

VOTING RIGHTS IN BLACK AND WHITE: A CRBW VIDEO CASEBOOK

2024-25 Syllabus

Co-Editors, Professor Guy-Uriel Charles & Professor Alexandra Natapoff

This Voting Rights casebook contains eight videos: one (1) overview/introductory video and seven (7) individual case videos, each authored and narrated by a different voting rights scholar. Every case video is accompanied by a PDF of that Supreme Court decision, marked-up and annotated by the author. Modules may also include additional materials such as law review articles, newspaper articles, and/or public legal documents.

The curriculum represents a handpicked selection of especially illuminating and influential Supreme Court decisions that collectively provide a rich introduction to U.S. voting rights, election law, and the complexities of the field. Each video is approximately 15-20 minutes long.

INTRODUCTORY OVERVIEW

Introduction to Voting Rights, Professor Guy-Uriel Charles

CASE VIDEOS (in chronological order of case decision)

Lassiter v. Northampton, 360 U.S. 45 (1959), Professor Guy-Uriel Charles, Harvard Law School

- **Holding that literacy tests do not violate the right to vote.**

Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533 (1964), Professor Tabatha Abu El-Haj, Drexel University Thomas R. Kline School of Law

- **Establishing the principle of one-person one-vote.**

Harper v. Virginia Bd. of Education, 383 U.S. 663 (1966),
Professor Yasmin Dawood, University of Toronto Faculty of
Law

- **Holding that poll taxes violate the Equal Protection Clause.**

Thornburg v. Gingles, 478 U.S. 30 (1986), Professor Ellen Katz,
Michigan Law School

- **Establishing the definition of racially polarized voting and violations of the Voting Rights Act.**

Shaw v. Reno, 509 U. S. 630 (1993), Professor Justin Levitt,
LMU Loyola Law School, Los Angeles

- **Holding that white voters can state a constitutional claim for racial gerrymandering.**

Citizens United v. FEC, 558 U. S. 310 (2010), Professor Michael
Kang, Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law

- **Holding that the First Amendment prohibits the regulation of independent electioneering expenditures.**

Shelby County v. Holder, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), Professor Luis
Fuentes-Rohwer, University of Indiana Maurer School of Law

- **Striking down Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act.**
-