

**Diversity Management and Affirmative Action:
Past, Present and Future**

R. Roosevelt Thomas, Jr.

Diversity Symposium

October 7, 2004

Diversity Management and Affirmative Action: Past, Present and Future

R. Roosevelt Thomas, Jr.

For the past forty years or so, the United States has struggled with the concept of Affirmative Action and its implementation. Currently, executives and managers operate Affirmative Action programs in anticipation that such efforts will no longer be needed in 25 years. They base their expectations on Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor's expressed expectation that "25 years from now, the use of racial preferences will no longer be necessary to further the interest (pursuit of diversity) approved today."¹

Response to Justice Day's anticipation has been mixed. Some observers have ignored this statement or viewed it as one person's hope for the future. Others have seen the Justice's view as a quasi-guarantee Affirmative Action will be acceptable legally for another twenty-five years. Still others have interpreted her comment as an admonishment to develop legitimate alternatives to Affirmative Action by 2028 – since, as some observers have contended, the Court at that time likely will not approve its continuation.

Those who believe that Affirmative Action's time is limited are of three minds. Some believe that discontinuing Affirmative Action would be a mistake—whenever that might be. Others see discontinuation as long overdue. Still others see Affirmative Action as a current necessity whose life expectancy is limited.

I count myself among the latter, and I am concerned. America has not used the time that Affirmative Action has bought wisely. To discontinue Affirmative Action today would result in divisiveness, conflict, and turmoil.

We must spend the grace time that has been given to achieve the desired state in which the need for Affirmative Action will no longer exist. That means that we *must collectively figure out how to secure the desired racial representation within America's institutions without resort to race-conscious tools*. Only then can we discontinue the use of Affirmative Action without chaos and dissension.

This is no easy challenge. The history of Affirmative Action is controversial and complex. Pro- and anti-Affirmative Action proponents remain passionate in their convictions, and the very existence of racial differences creates tensions (not necessarily conflict) under the best of conditions.

Though time is of the essence, we must make haste slowly. The issue is too important to take shortcuts. The goal of this article is to provide clarity in a generally confusing arena. It begins with definitions, explores the past, present, and future of Affirmative Action, and looks at the hindering and facilitating factors for reaching the desired state. It then proceeds to my recommendations for achieving the necessary conditions for discontinuing Affirmative Action in a productive way.

Key Definitions

So much has been written and said about Affirmative Action and diversity that it is tempting to launch immediately into the discussion. But doing so would be unwise. Definitions of both terms are so ubiquitous as to be confusing. As a result, both of these key terms have come to mean different things to different people. By defining my terms before beginning, I hope to prevent the reader from experiencing either frustration or confusion.

Affirmative Action. Initially, President Lyndon Johnson's Executive Order 11246 prescribed Affirmative Action as affirmative efforts "to overcome the effects of past discrimination."² This translated into programs for enhancing the representation of African Americans in hiring and promotion pools so that they would be better represented among those hired, promoted and retained in organizations' work forces. *

Diversity. This term refers to the differences, similarities and related tensions that can exist among the elements of a mixture. For example in Exhibit A, you have a mixture of six individuals. As is, the Exhibit says nothing about the diversity of this group.

Exhibit B portrays the group as having only similarities with respect to the diversity dimensions in question. Along these dimensions, the group constitutes a homogeneous mixture.

Exhibit C reflects this group as having only differences with respect to the diversity dimensions in question. In terms of these dimensions, the group has significant potential for fragmentation. Indeed, if the dimensions under consideration are critical, chaos may well result. Potentially, this is an example of having too much diversity unless the group's leaders are immensely skilled in group facilitation.

Exhibit D shows the group as having differences and similarities with respect to the diversity dimensions under consideration. In the context of these dimensions, I can describe the group as diverse.

A "diverse mixture" then is one characterized by differences, similarities and related tensions among its elements. By implication, if I am going to discuss a group or mixture's diversity, I must specify the diversity dimensions in question. A group can be homogenous - say - with respect to age-- and be diverse, for example, in terms of geographic origin.

* Affirmative Action subsequently came to cover women, ethnic minorities and other "protected groups." However, since I am talking here primarily about the early days of Affirmative Action, I will refer mostly to African Americans. In the discussion about the present and future, I will employ broader descriptions of those covered by Affirmative Action.

Strategic Diversity Management Process™ (SDMP™). This concept refers to a framework for making quality decisions about strategic (critical) diversity mixtures in the midst of differences, similarities and tensions. A basic premise here is that the greater the number

of differences, the greater the diversity, the more difficult it is to make quality decisions in support of an organization's or individual's mission, vision, and strategy. At base, Strategic Diversity Management™ is a decision-making process and capability.

Past, Present and Future of Affirmative Action

What follows is an evolutionary overview of Affirmative Action through the lens of the past, present and future. In each case, I follow my exploration of the proponents' views with a comment of my own. When speaking of the future, I project and present within the framework of American's desired state –an environment in which America has achieved the ability to *secure the desired racial representation within America's institutions without resort to race-conscious tools.*

The Past

Affirmative Action as Symptom of America's Unreadiness for Diversity. A reading of civil rights history indicates that the United States' lack of readiness for diversity produced Affirmative Action. When the Civil Rights Act of 1964 passed into law and desegregation became the legal order of the day, relatively little changed in terms of minority representation where it previously had been constrained legally. As Arch Puddington notes, this paucity of change led some to fear that eliminating legal discrimination might not bring significant progress quickly.

In 1964, the year the Civil Rights Act was passed, an optimistic and morally confident America believed that the challenge posed by the "Negro revolution" could be met through a combination of anti-discrimination laws, economic growth, and the voluntary goodwill of corporations, universities, and other institutions. But by the decade's end, a crucial segment of elite opinion had concluded that America was deeply flawed, even sick, and that racism, conscious or otherwise, permeated every institution and government policy. Where individual prejudice had previously been identified as the chief obstacle to black progress, now a new target, "institutionalized racism," was seen as the principal villain. And where it was once thought that democratic guarantees against discrimination, plus the inherent fairness of the American people, were sufficient to overcome injustice, the idea now took hold that since racism was built into the social order, coercive measures were required to root it out.

In this view, moreover, the gradualist Great Society approach launched by Lyndon Johnson, which stressed education, training, and the strengthening of black institutions, could not alleviate the misery of the inner city poor, at least not as effectively as forcing employers to hire them.³

With the advent of the Civil Rights Act, the racial diversity of the pool of potential employees increased greatly; however, this did not translate into corresponding growth in work

force representation for African Americans. The Civil Rights Act also did not result in substantial upward mobility for the relatively few African Americans already in the pipeline.

