U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, JULY 6, 2010

+ + + + +

THE NEW BLACK PANTHER PARTY HEARING (2)

+ + + + +

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 TODD F. GAZIANO, Commissioner GAIL L. HERIOT, Commissioner PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., Commissioner

MARTIN DANNENFELSER, Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

DAVID BLACKWOOD, General Counsel, OGC
CHRISTOPHER BYRNES, Director, RPCU
DEMITRIA DEAS
LILLIAN DUNLAP
PAMELA A. DUNSTON, Chief, ASCD
LENORE OSTROWSKY
JOHN RATCLIFFE, Chief, Budget and Finance
KIMBERLY TOLHURST
VANESSA WILLIAMSON
AUDREY WRIGHT

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

NICHOLAS COLTEN
ALEC DEULL (via telephone)
TIM FAY
DOMINIQUE LUDVIGSON
JOHN MARTIN
ALISON SCHMAUCH

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

$\texttt{T} \; \texttt{A} \; \texttt{B} \; \texttt{L} \; \texttt{E} \; \; \texttt{O} \; \texttt{F} \; \; \texttt{C} \; \texttt{O} \; \texttt{N} \; \texttt{T} \; \texttt{E} \; \texttt{N} \; \texttt{T} \; \texttt{S}$

I.INT	RODUCTION BY CHAIR
II.	TESTIMONY OF J. CHRISTIAN ADAMS, 8 FORMER DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE VOTING RIGHTS ATTORNEY
	Exhibit A 16 Exhibit B 27 Exhibit C 32
III.	Adjourn

NEAL R. GROSS

PROCEEDINGS

2

1

9:31 a.m.

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INTRODUCTION BY CHAIR

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: On the record. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Okay. Before I I'd like to ask each Commissioner and the begin, audience to please take a moment to silence your cell phones and for Commissioners to move your phones away from your microphone.

I'd also like to note that we have a sign language interpreter for anyone who may need one. Those who need those services please contact Dunston. Ms. Dunston, please raise your hand so folks can see you.

(Show of hand.)

Thank you.

This hearing is called to order. Today we embark on a continuation of a hearing that we started on April 23, 2010 examining the Justice Department's handling of voter intimidation litigation involving the New Black Panther Party. This hearing is being conducted pursuant to 42 USC Section 1975(a) and the Commission Regulations at 45 CFR Section 702.

I'd like to thank all the Commissioners here today who worked to arrange their holiday travel

NEAL R. GROSS

plans and vacation schedules to be here for this important hearing into the New Black Panther Party matter. We had to accommodate a number of schedules including our witness and his attorney as well as the Commissioners. It's needed so that we can complete our investigation, finalize our report and submit our report to Congress, the President and the American people.

So, again, thank you for -- I'd like to thank all the Commissioners for rearranging your schedules to be here.

In the course of this investigation which began over a year ago in June 2009, the Commission has heard from various fact witnesses who witnessed the Election Day 2008 incident that is at the heart of our analysis. We've heard from Representative Frank Wolf, a former DOJ official, Greg Katsas and the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division, Thomas Perez.

As most of you are aware by now, the litigation stemmed from an incident on Election Day 2008 in which two members of the New Black Panther Party appeared at a polling station in Philadelphia. Video and eyewitness testimony showed that they stood at an entrance to a polling place dressed in

NEAL R. GROSS

paramilitary garb and black combat boots. One brandished a nightstick. They hurled racial epithets at whites and blacks alike, taunting poll watchers and poll observers who were there to aid voters.

The Department of Justice at first aggressively pursued this filing case, voter intimidation charges against four defendants: the two New Black Panthers who appeared at the Philadelphia polling place on the Election Day, the New Black Panther Party chairman, and the organization itself. None of the defendants contested the charges and the Department was poised to seek a default judgment in the case and to seek an injunction to stop further acts of intimidations.

But on the eve of the date which the court Department's request for default the trial judgment, the attorneys in the case instructed to request a continuance by then-Acting Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights Loretta In the days that followed, and despite the King. robust justification that they had prepared at the inception of the case to support its request to file experienced line career attorneys the suit, the responsible for the case were put under pressure to justify the lawsuit against the Panthers,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and they were required to prepare a defense of their proposed injunction and request for default.

In addition, Ms. King sought a review of the matter by the Division's appellate section, which agreed with the Department that the Department could make a reasonable argument in favor of default relief against all of the defendants and probably should, given the unusual procedural posture of the case. And just to unpack that, the defendants did not contest the case. They essentially had defaulted.

A total of at least six career attorneys intimately familiar with the details of the shared this view, including the two who opined from the appellate section. Nonetheless, charges were dropped against all of the defendants but one, Minister King Samir Shabazz, who had wielded the billy The case against Jerry Jackson, the club that day. other New Black Panther Party member at the polling station that day, was dropped, as were charges against chairman. the party and its Furthermore, injunctive relief sought against King Samir Shabazz was limited to prevent acts of intimidation by him solely in the City of Philadelphia and only through Election Day November 2012.

Last month, we heard testimony from Thomas

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Perez, who is the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, regarding the Department's decision to largely dismiss the case. He testified that the facts and the law supported dismissal of the case against all but one defendant and the narrowing of the injunction sought against the defendant.

This morning we will present one witness,

J. Christian Adams, a member of the trial team in the

New Black Panther Party case and a former DOJ lawyer

who has resigned over the Department's handling of the

case. Mr. Adams has spoken publicly regarding what he

views as the serious mishandling of the New Black

Panther Party case and will answer questions for us

today as a part of our investigation of this matter.

Our general counsel, Mr. Blackwood, will initiate the questions. Following Mr. Blackwood, the Commissioners will have an opportunity for at least two rounds of questions. Each Commissioner will have five minutes per round and we will proceed in the following order. I will go first. The Vice Chair is not with us today and then the remaining Commissioners in order of seniority.

Commissioners may, of course, yield their time to one another. I may allow additional rounds of questioning as time permits.

NEAL R. GROSS

8 1 II. TESTIMONY OF J. CHRISTIAN ADAMS, 2 FORMER DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 3 VOTING RIGHTS ATTORNEY 4 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Mr. Adams, thank 5 you for appearing before the Commission today. I'd 6 like to swear you in. Please raise your right hand. 7 Do you swear or affirm under penalty of perjury that the testimony you're about to give will be the truth, 8 9 the whole truth and nothing but the truth. 10 MR. ADAMS: I do. 11 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Kind sir, thank you for being here. I appreciate the dedicated service 12 13 that you've provided over the years. And I want to 14 recognize your courage for speaking out against what 15 you believe is wrongdoing. At this point, I would like to turn it 16 17 over to our general counsel, Mr. Blackwood. 18 MR. BLACKWOOD: Good morning. Mr. Adams, 19 you're here with counsel today. Is that correct? 20 That's correct. MR. ADAMS: 21 MR. BLACKWOOD: Could you please identify 22 him?

MR. ADAMS: This is Mr. Richard Bolen.

MR. BLACKWOOD: Good morning.

MR. BOLEN: Good morning.

NEAL R. GROSS

24

1 MR. BLACKWOOD: Now, Mr. Adams, you're 2 here because the --3 MR. DANNENFELSER: Did you have a question 4 at this time? 5 MR. ADAMS: I don't right now. MR. DANNENFELSER: All right. 6 MR. BLACKWOOD: 7 You're here because of a subpoena issued by the Commission. 8 Is that correct? 9 It is and I do have something MR. ADAMS: 10 I'd like to say about that. 11 MR. BLACKWOOD: Go ahead. Okay. I would rather not be 12 MR. ADAMS: 13 here to testify despite reports to the contrary. 14 and my attorneys have invited the Department to file a 15 motion to quash for the subpoena, and we informed the 16 Department that we would not object to the motion to 17 quash and, frankly, would probably have encouraged it. 18 Obviously, the motion to quash was not forthcoming. instructed, Mr. 19 Coates and 20 particularly me, that the Department of Justice would 21 not enforce this subpoena against and that me 22 therefore I need not comply with the subpoena which, 23 of course, provides cold comfort to anybody who is 24 under subpoena. For example, the Department recently

reversed a number of declamations not to prosecute

from the previous administration and reopen the examination of a number of matters which I won't detail here.

So administrations change and policies toward my dodging a subpoena in the future might also change over. Even if true, it seemed improper to tell me not to comply with the subpoena issued pursuant to Federal law simply because they don't intend to enforce it and to comply with the request from the Commission as the law permits the Commission to do. Congress has noted, some members, that they want a special prosecutor appointed in this case to enforce subpoenas, which further complicated my legal position in not complying with the subpoena.

The Department has asserted a variety of privileges regarding this case, and these assertions of privilege have been the subject of debate by some very, very able attorneys, with some saying the privileged assertions are meritless and the Department asserting they are legitimate. I had hoped executive privilege would be asserted to resolve the matter conclusively. But the Department informed me that they had not exerted executive privilege.

Nevertheless, in order to avoid these concerns, I will not testify about genuine

NEAL R. GROSS

deliberative process in this case, not because I concede those objections are valid but because I have far different matters to testify about which have absolutely nothing to do with any colorable privilege relating to the Black Panther case.

I will not discuss the mechanics or particularly the legal and factual debate within the Department in the case. You already have one side of that debate presented by Mr. Perez in various Department responses. On the other hand, Mr. Gregory Katsas testified to you and presented a legal analysis in his testimony that seeks to rebut many of the claims of the Department.

I'll not provide my opinion or recollection of those internal legal debates here. Please understand, therefore, that my attorney or I may have objections to answering some questions you ask regarding matters that may offend the Department's position, whether correct or not, regarding genuine deliberative process.

On the other hand, I am confident that what I will testify about today would be corroborated if Mr. Christopher Coates were allowed to comply with his subpoena. In fact, Ι would encourage Commission to broaden its inquiry and subpoena

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

individuals who recently left the Department, who no longer work there over the last four years, and work within the voting section because they, too, I believe would corroborate the testimony I'm going to give today.

Other current employees also could corroborate the testimony because I have absolute confidence, the deeper that your inquiry about matters I will speak about goes, the greater the certainty that I am describing matters accurately.

Mr. Bolen, one of my attorneys, has worked with the Department, as well as Mr. Jim Miles who is not here today who tried to reach a resolution. Mr. Miles could not be here because he's actually in Alaska until the snow starts to fly. So your schedule will not permit him to be here.

This matter has resulted in me paying attorneys, and I wish that the parties had reached a resolution that fully respected the legal obligations of the individuals subpoenaed.

Finally, for the record, I want to point out that the Department has previously allowed Mr. Christopher Coates to appear before this very Commission pursuant to a subpoena in 2008. Moreover, the Department has permitted line attorneys to testify

NEAL R. GROSS

before Congress on at least three occasions. Chief John Tanner in the voting section went before the House Judiciary Committee in October 2007. Line attorney Gerry Hebert appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 18, 1986 to oppose the nomination of Judge Sessions to the District Court in Alabama. The next day Paul Hancock, another voting section line attorney, appeared with Barry Kowalsky, a deputy in the criminal section, and Daniel Bell, another deputy in the criminal section, to provide evidence unhelpful to Mr. Sessions' nomination to the United States District Court in Alabama.

Therefore, I am here and ready to provide you as much information as possible.

MR. BLACKWOOD: Thank you. I do want to point out that, although I understand your assertion of privilege relating to decision making within the Department of Justice, this Commission is not necessarily bound. But that said, let's proceed.

There are two main issues that I want to address today. First is obviously the Black Panther matter, the case, and what happened in that case. Also about what you have described as the open and pervasive hostility within the Justice Department to bringing civil rights cases against nonwhite

NEAL R. GROSS

defendants on behalf of white victims. But to start with, let's go through some of the Black Panther matter.

As the Chairman pointed out, on Election Day in Philadelphia in 2008, there was an incident outside the Fairmount Street polling place. How did you become involved in that incident?

Well, at the time I was an MR. ADAMS: voting section attorney in the in Washington. Election Day, the Department sends Normally, on attorneys all over the country, as well as Federal observers and as well as other observers to monitor the election. I ball-parked that we had somewhere between 400 and 700, just ball-parking, attorneys around the country and Federal observers that day.

I was back in Washington to help coordinate the information flow of incidents as they arose throughout the country on November 4, 2008. So that's how the matter came to my attention.

MR. BLACKWOOD: Now we've had several witnesses who were present at Fairmount Street and they indicate that the Department of Justice lawyers, part of a roving team, met with them on Election Day to take some statements. Do you know who those individuals were?

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	MR. ADAMS: I do not, actually. I knew
2	that there was a team deployed to Fairmount Street,
3	but I don't know who the individuals were.
4	MR. BLACKWOOD: Do you know whether those
5	individuals took written statements from any of the
6	witnesses?
7	MR. ADAMS: I know they took statements
8	from the witnesses.
9	MR. BLACKWOOD: Did you actually see them?
10	MR. ADAMS: I did not.
11	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. As you became
12	involved in the matter, did you meet with and take
13	notes with regard to any of the witnesses that you
14	spoke with?
15	MR. ADAMS: Of course. There's Of
16	course. Any attorney would do that.
17	MR. BLACKWOOD: We have asked for those
18	statements and the Department has indicated that
19	they're not going to turn them over. And it's been
20	extremely frustrating. Can you tell us whether those
21	statements were straightforward fact statements or did
22	they also include legal analysis and your
23	observations? Or was it strictly the fact-finding?
24	MR. BOLEN: I'm going to have to object
25	because, again, it's deliberative process as they were

1	preparing the case.
2	MR. ADAMS: Yes. I mean, you're getting
3	into the mechanisms of how the Department conducts an
4	investigation and the particulars of what records
5	there are. The existence of records the Department
6	has asserted as somehow privileged, just the mere
7	listing of what's there. So, I mean, you're getting
8	to an area that I can't be very helpful in.
9	MR. BLACKWOOD: Do you have exhibits in
LO	front of you, Mr. Court Reporter?
L1	COURT REPORTER: Yes.
L2	MR. BLACKWOOD: Let me ask you to look at
L3	Exhibit A which is the J memo.
L4	MR. ADAMS: Oh.
L5	MR. BLACKWOOD: And we have obtained
L6	Exhibit A as part of our investigation into this
L7	matter, and the J memo is an attempt to summarize what
L8	the trial team is finding with regard to the case, and
L9	to suggest a particular action and approval by higher
20	ups. Is that accurate?
21	MR. ADAMS: Yes. I mean, yes. It stands
22	for justification. Every case that the Voting section
23	brings, you produce a justification memorandum.
24	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. Now this memorandum
25	has, indicates that it is from Chris Coates, Robert

1	Popper, yourself and Spencer Fisher. Is that right?
2	MR. ADAMS: That's what it says.
3	MR. BLACKWOOD: And is it fair to say at
4	that time that each of those four individuals
5	including yourself supported the recommendation of the
6	J memo?
7	MR. ADAMS: It's customary practice in the
8	Department that you do not attach your name to a
9	document that you disagree with.
10	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. And each of those
11	four individuals, Mr. Coates, Mr. Popper, yourself and
12	Mr. Fisher, you're all career employees, correct?
13	MR. ADAMS: That is correct.
14	MR. BLACKWOOD: Did In preparing the
15	lawsuit, did the Department consider any criminal
16	charges?
17	MR. ADAMS: Again, that's something I'm
18	not going to answer.
19	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. The fact is that
20	you sought, the suit sought, remedies under Section
21	11(b) of the Voting Rights Act. Right?
22	MR. ADAMS: 11(b) is a civil provision in
23	the Voting Rights Act of 1965.
24	MR. BLACKWOOD: In preparing the suit, did
25	you all, you the trial team, have any concerns about

the First Amendment having any implications in a Section 11(b) case?

