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How to Cope with Cultural Diversity: 
What is the U.S. Debate on Political Correctness Really About?

Currently Political Correctness (PC) is one of the overused terms in the U.S. media and in public discourse in general. Advocates of liberal, Left, and minority issues complain bitterly that the term is used derogatorily to describe their attempts to make American society more pluralistic or to question societal taboos, belief-systems, and stereotypes. In fact, the debate on political correctness has been described as a cultural war (Gates 1992; Graff 1992), a struggle about how to redistribute power, knowledge, and resources in this country (Bonevac 1993, p. 15; Martin 1991, p. 208; Perry 1992, p. 77; Siegel 1992), a symbolic conflict about multiculturalism and egalitarianism (D'Souza 1991, p. 39; Fox-Genovese 1991; Siegel 1992, p. 218; Kimball 1990, p. 63 f; Schlesinger 1991; Siegel 1992; West 1991), a redefinition of American identity and values (Fox-Genovese 1991, p. 48; Lipset 1991; Nixon quoted by Rosenthal 1994; Schlesinger 1993), a crisis of legitimacy and hegemony (Schlesinger 1991, West 1991), a moral crusade of neo-Puritanism with religious underpinnings (Lipset 1995, p. 71 ff), a segregationist movement leading to Balkanization (Podhoretz, cited in: Kimball 1990, p. 60 ff; Schlesinger 1991), an ethnocentric movement (D'Souza 1991), and a job program for tenured radicals (Kimball 1990).

If an issue receives attention such as this, it can hardly be considered an isolated academic or intellectual fad that will disappear as fast as it has been brought up. In fact, an examination of the etymology of the term and the topics it includes reveals that PC has been in the U.S. a long time and isn’t likely to disappear soon.

The Background of the Debate

Etymology of the Term Political Correctness

According to Perry (1992) the term PC originated in Maoist and Stalinist literature. It came into use in the counterculture of the sixties as an ironic, self-critical statement among Leftists, Blacks, and feminists who were “guilt-tripping” or being “guilt-tripped” about their commitment to their beliefs (Perry 1992, p. 73). If they did something that was not consistent with their professed political beliefs, that would be called, either by themselves or by another member of their in-group, “not politically correct.”

Toni Cade, an African American author who edited a book entitled The Black Woman may have made the first textual reference to PC. It was in a line that read, “A man cannot be politically correct and a chauvinist, too” (Perry 1992, p. 73). In this context it meant a man cannot believe in equality for black people and not for women, too. It reveals an inconsistency in his beliefs.

The term PC continues to be used as a term of personal derision by Left-leaning liberals. People might say, “I want to do X or say Y, but that wouldn’t be politically correct.” In this way the users indicate their awareness of something counter to their political values in their behavior and attitude, or they might legitimate an action or inaction, or give it an ironic, playful and skeptical twist against dogmatism and distrust against all sorts of party lines. In other words it was used with a “self-mocking ... double consciousness” (Perry 1992, p. 77) that the current adoption of the term by the Right is missing.

By conservatives the term is used privately to show disdain for a public taboo when acting against it. It is also used as an excuse or opportunity to use anti- or non-PC language by saying they know that it’s not politically correct, then saying it anyway.
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More recently, PC has been transformed in the media and the general public into an ideological weapon to attack perspectives and programs that are associated with a Left political agenda. Isserman characterizes this as an usurpation of the term by Right enemies of Left and liberal politics: "The irony is that the Left's own in-joke has been appropriated by the Right to bludgeon the Left ..." (Isserman 1991, Footnote p. 83). Its derogatory use is "now forestalling discussion of everything it ever stood for," Perry concludes (1992, p. 78).

Definitions

Current definitions of the term PC reflect changes that have occurred in the use of the term in academia, in politics, and in the media. The multitude of interpretations also reflect a polarization between opponents and supporters of PC.

Supporters, for example, define it as follows: "PC consists of theories and practices that are designed to end injustices based on sex, race, class, and other social variables" (Choi and Murphy 1992, p. 2). Stanley Fish, a professor of law and literature at Duke University who has come under personal attack by PC opponents, defines PC with a tone of mockery: "Political correctness is supposedly the property of Left-leaning academics who have conspired to subvert standards by imposing ideological requirements on the content of courses and by penalizing those who prefer to teach traditional materials by traditional methods" (Fish 1994, p. 99).

From the neo-conservative perspective, Lipsitz claims: "The term refers to the efforts by campus advocates of Left-liberal politics to control the content of speech, courses, and appointments, and to impose their views with respect to multiculturalism, minority rights, and feminism." (Lipsitz 1993, p. 71). Note the negative terms in the last definition: control and impose.

This more derogatory definition comes closest to the current public usage of the term PC. Taylor (1999) reflects such convictions in the popular New Yorker magazine when he states that those who are politically correct are united by "their conviction that Western culture and American society are thoroughly and hopelessly racist, sexist, oppressive" (p. 33).

But the debate has become broader and more complex than these definitions suggest. The term PC is used to reflect a multitude of positive, ambivalent, or negative, emotionally-loaded meanings. As in, more sympathetic to the liberal notion of PC and a professor at UCLA Graduate School of Education, contends that "PC is a kind of Christmas tree [on which] the Right has chosen to hang ... all the things it doesn't like about higher education today - affirmative action, special admissions, changes in the curriculum" (quoting from Daniels 1991, p. 8). Likewise, Daniels (1991) writes in his article "Diversity, Correctness, and Campus Life - A Closer Look" that "political correctness ... serves as a rhetorical shorthand for ... dissatisfaction with higher education, as well as for the entire debate about diversity and multiculturalism" (p. 8). In fact, such distinguished PC critics as Bloom (1987) find a relationship between PC and almost every aspect of the current Zeitgeist, supposedly responsible for the decomposition of the American society, such as rock-music and narcissistic relationships, sexual liberation, television, and what Bloom (1987) describes vividly as cowardly opportunism of politicians, administrators, and teachers.

Because of the current ideologically-loaded usage of the term PC and the lack of a consensus on how to define it as a word and a policy, any attempt to shed light on this issue runs into difficulties, for even an analysis that does not wish to take sides must be based on a definition. Therefore, we will use the term PC in its current public denotation accepted by supporters and foes - a symbol for programs, initiatives, and attitudes ostensibly designed to improve the public representation of certain social groups, in particular minorities and women - but we do not subscribe to the negative connotations currently attached to the term.

