

The Politics of Dignity

Robert W. Fuller

Preamble: Youthful Dreams of Dignity

Not to be a socialist at twenty is proof of want of heart;
to be one at thirty is proof of want of head.
– George Clemenceau¹

In 1957, at the age of twenty, I sailed to France to spend a year at l'École Normale Supérieure. Many of my fellow students at ENS regarded themselves as either socialists or communists, and were contemptuous of capitalism and American democracy. Though I was often tempted to point out that America had brought about their liberation from German occupation and helped them back onto their feet in the postwar years, I usually held my tongue. On one occasion when I did not, my French classmates argued that it was actually the Soviet Red Army that defeated the Germans, not the Americans. Later, I would realize there was far more truth to this than had been acknowledged in the West.

My year in France did not convert me to socialism, but I returned to America intrigued by its promise of economic justice. I'd always been stirred by the egalitarian elements of Jeffersonian democracy, and America's persistent inequities gnawed at me. The socialism of my French schoolmates sounded both more compassionate and fairer than America's "every man for himself" and "winner take all" brand of capitalist democracy. But wasn't America richer than the socialist countries? What good is equality, I wondered, if it means everyone is equally poor?

I'd gone to France to study math and physics, but to find answers to my budding social questions, I needed to know some economics. During my year abroad, I read undergraduate texts in economics and political science and, upon

returning to the States, I left physics at Princeton to take up graduate economics at the University of Chicago.

It quickly became apparent that the faculty at the University of Chicago had *its* answer to my questions. For the most part, Milton Friedman and his departmental colleagues of the “Chicago School,” extolled the virtues of American capitalism and ignored issues of social justice.²

Not finding what I sought in their courses, I turned to books outside the assigned texts—works by Max Eastman, Sidney Hook, Ludwig Feuerbach, Bertram Wolfe, Edmund Wilson, and of course, Marx and Engels.

As a twenty-year old, my attraction to egalitarian values could be chalked up to youthful idealism, but there’s a more down-to-earth explanation. Young people stand on the threshold of a working life which, for many, will mean putting up with indignity, if not exploitation. Their sympathy for socialist values is neither idealistic nor altruistic. Rather, it’s rooted in an instinct to safeguard their own dignity. I knew that so long as anyone’s dignity was at risk, mine was too.

The effect of my exposure to French socialism and Chicago conservatism was to lodge a desire to check out Soviet claims of superiority in person. As things turned out, it would be ten years before I’d get to Russia. But, once there, questions that had lain dormant for a decade took hold of me again and triggered a lifelong quest for a political model that could actually deliver social justice.

The Legacy of “Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité”

For centuries the French Revolutionary slogan—Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité—has served as an inspiration to would-be reformers the world over. But almost from the start, there were indications that something was missing in this prescription for political change. Initially in France, and subsequently in a wide variety of settings, advances won under this banner have come at the price of misery, mayhem, and murder.

Though the ideal of Liberty has repeatedly served as a midwife to democracy, it may also shelter a predatory species of capitalism. Beginning in the nineteenth century and continuing to the present day, critics on both left and right have pointed out that uninhibited free-market capitalism, driven by the profit motive, has inherent monopolistic tendencies, and that political intervention is required to prevent unhealthy concentrations of economic power that then become a law unto themselves. Purloined elections, bought legislation, unwarranted disparities in wealth, unsafe working conditions, persistent poverty, and the exploitation of natural resources for private gain are unjust consequences of unfettered capitalism.

Even as “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity” sounded round the globe, the French statesman Chateaubriand was warning that “equality and despotism have secret connections.”³ In hindsight it’s obvious that although “equality” has often been the watchword for political and social movements, it has also provided ideological cover for regimes that while claiming to be egalitarian are in fact oppressive police states.

The ideal of Fraternity is no less susceptible to distortion and caricature. Although a certain nostalgia clings to the Age of Aquarius, many now see it as a time of naïveté and excess. Countless communities that idealized “Love,” devolved into exploitative cults. More darkly, the fraternal ideal of brotherly love has been distorted by fascist and other demagogues into creeds of blood, racial, and ethnic purity that sanction xenophobia, ethnic cleansing, and genocide. Twentieth-century examples include Nazi Germany, Cambodia, Rwanda, and the former Yugoslavia.

In sum, political reformers who put their faith in an ideology derived from either Liberty, or Equality, or Fraternity have usually been disappointed by the dividends for justice and chastened by the blood spilled in what they thought was a noble cause.