MR. ADAMS: Well, I'll speak broadly, but not specifically. The First Amendment, this is of course an issue in any case involving elections, politics, speech. Where the boundaries of the First Amendment concerns start and stop is often a very difficult issue. And I don't want to belabor the jurisprudence here, but you'd clearly have to consider First Amendment issues when you're dealing with any form of political speech or activity.

example, which the Fifth Circuit affirmed and I'll get to in greater detail later, the defendants in the <u>U.S.</u>

<u>v. Brown</u> case asserted a First Amendment defense to their blatant racial discrimination against white voters in Mississippi. So often times, or at least in that instance, the assertion of the First Amendment was suspect from the beginning, but nonetheless they asserted it.

The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals took up the First Amendment defense in that particular case and said it was meritless that when you break the law, in and of itself, when you're breaking the law through an act that is separate from the First Amendment, that

NEAL R. GROSS

is satisfactory to proceed against that breaking of the law and the First Amendment concerns or defenses exist outside of the civil action to remedy the lawbreaking. And in that particular case, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals agreed with the position of mine and held that there was no First defense to stop what Ike Brown was doing in Mississippi.

MR. BLACKWOOD: The defendants named in the <u>Black Panther</u> case included the two individuals at the polling place, King Samir Shabazz and Jerry Jackson. But the complaint also pursued action against the party itself, the New Black Panther Party, and Malik Zulu Shabazz. What was the basis of naming the latter two in this lawsuit?

MR. ADAMS: Well, I would turn -- I would suggest you look at the complaint. The complaint makes allegations that, for example, Malik Zulu Shabazz, who is the national party chairman of the New Black Panther Party, was responsible for organizing the deployment and, more importantly, endorsed the use of the weapon after the deployment occurred and to paraphrase the allegation that he was aware the weapon was used and that's just how it had to be. And for somebody to assent to that sort of illegal behavior as

NEAL R. GROSS

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 chairman of an organization would tend, and as Mr. Katsas testified to you, create an agency liability for Shabazz.

The organization is a similar situation. If you look at the complaint, you'll see that the same agency principles were discussed in the complaint. And for -- they were addressed -- the Panthers were dressed in a trade dress of the organization. The Panthers had announced before the election -- I believe the week before the election, October 28th perhaps -- that they were going to have a nationwide deployment of 300 Panthers at polls. And this was on the Black Panther webpage. It's probably still there if someone looks.

So when you have an organization, whether it's the KKK or the Black Panthers or the Aryan Nation, announcing before an election that they're going to do X and then on Election Day X occurs, as Mr. Katsas testified, it might create agency liability for that organization.

MR. BLACKWOOD: In an interview that Malik Zulu Shabazz gave on Fox News several days after the election, he indicated that the reason Black Panther members were at the polling place and armed was because of the presence of skinheads and white

NEAL R. GROSS

supremacists. Did you all look into those
allegations?
MR. ADAMS: Well, that's one of the
questions about the extent and nature of the
Department's investigation I will not answer. But I
can say that no credible public information has ever
appeared to establish there were skinheads.
If you listen to that interview and you
may get to this in your question, your next question,
Mr. Malik Shabazz said on Fox News that the use of the
weapons, I believe, was an emergency response, that
again he was endorsing the behavior of the Panthers on
Election Day in Philadelphia. So you have him on
national television saying that he was involved in
this incident in Philadelphia in one way or another.
MR. BLACKWOOD: In the J memo, it's
indicated that you actually talked to Malik Zulu
Shabazz. Is that accurate?
MR. ADAMS: Well, the J memo probably says
that. I haven't looked at it for a long time. But I
won't dispute that.
MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. Did you actually
talk to him and what was said?
MR. ADAMS: I did talk to him.
MR. BLACKWOOD: And did he defend the

presence of the Panthers at the polling place?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, and he said the weapon was necessary.

MR. BLACKWOOD: In some of your recent writings, you indicated that there were prior acts of the Black Panthers at polling places during the primaries. Could you tell us about that?

MR. ADAMS: I can, and let me stress that this is very preliminary and this is also in the public domain if anybody cares to actually do some work and look at it. There were indications, and I will concede that indications as not admissible evidence, but indications are where every single case starts.

There were indications that the Black Panthers were also doing the same thing to supporters of Hillary Rodham Clinton in the primaries, especially and particularly I believe in March and April of 2008. Those were simple indications that certainly would have been followed up on at some point by me, because I don't ever leave any stone unturned on these kind of cases if it had gone forward. Had there been a of this activity going beginning back primaries, it would have been very, very significant from my view to what was happening on Election Day.

NEAL R. GROSS

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	MR. BLACKWOOD: When did you become aware,
2	though, of alleged acts during the primary? Before
3	the prosecution of this case?
4	MR. ADAMS: I can't no, certainly not
5	before. It never came to my attention before the
6	prosecution of this case. But at some point in 2009 I
7	picked up on some information that indicated this
8	behavior was happening well before November 4th.
9	MR. BLACKWOOD: Now, on their website, the
LO	date is in question, but the Black Panthers allegedly
L1	renunciated the acts that occurred on Election Day and
L2	also suspended Jerry Jackson and King Samir Shabazz.
L3	Was there any indication that that occurred, these
L4	acts occurred, directly as a result of the election,
L5	you know, right after Election Day, or that it
L6	occurred only after the lawsuit was filed?
L7	MR. ADAMS: I think it only occurred after
L8	we started calling Malik Zulu Shabazz to talk to him.
L9	I mean, that's my view.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: Do you One of those
21	comments renunciating the event was dated anyway
22	Election Day. Do you have any indication whether that
23	actually occurred on Election Day or whether it was
24	posted some time and just back dated?
55	MP ADAMS: Whether or not this

Τ.	Intermation was on the web for the public to consume
2	on Election Day or shortly thereafter or on January
3	4th when the lawsuit was filed, I cannot conclusively
4	answer with certainty.
5	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. At this part, I'd
6	like to walk through some of the chronology of the
7	Panther case and we have up on the screen some of the
8	more important dates but just You should have it
9	also in front of you. But let me walk you through.
10	First off, the suit gets filed. The
11	defendants are served, but they don't file an answer.
12	Correct?
13	MR. ADAMS: That's correct. They didn't
14	file an answer. There's no answer in the public
15	record.
16	MR. BLACKWOOD: And the failure to file an
17	answer under Federal Rule 8 means the liability is
18	conceded, right?
19	MR. ADAMS: All facts as pled are taken in
20	favor of the plaintiff in that circumstance.
21	MR. BLACKWOOD: As indicated, on April
22	28th, the record that we have received indicates that
23	notices were sent to the defendants of the
24	Department's intent to seek a default judgment. But
25	cross reports indicated something occurred on April

_	2) cii wicii regard to aii objection by Mr. Rosenbadiii.
2	Can you tell us about that?
3	MR. ADAMS: I really can't. I mean,
4	again, I'm not going to discuss the internal
5	deliberations that went on and particularly this time
6	period about the merits of those deliberations. I'm
7	not going to talk about what the arguments were on
8	each side. I just As I've stated in my opening,
9	while I may not concede that that's deliberative
LO	process at this point, I'm nonetheless going to
L1	respect the Department's position that that's
L2	deliberative process.
L3	MR. BLACKWOOD: All right. This is part
L4	of a press report that occurred in the Weekly
L5	Standard. Let me just ask factually. Did Mr.
L6	Rosenbaum note an objection that date?
L7	MR. ADAMS: Well, I think Mr. Perez told
L8	you that he did, and I'd have no reason to differ with
L9	that testimony of Mr. Perez.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: And was that the first
21	objection noted by anyone higher up?
22	MR. ADAMS: I'm not sure if April 28th is
23	the date. But suffice to say we were proceeding as
24	the public record shows, and the court files, we were
25	proceeding along merrily up until this point.

1	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. The press reports
2	also indicate that that date, the date that Mr.
3	Rosenbaum first raised an objection, the trial team
4	prepared a response. Was this in the form of a
5	memorandum or an email?
6	MR. ADAMS: Probably both.
7	MR. BLACKWOOD: Did you ever receive a
8	response?
9	MR. ADAMS: I never received a
LO	communication from Mr. Rosenbaum.
L1	MR. BLACKWOOD: Now your position is that
L2	you're not going to tell us what the basis of the
L3	objections were.
L 4	MR. ADAMS: Well, I mean listen. You had
L5	the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights come
L6	here and tell you a whole litany of things that
L7	justified dismissing the case, facts in law, First
L8	Amendment, agency, all those things. Let's just put
L9	it this way. Those are not new arguments to me.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. The press reports,
21	that same article that I referenced before from the
22	Weekly Standard, also indicated that, right after Mr.
23	Rosenbaum made his objections, after a response was
24	prepared by the trial team, there was "two days of
5	velling " Can you confirm that?

	MR. ADAMS: Yelling was part of it. There
2	were other things, profanity, tossing of papers at
3	each other, all-nighters.
4	MR. BLACKWOOD: All-nighters by the trial
5	team?
6	MR. ADAMS: Correct.
7	MR. BLACKWOOD: Defending their position?
8	MR. ADAMS: Correct.
9	MR. BLACKWOOD: In any case, on May 1st,
10	the motion to extend the deadline was filed to
11	evidently give more time, is that correct, for the
12	Department to consider what it's going to do?
13	MR. ADAMS: The face of the pleading, I
14	believe, states that, due to the weighty issues
15	involved in this case, we need more time to consider
16	what would be an appropriate remedy.
17	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. So the Department
18	buys itself an extra 15 days.
19	MR. ADAMS: That's right.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: And during that 14 days
21	what occurs?
22	MR. ADAMS: More of the same.
23	MR. BLACKWOOD: Well, let me show you
24	You should have in front of you what's marked as
25	Exhibit B, which is a remedial memorandum dated May 6,

1 2009 which we have received of as part our 2 investigation. Is that an accurate copy 3 memorandum? It doesn't 4 MR. ADAMS: I suppose it is. 5 look --I mean I have no reason to dispute its 6 accuracy. 7 MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. Again, on the it indicates that Mr. 8 front, Coates, Mr. 9 yourself and Mr. Fisher all join in support of the 10 memorandum. Is that correct? As I stated, it is customary 11 MR. ADAMS: 12 practice in the Department to not attach somebody's 13 name to a document with which they disagree. 14 MR. BLACKWOOD: That memorandum, if you 15 won't talk about it, the public can at least review 16 the memorandum, and it points out or addresses a 17 arguments including First variety of Amendment 18 concerns. One of the matters that Mr. Perez testified 19 about was Rule 11. And he made public comments before 20 Congress indicating that there were Rule 11 concerns. 21 Could you describe for the public what Rule 11 is and 22 why that might have caused consternation among the trial team? 23 24 MR. ADAMS: Yes. This is an issue near 25 and dear to my heart. Rule 11, any lawyer knows, is

an ethical obligation to only sign a complaint or a pleading that can be supported by the facts of the law. It's one of the first things you learn in law school. And most lawyers, in my experience, and all lawyers in my experience at the Department, take it very, very, very seriously. It's one of the most important parts of the whole Rules of Civil Procedures in my view.

When I heard the testimony that Rule 11 would not support going forward in this case, I -- my blood boiled because I've never done anything like that in my life and never will. And for someone to assert that a pleading we signed and something this important could not be ethically supported was a very low moment. And it is false.

MR. BLACKWOOD: Has anybody at any time during your time at the Department, with regard to the Black Panther case, ever to your face accused you or any other members of the trial team that you're aware of of having violated Rule 11?

MR. ADAMS: Of course not. And there are so many procedures in place. For example, if Rule 11 was at risk, why wasn't there an OPR investigation of Christian Adams and Christopher Coates and Robert Popper? There's an OPR investigation with somebody

NEAL R. GROSS

1 else, but it's not us. If there's a Rule 11 violation 2 here, then bring it on because we didn't do anything 3 wrong. 4 MR. BLACKWOOD: One of the things that you 5 have mentioned in the two articles that you wrote 6 immediately or last week or with so, one 7 Washington Times and then Pajamas Media, you mentioned an incident where the remedial memo or other memos 8 were thrown at Steven Rosenbaum by Chris Coates. 9 10 you tell us about that? 11 ADAMS: Well, I could. Again, I 12 hardly consider profanity and assaults to be -- and I'm using the term "assault" in the lightest of terms 13 14 -- it's a piece of paper -- could be considered 15 deliberative process. It's kind of a lack 16 deliberation. Mr. Rosenbaum told Mr. Coates, and I'm 17 sure Mr. Coates would testify under oath if he were 18 able to comply with the subpoena, that he hadn't even 19 read these memos. MR. BLACKWOOD: He Rosenbaum. 20 21 MR. ADAMS: That's correct. Before he 22 began to argue against this case. And Coates was so 23 outraged. He said, "That's bullshit. How dare you. 24 That's bullshit." And Coates threw the memo at him 25 and said, "You can't do that."

1	MR. BLACKWOOD: Who is Steve Rosenbaum?
2	MR. ADAMS: At the time he was the Acting
3	Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.
4	MR. BLACKWOOD: Had he been assigned to
5	the voting rights section any time before that?
6	MR. ADAMS: Fifteen years ago he was in
7	the voting I think at one point he was an acting
8	chief. But I'm not sure about the chronology.
9	MR. BLACKWOOD: But immediately before
10	this election, before 2008, was Steve Rosenbaum in the
11	voting rights section?
12	MR. ADAMS: Yes, I think he was fifteen
13	years ago.
14	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay.
15	MR. ADAMS: Maybe 14, 16. But I wasn't
16	there. I can't tell you exactly when.
17	MR. BLACKWOOD: To what section was he
18	assigned during the election?
19	MR. ADAMS: At the time?
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: Yes.
21	MR. ADAMS: Okay. He is currently the
22	Housing Chief in the housing section, Housing and
23	Civil Enforcement, which has, of course, nothing to do
24	with voting, and has been in housing for a long time.
25	But I don't know exactly when he started.

1	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. Now the incident
2	you mentioned about the throwing of the memorandum,
3	were you there?
4	MR. ADAMS: I was not but, as I said, if
5	Mr. Coates were allowed to comply with the subpoena
6	and if Mr. Popper was sitting in this chair right now,
7	I have absolute certainty that they would say this,
8	and it's not hearsay that Mr. Coates and Mr. Popper
9	told me this. It's hearsay what happened. But it's
10	not hearsay that I was told this.
11	MR. BLACKWOOD: During this period from
12	May 1st when the case got extended until May 15th when
13	the response is due to the court, did you become aware
14	that the appellate section was asked to review the
15	case as well?
16	MR. ADAMS: Well, that's one of the
17	questions that will deal with something involving the
18	deliberative process that I'll not answer.
19	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. Before you, you
20	should have Exhibit C which is another document that
21	we received through our investigation, which purports
22	to be an email from Diana Flynn, also includes
23	supporting information from Marie McElderry. Do you
24	know who those individuals are?
25	MR. ADAMS: Diana Flynn is currently, as

1	far as I know, the Chief of the Appellate section. I
2	don't know who the other person is.
3	MR. BLACKWOOD: Do you know whether Diana
4	Flynn is a career employee?
5	MR. ADAMS: Yes.
6	MR. BLACKWOOD: In that memorandum it
7	states at the beginning of numbered paragraph one, and
8	this is from the Appellate section
9	MR. ADAMS: Can I interrupt you?
10	MR. BLACKWOOD: Yes.
11	MR. ADAMS: The answer to my last question
12	simply said whether I knew she was a career employee.
13	MR. BLACKWOOD: Yes.
14	MR. ADAMS: That I do know whether or not
15	she is and the answer is, yes, she is a career
16	employee.
17	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay.
18	MR. ADAMS: I've read too many
19	depositions.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: All right. Going back to
21	Exhibit C, which purports to be a memorandum, an
22	email, from the Appellate section. Ms. Flynn
23	indicates "We can make a reasonable argument in favor
24	of default relief against all defendants and probably
25	should given the unusual procedural situation."

