

DEI and the Crisis of Liberal Democracy

Guoping Zhao

Oklahoma State University

It has become increasingly clear that we are at a pivotal moment for democracy. The deeply polarized political landscape, the increasingly illiberal public discourse, and the growing authoritarianism all indicate that democracy is in crisis. We are living in a historical moment in which people on both sides of the political spectrum express deep concerns about the future of the United States' democracy. Some suggest that democracy is in crisis but also that there is "erosion of democratic values."¹ There is also no general public consensus on what democratic values are under threat and what the sources of the threat are.

This sense of tension and urgency is clearly felt in American schools. As Julian Culp and his colleagues state, "These political developments have . . . placed immense strain on the existing structures of public education."² The attempts to censor school library books and K-12 curriculum as well as the widely publicized parents' protests at school board meetings all point to not only "political polarization and 'sectarianism'" but also waning public trust and confidence in government institutions such as the public school.³ Some also argue that "the way democratic education is practiced in the school systems of liberal democracies has in fact contributed to the genesis of the current political situation."⁴

Nonetheless, when democracy is in crisis, it is often proposed that more "various forms of 'liberal democratic education' are needed."⁵ John Dewey is also known for stating that democracy lives or dies on the ability of its citizens to deliberate well.⁶ But open deliberation is a specific liberal democratic value, and at a time when liberal values are being questioned and challenged and when public schools and higher education institutions have adopted initiatives that deviate from liberal values, it is questionable whether such forms of liberal education can still play their role.

In this paper, I will argue that the current crisis of democracy is a crisis of liberal democracy and that both the right and the left populist movements

have contributed to its crisis. Acknowledging sustained attack on liberal and democratic values from the far right, I will pay particular attention to how justice-oriented education efforts, especially those focusing on race, gender, and sexual diversity, have contributed to the erosion of liberal democratic values. Using the current DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) initiatives in educational settings as an example, I will analyze how liberal values have been shifted and questioned and how our concerns for social justice and inequality have led to imposition of new ideas and policies that are in need of serious deliberation.

LIBERAL DEMOCRACY AND AUTHORITARIANISM

While widespread concern has been expressed about democracy and the erosion of democratic values, there has been less clarity about what concept of democracy is being used and what democratic values are being referred to. If basic democracy meant equal and inclusive citizenship and majority rule, democratic values would be centered on election inclusivity and fairness, and we should be prepared for any possible election outcomes and directions. After all, before ascending to absolute power, Hitler came close to winning a democratic election. Yet, concern about democracy is frequently accompanied by concern about the rise of authoritarianism and totalitarianism, the antithesis of liberal democracy, indicating that we are dealing with a crisis of liberal democracy.

Tyranny, totalitarianism, or authoritarianism—different terminologies have been used to underscore different aspects of the same concentration of power and deprivation of individual freedom and basic rights. In recent history, totalitarianism has cost the lives of tens of millions, either as Nazism or as Stalinism under communist regimes. When considering what caused people to turn to authoritarianism, however, many analyses have focused on the pathologies of the distressed population: the “losers” of economic globalization who have lost not only jobs and incomes but also social status and who fear losing their cultural traditions and way of life as a result of the inflow of immigrants.⁷ This narrative of cultural and economic grievances, like the narrative of “great replacement” that plagued pre-Nazi Germans, can easily be seen as warning signs of authoritarianism, with citizens losing faith in the future and turning to “strong leaders” at the expense of liberal-democratic principles.

Since World War II, we have developed vigilance with respect to the warning signs of authoritarianism, such as grievance, animosity toward immigrants, distrust of the institution, and willingness to follow charismatic figures. Yet, while the pathologic conditions may bring people to a strong leader and undermine the structure of democracy, it is unclear why such pathologies would inexorably lead to violence, racism, and anti-Semitism, wreaking unthinkable destruction and atrocities on humanity. Authoritarianism is far more insidious and destructive at its root than feelings of resentment and loss of confidence. The threat to the political system may be a more serious concern for democratic defenders.⁸ The emergence of authoritarian elements in society, rather than the election of charismatic figures, should also raise our vigilance.

