

THE MESOCRATIC PARTY | FRAMEWORK WHITE PAPER

The Politiverse

Why the Political Spectrum Failed America and What Replaces It

The left-right line is a cage. The Politiverse is the key.

Published by the Mesocratic National Committee February 2026

Paid for by the Mesocratic National Committee. Not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

1. The Problem: A 200-Year-Old Line

- 1.1 The Origin of Left and Right
- 1.2 How One Dimension Became the Entire Framework
- 1.3 What the Line Forces You to Accept

2. The Data: The Spectrum Is Failing

- 2.1 The Independent Majority
- 2.2 Congressional Approval and Institutional Collapse
- 2.3 The Ideology Mismatch
- 2.4 The Moderate Majority That Has No Party

3. What the Spectrum Misses

- 3.1 Seven Dimensions of Political Identity
- 3.2 Economic Policy: Free Market to Regulated
- 3.3 Governance: Distributed to Centralized
- 3.4 Personal Liberty: Collective to Individual
- 3.5 Cultural Identity: Evolution to Tradition

- 3.6 Foreign Policy: Non-Interventionist to Interventionist
- 3.7 Fiscal Approach: Investment to Austerity
- 3.8 Social Structure: Egalitarian to Hierarchical

4. The Politiverse Model

- 4.1 From One Dimension to Seven
- 4.2 How the Model Works
- 4.3 Where Real Americans Actually Land

5. Where the Parties Sit

- 5.1 The Democratic Profile
- 5.2 The Republican Profile
- 5.3 The Typical American Profile
- 5.4 The Mesocratic Position

6. Why This Matters for Policy

- 6.1 Coalition Building in Multi-Dimensional Space
- 6.2 The End of False Binaries
- 6.3 Policy Without Tribal Identity

7. The Case for a Third Way

8. Conclusion

Sources and References

Executive Summary

The political spectrum --- the familiar left-right line that has organized American politics for generations --- is not a natural law. It is a metaphor. It was born in the French National Assembly in 1789, when supporters of the king sat on the right and supporters of the revolution sat on the left. That seating arrangement became the dominant framework for understanding political identity across the Western world.

It was never designed to describe what real people actually believe.

The one-dimensional spectrum forces every political position into a single axis. If you support gun rights, the spectrum places you on the right. If you support universal healthcare, it places you on the left. If you support both, the spectrum has no place for you. You are reduced to a "moderate" --- a word that implies you simply believe less strongly, rather than that you hold a distinct and coherent set of positions that the spectrum cannot represent.

This is not a minor inconvenience. It is the architecture of a broken political system.

The two-party system depends on the spectrum. Two parties require two sides. Two sides require one line. The line creates the illusion that every issue can be sorted into left or right, and that every voter belongs on one side or the other. Voters who do not fit are told they are "independent" or "moderate" --- labels that define them by what they are not, rather than by what they believe.

As of 2025, 45% of American adults identify as political independents, according to Gallup --- a record high. Only 27% identify as Democrats and 27% as Republicans. Congressional approval sits between 15% and 32%, depending on the poll. The American people have not abandoned politics. They have abandoned the framework.

The Politiverse is a multi-dimensional model of political identity that replaces the single left-right axis with seven independent dimensions: economic policy, governance, personal liberty, cultural identity, foreign policy, fiscal approach, and social structure. Each dimension is a spectrum unto itself, with two poles that represent genuinely different values rather than party labels.

In the Politiverse, a voter who supports free-market economics, universal background checks, strong borders, free public college, and reduced military intervention is not a contradiction. They are a point in seven-dimensional space --- a coherent political identity that the one-dimensional spectrum could never describe.

This white paper presents the data behind the spectrum's failure, introduces the seven-dimensional Politiverse model, maps where real Americans fall within it, and makes the case that multi-dimensional political thinking is not just theoretically superior but practically necessary for building the coalitions that can actually govern.

1. The Problem: A 200-Year-Old Line

1.1 The Origin of Left and Right

The terms "left" and "right" in politics have a remarkably specific origin. In June 1789, members of the French National Assembly divided over a single question: should the king have veto power over the new legislature? Those who supported the king's authority sat to the right of the president's chair. Those who opposed it sat to the left.

That was it. A seating arrangement over one question in one country became the organizing framework for all of Western political thought.

The metaphor spread because it was useful. The French Revolution simplified a complex political landscape into two camps: those who wanted to preserve the existing order and those who wanted to change it. "Right" came to mean conservative --- in favor of tradition, hierarchy, and established institutions. "Left" came to mean progressive --- in favor of change, equality, and new institutions.