_	During that time between may ist and may istn, did you
2	become aware of the opinion of the Appellate section?
3	MR. ADAMS: I have seen this document
4	before.
5	MR. BLACKWOOD: All right. But at that
6	time did you were you aware of it?
7	MR. ADAMS: Yes.
8	MR. BLACKWOOD: At that point then, you
9	have the trial team, Mr. Coates, Mr. Popper, yourself,
LO	and Mr. Fisher, and also now Diana Flynn and Marie
L1	McElderry. All six are career employees and all six
L2	say the case should go forward. Is that correct?
L3	MR. ADAMS: I won't dispute that.
L4	MR. BLACKWOOD: Is it unusual to have six
L5	career employees overruled like that?
L6	MR. ADAMS: Well, if you listen to the
L7	press accounts from the Bush Administration, you think
L8	it happened every day. But it really didn't. It is
L9	unusual.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: Have you ever heard of the
21	Appellate section reviewing a case that was in a
22	default procedure or a default status?
23	MR. ADAMS: In my experience, no. And I'm
24	quite confident, if Christopher Coates was sitting in
25	this chair and were able to comply with the subpoena,

The will tell you the same thing. And he's been there
since 1996.
MR. BLACKWOOD: Was there any indication
that anyone higher up than Loretta King or Steve
Rosenbaum was making the decision to override the six
career attorneys who said the case should go forward?
MR. ADAMS: None that I had any indication
of.
MR. BLACKWOOD: When you were told, or the
trial team was told, to dismiss the claims as to three
of the defendants, was any reason given?
MR. ADAMS: Well, I mean, listen. You had
Assistant Attorney General Perez come and tell you
what he told you in his testimony here. And, as I
indicated, those were not unfamiliar arguments to me.
MR. BLACKWOOD: As of today, you're not in
the or don't feel free to testify exactly what you
were told at that time.
MR. ADAMS: I will not.
MR. BLACKWOOD: During this process that
went on between May 1st and May 15th, were there
emails that you saw, documents back and forth,
discussing the merits of the case?
MR. ADAMS: Well, that gets back into
things I won't testify about.

1	MR. BLACKWOOD: I'm not asking about the
2	substance. But is there a paper trail out there?
3	MR. ADAMS: There is a there are large
4	volumes of documents about this case.
5	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. You don't have
6	those documents. Is that correct?
7	MR. ADAMS: No, sir.
8	MR. BLACKWOOD: They're back with the
9	Department. Is that right?
LO	MR. ADAMS: Or wherever else they might
L1	be. You know, they may be at the Assistant's office.
L2	I have no I mean, they're mostly electronic. I
L3	mean, we reduced everything. The Department has this
L4	wonderful software package called Summation where we
L5	crank everything into Summation so it can be text
L6	searchable.
L7	Now there was a lot of video, obviously,
L8	if you look on the web. And those don't lend
L9	themselves to Summation quite as easily. But,
20	nonetheless, everything was converted to electronic
21	because, when you go to trial, you want to have
22	everything electronic. And you might as well do it at
23	the very beginning.
24	There's no sense in saying a month before
25	trial "Let's convert everything electronically." We

1	were cranking things electronic as we got it.
2	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. So that would
3	include This electronic database, if you will,
4	would have not only the information about the
5	substance of the case but also the communications back
6	and forth between the trial team and higher ups.
7	MR. ADAMS: Probably, but I'm not sure
8	about the latter part of your question. About the
9	communications, I'm just not sure. Those will be
10	electronic but maybe not in that database.
11	MR. BLACKWOOD: During the decision making
12	process about the <u>Panther</u> case, did you hear that
13	anyone at the Department was consulting with any
14	outside groups such as the NAACP Legal Defense Fund?
15	MR. ADAMS: Well, I did, but we were also
16	consulting with outside groups. We visited the
17	Southern Poverty Law Center. We visited the Anti-
18	Defamation League and would have probably hired them
19	as an expert in this case if it had gone forward.
20	Because, of course, the Black Panthers, they're a
21	militant, anti-Semitic group. They're not just black
22	nationalists. They hate Jews. And the ADL has an
23	extensive database on this organization.
24	MR. BLACKWOOD: But the Your
25	communications with the ADL and the Southern Poverty

	Law Center, I assume, were related to the substance of
2	the case.
3	MR. ADAMS: That's correct.
4	MR. BLACKWOOD: Do you know whether
5	anybody was consulting as to whether to proceed on the
6	merits of the case with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund?
7	MR. ADAMS: Well, listen. This is not
8	firsthand. But I was told by section management that
9	NAACP members or staffers were talking with a voting
10	section attorney in March of 2009 and asking, "When is
11	this case going to get dismissed which, of course, is
12	interesting to hear for the first time that someone's
13	even thinking about dismissing the case that you're in
14	the middle of building. And that was It seemed
15	strange. But it didn't really give me much pause
16	other than to think that's a really strange request.
17	MR. BLACKWOOD: Well, all press reports
18	indicated a conversation between Kristen Clarke of the
19	Legal Defense Fund and a Laura Coates of the
20	Department. Who is Laura Coates?
21	MR. ADAMS: She is a line attorney in the
22	voting section, no relation to Christopher Coates.
23	MR. BLACKWOOD: And, according to the
24	press reports, Laura Coates reported this contact,
25	this conversation, with Kristen Clarke of the NAACP

1	Legal Defense Fund "to her superiors." Do you know
2	whether that occurred?
3	MR. ADAMS: I do. And, if Mr. Coates were
4	able to comply with his subpoena and testify under
5	oath, I'm quite confident that he would be able to
6	share the full details of those communications as
7	conveyed to him.
8	MR. BLACKWOOD: But you're not in the
9	position to do that.
10	MR. ADAMS: Other than they existed and
11	you accurately and that I characterized them as a
12	request as to when the case was going to be dismissed
13	as conveyed to me by Mr. Coates.
14	MR. BLACKWOOD: After the decision is made
15	And let me back up for a second about the merits of
16	the case or what happens the Department orders the
17	trial team to dismiss the case as to three of the
18	defendants. Correct?
19	MR. ADAMS: That's correct.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: That's Jerry
21	MR. ADAMS: That's in the public
22	pleadings.
23	MR. BLACKWOOD: Right.
24	MR. ADAMS: That's what happened.
25	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. And also the
	NEAL R. GROSS

	Injunctive refrer that was sought was decreased from
2	what was sought in the complaint to the ultimate
3	relief that was sought.
4	MR. ADAMS: I won't dispute that.
5	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. And those are
6	direct orders from Steve Rosenbaum and Loretta King?
7	MR. ADAMS: Those are direct orders from
8	Christopher Coates to me on May 15th to prepare those
9	pleadings. And, as I said, if Mr. Coates were allowed
10	to testify about what the orders were, he would be
11	able to corroborate what I'm telling you today.
12	MR. BLACKWOOD: Did he indicate who he
13	received the orders from?
14	MR. ADAMS: Well, he put the phone down
15	and said what the orders were and I seemed to recall
16	it came from Rosenbaum. But I might be wrong. But
17	Coates would be able to answer that question.
18	MR. BLACKWOOD: Something you just
19	mentioned struck me. You were told that on May 15th,
20	the day that the filings were due?
21	MR. ADAMS: A couple hours before they
22	were due.
23	MR. BLACKWOOD: Isn't that slightly
24	unusual to have direction like that on a case of this
25	magnitude, to get the decision the same day that the

pleading was due?

MR. ADAMS: I'll differ slightly. The Department frequently has tight deadlines. There is so much litigation going on, litigation I would be doing. And at this time period Rosenbaum was reviewing absolutely everything that Coates was doing, everything. And so he had a heavy workload because he was essentially acting in large status as the chief of the Voting section in place of Coates. So I can understand that Mr. Rosenbaum was probably backed up.

MR. BLACKWOOD: All right. What you just mentioned, that Mr. Rosenbaum was monitoring Mr. Coates, when did that begin?

MR. ADAMS: After the Inauguration and Mr. Rosenbaum moved into that position. If Mr. Coates were here to comply with the subpoena, I'm quite sure he would tell you all about that particular development.

MR. BLACKWOOD: All right. So it wasn't just the <u>Black Panther</u> case that precipitated this dispute or being reviewed. It was shortly after the election that Mr. Rosenbaum was overseeing Mr. Coates -- how do you put it -- rather closely or excessively closely?

MR. ADAMS: That's the gentle way.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay.
2	MR. ADAMS: Yes.
3	MR. BLACKWOOD: Literally every piece of
4	paper issued?
5	MR. ADAMS: Every single paper that would
6	go to court would have to be reviewed by Mr.
7	Rosenbaum, which was a departure from the previous
8	eight years, at least, the previous four years in my
9	personal experience. No front office in my mind would
10	have ever had the time to do that sort of thing, but
11	they found it.
12	MR. BLACKWOOD: After the dismissal of the
13	Black Panther case on May 15th or, I won't say
14	dismissal of the case, but dismissal as to three, the
15	reduction of the injunctive relief sought, did Mr.
16	Coates' position worsen?
17	MR. ADAMS: Of course.
18	MR. BLACKWOOD: Tell us how.
19	MR. ADAMS: He was, as I write in my
20	Pajamas video piece, all of his power was slowly
21	sucked away. He couldn't make decisions about to whom
22	to assign a case. He couldn't make decisions about
23	who would review a case, which deputy. He had a very
24	difficult existence after the dismissal of the <u>Black</u>
25	Panther case and I'm quite certain that, if he were

allowed to comply with his subpoena, he would fully inform the Commission of what happened.

MR. BLACKWOOD: Just so I'm clear, it's almost like a two-step process. After the

Inauguration, Steve Rosenbaum also steps up the monitoring of Mr. Coates. Every piece of paper and litigation has to be reviewed by him. And then after the Black Panther case dismissal, all of a sudden,

his duties start to disappear as well.

MR. ADAMS: Yes. And it's far more extensive than this and I'm not going to fully get into it. I'm not going to speak for Mr. Coates. But as someone who admired his 30 some career years in Voting Rights, it obviously was disappointing to see, because nobody knew this area of the law better than Mr. Coates except perhaps the current Chief, whose results are also very good.

And so Mr. Coates had a very difficult time. And I'm sure he would testify about precisely why he thinks this was happening if he were allowed to testify.

MR. BLACKWOOD: Certainly within the Department and the line attorneys, there must have been some explanation that was circulating as to why this was happening to Mr. Coates.

NEAL R. GROSS

	MR. ADAMS: Well, I don't I can't
2	quantify that. I mean there's always talk in an
3	office, so
4	MR. BLACKWOOD: How about your duties?
5	Did they change after the dismissal?
6	MR. ADAMS: Not so much. I was litigating
7	a great case for the benefit of African Americans in
8	Florida called <u>United States v. Lake Park</u> , which is a
9	redistricting case or vote dilution case under Section
10	2 in the Southern District of Florida. And I had a
11	wonderful summer litigating that case after the Black
12	Panther dismissal, you know, getting ready for
13	depositions, investigations, settlement negotiations,
14	throughout the fall. So I had a very good time
15	working on other matters.
16	MR. BLACKWOOD: Other than the <u>Ike Brown</u>
17	case and the <u>Black Panther</u> case, all your other cases
18	dealt with protecting minority rights. Is that
19	correct?
20	MR. ADAMS: That's correct. I brought
21	cases to protect Hispanic voters, language-minority
22	voters. I brought cases in <u>United States v.</u>
23	Georgetown County, which is a school board down
24	therethat the county is almost 40 percent African
25	American and no school board members were getting

1	elected. We sued Georgetown County.
2	I've done election coverages all over the
3	country for the benefit of African Americans.
4	<u>United States v. Lake Park</u> was another
5	case to benefit African Americans who were over 40
6	percent of the population of Lake Park and had never
7	elected a candidate since 1923 when the town was
8	founded. And we brought that case and settled that
9	case also.
LO	MR. BLACKWOOD: During this time
L1	initially, Loretta King and Steve Rosenbaum are
L2	serving in acting positions. Correct? I mean as
L3	acting
L4	MR. ADAMS: Under the Vacancy Reform Act,
L5	they were serving in acting positions.
L6	MR. BLACKWOOD: At what point did somebody
L7	actually step into it, a political appointee step in
L8	full-time step into the position of supervisor?
L9	MR. ADAMS: I don't know exactly when.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: Roughly when?
21	MR. ADAMS: Fall.
22	MR. BLACKWOOD: And who became that? Took
23	that position?
24	MR. ADAMS: It was Assistant Attorney
25	General Perez, I think, was confirmed in the fall. So
	NEAL R. GROSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	that would have replaced Loretta King.
2	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. How about Steve
3	Rosenbaum?
4	MR. ADAMS: That's harder for me to pick.
5	I mean, maybe July, August, September, October a new
6	DAAG was appointed, Julie Fernandes.
7	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. And DAAG is what?
8	MR. ADAMS: Deputy Assistant Attorney
9	General.
10	MR. BLACKWOOD: So she serves under Perez.
11	MR. ADAMS: That's correct.
12	MR. BLACKWOOD: On January 4, 2010, there
13	was a going-away party for Christopher Coates,
14	correct?
15	MR. ADAMS: That's correct.
16	MR. BLACKWOOD: Were you there?
17	MR. ADAMS: I was.
18	MR. BLACKWOOD: Who else was there? I
19	mean, by that, any supervisors?
20	MR. ADAMS: Yes. Assistant Attorney
21	General Perez was there and DAAG Fernandes was also in
22	attendance. I should note, though, that before Coates
23	and I'm sure you're going to ask about his going-
24	away speech before he got to his going-away speech
25	Assistant Attorney General Perez had to catch a plane.

Coates was about to deliver the speech in front of 2 both of those individuals. 3 4 MR. BLACKWOOD: Well, I do have some 5 questions about his speech. My understanding is that 6 he talked about the two voting rights cases that were 7 brought by the Department involving black defendants and he indicated that he had been criticized by those 8 9 within the Department. And he had been, correct? 10 MR. ADAMS: I have a long list here that 11 I'd like to get to about this very matter of many, 12 matters where there was hostility expressed 13 toward a race-neutral enforcement of law. But you're 14 summarizing one of them. 15 Okay. Then we'll get to MR. BLACKWOOD: 16 that in just a second. So the public can follow 17 along, he did mention two specific cases involving 18 cases in which the defendant was black and the victims 19 were white, first the Black Panther case and then 20 called what's the Ike Brown in Noxubee, case 21 Mississippi. 22 that, let me read excerpt an 23 something that was released as allegedly a paraphrase 24 of Mr. Coates' statement on his going-away party and 25 ask if you can confirm whether it was said or not.

So he left the room. But it tells you that Mr.