Academic Roots of the Concept of Political Correctness

Although the emergence of PC has to be seen in a wider context of political, sociological, and historical changes, it was nourished originally and has flourished in the academy. Therefore some observers tend to describe it as a purely academic phenomenon located in certain departments in the Humanities, literary criticism and in a few English departments. Here it is identified particularly with Franco-German postmodern theories, i.e. decon-
structionism, poststructuralism, the Frankfurter Schule, and neo-Marxism.

However, the main critics of PC like Bloom (1987), D'Souza (1990), Kimball (1990), and Schlesinger (1993) have tried to trace the sources farther back to Marx, Freud, Nietzsche and Heidegger, in what particularly Bloom and Kimball have called the »German connection« (Bloom 1987, p. 142 ff, 315 ff), implicitly accusing PC and its proponents of imported un-American relativism, nihilism, and sophism, which promote a new age of irrationality.

Not every critic of PC subscribes to the notion of such a broad definition of the theoretical and institutional roots of PC and in particular the assumption of a dangerous and powerful academic «anti-Western, anti-capitalist» (D'Souza 1993, p. 13) and neo-Marxist radicalism. Douglas (1992) and Lipsitz (1993), for example, point out that PC flourishes in the academy because the »tenured radicals« in fact are isolated from society or evade engagement in the real world and accordingly compensate for this impotence and political irrelevance with rhetorical radicalism that attacks American values.

This view of a powerless left is supported by others, like Epstein (1992) and Searle (1993), who stress the internal fragmentation, diversity, and disparity of what has remained of the Left. Ehrenreich (1992a) denies the existence of any significant and coherent movement behind PC. In my four years as a student at Harvard, I found few signs of a new fascism of the Left. For that matter, there are few signs of the Left at all. (1992b, p. 133).

According to some, what makes PC dangerous is not the Left per se, but that the liberal majority... manifestly surrendered to the pressures of vocal opinion» (Weisberg 1992, p. 83, quoted from Academic Questions, edited by the conservative National Association of Scholars).

Although PC proponents draw a picture of powerlessness similar to that of Lipset and Douglas (Berube 1992), they do not subscribe to the opinion that PC is the result of sectarian radicalism. Rather they point to societal forces and developments that made PC supporters the vanguard of a social movement and a spearhead in a world of academic conformity and opportunism.

Moreover, the recognition of non-American theoretical traditions and the participation in international intellectual debates indicates the opposite of what Bloom calls The Closing Of The American Mind (1987). The fact that American academics and the public are open to debating new ideas and sometimes disturbing ideas indicates more than curiosity, a bow to intellectual fashions, or the import of dangerous and un-American ideologies; more accurately it suggests a strength – a desire for inquiry into a changing world.

The fact that hard-to-understand philosophical and esoteric literary discussions have become so successful in what is considered by some only a materialist «consumer society» may indicate a desire or a need to shed old ways of reflection and self-identification beyond the interests of a few academic circles, thereby reflecting a changing society. But the conservative critics may be correct to suspect that this vital American intellectual and political search for new self-understanding and theoretical explanations may, in fact, indicate a diminishing belief in the superiority of the traditional, white-dominated, American way of life and its intrinsic values and myths of an untarnished and glorious past.

Theories of postmodernism, poststructuralism, and neo-Marxism represent theoretically what multiculturalism, affirmative action, feminism, and other PC-related topics represent on the policy level. Both are supportive of the advancement of minorities and women and criticize the traditional values, norms, and rituals of American society ranging from the world of art and architecture to education, sports, and politics. In other words: the intellectual debates surrounding PC have become an intellectual and moral tool to legitimate, reflect, and negotiate the redistribution of societal resources – material, cultural, linguistic, and normative – and further, to reinterpret the past, present and future.

These theories, however, are difficult for the public to comprehend or for the mass media to explain in a sound bite. It is much easier to resort to emotional appeals and name calling (e.g., «radical», «Marxist») than to present how these theories might explain our past and help to plan the future (Gamson and Modigliani 1987; Losey and Kurthen 1994). But attempts to apply postmodern or poststructuralist criticism is often hampered by the arcane and convoluted language that seems more intended to intimidate the uninformed than to enlighten the masses.

Multiculturalism
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Topics Covered by Political Correctness

As mentioned above, a multitude of topics fall under the heading PC. Friends and foes of PC agree that the most common are the controversy about multicultural curricula, conflicts of free speech in relation to ethnicity and gender-based behavior and attitudes, and affirmative action.

Multiculturalism

«Multiculturalism» is a term used to describe efforts to include non-white cultural issues in the white-dominated American culture, to increase the representation of minorities and of women in politics and public affairs, and to raise public awareness of the achievements of formerly oppressed groups.

In its original form, multiculturalism was a tool to deal with violence and hate speech on college campuses. It included, for example, creating awareness through requiring ethnic studies classes; training students and faculty in cross-cultural communication; empowering targets of violence; and fostering social and cultural interaction between whites and minorities. Methods ranged from quota-based admission policies to public forums and festivals.

Furthermore, multiculturalism made it academically respectable to systematically study and spread knowledge about traditionally oppressed groups, their cultures, ideas, icons, and values, inside and outside of academia and to include these formerly excluded, silenced, or hidden «other» perspectives into curricula, teaching and research. According to Hughes (1999) the academic Left embraced multiculturalism in the 1970s and 1980s as a compensation for their lost belief in the transformation of society through class-struggle and a reform of the socio-economic system of capitalism. Now «the academic Left is much more interested in race and gender than in class. And it is very much more interested in theorizing about gender and race than actually reporting on them» (p. 76).

At the same time the rediscovery of cultural heritage by minority groups, the memory of what was forgotten and oppressed, resulted in a new interest in non-mainstream groups, ideas, interests, and values. Discovering suppressed, distorted or ignored cultural roots, heritage, and ethnic affiliations became a legitimate and even laudable means of emancipation and of expressing self-interest that would help counteract, it was hoped, the shortcomings and neglect of the system.

