

# The Unhappy Difference Diversity Makes

*Carol Iannone*

*Editor's note:* This article follows upon the comments and conclusions that the author drew in "Diversity and the Abolition of Learning," which appeared in our previous issue, the *AQ* of Winter 2002–03.

The concept of "diversity" in higher education today goes far beyond simply offering access to college to all who might want to attend. It goes far beyond attaining proportional representation of racial and ethnic groups in the college population as well, although this is clearly one of the goals. Diversity has now come to entail completely restructuring all aspects of university life, including the curriculum itself. Diversiphiles make no secret of this endeavor and their growing success in realizing it. "The process is very much a work in progress," a diversity publication remarks, "but a new academy is definitely under construction."

Diversity educators now acknowledge that increasing minority numbers through affirmative action, whether overtly or covertly, has failed to make students bridge racial and ethnic divides. Everyone has heard of the segregated orientations, residences, graduations, classroom corners, and cafeteria tables that have become familiar aspects of the contemporary university. These educators are not deterred, however. They now speak of a "second phase" of the "campus diversity movement"—beyond achieving group parity—and express their intention "to create a new category of graduate" who will be "culturally competent." In this second phase, a new all-encompassing "educational environment" is being fashioned, in which faculty are given "diversity training"; students from the diverse groups are made to "learn from one another" by such means as "structured discussions"; and staff members are directed in workshops "to think in terms of classism, racism, and sexism," to "make recommendations for improvement," and to "find ways to incorporate these suggestions into their own lives."<sup>1</sup>

As it turns out, the "educational environment" deemed necessary to achieve the objectives of diversity is one entirely devoted to . . . diversity! That is, the study and cultivation of the differences among groups, the exposure of the

---

Carol Iannone is editor-at-large of *Academic Questions* and a vice president of the National Association of Scholars. Please address correspondence for Dr. Iannone to *Academic Questions* / NAS, 221 Witherspoon Street, Second Floor, Princeton, NJ 08542–3215; editor@nas.org.

inequalities among groups that are thought by diversiphiles to be the result of systemic injustice and persistent patterns of discrimination, and the effort to eliminate these inequalities both in education and society in general, while evidently maintaining the differences. Older understandings of the purpose of the university, such as safeguarding and transmitting the intellectual tradition or supplying a liberal education that expands the individual mind or even preparing the student for a career, are being replaced by the new concept of diversity, which is rapidly displacing every other educational value. Or, to put it another way, every educational value is now being redefined in terms of diversity—implementing it, facilitating it, teaching it, studying it, researching it, assessing it, and enforcing it. Opponents of racial preferences criticize unfair double standards in admissions and they are right to do so, but they pay less attention to a related fact, that the artificially diversified student body is being used as a wedge to alter the entire content of the educational experience.

### **AAC&U Diversity Project**

Under the auspices of the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), a mammoth multifaceted range of diversity projects is underway on campuses throughout the country. In the last issue of *AQ*, I examined the publications of the project titled “American Commitments: Democracy, Diversity, and Liberal Learning,” which yielded disturbing insight into the nature of diversity ideals. The present article will examine the publications of a second AAC&U project, titled “The Difference Diversity Makes: Assessing Campus Diversity Initiatives.” The three monographs produced by this project, from 1999 to 2001, just a few years after the previous set, which appeared in 1995, show the campus diversity project far more advanced into “a second wave of innovation, experimentation, and institutional self-evaluation” that puts “diversity more squarely at the center of educational missions.”<sup>2</sup>

