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ABSTRACT

Numerous studies have been conducted on the spiral of silence since Noelle-Neumann formulated the theory a quarter of a century ago. As a whole, these studies draw upon different conceptualizations, employ inconsistent operationalization, and give short shrift to important macroscopic variables. Such inconsistencies potentially account for substantial proportions of the variance in spiral of silence effects. This paper examines these three areas in greater detail. First, we review key assumptions and theoretical statements of the spiral of silence. Second, we examine how these conceptual issues translate into operational ones. Finally, we outline areas that have remained largely unexplored over the last years. Specifically, we contend that spiral of silence studies in different cultures have failed to take into account culture-specific variables that may mitigate the importance of opinion perceptions as predictors of individual behavior or attitudes. In other words, cross-cultural differences are key factors in predicting speaking out, the key dependent variable in spiral of silence research. As a result, we call for the return to a more macroscopic focus in spiral of silence research. When Noelle-Neumann formulated the spiral of silence theory, she in essence posited that an individual's willingness to express his or her opinion was a function of how he or she perceived public opinion. After all, individuals' ideas, attitudes, and behaviors are often influenced by their perception of what others do or think.
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Introduction

Noted: 'These cognitive attributions may be widespread, firmly held and provide common understanding, but their accuracy is not to be assumed. 'Researchers have examined individual perceptions of public opinion and their impact on political behaviors and attitudes, and some have concluded that ‘the spiral of silence is the only theory of public opinion possessing the attributes of depth, range, and to more limited extent, accuracy’ (Since its inception a quarter of a century ago, the spiral of silence has generated considerable empirical research with inconsistent findings, leading Glynn, Hayes, and Shanahan to examine the key relationship between perceptions of majority opinion and an individual’s willingness to express his or her opinion. Their meta-analysis of over empirical studies revealed a small but significant effect.

Contradictory results and the inconsistently strong findings across spiral of silence studies have their origin in a number of sources: conceptual problems, e.g. inconsistencies in how key concepts in the spiral of silence are explicated; problems regarding the measurement of key variables in the process; and varying levels of attention paid to testing important macroscopic variables.

This paper examines all three areas in greater detail, looking back over the history of spiral of silence research. First, we review key assumptions and theoretical statements of the spiral of silence, grounding the theory in public opinion and situating it in the more general framework of theories on opinion perceptions. Based on this framework, we address problematic assumptions and theoretical statements in spiral of silence research. Second, we examine how these conceptual issues translate into concrete operational ones. Finally, we outline areas left largely unexplored by previous research on the spiral of silence.

Specifically, we address a concern raised by McLeod and Bulmer who argued for a more macroscopic focus in communication sciences that will enable researchers to make cross-cultural comparisons. While we argue that inconsistent findings across studies in different cultures (for an overview, see Glynn et al. stem from the inapplicability of a given measure in different cultures or general operational differences among studies, cross-cultural research suggests that cultures differ in their socially shared meanings, norms of
interpersonal relationships, and conflict resolution. Hence, the question for spiral of silence research becomes: to what degree can cultural specific variables offset or increase the importance of opinion perceptions as predictors of individual behavior or attitudes? As a result, we call for a return to a more macroscopic focus in spiral of silence research.

But in Islamic & Asian population this opinion is not to this model and I research about it.

Materials and Methods

DEFINING PUBLIC OPINION AND its ROLE
IN SOCIAL CONTROL

Against a backdrop of philosophers and researchers grappling with the task of defining public opinion (see Davison 1968 for an overview), Noelle-Neumann (1995) differentiates two concepts of public opinion: (1) public opinion as rationality, which makes it 'instrumental in the process of opinion formation and decision making in a democracy'; and (2) public opinion as social control, where 'its role is to promote social integration and to ensure that there is a sufficient level of consensus on which actions and decisions may be based'[48].

It is, however, the model of public opinion as social control [9], that underlies the spiral of silence theory. Because successful social systems 'must have ways to institutionalize consensus' [14], they threaten individuals with social isolation in order to ensure these necessary levels of cohesion [50]. At the same time, individuals constantly scan their environment for present and future distributions of public opinion 'in order to see which opinions and modes will win the approval of society and which will lead to their isolation'[51].

Public opinion as social control is thus defined as opinions that can be expressed without risking sanctions or social isolation, or opinions that have to be expressed in order to avoid isolation [49].

