



“Diversity” Is Really “Diversityism,” and Means Conformity of Thought

Does “diversity” really now mean conformity of thought? This question arises with a Supreme Court case, *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard*, involving racial affirmative-action policies.

The defendants, Harvard and the University of North Carolina, have argued that diversity is a benefit. The former asserted in its court brief that “decades of experience and study prove ‘that diversity “lead[s] to greater knowledge” for everyone,’ and promotes ‘the tolerance and mutual respect that are so essential to the maintenance of our civil society,’” [relates](#) *Newsweek’s* James Piereson. Yet this argument might have just been blown up, the writer states, by a headline-grabbing little incident recently occurring at Stanford Law School.



AnVr/iStock/Getty Images Plus

On March 9, Stanford law students shouted down Fifth Circuit Judge Stuart Kyle Duncan at a Federalist Society event at their school. What’s more, not only did five administrators present allow the blatant disruption — in violation of Stanford’s policies — but diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) dean Tirien Steinbach actually fanned the flames. Taking the microphone and delivering prepared remarks, she claimed that Duncan “literally denies the humanity of people” and told him, “Your work has caused harm.”

Mentioning “marginalized” people (i.e., everyone except white men), Steinbach also said that the judge’s “presence on campus represents a significant hit to their sense of belonging.” In summary, this “diversity” dean exhibited Jonestown-like cult devotion and essentially expressed that “free speech” was sorta, maybe, kinda, perhaps okay — but not for those disagreeing with her. Duncan was unable to continue his talk.

To be clear, the Supreme Court should rule only based on whether affirmative-action policies are constitutional, not on whether they’re a “good idea.” But they’re not a good idea — nor is the DEI theory now driving them. In fact, as Piereson points out, as “the diversity bureaucracies have expanded, so have the frequency of these [Stanford-like] disruptions, usually carried out in the name of diversity.”

This reflects how diversity has become *diversityism*, a “distinctive doctrine.” Moreover, while Stanford has been dubbed the “Ivy of the West,” a place where, ostensibly, profound intellectualism reigns, the diversityism it embraces epitomizes anti-intellectualism.

Even diversity itself, far from being a “strength,” is actually “a difficulty to be overcome,” as pundit Ann Coulter [observed in 2009](#). The notion “Our strength lies in our diversity” is completely unproven, accepted on blind faith. It makes as much sense as saying “Chocolate pudding is dramatic irony,” wrote



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 23, 2023

Coulter, or “Nicolas Cage is a two-cycle engine.”

“Before you know it, liberals will react to news of a mass murder by muttering, ‘Well, you know what they say: Nicolas Cage is a two-cycle engine,’ while everyone nods in agreement,” she continued.

Coulter was being comedic, but the point is airtight: The diversity mantra reflects the Big Lie technique. Where’s the proof of its benefit?

Japan, one of the most homogeneous nations, has the world’s third-largest economy by nominal GDP and is often called an East Asian model. China also rejects diversity and is a burgeoning power perhaps poised for hegemon status. This doesn’t mean diverse countries can’t be and aren’t often economically vibrant; it does mean that their success likely has nothing to do with their diversity.

Then there’s Harvard’s assertion that diversity leads to greater knowledge and promotes tolerance. Proof?

That it begets greater knowledge — related to the popular notion that it strengthens us — seemingly implies that certain groups possess strengths others don’t, that they’re *superior* in some respects. Yet asserting such in different contexts can bring bigotry charges, as another leftist dogma has been that all groups are equal in worldly abilities. So which is it?

As for “tolerance,” do note that it actually implies the abiding of a negative (you wouldn’t tolerate a delectable meal but would have to tolerate a stubborn cold). So to relate what Harvard officials were trying to say better than they understand it, they actually mean that diversity allegedly creates an environment in which people develop warmer feelings towards those who are different.

This brings to mind something I once heard a clergyman say, humorously, in a sermon: Many people will state, “I love *everyone* in the *whole* world...except for the 16 or 17 people who happen to be around me!” His point was that it can be easier loving people in the abstract than in practice — when they’re distant and mysterious than when up close and personal.

Hence the sayings, “Absence makes the heart grow fonder” and “Familiarity breeds contempt.” When we kids watched those 1970s cartoons with “stereotypes” of Japanese, Arabs, etc., it didn’t, as the thought police now claim, engender prejudice. It just made us more curious about the cultures presented. It’s when people live in close proximity that they may rub each other the wrong way and have conflict.

This doesn’t mean diverse groups of people can’t get along; they can and often do. It just means there’s no proof diversity increases the probability this will happen.

As for diversityism, research shows that diversity programming [is actually counterproductive](#). There’s a delicious irony here, too: Harvard’s own magazine, the *Harvard Business Review*, [reported](#) on this in 2016 in “Why Diversity Programs Fail”!

Diversityist “tools are designed to preempt lawsuits by policing managers’ thoughts and actions,” the magazine wrote. “Yet laboratory studies show that this kind of force-feeding can activate bias rather than stamp it out.”

My, my, was this introduced at the Supreme Court in the affirmative-action case? If so, I’d love to have seen the look on the Harvard lawyers’ faces.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe