent, no guidelines, unlike Section 2, unlike Section 5 -- well, unlike Section 5, really, most importantly, no guidelines within the Justice Department on how that section should be interpreted and enforced.

And so, you know, there are legitimate disagreements here that need to be acknowledged, at the same time that, of course -- and I will repeat --

of course, if there is -- if racial double standards are being used to enforce the Voting Rights Act, I care.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom, there are moments where, you know, men and women of good will could look at the same set of facts and disagree. But I would challenge you on the notion that the facts that have been presented thus far falls into that category.

The memos that were produced by the career staff at the Department of Justice are compelling. For one person to offer up the statement that people can disagree, no analysis, an allegation that the decisionmaker didn't even read the memorandum -- the memoranda that were prepared by the career staff, and yet that individual made this important decision, I don't think that we're there. I don't think that the hypothetical that you just put on the table is one that we are entertaining.

The facts are different. It is -- so far -- and things could change, but so far it is not close. It is not a close call.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, which is not a close call? I mean, if they --

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That the Department of
2	Justice
3	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: a law is
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: had they proceeded,
5	would have gotten a default judgment and could have
6	gotten the sanctions that it had originally proposed.
7	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Regular order. Can
8	we possibly have Mr
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's try to
10	move on, so
11	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I have a concluding
12	but Mr. Kirsanow, Commissioner Kirsanow, first.
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you,
14	Commissioner Gaziano. I much appreciate it.
15	And I'm sure Commissioner Gaziano has more
16	to say, but I'd like to see if we can move this
17	forward.
18	I want to crystallize something. We have
19	not gotten cooperation from the Department of Justice,
20	and let's credit their position that some of the
21	testimony that we seek to elicit is privileged. I
22	disagree, but let's credit that.
23	That pertains only to the deliberations
24	related to dismissal of the New Black Panther case.
25	As I indicated before, this matter has morphed into

something potentially far larger than that. Everything related to that -- that is, whether or not an edict was issued or a pronouncement was made that no cases would be brought against minority defendants, and also that Section 8 will not be enforced, none of that is privileged.

I would move that we send a letter or subpoena to Mr. Perez related to those witnesses who could testify one way or another --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: -- either --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: -- rebut or corroborate the allegation that in fact there is a discriminatory enforcement of the civil rights laws within the voting section of the Civil Rights Division, and there is a refusal to enforce Section 8.

None of that is privileged, and I would assume that DOJ would have absolutely no problem in rebutting evidence that is standing out in the public domain that seems to implicate the Justice Department. If we can adduce such testimony, then we can make a determination. Or if we can't make that determination, at least the evidence will be out there for others to judge for themselves.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second. Discussion?
2	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: May I
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: speak to the
5	motion? First of all, I am tempted to stand and
6	pontificate, but I will
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Come on now. We're
8	getting toward the end.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: If you have a bad
10	back, Commissioner Gaziano, you can be
11	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I'll
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Before you make those
13	kind of allegations, you might want to ask whether or
14	not my back is hurt.
15	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: If you can't take a
16	joke, Commissioner Yaki, I apologize. I apologize.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Whoa. You two are the
18	most sensitive Commissioners.
19	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I apologize.
20	(Laughter.)
21	I apologize.
22	Okay. Now
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: If you want to say
24	"aggrandize," that would be different.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Commissioner, I just wanted to endorse your --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Don't pontificate.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: wanted t.o endorse one of your points. First of all, I just want to point out again for some in our audience who have not followed this as carefully as we have is that the Department, after months of being Justice asked whether the President and Attorney General has invoked executive privilege to support the cover-up and the refusal not to enforce our subpoenas, did say in a 13th rather surprising letter of May that President and Attorney General, who must personally invoke executive privilege, have not done so.

But I would state as a matter of law U.S. v. Nixon. The Supreme Court held that executive privilege does not apply to cover up wrongdoing, and that the particular allegations that Commissioner Kirsanow, and I think the rest of us, are interested in do amount to wrongdoing.

So I think even if the President of the United States were to invoke executive privilege, that would not arise above our interest in hearing the witnesses. And we may disagree, or I don't know where

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

we'll come down, but at least hearing the witnesses, adducing the evidence.

And the point about categorical denials, in 1957, the states in the South categorically denied that they disenfranchised blacks and other minorities, but this Commission didn't take those categorical denials at their word. We heard witnesses. We made findings of fact. That is our sole central purpose. It is our most important purpose today.

Commissioner Yaki seems to think that there will be a disagreement among the witnesses about whether certain statements were made. It is our duty to hear them, to let the public hear them, and then to make our determination based on the credibility, and let the rest of the world judge whether we have made the right call.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I want to distill the motion down a little bit more. Christopher Coates has not been produced, presumably because his testimony would fall within an asserted privilege by DOJ related to dismissal of New Black Panther.

I would move that the letter or subpoena would cap everything related to New Black Panther Party dismissal. We will forswear any inquiry into

that. Our sole element of inquiry will be into whether or not those statements were made saying that there is going to be discriminatory enforcement of civil rights laws and a non-enforcement of Section 8.

about is what we are going to be seeking testimony on, as Christopher Coates is clearly the most important witness here, but there are a raft of other witnesses who have been identified, either by Mr. Adams or subsequent affidavits, that either could rebut or deny what Mr. Adams said. And I'm willing to entertain any other witnesses.

And, again, we would make a representation to DOJ that nothing that they assert a privilege on will we make inquiry into.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: May I make a friendly amendment? May I make a friendly amendment?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'll also say this. I think this will go to it. We will not waive, however, our right to at some point ask them to testify about those matters related to New Black Panther Party. This is not a waiver of that. But for the purposes of adducing testimony only on the very narrow issue of, is there a policy of discriminatory enforcement of civil rights laws, and is there

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 policy not to enforce Section 8, only on that will we 2 inquire of those witnesses. REYNOLDS: 3 CHAIRMAN And was there 4 direction or а statement made by а particular 5 individual that the law would not be enforced on --6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Exactly. And is 7 there, in fact, a culture within the Department, 8 regardless which administration is in οf 9 whether or not it's the Bush administration, whether 10 Clinton administration, goes back to the 11 irrelevant as far as I'm concerned. Is there a 12 culture within this particular department that says, 13 "We are not going to move in a certain direction"? 14 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Mv friendly 15 amendment is that the Department -- I suppose the -it is just in the details of how we indicate whether 16 17 are not interested in the are 18 information that we have Mr. Coates under subpoena 19 Certainly, they can instruct him simply not to 20 That's one alternative to -answer those questions. 21 but that I think can -- we can work out in subsequent 22 negotiations with the Department of Justice, if they

> I think Mr. Popper has been identified, the Deputy Chief of the voting section, as another

are willing to produce Christopher Coates for others.

