1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	x
3	BILL SCHUETTE, ATTORNEY :
4	GENERAL OF MICHIGAN, :
5	Petitioner : No. 12-682
6	v. :
7	COALITION TO DEFEND AFFIRMATIVE :
8	ACTION, INTEGRATION AND IMMIGRANT:
9	RIGHTS AND FIGHT FOR EQUALITY BY :
10	ANY MEANS NECESSARY (BAMN, ET AL.):
11	x
12	Washington, D.C.
13	Tuesday, October 15, 2013
14	
15	The above-entitled matter came on for oral
16	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
17	at 1:00 p.m.
18	APPEARANCES:
19	JOHN J. BURSCH, ESQ., Solicitor General, Lansing,
20	Michigan; on behalf of Petitioner.
21	MARK D. ROSENBAUM, ESQ., Los Angeles, California; on
22	behalf of Cantrell Respondents.
23	SHANTA DRIVER, ESQ., Detroit, Michigan; for Coalition to
24	Defend Affirmative Action Respondents.
25	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	JOHN J. BURSCH, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	MARK D. ROSENBAUM, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Cantrell Respondents	25
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	SHANTA DRIVER, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Coalition to Defend	
11	Affirmative Action Respondents	41
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
13	JOHN J. BURSCH, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioner	53
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(1:00 p.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We will hear
4	argument next today in Case 12-682, Schuette v. The
5	Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action.
6	Mr. Bursch.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF JOHN J. BURSCH
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
9	MR. BURSCH: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice,
10	and may it please the Court:
11	The issue in this case is whether a Michigan
12	constitutional provision requiring equal treatment
13	violates equal protection. And for two reasons, the
14	answer is no.
15	First, unlike the laws at issue in Hunter
16	and Seattle, Section 26 does not repeal an
17	antidiscrimination law. Instead, it repeals
18	preferences, and thus, it's an impediment to
19	preferential treatment, not equal treatment.
20	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Holt had nothing to do
21	with an antidiscrimination law. It had to do with a
22	remedy, defacto segregation. Why isn't this identical
23	to Seattle?
24	MR. BURSCH: Justice Sotomayor, it's not
25	identical because of the remedy issue. In Seattle, they

- 1 were trying to create, in the court's words, equal
- 2 educational opportunity by imposing a remedy that would
- 3 result in equality in the schools.
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You don't think that the
- 5 proponents of affirmative action are attempting to do
- 6 the same thing? One of the bill sponsors here said that
- 7 this constitutional amendment will bring back
- 8 desegregation in Michigan, and it appears to have done
- 9 just that.
- MR. BURSCH: Well, there's two points to
- 11 that question and I'll address them both. First on the
- 12 merits, under Grutter, the point of preferences in
- 13 university admissions cannot be solely the benefit of
- 14 the minority because under Grutter, it's supposed to
- 15 benefit the campus as a whole through diversity, and
- 16 which we think is a laudable goal.
- 17 It's a forward-looking action, not a
- 18 backward-looking action, to remedy past discrimination.
- 19 And we know that because under Grutter, you can use
- 20 preferences whether or not there's de facto or de jure
- 21 segregation, simply to get the benefit.
- But with respect to your -- your point about
- 23 the University of Michigan and what has or has not
- 24 happened here, two thoughts on that. First, we have the
- 25 statistics that we discuss in our reply brief where it's

- 1 not clear that -- that the diversity on Michigan's
- 2 campus has gone down. But our main point on that is --
- 3 is not those numbers, but the fact that there are other
- 4 things that the University of Michigan could be doing to
- 5 achieve diversity in race-neutral ways.
- 6 For example, we know that --
- 7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I -- I thought that in
- 8 Grutter, all of the social scientists had pointed out to
- 9 the fact that all of those efforts had failed. That's
- 10 one of the reasons why the -- I think it was a law
- 11 school claim in Michigan was upheld.
- 12 MR. BURSCH: Well, there's social science
- 13 evidence that goes both ways. But I want to focus on
- 14 the University of Michigan because there's two things
- 15 that they could be doing right now that would get them
- 16 closer to the race-neutral goal.
- 17 The first thing is that they could eliminate
- 18 alumni preferences. Other schools have done that.
- 19 They have not. That's certainly one way that tilts the
- 20 playing field away from underrepresented minorities.
- 21 The other one, and this is really important,
- 22 is the focus on socioeconomic --
- 23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It's always wonderful
- 24 for minorities that they finally get in, they finally
- 25 have children and now you're going to do away for that

- 1 preference for them. It seems that the game posts keeps
- 2 changing every few years for minorities.
- 3 MR. BURSCH: Given the makeup of Michigan's
- 4 alumni right now, certainly that playing field would be
- 5 tilted the other way.
- 6 The other thing that we press is
- 7 socioeconomic diversity. And at the University of
- 8 Michigan, there was a stat in "The Wall Street Journal"
- 9 just two days ago that if you measure that by Pell
- 10 grants, the number of students who are eligible for
- 11 those, at the University of Michigan the number of
- 12 students who have Pell grants is half what it is at more
- 13 progressive institutions like Berkeley and the
- 14 University of Texas at Austin.
- 15 So the University of Michigan could be
- 16 trying harder. But our point isn't to get into a debate
- 17 about whether preferences are a good or bad thing
- 18 because that's not what this case is about. The
- 19 question is whether the people of Michigan had the
- 20 choice through the democratic process to accept this
- 21 Court's invitation in Grutter to try race-neutral means.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Bursch, could you go
- 23 back --
- 24 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, while you're on
- 25 Seattle, can you -- I have difficulty distinguishing

- 1 Seattle. One factual difference is that there was a
- 2 school board there, a directly-elected school board
- 3 elected for a short term of years. Here there's a board
- 4 of trustees.
- 5 Is that -- is that the distinguish -- a
- 6 distinguishing factor in the case in which a principal
- 7 distinction could be made?
- 8 MR. BURSCH: I think it's a distinguishing
- 9 factor. You know, kind of sticking with how hard is it
- 10 under the new political process. And I think the chart
- 11 that we have on page 17 of our reply brief explains that
- 12 it's really easier to change race-based admissions
- 13 policies now than it was before Section 26. And that's
- 14 one basis.
- 15 But I think the more fundamental basis is to
- 16 say, you know, what Seattle is about. And -- and if you
- 17 indulge me, I'm going to suggest that Seattle could mean
- 18 one of three things. One of those I think you should
- 19 clearly reject, and then the other two I think are --
- 20 are possible interpretations that you could adopt.
- 21 When Seattle talks about racial
- 22 classifications, it focuses on laws that have a racial
- 23 focus. Now, right out of the box, equal protection is
- 24 about people, not about laws, but even more
- 25 fundamentally, that cannot be the right test. At a

- 1 minimum, that part of Seattle has to go because if you
- 2 had a race-neutral law, like Michigan's Equal Protection
- 3 Clause, which forbids discrimination on the basis of
- 4 race or sex -- you know, it mirrors the concept of the
- 5 Federal clause -- that itself would be subject to strict
- 6 scrutiny because it has a racial focus. So we know that
- 7 can't be right and that's Respondent's position.
- 8 So that leaves you two other choices. And
- 9 one would be an incremental change to this political
- 10 restructuring doctrine; the other would be a more
- 11 aggressive change. The incremental change would be to
- 12 interpret racial classification in Seattle as meaning a
- 13 law that, one, repeals an antidiscrimination provision,
- 14 as it did in Hunter and Seattle. And two, removes that
- issue to a higher level of the decision-making process.
- And because Michigan's law requires equal
- 17 treatment, it eliminates preferences, not an
- 18 antidiscrimination law. That would be a way that you
- 19 could keep Seattle and Hunter as a viable doctrine, and
- 20 still rule in our favor on this case.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I don't see the
- 22 distinction. Bussing could be viewed, and was viewed,
- 23 to benefit only one group. It was a preference for
- 24 blacks to get into better schools. That's the way the
- 25 case was pitched, that was its justification, and to

- 1 integrate the society. Affirmative action has the same
- 2 gain. We've said that in Fisher, it should be to
- 3 diversify the population, and so it favors diversity as
- 4 opposed to desegregation.
- 5 MR. BURSCH: Right. But there's a
- 6 difference between favoring diversity as an abstract
- 7 concept on campus, which Grutter clearly allows, and
- 8 remedying past discrimination, which was the point of
- 9 the bussing in Seattle. And that's why we're really in
- 10 a post-Seattle world now because under --
- 11 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But there -- there was no
- 12 proof that there was any de jure segregation in Seattle.
- 13 MR. BURSCH: That's correct because, at the
- 14 time of Seattle's decision, we didn't yet have parents
- involved, and so there wasn't a strict scrutiny test
- 16 that was being applied to that bussing program. And so
- 17 you didn't have to go as far as you would today if you
- 18 wanted to uphold that same bussing program.
- But what really -- what ties this case up --
- 20 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But you're saying there --
- 21 there are three things. One, the first you reject.
- MR. BURSCH: Yes.
- 23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: The law was a racial
- 24 focus.
- MR. BURSCH: It can't be because of racial

- 1 focus.
- 2 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Okay. And the second was
- 3 an incremental improvement in the -- in the democratic
- 4 process -- or democratic responsibility?
- 5 MR. BURSCH: That, plus --
- 6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Responsiveness, I quess.
- 7 MR. BURSCH: Right. That, plus repealing an
- 8 antidiscrimination law. I think that's a narrow way --
- 9 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And was there a third, did
- 10 you say?
- MR. BURSCH: Well, the third way is really
- 12 to -- to look at racial focus and say that's wrong, and
- 13 maybe this whole doctrine needs to be reexamined. And
- 14 the way that you could do that is to look at what
- 15 Seattle and Hunter are really doing, which is falling
- 16 right into the Washington v. Davis line of cases.
- 17 Both of those cases could have been resolved
- 18 by saying, one, there's a disparate impact; and two,
- 19 given the facts and circumstances in 1969, Akron, Ohio
- 20 and 1982, Seattle, Washington, that there was
- 21 discriminatory animus based on race. And if you did
- 22 that, you could reconcile those cases with
- 23 Washington v. Davis and the entire line of equal
- 24 protection jurisprudence this Court has used since that
- 25 time.

- 1 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the reason to claim
- 2 in this case, it just wasn't decided -- wasn't there a
- 3 racial animus, that the reason for Proposition 2 was to
- 4 reduce the minority population? The court of appeals
- 5 didn't get to that, but there was such a claim.
- 6 MR. BURSCH: There was a claim, but, Your
- 7 Honor, there was also a decision. And the district
- 8 court was really clear on this. Keep in mind that this
- 9 was a summary judgment posture, and the district court
- 10 concluded properly that there wasn't even a question of
- 11 material disputed fact with respect to intent. This is
- 12 at pages 317 to 319 of the supplemental appendix
- 13 petition.
- And that's because the primary motivation
- for Section 26 included so many nondiscriminatory
- 16 reasons, including the belief of some in Michigan that
- 17 preferences are themselves race discrimination. Others
- 18 that -- race-neutral alternatives is actually a better
- 19 way to achieve campus diversity that results in better
- 20 outcomes for underrepresented minority students. Some
- 21 could believe that the preferences result in mismatch,
- 22 as Justice Thomas is --
- 23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: That, it seemed to me a
- 24 good distinction for Hunter and Mulkey v. Reitman, which
- 25 the briefs don't talk much about.

- 1 MR. BURSCH: Yes.
- 2 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But not necessarily a
- 3 distinction in Seattle because Seattle you could argue,
- 4 well, there are other methods that are less racially
- 5 divisive.
- 6 MR. BURSCH: And I think -- and I would like
- 7 to come back to Reitman because that fits into this
- 8 framework, too.
- 9 But I think if you have any question about
- 10 what Seattle really meant, the place to look is the
- 11 later decision in Cuyahoga Falls because in Cuyahoga the
- 12 Court specifically mentions, quote, "the evil of
- 13 discriminatory intent present in Seattle." That's at
- 14 pages 196 to '97 of the opinion.
- 15 And it also talks about the decisionmakers'
- 16 statements as evidence of discriminatory intent in the
- 17 Hunter case, at page 195. And so I think if you look at
- 18 Cuyahoga Falls, it has already done some of the work for
- 19 you if you are going to take the more conservative route
- 20 and say there's intent.
- 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But I don't see how the
- 22 argument would be any different here. One of the main
- 23 sponsors of this bill said it was intended to segregate
- 24 again. The voters in Seattle were not all filled with
- 25 animus, some of them just cared about their children not

- leaving -- not having outsiders come in. I mean,
- 2 there's always voters who have good intent.
- 3 MR. BURSCH: That's true and there is always
- 4 some bad apples, too. We don't dispute that point. But
- 5 -- but here you have a district court holding that there
- 6 is not even a material question of fact with respect to
- 7 animus, because there are so many reasons that could be
- 8 advanced, legitimate reasons again, about mismatch and
- 9 about the benefits of racial --
- 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: In Seattle as well. So
- 11 it wasn't the issue of animus that drove Seattle.
- 12 MR. BURSCH: I think it's much harder in
- 13 Seattle, Your Honor. But, you know, to fit Reitman into
- 14 this discussion and what I would consider the more
- 15 conservative way to deal with Seattle and Hunter, one
- 16 that would preserve those as a doctrine, is to think
- 17 about how Reitman would come out under that test.
- In Reitman, of course, you had
- 19 antidiscrimination laws, just like in Hunter, at the
- 20 local level, which were then repealed by a State
- 21 constitutional amendment. And the political
- 22 restructuring doctrine had not yet been invented yet,
- 23 and so what the Court did is it relied on the California
- 24 Supreme Court's finding that there was discriminatory
- 25 animus in striking down those antidiscrimination laws.

