

Bijlage VWO

2025

tijdvak 2

Engels

Tekstboekje

VW-1002-a-25-2-b



Examentor — Slim slagen voor je eindexamen
www.examentor.nl · AI-tutor · Gratis beginnen

© Staat der Nederlanden · examenblad.nl



Person of the Year

An enthusiastic 'yes' to the choice of journalists as your Person of the Year. But there's an irony here. Truth seekers are telling us that many of Trump's statements are untrue, and Trump himself is proclaiming that his opponents are indulging in 'fake news', but there is something insidious going on in our free press. Newspapers in Australia, and all over the world, are mixing editorial positions in with news stories. Physician, heal thyself! It is only when the press itself has taken the high road to journalistic integrity that it can stare down those who are trying to subvert it.

Robert L. Glass,
TOOWONG, AUSTRALIA

TIME, 2019



Tekst 2

From Bill Foster:

When considering the judicial ramifications of understanding the neurology of crime, neuroscientist Martha J. Farah needs to consider whether the purpose of judicial punishment is deterrence or retribution.

Legal systems that have an emphasis on guilt appear to favour the latter. But no one should be punished for something for which they are not responsible. If morality is linked to brain function, as Farah states, then there is no free will so no one is responsible for anything. If that is the case, it is best to leave the question of guilt to the hereafter.

Considering punishment as a deterrent is 2, as it prevents the offender from repeating their offence and discourages copy-cat offenders. However, if anyone claims that they couldn't help themselves, their punishment should be increased rather than reduced, as they obviously require more deterrence.

NewScientist, 2010



Campaign season

- 1 Regarding “Campaign finance in Texas: Greg Abbott, Beto O’Rourke shatter records in governor’s race” (Oct. 12): Applause and high-five to *The Chronicle*! The decision to provide the last names of those who vote in Harris County, along with the finances of the key candidates, puts a spotlight on our commitment to our democracy. It is also one of the best pieces of evidence that the 2010 Supreme Court Citizens United ruling¹⁾ is adding insult to injury. It is disturbing to see what candidates have to do, and what we have to put up with, to run our free and fair elections.
- 2 It doesn’t matter who you are, it seems that the rich run the show. And as much as we all say that there is no “quid pro quo” between candidates and contributors, who is going to ignore a \$2 million “vote of confidence”? It is difficult to imagine that being consistently true.
- 3 4 is like a circular firing squad with attacks coming from everywhere, but mostly from those inside the circle. I hope the editorial board will continue to shine a light on the issues and the data to better inform us on how all of the parts of this democratic machinery are working or should work. We need all of the data that we can get.

Patricia Garris

houstonchronicle.com, 2022

noot 1 This ruling stops the government from limiting how much money corporations, including nonprofits, labor unions, and other groups, can spend on political campaigns.



To the Editor:

Re “Self-Censorship Is Stifling Campuses” by Emma Camp (Opinion guest essay, March 9):

- 1 I applaud Ms. Camp’s essay about the state of 5-1 (or the lack thereof) on college campuses in this country. She accurately and perceptively criticizes the growing trend in academia to promote and enforce an inflexible social ideology that intimidates any student or professor who does not embrace it. Colleges and universities, instead of being a fertile environment to question, learn and grow, are now teaching our children to be intolerant and judgmental, and to humiliate any who might disagree with the 5-2. And if you happen to be a professor who challenges this dogma, you face disgrace or even termination.
- 2 It is a sad state of affairs when our institutions of “higher learning” are embracing such a biased and disparaging environment that their students feel the need to censor their own thoughts and expressions on campus. 6 serves no one well, regardless of where one sits on the political spectrum.

John M. Singer
Portsmouth, N.H.

nytimes.com, 2022



Cruise has still got it

by Emma Brockes

1 Before going to the movies this week to see *Top Gun: Maverick*, I hadn't thought about Tom Cruise for a while. Or rather, I hadn't thought about him in his capacity as a movie star. Cruise's reputation has ranged over the years from hero to villain to general curiosity. At nearly 60, one might imagine he's done. Instead, here he is, skin stretched taut by forces greater than G-force, at the helm of a \$170m action movie that broke US box office records on its opening weekend. We've been through a lot with Cruise, but I'm going to say it: he's the last great movie star and this film, coming at a dismal moment in history, is close to being the perfect distraction.



