SUPREME COURT DECISION ON EQUAL MARRIAGE CASE DUE JUNE 2015

UPDATE: "SOUTHERN MAN"

Thereafter the above Supreme court ANTICIPATED FAVORABLE to gay Marriage, then the Real NeverENDING CULTURAL WAR Commences!

Three Rupublican Presidential candidates. Namely, Mike Huckabee, MEET THE PRESS MAY 18, 2015 and Rick Santorum MEET THE PRESS MAY 31, 2015, told Chuck Todd: they believed the President had CONSTITUTIONAL Authority to DISREGARD, as UNenforcable, certain UNlawful, like equal marriage, Supreme Court Decisions.

Huckabee made a darn good Lawyers Argument (i.e. SOPHISM !!!] MisCiting two Former Presidents, Namely, Andrew Jackson relating to moving Native Americans to OKLAHOMA, and LINCOLN.

He "RationAlly" Argued A GAY MARRIAGE FAVORABLE DECISION Would have NO existing Basis IN Federal Law NOr CONSTITUTION.

Later Santorum and Gov. Scott Walker (R.Wis.) A Front RUNNER, ON Local WISCTVNEWS channel 3000.com (Madison), SECONDED HIS EMOTIONS. *

Ostensibly, some RIGHTWING THINK TANK (e.g. ALEC; HERTIAGE, BRADLEY, et.al.) IS Cooking-UP this strange Voodoo Brew.

UNlike ELLENTV.COM and Her "HOLLY-WOOD" TEAM, OUR Friend Stephanie Miller ANd TEAM, LIVING IN THE REAL WORLD, KNOWS: "IT'S NOT OVER", BK. BY MICHAEL ANOTHY; RADIO, APRIL 20, 2015, MONDAY 11:A.M. CDT.

* - There are some ON the Left who have Similarly argued President Barack OBama had this Authority...

SEE BELOW: P.P. 4-5 I OFFER ARTICLE "SUPREME COURT GUTS VOTING RIGHTS AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION TO ILLUMINATE THE LAW IS WHAT THE JUSTICES (NOT THE LAW) SAYS. JUDGES MAKE LAW.

FRIENDS Live IN the Real UNIverse
(NOT IN THE AMERICA DREAM!! ;)

Jury acquits Zimmerman

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel
July 14, 2013

After lengthy deliberations, he's cleared in shooting death of Trayvon Martin

By LIZETTE ALVAREZ
New York Times News Service

Sanford, Fla. — George Zimmerman, the neighborhood watch volunteer who fatally shot Trayvon Martin, an unarmed black teenager, igniting a national debate on racial profiling and civil rights, was found not guilty late Saturday of second-degree murder. He also was acquitted of manslaughter, a lesser charge.


Zimmerman

After three weeks of testimony, the six-woman jury rejected the prosecution's contention that Zimmerman had deliberately pursued Martin because he assumed the hoodie-clad teenager was a criminal and instigated the fight that led to his death.

Zimmerman said he shot Martin on Feb. 26, 2012, in self-defense after the teenager knocked him to the ground, punched him and slammed his head repeatedly against the sidewalk. In finding him not guilty of murder or manslaughter, the jury agreed that Zimmerman could have been justified in shooting Martin because he feared great bodily harm or death.

The jury, which has been sequestered since June 24, deliberated 16 hours and 20 minutes over two days. The six female jurors entered the quiet, tense courtroom, several looking exhausted, their faces drawn and grim. After the verdict was read, each assented, one by one, their agreement with the verdict.

Saturday night, when the verdict was read, Zimmerman, 29, smiled slightly. His wife, Shellie, and several of his friends wept, and his parents kissed and embraced.

Sybrina Fulton and Tracy Martin, who lost their son a few weeks after his 17th birthday, were not in the courtroom.

After the verdict, Judge Debra Nelson, of Seminole County Court, told Zimmerman, who has been in hiding and wears a bulletproof vest outside, that his bond was revoked and his GPS monitor would be cut off. "You have no further business with the court," she said.

Outside the courthouse, perhaps 100 protesters who had been gathering through the night, their numbers building as the hours passed, began pumping their fists in the air, waving placards and chanting "No justice, no peace!" Sheriff's deputies lined up inside the courthouse, watching the crowd, who were chanting peacefully, but intently.

