



Research Article

Volume-02|Issue-12|2021

Countering the Threats to Democracy

Bernard Phillips

Boston University

Article History

Received: 01.12.2021

Accepted: 18.12.2021

Published: 29.12.2021

Citation

Phillips, B. (2021). Countering the Threats to Democracy. *Indiana Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(12), 64-71.

Abstract: How are we to explain the threats to democracy illustrated in so many countries throughout the contemporary world? Following Jane Addams, the cure for the ills of democracy is “more democracy.” She meant nothing less than an entire way of life emphasizing dignity and equality for all of us. John Dewey added an education involving the efforts of all institutions to fulfill the capacities of every single one of us. Following an analysis of human biology based on the recent studies of Jonathan Turner and Carl Zimmer, those capacities have hardly been tapped. For we humans are capable of personal evolution within our own lifetimes. This cure for our way of life requires understanding the full power of our bureaucratic way of life with its focus on persisting hierarchy, conformity, and narrow specialization with limited integration of knowledge. From the moment of birth we are taught our own limitations. The enormous possibilities of a linguistic approach that can reach up to a paradigmatic level, coupled with an interdisciplinary scientific method that attends to physical, biological, social and personality structures, can help to yield this cure when placed in the hands of the individual. This is particularly true when societies are in a state of crisis. Beyond finding a cure for the ills of democracy, movement in this democratic direction would yield progress on the full range of society’s threatening problems.

Keywords: Democracy, Limitations, Societies, Threats.

Copyright © 2021 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

INTRODUCTION

The threats to democracy throughout the world are illustrated by the crushing of the Arab Spring in Egypt and North Africa, the autocratic developments in Russia and China, the undemocratic movement in Brazil, Hungary and the Philippines, the repression of protests in Belarus, Hong Kong and Myanmar, the Taliban’s takeover of Afghanistan, and the attempted insurrection at the U. S. Capitol. Granting that the problem of autocratic resurgence is deep and far-reaching, I emerge with a sense of optimism about the future of the democratic project. Not only because of the strenuous efforts of the proponents of democracy. But also because of the incredible yet unfulfilled potentials for personal evolution of the individual.

My overall approach to finding a way out of these threats to democracy is based on the work of Fred Polak, a Dutch futurist who uncovered the characteristics of those social movements which proved to be most successful throughout the entire history of Western civilization. I combine that framework with the full power of the scientific method and language when placed in the hands of ordinary individuals. And I take into account the biological potential of every human being for personal evolution within one’s own lifetime.

I begin with a very general description of the present way of life of democratic societies, seeing them as bureaucratic democracies, in the section, “Our Bureaucratic Way of Life.” I continue with a democratic vision of an alternative, illustrated by Jane Addams’s image of democracy, in a section called “A

Democratic Vision.” I conclude with ideas on how societies can move toward an actual democratic way of life, within a section entitled “Toward a Democratic Way of Life.”

This approach is necessarily interdisciplinary. It is only by taking into account all structures—physical, biological, social and personality—that we can hope to understand the nature of current problems and how to solve them. It was the work of C. Wright Mills—my mentor at Columbia—that started me on my own efforts. His *The Sociological Imagination* (Mills, 1959) alerted me to the potentials of personality structure no less than social structure. Jonathan Turner’s recent *On Human Nature* (Turner, 2020) helped me to understand the biological potentials of the human being. And my work with colleagues over six years on *Creating Life Before Death* (Phillips *et al.*, 2020) helped me understand how to integrate physical along with biological, social and personality structures.

Movement from a bureaucratic toward a democratic way of life constitutes far more than a change in political institutions. Linked to the present threats to democracy are a host of highly threatening yet unsolved problems, such as climate change, our worldwide pandemic, the possibility of nuclear warfare, and the growing gap between the rich and the poor. The present highly specialized approach to human behavior that fails to integrate knowledge is largely responsible for our failure to cope with these problems. By contrast, a vision of a democratic way of life, which makes full use of our two most powerful tools—language and the scientific method—promises to give us the solutions we

desperately need at this time in history.

