

---

## UNIT 12 ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE

---

### Structure

- 12.1 Introduction
- 12.2 On Democracy, Revolution and the Modern State
- 12.3 Religion
- 12.4 Women and Family
- 12.5 Conclusion
- 12.6 Summary
- 12.7 Exercises

---

### 12.1 INTRODUCTION

---

Sheldon Wolin has pointed out that *The Federalist Papers* (1787-88) and *Democracy in America* (1835) are the two classics in American political theory. While the former represents the thinking of the founding fathers of the American Republic, the latter "is invoked more often in support of some interpretation of present day American politics" (Wolin 2001: 3). The author of *Democracy in America*, Charles-Alexis Henri Clerel de Tocqueville (1805-59) was one of the most imaginative French political theorists, sociologist and a historian of the 19th Century. His writings reflected the concerns of a historian, a political scientist and a sociologist making it difficult to categorise these. Tocqueville was concerned with the future of the democratic society and was conscious of the tumultuous social changes that his times produced and the impact it had. He understood democracy as an unstoppable march towards equality in all its dimensions—legal, political, social and economic.

Tocqueville along with his friend Gustave de Beaumont (1802-65) visited America in 1831 to study its democratic institutions and draw lessons for France and penned them down in two volumes entitled *Democracy in America*. He analysed the federal constitution, the question of people's sovereignty, the role of the constitution and warned about the tyranny of the majority, a theme, that John Stuart Mill (1806-73) subsequently developed. He could grasp the new and universal trend, namely the desire for equality and its intricate relationship with individual liberty and democracy. He stressed on the importance of local self-government, decentralised administration, widespread ownership of property and voluntary associations for maintenance of political liberties, stability of government and protection against the tyranny of the majority. Like Charles-Louis de Secondat Montesquieu (1689-1755) he admired English political institutions and the English aristocracy. Unlike France, the English aristocracy constantly renewed itself and was in a position to wield its authority through proper exercise of political experience and wisdom. He could perceive the momentous changes sweeping his time, which was why he described it as the end of an era and a beginning of a new one. Both Montesquieu and Tocqueville dissected the merits and demerits of the different forms of governments not in an abstract timeless sense but in its historical, political and social contexts.

Tocqueville, according to J.S. Mill was the first to write about democracy and its actual functioning in the belief that it could become a viable political system. An aristocrat, Tocqueville became a liberal while studying and writing about American democracy. He considered freedom or liberty as the core political value, which stood threatened by the lethal combination of political democracy and social equality (Wolin 2001:8). *Democracy in America* is considered

as the "best ever written work on democracy and the best book ever written on America" (Mansfield and Winthrop 2000: xvii). Tocqueville considered America to be at the forefront of a 'great democratic revolution' and that it would bring to Europe 'an almost complete equality of condition' like the one that existed in the New World. His aim was to describe the impact of democratic social conditions not only on politics but also 'on civil society, on habits, ideas, and mores'. He did not think it was necessary for Europe to imitate American political institutions but stressed that the study of America would yield instruction from which Europe could gain.

An analysis of the writings of Tocqueville does not allow us to simply conclude that he was an aristocratic reactionary. Curtis (1961) labelled him as an aristocratic conservative, while Kirk (1960) regarded him as a liberal conservative in the same tradition as Edmund Burke (1729-97). In Tocqueville's writings one finds both liberal and conservative dimensions. His passion for freedom and its protection and the desire to protect property rights represent the liberal tendencies. As a conservative he was the first to caution against the dangers about too much of democracy.

---

## 12.2 ON DEMOCRACY, REVOLUTION AND THE MODERN STATE

---

Tocqueville accepted that there have been healthy aristocracies. But the French landed nobility was undermined by the policies of the absolutist monarchs who had centralised the government apparatus and excluded the old aristocracy from provincial administration. The aristocracy had its privileges but without any link between duty and privileges. Tocqueville regarded the link of interdependence and obligation between social groups as of crucial significance. He often compared the French nobility with their counterpart in England and praised the latter's modest and low key profile which allowed their continued participation in local administration and politics throughout the 19th Century. Tocqueville was equally critical of the Irish aristocracy, generally absentee landlords who remained unconcerned about the plight of their tenants. He concluded that an aristocracy once dislodged could never be restored.

