

7

DEMOCRACY IN OUR DAILY LIVES

There is a world of difference between accepting the democratic ideal for society at large and being willing to accept it as a guide for one's own everyday conduct.¹

—Bruno Lasker

Conversation

DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES HAVE direct implications for small group decision making, but they also suggest guidelines for how we live day to day. Conversations are a powerful part of social life, because it is often in conversation that we decide how to view or "name" ourselves and our world. A long and heartfelt talk with a spouse, sibling, or friend can change a person forever, and many people can recall conversations that became turning points in their lives. Even a talk between strangers on a train can change the way they understand themselves and others.

This influence we have upon one another is a form of power, and in democratic conversations, it is shared among participants. Equal power manifests itself in the joint development of the conversation. No single speaker dominates in shifting the conversation's topic or direction.

Democratic conversation has an open character. Although individual conversations may involve only two or three participants, democratic conversationalists seek to maintain an inclusive network of conversation partners. Democratic conversationalists sometimes ask, who is not present? Is anyone being ignored, and if so, why?²

Fully democratic conversations also embody the relational and deliberative features of small group democracy. Partners respect and appreciate one another, safeguard speaking and listening opportunities, speak responsibly, and listen carefully. These idealized conversational

norms may sound familiar, because according to linguists, these rules define the conversational ideal in Western cultures.³

Unfortunately the norm is far from the ideal. In *The Pursuit of Attention*, Charles Derber shows how competitiveness, individualism, and narcissism predominate in many conversations in the United States:

Everyone is in a competitive position in a conversation because the amount of attention received depends on the relative success of one's own initiatives to attract and hold the common focus. Commonly focused attention ... is limited and can become "scarce" if the amount any person seeks is greater than that available. Under conditions of unusual scarcity, the competitive features become more visible and pronounced.... However, in most settings the competition remains disguised because [participants] are expected to be more subtle and discreet.⁴

In three-fourths of the conversations Derber recorded, there was "significant inequality in the distribution of attention ... with one person described as clearly dominant in over fifty percent of the conversations." Sometimes a participant became virtually "invisible" by failing to obtain "even the minimum attention required to feel that his or her presence has been acknowledged and established."⁵

The opposite of the invisible participant is the "conversational narcissist." Whereas democratic conversationalists occasionally shift the conversation's topic, narcissists quickly shift the topic to themselves after dispensing with the requirements of politeness. Narcissists use supportive responses sparingly, and they sometimes use purposefully flawed timing to disrupt the flow of conversation. When they respond supportively, they typically use weak forms of support, such as background acknowledgments ("Mm-hmm," "Yeah"), instead of questions or statements that would better sustain the conversation's focus on the speaker and the speaker's topic.

Conversational narcissism may be more of a relational dynamic than a personality trait, with all people showing varying degrees of narcissism depending on the setting, circumstances, and conversational partners.⁶ It is likely that everyone, whether intentionally or unwittingly, sometimes uses undemocratic conversational tactics.

Breaking the habit of conversational competition may be difficult, but it is far from impossible. The first and most important step is to become aware of one's own conversational behavior. As a personal example, I have always known that I have a tendency to talk at great length in certain situations, but I did not understand precisely when and why I did it. As I reflected on my past conversations, I realized that I become most competitive, unresponsive, and self-absorbed in conversations that have high social or political stakes and a relatively large number of participants. Now when I enter such a setting, I make an extra effort to remain calm,

attentive, and self-restrained. Most of the time it works. I have even discovered that when I make a conscious effort to keep the conversation civil or respectful, other participants often follow suit. Compared to other social institutions, conversations are highly malleable, and earnest efforts to make them democratic can produce immediate and gratifying results.

Love and Relationships

Democratic ideals and politics have to be put into practice in the kitchen, the nursery and the bedroom.

—Carole Pateman

Compared to conversations, intimate personal relationships involve explicit decisions. As Pateman suggests, couples make joint decisions about many issues, including cooking, child care, and sex. The foremost feature of a democratic partnership or marriage is an egalitarian power distribution. Decisions that have serious consequences for both partners are reached through consensus. If a decision requires great sacrifice by one partner (e.g., one has to move to follow the other's career), compensation, compromise, and balance are needed to maintain equality.