In one of the most powerful post-World War II analyses of what lies at the heart of Nazism, German critical theorist Theodor Adorno points to identity thinking, in which we subsume ourselves and others, with all our otherness and unidentified sphere, to the identity categories of “us” and “them,” rendering all identity categories homogeneous and “same.”⁹ Such identity thinking treats people not as unique individuals but as members of identity groups with varying characteristics and status, which Adorno claims is at the root of racism, anti-Semitism, and xenophobia. Nazism is essentially an ethno-nationalism, an identitarian movement carried to its logical conclusion in order to preserve the purity and superiority of the Aryan race at the expense of all others. When group allegiance, membership, and identitarian beliefs override individual conscience, the seeds of tyranny are sown. Individuality vanishes in this conception, and the other’s humanity and freedom are stripped away, sacrificed for the cultural or moral superiority of one’s identity group.

If we follow this analysis, then, a similar approach and logic exist in the other types of authoritarianism, Stalinism and communism, which regard individuals as oppressors and oppressed in terms of class, race, gender, and so on. Many of the political movements on the left inherited Marx’s critical framing of social structure as essentially hierarchical and founded on group identities, with problems and solutions inextricably linked to identity divisions. So, for fascism, it is “the folk,” while for communism, it is “the proletariat.”

The right-leaning populists historically stressed shared ancestry and descent, or shared culture and tradition, while the left-leaning populists frequently defined people in terms of class and power, rejecting those with wealth and influence. What remains constant, though, is identity thinking, racism, and classism, although different classes or races are demonized. Such structural thinking can be useful in recognizing shared experiences and addressing systemic challenges and obstacles; however, when identity categories are essentialized to the point where people's individuality becomes dismissible, and when such identity categories are incorporated into the building blocks of an envisioned new social order, individuals outside oppressed groups may be denied equal participation, violating the democratic concept of inclusion. The door opens to forms of authoritarianism unrecognized by many. It comes as no surprise that observers of the socialist regimes have often found unexpected consequences of totalitarianism and the "extraordinary similarity in many respects of the conditions under 'communism' and 'fascism.'"¹⁰

What authoritarianism is really up against is not necessarily democracy, but liberal democracy. A basic democracy, with equal and inclusive citizenship and majority rule, can still make majoritarian decisions that consistently work to the detriment of particular individuals and groups or infringe on their rights and freedom, as amply demonstrated in world history. Liberal democracy, on the other hand, is the very antithesis of authoritarianism in that it is built upon individual liberty rather than identity hierarchy. In fact, the emergence of liberalism in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that postulates that both king and peasant are equal in the eyes of the law has enabled and grounded the development of democracy as a form of government in the world.

Liberalism, which first arose in the Enlightenment, is a worldview devoted to two essential doctrines: the doctrine of individual liberty and the doctrine of human equality. In the classic work of liberal political theory, *Second Treatise on Government*, John Locke proposes that the state "all men are naturally in" is a state of "perfect freedom" and "a state also of equality."¹¹ Liberalism emphasizes that individuals have natural rights to life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness, and all people are equal in their natural rights. The natural

rights to liberty and equality are intimately connected, because “if all men are naturally free, then none can have a natural right to rule over others.”¹²

Such doctrines of natural rights necessitate government to protect those rights, but because government can also threaten them, it is also necessary to guard against government infringement of those rights. “Thus liberalism entails a government that is limited by a constitution and by the rule of law.”¹³ The legitimacy of government is based on the consent of the governed, which means that people, all those who belong to society, are the ultimate sovereign, and they have “a right to resume their original liberty” and choose a new legislative power if the current one betrays their trust.¹⁴ These liberal ideas gradually and inexorably undermined any effort in history to exclude people from political participation on the basis of such factors as race, religion, or sex and lead to popular democracy as the only legitimate form of government. “Today, wherever one finds liberalism, it is almost invariably coupled with democracy (understood as the selection of government officials by universal suffrage).”¹⁵ Liberal democracy has become the dominant form of governance in the developed world.

