

WHAT DOES IT MATTER TO ME?

by Robert M. Johnstone

(prepared as the Baccalaureate Address for the
Earlham College graduating class of 2004,
Saturday, May 8, 2004)

Welcome to you all: members of the graduating class of 2004; your parents, relatives and friends; my colleagues here on the stage. Six years ago I sat on this platform in a dual capacity: as a member of the faculty but also as the father of an Earlham graduating senior. I well remember how proud I was when my daughter walked across this stage to accept her diploma. I know that parents here today are feeling those same emotions. And I know, graduates, that you are proud of your parents and families, and honor them for their sacrifices that have led you to this momentous day in this beautiful place.

This month in thousands of colleges and universities all across this land, commencement and baccalaureate speakers are addressing graduates. It is a daunting task and one that I never anticipated performing. Actually there is not a word of truth in that last statement. Each year, for 28 years at Earlham, I've thought after every baccalaureate service, what if?? If I were ever called upon to speak, whatever would I say? Over these many years I've listened to, and forgotten, many addresses of distinction by colleagues, past and present. Some, a happy few, have been called upon more than once.

Yet, for 28 years the call, with deepening predictability, never came my way---until today---for you, the class of 2004.

My gratitude to you is profound. When Bonita called me with the news, she shared with me some of the comments that you made on my behalf. I was flattered by your kindness---and impressed by your perceptiveness! Of all the comments, I must say the one that affected me the most was, "HE ROCKS!"....

I wish I knew what that means!

We've been through a lot together in the last four years: in your first semester we experienced the controversial election of a minority President; as your second year was just getting underway, we all suffered through the horrors of 9/11 and the launching of a "war on terrorism." Last year it was---and alas still remains---the war in Iraq; and now a new presidential campaign proceeds, with the prospects of another close call this November.

Along the way we've had visits to campus from a number of prominent speakers and performers, among them Mark Shields, David Satcher, bell hooks, David Sedaris, Bill Cosby, Linda Greenhouse, Ward Connerly, our own Andrea Seabrook, the Juilliard String Quartet, Ralph Nader...and who can forget Ann Coulter! We've lived through economic recession, corporate scandal, the fall of Martha Stewart, the rise of Eminem and Beyoncé, and the breakup of J-Lo and Ben!

And through it all, you've managed to find a major and acquire at least 120 credit hours---well, most of you have---in courses with the folks behind me. Along the way you've grown intellectually, emotionally, spiritually, in ways that you scarcely imagined and may even yet not fully fathom. It's been an inspiration to share the journey with you.

Talks like this are a distinct subset of the art of public speaking, with its own norms and expectations, and speakers are expected to play their roles: often that takes the form of talking in general terms about issues of public moral concern, and in the process exhorting the new graduates to live lives of worth. I will try to follow in that tradition this morning. I also intend, as is customary, to speak directly to you graduating seniors (the rest of you may listen in if you promise to behave!)

I might be expected to urge you to labor in the cause of world peace; or to work to save the environment; or to engage in struggles for social justice; or to extend the boundaries of human knowledge. I hope you will do all of these things, and more. I also hope that some of you will make lots of money and give some of it to dear ol' Earlham!

I

But my appeal to you today is, at least at first glance, a more modest one. I ask you to be *citizens*. Ah, some of you are thinking: "How utterly predictable from a professor of politics!" Others of you must be sighing inwardly with some relief, "Be a citizen, right! that's OK, then. World peace, environmental protection, social justice, advances in scholarship...tough things to achieve. But to be a citizen? Not a problem!" What's a citizen, after all--- merely a member of a state! Citizenship comes, as it has for most of us, simply by right of birth; for others, by a process of naturalization. In either case, most of us are either already citizens or can become so easily enough.

But citizenship in a democracy means more than that, much more, and my concern is that its full meaning is eluding us as a people---has for some time in fact---and we need to be recalled to first principles. What better time than at commencement!

The duty of a democratic citizen is to "take care of the "public" business. The French philosopher Rousseau wrote in *The Social Contract*, "The better the state is constituted, the more does public business take precedence over private in the minds of the citizens..." He goes on, "In a well-regulated nation, every person hastens to the assemblies; under a bad government, no one wants to take a step to go to them, because no one feels the least interest in what is done there." And in the next sentence, from which the title of my talk is drawn, he writes, "As soon as someone says of the business of the state---'What does it matter to me?'---then the state must be reckoned lost."