In the 1960s what started as a protest culture ended as multiculturalist initiatives that have been, to some extent, successful in the following decades in addressing the tradition of racism, ethnocentrism, discrimination, and ignorance. For example, the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) found that the desire for segregated schools and neighborhoods and for laws prohibiting interracial marriage has decreased while the general attitude towards minorities has improved. One reason for an opening of the American society was the fact that formerly suppressed groups went public and presented their distinctive perspectives and histories.

Radical minority factions however used multiculturalism as a counter-ideology that put ethno-racial and cultural identity before unity. This was highly subversive to the ideals of E pluribus unum of the founding fathers of the United States and helped cause a conservative backlash.

Conservatives like Norman Podhoretz (see Kimball 1990, p. 60 ff.) and liberal traditionalists like Schlesinger (1999) concentrate on the danger of radical versions of multiculturalism, i.e. separatism and segregationism and declare it a PC issue (Elfin and Burke 1999). They fear multiculturalism will destroy the American fabric – its supposed «common» icons, core values, and moral standards. To dramatize their view the conservatives have repeatedly drawn the picture of racial tensions, the «Balkanization» of American society and the suicidal behavior of American liberalism (D’Souza 1992, p. 21). By accepting multiculturalism America would be tolerant enough to give its enemies a platform to spread a supposedly poisonous, dangerous, and divisive ideology. Conservatives insist that separatism is the inevitable result of multiculturalism. They deny the claim of multiculturalists that multiculturalism favors exchange and co-existence of cultures, not their separation.

Therefore, against multiculturalism, conservatives and traditionalists increasingly distinguish between a «multiracial» and a «multicultural» society, the latter of which they see as a threat to the need to have a nationally accepted set of values. They ask, how could new immigrants in the future be inte-
grated if no common standards exist to which they should adhere. According to Bloom (1897), the society has to prevent the production of permanent outsiders and, instead, turn immigrants into Americans. But he gives no answer to the question of whether a nation based on Western values alone will be able to integrate the increasing cultural diversity.

The Challenge to the "Canon"

Another strand of the multiculturalism debate is about keeping the traditional curriculum or "canon." PC supporters have been accused by neo-PC conservatives like Douglas (1992), neo-conservatives like Kimball (1990), and liberal traditionalists like Schlesinger (1992) of replacing the old established canon with a multiculturalist, essentially un-American and divisive one.

Critics are particularly furious about certain claims by PC supporters about the traditional canon, such as their denunciation of classical humanist Western thought as "Eurocentric" (Siegel 1992, p. 218 ff; Herrnstein Smith 1992, p. 9 ff; Asante 1992, p. 229; Stansell 1991, p. 53 ff) or - more pronounced - as the work of "dead white males".

However, many of these oft-repeated and emotional accusations are controversial among PC supporters themselves. For example, the "dead white male" indictment has rarely been brought forward as a serious argument (Stansell 1991, p. 54).

Asante (1992), an outspoken critic of "Eurocentric hegemonism" and the "myth of the mainstream" rejects the attack directed particularly at the concept of Afrocentrism. In his words the question is not replacement or downgrading of Western culture but infusion of such concepts into the curricula.

The fundamental objective is not directed at identity politics or raising self-esteem but to provide accurate information. A secondary effect of accuracy and truth might be the adjustment of attitudes by both black and white students. ... Afrocentrism does not seek an ethnocentric curriculum" (p. 307).

In other words: Asante does not question a common American society but believes in cultural pluralism without hierarchy. However, he does not explain how such a balanced and equal pluralism should be created and sustained.

Observers like Searle (1992, pp. 103 ff.) have noted that the furious outcry over the content of a few introductory courses in some Ivy League schools, the outpourings of a few marginalized scholars in literary criticism, and what he calls the follies of some orthodox and repressive feminist or Afro-American radicals is ironic. Rather, students and parents should be concerned about the general state of undergraduate education, particularly in the Humanities, the cultural illiteracy, "know-nothing moods" (Gitlin 1992, p. 187) and "anti-intellectualism" (Ehrenreich 1992a, p. 350) of the student body, the ambiguous objectives of teaching and research, and the bureaucratization and formalization of American higher education.

Besides the canon new, critical theories in the humanities have become the target of attacks as well. Some conservative opponents reject the post-modern and post-structuralist view that truth and knowledge are relative because they are historically and socially determined. As in the canon debate, they suspect that such views undermine educational efforts and create nihilism, cynicism, shallow intellectualism and lead finally to - as they see - undue politicization of education (Bloom 1897). Supporters of an expansive versus an exclusive canon have rejected the notion of an unpolitical and "ossified" canon as cultural nostalgia because "the canon is not a fortress but a permeable membrane" (Hughes 1993, p. 109).

The fact that allegations of narrow-mindedness and cultural intolerance are used on both sides illustrate the emotions PC issues can elicit. The mainstream media and popular magazines such as Newsweek and New York have reported and editorialized on these aspects of the PC debate by poking fun at PC speech, depicting supporters of change as sectarians, segregationists, status victims and oppressors of free speech, as in the case of the curriculum "revolutions" at Stanford or the University of Texas at Austin. For example, syndicated columnist George Will (1992b) in his editorial "Radical English" claims that professors bring into the classroom the issues of race and gender because "campuses have become refuges for radicals who want universities to be as thoroughly politicized as they are" (p. 282). Another columnist John Leo (1994) displays popular anti-intellectualism when he maintains that the new academic theories such as deconstruction are "all intellectual junk" (p. A8).

