1

An Overview of the Emerging Political Paradigm: A Web of Transformational Theories

CHRISTA DARYL SLATON

"The Great Question before us is: Can we Change? In Time? and we all desire that Change will come.

. . . And THEORY? How are we to proceed without THEORY? What System of Thought have these Reformers to present to this mad swirling planetary disorganization, to the Inevident Welter of fact, event, phenomena, calamity? . . .

Change? Yes, we must change, only show me the Theory. . ."

Tony Kushner, *Angels in America*

Introduction

We are living in a time of extraordinary change whether we choose it or not. Forces of change act upon us even as we cling to the "security" of the past. Political systems, once powerful and entrenched, are collapsing—often through nonviolent uprisings of masses of citizens, such as in the Soviet Union, South Africa, Iran, and the Philippines. Americans rejoiced at the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Many interpreted the downfall as proof that the American economic and political system was superior to the communist state and that the United States could truly lead the world as the last remaining superpower.

For all the feelings of grandeur Americans experienced when they saw the Berlin Wall dismantled, the fact is Americans are extremely disenchanted with their own political system. Only about 50 percent of Americans vote in presidential elections, 35–40 percent in congressional, and turnout for elections at the local level is usually below 30 percent. Lest anyone interpret low voter turnout as voter satisfaction with the status quo, one needs to examine survey data that has indicated consistently for the last three decades that large percentages of Americans believe politicians do not really care what they think. In spite of built-in electoral advantage, a significant number of powerful incumbents suffered defeat or greatly reduced support in the 1994 national elections.

Even conservatives advocate major constitutional reform to address flaws in the political system. Third-party challenges, such as the Green Party and the Reform Party, are gathering strength at the local and national level. Antigovernment groups are gaining strength and getting more bold (and often violently destructive) in their challenges to governmental power and authority.

Public dissatisfaction has been documented and discussed in a variety of recent popular books, such as E. J. Dionne's *Why American's Hate Politics*, David Osborne and Ted Gaebler's *Reinventing Government*, Kevin Phillip's *Arrogant Capital* and *The Politics of Rich and Poor*. It is the contention of this text that public discontent is not merely a reflection of dissatisfaction with policy decisions, political leaders, or political institutions. Its roots are much deeper, even global (Sartori 1994) and its implications are far more profound. Americans themselves are questioning and often rejecting the tenets of liberalism—the philosophical grounding for the American political system and way of life.

The thesis of this book is that the world is in a period of radical transformation—a time of turbulence, change, and uncertainty. Not only are political systems being recreated but deeply held basic values are being reexamined and fundamental epistemological and ontological questions are being posed and answered anew. What do we know? How do we know it? What is the origin and nature of existence? What does it all mean?

This chapter explores the theoretical underpinnings of the politics in this period of upheaval and uncertainty. Briefly addressing some of the inadequacies in the prevailing political theories, the chapter focuses on the components of a nascent theory of transformational politics.

As will be revealed in the following discussion, a theory of transformational politics is a web of theories, ranging from ancient to novel. The theory articulated in this book is a complex network of interwoven parts. As such, it is a theory that is evolving and mutable. Yet it has form and substance that offers a useful guide for understanding where we have been, where we are now, and where we are (or should be) going.

This introductory chapter weaves the theories together to demonstrate connections and integration. Contributions in this section highlight the theoretical approach of scholars who identify themselves as transformational political scientists. While each chapter focuses on particular theoretical nodes in the web, such as chaos, ecofeminism, archetypal analysis, and democracy, all are compatible with each other and provide critical links in the web. And while each scholar embraces a holistic approach to study, each also provides particular expertise to emphasize the intricacy and complexity of the web.

Where Have We Been? Origins of Modern Scientific Thought

"In everything there is a portion of everything."

Anaxagoras, 460 B.C.

As Louis Herman discusses in chapter 2, a theory of transformational politics must consider the democratic underpinnings in our primal past. We learn from the "shamanic religion of Paleolithic and contemporary hunter gatherers and the Socratic search for the 'best way to live.'" In examining where we have been, however, this essay will focus on the origins and influences of modern scientific thought that have profoundly shaped our view of the universe and how we seek answers to questions we pose. It will also emphasize how the tenets of modern thinking have trapped us and precluded us from examining important phenomena, raising new questions, and taking different paths in our journey of discovery.

Nearly four centuries ago, Francis Bacon was at the forefront of a changing worldview or paradigm shift. Writing in a time of the scientific discoveries of Copernicus and Galileo, Bacon challenged the prevailing orthodoxy, which relied on religious leaders and divine guidance as revealed through the church hierarchy for an under-

standing of the universe and the roles of humans in it. Bacon
wanted to discard the theories of ancient and contemporary philoso-
phers and theologians by establishing a naturalistic, materialistic
philosophy that would become "a kind of second Scripture" (Bacon
1960, 282).