One might say that poor old Rousseau is being just a touch alarmist here. But if we choose to measure the condition of our republic by Rousseau's stringent standards, I think we must agree that something is lacking. I see few Americans "hastening to the assemblies" these days; the hastening would seem to be in the other direction! And I suspect far too many of us are asking the question, "what does it matter to me?"

Now, I do not despair of civil society. My remarks today are not intended as a cry of lamentation. Goodness knows there are lamentations aplenty in the public dialogue in recent years. On the Left, Christopher Lasch attacks what he calls our modern "culture of narcissism;" Richard Rorty anticipates either a national "nervous breakdown" or an imminent "slide into fascism"; while Paul Ehrlich periodically predicts a new ecological catastrophe. On the Right, Gertrude Himmelfarb deplores our drift into moral decay ever since the 1960s; Robert Bork scolds us for our material greed and moral relativism as we "slouch towards Gomorrah." Jacques Barzun recently discerned the symbol of our

modern decay in another slouch---toward an ever greater casualness of dress!ⁱⁱ (At least this morning, we would seem to be bucking that trend!)

I want no hand-wringing this morning; I see no impending apocalypse; no inevitable drift to societal perdition. Nonetheless, as some of my Quaker friends might say, “I worry.” And I share with many of today’s social critics a concern about the preservation of civic virtue in a polity that is hostile to politics.

II

What is this “citizen” that I urge you to be? And what is this “civic virtue” that is in such need of preservation?

Aristotle---an old friend to some of you---well, an acquaintance---poses a question in Book III of *The Politics*: what determines the citizen? He answers first by saying what does not: mere place or location or the ability to exploit the laws to one’s advantage. Rather, a citizen is one who participates in ruling and being ruled; more strictly, one who rules and is ruled in turn. This means a citizen is one who shares in the offices of the state, who takes an active part in governance. “Place, legal capacity, birth and parentage...do not demonstrate merit” in a citizen, as Jill Frank has recently pointed out. Rather, “sharing in a constitution” qualifies one for citizenship. It is the *engagement* that makes all the difference. Citizens, in this view, are not born such; they are works in progress. We are made citizens by our collective activity on behalf of what Aristotle called, in his more circumscribed political world, “the city.”ⁱⁱⁱ

The great Roman lawyer and statesman, Cicero, also wrote of citizenship. In preferring the good life to mere life, Cicero argued that that person is happiest who lives with a care for the public good. Cicero used the term “*res publica*.” It literally means “the people’s affair.” It is often translated as “commonwealth.” What is a commonwealth? It is, he writes, “an association with respect to justice and a partnership for the common good---an *association* with respect to justice and a *partnership* for the common good.” As a philosopher, Cicero valued a life of contemplation, but his ideal life seems to have been a union of knowledge with experience, a union that produces something akin to what we might call “civic virtue.” For Cicero, “the existence of virtue depends entirely upon its use; and its noblest use is the government of the state.”^{iv}

Aristotle’s definition of the citizen as one who shares in rule would seem to fit best a democracy. Aristotle was no democrat; he rejected democracy as essentially rule by the poor and the unqualified, and he feared a freedom that too often degenerates into license. Nevertheless he agreed with the democrats of his day on one point: the decisive importance of political participation as a means for the development of human character. The linkage here is crucial. Aristotle was concerned with the promotion of the virtues, that is, of the positive human excellences, as qualities that develop the whole character of a person. Civic or public virtue is only one of a number of these “excellences,” but it is one of the most crucial for the proper realization of the others. Aristotle tells us in the *Nichomachean Ethics* that “all communities are like parts of the political community... All these lesser communities are encompassed by the political community, for the political community does not aim at the advantage of the moment, but at what is advantageous for the whole life.”^v

These observations in the Ethics occur, by the way, as part of an extended treatment of *friendship*. Friends live together in associations for good living. Friends care for each other; friendship involves a sort of “possession”---they are “our” friends. Friendship is one of the most important realities that *bind* us one to another. Aristotle tells us that these “friends” must be brought to extend their friendships---their cares for what is their own---more broadly, to embrace their fellow citizens and the political community.

Politics, in this view, is an activity that takes human beings, the reasoning creatures, and involves them in reasoned discussion of the best ways to order their lives together. As political animals---not merely social animals, like bees or beavers---our natures are fulfilled when we engage in the processes of rule. The interaction with others on the grandest stage of all helps us to develop our capacities as social AND as political beings. At its best, then, there occurs in this process a blending of private and public good; not a surrender of one to the other, but a marriage of individuality with community.