23

24

1 witness who was -- may be relevant at this time for 2 some of these statements. But I think, in general, 3 that's a fair motion, as long as 4 inadvertently or misleadingly waive our continued 5 right and interest to the other evidence. 6 REYNOLDS: And Commissioner CHAIRMAN 7 Kirsanow made clear that that was not the intent. 8 Commissioner Yaki? 9 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Can we just close this 10 I mean, as the motion started from in a second? 11 Commissioner Kirsanow, it had --12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We can vote now, 13 you'd like. COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- I had some interest 14 15 possibly. And then, as it started to get broader, and 16 then amended, and then you started talking about a 17 culture within the Department of Justice, 18 proves again to me that there is going to be no 19 resolution of this investigation other than that of 20 which the majority wishes it to be. 21 So I move to call the question and vote on 22 that, and also end discussion on this topic and move 23 on to the rest of the agenda. 24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's vote,

All in favor please say aye.

folks.

1 (Chorus of ayes.) 2 Opposition? Abstentions? VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Me. 3 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Abstention. 4 5 Melendez. 6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Two 7 abstentions, one objection. The motion passes. 8 Next up? 9 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chair, I will 10 supply names of individuals, as have been set out in 11 the record thus far, who have been identified as 12 individuals either who were present when 13 testimony rendered by Mr. Adams as to a statement 14 being made that there was going to be discriminatory enforcement of the laws. 15 16 Those individuals I will supply, so that 17 subpoena letter or can be sent out in 18 expeditious fashion. I have at least thus 19 identified five individuals. I think Commissioner 20 Gaziano may have others. 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Everyone, send 22 whatever you have to me, and I'll take a look at it. 23 Commissioner Yaki, would you like 24 submit anything?

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'd like to move for a
2	10-minute break.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Are we going to get
5	through our agenda?
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's get
7	through STEM first.
8	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I do think we need
9	a 10-minute break.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would like a 10-
11	minute break.
12	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: We just need to
13	we'll have to press through lunch, that's all.
14	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Well, some people
15	have lunch, and they are going to go. So I think we
16	need to
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Oh, okay.
19	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: let's get
20	through STEM and then take a break.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Yes. Let's move
22	quickly. Let's okay. In that case, STEM is not
23	going to go quickly.
24	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes. I mean

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. That's fine.
2	I've got the time.
3	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I've got the time,
4	too.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. At the
6	June 11th meeting
7	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Let's take a 10-
8	minute break.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry?
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Wouldn't a 10-minute
11	break work better here?
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: It would work
13	better.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It would work a lot
15	better.
16	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: People need a 10-
17	minute break.
18	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Just a 10-minute
19	break, and, you know, at the end of 10 minutes we
20	start again.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's fine.
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Let's go. Ten
23	minutes. Let's go, let's go.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, folks. We're
25	going to do this, but you need to be back here in 10

1 minutes. And those who are not, if we have a quorum, 2 we're going to start. 3 (Whereupon, the proceedings in the foregoing matter 4 went off the record at 10:30 a.m., and 5 went back on the record at 10:44 a.m.) 6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The Okay. 7 recommendations have been recirculated. Any luck? 8 Commissioner Melendez, are you still on the line? 9 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez, 11 one day we will have to sit down and talk. You are a 12 wise man. 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We have all returned from our break. Next up 14 is -- well, 15 June 11, 2010, at that meeting we were unable to conclude consideration of the recommendations for the 16 17 briefing report on encouraging minority students to 18 pursue science, technology, engineering, and math 19 careers, also known as STEM careers. 20 will consider We now the remaining 21 recommendations. Prior to the break, we distributed a 22 revised set of recommendations, and I will read them 23 into the record. Well, first, I would like to move to 24 reconsider the first recommendation. We voted on the

1	first recommendation, and we voted it down. I was one
2	of the individuals who voted against it.
3	I would like to reconsider that
4	recommendation. Is there a second?
5	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Second.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second. Discussion?
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So are we voting on
8	whether we are allowing you to reconsider your opinion
9	on the subject, or discussing the entire thing?
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: We are actually
11	doing a somewhat different version.
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: But are we voting
13	on this version, or are we voting for
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The idea is taking a
15	joke, because you led off as saying, "I'd like to
16	reconsider this. Is there a second?"
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. You are about
18	as funny as I am.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's right. And
20	that really takes some real hard work.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's not quit
22	our day job.
23	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It's probably more
24	efficient for us just to go straight to the version
25	that

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right.
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: read that version
3	and then
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Here we go.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: When does this version
6	come out?
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: This was
8	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Two minutes ago.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is not the
10	version that was e-mailed to us a few days ago.
11	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm seeing it for
12	the first time.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Rather than trying to
14	talk through the proposed modifications, the thought
15	was to provide something that people can read. In the
16	past, people have commented, rightly so, that it is
17	sort of disjointed to have discussions about
18	modifications without having any paper in front of
19	them.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: True. But I just
21	wanted to state for the record that what we got in the
22	packet, and then what we got in e-mail, is different
23	from what we just received now.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
	NEAL D. CDOCC