Recent developments suggest that finding a path to social justice has become urgent. First, there is the growing lethality and proliferation of modern weaponry and the increasing willingness of aggrieved peoples to employ them in

their pursuit of respect or revenge. A new framework is required to guide the community of nations into an era of global peace and prosperity without triggering an intolerable level of violence.

The potential for social unrest exists not merely among nations, but within them. Even in developed countries, there is a growing fissure between the well-off and a hermetic underclass. In America, Reverend Jim Wallis has argued that, “Poverty is the new slavery.”⁴ Why is it becoming ever more difficult to escape poverty in rich countries? What can be done to close the dignity gap that divides rich from poor the world over?

We can no longer look for guidance to our old friend “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.” The flaw in the tripartite French formula is that it overlooks the sine qua non of social harmony—dignity. A persistent lack of dignity breeds indignation. Blowback may be suppressed for a time, but indignities, once lodged in the breast, fester until the aggrieved person, group, or nation sees a chance to get even.

What People Actually Want: Dignity

Dignity is not negotiable.
– Vartan Gregorian

As with liberty, dignity is most readily defined in the breach. As individuals, we know at once when we’re treated with disrespect, and for good reason. An intimation or overt gesture of disregard may be a test to gauge the degree of our resistance to subordination, or to remind us of our place. An insult is often a signal of intent to ostracize someone, to cast him or her as a nobody.

To be “nobodied” carries the threat of being deprived of social and material resources critical to well-being. Such threats are tantamount to blackmail or extortion, forcing targets to toe the line or face banishment.

Whole groups may be marginalized, as well as individuals. As between tribes (or nations) an insult or indignity carries an implicit threat of possible

subordination and enslavement. Status remains a determinant of whether we prosper or decline, so an attack on status is experienced as an existential threat.

While those atop the social pyramid prize liberty above all, most people put dignity first. History is full of examples of humiliated peoples who willingly surrender their freedom to a demagogue who promises to restore their pride. One has only to think of Weimar Germany in the aftermath of the punitive Versailles treaty that concluded World War I. Almost a century before that, in a prophetic letter about German nationalism, Karl Marx had observed that "...if a whole nation were to feel ashamed it would be like a lion recoiling in order to spring."⁵ A proud Russia, reeling from the disintegration of the Soviet Empire and wary of an expanding NATO, provides an example of the same dynamic. A humiliated bear is no less dangerous than a recoiling lion.

We promote justice indirectly—by removing the causes of injustice. So it must be with dignity. But before we can effectively target indignity, we must understand its origins.

The Source of Indignity

Every child knows that indignities flow downstream—from “somebodies,” of higher rank (indicating greater power) to “nobodies,” of lower rank (and relatively less power). No sooner do we understand this, than we imagine a solution: equalize power, eliminate rank.

But power differences are a fact of life. To bemoan them is like bemoaning the fact that the sun is brighter than the moon. And rank differences merely reflect power differences, so rank differences cannot be eliminated by decree.

Fortunately, this stark reality does not doom the prospects of achieving equal dignity for all. Understanding why is the key to a new politics—the politics of dignity.

Hasty youthful conclusions notwithstanding, rank, in and of itself, is *not* a source of indignity. Unless rank is inherently illegitimate—as, for example, the

specious social rankings that accord certain identity groups second-class citizenship—then the problem is not with rank per se but rather with its abuse. The distinction between rank and its abuse goes to the heart of many vexing and intractable political issues, domestic and international. In the vast majority of situations, indignity has its origins in *abuse* of the power signified by rank.

Confusing rank with its abuse occurs because rank is so commonly misused that young and old alike jump to the conclusion that the only remedy is to eliminate ranks. Conflating rank and rank-based abuse is logically unnecessary and it's a mistake with grave consequences. The socialists of nineteenth-century Europe and communists of the twentieth century often suffered from, or cynically exploited, this misconception. When egalitarian ideologies did prevail, the self-appointed leaders typically imposed even harsher tyrannies than the ones they replaced—as if to vindicate Chateaubriand's warning. In hindsight, the “secret connections” he foresaw between egalitarianism and despotism can be understood as a consequence of the indignation that builds up in long-suffering victims of indignity. Their bottled-up rage falls on anyone they see as opposing their cause or their leadership of that cause. Moreover, to seize power from a propertied elite, the party of equality has to marshal strength commensurate with that of the state and its police force, which serves the elite. In such struggles, both parties are apt to act despotically.

