things and understand things and have skills that the white males and their children must learn for success in our evolving world.

Shepard alleges that some colleges and universities hire both minorities and devotees of unconventional views who are unqualified. Perhaps he means to argue that pursuing diversity creates an unacceptable risk that the well-meant effort will be hijacked by ideologues who sacrifice good education to political agendas. This is certainly possible. If popular horror stories are true, it has happened in some places. But this only illustrates that any good faith program or approach in higher education can produce untoward results when it is dominated by venal, incompetent, or misdirected people.

If the constituencies that control and support America's colleges and universities will have the courage to require that diversity proponents justify their programs by demonstrating how their actions contribute to achieving the legitimate educational expectations of students and parents and how their approaches will better prepare graduates to meet the tests of the real world, the sensational stories that are repeated by diversity critics can be avoided and we will still have increased diversity.

Becoming fixated on the risks of greater diversity overlooks its considerable rewards. Today's college and university campuses are less tranquil than they once were but they are, on the whole, incomparably more vibrant and effective than when institutions of higher education relied on conventional indicators, leavened by considerations of family connections and donative generosity, to select the "best" students and faculty.

Granted, many students graduate with weaker writing skills than a generation ago, but this is due principally to weaker pre-college preparation across all economic, racial, and ethnic lines in America. Seeking ethnic and gender diversity as an element in the pursuit of better education is worth the downside risks for several reasons, including the fact that the arrival of significant numbers of qualified women and minorities on our campuses has forced students and faculty to think more deeply, consider

more alternatives, and engage in more dialogue than ever before. To appreciate these benefits is not to engage in racism.

J. Clifton Fleming, Jr.
J. Reuben Clark Law School
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

The Heritage of Sociology

To the Editor:

As much as I regret to say so, I do not share Irving Louis Horowitz's enthusiasm for the Chicago Heritage of Sociology Series he expressed in his interesting review "Max Scheler and the Heritage of Sociology" (SOCIETY, March/April 1993). The fact of the matter is that The University of Chicago Press is not doing a good job. Why was the recent edition of Lewis A. Coser's partial translation of *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* given the title *On Collective Memory*? Such a title is most unacceptable given that the title of Maurice Halbwachs' more famous work on this subject is *La mémoire collective* (The Collective Memory). Confusion can be the only result.

However, as important as this matter of the title is, there is a more pressing concern. I was distressed to discover that this edition contains less than half of *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. In the original French version, the sociologically extremely interesting phenomenon of the "localization of memory" takes up thirty-one pages; in the Heritage volume, the chapter has been reduced to two pages! Why not simply translate the entire book? That would surely have been the more scholarly way to proceed, even if that might mean eliminating the concluding section on the legendary topography of the Holy Land (a section that has been of considerable interest to my own scholarly work).

When I look through the earlier editions of the Heritage Series, they appear to have been edited with more discrimination. Many of the volumes, for example *Constitution of Society* by Edward Shils, contain previously uncollected essays in their entirety. In the volume of some of the writings of Schmalenbach, while there is the occasional ellipsis, most of the article appears. More im-

portantly, none of Schmalenbach's articles had been previously translated; thus the edition was a real contribution to sociology in America.

The volume of Max Scheler's writings is too much along the lines of the recent sloppy practice. If one includes a section from, say *The Nature of Sympathy*, why not include an entire, more or less self-contained chapter? Furthermore, of the twelve chapters, only one has not already appeared in English. It is also odd that there is no selection from either *On the Eternal in Man* or from *Man's Place in Nature*.

Given the behavior of academics, I should make it perfectly clear that I am not grinding any axes. I do not have nor have I had any relation with the Heritage Series, other than buying and reading the books in the series. Quite simply, I was rather taken aback when I examined these two recent volumes in the Series.

Steven Grosby
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania

Correction:

Two omissions occurred in the article by Robert B. Smith "Health Care Reform Now" in the March/April 1993 issue of SOCIETY. These sentences, on page 58, should read:

HPPCs would create competition among accountable health plans for their business. A National Health Board would certify health plans as accountable, define the basic benefits package, guarantee the provision of insurance regardless of health risk, subsidize the insurance of low income and Medicaid enrollees, and report on the effectiveness and quality of the health plans. [. . .] Occupational groups, or a large employer, one with at least 1,001 employees, could form their own closed health plan, but must offer enrollment in the basic plan. The bill requires all employers to deduct their employees' contributions from their paychecks, but it neither mandates nor prohibits employer contributions for health insurance. □