2 The original *Top Gun* was released in 1986 and the makers of the sequel have shrewdly leaned into the nostalgia, updating the fighter jets and crew, but soaking every other detail in references to the original. It's all there, from the opening words on-screen, to the jump-jets landing on the carrier, to the tight white T-shirts and aviator shades. Because of all this, and the thrill of watching F-18s fight over unnamed enemy territory, *Top Gun: Maverick* hit \$160m at the US box office on its opening weekend, with the smallest drop ever – 29% – to \$90m for the second weekend.

3 A lot of this has to do with Cruise himself. His persistent strangeness off-screen has made it easy to forget just how good he is on-screen. Cruise has decent acting chops, but it's not that. It's the smile, obviously, which he rations so severely every flash of it lights up the scene. It's the nose. It's the eyebrows. It's that weird clenching thing he does with his jaw. It's the sheer distance between him and his co-stars, in this case Jon Hamm, a prissy creature of the small screen who looks thoroughly out of place in a blockbuster. Only Val Kilmer can hold his own opposite Cruise in this movie.

4 There are other films, other movie stars, but it's never quite the same. Brad Pitt – look, we all loved him back in the day, but he's become incrementally seedier and less appealing over the years, and not just for his behaviour towards Angelina Jolie. George Clooney? Too urbane. There's not enough mystery about Clooney and that charm of his has



curdled over the years into a self-regard so solid it's practically Clintonian. I recall seeing him at a press launch years ago, surrounded by acolytes, radiating what can only be called yes-I'd-be-excited-to-meet-me-too energy. There are younger contenders, too, all hobbled by various limitations. Chris Hemsworth, like Jason Momoa, looks like a boulder person from *Frozen 2*, who one imagines being broken by any question larger than "tea or coffee?".

- 5 So, to Cruise. I know, his adherence to Scientology. I used to fuss about that, but these days couldn't care less. At this distance, it almost 11. Cruise is consistently odd, thoroughly unknowable. He rarely posts on socials. He won't do a TV show. He fought to have the release of *Top Gun: Maverick* limited to cinemas rather than, as per industry standards, shared with a streaming giant.
- 6 The movie's one downside is the absence of Kelly McGillis, who, though only five years older than Cruise, is still a woman, so as per Hollywood bylaws isn't permitted within 100 feet of a romantic role in a blockbuster (Jennifer Connelly plays the love interest). In an interview with *Entertainment Tonight* recently, McGillis said: "I'm old and I'm fat and I look age-appropriate for what my age is, and that is not what that whole scene is about." Quite.
- 7 Still, I loved it. Here was the excitement America has for itself in its most innocent form. Killjoys will say it fetishises the military, and you can do that, if that's what you do. It is also joyous, and silly, and thrilling, and triumphant, a movie you have to submit to on its own terms or go home. "Well?" said a friend who I phoned immediately on leaving the cinema. "Greatest country on Earth," I said.

guardian.com, 2022



The Stonehenge Tunnel development

by Tom Holland



- 1 The Conservative Party, over the course of its lengthy history, has been defined by two particular traditions. One emphasises the duty of care to the past. It nurtures a suspicion of grandiose and ill-founded schemes. It never forgets that the responsibility of a conservative is ultimately to conserve. Then, parallel to this, there is a second tradition. This emphasises the importance of sound finance. It scorns to believe in magic money trees. It does not spray taxpayers' cash around like there is no tomorrow. It pays scrupulous attention to the bottom line.
- 2 Today, a supposedly Conservative government has made a mockery of its legacy. Upwards of £2 billion, at a time when the country's finances are in a shocking state, will be blown on a monstrous white elephant of a road development that will permanently disfigure Britain's most significant and sacred prehistoric landscape. The decision of Mark Harper to green-light the building of a tunnel through a stretch of the World heritage Site that surrounds Stonehenge is as inexplicable as it is disgraceful. Certainly, no one can be in any doubt that the scheme will inflict "permanent, irreversible harm" on a landscape that is the supreme icon of British archaeology. We know this because the Planning Inspectorate commissioned by the Government itself to deliver a 560-page report on the Stonehenge tunnel, said so. The inspectors did not mince their words. Proceed with the development, they declared, and it will "introduce a greater physical change to the Stonehenge landscape than has occurred in its 6,000 years as a place of widely acknowledged human significance." This was why, two years ago, the High Court ruled that Grant Schapps, the then Transport Secretary, had acted irrationally and unlawfully when he approved the project: a ruling that the Government has 15. By doing so, they threaten the gravest act of desecration knowingly perpetrated by any recent British government.



