Do not dominate the conversation, do not speak more than twice before allowing Hall where the Constitution of the United States was written and signed during the summer of ADVICE TO STUDENTS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL DELIBERATION these ideas to support or build compromise into your position.
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INVESTIGATION (part 1)

Investigation (part 1) and then present the group's answers to the class.
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INDEPENDENT Q & A

INDEPENDENT Q & A 6. Have the groups brainstorm answers to the following three questions. Have one member of each group Q: What evidence do you have to support your perspective? Q: For those who have a different perspective, what could be the political and social consequences

---

We the people

Our country faces enormous challenges—the economy, the war in Iraq, the education of American children, the health of the environment, the rights of women, immigrants, and all Americans. The Constitution is not just a blueprint for government; it is a blueprint for our lives as Americans. The Founders who wrote it in 1787 understood that the Constitution is the expression of the people of this nation, and that the rights we enjoy today are the result of a long struggle by those who came before us, a march for a more just, more equal, more free, more caring and more prosperous America. I chose to run for President because I believe that this is a country on the move, with the potential to do great things over the next generation. And I chose to run because I believe that you can be a senator and a strong advocate for your views without being a member of a political party. Barak Obama's Speech on Race

---

The migration or importation of such persons as any of the states now existing shall think may be included within this union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be Constitution:
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Is the Constitution Color-Blind?

“No state shall...deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

—Equal Protection clause of the 14th Amendment

Issues of race and race relations have always been a constitutional dilemma. The Constitution of 1787 protected slavery—our nation’s original sin. In the centuries since—through Civil War, Jim Crow segregation, the Civil Rights era and beyond—constitutional debates about race and equality have shaped the nation, and changed our Constitution.

Writing in 1896, Justice John Marshall Harlan observed: “Our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens.” Today, debates over affirmative action and equal opportunity still center on whether the Constitution tolerates distinctions on the basis of color. Believers in a color-blind Constitution say it does not. They say affirmative action is wrong because it treats people unequally. Believers in a color-conscious Constitution support affirmative action. They say that until racism disappears from our society, government may take race into account to guarantee equal access to education and employment.

Now it’s your turn to answer the question:

Is the U.S. Constitution color-blind?

**YES**

- The Constitution demands that government treat people on the basis of individual merit, not as members of racial groups.
- The 14th Amendment should be interpreted to prohibit any and all discrimination, against racial minorities and whites alike.
- It is not fair to penalize people who themselves have committed no acts of discrimination for the past discrimination of others.

**NO**

- The Constitution demands that all people have a fair chance; sometimes that means government must make up for discrimination.
- The 14th Amendment should be interpreted to give special protection to African-Americans and other racial minorities that have experienced discrimination.
- In a color-conscious society, taking account of race is necessary to promote diversity.

www.constitutioncenter.org/exchange
A More Perfect Union (excerpts) speech by Barack Obama at the National Constitution Center on March 10, 2008

"We the people..."
WE THE PEOPLE

Our country faces enormous challenges—the economy, the war in Iraq, the environment, the civil rights movement, which seeks to overcome the tension between those who believe the Constitution is color-blind and those who believe it is not.

This is why Abraham Lincoln’s words 145 years ago still ring true today:

“...government of the people, by the people, for the people...”

BE HEARD

New York students are using an innovative way to deliberate current constitutional issues with other high school students across the nation for free of charge.

The Exchange is a dynamic way for high school students to discover how their peers in other parts of the country think and feel about the issues that worry them. The Exchange topics include Black Public Schools, School Safety, Important Issues Facing America 2008, Setting the Student Political Platform for the 2008 Presidential Election, and Is the Constitution Color-blind?

All protocols to get involved in:

• interest in deliberating current issues in your classroom
• interest in participating in email-based discussion
• need assistance with research

Join the nationwide conversation! Join the exchange by email. Information and educational resources we provide include historical documents, information on the interest web sites and taking part in our moderated online chat and forum.

Join the conversation online at:

www.constitutioncenter.org/exchange

THE EXCHANGE
A MARKETPLACE OF STUDENT IDEAS

Is the Constitution Color-blind? Poster

www.sunnylandsclassroom.org

Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1

The Supreme Court ruled in May 2007 in the Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1 that a school plan involved no individualized consideration of students, and it employed a very limited notion of diversity (“white” and “affirmative action” for African-American and Asian-American applicants). The court ruled that the District Court had failed to show that its objectives could not have been met with non-race-conscious means. In a separate opinion concurring in the judgment, Justice Kennedy agreed that the District’s use of race was unconstitutional but stressed that public schools may still use race in their admissions processes to promote diversity and non-discrimination.

The court held that the plan violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The court said the plan was a reverse form of quota and was intended to achieve racial balance. It reversed the District Court’s decision and remanded the case.

Advising the students to work individually to answer the following three questions:

3. Ask them to share their answers with the class.

INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Students should use evidence from the school to support their answers.

Students should list moral principles or standards which influence both choices.

Students should list the benefits and drawbacks of using race-conscious means.

