

Forthcoming in *Ethics, Left and Right: The Moral Issues That Divide Us*, Bob Fischer, ed. (Oxford University Press).

Penultimate draft v.2: October, 2018

Word count: 3956

Ashes of Our Fathers: Racist Monuments and the Tribal Right

Dan Demetriou

ddemetri@umn.edu

Introduction

At least for now, a statue of Paul Kruger still stands in Pretoria, South Africa's Church Square, though it's surrounded by protective fencing and concrete barriers. Kruger embodied the Afrikaner experience: as a child, he was a Voortrekker who fought Zulus for control of the Transvaal; as a young man, he led Boer forces against British colonialists; later in life, he served as president of the South African Republic. Over the past few years the Church Square monument honoring "Oom" (Uncle) Paul has been repeatedly defaced and threatened with destruction, through legal and illegal means, by black nationalists (chiefly Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) representatives and supporters) and anti-colonialist #RhodesMustFall activists. "There is a national mandate to all the EFF branches to remove all the apartheid statues and symbols," one EFF councilman has said. "One day people are going to wake up and find the statue not being there."¹ Counter-protests, including one by an Afrikaner singer who chained herself to the monument, have made international news.² Plans are underway to add items to the square that celebrate the freedom struggle of nonwhite South Africans, but debate still rages over whether to remove Kruger's statue completely.³

Meanwhile in the US, a Charlottesville, Virginia circuit court judge has just ruled that tarps covering a monument of iconic Confederate general Robert E. Lee be removed.⁴ Lee's loyalty to his people (Virginians), brilliant generalship, and quiet dignity inspire millions of devotees today, despite the fact that Lee himself wished not to be memorialized for the sake of reunification.⁵ In February

of 2017 the Charlottesville city council voted to have the statue in Emancipation Park—recently, Lee Park—taken down, but the process has been halted by legal challenges, as, like many places in the South, state laws protect Confederate monuments.⁶ In response to the city council’s vote, the 26-foot tall equestrian statue was the scene of a “Unite the Right” rally that descended on Emancipation Park to protest the statue’s removal with white nationalist and anti-Semitic chants. The right-wing protestors were met by crowds of “antifascist” counter-protesters, and state police shut down the rally. In the chaos that ensued, a right-wing activist plowed his car into a group of counter-protesters, resulting in the death of one person.⁷

These are just two of many cases of monuments jeopardized or already dismantled because of their alleged racist or (racially-motivated) colonialist significance. Elsewhere, philosopher of political aesthetics Ajume Wingo and I’ve sought to catalogue the principal sorts of preservationist and removalists arguments one hears in the “racist monument” debate, and there are broadly leftist and rightist rationales for both positions.⁸ As I cannot discuss here even all the rightist considerations relevant to this issue,⁹ I’ll focus only on what I see as the fundamental one, which is social cohesion, both across time and across the relevant races or ethnicities. Specifically, in this chapter I sketch a rightist approach to monumentary policy in a diverse polity beleaguered by old ethnic grievances. I begin by noting the importance of tribalism, memorialization, and social trust, and then provide policy guidance based on these concerns to the racist monument debate as it stands in the English-speaking world today.

A word on terminology: I use the phrase “racist monument” to refer to any monument seriously controversial because of its alleged racist significance. This definition entails that the above statues to Kruger, Lee, and hundreds more are indisputably “racist monuments” for the purposes of this chapter. This nomenclature is necessary shorthand because phrases such as “Confederate statues” or “colonialist monuments” are too narrow, as I want to discuss any monument thought problematic for reasons of racism, while “controversial monuments” and the like are too broad, as I wish to exclude monuments contentious because of other political or religious associations, such as the Buddahs of Bamiyan dynamited by the Taliban in 2001. I don’t necessarily concede with this term that the monuments in question are “in fact” racist—indeed, there may be no sense to saying a monument is “in fact” racist beyond its seeming racist to enough people. Nor should this terminology prejudice the issue for the removalist position, for the mere fact that a monument is thought by many to be racist simply doesn’t entail that it ought to be removed.