1	"Selective enforcement of the law including the Voting
2	Rights Act on the basis of race is just not fair and
3	does not achieve justice. I have had many discussions
4	concerning these cases. And one of my discussions
5	concerning the <u>Ike Brown</u> case, I had a lawyer say he
6	was opposed to our filing such suits. When I asked
7	why, he said that only when he could go to
8	Mississippi, perhaps 50 years from now, and find no
9	disparities between the socioeconomic levels of black
10	and white residents might he support such a suit. But
11	until that day, he did not think that we should be
12	filing voting rights cases against blacks or on behalf
13	of white voters." Did you hear that statement?
14	MR. ADAMS: Yes, I did. And there's more.
15	MR. BLACKWOOD: Well, in your experience
16	at the Department, have you had similar statements
17	from have you heard similar statements from
18	attorneys about a reluctance to pursue voting rights
19	cases in which the defendants are black or the victims
20	are white?
21	MR. ADAMS: Over and over again.
22	MR. BLACKWOOD: I sense that you Well,
23	since you just mentioned a list, why don't you tell us
24	about it?

MR. ADAMS: Okay. Mr. Coates was told

that particular instance on or around when they were doing coverage in Noxubee in 2003. If Mr. Coates were here, he could tell you about this firsthand. But it was conveyed to me by Mr. Coates.

In the 45 years since the Voting Rights Act was passed in 1965, the Department has brought hundreds and I believe hundreds of cases to protect African Americans, language, minorities and so forth. There are only two cases that the Department has brought to protect white voters and have African-American defendants. One was the New Black Panther case and one was U.S. v. Ike Brown. Those two cases provide the illustrations that I'm going to go through to make sure that all of these particular instances are out in the record and as to why I came to the conclusion in the my article that this is open and pervasive.

For example, and this is one of many, an attorney told Mr. Coates after the <u>U.S. v. Ike Brown</u> case was filed. He came to Mr. Coates and attorneys, people, refused to work on the case. They literally said, "I'm not going to work on that case." I refuse to work on that case.

MR. BLACKWOOD: How can that happen? And as a supervisor he had to accept that?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. ADAMS: This is how the Civil Rights division is. Listen. The Housing section won't even have an office picnic because the word "picnic" is viewed offensive. Okay. This is the Civil Rights division. Anybody who's been there can tell you this, and anyone who's there now knows this is the truth. You just work around it. You work around it.

So, anyhow, this person comes to Mr. Coates and he says, "I'm not going to work on the case because I didn't join the Voting section to sue black people." So this happened right after the case was filed. People refused to work on the matter.

One of the most compelling examples of this hostility, and I'll get to more conversations in a second, is how the Department refuses to enforce Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act on behalf of white victims. Section 5 is the preclearance provision. It's sort of technical. I understand. But it's what allows the Department to block implementation of voting changes, a very important part of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

But I will guarantee you, in 45 years of this law's existence, not only has there never been an objection on behalf of a white victim, but there hasn't even been the analysis. They don't analyze

NEAL R. GROSS

this. It isn't done. There's hostility toward even opening up that can of worms.

And I'd like to submit for the record this submission. It just came in. This is from Noxubee County, Mississippi, the place where Ike Brown was found to have discriminated against the rights of white voters in 2007. This submission is asking the Department to approve Mr. Brown's right to block voters from voting. That's what this submission is, based on their ideology whether they've supported Republicans.

Now the Federal Court in Mississippi found that that particular behavior was indicative of racial intent, an illegal racial intent, and found in favor of the United States. Well, right now, we'll know by July 14th of this year whether or not what I'm saying is accurate about the Department, because this submission should be objected to. The Department should take the ruling in the <u>U.S. v. Brown</u> case and lodge an objection to this.

But I'll bet you that's not what's going to happen. And everyone's going to be able to see that they're not going to object to something they should be objecting to.

They have a couple of options. They could

NEAL R. GROSS

preclear it. That would be an embarrassment because the Federal Court already found that it violated the law. They could ask for more information under the statute, but that's a delaying tactic that would only give them until September 14th to decide.

They could do what's called a no determination letter, which is essentially a copout saying "Well, the Federal Court stripped you of power to run the election" which they did because he was so bad. "So you can't make this submission right now until you're back in charge." He's still going to have these rules in place in Mississippi after he's back in charge. So the no determination letter would be a copout.

Another copout would be a Section 2 case or an offensive attack in Federal District Court against Ike Brown for this submission. That would be to go to the judge with all those higher standards of proof of preponderance of the evidence and a Federal judge. And all those other risks that are involved with going to court in a Section 2 matter, if that Department chooses that, it will be more evidence they are unwilling to lodge an objection under Section 5 to this submission simply because it's white victims.

Now how do I know that they're not going

NEAL R. GROSS

1	to do this? Because I've talked to the victims in the
2	last week. I've called the people in Noxubee,
3	Mississippi and I've said to them, "Has the Department
4	been calling you like they always do when a Section 5
5	submission comes in, the minorities in the area?"
6	"No, we haven't heard a word." "You're kidding me,
7	right?" They haven't called about this submission
8	which targets them because the Department doesn't want
9	to use Section 5 to protect white voters.
10	And we will know by July 14th whether or
11	not they have lodged an objection to this particular
12	submission. My guess is they'll either say no
13	determination or they'll try to go to Federal District
14	Court, which of course both are copouts because of the
15	risk involved in Federal Court, the higher standards.
16	Mississippi has a whole bunch of loyalty
17	oath litigation that also complicates the issue that I
18	won't discuss here. But it's a loyalty oath and it's
19	a racially-based loyalty oath that the Department
20	could object to tomorrow but won't.
21	MR. BOLEN: Can we submit that?
22	MR. BLACKWOOD: Yes. For the record,
23	Chair?
24	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: It's accepted.
25	MR. BOLEN: Thank you.

1 MR. BLACKWOOD: Are there any more items on the list that you --2 Oh yes. There's plenty. 3 MR. ADAMS: MR. BLACKWOOD: This is the time. 4 5 MR. ADAMS: Okay. At one meeting with the 6 chiefs of the Civil Rights Division, including the 7 Chief of the Criminal Section, Mark Kappelhoff, and other various leaders of the division, Mr. Kappelhoff 8 made a statement where many people were present that 9 -- it talked about the U.S. v. Ike Brown case, and he 10 11 said, "That's the case that has gotten us into so many 12 problems with civil rights groups." 13 Coates complained to the Acting Mr. 14 Assistant Attorney General Grace Chung Becker, and 15 said that that's a totally inappropriate statement. 16 It is my understanding -- and if Mr. Coates were here 17 to testify, to comply with the subpoena, he would tell 18 you that Mr. Kappelhoff was told that in no uncertain 19 should we be criticizing cases Department has decided to bring, and, in fact, in this 20 21 case won. 22 But it shows you that, not only are people 23 in the Department hostile to the case but, for reasons 24 I can't even begin to explain, so is the civil rights

community. It is a very short-sighted view.

Now, there's more. In 2003, when the Department first started monitoring the behavior in Mississippi -- in <u>U.S. v. Ike Brown</u> we do election coverage -- a deputy named Robert Kengle, who is the Voting Section Deputy, told Mr. Coates while they were going down traveling, I think at the airport or near it, he said, "Can you believe we are being sent down to Mississippi to help a bunch of white people?"

Again, Mr. Coates, if he were allowed to comply with the subpoena, would tell you this and tell you more. Other people told me in the section when I was assigned to the case that -- they came and visited and they echoed the statements that you made earlier that, until blacks and whites achieved economic parity in Mississippi, we had no business This obviously bringing this case. was discouraging, to hear that, you know, people didn't want to pursue a case that you were on.

There's more, and it goes to the J memoranda process in the <u>U.S. v. Ike Brown</u> case, and this is very, very important to understand, because there's other witnesses to this, too.

Mr. Coates prepared, in 2003, a

J memoranda -- a memorandum about the Noxubee case.

He included an extensive discussion as to why a civil

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

case should be brought against Ike Brown in Mississippi and why it was very good to bring a civil case.

The Chief of the Voting Section at that time was a man named Joe Rich. Joe Rich forwarded a recommendation to closely monitor the situation, not omitted sue, closely monitor, and all of the discussion that Mr. Coates made about why a civil lawsuit was the best course of action. He also kept if Mr. Coates' name on the recommendation. And, you'll recall, we talked about how that is a violation of how you do things.

The front office found out about this surreptitious removal of the recommendation and exploded on Mr. Rich. Mr. Rich will not be able to deny under oath that he was scolded for this behavior and admitted that he did it. The recommendation was then repackaged and resubmitted with Mr. Coates' original recommendation for civil litigation included, But this is another and the case was approved. example of the hostility from the very inception of the U.S. v. Ike Brown case that was pervasive and open.

An employee who worked on the case of United States/Brown -- versus Ike Brown, worked very

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

hard and very dedicated, and he is a minority. He was relentlessly harassed by Voting Section staff for his willingness as a minority to work on the case of United States v. Ike Brown.

Nobody will be able to deny under oath that this occurred, and Mr. Coates, if he were allowed comply with his subpoena, would describe harassment of this employee that resulted in investigation, an employment investigation, of individuals involved, and I believe, although I am not sure, a reprimand of the individuals involved. be written documents about this incident racial harassment of an employee a dedicated -department employee who is working on this case.

Others assigned to the case were harassed in other ways, such as being badgered and baited about their evangelical religious views or their political beliefs. In these instances, the victimized employee was openly assumed to espouse various political positions hostile to civil rights, simply because he worked on this case.

In one instance I had in the presence of other employees, I had to report to Mr. Coates that such harassment was being directed at me, too. There was an aggressive campaign in the media to discredit

NEAL R. GROSS

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 case of <u>United States v. Ike Brown</u>, often quoting former Voting Section attorneys.

There was outrage that was pervasive that the laws would be used against the original beneficiaries of the civil rights laws. Some people said, "We don't have the resources to do this. We should be spending our money elsewhere." And that was how they would cloak some of these arguments.

Another deputy in the section said in the presence of Mr. Coates, "I know that Ike Brown is crooked, and everybody knows that, but the resources of the division should not be used in this way."

To deny that there was open hostility in the Voting Section in regards to the <u>U.S. v. Ike Brown</u> case, and towards the staff who brought the case, to me is the same as denying that we are all sitting here in this room today.

There was nothing more plain to me and others working on the case, but we persisted and we won. If you had the time to bring every single person who served in the section before this Commission, and if they testified truthfully, little doubt would remain whether or not open hostility exists towards race-neutral and equal enforcement of the voting laws, particularly in the case of <u>United States v. Ike</u>

1 But it won't even take the whole section; just Brown. 2 let Mr. Coates testify. 3 MR. BLACKWOOD: Could I ask you, was there 4 ever a rationale given to you that you heard that 5 explained what the opposition to race-neutral 6 enforcement of the law was? 7 There was many rationales, and MR. ADAMS: I discussed this in my Pajamas Media piece. There is 8 Let me just highlight one I didn't get to 9 a couple. 10 yet. 11 I had a visit once from an attorney who 12 said, "You know what? There has never been official 13 discrimination against white people in Mississippi," 14 which is of course true. There is no question about 15 that. But that doesn't mean you don't enforce the law 16 equally. 17 And I was told that it's -- essentially it 18 was called Senate Factor One. Voting attorneys will 19 recognize the argument that, in the absence 20 official discrimination, you shouldn't be pursuing 21 these cases. And, of course, this is incredibly 22 offensive to me, and I just persisted. But, you know, 23 they have their arguments, and that's how it goes. 24 MR. BLACKWOOD: Are there any other items

on your list?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, there are. On the day that the Black Panther case -- or, excuse me, the day after the election -- it would be November 5, 2008 -- I heard discussions in the hallways throughout the Voting Section, or actually in the Housing Section -- I'm on the far frontier.

The Housing and Voting, believe it or not, are together, on the same floor. I'm on the edge, though, and I could hear discussions about what a joke it was. I heard things such as, "No big deal, the Black Panthers." Or it was a media-generated event, which of course if you remember back to the '60s that is what the old SEGs used to say whenever The New York Times was in town. This was just the media that was causing all of this trouble. Fox News.

The irony is, of course, that Housing is where Rosenbaum was. These were his employees. And, you know, I had visits saying there's lots of issues with that case. I reported all of these comments to Mr. Coates and to Robert Popper. And if they were allowed to testify, they would -- they once again would tell the truth about what was happening inside the section.

I was shocked that there was skepticism about the Black Panther case, and it deeply troubled

NEAL R. GROSS

2 to let our colleagues know about how bad these guys were was something that this Commission did. 3 We got the National Geographic video where 4 5 the Black Panthers are calling for the murder of white babies in their cribs, which I understand you showed 6 7 here, and calling for the murders of white people, to show the section. We thought, my goodness gracious, 8 fair-minded people will soften their hearts -- will 9 10 soften their hearts after they see these things. 11 I was not there the day the video played, but I'm told it did not exactly attract a large crowd. 12 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: 13 Could I interrupt 14 just to let the record reflect that the individual on 15 the New Black Panther tape who was urging AfricanAmericans to kill white babies was one of the 16 17 defendants. 18 MR. BLACKWOOD: King Samir Shabazz. 19 MR. ADAMS: That's correct. He was the 20 defendant urging -- and Jerry Jackson was right there 21 with him at this particular event when he said it. 22 It became perfectly clear to me that not 23 only was there open hostility toward equal enforcement in a colorblind way of the voting rights laws, but 24 25 instructions were given in this regard.

the people on the team. So what we did in an effort

1	was told by voting section management
2	that cases are not going to be brought against black
3	defendants for the benefit of white victims, that if
4	somebody wanted to bring these cases it was up to the
5	U.S. Attorney, but the Civil Rights Division wasn't
6	going to be bringing it. If Mr. Coates were allowed
7	to testify and tell the truth, then you would hear
8	that these instructions were given.
9	MR. BLACKWOOD: That is extremely
10	important these instructions. Were you there when
11	they were given?
12	MR. ADAMS: I was I was present at one
13	instance when the statement was made, and Mr. Coates
14	gave me a recollection of a second time that
15	instructions were given in a management situation.
16	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. The first time,
17	when you were present, who made the statement?
18	MR. ADAMS: Okay. Two things. The
19	statement was that we were in the business of doing
20	traditional civil rights work, and, of course,
21	everybody knows what that means, and helping
22	minorities helping litigating on their behalf.
23	That statement was made by Julie
24	Fernandes, who is the DAAG. The statement that Mr.
25	Coates that was conveyed to me about the U.S.

	Actorney would have to do these cases, because we
2	weren't going to do them, was also the same
3	individual, Julie Fernandes, as told to me.
4	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. Any other comments?
5	MR. ADAMS: That's all.
6	MR. BLACKWOOD: You mentioned Ms.
7	Fernandes. There is a press report also that, in
8	front of the entire Voting Section, all of the career
9	staff, she explicitly told them that this
10	administration would not be enforcing Section 8 of the
11	National Voter Registration Act. Were you there, and
12	did
13	MR. ADAMS: I was there
14	MR. BLACKWOOD: she say that?
15	MR. ADAMS: I was there for that, and it
16	I can tell you more about that.
17	MR. BLACKWOOD: Would you please? And
18	also explain what Section 8 of the
19	MR. ADAMS: Okay.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: NVRA is.
21	MR. ADAMS: Motor Voter everybody knows
22	Motor Voter has a number of provisions. One, for
23	example, Section 7 is that welfare offices have to
24	give out voter application forms. That's Section 7.
25	Section 8 is a general obligation to do

1	list maintenance. In other words, no dead people can
2	be on the voter rolls, no duplicates, people who have
3	moved away. They have to be taken off the rolls.
4	Okay? So they kind of work hand in hand. You want to
5	have everybody registered to vote, but you don't want
6	to have ineligible people registered to vote. It's a
7	partnership.
8	Section 8 is the ineligible part, and a
9	meeting of the entire Voting Section was assembled to
10	discuss NVRA 8. This occurred in November of 2009.
11	Deputy Assistant Attorney General Julie
12	Fernandes, when asked about Section 8, said, "We have
13	no interest in enforcing this provision of the law.
14	It has nothing to do with increasing turnout, and we
15	are just not going to do it."
16	Everybody in the Voting Section heard her
17	say this. Mr. Coates heard her say it. If he were
18	allowed to comply with the subpoena, he would testify
19	to the exact same thing.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: And you heard it as well,
21	though.
22	MR. ADAMS: Absolutely. I was shocked.
23	It was lawlessness.
24	MR. BLACKWOOD: Are there any other
25	similar type instructions that you can

MR. ADAMS: No.

MR. BLACKWOOD: -- tell us about? There is one argument that you mentioned that was raised about resources, and very quickly I will read you part of what purportedly was what Mr. Coates said at his going-away party and ask if you can confirm that this was his statement.

"Some who criticized the two cases" -- and that's Ike Brown and the Black Panthers -- "about which I speak claim that they are not opposed to protecting the rights of white voters, but question using the resources of the Voting Section in that manner. I question the validity of that criticism.

"Given the number of cases that the Voting Rights -- the Voting Section has filed during the past 40 years on behalf of racial minorities, I do not understand why a mere two cases on behalf of white voters would have raised the ire of most of the critics of the Ike Brown and New Black Panther Party cases to the level that has been observed.

"Those critics are not motivated primarily by resource concerns, but, rather, in my opinion, by a strongly held but erroneous view that the work of the Civil Rights Division and its enforcement of the VRA should be limited to protecting racial, ethnic, and

NEAL R. GROSS

_	Tanguage minority voters.
2	"The resource issue is a red herring
3	raised by those who want to continue to enforce the
4	Voting Rights Act in a racially-biased fashion, and to
5	turn a blind eye whenever incidents arise that
6	indicate that minority persons have acted improperly
7	in voting matters."
8	First, did he say something along these
9	lines?
10	MR. ADAMS: Yes, he did, in front of the
11	whole section and in front of Deputy Assistant
12	Attorney General Julie Fernandes, and he thought that
13	Tom Perez was also going to be there for that message.
14	MR. BLACKWOOD: What was the reaction to
15	these statements?
16	MR. ADAMS: What was my reaction?
17	MR. BLACKWOOD: No. What was the
18	reaction? Or, first, your reaction?
19	MR. ADAMS: Well, of course, I have lived
20	that for the last five years. So it was
21	MR. BLACKWOOD: You feel he was accurate.
22	MR. ADAMS: There's no question about it.
23	I mean, as I said, that's as plain as the fact that
24	we are all sitting in this room. I have lived it. I
25	know that's the truth. And, if he were here to

1	testify, he would tell you that's the truth.
2	MR. BLACKWOOD: Was there any comment that
3	you picked up as far as the rest of the section, what
4	their reaction was?
5	MR. ADAMS: It was very uncomfortable for
6	a lot of people because, when you have the courage to
7	call people out for lawlessness, they don't like to
8	hear it.
9	MR. BLACKWOOD: After the Commission began
10	its investigation, were you asked to help produce the
11	evidence and review what had occurred?
12	MR. ADAMS: I'm not going to answer that
13	question. I'm sorry. That I mean, that gets into
14	that gets into them judging what the extent of
15	their privilege was, which arguably is an internal
16	deliberation on a privilege matter that I'm not going
17	to answer.
18	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. I'm not asking
19	about the substance. I'm just asking, were you part
20	of it?
21	MR. ADAMS: But deployment of resources is
22	part of it, and I'm just not going to answer that
23	question.
24	MR. BOLEN: And I'm objecting officially
25	for that purpose.

1 MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. You have indicated 2 publicly, though, that you met with Mr. Perez before 3 he testified before the Commission, is that correct? 4 MR. ADAMS: That is correct. 5 MR. BLACKWOOD: Tell us about that, please. 6 7 I held out hope. MR. ADAMS: I think Tom Perez is a good man, I really do. We might disagree 8 on how to get certain things done. We might have 9 10 different views. But I have always sensed that he is 11 a good person. I can't say that for everybody I have 12 met in this, but with Tom Perez I can. 13 And I held out hope that a good person, 14 like I thought he was, and still do, would have 15 changed their mind if only we had an opportunity to 16 warn him that the testimony he might give would be 17 I have not said that he inaccurate. 18 falsely. I have not said that he lied. I think that 19 he believes in some measure what he is saying. 20 But Mr. Coates and I and Popper went and 21 met with him the day before he testified here for 22 about an hour, and we laid out all of our arguments 23 and begged him not to testify inaccurately about the 24 case.

MR. BLACKWOOD: Just so it's clear -- and

2	last day or so you are just saying that he is
3	inaccurate. Is that correct?
4	MR. ADAMS: Yes, I have never accused him
5	of lying. Those are those are inaccurate news
6	reports. I have accused him of testifying
7	inaccurately, because I really believe he is a good
8	man. I really believe that, if anybody can clean this
9	mess up, who would be acceptable to this
10	administration, he is the guy to do it.
11	MR. BLACKWOOD: Now, you said Mr. Coates
12	was there as well. Was he brought back specifically
13	to meet with
14	MR. ADAMS: No.
15	MR. BLACKWOOD: Mr. Perez?
16	MR. ADAMS: He called in by phone.
17	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. Why did you resign?
18	MR. ADAMS: Well, as I said I believe in
19	one of my articles, I was placed and as I said in
20	the opening, I was placed in a position where there
21	was a clear federal law on point that required
22	cooperation with the lawful subpoena of this
23	Commission, where I was being instructed, I believe
24	illegally, to dodge the subpoena.
25	Also, the testimony that was given to this

I believe you have issued a statement recently, in the

1	Commission, I continue to believe, was inaccurate by
2	Mr. Perez, and I resigned.
3	MR. BLACKWOOD: Did you resign as a direct
4	result of his testimony?
5	MR. ADAMS: If he had not testified the
6	way he did, there is some chance I would not have
7	resigned.
8	MR. BLACKWOOD: There are press reports,
9	basically leaks, about you saying that you are
10	"disgruntled" to your conservative activists. Can you
11	address those?
12	MR. ADAMS: Well, I was just promoted two
13	weeks before I resigned, so I am certainly not
14	disgruntled.
15	Let me take up the second point. My
16	personal views about things never had anything to do
17	with what I did at the Voting Section. You mentioned
18	being conservative. I think that's pretty simplistic
19	and juvenile for people to say that.
20	For example, did the fact that I wanted my
21	taxes lowered have anything to do with what I did in
22	the Voting Section? Of course not. Did the fact that
23	I agree with the Supreme Court in Lawrence v. Texas
24	when it struck down restrictions on sodomy laws, when
25	it allowed gay people to live in freedom, the fact

that I agreed with that, did that affect my work? Never.

But there is one personal belief that affected my work, and that was my deep and abiding respect of the 14th and 15th Amendments. There are no amendments to the Constitution that were gotten with such cost.

I mean, think about this. Two percent of the American population died to get those amendments, to ensure racial equality. That would be the same as Cleveland, Indianapolis, and Denver today just vanishing in some struggle. So we got racial equality enshrined as the Constitutional principle at such enormous cost in this country.

And so it affected me profoundly. That was a personal belief that every single day when I came to work meant a great deal to me. And so all those other things didn't, but this one did.

MR. BLACKWOOD: Now, one of the things that we were told -- by that I mean the Commission -- as far back as September 2009, that the Department couldn't cooperate in our investigation, because the matter was being investigated by the Department -- or by the Department's Office of Professional Responsibility.

1	MR. BOLEN: I'm sorry. I'm going to
2	object to any questions in reference to the Office of
3	Professional Responsibility.
4	MR. BLACKWOOD: My only
5	MR. BOLEN: This is an ongoing
6	investigation.
7	MR. BLACKWOOD: My only question is: were
8	you ever interviewed?
9	MR. ADAMS: I'm not going to answer that.
10	MR. BLACKWOOD: I believe there was a
11	press report where you indicated that you were only
12	interviewed a week before you resigned?
13	MR. ADAMS: I never said anything like
14	that.
15	MR. BLACKWOOD: Okay. One of the matters
16	that has been raised in the press about the
17	Commission, about this investigation, is that other
18	cases were not pursued, and specifically a matter
19	involving, in 2006, an incident in Pima, Arizona.
20	Were you ever involved in a case involving an incident
21	in Pima, Arizona, with regard to armed individuals
22	challenging witnesses I mean, challenging voters?
23	MR. ADAMS: I had no involvement with
24	that.
25	MR. BLACKWOOD: I have no further

Mr.

1 questions. 2 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Thank you. At this point, we will have questions from 3 each of the Commissioners. As I said earlier, we will 4 5 have two rounds. Each Commissioner will have five 6 Ordinarily, Ι would start minutes. 7 questioning, but I am going to swap positions with Commissioner Gaziano. So, Commissioner Gaziano? 8 9 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Thank you, 10 Chairman, and thank you very much --11 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Now, before you I just wanted to make sure that we had 12 start -- okay. someone on the clock. I will add -- I will add some 13 14 time for my interruption. 15 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Thank you very much 16 also, Mr. Adams. 17 18

And if another round permits, I would like to explain further just how grateful I am that you are trying to thread this very difficult that you have between maybe Scylla Charybdis, your legal obligation to come forward and comply with our subpoena, and what I think are the bogus but still threatening claims that the Department may have if you stray.

And I would like to explain that to the public and, again, why I think that is still very

NEAL R. GROSS

19

20

21

22

23

24

courageous that you are able to do so. But I need to drill down on some of these matters you have already set forth.

First, with regard to -- let me just -- you have probably read Perez's testimony and my questioning of him. But just for the record, let me very briefly go through a few of the questions I asked him.

I mentioned news reports about the pervasive culture that we read within the division that many senior lawyers, supervising attorneys, and others, believed that civil rights law should not be enforced in a race-neutral manner, and should never be enforced against blacks or other national minorities.

And I asked him whether, when he came into the division, since he was in charge of the transition for the division, that he was certainly aware of these -- for the entire Department he was in charge of the transition -- what steps he took to investigate those -- that culture of the division he was inheriting, and he refused to say, which I -- that he did any investigation, which I -- except to say that he didn't believe anyone in his division had those views. denial took that to be а that he did any investigation.

NEAL R. GROSS

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	I asked him about other press reports at
2	the time the New Black our investigation began and
3	members of Congress, whether he that The Washington
4	Times, for example, said the motive for dismissal was
5	this caustic view that the civil rights laws should
6	never be enforced against blacks and other minorities.
7	I asked him whether he took any steps to
8	investigate that. He did not. I asked him about
9	Coates' statement. I said, "Coates, your Voting
10	Section Chief, resigned and gave a statement that he
11	thought that was an improper did you ever talk to
12	Coates?" He denied he did that.
13	And then I asked him what he would do if
14	others in his division had such views. And so it is
15	particularly important to me to ask about these Julie
16	Fernandes statements, because Julie Fernandes is it
17	his principal deputy, his most senior deputy, or is
18	she just one of his deputies?
19	MR. ADAMS: I don't know the answer to
20	that. She you could look on the website. She is
21	the deputy over Voting, so that's all that mattered to
22	me.
23	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. This
24	statement that Coates told you about where she
25	essentially gave an instruction, as I understand your

testimony, and I have heard it from one other source, Julie Fernandes, the Deputy Assistant Attorney General under the Obama administration, said that the Voting Section will never or will not, at least while she is there, bring any more cases against blacks or other national minorities. Is that essentially what you heard?

MR. ADAMS: Well, it is. It is what I heard. But bear in mind what I talked about in the U.S. v. Ike Brown Section 5 submission where, even if they did bring a case in the next couple of weeks, it would be inadequate given the power they have to object to that racially discriminatory submission as it stands right out of Washington. They don't need to go to Jackson to do it.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I understand. I am going -- at some point in our investigation, I am going to not only re-urge that we try to press the Department to allow us to hear from Chris Coates. I am going to ask that we seek a subpoena for Julie Fernandes as well.

But it -- based on what you've heard about that incident, she supposedly said, "Well, it may be brought by U.S. Attorneys, but not by the Civil Rights Division."

NEAL R. GROSS

2	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Is that I mean,
3	that is pretty shocking to me. Do U.S. Attorneys have
4	the expertise to bring voter intimidation or other
5	MR. ADAMS: I mean, voter intimidation is
6	so simple they could probably do that. But Section 2
7	cases, absolutely not. It is one of the most complex
8	areas of law, bar none, maybe antitrust, but either
9	that or Section 2.
10	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes. Even if Obama
11	administration U.S. Attorneys are going to bring this,
12	it still it is still troubling to me that Julie
13	Fernandes would issue this edict. Who else was
14	present at the meeting besides Coates?
15	MR. ADAMS: You would have to ask Coates.
16	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Last
17	question, Commissioner Gaziano. You can follow up
18	during the second round.
19	Commissioner Kirsanow.
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr.
21	Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Adams. Your testimony is
22	easily, I would think, the most extraordinary I have
23	heard in the nine years I have been on this
24	Commission, and I would suspect that, in the 50-plus
25	years of the existence of this Commission, it ranks

MR. ADAMS: Yes.

way up there.

We have gotten considerable resistance from the Department of Justice regarding our requests for information. The same resistance was experienced by Congressman Smith and Congressman Wolf. And, but for your resignation, I suspect that we wouldn't have even gotten close to the testimony, or the evidence adduced in your testimony, today.

I've just got some summary questions to ask. Most of them I think are susceptible of yes or no answers. To the extent they implicate any privileges, let me know.

Based on your testimony, to what extent can Americans rest assured that the Voting Rights Section or the Civil Rights Division will extend equal protection or equal treatment to all voters in terms of their prosecution of the Voting Rights Act?

MR. ADAMS: Well, to what extent is the big mystery. Let's hope that they object to the <u>U.S.</u>

<u>v. Ike Brown</u> -- the Ike Brown submission next week.

They probably won't, because they don't believe Section 5 applies to white voters, if they are victimized.

Let's hope they don't just try to sue and cop out and stop what he is trying to do. Let's hope

NEAL R. GROSS

they object.

We will know more about the answer to your question after July 14th. If they do anything other than object, clearly they will be announcing for everyone to hear what they think about your question.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: As you sit here today, do you feel confident that Americans can be confident that they will be extended equal protection or equal treatment by the section?

MR. ADAMS: If the Department objects to the Ike Brown submission, I will begin to change my mind about their attitude. If they do anything other than object, I will not change my mind.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Taking the obverse of the New Black Panther Party case, if a member of the Ku Klux Klan or the National White People's Party or the Nazi Party, Aryan Nations, was stationed outside a polling place with full respective regalia — Klan outfit, Nazi Party outfit, carrying a baton, shouting racial epithets, and making threats — would you consider that to be something that is an 11(b) violation?