Students are to answer the following three questions:

Q: What evidence do you have to support your perspective?

Q: Why do you feel this way about affirmative action?

Q: What are the possible long-term effects of this issue in the country? How might these effects benefit or harm Americans?

INVESTIGATION (part 1)

Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1

The District Court held that the primary purpose of the plan was to foster diversity, and that the plan had achieved the goal of diversity.

The court held that the plan violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The court said the plan was a reverse form of quota and was intended to achieve racial balance. It reversed the District Court’s decision and remanded the case.
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Students are to answer the following three questions:

Q: What evidence do you have to support your perspective?

Q: Why do you feel this way about affirmative action?

Q: What are the possible long-term effects of this issue in the country? How might these effects benefit or harm Americans?
Affirmative Action & the Boundaries of Discretionary Exemptions

The Supreme Court’s decision in Korematsu v. United States (1944) expanded the notion of “separate but equal” by authorizing discrimination against Japanese Americans, a move that paved the way for future discriminatory policies. It was during this time that the Supreme Court ruled that the implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 could be used to prevent Japanese Americans from becoming American citizens. This decision was based on the assumption that the act only prohibited discrimination against African Americans. In reality, the decision also prevented Asian Americans from becoming American citizens, as well.

- Korematsu v. United States (1944)
- The Supreme Court’s decision in Korematsu v. United States (1944) expanded the notion of “separate but equal” by authorizing discrimination against Japanese Americans, a move that paved the way for future discriminatory policies. It was during this time that the Supreme Court ruled that the implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 could be used to prevent Japanese Americans from becoming American citizens. This decision was based on the assumption that the act only prohibited discrimination against African Americans. In reality, the decision also prevented Asian Americans from becoming American citizens, as well.
Affirmative Action & the Boundaries of Discrimination (excerpts)

The Supreme Court’s decision in a series of education (1978-95) cited the practice of “reverse discrimination” found to be illegal for 15 years after the fact of desegregation being a merit-based system for admission.


FACTS OF THE CASE

The Seattle School District allowed students to apply to a high school in the District. Several of the schools often have been identified as “racially imbalanced” for many years. When S and the first group of admissions in the school for the 1995-96 school year, the school board adopted a plan of “affirmative action” to increase the number of minority students. The plan was challenged by parents of white students as “reverse discrimination” and the city of Seattle was sued for violation of the Equal Protection Clause.

Q: What are the main arguments of the Supreme Court’s decision in this case?

A: In this case, the Supreme Court upheld the plan of affirmative action as it is a form of race-conscious admissions policy that seeks to promote diversity in the classroom.

Q: What did the Court rule in this case?

A: The Court ruled that affirmative action programs like these are constitutional and can be used to achieve a diverse and representative student body.

Q: What is the significance of this case for educational institutions?

A: This case is significant because it sets a precedent for the use of race-conscious admissions policies in higher education.

Q: How do you reconcile the concept of affirmative action with the Supreme Court’s decision?

A: Affirmative action is a means of overcoming the effects of past discrimination and promoting diversity in higher education. The Supreme Court’s decision in this case validates this approach.

Investigation

1. How do you think the Supreme Court’s decision would affect the use of affirmative action in other cases?

A: The Supreme Court’s decision in this case is likely to affect the use of affirmative action in other cases, and it may set a precedent for the use of race-conscious admissions policies in higher education.

2. What do you think the impact of this decision will be on future affirmative action programs?

A: It is too early to tell, but the Supreme Court’s decision in this case is likely to affect the use of affirmative action in other cases, and it may set a precedent for the use of race-conscious admissions policies in higher education.

LESSON

Introduction

Objectives

1. Understand the concept of affirmative action.
2. Analyze the Supreme Court’s decision in Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1.
3. Evaluate the impact of affirmative action on educational equity.

Materials

1. Handout discussing the Supreme Court’s decision in Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1.
2. Handout discussing the implications of affirmative action on educational equity.
3. Handout discussing the historical context of educational desegregation.

Teacher Preparation

1. Review the Supreme Court’s decision in Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1.
2. Reflect on the implications of affirmative action on educational equity.
3. Prepare to facilitate a discussion on the historical context of educational desegregation.

Classroom Procedures

1. Introduce the concept of affirmative action and the Supreme Court’s decision in Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1.
2. Facilitate a discussion on the implications of affirmative action on educational equity.
3. Reflect on the historical context of educational desegregation.

Assessment

1. Evaluate students’ understanding of the concept of affirmative action.
2. Assess students’ critical thinking skills in analyzing the Supreme Court’s decision.
3. Evaluate students’ capacity to reflect on the historical context of educational desegregation.

Investigation

1. Design an affirmative action plan for a fictional high school.
2. Analyze the impact of affirmative action on educational equity.
3. Reflect on the historical context of educational desegregation.

DELIBERATION

1. Discuss the Supreme Court’s decision in Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1.
2. Analyze the implications of affirmative action on educational equity.
3. Reflect on the historical context of educational desegregation.