When legitimately earned and properly used, rank is an important—often indispensable—organizational tool for achieving group goals. We rightfully admire and love authorities—parents, teachers, bosses, even political leaders—who hold their rank and use the power it signifies in an exemplary way. One need look no further than George Washington for an example of someone who earned his rank and never lost sight of the fact that his role was to serve those of lower rank.

Accepting such leadership entails no loss of self-respect or opportunity by those in subordinate roles. It is when people use the power of position to aggrandize themselves or disadvantage those they outrank that seeds of indignity are sown. The consequences range from foot-dragging to genocide.

A Name for the Cause of Indignity—Rankism

To have a name is to be.
– Benoit Mandelbrot⁶

We don't have an inclusive name for rank-based abuse, but if we are to delegitimize it, it needs one. When abuse and discrimination are race-based, we call it racism; when they're gender-based, we call it sexism. By analogy, abuse of the power inherent in rank is *rankism*.

Rankism lies at the root of organizational dysfunction and corruption as well as the incendiary resentments that weaker nations harbor for stronger ones. International terrorism has multiple, complex causes, but one factor we can address is rankism between nations. There is no fury like that borne of chronic humiliation.

To victims, rankism feels like being taken for a nobody. For example, when a boss harasses an employee or a teacher humiliates a student, that's rankism. "Somebodies" with higher rank and more power in a particular setting can maintain an environment that is hostile and disadvantageous to "nobodies" of lower rank and less power in that setting, much as, most everywhere, whites used to be at liberty to mistreat blacks.

Perpetrators of rankism presume their own superiority and act as if their rank justifies them in demeaning or exploiting their subordinates and others whom they take to be their inferiors.

Front-page examples of rankism include corporate corruption, sexual abuse by clergy, elder and inmate abuse, torture, and the undue political influence of special-interest groups. The photos of Iraqi prisoners humiliated at Abu Ghraib gave the world a look at rankism's brutish face. Hurricane Katrina made visible rankism's most common victims—the poor, the weak, the sick, the old.

At the societal level, rankism afflicts none more inescapably than those lacking the advantages and protections of social rank—the working poor. In *Nickel and Dimed*, Barbara Ehrenreich chronicles this widening fissure and

makes the case that the working poor are in effect unacknowledged benefactors whose labor subsidizes the more advantaged. In *The Working Poor: Invisible in America*, David Shipler describes the economic black hole into which the poor can fall with scant hope of ever extricating themselves.

Rankism distorts personal relationships, erodes the will to learn, taxes economic productivity, and stokes international enmities. The effects on its victims are like the impact of racism and sexism on minorities and women. But, unlike these isms, which are tied to relatively fixed traits, rank is mutable—one may be a somebody in some contexts and a nobody in another. This means that unlike the isms we've confronted during the last half-century, most people are both victims and perpetrators of rankism. At first, our dual roles as victims and perpetrators might seem to present an insuperable obstacle to overcoming rankism. But in tackling the familiar isms, we've learned what we need to take it on.

Rankism is the illegitimate use of rank and, equally, the use of rank illegitimately acquired or held. The familiar isms are all examples of this latter form. They are based on the construction and maintenance of differences in social rank that violate ethical symmetry principles such as the golden rule and flout constitutional guarantees of equal protection under the law.

The relationship between rankism and the various isms targeted by identity politics can be compared to that between cancer and its subspecies. For centuries the group of diseases that are now seen as varieties of cancer were regarded as distinct illnesses. No one realized that lung, breast, and other organ-specific malignancies all had their origins in a similar kind of cellular malfunction.

In this metaphor, racism, sexism, homophobia, and other varieties of prejudice are analogous to organ-specific cancers, and rankism is the generic malignancy analogous to cancer itself.

The last century has borne witness to the delegitimization of racism and the transformation of many ethnically homogeneous and segregated societies into multicultural ones. The process of globalization calls for a change of comparable scope. That humans have modified their values and behavior when it

comes to race and gender is reason to believe that we will also find a way to disallow rankism and create a world of dignity for all.

Dignity is a universal desire, not something that liberals favor and conservatives oppose. This suggests that both the left and the right have essential parts to play in overcoming rankism.

How Can the Left and the Right Work Together to Overcome Rankism?