ATTENTION: THE SPIRAL OF SILENCE AS A
THEORY OF SOCIAL PERCEPTION

With an emphasis on the formation, functions and effects of public opinion, the spiral of silence presents an approach that integrates what some consider a fractured concept of public opinion and offers the possibility to test it empirically (Salmon and Kline 1985, p. 3). This section outlines the assumptions and key theoretical statements of the spiral of silence, and evaluates conceptual issues that have arisen since the theory was introduced.

Assumptions:

The assumptions of the spiral of silence can be outlined in the form of five major hypotheses [51]:

1. Threat of Isolation: 'In the social collective cohesion must be constantly ensured

2. Fear of Isolation: The formation of individual opinion and action is characterized by individuals' fear of becoming 'social isolates' [66]. This second assumption of the spiral of silence derives from experimental studies on conformity. Social conformity can be either informational social influence, reflected in individuals accepting information from others as evidence about reality, or normative societal influence, in which individuals 'conform to the . . . expectations of others' [22].

3. Quasi statistical Sense: As a result of fear of isolation, individuals constantly monitor their environment to check on the distribution of opinions as well as the future trend of opinion. Such monitoring can involve attending to media coverage of an issue, direct observation of one's environment, or interpersonal discussion of issues.

The quasi statistical sense is probably the most widely misinterpreted concept in the spiral of silence. Critics have challenged the notion that a quasi-statistical perception of the climate of opinion is usually accurate. For example, some have suggested that 'Noelle-Neumann's model predicts the complete accuracy of a respondent's perception of majority opinion' [46]; see also Salmon and Kline 1985, Neuwirth and Ilundain 1984) and therefore cannot account for phenomena such as pluralistic ignorance or the looking glass perception. A Salwen, Lin, and Matera (1994) point out, however, the hypothesis focuses on people's perceptions of the climate of opinion, rather than a real climate of opinion' [65].

4. Misperceptions of public opinion like pluralistic ignorance or the looking glass perception are an integral part of the spiral of silence theory with respect to phenomena like the dual climate of opinion [56]. i.e. the misrepresentation of public opinion in mass media. However, Glynn et al.'s (1996) meta-analysis identified a relatively large number of 'researchers [who] fail to operationalize perceived congruency as such, instead focusing on 'objective' congruency'[33].

4. Willingness to Speak Out and Tendency to Remain Silent: Individuals tend to publicly express
their opinions and attitudes when they perceive their view to be dominant or on the rise. In contrast, when people sense their view is in the minority or on the decline, they become cautious and silent.

5 Spiral of Silence: The interaction of these four factors leads to a process of formation, change and reinforcement of public opinion. Over time, changing perceptions of the opinion climate influence people's willingness to express minority opinions and establish one opinion as the predominant one. Public opinion is transformed from a morally loaded issue to an issue of norm or dogma [57].

Willingness to Speak Out:

Criticism of the spiral of silence as a macro theory has mainly focused on three areas [21]. First, researchers have questioned whether fear of isolation adequately and sufficiently explains one's willingness to speak out in experimental and survey designs [27]. Others have suggested factors other than fear of isolation that potentially influence people's willingness to speak out [41]. Second, studies examining the spiral of silence empirically have criticized Asch's (1955, 1965) and Milgram's (1961) conformity experiments as providing an adequate basis for the spiral of silence theory. Third, researchers have suggested that cues about opinion distribution may come from sources other than the national climate of opinion [27].

Results and Discussions

Speaking Out As The Key Variable:

In order to specify the effective factors in the formation of silence spiral, before an opinion develops about a subject, people exchange ideas with their fellows to define and describe how the silence spiral is formed, produced, or how opinions in most cases change.

The primary groups, such as family members, office co-workers, and friends definitely have an impact on shaping one's personal opinion; in other words, the formation of ideas does not take place in a vacuum; interpersonal relationships create some networks which contribute to this process. Interactions not only shape public ideas, but also shape the personal ideas, and therefore ideas are the result of some argumentative activity; and this gives a social dimension to this process.

Various operationalization of public opinion expression on controversial issues

Have been suggested [27]. Generally, public expression has been operationalized by some measure of the respondent's willingness to express his or her opinion in a hypothetical situation. A valid measure, however, needs to take into account at least six factors.

1 Cross national differences: major problems have emerged in comparative studies due to the inapplicability of empirical tests of willingness to speak out in different cultural settings [56][43]. Therefore operationalizations have to be developed which can be applied across cultures.