OUR BUREAUCRATIC WAY OF LIFE

If we look to the proportion of individuals eligible to vote who actually do exercise the franchise, we find that the U.S. turnout rate for the 2016 election was 60%. Many factors limit voting in this country, such as the lack of a holiday on Election Day, the lack of compulsory voting, the limited number of days available for mail-in voting, the requirements for the distribution of ballots, the number of drop-boxes for ballots, the number of voting centers, the requirements for voter identification, and the hours available for voting.

Perhaps most important, however, is the emotional commitment of citizens to vote. Our emotions are in turn affected by what might be called our bureaucratic way of life, defined in *Creating Life Before Death* as: “Patterns of persisting hierarchy, personal conformity to the powers that be, and narrow specialization without integrating knowledge” (Phillips *et al.*, 2020: 4). I have elaborated on the nature of that way of life along with a direction for moving beyond it in recent publications (Phillips, 2019; Phillips, 2020; & Phillips, 2021).

A key result of this pattern of behavior is an individual’s outward orientation tied to patterns of conformity, distancing individuals from their own emotions and sense of self. P. D. Ouspensky, a student of the Armenian philosopher George Gurdjieff, recorded his teacher’s ideas in *The Fourth Way* (Ouspensky, 1971):

If we begin to study ourselves we first of all come up against one word which we use more than any other and that is the word “I”. We say “I am doing”, “I am sitting”, “I feel”, “I like”, “I dislike” and so on. This is our chief illusion . . . we consider ourselves one So in self-observation . . . generally you do not *remember yourself* . . . because you cannot remember yourself, you cannot concentrate, and . . . you have no will. If you could remember yourself, you would have will and could do what you liked . . . You may sometimes have will for a short time, but it turns to something else and you forget about it . . . we become too absorbed in things, too lost in things (3-4, 12).

An aspect of our patterns of conformity that take us away from awareness of ourselves is our addiction to advertising, which besieges us wherever we go. John Berger, in his book based on his BBC television series, *Ways of Seeing* (Berger, 1985), concludes that advertising steals our love for ourselves, and then offers it back for the price of the product. He

also assesses advertising’s impact on democracy. As for what happens to the choice between voting and not voting in a primary election, between communicating or not communicating to a Congressional Representative, between joining or not joining a march that demonstrates what one believes, between running and not running for a public office to start a movement opposing injustices, forget all of that. For one’s choice of Coca-Cola over Pepsi- Cola becomes our substitute for democracy.

We might ask how it is possible for advertising to remain credible, for its claims are far from scientific ones. Yet corporations would not continue to spend billions on advertising unless it actually works for them. John Berger’s conclusion was this: “It remains credible because the truthfulness of publicity is judged, not by the real fulfillment of its promises, but by the relevance of its fantasies to those of the spectator-buyer. Its essential application is not to reality but to daydreams” (Berger, 1985: 149).

If Berger is correct, then we can begin to understand why we are presently living in an era when scientific facts, and other facts of all kinds, are attacked as “fake news,” and not just in the United States. Given that advertising has succeeded in creating a fantasy world that so many of us dwell in, it has prepared us for our present era.

But it is unfair to place all of the blame for our lack of realism on advertising. We have depended on our educational system to teach more and more of us to value truth. Apparently, we were wrong.

The historian Daniel Boorstin illustrates our lack of realism in his *The Image*:

In this book I describe the world of our making, how we have used our wealth, our literacy, our technology, and our progress, to create the thicket of unreality which stands between us and the facts of life . . . We expect the contradictory and the impossible. We expect compact cars which are spacious; luxurious cars which are economical. We expect to be rich and charitable, powerful and merciful, active and reflective, kind and competitive. We expect to be inspired by mediocre appeals for “excellence,” . . . to eat and stay thin, to be constantly on the move and ever more neighborly . . . to revere God and to be God. Never . . . have a people felt more deceived and disappointed. For never has a people expected so much more than the world could offer (Boorstin, 1961: 3-4, 6).

There are specific procedures we use to manage our lives in a world of unreality. Several of them are outlined in a 1950s study by Vidich & Joseph (1960) of “Springdale,” entitled *Small Town in Mass Society*.

This was a community that lacked the power to control its economic fate, yet refused to face this reality. Here are three ways they used to live in their fantasy world:

- **The Technique of Particularization:** All these explicit mentions of community dependence are made in the context of highly specific detailed cases. No generalization sums up these detailed statements, so that individuals are not explicitly aware of the total amount of their dependence. Particularizations prevent the realization of the total impression
- **The Falsification of Memory:** The realization of lack of fulfillment of aspiration and ambition might pose an unsolvable personal problem if the falsification of memory did not occur But the individual, as he passes through time, does not live in spans of decades or years. Rather, he lives in terms of seasons, days and hours and the focus of his attention is turned to immediate pressures, pleasures and events As a consequence, his present self, instead of entertaining the youthful dream of a 500-acre farm, entertains the plan to buy a home freezer by the fall
- **The Externalization of the Self:** The greatest dangers to a system of illusions which is threatened by an uncompromising reality are introspection and thought The major technique of self-avoidance is work Religious activities such as suppers, choirs and fund raising involve a great deal of physical and social effort and support the process of continuous externalization (1960: 299, 303, 311).

In my book with Louis C. Johnston, *The Invisible Crisis of Contemporary Society* (Phillips & Louis, 2007), I saw such life in a fantasy world as illustrating a gap between aspirations and their fulfillment. I also tested this hypothesis: “The gap between aspirations and their fulfillment is in fact increasing in contemporary society” (234), based on an analysis of the studies of thirty-two individuals from a variety of disciplines. My conclusion: “substantial evidence in support of this hypothesis” (235).

At that time I did not realize that I was building on a central insight of someone who lived twenty-five hundred years ago: the Buddha. His First Noble Truth is the frustration or *dukkha* we all experience as the result of our gap between wants and their fulfillment. What this might mean concretely is a job that pays so little that one remains in poverty, an inability to pay for higher education for oneself and one’s children, and housing so expensive that little is left for food, medical care or recreation.

If we turn to the institution of education, we can encounter clear examples of the impact of our bureaucratic way of life on the individual. For example, the educator Illich (1971) stressed the concept of conformity with his idea of the student being

“schooled” in his *Deschooling Society*: “The pupil is thereby “schooled” to confuse teaching with learning, grade advancement with education, a diploma with competence, and fluency with the ability to say something new. His imagination is “schooled” to accept service in place of value. Medical treatment is mistaken for health care, social work for the improvement of community life, police protection for safety, the rat race for productive work” (1-2).

Society’s very limited understanding of the problems of society—much less how to confront them effectively—is illustrated by the increasing degree of specialization with little attempt to integrate knowledge throughout the social sciences. For example, at the start of my career in sociology there were six specialties within the American Sociological Association. Now there are fifty-three, and counting, a situation repeated in anthropology, psychology, economics, political science and history. This is a direct violation of the ideals of the scientific method, which follow Newton in calling on researchers to stand on the shoulders of the full range of relevant giants.

Given the enormous power over us of our bureaucratic way of life coupled with the huge problems this yields—such as challenging our movement toward democracy as well as personal evolution—is it indeed possible to solve these problems? Let us not forget that they are deeply embedded within one’s personality structure as well as throughout our many social structures.

A DEMOCRATIC VISION

Jane Addams, the philosopher who founded the discipline of social work, wrote these words in her *Democracy and Social Ethics*: “The cure for the ills of Democracy is more Democracy” (1902: 8). She shed light on what she meant by “more Democracy”: “A conception of Democracy not merely as a sentiment which desires the well-being of all men, nor yet as a creed which believes in the essential dignity and equality of all men, but as that which affords a rule of living as well as a test of faith” (6).