It was unable to do so because America's organizations lacked the wherewithal to make quality decisions in the midst of increased racial diversity (racial differences, similarities and tensions). Collectively and individually, organizations and their participants lacked both diversity skills (ability to recognize, analyze and respond appropriately to diversity mixtures) and diversity maturity (the wisdom and judgment necessary for using the skills effectively). In their absence, The Civil Rights Act was unable by itself to ensure mainstreaming for African Americans.

As they realized the limitations of antidiscrimination laws to promote rapid change, concerned officials started looking for ways to jump-start the mainstreaming of African Americans. Paul Craig Roberts and Lawrence M. Stratton, Jr. describe the thinking of one such official—Robert W. Blumrosen, the EEOC's first compliance chief—through a quote from a book he authored.

If discrimination is narrowly defined...by requiring an evil intent to injure minorities, then it will be difficult to find that it exists. If it does not exist, then the plight of racial and ethnic minorities must be attributable to some more generalized failures in society, in the fields of basic education, housing, family relations, and the like. The search for efforts to improve the condition of minorities must then focus in these general and difficult areas, and the answers can come only gradually as basic institutions, attitudes, customs, and practices are changed. We thus would have before us generations of time before the effects of subjugation of minorities are dissipated.

But if discrimination is broadly defined, as, for example, including all conduct which adversely affects minority group employment opportunities...then the prospects for rapid improvement in minority employment opportunities are greatly increased. Industrial relations systems are flexible; they are in control of defined individuals and institutions; they can be altered either by negotiation or by law. If discrimination exists within these institutions, the solution lies within our immediate grasp. It is not embedded in the complications of fundamental sociology, but can be sharply influenced by intelligent, effective and aggressive legal action.⁴

In other words, once the law precluded discrimination, it became clear that existing organizational policy and practices did not facilitate the inclusion and utilization of African Americans. That is, cultures would not facilitate mainstreaming of minorities. Moreover, the existence of these barriers did not constitute discrimination as defined by the civil rights laws.

The search for ways to expedite the integration ("mainstreaming") of African Americans led to presidential directives, administrative guidelines, and court decisions that created Affirmative Action. Initial efforts relied on "outreach" Affirmative Action—the identification and recruitment of qualified or qualifiable African Americans.⁵ But eventually these efforts were

supplemented with more specific goals and target requirements. Advocates believed that “institutional racism” dictated the need for these “racial preference” remedies.

Certain realities should be noted here: For instance, “institutional racism” as a label may not capture the true nature of the barriers, especially if one interprets racism specifically to mean evil intent against the members of a race. Obviously, some barriers resulted from such intent, but others did not—they simply worked against minorities.

Affirmative Action did not seek to change or eliminate these barriers, but simply to get around them. Affirmative Action was not the solution to these challenges. Instead, it was intended to provide a transitional band-aid until the prescription of legal color-blindness could facilitate the mainstreaming of African Americans.

Not everyone thought Affirmative Action was a good thing. Concerns about gradualism differentiated those persons primarily interested in eliminating discrimination before the law, and advancing color-blind law and policy from those primarily focused on improving the lot of African Americans. Until 1964, the agendas of these two groups had coincided. The goals of the civil rights movement sought through litigation, legislation and public protest to bring about a condition “in which any individual black could have access on equal terms to the institutions and opportunities of white society. The society was to be ‘color-blind.’”⁶

However, shortly after the passing of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, as Glazer notes, matters shifted.

It was a striking shift: from color blindness to color consciousness, from desegregation to integration, from individual rights to a concept of group representation.... And it led to Affirmative Action.⁷

The antidiscrimination camp complained that Affirmative Action with its race consciousness directly contradicted the Constitution and civil rights laws.⁸ As Affirmative Action evolved, and goals and quotas emerged, these previously allied camps increasingly found themselves at odds. In the words of Roberts and Stratton, “Americans who supported desegregation and equal rights are astonished to find themselves governed by quotas which were prohibited by the Civil Rights Act of 1964.”⁹

Members of the antidiscrimination camp preferred to rely on economic realities and the Great Society programs to bring about the integration (“mainstreaming”) of African Americans. They believed, for example, that racial discrimination would be too costly for corporations to sustain. They postulated that qualified underpaid and underutilized minorities would move to firms willing to pay and utilize them appropriately. Companies that did so would have an advantage over those that clung to segregation because these companies, unlike their segregationist counterparts, would have access to the best qualified employees regardless of color.¹⁰ Members of this camp also expected that continued economic growth would facilitate the integration of minorities into the employment mainstream.¹¹

Furthermore, the antidiscrimination forces expected that the Great Society programs would alleviate the barriers facing African Americans through education, training, and the

strengthening of minority institutions. ¹² The access to enhanced qualifications would position the beneficiaries to take advantage of opportunities projected from economic growth.

The Cases for and Against Affirmative Action

Positions hardened following the initiation of Affirmative Action. What follows are the arguments for and against Affirmative Action that have kept this issue contentious.

The Case for Affirmative Action Over the past 25 to 30 years, Affirmative Action advocates have set forth various justifications for continuing Affirmative Action. As with the original rationale, however, subsequent justification focused on the symptoms of America's inability to address diversity adequately rather than the core issue of adapting to the increased diversity in the work force pools. These additional symptoms (justifications) are noted below:

To foster equal opportunity. The notion of equal opportunity means equal access to the opportunity to compete. It calls for "an equal chance to compete within the framework of goals and the structure of rules established by our particular society...." ¹³ Equal opportunity, however, does not address the "conditions of competition." So, an African American who is admitted to a game that was not designed with him in mind, and is told to compete with those for whom the game was designed may have equal access without necessarily having equal opportunity with respect to the "conditions of competition".

I do not believe that Affirmative Action addressed this issue. True equal opportunity would have required removing those nonrequirement barriers (traditions, preferences and conveniences) that disadvantaged African Americans. This would not have meant lowering standards or compromising the game. Requirements are requirements. People who do not meet them are candidates to be excluded. But much of what has been labeled requirements are not so, but rather preferences, conveniences or traditions. Herein lies the opportunity to adjust the "conditions of competition" so that they offer equal opportunity. All of this is necessary because organizations are not prepared for diversity.

To foster equality of results (statistical parity integration). While there is overlap between this justification and the original rationale, a significant difference exists. For those trying to avoid gradualism, statistical parity and integration ("mainstreaming") were *means to an end, not ends in and of themselves*. People who offer this justification include those who see statistical parity, equality of results and integration "mainstreaming" as desired ends.