This binary had some descriptive power in 18th-century France. It has far less in 21st-century America, where the political landscape involves hundreds of distinct issues, each with its own spectrum of positions, and where the "existing order" and the forces for "change" do not sort neatly into two camps.

1.2 How One Dimension Became the Entire Framework

The left-right spectrum persisted because it served the interests of the two institutions that dominate American politics: the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.

A one-dimensional spectrum creates a zero-sum game. There are only two sides. Every voter must eventually choose one. Third parties are mathematically disadvantaged by the first-past-the-post electoral system, but they are conceptually disadvantaged by the spectrum itself. If all of politics is a line, and the two parties occupy the two halves of that line, then any alternative is either redundant (overlapping with one side) or irrelevant (occupying a sliver of space between them).

The media reinforces this framework because it is simple. Every issue gets a left take and a right take. Every panel has a liberal and a conservative. Every election is a contest between two sides of one line. The spectrum is not just a model --- it is the product, the brand, the narrative structure that drives engagement.

The result is a political system organized around a metaphor that was never meant to carry this much weight.

1.3 What the Line Forces You to Accept

The one-dimensional spectrum imposes several false constraints on political thought:

False bundling. The spectrum assumes that if you hold one position on the right (say, lower taxes), you must hold other positions on the right (say, opposition to immigration reform). In reality, issue positions are far less correlated than the spectrum implies. Americans hold unique combinations of views that do not cluster neatly along a single axis.

The myth of the moderate. The spectrum defines the center as a point equidistant from left and right. This implies that "moderate" voters are simply less committed versions of partisans --- people who believe watered-down versions of what the left and right believe. In reality, many Americans hold strong views that happen to come from different sides of the spectrum. They are not moderate in intensity. They are multi-dimensional in position.

Two-party inevitability. The spectrum makes the two-party system feel natural, even inevitable. If politics is a line, two parties is the logical equilibrium. But politics is not a line.

When you add dimensions, the political space becomes large enough for many distinct positions --- and for parties that represent them.

Tribal identity over policy. When every position is sorted into left or right, voters begin to adopt positions based on which side they belong to rather than what they actually believe. Research from the Pew Research Center has documented increasing partisan sorting over the past three decades: voters' positions on individual issues have become more predictable from their party identification, not because voters changed their minds on issues, but because the parties demanded loyalty across the board.

2. The Data: The Spectrum Is Failing

2.1 The Independent Majority

According to Gallup's 2025 tracking data, 45% of American adults identify as political independents. This is the highest figure Gallup has recorded since it began tracking party identification in 1988.

Democrats and Republicans each claim 27% of the adult population --- tied at their lowest combined share in modern polling history.

This is not a recent phenomenon. Independent identification has been rising steadily for two decades. In 2004, approximately one-third of Americans identified as independent. By 2011, the figure had risen above 40%, where it has remained ever since. The 2025 figure represents a structural break, not a temporary fluctuation.

The increase is driven disproportionately by younger Americans. According to the same Gallup data, 56% of Generation Z and 54% of Millennials identify as independents. These cohorts are not trending back toward party identification as they age --- they are maintaining their independence at rates higher than any previous generation at the same age.

2.2 Congressional Approval and Institutional Collapse

The people who are elected through the two-party system are deeply unpopular with the people they represent.

As of early 2026, Ballotpedia's congressional approval polling average sits at 32%. Gallup has recorded approval as low as 15%. The 119th Congress hit a low of 14% approval in November 2025. A December 2025 Quinnipiac poll found that Democrats in Congress had an approval rating of just 18% --- a record low --- while Republicans in Congress were at 35%.

These numbers are not anomalies. Congressional approval has averaged below 30% for more than a decade. The last time it was above 50% was in 2003.

This is the system the spectrum produces: two parties with historically low public support, in a legislature with historically low public approval, elected by a population that

increasingly identifies with neither party. The system is not delivering what the public wants, and the public knows it.

2.3 The Ideology Mismatch

The spectrum assumes that most Americans can be described as "liberal," "conservative," or "moderate." Gallup's 2025 ideology data shows: 35% of Americans identify as conservative, 33% as moderate, and 28% as liberal.

But these labels mask enormous internal diversity. About half of independents --- 47% --- describe themselves as moderate. Among Democrats, 59% now identify as liberal, while among Republicans, 77% identify as conservative. The parties have polarized. The people have not.

