

---

# Liberty, Equality and Community

**The Hon. Dr. Geoff Gallop**

Public Policy Forum

John Curtin Institute of Public Policy, Curtin University

Perth

24 August 2018

Firstly, many thanks to John and Curtin University for providing me with a platform today. I'm now a proud possessor of a Seniors Card and not subject to the time and place disciplines of wage labour. So too my thinking on this, that and the other; it's what interests me at the time. I trust you will find my thoughts on a subject inspired by a lengthy stay in France in 2015-16 as interesting as I did. If not, I need to remind myself of what Meng Zi (372BC-289BC) had to say: "If you are listened to, be content. If you are not listened to, be even more content".

## **THE FRENCH REVOLUTIONARY MOTTO**

But back to France where I was resident there I couldn't help but notice the motto of the French revolution - "liberty, equality and fraternity" - emblazoned on government buildings all throughout the country. There's some debate about its origins but we do know Robespierre advocated its use in a speech on the organisation of the National Guards in 1790. It's promoted as both a guide and an inspiration in the way the French think about their rights and responsibilities as human beings living together within a proud nation. Recognising and fearing its significance as a motto soaked in Enlightenment values and a belief in human rights, the Vichy Government in the south of France throughout the Second World War replaced it with "work, family and fatherhood". Not surprisingly then, when France was liberated from the Germans, "liberty, equality and fraternity" was re-instated in the constitutions of 1946 and 1958. It's still there today.

In simple terms, the French revolutionaries explained their cause in the 1789 Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen like this: each of us is granted freedom so long as our agitations and activities don't harm others (Article 4) and we are all equal before the law and "equally eligible to all high offices, public positions and employments" (Article 6). The delivery of these principles wasn't as pure as we might wish but inspire even more change it did. Hopes were high, it was to be a revolution for all of us as human beings. Writing in *The Watchman* in 1796 the English poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge contrasted the French with the American Revolution by saying the latter was a revolution of a people over their "old and doting Foster-Mother", the Congress thus created being "a respectable body of Tradesmen, deeply versed in the ledgers of commerce". France was different said Coleridge, her political ideologists - if not all their politicians - being focussed on "the interests common to all intellectual beings." They were seen as legislating for "the WORLD", their victories being the "victories of Human nature" and an inspiration to the oppressed everywhere. Thus, the priority given to liberty and equality, not one without the other (Collected Works, ed. Lewis Patton, Volume 2, pp 269-270)

In today's discussion and debates about these values the boundaries have been widened to include, firstly, the capacities we need for the exercise of our freedom from oppression. Isaiah Berlin captured this broadening nicely with his distinction between "freedom from" and "freedom

---

to” (Two Concepts of Liberty, 1958) Secondly, we’ve seen a whole range of social and economic rights added to those we enjoy as persons and citizens. In all of this there was, as T.H. Marshall observed in an English context, an evolution; civil rights in the eighteenth, political in the nineteenth and social in the twentieth century (Citizenship and Social Class and other Essays, 1950) Discussions today differ in that our notion of liberty has been deepened and that of equality broadened, however, the political and policy context for the discussion remains the same – how do we bring liberty and equality together to create the good society? At what point is the reconciliation between the two most conducive to the greatest happiness for the greatest number?

This takes me to the third arm of the motto, fraternity. It’s the strength of our feelings for and commitment to each other and the nation. In the context of the French Revolution it’s easy to understand its importance; France was at war with the monarchies of Europe for whom liberty and equality were dangerous distractions, heralding anarchy rather than a new order of things. Words like fraternity - and brotherhood and solidarity - were put to good use to rally the people in the defence of the Revolution. Note, for example, the variation on this theme in a revised version of the motto in 1793: “Unity, indivisibility, brotherhood or death”. Fraternity, as Wikipedia observed, is more about “moral obligations rather than rights”.

