COMPARISON: IMPROVING HOW THE LEGACIES OF STATE-SPONSORED SEGREGATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH AFRICA AFFECT EQUITY AND INCLUSION IN AMERICAN AND SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS
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INTRODUCTION

From time immemorial, our world has exhibited a pattern: people of all races, ethnicities, religions, and backgrounds, have designated themselves the proverbial “in-group” as a means to claim superiority over others. Those who identify as being within an “in-group” attribute positive characteristics to the group, and attribute negative qualities to the “out-group.” Racial tensions and their societal manifestations in the United States and around the world illustrate a broader human problem. Examining the historical and current racial postures in the United States and South Africa reveals education’s crucial role in characterizing status in both nations. These histories reveal how educational systems are used as control mechanisms to perpetuate racial and economic stratification. However, education—particularly higher education—can be utilized to neutralize, rather than exacerbate, racial and economic divides.

The phenomenon of people being categorized along white, Black, or yellow lines is a social construct. As a consequence, “Black” is
understood differently in South Africa than in the United States.\(^5\) For instance, someone considered Black in America could be regarded as colored in South Africa.\(^6\) In South Africa, a Black person is someone generally accepted as a member of “any aboriginal race or tribe of Africa.”\(^7\) The term “colored” refers to South African people of mixed race, and a “white” South African is someone who, based on appearance, is obviously white and “generally not accepted as a colored person.”\(^8\) Colored people and people of Indian descent were also identified as second-class citizens in South Africa. Consequently, both groups were also victims of harsh discriminatory laws.\(^9\) Each racial group entailed immensely distinct legal entitlements and social statuses.\(^10\) However, generally any “African ancestry made one’s racial classification [B]lack.”\(^11\)

Juxtaposing these racial histories requires mindfulness of the substantial differences in each country. For example, apartheid was a nationally imposed system, while Jim Crow applied regionally in the South.\(^12\) Also, \textit{de jure} segregation in the United States lasted from the early 1600s until the mid-1960s.\(^13\) Alternatively, in South Africa,


\(^6\) \textit{Id}.

\(^7\) \textit{Id}.

\(^8\) \textit{Id}.


\(^10\) Higginbotham, \textit{supra} note 5, at 188 n.5.

\(^11\) \textit{Id}.; see Shari Dworkin & Kari Lerum, \textit{Race, Sexuality, and the “One Drop Rule”: More Thoughts about Interracial Couples and Marriage}, SOCIETY PAGES (Oct. 18, 2009), https://thesocietypages.org/sexuality/2009/10/18/race-sexuality-and-the-one-drop-rule-more-thoughts-about-interracial-couples-and-marriage/ (describing the United States’ “one drop rule” which is how courts and law books historically declared whether a mixed race person with “one black ancestor” or “one drop of black blood” should be categorized or treated as black; this rule reveals the “arbitrary nature of racial classifications.”).


\(^13\) \textit{Civil Rights Act of 1964}, HISTORY.COM (Jan. 4, 2010), https://www.history.com/topics/black-history/civil-rights-act (explaining that \textit{de jure} segregation is “a state of affairs that is in accordance with law (i.e. that is officially
apartheid existed from 1948 until 1994.14 Remembering these temporal distinctions are useful in appreciating the extent of progress and the need for improvement in each nation.

Moreover, in South Africa, white people, who have historically comprised a “distinct numerical minority” of the population, implemented domineering tactics over Black South Africans.15 Alternatively, in the United States, white Americans have historically constituted a “numerical majority,” and have enslaved and oppressed the Black American minority.16 Typically, societal outcomes depend on who holds political and economic power.17 Thus, the differentiations between these social structures contextualize the understanding of potential solutions. Remembering these temporal distinctions are useful in appreciating the extent of progress and the need for improvement in each nation.

Considering the distinct cultures, religions, governments, demographics, and economics of each country, it is unrealistic to assume a successful prescription for the United States would automatically produce the same result in South Africa, or vice versa. However, the similar histories and comparable present-day situations in both countries offer a unique lens to examine how each country can redress legacies of state-sponsored segregation within higher education.

This note provides a comparative review of the historical inequalities stemming from the legacies of state-sponsored segregation in education. Part I studies the role of affirmative action in addressing the historical inequities in higher education. Part II describes how social attitudes toward affirmative action influence legislation. The note concludes by recommending a synergy of historical consciousness, social responsibility, and calculated preemptive legal measures to address and improve the state of Black Americans and Black South
Africans in higher education. This recommendation is specifically tailored to address higher education in light of the nuances and comparative systems arising from state-sponsored segregation and its legacy in the United States and South Africa. Nevertheless, if specific and relevant characteristics are accounted for, this recommendation could be applied as a broad framework to bring forth racial parity within higher education systems around the world.

I. THE HISTORICAL INEQUITIES STEMMING FROM STATE-SPONSORED SEGREGATION IN EDUCATION

Comparing the United States and South Africa reveals both countries’ oppressive practices have created long-term structural disadvantages for their Black populations. These historical inequalities are reflected in each country’s respective Black populations’ limited participation and success in higher education. Increasing access to and achievement in higher education for Black populations remains a critical component for both countries to attain more equitable societies.

A. Reviewing the Historical Factors Leading to the Contemporary Statuses of Black Americans in Higher Education

During slavery in the United States, from the early 1600s until 1865, slaves were institutionalized as a racial caste associated with African ancestry. The ability to read and write meant intellectual freedom, a dangerous notion for the master-slave dynamic. Accordingly, protecting the institution of slavery required laws both forbidding slaves from learning and criminalizing those who taught

18. The term Black here refers to people who would be classified Black or colored in South Africa and people with African ancestry in the United States.


slaves to read or write. The consequence? A prevailing narrative: education for Black people was unnecessary and detrimental. Depriving Blacks access to education inhibited their ability to function and flourish in mainstream society.

After the Civil War in 1865, the Thirteenth Amendment abolished slavery in the United States. One year later, the Civil Rights Act of 1866 defined citizenship and affirmed equal protection under the law for all citizens. Then, in 1868, the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified and promised “equal protection of the laws.” It gave authority to apply the Fifth Amendment to states precluding the government from depriving any person from “life, liberty or property, without due process of law.”

Despite the United States’ efforts to provide Black Americans with equal rights through acts and amendments, Black Americans’ social status was still perceived as inferior. The stigma of Black inferiority lingered, and Black Americans were still largely viewed as undeserving of the same societal privileges, like education, as white people. Consequently, in the late nineteenth century, white-dominated state legislatures enacted Jim Crow laws.

22. Id.
23. Id.
24. Id.
Jim Crow laws imposed government sanctioned racial segregation throughout the South and parts of the United States. Jim Crow relegated former slaves “little or no resources to begin with ... into [ ] the worst educational systems.” In 1896, the United States Supreme Court (“Court”) upheld the constitutionality of racial segregation laws through the concept of “equal but separate.” The Court opined, “Legislation is powerless to ... abolish distinctions based upon physical differences ... If one race be inferior to the other socially, the constitution of the United States cannot put them upon the same plane.” This decision further legitimized and facilitated government-sanctioned racial segregation in public facilities.

After the Civil War, access to and participation in higher education became the first and most important item “on the [B]lack national agenda for freedom and independence.” Nevertheless, the conditions of the Black schools during Jim Crow were dismal. These schools were virtually at the mercy of white-controlled state governments for funding, which provided significantly less financial support to Black schools than white schools. For example, during Jim Crow, Alabama allocated thirty-seven dollars per white student but only seven dollars per Black student. Inevitably, Black schools lacked adequate books, were overcrowded and poorly maintained, with faulty physical structures and underequipped teachers.