1	Τ	tnink	tnat	lΙ	you	view	Hunter	and	Seattle

- 2 similarly as cases where if you repeal an
- 3 antidiscrimination law, as opposed to one that requires
- 4 equal treatment, that's the narrow way to cabin those
- 5 cases and ones that -- a way that would allow those
- 6 cases to survive, yet to distinguish Section 26.
- 7 One point that we haven't discussed much is
- 8 the democratic process, and it's important that I
- 9 emphasize that, obviously, the use of race-based and
- 10 sex-based preferences in college education is certainly
- one of the most hotly contested issues of our time. And
- 12 some believe that those preferences are necessary for
- 13 campus diversity. Others think that they are not
- 14 necessary, and in fact that we would have a much better
- 15 world if we moved past the discussion about race and
- 16 instead based it on race-neutral criteria.
- 17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Bursch, can I ask you
- 18 to go back to the very first thing you said because I
- 19 didn't get your get your point. The question, what
- 20 impact has the termination of affirmative action had on
- 21 Michigan, on the enrollment of minorities in the
- 22 University of Michigan? Do we have any clear picture of
- 23 that, what effect the repeal of affirmative action has
- 24 had?
- MR. BURSCH: Yes, Justice Ginsburg, we have

- 1 a muddy picture. As we explain in our reply brief, the
- 2 first thing that we have is the actual statistics for
- 3 the first full year after Section 26 went into effect.
- 4 This is 2008.
- 5 And what we find is that the number of
- 6 underrepresented minorities as part of the entering
- 7 freshman class at Michigan as a percentage changed very
- 8 little. It went from about 10-3/4 percent to about
- 9 10-1/4 percent.
- 10 Then it gets very difficult to track,
- 11 because, following the U.S. Census's lead, in 2010 the
- 12 University of Michigan stopped requiring students to
- 13 check only a single box to demonstrate what their race
- or ethnicity was and moved to a multiple checkbox
- 15 system.
- And Justice Sotomayor, when you see in the
- 17 amici briefs that there has been a dramatic drop, for
- 18 example, in African American students on campus at the
- 19 University of Michigan, those numbers don't take into
- 20 account that people who before were forced to check a
- 21 single box now could be checking multiple boxes. And if
- 22 you fold in the multiple checkbox students, the number
- 23 of underrepresented minorities on campus actually comes
- 24 out higher. Now, we don't know what those numbers are
- 25 because you could have a student who might be white and

- 1 Asian and they would not be considered an
- 2 underrepresented minority, and they could be in there.
- 3 But we know that the numbers are a lot closer than when
- 4 you just look at single checkbox students in isolation.
- 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So what do we do with
- 6 the statistics from California? An amici from
- 7 California, their attorney general, has shown, another
- 8 State with a similar proposition, has shown the dramatic
- 9 drop.
- 10 MR. BURSCH: Well, the statistics in
- 11 California across the 17 campuses in the University of
- 12 California system show that today the underrepresented
- minority percentage is better on 16 out of those 17
- 14 campuses. It's not at Berkeley, they haven't gotten
- 15 there yet, but it's better on the rest.
- And by going to race-neutral criteria, what
- 17 they discovered was that underrepresented minority
- 18 students have higher GPAs, that they take more
- 19 technology, engineering, and math classes, and they have
- 20 a graduation rate that is 20 to 25 percent higher than
- 21 it was before California's Proposition 209.
- 22 You can see similar effects in Texas in
- 23 their top 10 percent program before it was modified.
- 24 And not only did it have those positive impacts, but it
- 25 actually increased minority performance at

- 1 social-economically disadvantaged high schools, where
- 2 the students said, hey, if I can only get into the top
- 3 10 percent of my class, I can be in the University of
- 4 Texas at Austin.
- 5 And again, we can all agree that diversity
- 6 on campus is a goal that should be pursued. What the
- 7 California and Texas experiences have demonstrated is
- 8 that there are good, positive reasons why the voters
- 9 might want to try a race-neutral alternative.
- 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So why is it okay to
- 11 have taken away -- not okay to have taken away the
- decision to have bussing from the local school boards,
- 13 the people on the ground, but it's okay to take that
- 14 power away from the people on the ground here, the board
- of regents, who are also elected like the school board
- 16 was in Seattle?
- 17 MR. BURSCH: Because as this --
- 18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The general population
- 19 has feelings about many things, but the only decision
- 20 that they're -- educational decision that they are
- 21 taking away from the board of regents is this one:
- 22 affirmative action. Everything else they leave within
- 23 the elected board of regents.
- 24 MR. BURSCH: You've put your finger on the
- 25 fulcrum of Respondents' best argument, that only race as

- 1 a factor alone has been removed. And there their
- 2 argument is exactly backwards because it's not Michigan
- 3 or Section 26 that single out race, it's the Equal
- 4 Protection Clause itself. Because, Justice Sotomayor,
- 5 if a student wants to lobby for an alumni preference or
- 6 a cello preference and put it in the State constitution,
- 7 strict scrutiny is never applied to that effort. But
- 8 when you try to get a preference based on race or not
- 9 based on race in the Federal -- or the State
- 10 constitution, strict scrutiny is always applied.
- 11 And so it's the Equal Protection Clause
- 12 which is making a differentiation between race and
- 13 everything else. And that's why this Court in Crawford,
- 14 again decided the same day as Seattle, at page 538,
- 15 recognized, quote, "a distinction between State action
- 16 that discriminates on the basis of race and State action
- 17 that addresses in neutral fashion race-related matters."
- 18 And Section 26 falls into that latter category.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You have been asked
- 20 several questions that refer to the ending or
- 21 termination of affirmative action. That's not what is
- 22 at issue here, is it?
- 23 MR. BURSCH: No, and I'm glad that you
- 24 brought that up, Chief Justice Roberts, because
- 25 affirmative action means a lot more than simply the use

- 1 of race or sex-based preferences in university
- 2 admissions.
- 3 The -- Article I, Section 26, only focuses
- 4 on this one aspect of university admissions. Now,
- 5 another important point to understand is that Section 26
- 6 is not all about university admissions. This is
- 7 actually a much broader law that applies not just to
- 8 race and ethnicity, but also to sex and other factors,
- 9 and that affects not just universities, but also public
- 10 contracting and public employment.
- 11 This was a broad-based law that was
- 12 primarily motivated by the people of Michigan's decision
- 13 to move past the day when we are always focused on race,
- 14 exactly as Grutter invited the States to do. And you
- 15 can -- you can see how that discussion gets mired when
- 16 you look at some of these statistics that we have been
- 17 talking about.
- 18 Is someone who has multiple racial boxes
- 19 checked more or less diverse than someone who only has
- 20 one box checked? Is someone who comes from outside the
- 21 country -- say from Mexico --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You've done something
- 23 much more. You are basically saying if -- because
- 24 Fisher and Grutter -- we've always applied strict
- 25 scrutiny.

- 1 MR. BURSCH: Correct.
- 2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. So it's
- 3 essentially a last resort, within some reason. But what
- 4 you are saying, if all those other measures fail, you're
- 5 by Constitution saying you can't go to the remedy that
- 6 might work.
- 7 MR. BURSCH: No, that's not what we are
- 8 saying.
- 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, but you're -- but
- 10 this amendment is stopping the political process. It's
- 11 saying the board of regents can do everything else in
- 12 the field of education except this one.
- MR. BURSCH: Well, again, it actually runs
- 14 the other way because equal protection is what singles
- 15 out race-focused measures for strict scrutiny. But what
- 16 we're saying is under Grutter, race preferences are
- 17 barely permissible. It cannot be unconstitutional for
- 18 the people to choose not to use them anymore, to accept
- 19 this Court's invitation in Grutter, to move past the
- 20 discussion about race and into a race-neutral future.
- 21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What would you do with a
- 22 constitutional amendment that said pro-affirmative
- 23 action laws, and only those, require a three-quarters
- vote of the State legislature?
- MR. BURSCH: Well, under what we're going to

- 1 call the narrow "Save Hunter and Seattle," something
- 2 like that would be unconstitutional because it removes
- 3 an antidiscrimination provision and moves it to a higher
- 4 level of government.
- Now, one of the problems with keeping that
- 6 doctrine is it could also work the opposite way. You
- 7 know, pretend that the political climate in Michigan was
- 8 turned on its head and that universities had agreed that
- 9 they were no longer going to use race or sex in
- 10 admissions and that it was the State electorate, either
- in the legislature or in the constitution, which imposed
- 12 a Grutter plan on everyone.
- 13 Well, under Hunter and Seattle, that would
- 14 have to go because that law removes an
- 15 antidiscrimination provision and moves it to the higher
- 16 level. And so that would be one reason why you might
- 17 want to take the Washington v. Davis approach and
- 18 consider whether there's discriminatory animus based on
- 19 race.
- 20 But, you know, in either of those cases, I
- 21 think you can either, you know, pare down the doctrine
- 22 or get rid of it entirely and distinguish our case from
- 23 it. But the one point that I want to leave you with
- 24 today is that the -- the core of Respondent's arguments
- 25 that somehow a racial classification can be any law that

- 1 has a racial focus, cannot be the right test. No matter
- 2 what, that portion of Seattle and Hunter has to go.
- 3 Because equal protection is about protecting
- 4 individuals, not about protecting laws, and even
- 5 nondiscriminatory race-neutral laws that have a racial
- 6 focus would fall under their racial focus test.
- 7 You know, the hypothetical we give in our
- 8 briefs on that, besides a State Equal Protection Clause,
- 9 would be the Federal Fair Housing Act because it
- 10 references race, it has a racial focus, in the words of
- 11 Seattle and Hunter, and it has the ability of preventing
- 12 anyone from lobbying for preferences based on their race
- or sex at lower levels of the government, either State
- 14 or local.
- 15 So under their theory, the Federal Fair
- 16 Housing Act would have to be applied under strict
- 17 scrutiny. And their only response to that in the brief
- 18 is that, well, the Supremacy Clause takes care of that
- 19 problem. And we all know supremacy doesn't kick in
- 20 until you first determine that the Federal law itself is
- 21 constitutional, and it wouldn't be under their theory.
- 22 So -- so what we're asking you to do is
- 23 eliminate that portion of Hunter and Seattle that
- 24 suggests that a law's racial focus is the sine qua non
- of a political restructuring doctrine test and to

- 1 either --
- 2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Bursch, isn't --
- 3 MR. BURSCH: Yes.
- 4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- isn't the position
- 5 that was taken in Seattle derived from a different view
- of the Equal Protection Clause? I mean, strict scrutiny
- 7 was originally put forward as a protection for
- 8 minorities -- a protection for minorities against
- 9 hostile disadvantageous legislation. And so the view
- 10 then was we use strict scrutiny when the majority is
- 11 disadvantaging the minority. So you do, under the
- 12 Carolene Products view, you do focus on race and you
- 13 ask, is the minority being disadvantaged?
- If that were the view, then I suppose we
- 15 would not be looking at this, well, the criterion is
- 16 race and wherever the disadvantage falls, whether a
- 17 majority or minority, it's just the same. That wasn't
- 18 the original idea of when strict scrutiny is
- 19 appropriate. So if we were faithful to that notion,
- 20 that it is -- measures a disadvantage the -- the
- 21 minority that get strict scrutiny.
- MR. BURSCH: Well, two thoughts on that,
- 23 Justice Ginsburg. First, under Grutter, this Court made
- 24 crystal clear that a Grutter plan is not about which
- 25 minority group is being advantaged or disadvantaged.

- 1 It's supposed to benefit the campus as a whole. And to
- 2 the extent the claim is that preferences benefit certain
- 3 classes of minorities and not others, you know, for
- 4 example, it benefits African Americans and Latinos, but
- 5 not Asians, even though they're both discrete and
- 6 insular underrepresented groups, that -- then it fails
- 7 under Grutter. It can only be something that benefits
- 8 everybody.
- 9 But more fundamentally, going back to your
- 10 question about the origin of the doctrine, I think it's
- 11 really important to understand why we have Hunter
- 12 because Hunter, remember, was decided before
- 13 Washington v. Davis. And when you look at the face of
- 14 the law in Akron, Ohio in Hunter, there's nothing in
- 15 there that would trigger strict scrutiny. And so this
- 16 Court was searching for another way to -- to strike down
- 17 a law that removed an antidiscrimination provision and
- 18 made it more difficult to reenact at the higher level of
- 19 the political process. It needed something to fix that.
- 20 And our point is you can either construe it
- 21 to do exactly that, that only antidiscrimination laws
- 22 being struck down and moved to a higher level can
- 23 satisfy a political restructuring doctrine, or you can
- 24 look at it differently. You can say, Now that we've got
- 25 Washington v. Davis and we all know what the intent was

- 1 in Akron, that that is a simpler way to address this --
- 2 this problem and we really don't need the political
- 3 restructuring doctrine at all anymore.
- 4 But the reason why we had the doctrine in
- 5 Hunter is because strict scrutiny did not apply.
- 6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: You said that the
- 7 district court found it was clear that there was no --
- 8 there was no discriminatory intent, but that wasn't
- 9 reviewed on appeal.
- 10 MR. BURSCH: No, it was not. But it wasn't
- 11 a finding. It was actually more than that. It was at
- 12 the summary judgment stage. The district court
- 13 correctly concluded there wasn't even a question of
- 14 disputed material fact as to whether intent was the
- 15 primary motivation of the electorate.
- Unless there are any further questions, I
- 17 will reserve the balance of my time.
- 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 19 Mr. Rosenbaum.
- 20 ORAL ARGUMENT OF MARK D. ROSENBAUM
- ON BEHALF OF THE CANTRELL RESPONDENTS
- MR. ROSENBAUM: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
- 23 it please the Court:
- Let me begin, Justice Kennedy, with the
- 25 questions you raise and then come to the question that

- 1 Chief Justice Roberts raised.
- To begin, Justice Kennedy, there's no way to
- 3 distinguish the Seattle case from this case nor the
- 4 Hunter case. Both those cases have to be overruled.
- 5 Here is why the Seattle case is -- is identical to this
- 6 case. Both issues -- both cases involve
- 7 constitutionally permissible plans which had as their
- 8 objective obtaining diversity on campuses. Seattle was
- 9 a K through 12 case. This case is a higher education
- 10 case. But in both instances, the objective was to
- 11 obtain diversity. No constitutional mandate to relieve
- 12 past discrimination.
- 13 Rather, in fact, as the Court said, Seattle,
- 14 Tacoma, and WASCO were attempting to deal with de facto
- 15 segregation.
- 16 JUSTICE ALITO: Is that an accurate
- 17 description of Seattle? I thought that in Seattle,
- 18 before the school board adopted the bussing plan, the
- 19 city was threatened with lawsuits by the Department of
- 20 Justice, by the Federal government, and by private
- 21 plaintiffs, claiming that the -- the previous pupil
- 22 assignment plan was -- involved de jure segregation.
- 23 Isn't that -- isn't that correct?
- 24 MR. ROSENBAUM: That's correct with respect
- 25 to at least one of the districts, Justice Alito. But in

- 1 terms of the program itself, there's no dispute that it
- 2 was done pursuant to a plan for de facto segregation.
- 3 Moreover, the question you asked, Justice Kennedy --
- 4 JUSTICE ALITO: I don't understand the
- 5 answer to that question. As to Seattle itself, is it
- 6 not the case that they were threatened with litigation?
- 7 MR. ROSENBAUM: Yes, but there'd been no
- 8 finding, Justice Alito, of de jure segregation.
- 9 JUSTICE ALITO: And isn't it correct that
- 10 the district court found that there was de jure
- 11 segregation?
- 12 MR. ROSENBAUM: That is not correct.
- 13 JUSTICE ALITO: No?
- 14 MR. ROSENBAUM: There was -- there was no
- 15 finding whatsoever that there had been de jure
- 16 segregation and that there was a constitutional
- 17 imperative to correct that desegregation. It was an
- 18 absolutely identical situation.
- 19 And regarding the accountability, Your Honor
- 20 is correct that in Seattle what we were dealing with was
- 21 an elected school board and here, as the Michigan brief
- 22 says, as the Wayne State brief says, as the court
- 23 specifically found at pages 326A and 327A of the record,
- 24 this is a political process in which the regents were
- 25 elected, have at all times maintained plenary authority