Though Tocqueville disliked revolutions yet he offered a balanced view. He conceded that "while one great revolution may establish liberty in a country, several revolutions in succession make orderly liberty impossible there for a long time" (Tocqueville 1955: 72). He disliked the reign of terror and despotism of the French Revolution. Our Economists had a vast contempt for the past. "The nation has been governed" Letronne declared, "on wrong lines altogether; one has the impression that everything was left to chance". Starting out from this premise, they set to work and there was no French institution, however venerable and well founded, for whose immediate suppression they did not clamour if it hampered them to even the slightest extent or did not fit in with their neatly ordered scheme of government.

When we closely study the French Revolution we find that it was conducted in precisely the same spirit as that which gave rise to so many books expounding theories of government in the abstract. Our revolutionaries had the same fondness for broad generalisations, cut-and-dried legislative systems, and a pedantic symmetry; the same contempt for hard facts; the same taste for reshaping institutions on novel, ingenious, original lines; the same desire to reconstruct the entire system instead of trying to rectify its faulty parts (Tocqueville 1955: 159, 147). He did not, like Burke criticise the French Revolution in its totality for he approved of its commitment to freedom and equality. But what he disapproved was the subsequent stress on extreme equality that undermined liberty and human greatness.

Though he proclaimed himself to be an aristocrat by instinct, one which despised and feared the masses he was prepared to accept the defeat of his class as inevitable. He described his age as a new one characterised by a desire for equality, a movement that was ardent, insatiable, incessant and invincible. America for him symbolised this new universal trend. He was worried that this passion for equality would lead to uniformity, which would eventually destroy liberty. The power of public opinion led to conformity rather than individuality, mediocrity rather than excellence, materialism rather than spiritualism.

Tocqueville took note of the widespread respect for the rule of law in America whereas in France arbitrary rule had only encouraged contempt for the law. In America and England local self-governing institutions were strong whereas in France the sale of municipal offices by the Crown had weakened the tradition. In America people naturally formed associations and groups whereas in France, individualism and reliance on omniscience of central government were much stronger. In America there was no fear from an elected chief executive since the constitution not only limited the powers of the government but also had an elaborate mechanism of checks and balance to counter any excess. In France, by contrast, the long established tradition of centralised administrative power and a weak legislature made the elected president at the head of the executive a threat to liberty.

As a sociologist Tocqueville took interest in the ethos of society and pointed to the contractual nature of modern relationships without any moral obligations or human affections. He understood the role of the state as one that would unify all special interests of the various social classes into a whole body politic. He could see the need for an adequate and equitable system of taxation if the state had to last for long. His insights into the economic foundations of the modern state enabled him to brilliantly analyse the character of the absolutist state. In *L'ancien regime et la Revolution* (1856) he discussed in detail the unfair distribution of taxes and services among the classes with the peasantry bearing the brunt. The absolutist state was made possible when the king liberated himself from constitutional institutions such as estates or parliaments in order to become free and independent to raise taxes for his own military or domestic projects.

Tocqueville was also cautious about the spread of democracy. He understood democracy to mean not only increased political participation but also civic and social equality. The abrogation of privileges was a means to an inevitable trend to the creation of an egalitarian society. The consequences of this change were momentous. Removal of social barrier led to new innovations. It also meant constant change within the social structure, as in a democratic society, unlike its predecessors, there would be absence of natural leaders. Individuals would have to fight for political position on the basis of interests rather than privileges. The passion for equality would lead to social levelling eroding any differences among human beings. Equality conferred power over public opinion and that meant the rule of the average person in the street. He argued that equal social conditions could lead to either 'sovereignty of all' or 'the absolute power of one man'. It is, in fostering free and participatory political institutions that he saw the key to resisting the despotic tendencies inherent in the principle of equality. Tocqueville's notion of the inevitable progress of equality is similar to the contemporary notion of modernisation. It is a historic process that would undermine all traditional or aristocratic political order that did not result in democratic self-government (Fukuyama 2000: 11-17).

Tocqueville defined liberty as absence of external political restrictions. He remained sceptical and fearful of the excessive emphasis on equality. We took note of the threat of 'the tyranny of the majority' which would manifest itself in the form of intolerance of individual deviation from the social norm. But he was realistic enough to accept the inevitable progress toward's

equality and attempted to reconcile equality with liberty. His political ideal was freedom under the rule of law. He was insistent that people ought to have as far as possible direct control over their own affairs, through vibrant local government and free associations, something that was different from decentralisation under feudalism. He, like Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) considered strong local institutions as a preventive to arbitrary intervention by central authority and the revolutionary subversion of the state, an aspect that the neo-conservatives in the United States revived in the last quarter of the 20th Century.