Tribal assumptions

As this volume reveals, there are many conceptions of what it means to be on the political “right” or “conservative.” Since the moral perspective I appeal to is older than Christianity and more properly considered “global” than “Western,” some of my fellow-travelers will disagree with parts of what I’m about to say.¹⁰ Be that as it may, anyone espousing the following principles will be considered on the political right today, especially if they believe these principles apply to whites or white ethnicities as well as for other races or ethnicities.

The first principle I’ll forward is that *humans are a tribal species, and political structures failing to accommodate this fact are doomed to fail*. Unlike tigers and sea turtles, humans don’t go through life alone.¹¹ We are a highly social species that seeks the comfort and protection of clans and tribes. Tribes gobble up loners; so as long as there are significant numbers of tribalists in the world (and there always will be), even (largely hypothetical) “individualists” and “cosmopolitans” must rely on tribal loyalty for their security, property, freedoms, and dignity, since these good things are secured only by a willingness of tribemates to sacrifice for and defend the territories individualists and cosmopolitans flit between.

If you don’t understand what “tribe” is, think of your family and proven friends. Think, in short, of who “has your back”: who would leap to your defense if you were in trouble before even asking if you were in the wrong, who would find space for you in their homes if you had nowhere else to go, who feels an obligation to feed you if you were hungry. Tribal affiliation isn’t *that* strong, usually (except in war, this level of sacrifice is typically reserved for family, clan, or gang) but nonetheless tribemates will do these things to some degree—especially if they are thrown together in a strange land, as the behavior of expats will testify.

If you’re a citizen or denizen of a high-trust Western country, you should know that the people who built that society worked hard to create institutions reliable enough for tribalism to be unnecessary below the level of the state itself. Their success at this was so spectacular that all this talk of “tribalism” may seem unsettlingly primitive. To this, all I can say here is that complacency about tribalism is as foolish as thinking that lights must turn on when you flip a switch, or that water must flow from the faucet when you turn the knob. A sense of tribal affiliation is the psychological infrastructure of any sustainable free society: if it goes, authoritarianism becomes necessary to maintain law and order.¹²

Second, *memorialization is essential to maintaining tribal identity and cohesion over time*. Humans evolved language and culture to transmit adaptive memes (units of information), and not just genes,

to the next generation.¹³ Populations pass on their cultures in large part by memorialization, which includes not only monuments but also *inter alia* museums (e.g., Cape Town’s District 6 museum), historical sites (such as the Gettysburg battlefield), temporary installations (such New York City’s Tribute in Light, representing the fallen Twin Towers), or one-off events (e.g., Nelson Mandela’s state funeral proceedings). Memorials bend our artistic and dramatic creativity to the tasks not of making money or entertaining, but expressing our values, remembering our tragedies, celebrating our victories, honoring our heroes, and affirming a shared identity, and thus memorialization is increasingly acknowledged as a human right.¹⁴ If we were to use a domestic analogy, memorials wouldn’t be mere decorations or microwave dinners, but family portraits, heirlooms, trophy displays, household altars, and Christmas dinners.

Is tribalism illiberal? Certainly the liberalism committed to the primacy of the individual or hostile to borders and nationalism will be anti-tribalist. Yet liberal thinkers formerly appreciated that individual rights are secure only within a tribal shell. For instance, John Stuart Mill himself seemed concerned about tribal cohesion even for free societies (he didn’t endorse liberalism for cultures still mired in “barbarism”).¹⁵ In fact, Mill was explicit in cautioning against combining various “nations” into one polity precisely because sub-state tribal loyalties either tear multicultural states apart or force their governments to become authoritarian in their struggle to maintain order.