Knowledge, according to Bacon, can *only* be attained by what
the eyes can see. By painstakingly recording observations with
great precision, Bacon proposed that one could "proceed regularly
and gradually from one axiom to another, so that the most general
are not reached till the last" (Bacon 1960, 20). This process would
"establish progressive stages of certainty" (33). Using the mind as a
controlled "machine," Bacon hoped to "open a new way for under-
standing" and an "Improvement in *man's* estate and an enlargement
of *his power over nature*" (35, 267).

Embracing the patriarchy of the church, Bacon viewed nature
as feminine. Nature/She is imperfect, capricious, and dangerous and
must be "constrained and molded by art and human ministry. . . .
For in things artificial nature [she] takes orders from man and
works under his authority, without man, such things would never
have been made" (Bacon 1960, 273). Left "free" and unconstrained
by man, Nature\She would make "errors" and would not serve the
needs of man. Bacon argues that "the main object is to make nature
[her] serve the business and convenience of man" (180).

The goal of man's inquiry, according to Bacon, is certainty and
the path to certainty must be cleared of the worthless citations of
antiquated philosophies, "superstitious stories," unreplicated cu-
riosities, and "experiments of ceremonial magic." His method is to
wipe the slate clean and create a new philosophy based on none of
the teachings of the past, but founded exclusively on the slow
process of induction.

Science throughout the Enlightenment continued to build on
Bacon's assumed first principles and presented a comprehensive
worldview, replete with laws of nature that include the basic nature
of humans, how humans relate to their environment, and how and
what kinds of sociopolitical structures humans create. This world-
view was also enhanced by Rene Descartes' mind/matter dualism
and Sir Isaac Newton's vision of the universe as mechanical and
predictable. Knowledge comes through breaking the whole down to
its smallest parts and placing the parts in isolation for careful ob-
servation to be recorded objectively. Newtonian theory posits that
such observation and study will reveal a world of certainty, order,
structure, status, and determinism.

Martin Landau argues that this eighteenth century cosmologi-
cal formula became so powerful that "Newton became not so much
the name of a man as of an infallible world outlook" (Landau 1961,
338). The mechanistic Newtonian world with its reductionist strat-
egy, as Gus diZerega argues, came to dominate the social sciences as
well as the natural sciences (diZerega 1991, 66). James Dator and
several other social researchers maintain that this worldview still
prevails in the twentieth century and that it determines not only
the methods of study but serves as the foundation of certain politi-
cal institutions and validates certain predominant political behavior
(Dator 1984; Becker 1991; Tribe 1991; Slaton 1992).

The Renaissance Period, however, was a time of more than
change in natural scientific thought. In a presentation at a 1992 in-
ternational conference in Ontario, Nicole Morgan argued in her
keynote address that during the Renaissance there was extraordi-
nary chaos and collapse as well as change and innovation. Budding
capitalism encouraged global mercantilism and the breakdown of
traditional land-based economies. There was widespread social
chaos that led to despair and destruction. And of course, a new po-
litical philosophy emerged.

Machiavelli wrote his classic advice in the *Prince* about how to
succeed in maintaining power. His method of the study of power was
to compartmentalize political knowledge as a separate discipline
with its own precepts. His precepts were based on a primarily nega-
tive view of human nature that saw self-interest as the motivating
factor in behavior. While many today find Machiavelli's advise to the
prince offensive, many of those active in the political arena embrace
it as the "gospel."

One of the more prominent philosophies was developed in the
work of Thomas Hobbes. His method à la Bacon, was to establish
clarity and certainty in understanding human behavior. Each
human emotion was to be defined precisely and explained. Through
a meticulous deductive method he took man from the state of na-
ture—"a state of war of all against all"— and led him to the ideal po-
litical system—hereditary monarchy. Following his logic, one could
arrive at only one conclusion: iron-fist rule by one was the only way
to keep the peace.

Later John Locke, a personal friend of Newton's, offered a view
of human nature more complex than Hobbes. While humans may be
driven by selfish interests, Locke explained that their reason could
also lead them to define their interests in broader terms. One may
use reason to conclude that the more the good of the whole is ad-

vanced, the more one's own selfish interests can be advanced. Locke's views of human nature and his argument that legitimate government is the result of the consent of the governed who decide the role and powers of government are central tenets of present-day liberalism and the theory of modern representative democracy.