PC supporters respond more defensively. The "Teachers For A Democratic Culture" (1992) blame the media, powerfully National Associcative conservaties for deliberate strategy of silencing very concepts of race being subverted agenda ... [that] not as legitimate agreement is possible between civilization.
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n some Ivy League schools, as marginalized scholars in that faculty call the foci of oppressive feminist or Afro-centric critiques, and students and faculty about the general state of the university, particularly in the illiteracy, "know-nothingness," and "anti-intellectualism" of the student body, the teaching and research, and formalization of American history, critical theories in the be target of attacks as well. Tents reject the post-modernist view that truth and cause they are historically constructed. In the canon debate, an undermining educational perspective, cynicism, shallow interest, as - as they see - nationalism (Bloom 1987). Superficial and an exclusive canon of an unpolitical and utopian nostalgia, because the "unpermeable membrane" as a narrow-mindedness is used on both sides of the issues can elicit. The popular magazines such as reported and editorialize the debate by poking fun at the image of change as secular victims and oppression, the case of the curriculum or the University example, syndicated columns in his editorials, "Radical" versus "conservative" being into the class gender because "men for radicals who want highly politicized as they insist John Leo (1994) shows, his discussion when he maintains the criterion of an ethnic group is that the "destandardization of the Culture," (1992) blames the media, powerful interest groups, such as the National Association of Scholars (NAS), and conservatives for deliberate misrepresentations and the strategy of silencing and intimidation so that the very concepts of reason, truth, and artistic standards are being subverted in favor of a crude ideological agenda ... that present[s] the current debate ... not as a legitimate conflict in which reasonable disagreement is possible, but as a simple choice between civilization and barbarism" (1992, p. 67 f).

Why has a curriculum change such as the inclusion of an author like Frantz Fanon or a Nobel-prize winner like Rigoberta Menchú into a first-year course about "Western Culture" evoked an emotionally-loaded response? One central answer may be that it breaks with a tradition of uncritically glorifying the history of the West and the underlying assumption of cultural supremacy. Another is the fear that in the current book-hostile culture many students will not read anything else or are just passive receptacles and therefore will be unduly influenced by a "biased" canon.

For many white Americans, the Euro-American heritage is still a major source of pride and identity. But if the dominant culture and its values derive from slavery, violent oppression, economic exploitation, racism and ignorance, how can American history be blindly and innocently celebrated and taught so gloriously? (Bennett 1992, p. 167 f). In other words, the inclusion of perspectives of formerly suppressed nations and cultures encourages a closer look at the past. This raises a new and potentially divisive specter of conflict about what should be valued and what should be forgotten. As Henry (1990) points out, such questions are forced: "Which is the more admirable heroism: the courageous holdout by a few conquistadors whites over Hispanics at the Alamo, or the anonymous expression of hope by millions who filed through Ellis Island? Was the subduing of the West a daring feat of bravery and ingenuity, or a wretched example of white imperialism?" (pp. 30 f.).

In the mass media, attempts to add diversity to the curriculum have met with responses ranging from the questioning of the veracity of revisionist histories (Leo 1994) to the subtle misrepresentation of the perspectives of Ronald Takaki, a multiculturalist who favors including all ethnic groups in the history of the U.S. (Folkenflik 1994).

On such contested terrain extreme voices are present. Feeding the arsenals of conservatives are traditionalist parents and professors who resent almost every idea or reform that promises change and questions the "old ways." According to them, "many books are treasured as classics by prior generations are now seen [by radicals] as tools of cultural imperialism. In the extreme form, this thinking rises to a value-deprived nationalism that views all cultures, regardless of the grandeur or paucity of their attainments, as essentially equal" (Henry 1990, p. 31). Or worse, militants replace pro-Western hypocrisy with another one. According to some militant Afrocentrists, current standards, values and discourses represent only a pseudo-liberal and pseudo-tolerant subtle hegemony of white racism and Eurocentrism. In their understanding only Africans or African Americans are able to give a fair view of African culture and history. "Whatever a white European male historian or witness has to say must be suspect; the utterances of an oppressed person or group deserve instant credence. ... Now the claims of the victim do have to be heard, because they may cast new light on history" (Hughes 1993, p. 140).

Such assertions forget that statements about history or other issues have to pass exactly the same tests of empirical validity and reliability.

Intricate and esoteric debate about the importance of Plato versus Confucius, Machiavelli versus Malcolm X in introductory university courses did not originally raise such concern outside of academia. This did not prevent the media from attempting to bring it to the attention of the public by making such arguments as that by Wil (1992) who wrote that the goal of those in favor of PC with regard to the canon is "delegitimatizing Western civilization by discrediting the books and ideas that gave birth to it" (p. 24). And in recent years with the help of the media the debate has shifted from university curriculum to the elementary and secondary-levels of the educational system (see Berman 1992, part 2; Howe 1992, p. 233), resulting in an increased interest in curricula issues in the general public.

Free Speech and Related Issues of Behavioral Codes

Constitutional arguments have been raised to challenge attempts to enforce multicultural awareness on individual behavior and conversation. In its essence the conflict about Free Speech (guaranteed in the First Amendment of the American Constitution) culminates in the question: Do the rights of those offended by what someone says outweigh the rights of the person who says it? (Harvey 1992, p. 145).

In its more harmless version PC «correct» terminology in an effort to avoid offending a person: For example, once accepted terms used to describe African Americans in the U.S. become derogatory as soon as they are no longer used among ardent PC supporters. Once a proud word, «Negro» now has a negative connotation almost as strong as «Nigger» or «colored.» Afro-American came into fashion during the late 1960s but was replaced by «Black» in the 1970s. Black is still used in some parts of the South while African American is the standard on the west coast. Similarly, words with «man» have been challenged by feminists as sexist.

More hotly debated are the desirability, appropriate and legality of campus policies regulating the behavior of students and faculty toward women and minorities.

Conservatives like George Will have defined anti-harassment codes as «codes, under which designated groups of victims are protected from whatever they decide offends them» (Will 1992b, p. 240). Defenders of such codes point at power differences and engrained structures of discrimination that can be broken only by enforcement of new behavior.

The result of this aspect of the PC debate has been the proliferation of behavior codes at many colleges that outline detailed rules for dating and sexual encounters.

Opponents of multiculturalism and PC have compared such codes with the «Hitler Youth or Mao Tse-Tung’s Red Guards» (Brodkey and Fowler 1992, p. 80) or denounced it as «a new fascism of the left» (ditto. p. 85, citing a Habermasian verdict), as inquisitory «McCarthyism» (D’Souza 1992, p. 13), as «post-Puritan» (Hughes 1993, p. 24), as the result of a tainted «culture of complaint» (Hughes 1993), and as mere «victimology» (Fox-Genovese 1991, p. 47 f, Kimbail 1992, p. 65; Ravitch 1992, p. 228 f; Siegel 1992; Stansell 1991, pp. 32 ff).

