TOCQUEVILLIAN ANALYTICS: A TOOL FOR UNDERSTANDING DEMOCRACY IN AFRICA AND THE NON-WESTERN WORLD[1]

Sheldon Gellar

> "A great democratic revolution is taking place in our midst; everybody sees it, but by no means everybody judges it in the same way."[1]
>
> Alexis Tocqueville

> "Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* was not preoccupied with an exotic experiment in the North American continent. Rather he was concerned with the viability of democratic societies under circumstances of increasing conditions of equality among mankind." [2]
>
> Vincent Ostrom

Most social scientists see Tocqueville as a brilliant commentator on American political institutions and culture who captured the essence of American democracy. Others who know his writings on France, England, Ireland, Germany, and Switzerland appreciate his interdisciplinary talents in history, sociology, comparative politics, and normative political theory. They see *Democracy in America* as an effort to understand the processes of democratization and its future in the western world. Although social scientists and democratic theorists often refer to the work of Alexis Tocqueville (1805-1859) in their analyses of American and European societies, they rarely apply his methodology and insights to the study of democracy in the non-western world.[3] This paper argues that Tocqueville analytics as reflected in Tocqueville's multilayered concept of democracy and the issues and concerns he raised are particularly important for understanding the movement towards democracy and the prospects for sustaining it in Africa and the non-western world.

---

[1] This paper owes a great debt to Vincent Ostrom who coined the term Tocquevillian analytics and convinced me that Tocqueville's work contained an analytic framework that could be applied in the contemporary world to understand the problematic of democracy in the non-western world in general and Africa in particular.

Tocquevillian Analytics: Asking the Right Questions

Many years ago, a bright young student of Talmud ran around his Yeshiva proclaiming, "I have discovered this fantastic wonderful answer! But I don't know the question. Can anyone help me find the right question?"

Tocquevillian analytics provides us with a powerful tool for understanding democratic processes not because it gives the right answers but because it asks the right kinds of questions.

The questions and issues raised by Tocqueville in his studies of France and America are just as crucial for understanding the development of democracy in Africa and other parts of the non-western world. How does the weight of the past affect the evolution of new political institutions and political behavior? What impact do differences in physical environment have on the organization of society? What are the relationships between social equality, freedom, and democracy? To what extent does centralization destroy the capacity for local initiative and self-governance? What conditions are needed to nurture the flourishing of self-governing communities? What safeguards are needed to preserve freedom and to prevent democracies from evolving into dictatorships?

Are Africa and the non-western world part of the modern Democratic Revolution that began with the American and French Revolutions? Is democracy only for western nations? If not, why has democracy had such a problem taking hold in Africa and other parts of the non-western world? What are the prospects for democracy in the future? How should one study democracy in non-western settings? Tocquevillian analytics can help us provide answers

Components of Tocquevillian Analytics

In *Democracy in America,* Tocqueville identified mores (manners and customs, habits of the heart and mind); laws, (institutional arrangements); and environmental factors (geography, topography, climate) as the three main factors shaping American democracy. The interrelationships between culture, institutional arrangements, and environmental factors constitute the heart of Tocquevillian analytics and have also inspired the development and refinement of the IAD framework. The following components can be regarded as a checklist of elements for conducting a comprehensive Tocquevillian analysis. Most of the references allude to Africa because of my work on applying Tocquevillian analytics to Africa using Senegal as a case study as Tocqueville used America. [2]

Contextual Components

1. ***The impact of the physical environment in shaping political, economic, and social structures and relationships.***[4] Tocqueville was acutely aware of the importance of physical environment in shaping the organization of societies. America's abundant natural resources and the availability of land facilitated the development of equalitarian social structures and a high

---

[2] See my manuscript , *Democracy in Senegal: Tocquevillian Analytics in Africa (Bloomington,Indiana, 2004)*

degree of mobility. The physical environment also had a major impact in shaping the development of political institutions and relationships within and between societies in Africa. Thus, the flat savannah country facilitated transportation and trade in the West Sudan and facilitated the rise of large-scale empires and the spread of Islam while societies in the dense tropical forest zones where communication was more difficult generally were more egalitarian, smaller in size, and more self-sufficient. In Asia and the Middle East, centralized irrigation systems gave rise to oriental despotism. V.O. Key in his classic study of southern politics and André Siegfried in his work on French electoral geography have both looked at how the physical environment affected politics.

