

Politik und Gesellschaft

International Politics and Society

1/1995

Helmut Schmidt:
Europa und die Deutschen in einer sich ändernden Welt

J. Brian Atwood:
The U.S. Agenda for International Development

H.C.F. Mansilla:
Kultur des Autoritarismus in der Peripherie

Klaus Klennert:
Gesellschaft und Demokratie in Pakistan

Hermann Kurthen/Kay M. Losey:
The U.S. Debate on Political Correctness

Karl Georg Zinn:
Auf dem Weg in die tertiäre Krise?

Nicolás H. Hardinghaus:
Die Entwicklung der internationalen Drogenwirtschaft

Kai Ambos:
Warum die internationale Drogenbekämpfung scheitert

Herausgegeben von der
Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung

Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft

Nr. 1/1995

Herausgegeben von der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung
Published by the Friedrich Ebert Foundation

Redaktion / *editorial board*

Alfred Pfaller (verantwortlich / *managing editor*)

Erfried Adam

Michael Dauderstädt

Michael Domitra

Albrecht Koschützke

Eckhard Lübckemeier

Redaktionsassistentin / *editorial assistant*: Brigitte Juchems

Beirat / *advisory board*

Leszek Balcerowicz

Jeff Bridgford

Ernst-Otto Czempel

Alfred Grosser

Klaus Hänsch

Gerd Junne

Catherine McArdle Kelleher

Hans-Ulrich Klose

György Konrad

Koo Bon Ho

Michael Lipton

Vincent Maphai

Hanns Maull

Dieter Nohlen

Ewald Nowotny

Ricardo Petrella

Gerd Rosenthal

Hans-Peter Schneider

Heinz Timmermann

Ernst-Ulrich von Weizsäcker

Inhalt / Contents 1/1995

Zu diesem Heft/About this issue 3

Beiträge/Articles 5

Rezensionen/Book Reviews 97

Aus internationalen Zeitschriften/
From International Journals 103

Résumés/Summaries/Zusammenfassungen 1

Autorinnen/Autoren/Authors 112

BEITRÄGE / ARTICLES

HELMUT SCHMIDT 5

Europa und die Deutschen in einer sich ändernden Welt
Nur feste Einbindung in ein geeichtes Weltgefüge schützt Deutschland vor verhängnisvollen Großmachtgefahren. Dieses Ziel muss möglichst bald bis an die Grenzen Europas durchgesetzt werden – um erneutem russischen Expansionsversuchen vorzubeugen, um europäische Präsenz der Großmächte zu sichern und anhaltenden Turbulenzen im Gefolge der internationalen Zusammenbrüche einzugreifen.

J. BRIAN ATWOOD: 15

Sustainable Development and Crisis Prevention: An Agenda for International Development

Failed states and imploding societies have become a major threat to world stability. Correspondingly, US policy, freed of the shackles of Cold War containment, has assigned key priority to the promotion of sustainable development. Assistance must be concentrated according to recipient needs, commitment and effectiveness.

H.C.F. MANSILLA: 19

Partielle Modernisierung und politische Kultur in der Peripherie

Außerhalb des (west-)europäischen Kulturkreises kann Demokratie schwer Fuß fassen. Weltumspannende Modernisierungsprozesse führen nicht zu einer Ausbreitung demokratischer Kultur, sondern traditionelle Grundmuster verstärken. Dies ist sowohl dezidiert antiwestliche Entwicklungen (u.a. islamischer Fundamentalismus) als auch Modernisierungsdiktaturen (u.a. in Lateinamerika) (s. Provenienz).

Zu diesem Heft/About this issue 3

Beiträge/Articles 5
Rezensionen/Book Reviews 97
Aus internationalen Zeitschriften/
From International Journals 103
Résumés/Summaries/Zusammenfassungen 105

Autorinnen/Autoren/Authors 112

BEITRÄGE / ARTICLES

HELMUT SCHMIDT 5

Europa und die Deutschen in einer sich ändernden Welt
Nur feste Einbindung in ein geeintes Europa schützt Deutschland vor verhängnisvollem künftigen Großmachtgebahren. Dieses Europa muß möglichst bald bis an die Grenzen Rußlands reichen – um erneutem russischen Expansionismus vorzubeugen, um europäische Präsenz im Konzert der Großmächte zu sichern und um die langanhaltenden Turbulenzen im Gefolge des sowjetischen Zusammenbruchs einzugrenzen.

J. BRIAN ATWOOD: 15

Sustainable Development and Crisis Prevention. The U.S. Agenda for International Development

Failed states and imploding societies in developing countries have become a major threat to world stability. Correspondingly, US foreign policy, freed of the shackles of Cold War diplomacy, has assigned key priority to the promotion of sustainable development. Assistance will be concentrated according to recipient countries' needs, commitment and effectiveness in using aid.

H.C.F. MANSILLA: 19

Partielle Modernisierung und politische Kultur des Autoritarismus in der Peripherie

Außerhalb des (west-)europäischen Kulturkreises kann Demokratie schwer Fuß fassen. Der weltumspannende Modernisierungsprozeß hat nicht zu einer Ausbreitung demokratischer politischer Kultur geführt, sondern traditionelle autoritäre Grundmuster verstärkt. Das Ergebnis sind sowohl dezidiert antiwestliche Defensivkulturen (u.a. islamischer Fundamentalismus) als auch Modernisierungsdiktaturen (u.a. marxistischer Provenienz).