For Addams, democracy requires far more than voting occasionally. She believed that the individual’s entire personality structure and way of life must be involved. An egalitarian “sentiment” suggests the importance of one’s emotional commitments. A “creed” invokes one’s intellect. And “a rule of living” calls for actions throughout one’s everyday life. To the extent that one’s “head,” “heart” and “hand” are all enlisted, the problem of a low voter turnout is reduced. Beyond simply voting, “a rule of living” encompasses the full range of one’s behavior.

John Dewey wrote about the importance of social structure: “Democracy has many meanings, but if it has a moral meaning, it is found in resolving that the

supreme test of all political institutions and industrial arrangements shall be the contribution they make to the all-around growth of every member of society” (1920/1948: 186). He envisioned that the central mission of government, business, education, religion, and the family should be to “educate every individual into the full stature of his possibility” (186).

For Dewey, the individual must be empowered by society to the fullest extent possible within a democracy, and all of the institutions of society must participate in this effort. By so doing, he points toward the goal of universal voting. He also suggests what Jurgen Habermas, a modern critical theorist, has called for in his *Theory of Communicative Action* (1981): Nothing less than the emancipation of the individual by making full use of the power of language to achieve “communicative competence.”

Dewey put forward another tool in addition to language that is fundamental to human development: the scientific method:

The first step [of reconstructing philosophy] . . . will be to recognize that . . . the present human scene, for good and evil, for harm and benefit alike, is what it is because . . . of the entry into everyday and common . . . ways of living of what has its origin in physical inquiry. The methods and conclusions of “science” do not remain penned in within “science” (1920/1948: xxvii).

Democracy is generally defined as a form of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people, and is exercised directly by them or by their elected representatives within a free electoral system. Given Addams’s and Dewey’s analyses, we add to this definition the idea that this kind of political structure increasingly yields a way of life emphasizing the dignity, equality and well being of all human beings, coupled with an education fulfilling their capacities for development.

Following the vision of Jane Addams and John Dewey, a democratic way of life calls for nothing less than the further and continuing development of the individual, by contrast with our bureaucratic emphasis on the power of social structures. Mills was by no means alone in emphasizing this with his idea of the development of a sociological imagination. Critical theory, developed in Germany in the 1930s, emphasized the importance of Freud no less than Marx, ideas presently carried forward by Jurgen Habermas with his focus on the “emancipation” of the individual.

I might note several others calling for attention to the individual. Dennis H. Wrong’s “The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology” cited a lack of focus on the independent power of the individual (1961). George C. Homans’s

Presidential address, “Bringing Men Back In” (1964), centered on the failure of sociology to pay sufficient attention to psychology. Alvin Gouldner’s *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* (1970) introduced the idea of a “reflexive sociology,” with the sociologist learning to study self no less than others. I might also mention my own work, with my article stressing the power of self-image (1957), and my three recent articles emphasizing the importance of personality structure (2019, 2020b, 2021).

Social scientists generally do not look to an examination of the biological structure of the individual as opening up potentials for individual development. Their opposition to biological limitations is illustrated by studies of IQ. For example, Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968), Nisbett (2009) and Shenk (2010) called into question our hierarchical view of human intelligence.

The noted biologist Stephen Jay Gould developed a most positive view about the capacities for learning of all human beings:

We are, in a more than metaphorical sense, permanent children . . . Many central features of our anatomy link us with fetal and juvenile stages of primates: small face, vaulted cranium and large brain in relation to body size, unrotated big toe, foramen magnum under the skull for correct orientation of the head in upright posture, primary distribution of hair on head, armpits and pubic areas . . . In other mammals, exploration, play, and flexibility of behavior are qualities of juveniles, only rarely of adults. We retain not only the anatomical stamp of childhood, but its mental flexibility . . . Humans are learning animals. (Gould, 1981: 333-334)

Yet there is far more to the nature of human biology than the fact that we are “learning animals.” The sociological theorist Jonathan Turner, who wrote the Foreword to *Creating Life Before Death*, has a new book, *On Human Nature* (2020). Our hominin ancestors had a physiology emphasizing their development as individuals—by contrast with other species such as monkeys—some ten million years ago. But episodic cooling of the forests in Africa, which forced them to come down from the trees, placed them in danger from larger predators. In order to survive, they had to emphasize close relationships with other humans to protect themselves. That emphasis on the group has continued to this day, putting aside their incredible potential for individual evolution.