According to Hughes (1993) the problem is the pervasiveness of shallow, guilt-ridden moralism, Manichean righteousness, and a «strange admixture of individualism and conformity» (Gittin 1992, p. 189) in the American culture, where «the Right is as corroded by defunct ideology as the academic Left. Propaganda-talk, euphemism, and evasion are so much a part of American usage today that they cross all party lines and ideological divides» (Hughes 1993, p. 26 f).

Can an honest and frank discussion happen in an environment where competing demands in the public and private sphere counteract the development of consistent codes of behavior and speech, which some have called the contradictory «American way of being» (Bennett 1992, p. 169)? Harvey (1992) illustrates such competing requirements in the socialization of students. «One force (principally the academic establishment) pulls the students in the direction of sensitivity. The other force (largely popular culture) jerks them toward the shocking or sensational» (p. 146 f). He then concludes that there seems to be no middle ground if the ground rules are that no one can be offended.

Affirmative Action

A third strand related to multiculturalism is the question of how or if ethnic, cultural and racial diversity and equality should be encouraged in American society. This question has resulted in a debate over affirmative action policies — which admit equally or less qualified minority students that can be broken only by enforcement of new behavior.

The result of this aspect of the PC debate has been the proliferation of behavior codes at many colleges that outline detailed rules for dating and sexual encounters.

Opponents of multiculturalism and PC have compared such codes with the «Hitler Youth or Mao Tse-Tung’s Red Guards» (Brodkey and Fowler 1992, p. 80) or denounced it as «a new fascism of the left» (ditto. p. 85, citing a Habermasian verdict), as inquisitory «McCarthyism» (D’Souza 1992, p. 13), as «post-Puritan» (Hughes 1993, p. 24), as the result of a tainted «culture of complaint» (Hughes 1993), and as mere «victimology» (Fox-Genovese 1991, p. 47 f, Kimbail 1992, p. 65; Ravitch 1992, p. 228 f; Siegel 1992; Stansell 1991, pp. 32 ff).

A critical re-thinking among cultural norms, ideas has recently led to an opening of the earlier Right, liberals and traditionalists.

Particularly the extra segregationists. Anti-feminists have been in the PC supporters. Excesses used by opponents in the objectives of PC, have been blamed for poisoning the women’s rights, multicultural cultural expression and rhetoric, often combine purist or, or a PC movement have been called «anti-Semitism», «hate speech» and «racism».

Labeling has led to a denunciation that it has led to «the recognition that a once held by» (Hughes 1992) use may have made it easier alliances of a strong ideal.

Under the pressure of the abhorrence of PC, one PC have started to distort notions of correctness, in «mation» (Epstein 1992, p. 17) or, «estrangement» debate among PC supporting groups, and in the sex
cesses in the national and individual psyche. Henry (1990) reported in a *Time* magazine article that when Florida Atlantic University, a state-funded institution under pressure to increase its low black enrollment, offered last month (March 1990) to give free tuition to every qualified black freshman who enrolled, the school was flooded with calls of complaint, some protesting that nothing was being done for "real" Americans. He continues that "as the number of minorities increase, their demands for a share of the national bounty are bound to intensify, while whites are certain to feel ever more embittered" (p. 31).

**Latest Developments**

A critical re-thinking and re-evaluation of the meaning of cultural norms, identity politics, and pluralism has recently led to an opening of the debate, relaxing some of the earlier polarization between Left and Right, liberals and conservatives, multiculturalists and traditionalists.

Particularly the extreme and militant rhetoric of separatists, Afrocentrists and of radical feminists has been increasingly rejected by moderate PC supporters. Excesses, many of which have been used by opponents in the past to denounce the objectives of PC, have been rejected as detrimental and blamed for poisoning the debate about minority and women's rights, multicultural diversity, freedom of cultural expression and equal opportunity. Radical rhetoric, often combined with an excessive, manipulative, or unwarranted use of labels like "racism", "sexism", "anti-Semitism", "fascist", "homophobic", "harrassment" and "rape" has helped to isolate militants from Left and liberal PC supporters.

Labeling has led to so many levels of indistinct denunciation that it has lost whatever stable meaning it once had (Hughes 1991, p. 19). And their use may have made it easier for the Right to create alliances of a strong ideological countermovement.

Under the pressure of public- and media-generated abhorrence of PC, once moderate supporters of PC have started to distance themselves from prior notions of correctness, moralism, and "self-intimidation" (Epstein 1992, p. 143) because they fear an infringement of censorship on a frank and honest debate among PC supporters, between the opposing camps, and in the society in general (fine arts, literature, journalism, theater etc.). It would be counterproductive and paradoxical if a movement that started to question cultural and societal taboos raised new taboos.

Other PC supporters are concerned that Left and liberal arguments are abused to shield growing ethno-racial para-chauvinism, cultural intolerance and group-egoism that is used to legitimate "identity politics" that makes a fetish of the virtues of the minority (Giritli 1992 p. 488). In the understanding of moderate multiculturalists, pluralism is not a self-serving ideology for the creation of separate cultural reservations but a tool to give minorities more opportunities for representation and to enrich and glue American society together according to the ideal of *E pluribus Unum*. They refer to the traditional notion of American individualism as the centerpoint of identity in contrast to a collectivism that overrides an individual's experience along ascriptive criteria of gender, class, race, or sexual orientation (Scott 1992).

Katie Roiphe (1992), one of the less dogmatic feminists, rejects rigid regulation of gender relations and the definition of women as victims of male sexual aggression. Robert Hughes (1991, p. 28) castigates "patriotic correctness" and pious bigotry of the Right as much as the Culture of Complaint (booktitle) on the Left. And among minority scholars there are also voices which suggest that weaknesses and problems of minorities themselves explain their lack of advancement.

Shelby Steele (1990) moves attention away from the unsolvable contradiction of black victim and white perpetrator and, instead, demands a concentration on one's own strength and autonomous identity. Others stress commonalities with conservative or liberal critics of PC. Exemplary of this new trend is the programmatic volume of Patricia Aufderheide (1992) *Beyond PC: Toward a politics of understanding* and Gerald Graff's suggestive title *Beyond the Culture Wars*.