KLAUS KLENNERT 29

Oligarchische Gesellschaft und demokratischer Staat? Der Fall Pakistan

Formal gesehen, hat Pakistan große Fortschritte in Richtung Demokratie zu verzeichnen. Doch hinter der demokratischen Fassade steht nach wie vor fest gefügt das Gebäude der oligarchischen Gesellschaft. Erste Erosionserscheinungen sind freilich auch an ihm zu erkennen.

HERMANN KURTHEN/KAY M. LOSEY 46

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

Cultural pluralism has become an unprecedented challenge to the hegemonic culture of »mainstream« America. In this context, the claim for the »politically correct« integration of minority viewpoints, values, symbols etc. into the public discourse is being rejected as a threat to American identity.

KARL GEORG ZINN 59

Auf dem Weg in die tertiäre Krise?

Der ungesicherte Übergang zur Dienstleistungsgesellschaft

Die Industrieproduktion stößt in den reichen Ländern zunehmend an Sättigungsgrenzen. Aber der Dienstleistungssektor wird kaum zum neuen Rückgrat der Wirtschaft werden. Vielmehr zeichnet sich der Weg in eine dauerhafte Stagnation ab, auf die der Mechanismus unseres Wirtschaftssystems mit profunder Krise reagiert.

NICOLÁS H. HARDINGHAUS 70

Die Entwicklung der internationalen Drogenwirtschaft

Weltweite Bekämpfung gibt dem internationalen Drogenmarkt sein besonderes Gepräge zwischen massivem Interventionismus und absoluter »Freiheit«. Sie vermag aber seine quantitative Bedeutung nicht zu schmälern. Legalisierung brächte einen Preissturz, der u.a. mit wirtschaftlichem Chaos für ganze Länder verbunden wäre.

KAI AMBOS 85

Warum die internationale Drogenbekämpfung scheitert

Der Strategie, das Drogenangebot schon an der Quelle zu unterbinden, mangelt es in den Anbauländern an kompetenten Verbündeten. Die Illegalität macht das Drogengeschäft so lukrativ, daß Bauern, Politiker, Beamte und Militärs sowie Teile der städtischen Bevölkerung davon profitieren.

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 1993, 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 1993; Siegel 1992; West 1993), a redefinition of American identity and values (Fox-Genovese 1991, p. 48; Lipset 1993; Nixon quoted by Rosenthal 1994; Schlesinger 1993), a crisis of legitimacy and hegemony (Schlesinger 1993, West 1993), a moral crusade of neo-Puritanism with religious undertones (Lipset 1993, p. 71 ff), a segregationist movement leading to Balkanization (Podhoretz, cited in: Kimball 1990, p. 60 ff; Schlesinger 1993), 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 when »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 wanted 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 skeptic 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.

More recently PC in media and the general weap on to attack persons are associated with a Left characterizes this as an Right enemies of Left a is that the Left's own i by the Right to bludge 1991, Footnote p. 82). forestalling discussion for«, Perry concludes (

Definitions

Current definitions of t that have occurred in academia, in politics, an tude of interpretations al ween opponents and s

Supporters, for exam »PC consists of theories a ed to end injustices bas other social variables« p. 2). Stanley Fish, a pro at Duke University who attack by PC opponents. mockery: »Political corr property of Left-leaning spired to subvert standa cal requirements on the penalizing those who p materials by traditional m

From the neo-conseve claims: »The term refers advocates of Left-liberal p tent of speech, courses, a impose their views with re minority rights, and femir Note the negative terms i trol and impose.

This more derogatory to the current public usag (1991) reflects such convict *Yorker* magazine when he politically correct are uni that Western culture and thoroughly and hopelessly (p. 33).

But the debate has bee

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. 82). 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. 93).

From the neo-conservative perspective, Lipset 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.« (Lipset 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 (1991) 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. Astin, 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« (quoted from Daniels 1991, p. 18). Likewise, Daniels (1991) writes in his article »Diversity, Correctness, and Campus Life – A Closer Look« that »Political correctness ... serves as a rhetorical shorthand for ... dissatisfactions with higher education, as well as for the entire debate about diversity and multiculturalism« (p. 18). 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 (1991), 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. 141 ff, 313 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 1992, p. 12) and neo-Marxist radicalism. Douglas (1992) and Lipset (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 (1992), who stress the internal fragmentation, diversity, and disarray 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. 135).

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 avantgarde 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 critical 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 treatises 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 legitimize, 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 uninitiated« (Boyte 1992, p. 178), than to enlighten the masses.

Topics Covered by Political

As mentioned above, a number of topics under the heading PC. Friends of the most common are the cultural curricula, confliction to ethnicity – and attitudes, and »affirmative

Multiculturalism

»Multiculturalism« is a term to include non-white culture dominated American representation of minorities and public affairs, success of the achievement groups.

In its original form, it to deal with violence in college campuses. It includes awareness through requiring training students and faculty; communication; empowering; fostering social and cultural whites and minorities. Model based admission policies festivals.