It was then that these hominin descendants of great apes learned our bureaucratic patterns of behavior, which mirrored the way other animals were behaving. Hierarchy ruled, where the strong killed the weak. For those animals who cooperate with one another for mutual protection, like a herd that can fight off a

predator, conformity is essential. It was these elements of a bureaucratic way of life that were learned by early humans, and they have persisted throughout history even after language and the scientific method were invented.

Yet the story of human biology has by no means been completed. Carl Zimmer's new book, *Life's Edge: The Search for What It Means to Be Alive* (2021), quotes this definition of life at a 1992 NASA meeting: "Life is a self-sustained chemical system capable of undergoing Darwinian evolution."

Following the second law of thermodynamics, a basic principle within physics about all physical structures, entropy or disorder tends to approach a maximum in a closed system. The continuing existence or self-sustaining of a chemical system avoids such disorder. This is because the universe is an open system, where interaction is the name of the game throughout the entire cosmos, and is essential for the existence of life. Indeed, it is this interactive nature of the entire physical universe that has made it possible for biological evolution to proceed.

Darwinian biological evolution is characteristic of all forms of life. Yet we humans can continue to learn throughout our lives, and need not depend on biological evolution to yield basic changes in social and personality structures. As a result, this definition of the nature of the life of our species is appropriate: **Human life is a self-sustained chemical system capable of undergoing evolution within the individual's own lifetime.** From this perspective, our definition of democracy can be changed by substituting for "capacities for development" the phrase, "capacities for continuing evolution."

As for what that evolutionary potential means in concrete terms, it can shape the full range of one's behavior in all of society's institutions. Economically, it points to work that is ever more productive. Politically, it suggests increasing involvement in governmental decisions affecting one's way of life. Educationally, it calls for no limit to one's developing increasing understanding of self and world. Religiously, it suggests the importance of a spiritual side to one's life. As for family and friends, it calls for commitment to ever deeper relationships with others.

Yet our capacity to achieve such continuing evolution is by no means the same as our ability to do so. Potential is not actuality. Educational efforts over thousands of years have certainly produced significant results, but they have fallen far short of fulfilling our full potential. How, then, are we to explain this failure?

I turn here to the final section of this paper. Following an ancient Japanese proverb, "Vision without action is a daydream; action without vision is a

nightmare."

TOWARD A DEMOCRATIC WAY OF LIFE

The Buddha did not stop with his First Noble Truth, but went on to develop other Noble Truths as a basis for helping people solve the problem of *dukkha*. Second, he saw every effect as having a cause or causes, following the approach of the scientific method. Third, he declared that by removing our unrealistic desires—the cause of our frustration—we remove that unhappiness. Fourth, he indicated that we can accomplish this by following an Eightfold Path of appropriate thoughts, goals and actions, taking into account "head," "heart" and "hand."

We moderns, given our understanding of language and the scientific method, can build on the Buddha's Eastern strategy with an East-West strategy, as outlined in *Creating Life Before Death* (86-98). By so doing we can make full use of the scientific method that can invoke increasing knowledge of physical, biological, social and personality structures. In this way, we follow an East-West strategy enabling us to raise in tandem both our aspirations and our ability to fulfill them. Following the psychologist George Kelly's *A Theory of Personality* (1963), we are all naive users of the scientific method. Following Stephen Jay Gould, we learning animals can become ever more sophisticated users of that method.

We might recall the French dramatist Moliere's play, *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*. Monsieur Jourdain learns from his philosophy teacher that he is speaking prose. He remarks: "Good heavens! For more than forty years I have been speaking prose without knowing it." In the same way, we've all been using the scientific method in our everyday lives without realizing it.