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
2	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I have had no time
3	to think about these.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, we had 10 minutes
5	during our recess
6	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Oh.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: to do it.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right.
9	First recommendation, I move to approve the following
10	recommendation. A college a selective college or
11	university should not admit any student with a large
12	deficit in academic credentials relative to its median
13	student, without fully informing the student of the
14	impact that this deficit could have. Such deficits
15	place students at a high risk of failure.
16	Is there a second?
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
19	Commissioner Yaki?
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. I need some
21	word definition here.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, first of all, I
24	am a little leery about saying "should not admit any

student," but that being the -- that aside, what is a 1 2 large deficit in academic credentials? CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: standard 3 Two 4 deviations. 5 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No, it would be a 6 large deficit as defined in the cases that -- in the 7 articles that we have looked at. I think actually the 8 best article on this issue is the one that is coming 9 out shortly -- and I don't know what journal that is 10 -- by Richard Sander and his colleague, whose name 11 escapes me right now. But this is a reference to the 12 report as a whole. 13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Does this --COMMISSIONER HERIOT: So I think "large 14 15 deficit" is the right term. COMMISSIONER YAKI: 16 But are we talking 17 about -- when we say "large deficit," are we talking 18 in all aspects of academic credentials, you know, SAT, 19 GPA, you know --20 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: We're allowing 21 schools to have a certain amount of leeway 22 interpreting this recommendation. It is not meant to 23 be a stranglehold. 24 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Why isn't it when we 25 say they should not admit?

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: 1 Should not admit 2 without fully informing the student of the impact the 3 deficit would have. I think actually they should 4 admit people when even they have a small deficit, but 5 still -- okay. You know, it is what it is. 6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom? 7 CHAIR THERNSTROM: the VICE In first 8 place, I do not want to give directives to private So 9 universities. colleges and as far 10 concerned, can set an admission standards they choose, 11 provided they don't violate the 14th Amendment and 12 ESEA, if they -- they obviously get federal funds. 13 But, I mean, large deficits -- I mean, I 14 happen to know a lot about the Harvard admissions 15 process, for better or worse, and they admit students 16 with large deficits all the time. It is -- somebody 17 who has an enormous strength in one area and --18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: For example, а 19 musician. 20 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: A musical --21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Or a football player. 22 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: -- or a writer. 23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What about the black 24 student population?

1	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, Harvard in
2	fact has almost no disparity in not a significant
3	disparity in the I mean, it's one
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. It's cascading
5	
6	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: It stops up all of
7	you know
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.
9	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: a large
10	proportion. You know, if a school I agree with
11	Richard Sander. It is not a good idea, but I don't
12	want to start issuing directives from this Commission.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It is not a directive.
14	I mean, we don't have any power
15	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, I only want
16	a recommendation. Let these schools figure out
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Shouldn't they inform
18	the student that they are that the likelihood of
19	being able to succeed or graduate based on the
20	historical data that they have is
21	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: It's a really ugly
22	message.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, fine. The world
24	is an ugly place. And unless we face things squarely,
25	we don't have I mean, just as as a consumer

1	protection approach, wouldn't you agree that it is
2	that these families would be better off, and these
3	students would be better off if they knew what their
4	fate looked like? Is there any harm in giving people
5	information and allowing them to make a decision?
6	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: It depends on how,
7	when you're 18 years old, you process that
8	information.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So we are going to
10	and, I mean, we are going to hide data, essentially.
11	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: The data is
12	available.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The data is not
14	available.
15	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, it is
16	available if you really are interested in it. But
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That data is guarded
18	by I mean, that data is not available. If I wanted
19	to know
20	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, crudely so.
21	No, okay, it's not available on an individual school
22	basis. But excuse me for eating.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We'll just have the
24	Court Reporter put in an appropriate translation of
25	everything that you're saying.

1 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Right. I'm sorry. 2 I got really hungry, and I didn't eat breakfast. 3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: She actually agreed 4 with --5 (Laughter.) 6 She supports this. To me it sounded -- it 7 may have came out different, but she really supports 8 Did you get that? it. 9 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Watch out. 10 Transcripts don't do irony very well. 11 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I am uncomfortable 12 with this. 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I am uncomfortable 14 with aspects of it myself. But my discomfort is 15 outweighed by the damage being done. These 16 universities know with a fair amount of precision how 17 someone is going to fare based on the historical data. 18 And the fact that people feel uncomfortable, that's a 19 personal problem. As a parent, I would want to know. 20 Commissioner Yaki? COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, this goes back 21 22 to what I said the last time we considered this. Ιt 23 really is -- it goes toward recommendations 1, 2, and 24 3, and that is at some point we have to recognize that 25 each of these students -- each of these young people

1 is an individual with their own potential, their own 2 hopes and dreams, their own, you know, 3 exercise. If, as you were --CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 4 Is it informed choice? 5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Wait. Hang on. You 6 -- I'm going to do Chairman Reynolds. You --7 (Laughter.) 8 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: The Court Reporter 9 is --10 (Laughter.) 11 COMMISSIONER YAKI: If we -- the problem 12 with this is that I think it turns the responsibility 13 I agree, and I said last time that I on its head. agree that there is some responsibility in terms of 14 15 the colleges and universities not to lead someone down 16 a primrose path of student loan ruin and personal 17 failure. 18 I think that, to the contrary, if, to the 19 extent that universities choose to do -- choose to admit students with loan deficits as -- whatever that 20 21 definition should be, that it is incumbent upon them 22 remedy those -- to remedy that and provide 23 appropriate support, remediation, as necessary, 24 because I just worry about how we are to be -- this

Commission is to be perceived as basically stating

that, you know, there are just students out there who just are not going to cut it.

One of the things I have always had an objection to educational systems in other parts of the world is how they so readily and ably and ruthlessly steer students into -- potential students into a lower track or a lower tier. I think it's classist. I think it goes against the very spirit of American individuality, self-reliance, and essentially the elements of the American dream that all of us still aspire to and agree with.

So I really am uncomfortable with us putting forth statements and guidelines that basically state that we are going to -- in essence, we are going to make sure the students -- colleges tell you that you're a loser, you're going to be a loser, and you should not even consider coming here because you are going to be -- you are never going to make it.

I think if colleges are going to engage in this kind of admission behavior, which I think that they should, they should be spent a lot more money and a lot more time on ensuring that these students, whose potential they see something in, live up to that potential.