Whereas these academic discussions have helped to clarify issues and separate militant from more moderate PC supporters, the conservative barrage has yet not stopped denouncing Left and liberal concern regarding minorities, women, and other formerly ignored groups and issues. With a tune lag and influenced by the media's continuing PC-bashing (Losey and Kurthen 1994) the public's response to PC has been strongly anti-PC — what some
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have called a neoconservative, grassroots backlash. For example, local school boards have been inundated with parents complaining about curricular changes that bow to multiculturalism, colleges have revised new race and gender policies for fear that they may be unconstitutional under first amendment free speech rights, and professors who were once embarrassed to be accused of sexual harassment are now going public, fighting back against a rash of abuses in this area.

Regarding the backlash Iserman (1991) warns against the paralysis, isolation, parochialism, and unattractiveness of the PC subculture. Only a broad, tolerant, and democratic Left will have a chance of surviving the attack; a Left mired in self-righteousness and symbolic politics is likely to find itself back in the soup again (p. 84).

The Common Ground of the Debate: the American Creed

Although bitter arguments are waged over these issues, PC is not a debate without a foundation. While the adversaries fight from different perspectives about meaning, importance, and interpretation, they fight on a common ground and their arguments are built on common assumptions which are – with the exception of a few radicals and fundamentalists on the margins – not contested. However, not surprisingly, extreme positions or anecdotes are often used as examples to denounce or ridicule opponents.

The basic assumptions and common foundations of the participants on both sides are what we want to call “axioms of the American creed.” They are: 

- Increasing diversity in higher education and in American society, reflected in demographic and cultural changes. However, opponents and supporters of PC draw different conclusions from these facts, particularly what and if commonalities and hierarchies exist among the many cultures and how much pluralism should be implemented to give these different voices their fair share of representation, resources, and opportunities.

- American liberties and foundations of democracy. Although it is questioned to what extent liberties are already realized and how broadly they should be interpreted, the great majority of disputants accept their superiority in comparison with other political systems and are in favor of upholding the Bill of Rights and other constitutionally guaranteed freedoms. Similarly the great majority of the debate’s participants subscribe to the notions of humanism and rationalism (Berman 1992, p. 18).

- The economic system of liberal market capitalism. Except for orthodox Marxists (who do not really participate in the debate although they are widely used as scapegoats) very few question the legitimacy of capitalism in contrast to the failed model of state-socialism.

The fact that the debate is centered around common axioms of a subtle consensus indicates that PC, in its current manifestations, has not the potential to seriously divide the nation. It might however, indicate a break with prior myths on which America was built, such as the melting pot ideology, which leaves unquestioned white Anglo-Saxon hegemony, and the uncontestable history of progress, expansion, and advancement in the name of democracy, freedom, equality. The debate might force America to look more inward and discover its inherent contradictions, ambiguities, and differences.

Toward a Socio-Historical Understanding of the Current PC Debate

To understand why PC has become such an important topic at this time and in these ways, it is important to look at broader demographic, historic, and socio-cultural changes in American society in the last few decades. Once a microcosm of European nationalities, America is now becoming a micro-cosm of the world.

At the heart of the question is the representation and participation of formerly oppressed or neglected groups, in particular women and minorities, and the question of redistribution of scarce resources between the white majority and minorities (Fox-Genoves 1991, p. 48). Affirmative action, multiculturalism, the canon and the examination of free speech issues related to racism and sexism are fields on which this battle is waged.

Most agree that PC has its roots in the 1960s ideals of liberal humanism and the quest for moral politics that centered around an epistemological preference for the oppressed (Boyle 1992, p. 179). Quickly following the Civil rights and anti-war movements came also the women’s liberation move-
The battle over PC issues and particularly multiculturalism and affirmative action is taking place at a time when the U.S. faces not only domestic demographic changes but also a relative decline of its hegemonic role as a leader of the Western world in international economic, political, and military affairs. Could it be that anti-PC rhetoric is serving as a compensation for the loss of a powerful external threat that held American society together? Some observers point in such a direction when they describe the Right's search for a new enemy after the end of the Cold War: "The Right needs a Left: if the battlements of Western culture were not under continuous siege, what would happen to their defenders? ... The favorite all-purpose Barbarians at present, are called multiculturalists" (Hughes 1995, p. 82; similar Gitlin 1992).

Conclusion

In our descriptive analysis of the origins and dimensions of PC we have come to two conclusions. On the one hand, PC issues have had an impact that goes beyond the notion of a battle over correct words. PC has become institutionalized in harassment codes, equality legislation, affirmative action, and attempts to revise the canon in educational institutions. All these events have had an impact on the mind of the average American, stirring up emotions and leading to some polarization. This impact has occurred in part because PC raises status fears, questions the dominant culture and identity, redefines America's past, present, and future, and reflects a redistribution of resources. Moreover it has had an impact because it has been portrayed as infringing upon American values, traditions, basic constitutional rights, and engrained modes of behavior and speech between the sexes and races.

We also have seen that the media, Conservatives, and even parts of the liberal establishment give what they identify as PC various labels that range from saying it is undermining academic standards to characterizing it as nihilist relativism, or tribal fragmentation leading to "Balkanization." Although this neo-conservative or traditionalist rhetoric may over dramatize PC, in our understanding it correctly reflects what PC, if enacted in policies and culturally institutionalized, threatens the traditionalist and neo-conservative hegemony. But we also have seen that the majority of PC opponents and supporters are not questioning the axioms of American society: capitalism, constitutional democracy, and increasing diversity and pluralism. The PC debate does not, therefore appear to portend a major political or economic revolution in the U.S.

Moreover, it is not just by coincidence that the debate about PC has been so intense in recent years. It reflects domestic and international changes. The increased immigration of non-European minorities forcing greater cultural diversity, the promised, but in many areas still unrealized removal of barriers and prejudice, the malaise of the conservative revolution initiated by Reagan/Bush, and the newly, more inwardly-oriented perceptions of the American public have been supportive of formerly silenced voices and a public orientation on domestic issues that reflect the issue of cultural and ethnic diversity.

Internationally, the decline of a previously unchallenged economic and political domination by Americans provides the backdrop for a discussion that stresses the multitude and equality of non-mainstream groups, interests, values, and identities. Ironically, this reordering of hegemony is simultaneous with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the rise of competitors in Europe and Asia, and the notion of a "new world order" with many centers and more equal participation of former excluded nations in Asia and Africa.