Now Aristotle and Cicero did not argue that human beings are naturally virtuous. They were not naïve about the evils we are prey to in the pursuit of our egoistic passions. Rather they argued that the way out of a narrow human egoism was through participation in a public life that extends our horizons beyond the confines of self. In this way political life can be regenerative; the virtues cultivated by public life working to nourish and to direct the passions of self-interest.

III

Few things are more intrinsically difficult for Americans---indeed, for Westerners---to accept as this notion of the character-forming function of the political community. To us, character is formed by many influences---parents and siblings, peer pressure, teachers and preachers, the physical environment, even the media of film, television and music---but it is NOT to be formed by the state. Our modern view, furthermore, is that happiness is entirely subjective and relative. Our founding tradition of liberalism, with its emphases upon individual liberty and the pursuit of private interests, seems to have left us without a deep sense of political community. In his memoirs, Theodore Roosevelt wrote of his education at Harvard in the 1880s, regretting that it taught only the dogma of the self-sufficient individual---autonomous, striving, competitive, and successful. His teachers, he wrote, “rarely viewed individuals as interdependent citizens, members of a national community who were responsible not only for their own well-being but also for the common good.”

Good liberals that we are---at least in this sense---most of us are followers of John Locke, even though we might never have read a word of him. We Lockeans believe that life is to be privately lived, with as little interference from anyone as possible, and especially from the state. We thus find the classical emphasis on civic virtue difficult to reconcile with our modern philosophy of natural freedom and equality and the primacy of unalienable natural rights. In our pluralist republic, commercial enterprise is encouraged, individual ambitions cultivated, private choice extolled, with only their worst excesses to be controlled by government. Government, indeed, as James Madison put it, “is the single greatest reflection on human nature. If men were angels, no government would be necessary.”

Little wonder, then, that few Americans have considered politics---the affairs of the city---to be a calling worthy of much respect!

Another intellectual friend to some of you---OK, acquaintance---is Alexis de Tocqueville, who visited America in the 1830s and observed us with penetrating clarity. Tocqueville recognized the problem posed by individualism in a commercial republic. Effective democratic government, *above all other forms*, he argued, requires a concerned, informed, and involved citizenry. Democratic peoples, *above all other kinds*, require a sense of public morality, a concern for the public good. But Americans, he observed, find this particularly difficult because they are so wedded to commercialism, individualism, and privatism. To mitigate these values he called for the development of an “enlightened” self-interest that would teach us that what is good for the civil society is also good for each of us *as* individuals. Yet the problem remains: we Americans are a “self-regarding” people. The great danger is that our concern for our private selves will degenerate into selfishness, withdrawing us each into a narrow domestic circle, with public spiritedness withering on the vine.^{vi}

Is it possible for us to grasp the classical notion that the life of the *citizen* is the best life FOR individuals; that in helping the political community to flourish, we are also contributing to our own individual happinesses? Are we any longer willing to subordinate our private desires to the demands of a public good in the way that Aristotle and Cicero and Rousseau and Tocqueville demanded? The questions beg for our attention.

IV

In addition to an education in enlightened self-interest, Tocqueville pointed to another possible avenue in America for the cultivation of civic virtue: the myriad of private associations that serve us as vehicles for public participation and concern. Indeed, as political scientist Theda Skocpol informs us, as late as the 1960s, Americans by the millions participated in what she calls “voluntary fellowship associations,” which forged solidarity among citizens while they pursued a variety of worthwhile moral undertakings. The years since the ‘60s have witnessed, in fact, a dramatic increase in the sheer number of national associations in this country, from some 6,000 in 1960 to over 23,000 today.^{vii} The increase includes expanding numbers of groups devoted to social welfare, civil rights, and public interest concerns. That would seem to be good news.

The bad news, however, is that in the same 40-year period American associational life has, in Skocpol’s words, “shifted away from popularly rooted membership associations and toward professionally managed organizations, many with no members or chapters at all.” She cautions us that while we may be pleased with advances in social rights and citizen advocacy since the 1960s---and goodness knows we have a lot to be pleased about---“more *voices*,” as she puts it, “are not the same thing as increased democratic capacity.”