MR. ADAMS: Okay. I don't want to err by not hearing one of your facts. But, as I understand your question, it was the Klan out in front of a

NEAL R. GROSS

1 polling place, "in front" I assume meaning at 2 entrance, shouting racial epithets. Did they have a 3 weapon in your fact pattern? I'm sorry. 4 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Baton similar to 5 that carried by the --There's absolutely no question 6 MR. ADAMS: 7 about that. I mean, to brandish a weapon, which a nightstick is, the Department on many cases involving 8 criminal matters viewed a nightstick as a deadly 9 10 weapon. There is case law in that regard. 11 To have a deadly weapon like a nightstick 12 in front of a polling place in Klan -- I mean, 13 everyone here knows the answer to that question. 14 don't even need to ask it. It is just reality. 15 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right. I'm going 16 to ask you a series of questions that I think may be 17 susceptible of inaccurate, false, incorrect, however 18 you want to respond. I understand it is your position 19 that no one in this particular case has lied -- that is, had an intent to deceive or mislead. 20 21 But, based on some of the testimony we 22 have heard thus far prior to your testimony, I would 23 like to ask you the following set of questions. career attorneys, rather than administration political 24

appointees, make the decision to dismiss the New Black

1 Panther case? 2 Oh, I see where you are -- in MR. ADAMS: my mind, and I think in the minds of anyone who fairly 3 reads 4 the Vacancy Reform Act with credibility, 5 political appointees made the decision. 6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. Was the 7 totality of law and facts such that it dictated dismissal in this case? 8 9 That's one I won't answer. MR. ADAMS: 10 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. Is this a 11 case that would subject DOJ attorneys to Section --12 I'm sorry, Rule 11 sanctions? 13 I -- that is one of the most MR. ADAMS: 14 outlandish things I have heard throughout this whole 15 affair, that we were in violation of Rule 11. And it is personally offensive, because it is not true. 16 17 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Is it accurate or 18 inaccurate to say that this case could not meet the 19 allegedly high standard required under Section 11(b)? 20 Look, someone could file this MR. ADAMS: 21 case tomorrow. One of these victims could go out and 22 It would be an enormous embarrassment to 23 the Department if that happens, and I hope it doesn't

happen, because I hope the Department refiles this

case.

24

1	They would win this case if a private
2	plaintiff brought it. I believe that they would
3	ultimately win this case, only because the Panthers
4	won't show up again, or they won't as I understand
5	it, they weren't even cooperative here. And so,
6	assuming they even show up on the merits, they are
7	going to have a very difficult time losing this case
8	from the plaintiff's perspective.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Is it common or
10	unusual for DOJ to dismiss a case that it's
11	essentially already prevailed upon on default?
12	MR. ADAMS: Chris Coates is someone who
13	you should talk to, because his institutional
14	experience goes back further than mine, and you have
15	plenty of other former DOJ people.
16	I think Mr. Katsas testified I may be
17	wrong that this is unprecedented.
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr.
19	Chairman.
20	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you.
21	Commissioner Taylor.
22	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr.
23	Chairman.
24	Mr. Adams, I wanted to talk to you about
25	this culture issue within the division, and also about

83 the mechanics of the default order or default But before I ask you those questions, it struck me as -- "unfortunate" is too soft a term -that you were placed in this position where you were forced to resign. You know, you receive a subpoena, you want to comply. I mean, in your own words, why did you feel compelled to resign? Well, the law still governs this country, and there is a federal law that says that you all have the power to issue the subpoenas,

and that federal agencies must comply, and personally received a subpoena. And I have learned in law I was school that, when you subpoenaed, you have to comply, or you go through the judicial process to extinguish the subpoena, which my attorney begged the Department to do. "Please file a motion to quash this subpoena. We will not oppose it. We will be happy as a lark if that happens."

There are some comical blogs that said that I was fighting to testify. That is not true.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Were you told that they would not enforce the subpoena?

MR. ADAMS: Oh, yes. Oh, yeah. That was the reason that I need not comply, because they had no intention of enforcing it.

NEAL R. GROSS

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 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Let me turn to this 2 culture question. You talked about this culture being 3 open, pervasive, bordering on a policy in terms of the 4 lack of neutral application of the law. And I 5 understand this pertains to white victims. Ι 6 understand this pertains to not prosecuting blacks 7 that violate the law and seek to prevent others from voting or intimidate others. 8 9 Did you hear a discussion of the refusal 10 to protect black victims in this regard? Because one 11 of the overlooked facts --12 MR. ADAMS: Yes. 13 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- pertains to a 14 poll-watcher --15 MR. ADAMS: Yes. 16 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- who was African 17 And we had testimony from Chris Hill, who American. 18 is a lawyer there onsite in Philadelphia, and he 19 talked about seeing the Black Panthers walking in to 20 find the Republican poll-watcher, and finding an older 21 African American cowered in the corner, who told that 22 there would be hell to pay if he stepped outside. 23 Those same folks who refuse to protect folks 24 white victims, those same who refuse to

prosecute blacks, do they also refuse to protect black

victims in that context?

MR. ADAMS: Yes. This goes -- this also goes to the <u>U.S. v. Ike Brown</u> case. In Noxubee, we had black victims there, individuals who got visits from notaries who cast their ballots for them. They denied them the right to vote as part of this illegal scheme to harvest votes.

We had a witness at trial in Noxubee say that he -- she was harassed by the defendant, and she said, "Don't you dare come around here telling me how to vote here in Mississippi, how I ought to be voting." This was a black lady. You know, "How dare you, in this place, come and intimidate me into this."

There were black victims over and over and over again in these cases. That is something that is lost on the civil rights groups who oppose these cases. It's tragic, because it's -- the people they purportedly protect are being harmed and losing their right to vote.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Let me talk to you, if I could for a moment, my last few minutes, about the mechanics. We have our timeline here, and you all filed your complaint, they failed to respond, and our timeline indicates that a default order was entered. Now, that is not a default judgment. It's an order of

NEAL R. GROSS

default. Correct? 1 2 That's right. That's right. MR. ADAMS: 3 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It is important that 4 folks understand this difference, because a default 5 judgment can require some type of proffer 6 discussion in open court. 7 And, going back to the Rule 11 question, as an officer of the court, you are required to be 8 truthful and honest and forthright to the court. 9 10 in the context of an adversarial proceeding, even in 11 an instance where the other side does not appear, you are still required to be truthful and honest in order 12 to have a default judgment in those cases entered. 13 14 Were you prepared if the Judge had said to 15 "Mr. Adams" -- you were a member of the trial you, 16 Were you prepared to present evidence team, I assume. 17 to the Judge to support your request? 18 MR. ADAMS: I think the answer is obvious, 19 but I don't want to give it. I will tell you that any 20 plaintiff who brings this case will not have a very 21 difficult time in a similar posture to 22 evidence. 23

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Well, let me ask you the question another way, because you signed the initial complaint, as did Grace Chung Becker, as did

NEAL R. GROSS

24

1 Mr. Coates, and Mr. Popper's name is on it as well. 2 The allegations in the complaint, they are what they 3 Had the court said to you, "Provide evidence to 4 support the allegations in the complaint you filed, " 5 could you have done that? 6 MR. ADAMS: Yes. Let me backtrack. Ι 7 wasn't saying I wasn't going to answer the last question because I didn't --8 9 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. 10 MR. ADAMS: -- know the answer. 11 saying because I am afraid that it could tread on 12 deliberative process. 13 I assure you, based on my experience with 14 the attorneys involved who are the best 15 business, the best -- Chris Coates is the best, Popper 16 is brilliant, he is like a professor. I hope he comes 17 here sometime. There is no doubt what we would have 18 done if we had proceeded. We're good attorneys, and 19 you prepare. 20 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you. 21 Commissioner Heriot? 22 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Well, first, I want 23 to say that I agree with Commissioner Kirsanow that 24 what you have been testifying to is quite

extraordinary, and I think by way of --

1 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Excuse me. 2 Commissioner Heriot, do you have your mic on? 3 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Do I? 4 going to resist the temptation to ask you about what 5 the Housing Section has against picnics. 6 (Laughter.) 7 But Commissioner Taylor started on a road that I would like to at least touch on. I'm not sure 8 9 whether this is going to be a question that you can 10 answer or not. But, as Commissioner Taylor has been 11 saying, this case went into default, and it 12 certainly true that courts do not always -- do not 13 always simply enter a judgment upon default. 14 require some proof. 15 But Mr. Perez told Congress, I believe, 16 that -- that -- he put it in such a way that it made 17 it sound like a default was actually an obstacle. 18 Just for the record here, if you can tell us, it's a 19 it, for plaintiffs thing, isn't 20 defendant goes into default, when the defendant fails 21 to appear? 22 MR. ADAMS: It's a beautiful thing. 23 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It usually makes 24 your job much, much easier, does it not? 25 The only thing that makes it MR. ADAMS:

easier than having a default is when there is actually 1 2 video. 3 (Laughter.) 4 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Gosh, was there 5 video in this case? 6 MR. ADAMS: Yeah, there was that, too. 7 Yes, yes. COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I heard about that, too. Well, let's look -- let me go into 8 9 some of the nuts and bolts here, and that is Mr. 10 Mr. Jackson, I am told, was actually a poll-11 watcher himself, right? Certified, I guess, by the 12 Democratic Party? 13 Mr. Jackson was indeed -- he MR. ADAMS: 14 is not only a poll-watcher, he is a Democratic Party 15 elected official in the city of Philadelphia, the Tall 16 Black Panther. He is an Executive Committeeman in 17 that particular precinct. He wasn't on the ballot 18 that day, I should note, though. 19 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okav. Okav. 20 police, I believe, when they came and told the -- Mr. 21 Shabazz, the one with the billy club, that he had to 22 vacate the premises, they let Mr. Jackson stay. 23 the fact that Mr. Jackson was a poll-watcher have any 24 bearing on his liability?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. ADAMS:

No.

25

Ι

Thank heavens, no.

1	mean, otherwise, you would appoint as poll-watchers
2	the biggest and baddest thugs you have and give them
3	credentials to roam about the community, nor does the
4	fact that the police let him stay have anything to do
5	with it.
6	The Federal Government has never taken the
7	position, and hopefully never will, that local law
8	enforcement officials can opine on matters of federal
9	law. We have entirely different laws that we enforce.
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay.
11	MR. ADAMS: And the Philadelphia police
12	don't enforce federal voting right statutes.
13	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: So you don't have to
14	defer to the Philadelphia police.
15	MR. ADAMS: Of course not.
16	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. Just want
17	that for the record.
18	MR. ADAMS: Yeah.
19	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And I would think,
20	if anything, the fact that Mr. Jackson was a poll-
21	watcher might even raise the standard of care we would
22	expect from him, wouldn't it?
23	MR. ADAMS: Well, you know what? I don't
24	want to add or subtract elements from the statute. It
25	was so clear you know, the statute is what it is,

1 and I don't think we need to add requirements. That 2 is just my personal view. COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Well, you think that 3 4 he gets training, and, therefore, at least he knows 5 things. It makes it more difficult for him to say, "I 6 didn't understand this." 7 MR. ADAMS: Fair enough. COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. 8 What about 9 the -- I'm skipping around here, because my colleagues 10 have already asked you a number of the questions that 11 I wanted to ask you. But one issue that interested me was the ultimate injunction that was -- well, first, 12 13 the injunction that was asked for, and then the rather 14 severe reduction in that injunction. What was 15 originally asked for? Well, if 16 MR. ADAMS: you read the 17 complaint, I believe it asks for an injunction against 18 all of the parties. I don't know whether it says 19 "nationwide" in the complaint. I can't remember. 20 it clearly asks for an injunction against all 21 parties. 22 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And what was in fact 23 obtained? 24 MR. ADAMS: Well, the what was 25 obtained, as I recall, was an injunction against King

1	Samir
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Only.
3	MR. ADAMS: only to not have a weapon a
4	certain distance, and I think it's through I think
5	it's 100 feet. And it expires in 2012.
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And if I'm
7	MR. ADAMS: And it's for Philadelphia.
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Not for the suburbs,
9	right?
10	MR. ADAMS: That's correct.
11	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: So it would be
12	perfectly legal for him to take a weapon to the polls
13	in the suburbs?
14	MR. ADAMS: Well, my position is it's not
15	perfectly legal for him to do this anywhere, so, I
16	mean, that just would have to be another case.
17	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. Within the
18	scope of the injunction.
19	MR. ADAMS: That's correct.
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. I was told
21	that
22	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Last question.
23	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. I was told
24	that someone at the Department of Justice has recently
25	alleged that it was the trial team that wanted to

shrink the injunction down to that tiny little "can't show up in the city of Philadelphia with a weapon."

Any truth to that?

MR. ADAMS: I would hope that Mr. Coates has the opportunity to answer that question. I know the truth.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. I just have a few questions for you. My colleagues and the General Counsel have done a good job of teasing out the information that we need.

mentioned that there was black attorney at DOJ who was willing to work on voting rights cases, and instances involving black also indicated that defendants. And you this individual was harassed. Do you believe that his willingness to work on these types of cases adversely -- will adversely affect his career advancement at the Department of Justice?

MR. ADAMS: Just to be clear, I didn't testify he was an attorney. I testified he worked on the cases. There's a difference. Whether or not it will affect his advancement I can only speculate, and I suspect after the attention that has now been given to this outrageous behavior directed toward him, it

NEAL R. GROSS

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 will not impair his advancement opportunities, as I 2 have confidence that good people will not allow it to interfere. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you. Also, 5 you testified as to an exchange where profanity was used where there was a tossing of paper. Could you 6 7 elaborate on that? Well, this is something, of 8 MR. ADAMS: course, that Mr. Coates would be the best person to 9 10 elaborate fully in front of the Commission about. 11 it was some time during one of these discussions where he was outraged about the lack of good faith and the 12 lack of due diligence, the duplicity, that was going 13 14 on, and he used the profanity and threw the materials 15 at the individual who had professed to have not read 16 them. 17 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. So he has 18 essentially gone to his superior --19 ADAMS: That's correct. superiors who he does this to. 20 21 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. So he goes 22 to his superior. He learns during this exchange that 23 an important decision is being made, and in this case it is the decision to withdraw charges against three 24 25 of the four defendants, and during this meeting he

Τ	learns that this individual had not read the J memo.
2	MR. ADAMS: That is correct.
3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you.
4	The remainder of my time, Commissioner
5	Gaziano?
6	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. Let me go
7	back to I will follow up on that. I have a few
8	other questions about that, but let me go back to the
9	two Julie Fernandes statements. I know they are not
10	they are only symptomatic of the culture that you
11	have spoken of, but I want to try to nail down the
12	time.
13	With regard to the instruction that
14	Fernandes gave to the management of the Voting Section
15	that no cases will be brought in the, you know, Obama
16	administration while she is there against blacks or
17	other minorities, about what time period was that
18	statement made?
19	MR. ADAMS: I would have to say some time
20	between September of '09 and December of '09.
21	Precisely when it was, I can't tell you.
22	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: So that is after
23	Congressmen Wolf and Lamar Smith began to investigate
24	this Black Panther suit, after we opened our
25	investigation, which I can tell you was June 16th was

1	our first letter to the Department. So it was some
2	months after that that Julie Fernandes made this
3	statement.
4	MR. ADAMS: I don't even think she worked
5	there in June of '09.
6	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. And when was
7	the other statement that you mentioned that you were
8	present for where she said, "We are going to only
9	handle traditional civil rights"?
10	MR. ADAMS: It would have been in the same
11	general time period.
12	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay.
13	MR. ADAMS: She was doing brown bag
14	lunches. That's when all of these outrageous
15	statements were made.
16	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay.
17	MR. ADAMS: Well, not all, but these
18	particular ones.
19	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: And the other motor
20	voter statement
21	MR. ADAMS: November 30, 2009.
22	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: November 30th.
23	MR. ADAMS: I'm pretty sure that is
24	accurate.
25	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. And let me
	NEAL D. CDOSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	now go back to the incident where Christopher Coates
2	threw the J memo. Was Perez aware of that incident
3	when he testified before us?
4	MR. ADAMS: I have no idea.
5	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: One of my
6	MR. ADAMS: Wait.
7	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: sources said
8	MR. ADAMS: Wait, wait.
9	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: that during your
10	meeting with him
11	MR. ADAMS: Yeah.
12	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: the day before
13	the hearing, Chris Coates related that story to him.
14	MR. ADAMS: Chris Coates related a lot
15	during that meeting. Whether or not he related that
16	he threw the J memo, I cannot recall.
17	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Did he relate to
18	Assistant Attorney General Perez that Rosenbaum had
19	not read the J memo?
20	MR. ADAMS: Again, I think he did, but I
21	just don't remember for sure.
22	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. What else
23	did you relate to Perez that in one of your
24	articles you say that you told Perez that, if he
25	testified that the facts and law did not support the

