

Geliř Tarihi / Received: 07.01.2017
Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 06.09.2017

Sayfa / pp: 183-192

A CRITICAL APPROACH TO TOCQUEVILLE'S UNDERSTANDING OF DEMOCRACY

TOCQUEVILLE'İN DEMOKRASİ ANLAYIŐINA ELEŐTİREL BİR YAKLAŐIM

Dr. Durmuő Ali YÜKSEK
Turkish Military Academy
Department of Sociology
durmusaliyukse@gmail.com

Abstract

Over the years, Alexis de Tocqueville's masterwork, Democracy in America, has been praised by politicians, scientists, and researchers as a brilliant analysis of modern democratic society. Observing American politics, society, and culture, Tocqueville's deep analysis has provided us a message which offers a political program for sustaining prosperous, stable, and free democratic societies. Today, this message becomes especially important and necessary for the democratic societies since today's problems are much more complicated, ambiguous, and unexpected than ever, and therefore it is more difficult to preserve and maintain democracy. In this regard, understanding what democracy means to Tocqueville, how he explains the social and historical origins of democracy, and how, according to him, democracy maintains itself becomes an inevitable task for today's democratic societies. This manuscript is an effort to search for plausible answers to these questions with a critical perspective to Tocqueville's understanding of democracy.

Keywords: Democracy, equality, liberty

Öz

Alexis de Tocqueville'in baőyapıtı, Amerika'da Demokrasi, yıllardır politikacılar, bilim adamları ve arařtırmacılar tarafından modern demokratik toplumun mükemmel bir analizi olduėu gerekçesiyle övülmektedir. Tocqueville'in Amerikan siyasetini, toplumunu ve kültürünü gözlemlediėi derin analizi, bizlere özgür, istikrarlı ve müreffeh demokratik toplumları sürdürebilmek için gerekli olan bir politik programın önerildiėi bir mesaj sunmaktadır. Günümüzde, bu mesaj demokratik toplumlar için özellikle önemli ve gerekli hale gelmiőtir, çünkü günümüzün problemleri hiç olmadığı kadar karmaőık, belirsiz ve beklenmedik bir durumdadır ve bu sebeple de demokrasiyi korumak ve sürdürmek çok daha zor hale gelmiőtir. Bu kapsamda, Tocqueville'e göre demokrasi ne demektir, Tocqueville demokrasinin toplumsal ve tarihi kökenlerini nasıl açıklar ve ona göre demokrasi kendisini nasıl idame ettirir sorularını anlamak günümüzün demokratik toplumları için kaçınılmaz bir görev haline gelmiőtir. Bu alıőma, Tocqueville'in demokrasi anlayıőına eleőtirel bir yaklaőımla bu sorulara makul cevapların arandıėı bir abayı temsil etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Demokrasi, eőtlik, özgürlük

1. INTRODUCTION¹

Alexis de Tocqueville was a lover of equality, he was a lover of liberty, and he was surely a lover of democracy. As a French nationalist, he wanted, as all nationalists want for their nation and their country, to promote the level of knowledge and the level of success of his country. He believed in the power of democracy and its irresistible spread throughout the world (vol. 1: xiii). Tocqueville was convinced that democratic governance would eventually come to European shores and he hoped to help the development of democracy in Europe and especially in his hometown, France (Kalberg, 2007). He was also the first modern thinker to predict that Western societies would be organized along democratic lines (Mitchell, 2004). Tocqueville illustrates this belief through his many historical and philosophical manuscripts, such as *Democracy in America* and *The Old Regime and the Revolution*. Not only does his love for democracy come through in his writing, but also his conviction that democracy is the natural next step in the development of civilized governments. He proves this when he discusses the ideas of equality and liberty. He believes that the spread of democracy is irresistible due to the gradual, universal, and permanent progress of equality that cannot be halted by anyone; especially in an era when democracy has grown so strong and its adversaries so weak (vol. 1: 12). As Tocqueville foresaw, democracy has demonstrated its gradual progress and unstoppable strength against the feudal system, emperors, tyrants, and dictators all around the world throughout history. As will be discussed in detail with all its aspects in the following sections, it has not been difficult for historians and the 18th and the 19th century thinkers such as Tocqueville to see this gradual progress of equality, liberty, and democracy throughout the world, especially after the 1789 French Revolution. Since then, with the ideas of nationalism that had been strengthened by the ideas of equality, liberty, and democracy, big empires such as Austria-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires started to lose their states one by one in the first place, and new democratic states started to be founded with the ideas of liberty and equality. Today, this unstoppable and indispensable progress of equality and democracy continues its journey. Considering the above ideas in mind, three issues will be addressed in this manuscript with a critical perspective: how Tocqueville understands the concept of democracy, how he explains the social and historical origins of democracy, and how democracy maintains itself according to him.