Individuals in this camp subscribe to one or more of the lines of reasoning below:

- 1) It is impossible to provide equal opportunity with respect to the opportunity to compete. Inequalities will always exist. The focus should be on equality of results.

- 2) The destructive competitiveness that characterizes organizations allows some to reap disproportionate rewards, while others starve.
- 3) Even if equal opportunity with respect to access could be achieved, it simply would open the door for new inequalities based on “accidents” of talent. These inequalities would be no fairer than any others.¹⁴

John Gardner notes that American society has difficulty with this “equality of results” perspective; in part, because some rewards relate to exceptional performance due not to “accidents,” but rather to factors such as perseverance, character and loyalty. On the other hand, some poor performances are attributable to laziness and irresponsibility. Americans wish to retain the option of differentiating between such performances.¹⁵

To compensate those who have been discriminated against. Here, the argument is that America uniquely deprived African Americans to the degree that compensation for many years will be required. In this context, advocates view Affirmative Action as a compensatory vehicle for leveling the playing field, and/or as an entitlement repayment for the “sins of the past.”

Roger Wilkins cites distortion of African American history as one “sin” committed against blacks. In speaking of the need for African Americans to recover the “real history” of their contributions, he notes that to do so would help them understand “... how deeply American they are, how richly they have given, how much has been taken from them and how much has yet to be restored.” Supporters of this view and others on additional “sins” believe that broad and deep damage has been done to American culture by racism and sexism throughout the course of American history and that they are still powerful forces today.¹⁶

However, indications are surfacing that white males are increasingly less receptive to the argument for compensation. Former Presidential candidate Bob Dole wondered aloud on *Meet the Press* whether future generations should pay for the sins of slavery that happened before they were born.¹⁷ Implying a change in his sentiments, Pete Wilson, another former candidate for president, explains previous support for Affirmative Action as a response to guilty feelings and “misfired good intentions” about past discrimination.¹⁸ “I am not responsible for the sins of my father” is becoming a frequent refrain on the part of white males.

Supporters of the compensatory approach do not readily release current white males from the “sins of their fathers.” I heard one champion of this school use the analogy of “theft by receiving.” He contended that today’s white males may not have done the offense (stealing), but they are benefiting from the consequences—they are guilty of “theft by receiving.”¹⁹ Nevertheless, I sense that this is becoming an increasingly difficult position to sustain.

To fight poverty. This rationale never quite hit center stage in the original discussions about Affirmative Action. But it has grown in significance over the years as a justification. While the need to fight poverty may have been a contributing factor, a much stronger force in the initial launching of Affirmative Action was the need to bypass gradualism so that African

Americans could be mainstreamed as quickly as possible—largely, because to do so was morally right.

In spite of this, many Americans now believe that the greatest rationale for Affirmative Action is the need to help minorities out of poverty. These individuals become particularly disturbed when they see apparently well-off people gaining through Affirmative Action intended for the “economically disadvantaged.” They conclude that these prosperous recipients do not “need” Affirmative Action.²⁰

In the context of original Affirmative Action theory, however, the determinant of the need for Affirmative Action is not wealth, but rather vulnerability to illegal and unnecessary legal barriers. A “wealthy” minority is not necessarily less vulnerable to institutional barriers than is a “poor” minority. Given that Affirmative Action band-aids around barriers, it is conceivable that proactive efforts could benefit an individual without changing the disadvantaging conditions at all. The result would be a recipient helped around barriers that still remain to thwart future efforts.

To create role models. Many managers believe that the absence of role models hinders the motivation and confidence of African Americans as they aspire for upper mobility. Rather than allow this to continue, some managers advocate using Affirmative Action to identify, recruit and hire African Americans from outside the organization for senior posts or the fast track. Once on board, these Affirmative Action hires “model” what is possible as they assume their responsibilities and move up the ladder. Max Frankel describes the probable effect of role models in the television industry:

...When women, Blacks and Asians first joined white men as television anchors, they surely ignited the ambition of many youngsters who had never before imagined themselves eligible. So, too, with judges, generals, editors. Obviously, role models in new settings need to be good at their work. Advancing them without stigma is a delicate business....²¹

I think that this justification is potent only where minorities and women trust the system. Without this trust, the perception that someone is an Affirmative Action hire does not necessarily enhance her credibility. Instead, it can cast a shadow as to whether the organization’s environment would work *without Affirmative Action* for others like the role model. Too often these creation-of-role model efforts model how minorities and women should position themselves to gain from future Affirmative Action efforts to build role models, and not how well systems can work for all.

To do the “right thing”. Proponents of this justification believe that the doers of “good” gain as well as the recipients. That is, Affirmative Action provides a framework for those who wish to work out of or off their guilt over slavery and past discrimination, while simultaneously helping the victims. Roger Wilkins states:

There is one final denial that blankets all the rest. It is that only society’s victims—Blacks, other minorities and women...have been injured by white male supremacy. Viewed in this light, Affirmative Action remedies are a kind of zero-

sum game in which only the “victims” benefit. But racist and sexist whites who are not able to accept the full humanity of other people are themselves badly damaged—morally stunted—people. The principal product of a racist and sexist society is damaged people and institutions—victims and victimizers alike.²²

To foster diversity. This rationale for Affirmative Action has emerged over the past eight years or so. In the mid-nineties when I did an analysis of the case for Affirmative Action, I did not cite this option. Simply stated, proponents of this argument believe that Affirmative Action can bring about racial, ethnic and gender diversity that, in turn, will foster creativity and innovation. Another version contends that Affirmative Action will foster the diversity necessary for pursuing diverse racial, ethnic and gender markets.

I personally can accept this rationale. However, I believe a few points of caution are in order.

- (a) This rationale presumes implicitly and often explicitly that “diversity is good.” Increasingly, I am understanding that diversity is inherently neither good nor bad, but rather a reality. Its potential for good or bad depends on the particulars of a given situation, the nature of the diversity in question and the capability of individuals to make quality decisions in the midst of differences, similarities and tension. If anything is inherently good, it is Diversity Management.
- (b) This rationale is inherently – intentionally or not – part of the responses that flow from the challenge to prove the merits of having a diverse work force. Implied here is that if I cannot prove diversity is a benefit to your organization, as a manager, you can ignore Affirmative Action and diversity. The reality is that regardless of whether I can demonstrate the benefits of a diverse work force, organizations will have a diverse work force. Even today, work forces are diverse – albeit not necessarily with respect to all “protected groups” or to the extent desired.
- (c) This rationale presumes that the most important argument for Affirmative Action is its potential benefits for an organization or community. However, the overarching case is the benefit to society in the United States of pursuing equal opportunity “to overcome the effects of past discrimination.” (FN) In other words, society collectively frowns upon the lack of equal opportunity and representation, regardless of the benefits of Affirmative Action and diversity. Increasingly, to avoid the displeasure of the public, the onus of justifying their circumstances falls on enterprises that lack racial, gender and ethnic representation.
- (d) A final presumption is that organizations can make quality decisions in the midst of the differences, similarities and related tensions that can flow from Affirmative Action. If Affirmative Action generates diversity that organizations cannot manage, potential gains from diversity will elude them.