Where Are We? Questioning the Certainty of
Principles of Modern Science

With such a "scientific philosophy and epistemology, it was not surprising that twentieth century social science became dominated by theories, methodology, and interpretations established in the natural sciences (Uphoff 1992). Rational choice theory, for example, with its roots in utilitarian philosophy and classical economics, presents a model of the self-interested, rational actor (Riker and Ordeshook 1973). The rational actor in this model is a passive information processor who has undistorted knowledge of an objective reality (Woolpert 1984). This social science theory is fundamentally derived from Newtonian physics which, as Laurence Tribe explains, views objects as acting "on each other across the expanse of a neutral, undifferentiated space in an objective and knowable manner, according to simple physical laws that seemed to explain observed reality without requiring much further reflection about the basic structure of the universe" (Tribe 1991, 171). Social scientists studying behavior adopt the empirical approach of the physical sciences. Therefore, "the only external evidence of what people want is what they do . . . When words and actions differ . . . the behaviorist position is to believe the inferences from action" (Riker and Ordeshook 1973, 21) Riker states: "We need no theory of human nature—it only confuses us . . . To bring in psychological considerations . . . distracts us from our business, which is the study of what is said and done, not the study of reasons for saying and doing" (Riker 1962, 22).

In sum, scientists applying rational choice theory have determined the laws of human behavior *a priori*. Such laws allow the application of cause and effect determinism and require purely objective and detached study by the scientist in determining and explaining human behavior. All action of actors that do not fit the rational theory model are actions of irrational actors or deviant cases that do not diminish the validity of the model.

Steve Woolpert counters such theories with Abraham Maslow's self-actualization theory. He argues that to study and understand

politics, one must study political motives and recognize that politics is not purely a function of reason, but also of psychological needs (Woolpert 1984). It is clearly oversimplification to say that the desire to win in politics is always rational. For instance, liberation movements are not just attempts to win power, but are also attempts to meet people's need for equal standing, respect, and esteem. Indeed, Woolpert argues that as physical and psychological needs are met, actors' behaviors become less predictable, opportunistic, and expedient.

Democratic theorist Benjamin Barber represents a number of social scientists who argue that Newtonian physics provides a shaky foundation for liberal democratic theories of knowledge and political institutions. Barber posits in *Strong Democracy* that classic liberalism rests on an unprovable axiom—humans are material beings.

Barber argues that the worldview that establishes materialism as an axiom produces some questionable corollaries. Also, challenges to the "givens" of the materialist axiom and its corollaries are ignored or dismissed peremptorily, which has stymied political science and the development of more relevant and significant theory. As a result important, nonmaterial phenomena continue to be ignored, marginalized, or studied in the same way by most scholars without a recognition that the existing theory and methods that fail to explain them arise out of a limited and inadequate paradigm. In fact, in his view liberalism is wrought with "pretensions to objectivity and philosophical certainty that have proven inimical to practical reason and to participatory political activity" (Barber 1984, 29).

So, if modern mainstream political institutions and thought are grounded on erroneous, incomplete dogma, which helps account for their increasing failure, where do we go from here?

Where Are We Going? Towards a Theory of Transformational Politics

The answer is to seek a new paradigm that incorporates change as a major variable. Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* discusses how changing paradigms define the growth of scientific study of all natural phenomena. According to Kuhn all sciences transform themselves by transcending a period of "normal science." During periods of "normal science," Kuhn states research is "firmly based upon one or more past scientific achievements, achievements that some particular scientific community acknowl-

edges for a time as supplying the foundation for its further practice" (Kuhn 1970, 10).

While "normal science" prevails, Kuhn argues, scientists do not look for new phenomena, they do not invent new theories, and they are often intolerant of those who do (Kuhn 1970, 24). However, all paradigms, according to Kuhn, have defects in that they narrow the focus of research and drastically reduce vision. Due largely to the defects, all scientific paradigms fail to produce answers to some phenomena. As the number and significance of these failures mount, confidence in the prevailing paradigm is shaken. This is a period "regularly marked by frequent and deep debates over legitimate methods, problems, and standards of solution" (47). Kuhn notes, the emergence of a new paradigm does not end the debates. Thus, it is so here, as we try to seek a "transformational political theory." Manfred Halpern argues in chapter 3 that persons moving through the "core drama of life"—transformation—are throughout their lives accepting the status quo, challenging it, and then creating alternative visions.

We are now in a period where confidence in the liberal paradigm has been undergoing profound challenge to its foundation. While most mainstream democratic theorists continue to hale the advancements of liberal, representative democracy that occurred during the reign of a paradigm and worldview shaped by Newtonian physics, many others have recognized its fundamental limitations and are demanding a dramatic change.

Several major challenges to the validity of that traditional political theory arose in the 1960s. Women demanded more than the right to vote. They demanded equality. African-Americans fought to overturn America's de facto apartheid system. Students took to the streets to challenge the elitist nature of the "establishment." Technology transformed the reporting of news, particularly the coverage of war and civil protest. This upheaval shattered what Samuel Huntington called American society's "broad consensus on democratic, liberal, egalitarian values" (Crozier and others 1975, 112). Huntington concluded that the United States was suffering from an "excess of democracy" and that what was needed was a "greater degree of moderation in democracy" (113). The demands of women, racial minorities, and young were "overloading the political system" and if the democratic system were to function properly, there needed to be some "measure of apathy and noninvolvement on the part of some individuals and groups" (114).