In the U.S. context, where Locke’s ideas were most widely adopted and monarchy and the aristocracy enjoyed much less support than in the more traditional societies of Europe, it was evident following the American Revolution that the people would only accept popular government.¹⁶ The U.S. Declaration of Independence embodies the essential liberalist principles. If all human beings are “created equal” and are endowed with “certain unalienable rights,” the government can only permit systems of governance that protect these rights. Despite the fact that slavery and Jim Crow laws in U.S. history manifested a contradiction between the liberal ideals granted by the Constitution and the actual reality of liberal democracy at the time, it is also true that liberal doctrines ultimately provide powerful resources for the civil rights movement’s quest for emancipation and the expansion of democracy.

With a long series of philosophical deliberation, now liberalism has embodied the Kantian idea of personal autonomy, public use of reason, Mill’s idea of press freedom, and Habermas’ idea of the public sphere as a key or-

ganizational principle of the liberal constitutional state. Fundamentally, liberal democracy is anti-tribal, anti-identity politics, and anti-racism. Even though it has failed to deliver on many promises, it provides the resources to reform itself. Therefore, the erosion of liberal democracy can come from political movements of all directions that treat people as identity groups and endorse identity thinking over individual conscience. The desire to protect and uplift oppressed groups is commendable, but it must be done in such a way that all marginalized groups and the conditions that lead to such marginalization are eventually eradicated and unique individuals with equal rights and freedom emerge in their place, rather than exploiting group identity as vital components of social structure. Imposing identity divisions on the reality of true diversity of individuals elevates some social groups over others. From this perspective, no form of identity politics can serve as the basis for modern, liberal democracy. If left unchecked, identity politics pose the greatest threat to liberal democracy.

In fact, the American political philosopher Francis Fukuyama's recent analysis highlights that identity politics may be behind the problems that liberal democracies are facing today.¹⁷ He notes that the current political struggle is "a struggle of identities. It's the dissatisfaction of the different identities and their representatives that is the cause of the problem in today's liberal democracy."¹⁸ When we look at the democratic society as a whole, if there is no universal connection of all sectors but only the incommensurable demands and expectations of groups competing within states, where others are seen as adversaries rather than fellow citizens, we are on the verge of tribalism, and liberal democracy is in peril.

In this context, examining the dominant DEI initiatives and their implications to liberal democracy becomes imperative.

THE DEI INITIATIVES

In recent years, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) initiatives have been widely embraced in American social and educational discourses and policies. While its origin dates to the 1960s, DEI has grown and evolved from its earlier emphasis on tolerance, to multiculturalism, and now to equity and inclusion.

Following the tragedy of George Floyd, people began to embrace the idea that we have a serious problem with diversity, and DEI quickly became mainstream guiding principles in American institutions, government, corporations, military, science, and health, and it is currently at the top of the priority list in higher education. According to Taffye Benson Clayton of the *American Council on Education*, “Diversity, equity, and inclusion are at the core of the mission of most higher education institutions.”¹⁹ Justice-oriented educators are fully engaged in this movement and actively promote DEI implementation in schools and universities, viewing it a necessary step in addressing persistent inequities and injustices. Even with increasing concerns about the decline of liberal democracy, there is little scrutiny of the initiatives and how the promotion of DEI may affect liberal democracy. It is therefore imperative for philosophers of education to examine and clarify the concepts of DEI and their implications for liberal democracy.

In a 2016 report, “Advancing Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education,” the U.S. Department of Education defines diversity as diverse student bodies of ethnic, cultural, and economic backgrounds. This report recognizes “both the tremendous value of increased diversity in higher education, and the role of higher education as a keystone to health, happiness, and economic mobility for all students, including low-income students and students of color.”²⁰ This definition of diversity is also used in the curriculum of education departments across the country to teach courses such as Diversity and Equity Issues in Education. This definition of diversity has been expanded to encompass a greater range of identity categories. For example, the UK Equality Act of 2010 lists the following as the “Protected Characteristics” against discrimination: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation, and in Northern Ireland, political opinion and community background.²¹

With the notion of intersectionality gaining popularity in race and gender studies, identity groups are ever expanding and ever dividing. The Black feminist concept of intersectionality highlights how our experience in a racialized society is shaped by the intersection of identity categories including race,

gender, sexuality, religion, immigrant status, and so on.

Such association of diversity with identity categories is justified firstly on the basis of the changing demographics of the country. “These demographic changes have largely informed our understanding of diversity and inclusion as our universities prepared for the influx of a more diverse student body.”²² Recruiting a greater diversity of teachers, providing opportunity to students with diverse experiences, and including a diverse range of perspectives are all necessary for schools and universities to build an inclusive environment.