2. THE CONCEPT OF DEMOCRACY

Lipset defines democracy “as a political system which supplies regular constitutional opportunities for changing the governing officials” (1959: 71). In this sense, democracy is a political mechanism for regular change, whenever necessary, of the set of political leaders in office. It is also “a social mechanism for the resolution of the problem of societal decision-making among conflicting interest groups which permits the largest possible part of the population to influence these decisions through their ability to choose among alternative contenders for political office” (Lipset, 1959: 71). Democracy, in this case, is known to be the societal influence on the selected political leaders’ way of ruling of people. Of course this ruling may regulate itself in different governmental ways. But the most important part of ruling in a democracy is that the power or the sovereignty, which for Tocqueville is at the bottom of all human institutions, is vested by people or at least a group of people who represent the whole body. Equality, on the other hand, is a measure of true democracy without which a true democracy cannot flourish since democracy means for each individual to have the right to equal representation. In *Democracy in America*, the masterpiece of Alexis de Tocqueville, Tocqueville clearly illustrates that he believes in equality and sees it as an indispensable feature of democracy. According to him, democracy cannot flourish without the existence of equality. For him, equality has a very important place in democratic life. He shows this by

¹ Throughout the text, I refer to the Doubleday & Company Inc. version of *Democracy in America*, published by Anchor Books, Garden City, New York (1969).

Doubleday version of *Democracy in America* has two volumes. Hence, throughout the text, vol. 1 refers to Volume 1 of the book followed by the page number.

explaining his feelings about the conditions of equality that he encountered in America. He says: “no novelty in the United States struck me more vividly during my stay there than the equality of conditions” (vol. 1: 9). According to Tocqueville, equality is the main element that enables the essential components to be created properly in a democratic regime. These essential components, such as free opinions and free associations of citizens are necessary for both governments and civil society. He puts forth his faith in the unstoppable progress of democracy with the explanations of the development of equality. He does this by considering the last seven hundred years of France wherein he believes that almost no political or historical development prohibited the development of equality and democracy (vol. 1: 9). Every battle between the powerful and the powerless to control power, political weight or landed property, which was actually the main source of power until the 18th century, created the essential components toward equality and democracy by way of new inventions, improvements and innovations. The geographical discoveries of the 15th and the 16th centuries, the Renaissance and Reform movements that took place from the 14th to the 17th centuries, and the Industrial Revolution of the 18th and the 19th centuries increased the level of knowledge of people. This increase in knowledge, which fostered the steps toward the equality of men, was required in a democratic society to “discern the causes of their [people in the democratic society] own wretchedness” (vol. 1: 225). Moreover, Tocqueville states, as the knowledge of all individuals increased, it leveled the knowledge gap among people of all classes and therefore the concept of equality among all also spread. Related to increased intelligence, the work of the mind, which, according to Tocqueville, became the new source of power in the information age, such as “poetry, eloquence, memory, the graces of the mind, the fires of the imagination and profundity of thought” (vol. 1: 11) have been a profit to democracy. For Tocqueville, this new step of general leveling and the increase in knowledge has been just the beginning of a democratic society. The next step has been to educate democracy which means “to substitute understanding of statecraft for present inexperience and knowledge of its true interests for blind instincts; to adapt government to the needs of time and place; and to modify it as men and circumstances require” (vol. 1: 12). Therefore, according to Tocqueville, democracy without limits and control brings the society both its ills and good points, but it is difficult to see the benefits it may bring.