Because the U.S. is characterized by a high degree of social differentiation, inequality and permanent sociocultural change - a society in constant evolution - there is a permanent need for consensus, that is, for unity in plurality. Neither the conservative fixation on ahistorical "truths" and universal values nor the abstract notion of unity through conflict or pluralist and cultural relativism is able to sufficiently define the American society or garner the support of a majority of Americans.

Therefore one may with confidence predict that for some time to come the American society will be characterized by an attempt to balance between conservative traditionalism and pluralist diversity, between the self-righteous proclamation of "universal truths" and skeptic relativism, between those representing the dominant hegemonic culture and the marginalized or radicalized minorities calling for counterhegemonic cultures and, in the extreme case for separatism or worse, supplanting Eurocentrism with otherisms (Kleinsteuber 1993, p. 265). Neither testimony of oppression justification for further
for high sounding cantitudes" (Said 1992, p.
America will not escape of diverse and pluralist conflicts. The question educational institutions are prepared and willing weather the unavoidable representation, and real or expressed, is America's knowledge without prejudice) the quest for ecumenical orthodoxy 1993, p. 330.
The PC debate reflects American culture and at hand, such as the barbarian and have been their rigid moralism and genuine American concepts not overlook that the legal hiring practices, the social scholarship, the concept of freedom, the canon, racism and sexism has sustenance of the central and belief-systems of the transverses can be interpreted, decline, or decadent democratic health, since crises are signs of life.

America could not come sooner or later will its democratic societies emancipate multicultural societies.
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opponents and supporters of American social democracy, and increas.

The PC debate does not extend a major political or cultural one of the PC debate. By coincidence that the so intense in recent years, international changes, the non-European minorities diversity, the promised, if not fixed removal of barriers and the conservative revolution in Bush, and the new, more equitable of the American white of formerly silenced nation on domestic issues cultural and ethnic diversity.

The decline of a previously undemocratic political domination by backlash for a discourse that equals non-mainstream values and identities. Historically hegemony is simultaneous: the Soviet Union, the rise of China and Asia, and the notion with many centers and more former exclusive nations in.

A society characterized by a high degree of inequality and permanent status, in a society in constant evolution, need for consensus, that inequality. Neither the conservative 1980s and universal values of unity through conflictual relativism is able to sufficient American society or garner the support of Americans.

With confidence predict that the American society will attempt to balance between racial and pluralism diversity, between the proclamation of a new relativism, between those re-produced hegemonic culture and the realized minorities calling for crises and, in the extreme case of supplanting Eurocentrism as the underdog (Hobsbawm 1993, p. 269). Neither

testimony of oppression nor of domination is a justification for further cruelty and inhumanity, or for high sounding cant and merely correct attitudes (Said 1992, p. 87).

America will not escape the almost certain future of diverse and pluralist societies and their ensuing conflicts. The question is whether the political and educational institutions, the media and the public are prepared and willing to take the challenge and weather the unavoidable battles over legitimacy, representation, and redistribution. Or more generally expressed, is America willing to begin a quest for knowledge without presuppositions, ... in (a time when) the quest for certainty, the quest for dogmatism and orthodoxy and rigidity is over (West 1992, p. 133).

The PC debate reflects weak and strong sides of American culture and public discourse. Some issues at hand, such as the battle over speech codes, are esoteric and have been rightly criticized because of their rigid moralism and intimidation. Some reflect genuine American concerns or problems. One cannot overlook that the debate about admissions and hiring practices, the social functions of teaching and scholarship, the concept of objectivity, truth, and free speech, the canon, tradition, common culture, racism and sexism has a deeper meaning for the sustenance of the central institutions as well as values and belief systems of the American society. The controversies can be interpreted not only as signs of corruption, decline, or decadence but of educational and democratic health, since the in intellectual matters, crises are signs of life (Berman 1991, p. 36).

America could come to mirror changes that sooner or later will come into being in other democratic societies emerging as multiethnic and multicultural societies.
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Auf dem Weg in die tertiäre
Der ungesicherte Übergang

Vor dem Hintergrund der größten diskrepanzen und der ökologischen und sozialen Probleme stellt sich für alle Volkswirtschaften die Frage, wie sie sich strukturell und strukturell verändern dürfen, um ihre Wohlfahrtsansprüche zu erfüllen. Die Veränderung der materiellen Konsum- und Verbrauchsgewohnheiten stellt eine Herausforderung dar, die sich nicht nur auf die individuelle Ebene, sondern auch auf die gesellschaftliche Ebene auswirkt.

Die Drei-Sektoren-Struktur der Volkswirtschaft

Zur statistischen und theoretischen Sektorenanalyse

Die industrielle Beschäftigung sinkt, und in jüngerer Vergangenheit ist der Abbau industrieller Arbeitsplätze zu verzeichnen. Um diesen Strukturwandel zu bewältigen, sind neue Wege zu finden, um Arbeitsplätze zu schaffen und die Wirtschaft zu Stabilität und Wachstum zu führen.
Developed states cannot be achieved overnight. However, this process is essential to the international community if it is to avoid jeopardizing economic prosperity, natural living conditions, international security and prospects for democracy.

H.C.F. Monsilo:
Partial Modernization and the Political Culture of Authoritarianism in the Periphery

Democracy is a rarity in a world that is mainly authoritarian. Modernization processes do not automatically lead to democratization. On the contrary, in the periphery they are leading to identity crises and defensive responses which draw on traditional cultural patterns and combine these with modern elements to form a new authoritarian "defensive culture". The Islamic regime in Iran is a prime example, but there are others in Latin America. Neither the advanced pre-Columbian civilizations nor the Iberian colonial regimes knew anything which could have been used as elements of an open society. They passed on a legacy of centralism and bureaucracy. As for Marxism, its Russian variant was taken up worldwide as a modernization ideology by backward societies and strengthened authoritarian tendencies by establishing the rule of the intelligentsia in the form of the communist party and turning the state into a central agency of modernization. The recent experience of democratization processes in the East and in the South does not allow for a definitive answer as to whether authoritarian capitalist modernization (as in the Far East) might not be the more successful model.