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner 2 Taylor? COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: You have shown great 3 4 restraint. That was very good. 5 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Who has shown 6 great restraint? 7 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Right there, right 8 there. He really wanted to get something in. Не 9 really did. 10 I'll be brief. And let me state at the 11 outset that I support recommendations 1 and 2, 12 particular, for a number of reasons. First of all, I 13 agree with Commissioner Yaki that every student should 14 be viewed as an individual. We should never place 15 people in typecast, such that we eliminate their 16 opportunity to expand and excel, but that we give 17 people every opportunity to do so, and we shouldn't 18 make assumptions about any individual. And that is 19 the beauty of our country is that we don't do that. 20 We don't have scripts for people, depending on what 21 class of society they come from. 22 It is also important, however, that that 23 student be made aware of the facts. And in this 24 regard, I agree with Commissioner Thernstrom.

those

brutal,

be

could

facts

25

could

be

facts

demoralizing, and I understand your reluctance and hesitation of presenting those facts to a student, an 18 year-old young adult who may not have the capacity to properly process and assimilate that information. I fully appreciate that.

And I also agree with Commissioner Yaki that the schools are -- have a duty to provide the support for every student they admit. Unfortunately, my sense is that we focus, as a society, and the school focuses a lot on admissions and matriculation and not enough focus on graduation and success upon graduation.

Because of that lack of focus, I support 1 and 2. I also support recommendations 1 and 2 for this very important reason, and this is a personal reason. In life, the only way you can know how much pressure to apply to a situation is if you know what you are up against.

To your point, Commissioner Thernstrom, I am very concerned that minority students walking into certain academic environments, where the school, to Commissioner Yaki's point, fails to provide that support naturally --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Like walking into a buzz saw.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- when they -- when the school doesn't uphold their end of the bargain, the student doesn't know how much force they are going to have to apply, how much harder they are going to have to work than the person sitting beside them. And they would apply that pressure if they knew.

And so I'm supporting recommendation 1 and 2, because I want those students who are in those difficult situations to know they are in a different situation. I want to encourage them. I want to say, "Buck up. You've got resources out there. You've got people out there who want to help." But I want you to know how much work it is going to take, and together we can do it.

I don't want you to assume that you can party like the person beside you and go party on Friday night. Don't make that assumption. Don't look to your peer to determine how much work you are going to have to put in to get an A in this class, because you are behind for reasons unrelated to your effort at the K through 12 stage.

So that is why I am supporting 1 and 2, so they can succeed, so they know exactly what they are up against, and it is a delicate balance and I acknowledge it's a delicate balance. But I fear,

because of our lack of focus on graduation at the end 1 2 system, that students don't know and they 3 assume entering into an environment that they simply 4 need to put forth the effort that their peers are 5 putting forth, and that's not the case. 6 They need to work a little harder. They 7 need to burn the midnight oil, and that's okay. And 8 I'm confident they can do it, if they're told that's 9 what they need to do. And in some cases the school is 10 not telling them. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow? 11 12 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I just want the 13 reflect record to that Ι align myself with 14 Taylor's Commissioner comments who expressed my 15 position better than I could have. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 16 That's right. Thank 17 you, Ashley. 18 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Call the question. 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All those in favor 20 please say aye. 21 (Chorus of ayes.) 22 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, wait 23 Are we moving on just recommendation 1? 24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 25 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: One.

1	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: One.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor please
3	say aye.
4	(Chorus of ayes.)
5	Objections?
6	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I object.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I object.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Abstentions? I'm
9	sorry. Commissioner Melendez?
10	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Opposed.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Three
12	objections. The motion passes.
13	Okay. Next up, I move to approve the
14	following. In addition to providing other appropriate
15	support and advice to students interested in STEM
16	majors and careers, high school student high
17	school
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Point of order. It
19	was a call the question, which is a two-thirds vote.
20	There is five-three, which is I whatever. I just
21	wanted to
22	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: No. No. Call the
23	question to vote was on approval of
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Calling the question
25	is a two-thirds vote.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Folks, folks, come on.
2	Come on. We don't follow the Robert's Rules. We
3	don't. We never have.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That will change.
5	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Has everybody got
6	that on the record?
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That will change.
8	(Laughter.)
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. In addition to
10	providing other appropriate support and advice to
11	students interested in STEM majors and careers, high
12	school guidance counselors should advise these
13	students about the significant impact of large
14	deficits and academic credentials on college
15	performance. Is there a second?
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
18	(No response.)
19	All those in favor signify
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Hey, hey, I've got my
21	hand up.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, I'm sorry.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Excuse me? Hello?
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You usually make a
25	noise.

(Laughter.)

Commissioner Yaki?

I would just like to point out one thing. I just wanted to thank Commissioner -- I was going to say Commissioner Ashley -- Commissioner Taylor for his well thought out remarks. I just wanted to point out that I agree that students in some instances, if they understand the challenge that they have, they can apply themselves better. My only problem is that recommendation 1 won't give some of those students that opportunity.

As regard to number 2, my concern about this goes to the fact that I think that it is more -- it is -- it takes a little bit more than just telling high school guidance counselors to do this kind of thing, because this is something that I believe should require -- would require a fair amount of training and understanding to do rather than simply telling some kid coming in, looking at colleges, nope, nope, that one, nope, nope.

I mean, this is something that requires a little bit more than just someone reading numbers off a page. There should be training. There should be a serious amount of -- some resources invested to ensure

that they -- if they do that, they do it in a way that doesn't unduly chill that student's ability to make an informed decision.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's my concern.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom?

WICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, as somebody who has had kids go through large -- a large public high school, I mean, these guidance counselors are -- I mean, they've got a slew of kids to advise. Their advice is ill-informed and pretty worthless, and they are not about to become -- I mean, they don't have the time, they don't have the resources, they aren't -- they themselves do not have the academic background to give proper advice to students, even if they were interested in doing so.

Look, colleges do weed out kids. They say, "I want to come as a physics major." Well, it becomes very clear on the first weeks of college whether you are going to make it through a physics class you have signed up for.

