ARTICLES

Diversity and the Abolition of Learning

Carol Iannone

L ast January, when President Bush announced his administration's posi-
tion on the University of Michigan affirmative action cases that are now
before the Supreme Court, educational traditionalists greeted his words with
a mixture of praise and concern. The President had denounced overtly
race-conscious affirmative action remedies, such as those practiced in
Michigan's undergraduate division, namely, the automatic allotment of
20 points out of a possible 150 to black and Hispanic applicants for ad-
mission. At the same time, however, he had also endorsed the idea of "diver-
sity," i.e., racial and ethnic proportionality in the college population, an idea
that stands to do as much if not more harm in the long run than overt racial-
ist policies.

Bush specifically commended the percentage plans that are in effect in
the Florida and Texas state university systems as race-neutral means of attain-
ing diversity. Under these plans, a certain top percentage of students from
every high school in the state is guaranteed admission to a college in the
state system. In a superb article in *Academic Questions*, William Casement
examines the myriad problems in this approach.[1]

Even apart from the deficiencies of specific race-neutral plans for achiev-
ing "diversity," however, the larger question remains, what does mandating
group representation mean for a country built on individual rights? The
most amazing feature of the rapid ascendancy of the concept of "diversity" is
how little thought is being given to that question, even as the idea is trans-
forming our country before our very eyes.

Actually, Bush did signal his views on diversity during his campaign for the
presidency, but what he said inexplicably aroused little notice. Campaigning
in Miami on 25 August 2000, in a speech devoted to U.S.-Latin American
relations, Bush presented a view of America that one would never have
thought to hear from the lips of a U.S. presidential candidate, much less a
conservative Republican.

"We are now one of the largest Spanish-speaking nations in the world," W.
declared. "We're a major source of Latin music, journalism and culture. Just
go to Miami, or San Antonio, Los Angeles, Chicago or West New York, New

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

Jersey . . . and close your eyes and listen. You could just as easily be in Santo Domingo or Santiago, or San Miguel de Allende."

Bush thus described in positive tones a social development many see as a source of worry and contention in our body politic. Moreover, he even seemed to be foreclosing any further discussion of the matter. "For years our nation has debated this change," he continued, "some have praised it and others have resented it. By nominating me, my party has made a choice to welcome the new America." That is, in face of the large-scale immigration of recent decades and the consequent demographic transformation of America that it has brought about, George W. Bush seemed to affirm multiculturalism and "diversity" rather than assimilation and integration as the goals.[2]

The Invention of Diversity

One can only wonder how a conservative politician, and one who has proven so effective a leader in so many other respects, came to embrace "diversity" in this meaning. An invaluable new book by Peter W. Wood, *Diversity: The Invention of a Concept*, gives us some insight into the way in which this poison weed came to take such deep root in our society.[3]

Wood, an anthropologist by training, makes a crucial distinction between two definitions of diversity. Diversity as fact is descriptive of America's varied ethnic and racial mix. Diversity as ideology aims, in effect, at a complete restructuring of society, mandating proportional outcomes for every group in every area of the culture. The generally accepted and mainly innocuous idea of diversity in the first sense is used to push the noxious ideology of diversity in the second sense.

Diversity seemed to arrive almost by stealth, Wood suggests. Unheralded by "any great mind, any prestigious philosopher or social theorist, or any major book," it was probably sparked by its mention by Justice Lewis Powell in his idiosyncratic concurrence in the *Bakke* decision of 1978, when he alone of the majority stipulated that colleges could consider race as one factor among others for the purpose of admitting an ethnically diverse student body. It thereafter germinated in the academy and at length began to burgeon in the early 1990s. Before long, it had invaded "one area of American life after another," altering "the root cultural assumptions on which American society is based."

Only a few years earlier, Wood marvels, say around 1987, diversity

> was a novelty item for law reviews and ethnic studies programs. By 1993, it was a principle of such presumed transcendent clarity that none could even imagine an argument against it. Or at least those who did imagined quietly. "Inclusion" in the sense of group entitlements had become such an obviously good thing that no one ever paused to wonder what happened to the older ideal of integration.

All the more astonishing, Wood explains, is that while diversity is "gigantic in its ambition" to transform American society, it has absolutely no lawful mandate in any of our founding principles or their subsequent organic developments. Unlike equality and liberty, diversity "is not announced . . . in the Declaration of Independence. In fact, it is not discernible anywhere in the founding documents of the United States" and is "not even remotely implied."