This is because we have also experienced, in her words, “dwindling avenues for participation.” Throughout much of our past, Skocpol writes, these “traditional fellowship federations have been...mechanisms for widely distributing civic skill and motivation.... As they cycled millions of Americans through official responsibilities, classic voluntary federations taught people how to run meetings, handle moneys, keep

records, and participate in group discussions. So many officers and activists were required that there were plenty of opportunities for people from blue-collar and lower-level white-collar occupations. Local activists, furthermore, got on leadership ladders that could lead to responsibilities at district, state and national levels.” These groups also conveyed politically relevant knowledge and motivation, stressing people’s value as “citizens.”

Today’s associations, by contrast, are for the most part professionally run by elites at the top. Because these groups depend on wealthy patrons, foundation grants, and computerized mailings to meet their ever-expanding financial needs, the leaders have little incentive to recruit an active mass membership and no desire to share leadership and control with state or local branches. The target of attention of these groups, increasingly, are the well-educated and the economically privileged. Those less affluent have fewer associational opportunities to further their values and interests. Skocpol finds that much of today’s civic life has “inadvertently become more oligarchic..., stressing expertise, management from centralized offices, and elites who *speak for* citizens rather than *speaking with* them.”

The mass voluntary associations of the past were not only more broadly based but they pursued a broader array of interests. People joined not only to follow political or social agendas but for reasons of sociability, or cultural expression, or even recreation. Yet they would end up absorbing skills and knowledge that could be relevant in political activities and community projects.

Traditional voluntary fellowship associations tended, furthermore, to emphasize the values of citizenship and community service, so that their decline today means there is less potential for social inclusion or for finding common ground across class or racial or gender divides. Whatever they have achieved---and we must acknowledge that the achievements are extensive---Skocpol warns that single-issue advocacy group tactics “may promote further artificial polarization and excessive fragmentation in American public life.”

In his celebrated recent study, *Bowling Alone*, political scientist Robert Putnam refers in a similar vein to the decline of what he calls “social capital” in the United States, by which he means “social networks and the reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them.” He argues that “civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a dense network of reciprocal social relations.”^{viii}

Putnam draws a distinction in *Bowling Alone* between a social capital that is “bonding” and one that is “bridging.” Bonding groups are exclusive; by choice or necessity they are “inward looking,” tending to “reinforce exclusive identities and homogeneous groups. Bridging groups, on the other hand, “are inclusive, outward looking, and encompass people across diverse social cleavages.” “Bonding social capital bolsters our narrower selves, while bridging social capital can generate broader identities and reciprocity. Or as Putnam vividly puts it, “Bonding social capital constitutes a kind of sociological superglue, whereas bridging social capital provides a sociological WD-40.” He argues NOT for one form of social capital over the other---both are important---but he senses a current imbalance that has stressed our differences, that has privatized and polarized us and that threatens our public life.

V

Skocpol's voluntary fellowship associations, Putnam's reciprocal social networks, teach another lesson that we could all profit from in today's political life: the idea of "civility." Civility is a word rooted in the same cluster of Latin derivatives as "citizen." To be civil means to be polite, tactful, obliging, courteous, accommodating. In today's politics, civility has fallen a casualty to fierce partisanship and polarization. Ours has become a politics of increasing rancor, bitterness, even hatred. We can all cite examples. Recall the vitriol poured by Republicans upon Bill Clinton, well before Monica Lewinsky and impeachment. Many conservatives didn't just think of Clinton as their political adversary; he was their enemy. Their hatred was almost instinctual. Today some see a danger of replacing Clinton hatred with Bush hatred---not just a vigorous opposition to his policies---which many Americans with plausibility may oppose---but a visceral loathing of the man.

The decline of civility and the excesses of our political rhetoric abound on all sides; no one has a monopoly on it. Conservative talk radio is on a feeding frenzy; liberals are scurrying to catch up. Few of us believe that George W. Bush's military service is the stuff of legend. But Michael Moore must call him a "deserter." Not to be outdone, Bush surrogates, with astonishing gall, are now impugning John Kerry's patriotism. Recently Secretary of Education Ron Paige referred to the National Education Association as a "terrorist organization." During the primary season Al Gore ranted before an audience hungry for raw meat that President Bush has "betrayed his country." To employ the language of treason is surely unhelpful to the enterprise of reasoned political discourse. And then there is Ann Coulter---our recent and unforgettable convocation speaker---who argues in her book entitled *Treason* that liberals are "either traitors or idiots" who routinely side with the enemy" and "aim to destroy America with their relentless attacks on morality and the truth."