Aside from equal power relations, the hallmark of democratic relationships is *love*. Psychologist Erich Fromm revered human affection and caring as much as democracy, and his classic work, *The Art of Loving*, promotes a conception of love that is both romantic and democratic. For Fromm, love is expansive and inclusive. People who love only one person and remain indifferent to the rest have not love, "but a symbiotic attachment, or an enlarged egotism.... *Their love is, in fact, an egotism à deux*; they are two people who identify themselves with each other, and who solve the problem of separateness by enlarging the single individual into two."⁸

The partners in a fully democratic relationship do not withdraw from friends and family; instead, they allow their love to radiate to the others around them, strengthening their bonds to the larger world.

The other distinguishing feature of a democratic relationship is an artful balance between separate and shared identities. "Mature love," wrote Fromm, "is union under the condition of preserving one's integrity, one's individuality.... In love the paradox occurs that two beings become one and yet remain two."⁹ Just as the members of a democratic group simultaneously affirm one another's individuality and mutuality, so do the partners in a democratic relationship cherish both their joint existence and their individual lives.

Existing relationships regularly deviate from this democratic ideal in every respect. In particular, long-term heterosexual partnerships have a tradition of male domination, exclusivity, and disrespect toward women.

Although numerous exceptions exist, husbands often regard their wives as less than equal partners when making important decisions, and a patriarchal legal structure has reinforced and legitimated this attitude. One of the most blatant examples is the historical absence of laws protecting wives from spousal rape. Even though there have been some legal advances in recent years, these changes are only partial, and underlying sexist attitudes too often remain unchanged. One need only listen to the words of Alaska Senator Paul Fischer, who insisted in 1985, "I don't know how you can have a sexual act and call it forcible rape in a marriage situation."¹⁰

As Fromm lamented, close relationships often lead to a withdrawal from larger social networks. Research on communication networks confirms this commonsense view.¹¹ An exception is that husbands have a tendency to seek political conversation partners outside of the marriage, because they devalue their spouse's political knowledge.¹² This move includes a person outside the relationship, but only at the cost of excluding the wife.

Patriarchal social norms in Western cultures discount women's competence not only as discussion partners but also as autonomous individuals capable of making their own decisions. As Pateman explains,

Women have ... been perceived as beings who, in their personal lives, always consent, and whose explicit refusal of consent can be disregarded and reinterpreted as agreement. This contradictory perception of women is a major reason why it is so difficult for a woman who has been raped to secure the conviction of her attacker(s). Public opinion, the police, and the courts are willing to identify enforced submission with consent.¹³

Pateman ties this denial of women's competence to a rejection of their individuality:

Women find that their speech is persistently and systematically invalidated. Such invalidation would be incomprehensible if the two sexes actually shared the same status as "individuals." No person with a secure, recognized standing as an "individual" could be seen as someone who consistently said the opposite of what they meant and who, therefore, could justifiably have their words reinterpreted by others.¹⁴

All friendly and romantic relationships can involve unequal power, exclusivity, and disrespect for one or both partners' competence and individuality, but patriarchal cultural traditions exacerbate these problems in intimate relationships. As Fromm observed in 1956, "Love is by necessity a marginal phenomenon in present-day Western society."¹⁵

Nonetheless, most people can point to a handful of exceptional friends or neighbors who have forged democratic partnerships. These couples offer the hope that daily resistance to undemocratic habits and traditions

can prove successful. These couples also show how constant personal struggle can benefit society by providing lessons and role models for others. As Richard Flacks writes,

Every woman's assertion of a degree of autonomy, or of a recognition of her needs, or of a restructuring of the division of labor and the decision-making process in the household today represents not only a change in her personal condition but also in the social position and role definitions of all women. Every man's recognition of the legitimacy of such claims, every change individual men make in the exercise of their traditional dominance, similarly contributes to the social reconstitution of sexual power relations.¹⁶

Raising Children

When relationships involve both children and adults, new opportunities and challenges arise. The age requirements for voting and seeking elected office in the United States reflect the fact that children and adults tend to have markedly different levels of political maturity. The task for educators and parents is to learn how to raise children in a way that develops the attitudes and abilities necessary for full participation in democratic groups and large-scale political systems.