The seven-point conservative advantage over liberals in 2025 is the smallest Gallup has measured since 1992. The ideological gap is closing not because Americans are moving left or right, but because the categories themselves are losing meaning. When "conservative" can mean libertarian, nationalist, religious traditionalist, or fiscal hawk --- and "liberal" can mean progressive, social democrat, civil libertarian, or environmentalist --- the labels describe tribes, not positions.

2.4 The Moderate Majority That Has No Party

The most revealing data point is not who Americans vote for, but what they actually believe when asked about individual issues.

On healthcare: majorities support both private insurance choice and some form of universal baseline coverage. On immigration: majorities support both stronger border security and a path to legal status for undocumented immigrants who meet certain conditions. On guns: majorities support both the right to own firearms and universal background checks. On education: majorities support both accountability for teacher performance and increased public investment in schools.

These are not "moderate" positions in the sense of splitting the difference. They are coherent combinations that draw from what the spectrum calls left and right simultaneously. The spectrum has no name for these people except "moderate" or "independent" --- terms that define them by their distance from the parties rather than by the substance of what they believe.

A Unite America survey of registered independents found that 75% disagreed that "most political issues are black-and-white," and 69% reported regularly agreeing with both Republicans and Democrats on different issues. These voters are not confused or disengaged. They are multi-dimensional thinkers trapped in a one-dimensional system.

3. What the Spectrum Misses

3.1 Seven Dimensions of Political Identity

The Politiverse model replaces the single left-right axis with seven independent dimensions. Each dimension represents a genuine tension in political values --- a spectrum with two legitimate poles, neither of which is inherently "left" or "right."

These seven dimensions were identified through analysis of the major policy areas in American politics, weighted by public priority polling, party platform salience, and the degree to which each dimension captures variation that the left-right spectrum collapses. They are not exhaustive --- political identity is infinitely complex --- but they capture the primary axes along which American political opinion varies.

3.2 Economic Policy: Free Market to Regulated

This dimension measures the degree to which a person believes economic activity should be governed by market forces versus government regulation.

At the free-market pole: minimal government intervention, low barriers to entry, price signals as the primary mechanism for resource allocation, and trust in competition to produce efficient outcomes.

At the regulated pole: government standards for wages, working conditions, environmental impact, consumer protection, and market structure. Trust in democratic institutions to correct market failures.

The spectrum collapses this into "right = free market" and "left = regulation." In reality, most Americans hold positions that combine elements of both. They want competitive markets and living wages. They want entrepreneurship and consumer protection. The Politiverse captures this range.

3.3 Governance: Distributed to Centralized

This dimension measures where a person believes political authority should reside --- closer to local communities or concentrated in federal institutions.

At the distributed pole: states' rights, local control, subsidiarity (decisions made at the lowest effective level), and skepticism of federal power.

At the centralized pole: national standards, federal enforcement, uniform rights and protections, and trust in federal institutions to act in the national interest.

The spectrum codes "distributed" as conservative and "centralized" as liberal, but both parties violate this mapping routinely. Republicans favor federal authority on immigration and drug enforcement while opposing it on education and healthcare. Democrats favor federal authority on civil rights and environmental regulation while opposing it on criminal justice and policing. The dimension is real. The party alignment is not.

3.4 Personal Liberty: Collective to Individual

This dimension measures the balance between individual freedom and collective responsibility.

At the collective pole: shared obligations, community standards, social cohesion, and willingness to limit individual behavior for the common good.

At the individual pole: personal autonomy, privacy, freedom from government intrusion into personal choices, and skepticism of collective mandates.

Both parties claim the individual liberty mantle selectively. Republicans emphasize individual rights on firearms and economic regulation; Democrats emphasize individual rights on reproductive choice and personal identity. Neither party is consistently individualist or collectivist. The Politiverse makes this explicit.

3.5 Cultural Identity: Evolution to Tradition

This dimension measures a person's orientation toward cultural change versus cultural continuity.

At the evolution pole: openness to new social norms, changing definitions of identity and family, multicultural integration, and progress as an inherent good.

At the tradition pole: preservation of established cultural institutions, continuity of social norms, respect for heritage and custom, and caution toward rapid cultural change.

This is the dimension the spectrum most often reduces to a simple left-right binary. In reality, many Americans hold nuanced positions: they may embrace cultural change on some issues (interracial marriage, women in the workforce) while preferring continuity on others (religious practice, community traditions). The Politiverse allows for this complexity.

3.6 Foreign Policy: Non-Interventionist to Interventionist

This dimension measures a person's views on the role of American military and diplomatic power abroad.