Free institutions are next to impossible in a country made up of different nationalities. Among a people without fellow-feeling, especially if they read and speak different languages, the united public opinion, necessary to the working of representative government, cannot exist.¹⁶

By “nation,” Mill means a population

united among themselves by common sympathies which don’t exist between them and any others—which make them co-operate with each other more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the same government, and desire that it should be government by themselves or a portion of themselves exclusively. [...] [Nationality is sometimes] the effect of identity of race and descent. Community of language, and community of religion, greatly contribute to it. Geographical limits are one of its causes. But the strongest of all is identity of political antecedents; the possession of a national history, and consequent community of recollections; collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incidents in the past.¹⁷

In other words, a “nation” for Mill is a “people,” or a big tribe. Mill realized that a functional polity requires citizens who are more willing to sacrifice for, and cooperate with, each other than they would with mere strangers. In contemporary sociological terms, what Mill was worried about is social cohesion. And just as Mill hypothesized, sociological research suggests that diversity decreases

social trust, an important element in social cohesion.¹⁸ These declines can be counteracted only, it's hoped by researchers, if the diverse peoples constituting the polity buy into a new, overarching cultural identity—a new tribe.¹⁹

The conservatism of this essay, then, is a traditionalism that acknowledges tribalism as an obvious fact and sees piety toward one's ancestors, traditions, and holy places as not only a *prima facie* moral obligation for individuals but an important civic virtue. Tribal folkways are so typical across the world that they are better categorized as the human psychological default than an ideology.²⁰ For instance, these lines, written by a Victorian poet about an ancient Roman hero who fought for his people's city and holy places, are something any traditional Yoruba, Jew, Sikh, or Maori would accept as a matter of course.

Then out spake brave Horatius,
The Captain of the Gate:
To every man upon this earth
Death cometh soon or late.
And how can man die better
Than facing fearful odds,
For the ashes of his fathers,
And the temples of his gods?²¹

Noble thoughts and feelings to be sure, but also utterly *normal*. It's the contemporary Western liberal ethos that discourages tribal identification that is unusual—or, as social psychologists have recently euphemized it, “WEIRD” (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic).²²

Rightists (and apparently, even liberals of the past) are not opposed to tribes mapping onto religious or ethnic lines. But even if the polity in question is for whatever reason committed to diversity on these dimensions, the solution isn't to eradicate tribal sentiment, but to replace the tribe of religion or ethnicity with another—in the case of states, what is today called “nationalism” or “civic nationalism.”

Most “tribal rightists” who think along these lines will be skeptical about the sustainability of any free yet significantly multicultural state.²³ Their skepticism is increasingly justified: at the time of this writing, moderates are converting to identitarian politics in the North America and Western Europe: rightist politics appear to be more and more popular among whites,²⁴ while new, ethnic/religious parties (such as the Turkish DENK in the Netherlands or Partij Islam in Belgium) emerge from nominally leftist parties, such Greens.²⁵ Violence on campuses over “hate speech” by invited speakers flared in recent years.²⁶ Canada, the UK, France, Sweden, and Germany are enforcing hate speech laws ever more rigorously in an effort to stifle rising anti-Islamic and anti-

immigrant sentiment.²⁷ The South African government's current plans to seize white farms may prove to be the tipping-point for ethnic cleansing there.²⁸ So there are grounds for tribal rightist skepticism about the sustainability of seriously multicultural states.

But it doesn't follow that skeptics about the feasibility of maintaining or rescuing something are a bad source of wisdom in a crisis. Indeed, skeptics may understand the dangers best, and therefore honest and well-meaning skeptics might provide valuable insight on how to avoid them. In particular, tribal rightists, not liberals, leftists, or (least of all) cosmopolitans, are likely to have the best instincts on matters of building social cohesion in ethnically divided polities.²⁹ That instinct tells us that forcibly destroying old tribal identities to encourage a new multiethnic tribal identity is self-defeating and unacceptably authoritarian. Widening tribal affiliation may be encouraged by the state, yes, but the process has to be far subtler than the measures called for by even many academic removalists.³⁰ As best I can tell, a tribal rightist committed to the long-term stability and freedom of a multicultural state with old ethnic grievances, when considering the monument controversy as it stands today in places such as the US or South Africa, will urge an honorable compromise on monument policy that 1) gradually narrows the gap between peoples in the heritage landscape, 2) conserves all but the most offensive of the least beloved racist monuments, 3) avoids recrimination (i.e., "keeps it positive") and eschews ideological commentary in new monuments or revisions to old ones, 4) as much as politically feasible, recognizes only the offense of willing tribesmates, and 5) responds to aesthetic and other "irrational" offenses more than to "objective" historical or philosophical critiques.