	Claim, that would be inaccurate.
2	MR. ADAMS: Correct.
3	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: And he did keep
4	repeating that line to us. I want to know what his
5	knowledge base was at the time he testified, because
6	it certainly seems to me, if he was aware of all of
7	the facts that you are telling us, that he gave very
8	incomplete testimony at best, and maybe misleading
9	testimony. That is for us to decide. I'm not asking
10	you to characterize that.
11	But I just want to know, what was the
12	nature of the information you provided you, Coates,
13	Popper, provided to Perez the day before he testified?
14	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Last question.
15	MR. ADAMS: I would characterize it as a
16	comprehensive review of the merits of the case.
17	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. This
18	concludes the first round. We start off a second,
19	and, Commissioner Gaziano, you are in the lead-off
20	position.
21	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. Well, thank
22	you. I think I get an extra, but I'll but I'll
23	yield to other Commissioners first.
24	Let me just go back to these other
25	statements regarding the culture at the time. Do you

Τ	know if anyone, after Coates' statement it was
2	January, early January 2010, that he made the
3	statement at his farewell reception regarding this
4	culture that the General Counsel read a portion of, do
5	you know if there was any investigation by anyone in
6	the division of whether there was any truth to Chris
7	Coates' statement?
8	MR. ADAMS: I was never asked. Whether or
9	not there was an investigation broadly, I can't
10	answer.
11	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. Who else do
12	you think we should subpoena to learn the facts of
13	this case?
14	MR. ADAMS: Listen, there is a whole lot
15	of attorneys who have left the Department over the
16	last couple of years that know this is the truth.
17	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: But who let's
18	start with who is there now.
19	MR. ADAMS: Okay.
20	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: What people what
21	people from Holder, Perrelli, and in the division
22	MR. ADAMS: Well, I
23	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: who should we
24	who would give us valuable information?
25	MR. ADAMS: I don't know. I mean, I

1	haven't had broad discussions with people. You all
2	are going to have to figure out how to do this
3	investigation. I can't help you with your
4	investigation other than to comply with your subpoena
5	and answer questions truthfully.
6	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: And you have been
7	very helpful, but let me just let me mention a few.
8	Popper do you think that we should that Popper
9	would be able to give valuable testimony?
10	MR. ADAMS: If Bob is I haven't turned
11	around for a while. If Bob is sitting behind me, I'll
12	say no, because he will club me in the back of the
13	head. But if he isn't, there is no doubt that Bob
14	knows about this case. There is no question that Bob
15	knows about this case.
16	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. Former
17	Associate Attorney General that's the number three
18	post in the Department Greg Katsas was just talking
19	about the normal procedures for this kind of a case,
20	and he testified that it was it would be a very
21	remarkable matter. It would actually make news to
22	dismiss a case, especially one that you had that
23	was on default.
24	He said that decision could not possibly
25	be made at the division level, even if there was a

Τ	confirmed head, that that kind of decision would have
2	to be made at the Associate Attorney General level or
3	higher. Do you have any reason to know whether that
4	is accurate or not?
5	MR. ADAMS: Very little, but some. On
6	some cases, I briefed the associate in my time at
7	Justice, not this particular associate but a previous
8	associate, on matters involving very important
9	matters, you know, ones that people need to know about
10	before something happens.
11	So it would not surprise me that, on
12	something like this, a similar briefing would occur,
13	but I have no personal knowledge of anything that
14	deals with briefing. We were just doing our job. I
15	mean, we were just line attorneys collecting evidence,
16	making phone calls, writing pleadings. So all of
17	these other issues are not my issues.
18	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Sure. But you did,
19	I think, answer, and I want to make sure I got it
20	right, that, in your knowledge, the Department has
21	never refused to pursue a default judgment.
22	MR. ADAMS: Well, in my knowledge, and if
23	Coates was here his knowledge goes back further, so
24	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. And I'm just
25	trying to get your general knowledge whether that

1	supports former Associate Attorney General Katsas that
2	it is unlikely that political acting officials, like
3	King and Rosenbaum, would have been able to make the
4	final call in the Department to dismiss the suit.
5	MR. ADAMS: My understanding is that
6	former Associate or Acting Associate and former
7	Assistant Attorney General Katsas gave testimony that
8	was consistent with your conclusion.
9	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Well, let me
10	since you did you have briefed the Associate
11	before. Their interrogatory answers from the
12	Department say that Perrelli, the current Associate
13	Attorney General, was briefed about the case and the
14	potential dismissal. It also said the Attorney
15	General was made generally aware. In your experience
16	in the Department, does the Attorney General and
17	Associate Attorney General have the authority to
18	express an opinion?
19	MR. ADAMS: I would hope so.
20	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: If they are being
21	briefed on a matter, can they ask for more information
22	if they want more information?
23	MR. ADAMS: I have been given a request
24	for more information from one of those offices you

named.

1	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. And those
2	offices are generally briefed about a matter, so that
3	they can take contrary action to the proposed they
4	can say, "Yes, your proposed action is okay," "No, I
5	don't want you to do that," they have the authority to
6	do that within the Department, don't they?
7	MR. ADAMS: I assume they do. But, again,
8	I'm a line attorney. I
9	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Last question.
10	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: That's fine. I'll
11	yield. Thank you.
12	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
13	Kirsanow.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr.
15	Chairman.
16	Mr. Adams, long-time civil rights attorney
17	Bartle Bull, who is a witness in this case, expressed
18	the opinion that this was the worst case of voter
19	intimidation he has seen in over 40 years. Do you
20	assess that do you concur with that assessment?
21	MR. ADAMS: Well, I haven't been around as
22	long as Bartle Bull has. He was in Mississippi in the
23	late '60s. He worked on Charles Evers' governor's
24	campaign. He was Jimmy Carter's campaign director.
25	He was Robert E Kennedy's He got a medal from the

Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights recently for his work.

He has been around a lot longer than me.

So I cannot corroborate his wisdom, because he has just seen more than I have. Nor would I disagree with it.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Vice Chair -- the Vice Chair, who is not here today, has a piece on National Review Online today, in which she makes light of the fact that there were only two Panthers involved in this case and describing this case as very small potatoes. Does the number of potential defendants have any bearing on whether or not 11(b) charges should be brought by the DOJ?

MR. ADAMS: It could have one defendant. It doesn't matter. If you break the law, you break the law. You know, if I might for a moment, the absent Commissioner is a friend of mine. And she wrote a book, which I highly recommend, called Voting Rights and Wrongs. I suggest that this Commission introduce portions of it into the record, because it is -- it corroborates much of what I am saying.

She has a whole section on page 124 called "A Lawless Civil Rights Division." She has descriptions how, on page 130, that the Civil Rights

NEAL R. GROSS

Division, from '93 to 2000, was forced to pay over \$4 million in attorneys fees and costs awarded against DOJ for filing frivolous and unwarranted discrimination cases in 10 lawsuits.

There is a whole lot more in her book that corroborates what I'm saying today, not specific facts, but the general culture. And, basically, from page 113 to 145, Commissioner Thernstrom, who is a friend, speaks about what I'm speaking about.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The Vice Chair also makes mention of the fact that these actions were allegedly performed in majority-black precincts. Should that have any bearing on whether or not 11(b) charges should be brought?

MR. ADAMS: Well, the relevance to whether they were performed in majority-black precincts shows up in a couple of different places. One, you won't want to be that 10 percent, in the minority, in that particular precinct with a Black Panther there. And that is exactly what it is, is 10 percent white in that precinct, according to my best estimates. It is probably plus or minus three.

So, yes, it has some relevance, but it shouldn't drive the question. The fact that it's a majority-black precinct in Philadelphia is a

NEAL R. GROSS

1	preposterous way to oppose going forward in this case.
2	It is saying, you know, the numbers are too slim.
3	You are only a few people, so you don't deserve
4	federal protection.
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The salient
6	timeframe for dismissal of this case was some time, I
7	believe, between April 29th of 2009 and May 15th.
8	April 29th, Mr. Rosenbaum expresses some doubts as to
9	whether or not this is a strong case, and then on May
LO	15th the trial team was ordered to dismiss a portion
11	of the charges and reduce the scope of the injunction.
L2	Are you aware of and I'm not asking for
L3	anything that is privileged or any detail, but are you
14	aware of whether or not any facts in the case changed
15	in that timeframe?
16	MR. ADAMS: What was your first date?
L7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: April 29th of 2009
18	through May 15th of 2009.
19	MR. ADAMS: No. No publicly-available
20	facts about the Black Panthers, about this event,
21	changed whatsoever.
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Did any aspect of
23	the law change? In other words, were there any
24	decisions rendered by any federal court that would
25	change the interpretation of 11(b) as applied to the

1	facts of this case?
2	MR. ADAMS: Nothing.
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: In that two-week
4	period, are you aware of any opinion, facts, evidence
5	introduced by any individual, group, branch, section,
6	of DOJ, that would affect the outcome of this
7	particular case?
8	MR. ADAMS: Well, you are asking me about
9	possible internal deliberations, and I won't answer
10	that question.
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. Getting
12	back to the description of this particular case as
13	very small potatoes, in your experience, would the New
14	Black Panther case be considered very small potatoes?
15	MR. ADAMS: Well, certainly not when you
16	if somebody were to get to the bottom of when this
17	really started, was it going on during the primaries
18	or not, that would become very big potatoes. But even
19	putting that issue aside, we in this country, I
20	believe, still recognize that the ballot box is
21	sacred, that there is something exceptional about this
22	nation that values the right to vote. We have shed so
23	much blood to get here.
24	And to excuse me, we have shed so much
25	blood to get here, and it has to be treated with

	absolute sanctity. And so it doesn't matter if it is
2	one person with a stick, or five people with a gun, or
3	a bunch of people in Philadelphia, Mississippi with a
4	deputy sheriff named Cecil Price working for him.
5	We have an ironclad obligation in this
6	nation to protect the right to vote, because so many
7	people died to get us here. And so I think the
8	argument that it was only one person doesn't matter,
9	because one person is the next person, and then more.
10	And, you know, we had evidence that this wasn't
11	necessarily just isolated.
12	So the idea that you wouldn't pursue this
13	because it was only one person is what an apologist
14	does, and that is what the SEGs did in the '60s.
15	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you.
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr.
17	Chair.
18	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: At this time,
19	Commissioner Taylor?
20	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr.
21	Chairman.
22	You have five years of experience in the
23	Voting Rights Section, correct?
24	MR. ADAMS: That's correct.
25	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: During that time
	NEAL D. GDOSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	period, was there any other instance in which the
2	division or the department, to your knowledge, walked
3	away from a default order and did not ask the court to
4	enter a default judgment for all of the relief
5	requested in the original complaint?
6	MR. ADAMS: No. In fairness, though, this
7	doesn't happen. The mere fact that there was a
8	default was an anomaly in this case, especially when
9	one of the parties had counsel, and one of the other
10	parties was an attorney.
11	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I want to follow up
12	on Commissioner Kirsanow's questions in terms of the
13	law not changing during the critical time period, and
14	the underlying facts of the case not changing. Once
15	the court entered its default order on April 17th, we
16	have our memo here from Diana Flynn dated May 13th,
17	were you aware of this memo's existence during this
18	time period?
19	MR. ADAMS: During this time period,
20	generally, yes.
21	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: You were aware of
22	it?
23	MR. ADAMS: Yes.
24	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Did you actually see
25	it?

1	MR. ADAMS: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So you were aware
3	that she said and this is Diana Flynn, who is in
4	the Appellate Section, sort of the second review, if
5	you will, of your work and whether or not you all
6	should proceed for a default judgment.
7	We have already brought the case and made
8	the allegations, and she says, "See the complaint.
9	And I assume that this reflects the division's policy
10	judgment that it is appropriate to seek such relief
11	after trial." She is talking about the relief
12	requested in the original complaint.
13	So the law hasn't changed, the facts have
14	not changed. The policy of the division is reflected
15	in the complaint in the relief sought. What changed?
16	MR. ADAMS: I can't answer that. I don't
17	know. I truly don't know.
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It is accurate to
19	say that the division's policy can be found in the
20	complaints it files, correct?
21	MR. ADAMS: Well
22	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So it's accurate to
23	say, as I read this complaint, that that articulates
24	the Department's policy

MR. ADAMS: That's a great point.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- at the time.

MR. ADAMS: That's a great point. In 2001, before the inauguration, the Department filed a case of the <u>United States v. Charleston County, South Carolina</u>. It was a redistricting case alleging that Charleston County had dilutive elections at large for districts -- or for County Council.

Chris Coates actually brought that case, That. before too. case filed the Bush was inauguration, with some concern that the Bush administration would reverse course and dismiss the Well, thankfully, the Bush administration took office and was absolutely committed to going forward with that case. And the Department won that case. Chris Coates won that case, along with some other very -- along with some other very able attorneys working on the case.

In hindsight, the fears that the case would be dismissed that were expressed by people in the Reno Justice Department proved not to be true, that the Bush -- the Ashcroft Justice Department did not dismiss that case and fought vigorously and won the case.

Fast forward. In this particular instance, based in some part on the Charleston

NEAL R. GROSS

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	precedent, you have a different outcome. So
2	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: That's all I have,
3	Mr. Chairman.
4	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
5	Heriot?
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. I guess I
7	just want to do some cleanup, since I am either the
8	last or second-to-the-last here, make sure that some
9	of the things that you have mentioned here that
10	we've gotten out everything.
11	You started to talk about attorneys who
12	are no longer with the Department who might
13	corroborate your view of the culture of the Voting
14	Section?
15	MR. ADAMS: That's correct.
16	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But I don't think
17	you ever got that out.
18	MR. ADAMS: Well, I said that there are,
19	and I would be happy to provide the names to your
20	counsel. But I am certainly not going to do that
21	until I have a chance to talk to them and make sure
22	they're okay with it.
23	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Well, then, I would
24	request that you do that.
25	MR. ADAMS: Okay.

