

## FROM THE EDITOR

Various aspects of employment discrimination are at the core of five of the six articles in this issue. At least two of these topics discussed are featured repeatedly in the popular press, the legislative halls, and the world of academe: affirmative action and sexual harassment. Despite the fact that the laws and executive orders that govern these topics are now four decades old, the controversy never dies.

This issue of *JIER* might be subtitled, “The Troy State Issue.” Henry Findley and his associates began submitting their studies to this *Journal* about two years ago, and hardly an issue goes to press without one of their studies included. This time we have three. In our lead article, Findley, Wheatley, and Ingram lay out the basic law on the controversial topic of affirmative action. In the second entry, the same team, with Ed Stevens added, move into the policy arena and propose a different approach to affirmative action—an approach based upon “disadvantage” rather than race, gender, or other characteristics. In our third entry, Findley, Wheatley, and Garrott address a different topic—color discrimination. I taught a generation of students that the Congressional ban on racial and color discrimination was redundant because both categories were synonymous. These authors taught me that I was wrong: the concept of color discrimination is, in fact, quite different from race discrimination.

We move to another university and another topic with our next entry: Nimmicht, Franz, and Pigeon bring us out of the policy area into a “nuts and bolts” topic. These authors propose a model of costing wrongful discharge cases, drawing the relevant policy implications. The Kleiman, Kass, and Samson study returns us to the legal arena with their discussion of the hostile environment aspect of sexual harassment claims. This issue closes where Johnson and Smith liken discrimination issues to such medical conditions as the flu.

*Charles J. Coleman*  
*Editor*