2. *The importance of history in shaping national character and institutions*.[5] To understand a society's character, Tocqueville argued that one needed to go back to its origins. Tocqueville would have found much that was familiar in Senegal's precolonial history and aristocratic social structures. However, other parts of Africa have had quite different histories, political institutions, and social structures that may have been less familiar to Tocqueville. The features of Africa's acephalous and pastoralist societies differed markedly from those in highly centralized and stratified African societies. Precolonial history, political institutions and social structures still affect African attitudes towards government and other ethnic groups and communities and institutional arrangements in the post-colonial era. Differences in colonial regimes –e.g. French, British, Belgian, and Portuguese—and the degree of colonial oppression and repression of indigenous institutions have played an important role in shaping national political institutions and attitudes of Africans towards government after independence. Many studies of democracy in Africa start with independence or the colonial era. They often downgrade the importance of history and consider indigenous traditions preceding contact with the west as obstacles to democracy. In Asia, history provides clues concerning the origins of cultural differences between China, Korea, and Japan. Because Tocqueville did not concentrate only on looking at national elites and national level institutions, he was able to see the great variety of institutions and mores within countries and their evolution. Tocqueville also did not see history as deterministic. Although influenced by history, individuals, peoples, and nations had choices in determining their historical paths.

3. *The importance of laws, especially property rights and inheritance laws in shaping political, economic, and social structures*. Tocqueville noted that the aristocratic order in Europe was based on land and property rights. Property rights systems in America favored more egalitarian distribution of land than the primogeniture system prevailing in Europe. In Africa, communal ownership of land and prohibitions against alienating communal land has helped to preserve communitarian structures at the village level. Colonial laws maintaining African populations as subjects restricted their political and civil rights. Conversely, laws providing for their enfranchisement radically transformed the political landscape. Colonial laws also expropriated large tracts of indigenous land which was transferred to the colonial state or the settler population. Property rights and access to natural resources constitutes one of the major arenas of politics. The *latifundia* system in Latin America still remains one of the main obstacles to democratization.

3

Social-Cultural Components

1. ***The degree of social equality in society and the extent to which there is movement towards greater equality***. Tocquevillian analytics examines the state of social equality with a given society and its influence on political institutions, behavior, and mores. Tocqueville was particularly interested in tracing the transformation of aristocratic societies into egalitarian societies. Although Tocqueville generally used national societies as the unit of analysis, he also looked at regional and local differences concerning the state of equality within larger national societies. Precolonial Africa had a wide range of societies ranging from highly egalitarian to highly aristocratic societies. Caste and slavery were important elements in many parts of precolonial Africa. Different types of colonial regimes affected the relative degree of equality, some weakening, and some strengthening precolonial forms of inequality. Colonial regimes also introduced new forms of inequality based on racial criteria and the creation of a new political elite based on knowledge of the language and institutions of the colonizer. What are the limits to democratization in societies where caste, slavery, and gender inequality are present or prevalent? In India Mahatma Gandhi fought the caste system and championed the rights of the Untouchables, thus contributing to the advance of democracy in that country. Hitler's racist ideology which excluded Jews as human beings, regarded Slavs as destined to serve the Aryan and non-Aryans as inferior provided the foundations for one of history's most autocratic regimes.

2. ***The importance of mores, customs, and values (culture) in shaping political institutions and political behavior***.[6] Tocqueville was acutely aware of the importance of moral values and norms determining social status and people's behavior towards each other in society. Mores, customs, and norms vary widely throughout Africa, affecting attitudes towards authority, strangers, gender, and different age groups in society. Traditional concepts such as caste, honor, loyalty, justice, clientship, and hospitality continue to affect political behavior and expectations concerning political institutions and other groups and communities. In many parts of the non-western world deference to elders and those in authority remain important values.

