IN THE SHADE OF TOCQUEVILLE

by

SHERYL GORDON

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2011

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in History in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Professor Richard Wolin

Date

Chair of Examining Committee

Professor Steven Remy

Date

Acting Executive Officer

Professor Martin Burke

Professor Matthew Mancini

Professor Helena Rosenblatt

Professor Jonathan Sassi

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

IN THE SHADE OF TOCQUEVILLE

by

Sheryl Gordon

Adviser: Distinguished Professor Richard Wolin

This dissertation examines the reception of Alexis de Tocqueville by American and European intellectuals who worked and lived in America during the 1940s and 1950s. The intellectuals featured in the dissertation include David Riesman, Louis Hartz, Hannah Arendt, and Leo Strauss. I analyze their personal correspondence and seminal scholarly works, each of which has helped promote different images of Tocqueville. Re-evaluating the Tocquevillean aspects of these influential works, such as *The Lonely Crowd, The Liberal Tradition in America, Origins of Totalitarianism,* and *Natural Right and History*, sheds new light on the authors' true understanding of Tocqueville and deep appreciation of his ideas. I also examine the use of Tocqueville by Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Council Against Communist Aggression, and F.A. Hayek to understand how Tocqueville became the anti-Marx during the fifties. I argue that Tocqueville's ideas played an important role in shaping the thoughts and views of all of these intellectuals during this important period after the Second World War and the beginning of the Cold War. Concerned with the flaws of a democratic society that promoted equality and liberty, they found in Tocqueville the ways to fix them, and, ultimately, hope.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the help, guidance and support from several individuals. Each has contributed greatly to my growth as a scholar, teacher and person.

Jack Diggins, who was always generous with his time and thoughts, helped spark my interest in Tocqueville. It was he who suggested writing a dissertation on the reception of Tocqueville. I am glad I did, and wish he knew that I finally listened to his command to Start Writing.

I am extremely grateful to my adviser, Richard Wolin, for his encouragement, patience, kindness, and advice. From his courses and example, he has showed me the importance of intellectual history. I am also very appreciative that he took the time to read multiple drafts of my dissertation and for his willingness to share some of his sharp insights with me. Helena Rosenblatt's invaluable critique of a draft of my dissertation challenged me to produce stronger work. I am very happy she served as my Second Reader. It has been an honor to work with Matthew Mancini. Every conversation inspired me, deepened my interest in Tocqueville, and helped me see beyond the dissertation stage. I am very fortunate that he also served on my dissertation committee. I would also like to thank Martin Burke and Jonathan Sassi for serving on my committee. I appreciated their careful readings of my dissertation and thoughtful questions.

I would also like to thank Jackie Gutwirth and the fantastic faculty at Bronx Community College for giving me the opportunity to present a chapter to one of their semester's Brainstorms

in Fair Weather seminars. Their professional treatment of my work gave me the motivation to finish.

During the course of my research, I gained access to several manuscripts. I could not have asked for better archivists to work with. All were extraordinarily helpful. I am also grateful for the financial support from CUNY over the years, including a Graduate Teaching Fellowship, Writing Fellowship, and the Geoffrey Marshall Dissertation Fellowship.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family. Whether gently or forcefully, they have always motivated me to reach my goal. My parents, Rhoda and Jay Epstein, showed me at an early age the true joy and greatness of learning. I wish I could share this accomplishment with them. I am incredibly lucky to have such amazing in-laws, Judi and Jim Gordon, who have always helped out in any way possible. I deeply appreciate their support, which has extended far beyond babysitting.

I could not have completed this dissertation without my husband, Dan, who has supported me in every way possible. His patience, wisdom, encouragement, and love seem to know no bounds. I hope he knows how much I love and respect him. It is to him, and to our wonderful children, that I dedicate this dissertation.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Statement of the Dissertation Problem

This dissertation analyzes the reception of Alexis de Tocqueville in America during the immediate post-World War II period. Despite the numerous works on Tocqueville, the depths of Tocqueville's influence on intellectuals and politicians in America have yet to be explored. In *Democracy in America*, Alexis de Tocqueville expressed his admiration of democratic societies, but also shared his misgivings. Viewing democracy as inevitable but fragile, Tocqueville was quick to expose all the ways democracy could lead to despotism, even a new, soft despotism. His hesitation to embrace democracy fully and his tendency to compare it to aristocracy owed to the paradoxes in his personal life. Born in 1805 into an aristocratic family who witnessed firsthand the effects of the Terror, Tocqueville grew up in the first few decades following the French Revolution and the subsequent fall of the old regime. Tocqueville was caught between worlds.