In this period, while the work of the mind had been demonstrating its influence on society, Europe, according to Tocqueville, was in a mess especially after the 1789 French Revolution, due to the chaos that arose from the disruption. The foundation of *ancien regime*, which treated different people unequally based on their birth status, disappeared after the revolution. However, the French Revolution was a radical affair. The reason is that the end of absolutism in France after the revolution opened the way for industrialization and rapid economic growth (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2012). In this regard, from the perspective of Tocqueville, there was no doubt whether France was to be a monarchy or a republic following the revolution, but whether it was to be an agitated or a tranquil, orderly or disorderly republic (vol. 1: xiv). Briefly, he was concerned with whether France was to be either a democratic liberty or a democratic tyranny in the recovering process after the destruction process, and he saw this as the main problem for France. In those days, while Europe had been struggling with wars, revolutions and complexities following them, he saw America as the best example of a republic that had solved these problems many years ago.

According to Tocqueville, democracy, as he observed and experienced in America and hoped to be established in France, is the natural next step for civilized governments. It is the final outcome of the gradual progress of equality, which for him has been universal, permanent, and unstoppable by any generation. He illustrates his faith in the progress of equality and democracy by defining this trend as God’s will. He says: “God does not Himself need to speak for us to find sure signs of His will; it is enough to observe the customary progress of nature and the continuous tendency of events” (vol. 1: 12). Tocqueville believes in the holiness of democracy and equality. He thinks that democracy is a social state that was imposed by God, and anyone who tries to prevent it is a sinner. Tocqueville thinks that democracy is the most plausible governmental form granted by God to people. Of course, while not appreciating a thing that was approved by God constitutes a sin, he thinks that not believing in democracy, not applying it, and the movements against it constitute a sin. He says: “effort to halt democracy appears

as a fight against God Himself, and nations have no alternative but to acquiesce in the social state imposed by Providence” (vol. 1: 12). With this faith in democracy and its unstoppable progress in history he believes that equality and democracy are the protectors of society from tyranny. Tocqueville sees one country in the world that has finished its journey through the gradual progress of equality and has completed its democratic revolution without actually experiencing the revolution itself. This country is the United States of America.

For Tocqueville, America was the best example for France to model its new republic. For him, America was a republic that has provided peace, guaranteed private property, and preserved rights for its citizens. America also impressed Tocqueville with its people, Americans, who resisted to take advantage of each other and instead looked out for themselves (Putnam, 2000). Moreover, Tocqueville believes that France should not only take America as a model for itself, but France should also try to better understand what institutions will best suit France rather than just copy the institutions that America has for itself. Tocqueville claims that France should adopt “the principles on which the constitutions of the American states rest, the principles of order, balances of powers, true liberty, and sincere and deep respect for law” (vol. 1: xiv), the principles, which are indispensable for all republics, the principles, which are essential for individual growth and fulfillment (Mitchell, 2004).

Based on his observations both in America and France, Tocqueville asserts that the progress of equality and subsequently democracy is unstoppable and inevitable for societies. As illustrated above, Tocqueville reinforces his faith in the unstoppable progress of equality and democracy in societies with his views that this progress is God’s will and anything against it means to defy His orders. However, when Tocqueville’s thesis of the gradual, unstoppable, and inevitable progress of equality and democracy is assessed in a more comprehensive manner, it seems implausible and inadequate. When the words unstoppable and inevitable are used in reference to anything, it is understood that it will happen sooner or later. Things that happen sooner or later reveal a perception in people’s eyes in time that the occurring event or the change is natural. In other words, as stated by Tocqueville, the unstoppable and inevitable change that has occurred in the direction of equality and democracy in societies over time and is expected to continue to occur in the future is a natural change. A natural change is expected to be a change that is spontaneous or at least has its resources in its own. It is illogical to claim that the change is natural when it occurs with the help of a force brought in from outside the system. This kind of change might possibly be called artificial since it is imposed from outside against the resistance of the intrinsic tendencies.