- 1 over the admissions process itself, and that --
- 2 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, there are two
- 3 things. Number one is it delegated to the faculty. And
- 4 number two, they're election -- they're elected only
- 5 rarely and in staggered terms.
- 6 MR. ROSENBAUM: That -- that is no
- 7 question that that's correct, Your Honor. But the --
- 8 the ordinary process itself is a politically accountable
- 9 process. That's what the district court found when it
- 10 looked at how the system worked. And in fact --
- 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What if the -- what
- 12 if the -- the board delegated to the various
- 13 universities the authority to develop their own
- 14 admissions programs?
- 15 MR. ROSENBAUM: It couldn't alter -- I'm
- 16 sorry, Chief Roberts.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm sorry, they did.
- 18 And then after several years they decided, you know, we
- 19 don't like the way it's working. They're adopting too
- 20 many racial preference programs, we're going to revoke
- 21 the delegation.
- MR. ROSENBAUM: Absolutely fine.
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Why is that any --
- 24 any different?
- MR. ROSENBAUM: Because the difference is

- 1 that in the Seattle case, in this case, and in the
- 2 Hunter case, what's going on is a change from the
- 3 ordinary political process, which Your Honor perfectly
- 4 described. They can change it today. They can go to
- 5 a -- an affirmative action plan today, repeal it
- 6 tomorrow, come back.
- 7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So if there were a
- 8 provision in the Michigan Constitution that says the
- 9 board of regents is authorized to enact these programs,
- 10 in other words delegated from the people in the
- 11 Constitution to the board, and then the people change
- 12 the delegation by saying, no, it's no longer -- we're no
- 13 longer going to leave that up to the board, we're going
- 14 to make the decision ourselves in the Constitution, how
- 15 is that any different?
- 16 MR. ROSENBAUM: It is different, Your Honor,
- 17 because of the racial nature of the decision. Under
- 18 their theory, under their theory, the people of the
- 19 State -- of a State could amend their constitution, put
- 20 in the legislature two rooms, one for racial matters,
- 21 one for all other sorts of matters, and say to any
- 22 entrant who wants to enter that first room, you may do
- 23 so, but first you have to pay an exorbitant cover charge
- 24 and then you have to mount multiple stairs -- climb
- 25 flights of stairs just to begin the process of enacting

- 1 constitutionally permissible legislation.
- 2 Or think about it in a desegregation case.
- 3 A student comes in -- two students come into the
- 4 admissions committee. One says -- and the admissions
- 5 committee says, we have one question for you. One
- 6 question for you since you're here to talk about a
- 7 legitimate -- a legitimate factor in pursuit of
- 8 diversity.
- 9 Here's the question, do you want to talk
- 10 about your race, your race in the context of other
- 11 factors? And if the answer is yes, that student is
- 12 shown the door, told go raise between 5 and \$15 million,
- 13 repeal Prop 2 and then you can come back to make -- make
- 14 the case.
- Whereas the student who says, no, I've just
- 16 got another legitimate factor, maybe geography. Maybe
- 17 alumni confections -- connections, whatever that is,
- 18 that person is permitted to make the case. It is a
- 19 racial distinction.
- Now, Chief Justice Roberts, you're certainly
- 21 onto something in terms of are there race-neutral
- 22 methods to get this done? Of course there are. The
- 23 State constitution itself could be altered so that a
- 24 different committee or a different set of individuals
- 25 could -- could make the decision that they don't like

- 1 the way the regents are doing it.
- 2 Or they could do it the old-fashioned way,
- 3 the way that the politically accountable system works,
- 4 which is to say, we are going to work at these
- 5 universities, that's how affirmative action involving
- 6 race happened in the first place. That's at pages 270
- 7 to 271A and 282A to 293A. They worked for years to make
- 8 that happen.
- 9 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I thought the whole
- 10 purpose of strict scrutiny was to say that if you want
- 11 to talk about race, you have a much higher hurdle to
- 12 climb than if you want to talk about something else.
- Now, you can argue that strict scrutiny
- 14 should only apply to minorities and not to students who
- 15 are not minorities, but I thought the Court decided that
- 16 a long time ago.
- 17 MR. ROSENBAUM: Exactly.
- 18 JUSTICE ALITO: So I don't know why that's a
- 19 hard question that you asked about the student who says,
- 20 I want to talk about race. What if it's a white student
- 21 who comes in and says, I want to talk about race. I'm
- 22 white and therefore you should admit me, you should give
- 23 me preference. The State can't say, no, we don't want
- 24 to hear that?
- 25 MR. ROSENBAUM: The State can say, we don't

- 1 want to hear that, whether it comes from a white person
- 2 or a black person or whomever, if in fact, they are not
- 3 doing it on a race-specific basis.
- 4 You're exactly right, of course, about
- 5 strict scrutiny. And the programs in this case, indeed,
- 6 the only programs in this case that are effective, are
- 7 those that have passed strict scrutiny --
- 8 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I don't understand
- 9 your answer then. If the student -- one student comes
- in and says I want to talk about how well I play the
- 11 cello, all right, we'll listen to that. I want to come
- 12 in and talk about why I as a white person should get a
- 13 preference. You have to listen to that because you're
- 14 listening to the -- to the talk about the cello, too?
- 15 MR. ROSENBAUM: You do, Your Honor, when the
- 16 program has passed the strict scrutiny test that we're
- 17 talking about. And that's the only sort of program that
- 18 is at issue in this case. Of course you're correct. If
- 19 it is a Gratz type program, if it's unconstitutional, if
- 20 it's a quota system, you don't have to listen to anybody
- 21 talk about race. But we are only dealing with
- 22 constitutionally permissible programs. Why it is
- 23 impossible, impossible to distinguish Seattle?
- And this argument about Hunter, page -- page
- 25 389 of the Hunter decision is the reason Hunter was

- 1 decided. It's not a Washington v. Davis case.
- 2 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, I'm not sure I
- 3 understood the answer you gave to the Chief Justice's
- 4 hypothetical. Maybe I misunderstood the hypothetical.
- 5 Suppose the board of regents have a rule,
- 6 it's written, it's a rule, that the faculty makes a
- 7 determination on whether there should be affirmative
- 8 action.
- 9 MR. ROSENBAUM: Yes.
- 10 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Five -- and the faculty
- 11 votes for affirmative action. Three years later, the
- 12 board of trustees said we're abolishing the rule, we're
- 13 doing that ourselves. Violation?
- MR. ROSENBAUM: Assuming that the regents
- 15 say that's fine, no problem whatsoever, no problem
- 16 whatsoever. That's the ordinary political process.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: So the -- so the regents
- 18 can take it away from the faculty?
- 19 MR. ROSENBAUM: The regents have plenary --
- 20 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But can the legislature
- 21 take it away from the regents?
- MR. ROSENBAUM: Not under the Michigan
- 23 Constitution because the Michigan Constitution --
- 24 JUSTICE KENNEDY: No, no. Hypothetical
- 25 case.

- 1 MR. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Under -- who's got
- 2 the authority here? The -- the legislature can take it
- 3 away. That's not a problem in a -- in a situation where
- 4 that's part of the ordinary process.
- 5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But then the voters can't
- 6 take it away. At what point is it that your objection
- 7 takes force? I just don't understand -- I just don't
- 8 understand --
- 9 MR. ROSENBAUM: Where there is --
- 10 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- the declension here --
- MR. ROSENBAUM: My apologies, Your Honor.
- 12 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Or the crescendo, whatever
- 13 you call it.
- 14 (Laughter.)
- 15 MR. ROSENBAUM: Both are music to my ears.
- 16 The point, Justice Kennedy, is that the --
- 17 the people of the State have multiple options available
- 18 to them if they don't like the way the universities are
- 19 operating. But the one option they don't have is to
- 20 treat racial matters different from all other matters.
- 21 The example that you gave --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: That applies in the Chief
- 23 Justice's hypothetical or my revision of it as between
- the board of regents and the faculty, or between the
- 25 faculty and the legislature.

- 1 MR. ROSENBAUM: Exactly. And the problem --
- 2 the problem that the restructuring process gets at
- 3 because of the particular concern that this Court has
- 4 shown with respect to the political process, that the
- 5 political process itself not become outcome
- 6 determinative. That the political process itself be a
- 7 place where we can air these discussions, but not create
- 8 it in a separate and unequal way to make the -- to
- 9 actually make the decision itself through the process.
- 10 So --
- 11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Why is -- why is the
- 12 faculty administration, a faculty decision, any less
- 13 outcome determinative than what the voters would say?
- 14 I -- I think there would be people that might disagree
- 15 with your empirical assumption.
- 16 MR. ROSENBAUM: Then I'm not explaining it
- 17 clearly. The first -- the -- when the faculty makes the
- 18 decision, Justice Kennedy, that's part of the ordinary
- 19 political process. Nobody's allowed to win all the
- 20 time. No one has to win all the time. No one has to
- 21 lose all the time. Whatever it is, it is. That's the
- 22 ordinary political process. That's how we use the
- 23 political process.
- 24 The problem with -- with mounting a racial
- 25 classification within the Constitution itself is that

- 1 then -- that takes the ordinary political process to the
- 2 extraordinary political process. That's --
- 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So I mean, you could
- 4 say that the whole point of something like the Equal
- 5 Protection Clause is to take race off the table. Is it
- 6 unreasonable for the State to say, look, race is a
- 7 lightning rod. We've been told we can have affirmative
- 8 action programs that do not take race into account.
- 9 Socioeconomic diversity, elimination of alumni
- 10 preferences, all of these things. It is very expensive.
- 11 Whenever we have a racial classification, we're
- immediately sued. So why don't we say we want you to do
- 13 everything you can without having racial preferences.
- 14 Now, if the litigation determines that we're
- 15 required to have racial preferences, this statute has an
- 16 exception and -- and allows that. But starting out, we
- 17 want to take race off the table and try to achieve
- 18 diversity without racial preferences.
- 19 MR. ROSENBAUM: The problem, Your Honor, as
- 20 this Court stated as recently as last term in the Fisher
- 21 case, is that under the Equal Protection Clause race is
- 22 not all the way off the table. And the problem with
- 23 Proposal 2 is that the substance and the message that it
- 24 communicates is that because of the separate and unequal
- 25 political track that is created with respect to the

- 1 extraordinary steps that have to be taken, the message
- 2 is that even where race is being utilized as one of many
- 3 factors in a constitutionally permissible way, the
- 4 message that is being communicated is that all uses of
- 5 race are illegitimate, all uses of race are -- are off
- 6 the table, that "race" itself is a dirty word.
- 7 JUSTICE SCALIA: Why -- why doesn't the
- 8 Fourth Amendment violate the rule you're saying -- or
- 9 the 14th Amendment violate the rule that you're
- 10 proposing? I mean, I'm -- I'm a minority and I want
- 11 laws that favor my minority. Not just in university;
- 12 everywhere. My goodness, I can't have that through the
- 13 normal legislative process. I have to get a
- 14 constitutional amendment to do it, right?
- 15 MR. ROSENBAUM: That is correct, Your Honor.
- 16 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, so I guess -- I guess
- 17 that on this subject of equal treatment of the races, we
- 18 can eliminate racism just at the -- at the legislative
- 19 level, can't we?
- 20 MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, the underlying
- 21 basis of the entire strict scrutiny doctrine in the 14th
- 22 Amendment is to preclude the government, preclude the
- 23 Legislative and Executive Branch, from making those
- 24 determinations as absolute determinations.
- The 14th Amendment sets the standards and

- 1 the criteria by which we measure that. Of course you're
- 2 correct. That's what the 14th Amendment does. It sets
- 3 what the rules are in terms of how race is utilized.
- 4 But what the Grutter case said --
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: And you can't change those
- 6 rules by normal legislation, correct?
- 7 MR. ROSENBAUM: That is correct.
- 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: So if you're a minority
- 9 that wants favored treatment, you're just out of luck.
- 10 MR. ROSENBAUM: You have to use the ordinary
- 11 political process. And that's all we're saying.
- 12 JUSTICE SCALIA: No, but the constitutional
- 13 amendment is not the ordinary political process.
- MR. ROSENBAUM: But the const...- but the fact that
- 15 it's a State constitutional amendment underscores my
- 16 argument, which is that -- that in order for the -- for
- 17 a -- the minority or any individual, and white,
- 18 minority, whatever -- whatever the individual is, to say
- 19 I want the same rule book, I want the same playing
- 20 field, the problem with Proposal 2 is that it creates
- 21 two playing fields.
- 22 JUSTICE ALITO: If Proposal 2 had been in
- 23 the Michigan Constitution before any affirmative action
- 24 program was adopted, would the result be the same?
- MR. ROSENBAUM: It would, Your Honor,

- 1 because -- because it would be building in this
- 2 explicitly facial racial classification into the State
- 3 Constitution. The problem are the separate and unequal
- 4 systems that are being used to deal with race. And
- 5 separate and unequal, under the 14th Amendment,
- 6 shouldn't come within ten feet of race.
- 7 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's not a racial
- 8 classification. You should not refer to it that way.
- 9 MR. ROSENBAUM: It is a racial --
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's the prohibition of
- 11 racial classifications.
- MR. ROSENBAUM: No, Your Honor.
- 13 JUSTICE SCALIA: Every prohibition of racial
- 14 classification is itself a racial classification?
- 15 MR. ROSENBAUM: No, Your Honor. The problem
- 16 with Proposal 2 is that it is -- just as in Hunter, just
- 17 as in Hunter -- it is an explicitly facial racial
- 18 classification. It singles out race for different
- 19 treatment.
- 20 My goodness, this was borne -- this campaign
- 21 started three days after Grutter itself. The author
- 22 said the purpose of it was to get rid of racial
- 23 preferences.
- 24 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, if that's how you're
- 25 using racial classification, I thought it meant, you

- 1 know, it's directed at blacks or Asians --
- 2 MR. ROSENBAUM: No.
- 3 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- or -- no. In that
- 4 sense, the 14th Amendment itself is a racial
- 5 classification, right?
- 6 MR. ROSENBAUM: Well, it sets the
- 7 standard --
- 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: In that sense, the 14th
- 9 Amendment itself is a racial classification, no?
- 10 MR. ROSENBAUM: I don't agree with that,
- 11 Your Honor, because I'm measuring it as a racial
- 12 classification by the 14th Amendment. And that comes
- 13 back to Justice Ginsburg's argument.
- 14 His argument, his revisionist history of
- 15 Hunter, his -- was -- was about motive. But, Your
- 16 Honor, that had nothing to do with the problem in this
- 17 case. When the Court looked -- when the district court
- 18 looked -- may I finish my answer, Chief Justice Roberts?
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yes.
- 20 MR. ROSENBAUM: When the court looked at
- 21 this particular issue, the concern was the way that it
- 22 racially divided the political process itself. What he
- 23 is saying is that, well, there may be all sorts of
- 24 motives. That's a rational basis test, and that has
- 25 nothing to do with the racial classification.