The monographs are written by a group of current and former administrators, faculty members, researchers, and one graduate student, all of whom, except for one humanist, identify themselves as “evaluators” and “statisticians.”<sup>3</sup> These publications, as well as the various campus initiatives that they draw on as resources and illustrations and that have been implemented at the hundreds of participating institutions, were funded by the Ford Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the James Irvine Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Lilly Endowment, and the Philip Morris Companies. The titles are: *To Form a More Perfect Union: Campus Diversity Initiatives* (1999), which synthesizes what is being done to further diversity on campuses today; *A Diversity Research Agenda* (2000), which sets forth guidelines for research in diversity; and *Assessing Campus Diversity Initiatives: A Guide for Campus Practitioners* (2001), which offers various means by which colleges can assess and evaluate their efforts toward diversity. Outlining, detailing, and recommending specific

diversity initiatives, these monographs show less of the clumsy, pompous rhetoric of the previous three, and more of the flat, complacent prose style indicative of an impacted bureaucratic mind-set. We learn of diversity audits, diversity workers, diversity practitioners, diversity scholarship, diversity interventions, as well as ways to measure such factors as “intergroup relations,” “minority community views,” “centrality of diversity in the planning process and mission statements,” and “perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity by all constituencies.”<sup>4</sup>

As is typical of academic activists of recent decades, the authors present their project as both radically new and yet only the latest in a series of historical developments in the American university. On this latter point they are not convincing. Previous expansions of university access in modern times, such as that accomplished by the post-World War II GI Bill, involved giving more people an opportunity for an education in what was deemed “the best that has been thought and said in the world,” to quote Matthew Arnold, and did not demand vast changes in the very nature of what is called an education. Neither did these expansions base themselves on divisive preoccupation with race, ethnicity, and the other kinds of group status noted by the authors, such as class, gender, sexual orientation, religion, nationality, and culture.

Not, we are given to know, that these categories are any longer simplistically understood as they were in the early days of the politicization of the academy, back in the 1970s and 1980s. In fact, the authors inform us, the very word diversity came into play in order to account for the “multiple,” “overlapping,” and “intersecting differences” that are now embraced in the ideology, leading to a “shift” in “intellectual theory” and yielding such portentous advances in thinking as: “that race is inflected by gender, that Latinos/Latinas come from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, that Jews are found in all racial groups, that sexual orientation intersects all the other lines of difference, and that increasing numbers of students assign themselves to ‘mixed’ racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds.”<sup>5</sup>

Be that as it may, the authors themselves undercut the claim of continuity with past expansions in higher education when, in a separate context, they admit that the current innovations, motivated as they are by concerns of “power, injustice, and social responsibility”—that is, by an activist political agenda—differ markedly from what has come before, mandating a complete “rethinking of the purposes and practices of the academy itself.”<sup>6</sup> Aside from increasing “access, recruitment, admission, and retention” of minorities and women, the institutionalization of diversity now requires “diversifying faculty, staff, and administrations”; “restructuring the curriculum”—and not just by adding specific diversity courses but by “permeating” every academic discipline with diversity ideals; “re-evaluating counseling, career planning, and residential life”; and “re-configuring the relationship between the campus and the community.”<sup>7</sup>

At a time when even Ivy League graduates emerge with embarrassingly little knowledge of American history, the AAC&U can report in its quarterly diver-

sity newsletter the results of a national survey conducted in 1998 “which shows that 62 percent of 543 responding colleges, universities, and community colleges either have in place a cultural diversity requirement for graduation (54 percent of responding campuses) or are in the process of developing one (8 percent). Of the 434 responding four-year campuses, 60 percent report that they already have requirements in place.” Furthermore, things are moving rapidly. Most of these requirements “have been established within the last decade and a significant number, 30 percent, within the last five years or less.”<sup>8</sup> And even short of actual course requirements, the authors of the monographs under review here certainly sound plausible to observers of higher education when they declare that “[t]here is hardly a university or college that has not included diversity somewhere as part of its educational responsibilities.”<sup>9</sup> Moreover, universities and colleges across the land are undertaking institution-wide diversity assessments, or audits, in which teams of evaluators scrutinize every corner of campus life and judge its success or failure in promoting diversity.

### **Academic Non-Excellence**

The reasons for diversifying the university are five, according to the authors—academic, moral, civic, demographic, and economic. We find that whatever is valid in these arguments either does not require the drastic, gargantuan makeover of the university that is now underway, or is positively undercut by it.