And the colleges and the admissions process weed out kids. I mean, I just -- you know, I just -- I think the up side of allowing this process to work out, as it now does, is larger than the down

1	side of this kind of intrusion, advice, whatever you
2	want to call it.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All those in
4	favor please say aye.
5	(Chorus of ayes.)
6	Objections?
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I object.
8	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I object.
9	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Opposed.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Same as before.
11	We have
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Just in case you
13	didn't hear me.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Mr. Chairman, I know
16	you're in a hurry.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, no.
18	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: The other three here
19	are not
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, no
21	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I'd like to try to
22	get to them.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The motion
24	passes.

Each individual student's right to decide
which high school to attend oh, I'm sorry which
school to attend based on the best available evidence
and with help from parents and advisors should be
respected. To aid students with the decisionmaking
process, schools with STEM programs should disclose to
all admitted students their projected college grade
point averages, and the range of error. Schools
should also disclose to interested students the
school's track record for graduating students with
similar academic indices and STEM majors.
Is there a second? Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Second.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
COMMISSIONER YAKI: I want to discuss it,
just in case you didn't hear.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
COMMISSIONER YAKI: Similar basic question
to what I asked about number 1. How in the name of
whatever can you project someone's GPA within a range
of error?
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, you can.
COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It's done all the
time.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I would argue
that what you may project, and what you may tell
someone, can become a self-fulfilling and self-
defeating prophecy. And I strongly I have real
strong concerns about telling kids that they are
whether they are going to be A students, B students, C
students, or D students, I have no idea what they
would have projected me to be. Probably a D student,
based on your opinion of me.
But the fact of the matter is is that I
don't understand why we should be engaged in this kind
of scientific steering for kids whose potential is
still yet to be fulfilled. I object to this.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other thoughts?
And I do have not a rejoinder but a comment to make in
response. But I will share it with Commissioner Yaki
after the meeting.
All those in favor please say aye.
(Chorus of ayes.)
Objections?
COMMISSIONER YAKI: I object.
COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Opposed.
VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I am opposed.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I abstain.

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The motion 2 passes. Well designed academic -- I move that we 3 4 adopt the following recommendation. Well designed 5 academic support programs can sometimes help students 6 with modest deficits in credentials to succeed in STEM 7 Schools should study and implement the best programs. 8 employed by successful academic support practices 9 Schools should also routinely disclose programs. 10 information about academic support services to all 11 admitted students. 12 Is there a second? 13 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Second. 14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki? 15 COMMISSIONER YAKI: If you take out the word "modest," I might support this. 16 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Heriot, 18 do you accept that as a friendly amendment? 19 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No. It seems to 20 invite large deficits. I guess I don't. 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Vice Chair 22 Thernstrom? 23 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: know, the 24 problem here, it seems to me, is that there 25 schools -- and this is in part a response to what

1	Commissioner Ashley has said before Commissioner
2	Taylor, sorry there are schools that are well
3	equipped to provide individual help to students, to
4	provide remedial classes, to you know, to nurture
5	students along.
6	In general, the elite schools cannot do
7	that, will not do that, do not have the facility
8	interested in doing that. And, I mean, it's just
9	you know, it's sink or swim.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So you let them in,
11	knowing that they are two standard deviations from the
12	main. You provide no support, and you don't let them
13	know what their likely fate is.
14	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: And you know what?
15	They all graduate, because
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Whoa, whoa, whoa,
17	whoa, whoa.
18	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: From your highly
19	selective schools
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, no. Even there,
21	there is a significant washout rate.
22	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Look, if you look
23	at the Bok and Bowen data, for instance, I mean, the
24	great inflation means kids find a way. They go to,

you know, basket-weaving as a --

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm not sure that that 2 is a solution. 3 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Because that is just 4 what we are trying to fight against here. 5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I don't feel better 6 because --7 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: If you take 8 Princeton or a Yale or a Harvard or a Swarthmore, or 9 whatever, these schools are not -- they are not 10 remedial schools. They are not going to become 11 remedial schools. Their faculty is not interested in 12 teaching such kids. And, you know, if the schools let those students will eventually --13 them in, 14 There are very few dropouts from the elite 15 schools. But they won't 16 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 17 graduate in STEM. They will graduate --18 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: They will graduate 19 in --20 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: They will graduate 21 in basket-weaving, and that is what this is directed 22 toward, to --23 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: They will not 24 graduate in STEM. You know why? Because as soon as 25 they find out, and it's true for most math majors at a

_	place like harvard, it's true for most majors in the
2	Harvard sciences, they are not going to be very good.
3	There are really whiz bang kids at a very early age.
4	They won't pursue those courses are too hard.
5	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: That's what this
6	briefing has been all about, the fact that some of
7	those students would have done well going to a less
8	selective school where they could have become MDs,
9	they might have gotten into medical school if they had
LO	just made it through physical chemistry.
L1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And to give an
L2	example, being in the top three percent well, the
L3	top, you know, 97th percentile in math, that will get
L4	you into MIT. But
L 5	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: You have to be in
L 6	the top it's 0.5 percent, but, anyway, go on.
L7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But if you but you
L 8	let someone in who is in the top 10 percent of the
L 9	country, that individual may be that individual may
20	be a superstar at Harvard, but will is not going to
21	make it at MIT.
22	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. I that
23	is correct. And MIT will not admit them, by the way.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No. MIT has a racial
25	preference policy and has had it for years.