It could be claimed that there are two possible ways for the comprehensive social changes in a society: a social change either in the form of a bottom-up or top-to-bottom. The first of these is the top-to-bottom change that is expected to happen with the enforcement or the guidance of the executive minorities or leaders who are at the top of the governmental hierarchy and manage the majority of society. The second of these is the bottom-up change that is expected to happen with the enforcement or the urge of the majority of the society who force their leaders to accept it. In the first of these two types of changes, the future of the change is expected to be uncertain since it is not adopted by the majority of the society and since it is by way of forcing the majority; however, in the second of these two types of changes, the future of the change is expected to be more certain and hopeful since it is adopted by the majority and since there doesn’t seem to be any possible resistance by the minority or the leaders. As Tocqueville argues, majority opinion has a moral authority. It is widely believed that “there is more enlightenment and wisdom in a numerous assembly than in a single man” and hence “the interests of the greatest number should be preferred to that of those who are fewer” (vol. 1: 247). If Tocqueville’s thesis of a social change in the direction of equality and democracy in a society is a natural phenomenon, it must be a change in the form of bottom-up. Only by this form of a change, by the urge of the majority of society and the effort that comes from inside the system, it can be claimed that this social change is performed in its natural cycle. Since the top-to-bottom change contains an enforcement performed by the leaders to the majority, this form of social change cannot be asserted as natural.

If we turn back to our discussion considering Tocqueville's thesis of unstoppable and inevitable progress of equality and democracy, it can be said that since democracy is a governmental form in a country, the change in the governmental form of that country is assumed to be major and comprehensive of public concern. Therefore, this change is supposed to happen by using one of above-mentioned two ways. It is assumed that the form of change that Tocqueville expects to happen for France by using America as the example is the second form of social change. Because Tocqueville implies that the social change in the direction of equality and democracy is natural, and that people will eventually put forward their desire to live in a more equal and free environment and force their leaders for equality and democracy as they increase their level of knowledge and realize the innovations, developments, and their importance as human beings for the society. Tocqueville believes that France should not copy the institutions that America has for herself, but France should only adopt America's general democratic principles while considering its own social and historical values. Here, Tocqueville mentions a social change that is derived from a motivation by individuals within a society. However, he does not take the facts into consideration that acceptance and the introduction of the principles of democracy produce different results in different societies according to the two forms of changes, either bottom-up or top-to-bottom.

Related to above, it can be argued that individuals of different societies value different religions, cultures, traditions, and customs, due to their unequal capacities. Tocqueville rejects the idea that all citizens have equal capacities. However, his major argument was that while democratic equality tends to draw individuals apart from one another, due to their unequal capacities, it also awakens them and makes them aware of their differences (Mitchell, 2004). For this reason, it would not be wrong to say that the creation of extensive planned changes in societies will be shaped in line with these social values. Also, it should always be expected that individuals within a society might not be in the same level of knowledge that Tocqueville mentions, and they might not be aware of the innovations and developments occurring throughout the world. Therefore, these individuals might not have the courage to put pressure on their leaders to make changes in matters of interest of the wider community. Considering that America was founded by the individuals who immigrated to America from Europe, it can be asserted that France has a close cultural background with America. Also, the fact that the main improvements and innovations throughout history, such as Renaissance and Reform movements and Industrial Revolution have taken place in an area that strongly influences both Great Britain and France prepares the ground for us to claim that both France and America, due to the immigrations from Great Britain to America, have extremely benefited from these innovations and developments. Additionally, Tocqueville believes that the general tendency towards equality and democracy is not peculiar to France. It also takes place throughout the Christian world (vol. 1: 12). Therefore, the similarity of the religious values between America and France can also be given as strong proof for the closeness of the social values of the two countries. When all these factors are considered, it would be too optimistic to expect the same natural development in the direction of equality and democracy, that Tocqueville especially suggests and hopes for France, in the societies that are far from Europe and far from the cultural and social values which are predominant in countries such as America and France. Because in the societies which are far from the European civilization² it would not be as easy as in France to occur a bottom-up social change, a change that originates in its own, due to the dominant religions, cultures, traditions, and customs of those societies. Still today, it doesn't seem to exactly get answer in those societies whether people can become aware of their own selves and whether they will be able to reach social change in the direction of equality and democracy, such as the one that Tocqueville anticipated for France.

Finally, it can be said that without people who know what democracy means and who consubstantiate themselves with a democratic society it will not be possible to reach the second stage of a democratic society that Tocqueville entitles it as democracy education, through which people learn how to build social and civic associations of all sorts that work as a new buffer against state centralization

² Especially in the 18th century and beyond.