- 1 The definition I'm using, Justice Scalia, is
- 2 this Court's definition of a racial classification, for
- 3 which all sorts trigger strict scrutiny. Thank you very
- 4 much.
- 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 6 Ms. Driver?
- 7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF SHANTA DRIVER
- 8 ON BEHALF OF THE COALITION TO DEFEND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION
- 9 RESPONDENTS
- 10 MS. DRIVER: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 11 please the Court:
- We ask this Court to uphold the Sixth
- 13 Circuit decision to reaffirm the doctrine that's
- 14 expressed in Hunter-Seattle, and to bring the 14th
- 15 Amendment back to its original purpose and meaning,
- 16 which is to protect minority rights against a white
- 17 majority, which did not occur in this case.
- 18 JUSTICE SCALIA: My goodness, I thought
- 19 we've -- we've held that the 14th Amendment protects all
- 20 races. I mean, that was the argument in the early
- 21 years, that it protected only -- only the blacks. But I
- 22 thought we rejected that. You -- you say now that we
- 23 have to proceed as though its purpose is not to protect
- 24 whites, only to protect minorities?
- 25 MS. DRIVER: I think it is -- it's a measure

- 1 that's an antidiscrimination measure.
- 2 JUSTICE SCALIA: Right.
- 3 MS. DRIVER: And it's a measure in which the
- 4 question of discrimination is determined not just by --
- 5 by power, by who has privilege in this society, and
- 6 those minorities that are oppressed, be they religious
- 7 or racial, need protection from a more privileged
- 8 majority.
- 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: And unless that exists, the
- 10 14th Amendment is not violated, is that right? So if
- 11 you have a banding together of various minority groups
- 12 who discriminate against -- against whites, that's okay?
- 13 MS. DRIVER: I think that --
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Do you have any case of
- ours that propounds that view of the 14th Amendment,
- 16 that it protects only minorities? Any case?
- MS. DRIVER: No case of yours.
- 18 JUSTICE BREYER: Some people think that
- 19 there is a difference between the plus and the minus.
- 20 Some judges differ on that point. Some agree sort of
- 21 with you, and some agree sort of not. All right? Let's
- 22 think of those who agree sort of, and then I have a
- 23 question. And you know this area better than I.
- 24 So think of Grutter. Grutter permits
- 25 affirmative action. Think of the earlier cases. They

- 1 permitted affirmative action where it was overcome, the
- 2 effects of past discrimination, but probably not
- 3 otherwise.
- 4 Now, that's what I want to know. Are there
- 5 areas, other than education, where affirmative action
- 6 would not be forbidden to achieve a goal other than
- 7 overcoming the effects? Have you got the question? And
- 8 does an answer come to mind?
- 9 MS. DRIVER: I think that affirmative action
- 10 programs could -- could be permissible under employment.
- 11 For instance --
- 12 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. So there are a set.
- 13 MS. DRIVER: That's right.
- 14 JUSTICE BREYER: Fine. If there are a set,
- 15 what I -- what I'd like you to explain, if -- if you can
- 16 take a minute, is think of how a city is set up. There
- 17 are a vast number of administrators. There are a vast
- 18 number of programs. It could be an administrator
- 19 somewhere says he'd like to give a preference, maybe for
- 20 good reason. But then the city council votes no. Or
- 21 because there are other ways of doing it, by, you know,
- 22 first come, first served or some other criteria that
- 23 doesn't use race.
- Are all of those unlawful? Every one? Do
- 25 you have to leave it up to the -- no matter what the

- 1 subject, no matter what the -- or are you going to draw
- 2 a line somewhere? Is there a line that you could draw
- 3 that would take your case on the right side from your
- 4 point of view, but would say we're not giving power to
- 5 every administrator in the city to decide on his own
- 6 whether to use racial preferences without a possibility
- 7 of a higher-up veto --
- 8 MS. DRIVER: I think --
- 9 JUSTICE BREYER: -- which I don't think you
- 10 want to say, but maybe you do.
- MS. DRIVER: No. I think these are very
- 12 fact-based determinations. And so somebody could make a
- decision that they wanted to use what you're calling
- 14 racial preferences. And that could mean a range of
- 15 things, and that could be subject to a veto higher up.
- 16 Yeah, I agree with you.
- 17 JUSTICE BREYER: So what's the line? Is
- 18 there any line that you can say, look here. We were
- 19 trying to be very helpful, and all of a sudden they put
- 20 this thing on the ballot, you can't even get it through.
- 21 Okay? That's your basic point.
- But -- but if you think of -- you have to
- 23 write something, and that something has tremendous
- 24 effect all over the place. So what kind of line is
- 25 there, in your opinion?

- 1 MS. DRIVER: I think Hunter-Seattle provides
- 2 the line. I think it says that if you have a law that
- 3 has a racial focus, and that law, part of proving that
- 4 it has a racial focus, is that it takes a benefit that
- 5 inures to minorities and it removes that benefit and it
- 6 restructures the political process and places a special
- 7 burden on minorities to re-ascertain that right, yeah, I
- 8 think that's a proper rule. Because it's -- it's --
- 9 JUSTICE ALITO: Can I -- can I come back to
- 10 the question that the Chief Justice and Justice Kennedy
- 11 were asking before? Essentially, it's their question.
- 12 Let's say that the -- the decision about admissions
- 13 criteria across the board is basically delegated to the
- 14 faculty. All right? And the faculty adopts some sort
- 15 of affirmative action plan. And now that is overruled
- 16 in favor of a colorblind approach at various levels
- 17 going up the ladder.
- 18 So maybe it's overruled by the -- the dean
- 19 of -- by a dean, or maybe it's overruled by the
- 20 president of the university. Maybe it's overruled by
- 21 the regents. Maybe, if State laws allowed, it's -- it's
- 22 overruled by an executive department of the State.
- 23 Maybe it's overruled by the legislature through ordinary
- 24 legislation. Maybe it's overruled through a
- 25 constitutional amendment.

- 1 At what point does the political
- 2 restructuring doctrine kick in?
- 3 MS. DRIVER: I think in this case, the
- 4 difference between what other groups can do in order to
- 5 get preferential treatment for their sons and daughters
- 6 and what racial minorities are subject to, the level of
- 7 distinction places such a high burden on minorities.
- 8 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, that really -- that
- 9 really isn't responsive to my question. Let's say
- 10 exactly what was done here is done at all of these
- 11 levels. At what point does the doctrine kick in? When
- 12 it goes from the faculty to the dean? From the dean to
- 13 the president, et cetera, et cetera? Where does this
- 14 apply?
- 15 MS. DRIVER: I think it depends on where it
- 16 is that minorities face a heavier and special burden.
- 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It can't be that because
- 18 the normal political process imposes burdens on
- 19 different groups. I thought the line was a very simple
- 20 one, which is if the normal academic decision-making is
- 21 in the dean, the faculty, at whatever level, as long as
- 22 the normal right to control is being exercised, then
- 23 that person could change the decision.
- 24 So if they delegate most admissions
- 25 decisions, as I understand from the record, to the

- 1 faculty, but they still regularly, besides race, veto
- 2 some of those decisions, and race is now one of them,
- 3 then the Board of Regents can do that normally. So
- 4 could the president, if that's the way it's normally
- 5 done.
- 6 It's when the process is -- political
- 7 process has changed specifically and only for race, as a
- 8 constitutional amendment here was intended to do, that
- 9 the political doctrine is violated. Have I restated?
- 10 MS. DRIVER: You have, you restated it very
- 11 well, and I agree with you in principle.
- 12 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But I still don't
- 13 understand your answer to Justice Alito's question.
- 14 Suppose the dean has authority in the bylaws of the
- 15 university to reverse what the faculty does, but you
- 16 have a dean who just does not like affirmative action.
- 17 He is dead against it. And he makes the decision to
- 18 reverse the faculty. Do you have a remedy?
- 19 MS. DRIVER: I don't think it -- I don't
- 20 think Hunter-Seattle applies.
- 21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: All right. Then you have
- 22 Justice Alito's question. Then it's the president of
- 23 the university, and then it's the legislature.
- MS. DRIVER: I think you need two things. I
- 25 think you need the decision making -- the decision

- 1 making body. If the University of Michigan regents
- 2 decided tomorrow to eliminate affirmative action
- 3 programs and there was no Prop 2, they have the legal
- 4 right to do that. They are the decision-making body.
- 5 And minorities still could go and lobby the
- 6 regents, still could go and talk about the questions of
- 7 racial equality difference --
- 8 JUSTICE ALITO: But would that be true --
- 9 I'm sorry. Would that be true if they had never gotten
- 10 involved in admissions criteria before? They have the
- 11 authority, but they left that to the university
- 12 officials.
- MS. DRIVER: I think if they have the
- 14 plenary authority to do that, yeah, I think that, again,
- 15 if they wanted to eliminate affirmative action programs
- 16 and they had that plenary authority and it was
- 17 guaranteed by the Michigan State Constitution and it had
- 18 existed for 150 years, and they chose to enter this
- 19 area, I think --
- 20 JUSTICE ALITO: I don't see how that is
- 21 consistent with Justice Sotomayor's answer to my
- 22 question. Don't the people of Michigan have -- don't
- 23 the people of Michigan have plenary authority?
- 24 MS. DRIVER: In this case, the particular --
- 25 it's -- they are applying that plenary authority in --

- 1 or in a way that is racially focused, and creates a
- 2 political process that disadvantage...-is disadvantageous to minorities.
- JUSTICE BREYER: I'm not saying instead of
- 4 political process. Don't let me put words in your
- 5 mouth. Think what you think here.
- 6 You say where the authority is divided in a
- 7 certain way, and that is true under the constitution of
- 8 the State. So the State government lacks the power.
- 9 And then you have to take the power from the people and
- 10 change the constitution, and when you do that in respect
- 11 to a benefit. Then, in respect to benefits,
- 12 Washington -- you know, Seattle and Hunter kick in.
- 13 See, where you're not dealing with past discrimination.
- 14 MS. DRIVER: This was -- what we're talking
- 15 about in terms of affirmative action are
- 16 constitutionally permissible programs that were shown to
- 17 this Court to be the only way to achieve racial
- 18 diversity and integration at the University of Michigan.
- 19 And whether you -- whether you explain that
- 20 by looking at the reality of the inequality in education
- 21 for black and white Michigan or whatever it is that you
- 22 come up with that requires that, the university has
- 23 shown that this is the only way to achieve diversity in
- 24 which racial diversity is a part of the -- is a part of
- 25 the quotient.

- 1 And so to take away that right from the
- 2 university and from the regents -- and I just want to go
- 3 back to one of the questions that was answered. If you
- 4 look at the law schools, the medical schools, the
- 5 professional schools now in the State of Michigan,
- 6 there's been a precipitous drop in underrepresented
- 7 minority enrollment in those schools. We are going back
- 8 to the resegregation of those schools because of the
- 9 elimination of affirmative action.
- 10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: To what extent -- to
- 11 what extent does your argument depend -- I thought both
- 12 Hunter and Seattle speak in these terms -- that the
- 13 policies that are more difficult to enact are beneficial
- 14 for the minority group?
- 15 MS. DRIVER: The -- -- say that -- I'm
- 16 sorry. Can you repeat --
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: To what extent does
- 18 your argument depend upon the assumption that the
- 19 programs that you say are now more difficult to enact
- 20 are beneficial to the minority group?
- 21 MS. DRIVER: I think it's an important
- 22 component part. Because I think it's in the benefit to
- 23 the minority group that it's especially important --
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, why do you --
- 25 MS. DRIVER: -- that the political process

- 1 be on a level field.
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right. What if the
- 3 question of whether it's a benefit to the minority group
- 4 is more open to debate, whether it's through the
- 5 mismatch theory that Taylor and Sander I guess have
- 6 adopted, or other theories? Do we have to assume in
- 7 your favor that these definitely are beneficial to
- 8 particular minority groups?
- 9 MS. DRIVER: Certainly the minority voters
- 10 of Michigan believe them to be because 90 percent of
- 11 black voters in Michigan voted against Prop 2. And I
- 12 think that that's a clear indication of the popularity
- 13 of these programs and the perceived benefit of these
- 14 programs.
- 15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: There's a difference- There may be a
- 16 difference between popularity and benefit. In other
- 17 words, you want us to assume that the programs are
- 18 beneficial to a minority group?
- 19 MS. DRIVER: Yes. And they are beneficial
- 20 to minority groups. They may -- they may serve to
- 21 provide benefits for the population beyond minority
- 22 groups, but they are a benefit if they --
- 23 JUSTICE SCALIA: Your opponent says
- 24 otherwise. He says that minority students have taken
- 25 tougher courses, they have been better qualified to be

- 1 admitted, and all sorts of other benefits. So it's
- 2 certainly a debatable question.
- 3 MS. DRIVER: It's a debatable question in
- 4 another forum in a different case, and in fact I think
- 5 that case was the Grutter case.
- 6 This case isn't about -- isn't just about
- 7 whether or not affirmative action benefits minorities.
- 8 It's also the restructuring of the political process and
- 9 the special burden that's placed on minorities. It's
- 10 not -- if you want to go back to debating the you know, whether
- 11 affirmative action --
- 12 JUSTICE SCALIA: You're changing your
- 13 answer, then. Your answer to the Chief was it does
- 14 depend and now you are saying it doesn't depend on
- 15 whether it benefits minorities at all, it's just whether
- 16 it places a -- a greater burden on minorities to change
- 17 it. Which is it?
- 18 MS. DRIVER: No, I --
- 19 JUSTICE SCALIA: One or the other?
- 20 MS. DRIVER: I think it's a two-part test.
- 21 I think the first, the first thing that you look at is,
- 22 is there a racial focus to the law, and is the benefit
- 23 that's been taken away something that inures to
- 24 minorities. And I think the second part of the test,
- 25 and that's why I think Seattle/Hunter is such a narrow

- 1 doctrine, is whether there also has been a restructuring
- 2 of the political process and a special burden placed on
- 3 minorities. It requires both.
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 5 Mr. Bursch, you have 4 minutes remaining.
- 6 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF JOHN J. BURSCH
- 7 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
- 8 MR. BURSCH: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.
- 9 I'm going to start with a sentence from
- 10 Crawford, decided the same day as Seattle, where this
- 11 Court defined what a racial classification is.
- 12 "A racial classification either says or
- implies that persons are to be treated differently on
- 14 account of race." It doesn't say anything about laws
- 15 with or without a racial focus. And we think that is
- 16 the test that ultimately should come out of the decision
- 17 in this case.
- 18 Now, my friends on the other side disagree
- 19 with that. Because if that's the test Section 26 is
- 20 constitutional. And so they draw this false dichotomy
- 21 between laws that involve race and laws that don't
- 22 involve race. We will put them in two separate chambers
- 23 of the legislature and charge a fee if you want to talk
- 24 about -- about race.
- 25 And we know that can't be right because of,

