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incentives of both the favorite and the non-favorite to perform their best – the former because doing so is unnecessary ... that they also create animosity towards favorite groups. [116]: 115-147 Diversity critics of affirmative action claim that they mainly take the ... among non-preferred groups (e.g., poor white or Asian) to the detriment of the least fortunate; that they reduce the primary beneficiaries of affirmative action [i.e. the primary beneficiaries of affirmative action]. [116] Key people ... are entitled to affirmative action. The former president's opinion for themselves. However, Bill Clinton made his stance on affirmative action very clear in a speech on affirmative action. He believes the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment forbids affirmative action. He argues that the principle of equal protection ensures that no group can be given special treatment.
the integration of Asian Americans in predominantly white educational institutions. This process is often referred to as affirmative action. Public universities have long been a focal point of affirmative action policies. The University of Texas at Austin is one such institution, and the case of Hopwood v. Texas has been a significant legal precedent.

In the legal system, affirmative action policies are scrutinized to ensure they are not discriminatory. For instance, in 1994, the U.S. Department of Labor - Office of Federal Contract Compliance Program (OFCP) issued a new directive that required contractors to submit affirmative action plans to demonstrate compliance with the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1964. This directive was a major step in enforcing affirmative action policies to ensure equal employment opportunities.

In the early 1970s, Walter J. Leonard, an administrator at Harvard University, invented the Harvard plan, one of the earliest affirmative action plans to diversify the student body. This plan focused on academic excellence and diversity, and it was later adopted by many other institutions.

However, the implementation of affirmative action policies has been subject to criticism and legal challenges. Many people argue that these policies have resulted in reverse discrimination, where individuals may be disadvantaged based on their race or ethnicity. For example, the case of Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña in 1995 tested whether affirmative action policies discriminate against Hispanic contractors.

The use of race as an admissions factor has been challenged in the courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court. In 2018, the court ruled in Fisher v. University of Texas that the use of race as an admissions factor is constitutional, but it requires strict scrutiny and must be shown to further a compelling interest.

In response to these challenges, many institutions have implemented alternative strategies to promote diversity without relying on race as a factor. For example, the University of California introduced the "Top 12" program, which ranks applicants based on a variety of criteria other than race.

Affirmative action policies have also faced criticism for their potential to limit access to opportunities for non-minority students. For instance, the case of Orange County v. Abraham in 1999 upheld a ban on racial preferences in voter college admissions in Michigan, arguing that such preferences were not a compelling reason for promoting diversity.

In conclusion, affirmative action policies have been a contentious issue in the United States, with debates over their effectiveness and fairness continuing. The legal system and public discourse will continue to shape the evolution of these policies in the future.