3. **T*he central role of religion and religious institutions in shaping political attitudes, institutions, and relationships***. . Tocqueville saw Christianity as a belief system proclaiming the equality of man before God and supportive of egalitarian trends. In America, religion reinforced democratic principles; in France, the pre-revolutionary Catholic Church by aligning itself with the old regime set off a reaction against the Church when the French Revolution Today, most African societies remain profoundly religious. Different forms of traditional religions, Islam, and Christianity continue to deeply affect the values and behavior of Africans. Tocquevillian analytics distinguishes between the spirit of religion and religion as an institution. The Spirit of Religion refers to religious values like human equality, tolerance, quest for peace or their polar opposite, the elect as belonging to the right religion, intolerance of other religions, and the obligation to impose one's religion by proselytizing or forced conversion. Religion as an institution refers to concrete organizations like the Catholic Church which has its own rules for membership, governance, and participation. Unlike Marxists and modernization theorists, Tocqueville did not see religion as the opium of the masses or atavistic and destined to decline with the spread of a scientific worldview. Tocqueville believed that faith in God was an inherent

feature of humanity. Although the influence of religion in Europe has been declining since the French Revolution, religion still plays a major role in Latin America, the Middle East and Asia.

4. ***The crucial role of language as an instrument for promoting mutual understanding and group identity***. Tocqueville was highly sensitive to the importance of language in defining group identity. He described how English became the dominant language in America and contributed to forming a distinctly American identity among different nationalities. He also pointed to differences in the use of language in aristocratic and egalitarian societies. In Africa, language forms one of the most important foundations of group identity. Ethnic identity was often based on the speaking of a particular language. Because of the presence of hundreds of different languages in Africa, many Africans were multilingual and often used a common lingua franca to communicate with strangers. Under colonial rule, western education and mastery of the language of the colonizer gave Africans higher political and social status. With the spread of Islam, literacy in Arabic also became an important component of group identity for Muslims.

Political Components

1. ***The importance of popular sovereignty and constitutional choice in the design of political institutions and the extent to which rules and laws after being prescribed are invoked, applied, and enforced.*** Tocqueville maintained that popular sovereignty and the ability of people to make their own laws through constitutional choice were key elements in modern political systems. He also noted that formal rules providing for democratic institutions and liberties would not necessarily be applied by rulers nor invoked by people in societies without liberal democratic traditions. Most precolonial societies exercised a certain degree of constitutional choice in organizing their political orders. These political orders were based on custom or charters elaborated by representatives of different groups in society. Under colonialism, indigenous African societies lacked the freedom to establish a new political order. Laws enacted during the last phases of colonial rule extended full political and civil rights to large segments of the African population in many countries. At independence, the leaders adopted liberal western constitutions based on European models with little consultation of the people. One-party states military regimes, and personal dictatorships violated political and civil rights guaranteed by their country's constitution and gave their people little say in making the laws and rules governing their lives. Tocqueville's notion of popular sovereignty focused on self-governance and participation of the people in managing public affairs rather than state sovereignty exercised by elected national elites ruling in the name of the people.

2. ***The identification of the concentration of power in centralized governments and bureaucracies as restricting freedom and initiative and leading to despotism and dependency***. Tocqueville regarded concentration of power in the hands of a single person, political institution, or bureaucracy as an obstacle to liberal democracy. Many precolonial African societies in Africa lived under highly centralized monarchies, particularly during the heyday of the slave trade. Colonial regimes in Africa established highly centralized autocratic state structures which were Africanized by those coming to power after independence. Concentration of power and overcentralization subverted democracy in most African nations. Contemporary analyses of democracy often focus on the capacity of national governments to extend their power throughout

the country. Tocqueville was concerned that an all powerful central government would intervene and attempt to control all aspects of social and economic life, thus stifling freedom and initiative.

3. ***The importance of local liberties and the constitution of self-governing communities as vital to democracy***. Tocqueville asserted that local liberties gave communities the right to manage their own affairs and reinforced their taste for liberty. In highly centralized regimes, decentralization provided a vehicle for local communities to take more initiative and have a greater voice in public affairs.   Many societies in precolonial Africa were self-governing communities that fiercely defended their independence. The imposition of colonial rule was often accompanied by the demise of local liberties. During decolonization and after independence, African political elites placed more emphasis on gaining control of national level institutions rather than seeking to reestablish local liberties and decentralized democratic governance. Local liberties did not necessarily insure more democratic norms of governance. Localities dominated by aristocratic elites, rural notables, etc. also could demand and fight for local liberties from central government without establishing democratic institutions. In Asia, local warlords historically sought greater freedom from centralizing states.