As for the nature of the scientific method, we might see it as an interactive process. Let us imagine a pendulum swinging in ever-widening arcs. Each swing to the left can represent further understanding of how to solve a problem, and emotional commitment to doing so. Each swing to the right can stand for further progress toward actually solving it. These swings back and forth can continue as long as it takes to solve the problem at hand. Just as there is no limit to how far the scientific method can take us in learning the nature of the world, so is there no limit to the understanding of us users of that method.

Fred Polak, a Dutch futurist, studied the entire history of Western civilization to uncover the characteristics of those social movements which had proved most successful (1961, 1973). The contemporary sociologist Lawrence Busch, basing his doctoral dissertation (1974) on Polak's work, attempted

to answer this question in an article following his dissertation. Busch focused on answering this question: “What conditions appear necessary to construct the future successfully, either as individuals, as organizations, or as a society?” (1976: 27-39). Here is an outline of his answer, which can be employed to achieving the cure for the ills of democracy that we seek:

- *An image of the future must be holistic if it is to achieve widespread acceptance*
- *A successful image of the future must provide the promise of the resolution of the anomalies and contradictions of the existing order*
- *The future must be constructed in the present, not the future*
- *A successful image of the future must provide an escape from the existing order, but it must find that escape within the existing order*
- *A successful image of the future must provide an operationalizable methodology for the individual*
- *All successful images of the future are structured*
- *A meaningful image of the future must involve the mundane*

One final point needs to be made; it cannot accurately be considered as a condition of a successful image but rather as a precondition of success. This is simply that a crisis must be widely perceived in the existing order. The crisis is the catalyst that makes the new image of the future meaningful as an alternative (Busch, 1976: 29-36).

All of Busch’s seven criteria for a successful image of the future—including the precondition of a widely perceived crisis, which we are now experiencing—are fulfilled to a substantial degree within the above vision of a cure for the ills of democracy. Our inclusion of physical and biological structures along with social and personality structures indicate the structured nature of our approach (#6) along with our holism or breadth (#1). Our focus on the tools of language and the scientific method in the hands of the individual yield the operationalizable methodology required by #5.

A few additional words about our tool of language might be helpful. Just as Mills emphasized the importance of moving up and down language’s levels of abstraction or generality, we have followed his advice. My contrast between a bureaucratic and an evolutionary way of life has required us to move extremely far up language’s “ladder” of generality or abstraction. An example of movement far down that ladder is my discussion of “the technique of particularization,” “the falsification of memory,” and “the externalization of the self.” This approach illustrates the linguistic power that we all can learn to make full use of.

What these tools of language and the scientific method mean at a practical level is nothing less than developing abilities to be ever more productive at work, ever more knowledgeable about self and world, ever more active and effective politically, and to develop ever closer relationships with others.

The result of such changes would be nothing less than movement from a world of scarcity to one of plenty. The former invites a see-saw mentality, the basis for aggression. The latter, by contrast, suggests a stairway orientation to life, where such aggression would be replaced by cooperation, for that would help people to learn from one another.

As for #4, I stay “within the existing order” by separating capitalism from its attachment to bureaucracy rather than attacking capitalism itself, which can be seen as a motivating force. Concerning #3, I build on the present or existing potentials for personal evolution of every single human being.

With respect to promising to solve existing problems, as required by #2, I’ve made at least some headway. For one thing, one cannot easily address what is wrong with our bureaucratic way of life without having in mind an alternative approach to human behavior, which this paper has at least sketched. In this way, current problems can become far more visible, and they can be countered with the aid of language and the scientific method.

For another thing, an experiment conducted by Jack Levin, my doctoral student at Boston University, has suggested the importance—for dealing with the problems of aggression and addiction—of an inward-outward orientation, versus the outward perspective enforced within our present way of life (Rosenthal & Lenore, 1968; Phillips & Christner, 2012, 137-139). Levin found that those in his experimental group who had adopted the former versus the latter orientation did not increase their prejudice or aggression against a minority group when they were frustrated. Neither did they experience the outward perspective generally fundamental in patterns of addiction.