Furthermore, multiculturally respectable to system knowledge about traditional their cultures, ideas, icons outside of academia and excluded, silenced, or hidden into curricula, teaching a Hughes (1993) the academic multiculturalism in the 1970s: tion for their lost belief society through class-structure socio-economic system academic Left is much more gender than in class. And interested in theorizing about actually reporting on the

At the same time the heritage by minority groups was forgotten and oppressed interest in non-mainstream and values. Discovering

osing Of The American Mind
merican academics and the
ring new critical and some-
ndicates more than curiosi-
fashions, or the import of
merican« ideologies; more ac-
length – a desire for inquiry

o-understand philosophical
ary discussions have become
s considered by some only
society« may indicate a desire
ways of reflection and self-
interests of a few academic
ng a changing society. But
may be correct to suspect
n intellectual and political
standing and theoretical ex-
indicate a diminishing belief
e traditional, white-domina-
life and its intrinsic values
inished and glorious past.
ernism, poststructuralism,
ent theoretically what multi-
action, feminism, and other
nt on the policy level. Both
ancement of minorities and
e traditional values, norms,
n society ranging from the
ecture to education, sports,
ords: the intellectual debates
become an intellectual and
e. reflect, and negotiate the
etal resources – material,
d normative – and further,
present and future.

wever, are difficult for the
or for the mass media to ex-
It is much easier to resort
ad name calling (e.g., »radi-
present how these theories
and help to plan the future
ini 1987; Losey and Kurthen
to apply postmodern or
m is often hampered by the
language that seems more
the uninitiated« (Boyte 1992,
iten the masses.

IPG 1/95

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 multi-cultural 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 (1993) 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

IPG 1/95

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 ideal 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 (1993) concentrate on the danger of radical versions of multiculturalism, i.e. separatism and segregationism and declare it a PC issue (Elfin and Burke 1993). They fear multiculturalism will destroy the American fabric – its supposedly »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-

Kurthen / Losey, Political Correctness 49

grated if no common standards exist to which they should adhere? According to Bloom (1987) 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 anti-PC conservatives like Douglas (1992), neo-conservatives like Kimball (1990), and liberal traditionalists like Schlesinger (1993) 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 humanistic Western thought as »Eurocentric« (Siegel 1992, p. 218 ff; Herrnstein Smith 1992, p. 9 f; Asante 1992, p. 229; Stansell 1991, p. 53 f) 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. ... Afrocentricity 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 mood« (Gitlin 1992, p. 187) and »anti-intellectualism« (Ehrenreich 1992a, p. 335) 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 1987). 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. 259). 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, powerful National Association of Teachers for delib-
servatives for delib-
strategy of silencing
very concepts of rea-
are being subverted
agenda ... [that] p
not as a legitimate c
agreement is possib
tween civilization a

Why has a curric
sion of an author l
prize winner like Rig
course about »Wester
ally-loaded response
that it breaks with
fying the history of
assumption of cultu
fear that in the curr
students will never
passive receptacles a
fluenced by a »bias

For many white
heritage is still a ma
ty. But if the domin
from slavery, violen
tion, racism and igno
be blindly and innoc
gloriously? (Bennett
the inclusion of per
ed nations and cultu
the past. This raises
specter of conflict ab
what should be forg
out, such questions
admirable heroism:
few conquest-mind
Alamo, or the anon
millions who fled thr
duing of the West
ingenuity, or a wre
perialism?« (pp. 30 f

In the mass medi
the curricula have me
the questioning of th
(Leo 1994) to the s
perspectives of Ronal
favored including all
of the U.S. (Folkenfi

On such contested

in some Ivy League schools, by marginalized scholars in what he calls the follies of aggressive feminist or Afrocentric. Rather, students and faculty are concerned about the general state of education, particularly in the areas of illiteracy, »know-nothingism« and »anti-intellectualism« of the student body, the teaching and research, and the formalization of American

and critical theories in the field are the target of attacks as well. Students reject the post-modernist view that truth and morality are cause they are historically contingent. As in the canon debate, these attacks undermine educational goals. Cynicism, shallow individualism – as they see – and fragmentation (Bloom 1987). Superficiality versus an exclusive canon and a lack of an unpolitical and nostalgic because »the canon is a permeable membrane«

of narrow-mindedness are used on both sides. Illiterate issues can elicit. The popular magazines such as *Time* reported and editorialized the debate by poking fun at supporters of change as sectarians, victims and oppressors. In the case of the curriculum at the University of California, for example, syndicated columnist John Leo (1994) discredited the argument for diversity when he maintains that the »diversity« is such as deconstructive (p. A8).

more defensively. The *PC Culture* (1992) blame

the media, powerful interest groups, such as the National Association of Scholars (NAS), and conservatives for deliberate misrepresentations and a 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 never 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 conquest-minded 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 curricula 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 favored including all ethnic groups in the history of the U.S. (Folkenflik 1994).

On such contested terrain extreme voices are pre-

sent. Fueling the arsenals of conservatives are traditionalist parents and professors who resent almost every idea or reform that promotes change and questions the »old ways«. According to them, »many books 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 neutralism 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. 146). 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 much 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 Will (1992a) who wrote that the goal of those in favor of PC with regard to the canon is »delegitimizing 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 curricula to the elementary and secondary levels of the educational system (see Berman 1992, part 2; Howe 1992, p. 223), resulting in an increased interest in curricula issues in the general public.

1. According to Hughes (1993, p. 103) the majority of American households did not buy one single book in 1991.

Free Speech and Related Issues of Behavioral Codes

Constitutional arguments have been raised to challenge attempts to enforce multiculturalist 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. 143).

In its more harmless version PC »corrects« 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, appropriateness 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. 260). 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. 115) or denounced it as »a new fascism of the left« (ditto, p. 115, 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; Kimball 1992, p. 65; Ravitch 1992, p. 228 ff; Siegel 1992; Stansell 1991, pp. 52 f).