31.  Id.
34.  Id. at 552.
38.  Id.
40.  Id.
Furthermore, the curricula for Black schools were limited because white school leaders recognized the dangers of exposing Black children to notions like freedom and equality. The sharecropper dynamic between Blacks and whites contributed to many Black children being divested of attending school altogether. Many stopped attending after the fourth grade to assist their families on the farms. Other factors, like fewer operational days and limited funding in Black schools, exacerbated the education disparity between Blacks and whites during that time. The outcome of these legal and systemic educational frameworks prolonged the second-class citizen status of Black Americans.

In the late nineteenth century, some universities like Stanford and Harvard began accepting exceptional Black students. For instance, the first Black male admitted to Stanford attended a white grammar school and his family knew “the eponymous Stanfords from a previous line of work.” Ultimately, the abolitionist family “prodded its university’s president to accept” the Black student. In 1847, when Harvard admitted its first Black student, “students, faculty, and pro-slavery
Southerners . . . rioted upon hearing the news." 48 It would be another twenty-three years until Harvard admitted another Black student. 49

The first Black students accepted to universities were exceptions to social and academic norms. Indeed, the majority of these Black students lacked the resources and skills to reach the high academic standards required to enter these institutions. 50 They experienced "giant mobs, picket lines, nuisance fires, and militant rioters." 51 Social rejection of Blacks involving themselves in higher education fueled the unequal education paradigm.

In addition to the social ramifications, experts recognized that segregation in the South, operating under Jim Crow laws, produced lasting psychological impacts on Black Americans. 52 For example, Kenneth Clark’s Doll Test revealed how children ages three to seven years old reconciled their self-identities with race. 53 In short, the study examined three hundred fifty-three children by presenting them with both a black and white doll. 54 The researchers asked each child to identify the doll’s race and with which doll they preferred to play. 55 The majority of Black students preferred the white doll with yellow hair "assigning positive traits to it." 56 Meanwhile, "most discarded the brown doll with black hair, assigning it negative traits." 57 The researchers concluded that by the age of three, Black children had already "formed a racial identity" and "attached negative traits to their own identity." 58 The researchers claimed these results provided "solid
The study’s findings contributed to the Court’s determination in the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision. In 1954, the Court declared state laws facilitating separate public schools for Black and white students unconstitutional. This resulted in “massive resistance” across the South. Many white schools were unwilling to incorporate Black students. Because the power to effectuate school desegregation was bestowed upon white schools, white reactions toward school desegregation exacerbated notions of inequity.

Further, Justice Warren, writing for the majority, focused on the need for integrated schools. The focus was to ensure Black students could attend white schools and receive equal education by attending white schools. This implied Black students would only receive equal education if they attended white schools. Rather than focusing on integrating and improving Black schools, the narrative centered on Black students benefiting from white students. This type of white-centric reasoning placed the interests of the victims—the Black students—as secondary.

After the *Brown* decision, many schools resisted the transition to desegregation. Absent explicit legal validation to segregate schools, lingering notions of superiority, economic advantages for whites, and resentment from both Black and white Americans, schools still

---


63. *Id.*


65. *Id.* at 305.
remained segregated. This social pushback to integrate schools has contributed to polarized schools today. These incongruities remain particularly severe in schools with the “highest concentrations of minority and poor students.”

Accumulations of these legal, social, financial, and psychological complications contribute to the continued plight of higher education for Black Americans. These inequities have been “constant during and since slavery ipso facto establishes a connection to slavery.”

B. Reviewing the Historical Factors Leading to the Contemporary Statuses of Black South Africans in Higher Education

Europeans infiltrated South Africa, stripping the indigenous people of their land and their “entire way of life.” Over time, the native people lost all freedom and became controlled by European colonizers. After a series of wars between the colonizers and the native people, white people began forming their own nation in South Africa. They established institutions and laws to safeguard their interests. In 1948, the National Party gained power, thereby strengthening the racial segregation that began during the colonial period.

68. \textit{Id.}
71. Goebel, \textit{supra} note 70.
72. \textit{Id.}
73. \textit{Id.} at 7.
From 1948 until 1991, apartheid legally formalized racial discrimination and segregation in South Africa. Analogous to the disenfranchisement of Blacks in America through Jim Crow laws, Apartheid functioned on white supremacy and repressed Black and colored South Africans. Jim Crow Laws in America subjected Black people to inferior public services, desolate living communities, subservient jobs, and suboptimal access to education.

While Blacks in the United States had restricted curricula, the South African government devised a completely separate set of educational material for Black students. In 1953, the South African government introduced the Bantu Education Act. This act effectively extended apartheid to Black schools by conditioning the school’s funding on implementing “racially discriminatory curricul[a].” Bantu schools for Black South Africans focused specifically on “law and order.” This distinct curriculum ensured Blacks were confined to be “the hewers of wood and drawers of water,” or rather, to work only low-level jobs.

The Bantu system affected South African students’ abilities to attend higher education. It established Black South Africans as the underclass by restricting their societal roles to those that served white South Africans by intentionally stifling the academic potential of

79. Id.
82. Moufid Jaber, *What was the level of education the blacks in South Africa were allowed to achieve under apartheid?*, QUORA (Sep. 15, 2014),
Black and colored South Africans. Similar to the undersupplied primary and secondary schools Black Americans attended during Jim Crow, Bantu schools suffered from government neglect and enormous funding disparities. To put this in context, in 1982, the South African government spent an average of R1, 211 educating each white child compared to R146 for each Black child. These conditions resulted in overcrowded classrooms, inadequate instruction, dilapidated facilities, and a shortage of textbooks. Today, this volatile educational foundation continues to have far reaching consequences for Black South Africans. This is particularly true, in terms of attaining higher education and securing leadership and influential employment opportunities.

The Extension of University Act of 1959 prohibited non-whites to register at white universities. This act was “the keystone” of efforts from the South African government to devise a “self-enclosed system of ‘Bantu Education’ that would fit the vision of a racially compartmentalized society.” The act established separate “tribal...
colleges” for Black, colored, and Indian university students. Notably, the South African government established these racially segregated universities.

In 1991, after significant domestic and international opposition, the South African government abolished apartheid. South Africa attempted to eradicate all remnants of apartheid by rewriting its entire constitution.

Analogous to the psychological effects of Black Americans from slavery and Jim Crow, Black South Africans suffer similar traumas. Even post-apartheid, lingering notions of superiority for white South Africans and insecurities for Black South Africans remain pervasive. Similar to the United States, deeply entrenched differential allocation of resources and socio-political privileges has fostered the build-up of economic, social, and mental disadvantages for Black South Africans. Despite efforts to rectify the atrocious realities of apartheid through legal reform, South Africa still struggles to combat the racist ideas and structures rooted in the institution of apartheid.

89. Bantu Education and the Racist Compartmentalizing of Education, supra note 87; see generally Perry, supra note 36.
91. Myre, supra note 74.
92. Langston, supra note 28, at 364.
94. Id.
96. Id. at 141.
II. THE INTRODUCTION OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICIES IN CONTEMPORARY HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH AFRICA

A. The Dawn of Affirmative Action in the United States

Slavery, Jim Crow, underfunded historically Black colleges and universities, and the enduring psychological harm on Black psyches, compounded by other demeaning societal attitudes, left gaping disparities between Blacks and whites in education. President Lyndon B. Johnson recognized the disproportionate racial situation and analogized the state of Black people to a physical footrace. He lamented that the “high hurdles of racism” made it impossible for Black Americans to effectively prepare future generations. He explained when Black Americans “passed the baton to the next generation, they did so running with less speed, having covered a shorter distance, and having less stamina than they would have in a non-racist society.”