Honorable compromises

On the assumptions above, the multicultural state isn't worth saving unless there's going to be a real sense of tribal fellow-feeling at the other end of reform. So although a tribe isn't as tightly-knit as a family, it may behoove us to revisit the domestic analogy.

Imagine an interracial couple deciding how to decorate their home. In an interracial household, we would expect mementos and pictures from both sides of the family. If for some reason the black spouse's family didn't take many pictures or lost all their heirlooms in a fire, we would expect the white spouse to find ways to represent the black spouse's family in other ways, and to be alert to opportunities to put up new pictures of them. Likewise, although a high-trust relationship doesn't keep strict track of the numbers—we don't need to limit monuments to African Americans to exactly 13%, and we don't need exactly 10% of monuments in South Africa to be of

whites—the monumetary gap between whites and blacks is impossible to ignore in the places under discussion and should gradually be closed. It would be undignified to close that gap too quickly, by erecting monuments honoring sub-par figures or unremarkable events just to even things out. But gradually, as historical research into ignored or preliterate cultures improves, and as new outstanding citizens arise, the formerly underrepresented peoples should be suitably showcased in the national household.

What about existing, or even future, racist monuments? Just as every married person knows it's possible to place on the same mantle pictures of in-laws who abused each other, we can tolerate monuments to figures who were enemies. A healthy racially diverse citizenry will *want* their fellow citizens to feel free to honor their ancestors and draw pride in their heritage. This means that white South Africans or white Americans can appreciate that their black countrymen may not personally advocate for radical political solutions today, but still wish to honor black nationalists or separatists who struggled on behalf of their people. And black Americans or black South Africans can recognize that a white fellow citizen may not condone all that her ancestors did, but still draw strength from their sacrifices or heroism. The many Native American monuments in the US, and to a much greater degree many democratic South African monuments, demonstrate that it's perfectly possible to memorialize culture heroes for their sacrifices for their peoples, even if they were at war with the ancestors of fellow citizens and completely opposed to the creation of the modern states that now memorialize them. For example, the statues of African royal captives recently installed at their former prison, Cape Town's Castle of Good Hope, harmoniously contribute to a more complete picture of the peoples whose history shaped the Castle and South Africa itself.³¹

Nonetheless, some racist monuments, whose designs are highly ideological, leave little room for interpretation, deliberately provoke, and carry little meaning to anyone but hardened ethno-tribalists uninterested in a shared future, are good candidates for removal, *only if* they are *actually* offensive to a significant number of citizens, especially if those citizens have given costly signals of interest in a multi-ethnic tribal future. For example, New Orleans' Battle of Liberty Place (BLP) monument, an obelisk explicitly calling for white supremacy, was little more than an ungracious little spike irritating both the literal and psychological landscape of that city, and its removal in 2017 is consistent with a tribal rightist approach.³² But if, quite contrary to the facts, the BLP monument were not controversial, even it should have remained absent some good reason to remove it, and mere (ignored) ideological inconsistency with our legal and political aims today is not one such reason. For instance, if the people of New Orleans overwhelmingly interpreted it as a living symbol

of a shameful past and/or a sort of trophy of a defeated regime, then it would be as strange to remove the BLP monument as to remove a public museum's installation about segregated drinking fountains.

