institutions. At the same time, however, the impossible strain put upon students involved in the elite educational system is said to lead to illness and pathology. Depression and anxiety, it often seems, are the price to pay to become and stay part of the elite.

Who benefits from this discursive paradigm? The emphasis on impossibility fuels the 'application support industry' I have discussed in the previous chapter: the sum of books, courses, tutors, and essay-ready summer programs that promise to increase the likelihood of admission. This industry has an obvious interest in keeping the admissions process as intransparent and unpredictable as possible, so as to keep families spending money in their attempt to navigate the system. In addition to these economic interests, however, the rhetoric of impossibility and pathology also informs the ways in which elite colleges can and do talk about themselves. Since the media discourse relentlessly re-emphasizes the eliteness—the exclusivity, the importance, the influence—of elite colleges, the institutions themselves are free to democratize their self-descriptions and focus on the pleasures of the elite educational experience. The resulting paradigm of self-representation, which I call the meritocracy of affect, is the subject of the next section of this chapter.

3. A Meritocracy of Affect

In the winter of 1746, ten young men convened in Reverend Jonathan Dickinson's parlor in Elizabeth, NJ to study and attend classes together. They were the first students enrolled in the College of New Jersey, founded in that same year to further "the Education of Youth in the Learned Languages and in the Liberal Arts and Sciences," as the charter granted by the Province of New Jersey, in the name of King George II, put it. A few years later, in 1756, the college moved southwest to Princeton and into its new quarters, Nassau Hall. For half a century, Nassau Hall housed the college in its entirety, and it is still one of its most recognizable and beloved landmark buildings. In 1896, during its sesquicentennial, the College of New Jersey expanded its program to gain full university status and renamed itself 'Princeton'. At this time, the institution also adopted its unofficial motto, "Princeton in the nation's service

and in service to all nations,"[3] which was inspired by a commemorative address delivered by Woodrow Wilson, then still a faculty member, but soon to be Princeton's president, and, later still, the nation's.

This brief historical overview can be found on the institution's official website, under the header "Princeton History at a Glance." The article is augmented by some observations on the university's "tradition of educational excellence," and mentions the year Princeton went coeducational (1969); it also addresses one of Princeton's most attractive and unique features, namely the fact that it is simultaneously a small college devoted to undergraduate education and one of the nation's leading research universities. This self-description is characterized by a number of obvious and important blind spots. There is no mention of the racial and religious discrimination practiced at Princeton for much of its long history, as outlined compellingly in Karabel's *The Chosen*, nor of the debates about deteriorating academic standards at the turn of the century and beyond—Scott Fitzgerald's famous diagnosis of Princeton as 'the pleasantest country club in America' does seem to contradict or at least challenge the notion of a 'tradition of educational excellence'. If one keeps looking, however, there is some official information on these problematic parts of Princeton's institutional history as well. The *Mudd Manuscript Library Blog*, for instance, features articles on the history of African American and Jewish students at Princeton[4], and even though these are phrased very cautiously and, at times, uncritically or euphemistically, this does testify to Princeton's—albeit selective—efforts at coming to terms with the less commendable parts of its past.

The information available on the website is complemented by a number of book publications that I interpret as officially sanctioned since they were written by Princeton graduates or professors and are sold at the official university store. Among the most recent is *Princeton: America's Campus* (2012), an architectural history written by W. Barksdale Maynard, who received his B.A. from Princeton in 1988 and now works as a lecturer at the art history department. Maynard points out that it is not easy "[t]o tell the story of this campus" (2012: 9), and he is right: Its "complex tale" (ibid.) does not only span almost

3 This was changed in 2016 in the aftermath of the debate about Woodrow Wilson's legacy at Princeton; the new informal motto now reads "Princeton in the nation's service and in service to humanity."