From the start, prosecutors faced a difficult task in proving second-degree murder. That charge required Zimmerman to have evinced a "depraved mind," brimming with ill will, hatred, spite or evil intent, when he shot Martin.

Manslaughter, which under Florida law is typically added as a lesser charge if either side requests it, was a lower bar. Jurors needed to decide only that Zimmerman put himself in a situation that culminated in Martin's death.

But because of Florida's laws, prosecutors had to persuade jurors beyond a reasonable doubt that Zimmerman did not act in self-defense. A shortage of evidence in the case made that a high hurdle, legal experts said.

The shooting also brought attention to Florida's expansive self-defense laws. The laws allow someone with a reasonable fear of great bodily harm or death to use lethal force, even if retreating from danger is an option. In court, the gunman is given the benefit of the doubt.

The outcry began after the police initially decided not to arrest Zimmerman, who is half-Peruvian, as they investigated the shooting. Martin, 17, had no criminal record and was on a snack run, returning to the house where he was staying as a guest.

Six weeks later, Zimmerman was arrested, but only after civil rights leaders championed the case and demonstrators, many wearing hoodies, marched in Sanford, Miami and elsewhere to demand action.

"Justice for Trayvon!" they shouted.

The pressure prompted Gov. Rick Scott of Florida to remove local prosecutors from the case and appoint the state attorney from Jacksonville, Angela Corey. She ultimately charged Zimmerman with second-degree murder. The tumult also led to the firing of the Sanford police chief.

Through it all, Martin's parents said they sought one thing: that Zimmerman have his day in court.

That day arrived on Saturday.

Kremlin says it awaits Snowden asylum plea

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

Meeting had been arranged in airport

By DAVID M. HERSZENHORN
New York Times
July 14, 2013

Moscow — Senior Kremlin officials said Saturday that Russia's Federal Migration Service had not yet received a formal appeal for asylum from Edward J. Snowden.

And the Russian foreign minister, Sergey V. Lavrov, insisted the government had no contact with him — a curious statement given the government's clear role in arranging a meeting at Sheremetyevo Airport in Moscow on Friday between Snowden and lawyers and human rights advocates.

At that meeting Friday, Snowden, the former intelligence contractor who is on the run from U.S. authorities and criminal charges of disclosing classified information, told the lawyers and rights advocates that he was requesting shelter in Russia because the United States and its allies were illegally preventing him from traveling to Latin America, where three countries have expressed a willingness to take him in.

The rhetorical maneuvering seems to signal that Russia's political position regarding Snowden has been complicated further by his now publicly professed desire to stay in the country. Although President Vladimir Putin has insisted that Snowden must stop harming American interests, the Obama administration has made clear that it believes American interests are being harmed so long as Snowden is on the loose.

Snowden on Friday appealed to the human rights advocates to intervene on his behalf with the Russian government, though it is unclear how influential they can be given that at least two of the groups represented — Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch — have had their Moscow offices raided by the authorities in recent months, and some of their local representatives have faced personal threats apparently aimed at curtailing their work.

"I ask for your assistance in requesting guarantees of safe passage from the relevant nations in securing my travel to Latin America, as well as requesting asylum in Russia until such time as these states accede to law and my legal travel is permitted," Snowden said Friday in his remarks, according to a text released by WikiLeaks, the anti-secrecy group that is helping him.

On Saturday, however, the director of Russia's federal migration service, Konstantin Romodanovsky, told the Interfax news agency that no request had been received. "At the present time, there have been no applications from Snowden," Romodanovsky said. "If we receive an application, it will be considered in due process of law."

Lavrov added, "We have no contacts with Snowden."

Snowden arrived in Moscow from Hong Kong on June 23, apparently with clearance in advance from the Kremlin.

Page 4 of 4
0 CENTS
.00
.00
.00
.00
.00
x.05
.00
.00
.00
.00
fill in
an $480.

without making a White applicant sense there is "reverse discrimination" even when none exists and create enough diversity to provide an educational benefit for White students while preventing Black students from feeling isolated and marginalized.

In the midst of this struggle, admissions officers are called benign slaveholders by Justice Clarence Thomas. He would dismantle all affirmative action programs. Comparing it to slavery and Jim Crow-era segregation this beneficiary of affirmative action believes it as harmful to Blacks and Hispanics as slavery.