Klaus Klenner:
Oligarchial Society and Democratic State? The Case of Pakistan

Although there has been some progress in Pakistan's formal democratic development since 1978, the prospects for a deepening and consolidation of this process are rather doubtful. Relations between the country's different communities are strained by subtle, but occasionally quite open, conflicts. The population explosion and the low level of education are preventing the emergence of a broad, politically aware and self-confident layer of citizens. The military, the bureaucracy, the aristocracy and the tribal leaders defend their powerful influence over politics and society and have been able to count on the submissive support of the industrial business elite. The parties are little more than election machines for politicians and totally lack internal democracy. The judiciary suffers from de facto dependency on the executive. In addition, foreign powers have so far done more to hinder than to promote democratic development. Nevertheless, there are some modest signs of democratization within Pakistani society. The influence of the Islamists has declined steadily since 1988. At the same time a remarkably independent and critical press has managed to establish itself. The elected middle class is increasingly addressing social and political abuses through their involvement in human rights, women's, environmental and labour organizations. Moreover, the transitional government under Moon Qureshi initiated structural reforms in the summer of 1993 which cannot easily be undone by any future government. The likelihood that the military will, yet again, seize power has decreased considerably in the light of the new international situation.

Hermann Kurthen / Kay M. Lossy:
How to Cope with Cultural Diversity. What is the U.S. Debate on Political Correctness Really About?

The call for "political correctness" (PC) was originally intended to take appropriate account of the rights, viewpoints and cultural traditions etc. of minorities, including women, who have suffered discrimination and marginalization. Expressions, behaviour and institutional arrangements which reflect the, as it were, automatic dominance of Anglo-Saxon "mainstream" culture and its barriers in public life in the United States were rejected as "politically incorrect". Above all, PC meant multicultural study programmes at schools and universities and affirmative action to give a more appropriate share of privileged positions to the minorities. Now, however, the public debate is dominated by the conservative critics of PC, who denounce it as advocates for playing down the importance of performance standards, stifling free speech and diverting the country by excessive emphasis on cultural difference. Although the PC debate does not call into question the fundamental American values of democracy and capitalism, it is threatening the Western identity of the United States in the wake of its evolution into a more and more multiracial, multicultural society.

Karl Georg Zinn:
The Precarious Transition to the Service Society

Consumption and production in the advanced industrial countries is experiencing a shift to the service sector. The share of the national product accounted for by the once dominant industrial sector is declining. At the root of this trend is the increasing saturation of demand for industrial products. Since falling demand has been accompanied by continual advances in productivity, we see no signs of a shedding of labour in this sector which echoes the earlier fate of agriculture. The transition from the industrial to the service sector is not, however, proceeding as smoothly as the move from agrarian to industrial society did. Firstly, with growing prosperity comes a greater propensity to save. Secondly, an expansion of demand for service is problematical that it was in the case of industry. Services are not cheapened in the same way, and they already face largely strained markets. We may be the result of declining industrial profits. Thus, the transition to the service sector brings - beyond the ups and downs of the business cycle - a prospect of relative economic stagnation, even if it may be delayed by new short-lived boosts to growth, full employment, the maintenance of security systems, and, indeed, the access of all to a reasonable prosperity. The nation's prosperity is therefore jeopardized as a quest to stimulate demand for services by pushing up service-sector wages (as in the United States) determines the foundations of mass prosperity, while leaving the mechanism of stagnation intact. In order to avoid the looming crisis, fundamental and political corrections need to be made to the existing mechanism.

Nicolas H. Nordheim:
The Development of the International Drugs Economy

The supply and demand for drugs are very much determined by the market, which is both intervention regulated:9 intervention because there is the regulation of producers, dealers and consumers because there are neither quality controls for the drugs nor trading standards for distribution. The market is flexible to new buyer countries (China, for example) and to new demand shifts (designer drugs). Developing countries have previously had a substantial influence on the world's drug market due to the lack of demand. Changes due to fully synthetic drugs and their pull in the developing countries producing major drug producing countries such as Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, Morocco, and Thailand are rapidly increasing. The Yunnan or other regions of the global economy are, with the help of the drug cartels, still a their part, stabilise the external value of the dollar and reduce or check their foreign debt. In Latin America, the drug industry provides a livelihood for 12 million people. The positive effects in terms of investment, employment and wealth creation are social costs of crimes whose dimension can hardly be measured. The legalization of the use and selling of drugs would considerably reduce the social costs, but it would also increase demand and thus reduce our foreign debt. In Latin America, the drug industry provides a livelihood for 12 million people. The positive effects in terms of investment, employment and wealth creation are social costs of crimes whose dimension can hardly be measured. The legalization of the use and selling of drugs would considerably reduce the social costs, but it would also increase demand and thus reduce our foreign debt. In Latin America, the drug industry provides a livelihood for 12 million people. The positive effects in terms of investment, employment and wealth creation are social costs of crimes whose dimension can hardly be measured. The legalization of the use and selling of drugs would considerably reduce the social costs, but it would also increase demand and thus reduce our foreign debt. In Latin America, the drug industry provides a livelihood for 12 million people. The positive effects in terms of investment, employment and wealth creation are social costs of crimes whose dimension can hardly be measured. The legalization of the use and selling of drugs would considerably reduce the social costs, but it would also increase demand and thus reduce our foreign debt. In Latin America, the drug industry provides a livelihood for 12 million people. The positive effects in terms of investment, employment and wealth creation are social costs of crimes whose dimension can hardly be measured. The legalization of the use and selling of drugs would considerably reduce the social costs, but it would also increase demand and thus reduce our foreign debt. In Latin America, the drug industry provides a livelihood for 12 million people. The positive effects in terms of investment, employment and wealth creation are social costs of crimes whose dimension can hardly be measured. The legalization of the use and selling of drugs would considerably reduce the social costs, but it would also increase demand and thus reduce our foreign debt. In Latin America, the drug industry provides a livelihood for 12 million people. The positive effects in terms of investment, employment and wealth creation are social costs of crimes whose dimension can hardly be measured. The legalization of the use and selling of drugs would considerably reduce the social costs, but it would also increase demand and thus reduce our foreign debt. In Latin America, the drug industry provides a livelihood for 12 million people. The positive effects in terms of investment, employment and wealth creation are social costs of crimes whose dimension can hardly be measured. The legalization of the use and selling of drugs would considerably reduce the social costs, but it would also increase demand and thus reduce our foreign debt.