I often think it's comical
How nature...does contrive
That every boy and every gal,
...born into the world alive,
Is either a little Liberal,
Or...a little Conservative!

– W. S. Gilbert, *Iolanthe*

The tendency of societies to divide into two opposing partisan camps—conservative and liberal, republican and democrat, right and left—is universal and, in democracies, usually results in a see-saw sharing of power between parties. Simply declaring one party or the other wrongheaded fails to understand the complementary and indispensable roles played by each of them.

Partisanship has its roots in the legitimate issue of how much authority to vest in rank. The right has traditionally been the party that defends the authority and prerogatives of powerholders; the left the party that would place limits on power and its privileges. In the hurly-burly of history, these identifications occasionally reverse. When the Bolsheviks seized power during the Russian Revolution of 1917, they abolished all constraints on governmental power.

Since both right and left orientations have a valid role in good management, it's not surprising that democratic electorates tilt first one way and then the other, like a navigator who makes a continual series of course corrections to avoid beaching the ship (of state) on the shoals (of extremism).

Which party fulfills the progressive or conservative role is secondary compared to the overarching need to maintain social and political stability. A society that can't trust anyone with power loses its ability to perform complicated tasks in a timely fashion. Systems of governance that cannot "stop people talking," in Clement Atlee's phrase, are vulnerable to what the women's movement called the "tyranny of structurelessness," which often takes the form of interminable, inconclusive meetings. On the other hand, societies that don't limit the power of their rulers (such as the USSR and Nazi Germany) find individual initiative stifled and liberty extinguished in a brutal tyranny of conformity.

Aversion to abuses of power can blind liberals to rank's legitimate functions. Likewise, excessive loyalty to powerholders can turn conservatives into apologists for rank's misuse.⁷ To paraphrase an unknown pundit, we have lunatic fringes so we know how far *not* to go.

By showing where each party's understanding of authority is valid yet incomplete, a dignitarian analysis locates libertarian and egalitarian values within a new larger synthesis—the politics of dignity

What Will the Dignity Movement Look Like?

In both business and government, many act as if finding the right leader is the solution to rankism. That is like hoping the next king will be more benevolent than the last one. A more realistic assessment recognizes the need for the bipartisan support that can develop only as broad popular opposition to rankism takes hold. For historical antecedents, we have again only to look to the civil rights and women's movements. Each had to acquire strength through numbers before there was sufficient bipartisan support to legislate against racism and sexism.

The dignity movement stands on the shoulders of all other liberation movements. Although these have done much to advance human and civil rights, there are still, even in the wealthiest democracies, significant numbers of people

living with indignity and injustice. The dignity movement is unlikely to resemble the iconic televised images of movements past. Don't look for a million-man march, but rather for millions of organizations to examine themselves through the lens of rank and then to root out the rankism they discover lurking within. Dignitarian societies will at first be built relationship by relationship, organization by organization, and only then consolidated at the national level.

Like the trait-based liberation movements, the dignity movement will initially depend critically on the support of a few enlightened leaders. People of lower rank are understandably reluctant to speak up unless it has been made safe for them to do so by someone with the authority to protect them when they question their managers or "blow the whistle."⁸

All movements begin with the formation of small groups of people who share a sense of injustice. In the modern women's movement, these discussions became known as "consciousness raising" and occurred behind the scenes, primarily among women. Then, with the coinage of the word "sexism,"⁹ large numbers of women, along with their male supporters, joined together in protest and mounted demonstrations on behalf of specific policy goals such as equal pay for equal work, a woman's right to choose, and Title IX.

Progress toward non-rankist, dignitarian values will likely follow a similar course. Much of the change will be set in motion in relatively private interpersonal conversations among victims and between victims and perpetrators within single organizations. Through such discussions, rankists will come to understand the impact of their behavior on their targets and some will be persuaded to modify it. Part of the incentive to change arises from empathy and an innate sense of fairness, but by itself empathy is often not enough. Also necessary to produce real change is a vivid prospect of the negative consequences of not doing so.

To build a movement you need to know both what you're for and what you're against. That is why the concept of rankism is essential. Without it, a movement for dignity is bootless. Try to imagine a civil rights movement absent the concept of racism, or a women's movement without the concept of sexism. Until the targets of injustice have a name for what they're suffering, it is very hard

to organize resistance. Not uncommonly, they blame their predicament on themselves and each other, never achieving the unity necessary to compel their oppressors to cease and desist.