It’s easy to see how these three values worked together, the first two being the goals and the third the attitude and commitment needed to defend them. On the one side Modernity, on the other the Ancient Regime and it was a struggle over constitutional fundamentals. Young reformers like Coleridge could see the logic of this, but worried about how it was being applied. As the Great Terror took hold, they saw what were assumed to be means become an end-in-itself; explained by the liberal-minded and Jesus-inspired Coleridge as the result of mobilising the mob before they were properly educated on the one hand and, by the declaration of war, by the European monarchists on the other. Of Robespierre he wrote: “...to prevent tyranny he became a Tyrant” who “despotised all the pomp of Patriotism, and masqueraded on the bloody stage of Revolution, a Caligula with the cap of Liberty on his head” (Collected Works, ed Lewis Patton and Peter Mann, Volume 1, p.35)

#### **FROM FRATERNITY TO COMMUNITY**

Fraternity was very much a concept for the times as indeed it is whenever a nation is being attacked from outside or its system is being attacked from within. In the case of a modern constitution which is based on liberty and equality and has been successful in the face of war or revolution or both, a new dynamic is created for which new terminology is needed. Fraternity is very much a militant and intensely communitarian concept. It’s a call suited to the “us versus them” circumstances of war and revolution. When used in the context of a working constitution based on liberty and equality it’s more suited to the bonding that happens within one group - a party, a movement or an association of some sort - rather than in connection to the system as a whole. It might also be a call to back up a majority as John Stuart Mill pointed out with his concept of the tyranny of the majority. He had in mind not just the numbers that come from an election but the prevailing opinions that can intrude too much on our freedom to think, speak, and associate. It’s that unruly mob again and its capacity to ride roughshod over the minority. He reminds us that it is liberty plus equality that we seek, not one without the other.

---

Any nation is not just a form of community in itself, with its own characteristics, but is also a mix of communities to which individuals attach themselves. People live in communities and define themselves in relation to those communities. These communities may be produced by the state and its political structures - global, national, regional and local. Part of our identity relates to these jurisdictional entities; after all it is in Western Australia that I speak today, not one of those Eastern States! As well, and perhaps more importantly, they relate to a range of other characteristics such as gender, race, religion, sexuality, class, geography, business and politics itself. All of these factors give reasons for people to join others; to band with like minds and like interests in order to protect and promote their particular tribe. On the one hand I'm reminded of de Tocqueville's description of America's many "small private societies, united together by similitude of condition, habits and customs" in order "to indulge themselves in the enjoyments of private life" (Democracy in America, NY Vintage Edition, p.215). He worried at what this would mean for citizenship and government. On the other hand, I'm reminded that many of these groupings, let's call them tribes, are the driving forces of politics, taking their views and their material interest into the arena where policies are made and delivered. I note too that what is private today may quickly become public tomorrow, as the Catholic Church is finding out in connection to the confessional. It's a robust mix and at various points different communities of interest and value cross paths, sometimes building bridges and sometimes struggling over who gets what, when and how. Indeed, some are defined by the fact that they seek or oppose change. Division is everywhere and disruption follows, sometimes peacefully, sometimes not so peacefully and sometimes as war, the point of politics being to bring it all together as peacefully as possible. As Bernard Crick put it in his 1962 classic *In Defence of Politics*, politics is politics, to be valued as itself and not subsumed by ideology, nationalism, technology or majoritarian democracy. Counter to absolutism were the political virtues such as prudence, conciliation, compromise, adaptability and variety.

That being said Crick does say that all of this politics needs some values to guide itself along the way as it builds a liveable consensus from so much difference. What we see is that liberty and equality enter the picture, a successful mix of the two being the "cause" and a healthy, productive and peaceful community the "effect". To explain how this works we need to turn to history.

#### **LEFT LIBERALISM/SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AS IDEAS FOR THE TIMES**

In the course of the nineteenth-century it became clear that unfettered freedom in commerce and industry led to unjustifiable levels of inequality and the creation of a self-destructing class society. The invisible hand that was, according to Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations* (1776, Book IV, Chapter II, paragraph IX), supposed to unite private interests and the common good wasn't working. In response to this arose a conservative movement wanting to turn the clock back to an idealised pre-industrial existence, a libertarian movement for whom freedom was an end-in-itself and, more importantly as it turned out, a socialist movement seeking collective control over the economy and an equal distribution of the burdens and benefits associated with its working. Socialists became divided between those committed to achieving electoral democracy and seeking reform within the boundaries it set and those advocating revolution and the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat. Victory by the revolutionaries in Russia in 1917 formalised this division between reformers (left liberals or social democrats) and revolutionaries (communists).