4 April C. Armstrong's "Dear Mr. Mudd: Who Was Princeton's First Jewish Student?" (2016) and "African Americans and Princeton University" (2015).

three hundred years of history, but involves countless actors—architects and builders, administrators and professors, alumni and trustees, and the thousands of students whose lives shaped the place. While it would thus not be productive or feasible to trace the historical development of the Princeton campus in any great detail, it is instructive to consider Maynard's discussion of the "series of identities" Princeton underwent in the course of its history:

> Over more than 260 years, the university has passed through a series of identities, each leaving their trace on the campus. At first, it was the staunchest of the Puritan colleges in America, bastion of "New Light," what we would today call evangelical Christianity. Then a famed School for Statesmen in the Revolutionary period. In the early nineteenth century, a training ground for gentleman farmers, clergy, and professional men from North and South alike. In the Gilded Age, "the pleasantest country club in America" and haunt of millionaire's sons, a flavor perfectly captured in Fitzgerald's novel. Up to the Vietnam War, the most conservative and blue-blooded of elite universities. […] Since coeducation, all has changed profoundly. Striving to redress old social wrongs, Princeton has rubbed away many quirks and eccentricities, and its outlook has come to more or less resemble its major rivals Harvard and Yale. Its demographics no longer recall a country club grillroom but rather the lobby of the United Nations. It aims for excellence and has earned a world-class reputation. (Maynard 2012: 2-3)

This paragraph can serve as a typical example of the kind of progressivist success story that is so often told about elite universities. The underlying assumption is that an institution passes through a series of distinct phases, which can then in retrospect be interpreted as individualizable parts of a grand narrative of obstacles overcome and goals achieved. The rhetoric of this passage is striking. The phrase 'quirks and eccentricities', for instance, certainly does not adequately capture the long history of racism, sexism, and religious discrimination practiced at Princeton; in a similar vein, describing the historical Princeton as 'conservative and blue-blooded' is as euphemistic as it is misleading. These problematic aspects notwithstanding, Maynard's brief synopsis demonstrates the multiplicity of narratives written into the campus, prompting us to take a closer look at some of the meanings inherent in the physical fabric of the university—to decode the palimpsest of the campus landscape.

Knowledge production at Princeton about Princeton serves a number of different purposes, and addresses various audiences by means of a range of

epistemological channels and practices. Much of this happens in the mode of publicity and marketing, through strategic communication between the university and the public via advertising and other promotional materials. The resulting economy of prestige relies on what sociologist Thorstein Veblen already a century ago had identified as "marketable illusions" (130). In *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men* (1918), his provocative critique of the collegiate landscape in the early twentieth century, Veblen discussed universities' increasing need for "a due and creditable publicity" (129). The "efficient salesman," he argued, manages to add to his actual marketable goods "an immaterial increment of 'prestige value'" (ibid.), and thus increases the overall success of his business. The main issue for Veblen is that in the context of the university, "[t]he gain which so accrues […] from such an accession of popular illusions is a differential gain in competition with rival seats of learning, not a gain to the republic of learning or to the academic community at large" (139). No matter how successful, publicity and its attendant illusions thus belong to the realm of the competitive market and not to that of the advancement of knowledge. Veblen's complaint, then, is directed at the disproportionate amount of resources invested in matters of marketing, because they detract from the real purpose of the university, which is to provide a space for scholars and the production of knowledge. Even though Veblen wrote *Higher Learning in America* a century ago, many of his observations still hold true today; universities in the early twenty-first century are much more preoccupied with the production of 'marketable illusions' than they were in Veblen's time. Since a number of important developments, technological and otherwise, have taken place since then, however, it is necessarily to briefly historicize Princeton's self-representational practices.

The landscape of higher education in the United States as such changed profoundly in the course of the twentieth century. Veblen was writing at the end of what economists Claudia Goldin and Lawrence F. Katz have called "the formative period of America's higher education industry, when its modern form took shape" (37), namely the two to three decades following 1890. During this period, Goldin and Katz explain, the American research university and the public sector flourished, expanding enrollments and widening the scope of higher education in the United States. Still, in the early years of the twentieth century, college choice was very much determined by region and class, and the competition Princeton faced was comparatively low. All in all, around 240,000 students were enrolled in institutions of higher education in 1900 ("Education Summary"). At the beginning of the twenty-first century,

by contrast, close to fifteen million students are enrolled in more than four thousand colleges in the United States; even if one just takes private four-year-institutions into account, Princeton is one among 1,845. This does not mean that Princeton competes directly with all of these institutions; the pool of immediate competitors is much smaller, including perhaps around eighty institutions (those listed as "most competitive" in *Barron's Profiles of American Colleges*). Princeton is thus part of a highly competitive marketplace in which colleges and universities compete for students, funding, and recognition. The resulting prestige economy is an important factor in Princeton's self-representation.