At the non-interventionist pole: restraint, diplomacy first, skepticism of military engagement, focus on domestic priorities, and opposition to nation-building.

At the interventionist pole: active global engagement, military readiness, defense alliances, willingness to use force to protect national interests, and belief in American leadership on the world stage.

The spectrum assigns interventionism to the right and non-interventionism to the left, but this has never been consistent. The strongest anti-war voices in 2025 come from both the populist right and the progressive left. The strongest pro-intervention voices come from the neoconservative right and the liberal internationalist center. This dimension cuts across the spectrum entirely.

3.7 Fiscal Approach: Investment to Austerity

This dimension measures a person's preference for public spending versus fiscal restraint.

At the investment pole: public spending on infrastructure, education, healthcare, and social programs as drivers of long-term economic growth. Willingness to run deficits for strategic priorities.

At the austerity pole: fiscal discipline, balanced budgets, reduced government spending, lower taxes, and skepticism of public investment as a growth strategy.

The spectrum assigns investment to the left and austerity to the right, but neither party practices what it preaches. Both parties have expanded the deficit when in power. The real question is not whether to spend, but what to spend on --- and that varies issue by issue, not along a single axis.

3.8 Social Structure: Egalitarian to Hierarchical

This dimension measures a person's views on how society should be organized --- with emphasis on equal outcomes or on earned distinctions.

At the egalitarian pole: reducing inequality, leveling the playing field, redistributive policies, and skepticism of inherited privilege.

At the hierarchical pole: meritocracy, earned success, natural stratification, and trust in competition to sort people by talent and effort.

Most Americans hold a position that combines elements of both: they believe in equal opportunity and earned success simultaneously. They want a level playing field and they want the freedom to rise. The Politiverse gives this position a location. The spectrum does not.

4. The Politiverse Model

4.1 From One Dimension to Seven

The Politiverse model represents each person's political identity as a point in seven-dimensional space. Each dimension is a scale from 0 to 100, with the two poles at each end. A person's "political identity" is the combination of their positions across all seven dimensions.

In the one-dimensional spectrum, every American is reduced to a single point on a line. In the Politiverse, every American occupies a unique location in a space with far more room for the complexity of real human belief.

The math is straightforward. A one-dimensional spectrum has a range of 100 points. A seven-dimensional Politiverse has a range of 100 to the seventh power --- 100 trillion possible positions. The vast majority of Americans occupy positions in this space that do not correspond to the standard party platforms of either the Democratic or Republican Party.

4.2 How the Model Works

Each of the seven dimensions is scored independently. A person who scores 80 on economic regulation and 80 on tradition is not placed at the "center" of a line --- they are placed at a specific point in multi-dimensional space that reflects both positions simultaneously.

The model does not require voters to take a quiz or self-identify along each axis. It is a framework for understanding political identity, not a personality test. Its purpose is to make visible the political positions that the one-dimensional spectrum renders invisible.

When political positions are mapped in seven dimensions rather than one, several patterns emerge:

The Democratic and Republican profiles are highly distinct, occupying different regions of the seven-dimensional space. But the Typical American profile --- based on aggregate polling data across all seven dimensions --- does not overlap neatly with either party profile. The average American is not "between" the parties on a line. They are in a different region of the space entirely.

4.3 Where Real Americans Actually Land

Based on aggregate public opinion data, the Typical American profile scores as follows on the seven Politiverse dimensions:

- Economic Policy:** 55 (slightly toward regulated --- want markets with guardrails)
- Governance:** 50 (genuinely split between local control and federal standards)
- Personal Liberty:** 65 (lean individual --- most Americans want to be left alone)
- Cultural Identity:** 55 (slight lean toward tradition, but open to change)
- Foreign Policy:** 35 (lean non-interventionist --- Americans are war-weary)
- Fiscal Approach:** 45 (favor investment but hate waste)
- Social Structure:** 45 (egalitarian instinct but respect earned success)

This profile does not match the Democratic platform, which scores high on regulation, centralized governance, and egalitarianism. It does not match the Republican platform, which scores high on tradition, austerity, and hierarchy. It is a distinct position that the one-dimensional spectrum would place at the "center" --- but in the Politiverse, it is not a center at all. It is a specific, coherent combination of values that happens to draw from what both parties claim as their own.