Ironically, affirmative action, which benefited Justice Thomas, has also given him the power to end it forever. It is also ironic that the Equal Protection clause, which was enacted solely for African Americans, is now used against them. Diversity, which was meant to focus on people of color, is now meant to benefit the education of White students.

In ruling to decide the fate of affirmative action another day, the U.S. Supreme Court did not 'kick the can' down the road. The Court kicked the future out of this policy. Shelby County, Alabama, with its troubled history and racial present-day, can determine the level of progress needed to end voter protections. Affirmative action will soon be an antiquated phrase. Its a post-race society no matter the reality.

If the direction of the Court does not change, the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade will become just a bad admissions policy.

~~Do Not Submi~~
~~Photocopies~~

Limit government over reach with shield law

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel Friday, June 7, 2013

~~Page 2 of 4~~
~~Your social security number~~
~~NO COMMAS, NO CENTS~~
~~.00~~

By CAROLINE LITTLE

The nation learned in May that the Justice Department secretly obtained the phone records of more than 100 Associated Press reporters and monitored Fox News reporter James Rosen's personal email and cellphone records, branding him a "possible co-conspirator" in a classified leak case for asking questions to a government source.

These revelations sent shockwaves throughout newsrooms nationwide. Reporters can no longer assure their sources that interviews will remain confidential because there is no way to tell whether the government is listening. This attack on journalism reaches far beyond hardworking journalists and their sources.

Make no mistake: The ultimate victims are the millions of Americans who rely on investigative journalism to inform them about their communities. When the government creates a chilling effect in newsrooms, it keeps important news away from the American public.

In Washington, real change often occurs in response to a crisis. That is precisely what is happening here.

For centuries, the American public has assumed that journalists are the public's watchdog, overseeing and revealing government abuses. But the AP and Fox News stories have exposed a sad truth: The government is overseeing journalists. The only way to limit this government overreach is through passage of a law that lays out clear rules for when the government can obtain information from the press.

Members of Congress from across the political spectrum recognized that need when in May they proposed the Free Flow of Information Act of 2013, which would prohibit federal prosecutors, criminal defendants or civil litigants from subpoenaing information from journalists unless they convince a federal judge that the need for the information outweighs the public interest in the free flow of information.

The shield law would be a huge improvement from the current federal system, which enables prosecutors to decide whether to notify the media of a subpoena and how broad the request should be, without any oversight or any effective ability of the press to challenge these government actions.

Rep. Ted Poe, a Texas Republican and a former judge, said that he sponsored the shield law because maintaining confidentiality "is critical to ensuring the free flow of information without government interference." His co-sponsor, Rep. John Conyers, a Michigan Democrat, noted that 49 states and the District of Columbia protect journalists' sources, and "it is long past time that our federal government provides similar protections."

Sens. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) and Lindsey Graham (R-SC.) co-sponsored a similar measure in the Senate. Schumer aptly observed that a law is needed, as "there's no supervision." President Obama recently reaffirmed the administration's support for a shield law and said that journalists "should not be at legal risk for doing their jobs."

The response can be summed up in one word, which is rare these days in Washington: bipartisanship. The swift reaction of legislators of both parties demonstrates that press freedom is not a Democratic or a Republican talking point. It is a quintessentially American value that transcends politics and shaped our nation's founding. As Thomas Jefferson famously wrote, the "only security of all is in a free press."

As the organization representing the nation's newspapers, the Newspaper Association of America is a proud member of a coalition of more than 50 media organizations that supports a federal shield law. Over the next few weeks, we will urge senators and representatives nationwide to sign on to the shield law (H.R. 1962 and S. 987) and codify this fundamental American principle. We encourage you to contact your members of Congress to tell them why a free press matters to you.

Proposed journalist shield law has holes

Jonah Goldberg

The Washington Post's Bob Woodward has no more rights than my dentist.

In response to the acknowledged abuses of his own Justice Department, President Barack Obama has urged Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) to reintroduce legislation for a "journalist shield law." And in typical Washington fashion, the proposed act would do nothing to prevent the abuses that supposedly make the law so necessary.