- 3 But what about the economy of the South-West? What about the need to keep Britain moving? What are aurochs bones or long barrows when weighed against the interests of the haulage industry? Reasonable questions – except that the Stonehenge tunnel makes no sense as a transport investment either. It is not only **17** who have pointed this out. So too have the National Audit Office and the Tax Payers Alliance, nobody's idea of tree-huggers. Stretches of the A303 west of Stonehenge will remain single lane. There will still be every chance of getting stuck behind a tractor. According to Highways England's own figures, the Stonehenge Tunnel development will save a mere 4.8 seconds/mile on an average 100-mile journey. Perhaps, were the times more prosperous, the prospect of spending billions on a development that **18** would seem less grotesque. As it is, with the country's finances currently shot to pieces, it beggars belief.
- 4 All of us are left to pray that the Government will come to its senses before it is too late – or, much more plausibly, that the High Court will once again come riding to the rescue.

spectator.co.uk, 2023



‘My truth’ is a mad concept

by Hugo Rifkind

- 1 Oh, hooray for actress Cate Blanchett. What wisdom! “One of the phrases I just cannot say,” she tells *Harper’s Bazaar*, “is ‘my truth’. I mean, the truth is the truth, isn’t it?” She’s right. By which, of course, I mean she’s speaking the truth. Although not just her truth. Or mine. Just truth. The real one.
- 2 What Blanchett is tilting at here is relativism, an ancient philosophical idea formalised in its modern sense, probably, by Immanuel Kant. My own personal truth has always been that Kant is completely unreadable, but my philosophy tutors disagreed, so I ended up having to read quite a lot of him. In a nutshell, relativism is the idea that truth is all about where you’re coming from. Your own experiences and preconceptions may make you think x, but other people may think y. Nobody is more innately right than anybody else. In some situations, in which differences must be respected, this is an immensely helpful framework in which to think. But it won’t tell you whether or not it’s the day on which bins are due to be collected.
- 3 Relativism is at its most useful when applied to ethics. Your culture tells you that women shouldn’t go to school; mine says they should. Whose is right? (Mine. I am not a relativist.) Whatever your view, it can still be helpful for both of us to realise that our views on this may be informed by our environments.
- 4 Today’s relativists, though, do not stop there. Relativism is at the core of identity politics, both on the left and the right. Fascists, propagandists and demagogues have all learnt to exploit the idea of their personal truths. Worse still, so has actress and lifestyle guru Gwyneth Paltrow. “My most lasting mistakes and the mess that comes with them have all stemmed from me not standing fully in my truth and speaking from it,” she wittered, in an essay to mark her 50th birthday. At the root of this is a sense of the empowerment of the self, and I doubt she means any harm. 23, do remember her dubious personal truth about matters of health and wellness.
- 5 Alas, we have not the space to chart how a philosophical conceit made its way from academia and totalitarianism to be so pervasive that it now even has a place in Gwyneth Paltrow’s daily life, but I’m tempted to blame Oprah Winfrey. Back in 2006 she championed *The Secret*, a book by the self-help guru Rhonda Byrne. Both dim and mad, it suggested achieving your life goals through a process of visualisation and self-belief.



- 6 As mere self-help, that's probably quite good advice. Yet Byrne's argument was not only that believing in yourself would be nebulously good for you. It was also that it would shape reality itself. As one incredulous critic put it at the time, "The cosmos isn't going to deliver a new car." Winfrey, though, described it as "the message I've been trying to share with the world on my show for the past 21 years." In such a mindset, not only are we all the centre of our own universes. We also get to demand to be the centre of everybody else's.
- 7 Of late, of course, the phrase "speaking my truth" has been most associated with Meghan, Duchess of Sussex, and especially since her interview with Winfrey. "Time for America to hear MY truth," Piers Morgan tweeted afterwards. "My' truth about Meghan and Harry," Jeremy Clarkson wrote in *The Spectator*. Andrew Neil complained that "apparently what matters now is people have their own truth." Even in parody terms, "my truth" has become a textbook Meghan-ish phrase, to the extent that I've used it myself. Ironically enough, though, I can't actually find any record of her saying it, either in that interview or anywhere else. Although it is clearly the truth of many people that she has.
- 8 We should also acknowledge, of course, that when you largely have white men on one side of this argument and two women of colour on the other, it's probably worth pondering why. For modern-day mytruthers, it's a matter of faith that when people insist that there is only one objective truth, what they're really defending is a sort of western, patriarchal truth that cannot acknowledge its own biases.
- 9 [...]
- 10 Really, what we have here is the breakdown between matters of opinion and matters of fact. I can have a fairly strong view that it's wrong for you to punch me in the face, but I can't know for sure. A jury may well choose your truth. Facts, though, aren't like that. A crowd is one size or another size. An army has either crossed the border or it hasn't. History either happened or it didn't. Think of it this way: one person believes there are aliens, one does not. One of them is wrong. The truth is out there. Not in here.