By tyranny of the majority in America, Tocqueville did not believe like James Madison (1751-1836) in a permanent and deep division in the community between majority and minority but a widespread consensus among citizens who rarely felt that laws enacted by the majority were arbitrary or unjustly coercive. Equal political rights and active participation in the political process gave individuals "an equal love and respect for the laws of which they consider themselves the author" (Tocqueville 1966a: 9). Besides political equality there was social equality, which was so widespread that it underpinned the idea of majority rule. He also pointed to the issue of uniformity considering it among the undesirable aspects of American life. He observed that unlike Europe there was just one society in America. "It may be either rich or poor, humble or brilliant, trading or agriculture; but it is composed everywhere of the same elements. The plane of uniform civilisation has passed over it. The man you left in New York you find again in almost impenetrable solitude: same clothes, same attitude, same language, same habits, same pleasures" (Tocqueville *ibid* 151). Tocqueville attributed this striking uniformity to the spirit of equality that made possible stable community life. The problem of uniformity was not a political one. Government and laws were seldom used for oppression and coercion as there was no distinct and separate group of citizens to coerce and oppress. Neither was majority rule a source of domination and despotism. Instead what it ensured was that fundamental differences did not arise within the community. What Tocqueville feared was the 'moral power' of the public opinion in America, which not only regulated people's actions but also moulded their very nature as well. He also noted with appreciation the extent of uniformity as it seemed to suggest that the majority of spirits were joined together in the expression of certain general opinions. However, this uniformity and harmony indicated a voluntary tyranny. Besides uniformity, there existed profound isolation and dependence that made possible for psychic coercion and thereby reinforced the uniformity inherent in an egalitarian community. He also observed that the old categories of political thought were inadequate to deal with this new state of affairs. Unlike traditional forms of despotism that oppressed through political coercion the new form is neither political nor overtly oppressive. It is social in nature. J. S. Mill took note of this observation and incorporated it in his arguments for freedom of individuality, his critique of majority domination and egalitarianism in his treatise *On Liberty* (1859). Mill believed that if people had the right idea about democracy then the tyranny of the majority that Tocqueville warned about could be abated. Unlike Tocqueville, Mill was sanguine that if the best minds could ensure their ascendancy by calling for democracy, for democracy accompanied by representation, would not threaten to induce debasement of intelligence or cultural deprivation. Representative democracy would ensure a free society without a dominant power. Unlike Tocqueville who eulogised the aristocracy Mill regarded it as a menace to the progress of civilisation.

Tocqueville, like Montesquieu considered commerce as the inevitable and appropriate development of growing social equality and individual freedom. However, he could also perceive the destructive side of unrestrained materialism and the hazards of excessive economic inequality. He pointed to the twin dangers of the relationship between democracy and equality that would result in 'tyranny of the majority' and also whether democracy was sufficient to overcome the powerful inegalitarian tendency latent in the development of capitalism.

Tocqueville regarded slavery as not only inhuman but also contrary to the enlightened self-interest of the slave owners themselves. He rejected Joseph-Arthur Gobineau's (1816-82) idea of racial hierarchy and warned against the selective misuse of the thesis, like the anti-abolitionist leaders in America who argued that the blacks were different and inferior but suppressed the proposition that the Anglo-Saxon race was also on the decline. He considered racial hierarchy as another form of aristocracy that was destined to crumble by the onslaught of democracy and social equality.

---

## 12.3 RELIGION

---

The 16th Century as exemplified in the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) is acknowledged to be the beginning of secular politics in Europe. Machiavelli though anti-Church and anti-clergy considered religion as necessary for individual's social life and for the health and prosperity of the state. Religion along with good laws and a well-disciplined citizen militia would produce order, which in turn brings forth peace, fortune and success. As a social force, religion played a pivotal role for through its doctrine of rewards and punishment it induced proper behaviour and good conduct that was necessary for the wellbeing of society. While Machiavelli understood that religion was socially useful he could not comprehend its intrinsic link with liberty, a theme that Tocqueville succinctly developed in opposition to the mainstream Enlightenment credo to uphold reason and liberty by being anti religion.,