Finally, we have requirement #7, calling for a focus on mundane or everyday behavior. It is exactly here that the individual can learn, over time, to apply an evolutionary vision to momentary activities. For example, I can come to understand my typing these words not only as completing my paper but also as a linguistic metaphor for fulfilling my potential for personal evolution. More generally, more and more of what I do can be tied, metaphorically, to my vision of personal evolution. As a result, I can become empowered to an increasing degree, gaining the motivation I require to continue my evolutionary journey.

Such behavior, which violates the outward orientation that Ouspensky (1971) saw as central to our present way of life, requires one to make full use of perceiving phenomena from an evolutionary perspective. Coming to see one's own behavior not just as fulfilling mundane goals but also as moving in an evolutionary direction would yield personal empowerment.

Of course, it would take time for people to learn to see all of their everyday behavior in this way. What would be involved is the development of a structure, or persisting pattern of behavior, such as an evolutionary self-image. We might think of the enormous power of the self-image by recalling the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* which desegregated public schools in the U.S. Segregated schools were seen as unconstitutional because they resulted in African-American children developing "a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community." That continuing or repetitive feeling was a structure linked to the way these children thought of themselves, that is, tied to their self-images.

I believe that people can begin to develop an evolutionary self-image with the aid of an educational experience—such as a seminar, workshop, or even an interactive website—that contrasts a bureaucratic with a democratic way of life and gives them the powerful tools of language and the scientific method, as discussed above. As a result, they might learn, for example, to believe that it is possible to solve such societal problems as racism and war, and personal problems like diet and exercise. More generally, such an experience could emphasize integration of our knowledge of physical, biological, social and personality structures. Yet this is an hypothesis that requires experimental tests.

I have already indicated the human being's incredible potential for what my colleagues and I have called "personal productivity" in *Creating Life Before Death* (2020: 49-63). This is an idea that has already been exemplified by the rapid reconstruction of Japanese industry following World War II, similar to the impact of the Marshall Plan in Europe. The Japanese idea of *kaizen*, or "continuous improvement," included both the reorganization of an entire area of production as well as the improvement by an individual of his or her own work.

Crucial to this achievement was the use of the scientific method by workers and administrators, and not just by professional scientists, outlined by the work of Deming (2000). As a result, Japanese products experienced a metamorphosis from cheap throwaways to products of extremely high quality, as illustrated by the worldwide purchases of Toyota cars. This exemplifies what Jane Addams might have called "more democracy."

It is such patterns of personal productivity that can yield new inventions throughout a nation's entire economic system, resulting in movement from an economy of scarcity to one of wealth. Such abilities can equally open up a huge educational market for learning how an individual or organization can move toward achieving personal evolution. Following the Levin experiment—which is illustrative of many studies linking frustration with aggression—the reduction of personal frustration that would result would point society away from patterns of aggression.

All this could take place because of the increasing empowerment of the individual. Not only could it yield wealth for society as a whole but also personal income enabling the individual to fulfill democratic ideals for dignity, equality, well-being, and educational development. Given such improvements in people's lives, there is every reason why they would seek to become more active in political processes tied closely to those achievements.

Contemporary tools linked to the internet, such as Facebook, twitter, YouTube and LinkedIn can be employed to rapidly and widely communicate successful educational efforts to achieve such fundamental changes in people's way of life. They are changes pointing us away from our present-day bureaucratic democracy, and toward the humanistic democracy called for by Jane Addams and John Dewey.

The optimistic view I am advancing in this paper might well sound naive to the reader. Given the long history of the human race proceeding within a bureaucratic way of life, how can we possibly alter that trajectory? Following the research of Weber (1922), our preeminent student of bureaucracy, that pattern of behavior is the best that we can do.

Yet other students of bureaucracy have suggested that Weber (1922) was wrong, given the incredible power of the scientific method (Constas, 1958; & Udy, 1959). We can add to this the full power of language. Still further, there is the human being's capacity to evolve within one's own lifetime. The result is that we may well be able to develop a cure for the ills of democracy, namely—following Jane Addams's vision—more democracy.