According to Hughes (1993) the problem is the pervasiveness of shallow, guilt-ridden moralism, Manichaeism, righteousness, and a »strange admixture of individualism and conformity« (Gitlin 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 them (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 into colleges and universities or into jobs before their white counterparts. These policies and the increased use of quotas in the admission and hiring of minorities and females have resulted in accusations of »reverse discrimination« and complaints of violations against the principle of meritocracy (D'Souza 1991, p. 24; Glazer 1987; Lynch 1989; Short 1986). Others have criticized preferential admissions and hiring because they are linked to ascriptive criteria like gender and race and neglect class, i.e. a person's poverty (Hughes 1993, p. 63).

Changes in the status-quo, supposedly generated by affirmative action, have led to resentment and fear among certain segments of the white majority. The fervor of the debate and the emotions raised can be explained by the deep cut of these pro-

cesses in the national a (1990 reported in a »when Florida Atlantic institution under press enrollment, offered last free tuition to every q enrolled, the school wa plaint, some protesting for »real« Americans.« number of minorities i a share of the national tensify, while whites ar embattled« (p. 31).

Latest Developments

A critical re-thinking and ing of cultural norms, ide has recently led to an of ing some of the earlier and Right, liberals and turalists and traditional:

Particularly the extre of segregationists, Afr feminists has been increa PC supporters. Excesses. used by opponents in th jectives of PC, have been blamed for poisoning the women's rights, multicu cultural expression and e rhetoric, often combined pulative, or unwarranted »sexism«, »anti-Semitism« »harassment« and »rape militants from Left and

Labeling has led to »sc denunciation that it has l ing it once had« (Hugh use may have made it eas alliances of a strong ideol

Under the pressure of red abhorrence of PC, on PC have started to distan notions of correctness, m dation« (Epstein 1992, p. infringement of censorshi debate among PC support ing camps, and in the soc

(1993) the problem is the
, guilt-ridden moralism,
, and a »strange admixture
of conformity« (Gitlin 1992, p.
ture, where »the Right is
ideology as the academic
phemism, and evasion are
can usage today that they
ecological divides« (Hughes

ank discussion happen in
ompeting demands in the
2 counteract the develop-
s of behavior and speech,
the contradictory »Ameri-
cett 1992, p. 169.)? Harvey
peting requirements in the
»One force (principally the
pulls them (the students)
ity. The other force (large-
them toward the shocking
. He then concludes that
idle ground if the ground
in be offended.

o multiculturalism is the
ethnic, cultural and racial
ould be encouraged in
question has resulted in a
ction policies – which ad-
ed minority students into
or into jobs before their
e policies and the increas-
admission and hiring of
ve resulted in accusations
« and complaints of viola-
e of meritocracy (D'Souza
Lynch 1989; Short 1986).
referential admissions and
linked to ascriptive criteria
l neglect class, i.e. a per-
993, p. 63).

quo, supposedly generated
ve led to resentment and
nts of the white majority.
, and the emotions raised
e deep cut of these pro-

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 com-
plaint, 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 embattled«
(p. 31).

Latest Developments

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

Particularly the extreme and militant rhetoric
of segregationists, Afrocentrists and of radical
feminists has been increasingly rejected by moderate
PC supporters. Excesses, many of which had been
used by opponents in the past to denounce the ob-
jectives 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, manipu-
lative, or unwarranted use of labels like »racism«,
»sexism«, »anti-Semitism«, »fascist«, »homophobic«,
»harassment« 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 mean-
ing it once had« (Hughes 1993, 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-gener-
ated 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. 148) because they fear an
infringement of censorship on a frank and honest
debate among PC supporters, between the oppos-
ing 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 parochialism, cultural intolerance and
group-egoism that is used to legitimate »identity
politics [that] makes a fetish of the virtues of the
minority« (Gitlin 1992 p. 188). 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 op-
portunities for representation and to enrich and glue
American society together according to the ideal of
E pluribus Unum. They refer to the traditional no-
tion of American individualism as the centerpoint
of identity in contrast to a collectivism that over-
rides an individual's experience along ascriptive
criteria of gender, class, race, or sexual orientation
(Scott 1992).

Katie Roiphe (1993), 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 (1993, p. 28) casti-
gates »patriotic correctness« and pious bigotry of
the Right as much as the *Culture of Complaint*
(booktitle) on the Left. And among minority schol-
ars there are also voices which suggest that weak-
nesses and problems of minorities themselves ex-
plain their lack of advancement.

Shelby Steele (1990) moves attention away from
the unsolvable contradiction of black victim and
white perpetrator and, instead, demands a concentra-
tion on one's own strength and autonomous
identity. Others stress commonalities with conser-
vative or liberal critics of PC. Exemplary of this new
trend is the programmatic volume of Patricia Auf-
derheide (1992) *Beyond PC. Toward a politics of under-
standing* 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 con-
cern regarding minorities, women, and other for-
merly ignored groups and issues. With a time lag
and influenced by the media's continuing PC-ba-
shing (Losey and Kurthen 1994) the public's re-
sponse to PC has been strongly anti-PC – what some

ts and other constitu-
ns. Similarly the great
rticipants subscribe to
and rationalism (Ber-

eral market capitalism.
ists (who do not really
lthough they are wide-
ery few question the
1 contrast to the failed

centered around com-
ensus indicates that PC,
s, has not the potential
on. It might however,
yths on which America
ng pot« ideology, which
Anglo-Saxon hegemony,
y of »progress«, expan-
the name of democracy,
ate might force America
discover its inherent con-
nd differences.