Technological developments, moreover, are among the most important changes informing the ways in which colleges are able to talk about themselves. Princeton now has a host of digital tools at its disposal that were unthinkable during Veblen's days—the university uses a range of social media platforms as well as Youtube and its regular website. These technological advancements have had a decisive impact on how Princeton is able to present itself and engage with an interested public. For one thing, the institution's self-representation is much more flexible, frequent, and interactive. The visual dimension, moreover, plays a markedly more pronounced role; as countless images on Instagram and Facebook demonstrate, for instance, Princeton is able to capitalize on the physical beauty of its campus in new and productive ways.

This brings us to a third change that distinguishes the early twenty-first century from Veblen's time: the pervasive influence of a number of economic, political, ideological, and cultural forces commonly subsumed under the header of neoliberalism. As we will see shortly, much of what sociologists Eve Chiapello and Luc Boltanski have memorably called 'the new spirit of capitalism' in their eponymous book is visible in the self-representation of Princeton University (*The New Spirit of Capitalism*, 1999). We shall also see, however, that Princeton's auto-epistemic efforts are not purely in line with neoliberal imperatives but instead present us with a conglomerate of liberal-humanist notions infused by neoliberal thinking.

Princeton's self-representation, then, is affected by its position in the competitive market of higher education, structured by technological innovation, and informed by the totalizing structures of neoliberalism. From these factors, a number of communicative objectives can be deduced: The first is to sell a product, namely a spot in the freshman class, by creating an attractive brand and encouraging as many people as possible to apply. In this

context, the materials employ the language of marketing and advertising, for instance by positioning the potential applicant as active agent and emphasizing the notions of choice and opportunity: "At Princeton, you have the freedom to explore your intellectual interests and follow your passions" (*Experience Princeton* 4). The second objective is to bind people to the institution, to inspire loyalty and create lasting relationships that generate long-term funding. Here, the institution relies on the register of civil religion to create an affective relationship between its students and their alma mater. This is not only actualized through language—the persistent use of a collective 'we', the notion of a complete transformation through the Princeton experience, etc.—but also supported by ritual practices, such as the annual progression across campus during Reunion Weekend. A third objective informs both of these epistemological endeavors, namely the legitimation of Princeton's own existence in the overall socio-cultural and political landscape of the United States. In this context, the materials draw on the rhetoric of diversity and social justice, for instance by including a disproportionately large number of minority students. These three objectives are reflected in the epistemological frames I discuss in the following section of this chapter—the diversity paradigm, the notion of the good life, and the trope of community building.

The primary addressees of these materials are prospective applicants and their families, but they also speak to current students and alumni, as well as to and for American society as a whole—institutions such as Harvard, Stanford, or MIT enjoy international reputations of excellence, after all. Stephanie Kim, writing about the South Korean "fad" of getting into US elite colleges, points out that an "Ivy League education certainly carries a global brand." These institutions, among "the most successful and singularly American brands" (Cappello 11), thus serve as globally legible symbols of American exceptionalism.

Among the most important of these channels are official brochures, available in both print and online versions; a youtube account featuring a variety of promotional videos; an Instagram account showcasing photos of the campus as well as encouraging users to post photos using the hashtag #princetagram; and the official website. In addition to these materials, I also consider the speeches of President Eisgruber as examples of intra-community knowledge production, as well as the meanings created and transported by the campus space itself and its staging during official campus tours. Most of these materials are produced or coordinated by the Office of Communications, which, according to its mission statement, is charged with the task of "promot[ing] and protect[ing] Princeton University's reputation of excellence" ("About Us").

In the process of telling "Princeton's story to a wide range of audiences around the world," the Office of Communications names four central priorities: the exceptional scholarship and teaching of Princeton's faculty; the university's diversity, "with special attention to our unparalleled commitment to affordability through financial aid" (ibid.); the university's international role, and the work of President Eisgruber.