5. Where the Parties Sit

5.1 The Democratic Profile

Based on the party's stated platform, legislative priorities, and the positions of its elected officials, the Democratic Party's Politiverse profile is approximately:

Economic Policy: 80 (strongly regulated)

Governance: 75 (favor federal authority)
Personal Liberty: 45 (mixed --- individual on social issues, collective on economics)
Cultural Identity: 25 (strongly favor cultural evolution)
Foreign Policy: 60 (moderately interventionist, multilateral)
Fiscal Approach: 20 (strongly favor public investment)
Social Structure: 25 (strongly egalitarian)

The Democratic profile is concentrated in the high-regulation, high-centralization, high-egalitarian region of the Politiverse. It is internally consistent but occupies a relatively narrow band of the seven-dimensional space.

5.2 The Republican Profile

Based on the party's stated platform, legislative priorities, and the positions of its elected officials, the Republican Party's Politiverse profile is approximately:

Economic Policy: 25 (favor free market)
Governance: 35 (lean distributed, but inconsistent)
Personal Liberty: 40 (mixed --- individual on guns and business, collective on social issues)
Cultural Identity: 85 (strongly favor tradition)
Foreign Policy: 65 (moderately interventionist)
Fiscal Approach: 80 (strongly favor austerity in rhetoric)
Social Structure: 70 (favor meritocratic hierarchy)

The Republican profile is concentrated in the low-regulation, high-tradition, high-austerity region of the Politiverse. Like the Democratic profile, it is internally consistent but narrow.

5.3 The Typical American Profile

As outlined in Section 4.3, the Typical American profile sits in a region of the Politiverse that does not overlap with either party's core position. On five of seven dimensions, the Typical American is closer to the midpoint than to either party's position. On two dimensions --- personal liberty and foreign policy --- the Typical American is more extreme than both parties, not between them.

This is the critical insight: the Typical American is not a moderate version of a Democrat or a moderate version of a Republican. They are a different political identity entirely --- one that the spectrum cannot describe and the two-party system cannot represent.

5.4 The Mesocratic Position

The Mesocratic Party's positions were developed through a research-driven process described in our white paper **How We Built the Platform**. Each policy position was designed to serve the American middle class — and every working American fighting to get there — without ideological commitment to left or right.

The result is a Politiverse profile that falls near the Typical American profile on most dimensions --- not because the party split the difference between Democrats and Republicans, but because the party asked the same question the public is asking: what actually works?

On the Politiverse radar chart, the Mesocratic profile appears as a distinct shape --- neither a shrunken version of the Democratic or Republican shapes, nor a point at the center of a line. It is a coherent political identity in multi-dimensional space, one that reflects the values and priorities of the Americans the two parties left behind.

6. Why This Matters for Policy

6.1 Coalition Building in Multi-Dimensional Space

In a one-dimensional system, coalitions are built by moving left or right to capture the median voter. This produces policies that are designed to win elections, not to solve problems. Candidates "tack to the center" in general elections and "energize the base" in primaries --- oscillating along a line rather than occupying a stable position.

In a multi-dimensional system, coalitions are built differently. Instead of moving along a line, parties identify regions of the seven-dimensional space where many voters cluster and build platforms that serve those clusters. A party can be economically moderate, culturally traditional, fiscally responsible, and pro-personal liberty simultaneously --- and that combination may describe more voters than either major party's platform.

The Mesocratic Party is the first party to explicitly build its platform using multi-dimensional political analysis rather than spectrum-based positioning. Every policy position is evaluated not as "left" or "right" but as a point in the Politiverse, optimized for the region of the space where most Americans actually live.

6.2 The End of False Binaries

The Politiverse eliminates the most destructive feature of the one-dimensional spectrum: the false binary.

In the spectrum framework, every issue has two sides. You are for gun control or against it. You are for immigration or against it. You are for big government or small government. These binaries are not just simplistic --- they are actively harmful. They prevent the kind of nuanced policy design that most issues require.

In the Politiverse framework, each issue exists in its own multi-dimensional context. Gun policy involves personal liberty, governance structure, and cultural identity simultaneously. Immigration involves economic policy, cultural identity, governance, and foreign policy. Healthcare involves economic regulation, fiscal approach, and social structure.

When you stop forcing each issue onto a single line, you can design policies that account for the real complexity of each problem. And when you stop forcing voters onto a single line,

you can build coalitions of people who agree on the issue at hand, even if they disagree on other dimensions.

6.3 Policy Without Tribal Identity

The most important consequence of the Politiverse model is the decoupling of policy from tribal identity.