Understanding of the Current

become such an import-
in these ways, it is im-
r demographic, historic,
; in American society in
e a microcosm of Euro-
ica is now becoming a

question is the representa-
f formerly oppressed and
ular women and minori-
redistribution of scarce
e majority and minorities
Affirmative action, multi-
d the examination of free
cism and sexism are fields
vaged.

as its roots in the 1960s
n and the quest for moral
ound an »epistemological
sed« (Boyte 1992, p. 179).
Civil rights and anti-war
women's liberation move-

IPG 1/95

ment of the 1970s, the gay rights movement of the
1980s and anti-discriminatory legislation. The ensu-
ing attitudinal and value changes led to increasing
awareness of prejudice and discrimination.

The »ethnocultural revolution« of the 1960s was
furthered by changing demographics, in particular
the rising rates of non-white immigration and high
birth rates of some minority groups (e.g. Hispanics).
Demographers have estimated that by 2010 38% of
Americans under age 18 will belong to minority
groups.

Affirmative action and civil rights legislation in-
creased the enrollment of minorities, particularly
African Americans, in higher education (2.5 million
each year) and provided gains in occupational re-
presentation as well (Gleckman et al. 1992, p. 152
ff). The advancement of women can be explained
similarly, as an outcome of reforms in education
and the workplace, a redefinition of gender roles,
and strong demand during periods of high employ-
ment.

In other words, the deeper significance of the
debate that surrounds affirmative action, multi-
culturalism, and PC is the fact that America is
becoming a more culturally diverse and less white-
and male-dominated society. This has led to a
reassessment of dominant values and cultural stan-
dards. More and more old certainties are question-
ed: What does it mean to be an American? Is a
nation based on Western values able to integrate
cultural diversity of the future? Or should the
»center« be redefined, if it cannot hold any more
increasing plurality and diversity? The Left and the
Right have responded differently to the demographic
changes in the U.S.

From the perspective of the Left, changes have
not been fast enough and have not increased the
participation of women and minorities in American
society as hoped. They perceive particularly the
Reagan/Bush years as a backlash against their in-
terests. It is argued that, while there are more
minorities in higher education and in the workplace
and in better positions than ever before, they are
not yet represented in these places in proportion
to their numbers in the general public. Moreover,
subtle or hidden mechanisms of exclusion may have
replaced open discrimination. In addition, they com-
plain that the public's awareness and understand-
ing of the diverse cultures that constitute America
is woefully limited. They claim that in schools, even

IPG 1/95

in universities, most students are still taught a cur-
riculum which suggests that white, European male
culture is the only source of knowledge and the
only culture worth knowing. Because of the re-
sistance of the Center-to-Right-oriented middle-class
majority, who are well-represented in positions of
influence in policy-making, business, academia, and
the media, the redistribution of entitlements and
the shift of the political agenda have not been as
successful as PC opponents like Bloom (1987) want
to make the public believe.

Those on the Right, however, interpret recent
developments differently. From their perspective the
increasing numbers of women and minorities in
schools and the workplace indicate that the legis-
lation of the 1960s and 1970s was a success and may
even suggest that – as a result of this legislation –
whites, particularly men, are losing opportunities
to women and people of color.

The Right is expressing the decline of the Ameri-
can »middle classes« which have been confronted
with the realization that the »Golden Age« is over.
In recent years they have had to face stagnating in-
comes and sinking standards of living in comparison
with other industrial democracies. They fear a
change in the status quo and the loss of the sup-
posed superiority of the American way of life that
they were used to. Such resentment has been trans-
lated by the mass media in its heavy coverage of
such PC opponents as Lynne Cheney and Richard
Nixon. Authors like Glazer, Schlesinger, and D'Sou-
za put this malaise into slogans like »illiberal educa-
tion«, »loss of excellence«, and »lowering standards«.

It might not be just a coincidence that such
pessimistic and almost defeatist assessments of the
state of the nation occurred at a time when – after
the optimism of the Reagan years and the short-
lived patriotism of the Gulf-War – the political and
ideological hegemony of the conservatives began
waning. PC-critical books examining the fall of
education, values, and various other aspects of
American life have come out in increasing number
since the late 1980s (Bloom 1987; D'Souza 1991; Kim-
ball 1992), at a time when Americans focused in-
ward and discovered that they had to bring their
own affairs in order. At the end of the Cold
War and the transformation of what was »typically
American« (Gitlin 1992, p. 186) some observers see
»the surface of a deeper fault line – a trauma in
American cultural identity« (ibid., p. 185).

Kurthen / Losey, Political Correctness

55

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 Isserman (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 uncontested 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-Genovese 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« (Boyte 1992, p. 179). Quickly following the Civil rights and anti-war movements came also the women's liberation move-

ment of the 1970s, the 1980s and anti-discriminating attitudinal and value awareness of prejudice.

The »ethnocultural« furthered by changing the rising rates of non-white birth rates of some minority groups. Demographers have estimated that by 2000, 30% of Americans under age 18 will be non-white.

Affirmative action increased the enrollment of African Americans, in higher education (each year) and provided a more diverse presentation as well (Goff). The advancement of women, similarly, as an outcome of the 1960s and the workplace, a result of the strong demand during the war.

In other words, the debate that surrounds multiculturalism, and PC is becoming a more cultural and male-dominated society. A reassessment of dominant standards. More and more people are asking: What does it mean to be American based on Western cultural diversity of the world? »center« be redefined, increasing plurality and diversity. The Left and Right have responded differently to changes in the U.S.