In all of the processes, I propose, Princeton has to navigate a number of tensions. First, it has to cater to different types of eliteness—social, cultural, financial, and intellectual—not all of which are entirely compatible. Second, the media discourse of impossibility and pathology described above creates an ambiguous communicative situation for elite institutions. On the one hand, they profit from the relentless dramatization of their own eliteness; after all, their unattainability is widely regarded as evidence of excellence and distinction. On the other hand, this unattainability has to be perceived as malleable enough to merit applying—elite colleges would suffer financially and otherwise if a critical mass of students was to stop from doing so. Not only would they then be faced with a smaller pool of qualified applicants to choose from, but, more importantly, one of the major signifiers of eliteness would lose potency: the admissions rate, which serves as an indicator of exclusivity and, accordingly, of desirability. Parents, moreover, might be hesitant to send their children to an environment perceived as fostering loneliness, depression, and anxiety due to its hyper-competitive, hyper-demanding nature. In its self-representation, Princeton has to navigate these various tensions, and it does so, I argue, by generating what I want to call a 'meritocracy of affect'.

Modulations of the Meritocracy: From Effort to Affect

Experience Princeton, the university's primary promotional brochure, features several instances of the conventional meritocratic narrative, which I call the 'meritocracy of effort'. One example, from the section "Student Stories," in which current students describe their reasons for choosing the college, encapsulates this perfectly. Chance Fletcher, a sophomore from Oklahoma, explains his unlikely path to Princeton:

> I never really thought about attending college outside Oklahoma. I'm from a small town, and many students from my high school don't go on to college. In high school, I was lucky to have opportunities that opened my eyes to schools like Princeton. The summer before my junior year, I attended the

> LEADership, Education and Development (LEAD) summer program at the Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College. I then become involved with QuestBridge, a nonprofit organization that guides low-income students through the college admission process. I was admitted to Princeton as a QuestBridge Scholar. I also received a lot of support from my community. I'm a member of the Cherokee Nation, and my tribal councilor is a key reason why I am at Princeton. […] I was in student government in high school and am now president of the sophomore class. I'm also social chair of the Pre-Law Society, a fellow in the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions, a member of the College Republicans, and one of the founders of the Native Americans at Princetons student organization. One of my favorite classes so far has been 'Introduction to American Studies'. I enjoyed debating the idea of the 'American Dream' with classmates. I'm a poor kid who went to Princeton and became class president. I'm living my American dream. (23)

Chance Fletcher's narrative includes most of the staples of the meritocracy of effort: the general trajectory of upward mobility, a nod to the diversity paradigm, a reference to the mechanisms that ensure the meritocracy is fully functioning (programs like QuestBridge), involvement in organizations, leadership skills, and a little bit of luck and humility. The only thing missing is test scores and grades, though these credentials seem implied in the general success narrative.

While these vignettes of the meritocracy of effort still play an important role in Princeton's self-representation, a range of crucial changes to key elements of this meritocracy become apparent when taking into account the whole of *Experience Princeton* and other materials. The traditional meritocracy is a system in which the individual proves herself—her talent, her abilities, her ambition—through a number of standardized tests and other rituals of distinction, to then be admitted to the next level and rewarded with certain advantages, such as a superior and more prestigious learning environment like Princeton. The meritocracy is a hierarchical system, shaped like a pyramid, and determined by competition; each contestant has to beat a number of other contestants to advance to the next level. The decision-making powers in these processes lie in the hands of the agents governing the system, not with the students themselves.

The Princetonian self-description differs from this blueprint in important ways. The neoliberal modulation of the meritocracy of effort creates what I call

a meritocracy of affect, which is informed, in part, by the cultural imperatives discussed by sociologists Eve Chiapello and Luc Boltanski in their seminal work *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (1999/2006). Boltanski and Chiapello describe the "profound transformation in the spirit of capitalism over the last thirty years" (57) by reading an assorted collection of management literature from the 1960s and the 1990s. The texts from the latter period, they argue, create a "new managerial norm" by criticizing, explicitly and implicitly, the ideological features of mid-century capitalism, specifically "large, hierarchized, planned organizations" (64). They do so by incorporating some of the main points of contention raised in the artistic and social critique of the 1960s and '70s, for instance the "demands for authenticity and freedom" (97). Among the most important changes Boltanski and Chiapello discuss is the "transition from control to self-control" (81), an "obsession with flexibility" (84), the primacy of the network metaphor (ibid.), and an insistence on the value of creativity, intuition, and visionary thinking (78).