Huntington's views epitomized the intolerance of those tied to an old paradigm or to the "normal science" of the day. The 1960s ac-

tivists challenged the prevailing definitions and practices of traditional, liberal democracy. Huntington's answer was to return to the normalcy, predictability, and safety of the paradigm that many began to see as obsolete.

Many of those leading the discussion of the antiquated aspects of the political system and identifying emerging trends came outside of the academic community or from those deviants in the academic community whom their colleagues tried to marginalize as being "radical," "unscientific," "emotional," or "demagogues." Best sellers began to emerge that rejected the rigidity and narrowness of "establishment" American political thought. Citizens found intriguing questions, analyses, and directions in books by nonacademics such as Alvin and Heidi Toffler (*Future Shock* and *The Third Wave*); Fritjof Capra (*The Turning Point* and *The Tao of Physics*); Marilyn Ferguson (*The Aquarian Conspiracy*), Hazel Henderson (*The Politics of the Solar Age*); Betty Friedan (*The Feminine Mystic*); E. F. Schumacher (*Small is Beautiful*); John Naisbitt (*Megatrends*), and Mark Satin (*New Age Politics*).

Scholars, too, began to redefine the parameters of study and the methods employed. Many academics with impressive credentials in "normal science" began to break out of the confines of the paradigm. Judicial scholars Theodore Becker (1986) and Glendon Schubert (1989; 1991) focused on teledemocracy and biopolitics, respectively. Lester Milbrath (1989), a major contributor to the study of political participation began to concentrate on environmental sustainability issues. James MacGregor Burns (1978; 1991), a Pulitzer prize winner and extraordinarily successful American government textbook writer, began to develop theories of transformational leadership and to discuss the necessity of redefining "rights." Democratic theorists Ben Barber (1984; 1992), Jane Mansbridge (1980; 1990), and Amitai Etzioni (1993; 1995) launched research in redefining democracy, moving beyond adversarial democracy, and promoting democracy in the age of technology. Feminist theorists, such as Jo Freeman (1995), Catherine MacKinnon (1987; 1989), Carole Pateman (1987; 1988; 1989; 1991), and Irene Diamond (1990) introduced theories that were never given consideration or validity under Newtonian thought. African-American intellectuals Cornel West (1991; 1993; 1994) and bell hooks (1984) followed in the footsteps of W. E. B. Dubois and resisted the confines of traditional liberal intellectualism and broke through boundaries of the academy established by white intellectuals seeing the world only through their particular lenses.

A theory of transformational politics, unlike *all* major political philosophical theories before it, concentrates on the dynamics of change itself and promotes change by challenging all theories and institutions that retard this process of transformation. By doing this, it transforms the worldview that evolved in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Transformational political theory does not replace all that is connected to Newtonian theory and politics. There are occasions when cause-effect determinism exists, predictions are appropriate, order abounds, and inductive reasoning prevails. Indeed as Majid Tehranian points out:

> New scientific metaphors do not replace, and new theories do not refute, the old ones but somehow remake them; even scientific revolutions preserve some continuity with the old order of things. This is as true of theoretical speculations about society as it is of the social system itself. (Tehranian 1979, 141)

The theory of transformational politics that is emerging tries to synthesize the significant political theoretical developments in the last few decades with the theoretical and institutional wisdom of the past, both within and outside of the academy. This nascent paradigm builds on a number of sources, including quantum theory, chaos theory, ecofeminist theory, archetypal theory, empowerment theory, self-actualization theory, participatory democratic theory, and new theories of spirituality to provide guidance to the researchers, theorists, and practitioners of the politics of the twenty-first century.

The Theory of Transformational Politics: Some Patterns Revealed in the Web of Theories

As stated earlier, the theory of transformational politics is a complex web of connected theories that attempt to supplement and correct the deficiencies in classic liberal theory as we move into a new paradigm. Table 1.1 offers a comparison between the established liberal theory and the ways in which this theory is being transformed by transformational scholars. It is important to note that although the table visually implies contrast, when one carefully examines the components of the transformational theory, one sees that the theory does not entirely reject liberalism. Instead, it merges it with components essential in the emerging paradigm. For in-