In fact, in its focus on group outcomes, and designation of certain groups as entitled to privileges, diversity directly *contradicts* America's founding principles of liberty and equality, that is, individual constitutional rights and equal treatment of individuals under the law. As Wood puts it, diversity can be understood as a "counterconstitutional principle," an "attempt to reverse the founders' efforts to check the growth and power of factions in American society." As such, it "promises to free people from the pseudo-liberty of individualism and to restore to them the primacy of their group identities." For "diversicrats," equality is then redefined to mean "parity among groups, and to achieve it, social goods must be measured out in ethnic quotas, purveyed by group preferences, or otherwise filtered according to the will of social factions."

Even short of a complete overturn of our present constitutional order, the diversity movement "already has achieved a substantial record of increased social discord and cultural decline," observes Wood, who devotes chapters to discussing how diversity has infested various areas of American life, such as business, education, and the arts, everywhere lowering standards, fomenting group grievances, and fostering resentment against the country. Moreover, he writes, diversity in campus life "gave feminists, gay advocacy groups and individuals with various disabilities a new way of construing moral entitlement to preferential treatment" in the same way as groups defined by ethnicity and race, thus degrading liberal education even further.

Wood outlines the various ways in which diversity has permeated university life as its proponents saw how it "could be used to checkmate traditional ideas of fairness and liberty"—mandating quotas in admissions and faculty; promoting identity-focused courses and curricula; transforming whole fields of study through ideological bias; trimming or eliminating academic requirements, standards, and expectations; and becoming a factor even in school accreditation.

In fact, Wood dates the clarion call that signaled the beginning of the ascent of diversity in the academy and elsewhere to 1990, the year of the accreditation battles in which the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges attempted to enforce "diversity standards" as the price of renewing the accreditation of certain institutions.[4] Although Middle States and the Western Association eventually backed down from enforcing explicit litmus tests for accreditation, now "*sub rosa* versions of them are widespread," Wood reports.

Wood's book is sometimes a little broad in its use of distracting metaphors to convey his ideas, and he has included a number of digressions that do not seem important to his main thesis, such as what amounts to a cataloging of the various uses of the word "diversity" through the centuries. More damaging to the overall effectiveness of his book, he positively flummoxes an ordinary reader with a section arguing that race does not even exist. Does he seriously think that this strained quasi-scientific formulation is going to put paid to everyone's common sense experience of race? We will return to this point later.

But this book is so needed and welcome, and its presentation of what diversity really is and what it entails is so important that these shortcomings can be overlooked. There is now no excuse for our leaders to fail to recognize the truth. The rise of diversity is not an expansion of the promise of America, but the gradual death of what America uniquely is.

Diversity Initiatives

Wood's analysis of the concept of diversity and how it is being wielded today is, unfortunately, fully borne out and then some by a project of the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) that began in the early 1990s called "American Commitments: Diversity, Democracy and Liberal Learning."

The basic outline of ideals and goals of the American Commitments "initiative," as it is also called, and of the subsequent diversity initiatives that are ongoing under the auspices of the AAC&U, lies in three barely distinguishable reports of about forty pages each produced by the "National Panel," a group of some fifteen or so faculty and administrators from a variety of institutions and the AAC&U.[5] All published in 1995, the reports are: *The Drama of Diversity and Democracy: Higher Education and American Commitments; American Pluralism and the College Curriculum: Higher Education in a Diverse Democracy;* and *Liberal Learning and the Arts of Connection for the New Academy.*

These have been followed by a number of additional publications and reports, some longer, some shorter, amplifying various aspects of the diversity projects undertaken by the AAC&U. For example, a second collaborative effort, "Understanding the Difference Diversity Makes," produced a trio of monographs that address more practical issues in enforcing diversity on college campuses.[6] Yet another trio of publications, the "Diversity Works Package," offers information on incorporating diversity into the curriculum and evidence of its effectiveness.[7]

Funded mainly by the Ford Foundation, with some aid from the National Endowment for the Humanities, and with additional support for specific projects from corporate and philanthropic sources such as the Philip Morris Companies and the Lilly Endowment, the diversity initiative involves hundreds of participating institutions, including Ivy League universities such as