In the “academic argument,” for example, the authors insist that one of the major insights of recent years has been that “diversity is essential for excellence,” because it expands the “knowledge base.”<sup>10</sup> If genuinely new knowledge related to groups arises, however, it could certainly be subsumed within the appropriate disciplines (more than enough “diversified” themselves, alas) without necessitating a separate category of “diversity scholarship” that is seldom controlled by systematic analysis and tends to evade judgment because of its political pretensions to justice, fairness, and equality.<sup>11</sup> But even more important is the question of how much of this knowledge, when it actually *is* knowledge, and not propaganda, is necessary for undergraduate or even graduate education.

In literature, for example, it is well known that proven works of the first rank are routinely displaced by less worthy and even ephemeral texts chosen for diversity purposes. In addition, in studying works of literature according to some politically tinged “theme,” the student loses the sense of literary art. As Jacques Barzun observes, a course devoted to “Sexual ambiguity in the novels of George Eliot,” for example, as opposed to a course in the English novel, “is an evasion of genuine thought, which at the same time spoils the reading of masterpieces.”

Something similar could be said of those “interdisciplinary” or “multidisciplinary” theme courses that have invaded the curriculum, largely in response to diversity demands, and that purport to explore some great issue

related to identity, or sexuality, or social justice, but frequently do so with an assortment of disconnected works from various cultures, periods, and areas. They thus fit Barzun's critical description as "conglomerates of fact and opinion with no structure, system, or progression from point to point to impart a body of knowledge."<sup>12</sup> Lacking a real intellectual *raison d'être*, such courses rely instead on the prefabricated notions about race, class, and gender that have displaced genuine thought in college teaching today, and exemplify educational degradation rather than "excellence."

Another aspect of the academic argument is the supposed educational desirability of "multiple viewpoints" that are thought to arise from the diverse mix of groups now assembled on campuses.<sup>13</sup> Inasmuch as these "viewpoints" are associated with group identity, however, they do not represent true intellectual thought, and can constitute no advance in academic "excellence." For example, in one of the diversity initiatives cited, students in a physics course were placed in "multiracial work groups." The authors claim that "the course not only stimulated more social contact among students interracially, but also increased the retention rate of students of color in science."<sup>14</sup> But we get no word on whether this procedure actually developed the students' knowledge of physics, nor, for that matter, of how the "multiple viewpoints" operated in service of the subject matter. Moreover, the awkwardness of teachers sorting their students by race simply appalls, but this is an instance of diversity trumping every other educational value.

Even in non-math and science courses, having a racial mix of students does not in itself produce educational enhancement. Jeffrey Rosen, journalist, professor of law, and a *supporter* of affirmative action, concedes that race in the classroom "is an imprecise and often unsatisfying proxy for intellectual diversity." In what should be no surprise to anyone not blinded by ideology, he has often found that "the views expressed by African American students on both sides of the political spectrum were indistinguishable from the views of other students."<sup>15</sup>

"Multiple viewpoints" can also be a matter of course content, say our authors. For example, "American Pluralism and the Search for Equality" is a diversity course mandated at the State University of New York at Buffalo in its general education core, and at the University of California—Berkeley, in its American Ethnic Studies requirement. In both cases, we are informed, "students must step outside the study of a single group and learn to compare groups in the context of the history of structured inequalities and prejudicial exclusion in the United States." At Berkeley, the course focuses on race and ethnicity, while at Buffalo, it includes not only these two elements, but also class, gender, and religion.<sup>16</sup> In this context then, "multiple viewpoints" refers to the content of the course. Such a nakedly predetermined focus will obviously offer little variety in analysis, causation, and alternative explanations, however, no matter how many groups are studied, since they will all be scrutinized against the

same template of unquestioned ideas, that is, “structural inequalities and prejudicial exclusion in the United States.”<sup>17</sup>

And we hear nothing of a required course in the American Founding itself, in which students might learn about the principles upon which the present demands are presumably being based. The authors seem to prefer that American ideals remain abstract and unspecified, in order to hold society at fault for failing to achieve them. For example, at one point they summarize these ideals as “equality, opportunity, and mutual well-being.”<sup>18</sup> We might question whether “equality” is being understood as group parity, which is in no way mandated by the constitution or any of its organic developments, as well as whether “mutual well-being” can rightfully be considered a specifically democratic principle. The genius of the Founders lay in their understanding of “enlightened self-interest” instead, but this concept would not serve the diversity agenda.