We saw a similar response to the horrible Connecticut school shootings last December — a raft of laws that wouldn't have prevented the tragedy in the first place. It seems that whenever government fails to do what it is supposed to do with the laws already on the books, the answer is to give the government even more power.

Ah, but proponents of journalist shield laws argue that such regulations actually limit the power of government by protecting the First Amendment rights of the press. But that begs the question. A journalist shield law must define who is a journalist and who isn't.

On May 26, Sen. Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) said on "Fox News Sunday" that the proposed shield law "still leaves an unanswered question. . . . What is a journalist today, 2013? We know it's someone who works for Fox or AP, but does it include a blogger? Does it include someone who's tweeting? Are these people journalists and entitled to constitutional protection?"

Part of the problem stems from Durbin's apparent suggestion that the First Amend-

~~.00~~
~~No~~
~~ge 34.~~
~~and belief.~~

BY: LEON IRBY 5 of 5 DATED: JUNE 14, 2015

ment protects only a free press. It also protects free speech, free assembly, freedom of worship and the right to petition the government for the redress of grievances. We all have these rights. The Washington Post's Bob Woodward has no more rights than my dentist.

And this is what is wrong with the idea of a federal shield law. One proposed version of the law says a "covered person" is someone who "for financial gain or livelihood, is engaged in journalism." In other words, a journalist is a professional. So, the government gets to decide who's a "real" journalist. That's a horrifying expansion in government authority.

Worse, many judges won't even go that far. For instance, an Illinois judge ruled last year that the popular website TechnoBuffalo didn't qualify for the same protections the state confers to "real" journalists. Cook County (Ill.) Circuit Judge Michael Panter said, "The content on TechnoBuffalo's website may inform viewers how to use certain devices or offer sneak peeks of upcoming technology, but that does not qualify the website as a 'news medium' or its bloggers as 'reporters.' "

So when this newspaper informs its readers about new gadgets or gives sneak peaks at upcoming technologies, that is journalism. But when a moneymaking website does the same thing, not so much.

In 2009, when the Free Flow of Information Act was last under consideration, Durbin and Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) pushed to have bloggers and other second-class journalists stripped of protections, eliciting outrage from the left and right. Their stated concern was that bad actors — terrorists, fraudsters, publicists — would claim status as journalists in order to cause mischief and harm. Some critics, though, sniffed a haughty bigotry against "citizen journalists."

Miami Herald columnist Leonard Pitts captured this attitude well when he proclaimed in 2010, "I do not believe in 'citizen journalism.' Yes, I know that's heresy. . . . Yet I remain convinced that, with exceptions, citizen journalism is to journalism as pornography is to a Martin Scorsese film; while they may employ similar tools — i.e., camera, lighting — they aspire to different results."

Pitts' ire was aimed at figures such as James O'Keefe, who has embarrassed a lot of liberal institutions — Planned Parenthood, National Public Radio and others — with his hidden camera operations. With remarkable brevity, Pitts managed to include nearly everything that is mule-headed in this debate. "60 Minutes" became a journalistic icon by using hidden cameras in stings. But when citizen journalists use the same methods, it's akin to pornography. Why? Because the results aren't to Pitts' liking.

When James Madison wrote the First Amendment, he undoubtedly had in mind not just journalists but also the countless private, often anonymous, pamphleteers who often went after those in power with hammers and tongs. And that points to the heart of the matter.

Journalism isn't a priestly caste or professional guild with special rights. It is an activity we all have a right to partake in. Whether it's a blogger with a virtual tip jar exposing malfeasance or "60 Minutes" making fraudulent charges about George W. Bush, there will always be good journalism and bad journalism.

It will undoubtedly be necessary from time to time for the government to distinguish between the two. But those instances should be exceedingly rare, and they should never hinge on who the government thinks is qualified to be a journalist in the first place.

Clarke offers county settlement on suits

No appeals if lawyer bills paid

By STEVE SCHULTZE
sschultze@journalsentinel.com

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel
July 4, 2013

Sheriff David A. Clarke Jr. has offered to drop legal appeals in a handful of cases in which he unsuccessfully sued Milwaukee County and others, if the county agrees to pay his outside lawyer's bill.

Clarke

The proposed settlement would cost the county $95,000, which would be paid to Clarke's attorney, Michael A. Whitcomb, according to a memo to county supervisors obtained Wednesday.