_	COMMISSIONER HERIOI: ITIEM, you mentioned
2	a second ago and this is not the first time I think
3	you said we had evidence that this wasn't
4	necessarily just an isolated incident. Could you run
5	me by exactly the evidence you are talking about at
6	this point?
7	MR. ADAMS: Yes. Let me stress, evidence
8	was if I said "evidence" in the record, that is not
9	what I should have said. I said "indications."
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You said
11	"indications" the first time.
12	MR. ADAMS: Okay.
13	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But I think you
14	actually said "evidence" the second time, unless I
15	misheard you, but I understand what you mean. What
16	were these indications?
17	MR. ADAMS: Indications were accounts from
18	other parts of the country that this behavior may have
19	been going on prior to the general election, and may
20	have been going on in the primaries with Hillary
21	Clinton supporters as the victims.
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And where did the
23	accounts come from?
24	MR. ADAMS: Okay. Publicly-available
25	information was the basis of these particular

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	indications. I'm not saying that they
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Are you talking
3	about press reports, something on the internet?
4	MR. ADAMS: Yes. I'm not saying that they
5	carried a great deal of weight. I'm not saying that I
6	would have gone to trial on what was out there. What
7	I am saying is, is if we had time to fully investigate
8	it, we would have gotten to the bottom of it.
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Do you remember
10	exactly what kind of indications you are talking
11	about, or is this sort of
12	MR. ADAMS: Same sort of Nation of
13	Islam/New Black Panther thugs.
14	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Through their
15	websites?
16	MR. ADAMS: No, people at the polls.
17	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: People at the polls
18	said
19	MR. ADAMS: Correct.
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. People at the
21	polls saying that they had seen this?
22	MR. ADAMS: There is a group of Hillary
23	Clinton supporters I think they call themselves
24	Pumas. I don't know enough about it, but I and
25	there

1	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I bet it's not
2	Cougars. That wouldn't be the
3	(Laughter.)
4	MR. ADAMS: No. There are indications
5	that this was occurring in the primaries. Thankfully,
6	we still have a free press, I'm told, that maybe they
7	can look into this and get to the bottom of it,
8	because certainly it is not going to happen now.
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Is there anything
10	well, let me backtrack a little bit. I take it you
11	have looked at the publicly-available documents that
12	the Commission has produced so far and put into the
13	record, the testimony.
14	MR. ADAMS: I haven't.
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You have not looked
16	at any of
17	MR. ADAMS: I mean, some of them I have.
18	I mean
19	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You have looked at
20	some of the depositions?
21	MR. ADAMS: Yes. But, I mean, today I
22	looked at the Kristen Clarke deposition, because if
23	you want to talk about some problems about veracity,
24	that is where to start.
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. Well, let me

_	ask that question. I want to talk about some problems
2	that have to do with veracity. What is it about the
3	Kristen Clarke deposition that causes you to say that?
4	MR. ADAMS: Yes. In that deposition, it
5	is sort of like and Rich will kick me if I get this
6	wrong is it Peter denying Jesus three times? Yes.
7	Peter denies Jesus three times. Kristen Clarke
8	denies Chris Coates six.
9	And in those e-mails that go back and
LO	forth between Clarke and people inside the Department,
L1	they were very angry at CC CC. And Clarke denies
L2	in that deposition, I think six times, that she knows
L3	who CC is. They used to travel together. They worked
L4	with each other. It is perfectly apparent to anybody
L5	who knows the reality of what was going on in the
L6	Voting Section that that is not truthful testimony.
L7	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: How long did she
L8	work with Chris Coates?
L9	MR. ADAMS: Again, you are going to have
20	to have Chris Coates here and tell him.
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Is there anyone else
22	at the Department with the initials CC
23	MR. ADAMS: Negative.
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: that you can
25	think of?

1	MR. ADAMS: Nobody.
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. Anything else
3	in that deposition that caused you concern?
4	MR. ADAMS: Well, that's the one that
5	comes first to mind. I seem to remember something
6	else, but I oh, it may be the denial that she was
7	lobbying the Department. I mean, look, that is a
8	question of competing witnesses. What does one
9	witness say? What does Clarke say? I can't answer
10	that. You all are going to have to do that. I can't
11	do that.
12	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Do you have any
13	personal knowledge of this?
14	MR. ADAMS: Coates does.
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You do not, I take
16	it.
17	MR. ADAMS: Only what Coates told me.
18	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. Okay. What
19	did Coates tell you?
20	MR. ADAMS: That it was reported to him
21	that Kristen Clarke was talking to an attorney in the
22	Voting Section, and asking when the case was going to
23	be dismissed, well in advance of that timeline up
24	there.
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Did anyone else talk

1	to you about it?
2	MR. ADAMS: Perhaps Popper, but I don't
3	remember. Again, you need to call them up to tell
4	about it.
5	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. Any other
6	inaccuracies or questionable items that you have seen
7	in the record that we have created so far?
8	MR. ADAMS: Not that I have seen, no.
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay.
10	MR. ADAMS: That doesn't mean I reviewed
11	the whole record. I just
12	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, I understand
13	that. I understand. I think that's all I've got.
14	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Before I
15	start, I'd like to poll the Commissioners to see if
16	there is a need for a third round.
17	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I'd kind of like
18	one.
19	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay.
20	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: If possible.
21	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Sure. Okay. I
22	just have a few questions for you. We have
23	throughout our exchanges, and throughout your
24	testimony, you have mentioned Coates. It is obvious
25	that he is a very important witness. Shortly after

1	this controversy took place, he was transferred to
2	South Carolina. He is still on the payroll at the
3	Department of Justice?
4	MR. ADAMS: Yes, sir.
5	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: He is currently
6	working in South Carolina?
7	MR. ADAMS: Yes, sir.
8	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Are you aware that
9	the Commission's jurisdiction, in terms of its
10	subpoena power, does not go past 100 miles?
11	MR. ADAMS: I did not know that.
12	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Is there are you
13	aware of any information that would support the
14	proposition that that transfer took place in part to
15	put him beyond the reach of the Commission's subpoena
16	power?
17	MR. ADAMS: That would be a personnel
18	matter about Chris, and I would not be privy to that
19	sort of thing anyhow.
20	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Mr. Coates,
21	his the working environment during this
22	controversy, I imagine that things became difficult
23	for him at the Department of Justice.
24	MR. ADAMS: That's an understatement.
25	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. And this

1	atmosphere, the environment in which he worked during
2	this period, was that in part the cause for his
3	willingness to be transferred to South Carolina?
4	MR. ADAMS: Look, I don't want to speak
5	for him. He is a dear friend. He is under subpoena.
6	He can answer these questions directly to this
7	Commission.
8	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I understand.
9	Thank you.
10	Okay. Commissioner Gaziano.
11	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Sorry to keep you,
12	and perhaps others. You were asked by the General
13	Counsel whether you were personally involved in the
14	Pima County, Arizona suit, and you said that you were
15	not on that trial team. Am I accurate in thinking
16	that Coates would provide the best evidence of that?
17	MR. ADAMS: Coates will be aware about
18	he will be aware of that, I am quite sure.
19	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: There are some
20	others involved in this investigation, whose names
21	won't be mentioned, that pretend that we are not
22	interested in those other cases that have been raised.
23	But we this Commission has always been interested
24	in comparing the actions of the New Black Panther case
25	and any others.

	Perez mentioned three or four others in
2	his prepared testimony. We have heard others. There
3	is one in Mississippi in 2005; Orange County,
4	California; Grand Coteau, Louisiana, in 2006. Is it
5	fair to say that, you know, there were other were
6	you personally involved in any of those other cases?
7	MR. ADAMS: I was involved in none of
8	them.
9	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay.
10	MR. ADAMS: Coates, however, would be able
11	to answer questions about those cases.
12	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. I
13	desperately want more information from the Department.
14	It is absolutely central to our original
15	investigation, and the implication that we don't want
16	to compare apples to oranges, or apples to apples, as
17	the case may be, offends me. But thank you for
18	identifying another reason for the Department to allow
19	Coates to testify again to this Commission.
20	Finally, I want to end where I said I I
21	kind of wanted to begin, to explain you are not
22	testifying to matters that are deliberative. But
23	deliberative process is a subset of executive the
24	President's executive privilege.

And as we in the Commission have explained

to the Department time and time again, the Supreme Court in $\underline{U.S.}$ v. Reynolds says that executive privilege is not to be lightly invoked, but it must be personally invoked by the President or the Department head.

And we finally heard only the night before Perez testified that it has not been invoked. And, as far as I know, it hasn't been invoked to this point. And yet the Department's position is that, even though it has not invoked executive privilege, it can simply refuse to comply with the Commission's request. Is that the way it has been communicated to you, or do you have some other understanding of that -- of their position?

MR. ADAMS: My understanding of their position is they have not invoked executive privilege. My understanding of their position is that they have interpretations of deliberative process that seem to be inconsistent with previous interpretations by the Office of Legal Counsel inside the Justice Department. That is one of the reasons I am here today.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. Well, I again just -- thank you for being in this position. But I'm going to ask you one question that I asked Perez, but this is as a general lawyer, as any lawyer

NEAL R. GROSS

	who has just taken your about conflicts of
2	interest.
3	We have asked the Department to appoint a
4	special counsel. Since they have a conflict of
5	interest in enforcing subpoenas against the
6	Department, we have asked them to appoint, like you
7	did, to go to court we have asked for special
8	counsel to go to court, since we have a disagreement.
9	We think there is no excuse for them not
10	to follow the law unless the President invokes it.
11	They think they can do whatever they want. We have
12	asked them to appoint a special counsel to go to
13	court, and I asked Perez, and they said, "No, they
14	don't want to do so." I asked him, and I'll ask you,
15	do you know of any situation where the entity with the
16	conflict of interest gets to decide how to resolve the
17	conflict of interest?
18	MR. ADAMS: A federal district court judge
19	who has a motion for recusal in front of him. That's
20	one that comes to mind.
21	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Is there any non-
22	judicial official?
23	MR. ADAMS: Probably not. But, again, I
24	am not an oracle of all things of the world, so I
25	can't I can't answer that question conclusively.

1	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: But I just I
2	don't know if you want to comment note for the
3	record that we are in a similar position to you. We
4	either would have been happy to go to court with the
5	Department, or for them to comply with the law. But
6	the Department has chosen to do neither.
7	MR. ADAMS: No. Clearly, my attorneys
8	very much made it clear, contrary to, as I said, some
9	comic blogs, that I would have welcomed a motion to
LO	quash the subpoena. I would have been perfectly happy
L1	if that had been the outcome in regards to that
L2	subpoena.
L3	I would have let the court know that I
L4	have no objection to the motion to quash, but that
L5	never came.
L6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you.
L7	Commissioner Kirsanow.
L8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr.
L9	Chairman.
20	Mr. Adams, is it would it be fair to
21	say that one of the objectives of the Voting Rights
22	Act, 11(b) in particular, is not simply to address any
23	particular harm or grievance of an affected
24	individual, but also to act as a deterrent? That is,
25	the Department of Justice would bring a case to make

1 sure that this type of conduct didn't occur 2 repeated basis. Would that be fair? ADAMS: 3 MR. Unquestionably. You know, 4 especially given the sacred nature of what we're 5 talking about, the right to vote. No question. 6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And then, to what 7 extent, then, would the fact that we have this video that has been seen by millions of people have any 8 bearing on the Department's determination to dismiss 9 10 this case, or to bring it in the first case, but then 11 to dismiss it after some deliberation apparently? 12 MR. ADAMS: That is one of the saddest 13 parts of this whole story is, so many young people are 14 going to see, as I put it, we abetted wrongdoers and 15 law-abiding citizens. abandoned Those messages 16 percolate throughout a culture, and it is a tragedy 17 that that occurred. 18 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: In 2007, Attorney 19 General Mukasey, then-Attorney General Mukasey, issued 20 a memo issuing guidelines restricting communications with the White House -- with DOJ with the White House 21 22 in certain circumstances. Are you aware of who within 23 Justice, if anyone, would have communications with the 24 White House regarding any type of dismissal of the New 25 Black Panther case?

MR. ADAMS: I have very little familiarity with what are -- I call or other people call inside the Department "the Mukasey memos," in regards to those communications. I may have looked at them one time and thought, "Well, that won't apply to me. I'm not going to have those communications anyhow," so I moved on to other more important things. But I don't have -- I don't have a lot of familiarity with those memos.

KIRSANOW: COMMISSIONER And just an observation. You made mention of the fact that whether or not the Department of Justice disputes the submission that you presented into evidence would be an indication as to whether or not they are engaged in, or continue to engage in, equal treatment or equal protection of all individuals in the United States of America with respect to voting rights. Given your testimony today, I would be astonished if they didn't dispute it.

MR. ADAMS: Well, don't forget, they have options on how to dispute it. I made it clear that if they do anything other than object to the submission, they will be televising to anybody who knows this area of the law that they don't believe Section 5 applies to white victims.

NEAL R. GROSS

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	Now, they can go and do a more
2	determination or, excuse me, a more information
3	letter or a no determination letter. They could even
4	go back to the federal judge with all of the inherent
5	heightened risk of doing so to try to seek a stoppage
6	of what is going on here. But they don't want Section
7	5 to be used for white victims, so it is not going to
8	happen.
9	Now, if they do it, I am going to be
LO	thankful. I am going to write a thank-you note, you
L1	know, "Please do this more." But it's not going to
L2	happen. You can know July 14th look, they may go
L3	file something in district court, but every lawyer
L4	knows that that carries risks that sending a letter
L5	saying, "We object under Section 5" doesn't. And they
L6	won't do the Section 5 letter because they don't want
L7	to help white victims in Noxubee County, Mississippi.
L8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr.
L9	Adams.
20	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
22	Taylor.
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Just one question,
24	Mr. Chairman.
25	Mr. Adams, could you share with the

_	Commission the response what I have heard described
2	as the smearing of your good name in response to your
3	willingness to speak candidly about these issues?
4	Share some of that with us, if you would.
5	MR. ADAMS: Well, you know, I don't want
6	to necessarily get in too much of a fistfight, but it
7	is curious how, you know, various things have been
8	said, whether it is that I am a conservative, which I
9	guess is somehow disqualifying to tell the truth, or
LO	axe to grind.
L1	Listen, I loved my job. It was a
L2	wonderful gig. I was at the top of the federal pay
L3	scale. I couldn't go any higher. I got promoted two
L4	weeks earlier before I resigned. It is intellectually
L5	enriching to do this work.
L6	For somebody to smear, as opposed to argue
L7	the merits, I guess when that is all you have that's
L8	what you have to do. So
L9	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
20	Heriot?
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Oh, I've got the
22	world's easiest question for you.
23	MR. ADAMS: Okay.
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You had mentioned
25	the brown bag lunches.

1	MR. ADAMS: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Could you just
3	describe what those are?
4	MR. ADAMS: Yes. The brown bag lunches
5	were a phenomenon in the Voting Section where Julie
6	Fernandes or others would come to the section,
7	assembled section in the conference room, and talk
8	about the law, what their priorities were. We would
9	all you know, people would bring lunch, and these
10	would go on inside the Voting Section.
11	And we would have a topic. One week it
12	was NVRA, the next week it is Section 2, the next week
13	it is Section 5. And so that's what the brown bag
14	lunches were.
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: So these were not
16	casual somebody happens just to say something.
17	MR. ADAMS: Oh, no. No, no. These were
18	policy discussions that you could bring lunch to.
19	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. I don't have
20	any questions during this round.
21	MR. ADAMS: I have a check that you all
22	gave me for a witness fee that I don't want to cash.
23	Can I give it back to you?
24	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. That's
25	(Laughter.)

1	We'll take care of that afterwards.
2	MR. ADAMS: Okay.
3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: And I
4	MR. ADAMS: I just want it to be on the
5	record that I didn't accept any money for this
6	testimony.
7	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Yes, we will
8	accept that
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Put on the record
10	how much that is, so it doesn't sound like we are
11	paying you a large
12	MR. ADAMS: \$40.
13	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: \$40, okay. I would
14	like to thank you for testifying today. I think that
15	your testimony today was powerful and will help us
16	shape our report. But this concludes our hearing
17	today.
18	III. ADJOURN
19	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: We are adjourned
20	sine die. We will hold the record open for additional
21	evidence pursuant to 45 CFR Section 702.8.
22	Individuals who wish to submit items for consideration
23	to be included in the record may send them to the
24	General Counsel of the Commission, which is located
25	624 9th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. The zip is

				131
1	20425.			
2		Thank you very much.		
3	(Whereupon,	at 11:49 a.m., the proceedings	in	the
4		foregoing matter were adjourned.)		
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
		NEAL D. CDOSS		

NEAL R. GROSS