4. ***The crucial role of political and civil liberties, especially freedom of association and the press as bulwarks against tyranny***. Tocqueville believed that freedom of association and freedom of the press were more important than holding free and periodic elections in preserving freedom and protecting minorities against the tyranny of the majority. He also believed that the "art of association" was the key to creating stable, self-governing communities in the democratic era. Associational life was highly organized in precolonial Africa, usually around gender, age-sets, and occupation. Most colonial regimes sharply restricted freedom of association, freedom of the press, and civil liberties for their African subjects. In many colonies Africans were subject to forced labor, forbidden to organize political parties and trade unions or to publish independent newspapers. The absence of civil liberties permitted forced labor and other abuses of civil liberties. In postcolonial Africa, military regimes and one-party states restricted political and civil rights and placed local government and civil, economic, and cultural associations under the tutelage of the state or the dominant party. In many African states, freedom of association and the press permitted people to organize and criticize the governments and enabled them to put pressure for greater democratization. Freedom of association also enabled Africans sharing common goals to form groups to achieve them.

5. ***An empirical approach to the study of societies that rejected the application of abstract political theories and philosophies***. Tocqueville attacked the 18th century *philosophes* and revolutionaries for creating "an imaginary ideal society in which all was simple, uniform, coherent, equitable and rational."[7] He recognized that the best of societies has its flaws and weaknesses. During the 1960s and 1970s, African elites adopted ideologies and development models that were poorly suited to Africa. In Senegal, the post-independence debates among the intellectuals advocating Negritude, African Socialism, and different varieties of Marxist ideologies had little meaning for most Senegalese and little to do with how the country was actually organized and functioning or how it should be organized.

Tocqueville did not believe that any one model of democracy could be applied universally and made it clear that the triumph of democracy would depend upon the application of principles rather than the export of models of democracy. While he proclaimed that America was the most advanced of democracies, Tocqueville insisted that the American model with its federal institutions could not be easily adopted in Europe. Tocqueville respected the great diversity of humanity and the need for different societies to find viable institutions that incorporated old and new mores, values, and customs in such a way as to make the best of what he considered the universal movement towards greater equality. In Africa, where communal values are still strong, the face of democracy will vary as African societies experiment with mixes of old and new political institutions that reflect diverse traditions, value systems and physical environments.

Waves Apart: Tocqueville and Huntington on Democracy and the Democratic Revolution

One of the main premises of this paper is that the application of what might be called Tocquevillian analytics will provide a deeper and broader understanding of democratic processes in Africa and other parts of the non-western world than analyses focusing on multiparty competition and free elections as the heart of democracy. This section contrasts Tocqueville's broader vision of democracy with that of Samuel P .Huntington, whose work has greatly influenced the study of democracy in the non-western world.

When Tocqueville wrote his masterpiece, America was the only democracy in the world. Since then, democracy has been consolidated throughout Europe and much of the western world and spread to the non-western world. In *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth* Century, which appeared one hundred and fifty years after the publication of the second volume of *Democracy in America* in 1840, Samuel P. Huntington credited Tocqueville for having predicted the trend towards democracy as it began.[8]

While Huntington and Tocqueville both maintained that democracy was the wave of the future and vulnerable to setbacks and reversals, especially in countries where democracy had not been firmly entrenched, they presented different definitions and approaches towards the study of democracy. With his emphasis on liberty, equality, popular sovereignty, and self-governance as the foundations of democracy, Tocqueville offered a broader vision of democracy than Huntington and other contemporary analysts who see democracy as based more narrowly on universal suffrage, periodic elections, and multiparty competition.

Following Schumpeter, Huntington defined political systems as democratic "to the extent that its most powerful decisionmakers are selected through fair, honest, and periodic elections in which candidates freely compete for votes and in which virtually all the adult population is eligible to vote."[9] He chose 1828 as the year marking the beginning of the first wave of democratization which coincided with the election of the populist Andrew Jackson as president that ushered in the "democratic era" in America.