In return, the sheriff would drop his appeal of a Milwaukee County Circuit Court ruling denying Clarke's bid to hang onto management control of the House of Correction. He was stripped of his oversight role by the County Board and County Executive Chris Abele as part of the 2013 county budget.

In addition, Clarke also would agree to drop his appeal of a case he lost on laying off three captains in 2011 who were not lowest in seniority. The deal also would resolve payment to Whitcomb for other cases for which Clarke hired him without first consulting with the county corporation counsel's office.

Furthermore, Clarke would agree to abide by county practice in the future of first seeking legal advice from the corporation counsel before going to an outside lawyer.

"If the proposed settlement is not approved, the appeals will continue and attorney fees being incurred will continue to increase in these matters," the memo to supervisors from Corporation Counsel Kimberly Walker says.

Whitcomb charges $325 an hour and his bills in five cases add up to nearly $150,000. He agreed to a discount to a $250-an-hour rate as part of the settlement offer.

In recommending the deal, Walker says even if Clarke had first sought legal representation in the cases at issue from the corporation counsel, a private lawyer still would have been recommended. That's because Clarke's position in the cases was contrary to county policy, the Walker memo says.

The common thread in most of the legal cases was that Clarke asserted his authority as an independently elected constitutional officer to make decisions counter to county policy.

Supervisor Theo Lipscomb Sr. said the proposed resolution seemed reasonable, but "hard to swallow . . . I don't think anybody's going to like the deal." He said he hadn't decided how he'll vote on it.

The matter is slated to come before the board's Judiciary, Safety & General Services Committee, which Lipscomb heads, July 11.

Clarke began pitching legal work to Whitcomb in early 2012, after Walker filed suit against Clarke to force him to carry out layoffs ordered by the county budget. The sheriff said that action showed the corporation counsel's office had a conflict of interest and could no longer represent him.

Clarke and Whitcomb didn't return calls seeking comment Wednesday.

The most expensive case on which Clarke used Whitcomb was over the layoff of captains. Whitcomb's bill for that was nearly $72,000.

The sheriff's lawsuit seeking to block the transfer of the House of Correction cost more than $68,000 in fees billed by Whitcomb. He has already been paid $49,000 of that amount.

The memo doesn't state what source of funds was used to pay the $49,000 portion of the bill in the House of Correction case.

Whitcomb billed another $49,000 in Clarke's case to dismiss a court-ordered monitor of jail conditions. Clarke lost that case.

Fees in two other cases also would be rolled into the settlement deal. Whitcomb billed $4,712 when Clarke sought a criminal charge against a man who made a death threat against radio talk show host Vicki McKenna.

Clarke was unhappy when the man was issued only a civil citation for disorderly conduct. A judge rejected Clarke's bid to order a criminal charge.

McKenna hosts a show on WISN-AM (1130).

Clarke also lost a case on hiring private bailiffs for courtrooms. Whitcomb's tab for that case was $3,575.

Man begins jail time for threat to sheriff

The man convicted of using a computer to illegally send a threatening email laced with racial slurs to Milwaukee County Sheriff David A. Clarke Jr. has started serving his jail sentence.

Mark Allan Lovejoy, 61, was sentenced to 45 days in jail Monday after Clarke gave a victim-impact statement. Lovejoy said he was just blowing off steam and didn't intend to actually send the message on March 4.

tary announcement, some vowing to fight against what they called a coup against the "Islamist project."

"Any coup of any kind against legitimacy will only pass over our dead bodies," one leading Brotherhood figure, Mohammed el-Beltagi, told the rally.

A line of about 1,500 men with shields, helmets and sticks — assigned with protecting the rally against attackers — stamped their feet in military-like lines, singing: "Stomp our feet, raise a fire, Islam's march is coming."

Army troops at checkpoints on roads leading to the pro-Morsi rally checked cars for weapons, after repeated reports that some Islamists were arming themselves.

The army's stance raises an unsettling prospect for many of Morsi's opponents as well — the potential return of the military that ruled Egypt directly for nearly 17 months after the Feb. 11, 2011, fall of autocrat Hosni Mubarak. During that time, many of those now in the anti-Morsi campaign led protests against military rule, angered by its management of the transition and heavy hand, including killings of protesters.