---

Within the left overall it was this question of revolution that was pivotal. Social democrats saw revolution in the interests of democracy and its liberties as a necessary if not sufficient condition for the social and economic reforms they sought but when it came to revolutionary socialism they were either deeply sceptical or downright hostile. Within the revolutionary left they saw a mindset and practices conducive not to liberation but to tyranny, rather like the young Coleridge quoted earlier. Indeed, for the social democrats means and ends were a package, attitudes towards the former telling us a lot about how ends being sought would turn out in practice. Politics and the negotiation and compromises that went with it, including respect for the other, being seen as essential to the maintenance of a free and open society.

Implicit in all of this was the belief that we had rights as individuals and obligations as citizens, a mix that conservatives with their hierarchies, libertarians with their small government and communists with their all-powerful state did not fully understand. For social democrats on the other hand the search was for the fair society where liberty and equality are in a healthy if never fully completed balance; the continual search being as important as the achievements along the way. Social democrats are confident that success in their quest for the right mix of liberty and equality would reflect in a strong sense of security and happiness but not at the expense of diversity. They also believed that this could be measured by looking to the levels and intensity of resentment about the way the burdens and benefits of life, work and play were being distributed. Trust too would be an indicator: Was the level of trust between the different participants in society and government high or low, reflective of the need for accountability or driven by the failure of those with power and authority to think and act in the public interest? Was the level of conflict in society, whether based on race, religion or class, a constructive or a destructive force? In pre-modern hierarchies, unfettered capitalist economies, fascist governments and authoritarian communist societies, it was clear that the mix of liberty and equality was incapable of generating community and the trust and security associated with it. It was either a case of too much or too little regulation and re-distribution – a state that was too powerful and intrusive or one that was too weak in the face of social and economic inequality.

### **WHAT ARE THE ASSUMPTIONS?**

We should note here that my belief that a proper balance between liberty and equality produces a sense of community assumes that human beings are reasoning and social beings. Security and survival require trust and co-operation despite the inevitable differences that emerge. Where individuals fit in the society with its rules and mores becomes all-important. Restrictions there will be, so too hierarchies of various sorts but they will always be reflecting on their relevance and on whether or not they are just. Indeed, humans have the capacity to imagine a better world. As Isaac Asimov has put it: “Man...has the capacity to remember the past in great detail, to imagine alternatives, to weigh and judge in the light of past experience, to deduce consequences from premises and to base his behaviour upon all of this” (The Human Brain, 1963, p. 318). They can even imagine how things might have been if they had been born in a different time or different world to that which is theirs. We can even imagine a state of affairs before the rules were devised and implemented. In this world, we are just one human being amongst others and our background and destiny, rich or poor, citizen or subject, is yet to be determined. What, asked John Rawls, would we wish for? What would satisfy our inquiries about what is right and just? His answer: “First: each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others” and in respect of social and economic inequalities

---

they are to be arranged so that “(a) they are to be of the greatest benefit to the least-advantaged members of society” and “(b) offices and positions must be open to everyone under conditions of fair equality of opportunity” (A Theory of Justice, 1971, pp. 60 and 266). What’s important to Rawls is that we have equal rights to freedom and opportunity and a collective responsibility to see to it that this is achieved. What happens, of course, is that the rich and powerful say it is “merit”, “hard work” or the “willingness to risk all” that justifies inequality. In a pre-modern world, defenders of inequality used to say it was a case of God’s will. Today it’s a battle over the fact or otherwise of existing inequalities being in the interest of all and not just some. It becomes a public policy question that is fought out not just between the fundamentalists of left and right but within the social sciences, most notably economics. Social democrats enter that battle as both liberals and socialists seeking balance – and in a sense as well - as conservatives wishing to see to it that any changes deemed necessary are achieved in an orderly way and by way of democratic negotiation. They believe that within the human heart there is a deep yearning for just outcomes; thwart it and there is a response, sometimes positive and all-too-often negative.

What we’ve got is a motto that makes sense of the ideas that drive much of modern politics. It’s transcendental enough to be critical when required, but not too utopian as to be impossible to use as a “light on the hill”. It accepts the tensions between liberty and equality and is also aware that the measures for a good community are a mix of the subjective and objective. It also accepts that context matters, such that what is a good mix in one set of circumstances is not necessarily that needed for another, different set. Noting this takes us back to that discussion related to fraternity and the French Revolution.