However, the main justification for such association of diversity with different identity groups stems from the reality that, despite decades of progress, various barriers remain, and there are disparities in educational outcomes and faculty and student representation from historically marginalized groups. A literature review shows that on higher education campuses, for example, faculty of color tend to experience exclusion, isolation, and alienation, minority students tend to feel isolated and unwelcome, and women students tend to experience chilly climate.²³ Historical and socio-cultural factors continue to make it difficult for minority students to thrive in higher education. Therefore, the justification for identifying diversity according to racial, gender, and other identity categories derives mainly from the historical fact that these characteristics have been arbitrarily used to exclude and discriminate and have shaped people’s opportunities and experiences, and it is believed that centering policies and actions on diversity as identity can address the inequality and injustice associated with these identity groups.

It is in this context that critical and feminist scholars have criticized the ever-widening identity categories included in diversity initiatives. For example, James M. Thomas comments that all kinds of things are placed under the umbrella of diversity, including religion, regional identity, educational backgrounds, and so on, “as if all these different things have equal bearing on a person’s access to opportunity and recourses.”²⁴ Feminist and critical race philosopher Sara Ahmed also notes that “diversity can mean potentially anything” and criticizes the way that “diversity work” has become a kind of performance that does not “necessarily get associated with the histories of struggle evoked by more

‘marked’ terms such as equality and justice.”²⁵ Some critical scholars claim that the “turn” to diversity in higher education is “from the imperative to ‘manage diversity’, or to value diversity ‘as if’ it was a human resource.”²⁶ As a result, they propose narrowing diversity to more defined categories such as race and gender for the focused work of addressing historical struggles.

In this view, however, the argument for promoting diversity as identity comes from the observation that, despite the liberal democracy principle of individual liberty and equality, identity construction has historically served as a key justification for the exclusion, exploitation, and oppression of certain groups in US history. Race is clearly such an example of identity construction and oppression. As Farhad Dalal points out, while every individual is unique with infinite similarities and differences, often “a similarity or a difference gets suddenly and powerfully privileged over the rest, so much so that it becomes the only thing visible.”²⁷ Such is always a cultural and political act to convey a sense of hierarchy in terms of worth and moral status, even though the differences are not inherently hierarchical, and thus justify inclusion or exclusion. Our history of inclusion and exclusion has been largely shaped by how differences were turned into identity categories with predefined meanings.

Yet, embracing diversity as identity in order to combat historical discrimination based on identity runs the risk of reestablishing the conditions for such discrimination and injustice. While associating diversity with identity can help people understand shared experiences of discrimination as well as the damaging legacy of laws and norms that artificially separated citizens from one another, the ultimate goal would have to be the abolition of identity categories that allow people to be treated differently and unjustly and the embrace of diversity as unique individuality so that everyone counts as an equal member of society. As discussed earlier, addressing historical injustice cannot be done through exploiting group identity as a vital component of social structure because doing so is against the principles of liberal democracy and can lead to unwanted consequences. It is important that we avoid identity thinking in the promotion of diversity and inclusion so we can demolish the basis of and justification for discrimination. In this approach, diversity transcends group

identity and identity politics, allowing liberal democracy to fulfill its premise of treating all individuals equally and respectfully, providing them the dignity and liberty guaranteed to them.

But there is no such vision, and no effort appears to be made to make eradicating identity categories and celebrating the universality of individuality the ultimate goals of DEI initiatives. Instead, diversity as identity is essentialized, and we are all defined indefinitely by our identity categories, not only to redress historical injustices, but also to envision future social orders of resource distribution and moral hierarchy. Scholars in critical race studies have promoted a color-conscious strategy in which intersectional identity categories are prioritized in the formation of social policies and actions. CRT scholars openly question and reject the “liberal order” that underpins American democracy. However, the claim that the liberal order rests upon the very exclusion of particular groups is unsubstantiated because, if that claim were true, the liberal order would collapse when those groups were included; instead, it has grown stronger. The proposed alternative, an identity-based social order, is also yet to be closely examined, and its danger has gone unnoticed.