Table 1.1
A Comparison of Liberal and Transformational Theories

Liberal Theory	Transformational Theory
cause-effect determinism, certainty, predictability	probability, randomness
objectivity	objectivity/subjectivity
one method of study, or path to Truth	multiple paths to understanding; multiple perceptions of truth
masculine	masculine/feminine
man—master of nature	human—part of nature
constrain and conquer nature	humans nurture and sustain nature as nature nurtures and sustains humans
wipe slate clean and consider only what is proven through scientific method	consider primal past, multi-civilizational approaches to understanding to complement scientific method
induction	induction/deduction/intuition
humans as material beings	humans as material and spiritual beings
individualism	individualism/communitarianism
reason	reason/emotion
self-interests	self-interests/common interests/ self-sacrifice
atomism	interconnectedness
isolation	interaction
ends-oriented	process- and ends-oriented
hierarchy	balance
power = dominance over others	power = empowerment of others
strength = assertiveness and aggression	strength = ability to exercise patience and tolerance as well as assertiveness
stasis	change
representative democracy	participatory democracy
thesis-antithesis	analysis/synthesis
adversarial	consensual/mediated
rational choice theory	self-actualization theory
independence	interdependence
one-way communication	networking
assimilation of differences by dominant culture	cooperation among diverse cultures

stance, whereas modern science offers a masculine vision of the universe, the theory of transformational politics seeks a synthesis of masculine and feminine perspectives. As is revealed in the table, transformational political theory seeks to correct the unidimensionality of mechanistic thought.

Integrating Theories from New Scientific Discoveries

Discoveries in quantum physics and the theory of relativity have led scientists to develop principles that explain the failure of significant progression towards certainty that Renaissance thinkers sought to establish (Tribe 1991). As physicist Fritjof Capra explains in *The Turning Point*, when physicists in the twentieth century began atomic experiments they found the old laws they were following produced paradoxes. It eventually became clear to them that "their basic concepts, their language, and their whole way of thinking were inadequate to describe atomic phenomena" (Capra 1982, 76). Many of the principles derived from quantum theory offer fundamentally improved interpretations and explanations of the world than those advanced by Francis Bacon in the seventeenth century and Sir Isaac Newton in the eighteenth century.

In a similar fashion, some of the more significant quantum principles need to be included as key components of a new social, economic, and political scientific paradigm. Here are several:

UNCERTAINTY. Objects are defined by their environments and their relationship to others. Political theory should question the assumption that humans have a predictable nature and that rationality alone guides the citizen in the pursuit of self-interests. A better explanation is that humans are complex, contradictory creatures that cannot be classified or identified out of the context of relationships or environment.

PROBABILITY. Cause-effect determinism and rational decision making are not at the root of all human interaction, or even primary in human affairs. James Dator concludes that probability and randomness are the norm (Dator 1984, 4). All theories of political behavior must be wary of absolutes and need to embrace probability as being more closely attuned to reality.

INTERCONNECTIONS AND INTERACTION. Dividing the universe, and the political system, into discrete units for analysis will not provide complete understanding. Instead inquiry should recognize the effects of interactions and process. Tehranian points out that democracy is a dynamic, moving process (Tehranian 1979, 52). Democracy

is not an institution or an end that can be best understood through mathematical formulas of voting behavior by citizens or legislators, but is a complicated process of interaction and deliberation among citizens (Mansbridge 1980; 1990).

NO OBJECTIVE REALITY. The important lesson from quantum theory for political theorists and empirical political scientists is that there is no objective real world apart from one's consciousness. It is essential to keep in mind that our observations, no matter how precise, are affected by our own concepts, thoughts, and values that vary with each individual and under varying circumstances. In other words, subjectivity always influences our objectivity.

Transformational social scientists, who are influenced by the theories of the natural sciences—in particular, quantum and chaos theories—develop metaphors from the models and concepts of the natural sciences to understand, reconstruct, and reenvision politics. Such practice is as old as the organic metaphors developed by ancient Greeks to study the "body politic" and has been useful throughout the centuries as an aid in understanding social as well as physical phenomena. There is, however, extensive criticism of such practice from both natural and social scientists. Criticism ranges from mere warnings to recognize the differences between animate and inanimate objects to ridicule, which calls such efforts "bad pseudoscience" (Beth 1995, 35).

Theodore Becker explains, however, that the political science contributors to his book *Quantum Politics: Applying Quantum Theory to Political Phenomena* do not believe "that the laws of physics strictly govern individual political behavior or should determine its study" (Becker 1991, xii). Nevertheless, each author recognizes the limitations of the Newtonian-inspired paradigm of Western politics and engages in "thought experiments" to apply the principles and concepts of the quantum paradigm. Their value to political scientists is to reconceptualize political science and politics. For instance, my own participatory democratic theory was enriched by applying the quantum principles of interactivity and interconnection rather than merely focusing on participation opportunities and examining barriers to participation. I also began to experiment with random selection of representatives rather than restrict my study to maintaining the highly unrepresentative electoral system designed under a Newtonian paradigm (Slaton 1992). In chapter 4 Barbara Knight discusses how social scientists use models and metaphors from chaos theory to bring feminist principles to the fore and to incorporate them in understanding the transformation of political community.