(Skocpol, 1997). Tocqueville doesn't answer the question of how people in those uncivilized societies would live in democratic regimes if there was a top-to-bottom social change in the direction of democracy which isn't natural with Tocqueville's words. It can be expected that the dominant social values in societies are extremely influential to the comprehensive social changes such as the one in the direction of equality and democracy. Therefore as Tocqueville mentions it should be considered that democracy without being approved by the society might bring its ills instead of its benefits.

3. THE SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF DEMOCRACY

In order to understand the way Tocqueville discusses the origins of democracy, first, it is needed to look at how he answers the question: who were the first immigrants to America? According to Tocqueville, they were people who had the same cultural and historical background. These immigrants had been raised in a country which provided them the protection of the laws, acquainted them with notions of rights and principles of true liberty, and learned them the importance of the dogma of the sovereignty of the people (vol. 1: 33). Therefore, historically, these people had the tendency and desire to live equally and freely. Second, it is needed to understand, from Tocqueville's perspective, why these people immigrated to America. The term colonialism can be explained as the establishment, acquisition and expansion of colonies in a territory by people from another territory (Cooper, 2005). When considering the importance of colonialism that lasted from 1500s to 1900s for European colonial powers, such as England, Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands, and France, Tocqueville queries the reasons of these migrations from Europe to America, especially from England. He consults the opinions of a historian of the early years of New England, Nathaniel Morton. According to Morton, the actual reason for British migration to America was not a materialistic reason or a feeling of adventure that arises from the colonial intentions of the immigrants; "it is the scattering of the seed of a great people which God with His own hands is planting on a predestined shore" (vol. 1: 37). The main reason for British migration to America was the advancement of the Christian faith for the glory of God. Tocqueville states that the colonial system that was performed by these first immigrants in America was different from the one that was adopted by the rest of the European colonial powers. Under this system a number of immigrants were given the authority to establish a government in the colony under the control of the motherland and were allowed to govern themselves freely in any way not contrary to the motherland's laws. According to Tocqueville, this mode of colonization was the most compatible with the idea of liberty, and was put into practice only in America (vol. 1: 40).

Tocqueville clearly explains the way the New World was colonized and the characteristics of the two different parts of the New World that allowed immigrants; one in the southwest of the Hudson "the South," and the other in the east of the Hudson "the North" (vol. 1: 34). Immigrants who were sent to the South were men without standards or wealth, and they had no noble thought or conception. Therefore, slavery was one of the first social institutions that had been introduced in the South. According to Tocqueville, slavery was the best indicator of the South's social condition and morality (vol. 1: 35). By means of demonstrating the unique characteristics of the English colonies of the South, Acemoglu and Robinson (2012: 30) states that "eighteenth-century England had a simple solution for dealing with criminals: out of sight, out of mind, or at least out of trouble." The empire sent the convicted criminals primarily to the American colonies, especially the South (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2012). On the other hand, although the English background of the colonies that were sent to the North was the same to the colonies who were sent to the South, the characteristics were totally different. In contrast to the South, the immigrants who came to settle in the North belonged to the well-to-do classes with wealth, education, and morals. As Tocqueville indicates, "it was in the English colonies of the North that the two or three main principles now forming the basic social theory of the United States were combined" (vol. 1: 35). Additionally, for Tocqueville, the most important difference between the immigrants sent to the North from the immigrants sent to the South was their different aims (vol. 1: 36). While the immigrants in the South came to America with materialistic intentions, the immigrants in the North came to America with

the intentions that Nathaniel Morton explained to us. The immigrants of the North “tore themselves away from home comforts in obedience to a purely intellectual craving; in facing the inevitable sufferings of exile they hoped for the triumph of an idea” (vol. 1: 36).