Affirmative action is currently understood as a legal response “intended to end and correct the effects of a specific form of discrimination.” Through a series of Executive Orders, laws, policies, and administrative practices, the United States government sought to redress the disadvantages associated with past and present discrimination. President Kennedy first implemented affirmative action as a means to present equal opportunities in the work force for all United States citizens. Eventually, affirmative action was implemented in public institutions, such as universities, to improve diversity and bring forth parity.

97. Langston, supra note 28, 348-49.
98. Id.
99. Id.
101. Id. at 275.
However, affirmative action policies in higher education admissions face controversy and constant challenges at the federal level.\textsuperscript{104} One of the reasons for social and political pushback against affirmative action is the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause.\textsuperscript{105} The clause “prohibits government entities[,] including public universities[,] from discriminating on the basis of race” unless the discrimination is “narrowly tailored to serve a compelling government interest.”\textsuperscript{106} Additionally, Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which applies to public and private institutions, sets forth a similar standard for racial discrimination.\textsuperscript{107} For programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance, this Act prohibits “discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin”\textsuperscript{108}

However, at the state level, several states, such as California, Washington, Nebraska, Arizona, Oklahoma, and Michigan, have outright banned affirmative action policies in admissions processes.\textsuperscript{109} As a result, college enrollment among Black students significantly decreased after California universities introduced affirmative action bans.\textsuperscript{110} For instance, after Proposition 209 banned race-conscious admissions in California, “underrepresented minority admissions dropped by [fifty-three] percent” at the University of California Los Angeles.\textsuperscript{111}

At the federal level, the government developed tactics to desegregate schools. For example, in the 1971, the Court determined

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{106} \textit{Id}.
\item \textsuperscript{107} \textit{Id}.
\item \textsuperscript{109} Halley Potter, \textit{What Can We Learn from States That Ban Affirmative Action?}, CENTURY FOUND. (June 26, 2014), https://tcf.org/content/commentary/what-can-we-learn-from-states-that-ban-affirmative-action/.
\item \textsuperscript{110} Erica Perez, \textit{Enrollments Down in UC Schools Despite Diversity Efforts}, HUFFINGTON POST (Apr. 25, 2012), https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/24/proposition-209_n_1300122.html.
\item \textsuperscript{111} \textit{Id}.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
busing students between schools was a “remedial technique” for achieving school desegregation. The Court reasoned that government officials needed to foster integration through affirmative measures to achieve racial neutrality in schools. Thus, school districts used busing to transport Black students to suburban schools and white suburban students to urban schools. Nevertheless, “[m]any white parents were outraged by the plan, and the school district [where the case was decided] declared that it was too burdensome to implement.”

Widespread social rejection of integrated schools triggered legal responses attempting to balance compelling government interests with individualized concerns. After Brown, several Supreme Court decisions have significantly muddled the original intent to provide accessible and equal educational opportunities. One such instance is the 1974 Milliken v. Bradley case, where the Supreme Court limited the previous decision in Swann regarding cross-district busing. The Court held students could only be bused across district lines after a showing of de jure segregation across multiple school districts.

In 1978, the Court acknowledged schools are permitted to consider race during their admission processes. The Court struck down the medical school’s admission policy, partly because it allocated a specific number of seats for minorities. This decision effectively deemed racial quotas unconstitutional. However, the decision was a split

113. Id. at 28.
114. Id. at 10.
117. Id.
118. Id. at 269.
120. Bakke, 438 U.S. at 375 (JJ., Brennan, White, Marshall, and Blackmun, dissenting).
121. Id. at 320.
decision, leaving much uncertainty for the future of admission quotas.\textsuperscript{122}

In 2003, the Court further obscured the legality of affirmative action in \textit{Gratz v. Bollinger} and \textit{Grutter v. Bollinger}. In \textit{Grutter}, the Court held that admission policies automatically giving preference on the basis of race and without additional individualized consideration “run[] afoul of the [Equal Protection Clause].”\textsuperscript{123} The Court ultimately upheld the affirmative action policies because the university did not employ a quota system.\textsuperscript{124} Instead, the university used a “narrowly-tailored” method for accomplishing its purpose.\textsuperscript{125}

In \textit{Gratz}, the Court held considering race as one element of a holistic admissions policy does not violate the Fourteenth Amendment.\textsuperscript{126} Together these decisions placed limits on how and when racial preferences could be incorporated into an admissions process.\textsuperscript{127} These decisions also created uncertainty about which admission policies served a compelling government interest.\textsuperscript{128}

In 2007, the Court further narrowed affirmative action.\textsuperscript{129} In response to student assignment plans, parents brought suit against the school district, claiming the district violated the Equal Protection Clause.\textsuperscript{130} The Court considered the issue of whether public school districts can achieve racial integration by assigning students to particular schools solely on the basis of race.\textsuperscript{131} Distinguished from \textit{Grutter}, the Court struck down the district’s affirmative action policy because its desegregation techniques were not sufficiently narrowly tailored.\textsuperscript{132}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{122} See \textit{Bakke}, 438 U.S. 265.
  \item \textsuperscript{124} \textit{Id.} at 306.
  \item \textsuperscript{125} \textit{Id.}
  \item \textsuperscript{126} \textit{Gratz v. Bollinger}, 539 U.S. 244, 271 (2003).
  \item \textsuperscript{128} \textit{Id.}
  \item \textsuperscript{129} Parents Involved in Cmty. Sch. v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1, 551 U.S. 701 (2007).
  \item \textsuperscript{130} \textit{Id.}
  \item \textsuperscript{131} \textit{Id.} at 710-11.
  \item \textsuperscript{132} \textit{Id.} at 715.
\end{itemize}
The issue appeared before the Court again in 2016. In *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*, the Court clarified that “obtaining the educational benefits that flow from student body diversity” was a compelling state interest.133 However, the Court determined the school must demonstrate how it previously made “serious, good faith consideration of workable, race-neutral alternatives” to achieve the sought-after racial diversity.134 Essentially, if universities consider race as a soft variable among many other variables in the admission process, then the policy has a better chance of surviving strict scrutiny.135

In 2015, Asian-American students accused Harvard University of discriminating against them in admissions and lodged a complaint with the U.S. Department of Justice.136 The students alleged the university gave preferential treatment to other racial minorities.137 While the students may have had valid claims, studies expose how Asian Americans “fare well beyond their numbers in admission to top colleges” as compared to their proportion of the general population.138 The data also exposes how, “without affirmative action the acceptance rate for” Black students would “likely fall by nearly two-thirds.”139 However, commentators expect that the Supreme Court will hear this case.140

Many of these decisions were plurality decisions, which illustrate the recurring difficulties inherent in striking a balance between affirmative action and the Constitution. Furthermore, by narrowing the scope of affirmative action, the Court left many schools confused in

134. *Id.* at 2218.
135. *Id.* at 2221. In the opinions of these cases, the Court cautioned that, even when such policies benefit members of minority races, they are subject to strict scrutiny, and when a fundamental constitutional right is infringed, courts apply strict scrutiny to ensure the policy is: (1) justified by a compelling government interest; (2) narrowly tailored to achieve the goal or interest; and (3) the law must be the least restrictive means for achieving that interest.
137. *Id.*
138. *Id.*
139. *Id.*
140. *Id.*
how to achieve the task of providing equal opportunity without engaging in a mechanical racial balancing.141

