

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF AMICI .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	7
I. CONSIDERATION OF RACE AND ETHNICITY IN AN INDIVIDUALIZED ADMISSIONS PROCESS SERVES COMPELLING INTERESTS ....	7
A. There Is a Broad Consensus On The Important Educational Benefits of Diversity.....	7
B. Consideration of Race and Ethnicity Grows Naturally Out Of The Needs Of The Professions and Of American Business .....	10
C. The Interests in Diversity and Inclusion That Support Well-Designed Programs of Race-Specific Affirmative Action in University Admissions Do Not Reflect Impermissible Stereotyping .....	12
D. Advancing The Interests In Diversity and Inclusion Is Not Tantamount to Attempting to Remedy Societal Discrimination. ....	14
II. STRICT SCRUTINY IS SATISFIED BY PROPERLY DESIGNED UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS POLICIES THAT CONSIDER RACE AND ETHNICITY .....	15
A. The Distinctive Educational Role of Universities Must Be Accommodated in The Application Of Strict Scrutiny .....	15

B. Explicit Consideration of Race and Ethnicity In an Individualized Admissions Process Is Fully Capable of Satisfying the Narrow Tailoring Requirement . . . . .	18
1. Petitioners’ Arguments Rest on a Misunderstanding of the Admissions Process At Selective Universities . . . . .	19
2. The Interest In Racial Diversity Cannot Be Served By Race-Neutral Reliance On Factors, Such As Economic Disadvantage, That Are Already Carefully Considered . . . . .	22
3. The Interest in Racial Diversity Cannot Be Served By The Newer Alternatives Involving Non-Individualized Guaranteed Admissions . . . . .	23
C. Consideration of Race Does Not Make An Admissions Plan A Quota . . . . .	26
D. Race-Conscious Admissions Programs Are Not Open-Ended Commitments . . . . .	27
CONCLUSION . . . . .	30

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page</b>
<i>Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena</i> , 515 U.S. 200 (1995) . . . . .	6, 14, 15-17
<i>Batson v. Kentucky</i> , 476 U.S. 79 (1986) . . . . .	26
<i>Board of Regents v. Southworth</i> , 529 U.S. 217 (2000) . . . . .	15
<i>Brown v. Bd. of Education</i> , 347 U.S. 483 (1954) . . . . .	28
<i>Burson v. Freeman</i> , 504 U.S. 191 (1992) . . . . .	28
<i>Bush v. Vera</i> , 517 U.S. 952 (1996) . . . . .	18
<i>City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.</i> , 488 U.S. 469 (1989) . . . . .	14
<i>Dickerson v. United States</i> , 530 U.S. 428 (2000) . . . . .	8
<i>Easley v. Cromartie</i> , 532 U.S. 235 (2001) . . . . .	18
<i>Eldred v. Ashcroft</i> , 123 S. Ct. 769 (2003) . . . . .	28
<i>Georgia v. McCollum</i> , 505 U.S. 42 (1992) . . . . .	26
<i>Hills v. Gautreaux</i> , 425 U.S. 284 (1976) . . . . .	28
<i>Hunt v. Cromartie</i> , 526 U.S. 541 (1999) . . . . .	18
<i>Hunter v. Underwood</i> , 471 U.S. 222 (1985) . . . . .	22
<i>J.E.B. v. Alabama ex rel. T.B.</i> , 511 U.S. 127 (1994) . . . . .	26
<i>Johnson v. Transportation Agency</i> , 480 U.S. 616 (1987) . . . . .	17
<i>Keyishian v. Board of Regents</i> , 385 U.S. 589 (1967) . . . . .	12
<i>Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC</i> , 497 U.S. 547 (1990) . . . . .	4, 13, 15
<i>Mississippi Univ. for Women v. Hogan</i> , 458 U.S. 718 (1982) . . . . .	17
<i>Planned Parenthood v. Casey</i> , 505 U.S. 833 (1992) . . . . .	8
<i>Regents of the University of California v. Bakke</i> , 438 U.S. 265 (1978) . . . . .	1, 7, 8, 14, 16, 25-27
<i>Regents of the University of Michigan v. Ewing</i> , 474 U.S. 214 (1985) . . . . .	16
<i>Shaw v. Reno</i> , 509 U.S. 630 (1993) . . . . .	22
<i>Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Education</i> , 402 U.S. 1 (1971) . . . . .	28

<b>Cases (continued)</b>	<b>Page</b>
<i>Sweezy v. New Hampshire</i> , 354 U.S. 234 (1957) . . . . .	16
<i>United States v. Virginia</i> , 518 U.S. 515 (1996) . . . . .	17
<i>University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC</i> , 493 U.S. 182 (1990) . . . . .	15
<i>Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Educ.</i> , 476 U.S. 276 (1986) . . . . .	7, 14

<b>Miscellaneous</b>	<b>Page</b>
ABA REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY IN LEGAL EDUCATION (1998) . . . . .	10
AMA BOARD OF TRUSTEES REPORT, DIVERSITY IN MEDICAL EDUCATION (1999) . . . . .	10
<i>Appearance and Reality in the Sunshine State</i> , Harvard Civil Rights Project (Feb. 2003) . . . . .	23
Derek Bok, <i>The Uncertain Future of Race-Sensitive Admissions</i> (Jan. 2003) . . . . .	10, 11, 23, 25
William G. Bowen & Derek Bok, THE SHAPE OF THE RIVER: LONG-TERM CONSEQUENCES OF CONSIDERING RACE IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS (2000) . . . . .	12, 21
William G. Bowen & Sarah A. Levin, RECLAIMING THE GAME (forthcoming) . . . . .	21, 29
William G. Bowen & Neil L. Rudenstine, <i>Race-Sensitive Admissions: Back to Basics</i> , CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION 87 (Feb. 7, 2003) . . . . .	11
Richard A. Epstein, <i>A Rational Basis for Affirmative Action: A Shaky But Classical Liberal Defense</i> , 100 MICH. L. REV. 2036 (2002) . . . . .	11
Holman W. Jenkins, Jr., <i>Why the Michigan Case Matters to Business</i> , Wall Street Journal, Jan. 22, 2003, at A15 . . . . .	11

<b>Miscellaneous (continued)</b>	<b>Page</b>
John F. Kain and Daniel M. O'Brien, "Hopwood and the Top 10 Percent Law: How Have They Affected the College Enrollment Decisions of High School Graduates," presented at the National Bureau of Economic Research Meeting on Higher Education (Boston: Nov. 9, 2001; revised Dec. 2002) . . . . .	24
Thomas J. Kane, <i>Racial and Ethnic Preferences in College Admissions</i> , in THE BLACK-WHITE TEST SCORE GAP (Brookings, 1998) . . . . .	23
Glenn Loury, THE ANATOMY OF RACIAL INEQUALITY (2002) . . . . .	29
<i>Percent Plans in College Admissions: A Comparative Analysis of Three State Experiences</i> , Harvard Civil Rights Project (Feb. 2003) . . . . .	23
Neil Rudenstine, THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT 1993-1995: DIVERSITY AND LEARNING . . . . .	9
STATISTICAL ABSTRACT OF THE UNITED STATES 2001 . . . . .	23
Kathleen M. Sullivan, <i>The Supreme Court, 1985 Term – Comment: Sins of Discrimination: Last Term's Affirmative Action Cases</i> , 100 HARV. L. REV. 78 (1986) . . . . .	14