The Case Against Affirmative Action. Opponents of Affirmative Action have been equally industrious in developing their justifications as have Affirmative Action's advocates. Below I examine briefly some of their arguments.

Affirmative Action departs from the ideal of a color-blind society before the law. These critics place a high priority on establishing color-blind law and social policy. Glazer, for example, complains about the departure from the color-blindness that was implicit in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In 1964, we declared that no account should be taken of race, color, national origin or religion in the spheres of voting, jobs and education (in 1968, we added housing). Yet no sooner had we made this national assertion than we entered into an unexampled recording of the records of the color, race, and national origin of every individual in every significant sphere of his life. Having placed into law the dissenting opinion of *Plessy v. Ferguson* that our constitution is color-blind, we entered into a period of color- and group-consciousness with a vengeance.²³

As noted earlier, color-blind advocates prefer to rely on antidiscrimination laws and—at least until recently—programmatic efforts to enhance the qualifications of minorities to foster their mainstreaming. Yet, neither antidiscrimination laws nor programs for minorities do much to eliminate the legal and illegal institutional barriers that spurred the evolution of Affirmative Action.

Max Frankel provides an example of institutional barriers that might require more than antidiscrimination laws or the “fixing” of minorities:

A decade ago, there were still too few women in The (New York—R.T.) Time's newsroom applying their experiences and insights to the day's events. We had even fewer Blacks, Hispanics and Asians with ties to New York's neighborhoods. Talented homosexuals were afraid that revealing their orientation would foreclose advancement. And the Cardinal himself complained to me that lay Catholics in New York found insufficient kinship and therefore inadequate coverage of themselves in The Times. These impediments to our work were not the result of conscious discrimination. They were rooted in cultural attitudes that had become discriminatory.²⁴

Affirmative Action fosters reverse discrimination. Roger Wilkins captures the essence of this position. He describes this view as contending that racial problems have been solved over the course of the past thirty years and that most of our current racial friction is caused by racial and gender preferences that almost invariably work to displace some “qualified” white male.²⁵ This school of thought makes no distinction between acts of discrimination to harm or acts of discrimination to remedy or restore.⁵⁴ Discrimination is discrimination.

Subscribers to this view, along with advocates of colorblindness, appear to hold that the creation of color-blind law and policy will lead to a color-blind society. Indeed, it sometimes seems that they almost believe that color-blind law and policy are equivalent to the reality of a

color-blind society. This fervor for and emphasis on law and policy clash often with the realities observed or experienced by rank-and-file members of society.

Personally, I am comfortable in agreeing that discrimination is discrimination, but simply prohibiting *future* discrimination does little to address the cumulative effects of past discrimination. Both this view, as well as that of color-blindness would seem more feasible if more attention were given to alleviating the continuing impact of previous acts.

Affirmative Action is divisive in its insistence on determining who is disadvantaged. Nathan Glazer discusses the challenges that have been associated with this process.

...To redress inequalities means, first of all, to define them. It means the recording of ethnic identities, the setting of boundaries separating "affected" groups, arguments among the as yet "unaffected" as to whether they, too, do not have claims to be considered "affected." It turned out that the effort to make the Negro equal to the *other* Americans raised the question of who *are* the other Americans? How many of them can define their own group as *also* deprived? The drawing of group definitions increased the possibilities of conflicts between groups and raised the serious question,,: What is legitimate redress for inequality? ²⁶

Schlesinger believes that the focus on differences has given rise to a cult of ethnicity that can be divisive. He argues that this new ethnic gospel rejects the unifying vision of individuals from all nations melted into a new race. Its underlying philosophy is that America is not a nation of individuals at all, but a nation of groups, where ethnicity is the defining experience for most Americans. He concludes that the idea of a unifying American identity is now in peril in the arenas of politics, voluntary organizations, the nation's churches and our language. ²⁷

Affirmative Action stigmatizes the beneficiaries and makes it difficult for them to gain respect for their accomplishments. Reflective of this perspective, Stephen Carter resents Affirmative Action because it denied him the opportunity to know if he could make it on his own. ²⁸

This criticism of Affirmative Action captures how many who have benefited from it feel. But it also raises the question, "Does anybody make it on their own or solely on merit?" Frankel comments on the role of non-merit factors in the American society.

To reward people for something beyond merit is as American as apple pie. Universities routinely bend a bit to admit the children of alumni, acknowledging with a wink that this fosters loyalty and annual contributions. Few objected when "diversity" in a Northern college meant saving a few places for Southern or Western students. If Californians don't watch the language of that (proposed) (prohibiting Affirmative Action) amendment they could end up sinking their best college teams; how else but by "Affirmative Action" do they recruit so many black athletes and favor them with "set aside" scholarships?

Many enterprises favor the rapid rise of the boss's kids, tapping their devotion to the business. Immigrants have always acted affirmatively to help their own advance in certain lines of work—Irish cops, Italian truckers, Jewish peddlers, Portuguese fishermen, Chinese launderers, Korean grocers. And politicians practiced Affirmative Action long before they had a name for it; no Voting Rights Act was needed 50 years ago to persuade New York Democrats to nominate a Vincent Impellitteri and a Lazarus Joseph to share the ticket with a William O Dwyer.²⁹

My research in organizations has convinced me that “merit” has three components: task proficiency, cultural compatibility, and political support. To do well in a given organization as an employee, one must demonstrate competency in his/her assigned responsibilities, fit in sufficiently with the enterprise's culture, and attract ample political support from people with power to make the “merit” case.

I am reminded of an interview with a Fortune 25 corporation president about the requirements for corporate success. He observed that up to a certain point in the organization, an individual can be assured of a desired promotion by having the best-written performance evaluation. Above this point, however, more is required. It becomes necessary to have a sponsor—someone with enough political clout to vouch for the candidate. Without this sponsor, he asserted, chances for continued advancement did not exist.