By legally “eliminat[ing] strategies[,] such as cross-district busing, dismantl[ing] local court supervision of desegregation plans, and limit[ing] use of race-based admissions to ensure diversity” in schools, the judiciary significantly diluted the strength of previous policies designed to achieve integrated schools.142 Given the level of social resistance and tensions between affirmative action and the Constitution, de facto segregation continues to affect many schools, and to some extent determines the fate of many Black American students.143

B. The Dawn of Affirmative Action in South Africa

During apartheid, the South African government prioritized higher education for white students while other racial groups were marginalized.144 Currently, the South African Constitution enshrines socioeconomic parity and explicitly defines education as a constitutional right.145 Alternatively, the authors of the United States Constitution did not include the right to education in the country’s founding documents. Instead, education has always been the state’s responsibility.146 Further, the South African Constitution states the government will work toward healing the divisions of the past and establishing a society based on democratic values, social justice and fundamental human rights.147 The United States and South Africa have similar intents for introducing affirmative action policies. However,
unlike in the United States, South Africa’s redress methods for equality are intended to realize constitutional objectives.148

In post-apartheid South Africa, affirmative action is presented as a means to correct historical injustices so “everyone can compete, based upon equal access to education[.]”149 South Africans refer to this ideological, political, and social shift as “transformation,” meaning to transform their society to be more inclusive.150 Furthermore, the government claims to have given consistently increased priority to developing and improving the educational system.151

Distinguished from the United States, South Africa’s constitution specifically calls for affirmative action. Missing a footnote here. Thus, South Africa’s transformation efforts introduced the concept of Black Economic Empowerment (“BEE”) and later Broad-Based Economic Empowerment (“BBEE”).152 BBEE expanded the initiatives to encompass coloreds, Indians, and Chinese South Africans.153 South Africa implemented specific initiatives with the explicit purpose to empower Black and colored South Africans. The South African government refers to BEE as “positive discrimination.”154 Where the United States is limited by the 14th Amendment and Title VI legislation, South Africa’s constitution requires it to prioritize measures in order to counteract apartheid’s divisive effects.155 It can be inferred

148. Id. at 651 n.195.


152. Herman, supra note 149, at 33.


154. Id.

that by promoting economic achievement for Black South Africans, access to higher education is an underlying factor of the BEE mission. For Black South Africans to partake in a greater share of the economy, and facilitate the transition to BEE, they must first acquire the necessary skills and education required to function in those capacities.

Compliance with BEE principles is governed by codes delineating procedures for how BEE should be implemented. BEE was first introduced in the 1990s; however, it was not until the beginning of 2007, when the government gazette updated the Codes of Good Practice. These improved Codes strengthened BEE as a “legal reality.” The Codes differ depending on the size of the organization; however, any state organization, public entity, or private enterprise undertaking business with a public entity must abide by the BEE Codes. The Codes specify numerical benchmarks for the required amount of diversity companies must possess. Furthermore, companies that adhere to these Codes avail themselves the benefits to bid for government tenders; have access to tax incentives and financial grants; and are generally favored as clients by other business. Additionally, compliance with the Codes eliminates the need to disclose any unmet requirements when competing for a contract, and it facilitates positive “participation in the formal South African economy.”

One of the initial BEE pieces of legislation was the Higher Education Act of 1997. This act addressed the need to create “a single coordinated higher education system” to more effectively address the needs of South Africa’s post-Apartheid, multicultural society. The act sought to remedy past discrimination, ensure equal access, and contribute “to the advancement of all forms of knowledge and scholarship.” The act also declared that for universities to function

156. Id.
157. Id.
158. Id.
159. Id.
160. Id.
162. Id.
most effectively, it was preferable for them to be autonomous from the state.\textsuperscript{163} Therefore, unlike the public universities in the United States, all universities in South Africa are autonomous and report to their own councils rather than the government.\textsuperscript{164} This is noteworthy because it reduces South African schools’ dependence on government funding and provides more leeway to implement creative improvement measures.

The Education White Paper 3 is part of a series of initiatives to facilitate the transition from apartheid.\textsuperscript{165} The document identified several social purposes of higher education.\textsuperscript{166} Some of the purposes include: addressing the development needs of society; improving access for “black, women, disabled and mature students;” and facilitating “fair chances of success to all while eradicating all forms of unfair discrimination and advancing redress for past inequalities.”\textsuperscript{167}

Contrary to the reform tactics in the United States, transformation in South Africa and its incorporation of purposeful stratagem offers a more direct avenue for achieving equality. Nonetheless, South Africa’s transformation efforts have not been entirely successful. Aside from the tremendous task to reverse decades of profoundly rife inequality, these efforts have triggered feelings of resentment and unworthiness.\textsuperscript{168} Indeed, providing Black South Africans with social, economic, political, and academic privileges once enjoyed solely by white South Africans will inevitably require redefining social categories.\textsuperscript{169} This adjustment incites a new set of social reactions and attitudes. Regarding some Black South Africans, it also incites feelings of false entitlement and guilt.\textsuperscript{170}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{163} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{164} Id. at 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{165} Id. at 5.
  \item \textsuperscript{166} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{167} Id. at 6.
  \item \textsuperscript{170} Serino, \textit{supra} note 168.
\end{itemize}
III. THE EFFICACY OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN UNITED STATES AND SOUTH AFRICA

Under resourced Jim Crow and Bantu primary and secondary schools were never completely rehabilitated. Currently, both the United States and South Africa struggle to erase the residual effects of state-sponsored segregation in education. As such, both countries currently experience similar predicaments linked to race and education, which continue to fuel disparate scholastic opportunities. For example, The New York Times claimed while Black American students have benefited from affirmative action policies, “persistent underrepresentation often stems from equity issues that begin earlier.”

A. The Efficacy of Affirmative Action in the United States

In 1965, Executive Order 11246 compelled universities to adopt recruitment policies tailored by affirmative action ideals. The concept of de facto racially segregated schools is relevant in evaluating the efficacy of affirmative action. Between 1970 and 1990, steady progress occurred toward desegregating schools at all levels. However, beginning in the 1990s, that progress diminished. Similar to the make-up of Black schools during the Jim Crow era, nationwide, roughly one-third of Black and Latino students attend schools that have a majority of minority students. These majority-minority schools have a much higher incidence of students in poverty than majority white schools.
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A report from the Center for American Progress identified that the racial gap in wealth is widening. In 2016, the median wealth of Black households was $13,460, while the median wealth for similar white households was $142,180. The report explained “[c]omponents of family wealth, such as stocks, bonds, money in the bank, and real estate, produce interest, dividends, or rental income which are commonly used to offset or pay college costs.” President Johnson’s quote about “the high hurdles” of historical racism further contextualizes the other report findings. The report discovered that the median wealth of Black households led by a college graduate was $57,250. This accounts for a “median wealth of only seventy percent of” what white households have when “led by a person without a college degree.”

This provides insight into a household’s ability to provide a college degree for their children. A 2016 study by the National Assessment of Educational Progress identified a consistent pattern of significant academic improvement for “states that sen[t] additional money to their lowest-income school districts.” This study demonstrates and provides support for the assumption that, generally, whether in schools or in a household, the more money available to students, the better the outcome for the student as an adult.