### Thought Control

So far from there being an expansion of thought, a great deal of control must be exerted in the diversity academy in order to assure proper outcomes. Ideally, professors should not be left to introduce diversity into their teaching out of their own disciplines but should “intensively study the developing scholarship of diversity” through seminars, workshops, and the like, made available through various programs instituted through the funding agencies. And this scholarship itself must be carefully watched, we learn. Scholars must be “aware of the ways in which research questions are framed,” and take care that they do not result, for example, in focus on the “supposed *deficits*” of women and minority students, implicitly blaming them for their own academic difficulties, and thereby “stigmatizing the very people” that are to be helped. Instead, scholars are learning to “include other factors that can influence student achievement, such as institutional climate, economic pressures, and teaching methods.” In other words, they are finding ways to make excuses and blame society for underachieving students. Similarly, scholars must also be aware of the “unanticipated effects” of “possible multiple interpretations” of their work by different “audiences.” In other words, they must shape their findings so as to prevent the emergence of anything that might inadvertently serve to contradict diversity ideology if placed in the hands of people less enamored of diversity goals.<sup>19</sup>

Regarding student learning outcomes as well, the evaluation process must ensure that the proper lessons are being learned in diversity courses, which can require especially thorough evaluation procedures. For example, in order to determine “whether students in a new diversity course understood the interconnections and disconnections between race and gender,” diversity evaluators conducting the university-wide diversity audits that many institutions are undergoing can examine “three data sets: student papers, final exam questions designed to elicit analysis of this area, and *student journal entries*” (Emphasis added).<sup>20</sup>

Students can also be given questionnaires that test learning outcomes. “For example,” we are told, “a student in SUNY at Buffalo’s American Pluralism course wrote at the end of the term, ‘There are more ways of looking at things than the one I came to class with.’” The authors find this totally banal statement “evidence that the student learning goal of the course, to learn about the experiences and perspectives of others, was met.”<sup>21</sup> One doesn’t know whether to laugh or cry at this.

Not only must students be diverse and study diversity, they must of course also be instructed by diverse faculty. The institutional audits must evaluate such factors as the distribution of female professors across the disciplines. After all, individual deans might be pleased with the progress in their departments, but only collective data can reveal, for example, “[c]vidence of women being more evenly dispersed across business, arts, and humanities, but in the sciences clustered only in biology.” (Note the mechanistic language of “dispersal” and “clustering,” as if female professors were so many movable molecules.) Moreover, an “overall audit” can suggest “strategies for new interventions,” such as affirmative action hiring, no doubt.<sup>22</sup>

The authors provide many types of evaluation “instruments” to answer the multifarious purposes of the institutional audits. For uncovering possible prejudice in the campus population, for example, a questionnaire called the “Situational Attitude Scale” (SAS) is recommended. The idea behind this test is to calibrate a person’s general comfort level in certain situations and then to find out if it decreases in the presence of minorities. Part one of the test asks ten questions along the lines of: “You are standing on a very crowded bus surrounded by many people,” and part two asks ten parallel questions, such as: “You are standing on a very crowded bus surrounded by many Arab people.” Each of the ten pairs of questions is followed by a different assortment of paired opposite feelings, and the taker must rate his own feelings in response to each question on a scale of ABCDE between the pairs. For the particular set of questions above, the feeling pairs are:

1. fearful/secure
2. tolerable/intolerable
3. hostile/indifferent
4. important/trivial
5. conspicuous/inconspicuous
6. calm/anxious
7. indignant/understanding
8. comfortable/uncomfortable
9. hate/love
10. not resentful/resentful

“Measuring the degree of prejudice against a group has been difficult because of the tendency many people have to mask or to avoid expressing such feelings because of social acceptability,” we are told, but the SAS “provides a

situational context to make *the psychological withdrawal from the stimulus more difficult*" (Emphasis added). And, we are assured, the test has been successful in unearthing prejudice.<sup>23</sup> Indeed.