Though Tocqueville and Huntington both regarded popular sovereignty as expressed through universal suffrage to be an essential feature of democratic regimes, they differed sharply

as to what that meant and how it was to be applied. For Huntington, popular sovereignty gave the people the right to choose and oust rulers through the ballot box and operated primarily at the national level when citizens elected national political elites to govern them. The national elites chosen by the electorate then used the state apparatus to rule over the people in the name of the people.

Tocqueville visualized popular sovereignty quite differently. He saw popular sovereignty as sovereignty directly exercised by and with the people through their participation in politics and self-governing institutions at all levels of society, not just in national elections.[10] The doctrine of popular sovereignty emerged from the people during the course of the American Revolution. In America, the body of the people themselves made the laws or chose duly elected representatives to act in their name under their close and immediate supervision. In America, the people governed themselves.[11]

Tocqueville also had a radically different conception of the state and the role of the state in a democratic order[12] than Huntington who accepted the Hobbesian concept of the state which gave the state a monopoly over political authority and unlimited and indivisible authority over those living in a given territory--i.e. the nation-state. Although a French patriot, Tocqueville rejected the idea that political authority needed to be concentrated in the state. For Tocqueville, such concentration of power was detrimental to the new democratic order and could easily lead to tyranny.

Unlike Tocqueville who saw the emergence of modern democracy as the result of movement of societies towards greater equality of social conditions, Huntington sees modern democracy as taking place uniquely within the framework of the nation-state.[13] While recognizing that democratic political institutions and elections existed in Greece and Rome in the ancient world, at the village level, and in many areas of the world where the people elect their tribal chiefs, he dismisses these examples as not relevant in the modern world:

> "Modern democracy is not simply democracy of the village, the tribe, or the city-state; it is democracy of the nation-state and its emergence is associated with the nation-state."[14]

Whereas Tocqueville regarded the centralized state as a source of despotism, Huntington saw the centralized state as essential for political modernization. While Tocqueville advocated more liberty to check despotism, Huntington maintained that order was the first priority:

> "Men may, of course, have order without liberty, but they cannot have liberty without order. Authority has to exist before it can be limited."[15]

Following in the Hobbesian tradition, Huntington sees politics as unrelenting competition and advocated a strong state to insure order and political stability. Weak central governments were bad governments. Hence, whatever strengthened central government institutions was good for the country and the public interest.[16] Huntington argued that democracy, especially in the

developing nations, had to be built from the top down by national elites in charge of a strong state that could preserve order and effectively deal with primordial claims.

In his *Democracy in America*, Tocqueville used the American example to demonstrate that a decentralized form of the state was possible in a democratic order.[17] In America, Tocqueville discovered that the absence of administrative centralization and the existence of multiple and diffuse sources of political authority permitted citizens to participate directly in the management of public affairs to solve their problems. The practice of citizen participation in local self-government described and advocated by Tocqueville as a concrete manifestation of popular sovereignty had little in common with notions of participation stressing citizen involvement in selecting national rulers and articulating opinions and interests that might or might not be taken into consideration by central government.

The kind of democracy envisioned by Tocqueville promoted self-government and the active participation of citizens in the management of local affairs. People learned how to work together and how to be self-governing within the framework of family, neighborhood, village, and other community-based institutions. For Tocqueville, these institutions needed to enjoy a certain degree of autonomy from the state in order to flourish. Free self-governing institutions and associations level provided a bulwark against state tyranny. Huntington, on the other hand, regarded sub-national group identities and communities based on religion, ethnicity, and kinship as potential dangers to order and political stability and obstacles to political modernization.

Huntington justified using a minimal and procedural definition of democracy based on free, fair, and open elections because it made it easier to classify political systems. Asserting that broader normative definitions of democracy may muddy the waters, he dismissed them out of hand:

> "To some people...."true democracy" means *liberté*, *égalité*, *fraternité*, effective citizen control over policy, responsible government, honesty and openness in politics, informed and rational deliberation, equal participation and power and various other civic virtues. These are, for the most part, good things and people can, if they wish, define democracy in these terms. Doing so, however, raises all the problems that come up with the definitions of democracy by source or by purpose. Fuzzy norms do not yield good analysis. Elections open free and fair are the essence of democracy, the inescapable sine qua non..."[18]

Classifying a regime as either democratic or authoritarian tells us little about how the regime functions, the degree of freedom enjoyed by its populations, the obstacles to democratization or its prospects for the future. Moreover, simplistic dichotomous regime classifications don't provide much help in designing, constructing, and maintaining viable democratic orders

Tocqueville himself never provided a precise and consistent definition of democracy.[19] Its meaning depended upon the context in which he wrote. He sometimes referred to democracy as a political regime characterized by popular sovereignty and at other times as a type of society based on equality of social conditions.