2 Public exposures: Taylor (1982) uses a measure of willingness to donate money for a group that supports one's own position as an indicator of public outspokenness. Financial contributions, however, lack the public element that produces conformity. In other words, public opinion needs to be operationalized as 'the tribunal at which judgment is passed' [57].

3 Anonymous public: even if a public element is included in the measures of public opinion expression, tests might neglect the anonymous character of the public. Glynn and McLeod (1984), for example, operationalized public as 'a social gathering of people you know' (p. 734). Salmon and Rucinski (1988, p. 9) used a hypothetical conversation 'with a group of friends' to operationalize public. Essentially private situations, however, i.e. outspokenness in the family or with friends, are not suited for empirical tests of the concept 'for it is the willingness to speak out in public (coram publico) which is important to the process of public opinion' [45].

4 Size of the public: when operationalizing outspokenness, experimental designs or hypothetical questions in surveys should be chosen in which the size of the public is kept constant and as small as possible. According to Noelle-Neumann (1994), 'the larger the public, the more personal characteristics--security, self-confidence, practice in speaking, education, role--will influence responses, independently of the climate of opinion' (p. 111).

5 Survey data: criticisms of the weak external validity of most conformity experiments make survey data the appropriate method for data collection for evaluating the willingness to speak out.

6 Moral loading: the issue under study has to be a controversial one with a clearly identifiable moral aspect attached to it.

The Differences in the formation of Silence Spiral between Eastern societies (Islamic and Asian) and Western Societies

A question that has remained virtually unanswered concerns whether the spiral of silence is a universal, cross cultural phenomenon. Salmon and Kline (1985) suggest that as a macro theory, the spiral of silence should be applicable across national boundaries. Indeed, the theory has been tested in a number of countries including Germany [55], Japan [39], Korea [84], and the USA [67]. In their meta-analysis of over 20 published and unpublished studies from six countries, Glynn et al. (1997) found small but significant effects of perceived congruency...
between own and perceived public opinion on people's willingness to express their opinion on controversial issues. Their meta-analysis, however, is plagued by the same problems of commensurability confronting cross national comparisons of spiral of silence research. Genuine comparability, of course, 'can be achieved only by the application of some carbon copy like process' [37]. Comparisons require that one key variable be reasonably similar with respect to how it is conceptualized and operationalized: the hypothetical situation commonly used to measure respondents' willingness to speak out.

As noted earlier, willingness to speak out has been measured in a number of ways, posing threats even to the comparability of studies within a single country or culture. Even more confusing is a finding reported by Donsbach and Stevenson (1984) who found that the same indicators for people's willingness to speak out might not be equally appropriate across different cultures. They conclude that 'the problem continues to exist of adapting the `public situation' and the `readiness to speak up' to the cultural and social conditions in a society' [23].

Research suggests that beyond the more methodological problem of finding appropriate indicators for concepts in a given culture, there is a substantial difference in personality traits for people living in different cultures. The concept 'culture', and differences between cultures, are hard to grasp and even more difficult to operationalize [72] Cushman and Sanderson King (1985) define culture in terms very similar to symbolic interactionism, in which an important aspect of culture is a 'symbolically integrated framework that regulates social interaction' [72].

Cultures differ 'in the extent to which cooperation, competition, or individualism are emphasized' [72]. The concept of individualism seems to be a key variable in differentiating social behavior, particularly communicatory behavior, across cultures [34]. Ting Toomey (1988) distinguishes between 'individualistic, low context cultures and collectivistic, high context cultures' [34]. Countries like Australia, Germany, or the USA can be considered individualistic cultures, while Asian countries exemplify collectivistic cultures.

In individualistic cultures, the consistency between private self-image and public self-image is of utmost importance [69] In other words, one has to be true to him or herself. As a result, 'members of individualistic cultures tend to stress the value of straight talk and tend to verbalize overtly their individual wants and needs' [74] What other people think of them is of only marginal importance to individuals in individualistic cultures (Ito 1993). It seems, however, that the idea of individualism is limited to certain cultures. Moscovici (1985) writes: 'To the best of my knowledge, it was the West, and the West alone, that produced and refined the concept of humanity as autonomous, rational, self-directed individuals' [44].