For in matters of trust-building, we must remember that offense often isn't rational.³³ Insofar as we are concerned about being good tribesmates, the historical context of a monument's installation or the momentousness of the historical figure or event's actual racism—i.e., that this general killed thousands for an apartheid state, that this statue was erected to bolster the Cult of the Lost Cause, etc.—is less important than the offense it actually causes fellow citizens of good will for whatever odd reason. Returning to our interracial household, a picture of a slave-owning Confederate ancestor may be perfectly acceptable whereas a meaningless racist tchotchke, such as a minstrel show poster picked up at a garage sale, may not. The black partner knows that unlike the poster, the picture is meaningful to the white partner, and this is what matters, even though slave owning is far worse than minstrelsy. Likewise, a gracious or beloved monument to Confederate general may be much less offensive to well-meaning black citizens than one to a figure thought to be much less racist: Washington, DC's Lincoln Park statue of Lincoln, portraying the president emancipating a kneeling black slave with arm outstretched in way thought demeaning to many, may be illustrative in this regard.³⁴

That said, even conscientious tribesmates shouldn't be morally concerned about everyone's offense, but only those who signal they are genuinely interested in being tribesmates with the rest of us. For example, activist and commentator Angela Rye opined in one interview that

George Washington was a slaveowner. [...] [W]hether we think he was protecting freedom or not, he wasn't protecting my freedom. My ancestors weren't deemed human beings to him. So to me, I don't care if it's a George Washington statue, or a Thomas Jefferson statue, or a Robert E. Lee statue, they all need to come down.³⁵

Whatever Rye's reflective judgments might be, this is the language of someone uninterested in a tribal future with not only Southern whites who feel special attachment to Confederate figures, but Americans. Nor, in my view, should the conscientious tribal rightist be concerned about the offense of citizens, such as white liberals, offended on behalf of other peoples. Nor should the offense of moralistic iconoclasts, who relish scrubbing heritage landscapes and traditions, weigh upon our conscience. Tribal continuity is impossible without memorializing, and memorializing is impossible if we are constantly razing our monuments because of the moral inadequacies of our ancestors: their racism today, their sexism after that, their crimes against non-believers next, their transphobia after

that. A heritage policy that dwells on historical injustices serves only to wedge apart peoples otherwise interested in a close-knit future.

Although not all offense matters morally, all offense does matter politically. And that means that the more ideological the monument, the more likely our descendants will find it morally repugnant. Here again it's helpful to contrast Charlottesville's Lee statue and New Orleans' BLP monument: the Lee statue was designed, and successfully so, to honor Southern valor while ignoring the question of who they fought against and what they fought for. The BLP monument, on the other hand, was explicit about the value of resisting Northern "usurpers" and called for "white supremacy." This distinction is instructive not only for monuments already around, but monuments being contemplated. Monuments can avoid being ideological without being anodyne if their message is about us, *these peoples*, not *these ideas*.³⁶ This means we need monuments that deftly leave unsaid who vanquished or was vanquished, who triumphed or was humiliated, whenever those facts touch upon the honor of the ancestors of those we would have as tribemates.

To sum up, the claim is not that rightists have been particularly good at building social cohesion in states with old ethnic animosities. It's rather that, since tribal fellow-feeling is necessary to avoid authoritarianism on the one hand and civil strife on the other, a tribal approach to the problem of racist monuments is likely to be the best for sustaining a multiracial state.

Conclusion

Any marriage worth having allows each spouse to maintain their family honor and their ties to the family they left behind. And as the interracial marriage case shows, people can navigate landscapes with memorials to people who were racists or fought for ethnocentric causes.³⁷ Granted, interracial relations in places such as the US or South Africa are nothing like a high-trust marriage. But then again, the five policy guidelines on monuments suggested above hardly paint a rosy picture: if anything, they seem more apt for a marriage where the spouses are trying their best to avoid divorce over racial animosity, and in fact these guidelines echo the heritage policies of Mandela-era South Africa.^{38,39} Nonetheless, to repair or build trust, each spouse must gradually make themselves more and more vulnerable to the memorial expressions of the other, assuming each concession is reciprocated and not abused. Analogously, aggressive assaults on a people's monuments and thus the continuity of their ethnic tribe are bound to decrease their faith in the proposed multiethnic upgrade. Cowed peoples may be compliant, but they are not trustworthy, and they typically become so degraded as to be a burden even as subjects. Of course, alienating and intimidating the relevant

populations is not a problem for those who deep down don't wish to be co-tribalists with anyone who would support maintaining a monument to Robert E. Lee or "Oom" Kruger. Casting down the monuments of your enemies is a time-honored practice of demoralization and establishing supremacy, and removalists may be gambling that the Horatiuses who rise up to defend the ashes of their fathers will be put down easily enough. They may be correct, but we should be under no illusions that the polity on the other side of such an endeavor would be both multicultural and free.⁴⁰