Furthermore, students are predominantly assigned to public schools based on where they live. Neighborhoods are, by and large, racially segregated as a result of economics. Discrepancies in schools occur
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because public school districts across the nation are controlled by local cities and are funded, in part, by local property taxes. Logically, high-poverty areas with lower home values collect fewer taxes to funnel into local schools. The result is the students who generally need the most support in school end up with the least support.

Generally, majority-minority schools are the least likely to have college preparation curricula, higher-level science and math courses, or guidance counselors. Indeed, “separate remains unequal,” for schools with concentrated poverty and racial segregation suggest a higher probability for having “less experienced teachers, high levels of teacher turnover, inadequate facilities[,] and fewer classroom resources.” Thus, students from these schools are unable to compete on college entrance exams with students from schools with far better resources.

For example, students who take advanced placement (A.P.) courses and pass the exams earn course credit for college. The A.P. exam administrator reports a wide disparity in success levels between white and Black American students on A.P. examinations. Generally, white and Asian American students enter university with college credits and are far more prepared than their Black student counterparts. With major impediments at every stage of a Black student’s scholastic journey, it is not surprising reaching college and succeeding once there can be a struggle for many Black Americans. These foundational shortcomings, coupled with economic struggles to remain in school, contribute to the present-day gap between Black and white college
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students and graduates. This is evident when comparing college graduation rates of Black Americans with those of other racial or ethnic groups. According to data from the National Collegiate Athletic Association, only forty-six percent of Black students who “entered bachelor’s degree programs at four-year institutions . . . earned their degree within six years.” Furthermore, the Black student college graduation rate was twenty-three percent “lower than the rate for whites and [thirty-one] percentage points below the rate for Asian Americans.” Hispanic students also had a fourteen percent higher graduation rate than Black students. Among Black college students, the data also revealed a nine percent gap in favor of Black women.

Moreover, according to the United States Census Bureau, in 2017 Blacks had attained the following education levels: 4,301,000 with Bachelor’s degrees; 1,872,000 with Master’s degrees; 194,000 with Professional degrees; and 297,000 with Doctoral degrees. In contrast, whites had attained the following education levels: 39,672,000 with Bachelor’s degrees; 16,169,000 with Master’s degrees; 2,655,000 with Professional degrees; and 3,109,000 with Doctoral degrees. Of people 25 years and over in the U.S. population, twenty-four percent of Blacks had received higher education degrees, while nearly thirty-five percent of whites had received higher education degrees.

An analysis by the New York Times determined that black representation at elite institutions has actually declined in the past 35 years. The senior vice president at the American Council on Education claimed that Black Americans have enjoyed improvements by being admitted to less selective colleges. However, he asserts this
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is not the case at the highly selective institutions. Although Black Americans are defying many obstacles by entering college, they still struggle to break into the most coveted and traditionally white-dominated academic arena, like Ivy League institutions.

Asian Americans account for about five percent of the nation’s population, yet account for twenty-two percent of admitted students at Harvard. Comparatively, Black Americans comprise slightly over twelve percent of the nation’s population, and they account for roughly twelve percent of Harvard’s admitted students. Hence, proportional to the American population, Asian American students, at Harvard, are far more represented than Black Americans. Experts also suggest that, if Harvard were forbidden from using race as a factor in admissions, the Asian American admission rates would increase, while the admission rates of other students would decrease. In fact, a 2005 study, appearing in Social Science Quarterly, found absent affirmative action, the acceptance rate for Black American candidates at elite colleges would likely fall by nearly two-thirds.

These statistics bespeak the social, economic, psychological, and political generational disenfranchisement of Black Americans, and it has resulted in acute imbalances and pervasive barriers between Black Americans and white Americans. Not surprisingly, education functions as a cyclic complication; that is, limited access low-quality schooling can operate as a self-fulfilling prophecy, restricting future generations’ prospects for advancement. Notably, even Black households led by a college graduate trail their white counterparts in terms of economic progress. Despite progress, future generations of Black students still face higher academic hurdles to compete with their white peers.
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B. The Efficacy of Affirmative Action in South Africa

Notable increases in Black student participation in public higher education have occurred post-apartheid.209 Still, when considering that “the majority of working class [B]lack students come from [a background of] poorly-resourced schools,” it is not surprising these students are often ill-equipped to surpass the minimum university grade.210 Statistics South Africa asserted, “Children with the required support, which includes better-educated parents, would pass these examinations and tests . . . [and] would be better off compared to children with less educated parents.”211

The country’s efforts to produce qualified Black professionals is complicated by social class. Similar to the role economics played in segregating schools in the United States, South Africa “remain[s] crippled by failing public high schools in impoverished rural areas and black townships . . . .”212 Hence, both in the United States and South Africa, predominantly Black neighborhoods still suffer from a disproportionate allocation of resources, likely stemming from each country’s historically state-sponsored segregation. As in the United States, limited access to, and quality of, education at the primary and secondary levels are reflected as similar shortcomings at the university level.

Given South Africa’s explicit affirmative action policy, universities have more incentive to accept Black South Africans. For example, the University of Cape Town (“UCT”) “has an openly stated policy of admitting Blacks, [even with] substantially lower test scores than whites.”213 Nevertheless, whites still outnumber Black South Africans
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nearly two to one.214 This is particularly striking when white South Africans account for only nine percent of the population.215

Additionally, UCT offers compensatory instructional programs designed to aid disadvantaged students.216 Even with reinforcement, roughly half of Black South African students graduate in five years.217 Comparatively, within that same time frame, four out of five white students completed their educations.218 Referencing the Black student population, the vice chancellor of the university lamented, “[W]e’re getting the best [of the Black South African students] here and the best [are] struggling.”219

The 2011 census established that Black South Africans still comprise the majority of the South African populace at 79.2 percent.220 Additionally, colored South Africans are 8.9 percent of the population and white South Africans are 8.9 percent of the population.221 However, according to Statistics South Africa, as of November 2017, 9.1 percent of Black South Africans attained post-secondary education.222 Comparatively, 38.3 percent of white South Africans acquired post-secondary education.223 Thus, despite Black South African students possessing a higher level of education than previous generations, presently and relative to the nation’s population, Black South Africans still trail their white counterparts.224 Therefore, despite BEE efforts, the
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journey from their first year to graduation still presents the most challenges for Black students.225

“While the ‘big five’ historically white universities have opened their [admissions] to non-white students, historically [B]lack universities . . . still languish at the bottom of the pile in terms of the volume and quality of their academic work.”226 “Most white students attend the previously advantaged universities,” including the UCT or Witwatersrand (“WITS”).227 This is analogous to the reputable Ivy League institutions and their student body consisting mostly of white and Asian Americans. Meanwhile, there is a significantly higher concentration of Black and colored South African students attending previously disadvantaged universities.228 The “big five” universities, which enjoy an established reputation as prestigious, obtain the majority of research funding from statutory bodies, and charge substantially higher tuition fees.229 Relatively, the ethnically differentiated universities, designated during apartheid, are still considered “bottom tier.”230 These tribal colleges have restricted research activity and provide students a slim chance to enter even the lower levels of global rankings of esteemed universities.231 These financial disparities maintain and fuel the “class structure of apartheid society.”232 The vice chancellor of WITS claimed in a lecture the “government has lacked the will or the imagination despite all of its
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political rhetoric to develop these historically black universities.”

He further claimed, as a result, these universities will be “mired in a suboptimal education trajectory.” Hence, despite efforts to include Black South Africans, meaningful rehabilitation is not occurring at the rate needed for significant improvement.