The question one might ask is: Are liberty and equality on their own sufficient as causes of and drivers for a good community? Yes, they are clearly modern and universal values but are they sufficient? Do they provide enough cement in and of themselves to bring people together? This brings us to the awkward questions associated with nationalism and patriotism on the one hand and globalism and internationalism on the other. Liberty and equality are universal values that take us beyond national to global interests. Just as individual interests can clash with the public interest within a nation, so too can national interests clash with our interests as global citizens keen to see liberty and equality for all and not just some.

This is a tension that necessarily comes with a primary commitment to liberty and equality and the good community they have the capacity to deliver. What we see is a different sort of patriotism born of values that are always challenging existing patterns of power and distribution, whether local or national or global. The demand for national self-determination is one thing a mix of liberty and equality will sanction but the belief that a nation’s interests can be abstracted from the wider world will fall short of the mark. The inter-relationships of all things and the universality of liberty and equality makes it so. We see this playing out in the debate about Australia’s responsibilities in relation to the global need to tackle climate change. Nationalists say that our freedom to grow our economy should be unconstrained by any notion of global responsibility. A believe in liberty and equality, on the one hand, validates it a question for debate.

Mentioning climate brings me to a second question-mark over liberty and equality. What about the environment, isn’t its protection as important a value as liberty and equality are? There are a number of ways such an issue may be addressed.

---

Firstly, it might be said that it is a value of equal importance and therefore the mix being sought should be liberty plus equality plus environment, rather like the formula used by theorists of sustainability - a strong economy, a fair society and a healthy environment.

On the other hand, a healthy environment could be seen as but one of the criteria used to define a good community, the correct mix of liberty and equality to achieve that being the desired goal. Liberty issues emerge, for example in relation to our freedom to produce and consume, as well as in relation to our lifestyles and technologies. Equality emerges in relation to access issues and inter-generational well-being. In this frame the environment is an “effect” along with others that are produced by particular mixes of liberty and equality. In the current context of climate change they have greater significance than was the case in earlier times.

What I’m looking for here is a lens through which to describe on the one hand and evaluate on the other. When the French revolutionaries positioned liberty and equality as essential to their mission, they were truly thinking as children of the Enlightenment and harbingers of the future. At that time, it was a revolution that needed to be defended against its enemies, thus the addition of fraternity to the motto. However, as time marched on the bigger issue became just what is the mix of liberty and equality we need to produce good outcomes for all? What would define such an outcome was that long existing human aspiration, the true and good community. Take out liberty or equality from its definition and it falls short, mix them both and a good result becomes possible.

That’s the theory of it all but I’m led to ask: “Does history provide solid evidence for the view that liberty and equality as a package of values to guide government is a major driver of change and indicator of human well-being? To answer this, I’ll go to the major industrial economies of Europe, North America and Australasia?”

### **FROM SOLIDARITY TO GLOBALISATION TO DISTRUST**

In the post-war democratic world (1945 to 1989) where fascism had been defeated and the Cold War was a moderating factor the level of community feeling was strong, this being reflective of not just the victory of freedom but also of the establishment of the modern welfare and opportunity state. At the level of politics power was shared between the centre-left and centre-right parties, a clear majority in the electorate being supportive of one or other of these major players. Some nations performed better than others, the Scandinavians coming to mind as success stories, and there were serious complications generated by the Cold War and the all too slow death of colonialism and imperialism. However, freedom held the line courtesy of the baby-boomer rebellion and equality joined in, courtesy of trade unions and a wide range of social movements, primarily but not only on the left. It was a world with room for John Stuart Mill (liberty), Karl Marx (equality) and Pope Leo X111 (reconciliation of capital and labour) – a powerful mix at any time but especially so following as it did from the Great Depression and the Second World War.