Rankism begets rankism. As surely as somebodies visit it upon nobodies, so too do nobodies inflict it on each other. Interpersonal rankism among the rank and file undermines their willingness to cooperate and unite against the more insidious forms of institutional rankism that marginalize them all. Nothing undermines labor's solidarity more than the rankism infecting its ranks. Only as it's eliminated, does broad social justice become a realistic political goal.

Even with the best of intentions, peoples' feelings and interests are invariably hurt. We're constantly overreaching in our uses of power—stepping on others' toes, if not their necks—and experiencing injury ourselves. But it's one thing to do this unintentionally and quite another to claim the prerogative to do it. Slavery and its segregationist aftermath were not defended as inadvertent deviations from the norm. They were defended in principle by whites who asserted their innate superiority and therefore their absolute right to dominate and exploit people of color.

So, too, many now defend rankism in principle: "I'm the boss, and I can do as I like!" Well, not really, not anymore, not in a dignitarian society. Actually, pity the poor boss: it's not going to be easy defending the right to cause others indignity.

There will probably always be lapses, but once the burden of proof shifts from the victims of rankism to its perpetrators, we'll know that rankism has lost its sanction and a dignitarian consensus is in formation.

Communist doctrine focused on class conflict and dictated a more equitable distribution of wealth. In the name of economic justice, communism built a variety of regimes, characteristically undemocratic and rankist. The dream of economic justice went unfulfilled and, more often than not, turned into the nightmare of life in indigent police states. The failure of these regimes strongly suggests there are no routes to economic justice that do not respect human dignity.

A rank-based strategy aimed at equalizing dignity contrasts with a class-based Marxist strategy aimed at equalizing wealth. To date, egalitarian regimes have typically created a new elite that arrogated wealth to itself. A rank-based strategy anticipates rather the redistribution of recognition until indignity is rare and dignity the norm.

The dignitarian strategy for overcoming injustice is to shine the spotlight on rank and its abuses. It sees dignity as a halfway house to justice, and identifies the principal impediment to dignity as rankism. Put another way, it sees a world of equal dignity as a steppingstone to the more just, fair, and decent societies long foreseen by utopian thinkers.

The identity-based movements persuaded oppressed groups to stop putting up with their own humiliation. Once blacks and women found their voices and focused national attention on race and gender-based oppression, it was only a matter of time until racists and sexists found themselves on the defensive. The methods that secured a measure of justice for trait-based identity groups can also work to overcome rankism.

The notion of rankism is the bridge that links two revolutions of the twentieth century—civil rights and human rights. A dignity movement against rankism provides a non-violent democratic way to meet the inescapable challenge of the twenty-first century—universal economic and social justice.

The Shape of a Dignitarian Society

Political slogans, no matter how grandiloquent, are apt to be empty promises or worse—Orwellian doublespeak. To realize its promise, a movement must evolve from a general call for change to detailed proposals for removing specific injustices.

How would a society in which dignity is preeminent differ from ones dedicated to ideologies in which the paramount value is liberty, equality, or fraternity?

In contrast to a libertarian society, a *dignitarian* society is one in which economic power is not allowed to confer educational or political advantages on those possessed of it. For example, in a dignitarian society you wouldn't have to be rich to attend good schools, or command a fortune to run for office. Economic policy would be determined, first and foremost, so as to support and maintain dignity for all.

What exactly is meant by equal dignity for all? The answer to this question will emerge from protracted conversations and negotiations among the ranks that mirror those we've been having since the sixties over race and gender. As the legitimacy of rank and the illegitimacy of rankism become widely understood, a new consensus will emerge in which the principle of equal dignity for all is inviolate. Of course, no principle is a blueprint. The principle of "Dignity for all" is rather a *condition* that the policy proposals that constitute a blueprint must meet.

At the heart of any model of governance is tax policy, and a dignitarian society requires an equitable one. Since budget priorities affect everyone, no one will be denied the franchise. This means that ways must be found to give electoral weight to the interests of the growing number of people below voting age who are now excluded from the political process.

In a dignitarian society, no one is a second-class citizen. Full membership is axiomatic, universal, and permanent. Your rank may change, but you know you'll always have a place—even if, upon conviction of a crime by a jury of peers, that place is a prison. Treating inmates with dignity is the most important thing we can do to reduce recidivism.

A dignitarian society has a national defense that deters aggression and repels aggressors, but it also understands that a vital part of a strong defense is not to give offense in the first place. For example, in negotiating security and environmental treaties, a dignitarian nation does not throw its economic or military weight around, but conducts itself respectfully, as one nation among equals.