From the perspective of the 1990s, it has not been fast enough a participation of women in society as hoped. The Reagan/Bush years as a result. It is argued that minorities in higher education and in better positions are not yet represented in higher education to their numbers in the population. The subtle or hidden mechanism replaced open discrimination with a more subtle plain that the public's perception of the diverse culture is woefully limited. They

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 hegemonial 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 1993, p. 30; 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 overdramatize PC, in our understanding it correctly reflects that PC, if enacted in politics 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 discourse 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 other -isms (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 redist expressed, is America w knowledge without pres when) the quest for ce matism and orthodoxy 1992, p. 332)?

The PC debate reflect American culture and pu at hand, such as the ba esoteric and have been r their rigid moralism and genuine American conce not overlook that the de hiring practices, the socia scholarship, the concept free speech, the canon, t racism and sexism has sustenance of the central and belief-systems of the troversies can be interpre tion, decline, or decade: democratic health, sinc crises are signs of life«

America could com sooner or later will ce democratic societies em multicultural societies.

Bibliography

- Asante, Molefi Kere (1992) change«, in: Paul Bern York: Laurel, pp. 299-; Aufderheide, Patricia (1992) Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyw* Graywolf Press, pp. 1-6
Bennett, Paula (1992): »Can in: Patricia Aufderheide Minnesota: Graywolf P

opponents and supporters
axioms of American socie-
mal democracy, and increas-
m. The PC debate does not,
rtend a major political or
the U.S.

ust by coincidence that the
n so intense in recent years.
international changes. The
of non-European minorities
diversity, the promised, but
lized removal of barriers and
of the conservative revolu-
Bush, and the newly, more
eptions of the American
ortive of formerly silenced
entation on domestic issues
cultural and ethnic diversity.
decline of a previously un-
nd political domination by
backdrop for a discourse that
and equality of non-main-
values, and identities. Ironi-
hegemony is simultaneous
e Soviet Union, the rise of
and Asia, and the notion
with many centers and more
former excluded nations in

characterized by a high degree
a, inequality and permanent
a society in constant evolu-
ent need for consensus, that
ty. Neither the conservative
»truths« and universal values
m of unity through conflict
al relativism is able to suffi-
merican society or garner the
of Americans.

with confidence predict that
e the American society will
attempt to balance between
ism and pluralist diversity, be-
s proclamation of »universal
lativism, between those re-
nt hegemonic culture and the
alized minorities calling for
ures and, in the extreme case
e, supplanting Eurocentrism
steuber 1993, p. 265). Neither

testimony of oppression nor of domination is »a
justification for further cruelty and inhumanity, or
for high sounding cant and merely »correct« at-
titudes« (Said 1992, p. 187).

America will not escape the almost certain future
of diverse and pluralist societies and their ensuing
conflicts. The question is rather if 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 dog-
matism and orthodoxy and rigidity is over« (West
1992, p. 332)?

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 can-
not 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 con-
troversies can be interpreted not as signs of corrup-
tion, decline, or decadence but of educational and
democratic health, since »in intellectual matters,
crises are signs of life« (Berman 1991, p. 26).

America could come to mirror changes that
sooner or later will come into being in other
democratic societies emerging as multiethnic and
multicultural societies.

Bibliography

- Asante, Molefi Kete (1992): »Multiculturalism: An Exchange«, in: Paul Berman (Ed.), *Debating P.C.* New York: Laurel, pp. 299-314
- Aufderheide, Patricia (1992): »Introduction«, in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 1-6
- Bennett, Paula (1992): »Canons to the Right of Them...« in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 165-174.
- Berman, Paul (1992): »The Debate and Its Origins«, in: Paul Berman (Ed.), *Debating P.C.* New York: Laurel, pp. 1-28
- Berube, Michael (1992): »Public Image Limited: Political Correctness and the Media's Big Lie«, in: Paul Berman (Ed.), *Debating P.C.* New York: Laurel, pp. 124-152
- Bloom, Allan (1987): *The Closing of the American Mind.* New York: Simon and Schuster
- Bonevac, Daniel (1993): »Leviathan U.«, in: Howard Dickman (Ed.), *The Imperiled Academy.* New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, pp. 1-26
- Boyte, Harry C. (1992): »The Politics of Innocence«, in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 177-179
- Brodkey, Linda and Shelli Fowler (1992): »What Happened to English 306?«, in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 113-117
- Choi, J.M. & Murphy, J.W. (1992): *The Politics And Philosophy Of Political Correctness.* Westport, CT: Praeger
- Crichton, P. (1993, October 25): »Sexual Correctness: Has It Gone Too Far?« *Newsweek*, pp. 53-56
- Daniels, Lee A. (1991, September/October): »Diversity, Correctness, and Campus Life«, in: *Change*, pp. 16-20
- Douglas, George, H. (1992): *Education Without Impact.* New York: Birch Lane.
- D'Souza, Dinesh (1991): *Illiberal Education. The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus.* New York: Macmillan
- D'Souza, Dinesh (1992): »The Visigoths in Tweed«, in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 11-22
- Ehrenreich, Barbara (1992a): »The Challenge for the Left«, in: Paul Berman (Ed.), *Debating P.C.* New York: Laurel, pp. 333-338
- Ehrenreich, Rosa (1992b): »What Campus radicals?«, in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 133-141.
- Elfin, M. & Burke, S. (1993, April 19): »Race on Campus«. *U.S. News and World Report*, pp. 52-56
- Epstein, Barbara (1992): »Political Correctness and Identity Politics«, in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 148-154
- Fish, Stanley (1994): *There's No Such Thing As Free Speech: And It's A Good Thing, Too.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- Folkenflik, D. (April 4, 1994): »Scholar Calls For Ethnicity In U.S. History«. *Durham Herald Sun*
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth, (1991): »The Self-Interest of Multiculturalism«, in: *Tikkun*, Vol 6 (4): 47-49
- Gamson, William A. and Andre Modigliani (1987): »The Changing Culture of Affirmative Action«, in: *Research in Political Science*, Vol 3, pp. 137-171
- Gates, Henry Louis, Jr (1992): »Whose Canon Is It, Anyway?«, in: Paul Berman (Ed.), *Debating P.C.* New York: Laurel, pp. 190-200

