

# **UCLA**

## **National Black Law Journal**

### **Title**

Editor's Note

### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9hg786gr>

### **Journal**

National Black Law Journal, 12(2)

### **Author**

Sutton, Brenda E.

### **Publication Date**

1992

### **Copyright Information**

Copyright 1992 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

## EDITOR'S NOTE

Editor in Chief, Stephanie Jackson brought in the Nineties with a renewed commitment on behalf of the NATIONAL BLACK LAW JOURNAL to address and analyze social, political and economic issues that impact people of color. In this Summer 1991 issue, the Consortium Editorial Board of the NATIONAL BLACK LAW JOURNAL of the University of Texas School of Law selected pieces that highlight particular facets of a complex spectrum of African-American opinion.

The issue of race-conscious remedies is addressed by Mr. William Bradford Reynolds in *The Supreme Court: A Bulwark in the Struggle for Civil Rights*. Mr. Reynolds favorably reviews the Supreme Court's implementation of a "color-blind" Constitution in its treatment of the series of racial-preference cases through the Court's 1989 term. Mr. Reynolds applauds the *Croson* decision and asserts that *Croson* heralds the "race-neutral affirmative action regime" of the 1990s. Meanwhile, Professor Julius G. Getman is sharply critical of Mr. Reynolds' analysis and conclusions, arguing that Mr. Reynolds describes events, cases and motives concerning race-conscious remedies from the perspective of someone totally opposed to them. He states, "Unlike Mr. Reynolds, I do not believe that the Court's current jurisprudence on racial matters is either sensitive or sensible." It remains to be seen what roles this controversial line of cases will play in light of the Civil Rights Reform Act of 1991. The National Black Law Journal will continue to serve as a forum for debate.

The dialogue on peremptory challenges continues as Professor Jon M. Van Dyke evaluates the constitutional legitimacy of a defense attorney's use of peremptories in a race-specific manner and discusses whether *Batson* should be applied to the criminal defendant who faces the potential loss of liberty. Author John Duer examines the specific application of *Batson* in Texas, and explores the ambiguities of the *Batson* decision as applied generally. Mr. Duer asserts that the Court fell short of solving the problem of racially discriminatory use of peremptory challenges, and he offers solutions to make the *Batson* decision effective.

Finally, authors Carol Burditt and Karen Carr address the weighty problem of insurance redlining and the momentum the practice lends to the downward spiral of those neighborhoods largely inhabited by people of color.

Appreciation goes to the University of Texas School of Law for its efforts in selection and production of this issue. The National Board of Editors will continue to reach out to other regions in order to benefit from the reflections of scholars across the nation who have studied, analyzed, and challenged the intersection of law and race in order to provide a beacon of hope for people of color.

BRENDA E. SUTTON  
Staff Managing Editor 1990-91