In contrast, the 'self' collectivistic culture is situationally based and depends heavily on the social environment at the time the social interaction takes place. Weaning (1985) suggests that this is partly a function of a widespread Confucian School of thought in Asian countries that 'has undermined the autonomy of the individual self' [75]. Consequently, individuals in collectivistic cultures display 'discretion in voicing . . . opinions and feelings' [74]. Hui and Triandis (1986) summarize what can be called the 'collectivist personality'.

Collectivists are more likely to pay more attention to the influencing agent than are individualists. As a result, collectivists are more conforming than individualists.

It may be safe to say that the former are more willing to go along with the group, to avoid being rejected [38].

This distinction between individualism and collectivism is highly relevant for future spiral of silence research. If it is indeed possible to identify personality characteristics common to citizens of a given culture, these characteristics might prove to be important long term predictors of people's willingness to speak out beyond more temporally bound perceptions of opinion climates.

In order to answer this question, the distinction between individualism and collectivism at the socio cultural level must be translated into equivalents at the psychological level: allocentrism and idiosyncrasy, respectively [73]. However, this dichotomy might need to be refined for cross cultural comparisons. In examining conflict styles in the USA, Yugoslavia, and Japan, Cushman and Sanderson King (1985) concluded that different cultures 'develop their own myths, rituals, and social dramas for conflict resolution' (Cushman and Sanderson King 1985, p. 117). They identified distinctively different patterns of conflict resolution for the three cultures: the Japanese manifested a pattern of collaboration, based on their 'strong respect for hierarchy [and] homogenous values' [15] the USA showed a pattern of competition, based on a strong sense of individual freedom and achievement; and Yugoslavia as a culture was characterized by a climate of compromise, which may stem from the ethnic diversity created somewhat artificially this century.

Cushman and Sanderson King's (1985) scheme, however, lacks the abstraction that makes it useful as a general classification scheme for types of cultures based on the collectivism individualism continuum. Moreover, at the psychological level, it does not allow us to determine the levels of all centrism or idiom centrist that might be important factors in predicting people's willingness to speak out.

More directly applicable approaches may be adapted from Rahim's (1983) work on interpersonal...
conflict styles and Putnam and Wilson's (1982) research on communicative strategies in organizational conflicts. By classifying respondents along their concern for themselves and for others, Rahim generated five different conflict styles: integrating (high concern for self and others), dominating (high concern for self and low concern for others), obliging (low concern for self and high concern for others), avoiding (low concern for self and others), and compromising as a middle category. Based on a similar reasoning, Putnam and Wilson (1982) suggested a dichotomous scale that orders respondents and their conflict resolution strategies hierarchically. Their scale can be used as a measure of all centrism vs. idiom centrism and, at the same time, explain the phenomenon of Avant grades or hard cores, or those respondents whose willingness to speak out seems mostly unaffected by their perceptions of the climate of opinion.

Putnam and Wilson (1982) suggested the following three dimensions of conflict styles:

1. No confrontation: indirect strategies for handling a conflict; choices are to avoid or withdraw from a disagreement; communication behaviors include silence, glossing over differences, and concealing ill feelings.

2. Solution orientation: direct communication about the conflict; behaviors that aim to find a solution, to integrate the needs of both parties, and to give in or compromise on issues.

3. Control: direct communication about the disagreement; arguing persistently for one's position, taking control of the interaction, and advocating one's position.

These scales may be used to identify persons who presumably react more or less strongly to social pressure, and can be employed in internationally comparative research to identify societies that have a particularly pronounced desire for consensus. Accordingly, the mechanisms of speaking out and falling silent described within the framework of the spiral of silence ought to be clearly evident in these societies.

Conclusion: arguing for a return to a:

Macro focus in spiral of silence research in eastern societies:

A stronger focus of macroscopic variables and a stronger emphasis on cross-cultural research has the potential to promote theory building in this area.

Putnam and Wilson's (1982) scale of conflict dimensions, for example, was not designed to tap cross cultural differences. If applied to spiral of silence research in a cross cultural setting, however, it might be useful in three areas.

First, measures of conflict styles can serve as measures of a phenomenon that Noelle-Neumann calls hardcore or Avant grades, tapping the degree to which individuals are susceptible to perceptions of opinion climates. In other words, are some people more concerned about themselves than about others, or vice versa, and are there personality characteristics that make some more likely to express their opinions, independent of their perceptions of their environment?