Boltanski and Chiapello describe how the new spirit of capitalism extracted some of the core themes of the "oppositional writings of the 1970s," decontextualized and detached them from their original critical trajectories, and employed them in the name of neo-management:

> [T]he qualities that are guarantees of success in this new spirit—autonomy, spontaneity, rhizomorphous capacity, multitasking (in contrast to the narrow specialization of the old division of labour), conviviality, openness to others and to novelty, availability, creativity, visionary intuition, sensitivity to differences, listening to lived experience and receptiveness to a whole range of experiences, being attracted to informality and the search for interpersonal contacts—these are taken directly from the repertoire of May 1968. (97)

As we will see below, these motifs and imperatives occur in Princeton's self-description as well. The ideology of the meritocracy, this demonstrates, is flexible enough to adapt in subtle and not-so-subtle ways whenever its legitimatory basis is in danger—changes may occur in the conceptualization of its central category, merit; in the emphasis on or downplay of certain cultural norms; or in the overall affective or aesthetic framing of the meritocratic structures. The interplay between effort and affect can be traced to different speaking positions within the materials. Whenever current or former students talk about Princeton, they tend to frame their experiences in the mode of the traditional meritocracy of effort. They list the various activities in which they engage,

for instance, or name honors they have received. When the university itself speaks, however, there is a strong emphasis on passion and choice. As I show in more detail below, the (neoliberal) modulation of the meritocracy includes the notion of the student as agent/customer, the absence of competition, an insistence on love and passion as guiding principles, and the promise of limitless opportunity. In all of these cultural scripts, affect outranks effort, and there is a continuous projection of ease and pleasure.

Let me outline the amalgamation of these two models in a little more detail. First of all, *Experience Princeton* introduces the students, rather than the university, as agents. On the first pages, a box titled "Why I Picked Princeton" features two students explaining their decision to attend, both beginning with "I picked Princeton because […]" (2). This subtly puts the student in the position of the customer who, with a number of choices at her disposal, makes an informed decision based on her interests and desires. The student-as-customer trope is a common occurrence in neoliberal discourse on education, as Marnie Holborow explains:

> The identification between what was a traditional customer in receipt of a good in exchange for money and a student in a learning institution is a metaphor redolent with ideology. It evokes superficially positive factors, in this case of putting the student first and responding to what he or she might want. But the terms of reference that the metaphor evokes are patently false. (61)

She argues that the customer metaphor does not accurately describe the "rounded experience of teaching and learning," since education as such cannot be bought or sold, but requires the effort and engagement of the student. Instead, the metaphor mirrors "new funding mechanisms which have increasingly been displaced from the institution to the individual student" (61). Under the guise of valuing agency and choice, then, the student-as-customer reflects the pernicious dismantling of the educational system in the era of neoliberalism.

The trope of the student as agent/customer moreover explains another crucial difference between the meritocracy of effort and Princeton's self-representation: the utter absence of the notion of competition. The brochure does not mobilize this notion at all, neither in explaining why students got into Princeton nor in detailing what they do once they are there. The 2015 version of *Experience Princeton* included as its first page a stylishly designed numeri-

cal overview of a variety of facets of the Princeton experience, including the following information:

> The undergraduate population is approximately 5,250.
>
> Students from nearly 100 countries outside of the U.S. make up 11% of undergraduates.
>
> Princeton's financial aid comes in the form of grants that do not need to be repaid. Because students are not required to take out loans, 83% of recent seniors graduate debt free. Those who chose to borrow graduates with an average debt of $6,600.
>
> The Princeton University Library has more than 8 million books in 10 buildings across campus.
>
> 42% of undergraduates are Americans of color.
>
> Students may chose from 36 majors and 50 interdisciplinary certificate programs.
>
> The student-to-faculty ratio is 6-to-1.
>
> Princeton's International Internship Program offers summer internships in approximately 60 countries.
>
> 98% of undergraduates live on campus.
>
> Students participate in 300+ student organizations.
>
> About 60% of students receive financial aid. The average annual grant for aid students admitted to the Class of 2019 is en estimated $46,350. (1)

The nodal points around which this self-description revolves are diversity, opportunity and choice, and the quality of the educational experience. The admissions rate, a strong signifier of the intense competition generated by the admissions politics of elite educational institutions, is conspicuously absent from this description. Princeton does not present itself as a place where everyone tries to outdo everyone else, but rather as one that encourages the

productive collaboration of all its inhabitants in a variety of exciting projects and endeavors. The student body is not conceptualized along the lines of a hierarchical composition, but as a community of equals who are united in their common identity as Princetonians. The absence of competition is in line with the metaphor of the student as customer, which, as Holborow points out, is "not naïve. 'Customer' equalizes everyone; applying it beyond those involved in a purely commercial transaction to other groups of people distorts social relations and effaces social power. The oppressive state of affairs [...] is blithely smoothed away in the customer designation" (64). This insistence on internal cohesion and equality is in notable contrast to the image of elite education created in the media discourse.