1	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. How many of
2	those students have actually flunked out of MIT?
3	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: They wash out of
4	STEM at MIT, too. I
5	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: They wash out of
6	STEM, but
7	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Well, that's what
8	this report is about, washing out of STEM.
9	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Students with very
10	high credentials wash out of STEM all the time.
11	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, but that's
12	what
13	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: They might succeed
14	at a different
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But your dream is to
16	succeed at that.
17	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No. I mean
18	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And you want to be a
19	doctor, or you want to be a scientist, or you want to
20	be an engineer.
21	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: People come into
22	Harvard and want to enter a STEM program, wash out of
23	a STEM

1 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: They ought to have 2 a realistic chance. If they have a realistic chance and they wash out, that's life. 3 4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's right. 5 But if they don't COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: 6 have a realistic chance, they have been fooled, they 7 have been told that they really do have a --8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. 9 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: -- and then, they 10 wash out, that's tragedy. Or tragic, anyway. That's 11 what we're talking about here. 12 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I just, you Yes. 13 know, you're talking about students that -- I mean, I 14 don't have any problem with --15 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Can we have a vote? VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: 16 -- law students. 17 You're talking about kids who are 18 years old. 18 just -- I don't like the message. 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But you don't mind the 20 likely consequences? 21 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: think Ι the 22 muddling through that we now do, I am of course -- I 23 am long -- I have long been opposed to racial and 24 ethnic preferences in institutions of higher

1 education. But I would rather do the muddling through 2 than this. COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Mr. Chairman, I just 3 4 want to say something. You know, imagine the student 5 his friends and that has told all all of his 6 relatives, I want to be a doctor, I'm going off to 7 such and such a school, because I want to be a doctor. That's the dream there. And it's not that they wanted 8 9 to go to that particular school. They are thrilled to 10 get into that school. 11 But had they been told they had a better 12 shot at being a doctor, or being an engineer, or being 13 a scientist, if they had gone to a different school, 14 they would have gone to that different school. 15 know, it's a disservice to students. 16 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, actually, 17 you know, you don't know that they would have gone to a different school. 18 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But they would have --20 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: There's 300 million 21 people in the country. They --22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom 23 An individual student could decide to --24 fully weigh the risk and decide to go into that 25 program anyway.

1	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes, some might.
2	But the recommendation we are discussing, and
3	hopefully voting on real soon, is whether they should
4	be given the information to allow
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thanks for reminding
6	me.
7	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: them to make
8	that decision for themselves.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All those in favor of
10	the motion please say aye.
11	(Chorus of ayes.)
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I objection.
13	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Which one are we
14	doing now?
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Number 4.
16	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Four? I am
17	opposed.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
19	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: And
20	Commissioner Melendez I think opposed.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, he opposes the
22	motion.
23	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Okay.
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I support it.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The motion
2	passes.
3	Next up. I move that the following
4	recommendation be adopted. K through 12 schools
5	should recruit qualified math and science teachers
6	using, if necessary, pay adjustments and incentives.
7	Is there a second?
8	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Second.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
10	Commissioner Yaki, you get to go again. You get to go
11	first again.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, no. I'll wait.
13	I'll pass.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. All right.
15	Vice Chair Thernstrom?
16	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Look, they already
17	try to do that using, if necessary, pay adjustments
18	and incentives. Well, I mean, you know, not going to
19	happen, but whatever.
20	(Laughter.)
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There are some
22	districts who do this.
23	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Specifically with
24	math and science?

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I am sure that
2	somewhere in the country someone has tried it.
3	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, it is really
4	opposed by the unions.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That is true. It will
6	be difficult.
7	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I don't have an
8	objection to that.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All those in favor
10	please say aye.
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Hold on.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. I'm so
13	accustomed to you being first. Commissioner Yaki?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: What I was going to
15	say, very briefly, was I'm okay with this one.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All those in favor
17	please say aye.
18	(Chorus of ayes.)
19	Commissioner Melendez?
20	(No response.)
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I heard a door
22	close.
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I did, too.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom?

1	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No, I'm going
2	along with it. I said I would.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let the record
4	reflect that Commissioner Melendez did not vote. The
5	motion passes unanimously.
6	And I have to run, so, Vice Chair
7	Thernstrom, I pass the gavel to you.
8	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: All right. Do you
9	really trust me with the rest of the meeting?
10	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I don't want to
11	reach rankings or discussion of our rankings without
12	the chair. Do we want to try to go through the SACs?
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Move to adjourn.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: How do you feel?
15	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I'm happy to do
16	them.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: How do you feel?
18	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: SACs?
19	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes, SACs.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We'll hold on.
21	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: But I don't want to
22	do the potential
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Hold on. There is
24	something simmering over on this side.

	NEAL B. OBOOG
25	the items? We've got a list here.
24	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Want to discuss
23	revised agenda? Oh, yes, 2011 enforcement report.
22	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: What is next on our
21	willing to go with the group.
20	adjourn? Do you want to go through this agenda? I'm
19	to does somebody want to make a motion to simply
18	people want to do? They want to adjourn? They want
17	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Look, what do
16	Florida SAC.
15	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: All right.
14	(Laughter.)
13	First time you have allowed me to do so in so long.
12	oh, God, I'm so thrilled to hold this in my hand.
11	rest of you decide. I'm willing to stay here. I mean
10	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm letting the
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, I understand.
8	issue.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Quorum may be an
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: a natural death.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
4	prefer that quorum go, as opposed to
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, no, I would
2	adjourn because quorum may be an issue.
1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I was going to move to

1	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Do you have the
2	script for the approval of the Florida SAC? Could you
3	borrow the script?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: There's a script for
5	the approval?
6	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I think so.
7	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: But first is
8	consideration of FY2011 enforcement
9	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: We amended I
10	think we amended did we not amend the agenda?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I move to adjourn.
12	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: We did, but that's
13	what's next.
14	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Oh, is that what's
15	next? Oh, okay.
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I second
17	Commissioner Yaki's motion.
18	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Pardon me?
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I second
20	Commissioner Yaki's motion.
21	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm abstaining.
22	I'm letting the rest of the group decide this. I'll
23	call the question. All in favor?
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Aye.
1	

1	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Aye.
2	(Laughter.)
3	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: All opposed to
4	adjourning, the question on the table is adjourning.
5	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I move we amend the
6	agenda again to put the SACs ahead of
7	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I think that there
8	is a vote on the table. We need to vote on that.
9	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. My friend
10	I want to amend the motion to strike everything and
11	to
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: You can't amend a
13	motion to
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We're in the middle of
15	a vote.
16	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: We're in the
17	middle of the vote. Just vote against the motion to
18	adjourn.
19	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I vote against the
20	motion to adjourn.
21	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: How many people
22	vote against the motion to adjourn, so we stay and
23	discuss this?
24	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I want to stay.