Constitutional scholar Laurence Tribe addresses the caution most social scientists use when they apply lessons of the physical sciences to social phenomena. He states he is not determined to bring science into law and does not believe there is an "epistemological hierarchy with law perched on a lower rung looking up to its superiors [quantum physics] for guidance" (Tribe 1991, 169). Instead Tribe states:

> I borrow metaphors from physics tentatively . . . to explore the heuristic ramifications for the law; my criterion of appraisal is whether the concepts we might draw from physics promote illuminating questions and direction. I press forward in this endeavor because I believe that reflection upon certain developments in physics can help us hold on to and refine some of our deeper insights into the pervasive and profound role law plays in shaping our society and our lives. (Tribe 1991, 169)

Richard Rubenstein states that "good theory" should make sense of everything around us and tie together events that may seem to have no connection (Rubenstein 1990, 317). Sound theory "reevaluates change-over-time, illuminating the connection and disconnections between past and present, and indicating to what extent the present can be projected into the future. It redefines relationships between thought and its objects and between oneself and others. And, of course, it stimulates new thinking" (317). Theory needs to help us understand the world. And even if theory does not rely on predictability or certainty, after unforeseen events happen, social theory should continue to reformulate to help explain and to more accurately anticipate events of the future.

Linking Past, Present, Future to Sustain the Planet

While transformational political theory integrates scientific discoveries and theories of the seventeenth through the twentieth century, it also reconnects us to our primal past. Louis Herman argues that our quest for understanding must connect us with our "primary pre-scientific life experiences" (chapter 2). Our search for truth must be global as well as multicivilizational. Similarly, Steve Sachs (1993) maintains that in reconceptualizing politics for the twenty-first century, theorists need to consider the pre-Western thought and way of life of Native Americans that Western scientific thought dismissed. In other words, Herman and Sachs emphasize that transforma-

tional political science can benefit from looking to the past as well as the future, particularly to overlooked and denigrated cultures that emphasize synthesis and offer a basis for a continuing dialectic on where we have been and where we are going.

While warning against romanticizing Native American culture (or any other culture), Sachs argues that modern theory needs to examine traditional Native American tribal and band societies and recognize the value of their ideas and practices that Western thought rejected—particularly the belief that humans are a part of the natural harmony of the whole of nature, not the masters of nature. Traditional Native American politics is about finding consensus within community. Tribal leaders see power as a means to empower others, not as a vehicle for control. Sachs maintains: "At the heart of [Native American tribal] politics is a set of communal relationships based upon mutual respect emphasizing both the community and the individual, so that in a very important sense the whole is equal to the part" (Sachs 1993, 1).

Biologist Mary Clark's writings consistently argue that Euro-American values have threatened the sustainability of the planet and that what we need to do to survive is to move towards decentralization and local self-sufficiency. Her global vision sets us on "a path emphasizing cooperation rather than competition, diversity rather than uniformity, social bondedness rather than self-centeredness, sacred meaning rather than material consumption" (Clark 1989, xx). Similar themes are echoed in Lester Milbrath's *Envisioning a Sustainable Society* and Vice President Al Gore's *Earth in the Balance: Ecology and the Human Spirit*.

Valuing the Feminine and Seeking Balance

Essential to the concept of harmony in Native American thought is "balance," not homogeneity or uniformity. Scholars learning from primal cultures and those concerned with sustainability are often in agreement with many feminist scholars who dispute modern theories that discount or devalue intuition, spirituality, and subjectivity (Spretnak 1986; Starhawk 1993; Armstrong and Botzler 1993; Warren 1993; Lahar 1993; Russell 1993; Shiva 1993).

The mechanistic world of Bacon and Newton valued the masculine dominance of nature and the feminine and discounted subjectivity and spirituality. This imbalanced worldview has encouraged the exploitation of the planet for man's convenience, and established a hierarchy of values and worths. It is a worldview that, mostly unchecked

and unchallenged, has resulted in serious threats to the sustainability of life on the planet. In this world we find that: (a) aggression and force are tools of the strong, whereas humility and accommodation are the trappings of the weak; (b) selfish ambition is prized and leads to power and wealth, whereas selfless generosity often subjects one to exploitation by the greedy; and (c) profit, expansion, money, and power are the ends of those who lead rather than spiritual growth, empowerment of followers, and harmony among equals.

Ecofeminism contributes to transformational theory by addressing the unidimensionality and pitfalls of patriarchal thought and systems and by offering a more balanced worldview that incorporates the value of the feminine. Susan Armstrong and Richard Botzler explain that ecofeminism is a form of feminism that not only seeks to end masculine oppression of women, but also rejects the patriarchy of western science that leads to destruction of nature. Ecofeminism strives to bridge the gap between nature and culture; mind and body; female and male; reason and feeling; theory and practice (Armstrong and Botzler 1993, 432).