In the world that emerged from the collapse communism new markets opened up, economic growth was unleashed and standards of living improved. What had been a democratic consensus around the mixed economy and social solidarity broke down and step by step we saw the principles associated with economic liberty (particularly but not only as they related to finance) taking precedence over equality just as the reverse had occurred in the four decades following the Second World War. Reforms based on the greater use of markets locally, nationally and

---

globally as a better means to the same ends became ends-in-themselves and inequality of a level not seen for decades returned to the scene. Even the centre left embraced globalisation and economic reform and sometimes with more vigour than that demonstrated by the more conservative centre right. Deep in our political culture and not always easy to see new divisions were emerging between old and new capital and labour and the markets, laws and technologies they represented. New competitors like China emerged in the world economy helping some sectors, for example resource industries, but harming others, for example large scale manufacturing. Then, at the very high point of capitalist expansion in 2008, the system faltered, growth vanished and significant unemployment dashed the hopes of many that their futures would be secure. Growing inequality in an expanding economy was one thing but when put into the context of a Global Financial Crisis it was fully exposed. What should have been a globalisation managed in the interests of all had become a money-making machine for the few.

Liberty and equality were no longer in balance and this was reflected in politics. Support for and memberships of the major centre left and right parties began to haemorrhage. New parties to the left and right as well as a growing band of independents gained footholds in the legislature and in some cases the executive arm of government. First to emerge were the greens with their critique of modern consumerism and the production systems which feed it but in more recent times right-wing populists have come to prominence challenging what had seemed to be, at least in the early years of the twenty-first century, an agreed position on social, economic and environmental reform both nationally and internationally. Rather than seek an updated accommodation between liberty and equality in the social democratic tradition the re-energised populists have challenged the very foundations of our system, including its account of what is and what isn't valid knowledge and what is and what isn't the best way to practice politics. The Economist magazine has aptly labelled it "post-truth politics".

Complicating the whole business has been, firstly, the emergence of radical Islam, starting in Iran back in 1979 and now a key player in the Middle-East and throughout the world. It's not just a direct threat by way of its terrorist arm but through the fear it generates, sensible responses aren't always the ones taken. It's helped return migration to the political agenda and given life to those opposed to liberal multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism despite the benefits, particularly in job creation, they have produced. Secondly, we've seen climate and our fossil-fuel industries emerge as political issues. It started with scientists raising the alarm, then came the insurance industries and finally the political elite; the consensus being that a secure future based on a sustainable environment required action to bring down greenhouse gas emissions. However, not all agreed or had a direct interest in agreeing and the new consensus wasn't locked in. So, it is that our technologies of living and powering industry relying on fossil fuels as they do, have become an issue that divides the community. For many brought up on a diet of small government and unfettered growth the very notion of serious intervention to reduce emissions, even if delivered by market mechanisms, was anathema; the world being seen as ours to control not ours to respect.

What we see in populism is a fearful and resentful segment of the society, restless rather than disciplined and more inclined to trust their own unsettled instincts and feelings rather than the outcomes of high-level investigation, reasoned conversation or parliamentary negotiation. "Don't trust the experts", they say. It's a world view that values authenticity over accuracy and is dangerous because of its contempt for the sciences associated not just with politics but also

---

economics and climate change. It seeks not to learn from history when it comes to community relations nor from economics when it comes to productivity and jobs. It prefers plebiscites over representation and deliberation and sees the environment simply as a resource rather than that which sustains life and well-being. It's negative rather than positive and divisive rather than constructive. Certainly, no jobs there and not a mix that creates community, rather a life that will be poorer, nastier and more brutish – apologies to Thomas Hobbes!

It had seemed that when communism collapsed at the end of the eighties community would be guaranteed as freedom replaced tyranny, choice replaced direction and sustainability replaced economic growth. Some like Francis Fukuyama even went so far as to describe it as a type of Hegelian “end of history” (The End of History and the Last Man, 1992) It wasn't to be and the post-war balance between liberty and equality was lost with new gaps emerging to feed feelings of alienation and disenchantment. The nationalist and radical right of politics, always there at the edges of society but without significant influence, re-appeared at the centre of things offering a lead for the disenchanted in Europe, North America and Australia. Nationalism, protectionism, religious fanaticism, and even bigotry is on the march again and all in the name of “freedom of speech” as against “political correctness”. It is, claim the disruptors of the right, a case of “the will of the people” up against “the dictates of the elite”. Their targets are both above and below; sometimes the foreigner, sometimes the multinational company, sometimes the Muslim, sometimes the migrant and sometimes the welfare dependent or “leaner” living off the efforts of the “lifters”. Looking above its all those seen as protecting the minorities rather than supporting what is assumed to be the majority; it might be a politician, a judge, a social or environmental activist or one of social science's many “experts”.