**IV. SOCIAL ATTITUDES TOWARD EFFORTS TO EFFECTUATE RACIAL EQUITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH AFRICA**

Social attitudes and legislation are intimately connected and often influence each other. Sometimes lawmakers attempt to reflect social norms and sentiments through legislation. For instance, in the United States, social attitudes about the legality of same-sex marriage, the use of recreational marijuana, and equal rights during the Civil Rights movement, have all catalyzed adjustments to legal frameworks. Analogously, in South Africa, domestic and international social resistance and pressure played major roles in the overhaul of apartheid.

Alternatively, laws can also dictate attitudes about social behavior. For example, the United States introduced laws mandating designated facilities for breastfeeding mothers; and the effect of this law
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was to normalize breastfeeding. Thus, laws can set values, which in turn can alter social behavior.

A. Social Attitudes Toward Efforts to Effectuate Racial Equity in Higher Education in the United States

The litany of Supreme Court cases, complaints about unfair preferences, and varying ideas about affirmative action illustrate the difficulty in reaching effective solutions. For instance, in 2003, the Court noted that using race as a factor in a holistic approach would likely no longer be necessary “within twenty-five years.” Comparatively, in 2007, Justice Roberts opined, “the way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race.”

As part of the current Executive Administration’s efforts to effectuate change in education, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department plans to investigate and “potentially take legal action against universities over affirmative action admissions policies.” Attorney General Jeff Sessions claims affirmative action policies “[have] delayed the kind of movement to racial harmony we ought to be going forward with today.” In fact, the President of the Conservative Center for Equal Opportunity told the New York Times, “[N]ot only are whites discriminated against now, but frequently Asian-Americans are as well.” In general, Americans against affirmative action policies claim that one set of injustices, such as state-sponsored segregation, does not excuse another – affirmative action.
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A 2016 Gallup poll revealed seven in ten Americans believe merit should be the only basis for college admissions. In fact, sixty-five percent of Americans polled disagreed with the Court’s decision to allow race as a factor in college admissions. Other social attitudes toward affirmative action suggest a color blind or race-neutral approach would address issues of equality and representation in higher education more fairly. Proponents of this view recommend considering economic status as a factor to avoid giving an unfair advantage to middle-class Black American students. Supporters of this approach assert this type of evaluation would benefit low-income students of all races. Also, policies similar to those adopted by public universities in Texas have been viewed as better alternatives to affirmative action policies. There, colleges automatically admit students graduating in the top ten percent of their high school classes. Many opponents of affirmative action view this policy as fairer.

Moreover, many white and sometimes Asian American students feel disadvantaged by affirmative action. For instance, in 2012, an
American conservative non-profit group, Turning Point USA, emerged with the mission to educate students about true market values. In 2017, at the University of New Mexico, members of this organization held an “‘Affirmative Action Bake Sale,’ with prices for products varying based on the customer’s race.”

The group’s motives were to incite debate about how different people received different opportunities that do not result in equal opportunity. These social views toward affirmative action dictate how often the Court examines this topic. They also reflect society’s willingness to support affirmative action legislation. They provide insight into how laws should approach the topic to maximize public support and thus, the execution of and compliance with such measures.

B. Social Attitudes Toward Efforts to Effectuate Racial Equity in Higher Education in South Africa

Today, some Black South African students experience an “unspoken” racial hierarchy. In an article published by The Atlantic, a student recounted his experience as a Black university student. He explained that gaining admission to formerly all-white universities is considered the “golden key.” However, this accomplishment is met with the expectation that one should “shut up and not do anything about [changing admission policies] because you’ve been given a gift—the gift of education.”

White South Africans, particularly poor ones, who once enjoyed elevated social, economic, and academic privileges, were forced to adjust to the new implications of Blacks being treated equally under the law. This meant many white South Africans had to reconcile with policies prioritizing Black South Africans and the process through which the government chose for realizing equality. Critical Race
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Theorist, Derrick Bell, explains how poor and powerless white people are “sustained in their sense of racial superiority.” That is, their “property right” in their “whiteness” renders them more willing to accept less in terms of social, economic, and political privileges.

Historically, courts and society in both countries have upheld the “property right” in “whiteness.” Derrick Bell claims this preservation of “whiteness” is driven by the fear that “[B]lack gains threaten the notion that white people are ‘entitled to priority and preference.’” This fear created the subclass that Black Americans and Black South Africans are attempting to transcend beyond the marginalized positions in which society has placed them. Challenging this idea has a domino effect on other widespread narratives. For instance, eliminating Blacks as an underclass implies Blacks can be perceived on the same level as whites. Traditional definitions of what is considered excellent and what constitutes privilege are disrupted. Thus, as Black students enter into spaces traditionally occupied by white students, a new status quo emerges.

Similar to white and Asian Americans feeling disadvantaged by affirmative action legislation, “more and more white South Africans” claim they have faced difficulties securing a job and as a result are living in poverty. The South African Institute for Race Relations (“SAIFRR”) reported white poverty levels have increased. Nevertheless, white poverty levels, still “pale in comparison to black poverty levels.” Despite data revealing white people are not being significantly adversely affected by affirmative action, white South
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Africans believe “a reverse apartheid” is occurring. The chief executive of SAIFRR advised South Africans to view things in “perspective” of the apartheid limitations on Black South Africans.

In 2010, university students at UCT, a university referred to as being a former “citadel” of “white privilege,” debated the boundaries of affirmative action. A UCT professor claimed affirmative action “betrays the ideals of nonracialism that so many fought and died for.” The professor asserted, the university must “resist pressure from the government to use racial benchmarks in determining how well the is performing.” Alternatively, the vice chancellor contended, “preferences based on apartheid’s racial classifications provide a means to help those harmed by that system to gain critical educational opportunities.”

In response to this sentiment, UCT developed nonracial benchmarks to measure disadvantage. For instance, the university will now consider whether the applicants’ parents attended a university or the quality of the high schools of the applicants. Nevertheless, the vice chancellor contends race should still be considered during admissions. Otherwise, he claimed many Blacks would be excluded from such universities, thereby reinforcing negative stereotypes of Black failure. Similar to the United States, the issues of affirmative access and bridging the opportunity gap is intricately intertwined with wealth, or lack thereof.

In 2015, Black, colored, and poor South African students disrupted the status quo by challenging high fees, structural inequalities, and colonial symbols. In late 2014, post-graduate students at the WITS drafted a “Transformation Memo,” calling for a “decoloni[z]ation of the curriculum, an increase in the number of Black academic staff, and
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a shift towards embracing the political, philosophical, and historical intellectual traditions of Africa . . . in order to build a truly post-colonial African university.” 280 Meanwhile, at UCT, a student threw a bucket of feces at the Cecil John Rhodes Statue on campus. 281 These events catalyzed a series of protests on the UCT campus, and after a month of “performance art, graffiti, posters and demonstrations,” the statue was removed. 282

The #feesmustfall and the #rhodesmustfall movements exposed stale notions of superiority from apartheid. 283 These massive protests triggered victory for the students by forcing former President Jacob Zuma to withdraw plans for an 11.5 percent tuition increase in 2016. 284 What began as protests over university fee increases culminated in nationwide momentum provoking considerations for a renewed perspective on the current racial state of South African universities. “Universities responded by committing to more student support, transformation of the curriculum, and a number of institution-specific demands. . . .” 285
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V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE STATE OF BLACK AMERICANS AND SOUTH AFRICANS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A. Historical Consciousness

The lingering effects of state-sponsored segregation in both countries are crucial components of the contextual framework within which these issues should be addressed. Opponents of affirmative action in both countries often de-emphasize how Black people in both nations were historically and systematically disenfranchised from education.