The danger of carrying diversity as identity beyond the demolition of systematic discrimination may be explained by an example of an anti-racist approach that defines racism as prejudice plus power or plus advantage, or as a “system of advantage based on race.”²⁸ Since American society is also defined as permanently a white-dominated society by these scholars, with this definition, all whites are automatically defined as racists, unless they actively prove otherwise. Because only whites are advantaged, only they can be racist. While Beverly Daniel Tatum justifies “reserving the term racist only for behaviors committed by Whites in the context of a White-dominated society” by the need to acknowledge “the ever-present power differential afforded Whites by the culture and institutions that make up the system of advantage,” such definition effectively establishes a caste system in which a white person, by being born into a racial/ethnic group, is inevitably morally depraved and deserves denunciation.²⁹ Some may argue that saying only white people can be racist is not the same as saying all white people are racist, but if the only way for whites to avoid being

racist is to go actively against their advantage or to be actively “anti-racist,” they are racist by default. Although individuals of color may target particular racial groups and use violence against them, this behavior is only viewed as “having prejudice” and is one of the unavoidable effects of existing in a racist society.³⁰ This potential caste system is the opposite of a liberal democratic order and should be denounced. In essence, diversity framed as identity, while not going deep enough to denounce the roots of historical injustice, inherits the same elements of historical injustice.

Another main initiative of DEI is the equity initiative. While the equality principle has long been a bedrock of a liberal order, promoting equal rights, equal treatment, and equal opportunity for all, persistent systemic disparities have led some social justice-oriented scholars and activists to reject the equality principle in favor of equity, the pursuit of equal outcomes and equal representation. While it is understandable that some marginalized groups have encountered persistent problems and have not been able to close the gap with other groups with respect to social economic outcomes and representations, promoting equity may result in more issues than it solves. Although there are undoubtedly hidden and invisible systemic barriers, the equity principle is based on a faulty assumption that disparity will not exist if there are no such barriers and that policy intervention can equalize all outcomes. Instead of doing the diligent work of examining and addressing all factors that have contributed to disparities, this assumption stifles and erases all individual differences, the true diversities we all have as human beings in the world, including the difference in passion and interest, in talent, in efforts, in family background, preferences, and perspectives, as well as the differences in race, gender, and sexual orientation. To force equal outcomes, all the differences must be erased or forced to conform, and there must be no recognition of and no respect for real human diversity. Equity appears to be an ideal that is unlikely to be realized in the absence of significant human suffering and injustice, not to mention that it fundamentally undermines the liberal democratic order.

Many educators and activists’ enthusiastic support for the equity principle is based on yet another assumption: only focusing on equal outcomes

allows for the reallocation of resources required to meet the diverse needs of marginalized communities. Because the reallocation is brought about by focusing on equal outcomes, it is assumed that the equity principle is at work, which proves that the equality principle is inadequate and needs to be replaced by the equity principle. Yet, this differential support based on needs is an essential part of the equality principle that promotes equal opportunity for all. The equality principle has long supported “leveling the playing field” in order to address historical, socio-cultural, and other systematic obstacles faced by marginalized communities. It also serves as the legal and constitutional foundation for initiatives such as Head Start, special education, gifted education, and inner-city school programs, funding, and resources. Government and organizations have long used the “means testing” method to identify different needs and determine different supports. This is precisely what the equality principle should entail: a careful examination of the factors that contribute to disparities followed by systematic support to level the playing field. Yet, even with these additional resources and support, there may still be different outcomes—due to different interests, talents, cultural values, preferences, choices, and so on—that no government intervention can equalize. In these cases, pursuing equity solely as a political struggle, as is frequently done now, may divert attention away from analyzing and addressing the real issues and from ensuring that all individuals do have equal opportunity.

The fundamental choice of DEI to define diversity as identity categories, combined with the pursuit of equity rather than equality, not only undermines the uniqueness and difference of all individuals but also fundamentally alters the liberal order upon which American democracy is predicated. The DEI proposal to distribute resources, representations, and weight to voices and interests based on identity categories is fundamentally illiberal and may have contributed to the decline of liberal democracy.

IS DEMOCRATIC DELIBERATION POSSIBLE?