Princeton; small liberal arts colleges such as Skidmore; and branches of large state systems such as those in California, New York, and Maryland. Maryland's College Park campus served as a model for the diversity initiative and is the subject of an entire separate publication.[8] The AAC&U and the University of Maryland also collaborated in creating a website, Diversity Web, which produces material on the curriculum, institutional leadership, student development, and other issues. In addition, the website features *Diversity Digest*, a quarterly newsletter, and *Diversity Connections*, a directory of campus diversity projects. The AAC&U also hosts regular conferences, institutes, workshops, and seminars on diversity and learning. If we want to know how diversity came to be "the most powerful ideology on college campuses today," as Peter Wood calls it, we need look no further.

The three original reports form the real heart and soul of the project and are vital to understanding not only what diversity portends in the academy but also in the society at large. Perusing these reports, one concludes that diversity, in the fullest meaning intended by its proponents, must necessarily entail the abolition of liberal education in any sense and of liberal democracy as well.

The reports are written in vague, repetitious generalities, full of unsupported assertions, unexamined assumptions, and undefined terms. Quotation can scarcely render the cumulatively bloated pretentiousness of the prose, and yet I must apologize to the reader for the extensive quotations that follow, for there is no other way in which I can convey some sense of the combination of threadbare thinking and presumptive certainty in the writing, what Peter Wood might call "prideful ignorance." Justice, injustice, equality, inequality, fairness, unfairness, inclusion, exclusion, democracy, discrimination, prejudice and other broad ideas are all liberally and repeatedly invoked, though inadequately defined, qualified, and contextualized, even while huge claims are made and large mandates ordered in their name.

"The new academy . . . is influencing virtually all disciplines now," we are told, "as many work to comprehend the differing sources and meanings of our diversities and to undo old injustices that, built into assumptions from earlier times, still skew efforts to think well about humankind and our relations to each other and to the earth we share.[9] The "situation in which we find ourselves today provides opportunities to think better than we have about our individual and cultural differences in relation to those created by unjust, untruthful human systems."[10] Contemporary scholarship in diversity is "pioneering ways of thinking, learning, and teaching," as well as contributing "in stunning ways to the expansion and reconfiguration of knowledge."[11] And, to some, the authors opine, "all these changes confirm the view that a new 'shape of life' is emerging, that may be more authentically democratic as it is released from old errors of ignorance and prejudice."[12]

While acknowledging the opposition they face from conservatives and traditionalists, the authors scarcely engage with it, and their handling of con-

trary views is almost entirely tendentious. For example, recognizing that some see an ominous fragmentation in the directions the academy is taking, the authors respond with personal pique and blanket condemnation:

> We have no desire to return to the kind of unity once found in curricula of schools that excluded most of us, not on the basis of our ability, or our historical and cultural significance to humankind or to this country, but solely and cruelly and ignorantly because of preconstituted (pre-judicial) categories that marked some kinds of us as inferior, not worthy of inclusion.[13]

While the specific meaning of important terms is left unclear or deployed with a broad brush, the reports are also full of squishy rhetoric about "nourish[ing] different voices," creating "intelligent and caring citizens," "building human capacities for associated living," and such pseudo-compassionate grandiosities as "making our campuses" places where "all participants are equally welcome, equally valued, and equally heard,"[14] as well as "mak[ing] a world in which everyone is heard and everyone counts."[15]

As is typical of diversiphiles, the definitions of diversity that the authors do supply do not fully comprehend the ways in which they generally deploy the term. They do assert that diversity "is not only the recognition of differences, but the recognition of those differences as rooted in power relationships which themselves are often opaque,"[16] and even more pointedly that diversity is "a complex set of efforts to uproot the sources and legacies of a long history of societal hierarchy and educational apartheid."[17]

But less explicit although quite clear from the context of the discussion is what the authors really mean by diversity, that is, group parity in all areas of the culture, and certainly in higher education. In her Foreword to *American Pluralism and the College Curriculum*, Carol Schneider, ex-officio Executive Vice President of the AAC&U and Director of the American Commitments Initiative, notes that the college-attending percentage of blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians, as well as smaller Asian groups such as Hmong, Laotian, and Cambodian, does not match their proportion of the population. Schneider mentions the fact that Indians, Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, and Koreans have *greater* than average percentages of participation in higher education, but does not register its significance since to do so would necessarily indicate that the system is not so exclusionary or discriminatory after all.