The intellectuals featured in this dissertation were also caught between worlds. Like Tocqueville, David Riesman, Louis Hartz, Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss's perspectives about democracy were shaped by their backgrounds. Despite their personal acrimony towards one another, Arendt and Strauss shared fears about democracy common to German-Jewish refugees. None of these intellectuals, whose works have been extremely influential, can be easily classified in traditional political terms. Their independent thinking earned them controversial legacies. I will show how Tocqueville's influence is visible in their thinking and writing. Each used Tocqueville to critique democratic society while defending the basic precepts of liberal democracy. For the scholars and politicians who used Tocqueville to support their respective

anti-communist agendas and policies, such as Friedrich August von Hayek and Dwight D. Eisenhower, I argue that in Tocqueville they saw key ways to bolster America's defense against the Soviet threat.

Examining the use of Tocqueville in the published and unpublished writings of these intellectuals will also provide a better understanding of how national and international events affected Americans during this period. Recognized as a critical period in American and world history, the fifties have come under increasing scrutiny. Contrasted to the sixties, the fifties in America have been viewed nostalgically as slow-paced and conservative. This has in part been due to the inability or reluctance of writers and scholars in the fifties to articulate their frustrations with a rapidly changing society. The Second World War barely ended when America became engaged in another international crisis. Scholar-refugees such as Arendt and Strauss had the added difficulty of getting used to a new government and culture. There was also a reluctance to come to terms with the Holocaust and America's choice to use the atomic bomb. Despite the outward signs of economic progress, intellectuals questioned the meaning and limits of progress in a democratic society.

Over the past couple of decades scholars have sought to gain a better perspective of the postwar decade. In *The Fifties* (1994), David Halberstam depicted the decade as revolutionary. Profiling individuals responsible for changing the way Americans lived, Halberstam argued that the keys to success for these individuals were their innovative ideas backed by the ability to mass-produce the product to reach the majority of Americans. The mass-production of items such as televisions, cars, houses, and even restaurants sparked new critiques of affluent America. In *The Proud Decades*, Jack Diggins described the new mentality of the middle classes due to these changes. "Members of the fifties generation were unique. They had more education and

aspirations…They possessed more buying power and enjoyed more material pleasure than any generation of men and women in American history. And it is a measure of the complexity of the fifties that its members could reach no consensus about the meaning of their accomplishments and disappointments."[1] Critics such as David Riesman read Tocqueville to understand how Americans could measure success and retain individuality in this age of conformity.

Other scholars have emphasized the fractious nature of the fifties. In *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974* (1996), historian James T. Patterson described how the tangible signs of success in the postwar decade created such an optimistic spirit that Americans believed they could conquer social, cultural, economic and political problems such as racism and poverty. This optimistic spirit dissolved over the next couple of decades, as these initiatives were met with resistance, at times violent. Quoting a newspaper headline from November 11, 1973 that warned, "Things Will Get Worse Before They Get Worse," Patterson stated, "Many of the would-be Tocquevilles who searched for the essence of the United States in the mid-1970s—and later—were almost as pessimistic as the headline-writer above. Americans, they said, had become discontented, fractious, alienated, and divided into ever more self-conscious groups that identified themselves narrowly by region, gender, age, religion, ethnicity, and race."[2] In *America in the Fifties*, Andrew Dunar wrote that the movements of the 1960s and 1970s in which groups formed on these distinctions sought political rights and social recognition "have undeniable origins in the 1950s." Dunar noted, though, that in the fifties the beginnings of these movements "seemed barely discernible."[3] The writings of Hannah Arendt reveal how she

[1] John Patrick Diggins, *The Proud Decades: America in War and Peace, 1941-1960* (New York: Norton & Company, Inc., 1989), 219.
[2] James T. Patterson, *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 786. Patterson quoted the newspaper headline from Peter N. Carroll, *It Seemed Like Nothing Happened: America in the 1970s* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1982), 118.
[3] Andrew J. Dunar, *America in the Fifties* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2006), 1-2.

perceived these changes and saw in Tocqueville ways Americans could gain political and social rights.