In a dignitarian society, loss of social mobility, let alone division into impermeable classes, is unacceptable. There is always a route out of poverty—

within a single generation—for those who apply themselves. To this end, everyone earns a living wage, and access to quality healthcare is universal.

In contrast to societies that have claimed to be egalitarian, a dignitarian society is one in which social institutions are structured so that rank is not abused and human dignity is universally protected. Rank itself may be unequal in a dignitarian society, reflecting undeniable differences in our talents, skills, and experience, but equal dignity is accorded people regardless of rank, both interpersonally and institutionally. Insofar as *dignity security* can be guaranteed, then job security, with all its attendant costs and inflexibility, will be phased out. Until dignity is generally secure, however, job security will remain what it has long been—a bulwark against indignity.

The politics of dignity spans the conservative-liberal divide not by replacing the values represented in the tripartite slogan, but by subordinating liberty, equality, and fraternity to the principle of equal dignity for all. Obviously, dignity requires a large measure of all three traditional values. But dignity wears the crown.

As a synthesis of Western political thought, the politics of dignity offers a practical way to close the ideological fissures that separate capitalist and socialist ideologies and thus to break the stalemate that has long delayed social justice.

Democracy's Next Step

The hellish twentieth-century has no equal when it comes to exploitation, genocide, and war. But it was also a century of liberation: empires crumbled, decolonization spread around the world, labor movements proliferated, women were enfranchised, environmental stewardship gained a foothold, and liberation movements arose to defend and expand the rights of people suffering from a laundry list of discriminatory “isms” based on religion, color, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, and sexual orientation.

From the dignitarian perspective, democracy is a work in progress. Its next evolutionary step is to build a dignitarian society. This will no doubt be dismissed as utopian, but the truth is that utopianism has not been utopian enough. Before we can realistically expect social justice, we must delegitimize rankism as we have the other isms. Hope for a peaceful and prosperous twenty-first century depends on it.

Absent a sustained grassroots demand for dignity, no leader will be able to prevail against self-serving forces that will inevitably resist the establishment of a dignitarian society. Like all successful movements, the dignity movement must gather strength before it will be a match for entrenched elites determined to retain their traditional right to deny dignity to others.

Achieving equal dignity by rooting out rankism in all its guises is the work of several generations. But, at last, the process has begun. More people are standing up for their dignity every day. Once enough of us are on our feet, the demand for justice will become irresistible.

[August 28, 2008; 4950 words]

[Robert W. Fuller is a former president of Oberlin College. He is the author of *Somebodies and Nobodies: Overcoming the Abuse of Rank*, and *All Rise: Somebodies, Nobodies, and the Politics of Dignity* (2006). In 2008, with Pamela Gerloff, he co-authored *Dignity for All: How to Create a World Without Rankism*.]

Contact information:

Robert W. Fuller
1716 Parker St.
Berkeley, CA 94703

Tel: (510) 841-0964
Email: bfuller@igc.org

¹ This aphorism, due to François Guisot, a French monarchist statesman under Louis Philippe, is most often, and improbably, attributed to Winston Churchill in the form: "If you're not a liberal when you're young, you have no heart; If you're not a conservative when you're old, you have no mind."

² Chicago's famously conservative Committee of Social Thought was promoting conservative ideology long before it surfaced in the administrations of Reagan and the Bushes. In addition to its Chairman, John U. Nef, there was Professor Allan Bloom,² fictionalized by Saul

Bellow as Ravelstein in the novel of that title. In 1992, Bloom would publish the bestseller *The Closing of the American Mind*.

³ The same connection was noted by Alexis de Tocqueville, who devoted a chapter of his classic *Democracy in America* to explicating the linkage between equality and despotism.

⁴ Jim Wallis, *God's Politics: Why the Right Gets It Wrong and the Left Doesn't Get It* (2005).

⁵ Thanks to Thomas Scheff for this quotation, which appears in a letter Marx wrote to Ruge in 1843.

⁶ Mandelbrot is the mathematician who invented, and named, fractals.

⁷ George Lakoff, *Moral Politics: What Conservatives Know that Liberals Don't* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

⁸ Lani Guinier discusses allies who, regardless of color, align themselves with the rights of subalterns seeking inclusion as "being politically black."

⁹ By Ellen Willis in 1968.