Barbara Knight argues in chapter 4 that whereas Newtonian science defined itself with masculine characteristics and identified the male intellect as the objective observer who must manipulate and tame unpredictable nature (feminine), chaos theory is intrigued by the feminine and develops far more complex models that abandon the either/or dualism central to the Newtonian paradigm. The Newtonian approach values only the masculine (equated with order and predictability) and deprecates the feminine (equated with chaos and unpredictability). Knight posits that chaos is not an absence of order, but instead is characteristic of complexity, diversity, interdependence, multiplicity, and cyclic processes. By recognizing feminine ways of knowing and understanding the world (intuition, contextual thinking, collaborative discussion, visions of life as a web of interconnections), chaos theory contributes to transformational political theory, which offers a vision of peaceful change and wholeness.

Recognizing Common Interests and Interdependence

The importance of individuals and their *relationships* is also stressed in ecofeminism. There is a rejection of the dualistic dichotomy between egoism and altruism, and between the self as atomistic or merged. Instead, ecofeminists argue, the self should be understood as being embedded in a network of essential relationships with distinct others (Armstrong and Botzler 1993, 433).

Stephanie Lahar argues that ecofeminism works to bring together the personal, social, and environmental issues in order to transform society (Lahar 1993, 445). As an integrated moral philosophy that combines humanity and nonhuman nature, Lahar points out that ecofeminist theory should be viewed as a living process. In the process of acting politically, ecofeminists should both deconstruct and reconstruct (Lahar 1993, 449–451). This distinguishes transformational political theorists from critical theorists or deconstructionists. While the crits and deconstuctionists do a thorough job of dismantling liberalism, they leave only the debris and cynicism from their destruction. They offer no hope, no vision, no alternative, no improvement.

Emphasizing Creativity and Innovation through Synthesis of Objectivity and Subjectivity

Louis Herman's contribution to transformational political theory, challenges academics to end the "unremitting critique" that leads only to destruction (chapter 2). Transformational theorists need to develop a dialectic between critique and creation; between analysis and synthesis. Manfred Halpern emphasizes the necessity in utilizing creativity in transformation (chapter 3). As we move through the various "Acts of Life"—defined by Halpern as Emanation (Act I), Incoherence (Act II), and Transformation (Act III)—Halpern contends we need to remain critically conscious as well as creative and caring in choosing what we accept and reject from the past and developing new strategies for moving into the future.

Transformational theorists make no pretense to pure objectivity. Indeed, they argue for a value-based (Rensenbrink 1992; Rohter 1992), morally-grounded (Lahar 1993) theory guided by compassion (Halpern chapter 3) that seeks to define the "good life" (Herman chapter 2). Yet description and definition alone are inadequate in transformational theory. Praxis—the wedding of theory and action—is also central to theories of transformation.

Developing Praxis that Enhances Democracy and Moves Towards Consensus

In chapter 5 Daniel Graham discusses a nascent international political movement, the Green Movement, that exemplifies how one acts politically when embracing the theories of transformational politics. Graham states: "The ecocentric paradigm of the Greens cre-

ates a 'new' (renewed) framework to evaluate the role of economics, science, technology, culture, epistemology, ideology, and spirituality in political/social transformation." His chapter discusses how the Green Movement (and later the Green political parties) began with the formulation of basic values that provided the foundation for political action.

It is noteworthy that several of those most active in Green Party politics in the United States have been political scientists who have rejected the classic liberal illusion of the detached scientist studying political phenomena. Theorists John Rensenbrink, Irene Diamond, and Louis Herman develop political strategies based on their theories and fine tune their theories through what they learn in their political activism. Likewise, Betty Zisk uses her in-depth knowledge of the history, key figures, and peak events to analyze Greens and other political activists to present a richness rarely found by the "detached" (and often clueless) observer. Green political scientists Tony Affigne, Ira Rohter, and Christopher Jones have lived in the "real" political world and understood it through their intellectual as well as activist lenses. When they teach students about politics, they have the "real world" experience to enrich the discussions.

The organized section on Ecological and Transformational Politics in the American Political Science Association states that its purpose is to "explore those trends in contemporary life that are challenging the viability of traditional divisions in political science and political life (normative/empirical; personal/professional; theory/practice; Liberal/Conservative; Left/Right; global/local; secular/spiritual . . . *We are committed to examining alternatives that seek a new synthesis*" (Schwerin 1995, 3). Members of the section seek concrete alternatives that would transform political systems and processes. Theodore Becker's discussion of teledemocracy in chapter 12 explores how modern technology can be used to develop a more democratic, interactive, and consensus-oriented political system—one that would go beyond reform by truly empowering citizens.

In the last few years, Becker and I have worked alongside others—Hazel Henderson, Duane Elgin, Amitai Etzioni—to develop electronic town meetings that are based on the democratic values of the traditional New England town meeting. Rather than seeing technology as an evil to be resisted, our research has focused on ways in which community, participation, dialogue, respect for diversity, and enlightened policy-making can be developed through technology that is employed by neutral facilitators working towards consensus.

