

ISSUE STATEMENT Social – Affirmative Action

Maintain Commitment to Affirmative Action

After more than 300 years of de facto affirmative action to benefit white males, we need affirmative action for people of color and women to offset enduring historic wrongs as well as present day inequalities. Affirmative action programs should not be based on quotas. Race and gender should not be the predominant factor in choosing qualified applicants. A good affirmative action program uses a variety of methods to achieve the goal of increasing diversity, including using race and gender as one of many factors in evaluating the suitability of an applicant.

More structural solutions are required to promote economic and educational equality, including a long overdue and practical Marshall Plan to eliminate poverty in the United States, and an education-focused restitution trust fund.

However, affirmative action remains an important opportunity-enhancing tool, as Americans for a Fair Chance, a coalition of civil rights organizations, has demonstrated. At the federal level, authentic minority set-asides and affirmative-action arrangements are a modest way to support the growth of businesses owned and controlled by people of color. Affirmative action is a modest means for businesses to redress historic discrimination. Affirmative action at universities is an important tool to promote campus diversity and educational equality.

ISSUE STATEMENT Single Payer Healthcare

Nader/Gonzalez favors a Canadian-style, private delivery, free choice of hospital and doctor, public health insurance system.

Right now, the United States spends \$7,129 per capita on health care—more than twice as much per capita as the rest of the industrialized world.

And yet, the United States performs poorly in comparison on major health indicators such as life expectancy and infant mortality

While other industrialized nations like Canada and Sweden provide comprehensive coverage to their entire populations, the United States leaves 47 million completely uninsured and tens of millions more inadequately covered.

According to an Institute of Medicine report, 18,000 Americans die each year because they cannot afford health care.

And inability to pay for medical bills is the leading cause of bankruptcies – they currently contribute to about half the bankruptcies in the United States.

In our current system, there are thousands of different payers of health care fees.

This system is a bureaucratic nightmare, wasting \$350 billion—close to a third of all health care spending on things that have nothing to do with health care—overhead, underwriting, billing, sales and marketing departments, huge profits and exorbitant executive pay.

ISSUE STATEMENT Single Payer Healthcare

In addition, there is over \$200 billion in computerized billing fraud and abuse.

Nader/Gonzalez support a single payer system that would save the \$350 billion and apply those savings to comprehensively cover everyone without paying more than we already do.

All Americans would be covered for all medically necessary services.

Patients would have free choice of doctor and hospital.

Costs would also be controlled in part by the single payer negotiating fees and making bulk purchases.

References:

- Physicians for a National Health Program, on the Web at: <http://pnhp.org/>
- Sicko, by Michael Moore, on the Web at: <http://www.michaelmoore.com/sicko/dvd/>
- Healthcare Now, on the Web at: <http://www.healthcare-now.org/index.html>

ISSUE STATEMENT Social – Affirmative Action

On June 23, 2003, the U.S. Supreme Court delivered its landmark ruling in *Grutter v. Bollinger*, concerning the admissions policies at the University of Michigan Law School. In a 5 to 4 decision, the majority ruled that student body diversity is a compelling state interest that can justify using race in university admissions. On the same day, in *Gratz v. Bollinger*, the Court ruled, in a 6 to 3 opinion written by Chief Justice Rehnquist, that the undergraduate university's use of race was too broad to achieve the university's asserted interest in diversity and needed to be recast.

The federal government should maintain its commitment to affirmative action -- even though such arrangements may violate the rules of the World Trade Organization binding on the US. We believe the WTO's powers to be unconstitutional. The Justice Department should intervene to oppose judicial rulings against affirmative action in higher education and other spheres.