However, not all voting for change are paid up and ideologically motivated members of the populist right but rather disillusioned and disenchanted citizens looking to bring some fairness back to the way the burdens and benefits of modern life are distributed throughout the community. There are leftists, old and new, offering leadership for the future. They defend much of what has been achieved through social and environmental reform but want more political and policy focus on employment and employee rights. Indeed, there's a segment of the organised working class for whom climate scepticism, criticism of the welfare state and protectionism made good, if only short-term sense. Some from the nationalist right go along with this as part of their vote-building strategy, others more versed in the world of small business don't, seeing unions and their activists as part of the problem. It's a complicated picture, other sections of the working-class, both organised and unorganised, seeing real benefits to them and their families by holding the line against the populists. It might be they have an interest in economic change and a more open economy or it might be that they value the employment and other opportunities that have come their way because of social reform of the sort attacked by the populists.

What we see in democracies like ours, then, is a complex mix of interests and ideas. Liberals and conservatives as well as social democrats and greens are on the defensive with most energy and political initiative coming from the radical, nationalist and populist right. Countering all of this is a medium to long-term project not helped by the sight of politicians on the take, businesses who cut corners and avoid tax, international agreements that push the envelope too far, welfare recipients who cheat the system and Muslim fanatics who oppress and kill. For all who care about community and the liberty and equality that promotes its health it's not an easy road ahead. Nor was it an easy road in the past when extremist movements right and left challenged the so-called



---

“bourgeois freedoms” and “capitalist democracies”. Today the battle-lines may not be so clear cut, the populists being more certain about what they oppose rather than on what they would like to create. Essentially, they are disruptors come to shake up what they see as a political world too influenced by human rights for all, both here and overseas, rather than protective of the specific racial, religious and national interests of their peoples. Disruption is, of course, just that and what happens as a result is very difficult to predict, particularly when such bold promises are being delivered on its behalf to a constituency angry and not inclined to careful consideration.

There’s clearly a whole range of issues at play in all of this - migration and trade at the international level and accountability and social division at the local level. There’s a view that whoever is in government and whatever it is that they say the results will be the same -a declining share of the cake to those who work for a living whether independently or as employees. Its inequality that’s creating distrust and enticing some if not many into the populist camp, whether to the right or left.

### **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE?**

This takes us to the major causes of inequality in our society, whether they relate to the power of decision, the need for employment, the right to the social basics of housing, health and education or the differential impacts of climate change. We need a renewal of the social contract between people and government that adds random selection and a wider range of deliberative institutions to our representative system, that commits to proper financial regulation and full employment, and which promotes (and monitors progress towards) social equality and a healthier environment. The aim here is to give hope to the less well-off and currently disadvantaged in a society where the waters are being muddied by populist demagogy. Rather than replace representative democracy the aim is to add new institutions to its working. Rather than destroy markets the plan is to properly regulate them in the public interest. Rather than reinforce the wide range of inequalities delivered by history it’s proposed to shift the policy emphasis to tackling them. Rather than rely on the capacity of wealthy societies like ours to alleviate the impact of climate change the project is to tackle its global causes.

It’s a social democratic mix that respects freedom but re-prioritises equality that is best placed to defeat populism. Pursuing growth on its own terms – and with some degree of trickle down as proposed by the business establishment– is not a liberty/equality contract between people and government that has the capacity to break the cycle of distrust that fuels the reaction we see in play today. It’s only by being specific on this point that our democracies can rejuvenate themselves in face of the populist challenge and the presence of new powers for whom freedom and the open society is anathema. Inevitably government has to play a greater role as funder and facilitator and this needs to be understood by the private sector’s owners and backers; just as organised labour needs to understand the positive role markets can play in job creation. So too will there need to be a better accommodation of the various parts of what is a more varied working class, between public and private sector employees, between employees and the self-employed, between those working in old as opposed to new and green technology industries and between those in the cities and the regions.

There’s a theory here, for which there is evidence. There’s a narrative too about fairness and the public good that would be appealing. Up against it all would be a range of vested interests and indeed the very concept of self-interest itself whether it reveals itself as top heavy nationalism or

---

bottom up localism. There's always winners and losers in politics but there is a certain logic to it all such that the self-defined left liberals and social democrats will need to focus on the equality deficit if they are going to cut through as they once did.