Very few individuals, if any “make it on their own.” Some kind of assistance—deserved or not—comes into play—even when it is not solicited. During a program that I was presenting, a manager questioned whether sponsors existed in his corporation. He asserted that he certainly had never had a sponsor. After the meeting, a fellow participant confided to me that the individual's sponsor had been sitting next to him—that everybody knew he would not be where he was without his sponsor, even though he may have been unaware of the assistance provided.

Managers, politicians and others have abused Affirmative Action. A number of alleged abuses have been cited: Orlando Patterson notes how minorities, women and employees have abused the process.

...too many minority workers and women felt entitled to automatic promotion and were too quick to use the accusation of racism or sexism when it was denied. Too many supervisors practice a patronizing racism or sexism. The cynical promotion of unqualified people, even if it happens only occasionally, damages the legitimacy of Affirmative Action since it takes only one such mistake to sour an entire organization.

Also damaging were clearly illegal practices such as using Blacks and women as entrepreneurial fronts to gain access to preferential contracts....³⁰

The Present

At present Affirmative Action continues not only under the conflicts noted above, but also amidst the uncertainty of recent court judgments; such as those related to the University of Michigan case. Organizational and community leaders, along with Affirmative Action practitioners, are not clear as to what to expect going forward.

Individuals opposing Affirmative Action interpret recently expressed concerns and challenges as signs that Affirmative Action is on its last legs. Persons favoring Affirmative Action find encouragement in how it has withstood major attacks.

Those of a different persuasion are concerned that even if Affirmative Action could withstand challenges indefinitely, the divisiveness and intensity of the struggle might be too much for the country. Members of this school call for explorations in search of complements or alternatives that would reduce dependence on Affirmative Action. They prefer an orderly transition, rather than a forced, contentious exit caused by sole dependence on Affirmative Action and unrealistic hopes that the status quo will continue into perpetuity. To proponents of this view, Justice O'Connor's twenty-five years represents a reasonable aspiration.

The significant question becomes, "Will diversity's gatekeepers (e.g. human resource professionals, admissions officers and internal diversity practitioners responsible for managing recruitment, selection and people processes) rise to the challenge? Will they work proactively to reduce their dependence on Affirmative Action, or will they cling to the status quo? In other words, "Will gatekeepers move to develop exit strategies from Affirmative Action?"

Hindering Factors. Multiple circumstances conspire to make it difficult for those with gate-keeping responsibilities to reduce their dependence on Affirmative Action. Several are listed below.

One principal barrier is the politicalization of Affirmative Action. By politicalization, I refer to the reality that debate about Affirmative Action has become part of the political process around the distribution of governance power in our country. As a result, much of what is believed and perceived about Affirmative Action can be traced to rhetoric and debate between political opponents. In addition, Affirmation Action not only has been a political topic, but also has become politicized. In politicized conversations, as opposed to political ones, the debate is not about the merits of the issue, but rather about the implications for the distribution of power. For political topics, merit still matters.

In particular, the politicized status has had several consequences that hamper our ability to become less dependent on Affirmative Action:

- (a) When Affirmative Action is politicized, it reduces the motivation to search for and develop alternatives and complements, primarily because the debate is not around the merits of the issue.
- (b) he politicized status of Affirmative Action has resulted in diversity being defined "as code" for Affirmative Action."

- (c) This politicized definition has compromised conceptual clarity about diversity. The resulting confusion has hampered the evolution and acceptance of Diversity Management as a concept and a process.

Confusion prevails as to the purpose of Affirmative Action. The notion that Affirmative Action is about achieving diversity is increasingly endorsed. Often accompanying this idea is the claim that “diversity” will benefit the organization.

Originally, after the United States concluded collectively that discrimination against “Negroes” was legally and morally unacceptable, Affirmative Action came to life as a vehicle for achieving the *societal* benefit of mainstreaming African-Americans. As Affirmative Action became less viable politically and legally, supporters cited the benefits of “diversity” as justification for its continuation. While the “diversity” benefits may be genuine, the fundamental historical point is that Affirmative Action was not intended to be about organizations. It was about increasing the representation (presence) of African-Americans in the mainstreams of life in the United States. Movement toward complements and alternatives to Affirmative Action must be grounded on an accurate reading of the historical purpose and beneficiary (society) of this initiative.

Continued tension exists between the “gradualist” anti-discrimination camp and those advocating organizational change to foster representation of minorities and women. Those who emphasize anti-discriminatory efforts view racial-, ethnic-, and/or gender specific interventions with suspicion. They believe that substantial progress has already been made with “mainstreaming” minorities and women since discrimination on the basis of race, gender and ethnicity became illegal. For these persons, interventions designed to foster representation must be race, gender, and ethnicity neutral.

On the other hand, proponents of specific interventions argue that not enough progress has been made quickly enough. They believe that reliance on anti-discrimination laws may not be enough. Pro-interventionists call for change through Affirmative Action and other efforts specific to given groups. Sometimes their efforts occur under the diversity rubric..

To the extent that this tension persists, it makes advocates of Affirmative Action nervous, fearful and defensive. They fear premature abolishment of Affirmative Action before the development of effective alternatives. Ironically, this concern hampers moving full speed ahead in developing the alternatives that will allow us to become less dependent on Affirmative Action.

Another barrier is a failure to consider approaches to diversity other than managing representation and relationships. I believe that four basic foci have evolved for addressing diversity:

- (1) Managing Work Force Representation (ensuring that the desired demographics exist in the work force).
- (2) Understanding Work Force Differences (ensuring that quality, productive relationships exist among work force participants).

- (3) Managing Work Force Diversity (ensuring the development of an internal environment that works for a representative and behaviorally diverse work force).
- (4) Managing Strategic Diversity (developing a capability to make quality decisions in the midst of differences, similarities, and tensions related to any mixture that is strategic for the organization).

Most practitioners either have no conceptual understanding of these four approaches, or are stuck on foci #1 and #2. Not long ago, a practitioner described such a situation to me:

“Roosevelt, you know our corporation. We made great progress with representation – our demographics and numbers were first-class. Then, we emphasized awareness and sensitivity training. And here, we also made significant progress. We then sort of went dormant or relaxed, and now we are back again working at representation – looking at how we can recapture the demographic gains we have lost. I guess that once our numbers are okay, we’ll revisit awareness. Is this the way it is suppose to flow?”