For Tocqueville, the Democratic Revolution marked the transformation of aristocratic orders based on birth and privilege into societies where political, social, and legal equality prevailed. Tocqueville regarded human equality as both a fact and article of faith that implied that all human beings had the capacity for self-government regardless of their social status at birth. Equality made democracy feasible.

Unlike Tocqueville, Huntington has little to say about equality in discussing democracy.[20] His analysis is elite-centered and focused on how elites come to power and maintain it. Huntington defines democracy primarily as a political system that gives the people a voice in the circulation of elites rather than a mechanism for promoting self-governance and preserving liberty. His mistrust of sub-national community identities-- i.e. the primordial forces-- reflects a pessimistic Hobbesian view of human nature that implies that human beings, if left to their own devices, will be constantly at war with each other and are incapable of self-governance, hence the need for a strong sovereign state to preserve the peace and maintain order. His emphasis on the primacy of central institutions and national elites in politics leaves little room for the people to manage their own affairs.

Tocqueville insisted on liberty as essential to an authentic democracy and the most important safeguard against tyranny. Huntington placed greater emphasis on the popular election of the top decisionmakers as the essence of democracy. For Tocqueville, the remedy to the flaws of democracy was more liberty rather than more order. In a vibrant democracy, individuals would use their liberties to form associations to solve their common problems, establish a free press to debate public policy, and defend the prerogatives of local government vis-à-vis the state.

The wave of the future, democracy did not necessarily have to turn out right. Tocqueville was deeply concerned with the viability of democracy and its capacity to preserve freedom. He argued that democracies could easily degenerate into democratic despotism. Democratic despotism would occur when too much power was concentrated in the hands of a single person, political institution, bureaucratic administration, or when the "tyranny of the majority" discarded the rights of the minority. Tocqueville's native France provided an excellent example of the difficulty of maintaining the viability of young democracies which lacked traditions of political freedom.[21] Most of the new African states that emerged after obtaining their independence experienced similar kinds of problems in sustaining democracy.

Brilliantly applied in his monumental study of democracy in America, Tocquevillian analytics provides a more powerful and comprehensive tool for understanding the processes of democratization and constitution of order in Africa than the concepts used by Huntington and others pursuing similar lines of analysis in post-colonial societies. Huntington and others have shed little light concerning the causes of the failure of the nation-state model and why democracy has had such a difficult time taking hold in Africa.

Tocquevillian analytics requires going well beyond Huntington's top-down approach to the analysis of democratization processes focusing on national elites, central government,

elections, and the nation-state. When applied to Africa, Tocquevillian analytics looks at the environment, history, institutions, ideas, and diversity of African peoples and places Africa within the mainstream of world history as societies passing from aristocratic to democratic orders. It also requires looking at African peoples and communities, their social state and capacity for self-governance, their efforts to work together to solve common problems, and the forces that obstruct or move them forward on the road to democracy. The same could be said in applying Tocquevillian analytics to the study of other non-western societies.

Updating Tocquevillian Analytics

The world has changed considerably since Tocqueville's death. These changes may require some updating of his methodology and assumptions.

1. ***Freedom of the Press as a bulwark against tyranny.*** Tocqueville lived before the advent of radio, television, and the internet. He argued that a strong and independent written press constituted one of the major bulwarks against tyranny and a key institution in any democratic system. In societies with relatively low rates of literacy, independent audio-visual media providing accurate information and a forum for debating public affairs are the functional equivalent of Tocqueville's Press. In the Senegalese context, radio played a more important role in serving as a bulwark against tyranny and an instrument for civic education than the press which was read primarily by the elite.