Additional Suggested Readings

Dan Demetriou and Ajume Wingo, "The Ethics of Racist Monuments," *Palgrave Handbook of Philosophy and Public Policy*, ed. David Boonin (New York, Palgrave) (forthcoming).

Michele Eileen Jacobs, "Contested Monuments in a Changing Heritage Landscape," Master's Thesis, University of Kwazulu-Natal (2014). Available:

<https://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/handle/10413/12069/>.

Erich Hatala Matthes, "Who Owns Up to the Past? Heritage and Historical Injustice," *Journal of the American Philosophical Association* (forthcoming).

¹ Rapula Moatshe, "Oom Paul Statue Excluded from Monument; EFF Threat [sic] to Topple It," *Pretoria News*, January 29, 2018, <https://www.iol.co.za/pretoria-news/oom-paul-statue-excluded-from-monument-eff-threat-to-topple-it-12988851>.

² Marianne Thamm, "Afrikaner Singer Chains Herself to Vandalised South African Statue," *The Guardian*, April 10, 2015, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/apr/10/afrikaner-singer-chains-herself-to-vandalised-south-african-statue>.

³ Sarel van der Walt, "Paul Kruger to Get New Neighbours at Pretoria's Church Square," *Netwerk24*, May 19, 2017, <https://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/paul-kruger-to-get-new-neighbours-at-pretorias-church-square-20170519>

⁴ Matthew Haag, "Judge Orders Tarps Removed From Confederate Statues in Charlottesville," *New York Times*, Feb. 27, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/27/us/charlottesville-confederate-monuments.html>.

⁵ James C. Cobb, "How Did Robert E. Lee Become an American Icon?" *Humanities: The Magazine of the National Endowment of the Humanities* 32, no. 4 (2011), <https://www.neh.gov/humanities/2011/julyaugust/feature/how-did-robert-e-lee-become-american-icon>.

⁶ Kaeli Subberwal, "Several States Have Erected Laws To Protect Confederate Monuments," August 17, 2017, https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/states-confederate-statue-laws_us_5996312be4b0e8cc855cb2ab.

⁷ "Unite the Right Rally," *Wikipedia*, accessed December 15, 2017, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unite_the_Right_rally.

⁸ Dan Demetriou and Ajume Wingo, "The Ethics of Racist Monuments," *Palgrave Handbook of Philosophy and Public Policy*, ed. David Boonin (New York, Palgrave) (forthcoming).

⁹ I must ignore, for instance, the critical importance of longstanding traditions of civic honor—in which memorialization plays a key role—to combating tyranny and kleptocracy by elites, and encouraging civic sacrifice from high and low alike. Dan Demetriou, "Civic Immortality: The Problem of Civic Honor in Africa and the West," *Journal of Ethics* 19, no. 3-4 (2015): 257-276.

¹⁰ For an example of an anti-tribalist conservatism, see Jonah Goldberg, *Suicide of the West: How the Rebirth of Tribalism, Populism, Nationalism, and Identity Politics is Destroying American Democracy* (New York: Crown Forum, 2018).