1	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: You're the
2	deciding vote.
3	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm the deciding
4	vote?
5	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Yes.
6	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: All right. I
7	think we should just stay and discuss this, then.
8	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Now I move to amend
9	the agenda to take up the SAC rechartering of the
10	State of Florida and the State of Texas.
11	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Why are we doing
12	the most boring and inconsequential
13	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: That's the one that
14	Congress tells us that we have to do.
15	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: That's our clear
16	statutory duty. We have the rankings, which we should
17	study, and I think there is two topics that just for
18	the record may be able to be married in some
19	interesting ways. But without the full Commission
20	present
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Are we for that
22	version of marriage? I didn't know.
23	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I'm for all
24	versions of marriage, except those that are bad.
25	(Laughter.)

1	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: But I move to take
3	up the Florida and Texas SAC rechartering. Is there a
4	second?
5	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Second.
6	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: All in favor? Any
7	discussion?
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I oppose.
9	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, we haven't
10	had a vote yet. Is there any discussion?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, I oppose.
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Oh, that's your
13	discussion.
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's my discussion.
15	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: All right. I'm
16	calling the question. How many in favor?
17	(Chorus of ayes.)
18	How many Yaki is opposed. Who else is
19	opposed?
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Opposed.
21	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Oppose. Melendez.
22	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Abstain.
23	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Okay. So
24	four-two-one, right?
25	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes, okay.
	NEAL D. CDOCC

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Okay. So Florida SAC, right?

## III. STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ISSUES

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Florida SAC.

Okay. On June 25, 2010, the Staff Director shared potential -- oh, no, this is not it, is it? No. Sorry, wrong part of the script.

meeting binder distributed by Staff Director July 8, 2010, contained on recommended list of candidates for the Florida State Advisory Committee. Could I have a motion that the Commission recharter the Florida State Advisory Committee?

Under this motion, the Commission appoints the following individuals to that Committee based on the recommendations of the Staff Director: Elena M. Flom, Judith Ann Albertelli, Clint Cline, Gilbert Colon, Charles Fred Hearns, Jay Robert McClure, Susan Perers, Elizabeth M. Rodriguez, Frank S. Shaw, III, Robert Siedlecki, M. Lourdes Villanueva, Allen B. Williams.

Pursuant to this motion, the Commission reappoints Elena Flom as chair of this rechartered Florida Advisory Committee. These members will serve as uncompensated government employees. Under this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	motion, the Commission authorizes the Staff Director					
2	to execute the appropriate paperwork for the					
3	appointment.					
4	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: So moved, if you					
5	if that wasn't a motion.					
6	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: That was a motion.					
7	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.					
8	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I need a second.					
9	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Second. Either					
10	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. Any					
11	changes? Discussions? Questions? No discussion					
12	about the Florida SAC Committee?					
13	(No response.)					
14	Okay. Calling the question. How many in					
15	favor?					
16	(Chorus of ayes.)					
17	How many opposed?					
	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I oppose.					
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I oppose.					
18 19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I oppose.  COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: One abstain.					
19	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: One abstain.					
19 20	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: One abstain.  Melendez.					
<ul><li>19</li><li>20</li><li>21</li></ul>	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: One abstain.  Melendez.  STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: For the					

1 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Was everyone 2 else in favor? 3 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, I'm 4 abstaining. I haven't looked through this carefully 5 enough. 6 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: So it would 7 be four to two to -- oh, wait a minute. Melendez 8 abstained? 9 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: 10 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: So four in 11 12 favor, one against, two abstentions. VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Passes. 13 Okay. You want to go on to the Texas one 14 15 as well. Could I have a motion that the Commission 16 recharter the Texas State Advisory Committee? 17 the Commission appoints the following this motion, 18 individuals that Committee, to based 19 recommendations of the Staff Director: Charles 20 Burchett, Bill Calhoun, Frances A. Carnot, Jason A. 21 Caselias, Russell B. Casey, Cecilia R. Castillo, 22 Norval D. Glenn, Glenn O. Lewis, Merrill Matthews, 23 Harriet Miller, Martha McConn, 24 Charles -- with apologies from me if I don't get

1	people's names right Charles Stolfus, Barbara J.			
2	Walters. Hold on here.			
3	Pursuant to this motion, the Commission			
4	appoints Merrill Matthews as chair of this rechartered			
5	Texas Advisory Committee. These members will serve as			
6	uncompensated government employees. Under this			
7	motion, the Commission authorizes the Staff Director			
8	to execute the appropriate paperwork for the			
9	appointment.			
10	So I need a "so move."			
11	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Do you so move?			
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes, I so move.			
13	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I second.			
14	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: You second. Any			
15	changes? Discussion? Questions?			
16	(No response.)			
17	All in favor please indicate aye.			
18	(Chorus of ayes.)			
19	Anybody opposed?			
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I object.			
21	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Melendez.			
22	Opposed.			
23	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: And I abstain. So			
24	the tally?			
l				

1	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Four in		
2	favor, two against, one abstention, right?		
3	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. New Jersey		
4	State Advisory Committee. Is there a motion to		
5	appoint Joan Gary to the New Jersey State Advisory		
6	Committee?		
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I so move. Do we have		
8	that on the agenda?		
9	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes, I didn't know.		
10	I asked the Commissioner Commissioner Yaki if the		
11	we had a sort of side agreement. I would ask it to		
12	be postponed, if it is on the agenda. I didn't see it		
13	on the agenda either.		
14	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I see it. I've		
15	got it in front of me. That's why I'm just reading		
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It was on the agenda.		
17	I thought that maybe you had done what you told me you		
18	were going to do.		
19	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: No. I thought you		
20	were going to call me.		
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. You said you were		
22	going to		
23	(Laughter.)		
24	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm going to make		
25	a motion that we postpone this.		