The striking originality of Tocqueville lies in recognising the extraordinary importance religion played in strengthening democracy in America. He considered religion as a 'political institution' and vital to the preservation of freedom in a democratic society particularly from the despotic tendencies that equality of conditions unleashed. He observed: "despotism may govern without religion... liberty cannot". Democracy, because of equality of conditions needed moral lies and hence needed religion. He pointed to the utility of religion rather than the truth of any one religion. This extraordinary emphasis on religion was because he regarded it to be crucial to establishing democracy in France and other Christian states of Europe. He concluded that due to the variance between "the spirit of religion" and "the spirit of freedom" democracy failed in Europe. The alliance between the Catholic Church and the French monarchy, although injurious to religion in itself, was characteristic of a more calamitous alliance between Christianity and the moribund aristocracy. The Church considered democracy to be antithetical to religion and consequently an enemy. In America the two were closely linked which explained the success of democracy there.

America, the nascent Puritan commonwealth rejected Europe's aristocratic heritage and accepted the principles of democracy. The Puritans brought to the New World a Christianity that was democratic, constitutional and republican. They introduced such principles as the participation by the people to rule, the free voting in matters of taxation, fixing the responsibility of political representatives, guarding personal liberty and trial by jury. They instilled a love of freedom anchored in religious conviction by teaching Americans that their freedom is a gift from God and therefore had to be taken seriously and used wisely. Christianity associated itself with the principles of liberal democracy that it initiated to create, and hence could hope for an autonomous space that was both enduring and timeless.

Historically, for Tocqueville democracy began when Jesus unequivocally proclaimed universal human equality thereby making the realisation of democracy possible. Furthermore the Christian teaching that was important for a democratic society was the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Religion taught human beings to strive for eternal happiness by resisting "the selfish

passions of the hour" and thus democratic individuals would learn that only through persistence and hard work something permanent could be attained in both private and public spheres. They acquired the art of managing their life. By believing in "supersensual and immortal principles" they learnt to focus on the spiritual rather than the base and thus develop an instinctive love for liberty. At a first glance it appeared that religion was divorced from American politics. The clergy restricted their sovereignty to religious matters and did not criticise the fundamental principles of the republic. However, in reality they actively promoted them. Tocqueville felt that if Christianity did not exercise such self-restraint then it ran the risk of not getting marginalised. American clergy not only accepted the supreme authority of self-interest but also enlisted the selfish passion for the service of religion. They showed in their congregations that Christian virtues were compatible with freedom and prosperity as well as salvation thus bringing both the head and heart to the altar. Furthermore, the dictum "the things that are Caesar's" and "the things that are not Caesar's" made it mandatory that no political or military authority could enjoy complete authority over human beings. This was the primary reason for the end of European feudalism.

Tocqueville, though himself a practicing Catholic, acknowledged, like Max Weber (1864-1920) later, that the Protestant Ethic encouraged individualism and freedom but with proper respect for political authority. With greater social equality and the support of the middle class, this spirit extended to democracy. The combination of all these factors led to the American success with a harmonious evolution of both Christianity and democracy in America. Interestingly, this unique achievement of America has been made possible by realising the principle of separation of the Church and the state. This has prevented the consolidation of vested religious interests' in particular political parties and groups as has happened in Europe. In America there was a harmonious coexistence of religion and democracy. In fact, democracy facilitates the spread of religion by guaranteeing the right of religious beliefs. All religious faiths gained by political liberty and consequently religion also supports the separation of state and Church.

Besides religion the second important factor conducive for democracy in America was equality of conditions. Interestingly, this attribute by itself did not lead to freedom and was compatible with a new kind of despotism made possible by the forces of individualism and materialism that democracy unleashed. While old aristocracies with its hierarchical class structures allowed people to forge firm and lasting political ties democracies with its doctrine of equality loosened those bonds. Large number of human beings became economically independent and as a result wrongly assumed that they had complete control of their destinies. This false sense of independence changed the sentiments of obligation that aristocracy fostered into radical self-interest.

Religion emerged as the savior of democracy by checking this degeneration. Tocqueville conceded that religion might not be able to contain the entire urge of individualism and the pursuit of well being, but was the only mechanism of moderation and education. He saw religion sustaining moderate individualism with drive for material prosperity, both of which were essential for the success of democracy. Instead of seeing religion as an antithesis of human liberation as Karl Heinrich Mars (1818-83) did, Tocqueville felt a happy blending of democracy and religion was possible and desirable.