2. ***The rise of an industrial aristocracy and industrial corporations***. Tocqueville visited America before the advent of modern industrial corporations. Although Americans could then become very wealthy, this fact did not necessarily establish wealthy industrialists as a hereditary elite since fortunes could be made and lost. He did warn that an industrial aristocracy could emerge. Tocqueville opposed concentration of power in the state and argued against massive state intervention in the regulation of economic life. My reading of Tocqueville suggests that Tocqueville would also have been appalled at the tremendous concentration of power in the hands of modern industrial corporations and the lack of internal democracy within the corporations and the corporations' lack of accountability to the public. It might now be time to apply a Tocquevillian analysis to the study of corporate power to find ways of promoting bulwarks against corporate tyranny

3. ***Colonialism and Self-Governance.***   Tocqueville himself justified French colonization and the imposition of French rule over non-western societies by force. This position contradicted his basic beliefs concerning human equality and the march of humanity towards democracy. Would Tocqueville accept the new non-western nation-states as the equal of western nation-states?

4. ***Polycentricity ,Globalization, and Self-Governance***. Although Tocqueville recognized the utility of polycentric governance arrangements like those reflected in the three-tiered

American political system, he did not have much to say about the importance of and structure of supra-national institutions. Communications and international trade has brought the world closer together and has generated a demand for supra-national institutions transcending the nation-state that assume some of the functions previously carried out by sovereign states. Would Tocqueville have supported these new international institutions – e.g. European Union, United Nations, and International Courts—in the name of polycentricity. To what extent would he have expressed concerns about the concentration of too much power in the hands of international bureaucracies at the expense of national, regional, and local governance bodies?

5. *Gender Equality*. Although Tocqueville believed in the inherent equality of men and women, he maintained that men should still be recognized as the head of the household and that women should not be involved in partisan politics and run for office. Would he have changed his views? Was he right?

6. *Associational Life*. Tocqueville maintained that associations were the building blocks of democracy and constituted bulwarks against democracy. In Tocqueville's day, there were relatively few, large-scale interest and advocacy groups. Unlike the smaller, self-governing civil associations mentioned by Tocqueville in *Democracy in America*, many of the new groups have large memberships who don't participate in the governance of their association except to send a check. Many are nationally-based and have their offices in the capital. Would Tocqueville have raised the question as how to democratize associations like the AFL-CIO, Common Cause, the AARP, etc.

7. *Tocqueville's Anti-Urban Bias.* Tocqueville's writings indicated a distinct dislike for large cities and his preference for small urban townships. Urbanization has become a major feature of modern times. Large numbers of people now live in cities with a population over one million. Many large cities are national capitals. How would Tocqueville deal with self-governance and the multi-cultural nature of the large metropolitan areas?

8. *Globalization, Migration, and Multiculturalism*. Tocqueville was a great admirer of the Anglo-Saxon Puritans, their culture, religious values, and modes of governance. Mobility helped make America because it detached the new immigrants from ties to the old aristocracy. Tocqueville expressed his concern about immigrants from Germany diluting America's democratic culture. What would he have said about the wave of Hispanic immigration to the US and the heavy migration of North Africans and Black Africans to Europe. Would he have accepted this as a manifestation of the freedom to move and lauded the possibility of enriching the dominant national cultures or would he have focused more on the dangers of diluting American and European democracy.

9. *Islam and Democracy.* Tocqueville had a negative view of Islam. His description of Islam seems to fit the profile of contemporary anti-western Islamist fundamentalists. But what about the potential in Islam for tolerance and peaceful coexistence on the basis of the Abrahamic tradition? .Would Tocqueville have recognized this potential?

10. ***Ethnicity***. Although he recognized differences among different nationalities and ethnic groups, Tocqueville had relatively little to see about ethnicity and the possibility of coexistence and collaboration between ethnic groups with different mores, political institutions, interests, and worldviews. In discussing local liberties, Tocqueville referred more to communities in a particular locality rather than to the ethnic character of those comprising the community. How would have Tocqueville incorporated ethnicity into his analytics? As a cultural trait? linguistic trait? How would he address ethnic conflicts?

Conclusions:

As Tocqueville might have predicted, there are many varieties of Tocquevillians just as there are many varieties and forms of democracy. Tocquevillians need not embrace all of Tocqueville's values. However, Tocquevillian analytics does require the following:

1. Application of the basic components of his methodology laid out in the first part of the paper.

2. An understanding of the interrelationships between components. For example, one can't look at civil associations without examining the legal framework in which they operate, their degree of autonomy from the state, their modes of governance, and the kinds of collective actions they pursue.