Instead, Schneider notes that even when members of the underrepresented groups do attend college, they are disproportionately attending community colleges and disproportionately failing to graduate. In their repetitious reference to persistent inequality, unfulfilled promises, America's tragic failures—resentfully dwelt on at length throughout the reports—what the authors mean is just this: the unequal achievements of various groups in the variegated areas of American life. And when they call for America to live up to its ideals, complete its unfinished tasks, fulfill the promise

of democracy, they mean to make every group equal in status and achievement in all areas according to its proportion of the population.

This is a key point. The authors hold America lacking in a promise America never made and could never fulfill without massive social engineering that would signal its demise as a free country. The American promise of equality signifies political and civic equality in the sense of constitutional rights and representational government, but not proportional group entitlement. The American Commitments model is actually closer to the "tribal pressure groups" of post-colonial Africa, as denounced in a speech by the main character to a gathering of university students in Chinua Achebe's novel, *Anthills of the Savannah*.[18]

The American Commitments authors emphasize that current debates about diversity are only "the latest . . . chapter in this country's ongoing negotiations over the meaning, application and inclusiveness of its democratic principles,"[19] and insist that America has had to "renegotiate" the terms of inclusion before. True enough, but never by means of racial and ethnic parity.

In one of their efforts to confront objections to their positions, the authors acknowledge that "the principle of individual rights," if "[a]bsolutized and lifted out of all temporal contexts," "may seem utterly incompatible with rights of groups." But they hasten to circumvent such "unproductive oppositions" by assuring us that "the relative weights of individuality, communality, and ascribed social groupings do not remain fixed over time. Sometimes one, sometimes another is more central or more marginal to a particular situation. We need to take particular situations into account to help us discern when justice is best served by stressing individuality or group concerns."[20]

In other words, leave the question of individual versus group rights flexible enough so that it can be decided by the diversiphiles, or, as Peter Wood would put it, "filtered according to the will of social factions."

The whole apparatus of the authors' position rests on the assumption that all groups, though of course diverse, are also the same, equal in ability and inclination and temperament and skill in every area to every other group, and therefore any differences in outcomes must be due to injustice, systemic discrimination, deeply rooted power hierarchies, and so on. The authors show absolutely no awareness of the decades of work by Thomas Sowell, illustrating the ways in which groups develop specific cultural skills and abilities, nurtured over long experience, which can lead them to achievement in diverse fields of endeavor.

Moreover, a large body of evidence documents significant differences among groups in academic achievement. Whether or not such differences are "intrinsic," as the authors put it, is irrelevant to the fact that at present we do not know how immediately to eliminate them, and we certainly will not overcome them by pretending they do not exist or by lowering, eliminating, or changing standards. Furthermore, more recently, scholars John McWhorter

and John Ogbu have delineated the problem of a self-defeating culture of anti-intellectualism and non-achievement among many black students, even among those from affluent middle class backgrounds; this is certainly an area that can be improved through targeted efforts.

At this point, the diversity authors meet up with Peter Wood, since both argue that race as a physical fact is imaginary, although with the crucial difference that for Wood, the upshot is that we should therefore cease to focus on it, whereas for the authors, race continues to matter as a social construct if not as a biological reality. Both seem to feel, however, that the entire democratic project would be discredited if different groups take different roads to achievement in the broad avenues of American life. But as Sowell declared with bracing frankness recently in his syndicated column, "The cold fact is that there was never any reason in the first place to expect all groups to have the same interest or the same performance, whether in education or anywhere else."[21]

Thus when the American Commitments authors pose one of their many presumptuous questions meant to provoke chagrin if not shame, such as, "For what kind of democracy is human plurality a problem?" we can answer readily, a plurality that demands that society should mandate proportional outcomes by group in every area of endeavor, since this stands to diminish the liberty and equality of us all. Or a pluralism that demands a redefinition of freedom, not as a state of being "unencumbered," but as the "capacity to envision and to create forms of society that respect one another's integrity and needs, including the needs for recognition, reciprocity, and dignity for each of the particular communities that define American's most immediate realities"—in other words, as ideological diversity.[22]