- ¹¹ See among many sources Aristotle, *Politics, The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon, trans. Benjamin Jowett (New York: Random House, 1941); Joshua Greene, *Moral Tribes: Emotion, Reason, and the Gap Between Us and Them* (New York: Penguin, 2013); Robert Sapolsky, *Behave: The Biology of Humans at Our Best and Worst* (New York: Penguin, 2017); Amy Chua, *Political Tribes: Group Instinct and the Fate of Nations* (New York: Penguin), 2018.
- ¹² Leftists typically acknowledge this dynamic in Africa especially, where political instability is often attributed to the legacy of “artificial” colonial borders that don’t reflect tribal affiliation (see e.g., James Brook, “In Africa, Tribal Hatreds Defy the Borders of State,” *New York Times*, August 28, 1988, <https://www.nytimes.com/1988/08/28/weekinreview/the-world-in-africa-tribal-hatreds-defy-the-borders-of-state.html>). Rightists point out that there is cautionary lesson here for Western nations as well.
- ¹³ Maciek Chudek, Wanying Zhao, and Joseph Henrich, “Culture-Gene Coevolution, Large-Scale Cooperation and the Shaping of Human Social Psychology,” in *Signaling, Commitment, and Emotion*, eds. Richard Joyce, Kim Sterelny, and Brett Calcott (Cambridge, MIT Press, 2013): 425-458.
- ¹⁴ “Statement by Ms. Karima Bennouna, Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, at the 71st session of the General Assembly,” Office of the High Commissioner, UN, October 26, 2016, <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=20831&LangID=E>.
- ¹⁵ “Liberty, as a principle, has no application to any state of things anterior to the time when mankind have become capable of being improved by free and equal discussion. Until then, there is nothing for them but implicit obedience to an Akbar or a Charlemagne, if they are so fortunate as to find one,” John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, ch. 1, <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/34901/34901-h/34901-h.htm>.
- ¹⁶ John Stuart Mill, *Representative Government*, ch. 16, https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/m/mill/john_stuart/m645r/chapter16.html
- ¹⁷ Mill, *Representative Government*, ch. 16.
- ¹⁸ Current research suggests that ethnic diversity either lowers social trust or lowers social trust for whites in particular, who have uniquely high social trust when they are in homogenous white areas. See especially Peter Thisted Dinesen and Kim Mannemar Sønderskov, “Ethnic Diversity and Social Trust. A Critical Review of the Literature and Suggestions for a Research Agenda,” *Oxford Handbook of Social and Political Trust*, ed. Eric Uslaner (Oxford University Press, 2017): 175–204; Maria Abascal and Delia Baldassarri, “Love Thy Neighbor? Ethnoracial Diversity and Trust Reexamined,” *American Journal of Sociology* 121, no. 3 (2015): 722-782.
- ¹⁹ Robert Putnam, “E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty- first Century” *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30 (2007): 137-174.
- ²⁰ “Tribalism, it’s always worth remembering, is not one aspect of human experience. It’s the default human experience,” Andrew Sullivan, “America Wasn’t Built for Humans,” *New York Magazine*, Sept.19, 2017, <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/09/can-democracy-survive-tribalism.html>.
- ²¹ Thomas Babington Macaulay, *Lays of Ancient Rome*, <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/847/847-h/847-h.htm>
- ²² Joseph Henrich, Steven Heine, and Ara Norenzayan, “The Weirdest People in the World?” *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 33, no. 2-3 (2010): 61-83
- ²³ Skepticism about the sustainability multicultural states is not warranted merely by recent history: see *inter alia* Ross Hammond and Robert Axelrod, “The Evolution of Ethnocentrism” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50 (2006): 926-936; Max Hartshorn, Artem Kaznatcheev and Thomas Shultz, “The Evolutionary Dominance of Ethnocentric Cooperation,” *The Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 16, no. 3 (2013): 7.
- ²⁴ Alberto Avalos, “50k ‘Gen Z’ Students Identify as Republican,” *HispanicHeritageFoundation*, Oct. 27, 2016, <http://hispanicheritage.org/50000-generation-z-high-school-students-identify-republican/>; Perry Bacon, Jr., “Charlottesville And The Rise Of White Identity Politics,” *FiveThirtyEight*, Aug. 14, 2017, <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/charlottesville-and-the-rise-of-white-identity-politics/>.
- ²⁵ Christ Tomlinson, “Belgian Islamic Party Announces ‘100 Per Cent Islamic State’ as End Goal,” *Breitbart*, April 7, 2018, <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2018/04/07/belgian-islamic-party-announces-islamic-state-end-goal/>.
- ²⁶ Sumantra Maitra, “Methods Behind the Campus Madness,” *Quillette*, March 7, 2017, <http://quillette.com/2017/03/07/methods-behind-the-campus-madness/>.
- ²⁷ See for example, David Shimer, “Germany Raids Homes of 36 People Accused of Hateful Postings Over Social Media,” *New York Times*, June 20, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/20/world/europe/germany-36-accused-of-hateful-postings-over-social-media.html>.
- ²⁸ Ahmed Areff, “‘We are Cutting the Throat of Whiteness’—Malema on Plans to Remove Trollip,” *News24*, March4, 2018, <https://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/we-are-cutting-the-throat-of-whiteness-malema-on-plans-to-remove-trollip-20180304>.
- ²⁹ Note how the institutions Putnam, in “E Pluribus Unum” (*op. cit.*), says overcome ethnic divisions are ones have strong conservative ethics: sports, the military, the churches.