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Just put it on the				
2	next regular business meeting.				
3	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: We're going to put				
4	it on the next regular business meeting.				
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: In-person business				
6	meeting.				
7	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: In-person business				
8	meeting.				
9	V. APPROVAL OF MARCH 12, APRIL 16,				
10	MAY 14, MAY 28, AND JUNE 11 MEETING MINUTES				
11	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Want to do				
12	minutes?				
13	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes.				
14	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I don't think so,				
15	but let's now let's be clear after the meeting.				
16	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm sorry. Tell				
17	me what you're saying.				
18	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: We had a little				
19	side we're fine.				
20	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Okay.				
21	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: We're fine.				
22	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Are we approving				
23	the minutes of March 12, March 16 April 16, May 14,				
24	May 28, and June 11? Does anybody want to make a				
25	motion to				

1 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I would abstain. 2 If I -- I can make the motion, but I would abstain. 3 haven't read those minutes. 4 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Me neither. Ι 5 abstain. 6 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Move to adjourn. 7 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Move to adjourn? 8 You don't want to discuss the enforcement topic? 9 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I think we can --10 now that we have covered the other business, I don't 11 mind a brief discussion. Sure. But I just wanted to 12 make sure we got through other --13 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: The reason for 14 having a discussion, Commissioner Yaki, is only to get 15 a little bit of a sense of where people are coming 16 from on this. And then, we can have a full discussion 17 at the next in-person business meeting. 18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I did not have the 19 opportunity to even vote on these things, so my votes aren't even reflected in --20 21 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Why? Never mind. 22 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Because they are lost 23 in like 400 other e-mails, and I was trying to figure 24 out what was going on.

1 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. So we have 2 a very brief discussion, just to lay the groundwork for a full discussion. 3 4 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Move to limit the 5 discussion to five minutes, and then we adjourn. 6 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I move to limit 7 the discussion to five minutes, and then we adjourn, 8 just to get a sense of the ground upon which we --9 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: We are probably all 10 in agreement on that. Let's go. 11 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. Who has got 12 anything to say on the -- have you all got in front of 13 The potential enforcement you the list? Okay. 14 reports, the number one came in, the Department of 15 Justice investigation into anti-Asian violence 16 South Philadelphia High School. It got 21 points. 17 But one Commissioner voted for this topic 18 on the understanding that its current scope would be 19 subject to further refinement. Two, disparities in 20 discipline. 20 school That got votes. 21 Commissioner voted for this topic on the understanding 22 that the scope would be expanded beyond the

Hispanic --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: A point of personal privilege. Does that indicate that I didn't vote, that not all Commissioners voted on this?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No, it does not on this piece of paper.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I think it should have.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Let us make a note that not all Commissioners voted on this. And this list, as we have known from past experience, is very fluid. We have started out with lists in numerical order, and the order has changed.

Commissioner Gaziano?

commissioner Gaziano: I would be very eager to see all Commissioners votes tallied and recirculated, so that I know what the -- but as far as the votes here, I don't know -- I don't -- I think the first topic of partner justice investigation of the Asian -- anti-Asian violence at South Philadelphia, we have had more work on that. But if it was going to be an enforcement report, I think it should be refined, although I don't think I was the Commissioner who voted for it, with that understanding. But I think it would need a little bit more refinement.

Ι not for investigating for an enforcement report one-off single incident. aminterested in only investigating matters that there is a significant enforcement issue on. And it is my understanding that we did not yet know whether, although the incident seems rather important, whether there was a significant enforcement matter about it, as was clearly the case with the New Black Panther --

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: As is clearly not the case with the New Black Panther.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: But I would also like to -- so that is one kind of reservation I have in defining that. But I also -- I think I was at least one of the Commissioners -- maybe there were more -- who voted for the second topic with the understanding that the scope be expanded beyond Hispanics.

is Obviously, this were an enforcement it would need to focus on the Department of recent initiative to sort of warn Education's follow disparities in student discipline up on generally. But I also think there is the potential and that we ought to consider the potential to making one topic where the umbrella is school violence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And the Justice Department, Department of Education -- I'm sorry, school violence and misconduct, because I think that the two may well be related or at least we should try to see if we can come up with topics and angles that make them relevant and related. And I think that one of the issues is is when, you know, student violence is -- or student disciplinary problems aren't properly taken care of, they may lead to violence.

So I think there is some potential to please everyone, at least everyone who has so far voted, in marrying these two topics. I don't know, you know, how we can work with staff to try to come up with a synthesis on that, but I think that I would be a little happier if we answered a few of those questions.

this is a topic I have written on in an article called -- I just lost the title for a minute, but, in any case, it's an issue I've done quite a bit of work on. It is a huge topic, Commissioner Gaziano. But when you are talking about disorder in the schools, as well as violence, two separate issues -- and there is much more of the former than the latter -- you are taking

on the world of education, because disorder in the schools is so pervasive.

And I would say, by the way, that the black anti-Asian violence -- I mean, we know by now it was -- is not confined to simply that South Philadelphia high school. It is quite pervasive in Philadelphia. It exists in San Francisco, and I don't know where else.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: What's the federal That is a little less clear to me enforcement book? at this point. Is it being appropriately it for investigated? Is not? Our report statutory -- or I don't -- the federal enforcement report has -- we can have other briefings on other state issues, but the issue for our annual federal enforcement report has to be a federal enforcement So I just think a little bit more work needs to be done.

And I hope maybe others on our staff can help us think of a way of looking at school violence generally and the relationship to the Department of Education's current inquiry into disparities in -- or apparent disparities, whether they exist or not, and whether they are explained or not in discipline.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	So I don't know that we can. I'm just			
2	suggesting that as a possibility.			
3	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Commissioner Yaki?			
4	VIII. ADJOURN			
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I don't think we can,			
6	and let's adjourn.			
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Five minutes are			
8	up.			
9	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Let's adjourn.			
10	That's fine. Let me have a motion to adjourn. Can I			
11	have a motion to adjourn?			
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, no, we've already			
13	adopted a motion to adjourn.			
14	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Oh, that's right.			
15	That's right.			
16	(Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m., the proceedings in the			
17	foregoing matter were adjourned.)			
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

	<b>.</b>	1 F O I
1		158
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		