1. **Utilitarian Diversity on Steroids (and Its Exceptions): The *SFFA* Amici**

Less than a decade after the Court upheld the use of race-conscious admission policies in *Fisher* (2016), affirmative action in higher education was challenged once again. The lawsuits were initiated by Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. (hereinafter: SFFA), a nonprofit organization based in Arlington, Virginia, established by the same Edward Blum who was involved in the lawsuit against the University of Texas in *Fisher*. In November 2014, SFFA filed separate lawsuits against Harvard College, Harvard University’s undergraduate division, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (hereinafter UNC and jointly the SFFA cases), arguing that their race-conscious admissions programs violated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964[[1]](#footnote-2) and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, respectively.[[2]](#footnote-3) The initial lawsuit against Harvard College, claimed that the college’s admissions policy, which took race into account, unfairly discriminated against Asian American applicants. SFFA argued that Asian Americans are notably less likely to be accepted to Harvard than are similarly qualified white, Black, or Hispanic applicants.[[3]](#footnote-4) The second lawsuit, filed against UNC, the state’s leading public university, claimed that the university’s use of race as a factor in its undergraduate admissions process violated both Title VI and the Constitution. Unlike Harvard, which is private, UNC, a public university, is subject to the Fourteenth Amendment’s mandate of equal protection.[[4]](#footnote-5) SFFA contended that neither Harvard’s nor UNC’s policies served a compelling state interest, nor were they sufficiently narrowly tailored due to their rejection of workable race-neutral alternatives.[[5]](#footnote-6) The district courts upheld both Harvard and UNC’s admission programs.[[6]](#footnote-7)

The Supreme Court granted certiorari to these cases in 2022. The timing here is important. Only six years had passed between the 2016 ruling in the second *Fisher* and the Court’s decision to hear the *SFFA* cases. Both in *Michigan* and in *Fisher*, the supporters of affirmative action arguments were directed to trying to sway the decision of Justice Anthony Kennedy, the “swing Justice” on the Court. By 2022, however, Justice Kennedy had retired and the Court no longer had a swing justice. The composition of the Court had changed dramatically, three appointments by President Trump having placed control of the institution in the hands of a conservative supermajority of six justices against three liberal justices.[[7]](#footnote-8)

For affirmative action, the shift in the composition of the Court was crucial. By the time the Court agreed to hear the *SFFA* cases, it was clear that the Court was unlikely to allow the race-conscious admission policies of public and private universities to continue, at least not in any familiar form. Three justices, appointed before the Trump administration—John Roberts, Samuel Alito, and Clarence Thomas—had already gone on record as firmly opposing affirmative action in higher education.[[8]](#footnote-9) The other three conservative justices appointed by President Trump—Neil Gorsuch, Amy Coney Barrett, and Brett Kavanaugh—were universally expected to agree with the first three. Even if only two of these three justices were to join their fellow conservatives, race-based affirmative action in higher education would be eliminated or nearly so.[[9]](#footnote-10) Melissa Murray explains: “They really are in this sort of moment where they can do whatever they like . . . . The decision to hear the admissions case[s] suggests that ‘they’re just checking things off their list and affirmative action will be next.’”[[10]](#footnote-11)

In July 2022, the Supreme Court announced that it would hear the two cases and was presented with \_\_\_ amicus briefs (how many for each side).[[11]](#footnote-12) Assuming that amicus briefs can play two roles—talking to the court and talking through the court and to the people—I argue in this article that the vast majority of amicus briefs submitted in support of race-conscious affirmative action in *SFFA* neglected the latter role. It is possible that the amici may have found arguing to a supermajority conservative court liberating, allowing them to reason more broadly about the importance of affirmative action instead of narrowly trying to convince Justice Kennedy of the merits of race-conscious admission policies and their benefits for all students.[[12]](#footnote-13) To make the broader claim, the SFFA amici briefs in support of the Harvard and UNC did not have to discard the diversity framework; instead, they could have tried to assign it new meaning, much as the *Michigan* amici did. Somewhat paradoxically, given that the outcome of the *SFFA* cases was largely foreseen, I suggest in this article that the amici could have treated this as an opportunity or a venue to remind their students, members, staff, and the public why affirmative action matters in the first place.