The Death of Liberal Learning

What specifically happens to education when diversity seizes the curriculum? Here the other definitions of diversity come into play as well: the study of differences, the recognition of power relationships, the uprooting of hierarchies all aimed not toward understanding but toward arousing guilt and grievance. The authors disdain all the traditional forms of liberal education, such as the Greco-Roman, Euro-American, Western Civilization, and Human Heritage models, but happily note that these have all been contested, complicated, and undermined by the newer ideologies. For their part, they profess themselves "increasingly uncomfortable with the individualistic assumptions that permeate public discussion of higher education." Instead, they insist, higher education must "address the communal dimensions and consequences of higher learning,"[23] "open spaces for more relational thinking,"[24] and to prepare students "for effective citizenship in a diverse democracy," code expressions for their political agenda![25]

To this end they outline four kinds of courses and experiences, once again rendered in their inimitably clumsy, pompous prose, which amount to

a program in navel-gazing, amateur social work, anti-American propaganda, and the cultivation of resentment:

1. Experience, Identity, and Aspiration: The study of one's own particular inherited and constructed traditions, identity communities, and significant questions, in their complexity.

Suggested writings in this area include "ethnic autobiography" and "family narrative." The rest of the items speak for themselves:

2. United States Pluralism and the Pursuits of Justice: An extended and comparative exploration of diverse peoples in this society, with significant attention to their differing experiences of United States democracy and the pursuits—sometimes successful, sometimes frustrated—of equal opportunity.
3. Experiences in Justice Seeking: Encounters with systemic constraints on the development of human potential in the United States and experiences in community-based efforts to articulate principles of justice, expand opportunity, and redress inequities.
4. Multiplicity and Relational Pluralism in Majors, Concentrations, and Programs: Extensive participation in forms of learning that foster sustained exploration and deliberation about contested issues important in particular communities of inquiry and practice.

To cap it off, the authors insist "that students must learn, *in every part of their educational experience*, to live creatively with the multiplicity, ambiguity, and irreducible differences that are the defining conditions of the contemporary world" (emphasis added).[26]

The old idea of liberal learning is totally upended by this new directed project of controlled thinking, which is obviously not meant to free us for vigorous intellectual discovery but to chain us to a crushing tedium of both endless ambiguities and prefabricated conclusions. This becomes even clearer when the authors describe their "ideal graduates" in the following citation, in which the stifling mechanisms meant to govern the "dialogue" deemed so central to diversity learning are on full display. Again, we must see this at length in order fully to take it in:

> Envision a group of Americans, different in background and economic resources. They are vigorously debating a contentious social issue, perhaps the justice of limiting welfare support to three years as a lifetime maximum. Each is listening carefully, without interrupting, to what the other is saying. Each is able to explain why other members of the group see the issues as they do. Each can describe how different histories and affiliations have shaped participants' different understandings. Each spends a great deal of time considering the effects of particular policies on different cases: the hardworking legal immigrant parent whose efforts to be self-sufficient are hindered by a poor labor market and employment preference for United States citizens; the drug addict who is not really available to work; the teenage mother with a sickly child. No one attacks the motives, intelligence, or worth of anyone else in the

conversation. No one applies a principle without considering its implications. Several people in the group have had family experiences or field studies that involved them in welfare issues; they bring a base of experience to the discussion.

By the time the discussion ends, every participant in the dialogue has recast at last part of his or her original position in light of insights and opposing views offered in the conversation. The group has decided on the points where agreement has to be reached and spent most of the time on those points. They have also acknowledged issues where continued disagreement must be accepted.[27]

How specious to suggest that this exercise in programmed political correctness represents a "vigorous debate." Any sense of true, sincere discussion, aiming for the best or at least the better understanding, any sense of the fearless and bracing pursuit of truth, any play of the intellect with unexpected ideas, is necessarily banished if no one can apply a principle without considering all its implications, and no one can exercise judgment, discrimination, or even initiative. This then is the goal of diversity education: preparation for the technocratic monotony of intellectual compromise and managerial bureaucratic emptiness, for a world of hollow men and women who must cluster together around contemporary cliches because they have never learned to think for themselves.

Alas, diversity is far advanced. But perhaps it is not too late. Through continued exposure of the sheer spiritual ugliness of this project, we may gradually rouse the opposition, those who will wish to stand up for a return to genuine education and the cultivation of the individual human soul.

