

# DEI Training Template

1. In **diversity** training, persuasive elements are limited, since the point is not to convince the audience, but rather to impose certain views and ways of seeing the world upon them, providing guidelines on how they should think and behave. Persuasion requires argument, while **diversity** speech in its deepest sense conveys what is conceived as a command. Its recipients – both individual and collective – must treat it as such. They are quietly and obediently to accept what the discourse serves up to them.
2. In **diversity** training sessions, we find a peculiar construction of the speaking subject, who is essentially not an individual, but rather the depository of “correctness.” This is the case both when the speaker can arbitrarily impose his opinions, and while excluding in advance any criticism. When the speaker is an insignificant member of the rank and file, then his or her task is merely to repeat whatever belongs to the official canon at a given moment.
3. For **diversity** training, unusually clear and dichotomous divisions are of fundamental significance, treated as absolute and indisputable. Any questioning of these divisions would be tantamount to casting doubt on the general principles of the discourse. In fact, the most important element is the very sharpness of the divisions.
4. The next feature of **diversity** training is linked with the clarity of the simplest dichotomous divisions. One-dimensional value judgments always predominate. They are formed in such a way as to be indisputable and to exclude any other axiological forms in advance. **Diversity** training imposes on the audience a certain system of values. Indeed, this is one of its most important distinguishing features. One-dimensional value judgments permeate everything that appears within **diversity** discourse.
5. **Diversity** training constructs a certain vision of the world. The vision is constructed as if it revealed certain features of the world that are inaccessible to the uninitiated or superficial glance. Specifically, it reveals how things really are, who is whom, who wants what, who stands behind whom, who is dangerous and hostile. We might say that this discourse—characterized by indisputable “correctness” and authority—forms a conspiracist vision of the world, often irrespective of its genuine subject.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from Michal Glowinski, *Totalitarian Speech*. Stanley Bill (trans.) (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2014), p. 97-99.