Notwithstanding the new composition of the Court, the majority of amici supporting the universities, as well as respondents themselves, decided to adhere to and even expand the utilitarian interpretation of diversity. As demonstrated below, the majority of the amici briefs followed the path of the *Fisher* amicus briefs and emphasized the pedagogical and market-oriented benefits of diversity, with one notable exception: The respondents and some of their amici did turn to history to refute SFFA’s argument that the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, as interpreted in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, is “colorblind” and permits no racial classifications by institutions of education.[[13]](#footnote-14) Most notably, Harvard College dedicated a section of its brief to “Text and History” and argued that “absolute neutrality has never been a universal constitutional principle, either at the time of ratification or in the Court’s jurisprudence. The Congress that adopted the Fourteenth Amendment rejected the ‘absolutis[t]’ view SFFA prefers (Br.51) and authorized numerous measures that benefited African Americans in the aftermath of the Civil War.”[[14]](#footnote-15) Similarly, UNC argued that SFFA’s colorblind construction of the Constitution “ignores the original meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment, defies this Court’s longstanding jurisprudence, and overlooks the compelling benefits that flow from diverse institutions of higher learning.”[[15]](#footnote-16) Despite this reference to the history of racial discrimination in some of the briefs, the majority of the amici failed to tie this history to their interest in diversity, thus largely negating the egalitarian roots and democratic aspirations of affirmative action.

Harvard opened its brief by stating that:

Harvard College seeks an exceptional student body diverse in many dimensions . . . [D]iversity “lead[s] to greater knowledge” for everyone, “as well as the tolerance and mutual respect that are so essential to the maintenance of our civil society.” . . . To achieve that objective, Harvard individually evaluates . . . the ways applicants might contribute to one another’s educational experience given their backgrounds, talents, interests, and perspectives.[[16]](#footnote-17)

Only later did Harvard assert that “a person’s race—like their home state, national origin, family background, or interests—is part of who they are, and that in seeking the benefits of a diverse student body, universities may consider race as one among many factors provided they satisfy strict scrutiny.”[[17]](#footnote-18) Similarly, UNC, the respondent in the second case, opened its brief by stating that:

In choosing to pursue such diversity and its educational benefits, UNC embodies the nation’s highest ideals and best traditions. On campus, diversity promotes the robust exchange of ideas, fosters innovation, and nurtures empathy and mutual respect. It also looks to the future, equipping students with the tools and experiences necessary for success in the modern world. In UNC’s academic judgment, diversity is central to the education it aims to provide the next generation of leaders in business, science, medicine, government, and beyond.[[18]](#footnote-19)

UNC also noted that there is a unique challenge in admitting represented minorities and that “[as] a Southern flagship university that for most of its history excluded racial minorities from admission altogether—[it] continues to have much work to do.” [[19]](#footnote-20) Then, however, it also defined this lack of representation as important because it “limits opportunities for exposure and learning.”[[20]](#footnote-21)

The amici briefs from other academic institutions focused almost exclusively on the pedagogical and economic utility of diversity. Thirty-three selective private residential colleges made it clear in their amicus briefs that they value diversity because: “[s]tudies consistently show that diversity—including racial diversity—meaningfully improves learning experiences, complex thinking, and non-cognitive abilities. Diversity also generates pedagogical innovations and decreases prejudice. These benefits are especially pronounced at liberal arts colleges and small universities, where smaller class sizes lead to greater engagement among diverse students.”[[21]](#footnote-22) MIT and Stanford articulated their particular interest in diversity for the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) field, asserting that: “[the] absolute necessity of diversity in STEM educational programs and the national STEM workforce, on which the United States’ economy and role in the global advancement of science and technology depend.” Furthermore, according to these elite institutions, “[n]ot only does diversity promote better outcomes for students in STEM, it contributes to better science. As such, American businesses at the forefront of innovation in STEM depend on the availability of a diverse cross-section of talented graduates from the nation’s most rigorous and elite institutions.”[[22]](#footnote-23) Similarly, the Association of American Medical Colleges saw diversity in the education of physicians and other healthcare professions as “a medical imperative . . . Diversity literally saves lives by ensuring that the Nation’s increasingly diverse population will be served by healthcare professionals competent to meet its needs.”[[23]](#footnote-24) Brown University and other elite institutions of higher education strongly emphasized how “[d]iversity fosters a more robust spirit of free inquiry [,] . . . encourages dialogue that sparks new insights, . . . [and] prepares Amici’s graduates to pursue innovation in every field.”[[24]](#footnote-25) For these and other academic amici, diversity is a means to achieve the educational goals of producing a better educational experience for their students and better preparing their graduates for the ever-changing global workforce.[[25]](#footnote-26) A group of law school deans defined their interest in student body diversity as a matter not of racial discrimination but of academic freedom.[[26]](#footnote-27)