- 1 Chief Justice Roberts, your observation that the whole
- 2 point of equal protection is to take race off the table
- 3 when everyone is being treated the same. That's why
- 4 they can't --
- 5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: You quoted -- you quoted
- 6 from Crawford.
- 7 MR. BURSCH: Yes.
- 8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And there is an opposing
- 9 quote in Seattle itself on page, what is it, 486?
- 10 MR. BURSCH: Yes.
- 11 JUSTICE GINSBURG: "When the State's
- 12 allocation of power places unusual burdens on the
- 13 ability of racial groups to enact legislation designed
- 14 to overcome the special condition of prejudice, the
- 15 governmental action seriously curtails the operation of
- 16 those political processes ordinarily to be relied on to
- 17 protect minorities."
- 18 And it quotes Carolene Products. So -- and
- 19 then the following sentence is: "In the most direct
- 20 sense, this implicates the judiciary's special role, not
- 21 of treating the individuals as individuals, but the
- judiciary's special role in safeguarding the interests
- 23 of those groups that are relegated to a position of
- 24 political powerlessness."
- 25 So the rationale of Seattle is that notion

- 1 that we can't put hurdles in the way of a disadvantaged
- 2 minority.
- 3 MR. BURSCH: Justice Ginsburg, there is two
- 4 problems with that. First, that's where the
- 5 Respondent's theory most closely knocks up against
- 6 Grutter. Because you are right, under Seattle and
- 7 Hunter you've got to have a policy designed for the
- 8 purpose of primarily benefitting the minority. But if
- 9 that's the policy, it violates Grutter, which is
- 10 supposed to benefit everyone. But the bigger problem is
- 11 if you treat a --
- 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Diversity does, but when
- 13 you take away a tool for diversity that's what Seattle
- 14 is saying is wrong.
- MR. BURSCH: Right, but the bigger
- 16 problem --
- 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You can't take the tool
- 18 away simply because it may include race as a factor,
- 19 simply because you are changing the playing field.
- 20 MR. BURSCH: But Justice Sotomayor, the
- 21 biggest problem with Respondents' test, with applying
- 22 the literal language of Seattle, is that as I said, the
- 23 Federal Fair Housing Act, the Equal Credit Act, a State
- 24 equal protection law that mentions race, all of these
- 25 things fall in the category of laws dealing with race.

- 1 Some are discriminatory.
- 2 JUSTICE ALITO: Seattle and this case both
- 3 involve constitutional -- Seattle and this case both
- 4 involve constitutional amendments. So why can't the
- 5 law -- the law be drawn -- the line be drawn there? If
- 6 you change the allocation of power in one of these less
- 7 substantial ways, that's one thing, but when you require
- 8 a constitutional amendment that's really a big deal.
- 9 MR. BURSCH: Because that would still
- 10 invalidate the Michigan Equal Protection Clause which
- 11 has a racial focus that says you cannot discriminate
- 12 based on race or sex, and yet no one would argue it
- 13 should be subject to strict scrutiny.
- 14 JUSTICE BREYER: That's the benefit to a
- 15 minority group. But what I'm thinking is go read the
- 16 cases. You yourself seem to say these cases seem to
- 17 apply alike to the benefits or to the discrimination
- 18 against it. I mean, there is lots of language in
- 19 Seattle.
- 20 MR. BURSCH: Right. Here-here-
- 21 JUSTICE BREYER: You come -- now, suppose
- 22 you take that and say, all right, it was meant in
- 23 context, but the context includes constitutional
- 24 amendments. Because with the constitutional amendment
- 25 you are restructuring. Now, you would lose on that

1	theory, but there would be a limitation on the extent to
2	which the people have the right to move powers around.
3	MR. BURSCH: Justice Breyer, the limitation
4	has to be not only that, but also that you are repealing
5	an antidiscrimination law, not an equal treatment law.
6	Or again, otherwise the State equal protection clause
7	has to fall. So to the extent that I am right, that is
8	a way that you can narrow Hunter and Seattle, and
9	section 26 has to survive. If I am wrong about that,
LO	then respectfully Seattle and Hunter should be
L1	overruled. Either way, it does not violate equal
L2	protection to require equal treatment. Thank you.
L3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel,
L 4	counsel. The case is submitted.
L5	(Whereupon at 2:00 p.m., the case in the
L 6	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
L7	
L8	
L 9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

			1	
A	30:4,4 45:12	alternative 17:9	47:20	30:13 40:13 41:15
ability 22:11 54:13	46:24 48:10	alternatives 11:18	apply 25:5 31:14	45:9 50:3,7 52:10
abolishing 33:12	admit 31:22	alumni 5:18 6:4	46:14 56:17	backwardlooking
aboveentitled 1:15	admitted 52:1	18:5 30:17 36:9	applying 48:25	4:18
57:16	adopt 7:20	amend 29:19	55:21	backwards 18:2
absolute 37:24	adopted 26:18	amendment 4:7	approach 21:17	bad 6:17 13:4
absolutely 27:18	38:24 51:6	13:21 20:10,22	45:16	balance 25:17
28:22	adopting 28:19	37:8,9,14,22,25	appropriate 23:19	ballot 44:20
abstract 9:6	adopts 45:14	38:2,13,15 39:5	area 42:23 48:19	bamn 1:10
academic 46:20	advanced 13:8	40:4,9,12 41:15	areas 43:5	banding 42:11
accept 6:20 20:18	advantaged 23:25	41:19 42:10,15	argue 12:3 31:13	barely 20:17
account 15:20 36:8	affirmative 1:7,24	45:25 47:8 56:8	56:12	based 10:21 14:16
53:14	2:11 3:5 4:5 9:1	56:24	argument 1:16 2:2	18:8,9 21:18
accountability	14:20,23 17:22	amendments 56:4	2:5,8,12 3:4,7	22:12 56:12
27:19	18:21,25 29:5	56:24	12:22 17:25 18:2	basic 44:21
accountable 28:8	31:5 33:7,11 36:7	american 15:18	25:20 32:24 38:16	basically 19:23
31:3	38:23 41:8 42:25	americans 24:4	40:13,14 41:7,20	45:13
accurate 26:16	43:1,5,9 45:15	amici 15:17 16:6	50:11,18 53:6	basis 7:14,15 8:3
achieve 5:5 11:19	47:16 48:2,15	angeles 1:21	arguments 21:24	18:16 32:3 37:21
36:17 43:6 49:17	49:15 50:9 52:7	animus 10:21 11:3	article 19:3	40:24
49:23	52:11	12:25 13:7,11,25	asian 16:1	behalf 1:20,22 2:4
act 22:9,16 55:23	african 15:18 24:4	21:18	asians 24:5 40:1	2:7,10,14 3:8
55:23	aggressive 8:11	answer 3:14 27:5	asked 18:19 27:3	25:21 41:8 53:7
action 1:8,24 2:11	ago 6:9 31:16	30:11 32:9 33:3	31:19	belief 11:16
3:5 4:5,17,18 9:1	agree 17:5 40:10	40:18 43:8 47:13	asking 22:22 45:11	believe 11:21 14:12
14:20,23 17:22	42:20,21,22 44:16	48:21 52:13,13	aspect 19:4	51:10
18:15,16,21,25	47:11	answered 50:3	assignment 26:22	beneficial 50:13,20
20:23 29:5 31:5	agreed 21:8	antidiscrimination	assume 51:6,17	51:7,18,19
33:8,11 36:8	air 35:7	3:17,21 8:13,18	assuming 33:14	benefit 4:13,15,21
38:23 41:8 42:25	akron 10:19 24:14	10:8 13:19,25	assumption 35:15	8:23 24:1,2 45:4,5
43:1,5,9 45:15	25:1	14:3 21:3,15	50:18	49:11 50:22 51:3
47:16 48:2,15	al 1:10	24:17,21 42:1	attempting 4:5	51:13,16,22 52:22
49:15 50:9 52:7	alike 56:17	57:5	26:14	55:10 56:14
52:11 54:15	alito 26:16,25 27:4	anybody 32:20	attorney 1:3 16:7	benefits 13:9 24:4,7
actual 15:2	27:8,9,13 31:9,18	anymore 20:18	austin 6:14 17:4	49:11 51:21 52:1
address 4:11 25:1	32:8 38:22 45:9	25:3	author 39:21	52:7,15 56:17
addresses 18:17	46:8 48:8,20 56:2	apologies 34:11	authority 27:25	benefitting 55:8
administration	alitos 47:13,22	appeal 25:9	28:13 34:2 47:14	berkeley 6:13
35:12	allocation 54:12	appeals 11:4	48:11,14,16,23,25	16:14
administrator	56:6	appearances 1:18	49:6	best 17:25
43:18 44:5	allow 14:5	appears 4:8	authorized 29:9	better 8:24 11:18
administrators	allowed 35:19	appendix 11:12	available 34:17	11:19 14:14 16:13
43:17	45:21	apples 13:4	B	16:15 42:23 51:25
admissions 4:13	allows 9:7 36:16	applied 9:16 18:7		beyond 51:21
7:12 19:2,4,6	alter 28:15	18:10 19:24 22:16	back 4:7 6:23 12:7	big 56:8
21:10 28:1,14	altered 30:23	applies 19:7 34:22	14:18 24:9 29:6	bigger 55:10,15
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		

		İ	Ī	ı
biggest 55:21	20:1,7,13,25 23:2	52:4,5,5,6 53:17	10:19	component 50:22
bill 1:3 4:6 12:23	23:3,22 25:10	56:2,3 57:14,15	city 26:19 43:16,20	concept 8:4 9:7
black 32:2 49:21	53:5,6,8 54:7,10	cases 10:16,17,22	44:5	concern 35:3 40:21
51:11	55:3,15,20 56:9	14:2,5,6 21:20	claim 5:11 11:1,5,6	concluded 11:10
blacks 8:24 40:1	56:20 57:3	26:4,6 42:25	24:2	25:13
41:21	bussing 8:22 9:9,16	56:16,16	claiming 26:21	condition 54:14
board 7:2,2,3 17:14	9:18 17:12 26:18	category 18:18	class 15:7 17:3	confections 30:17
17:15,21,23 20:11	bylaws 47:14	55:25	classes 16:19 24:3	connections 30:17
26:18 27:21 28:12		cello 18:6 32:11,14	classification 8:12	conservative 12:19
29:9,11,13 33:5	C	censuss 15:11	21:25 35:25 36:11	13:15
33:12 34:24 45:13	c 1:12 2:1 3:1	certain 24:2 49:7	39:2,8,14,14,18	consider 13:14
47:3	cabin 14:4	certainly 5:19 6:4	39:25 40:5,9,12	21:18
boards 17:12	california 1:21	14:10 30:20 51:9	40:25 41:2 53:11	considered 16:1
body 48:1,4	13:23 16:6,7,11	52:2	53:12	consistent 48:21
book 38:19	16:12 17:7	cetera 46:13,13	classifications 7:22	const 38:14
borne 39:20	californias 16:21	chambers 53:22	39:11	constitution 18:6
box 7:23 15:13,21	call 21:1 34:13	change 7:12 8:9,11	clause 8:3,5 18:4,11	18:10 20:5 21:11
19:20	calling 44:13	8:11 29:2,4,11	22:8,18 23:6 36:5	29:8,11,14,19
boxes 15:21 19:18	campaign 39:20	38:5 46:23 49:10	36:21 56:10 57:6	30:23 33:23,23
branch 37:23	campus 4:15 5:2	52:16 56:6	clear 5:1 11:8	35:25 38:23 39:3
breyer 42:18 43:12	9:7 11:19 14:13	changed 15:7 47:7	14:22 23:24 25:7	48:17 49:7,10
43:14 44:9,17	15:18,23 17:6	changing 6:2 52:12	51:12	constitutional 3:12
49:3 56:14,21	24:1	55:19	clearly 7:19 9:7	4:7 13:21 20:22
57:3	campuses 16:11,14	charge 29:23 53:23	35:17	22:21 26:11 27:16
brief 4:25 7:11 15:1	26:8	chart 7:10	climate 21:7	37:14 38:12,15
22:17 27:21,22	cant 8:7 9:25 20:5	check 15:13,20	climb 29:24 31:12	45:25 47:8 53:20
briefs 11:25 15:17	31:23 34:5 37:12	checkbox 15:14,22	closely 55:5	56:3,4,8,23,24
22:8	37:19 38:5 44:20	16:4	closer 5:16 16:3	constitutionally
bring 4:7 41:14	46:17 53:25 54:4	checked 19:19,20	coalition 1:7,23	26:7 30:1 32:22
broadbased 19:11	55:1,17 56:4	checking 15:21	2:10 3:5 41:8	37:3 49:16
broader 19:7	cantrell 1:22 2:7	chief 3:3,9 18:19,24	college 14:10	construe 24:20
brought 18:24	25:21	25:18,22 26:1	colorblind 45:16	contested 14:11
building 39:1	care 22:18	28:11,16,17,23	come 12:7 13:1,17	context 30:10 56:23
burden 45:7 46:7	cared 12:25	29:7 30:20 33:3	25:25 29:6 30:3	56:23
46:16 52:9,16	carolene 23:12	34:22 36:3 40:18	30:13 32:11 39:6	contracting 19:10
53:2	54:18	40:19 41:5,10	43:8,22 45:9	control 46:22
burdens 46:18	case 3:4,11 6:18 7:6	45:10 50:10,17,24	49:22 53:16 56:21	core 21:24
54:12	8:20,25 9:19 11:2	51:2,15 52:13	comes 15:23 19:20	correct 9:13 20:1
bursch 1:19 2:3,13	12:17 21:22 26:3	53:4,8 54:1 57:13	30:3 31:21 32:1,9	26:23,24 27:9,12
3:6,7,9,24 4:10	26:3,4,5,6,9,9,10	children 5:25 12:25	40:12	27:17,20 28:7
5:12 6:3,22 7:8	27:6 29:1,1,2 30:2	choice 6:20	committee 30:4,5	32:18 37:15 38:2
9:5,13,22,25 10:5	30:14,18 32:5,6	choices 8:8	30:24	38:6,7
10:7,11 11:6 12:1	32:18 33:1,25	choose 20:18	communicated	correctly 25:13
12:6 13:3,12	36:21 38:4 40:17	chose 48:18	37:4	couldnt 28:15
14:17,25 16:10	41:17 42:14,16,17	circuit 41:13	communicates	council 43:20
17:17,24 18:23	44:3 46:3 48:24	circumstances	36:24	counsel 25:18 41:5
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