Democratic Schools

Many educational reformers have envisioned and created democratic classrooms and schools. Their view of democratic education incorporates all the features of small group democracy. Democratic schools give substantial power to students, make themselves inclusive, and instill a commitment to democratic values. A democratic education also develops children's autonomy, self-esteem, mutual respect, group identity, and friendliness, and it teaches children the skills and habits of deliberation and cooperative decision making. These ideas are discussed at length in the writings of educators and philosophers such as John Dewey and Polly Greenberg.¹⁷

The most challenging of these imperatives is the call for egalitarian power relations between students and faculty; this issue I wish to discuss briefly. Wholesale equalization of power is often unworkable, but some schools have chosen to use very egalitarian decision-making structures. One example is the Meeting School, whose experience may inspire others to explore the possibilities of democratic education.

At this Quaker boarding high school in New Hampshire, many important decisions are reached during weekly community gatherings. These three-hour meetings involve students and faculty (who also do the administrative work), and all participate as equals in a consensus method

of decision making. During these meetings students and faculty have reached numerous decisions, ranging from the abolition of student curfews to the use of a cut Christmas tree. Although consensus provides a safeguard against hasty policy changes, students are given the power to shape the school rules that govern their daily lives.

Consensus and democracy do not always work to the satisfaction of the faculty and students at the Meeting School. Faculty can take pride in the fact that students have obtained greater power in recent years; however, these same students are reluctant to deal with many important issues. Faculty meetings, which retain final authority over hiring, firing, expulsion, and the annual budget, have had to address administrative and other concerns that the community might otherwise ignore. Student participation in the committees that draft policy proposals is less than ideal, and during community meetings students (and new faculty) have sometimes shown apathy, impatience, frustration, and an incomplete understanding of consensus.

The point of such a system, though, is to educate the students through direct participation in democratic decision making. Setbacks and errors due to inexperience are inevitable, and so long as they do not threaten the existence of the system itself, they can be as valuable for the students as they are frustrating. What counts is that students learn about the process and come to appreciate its virtues. According to two recent faculty members, the Meeting School appears to be succeeding in this regard.¹⁸

Democratic Families

Compared to education, the family has received relatively less attention in the literature on democracy. In the writings of some classical philosophers such as John Stewart Mill, one occasionally finds the claim that when "justly constituted," the family is the "real school of the virtues of freedom."¹⁹ The implications of such a statement, however, are rarely drawn. More often, the family is ignored altogether or assumed consistent with democratic principles.

This inattention toward the family is unfortunate, since many family structures instill patently undemocratic dispositions in children. Because of its rarity and invaluable impact upon children, democratic parenting should not be devalued or taken for granted. Instead it should be viewed as a responsibility of citizenship, as highly regarded as other forms of civil service.²⁰

Democratic relations between children and parents share many of the features of small group democracy.²¹ The ultimate in family democracy, writes therapist Cameron W. Meredith, "is when the family begins to function as a democratic group and is truly a microcosm of our dream of a larger democratic society." An example is "a family council with regular

meetings, rotating chairperson, and council minutes, but families need not be that structured to reach decisions democratically." The essential features of this example are equal power among participants and the inclusion of as many family members as is appropriate in a given situation.²²

In all other respects, the task of democratic families parallels that of democratic educators. The family needs to provide a space in which children can become committed to the democratic process, develop healthy relationships with parents and peers, and learn how to speak and listen in a deliberative manner.²³

It can be difficult for parents to pursue this ideal in their daily interactions with their children. Parents have to draw a delicate line between limiting children's choices and letting children make decisions for themselves. Some parents prohibit drug abuse or smoking, because these behaviors pose clear dangers to children's health. It is not as easy to establish and enforce rules about playing with war toys, overusing Nintendo, and watching too much television. In these cases it is not as clear that the cost of parental intervention—in terms of the child's reduced autonomy—outweighs the cost of the child's behavior. After all, many of today's parents laugh at the extreme restrictions previous generations of parents placed on romance, radios, and the reading of comics and other "unsuitable" books.