### **Civic Mis-Education**

Let us return now to the authors' arguments for diversifying higher education, specifically the "civic argument." Here they assert that, since the "integrity and stability" of democracy "depend[s] on making certain that the communities people live in are fair and just," diversity education is needed in "preparing people, through college experience, to be responsible members of their communities, graduating from college with a greater sense of obligation to the well-being of the whole."<sup>24</sup> First, it must be said that this kind of civic education used to be the province of the high school, while college was meant more for the pursuit of advanced learning and preparation for a career. Nevertheless, it is not undesirable for college students to emerge with some sense of being part of a larger whole (although what is meant by "fair" and "just" needs examination). But once again such a goal cannot truly be achieved with the "deliberative dialogues," "structured discussions," and "collective conversations" of the diversity mandate, in which little honest exchange can occur in an atmosphere charged with the tension of political correctness and enforced by speech codes, and in which diversity practitioners (often specially trained students, we learn from our authors) have already been instructed in how to handle negative views, "emotional issues," and "difficult dialogues" with people who are "threatened." Much less does it demand an entire curriculum permeated by diversity concerns.

A recent article on the law school at the University of Michigan, although written from a point of view sympathetic to affirmative action and diversity, offered some startling examples of the strain and tension they have brought to the campus. For example, one professor shuffles picture cards of the students in his large class in order to be sure to call upon a diverse array. We also find that the black students huddle together in almost every class, and that everyone "shuts up" when the race issue arises.<sup>25</sup>

Moreover, even as the diversity authors recommend giving students a sense of obligation to the whole, they also set down in their checklist for diversity auditors the following item as one of the marks of a college's "commitment to multiculturalism": "Encouraging the social bonding of students from a common culture in affirming their right to be drawn to each other and to have some campus space set aside where they can engage in social and educational exchanges."<sup>26</sup> Obviously the "common culture" referred to here must be that of minority students, since if a group of white students tried to demand this "right," it would become an occasion for a major session in sackcloth and ashes on the part of every member of the university community. A "fair and just"



society cannot be formed when minorities are allowed the “right” to be “drawn to each other,” while white students are not. This represents a radical undermining of American democracy, introducing (*after* the civil rights movement) a hierarchical system of differential treatments and privileges based on race and inherited guilt. (Remember, too, the whole incentive for the “second phase” of the campus diversity movement was that students were failing to connect across racial and ethnic lines.)

In addition, “the well-being of the whole” cannot be served when minorities are encouraged to isolate themselves and, inevitably, rehearse their grievances against the institution and their fellow students, especially when many of these grievances arise from affirmative action itself. The article on the University of Michigan cited above notes that “in the cramped corner devoted to the Black Law Students Alliance, everyone has a story of being stigmatized, of being presumed less qualified, of being looked to as an advocate for some particular perspective.” And how are minority students to feel *their* obligation to the whole when they are encouraged officially to indulge this partiality for what used to be called “their own kind”?

What actually *would* create a better sense of participation in the whole would be to impart to young people, regardless of race or group, an understanding of the best of the intellectual, political, aesthetic, moral, and civic traditions that have shaped their world; a mastery of a body of knowledge; an acquaintance with works of lasting value, including works of genuine quality that have sprung from minority authors and thinkers; and a sense of being part of a common culture and a common humanity, regardless of background.<sup>27</sup>

Of course, for this kind of education to work again, some of the old moral values would have to be returned to education: the belief in truth, objective standards, and honest work; the affirmation of the gratification arising from individual achievement, however modest, if genuinely earned; and a repudiation of the cynicism that demands reverse discrimination and the panoply of falsehoods that supports it.