Many of the problems with DEI stem from well-intended concerns but inadequate examination and open deliberation on its consequences. If the adaptation and implementation of DEI were not so sweeping and unquestioned,

if public deliberation is still possible, we may recognize the profound shift in our values away from liberal democratic principles and consider whether such a shift is justified and desirable. If the current liberal order is insufficient, its problems and how it should be expanded must be thoroughly examined and debated. The sense that times have changed and that we need different values of democracy needs to be brought out into the open and deliberated upon regarding its impact and consequences. Ironically, the values of freedom of conscience and freedom of expression, and hence freedom of public deliberation, are part of the liberal order. Thus, whether democratic deliberation is possible appears to depend on how much we believe a liberal order is still possible and necessary as well as whether we still want to pursue liberal education.

REFERENCES

- 1 Philosophy of Education Society, *PES 2023 Call for Papers: Democratic Education in Undemocratic Times* (2023), <https://www.philosophyofeducation.org/Conference>.
- 2 Julian Culp et al., *Liberal Democratic Education: A Paradigm in Crisis* (Boston, MA: Brill, 2022), vii.
- 3 Culp et al., *Liberal Democratic Education*, vii.
- 4 Culp et al., *Liberal Democratic Education*, viii.
- 5 Culp et al., *Liberal Democratic Education*, vii.
- 6 Philosophy of Education Society, *PES 2023 Call for Papers*.
- 7 Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publisher, 1951).
- 8 Jon Stewart, an American political commentator, recently warned that there may be more risk to the political system than to the “supervillain” Trump, saying that “Trump isn’t some incredible supervillain.” View at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fav5_H1qaFA.
- 9 Theodor W. Adorno, *Negative Dialectics* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973).

10 Friedrich A. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1944), 27.

11 John Locke, *Second Treatise on Government*, ed. Thomas P. Peardon (Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1952), 4.

12 Marc F. Plattner, "From Liberalism to Liberal Democracy," *Journal of Democracy* 10, no. 3 (1999): 121-134.

13 Plattner, "From Liberalism to Liberal Democracy," 121-134.

14 Locke, *Second Treatise on Government*, 124.

15 Plattner, "From Liberalism to Liberal Democracy," 121-134.

16 Clinton Rossiter, ed., *The Federalist* (New York: New American Library, 1961), 240.

17 Francis Fukuyama, *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment* (New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2018).

18 František Paďour, "Identity According to Francis Fukuyama: An Obstacle to the End of History," *Politics in Central Europe* 16, no. 1 (2020): 327-345.

19 Taffye Benson Clayton, "Refocusing on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion During the Pandemic and Beyond: Lessons from a Community of Practice," *Higher Education Today* (blog), January 13, 2021, <https://www.higheredtoday.org/2021/01/13/refocusing-diversity-equity-inclusion-pandemic-beyond-lessons-community-practice/>.

20 Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, U.S. Department of Education, "Advancing Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education: Key Data Highlights Focusing on Race and Ethnicity and Promising Practices," (2016), <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/advancing-diversity-inclusion.pdf>.

21 UK Public General Acts, "UK Equality Act 2010," <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents>.

22 Clayton, "Refocusing on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion."

- 23 The University of Arizona, “What are the Challenges to Creating a Diverse and Inclusive Campus?” https://www.uww.edu/Documents/diversity/diverse_campus.pdf.
- 24 James M. Thomas, *Diversity Regimes: Why Talk Is Not Enough to Fix Racial Inequality at Universities* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2020).
- 25 Sara Ahmed, “Doing Diversity Work in Higher Education in Australia,” *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 38, no. 6 (2006): 745, 747.
- 26 Ahmed, “Doing Diversity Work,” 746.
- 27 Farhad Dalal, “Against the Celebration of Diversity,” *British Journal of Psychotherapy* 24, no. 1 (2007): 10.
- 28 David Wellman (1977). *Portraits of White Racism* (Cambridge University Press). 1-44.
- 29 Beverly Daniel Tatum, “Defining Racism: ‘Can We Talk?’” in *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States: An Integrated Study*, 11th edition, ed. Paula S. Rothenberg and Christina Hsu Accomando (New York, NY: Worth Publishers, 2019), 115.
- 30 Tatum, “Defining Racism,” 112-113.