To resolve such dilemmas, some parents strike a middle ground by refusing to pay for war toys or video games, but allowing their children to spend their own money and use other children's toys. In effect the parents veto the use of family funds for these activities, while allowing their children the autonomy to engage in them through the use of their own personal resources—friends and allowances.

As in other democratic relationships, another problematic issue for families is the tension between individuality and mutuality. This is particularly true of patriarchal families, where the mother is the sole caretaker and gender roles are rigidly reinforced. In *The Reproduction of Motherhood*, Nancy Chodorow explains how the "sexual and familial division of labor" makes women "more involved in interpersonal, affective relationships than men" and "produces in daughters and sons a division of psychological capacities which leads them to reproduce this sexual and familial division of labor." Sacrificing their individual identities, daughters learn to overidentify with others, whereas sons develop an isolated sense of self at the cost of mutuality.²⁴

The solution, Chodorow argues, is for fathers to fulfill a greater proportion of primary parenting responsibilities:

Children could be dependent from the outset on people of both genders and establish an individuated sense of self in relation to both.... This

would reduce men's needs to guard their masculinity and their control of social and cultural spheres which treat and define women as secondary and powerless, and would help women to develop the autonomy which too much embeddedness in relationship has often taken from them.²⁵

Shared parenting sows the seeds of a democratic adulthood by developing a stronger sense of individuality in girls and mutuality in boys.

Parents also pass on to children their orientations toward political discussion. In a study of married couples and their grade school children, Steven Chaffee and his colleagues distinguished two ways in which parents speak to their children. Some parents simply stress the need to follow social and parental rules, whereas other parents openly discuss the reasons behind these rules. The authors found that children from families with the more deliberative orientation developed higher levels of political knowledge and involvement; a deliberative child is more likely to become a deliberative adult.²⁶

Social Butterflies

People who, in the name of democracy, change the way they talk, relate to one another, and raise their children are welcoming profound changes into their lives. Such changes might seem insignificant, but these personal acts are the building blocks of larger social habits and expectations. As Richard Flacks explains in *Making History*, the minor victories we can win in our everyday lives are all ripples in time: "Historical action is not necessarily noted or recorded, nor is it always embodied in the kinds of public happenings that are taught as history in schools. A historical act may appear as exceedingly mundane behavior." Something as small as a phone conversation, a lovers' quarrel, or a mother-daughter picnic "can initiate a chain of actions and events that fundamentally reshape the lives of millions."²⁷

This view appears naive only if one stubbornly overlooks the ways in which people influence one another every day. When Michael MacKuen and Courtney Brown studied political conversations, they found that people regularly change each other's minds and voting decisions. When friends and acquaintances influence each other, there is an explosive potential whereby Person A changes the votes of Persons B and C, then Persons B and C change the votes of Persons D, E, F, and G, etc.²⁸ Just as we change one another's votes, so do we influence the way we act in the other parts of our lives.

Initially we might change our daily lives for purely personal reasons. Even if unintended, these decisions have a profound effect upon the ever-changing social world. The changes in our own lives affect people close to us, and these friends and family members may, in turn, change the

lives of others. In the words of Czechoslovakian poet and president Vaclav Havel, "Everything in the world is so mysteriously and comprehensively interconnected that a slight, seemingly insignificant wave of a butterfly's wing ... can unleash a typhoon thousands of miles away."²⁹