- Gitlin, Todd (1992): »On the Virtues of a Loose Canon«, in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 185-190
- Glazer, Nathan (1987): *Affirmative Discrimination: Ethnic Inequality and Public Policy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Graff, Gerald (1992): *Beyond The Culture Wars: How Teaching The Conflicts Can Revitalize American Education.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton
- Graff, Gerald (1991): »The Nonpolitics of P.C.«, in: *Tikkun*, Vol 6 (4): 50-52
- Harvey, Miles (1992): »Politically Correct is Politically Suspect«, in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 142-147
- Henry, William A. III (1990): »Beyond the Melting Pot«, in: *Time Magazine*, April 9, 1990, pp. 28-31
- Herrnstein Smith, Barbara (1992): »Introduction: The Public, the Press, and the Professors«, in: Darryl J. Gless and Barbara Herrnstein Smith (Eds.), *The Politics of Liberal Education.* Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 1-11
- Howe, Irving (1992): »The Value of the Canon«, in: Paul Berman (Ed.), *Debating P.C.* New York: Laurel, pp. 153-171
- Hughes, Robert (1993): *The Culture Of Complaint.* New York: Oxford University Press
- Issermann, M. (1991): »Travels with Dinesh«, *Tikkun*, 6 (5), pp. 81-84
- Kimball, Robert (1990): *Tenured Radicals. How Politics has Corrupted Our Higher Education.* New York: Harper & Row
- Kimball, Robert (1992): »The Periphery v. the Center: The MLA in Chicago«, in: Paul Berman (Ed.), *Debating P.C.* New York: Laurel, pp. 40-60
- Kleinsteuber, Hans J. (1993): »Massenmedien in den USA«, in: Hartmut Wasser (ed.), *USA-Wirtschaft-Gesellschaft-Politik.* 2. Aufl. Opladen: Leske und Budrich, pp. 271-292
- Leo, John (1994, February, 23): »Customized History Turns Fiction Into Fact.« *Durham Herald Sun*, p. A8
- Lipset, Seymour Martin (1993): »The Sources of Political Correctness on American Campuses«, in: Howard Dickman (Ed.), *The Imperiled Academy.* New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, pp. 71-96
- Losey, Kay and Hermann Kurthen (1994): »The Rhetoric of Political Correctness: Ethnicity and Gender in the U.S. Media«, Paper given at the 4th Annual Meeting of the German Association for American Studies, Universitaet Tuebingen, May 25, 1994
- Lynch, Frederick R. (1989): *Invisible Victims: White Males and The Crisis of Affirmative Action.* New York, Westport CO and London: Greenwood Press
- Martin, Jerry L. (1993): »The University as Agent of Social Transformation: The Postmodern Argument Considered«, in: Howard Dickman (Ed.), *The Imperiled Academy.* New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, pp. 203-238
- Perry, R. (1992): »A Short History Of The Term Politically Correct«. In P. Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, MN: Graywolf Press
- Ravitch, Diane (1992): in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 228 f.
- Roiphe, Katie (1993): *The Morning After: Sex, Fear, And Feminism On Campus.* Boston: Little Brown
- Rosenthal, Harry (1994, April 30): »Nixon Blasts Hollywood in Parting Book«, in: *Durham Herald Sun*, pp. 1A f.
- Said, Edward W. (1992): »The Politics of Knowledge«, in: Paul Berman (Ed.), *Debating P.C.* New York: Laurel, pp. 172-189
- Scott, Joan Wallach (1992): »Campus Communities Beyond Consensus«, in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 212-224
- Schlesinger, Arthur M. Jr (1993): »E Pluribus Unum«, in: Charles Lemert (Ed.), *Social Theory.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 567-576
- Searle, John (1992): »The Storm over the University«, in: Paul Berman (Ed.), *Debating P.C.* New York: Laurel, pp. 85-123
- Short, Thomas (1986): »A New Racism On Campus?« In: *Commentary* 88, 1986, p. 46-50
- Segel, Fred (1992): »The Cult of Multiculturalism«, in: *Race and Ethnic Relations.* Annual Editions 1992/93, John A. Kromkowski (ed.), Guilford, Connecticut: Dushkin, pp. 218-223
- Stansell, Christine (1991): »Liberated Loudness«, in: *Tikkun*, Vol 6 (4): 52-54
- Steele, Shelby (1990): *The Content Of Our Character.* New York: St. Martin's Press
- Taylor, J. (1991, Jan. 21): »Are You Politically Correct?« *New York*, 32-40
- Teachers for a Democratic Culture (1992): »Statement of Principles«, in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 67-70
- West, Cornel (1992): »Diverse New World«, in: Paul Berman (Ed.), *Debating P.C.* New York: Laurel, pp. 326-332
- West, Cornel (1993): »The New Cultural Politics of Difference«, in: Charles Lemert (Ed.), *Social Theory.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 577-589
- Will, George F. (1992a): »Literary Politics«, in: Patricia Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond P.C.* Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press, pp. 23-26
- Will, George F. (1992b): »Radical English:«, in: Paul Berman (Ed.), *Debating P.C.* New York: Laurel, pp. 258-261