Balancing Rights and Responsibilities

One of the strongest held tenets of liberalism is individualism. Yet how does one build community essential to democracy, according to theorist John Dewey, when each citizen is pursuing his or her self-interests? In a paper presented to the 1995 American Political Science Association Annual Conference, William Caspary astutely utilizes Dewey's theories to direct transformational political scientists on this topic. The task is daunting in an American society that has over-whelmed its court system with citizens asserting their rights.

Amitai Etzioni (1993; 1995), an early advocate of electronic town meetings, has worked with other scholars and leaders recently in developing the burgeoning communitarian movement in the United States. One of the major principles of communitarianism is that in democratic societies, citizens not only have rights, but also responsibilities. Communitarians contribute to transformational po-litical theory by helping us understand that if we want the benefits of government, and we want a say in how government is run, we must be responsible citizens who recognize we also have obligations to others. The American Greens echo the same theme in the pillars of their philosophy that emphasizes social and personal responsibil-ity and respect for diversity.

The United States is the homeland of many diverse cultures. Except for Native Americans who were displaced, all Americans are descendants of immigrants. No one nation or culture can legiti-mately claim title to the land or dictate to others. Earlier in our his-tory we embraced the image of "the melting pot," where diverse cultures blend into one. This metaphor was never really accurate. In the 1990s, transformational social scientists are arguing it is not even desirable. Our diversity is our richness. Through respecting di-versity we can open our eyes to new understandings and develop creative ways of dealing with difficulties. As Halpern points out in chapter 3 our multiculturalism helps us become whole, rather than partial, selves. Halpern argues that transformation entails our learning to open ourselves to others—to the unfamiliar.

Empowering Ourselves and Others

Edward Schwerin's book *Mediation, Citizen Empowerment and Transformational Politics* analyzes several political movements and their theoretical grounding to develop a theory of empowerment that is a "core concept or value" of transformational theory and poli-

tics (Schwerin 1995, 6). The synthesis that leads to his definition of empowerment emerges from theorists in quantum theories (Becker 1991; Slaton 1992); transformational leadership (Burns 1978; Fishel 1992; Couto 1993); individual transformation (Halpern 1991; Abalos 1993); communitarianism (Bellah 1985; Barber 1992; Etzioni 1993); teledemocracy (Becker 1991; Slaton 1992); strong and mass participatory democracy (Barber 1984; Mansbridge 1993); and spirituality (Spretnak 1986; McLaughlin and Davidson 1994) .

He also examines political movements and trends that began to emerge in the 1960s to challenge the prevailing paradigms and political institutions. Empowerment is found at the heart of many of these movements—Green (Capra and Spretnak 1984; Slaton and Becker 1990; Rensenbrink 1992; Rohter 1992); environmental (Milbrath 1989); feminist (Kelly 1989; Starhawk 1993); peace (Zisk 1992) new age (Satin 1979; Bookchin 1986; Spangler 1988); neopopulist (Boyte 1980; Boyte and Reissman 1986; Bellah and others 1985; Reissman 1986); and conflict resolution (Burton and Dukes 1990). Schwerin concludes that empowerment is grounded in the values of "self-sufficiency, personal competence, mass political participation, community involvement, social responsibility, human freedom and dignity, and cultural diversity,"—all nodes already described as part of the web of transformational theory. (Schwerin 1995, 165)

Steve Woolpert's examination of self-actualization theories arising out of humanistic psychology emphasizes the same themes and values of empowerment. Citing Carl Rogers' work in human growth and Abraham Maslow's theory of human development, Woolpert depicts a transformational society as one in which there is "movement away from dependency and toward the fulfillment of potential" (Woolpert 1984, 57). In such a "healthy" society:

> "personal well-being and political well-being go hand in hand. Such a society encourages its citizens to be open to experience, to discover and pursue their own preferences, and to join together to achieve their common goals. Authenticity, tolerance of diversity, and interpersonal understanding are highly valued." (Woolpert 1984, 57)

Conclusion

Kuhn states that new paradigms emerge for two reasons. First, the paradigm has produced achievements that are "sufficiently unprecedented to attract an enduring group of adherents *away* from

competing modes of scientific study." Second, the paradigm is "suffi-
ciently *open-minded to leave all sorts of problems for the redefined
group of practitioners to resolve"* (Kuhn 1970, 10, emphasis mine).

Transformational political theorists are offering guides to reex-
amine our study and to ask different questions as we journey on a
truth quest to discover who we are, where we have been, and where
we want to go. As with all paradigms, there are likely to be errors
and gaps in the emerging epistemology. And clearly, there is not uni-
versal consensus on the components of the theory or its methods of
inquiry. Yet as this volume indicates, there is a growing consensus
and synthesis arising in both the physical and social sciences that
legitimize this fundamentally new way of looking at old and emerg-
ing phenomena. The test remains: Can transformational theory pro-
vide fresh answers, novel insights, and innovative approaches not
found in theories grounded in Newtonian thought? As the next two
sections of this book indicate, there are increasing numbers of polit-
ical scientists testing the theory to answer this question.