Considering the above explanations about the first immigrants who came to America and their differentiating characteristics in the South and in the North, Tocqueville asserts that the origins of democracy consist of circumstances, origin, education, and mores, namely the whole moral and intellectual state of an individual, meaning the opinions, notions, and ideas that shaped their mental and moral habits (Mitchell, 2004). For Tocqueville, circumstances are briefly the laws of land inheritance that prevent the creation of great wealth and strengthened the family. The laws of inheritance lead them to cooperate with the law. The origins of democracy, according to Tocqueville, are the sources of the Anglo-American civilization and the two perfectly distinct elements which have normally been at conflict with each other, but have been in a perfect harmony in America: the spirit of freedom and the spirit of religion. As Mitchell (2004) argues, freedom and religion are linked to each other in an individual who struggles to have an exemplary life and to attract the good grace of God through the belief that freedom is a question of choosing to do evil as well as to do good. The spirit of freedom arises from the social and historical background of the British that demonstrates itself as the germ of freedom. The spirit of religion arises from the English sect Puritanism, which embraces the most absolute democratic and republican theories. It protects and creates mores, and mores limit democracy for the maintenance of freedom (vol. 1: 47).

When considering Tocqueville’s opinions regarding the origins of democracy, the necessity to look at the issue from a different perspective emerges due to his flawed argument and inadequate concentration on the origins of democracy, especially on education. First of all, the effects of the origins of democracy in the formation of a democratic society by examining the existing American social order at that time and by considering the characteristics of the British colonies in the North and in the South can be more clearly delineated. At this point, it can be claimed that while the two elements of the origins of democracy for Tocqueville, circumstances and origin, are the same for both the North and the South, education and mores are not the same for the two. It can also be claimed that the difference between the North and the South, that arises from the different levels of education and mores, create social differences between the two. Even though there is a difference between the levels of education of the immigrants in the North and in the South, it comes to mind the question of whether the South has shortcomings with regard to religion, especially considering that immigrants from both the North and the South had connections to the same religion. Moreover, this religion to which almost all British immigrants to America were connected, stressed the importance of equality and freedom given by religion, as Tocqueville suggested: “it is religion which leads to enlightenment and the observance of divine laws which leads men to liberty” (vol. 1: 45). Although it is not exactly possible to prove here, education is expected to make a considerable contribution to the creation of mores assuming that religion, from the perspective of Tocqueville, creates mores. This emphasizes the importance of the education of religion. Therefore, considering the relationship between education and religion, it can be claimed that education is the most fundamental difference between the North and the South, compared to other origins of democracy. This relationship between education and religion puts forward a conclusion that supports the thesis presented in the first section which stated that comprehensive social changes in societies take place by either a bottom-up or a top-to-bottom form of change, and the possible change in these societies are shaped in line with the dominant social values in these societies. Since there has not been the ability to provide a bottom-up social change in the societies that have low levels of education, a social change towards an equal, free, and democratic society does not occur in them as it didn’t occur in the South. On the other hand, in the educated North, as Tocqueville puts it “we can see the birth and growth of the local independence which is still the mainspring and lifeblood of American freedom” (vol. 1: 44) that provides the ability for a bottom-up social change in America.

Additionally, when the British colonial history is examined, it can be seen that they established many colonies throughout the world in a very short time (Murdoch, 2004). Considering this information, it

comes to mind the question of why the first democratic movements began not in any other colony, but in America. When it is assumed that all the immigrants who were sent to the colonial territories other than America had the same circumstances and origins, two different conclusions can be reached. First, the immigrants who were sent to the other colonial territories had lower levels of education than the ones who were sent to New England, and therefore democracy in the real sense was first put into practice in New England. Second, circumstances, origins, education, and consequently mores of the immigrants who were sent to the other colonial territories were the same with the ones who were sent to New England. However, as stated above, democracy in the real sense was first put into practice in New England. In this case, it turns out to be another reason or origin of democracy that causes this conclusion to occur. Tocqueville doesn't give any explanation in this regard.