Tocqueville was categorical that democracy did not rest on either constitutional arrangements or laws but on mores of society, which embraced both habits and opinions made possible by religion for it inculcated moral habits, with respect for all human beings. This was necessary in a free society in the absence of political control. This was the essence of the success of American religion. In contrast in Europe the champions of human freedom attacked religious

opinions not realising that without religious faith despotism was inevitable and liberty unrealizable. The lack of self-restraint due to destruction of faith led to the reign of terror after the French Revolution. In the absence of religion, atheism and tyranny would be the fate of all modern democracies.

A successful political democracy has to be grounded on moral institutions, which means religious faith. The dynamics of the democratic process and its interaction with society at large minimises theological considerations and the otherworldly attitude that religion fosters. The adaptation to democratic life means religion would have to accept the philosophies of well being and prosperity. In return religion purifies and regulates by emphasising honest means to reach these ends. The greatest advantage of religion is moderation and self-control. The fine balance of democracy and religion and its uninterrupted success in America contrasted with the stark failure of irreligious communism gives credence to Tocqueville's analysis.

---

## 12.4 WOMEN AND FAMILY

---

Like Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-97), Tocqueville attacked the institution of arranged marriages for it encouraged loose sexual morals thereby undermining personal freedom. He is critical of the French Revolution which might have democratised the country's political life but failed to create a culture of freedom. He was impressed with the high level of sexual morality in America which was seen as a private affair buttressed by religion particularly Christianity rather than political traditions. The sexual code as outlined by the Christian ethics included virginity outside of marriage, continence and fidelity within marriage, and strict avoidance of all forms of licence. Besides religion other factors like racial makeup, climate, social condition and role of statesmanship also played a significant role. Marriages in America were not arranged and that enabled women to enjoy personal happiness and sexual relationship based on mutual respect and love. Marital freedom guaranteed a high level of chastity.

For Tocqueville Americans educated their women by giving them freedom rather than exerting parental authority. Americans valued chastity because it promoted healthy commercial habits, kept families productive and helped in maintaining political stability, the key to prosperity proving that chastity was not due to religion alone but also had its secular origins. This was not the case with European women. Nevertheless they enjoyed unprecedented equality with their spouses for marriage was a contract between two mature, morally responsible and free adults. Tocqueville observed that American women despite their lack of formal political power were able to contribute to America's freedom and prosperity because of the dignity and freedom in their personal lives.

In America there was no adultery or crimes against women. In the 1830s women could fearlessly undertake long journeys alone. Men also adhered to the sexual morals partly due to marital freedom and restraints imposed by an articulate public opinion, and partly due to their ambition to pursue wealth making them practical, non-erotic and busy, Tocqueville regarded prostitution as a regrettable but wise concession keeping in mind the lust of the male.

---

## 12.5 CONCLUSION

---

Tocqueville's central concerns were to understand the forces that created the democratic order in America and find ways and means to prevent revolution in France. His analysis of politics was within a sociological framework. He focussed on culture, manners and habits of people. He also wrote on social stratification, race relations, slavery, colonialism, communities, voluntary

associations, bureaucracy, armies, language, literature, art, religion, prisons and crimes. Using the comparative method extensively in his arguments he explained the root causes for the success of democratic institutions in America, the importance of laws over geographical circumstances and eventually the importance of manners over laws. Initially he compared between America and the geographically similar but socially and politically different societies of Latin America and French-Canada. Subsequently he extended the same to the eastern states of the Union and the frontier states of the West, where the laws were the same but the manners of democracy less entrenched.