Previous research has treated the concepts of 'hardcore' or 'avant-gardes' as assumptions rather than variables. We strongly argue for including measures of these concepts in future empirical research on the spiral of silence.

Second and closely related, this measure might serve as a measure of fear of isolation. As we mentioned earlier, Glynn and McLeod (1985) suggested that fear of isolation should be treated as a variable rather than an assumption.

So far, research has widely ignored this suggestion:

Third, and finally, a measurement of conflict styles could serve as a control for cross cultural comparisons. If cultures truly differ with respect to how individuals handle conflict and deal with public pressure, this variable is crucial in revealing these cultural differences and providing further insights into the process of the spiral of silence.

Therefore, the formation of silence Spiral in its confirmed examples has mainly occurred in western countries. But, in Islamic and Asian societies, where the attitudes and thoughts based on spirituality basically dominate the society, the recourse to metaphysics or spirituality in various religions of this regions from Islamic and Christianity, Jewish to Buddhism, Hinduism …all are concerned with turning to the spiritual, divine world which prevents their views from being affected by the influential media.

That is why in eastern societies, as opposed to the west (who are to base to pragmatism and lost real & trust) the primary groups such as family, colleagues, friends and relatives have a more active role in social life, and the media have a lesser influence on changing people’s ideas. In Islamic societies also numerous recommendations of Islam regarding social interactions, visiting relatives, and the rights of relatives and neighbors lead to the growth of people's social relationships, thus reducing the influence of the media.

Another point is the prejudices that have deeply taken root in the individual and secure him in facing with any wind of new information. These prejudices have an intertwined relationship with molded thoughts. It is more correct to say that prejudices emerge through the molded thoughts.

People's silence against the majority-opinion which is expressed by the media, is a difficult issue if it does not correspond to the molded thoughts which lie in the individual's unconscious. People unconsciously insist on the molded thoughts and
prejudices which derive from values, beliefs, and faith in their religious teachings, and do not easily replace them with the opinion imposed upon them by the media.

However, one should bear in mind that the media play the major role in the culture of society, and they play this role not only by reflecting the culture, but also through participation in cultural formation. The role of the media is complex.

On the one hand: they are part of the processes from which culture is derived and formed, and on the other, they play a role on a stage where the social and cultural life permeates it. Media have the major role in shaping the structure of different issues for the perceptive public.

Many scientists believe that ideas are not invented, rather, they are discovered, and that is, they turn into a new form. With respect to the human being, it should be muted that imitation is the constitutive principle of human communities, and that an individual often imitates another individual, because he is also imitated by the others. New opinions are communicated though the social movement of imitation.

We know that an individual in a group acts in a way that is different from the way he acts when alone. Studies indicate that even if an individual be acts logically and his behavior is always rational, and thinks and understands something before he acts; and does not accept other people's opinions until he considers their advantages and disadvantages, he, however, when comes among his close relatives, he forgets about logical thinking.

In All port's view, fearing other's bad a judgment causes this state, because we know that a group never forgives those who try to disrupt the unity in it.

When judgment is concerned with the analysis of public thoughts, one of the majorities; Tocqueville has called this rule "despotism of the majority". He argues that the rule of the majority, which is so important to democracy, is a pressure for conforming to the rules: The foundation of the moral emperor of the majority of the majority should be preferred to the interests of the minority should be preferred to the interests of the minority.

Indeed, such an approach is more common in western societies ethics are based on liberal democracy, pragmatism, in that in most eastern societies what constitutes the main center of the political systems and social mores is spirituality /god/ divine religions and the holy books, and what has mostly been stressed in them is the latent intention and though of people in their deeds, in contrast to the media which express the reality of the events, but in an aura of falsehood.

Heavenly, divine religions have all recommended the necessity of people's autonomy in their thoughts even when they disagree with other people.

The influence of the media in general, and the development of the silence spiral depend to a large extent on the cultural and native grounds of the society which is influenced by the media. Even Noel Newman himself also makes it clear that the thorough study of the public thought should also deal with the atmosphere in which the opinion is created. This would be possible by asking people questions, not only about their own opinions, but also about what they think of others' opinions and of the political status, and of how they predict its development in the future.

In western societies, the media have turned into took that provide information and recreation.

