

This question requires you to compare a Supreme Court case you studied in class with one you have not studied in class. A summary of the Supreme Court case you did not study in class is presented and provides all of the information you need to know about this case to answer the prompts.

Bush v. Vera (1996)

As a result of the 1990 census, Texas was given three additional congressional districts. In the redistricting process that followed, the Texas state legislature redrew the borders of its current districts to make room for the three new ones. Texas voter Al Vera sued the state of Texas for creating gerrymandered districts. In response, the state of Texas cited compliance with federal regulation of federal elections, as well as seeking to reduce the incumbency advantage. Supporters of the plan claimed that the districts establish minority-majority districts that would ensure minority representation in Congress. The Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit struck parts of the plan, and the state of Texas appealed to the Supreme Court.

In *Bush v. Vera*, the Court held in favor of Vera and struck down the redistricting plan. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor reasoned that race was the primary factor used to redraw the districts and that other, race-neutral factors were given less consideration. The Court used the highest standard of review to determine the constitutionality of the government discrimination on the basis of race.

3. Respond to parts A, B, and C.

- A.** Identify the constitutional clause that is the basis for the decisions in both *Shaw v. Reno* (1993) and *Bush v. Vera* (1996).
- B.** Explain how the facts in *Shaw v. Reno* and *Bush v. Vera* led to similar holdings.
- C.** Explain how the decision in *Bush v. Vera* relates to the democratic ideal of republicanism.