Political scientist Larry Sabato has recently observed: "Twenty years ago there were a lot more TV talk shows with reasonable discussions. Today the only thing that sells is the screamers. Anyone who won't conform to the shouted sound byte format just isn't invited back again."^{ix}

Partisan rancor is notorious these days within the halls of Congress, as well. Members on both sides of the aisle decry the decline in civility in our legislative halls, while often contributing to it. Recently the powerful chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee called out the Capitol police to arrest his Democratic colleagues on the committee for daring to hold a separate caucus down the hall. He later apologized in a tear-stained appearance on the House floor for his "misjudgment."

New York Times columnist David Brooks recently wrote that "for the past few years we have been happily hiving ourselves off into self-congratulatory reinforcement groups." Observing that liberals and conservatives today have different radio networks, different Web sites and different networks of friends, Brooks calls, facetiously, for separate airlines: "Liberal Air, with direct flights between Madison, Berkeley, Ann Arbor and the New School for Social Research; and Right Wing Express, which will have planes with no oxygen masks in case of emergencies, because anybody who can't handle a little asphyxiation doesn't deserve to live."^x

The causes of today's polarized politics are not hard to find. The attacks of 9/11 and the war on terrorism and in Iraq have unsettled our politics and, as is usual in wars, fueled fears of dissent and difference. But we can trace the underlying causes back to the 1960s when major changes began both in our political institutions and in the issues that they confront.

With the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act and the addition of more than a half-million new African-American voters in the South, the shape of the Democratic Party was fundamentally altered. The southern segregationist wing of the party was replaced by a new generation of moderates, so that the electoral interests and policy preferences of southern and northern Democrats converged. The Democratic Party became more homogeneous and internally cohesive. At the same time similar changes were underway in the Republican Party. Beginning with the Goldwater movement of the 60s and extending through Reaganism in the 80s and beyond, the party embraced a more consistently conservative agenda, purging itself of moderates and turning to a new breed of more strident leaders less inclined to compromise their views.

These changes in our two parties, with each becoming more internally cohesive and more consciously partisan---each becoming, in Putnam's terms, more a "bonding" than a "bridging group---coincided with two further developments: the coming of divided government as the norm rather than the exception; and the rise of an array of new "social" issues as the subject matter of partisan contention.

Nine of the ten elections between 1980 and 1998 resulted in divided government, with the presidency in the hands of one party and the Congress controlled by the other. Most Washington watchers agree that this has contributed both to policy gridlock and to a growing frustration, anger, and bitterness in relations between the parties and the branches of government.

The new so-called "social issues" of the 60s and beyond---race relations and affirmative action, gender and gay rights, abortion, drugs, gun control, school prayer---these social issues triggered the "culture wars" which have rarely abated in the 40 years since. These were and remain issues that not only divide us, but inflame us.

With our politics polarized in Washington and our people divided at home---red states vs. blue states--- there is less room for accommodation across the aisle or over the back fence, less scope for the working out of policies that, while not perfect, are such that most of us can live with. Accommodation, after all, is possible only where there is a perceived mutuality of interest. But one cannot compromise with evil! One cannot negotiate with the Devil! Instead, on every issue that divides us, it seems, we must "stand at Armageddon and battle for the Lord!"

VI

The polarized politics that we are enduring today is doing what polarization often does: it is damaging the quality of the debate and it is working against that accommodation of interests---that search for common ground---that is the life blood of an effective pluralist society. Today's political climate threatens to smother reasoned conversations about the pressing public questions of the day. Americans in recent decades have been engaged in what journalist E. J. Dionne has called a "flight from public life." Dionne argues that this is occasioned in large part by the failure of both our

dominant ideologies, liberalism and conservatism, to serve us well. In his view, both liberals and conservatives are framing issues as a series of false dichotomous choices. They must share the blame for a politics that is increasingly seen as irrelevant---or worse--- in most peoples' lives. Since government appears to be little more than a broker of narrow private interests, it is the private interests, not the problems of brokerage, that most command our attention.^{xi} And so we turn with relief to our private lives, reinforced by our rejection of political involvement.

This rejection is affecting our public response to the war in Iraq. We would seem to be, again, divided. But our division, oddly, has not yet resulted in any extensive public debate over the wisdom or conduct of the war. Such a public debate is probably long overdue. Yet there has been surprisingly little public resistance to this war to date. The divide would seem, instead, to be between "the America at war and the America at peace." Peter Beinart in this week's issue of *The New Republic* reminds us that for the troops---regulars, reservists, and National Guard---and their families the strains of this war are immense. But for the rest of us, we civilians, there has been virtually no strain at all. Taxes are low, domestic public spending is up, and with the exception of longer lines at airports and higher fuel prices for our two-ton gas-guzzlers, it is "business as usual."