This individual was describing being stuck on Managing Work Force Representation and Understanding Work Force Differences. He lacked clarity or even awareness of foci #3 and #4, but possessed a sense that his organization was not necessarily on a productive track. As illustrated by this example, organizations not culturally prepared for a representative work force can experience difficulty in maintaining demographic gains. As a consequence, they cycle repeatedly back and forth between Managing Work Force Representation and Understanding Work Force Differences.

Here, the distinction between the pursuit of representation and diversity becomes important. Diversity, in contrast to representation, includes behavioral similarities and differences. Gatekeepers can achieve representation without generating behavioral variations. The presence of multiple races does not necessarily equate to behavioral diversity. However, increasingly, the creation of a representative work force does, in fact, result in the presence of behavioral differences as well. Work forces that are representative **and** behaviorally diverse require attention to foci #1, #2 **and** #3.

Being “stuck” on foci #1 and #2 severely hampers the gatekeeper’s ability to reduce reliance on Affirmative Action, since the cycle makes it necessary to focus almost continuously on racial representation and Affirmative Action. Without movement to approaches #3 and #4, managers are unlikely to develop a general, universal, capability that can be used for making quality decisions in the midst of racial differences, similarities and tensions.

A barrier of growing importance is the emerging tendency of organizational leaders to focus primarily on avoiding public relations and/or legal embarrassments. Here, managers place little importance on organizational change, improvements, or innovations that might attract and retain a representative workforce. Instead, they give priority to protecting their

enterprise's image. Leaders who do this give gatekeepers little motivation to move beyond Affirmative Action.

An "Affirmative Action forever!" attitude hampers the development of complements and alternatives. Subscribers to this view see Affirmative Action gradually and painfully becoming the permanent "practice of the land." They also contend that advocates must remain watchful and alert to counter any attacks on Affirmative Action. Obviously, this attitude discourages change.

The "entitlement" school of thought is an ongoing impediment to minimizing dependence on Affirmative Action. Proponents here see Affirmative Action as a form of reparations due African-Americans. For these individuals, the country has not settled its slavery debt. Affirmative Action is only a small step toward retiring this obligation. Movement away from Affirmative Action would represent a default on debt that has been outstanding far too long. Subscribers to this school would require some substitute "reparation" to replace the loss of Affirmative Action.

The belief that racism and oppression remain the primary reasons for retaining Affirmative Action hinders the development of complements and alternatives. Proponents of this belief see Affirmative Action as a tool for fighting racism and oppression. They interpret any decline in emphasis on Affirmative Action as a backing away from efforts to eliminate both. In doing so, they create a major obstacle to moving ahead in identifying complements and alternatives.

A preoccupation with work force issues creates a barrier to developing complements and alternatives. Practice in thinking through challenges concerning non-work force differences, similarities and tensions would, at a minimum, broaden understanding of the dynamics of the differences, similarities, and tensions that accompany representation. As such, it would enhance the likelihood of discovering an effective alternate to continuing Affirmative Action. Yet, even when gatekeepers acknowledge that other important diversity mixtures exist (such as, functions, acquisitions/mergers, lines of business, and/or headquarters/field mixtures), they rarely venture beyond the work force.

The tendency to view Affirmative Action as inherently part and parcel of the Civil Rights Movement is a significant barrier. The emotional connection of these two forces works against change, as most people endorse the Civil Rights Movement. Yet, Affirmative Action reflects the reality that the guaranteeing of civil rights alone will not necessarily generate a level playing field (equal opportunity). Affirmative Action is a post-Civil Rights Movement phenomenon..

Facilitating Factors. In spite of an impressive array of barriers to retiring Affirmative Action, three factors work together to make its status quo continuation problematic. Together, they exert pressure to develop complements and alternatives.

The clock keeps ticking. As we approach 2028, debates around Affirmative Action will be influenced increasingly by its "temporary, band-aid" status. Pressure will mount for specifics as to exit strategies that will generate effective race-neutral frameworks for achieving

the desired mainstreaming. By 2028, the country will have had 60 plus years of experience with Affirmative Action. “How much more time will be needed?” will become the pressing question and also a major force for change.

Implementing Affirmative will become increasingly complex. The burden of this complexity will encourage change. Hispanics have recently become the largest minority, thus putting the dynamics of minority relationships and politics in flux. Not only will all kinds of groups (not just racial and other minorities) clamor for “protected status” and inclusion under Affirmative Action, the protests of those not encompassed likely will become louder. To complicate matters more, as slavery and legal discrimination recede further into the country’s history, fewer and fewer citizens will have an accurate understand of the meaning or intent of Affirmative Action. All of these realities will make continuation of the Affirmative Action status quo extremely challenging.

Eventually, the question will not be whether to eliminate the need for Affirmative Action. It will be whether we will prepare for its dismantlement in a planned, systematic fashion or, through our inaction, contribute to divisiveness, conflict, and turmoil. The longer we delay beginning the transition, the more likely turbulence and divisiveness will become the precipitating factors.

Finally, managers and diversity practitioners are becoming aware that they are stuck in their diversity efforts. The growing knowledge that they continue to “retread old ground” may ultimately be the overwhelming force in promoting needed change.

The Future

Prescriptions for fixing the ailing Affirmative Action are numerous, contradictory, and often offered shrilly. Most have one major limitation. They continue to focus on how to apply the Affirmative Action band-aid and neglect the basic symptom of dysfunction. As such, they cannot carry us adequately into the future. Remember: The goal of all adjustments, complements, or alternatives to Affirmative Action must be to facilitate the ability to secure the desired racial representation within America’s institutions without resort to race-conscious tools. Prescriptions that fail to do so waste valuable time.

Prescriptions for the Future: The Views of Others. Within the context of this requirement, I offer both a representative sampling of prescriptions offered currently by others as well as my comments on these prescriptions.

Max Frankel argues for clarifying the benefits of Affirmative Action—for affirming the affirmative. He contends that if Americans were clearer about Affirmative Action’s objectives, more would be receptive. He sees reasonable kinds of favoritism in pursuit of acceptable, clear objectives as a common part of the American scene.³¹

Such clarification would make “outreach Affirmative Action acceptable,” but still would do little to move beyond the band-aid approach. It would not, for example, promote progress in removing the remaining institutionalized barriers to diversity—with preparing the country for increased diversity. Essentially Frankel proposes a justification for the band-aid, but does not address eliminating the conditions necessitating the band-aid.

Others, including Orlando Patterson, call for acknowledging abuses of Affirmative Action and correcting these situations. ³² They see the legitimate criticisms of Affirmative Action as treatable.

Even if we could restore Affirmative Action and practice it in its purest conceptual form, this would only skirt societal parameters not grounded on the assumption of diversity. It would do little—if anything—to eliminate institutional barriers that prohibit the effective management of the ever-increasing reality of diversity.

