I. Some Distinctions: "Weak" vs. "Strong" AA; & Goals vs. Quotas
   A. "Weak" = Outreach, recruitment, extensive search, training – all efforts aimed to promote diversity
   B. "Strong" = use of preferential hiring/admissions standards (Does higher wage for minorities=AA?)
   C. AA defenders say these not same. "Goals" OK but "Quotas" bad – but, why?
   D. Goal="soft" and Quota="firm target". Does this distinction survive in practice? (Texaco case.)
   E. The key question is "What happens if 'goal' not met?" Strong penalties turn goals into quotas.
   F. AA often anti-discrimination law-enforcement tool, not just race-based redistribution of opportunity.
      Need numbers to find discriminators; remedy for discrimination may require "quotas."

II. Contexts in which AA Employed
   A. Employment: E.O. 11246; OFCCP reporting/compliance reviews. History: Johnson/Nixon/Reagan
   B. Government Procurement: Set-Aside at Fed. and state/local level. (Clinton’s Mend/Don’t End)
   C. College Admissions (gets more “play” than extent would warrant)
   D. Private, "voluntary" efforts. Political/economic realities: big (not small) business supports AA—why?

III. Objectives of Affirmative Action Policies (Should ask how well achieved, and by what means.)
   A. The "representation" vs. the "role-model" vs. the "chaperone" motives.
   B. To insure non-biased hiring practices; to correct for the effects of past discrimination.
   C. To reduce general group inequality. To secure/dignity and respect for "out" group.
   D. To change the conception of organization by bringing in diverse points of view.

IV. Some Arguments Pro and Con [Summarized here; to be reviewed at greater length later]
   A. Limitation of the "Color-Blind" Principle
      1. Discrimination in “contract” vs. “contact”
      2. Training/enforcement/outreach already violate color-blind principle.
      3. CB locks-in effects of past, which are perpetuated by non-color-blind social actions.
   B. What does a person have a "right" to anyway?
      1. Does “equality of opportunity” principle imply "meritocracy" principle. (What’s that, anyway?)
      2. Right "to be judged by same standard" not same as “right to be judged by any particular standard."
      3. Equal weight on one’s interest in the calculation of policy not same as equal benefits from policy.
   C. Why race/gender and not "class"? Which races? What about "ethnicity"?
      1. "Asians" complicate picture: non-white minority with high test scores and a history of discrimination
      2. Women (middle class, esp.) are very different from disadvantaged minority groups.
   D. AA as "reparations" and the problems of victim-based claims.
      1. Rely on magnanimity of oppressors
      2. The dilemmas of comparative victimology
   E. "Informational externalities". Stigma; stereotyping; patronization. Problem of honor/respect, to which a legislated outcome need not be a remedy. (Aff. Action for Nobel Prizes won’t work.)
   F. Incentive problems

IV. Why worry about "group" representation in the top jobs?
   A. May be evidence of discrimination. Absence of some groups conspicuous, reinforces stereotypes.
   B. Balances power among groups (E.g., in politics, the regionally or ideologically “balanced ticket.”)
   C. “Representation” not just statistical; looks after group interests, monitors deliberations.
   D. US Constitution requires geographical representation. Why? How else might the people be represented?
   E. Some examples of (dis)representation. Which are problematic? Why?
      1. Supreme Court. Which "groups" should be represented? [Women, "minorities". Non-lawyers? Italians, Jews? Political ideology? Why must this be informal?]
      2. Military. Should officer corps reflect (ethnic/gender) composition of enlists? Those fighting/dying in wartime should reflect (class/ethnic/religious/regional) composition of population?
      3. Children not represented, depend on parents, lobbyist to protect their interest. Contrast elderly.
      4. Should juries be representative – but how?