Notes

1. William Casement, "Percentage Plans and College Admissions," *Academic Questions* (Fall 2001).
2. The speech, titled "Century of the Americas," is available at the website of the Council on Foreign Relations.
3. Peter W. Wood, *Diversity: The Invention of a Concept* (Encounter Books, 2003).
4. See, for example, William R. Beer, "Accreditation by Quota," *Academic Questions* (Fall 1990); and "God, Man, and Middle States," an interview with Samuel T. Logan, president of Westminster Theological Seminary, *Academic Questions* (Fall 1991).
5. Suzanne Benally, Alfred H. Bloom, Johnella Butler, Carlos Cortés, Bonnie Thonton Dill, Troy Duster, Ramón Gutiérrez, Patrick J. Hill, Harry H. Kitano, Lee Knefelkamp, Elizabeth K. Minnich, Caryn McTighe Musil, Gayle Pemberton, Carol Schneider, Uri Treisman, Frank Wong.
6. These three monographs all list the same authors—Caryn McTighe Musil, Mildred Garcia, Cynthia A. Hudgins, Michael T. Nettles, William E. Sedlacek, and Daryl G. Smith—and are titled (1) *To Form a More Perfect Union: Campus Diversity Initiatives* (1999), which "reviews the lessons learned by educators at hundreds of colleges and universities as they have worked to promote campus diversity and to weave it into the very definition of education excellence"; (2) *Assessing Campus Diversity Initiatives* (2001), which "offers practical guidance for those involved in assessing diversity projects"; and (3) *A Diversity Research Agenda* (2000), which is meant to complement the other two and "attempts to outline areas of research that are still needed and that will be critically important in helping shape the work that lies ahead."
7. *Diversity Works: The Emerging Picture of How Students Benefit* (1997), by Daryl G. Smith; *Diversity in Higher Education: A Work in Progress,* by Caryn McTighe Musil with Mildred Garcia, Yolanda T. Moses, and Daryl G. Smith (1995); *Achieving Faculty Diversity: Debunking*

the Myths, by Daryl G. Smith with Lisa E. Wolf and Bonnie E. Busenberg (1996). Yet another publication on achieving faculty diversity is *Diversifying the Faculty: A Guidebook for Search Committees*, by Caroline Sotello Viernes Turner (2002).

8. Lists of participating institutions can be found in the publication titled *To Form a More Perfect Union: Campus Diversity Initiatives* (1999). The publication concerning the University of Maryland at College Park is *Diversity Blueprint: A Planning Manual for Colleges and Universities* (1998).
9. *Liberal Learning*, 3.
10. *Liberal Learning*, 11.
11. *Liberal Learning*, vii.
12. *Liberal Learning*, 8.
13. *Liberal Learning*, 9.
14. *Drama of Diversity*, 36 and *Liberal Learning*, xiv.
15. *Liberal Learning*, viii.
16. *Drama of Diversity*, 24.
17. *Drama of Diversity*, xii.
18. "Do you not form tribal pressure groups to secure lower admission requirements instead of striving to equal or excel any student from anywhere? Yes, you prefer academic tariff walls behind which you can potter around in mediocrity." (New York: Anchor Book, Doubleday, 1987), 148.
19. *Drama of Diversity*, xiv.
20. *Liberal Learning*, 23–24.
21. Thomas Sowell, "School Disasters," *New York Post*, 1 March 2003, 17.
22. On a related matter, the American Commitments authors do make one good point, that the kind of liberal universalism that defines the human person as an isolated rights-bearing atom is insufficient, that we arise from and are nourished by particular cultural contexts. Through the decades, the meaning of America has been universalized to such an extent that it no longer satisfies the thirst for specific cultural meaning in the human soul, and thereby helps produce a backlash in multiculturalism. Although this topic is too large to address here, the answer generally lies not in the fragmentation into the the pseudo-cultures of diversity ideology but in the redefinition of America as a particularity and her citizens as a people.
23. *American Pluralism*, xiii.
24. *Liberal Learning*, xiii.
25. *American Pluralism*, 23–24.
26. *American Pluralism*, xxi–xxii.
27. *American Pluralism*, 41.

The American Musicological Society announced the Philip Brett Award with this email flier in early 2003.

The Philip Brett Award, sponsored by the Gay and Lesbian Study Group of the AMS, each year honors exceptional musicological work in the field of transgender/transexual, bisexual, lesbian, gay studies completed during the previous two academic years (ending June 30), in any country and in any language.