3. An open mind and willingness to challenge Tocqueville when the data do not support his propositions.

Although more demanding than most approaches to the study of democracy in the non-western world, Tocquevillian analytics provides a more accurate and comprehensive portrait of societies undergoing processes of democratization that can be applied everywhere.

END NOTES

[1] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*. Edited by J.P. Mayer (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1988 p. 9.

[2] *The Meaning of Democracy and the Vulnerability of Democracies: A Response to Tocqueville's Challenge* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997), p. 17.

[3] For some of the rare examples of scholars systematically using Tocqueville to understand democracy in the non-western world see Vincent Ostrom, *The Meaning of Democracy and the Vulnerability of Democracies: A Response to Tocqueville's Challenge* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997); Carlos A. Forment, *Democracy in Latin America,1760-1900* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); and Sombat Chantornvong, " Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* and the Third World," in Vincent Ostrom, David Feeny, and Hartmut Picht, (eds.) *Rethinking Institutional Analysis and Development: Issues, Alternatives and Choices* (San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1988), pp. 69-99.

[4] In *Democracy in America,* pp. 23-30, Tocqueville used the term "physical configuration" to refer to the physical environment and how it shaped people's thinking and attitudes.

[5] Tocqueville began his study of *Democracy in America* with an analysis of its history. Although not an historian, Tocqueville looked to history to provide the background for understanding the causes of such phenomena as the evolution of democracy and the French Revolution. Tocqueville stressed the need to understand what he called the "point of departure" of a nation in order to appreciate its political institutions and social conditions.

[6] In writing *Democracy in America*, Tocqueville struggled with determining which factor most affected the maintenance of America's democratic institutions. In the end, he pointed to *moeurs* as the most significant factor explaining the success of American democracy. The term embraced American values, morality, ideas, attitudes, and customs. See Schleiffer, *The Making of Tocqueville Democracy in America*, pp. 58-61. Tocqueville thus incorporated political culture into his analyses.

[7] Tocqueville, *The Old Regime and the French Revolution*, pp. 146-147. Tocqueville complained that the French men of letters who shaped the national temperament and outlook on life were able to do so because the French had little training in politics.

[8] *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990), p.17.

[9] Huntington, *The Third* Wave, p. 7.

[10] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, pp 58-60.

[11] Ibid., p.60.

[12] For a discussion of Tocqueville's overturning of the prevalent European idea of the state and sovereignty, see Larry Siedentop, *Tocqueville* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp.41-43.

[13] Huntington, *The Third Wave,* p.16.

[14] Ibid. p. 13.

[15] Samuel P. Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968) pp.7-8.

[16] Ibid. p.26.

[17] For a sharp denunciation of the authoritarian European state tradition and a vigorous defense of Tocqueville's approach affirming the importance of decentralized politics and local self-government in fostering freedom, see Michael Hereth, *Alexis de Tocqueville: Threats to Freedom in Democracy* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1986), pp.39-44.

[18] Huntington, *The Third Wave*, p. 9.

[19] For a detailed discussion of how Tocqueville wrestled with the fact that he could not come up with a clear-cut definition of democracy, see James T. Schleifer's *The Making of Tocqueville's Democracy in America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press), pp. 263-274. Equality was such a major component of his definition of democracy that Tocqueville once thought of naming the second volume of his study of American democracy, which appeared in 1840, *Equality in America*.

[20] For example, there are no entries for equality in the index of *The Third Wave*.

[21] Democratic despotism came to France during the course of the French Revolution. The liberal phase of the French Revolution gave way to the Reign of Terror, Napoleon, and the Bourbon Restoration. The 1830 revolution failed to transform France into a democracy because it restricted participation to a tiny minority of educated men of wealth and property.. As a deputy in the French Parliament (1839-1851), Tocqueville witnessed the overthrow of the July Monarchy in the 1848 Revolution and the *coup d'état* engineered by Louis Napoléon that shelved the Second Republic's democratic institutions. France did not become a liberal democracy until the establishment of the Third Republic (1879-1940) until twenty years after Tocqueville's death in 1859.