



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on April 29, 2026

Is Our “Equality” Obsession Destroying Our Nation?

“Equality tells us nothing about quality.” This is a simple truth — hiding in plain sight. Would we, after all, rather have equality in poverty or inequality in abundance? Would we prefer the equality of all being deathly ill or the inequality of varying levels of health? Would we choose equality in abject stupidity or the inequality of differing degrees of brilliance?

Brilliance isn’t required to know the answers, but, still, man so often kneecaps himself with equality efforts. Affirmative action — which metastasized into diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) — seeks outcome equality at competence’s expense. And if [a few more helicopters and planes crash](#), and [more criminals escape miniature cops](#), well, eggs for omelets, ya know?



Jacob Wackerhausen/iStock/Getty Images Plus

This all raises a question: Is a “bad take on equality,” as a commentator recently put it, destroying our country? But then there’s a more fundamental question:

Is the focus on equality itself, no matter *how* it’s conceived, tragically misguided?

Making his case for the former, the aforementioned commentator, Dalton Henderson, [wrote](#) Sunday:

In Aristotle’s exploration in *Politics*, equality is governed by justice — the principle that *each is given his due*. But exactly what is “due” depends on the object being distributed. To account for this, Aristotle distinguished two types of equality: numerical, or equality of distribution, and value, or equality of proportion. The first is characterized by each receiving the exact same, the second by each receiving an amount proportional to his contribution, ability, or merit.

A just society requires a combination of both, each to its appropriate object.

... The question, then, is which aspects of society should be governed by which types. Citizens should have numerical equality in that which is innate and belongs to man by nature itself: rights endowed by the creator, equal protection under the law, respect, and dignity. A just state gives these things equally to everyone; they don’t require another’s physical production and are intrinsically owed by the laws of nature. Proportional equality, however, should be owed to objects that belong to man by action and do require external production by other humans: wealth, services, and material goods.

Most Americans and virtually all conservatives will agree with the preceding.

But should they?



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on April 29, 2026

What if the above imperatives are better achieved by dispensing with equality dogma altogether? Note here, since Henderson mentioned Aristotle, that the philosopher did *not consider equality a primary or unconditional good*. In fact, a certain word he used hints at a better model for society.

Equality vs. Quality

Harking back to this article's opening sentence, is "equality" a meaningful measure in any way? Consider an example:

You bring your child to a doctor for a check-up. Upon its conclusion you ask, "How is he?"

"Oh, good news," replies the physician. "Your boy's health is equal to that of all the other kids I treated today."

Would you be reassured by this answer? I mean, the doc might've spent that morning working in a pediatric cancer ward.

Or imagine you'd tutored a couple's five kids for a period of time. Then, when asked by mom how they're doing, you respond, "They're more equal than ever!" Mom might wonder, "Is this a dodge? Are they all equal in abject failure?!" (The [tennis-centers analogy](#) also [illustrates](#) this truth.)

Now let's apply this to a real-life phenomenon. The world is now [on average](#) the wealthiest it historically has ever been. Imagine now, though, that you had only one sentence to relate this development to an extraterrestrial. Would you say, "Man's worldwide inter-nation wealth inequality has decreased"? Or would you state, "Man is on average wealthier than ever, and fewer people than ever are living in poverty"?

The first one could leave the little green man scratching even his over-sized head. "Are the Earthlings more 'equal' because the richer nations have, possibly, become poorer?" he may wonder. The second sentence relates far more about the actual situation.

Again, equality tells us nothing about quality. If anyone can, too, think of an exception to this, I'm all ears.

Necessary Equality?

That's fine, many may now say. But some types of equality are necessary, such as equality of opportunity. Do we, however, really believe this — and apply it?

Consider that minors can't join the military or enter into contracts. This is reasonable, you may say, and I agree. But it doesn't change the fact that it represents a failure to abide by the principle of equality of opportunity.

What of equality under the law? We violate this when forcing young men, but not young women, to register for the draft. We also violate it when putting males but not females in combat roles. Again, we may consider these standards common-sense oriented. Nonetheless, does the fact that we can't actually adhere to equality principles call their validity into question?

This raises other matters, too. For instance, if violating equality under the law with single-sex draft registration is just, should we feel constrained to allow women to become police and firefighters based on "equality of opportunity"? If men have unique (and perhaps deadly) responsibilities, should they also perhaps have unique opportunities? Clearly, our "equality" model fails to account for a lot.

Yet equality dogma won't be reconsidered unless we heed something famed late architect Buckminster



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on April 29, 2026

Fuller emphasized. “You never change things by fighting the existing reality,” he said. “To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete.”

A Better Way

We’re blessed, though, in that we don’t need a new model. We only need resurrect an eternal one: [the virtues](#) (i.e., objectively good moral habits).

As mentioned, Aristotle alluded to this with one word: *Justice*. We shouldn’t deny a qualified man a job based purely on prejudice because it’s a violation of Justice. It’s also contrary to the virtues of Charity, Kindness, Love, and Prudence. Why the latter? Because excluding the qualified can harm the arenas they’re kept out of by reducing their overall competence levels. This damages the wider society, too.

The virtues, however, also don’t just allow for, but actually *prescribe*, male-only drafts and female exclusion from police and firefighting. They are *universally applicable because they are sound principles*. They are perfect.

Then there are some things the virtue model wouldn’t allow:

- Boys in girls’ bathrooms and men in women’s sports (“transgenders”).
- Women in formerly men’s institutions ([VMI](#)).
- The sexual-devolutionary agenda in schools.
- LGBTQ “rights” and Drag Queen Story Hour.
- Claims that Muslim immigrants can’t be denied entry.
- 1965 immigration act-born demographic upheaval.
- Same-sex “marriage.”
- The Boy Scouts becoming “gender-neutral” scouts.
- [Coercing businessmen](#) into servicing homosexual events.
- Satanic “Christmas” [displays](#) and countless other such trespasses.
- The denying of a multiple-sclerosis patient possibly [restorative drug treatment](#) — that he was willing to finance himself — because it would violate the “equal access to medicine” principle.

Equality dogma, however, does, and *did*, enable the above. For how long will we, indulging insanity, [do the same thing over and over again](#) while expecting a different result?



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.