Davis recall not as titanic as it seemed then

By Joe Mathews

Ten years ago this month, the nation was riveted by a large majority of Cali-
ifornia voters approving the recall of Gov. Gray Da-
is. Davis was the second governor in U.S. his-
tory to suffer the igno-
dignity of being recalled.

The recall was not, in one poll, 90 percent of state residents who were follow-
ing events. It made the New
Yorker and the National
Enquirer, Oprah and
CNN.

Most elected for-
er of a choice of a
d half-dozen
dates. The recall offered 115 choices, including a
one, actor Gary Cole-
man and a race
rator.

The recall was probably the
greatest fear ever for civic
engagement I've ever seen in Californians. In terms of
events, including a world-
less other historical
titanic in impact.

Whether you were in San
Francisco or in Cali-
ifornia. While most
voters who favored the
replacement, Gov. Arnold
Schwarzenegger, and the
Huffington Post in part by
the inclusion of Ac-
california off-
recall's dark
appears to have been a
hardening of the
minister that pro-
California maintain a
depth for political
and civic, and com-
with a deep belief in
as to why it is so difficult to
from office.
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If Michigan's Proposal 2 is unconstitutional, then
Prop. 209, unquestionably, will
be, too.

The legacy of past and current
discrimination means, that
without affirmative
action, very few minorities
will be enrolled at the nation's top
colleges and universities.
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and the City Council. For
example, voters in Akron, Ohio, amended
their city charter to say that open-housing
requirements would apply to some but not to others. This is impermis-
sibly restructures the political
process along racial lines.

As the legacy of past and current
discrimination means, that
without affirmative
action, very few minorities
will be enrolled at the nation's top
colleges and universities.

In 2006, Michigan voters passed Proposal 2, which amended the Michigan Constitution to prohibit governments at any level from giving preferences based on race or gender in education, em-
ployment or contracting.

The constitutionality of this
initiative will be argued before the Supreme
Court on Oct. 8 in Schuette v. Coalition for Affir-
mativ Action. The outcome could matter
greatly to California, where voters in 1996
passed a virtually identical initiative, Prop-
osal 209.

Affirmative action is tremendously con-
troversial. Critics see it as “reverse dis-
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