### **The Difference Diversity Makes**

The reason the first phase of the diversity movement failed to bring about genuine diversity is that it was built on the falsehoods of affirmative action, and the second phase will fail for the same reason. As long as the higher education system admits young people to colleges for which they are unqualified, instead of placing them in schools where they can honestly compete, the quasi-totalitarian diversity project will continue, providing employment for the diversity industry. And let’s not be naive. The fact that the purported aims of diversity education are not really achieved by the means employed does not mean that the diversity movement is failing in its goal to reconstruct the university experience from top to bottom—altering the content of study, eliminating stan-

dards, attempting to disguise differences in group achievement, and creating an uneasy, controlled climate in which honest intellectual discussion is all but impossible.

Far from achieving justice, however, or demonstrating compassion, those who support this kind of diversity and the racial preferences that create it are denying the very humanity of their minority beneficiaries because they are seeing them entirely in terms of their race. Shelby Steele has gone so far as to lament "the disappearance of the black individual," so all-encompassing has racial identity become for minorities today.<sup>28</sup>

Even more, supporters of diversity ideology and racial preferences are also denying the humanity of their supposed beneficiaries because they are expecting them to be what they are not. For an illustration, at a recent New York Association of Scholars (NYAS) meeting in New York City, the topic was whether remedial courses should be confined to the two-year community colleges in the city system, or be offered at the four-year city colleges as well, thus supposedly giving remedial students the true university experience that the four-year college represents. NYAS member Nahma Sandrow, who taught for many years at a city community college, observed that those who argued that only the four-year campuses could provide a true college experience were denigrating the work done at the community colleges by the many minority students who have gotten a helpful start at such institutions, and were also conveying to the two-year students that they were somehow being cheated.

Something similar could be said of Nathan Glazer's pronouncement that "we are all multiculturalists now" and therefore cannot abide a return to the time when few minorities were enrolled at elite colleges. In advancing this position, Glazer implicitly devalues the hard work being done by all sorts of students at lesser institutions, while also encouraging a sense of envy and entitlement in minorities, ensuring their dissatisfaction with what they might genuinely earn. And affirmative action does not only make minorities feel dissatisfied and uncomfortable with what is truly possible to them at present, but it also does the same thing to America as a whole, forcing us into a ceaseless, anxious, dishonest pursuit of racial utopia.

Oh yes, the few minorities admitted to or appointed by elite institutions gain all kinds of material and psychological advantages from their unearned boon, but are also corrupted in the process, and are often resentful and defensive about what they've been assured is due them.<sup>29</sup> Likewise, when an academic of the stature of Civil War historian James McPherson disparages his own genuine achievements as being the product of an "affirmative action" that favored the "white males" of his generation, he may be successful in relieving his own misplaced guilt feelings, but at the cost of destroying the moral fabric by which society lives.<sup>30</sup>

Another of the arguments the diversity authors put forth is the "economic argument," that a college degree has become increasingly necessary for suc-

cess in advanced technological society. If that is the case, then they should stop tearing down the educational structures which can help students at their respective levels of ability, stop making the genuine academic achievements of minorities seem inadequate, and stop devaluing liberal education itself, which has been the passport for so many young people of various backgrounds to the life of the mind and a greater understanding of the human condition.