The Exchange

The Exchange is an interactive platform that facilitates discussions on the impact of affirmative action on educational equity. Students are encouraged to engage in critical thinking and to reflect on the historical context of educational desegregation.

FACTS OF THE CASE

The Seattle school district allowed students to apply to high school in the District where certain schools often overenroll students and have waiting lists. Some students selected their first choice and were enrolled, while others were not. In 1997, the district and a number of its students filed suit in federal court to seek an end to the racial imbalance in the district's high schools. The suit claimed that the district's admissions policy violated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits the use of any race consciousness policy. The suit was brought on behalf of black and Latino students who claimed that they were denied admission to integrated schools and forced to attend schools that were not well funded.

Q U E S T I O N S  O F  C O N S T I T U T I O N A L  L A W

The Supreme Court decided that the question presented by the appeal was whether the district's policy of admitting students by lottery violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The district claimed that it had followed the Supreme Court's decision in Milligan v. Pittsburgh, 381 U.S. 711 (1965), which held that a city's lottery system for selecting students for high schools was constitutional.

C O N C L U S I O N

In the conclusion, the Court found that the district's policy of admitting students by lottery was constitutional. The Court held that the district had a strong interest in achieving racial diversity in its schools and that its policy was a reasonable means of achieving that goal. The Court also noted that the policy was consistent with the district's commitment to providing a quality education for all its students.

The Court's decision was a victory for the district, which had argued that its policy was necessary to achieve racial diversity in its schools. The decision was also a victory for the Supreme Court, which had held that the district's policy was constitutional.

The Court's decision was also a victory for the students, who had argued that the district's policy was discriminatory. The decision was also a victory for the district's commitment to providing a quality education for all its students.
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A More Perfect Union (excerpts) 

Speaker Barack Obama at the National Constitution Center on March 18 2008

"We the people... In order to form a more perfect union..."

Two hundred and seventy one years ago, on a field that still stands across the street, a group of men gathered... and had barely begun to advance, the only issue we had to decide was the fate of our own freedom, and the liberty of all mankind."

In a speech to the 135th Constitutional Convention, which included one of his favorite topics—affirmative action and the boundaries of discrimination—Obama said,

Obama’s Speech on Race at the National Constitution Center on March 18, 2008

"The time for a more perfect union has come."

In his address, Obama discussed the challenges facing the nation today, including the need for unity and understanding among different groups, and the importance of working together to address these issues. He highlighted the role that the Constitution has played in shaping the nation's history, and emphasized the importance of continuing to uphold its principles in the face of current challenges. Obama's speech received widespread coverage in the media and was widely regarded as a significant moment in his tenure as president.

FACTS OF THE CASE

The Seattle School District (SSD) is a large urban school district in Washington State, with approximately 60,000 students. Parents in low-income and minority areas in Seattle were concerned about the performance of their children in school and the performance of black, Hispanic, and low-income children specifically. In 1998, the parents filed a lawsuit against the SSD, claiming that the district’s school assignment policies were discriminatory and violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. The parents argued that the district’s policies, which included a lottery system for assigning students to schools, had a discriminatory impact on minority students.

The court found that the SSD’s policies, which included a lottery system for assigning students to schools, had a discriminatory impact on minority students.

Q: Why was affirmative action instituted and how did it attempt to change America?

Q: What evidence do you have to support your opinion?

Q: What evidence do you have to support your answer?

Q: How does affirmative action address the problem of discrimination?

Q: How do you think affirmative action has affected minority groups?

Q: Do you think affirmative action is necessary to combat discrimination?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies are enforced and enforced?

Q: What are some of the challenges that arise in implementing affirmative action policies?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies have been successful?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies have been unsuccessful?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies could be improved?

Q: What are some of the potential negative consequences of affirmative action policies?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies could be made more effective?

Q: Do you think affirmative action policies are fair to all members of society?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be implemented?

Q: What are some of the potential benefits of affirmative action policies?

Q: What are some of the potential drawbacks of affirmative action policies?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be evaluated?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be revised?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be defended?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be criticized?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be supported?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be opposed?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be avoided?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be eliminated?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be minimized?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be maximized?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be modified?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be adapted?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be adjusted?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be phased out?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be strengthened?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be weakened?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be balanced?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be prioritized?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be given priority?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be downplayed?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be foregrounded?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be underscored?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be emphasized?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be diminished?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be advanced?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be delayed?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be accelerated?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be deferred?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be accelerated?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be delayed?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be accelerated?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be delayed?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be accelerated?

Q: How do you think affirmative action policies should be delayed?
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A More Perfect Union (excerpts)

Barack Obama at the National Constitution Center on March 18, 2008

...working together we can move beyond some of our old racial wounds, and that in fact we have no choice if we are to continue on the path of a more perfect union.

For the African-American community, that path means embracing the burdens of our past without becoming victims of our circumstances or our history, understanding that we cannot be free except in the freedom of other Americans; that our destinies are inextricably linked to the destiny of a people who together formed this country, the most successful experiment in human history.

...and the Constitution Color-blind?

...government of the people, by the people...