Beinart writes of "two countries"---the military and the rest of American society---with the gulf between them wider than it has been for nearly a century. And that divide reveals, in his words, "an ugly---and growing---class skew." Racial minorities, who made up about a fourth of the Vietnam-era military, today are approaching 40 percent. Beinart cites a RAND study that finds that "one of the best predictors of whether a high school senior will enlist in the military is the unemployment rate in his or her county." And as to the leadership? For a long time the professional officer class has been leavened by additions from the Reserve Officer Training Corps, so-called "citizen officers." This month the Ivy League universities will graduate a total of 24 Army R. O. T. C. students, while the historically black colleges will graduate over ten times that number. This is a war ordered by an educated and affluent political elite, most with little or no military experience, to be fought by "those others," while the rest of us look on, disturbed on occasion by the nightly casualty lists and stories of brutality, but with little more real engagement than we would feel in watching a TV "reality" show.

One of the first obligations of the citizen is the defense of one's "city." Whether that defense leads one to take up arms or to oppose a war policy that is itself endangering the security of that city, true citizens "take care of their city" in times of sickness as well as health.^{xii}

On this, as on so many pressing issues that face us, we must, in Rousseau's words quoted earlier, "hasten to the assemblies." We citizens have a duty to speak and to act. We must reclaim our commonwealth. In a larger sense, we must try to answer positively Tocqueville's question: Can a people so devoted to private pursuits accept the obligation to pursue a public life that may well demand sacrifices of personal gratification? The view that the good life is the private life leads us to forget that the good private life rests---it must rest ultimately---upon healthy public institutions. To ignore that fact leads us to what John Kenneth Galbraith once called a land of private affluence and public squalor.

To reverse these trends we need, in Putnam's words, to widen once again "our awareness of the many ways in which our fates are linked." Or as former senator Bill Bradley put it, "The language of mutual obligation has to be given equal time with the

language of rights.”^{xiii} We must be prepared to sacrifice a portion of our time and treasure to the welfare of the political community. We need to seek that common ground. We must, in short, think and act as citizens. Steve Heiny said it on this occasion just two years ago: “the city still needs saving!”

So, “what does it matter to me?” And what should it matter to you? I hope I’ve given you some ideas from which to hesitate an answer.

Bless you all---and keep in touch!

ⁱ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract* (ed. Maurice Cranston), (1968), p. 141.

ⁱⁱ See, for example, Christopher Lasch, *The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy* (1995); Robert N. Bellah, et al., *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (1996); Paul R. Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb* (1968), among many others); Gertrude Himmelfarb, *One Nation, Two Cultures* (1999); Robert H. Bork, *Slouching Towards Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline* (1996); Jacques Barzun, *From Dawn to Decadence: 500 Years of Western Cultural Life: 1500 to the Present* (2000). For an extended discussion of “Jeremiads” in modern discourse, see Richard A. Posner, *Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline*, 2003.

ⁱⁱⁱ Aristotle, *The Politics*, Book III (ed. Karnes Lord) (1984); Jill Frank, “Citizenship, Slaves and Foreigners: Aristotle on Human Nature,” in *American Political Science Review*, v. 98, no. 1 (2004), pp. 93-94.

^{iv} Cicero, *On the Commonwealth* (ed. George Sabine & Stanley B. Smith) (1929).

^v Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* (ed. Martin Ostwald) (1962).

^{vi} Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (ed. J. P. Mayer) (1969).

^{vii} The findings and insights of Skocpol are taken from Theda Skocpol, “Voice and Inequality: The Transformation of American Civic Democracy,” in *Perspectives on Politics*, v. 2, no. 1 (March 2004), pp. 4-14.

^{viii} The insights of Putnam are from Robert Putnam, *Bowling Alone* (2000).

^{ix} Larry J. Sabato, *Feeding Frenzy: Attack Journalism and American Politics* (2000).

^x David Brooks, “Fly the Partisan Skies,” *The New York Times*, April 8, 2004.

^{xi} E. J. Dionne, Jr., *Why Americans Hate Politics* (1992).

^{xii} Peter Beinart (TRB), “Two Countries,” *The New Republic*, May 10, 2004, 6.

^{xiii} Quoted in David Price, *The Congressional Experience*, 2nd ed. 2000.