KARL GEORG ZINN

Auf dem Weg in die tertiäre Der ungesicherte Übergang

Vor dem Hintergrund der großen Diskrepanzen und der ökologischen Diskrepanzen zwischen dem bisherigen, stark umweltschonenden Wirtschaftswachstum und der für alle Volkswirtschaften aber für die reichen Gesellschaften künftige sozialökonomische Welt- und ressourcenschonend zu zwei bis drei Jahrzehnten in der sichtbaren strukturellen Verschiebung Dienstleistungsproduktionen sich Neuorientierung der Wachstumsnügen. Die Verlagerung vom materiellen Konsum, vom Verbrauch von Gütern zu den Dienstleistungen, das künftige Wohlstandswachstum sieht man sich auf Natur und ökologischen Grundlagen der Menschheit zu verhandelt sich nur um eine Möglichkeit um einen zwangsläufigen Prozess, nur verschiedene Wege zu einer Gesellschaft, sondern es sind rechtliche Typen der Tertiarisierung denkbar durch ihre jeweiligen Umweltförmigen beanspruchung unterschieden wärtige sich etwa die unterschiedlichen landschaftsverbrauchenden Reiskonsum einerseits und der Bildungstutorientierung einer »Freizeitgesellschaft«.

Die Drei-Sektoren-Struktur der Volkswirtschaft

Zur statistischen und theoretischen Sektorenstruktur

Die industrielle Beschäftigung sinkt, und in jüngerer Vergangenheit der Abbau industrieller Arbeitsplätze. Um diesen Strukturwandel beurteilen zu können und die Bahnen zu lenken, müssen die

veloped 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. Mansilla:

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 what tends to be an authoritarian »defensive culture«. In the Islamic region radical fundamentalism is only one extreme manifestation of a general anti-individualist view of society which places no value on the rights of the individual. The authoritarian tradition is sustained by other roots in Latin America. Neither the advanced pre-Columbian civilizations nor the Iberian colonial regimes knew anything much of the elements of an open society. They passed on a legacy of centralism and bureaucracy. As for Marxism, its Russian variety was taken up worldwide as a modernization ideology for backward societies and strengthened authoritarian tendencies by establishing the rule of the intelligentsia class in the form of the »communist« party and turning the state into the central agency of modernization. The recent experience of democratization processes in the East and in the South do 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 Klennert:

Oligarchical Society and Democratic State? The Case of Pakistan

Although there has been some progress in Pakistan's formal democratic development since 1988, 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 educated middle class is increasingly addressing social and political abuses through their involvement in human rights, women's, environmentalist and labour organizations. Moreover, the transitional government under Moeen 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. Losey:

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 male »mainstream« culture and its bearers 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 its advocates for playing down the importance of performance standards, stifling free speech and dividing 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 redefining the Western identity of the United States in the wake of its evolution into a more and more multicultural society.

Karl Georg Zinn:

On the Road to the Tertiary Crisis?

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 are seeing a shedding of labour in this sector which echoes the earlier fate of agriculture. The transition from the industrial to the service society 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 services is more problematic than it was in the case of industrial products. Services are not cheapened in the same way, and are already facing largely saturated markets, which are in any case linked to (declining) industrial production. Thus, the transition to the service society brings – beyond the ups and downs of the business cycle – the prospect of relative economic stagnation, even though this may be delayed by new short-lived boosts to growth. As a result, full employment, the maintenance of a security system and, indeed, the access of all to the nation's prosperity are seriously jeopardized. Attempts to stimulate demand for services by pushing up service-sector wages (as in the United States) directly undermines the foundations of mass prosperity, while leaving the mechanism of stagnation intact. In order to avoid the looming crisis, fundamental and politically controlled corrections must be made to the existing economic mechanism.

Nicolás H. Hardinghaus:

The development of the international drugs economy

The supply and demand for drugs are determined by the market, which is both interventionist and regulated: interventionist because there is the repression of producers, dealers and consumers; regulated because there are neither quality controls for production nor trading standards for distribution. The market is flexible to new buyer countries (China, CIS countries) and demand shifts (designer drugs). Developing countries producing organic drugs have previously had »advantaged« industrial countries on the world drug market. This can change due to fully synthetic drugs and their pull in the developing countries producing »natural« drugs (Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, Morocco, Myanmar, Thailand, Yunnan or other regions of the global economy). Developing countries are, with the help of the drugs sector, still able to increase their GNP, stabilize the external value of the national currency and reduce or check their foreign debt. In Latin America alone, the drugs industry provides a livelihood for 12 million people. The positive effects in terms of investment, employment and wealth creation are offset by social costs whose dimension can hardly be estimated. The legalization of the use and selling of drugs would considerably reduce the social costs, but it would turn some developing countries into even worse economic chaos. The other economic parameters would continue to move in a positive direction if the liberated capital is not and legally reinvested.

Kai Ambos:

Why the International War on Drugs is Failing

The internationally dominant strategy of controlling drug production directly at source is doomed to failure because farmers cannot be persuaded to give up their