In the current system, a voter's position on climate change predicts their position on gun control, which predicts their position on immigration, which predicts their position on healthcare. This is not because these issues are logically connected. It is because the one-dimensional spectrum forces voters into tribes, and the tribes demand loyalty across all issues.

The Politiverse breaks this link. In a multi-dimensional framework, there is no reason to assume that a person's position on one dimension predicts their position on another. Voters are free to hold the positions they actually believe, rather than the positions their tribe demands.

This is not a utopian fantasy. It is a description of how most Americans already think. The 45% who identify as independent are already multi-dimensional thinkers. They just do not have a party --- or a framework --- that reflects it.

The Politiverse provides both.

7. The Case for a Third Way

The Politiverse is not merely an intellectual exercise. It is the foundation for a new kind of political party.

The Mesocratic Party exists because the two-party system has left the majority of Americans without representation. The 45% who identify as independent are not apathetic. They are underserved. They hold strong views, they care about policy, and they are ready to engage --- but the system offers them two choices that do not reflect what they believe.

The Politiverse gives these Americans a language for their political identity. It shows them that they are not confused or undecided. They are multi-dimensional thinkers in a one-dimensional system.

The Mesocratic Party gives them a home.

Not in the center of a line. Not between left and right. Not as a compromise between two extremes. But as a distinct position in multi-dimensional political space --- a position defined by evidence, built for the middle class and every working American who belongs in it, and designed to represent the people that neither party can see because neither party is willing to look beyond the line.

The two-party system needs the line. The American people do not.

8. Conclusion

The left-right political spectrum is not a law of nature. It is a metaphor from 1789 that has been stretched far beyond its capacity to describe what real people actually believe.

The data is clear. Forty-five percent of Americans reject both major parties. Congressional approval is at historic lows. Voters hold complex, multi-dimensional positions that do not fit on a line. The system built on the spectrum is producing outcomes that the public does not want and representatives the public does not trust.

The Politiverse offers an alternative: a seven-dimensional model of political identity that captures the real complexity of what Americans believe. It does not split the difference between left and right. It replaces the line with a space large enough for the full range of human political thought.

In that space, the Mesocratic Party is not the center. It is a distinct position --- one that happens to be where most Americans actually stand when they are free to describe their views without the constraints of a 200-year-old seating arrangement.

When you stop forcing people onto a line, you see where they actually stand

Sources and References

Party Identification and Independent Voters

Gallup. "Party Affiliation." Annual tracking data, 2025 results. Record 45% independent identification.

Gallup. "New High of 45% in U.S. Identify as Political Independents." January 2026.

Pew Research Center. "Party Affiliation Fact Sheet (NPORS)." December 2025.

Unite America. "Research Brief: Growing Cohort of Independent Voters Becomes Critical Segment of Electorate."

Congressional Approval

Ballotpedia. "Congressional Approval Rating." Polling average, February 2026.

Gallup. "Congress and the Public." Historical trend data.

Quinnipiac University. National poll, December 2025. Record low 18% approval for Democrats in Congress.

Ideology and Political Attitudes

Gallup. "U.S. Political Ideology." 2025 annual averages: 35% conservative, 33% moderate, 28% liberal.

Pew Research Center. "Political Typology." Multi-dimensional clustering of American political attitudes.

SNF Agora Institute, Johns Hopkins University. Mid-2025 survey of 4,500 Americans on institutional trust and political reform.

Harvard Youth Poll. Late 2025 survey on generational political attitudes.

The Political Spectrum: History and Critique

- Nolan, David. "Classifying and Analyzing Politico-Economic Systems." *The Individualist*, 1971.
- Eysenck, Hans. "The Psychology of Politics." 1954. Early multi-dimensional model.
- Political Compass. Multi-axis political mapping methodology.

Partisan Sorting and Polarization

- Pew Research Center. "Political Polarization in the American Public." Multi-year tracking of partisan sorting across issue positions.
- Abramowitz, Alan. "The Great Alignment: Race, Party Transformation, and the Rise of Donald Trump." Yale University Press, 2018.

Multi-Dimensional Political Models

- Rokeach, Milton. "The Open and Closed Mind." 1960. Two-dimensional model of political belief.
- Mitchell, Brian Patrick. "Eight Ways to Run the Country." 2006. Multi-axis political taxonomy.
- World Values Survey. Cultural map of world political values across two dimensions.

This document is published by the Mesocratic National Committee and is available for public download at mesocrats.org/about/politics.

Paid for by the Mesocratic National Committee. Not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.

(c) 2026 Mesocratic National Committee. All rights reserved.