Indeed, the historically disproportionate allocation of resources; the blatantly unequal educational foundations; and the entitlement and stigma stemming from racially disparate treatment have produced and continue to contribute to racial gaps in education at every level. These imbalances accumulate and erupt in college where marginalized students are ripe to suffer its consequences. Therefore, it is inaccurate to assert students, who are academically dissimilarly situated, ought to be regarded similarly during college admission processes.286

Challenging the stock story and presenting the experiences of the disempowered through stories of the lived experiences of Black American and South African students is crucial.287 Resituating the narrative will expose “deficit-informed” stories of racial privilege and further the discourse for reform.288 Majoritarian stories often explain education inequity through a “cultural deficit model.”289 In turn, these narratives influence how teachers interact with Black students.290 Presenting the experiential knowledge of Black students is “legitimate, appropriate, and critical to understanding, analyzing, and teaching racial subordination.”291 Incorporating historical and present-day Black
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perspectives and experiences is the first step in reshaping the relationship between race and education in both countries.

B. Social Responsibility for Attaining Equity in Higher Education in the United States and South Africa

The United States and South Africa share similar backstories regarding their initial motives to implement affirmative action policies. After Dr. King was assassinated in 1968, there were “riots in sixty American cities simultaneously.”292 The complete state of unrest precipitated societal leaders in government, business, and academia, to realize Black people could no longer be socially marginalized. Additionally, pressure, from abroad following the end of World War II, compelled the United States to address segregation and inequality.293

Similarly, the 1980s marked an era with the biggest, longest and most violent black uprisings in South African history.294 Riots and violence were ubiquitous throughout the country.295 Similar to the Black American retaliation, Black South Africans vigorously combatted political and economic deprivation and other apartheid laws.296 By 1985, violence was “at an all time high,” and the government declared a state of emergency.297 Taken in tandem with rising social and economic pressures from other countries, and increased media coverage of the hostilities, the government was forced to react.298 In the same way, increased attention to state-sponsored segregation in the United States was implemented to quell social unrest;
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the end of apartheid was, in part, a solution to restore the country’s order.299

Thus, serious efforts in both nations toward affirmative action only became paramount when white people feared for their social stability and global images.300 Including Blacks into workplaces and educational institutions was not an entirely conscious effort to elevate the status of Blacks. Critical Race Theorists, Dr. Derrick Bell, labeled this sort of reaction, “interest convergence.”301 In other words, when the interests of white people and racial justice converge, white people will support racial justice to further their agendas.

With greater clarity of each country’s objectives, reintroducing affirmative action policies as measures intended to actually advance the status of Black people is paramount. Of course, affirmative action does not relieve Black people from their duty to take proactive measures toward their futures. Nevertheless, modifying social perceptions of affirmative action is useful. This process should begin by simply replacing current terms. Continuing to refer to programs seeking to level the higher education playing field as “affirmative action” programs is detrimental. Alternatively, these programs would be better suited as being coined equity and inclusion programs. “Affirmative action” places stigmas on those benefiting from affirmative action policies. By addressing existing and new programs in terms of the goals the programs seek to achieve—equity and inclusion—such programs would be more accepted.

First, in both countries, social backlash against affirmative action presumes a stance of “white innocence” and avoids confronting the obvious argument that “white people [in both countries] have been advantaged by this oppression” of Black people.302 The working
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assumption of attitudes against affirmative action is one where innocence necessitates not having received any advantages at the expense of others. Accordingly, it is impossible for white Americans and white South Africans to be innocent. Recognizing the historical factors that have afforded privileges to white people, at the expense of Blacks, resituates the issue by emphasizing relevant reasons for why affirmative action is necessary.

The second component of shifting rhetoric around affirmative action policies requires questioning Black people as actual victims. As demonstrated through each country’s history, pervasive and ongoing discrimination make Black people victims of historical and lingering inequities. By understanding these historical components, it becomes clear how Black people have been, and to some extent, still are victims. Therefore, affirmative action aids in neutralizing historical legacies responsible for assigning Black people second-class citizenship.

Highlighting contradictions from opponents of affirmative action dismantles their contentions of fairness. In the United States, legacy admissions allot extra points to children of alumni. At prestigious American universities, the same ones where Black Americans are underrepresented, legacy admissions account for nearly thirty percent of admitted students. These programs disproportionately benefit middle-class white and Asian students. The programs promote students who have been afforded generations of privilege because of state-sponsored segregation. Black and poor students are precluded from receiving this type of preferential consideration. If the issue with affirmative action is fairness, then it would be reasonable to equally condemn programs providing unfair admission advantages to wealthy students.

In South Africa, complaints that affirmative action is causing white South Africans to become poorer is subject to logical scrutiny. These
contentions are exaggerated and factually inaccurate. Thus, South Africans can realistically confront affirmative actions.

Furthermore, profits, from slavery and notoriety stemming from apartheid, benefited universities in both countries. In the United States, slavery and its related industries contributed to funding several prestigious institutions. For example, Harvard, Columbia, Princeton, and Yale reaped benefits from slavery, even to the extent that enslaved people built their campuses.\(^{309}\) Comparatively, in South Africa, formerly all-white institutions were well-resourced from the government and from alumni. Given Black South Africans were historically unable to attend those schools or work decent jobs, it is logical that parents of Black students were not able to contribute to the formerly Black universities in the same way. At minimum, universities could contribute to the process by expanding measures of excellence and shifting destructive narratives about Black students.

Also, both nations should expand their notions of what is considered meritoriously excellent. Currently, the definition of merit presumes every student comes from an even playing field; thus, the best students work the hardest to achieve the highest test scores and grades.\(^{310}\) However, both countries’ racially segregated histories effect how Black students are still generally not receiving the same education, as white students.\(^{311}\) A new approach to determine aptitude is appropriate because test scores and grades are also not necessarily indicative of intelligence or potential.\(^{312}\) Mari Matsuda from Georgetown Law asserts, the only way to “surviving the assault on affirmative action” is to require universities to measure students more holistically.\(^{313}\) She claims, diversity will be realized and the entire process will be fairer to all students, specifically those who are “shut out by the present system.”\(^{314}\)

For instance, many Black students in the United States and South Africa often overcome, generational and economic barriers, inadequate
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primary and secondary schooling, feelings of inferiority and inadequacy, and a variety of other obstacles not typically part of their white counterparts’ paths to college.\textsuperscript{315} Acknowledging the skills and tenacity involved in overcoming tumult and how the traits acquired during those struggles also contribute to a flourishing society, would transform higher education to be more inclusive. Prioritizing grit over grades, resourcefulness over resources, creativity over capacity to succeed on standardized exams, could lead to profound benefits.\textsuperscript{316} This could be achieved by taking into account how much adversity a student has overcome. Assessments similar to the Childhood Ace Quiz, which quantifies the amount of trauma in a child’s life, could be useful as supplementary instruments for determining college admission.\textsuperscript{317} Points during admissions would also be based on how much adversity a student has overcome. While some disciplines require precise measures, expanding perceptions of merit could generate more confidence among Black students. Heightened level of appreciation for Black talent could combat the lingering psychological effects of state-sponsored segregation. By affirming that Black students are capable and smart, albeit in different ways from their white counterparts, tendencies toward self-fulfilling prophecies would shift from negative to positive. Perhaps then, Black students could even improve in other more traditional scholarly measures.