thetimes.co.uk, 2022



The decline of the girlboss

by Rhiannon Lucy Cosslett

- 1 A few months after graduating, mid-recession, on to the dole and shortly before I started writing for *The Guardian*, I worked very briefly for an online magazine as an editorial assistant. It was on my first day there that my older, female boss taught me a lesson I have never forgotten. After running through my various duties, she added this advice: “The men upstairs,” she said, “are going to think you are their secretary. They are going to ask you to do their photocopying and answer their phones. And it is very important that when they do, you say the following phrase: ‘No, that’s not my job.’”
- 2 I’ve been thinking about this because Anne Dickson’s *A Woman in Your Own Right*, the classic assertiveness bible first published in 1982, is being rereleased next month. My mother first gave me a copy when I was a teenager and, having worked with women’s groups in the 1980s, schooled me in assertiveness and self-defence at a time when “girldboss” culture was barely a glint in Margaret Thatcher’s eye.
- 3 Girldboss culture is the latest incarnation of the assertiveness and empowerment guides of the 1980s. A girldboss, for those who don’t know, is a 21st-century working woman “whose success is defined in opposition to the masculine business world in which she swims upstream” (this, according to the businesswoman and #Girldboss author Sophia Amoruso). The girldboss is essentially a power-suited working girl for the Instagram era, a pinkwashed hypercapitalist career queen who “leans in”.
- 4 She is reportedly on her way out, and not before time. Her place in fourth wave feminism has been mired by controversy: on the one hand, she has been accused of rebranding personal power and success as a quest for equality while doing nothing to challenge structural inequalities; on the other, she has at times served as a powerful archetype for women of colour, in terms of achieving success in areas dominated by white men.
- 5 All of which begs the question, do we really need assertiveness training these days, when everywhere you look women are loudly professing how empowered and confident they are? If we are smashing glass ceilings, are we really likely to cave in to pressure from our family to not order the jalfrezi for fear it will be too spicy, as one scenario in *A Woman in Your Own Right* plays out? Dickson argues that awareness and action are not the same thing. “It is easier to recognise



inequality, to be aware of it, than it is to know how to change our behaviour," she tells me. "We simply don't know how to alter our speech or approach, so again the skills in this book are essential for personal change."

- 6 She also notes that, despite huge advances, sexism hasn't gone away, "just underground", and that women are still struggling to assert themselves equally because "we have many inner attitudes to overcome" including "a dependence on outside approval, uncertainty about how to express a difference of opinion or to ask someone to change their behaviour".
- 7 This focus on women's behaviour has made assertiveness training a precursor to what Rosalind Gill and Shani Orgad call "confidence culture". Confidence culture, as Gill and Orgad explain in their new book of the same title, posits that "women suffer from an internal 'defect', namely a 'confidence gap', which holds them back in the world of work". A woman's job, indeed her labour, is to remedy that, often at the expense of challenging the unequal sexist and racist structures that obstruct women's careers. Books such as Sheryl Sandberg's *Lean In* exemplify this "cult", which encourages women to internalise the problem of inequality as individualised. In other words, you work on changing yourself within the existing capitalist, corporate reality, rather than trying to transform that reality. Realising this, well-meaning slogans about a woman's need to "stop apologising" or "never ask permission" 32.
- 8 None of this is to say that we should never work on ourselves. I have found the power of no very useful in my career. Nevertheless, the feminist imperative of the 1980s towards assertiveness has in the intervening decades morphed into a culture that prizes confidence as meme, as marketing tactic, and as a distraction from fighting for real political change. *A Woman in Her Own Right* and similar philosophies focused on language and behaviour as a way of helping women feel better equipped to survive in sexist environments. Today's confidence culture expects a woman to remake her whole self.
- 9 Far from being liberating, it all seems like a lot of, well, work. Which is why I suspect that you might be better off with *A Woman in Your Own Right* than any of the modern girlboss manuals that claim to be able to transform you wholesale into a kickass corporate woman. How much more are we expected to work on ourselves? Perhaps it's time to turn to these girlbosses and tell them: "No, that's not my job."

guardian.com, 2022



What does *imho* mean?

