

Acknowledgments

Once again, my deepest gratitude to John Raisian, director of the Hoover Institution, for his enthusiastic and generous support for this project. Whichever way the cases of *Gratz v. Bollinger* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* came out, John agreed that it would be worthwhile to take a look at the newly redefined status of the law on the subject of race preferences and provide some sense as to which options had been foreclosed and which remained open to the combatants in the arena.

As usual Senior Associate Director Richard Sousa was a big help in getting matters underway. His counsel is uniformly wise; his instincts, sound.

Patricia Baker, executive editor of Hoover Press, took control of the manuscript from the moment of its submission and made certain that it was reviewed in a highly professional manner. I would also like to thank Ann Wood, Senior Editor of the Hoover Institution, and her colleague Tara Joffe for the superb copyediting performed on the original manuscript. The corrections were essential, and the editorial questions and suggestions, quite helpful.

Three researchers were most helpful. Terrence Burlij, at the time an intern with PBS, did a wonderful job pulling together material on the operation of the so-called percentage plans used by California, Texas, and Florida in lieu of race-conscious university admissions procedures, which had been banned by referendum, court decision, or executive order. Zach Altschuler, a law student at Columbia University, provided useful legal research. Katherine McFarland, a law student at Boston University (my own employer), took charge of citations and also suggested several editorial and stylistic changes in the manuscript. In addition, my wife, Pamela, saved me weeks of labor by segregating dozens of pages of quotations from source materials, thus sparing me the burden of reviewing unedited source material from scratch.

My thanks to Carl Cohen, the gifted professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan whose tenacious opposition to race preferences over the course of thirty years has left him with a historical perspective about the issue at Michigan that cannot be matched. The staff at the University of Michigan public affairs office, headed by Deborah Green, was most helpful, as were the good people at the Center for Individual Rights. Both offices, particularly Michigan's, maintain Web sites that provide essential material on the cases. I was prepared to impose on them further, but the more I worked on the project, the more I came to conclude that this is really a story of a legal battle. The more I kept my focus on that battle and the emerging affirmative action law, the more useful my book would be to lawyers, scholars, and interested laypeople alike.

Working on this book, of course, distracted me from some of my duties as chair of the Department of Journalism at Boston University College of Communication. Dean John Schulz and his associate Tobe Berkovitz helped cover my

Acknowledgments

xi

administrative lapses, and the students in my foreign reporting class pretended that nothing whatsoever interfered with my devotion to them.

In the deepest sense, they were right.