In an amicus brief in support of the universities, the Biden administration focused primarily on the importance of diversity for the military.[[27]](#footnote-28) It did mention in its brief that “[t]he absence of diversity in the officer corps also undermined the military’s legitimacy by fueling “perceptions of racial / ethnic minorities serving as ‘cannon fodder’ for white military leaders.”[[28]](#footnote-29) However, instead of connecting these ideas about legitimacy to a larger vision of American democracy, it subordinated them to national security interests in “[the] overall readiness and mission accomplishment” of the military.[[29]](#footnote-30) Similarly, the Biden administration defined diversity as a national interest because “‘the United States is at its strongest when our Nation’s workforce reflects the communities it serves, and when our public servants are fully equipped to advance equitable outcomes for all American communities.”[[30]](#footnote-31) Notably, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, referenced in the brief, did recognize “the need to reflect the communities that we serve, because when people look at us, they need to see themselves. If they don’t see themselves, it’s harder for them to trust us . . . . ”[[31]](#footnote-32) Still unclear, however, is whether any of these amici briefs regarded diversity as an instrumental good that is needed for the performance of a better job, or whether they regarded it as a good in itself within the broader construct of a democratic vision of American society and its institutions. Thus, while the Biden administration recognized the “academic and civic benefits of racial diversity on university campuses,”[[32]](#footnote-33) it refrained from recognizing the broader democratic value of diversity that was recognized in *Grutter* and that reflects an obligation to openness among all institutions and positions of leadership. Other public officials and civil society organizations seconded this approach, stressing the importance of diversity and, in some cases, its anti-stereotyping effects for the greater good of better preparing students for the “workforce of the world economy.”[[33]](#footnote-34)

The strong trend toward a utilitarian view of diversity was amplified by professional and business amici. A brief submitted by Microsoft and other technology companies emphasized that “[r]acial and other diversity improves scientific endeavors and the innovation of new technologies. A racially diverse workforce also helps guard against the possibility that science and technology companies will be out of touch with their increasingly diverse and global customer base.”[[34]](#footnote-35) In The HR Policy Association added in its brief that: “[a] diverse workforce is essential for successful business outcomes” and that “[d]iverse teams constituting individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds and perspectives perform better than their homogenous counterparts, particularly in an increasingly global consumer market.”[[35]](#footnote-36) Major American business enterprises wrote that “[d]iverse workforces improve Amici’s business performance—and thus strengthen the American and global economies. Amici seek employees who have been educated at universities with exposure to a broad array of life experiences and viewpoints, and who can bring diverse perspectives and experiences to the workplace.”[[36]](#footnote-37)