By Robinson Meyer

- 1 It's impossible not to like *imho*. If you've spent any time online, you've seen the word at least a dozen times. It usually sets off an opinion from the text around it: *Those jeans don't look very good, imho*.
- 2 But it's a pliable little devil. Depending on its context, *imho* can function as a gentle nudge or a punch in the gut. It can ease you into the persuasive mode: *This is all smart but imho you need to talk to him again*. It can spring-load sarcasm: *imho this column is Absolutely Correct*. It can set off a punch line: *Nuclear war sounds pretty bad imho*. Much like *lol* or *omg*, it can 35. It can even be a little phatic.
- 3 Yet on Wednesday *imho* suffered an apparent crisis. Employees at *BuzzFeed* reportedly could not agree on what the letters in *imho* represented. Some staffers claimed they meant "in my humble opinion." Others said that *imho* stood for "in my honest opinion." They turned it into content and posted a poll (which is silly, because democracy alone cannot determine correct usage). The debate soon metastasized across the English-speaking internet.
- 4 At press time, their poll showed "honest" in the lead with about 11,000 more votes. Here at *The Atlantic*, my esteemed colleague Alexis Madrigal has already weighed in on the debate: According to dozens of guidebooks dating back to the early days of the internet, *imho* stands for "in my humble opinion." What's more, there are many books that list *humble* alone, and many that list *humble* and *honest*. But there are none that list only *honest*. Etymologically speaking, Alexis is correct. The *h* in *imho* clearly did originate from *humble*.
- 5 But he's wrong about what *imho* means today. (Sorry, Alexis – I'm just being honest.) Think about it: *Honest* and *humble* have two wildly different meanings. They're not even talking about the same quality. *Honest* conveys something about the truth value of the statement that follows. *Humble* communicates its tone and emotional charge. If *imho* could legitimately mean either *humble* or *honest* – and half of us have been using it one way, and the other half the other – then we live in semantic anarchy. We were all typing, *clickety-clacking* with our fingers, but we weren't communicating anything. If *imho* can mean *humble* or *honest*, then the internet is full of noise and empty of soul: little more than a broadband Tower of Babel.

The Atlantic, 2018



Chronicle Fatigue

As the *Eye* reported, the Conservative Party spent August cramming letterboxes across the nation with party propaganda designed to resemble local newspapers, under convincing-looking mastheads reading “*Constituency X Reporter*” or “*Constituency Y Chronicle*”.

5 Oops! The latter titles included the *Wolverhampton Chronicle*, *Dudley Chronicle* and *Sandwell Chronicle*, all distributed in the area where local publisher the Midland News Association (MNA) owns trademarks to such titles, and publishes its own genuine *Chronicle Week* series of newspapers. Last week the Tory party had to issue a grovelling apology, 10 pointing out that “MNA Media has never been and continues not to be associated with the Conservative Party... We understand the confusion this may have caused, and we sympathise with the reputational damage this could cause an independent media outlet with nearly 150 years’ service to your local community”. By way of reparation, it made donations 15 to several local charities of the company’s choice.

Private Eye, 2023



To the editor:



Ryan Craig's opinion piece on student swapping by flagship publics¹⁾ (June 2) omits an important fact: if all public colleges limited out-of-state enrollment, it wouldn't provide any extra spaces for poor kids in their home states.

Instead, the elite rich kids banned from swapping would simply attend the flagships in their own states and pay lower tuition to occupy those spots. Student swapping provides a clear benefit by enabling rich kids to choose the colleges they prefer, and by helping public colleges profit from it.

If state colleges limited their out-of-state enrollment, they would have lower tuition revenues which in turn would require them to reduce their overall enrollment and reduce spaces for poorer students. Everyone benefits from student swapping because it increases the contribution of the rich to higher education funding.