³⁰ E.g., the short recommendations published in “Tear Down the Confederate Monuments—But What Next? 12 Art Historians and Scholars on the Way Forward,” *Artnet News*, Aug. 23, 2017, <https://news.artnet.com/art-world/confederate-monuments-experts-1058411>.

³¹ Aphwiwe DeKlerk, “Statues of Royal Prisoners Unveiled at Castle of Good Hope Commemoration,” *Business Day*, <https://www.businesslive.co.za/bd/life/2016-12-11-statues-of-royal-prisoners-unveiled-at-castle-of-good-hope-commemoration/>.

³² “Battle of Liberty Place Monument,” *Wikipedia*, accessed April 8, 2018, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Liberty_Place_Monument.

³³ On the irrationality of political symbols, see Ajume Wingo, *Veil Politics in Liberal Democratic States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

³⁴ Charmaine Nelson, “Racist Monuments Don’t Belong In Public. But They Could In A Museum” [sic], *Huffpost*, Sept. 28, 2017, https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/charmaine-nelson/racist-monuments-dont-belong-in-public-but-they-could-in-a-museum_a_23224080/.

³⁵ “Rye: White Supremacist Statues Need to be Removed,” *CNN*, August 18, 2017, <http://edition.cnn.com/videos/politics/2017/08/18/angela-rye-statues-washington-jefferson-lee-come-down-sot-ath.cnn>.

³⁶ If indeed monuments should dwell on telling a story about peoples rather than ideas, then mass immigration is bound to undermine any memorializing culture, and thus culture, but this point will take us too far afield.

³⁷ In many current polls, about 30% of American blacks still oppose removal of Confederate monuments (while about 50% support; support among whites is almost double that). See e.g., Ariel Edwards-Levy, “Polls Find Little Support For Confederate Statue Removal—But How You Ask Matters,” *HuffPost*, Aug. 23, 2017, https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/confederate-statues-removal-polls_us_599de056e4b05710aa59841c.

³⁸ “Arts, Culture and Heritage White Paper: ‘All Our Legacies, Our Common Future,’” Department of Arts and Culture, June 4, 1996, http://ocpa.irmo.hr/resources/docs/South_Africa_White_Paper_Arts_Culture-en.pdf; Annie Coombes, *History after Apartheid: Visual Culture and Public Memory in a Democratic South Africa* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003); Mcebisi Ndletyana and Denver A. Webb, “Social Divisions Carved in Stone or Cenotaphs to a New Identity? Policy for Memorials, Monuments and Statues in a Democratic South Africa,” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 23, no. 2 (2016): 97-110.

³⁹ It’s worth bearing in mind that Mandela—who is not considered a rightist—was the son of a traditional Xhosa kingmaker, and had great instincts for building tribal unity among old enemies.

⁴⁰ This research was generously supported by UC Riverside’s Templeton-funded Immortality Project and the University of Minnesota’s Grant-in-Aid program.