Notes

1. Bruno Lasker, *Democracy through Discussion* (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1949), 3.
2. In other instances there may be a need for exclusion, as is often the case when members of oppressed social groups desire conversation only with people in the same situation.
3. See Anthony Giddens, "Jurgen Habermas," in Quentin Skinner, ed., *The Return of Grand Theory in the Human Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 121-39; H. Paul Grice, "Logic and Conversation," in P. Cole and J. L. Morgan, eds., *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts* (New York: Academic Press, 1975), 113-28; Jurgen Habermas, *Communication and the Evolution of Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1979 trans. T.A. McCarthy). John Wilson goes a step further by defining conversation as the condition of participants having equal speaking opportunities. Communication that violates this rule is not, by his definition, conversation. See *On the Boundaries of Conversation* (Oxford: Permagon Press, 1989).
4. Charles Derber, *The Pursuit of Attention: Power and Individualism in Everyday Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 16-17.
5. *Ibid.*, 17-19.
6. *Ibid.*, 35. For recent research on conversational narcissism, see Anita L. Vangelisti, Mark L. Knapp, and John A. Daly, "Conversational Narcissism," *Communication Monographs* 57 (1990): 251-74. The distinction between narcissism as a trait versus a relational dynamic is conceptually similar to L. Edna Rogers-Millar and Frank E. Millar's distinction between the trait of domineeringness and the practice of dominance in relational communication. "Domineeringness and Dominance: A Transactional View," *Human Communication Research* 5 (1979): 238-46.
7. Carole Pateman, "Feminism and Democracy," in Graeme Duncan, ed., *Democratic Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 216.
8. Erich Fromm, *The Art of Loving* (New York: Harper & Row, 1956), 46, 55.
9. *Ibid.*, 20, 21. So long as one relational partner views the other as something other than a competent and independent individual, the relationship will also lack truly mutualistic bonds. Mitchell Aboulafia makes this argument by applying the Hegelian master-slave dialectic to male-female relationships. True acknowledgment of one's independent existence can come only from another independent being; thus the master and the slave cannot receive recognition from one another until they reject their master-slave relation and become equals.

Similarly, male-female relationships are incomplete until prevailing patterns of male domination are rejected. "From Domination to Recognition," in Carol Gould, ed., *Beyond Domination* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Allanheld, 1984), 175-85. Notice that this parallels Carol Gould's concept of "reciprocal recognition," discussed above in chapter 2.

10. Quoted in Susan Moller Okin, *Justice, Gender, and the Family* (New York: Basic Books, 1989), 42. On unequal power in marriage, see Carol Gould, "Private Rights and Public Virtues: Women, the Family, and Democracy," in Carol Gould, ed., *Beyond Domination* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Allanheld, 1984), 3-18; Catharine A. MacKinnon, *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989); Okin, *Justice*; Pateman, "Feminism and Democracy."

11. M. P. Johnson and R. M. Milardo, "Network Interference in Pair Relationships: A Social Psychological Recasting of Slater's Theory of Social Regression," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 46 (1984): 893-99.

12. Bettina Brickell, Robert Huckfeldt, and John Sprague, "Gender Effects on Political Discussion: The Political Networks of Men and Women" (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Ill., April 1988).

13. Pateman, "Feminism and Democracy," 213.

14. *Ibid.*

15. Fromm, *The Art of Loving*, 132.

16. Richard Flacks, *Making History: A Radical Tradition in American Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 240.

17. Classic writings by John Dewey on the subject include *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1964), and *Education Today* (New York: G. P. Putnam's & Sons, 1940), esp. chap. 5. Amy Gutman's recent book *Democratic Education* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987), is the most powerful theoretical work on the subject in recent years.

For a case study and advice to teachers and principals see Mary A. Hepburn, ed., *Democratic Education in Schools and Classrooms* (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1983). On democracy and elementary school education see Po!v Greenberg, "Why Not Academic Preschool (Part 2): Autocracy or Democracy in the Classroom?" *Young Children* (March 1992): 54-64, and "Ideas That Work with Young Children," *Young Children* (July, 1992): 10-17; Emma E. Holmes, "Democracy in Elementary School Classes," *Social Education* (March 1991): 176-78; Shirley A. Kessler, "Alternative Perspectives on Early Childhood Education," *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 6 (1991): 193-96. On democracy and adult education see Rick Arnold et al., *Educating for a Change* (Toronto: Doris Marshall Institute for Education and Action; Toronto: Between the Lines, 1991). On democracy and higher education see Bernard Murchland, ed., *Higher Education and the Practice of Democratic Politics: A Political Education Reader* (Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation, 1991).

Unfortunately there is a paucity of systematic studies assessing the effects of different educational strategies on children's ability to develop the attributes needed for active democratic citizenship. Studies typically show how one's level

of education correlates with political sophistication (e.g., Luskin). However, there is probably variation according to the type or quality of education children receive. In addition it is necessary to develop more elaborate methods for measuring citizenship; this is the aim of the "Measuring Citizenship" project underway at Rutgers University's Walt Whitman Center for the Culture and Politics of Democracy.