4. HOW DEMOCRACY MAINTAINS ITSELF

For Tocqueville, there are three causes that maintain the democratic republic in the United States: the peculiar and accidental situation of America, the laws, and the habits and mores of the Americans (vol. 1: 277). When Tocqueville speaks of the peculiar and accidental situations in America, he means the characteristics of the environment in which the Americans have lived. America has provided its citizens a peaceful environment with no hostile neighbors, no crisis, no wars or no fear of invasions. As Ostrom (1997) points out, these circumstances did not exist in a Europe plagued by warfare and quests for imperial dominance. According to Tocqueville, there are four accidental sub-situations that maintain the democratic republic in the United States. First, Tocqueville thinks that the preponderance of great capitals in a country is a threat to the representative system since they might prevent people to assemble and get excited for their rights. Moreover, the existence of great capitals may encourage individuals to use intermediaries for the execution of their desires, which therefore may be dangerous for the protection of their rights. Following this logic, Tocqueville asserts that the fact that America had no great capital had been the primary reason for the maintenance of its republican institutions (vol. 1: 279). Second, for Tocqueville, one of the origins of democracy, the Puritan origin of the first immigrants who were sent to New England, is also an accidental cause that maintains democracy in America. He states that this is because the characteristics of the Puritans that they inherited from their ancestors best fit to make a republic flourish (vol. 1: 279). The third accidental cause, which is the most important and the most extraordinary for Tocqueville when compared to other causes, is the land choice. He states that the land that the Americans have lived on provides them a limitless continent where they can live freely and equally, a land that can lead these lucky people to prosperity (vol. 1: 279). Finally, Tocqueville thinks that as new immigrants from Europe come to the New World, they settle down and dwell on the transatlantic coast while the American population who had lived on the shores of the New World left their birthplaces and moved off to the wilderness of America. He calls this as the double movement. For him, the double movement which can be achieved with a restless spirit, immoderate desire for wealth and an extreme love of independence assures a long and peaceful future for the republic (vol. 1: 281).

According to Tocqueville, laws, one of the three main causes, contribute to the maintenance of a democratic republic with the combination of three factors: first, federalism, which enabled "the Union to combine the power of a great republic with the security of a small one;" second, communal institutions, which "limit the despotism of the majority and at the same time impart to the people a taste for freedom and the art of being free;" and lastly the organization of the judicial power, in which citizens as jurors directly participate in the application and enforcement of law (vol. 1: 287). He asserts that laws demonstrate their importance for democracy as barriers that restrain people's unlimited passions since these passions might overthrow the democratic republic unless they are controlled.

In the discussion of the mores as one of the three essential necessities for the maintenance of democracy, Tocqueville first mentions the prevalence of religion in the United States. According to him, this prevalence arises from the complete separation of church and state. Then, he reemphasizes the relationship between religion and mores. He asserts that religion controls and directs mores, thus regulates

individuals' lives and finally organizes the state (vol. 1: 291). According to him, religion is a need for a republic, and a society without strong religious and moral values cannot survive.

Tocqueville believes that the three main causes of the maintenance of democracy have different levels of influence on American democracy. While the peculiar and accidental causes have less influence than the laws, the laws also have less influence than mores. He proves these different levels of influence between the three main causes by using comparisons. For instance, he compares the Northern portion of America to the Southern portion in order to deduce that accidental causes cannot be the real reason for America's democratic success (vol. 1: 306). Then, he compares America to Mexico to deduce that the laws also cannot be the real reason for democracy to progress in America (vol. 1: 307). Lastly, he compares the Anglo-Americans in the East to the Anglo-Americans in the West to deduce that "it is mores that is capable of maintaining to rule democracy in the United States, and it is mores again that make the various Anglo-American democracies more or less orderly and prosperous" (vol. 1: 308).