53:4 57:13,14	dead 47:17	depend 50:11,18	17:1 23:13,25	6:7 9:3,6 11:19
country 19:21	deal 13:15 26:14	52:14,14	55:1	14:13 17:5 26:8
course 13:18 30:22	39:4 56:8	depends 46:15	disadvantageous	26:11 30:8 36:9
32:4,18 38:1	dealing 27:20 32:21	derived 23:5	23:9 49:2	36:18 49:18,23,24
courses 51:25	49:13 55:25	described 29:4	disadvantaging	55:12,13
court 1:1,16 3:10	dean 45:18,19	description 26:17	23:11	divided 40:22 49:6
10:24 11:4,8,9	46:12,12,21 47:14	desegregation 4:8	disagree 35:14	divisive 12:5
12:12 13:5,23	47:16	9:4 27:17 30:2	53:18	doctrine 8:10,19
18:13 23:23 24:16	debatable 52:2,3	designed 54:13	discovered 16:17	10:13 13:16,22
25:7,12,23 26:13	debate 6:16 51:4	55:7	discrete 24:5	21:6,21 22:25
27:10,22 28:9	debating 52:10	determination 33:7	discriminate 42:12	24:10,23 25:3,4
31:15 35:3 36:20	decide 44:5	determinations	56:11	37:21 41:13 46:2
40:17,17,20 41:11	decided 11:2 18:14	37:24,24 44:12	discriminates	46:11 47:9 53:1
41:12 49:17 53:11	24:12 28:18 31:15	determinative 35:6	18:16	doesnt 22:19 37:7
courts 4:1 6:21	33:1 48:2 53:10	35:13	discrimination	43:23 52:14 53:14
13:24 20:19 41:2	decision 9:14 11:7	determine 22:20	4:18 8:3 9:8	doing 5:4,15 10:15
cover 29:23	12:11 17:12,19,20	determined 42:4	11:17 26:12 42:4	31:1 32:3 33:13
crawford 18:13	19:12 29:14,17	determines 36:14	43:2 49:13 56:17	43:21
53:10 54:6	30:25 32:25 35:9	detroit 1:23	discriminatory	dont 4:4 8:21 11:25
create 4:1 35:7	35:12,18 41:13	develop 28:13	10:21 12:13,16	12:21 13:4 15:19
created 36:25	44:13 45:12 46:23	dichotomy 53:20	13:24 21:18 25:8	15:24 25:2 27:4
creates 38:20 49:1	47:17,25,25 53:16	didnt 9:14,17 11:5	56:1	28:19 30:25 31:18
credit 55:23	decisionmakers	14:19	discuss 4:25	31:23,25 32:8,20
crescendo 34:12	12:15	differ 42:20	discussed 14:7	34:7,7,18,19
criteria 14:16	decisionmaking	difference 7:1 9:6	discussion 13:14	36:12 40:10 44:9
16:16 38:1 43:22	8:15 46:20 48:4	28:25 42:19 46:4	14:15 19:15 20:20	47:12,19,19 48:20
45:13 48:10	decisions 46:25	48:7 51:15,16	discussions 35:7	48:22,22 49:4
criterion 23:15	47:2	different 12:22	disparate 10:18	53:21
crystal 23:24	declension 34:10	23:5 28:24 29:15	dispute 13:4 27:1	door 30:12
curtails 54:15	defacto 3:22	29:16 30:24,24	disputed 11:11	dramatic 15:17
cuyahoga 12:11,11	defend 1:7,24 2:10	34:20 39:18 46:19	25:14	16:8
12:18	3:5 41:8	52:4	distinction 7:7 8:22	draw 44:1,2 53:20
	defined 53:11	differentiation	11:24 12:3 18:15	drawn 56:5,5
D	definitely 51:7	18:12	30:19 46:7	driver 1:23 2:9
d 1:12,21 2:6 3:1	definition 41:1,2	differently 24:24	distinguish 7:5	41:6,7,10,25 42:3
25:20	delegate 46:24	53:13	14:6 21:22 26:3	42:13,17 43:9,13
daughters 46:5	delegated 28:3,12	difficult 15:10	32:23	44:8,11 45:1 46:3
davis 10:16,23	29:10 45:13	24:18 50:13,19	distinguishing 6:25	46:15 47:10,19,24
21:17 24:13,25	delegation 28:21	difficulty 6:25	7:6,8	48:13,24 49:14
33:1	29:12	direct 54:19	district 11:7,9 13:5	50:15,21,25 51:9
day 18:14 19:13	democratic 6:20	directed 40:1	25:7,12 27:10	51:19 52:3,18,20
53:10	10:3,4 14:8	directlyelected 7:2	28:9 40:17	drop 15:17 16:9
days 6:9 39:21	demonstrate 15:13	dirty 37:6	districts 26:25	50:6
de 4:20,20 9:12	demonstrated 17:7	disadvantage 23:16	diverse 19:19	drove 13:11
26:14,22 27:2,8	department 26:19	23:20 49:2	diversify 9:3	
27:10,15	45:22	disadvantaged	diversity 4:15 5:1,5	E

			i	
e 2:1 3:1,1	entrant 29:22	37:1	field 5:20 6:4 20:12	27:23 28:9
earlier 42:25	equal 3:12,13,19		38:20 51:1 55:19	fourth 37:8
early 41:20	4:1 7:23 8:2,16	F	fields 38:21	framework 12:8
ears 34:15	10:23 14:4 18:3	face 24:13 46:16	fight 1:9	freshman 15:7
easier 7:12	18:11 20:14 22:3	facial 39:2,17	filled 12:24	friends 53:18
education 14:10	22:8 23:6 36:4,21	fact 5:3,9 11:11	finally 5:24,24	fulcrum 17:25
20:12 26:9 43:5	37:17 54:2 55:23	13:6 14:14 25:14	find 15:5	full 15:3
49:20	55:24 56:10 57:5	26:13 28:10 32:2	finding 13:24 25:11	fundamental 7:15
educational 4:2	57:6,11,12	38:14 52:4	27:8,15	fundamentally
17:20	equality 1:9 4:3	factbased 44:12	fine 28:22 33:15	7:25 24:9
effect 14:23 15:3	48:7	facto 4:20 26:14	43:14	further 25:16
44:24	especially 50:23	27:2	finger 17:24	future 20:20
effective 32:6	esq 1:19,21,23 2:3	factor 7:6,9 18:1	finish 40:18	
effects 16:22 43:2,7	2:6,9,13	30:7,16 55:18	first 3:15 4:11,24	G
effort 18:7	essentially 20:3	factors 19:8 30:11	5:17 9:21 14:18	g 3:1
efforts 5:9	45:11	37:3	15:2,3 22:20	gain 9:2
either 21:10,20,21	et 1:10 46:13,13	facts 10:19	23:23 29:22,23	game 6:1
22:13 23:1 24:20	ethnicity 15:14	factual 7:1	31:6 35:17 43:22	general 1:4,19 16:7
53:12 57:11	19:8	faculty 28:3 33:6	43:22 52:21,21	17:18
elected 7:3 17:15	everybody 24:8	33:10,18 34:24,25	55:4	geography 30:16
17:23 27:21,25	evidence 5:13	35:12,12,17 45:14	fisher 9:2 19:24	ginsburg 6:22 9:11
28:4	12:16	45:14 46:12,21	36:20	11:1 14:17,25
election 28:4	evil 12:12	47:1,15,18	fit 13:13	23:2,4,23 25:6
electorate 21:10	exactly 18:2 19:14	fail 20:4	fits 12:7	54:5,8,11 55:3
25:15	24:21 31:17 32:4	failed 5:9	five 33:10	ginsburgs 40:13
eligible 6:10	35:1 46:10	fails 24:6	fix 24:19	give 22:7 31:22
eliminate 5:17	example 5:6 15:18	fair 22:9,15 55:23	flights 29:25	43:19
22:23 37:18 48:2	24:4 34:21	faithful 23:19	focus 5:13,22 7:23	given 6:3 10:19
48:15	exception 36:16	fall 22:6 55:25 57:7	8:6 9:24 10:1,12	giving 44:4
eliminates 8:17	executive 37:23	falling 10:15 falls 12:11,18 18:18	22:1,6,6,10,24	glad 18:23 go 6:22 8:1 9:17
elimination 36:9	45:22	23:16	23:12 45:3,4	14102052114
50:9	exercised 46:22	false 53:20	52:22 53:15 56:11	22:2 29:4 30:12
emphasize 14:9	existed 48:18	far 9:17	focused 19:13 49:1	48:5,6 50:2 52:10
empirical 35:15	exists 42:9	fashion 18:17	focuses 7:22 19:3	56:15
employment 19:10	exorbitant 29:23	favor 8:20 37:11	fold 15:22	goal 4:16 5:16 17:6
43:10	expensive 36:10	45:16 51:7	following 15:11	43:6
enact 29:9 50:13,19	experiences 17:7	favored 38:9	54:19	goes 5:13 46:12
54:13	explain 15:1 43:15	favoring 9:6	forbidden 43:6	going 5:25 7:17
enacting 29:25	49:19	favors 9:3	forbids 8:3	12:19 16:16 20:25
engineering 16:19 enrollment 14:21	explaining 35:16	federal 8:5 18:9	force 34:7 forced 15:20	21:9 24:9 28:20
	explains 7:11	22:9,15,20 26:20	forced 15:20 forum 52:4	29:2,13,13 31:4
50:7 enter 29:22 48:18	explicitly 39:2,17	55:23	forum 52:4 forward 23:7	44:1 45:17 50:7
	expressed 41:14 extent 24:2 50:10	fee 53:23		53:9
entering 15:6 entire 10:23 37:21	50:11,17 57:1,7	feelings 17:19	forwardlooking 4:17	good 6:17 11:24
entirely 21:22	extraordinary 36:2	feet 39:6	found 25:7 27:10	13:2 17:8 43:20
CHUICIY 21.22	EXITAGE UHITATY 50.2		10ana 25./ 27.10	15.2 17.0 15.20
	l	l	I	I

goodness 37:12	hey 17:2	33:2 35:16 37:10	interests 54:22	17:18 18:4,19,24
39:20 41:18	high 17:1 46:7	37:10 40:11 41:1	interpret 8:12	19:22 20:2,9,21
gotten 16:14 48:9	higher 8:15 15:24	48:9 49:3 50:15	interpretations	23:2,4,23 25:6,18
government 21:4	16:18,20 21:3,15	53:9 56:15	7:20	25:22,24 26:1,2
22:13 26:20 37:22	24:18,22 26:9	immediately 36:12	inures 45:5 52:23	26:16,20,25 27:3
49:8	31:11 44:15	immigrant 1:8	invalidate 56:10	27:4,8,9,13 28:2
governmental	higherup 44:7	impact 10:18 14:20	invented 13:22	28:11,17,23 29:7
54:15	history 40:14	impacts 16:24	invitation 6:21	30:20 31:9,18
gpas 16:18	holding 13:5	impediment 3:18	20:19	32:8 33:2,10,17
graduation 16:20	holt 3:20	imperative 27:17	invited 19:14	33:20,24 34:5,10
grants 6:10,12	honor 11:7 13:13	implicates 54:20	involve 26:6 53:21	34:12,16,22 35:11
gratz 32:19	27:19 28:7 29:3	implies 53:13	53:22 56:3,4	35:18 36:3 37:7
greater 52:16	29:16 32:15 34:11	important 5:21	involved 9:15 26:22	37:16 38:5,8,12
ground 17:13,14	36:19 37:15,20	14:8 19:5 24:11	48:10	38:22 39:7,10,13
group 8:23 23:25	38:25 39:12,15	50:21,23	involving 31:5	39:24 40:3,8,13
50:14,20,23 51:3	40:11,16	imposed 21:11	isnt 3:22 6:16 23:2	40:18,19 41:1,5
51:18 56:15	hostile 23:9	imposes 46:18	23:4 26:23,23	41:10,18 42:2,9
groups 24:6 42:11	hotly 14:11	imposing 4:2	27:9 46:9 52:6,6	42:14,18 43:12,14
46:4,19 51:8,20	housing 22:9,16	impossible 32:23	isolation 16:4	44:9,17 45:9,10
51:22 54:13,23	55:23	32:23	issue 3:11,15,25	45:10 46:8,17
grutter 4:12,14,19	hunter 3:15 8:14	improvement 10:3	8:15 13:11 18:22	47:12,13,21,22
5:8 6:21 9:7	8:19 10:15 11:24	include 55:18	32:18 40:21	48:8,20,21 49:3
19:14,24 20:16,19	12:17 13:15,19	included 11:15	issues 14:11 26:6	50:10,17,24 51:2
21:12 23:23,24	14:1 21:1,13 22:2	includes 56:23	ive 30:15	51:15,23 52:12,19
24:7 38:4 39:21	22:11,23 24:11,12	including 11:16	J	53:4,8 54:1,5,8,11
42:24,24 52:5	24:14 25:5 26:4	increased 16:25		55:3,12,17,20
55:6,9	29:2 32:24,25,25	incremental 8:9,11	j 1:19 2:3,13 3:7 53:6	56:2,14,21 57:3
guaranteed 48:17	39:16,17 40:15	10:3	john 1:19 2:3,13	57:13
guess 10:6 37:16,16	49:12 50:12 52:25	indication 51:12	3:7 53:6	justices 33:3 34:23
51:5	55:7 57:8,10	individual 38:17,18	journal 6:8	justification 8:25
H	hunterseattle 41:14	individuals 22:4	judges 42:20	K
half 6:12	45:1 47:20	30:24 54:21,21	judgment 11:9	$\frac{\mathbf{k}}{\mathbf{k}}$ 26:9
happen 31:8	hurdle 31:11	indulge 7:17	25:12	keep 8:19 11:8
happened 4:24	hurdles 55:1	inequality 49:20	judiciarys 54:20,22	keeping 21:5
31:6	hypothetical 22:7	instance 43:11	jure 4:20 9:12	keeps 6:1
hard 7:9 31:19	33:4,4,24 34:23	instances 26:10 institutions 6:13	26:22 27:8,10,15	kennedy 6:24 9:20
harder 6:16 13:12	T		jurisprudence	9:23 10:2,6,9
havent 14:7 16:14	id 43:15	insular 24:6	10:24	11:23 12:2 20:21
head 21:8	idea 23:18	integrate 9:1 integration 1:8	justice 3:3,9,20,24	25:24 26:2 27:3
hear 3:3 31:24 32:1	identical 3:22,25	49:18	4:4 5:7,23 6:22,24	28:2 33:2,10,17
heavier 46:16	26:5 27:18	intended 12:23	8:21 9:11,20,23	33:20,24 34:5,10
hed 43:19	ill 4:11	47:8	10:2,6,9 11:1,22	34:12,16,22 35:11
held 41:19	illegitimate 37:5	intent 11:11 12:13	11:23 12:2,21	35:18 45:10 47:12
helpful 44:19	im 7:17 18:23	12:16,20 13:2	13:10 14:17,25	47:21
heres 30:9	28:15,17 31:21	24:25 25:8,14	15:16 16:5 17:10	kick 22:19 46:2,11
	,-,-,-	27.23 23.0,14		,,
	1	1	ı	I