18. I thank Janet Hankins Gastil for discussing the Meeting School at length. She and George Gastil served on the faculty for three years. Her descriptions are current as of the academic year 1991-1992.

19. John Stuart Mill quoted in Pateman, "Feminism and Democracy," 211. On the treatment of the family in modern moral and political philosophy, see Okin, *Justice*, passim, esp. 8-10.

20. The idea for labeling democratic motherhood or parenting as a citizen responsibility, on par with other forms of public service, comes from Carole Pateman, "Political Obligation, Freedom and Feminism," *American Political Science Review* 86 (1992): 181-82; Anne Phillips, "Must Feminists Give Up on Liberal Democracy?" *Political Studies* 40, Special Issue (1992): 71.

21. One early attempt to develop a definition of democratic families is Mary Stewart Lyle's *Adult Education for Democracy in Family Life* (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1944). In the decades since, Adlerian therapists have taken an interest in the notion of the "democratic family." Unfortunately these scholars often define the term loosely and do not connect it to political theory (e.g., James W. Croake, "An Adlerian View of Life Style," *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 31 [1975]: 513-18). On the benefits of raising children democratically see Robert N. Bellah et al., *The Good Society* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), 256-61; Martin Gold and Denise S. Yanof, "Mothers, Daughters, and Girlfriends," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 49 (1985): 654-59. As with studies of democratic education, there is a need for more sophisticated research on the effects of different parenting strategies on the development of democratic dispositions and behaviors in children.

22. Cameron W. Meredith, "Democracy in the Family," *Individual Psychology: Journal of Adlerian Theory, Research and Practice* 42 (1986): 609.

23. During World War II, Lyle (*Adult Education for Democracy in Family Life*, 10) offered a similar understanding of the democratic family. In her study she defined democracy as "a quality of human relationships characterized by respect for individuality, by sharing in policy-making as well as in efforts to achieve the goals jointly determined, and by confidence in intelligence as the means of resolving conflicts and meeting situations successfully."

More recently, Richard M. Merelman argued that the real basis of sophisticated political thought is moral and cognitive development during childhood. The key factors necessary for the development of ideology are (1) maintaining a parental consensus on basic values within the family, and the child's identifying herself or himself with this consensus, and (2) giving the child responsibility, psychological discipline, and warmth, coupled with low frustration and anxiety. According to Merelman, these high standards are rarely met in our childhood, and that is why few citizens in the United States have sophisticated political ideologies; see "The

Development of Political Ideology: A Framework for the Analysis of Political Socialization," *American Political Science Review* 63 (1971): 1033-47.

24. Nancy J. Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 7. Concerning negative effects on women of the maternal stereotype, see "The Fantasy of the Perfect Mother," cowritten with Susan Contratto, in Nancy J. Chodorow, *Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989).

25. Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering*, 218.

26. Steven H. Chaffee, Jack McCleud, and Daniel B. Wackman, "Family Communication Patterns and Adolescent Political Participation," in Jack Dennis, ed., *Socialization to Politics: A Reader* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973), 349-64. These distinctions parallel the distinction between attitudes serving social-adjustive functions and those serving a value-expressive function. If parents influence which attitudinal functions undergird a child's adherence to democratic values, concept-oriented communication may aid the development of the more enduring and powerful commitment that comes with a value-expressive attitude. See John Gastil, "Why We Believe in Democracy: Testing Theories of Attitude Functions and Democracy," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 22 (1992): 423-50.

27. Richard Flacks, *Making History*, 3.

28. Michael MacKuen and Courtney Brown, "Political Context and Attitude Change," *American Political Science Review* 81 (1987): 471-90.

29. Václav Havel, "Politics and the World Itself," *Kettering Review* (Summer 1992): 13. The technical name for the butterfly effect is "sensitive dependence on initial conditions," and it appears to be a pervasive phenomenon in the physical world. See James Gleick, *Chaos: Making a New Science* (New York: Viking, 1987), 20-23.