Tocqueville's opinions about the successful implementation and maintenance of democracy in America are comprehensive and should be carefully examined. Especially the comparative analysis that he puts forward between the accidental causes and the laws and between the laws and mores are highly successful. However, his opinions about the strong association between religion and mores subsequent to his ideas about the importance of religion for a democratic society have caused the formation of different perceptions in the triangle of democracy, religion, and mores. Therefore, they need to be elaborated. Tocqueville says: "religion is much more needed in the republic they advocate than in the monarchy they attack, and in democratic republics most of all. How could society escape destruction if, when political ties are relaxed, moral ties are not tightened? And what can be done with a people master of itself if it is not subject to God?" (vol. 1: 294). Here, according to Tocqueville, the importance of religion for a democratic society is clear. In addition, for him, the moral tightness is needed rather than political tightness for a society to survive, that is, individuals need to be well-educated in terms of certain human values. Tocqueville believes that these values can be best acquired with an adequate religious education. Also, it is understood from the above statement that individuals who do not believe in God and who are self-sufficient cannot be beneficial to society or can be detrimental to society. In this case, it appears that there are a few unanswered questions. First of all, should it be understood from Tocqueville's views that individuals who don't believe in God or who don't have any commitment to any religion cannot develop mores? Can democracy not thrive in a society of people who do not believe in God? And lastly, does the fear of God, which arises from the commitment to a religion, pushes individuals to the belief in equality, freedom, and democracy? It could be said that it is quite difficult to deny the existence of education in the development of mores. However, while this education might be religious education, it may, in fact also be the education of basic human values that is obtained from family. Values such as honesty, honor, being considerate, being well-intentioned, and being understanding in addition to traditions and customs are not only obtained by religious education, but substantially they are instilled by family in the upbringing process of the child. There is no doubt for a society consisting of well-trained individuals in terms of these values to remain strong even if a problem in political ties emerges, as Tocqueville stated. Therefore, the question of whether or not individuals who do not believe in God or individuals who do not believe in the importance of human and social values are beneficial to society becomes more of an issue.

Additionally, Tocqueville emphasizes the importance of the complete separation of church and state for the prevalence of religion in the United States and presents this fact as the main reason of this prevalence (vol. 1: 294). Complete separation of church and state means to separate religion and state affairs. In this case, it comes to mind that whether this separation is secularism or not. It is the religious freedom in question in secularism. In secularism, while state does not intervene to individuals' faith, individuals also do not let their faith to intervene to state affairs. Therefore, while Tocqueville emphasizes the importance of the separation between church and state, namely secularism, doesn't he also emphasize the freedom not to believe in anything at the same time? If he does, doesn't he contradict himself by his view that an individual who do not believe in God, namely an atheist, cannot be beneficial to the society?

5. CONCLUSION

Tocqueville clearly believed in equality, liberty, and democracy and hoped for democratic institutions to dominate in all governmental forms throughout the world. However, upon further inspection of his arguments, criticism can be made in three different points. First, in his argument of the natural progress of equality and democracy, he does not consider the societies other than American and French societies and generalizes this natural cycle for all the societies without considering their social values and the differentiating interactions between social values in those societies and the concepts of equality and democracy. Second, in his argument of the origins of democracy, he does not give enough importance on education as possibly the most fundamental origin of democracy, and does not consider the possibility of the availability of other types of origins of democracy. Third, in his argument of the maintenance of democracy, he does not sufficiently elaborate the concepts of religion, mores, and secularism. Those that I have suggested in the sections above show that, although Tocqueville examined America in detail by addressing all its aspects, there might still be questions to be answered and issues to be more clearly elaborated. Today, while there still are people who have been struggling for equality, liberty, and democracy throughout the world, Tocqueville's ideas about democracy continues to light the way for them. Because, as Mitchell (2004: 48) argues, "Tocqueville reaches beyond the future of America to the future of Western society, indeed to the future of the entire human race. While, to be sure, people were becoming more and more alike, they were also gaining more and more knowledge about people in different parts of the world. Democracy is indeed universal in its thrust. No one is left untouched."

REFERENCES

- ACEMOGLU, D. and ROBINSON, J. A. (2012). *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*. Crown Business.
- COOPER, F. (2005). *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge and History*. University of California Press.
- DE TOCQUEVILLE, A. (1969). *Democracy in America*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co, Anchor Books.
- KALBERG, S. (1997). "Tocqueville and Weber on the Sociological Origins of Citizenship: The Political Culture of American Democracy." *Citizenship Studies*. 1(2): 199-222.
- LIPSET, S. M. (1959). "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy." *The American Political Science Review*. 53(1): 69-105.
- MITCHELL, H. (2004). *America After Tocqueville: Democracy Against Difference*. Cambridge University Press.
- MURDOCH, A. J. (2004). *British Emigration, 1603-1914*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- OSTROM, V. (1997). *The Meaning of Democracy and the Vulnerabilities of Democracies: A Response to Tocqueville's Challenge*. The University of Michigan Press.
- PUTNAM, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon and Schuster.
- SKOCPOL, T. (1997). "The Tocqueville Problem: Civic Engagement in American Democracy." *Social Science History*. 21(4): 455-479.