				3
49:12	legislature 20:24	m 1:17 3:2 57:15	33:22,23 38:23	moved 14:15 15:14
kind 7:9 44:24	21:11 29:20 33:20	main 5:2 12:22	48:1,17,22,23	24:22
knocks 55:5	34:2,25 45:23	maintained 27:25	49:18,21 50:5	moves 21:3,15
know 4:19 5:6 7:9	47:23 53:23	majority 23:10,17	51:10,11 56:10	muddy 15:1
7:16 8:4,6 13:13	legitimate 13:8	41:17 42:8	michigans 5:1 6:3	mulkey 11:24
15:24 16:3 21:7	30:7,7,16	makeup 6:3	8:2,16 19:12	multiple 15:14,21
21:20,21 22:7,19	level 8:15 13:20	making 18:12	million 30:12	15:22 19:18 29:24
24:3,25 28:18	21:4,16 24:18,22	37:23 47:25 48:1	mind 11:8 43:8	34:17
31:18 40:1 42:23	37:19 46:6,21	mandate 26:11	minimum 8:1	music 34:15
43:4,21 49:12	51:1	mark 1:21 2:6	minorities 5:20,24	
52:10 53:25	levels 22:13 45:16	25:20	6:2 14:21 15:6,23	N
	46:11	material 11:11 13:6	23:8,8 24:3 31:14	n 2:1,1 3:1
L	lightning 36:7	25:14	31:15 41:24 42:6	narrow 10:8 14:4
lacks 49:8	limitation 57:1,3	math 16:19	42:16 45:5,7 46:6	21:1 52:25 57:8
ladder 45:17	line 10:16,23 44:2,2	matter 1:15 22:1	46:7,16 48:5 49:2	nature 29:17
language 55:22	44:17,18,24 45:2	43:25 44:1 57:16	52:7,9,15,16,24	necessarily 12:2
56:18	46:19 56:5	matters 18:17	53:3 54:17	necessary 1:10
lansing 1:19	listen 32:11,13,20	29:20,21 34:20,20	minority 4:14 11:4	14:12,14
latinos 24:4	listening 32:14	mean 7:17 13:1	11:20 16:2,13,17	need 25:2 42:7
laudable 4:16	literal 55:22	23:6 36:3 37:10	16:25 23:11,13,17	47:24,25
laughter 34:14	litigation 27:6	41:20 44:14 56:18	23:21,25 37:10,11	needed 24:19
law 3:17,21 5:10	36:14	meaning 8:12	38:8,17,18 41:16	needs 10:13
8:2,13,16,18 9:23	little 15:8	41:15	42:11 50:7,14,20	neutral 18:17
10:8 14:3 19:7,11	lobby 18:5 48:5	means 1:10 6:21	50:23 51:3,8,9,18	never 18:7 48:9
21:14,25 22:20	lobbying 22:12	18:25	51:20,21,24 55:2	new 7:10
24:14,17 45:2,3	local 13:20 17:12	meant 12:10 39:25	55:8 56:15	nobodys 35:19
50:4 52:22 55:24	22:14	56:22	minus 42:19	non 22:24
56:5,5 57:5,5	long 31:16 46:21	measure 6:9 38:1	minute 43:16	nondiscriminatory
laws 3:15 7:22,24	longer 21:9 29:12	41:25 42:1,3	minutes 53:5	11:15 22:5
13:19,25 20:23	29:13	measures 20:4,15	mired 19:15	normal 37:13 38:6
22:4,5,24 24:21 37:11 45:21 53:14	look 10:12,14 12:10		mirrors 8:4	46:18,20,22
53:21,21 55:25	12:17 16:4 19:16	measuring 40:11	mismatch 11:21	normally 47:3,4 notion 23:19 54:25
lawsuits 26:19	24:13,24 36:6	medical 50:4	13:8 51:5	number 6:10,11
lead 15:11	44:18 50:4 52:21	mentions 12:12	misunderstood	15:5,22 28:3,4
leave 17:22 21:23	looked 28:10 40:17	55:24	33:4	43:17,18
29:13 43:25	40:18,20	merits 4:12	modified 16:23	numbers 5:3 15:19
leaves 8:8	looking 23:15	message 36:23 37:1	motivated 19:12	15:24 16:3
leaving 13:1	49:20	37:4 methods 12:4 30:22	motivation 11:14	13.24 10.3
left 48:11	los 1:21		25:15 motive 40:15	0
legal 48:3	lose 35:21 56:25 lot 16:3 18:25	mexico 19:21	motive 40:15 motives 40:24	o 2:1 3:1
legislation 23:9	lots 56:18	michigan 1:4,20,23 3:11 4:8,23 5:4,11	mouves 40:24 mount 29:24	objection 34:6
30:1 38:6 45:24	lower 22:13	5:14 6:8,11,15,19	mount 29:24 mounting 35:24	objective 26:8,10
54:13	luck 38:9	11:16 14:21,22	mouth 49:5	observation 54:1
legislative 37:13,18	1 UCK 30.3	15:7,12,19 18:2	move 19:13 20:19	obtain 26:11
37:23	M	21:7 27:21 29:8	57:2	obtaining 26:8
		21.727.2127.0	57.2	
	1	ı	1	•

obviously 14:9	P	35:
occur 41:17		place
october 1:13	p 1:17 3:1,2 57:15	place
officials 48:12	page 2:2 7:11 12:17	52:
ohio 10:19 24:14	18:14 32:24,24	plair
okay 10:2 17:10,11	54:9	_
17:13 34:1 42:12	pages 11:12 12:14	plan 26:
43:12 44:21	27:23 31:6	20. 29:
	pare 21:21	
oldfashioned 31:2	parents 9:14	plan
ones 14:5	part 8:1 15:6 34:4	play
open 51:4	35:18 45:3 49:24	play
operating 34:19	49:24 50:22 52:24	38:
operation 54:15	particular 35:3	plea
opinion 12:14	40:21 48:24 51:8	41:
44:25	passed 32:7,16	plen
opponent 51:23	pay 29:23	33:
opportunity 4:2	pell 6:9,12	48
opposed 9:4 14:3	people 6:19 7:24	plus
opposing 54:8	15:20 17:13,14	poin
opposite 21:6	19:12 20:18 29:10	6:1
oppressed 42:6	29:11,18 34:17	14:
option 34:19	35:14 42:18 48:22	21
options 34:17	48:23 49:9 57:2	34
oral 1:15 2:2,5,8	perceived 51:13	44:
3:7 25:20 41:7	percent 15:8,9	54:
order 38:16 46:4	16:20,23 17:3	poin
ordinarily 54:16	51:10	poin
ordinary 28:8 29:3	percentage 15:7	polic
33:16 34:4 35:18	16:13	polic
35:22 36:1 38:10	perfectly 29:3	polit
38:13 45:23	perfectly 29.3 performance 16:25	13
origin 24:10	±	22
original 23:18	permissible 20:17 26:7 30:1 32:22	25
41:15		33
originally 23:7	37:3 43:10 49:16	35
outcome 35:5,13	permits 42:24	36
outcomes 11:20	permitted 30:18	40
outside 19:20	43:1	46
	person 30:18 32:1	49
anterdare L4.1	32:2,12 46:23	53
		רו
overcome 43:1	persons 53:13	
outsiders 13:1 overcome 43:1 54:14	petition 11:13	polit
overcome 43:1 54:14 overcoming 43:7	petition 11:13 petitioner 1:5,20	polit 31:
overcome 43:1 54:14 overcoming 43:7 overruled 26:4	petition 11:13 petitioner 1:5,20 2:4,14 3:8 53:7	polit 31: popu
overcome 43:1 54:14 overcoming 43:7 overruled 26:4 45:15,18,19,20,22	petition 11:13 petitioner 1:5,20 2:4,14 3:8 53:7 picture 14:22 15:1	polit 31: popu 51:
overcome 43:1 54:14 overcoming 43:7 overruled 26:4	petition 11:13 petitioner 1:5,20 2:4,14 3:8 53:7	polit 31: popu 51: popu 11:

:7 44:24 ed 52:9 53:2 es 45:6 46:7 :16 54:12 **ntiffs** 26:21 21:12 23:24 :18,22 27:2 :5 45:15 s 26:7 32:10 ing 5:20 6:4 :19,21 55:19 se 3:10 25:23 :11 ary 27:25 :19 48:14,16,23 :25 10:5,7 42:19 t 4:12,22 5:2 16 9:8 13:4 :7,19 19:5 :23 24:20 34:6 :16 36:4 42:20 :4,21 46:1,11 ∴2 ted 5:8 ts 4:10 cies 7:13 50:13 cv 55:7,9 tical 7:10 8:9 :21 20:10 21:7 :25 24:19,23 :2 27:24 29:3 :16 35:4,5,6,19 5:22,23 36:1,2 5:25 38:11,13 :22 45:6 46:1 5:18 47:6,9 49:2 :4 50:25 52:8 :2 54:16,24 tically 28:8 :3 ularity 51:12 :16 ulation 9:3 :4 17:18 51:21

portion 22:2,23 **position** 8:7 23:4 54.23 positive 16:24 17:8 possibility 44:6 possible 7:20 posts 6:1 postseattle 9:10 posture 11:9 power 17:14 42:5 44:4 49:8,9 54:12 56:6 powerlessness 54:24 powers 57:2 precipitous 50:6 preclude 37:22,22 **preference** 6:1 8:23 18:5,6,8 28:20 31:23 32:13 43:19 preferences 3:18 4:12,20 5:18 6:17 8:17 11:17,21 14:10,12 19:1 20:16 22:12 24:2 36:10,13,15,18 39:23 44:6,14 preferential 3:19 46:5 prejudice 54:14 present 12:13 preserve 13:16 president 45:20 46:13 47:4,22 press 6:6 pretend 21:7 preventing 22:11 previous 26:21 primarily 19:12 55:8 primary 11:14 25:15 principal 7:6 principle 47:11 private 26:20 privilege 42:5

privileged 42:7 proaffirmative 20:22 probably 43:2 **problem** 22:19 25:2 33:15,15 34:3 35:1,2,24 36:19 36:22 38:20 39:3 39:15 40:16 55:10 55:16,21 **problems** 21:5 55:4 **proceed** 41:23 process 6:20 7:10 8:15 10:4 14:8 20:10 24:19 27:24 28:1,8,9 29:3,25 33:16 34:4 35:2,4 35:5,6,9,19,22,23 36:1,2 37:13 38:11,13 40:22 45:6 46:18 47:6,7 49:2,4 50:25 52:8 53:2 processes 54:16 products 23:12 54:18 professional 50:5 **program** 9:16,18 16:23 27:1 32:16 32:17,19 38:24 programs 28:14,20 29:9 32:5,6,22 36:8 43:10,18 48:3,15 49:16 50:19 51:13,14,17 progressive 6:13 prohibition 39:10 39:13 **proof** 9:12 **prop** 30:13 48:3 51:11 proper 45:8 properly 11:10 proponents 4:5 proposal 36:23 38:20,22 39:16

proposing 37:10	51:3 52:2,3	39:17,22,25 40:4	regularly 47:1	responsibility 10:4
proposition 11:3	questions 18:20	40:9,11,25 41:2	reitman 11:24 12:7	responsive 46:9
16:8,21	25:16,25 48:6	42:7 44:6,14 45:3	13:13,17,18	responsiveness
propounds 42:15	50:3	45:4 46:6 48:7	reject 7:19 9:21	10:6
protect 41:16,23,24	quota 32:20	49:17,24 52:22	rejected 41:22	rest 16:15
54:17	quota 32.20 quote 12:12 18:15	53:11,12,15 54:13	relegated 54:23	restated 47:9,10
protected 41:21	54:9	56:11	relied 13:23 54:16	restructures 45:6
protecting 22:3,4	quoted 54:5,5	racially 12:4 40:22	relieve 26:11	restructuring 8:10
protecting 22.3,4 protection 3:13	quotes 54:18	49:1	religious 42:6	13:22 22:25 24:23
7:23 8:2 10:24	quotient 49:25	racism 37:18	remaining 53:5	25:3 35:2 46:2
18:4,11 20:14	quotient 49.23	raise 25:25 30:12	remedy 3:22,25 4:2	52:8 53:1 56:25
22:3,8 23:6,7,8	R	raised 26:1	4:18 20:5 47:18	result 4:3 11:21
36:5,21 42:7 54:2	$\overline{\mathbf{r}3:1}$	range 44:14	remedying 9:8	38:24
55:24 56:10 57:6	race 8:4 10:21	rarely 28:5	remedying 9.8	results 11:19
57:12	11:17 14:15 15:13	rate 16:20	removed 18:1	reverse 47:15,18
protects 41:19	17:25 18:3,8,9,12	rational 40:24	24:17	reviewed 25:9
42:16	18:16 19:1,8,13	rational 40.24	removes 8:14 21:2	revision 34:23
provide 51:21	20:16,20 21:9,19	read 56:15	21:14 45:5	revision 54.25
provides 45:1	22:10,12 23:12,16	reaffirm 41:13	repeal 3:16 14:2,23	revoke 28:20
proving 45:3	30:10,10 31:6,11	reality 49:20	29:5 30:13	rid 21:22 39:22
provision 3:12 8:13	31:20,21 32:21	really 5:21 7:12 9:9	repealed 13:20	right 5:15 6:4 7:23
21:3,15 24:17	36:5,6,8,17,21	9:19 10:11,15	repealing 10:7 57:4	7:25 8:7 9:5 10:7
29:8	37:2,5,5,6 38:3	11:8 12:10 24:11	repeals 3:17 8:13	10:16 20:2 22:1
public 19:9,10	39:4,6,18 43:23	25:2 46:8,9 56:8	repeat 50:16	32:4,11 37:14
public 19.9,10 pupil 26:21	47:1,2,7 53:14,21	reascertain 45:7	reply 4:25 7:11	40:5 42:2,10,21
purpose 31:10	53:22,24 54:2	reason 11:1,3 20:3	15:1	43:13 44:3 45:7
39:22 41:15,23	55:18,24,25 56:12	21:16 25:4 32:25	require 20:23 56:7	45:14 46:22 47:21
55:8	racebased 7:12	43:20	57:12	48:4 50:1 51:2
pursuant 27:2	14:9	reasons 3:13 5:10	required 36:15	53:25 55:6,15
pursued 17:6	racefocused 20:15	11:16 13:7,8 17:8	requires 8:16 14:3	56:20,22 57:2,7
pursuit 30:7	raceneutral 5:5,16	rebuttal 2:12 53:6	49:22 53:3	rights 1:9 41:16
put 17:24 18:6 23:7	6:21 8:2 11:18		requiring 3:12	roberts 3:3 18:19
29:19 44:19 49:4	14:16 16:16 17:9	recognized 18:15 reconcile 10:22	15:12	18:24 25:18 26:1
53:22 55:1	20:20 22:5 30:21	record 27:23 46:25	resegregation 50:8	28:11,16,17,23
33.22 33.1	racerelated 18:17	reduce 11:4	resegregation 30.8	29:7 30:20 36:3
0	races 37:17 41:20	reenact 24:18	resolved 10:17	40:18,19 41:5
qua 22:24	racespecific 32:3	reexamined 10:13	resort 20:3	50:10,17,24 51:2
qualified 51:25	racial 7:21,22 8:6	refer 18:20 39:8	respect 4:22 11:11	51:15 53:4 54:1
question 4:11 6:19	8:12 9:23,25	references 22:10	13:6 26:24 35:4	57:13
11:10 12:9 13:6	10:12 11:3 13:9	regarding 27:19	36:25 49:10,11	rod 36:7
14:19 24:10 25:13	19:18 21:25 22:1	regents 17:15,21,23	respectfully 57:10	role 54:20,22
25:25 27:3,5 28:7	22:5,6,10,24	20:11 27:24 29:9	respectiony 37.10 respondents 1:22	room 29:22
30:5,6,9 31:19	28:20 29:17,20	31:1 33:5,14,17	1:24 2:7,11 8:7	rooms 29:20
42:4,23 43:7	30:19 34:20 35:24	33:19,21 34:24	17:25 21:24 25:21	rosenbaum 1:21
45:10,11 46:9	36:11,13,15,18	45:21 47:3 48:1,6	41:9 55:5,21	2:6 25:19,20,22
47:13,22 48:22	39:2,7,9,11,13,14	50:2	,	26:24 27:7,12,14
,22 .0.22	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	30.4	response 22:17	20.24 27.7,12,14
	l	<u> </u>	ı	I