Advocates of the color-blindness school call for the abolishment or minimization of Affirmative Action and greater reliance on the enforcement of antidiscrimination laws. These individuals argue that eliminating discrimination through law enforcement will provide equal opportunity. Unfortunately, the challenge may be more complex.

Antidiscrimination laws address current, explicit discriminatory behavior, but do little or nothing to remedy discriminatory barriers intentionally or unintentionally built into the fabric of society and its institutions. Inviting elephants into a giraffe house and forbidding the giraffes to discriminate against elephants does nothing to alleviate the discriminatory effects inherent in a house built for giraffes. A house built for giraffes simply will not work as well for elephants regardless of the extent to which current explicit discrimination is eliminated.

Even if we acknowledge that antidiscrimination laws aren’t enough and that structural barriers must be addressed, we have only described the problem, not solved it. Building a house for giraffes **or** for elephants is much easier building one for giraffes **and** elephants. Few managers have experience in building a house on the assumption of diversity; instead, they typically have built for giraffes or elephants and welcomed everyone else willing to adapt. Without the ability to incorporate diversity into the structure, antidiscrimination may do little to foster equal opportunity—especially with respect to the “conditions of competition.”

Another prescription is to see individuals as individuals. This message, consistent with our national individualistic spirit and the understanding of many as the essence of Dr. Martin Luther King’s message, calls for the avoidance of stereotyping. It attracts considerable support.

It does not, however, relax the “fitting in” requirement. In other words, many of us are willing to see individuals as individuals as long as they “fit in.” This is analogous to the giraffe being willing to see the elephant as an individual, as long as he behaved like a giraffe. As such, this prescription gives us no tools for addressing institutional barriers.

A related prescription advocates race—blindness, ethnic-blindness and gender-blindness. This prescription too, fits well with the American spirit.

Clearly, we want a society that does not judge people on the basis of their race, ethnicity or gender. Ironically, however, we cannot build communities or organizations that work for *all* races and *both* genders unless we are race- and gender-conscious. To build a house that works for giraffes and elephants requires that we know something about the particular giraffes and elephants involved and to use this knowledge in designing the house.

We must, of course, avoid racial and gender stereotyping. Nevertheless we must take into account *individual* manifestations of race and gender as we build organizations and communities that work for *all*. Implicit here is the reality that the nature of the significance of race and gender may vary from individual to individual, but yet must be addressed.

Orlando Patterson calls for an approach that reflects the need to be race conscious without stereotyping.

Race...should have nothing to do with the assessment of...virtues. Race, however, refers to several aspects of the person. It refers to physical appearance, and this, every African American would agree...should be a matter of no importance. But for African Americans, race also means surviving an environment in which racism is still pervasive. It has to be taken into account in assessing the context of any black person's character, and to assert that this amounts to a divisive glorification of race is as disingenuous and as absurd as claiming that we are divisively glorifying poverty and broken families when we take account of these factors in assessing a white student's character.³³

In any event, interestingly and paradoxically, race- and gender-blindness are likely to hamper modifying institutionalized barriers so that society works for all. The need to come to grips with this reality adds another complexity to the challenge of achieving equal opportunity.

A prescription receiving increasing attention calls for Affirmative Action based on social class or income. Our earlier discussions do not offer much hope for such an approach. The mere fact that Affirmative Action is being considered suggests that the current situation is not working for individuals in certain classes. As with the original version, the revised Affirmative Action methodology would not attempt to modify existing arrangements; it would offer a band-aid around them. Stated differently, present status-quo parameters are not designed for "class diversity" and the proposed modified Affirmative Action methodology would do little to address this reality.

Not everyone agrees. Some—including Arch Puddington—see possible gains from the proposed modifications around class or income. He anticipates some benefits in the arena of education. Blacks would profit, he says, because they suffer disproportionately from poverty. And real campus diversity would be enhanced by the presence of students whose backgrounds differ radically from the middle and upper class majority, and whose opinions could not be so predictably categorized along the conformist race (and gender) lines.³⁴

The validity of Puddington's projections would hinge on whether our society and its organizations are better suited for other kinds of diversity than they were for the race and

gender variety. My observations indicate that we are not prepared for or receptive to significant diversity of any kind. I remember vividly the comments of a senior white male manager twenty years ago:

I don't have any problem with getting on with managing diversity. We need to move forward. But I resent the insinuation that we did not have diversity until women and minorities arrived in significant numbers. Even when we were all white males in this corporation we had diversity. We've always had it, and we've always *squashed* it! That's why we're having difficulty today with minorities and women.

Prescription for the Future: My Personal View *My personal prescription calls for individuals, organizations and communities to develop a Diversity Management capability within the context of the Strategic Diversity Management Process™; that is, the ability to make quality decisions in the midst of any differences, similarities and tensions, including those related to race, gender, and ethnicity. This prescription originates from my belief that the principal reason for the creation of Affirmative Action was the lack of readiness for diversity.*

After nearly 40 years of Affirmative Action, as a society we are no more ready for diversity than we were almost four decades ago. This is in part because the Affirmative Action band-aid allowed us to ignore our inability to address diversity effectively. I can predict with confidence that, without any significant shifts in approach, another 40 years of Affirmative Action would also bring limited progress. If we are to create communities and organizations that work for diverse populations, we must look beyond Affirmative Action.

I recommend the Strategic Diversity Management Process™ for four reasons:

- (1) It offers a context for addressing racial diversity. Given my contention that a lack of readiness for racial diversity led to the need for Affirmative Action, SDMP™'s applicability for racial diversity is a positive.
- (2) It is race-neutral. While SDMP™ can be applied to racial diversity, it is not a racial framework. It offers a capability for dealing with differences, similarities and related tensions of any (including racial) kind.
- (3) It can accommodate the gradualist school of thought. The gradualist approach to mainstreaming meshes well with SDMP™'s principle that "context is important." Color-blind laws and policies provide context supportive of the mainstreaming objective.
- (4) Finally, SDMP™ can accommodate the interventionist school. One caveat would be required; namely, that the intervention would be race-neutral. In "From Affirmative Action to Affirming Diversity, I discussed such interventions:

There is a simple test to help you spot the diversity programs that are going to eat up enormous quantities of time and effort. ... The test consists of one question: Does this program, policy or principle give special consideration to

one group? Will it contribute to everyone's success, or will it only produce an advantage for blacks or whites or women or men? Is it designed for them as opposed to us? Whenever the answer is yes, you're not yet on the road to managing diversity.