Tocqueville wrote keeping France in mind for the French had already shown a penchant for sacrificing their liberty to a longing for equality. He portrayed America as the land of pluralism, localism, self-help and eagerness for voluntary associations. He expressed anxiety about America becoming more obsessed with material success and forgetting the political arena held together by public opinion and from there linked his fears about the emergence of a 'soft' despotism that allows manipulation of one's mind. He also understood the threat individuality faced under the clamour for social equality and democracy, a theme that J. S. Mill succinctly developed subsequently. He could perceive the threats that democracy posed to the 'sacred thing' called liberty. He also emphasised that only "political freedom could remedy the ills to which equality of conditions gives rise, he hopefully accepted that equality and, despite his fears, embraced the political freedom that democracy promised" (Mansfield and Winthrop 2000:xxxvi). He understood democracy in two senses. In the political sense it implied representative institutions based on extended franchise but more importantly it also meant social democracy or the acceptance of equality at the societal level. Democracy fosters equal social conditions and is different from both aristocracy and despotism. He also anticipated the present day pluralist theories of democracy popularised by Dahl and his associates. He could perceive that the strength of the American political system was derived from the Constitutional provisions and from the tradition of local governments and mediating institutions, which people formed, a theme reiterated by the American neo-conservatives. Tocqueville was the pioneer to analyse the social roots of democracy for he emphasised the importance of shared beliefs and network of social relations, a theme resurrected by the communitarian critics of modern liberalism.

Tocqueville also highlighted two aspects of individualism, the basis of a democratic society. These were faith in individual reason as the sole basis of opinion and belief in a self centred and self-interested pursuit of one's personal ends. He supported the individual right to rebel against intellectual authority as a natural democratic right. The other aspect of democratic individualism was the withdrawal from the public sphere and focus on material welfare of the family as the main goal. This would lead to greater personal ambition and competitiveness. In a society based on equality of opportunity it was possible to pursue this goal without being hindered by disadvantages of birth making competition intense and bitter. Those who succeeded were resented for that demonstrated inequality of ability. This middle class desire for material security was according to Tocqueville 'natural'. At the political level such a pursuit of material comforts threatened individual liberty encouraging conformism and tyranny of majority opinion. In a society of equals every individual felt he was equal to the others and thereby feeling powerless. None could claim to have a unique right over truth since the majority had to be right. This encouraged conformism for a dissenting individual came to believe that his position had to be a wrong one. This conformism leads to curtailment of individual autonomy and extension of state power. One casualty of extension of state power was the eclipse of intermediate institutions between the individual and the state. Individuals would increasingly be concerned with private benefits and indifferent to public responsibilities leaving politics to politicians. All this would only result in the atomisation of society with the state being viewed as the main social organisation. This would lead to a new kind of despotism where the individuals permit



and accept a degree of benevolent intrusion for they are afraid of public opinion. This would only weaken individual liberty. As an antidote Tocqueville suggested strengthening political democracy through representative institutions, free political parties and free press. It is for these reasons that he styled himself as 'liberal of a new kind'.

Ever since the Pilgrim fathers settled down in America, the New World attracted the attention of European political thinkers. For instance, the libertarian liberalism of Locke would have been inconceivable without the discovery of America. Tocqueville's importance lies in his penetrating analysis of the social factors that are essential for strengthening democratic order anywhere in the world. It is because of this universalistic paradigm that *Democracy in America* is not merely a description of the consolidation of the first mass democracy in the world, but an essential primer for understanding the very nature of modern democratic order both in theory and practice.

---

## 12.6 SUMMARY

---

Alexis de Tocqueville has been labeled as an aristocratic conservative or even a liberal conservative. His passion for freedom and its protection of property rights represented his liberal tendencies but he cautioned against dangers about too much democracy. He disliked revolutions but offered a balanced view because revolution established liberty. But several revolutions in succession make orderly liberty impossible. He disliked the terror and despotism of the French Revolution but approved of its commitment to freedom and equality.

He was cautious about the spread of democracy, as in a democratic society there would be an absence of natural leaders. Individuals would fight for positions on the basis of interests rather than privileges. It is, in fostering free and participatory political institutions that he saw the key to resisting the despotic tendencies inherent in the principle of equality. He considered strong local institutions as a preventive to arbitrary intervention by central authority. According to him, religion was a 'political institution' and vital to the preservation of freedom in a democratic society particularly from the despotic tendencies that equality of conditions unleashed. Democracy, because of equality of conditions needed moral ties and hence needed religion.

He attacked the institution of arranged marriages for it encouraged loose sexual morals thereby undermining personal freedom. According to him, marital freedom as practiced by the Americans guaranteed a high level of chastity. Tocqueville's central concerns were to understand the forces that created the democratic order in America and find ways and means to prevent revolution in France.

---

## 12.7 EXERCISES

---

- 1) Discuss Tocqueville's views on democracy, revolution and the modern state.
- 2) What role did religion play in politics according to Tocqueville?
- 3) Why did Tocqueville attack the institution of arranged marriage?