REFERENCES

1. Addams, J. (2002). *Democracy and Social Ethics*. Champaign, Illinois: Univ. of Illinois Press,
2. Berger, J. (1985). *Ways of Seeing*. London: BBC and Penguin Books.
3. Boorstin, D. (1961). *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
4. Busch, L. (1974). *Macrosocial Change in Historical Perspective* (Unpublished Doctoral

- Dissertation), Ithaca, New York: Cornell University.
5. Busch, L. (1976). A Tentative Guide to Constructing the Future, *Sociological Practice*, 1, 27-39.
 6. Constat, H. (1958). Max Weber's Two Conceptions of Bureaucracy. *American Journal of Sociology* 52, 400-409.
 7. Deming, W. E. (2000). *The New Economics for Industry, Government, Education* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
 8. Dewey, J. (1948). *Reconstruction in Philosophy*. Boston: Beacon Press.
 9. Gould, S. J. (1981). *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton.
 10. Gouldner, A.W. (1970). *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Books.
 11. Habermas, J. (1981). *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1981.
 12. Homans, G. C. (1964). Bringing Men Back In. *American Sociological Review*, 29,809-818.
 13. Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harper & Row.
 14. Kelly, G. A. (1963). *A Theory of Personality*. New York: W. W. Norton.
 15. Levin, J. (2012). *The Influence of Social Frame of Reference for Goal Fulfillment on Social Aggression* (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation). Boston: Boston University.
 16. Mills, C. W. (1959). *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press,.
 17. Nisbett, R. E. (2009). *Intelligence and How to Get It: Why Schools and Culture Count*. New York: W. W. Norton.
 18. Ouspensky, P. D. (1971). *The Fourth Way: A Record of Talks and Answers to Questions Based on the Teaching of G. I. Gurdjieff*. New York: Vintage,
 19. Phillips, B. (1957). A Role Theory Approach to Adjustment in Old Age. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 212-217.
 20. Phillips, B. (2019). Sociology's Next Steps?. *Contemporary Sociology*, 382-387.
 21. Phillips, B. (2020). Sociology's Next Steps? 50th Anniversary of Gouldner's Vision and 60th Anniversary of Mills's Vision. *Contemporary Sociology*, 226-229.
 22. Phillips, B. (2021). Creating Life before Death with a Vision for Action, In Jonathan Frauley, (Ed.), *Routledge International Handbook of C. Wright Mills Studies*.
 23. Phillips, B., & David, C. (2012). *Revolution in the Social Sciences*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.
 24. Phillips, B., & Louis, C. J. (2007). *The Invisible Crisis of Contemporary Society: Reconstructing Sociology's Fundamental Assumptions*. Boulder, Colorado: Paradigm Publishers.
 25. Phillips, B., Thomas, J. S., Andy, P., Neil, S. W., & Max, O. S. (2020). *Creating Life Before Death*. Champaign, Illinois: Common Ground Research Networks.
 26. Polak, F. L (1961). *The Image of the Future* (Vol. 2). Leyden: W. W. Sythoff.
 27. Polak, F. L. (1973). *The Image of the Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
 28. Rosenthal, R., & Lenore, J. (1968). *Pygmalion in the Classroom*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
 29. Shenk, D. (2010). *The Genius in All of Us: Why Everything You've Been Told About Genetics, Talent, and IQ Is Wrong*. New York: Doubleday.
 30. Turner, J. H. (2020). *On Human Nature*. Oxfordshire: Routledge Press.
 31. Udy, S.H. (1959). Bureaucracy' and 'Rationality' in Weber's Organization Theory. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 591-595.
 32. Vidich, A. J., & Joseph, B. (1960). *Small Town in Mass Society: Class, Power, and Religion in a Rural Community*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
 33. Weber, M. (1922). *Economy and Society*. Oakland: University of California Press.
 34. Wrong, D. H. (1961). The Overspecialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology. *American Sociological Review*, 26, 183-192.
 35. Zimmer, C. (2021). *Life's Edge: The Search for What It Means to Be Alive*. New York: Dutton.