20.6 15 22 25	gamutiny 0.6 0.15	anta 27:25 29:2 40:6	19.4 10.22 20.2 0	22.16 27.21 41.2
28:6,15,22,25	scrutiny 8:6 9:15	sets 37:25 38:2 40:6	18:4 19:22 20:2,9	32:16 37:21 41:3
29:16 31:17,25	18:7,10 19:25	sex 8:4 19:8 21:9	46:17 55:12,17,20	56:13
32:15 33:9,14,19	20:15 22:17 23:6	22:13 56:12	sotomayors 48:21	strike 24:16
33:22 34:1,9,11	23:10,18,21 24:15	sexbased 14:10	speak 50:12	striking 13:25
34:15 35:1,16	25:5 31:10,13	19:1	special 45:6 46:16	struck 24:22
36:19 37:15,20	32:5,7,16 37:21	shanta 1:23 2:9	52:9 53:2 54:14	student 15:25 18:5
38:7,10,14,25	41:3 56:13	41:7	54:20,22	30:3,11,15 31:19
39:9,12,15 40:2,6	searching 24:16	short 7:3	specifically 12:12	31:20 32:9,9
40:10,20	seattle 3:16,23,25	shouldnt 39:6	27:23 47:7	students 6:10,12
route 12:19	6:25 7:1,16,17,21	show 16:12	sponsors 4:6 12:23	11:20 15:12,18,22
rule 8:20 33:5,6,12	8:1,12,14,19 9:9	shown 16:7,8 30:12	stage 25:12	16:4,18 17:2 30:3
37:8,9 38:19 45:8	9:12 10:15,20	35:4 49:16,23	staggered 28:5	31:14 51:24
rules 38:3,6	12:3,3,10,13,24	side 44:3 53:18	stairs 29:24,25	subject 8:5 37:17
runs 20:13	13:10,11,13,15	similar 16:8,22	standard 40:7	44:1,15 46:6
	14:1 17:16 18:14	similarly 14:2	standards 37:25	56:13
S	21:1,13 22:2,11	simple 46:19	start 53:9	submitted 57:14,16
s 2:1 3:1 15:11	22:23 23:5 26:3,5	simpler 25:1	started 39:21	substance 36:23
51:15	26:8,13,17,17	simply 4:21 18:25	starting 36:16	substantial 56:7
safeguarding 54:22	27:5,20 29:1	55:18,19	stat 6:8	sudden 44:19
sander 51:5	32:23 49:12 50:12	sine 22:24	state 13:20 16:8	sued 36:12
satisfy 24:23	52:25 53:10 54:9	single 15:13,21	18:6,9,15,16	suggest 7:17
save 21:1	54:25 55:6,13,22	16:4 18:3	20:24 21:10 22:8	suggests 22:24
saying 9:20 10:18	56:2,3,19 57:8,10	singles 20:14 39:18	22:13 27:22 29:19	summary 11:9
19:23 20:4,5,8,11	seattles 9:14	situation 27:18	29:19 30:23 31:23	25:12
20:16 29:12 37:8	second 10:2 52:24	34:3	31:25 34:17 36:6	supplemental
38:11 40:23 49:3	section 3:16 7:13	sixth 41:12	38:15 39:2 45:21	11:12
52:14 55:14	11:15 14:6 15:3	social 5:8,12	45:22 48:17 49:8	suppose 23:14 33:5
says 27:22,22 29:8	18:3,18 19:3,5	socialeconomically	49:8 50:5 55:23	47:14 56:21
30:4,5,15 31:19	53:19 57:9	17:1	57:6	supposed 4:14 24:1
31:21 32:10 43:19	see 8:21 12:21	society 9:1 42:5	stated 36:20	55:10
45:2 51:23,24	15:16 16:22 19:15	socioeconomic 5:22	statements 12:16	supremacy 22:18
53:12 56:11	48:20 49:13	6:7 36:9	states 1:1,16 19:14	22:19
scalia 37:7,16 38:5	segregate 12:23	solely 4:13	54:11	supreme 1:1,16
38:8,12 39:7,10	segregation 3:22	solicitor 1:19	statistics 4:25 15:2	13:24
39:13,24 40:3,8	4:21 9:12 26:15	somebody 44:12	16:6,10 19:16	sure 33:2
41:1,18 42:2,9,14	26:22 27:2,8,11	somebody 44.12 sons 46:5	statute 36:15	survive 14:6 57:9
51:23 52:12,19	27:16	sorry 28:16,17 48:9	steps 37:1	system 15:15 16:12
school 5:11 7:2,2	sense 40:4,8 54:20	50:16	sticking 7:9	28:10 31:3 32:20
17:12,15 26:18	-	sort 32:17 42:20,21	<u> </u>	
27:21	sentence 53:9 54:19 separate 35:8 36:24	-	stopped 15:12 stopping 20:10	systems 39:4
schools 4:3 5:18	_		stopping 20.10 street 6:8	T
8:24 17:1 50:4,4,5	39:3,5 53:22	sorts 29:21 40:23		t2:1,1
50:7,8	seriously 54:15	41:3 52:1	strict 8:5 9:15 18:7	table 36:5,17,22
schuette 1:3 3:4	serve 51:20	sotomayor 3:20,24	18:10 19:24 20:15	37:6 54:2
science 5:12	served 43:22	4:4 5:7,23 8:21	22:16 23:6,10,18	tacoma 26:14
scientists 5:8	set 30:24 43:12,14	12:21 13:10 15:16	23:21 24:15 25:5	take 12:19 15:19
SCICILISES J.O	43:16	16:5 17:10,18	31:10,13 32:5,7	tant 12.17 13.17
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

16:18 17:13 21:17	40:24 41:13 42:1	50:11	8:14 10:18 23:22	uses 37:4,5
33:18,21 34:2,6	42:12 43:4,13	thoughts 4:24	28:2,4 29:20 30:3	utilized 37:2 38:3
36:5,8,17 43:16	44:21 45:8 47:4	23:22	38:21 47:24 53:22	
44:3 49:9 50:1	51:12 52:9,23,25	threatened 26:19	55:3	V
54:2 55:13,17	53:19 54:3 55:4,9	27:6	twopart 52:20	v 1:6 3:4 10:16,23
56:22	55:13 56:7,8,14	three 7:18 9:21	type 32:19	11:24 21:17 24:13
taken 17:11,11	theories 51:6	33:11 39:21		24:25 33:1
23:5 37:1 51:24	theory 22:15,21	threequarters	U	various 28:12
52:23	29:18,18 51:5	20:23	u 15:11	42:11 45:16
takes 22:18 34:7	55:5 57:1	ties 9:19	ultimately 53:16	vast 43:17,17
36:1 45:4	thered 27:7	tilted 6:5	unconstitutional	veto 44:7,15 47:1
talk 11:25 30:6,9	theres 4:10,20 5:12	tilts 5:19	20:17 21:2 32:19	viable 8:19
31:11,12,20,21	5:14 7:3 9:5	time 9:14 10:25	underlying 37:20	view 14:1 23:5,9,12
32:10,12,14,21	10:18 12:20 13:2	14:11 25:17 31:16	underrepresented	23:14 42:15 44:4
48:6 53:23	21:18 24:14 26:2	35:20,20,21	5:20 11:20 15:6	viewed 8:22,22
talking 19:17 32:17	27:1 50:6	times 27:25	15:23 16:2,12,17	violate 37:8,9 57:11
49:14	theyre 17:20 24:5	today 3:4 9:17	24:6 50:6	violated 42:10 47:9
talks 7:21 12:15	28:4,4,19	16:12 21:24 29:4	underscores 38:15	violates 3:13 55:9
taylor 51:5	thing 4:6 5:17 6:6	29:5	understand 19:5	violation 33:13
technology 16:19	6:17 14:18 15:2	told 30:12 36:7	24:11 27:4 32:8	vote 20:24
ten 39:6	44:20 52:21 56:7	tomorrow 29:6	34:7,8 46:25	voted 51:11
term 7:3 36:20	things 5:4,14 7:18	48:2	47:13	voters 12:24 13:2
	9:21 17:19 28:3		understood 33:3	17:8 34:5 35:13
termination 14:20 18:21	36:10 44:15 47:24	tool 55:13,17	unequal 35:8 36:24	51:9,11
		top 16:23 17:2	39:3,5	votes 33:11 43:20
terms 27:1 28:5	55:25	tougher 51:25	united 1:1,16	Votes 33.11 43.20
30:21 38:3 49:15	think 4:4,16 5:10	track 15:10 36:25	universities 19:9	\mathbf{W}
50:12	7:8,10,15,18,19	treat 34:20 55:11	21:8 28:13 31:5	wall 6:8
test 7:25 9:15 13:17	10:8 12:6,9,17	treated 53:13 54:3	34:18	want 5:13 17:9
22:1,6,25 32:16	13:12,16 14:1,13	treating 54:21	university 4:13,23	21:17,23 30:9
40:24 52:20,24	21:21 24:10 30:2	treatment 3:12,19	5:4,14 6:7,11,14	31:10,12,20,21,23
53:16,19 55:21	35:14 41:25 42:13	3:19 8:17 14:4	6:15 14:22 15:12	32:1,10,11 36:12
texas 6:14 16:22	42:18,22,24,25	37:17 38:9 39:19	15:19 16:11 17:3	36:17 37:10 38:19
17:4,7	43:9,16 44:8,9,11	46:5 57:5,12	19:1,4,6 37:11	38:19 43:4 44:10
thank 3:9 25:18	44:22 45:1,2,8	tremendous 44:23	45:20 47:15,23	50:2 51:17 52:10
41:3,5 53:4,8	46:3,15 47:19,20	trigger 24:15 41:3	48:1,11 49:18,22	53:23
57:12,13	47:24,25 48:13,14	true 13:3 48:8,9	50:2	wanted 9:18 44:13
thats 5:9,19 6:18	48:19 49:5,5	49:7	unlawful 43:24	48:15
7:13 8:7,24 9:9,13	50:21,22 51:12	trustees 7:4 33:12	unreasonable 36:6	wants 18:5 29:22
10:8,12 11:14	52:4,20,21,24,25	try 6:21 17:9 18:8	unusual 54:12	38:9
12:13 13:3 14:4	53:15	36:17		wasco 26:14
18:13,21 20:7	thinking 56:15	trying 4:1 6:16	upheld 5:11	washington 1:12
26:24 28:7,9 31:5	third 10:9,11	44:19	uphold 9:18 41:12 use 4:19 14:9 18:25	10:16,20,23 21:17
31:6,18 32:17	thomas 11:22	tuesday 1:13		24:13,25 33:1
33:15,16 34:3,4	thought 5:7 26:17	turned 21:8	20:18 21:9 23:10 35:22 38:10 43:23	49:12
35:18,21,22 36:2	31:9,15 39:25	two 3:13 4:10,24		wasnt 9:15 11:2,2
38:2,11 39:24	41:18,22 46:19	5:14 6:9 7:19 8:8	44:6,13	,, 40116 7.13 11.2,2

			 <i>j</i> e 00
11:10 13:11 23:17	T	2013 1:13	
25:8,10,13	<u>Y</u>	2013 1.13 209 16:21	
way 5:19 6:5 8:18	yeah 44:16 45:7	25 2:7 16:20	
8:24 10:8,11,14	48:14	26 3:16 7:13 11:15	
11:19 13:15 14:4	year 15:3		
	years 6:2 7:3 28:18	14:6 15:3 18:3,18	
14:5 20:14 21:6	31:7 33:11 41:21	19:3,5 53:19 57:9	
24:16 25:1 26:2	48:18	270 31:6	
28:19 31:1,2,3	youre 5:25 6:24	271a 31:7	
34:18 35:8 36:22	9:20 20:4,9 30:6	282a 31:7	
37:3 39:8 40:21	30:20 32:4,13,18	293a 31:7	
47:4 49:1,7,17,23	37:8,9 38:1,8,9	3	
55:1 57:8,11	39:24 44:13 52:12	$\frac{3}{32:4}$	
wayne 27:22	youve 17:24 19:22		
ways 5:5,13 43:21	55:7	317 11:12 319 11:12	
56:7			
went 15:3,8	Z	326a 27:23	
weve 9:2 19:24	0	327a 27:23	
24:24 36:7 41:19		389 32:25	
41:19	00 1:17 3:2 57:15	4	
whats 29:2 44:17	1	4 15:8,9 53:5	
whatsoever 27:15	11:17 3:2	41 2:11	
33:15,16	10 16:23 17:3	486 54:9	
white 15:25 31:20		400 34.3	
31:22 32:1,12	101 15:9	5	
38:17 41:16 49:21	103 15:8	5 30:12	
whites 41:24 42:12	12 26:9	53 2:14	
whos 34:1	12682 1:5 3:4	538 18:14	
win 35:19,20	14th 37:9,21,25		
wonderful 5:23	38:2 39:5 40:4,8	6	
word 37:6	40:12 41:14,19		
words 4:1 22:10	42:10,15	7	
29:10 49:4 51:17	15 1:13 30:12		
work 12:18 20:6	150 48:18	8	
21:6 31:4	16 16:13	9	
worked 28:10 31:7	17 7:11 16:11,13		
working 28:19	195 12:17	90 51:10	
works 31:3	196 12:14	97 12:14	
world 9:10 14:15	1969 10:19		
wouldnt 22:21	1982 10:20		
write 44:23	2		
written 33:6	2 11:3 30:13 36:23		
wrong 10:12 55:14	38:20,22 39:16		
57:9	48:3 51:11 57:15		
	20 16:20		
X	20 16:20 2008 15:4		
x 1:2,11			
	2010 15:11		