July 6, 2013 Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

Nicaragua, Venezuela offer Snowden asylum

Managua, Nicaragua – The presidents of Nicaragua and Venezuela offered Friday to grant asylum to National Security Agency leaker Edward Snowden, one day after leftist South American leaders gathered to denounce the rerouting of Bolivian President Evo Morales' plane over Europe amid reports that Snowden was aboard.

Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua and Nicolas Maduro of Venezuela made their offers during separate speeches in their home countries Friday afternoon. Snowden has asked for asylum in numerous countries, including Nicaragua and Venezuela.

In his speech marking the anniversary of Venezuela's independence, Maduro did not make it clear if there were any conditions to Venezuela's offer.

In Nicaragua, Ortega said he was willing to make the same offer "if circumstances allow it." Ortega didn't say what the right circumstances would be when he spoke during a speech in Managua.

Snowden is still believed to be stuck in a Moscow airport's transit area.

Supreme Court guts Voting Rights and Affirmative Action

By Gloria Browne-Marshall

Supreme Court Correspondent for The Milwaukee Courier

JUNE 29, 2013

Trayvon Martin's parents seek justice for a son killed for walking while Black. The Court gutted Voting Rights. Paula Deen is caught using racial slurs. Yet, the U.S. Supreme Court gutted both affirmative action and decided essential protections within the Voting Rights Act were unconstitutional.

When Chief Justice Roberts read the decision in the Shelby County voting rights case the courtroom was graveyard silent. He spoke of the lives lost and brutal injustices that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. However, the country had changed, he said. Congress was wrong to re-authorize these voting protections in 2006. Section 5 of the Act, the part which requires many Southern states to seek pre-clearance from the U.S. Attorney General, based on a certain formula, was wrong.

The formula was old. Congress must start over with a new formula. The chances of this happening are nearly nonexistent.

Given the past failures of a conflicted Congress, the Court had torn away the most powerful part of the Act and left a battered shell for a distracted Congress to retrofit. The same Congress unable to complete its own agenda has been told to pass voting legislation only passed in 1965 because people were dying just to vote.

Like so many listening that day, a sense of doom grew with each word. Despite 15,000 pages of evidence that people of color still needed to be protected, a 5-4 majority believed people of color must once again prove their vulnerability to racism, bigotry, and the machinations of majority politics.

Now, expensive lawsuits must be brought to prove harm after a stolen election is over. Before, under Section 5, the burden was on the local government to prove voting changes were harmless.

Justice Thomas wrote that he would completely abolish all of Section 5, not just the formula pertaining to certain States. Then again, Justice Thomas described affirmative action as insidious and racial engineering. To him, college admissions officers are doing students of color an injustice. Black and Hispanic student achievement are harmed by affirmative action policies like those in the case of Fisher v. University of Texas.

Abigail Fisher challenged her denial of admission to the University of Texas-Austin as race discrimination. Although the school takes into account a number of factors, including race, Fisher claims it was only her race that prevented admission. Although Texas created its admissions' policy based squarely on compliance with an earlier Michigan ruling, this recent Texas decision once again places affirmative action in jeopardy.

In that early Michigan case, a White applicant, Barbara Grutter claimed she was denied admission to University of Michigan's law school due to her race. The Court in Grutter v. Bollinger ruled race could be part of admissions, as long as it was only a part, and not the sole reason.

So, Texas used race as a part and not the sole reason. Texas allows the top 10 percent of all high school students to attend the college. Then, those not admitted into the top 10 percent may be selected based on personal factors such as whether the applicant is an immigrant or a child of a single parent or poor or a person of color. Race is only one part; not the sole reason.

However, now race as only one factor may be unconstitutional.

The Court's Fisher decision is disappointing. But, it's not an outright disaster. The lower court is supposed to review the case and decide if there is any other workable alternative that creates diversity on campus without involving r-a-c-e at all.

Certainly, this non-race admissions policy may be challenged as some clandestine affirmative action. Either way the question emerge. How many students of color are needed to provide diversity? Since the Court allows affirmative action in order to bring diversity to the education of White students then students of color are playing a precarious role.

In other words, Universities are expected to fix a festering race discrimination problem without using the word "race" and

To P. 24 AT X

4 of 5