## Notes

1. Sara Rimer, "Colleges Find Diversity Is Not Just Numbers," *New York Times*, 12 November 2002, A1, 25.
2. *To Form a More Perfect Union*, 17; the quotation in my first paragraph also comes from this monograph, 18.
3. The authors are Caryn McTighe Musil, Mildred Garcia, Cynthia A. Hudgins, Michael T. Nettles, William E. Sedlacek, and Daryl G. Smith.
4. *Assessing Campus Diversity Initiatives*, 33.
5. *To Form a More Perfect Union*, 21. Anyone relying on intermarriage and the increase in "multi-racial persons," as the authors call them, to undo the push for diversity ideology and preoccupation with group representation in the various walks of American life should take heed. These "persons" will simply become more fodder for the diversity mill.
6. *To Form a More Perfect Union*, 5.
7. *To Form a More Perfect Union*, vii.
8. *Diversity Digest*, Winter 2001, available online.
9. *To Form a More Perfect Union*, 17–18.
10. *To Form a More Perfect Union*, 9.
11. The misuse of data by Patricia Gurin in her 1998 expert witness report for the *Gratz v. Bollinger* suit claiming that diversity yields educational benefits, for example, was exposed in a study undertaken by the National Association of Scholars, not by fellow diversity researchers.
12. Jacques Barzun, "What Is a School," pamphlet published by the Hudson Institute (2002), 21–22.
13. *To Form a More Perfect Union*, 9.
14. *To Form a More Perfect Union*, 28. For further discussion on efforts to inject diversity into science and math courses, see Christine Clark, "Effective Multicultural Curriculum Transformation in 'Advanced' Mathematics and 'Hard' Sciences," *Diversity Digest* (Fall/Winter 2002), available online.
15. Jeffrey Rosen, "How I Learned to Love Quotas," *New York Times Magazine* (1 June 2003), 52–55.
16. *To Form a More Perfect Union*, 26–27.
17. By the way, this goes to the "moral argument" that the authors make for diversity measures in higher education as well, namely, that "historic inequalities have produced current inequalities" (*To Form a More Perfect Union*, 10). But inequalities among various groups can arise from multiple sources, and even if historic inequality is among them, it cannot be addressed or undone through diversity measures consisting of artificially achieved racial proportionality, education in grievance and guilt, and reverse discrimination against innocent young people.
18. *To Form a More Perfect Union*, 5.
19. *A Diversity Research Agenda*, 8–9.
20. *Assessing Campus Diversity Initiatives*, 23.
21. *Assessing Campus Diversity Initiatives*, 85.
22. *Assessing Campus Diversity Initiatives*, 22.
23. *Assessing Campus Diversity Initiatives*, 41–52.
24. *To Form a More Perfect Union*, 10.
25. Jodi Wilgoren, "Where Race Matters," *New York Times* (13 April 2003), Sec. 4a, 20–23. For

- further illustration of the tensions attendant on communication between the races on campuses today, as well as the defensive feeling affirmative action can arouse in its recipients, see Jonathan Kay, "The Scandal of Diversity," *Commentary* (June 2003), 41–45.
26. *Assessing Campus Diversity Initiatives*, 114–15.
  27. This would answer the author's "demographic argument" as well—that education must change because the student population is changing. On the contrary, all students are entitled to encounter the best in their college education.
  28. Shelby Steele, "The Age of White Guilt and the Disappearance of the Black Individual," *Harper's* (November 2002).
  29. For further discussion see my article, "Preferential Damage," *New York Press*, 27 February 2002, available online.
  30. Cited in Thomas Sowell, "Quota 'Logic,'" *townhall.com* (22 and 23 April 2003). Sowell analyzes and eviscerates McPherson's claims.

*for reasoned scholarship in a free society*

The National Association of Scholars (NAS) is an organization of professors, graduate students, college administrators, independent scholars, and trustees committed to rational discourse as the foundation of academic life in a free and democratic society. The NAS works to enrich the substance and strengthen the integrity of scholarship and teaching, persuaded that only through an informed understanding of the Western intellectual heritage and the realities of the contemporary world, can citizen and scholar be equipped to sustain our civilization's achievements. In light of these objectives, the NAS is deeply concerned about the widening currency within the academy of perspectives that reflexively denigrate the values and institutions of our society. Because such tendencies are often dogmatic in character, and indifferent to both logic and evidence, they also tend to undermine the basis for coherent scholarly dialogue. Recognizing the significance of this problem, the NAS encourages a renewed assertiveness among academics who value reason and an open intellectual life.