Another dominant motif in Princeton's self-description, and particularly of those parts in which the university itself speaks, is the notion of love and passion for one's work. The Office of the Dean of the College urges the students to "[s]tudy what you love, take advantage of the opportunities around you and find help when you need it" (16), thus connecting the notion of the possible to that of passion, which the brochure likewise emphasizes. The affective framework of conceptualizing the college experience is actualized when students are asked to "follow your passions" (6) and "discover new passions" (10); when the brochure tells us that students choose their senior thesis topic "based on their passions" (16) or when one students explains that his "passion is in public and global health" (23) and another that she is "passionate about programming and cryptography" (18). Princeton professors, too, "have a passion for teaching" (14), and coaches support student athletes in pursuing "other passions" (35) beyond sports. A second brochure, focusing on undergraduate research at Princeton, even marks this emphasis in its title, *Pursue Your Passion*, and tells the reader to "[s]tart with curiosity. Study what you love. Make something happen. The process of learning is for you to explore." Passion is at the heart of what Princeton conceptualizes as the ideal student, as another brochure points out: "You may be a good candidate for Princeton if your pursue everything you do with equal passion" (12).

This rhetoric of love and passion is complemented by a poetics of limitlessness that revolves around the nodal points 'opportunity' and 'choice'. The second section of *Experience Princeton*, for instance, is titled "Freedom to Explore," and explains that "[a]t Princeton, you have the freedom to explore your intellectual interests and follow your passions" (*Admissions Viewbook* 4). Students are furthermore "encouraged to explore many academic and extracurricular opportunities" (4), a "multitude of international opportunities"

(6), "unrivaled opportunities" (20), "ample opportunities" (22), "many opportunities" (34), "new opportunities" (32), and "endless opportunities" (35). In terms of academics, the brochure explains that students "can choose from among 37 concentrations" (7) and "can choose from among 53 certificates of proficiency" (9), but the individual choice seems almost secondary, since "[a]ny field you choose will teach you to think critically, solve problems, express yourself clearly" (6). Students can choose where they want to live, where they want to eat, which clubs they want to join; in short, they can "choose from a multitude of experiences" (37)

The rhetorical and ideological architecture of neoliberalism is thus certainly adopted, but only partially. While vocabulary from the semantic field of 'creativity'—as described by Boltanski and Chiapello above—is frequently used (choice, freedom, flexibility, multiplicity, etc.), the materials eschew the language of corporate business, which is such an important part of the culture of neoliberalism: competition, efficiency, cost-effectiveness, supply and demand, etc. Princeton's self-representation creates a new paradigm of elite education that merges traditional, liberal-humanistic notions of learning and self-fulfillment with the neoliberal frames and scripts described by Boltanski and Chiapello. This new paradigm, I want to suggest, reflects Princeton's knowledge of its core audience: members of the upper and upper middle class, who value achievement and financial success, but at the same time betray a strong nostalgic penchant for college as a haven of learning and self-fulfillment in the tradition of liberal humanism.

4. Epistemological Frames: Diversity, the Good Life, Community

The meritocracy of affect is embedded in and bolstered by three different epistemological frames that further mark and inform Princeton's self-representation: the diversity paradigm, the notion of the good life, and the trope of community. These frames help to situate and actualize the meritocracy of affect, and alleviate the tension between elitism and egalitarianism. The three categories that form the core interest of my book—merit, class, and eliteness—are negotiated in particularly interesting ways in the context of these frames. Meritoriousness is the central implication of the diversity paradigm, but it is rarely made explicit; class or, more specifically, upper-classness is the central implication of the notion of the good life, but it is translated into a certain aesthetic and spatial experience; and eliteness, finally, is the central