*An egalitarian alternative:* The utilitarian business case for diversity is strong and dominant in the *SFFA* briefs. Several amici, however, took an alternative approach, reinfusing the conversation about affirmative action with backward- and forward-looking egalitarian values. The majority of these amicus briefs either present the objective of remedying past wrongs as an alternative to the diversity rationale or simply fail to tie this goal to the discussion of the diversity rationale. In this sense, these briefs revive the history of racial disparities in America and the role of affirmative action in correcting it but risk being overlooking the scope of the permissible interest in diversity. Most explicitly, a group of Black women law scholars asserted that while diversity is “a sufficient basis on which to reaffirm the constitutionality of race-conscious admissions programs, [there is a] far more compelling justification for race-conscious admissions programs [:] remedying the lasting and lived effects of centuries of racial discrimination against Black people and other historically underrepresented groups.”[[37]](#footnote-38) Citing Justice Marshall’s opinion in *Bakke*, this group goes on to argue*,* that: “race-conscious admissions programs are constitutionally permissible ‘to redress the continuing effects of past discrimination.’”[[38]](#footnote-39) Other amici presented an egalitarian vision of affirmative action that they treated, to a large degree, as a separate rationale for affirmative action. The Washington Bar Association and the Women’s Bar Association of the District of Columbia, for example, wrote little for or against diversity but instead directly justified affirmative action as a remedial tool, arguing that in order “[t]o understand the importance of affirmative action, one must be careful to remember this country’s history, which underscores the dire need for race-sensitive policies. The Fourteenth Amendment was put into place to correct the injustices perpetrated against Black Americans through centuries of enslavement and second-class citizenship.”[[39]](#footnote-40)

In a rather distinctive amicus brief, a group of twenty-five Harvard student and alumni organizations rooted their argument for affirmative action in the history of the civil rights era:

In Brown v. Board of Education, this Court recognized that racial segregation in education “deprives [Black children] of equal status in the school community” and “stamps [them] with a badge of inferiority.”4 This same system of racial apartheid—and the badge of inferiority it placed upon Black students and other students of color—also existed in private educational institutions like Harvard. Following this Court’s rejection of public school segregation as unconstitutional in Brown, Harvard and other private institutions followed suit and opened their doors to previously-excluded applicants. Yet, Students for Fair Admissions (“SFFA”) now seeks to turn Brown on its head, invoking that seminal ruling\*3 to ask the Court to turn back the clock and cause Harvard to be out of reach to many students of color who, due to persistent inequalities in K–12 educational opportunities and despite being eminently qualified, are not able to gain that competitive edge to assure their admission.[[40]](#footnote-41)

Rather than leave the history of racial discrimination and the efforts to ameliorate it divorced from the idea of diversity, however, they also pronounced “the educational benefits of diversity” as “essential to a healthy democracy”[[41]](#footnote-42) and explained that:

The absence of equal educational opportunities undermines democracy because it allow[s] a subset of the population to either hoard or be deprived of the kinds of educational opportunities that allow for social mobility, better life outcomes, and the ability to participate equally in the social and economic life of the democracy.[[42]](#footnote-43)

Historically Black Colleges and Universities articulated a similar vision in its brief, recapturing the history of racial discrimination in higher education from slavery to our days and connecting it to the interest in diversity by stating that “student body diversity—remains as compelling today . . . [because] [r]espondents and other top schools have yet to achieve that goal and thereby enable students of all races to participate fully and equally in academic life.”[[43]](#footnote-44)

The egalitarian alternative was powerful and eventually proved persuasive for the minority opinions in *SFFA—*which, however, remained minority opinions. The dominant values that the amici attributed to diversity specifically, and to affirmative action more broadly, were utilitarian, as my algorithmic analysis confirms. I used the Keynessfunction to identify words that were unusually frequent in the \_\_\_ *SFFA* amici briefs in comparison to the amici briefs submitted to the Court in the two previous affirmative action cases that I examined.[[44]](#footnote-45) The words *innovation* and *benefits* occurred with unusual frequency in the *SFFA* amici briefs in support of the universities, in comparison to both the *Michigan* and *Fisher* amici briefs.[[45]](#footnote-46) Similarly, the collocates analysis showed that *benefits* was the most likely word to appear in a seven-word proximity to diversity in the SFFA amici briefs.[[46]](#footnote-47) Other words likely to appear in proximity to diversity in the *SFFA* cases were *racial, educational, achieve, profession, innovation,* and *business*.[[47]](#footnote-48) This analysis confirms that while some voices made an egalitarian case for affirmative action, the SFFA’s overwhelmingly dominant plea for diversity was utilitarian.
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