\section*{C. Calculated Preemptive and Legal Measures in South Africa and the United States}

Given the nature of racial disparities in education in both countries, it is unlikely the United States or South Africa will realistically be able to phase out affirmative action policies within the near future. The first step in the United States to resolve educational disparities would be to include education as a fundamental right, like in the South African constitution. If the federal government included education as a right in the Constitution, perhaps states would be inclined to follow suit. The
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federal government could offer incentive money for states to include education. However, to avoid any Tenth Amendment issues, it would not be a requirement. In some situations, Congress is permitted to attach conditions to its spending of federal funds; therefore, absent coercive conditions, the federal government could delegate funds to state grantees.  

Beyond recognizing equal access to education as a right, the most obvious solution to this quandary is to focus on neutralizing inequities before accumulating at the university level. If both countries refocused their efforts to ensure students were coming from similar educational starting points, measures like affirmative action would be less necessary over time. Both South Africa and the United States should develop legislative initiatives to target pre-school, primary, and secondary school systems. These initiatives would aid in offsetting South Africa’s implementation of specific quotas for Black university students and the United States’ balancing between constitutional rights and fulfilling a compelling government interest.

In the United States, Head Start is a federally funded non-profit administered through the Department of Health and Human Services. The program provides early childhood education to children from low-income families. Studies show the long-term gains from this program include increased post-secondary credential attainment, and translating to a “variety of economic, and social outcomes.” While Head Start sometimes receives backlash from conservatives, it is generally received as a bipartisan form of improving education. South Africa could adopt a similar model to develop a system targeting their poor and Black young students. Furthermore, both the United States and South Africa could take this model, which focuses on preparing students from low-income families for the next level of schooling, to extend these techniques beyond pre-school into each level of schooling leading up to college.

Additionally, more equitable ways to fund schools would likely alleviate some of the disparities that surface once students enter college.


Each country could develop a system that would facilitate social sharing programs; that is, districts with more funding could share resources with districts or townships with less funding. Schools could comply with a pooled resource system, similar to the BEE programs. This could result in the school’s ability to bid for government tenders, have access to tax incentives and financial grants, and be favored as progressive schools.

Logistically, a pooled resource sharing system would be easier to implement in South Africa, since the BEE framework already exists. Moreover, the United States could use the BEE system as a model.

Although the United States is restricted in implementing explicit affirmative action measures in the same way as South Africa, the BEE model offers unique ideas that could be implemented in the United States. For instance, instead of requiring universities, or schools in general, to meet certain racial quotas, the United States could simply reward schools participating in programs to promote diversity. Promoting diversity would include focusing on a diverse student body, as well as, faculty and professors. The federal government could provide states with additional resources to use as incentives for primary and secondary schools, as well as, universities to incorporate voluntary diversity standards. Participating schools could gain recognition on a national registry as being schools of distinction, which in turn would lead to favorable social reputations. The prospect of being nationally recognized could encourage other schools to participate in the diversity program.

Furthermore, diverse representation within universities could reinforce Black students’ beliefs that they can fulfill certain jobs and societal roles. Thus, increased efforts to incorporate Black people into higher education through faculty and leadership positions are also a necessary component to actualize progress. In 2016, Black professors in the United States constituted three percent of all full-time faculty at degree-granting post-secondary institutions. In light of the hiring explosion many American schools experienced beginning in the 1990s,

“it’s mildly surprising that not many more minorities were included in that growth.”\footnote{321}

Comparatively, Black professors in South African universities account for merely seventeen percent of the country’s university professors.\footnote{322} Diverse educators provide different perspectives and ultimately contribute to more well-rounded graduates, future employees, and entrepreneurs. Black students learning from professors who are racially reflective of their background will contribute to increased confidence. Black students may perceive their goals and ultimate success as more realistic if they witness and interact with successful Black role models during college.

Apart from diversity incentives, the governments of both nations could also provide tax incentives or loan forgiveness for teachers and professors.\footnote{323} Under the new House tax plan in the United States, teachers are no longer permitted to deduct school supplies from their taxes.\footnote{324} For genuine improvements in education, teachers should be supported in their reasonable endeavors to supplement their classrooms. Considering teachers in both countries are generally not paid high wages, reincorporating, or in the case of South Africa simply introducing, tax legislation to incentivize or support teachers, is another avenue to alleviate disparities.

Legal initiatives geared toward redirecting affirmative action toward early education, leading up to higher education, could eventually eliminate the need for affirmative action in higher education.

\footnote{321} Matthew Lynch, \textit{Study: Nearly 90 Percent of Full-Time Professors are White}, \textit{EDVOCATE} (Feb. 21, 2018) \url{https://www.theedadvocate.org/study-nearly-90-percent-of-full-time-professors-are-white/}.


\footnote{323} Wondering whether you can get your federal student loans forgiven for your service as a teacher?, \textit{FED. STUDENT AID}, \url{https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/repay-loans/forgiveness-cancellation/teacher} (last visited Nov. 14, 2018) (explaining that under the Teacher Loan Forgiveness Program, if teachers meet certain requirements, they may be eligible for loan forgiveness for up to $17,500; this type of program is a useful start toward incentivizing qualified teachers to serve in low-income areas).

\footnote{324} Katie Reilly, \textit{4 Ways the Republican Tax Plan Could Affect Teachers, Students and Schools}, \textit{TIME} (Dec. 4, 2017), \url{http://time.com/5047680/gop-tax-plan-education-impact/}.
Nevertheless, until systems are implemented in a different way, affirmative action during admissions will remain necessary.

CONCLUSION

By promoting Black student inclusion and representation at the university level, specifically, within esteemed universities, more Black students will be equipped with the necessary skills to participate in and contribute to society. Specifically, Black students could acquire the academic and professional acumen through which they could be funneled into prominent leadership roles in both countries.

When Black and minority students attend higher education, they generally end up paying more taxes, leading healthier lives, relying less on public assistance, being more politically involved, and having lower unemployment rates. Furthermore, white students who may have never been exposed to other races or diversity are given the opportunity to acquire new perspectives with which to view the world, and ultimately approach and solve problems. Facilitating young Black professionals to assume leadership roles in spaces traditionally and predominately held by white people, specifically white males, will benefit everyone. The concept of interest convergence could serve the goals of this movement by highlighting these benefits that arise from a more inclusive higher education landscape.

For example, legal clerkships in the United States are some of the most valuable experiences within the legal profession. These opportunities provide a network and credentials that many employers value. Yet, in 2012 when Blacks accounted for 13.6 percent of the total population, they only comprised 2.4 percent of federal appeals clerks and 3.2 percent of federal district court clerks. Considering the role of a clerk is often to advise, and even sometimes make prescriptive rulings for judges, the dearth in representation directly shapes legal
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precedent and policies. Meaning, American laws are heavily influenced by one demographic of people, and are being applied to the entire nation. Not surprisingly, this has the effect of creating laws that often exclude or completely ignore entire segments of the population.

Replacing stale notions of inferiority and control with concepts of equity and progress will surely trigger positive implications for both nations. Educational parity translates into a wealth of positive societal outcomes. Qualified and educated Black members of the population will inevitably create more diverse and inclusive societies. Enabling Blacks to assume leadership positions across several societal sectors will set new precedents for future generations of Black students and young adults. Everyone will benefit, and the goals that the United States and South Africa have attempted to achieve will finally become realities.
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