John K. Wilson

insidehighered.com, 2023

noot 1 flagship publics = universiteiten die met overheidsgelden worden betaald en veel aanzien hebben





Newsnight reports on GIDS

Bernadette Wren mentions BBC Newsnight several times in her piece on the Gender Identity Development Service (GIDS) at the Tavistock Clinic (LRB, 2 December 2021). In February 2020, while being interviewed live on the programme, the comedy writer Graham Linehan made a vile remark about doctors prescribing puberty blockers. It is false that any Newsnight producer invited Mr Linehan on in order to make this comment, and he was immediately and robustly challenged on air when he did. Entirely separate to this interview, Newsnight has broadcast four films exploring different aspects of the healthcare provided to young people questioning their gender identity. On every occasion where GIDS was the focus, we extended an invitation of interview to its leadership; this was declined each time by a representative of the Tavistock and Portman NHS Trust. Our journalism throughout was evidenced-based and highlighted the serious safeguarding concerns raised about the service.

Esme Wren
London W1

lrb.co.uk, 2022



Tekst 13

Lees eerst de opgave voordat je naar de tekst gaat.

Pros and cons of affirmative action

Affirmative action policies discriminating in favour of members of disadvantaged groups have become widespread in countries worldwide since the 1960s, but the “very phrase is vague”, said *The Economist*. Then president John F. Kennedy signed an executive order in 1965 that required US government employers to “hire without regard to race, religion and national origin”. Yet since then, said the magazine, affirmative action “has come to mean more or less the opposite: giving preference to people because they belong to a particular race, religion, caste or sex”. Supporters argue that such policies – also known as positive discrimination – level the playing field for historically disadvantaged groups, but critics claim they unfairly discriminate and should be illegal.



1

“Since nine states already have bans on affirmative action, it’s easy to know what will happen if affirmative action is outlawed,” said Natasha Warikoo, a Tufts University professor who studies racial equity in education, in an article on *The Conversation*. Studies into college enrolment in those states indicate that the number of black, Hispanic and native American undergraduate students will decline in the long term.

Universities may lose out from ditching such policies, said Jennifer Lee, a professor in the Department of Sociology at Columbia University in New York. If the Supreme Court decides to end affirmative action, the result will ultimately “be institutions that are less representative, less intellectually stimulating, and less equipped to serve an increasingly diverse America”, Lee warned in an article for *Science*.

2

Polls show that affirmative action policies have become increasingly accepted over time. Gallup polling found that general support in the US stood at between 47% to 50% between 2001 and 2005, before climbing to 54% in 2016 and then 61% in 2018. And a poll by Quinnipiac University in 2020 of more than 1,300 people found that two-thirds believed that discrimination against black people in the US was a serious problem.

“Americans are also solidly behind the broad concept of equal opportunity and improving the position of racial minorities in society – the underlying rationale for affirmative action,” said Gallop.



3

Somewhere along the decades, affirmative action “has lost its way”, said law experts Richard Sander and Stuart Taylor Jr. in *The Atlantic*. “The largest, most aggressive preferences are usually reserved for upper-middle-class minorities on many of whom they inflict significant academic harm,” they wrote, “whereas more modest policies that could help working-class and poor people of all races are given short shrift.”

“We want diverse stock traders, corporate-boardroom members, and tenured professors,” said Jay Caspian Kang in *The New Yorker*, but “it’s clear that what’s at stake isn’t a vision of social and racial justice that would ameliorate inequalities for a broad swath of people but, rather, a fight for spots in the elite ranks of society”.

4

Advocates often argue that affirmative action is necessary to correct historical injustice and that discrimination against some groups is so pervasive that it can only be corrected with reverse discrimination.

But “critics of affirmative action argue that two wrongs do not make a right; that treating different racial groups differently will entrench racial antagonism and that societies should aim to be colour-blind”, said *The Economist*.

5

High-profile companies including Apple, Starbucks and Ikea joined together to file briefs at the Supreme Court arguing that racial diversity improves decision-making at their companies, said NPR’s Mary Louise Kelly on daily news show *All Things Considered*. Similarly, “a bunch of big law firms also weighed in on the value of a racially diverse pool of talent coming in to them”.

6

Critics question whether the costs associated with affirmative action policies, such as grants and scholarships to help access higher education, could be better spent improving opportunities for a wider demographic. “The staggering cost of the diversity bureaucracy contributes to the rising cost of tuition,” said Peter Kirsanow, a member of the US Commission on Civil Rights, in a 2011 article for *National Review*. “Consequently, all students (or their guarantors/creditors) are paying more money/incurring greater debt so that preferred minority students will have a higher probability of flunking out.”

theweek.co.uk, 2022