Investigations show that people also consider the media as the primary sources of information. The inhabitants of western societies are the citizens of a world which the media have constructed for their existence and for the expansion of the scope of Business, and their rule and power. That is to say, people who have become fascinated with the virtual world constructed by technologies, and in a sense owe their lives to technology, worship the media and whatever they consider as the majority, see it as conforming to the rule of the majority, and destroy their opinions in an aura of fear of isolation. It is clear that in Asian/Eastern/Islamic societies, people have always been cynical of technology, and have always sought to avoid it, to the extent that they considered the use of the new means of technology as a kind of national, religious aberration.

In such circumstances, the change of opinion or imitating the media, which are latest communicative technology of the contemporary world, would not be appropriate. Multi-faceted ignorance is concerned with a situation in which the mass of people are ignorant of their agreement (implied) about a subject. In this case if people (wrongly) assume that there is no disagreement, this assumption might keep them from revealing their real opinions. In these circumstances, publicity for the opinion of the ruling minority, in a surprising way is understood by the public, and creates the assumption that people will quickly join this new opinion. In other words, here we are dealing with a situation in which people apparently (social actors) inhabit a "false" social world or at least a world totally different from the real worlds which the researchers have scientifically observed.

In this theory, the social-professional position, age and sex are effective in shaping the public thought, but have no influence on personal opinions. This means that it does not change the influence of the individual's thoughts (who does not change his opinion), but it influences his awareness of whether or not he has a place in public thought. A person who sees that his opinion differs from that which is presented in the media, leaves the public space, and turns to private space.
Individual differences, and social-cultural dependence also play a role in this difference, but these factors finally depend on the extent to which they are used.

Another point which is worth noting is that during the researches done on the human brain, experts have discovered the relationship between emotions and the partial stimulation of brain in different times during different events. The cerebral cortex is in the last, outer layer of the brain which is the farthest from the center of the brain. Numerous which take place and the messages the individual receives, first enter the central part of the brain, and then if they need logical analysis, they are conveyed to the outer parts.

In the process of the development of silence spiral, it would be interesting that because people are influenced by the false space of the media, first the message of the media as to the warning about the isolation in the case of expressing the opposite opinion that of the media, enters the central parts of the brain, forcing the individual to conform to the media. This event causes the individual to helplessly and unintentionally accept the opinion of the media without doing any kind of logical analysis and thinking about the opinion of the media, and he preferably chooses the easiest way possible when facing the opinion of the media, i.e., Silence. However, according to the previously mentioned researches, data are gradually transferred from the emotional part (brain center) to the logical part (near cortex), and by doing a rational analysis they realize the falsehood of the media and find out that their opinion is not minority and that their silence is not right in necessary times.

In this way the individual regrets remaining silent and being influenced by the media.

Conclusion:

We have not forgotten the proverb in our ancient Persian literature which says when in Rome, do as the Romans do, and we believe that for preserving the unity of the society in times of expediency, silence is a logical and appropriate solution which people should adopt by taking into account the expediencies of time and place when facing the social issues, and then they should adopt silence or express their opposite opinions.

Cultural factors of various societies have a decisive role in the conformity of these societies to mass media /the elite and leading thinkers/ dictatorial and hegemonic governments / foreign colonizers / adherence and commitment to divide religions etc.

What is crucial in the influence of people's attitudes on their fellows in the society, and in the change of their opinions and or their silences against them, is the role of the social structure. If the social structure of the people is founded on the basis of spirituality and faith, and if family has a pivotal role in the social life of people, and the cultural background does not worship technology, as the western culture does, and escaping from technology is regarded as value, and if people are not proud of their citizenship in the reconstructed virtual world through the media, and do not compete with one another over it ... and if the other numerous conditions are consolidated on the basis of an absolute, spiritual power, them silence is the last choice people make when they encounter the opinion of the majority.

The supreme human values compel their believers to act in many circumstances. For instance, when a seemingly powerful tyrant oppresses a helpless person, and the individual who adheres to there supreme values cannot practically an stage a rally, and before the cameras of the correspondents of the international media justifies his cry in such a way that least he can do when facing the tyranny of the powerful majority over the week minority is that we should not be silent. In divine teachings there has always been some hope that someday will come when the majority of believers in God and truth will replace the minority of the unbelievers and falsehood.

And in the arena of communications also scientists always prevent the minority from remaining silent out of fear, when they see the opinions of the minority as profoundly true.

As Stoetzel points out, we should always bear in mind that "the today minority is capable of being the tomorrow majority, because there is change in opinions, just as there are social changes."
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