This does not rule out the possibility of addressing issues that relate to a single group. It only underlines the importance of determining that the issue you're addressing does not relate to other groups as well. For example, management in one company noticed that blacks were not moving up in the organization. Before instituting a special program to bring them along, managers conducted interviews to see if they could find the reason for the impasse. What blacks themselves reported was a problem with the quality of supervision. Further interviews showed that other employees too – including white males – were concerned about the quality of supervision and felt that little was being done to foster professional development. Correcting the situation eliminated a problem that affected everyone. In this case, a solution that focused only on blacks would have been out of place.³⁵

Should we then abolish or minimize Affirmative Action? No!! Until we modify our communities and organizations around diversity realities, Affirmative Action enables us to use band-aid approaches that artificially allow the accommodation of diversity to some extent. Remove the band-aid, and the non-diversity grounded policies and practices *naturally* will return to dominancy. But going against the grain can be exhausting, challenging and divisive.

The solution is to move forward with remodeling organizations and society around assumptions of all kinds of diversity. An emerging process for doing this is "Managing Diversity" with respect to work force and population diversity, and "Diversity Management" with respect to all kinds of diversity.

Implications for Action

What are the implications for action? What must executives, internal human resource professionals, and those responsible for diversity efforts do to help their organizations develop complements and alternatives to Affirmative Action?

Affirm your organization's commitment to racial and ethnic representation in your work force. By commitment, I mean a willingness to work proactively to ensure the creation and maintenance of a representative work force. Without a firm, trustworthy commitment to representation, any exit strategy will be difficult to implement. Any sense that commitment is lacking would provoke a defensive reaction to cling to the status quo.

Because representation is the focus of Affirmative Action, I do mean a representative work force, as opposed to one that is behaviorally diverse. Commitment to representation does not preclude pursuit of behavioral variations. But these are two different questions: "Do we want representation?" "Do we want behavioral variations?" Both must be examined.

Work to de-politicize Affirmative Action within your organization. If there is to be any hope for finding complements and alternatives for Affirmative Action, the concept must be de-politicized. If we don't, any serious discussion of Affirmative Action will continue to take place primarily in the context of political contests. This win/lose environment would not bode well for progress with complements and alternatives.

Secure commitment for the development of an exit strategy from Affirmative Action. This is not a commitment to abandon or oppose Affirmative Action, but rather one to prepare for an orderly transition when the time comes. Proponents of Affirmative Action will be able to accept the concept of an exit strategy only if convinced the organization will maintain a continued, effective effort to achieve a representative work force at all levels.

Legitimize the dialogue, debate and experimentation that will generate the creativity and innovation needed to develop an effective Affirmative Action exit strategy. Care will be needed to create a context of trust, openness, and candor. Leaders will have to nurture this process carefully.

Part of the process will involve answering the question, "Why representation?" Wherever you end up in your response, do not downplay the societal imperative – as opposed to the business rationale – for achieving representation. In many settings, with respect to representation, the societal imperative will be greater than that of business urgency. Simply stated, a democratic, racial and ethnic pluralistic country requires the proportional economic participation and inclusion of all groups. This is a must for societal well-being.

Deliberately develop race-neutral, gender-neutral, and ethnic-neutral people processes for attracting, selecting and retaining a representative work force. Begin by applying a common set of process criteria and performance standards to all. Do whatever you must to ensure that each criterion and standard is based on absolute requirements, and not on personal preferences, conveniences or traditions. You do not want to screen out someone on the basis of anything less than a requirement.

Build a collective and individual Diversity Management capability. Collectively and individually, organizational participants should work to acquire the diversity skills (ability to recognize, analyze and respond appropriately to diversity mixtures) and to attain diversity maturity (the wisdom and judgment necessary for using the skills effectively). This capability is unquestionably necessary for the development of an environment that fully engages a representative and behaviorally diverse work force. Such an environment would greatly facilitate the transition to race-neutral people processes, and ultimately make Affirmative Action unnecessary.

No individual, indeed no one organization can "fix" Affirmative Action or single-handedly teach America to achieve the ability to secure the desired racial representation without resort to race-conscious tools. But well-informed, well-motivated individuals and organizations working together can make major progress in doing so. I urge you to individually and collectively become part of the solution to what ails Affirmative Act

Notes

- 1 To be located.
- 2 To be located.
- 3 Arch Puddington, "What to Do About Affirmative Action," Commentary, June, 1995, p. 23.
- 4 Paul Craig Roberts and Lawrence M. Stratton, "Color Code," National Review, March 20, 1995, p. 40.
- 5 John W. Gardner, Excellence (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1984), pp. 43-44.
- 6 Glazer, p. 42.
- 7 Ibid., p. 43.
- 8 Ibid., p.4.
- 9 Robert and Stratton, p. 36.
- 10 Ibid., p. 38.
- 11 Puddington, p. 21.
- 12 Ibid., p. 23.
- 13 Gardner, p. 46.
- 14 Gardner, p. 48.
- 15 Ibid., p. 49.
- 16 Roger Wilkins, "Racism Has Its Privileges: The Case for Affirmative Action," The Nation, March 27, 1995, p. 410.
- 17 Wilkins, p. 412.
- 18 William Claiborne, "Affirmative Action Curbed in California," Washington Post, June 2, 1995, p. A01.

- 19 Author unable to recall the address in which the speaker used this analogy.
- 20 Terry Eastland, *Ending Affirmative Action: The Case for Colorblind justice*, New York: Basic Books, 1996, p.139.
- 21 Max Frankel, "Reaffirm the Affirmative," *New York Times Magazine*, February 26, 1995, p. 22.
- 22 Wilkins, p. 414.
- 23 Glazer, p. 31.
- 24 Frankel, p. 414.
- 25 Jeffrey Rosen, "The Color Blind Court," *The New Republic*, July 31, 1995, pp. 19-25.
- 26 Glazer, p. 31.
- 27 Schlesinger, pp. 16-17.
- 28 Stephen L. Carter, *Reflections of an Affirmative Action Baby* (New York: Basic Books, 1991), pp. 47-50.
- 29 Frankel, p. 414.
- 30 Orlando Patterson, "Affirmative Action on the Merit System," *New York Times*, August 7, 1995, p. A-1.
- 31 Frankel, p . 22.
- 32 Patterson, p. A-11.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Puddington, pp. 26-27.
- 35 R. Roosevelt Thomas, Jr., "From Affirmative Action to Affirming Diversity", *Harvard Business Review*, March-April 90 Number 2 , p. 117