In *A Kindler, Gentler America: Melancholia and the Mythical 1950s* (2005), Mary Caputi argued that neoconservatives have deliberately created a false image of the decade.[4] 1950s America, she wrote, "is a spiritual place housed in our past, an imagined dwelling space where neoconservatism would like us to live in the future. It is an idealized locale created by a longing in the present, a painful awareness of our current lack."[5] Missing from Caputi's work is any mention of Leo Strauss, who has been portrayed as the father of neo-conservatism. Straussians, scholars who declare an intellectual debt to Leo Strauss, have been the source of heated controversy. Critics of Straussians claim Straussians have an inordinate amount of power and influence and were responsible for shaping the hawkish foreign policy during George W. Bush's presidency. As Strauss wrote during the fifties, it is beneficial to revisit and situate his views of the world around him.

Dissertation Overview

This dissertation asks the following questions: How did intellectuals, organizations, and politicians in the late nineteen forties and fifties use Tocqueville to promote their ideal democratic society? How did their selective readings of Tocqueville reflect their own biases and beliefs? How have their influential works affected the national discourse in America? And, why Tocqueville?

In this dissertation I primarily conduct textual analysis. Scholars have often employed quantitative data to study the reception of Tocqueville in the postwar period. Following Robert

[4] Mary Caputi, *A Kindler, Gentler America: Melancholia and the Mythical 1950s* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005).
[5] Ibid., 18.

Nisbet's 1971 influential article, *Many Tocquevilles*, scholars have referenced the number of mentions of Tocqueville. However, Nisbet did not use actual statistics. Instead, he invoked anecdotal evidence. As Matthew Mancini has noted, later scholars took Nisbet's argument as fact and have not reviewed empirical evidence. Analyzing the number of times Tocqueville has been mentioned in scholarly journals since the nineteenth century is useful, as it shows the waves of Tocqueville's popularity in the United States and shows the widening scope of Tocqueville's influence in disciplines after World War II. However, the context and relevancy of Tocqueville in these articles must be considered as well. Taking this approach reveals that a key change to reading Tocqueville occurred at the turn of the twentieth century in a most unexpected area—the women right's movement. It also helps to understand why Tocqueville was given such preferential treatment in America. Analyzing the use of Tocqueville by intellectuals reveals the deep impact he had on their understanding of the changes to their cultural, social and political environment.

I revisit commonly known texts such as the influential works of David Riesman, Louis Hartz, Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss. Examining the visible and hidden elements that have made these works Tocquevillean, I look for ways Tocqueville was instrumental to the authors' theses and structural frameworks. I further explore how they used Tocqueville as a benchmark for their shifts in positions over time. I use both their published works and private correspondence to ascertain the depth and meaning of Tocqueville's influence in America during this critical time period.

I also take into account how their personal backgrounds affected their readings of Tocqueville. This adds a new dimension to the use of Tocqueville in the cold war, as it shifts the

focus from using Tocqueville as the anti-Marx to reading Tocqueville as the anti-Hitler, anti-Mussolini, and even anti-Hirohito.

Significance

Far from declining in importance, Tocqueville has become increasingly relevant since the fifties.[6] The theme of individualism that appeared in the fifties and became closely connected to Tocqueville became dominant in the nineteen eighties and nineties. In the 1980s, Robert Bellah's *Habits of the Heart* used Tocqueville to critique the individualization of Americans in a mass society. Harvard sociologist Robert Putnam's Tocquevillean work, *Bowling Alone* (2000) sparked a national critique on civil society in America. *Bowling Alone* quickly became an enormous bestseller, and Putnam soon became an invited guest on television programs, at Camp David, and "generally the toast of the beltway and academia."[7] In *Bowling Alone*, Putnam used Tocqueville's theory that voluntary associations are important for a functioning democracy to critique the disengagement of Americans.

Written after the West's victory in the Cold War, Putnam was not concerned with the possibility of America turning toward despotism or dictatorship. In fact, in over 400 pages, there is no reference to despotism. The only mention of dictatorship is in reference to online groups. "But to date, most online groups have the structure of either an anarchy [if unmoderated] of a dictatorship [if moderated]."[8] Rather, Putnam found that an abundance of social capital meant

[6] Scholars have also continued to find new aspects in Tocqueville's thought. See, for example, Aurelian Craiutu and Jeremy Jennings, *Tocqueville on America after 1840: Letters and Other Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). An increasing attention has been paid to Tocqueville's observations on the role of women as well. See, for example, Jill Locke and Eileen Hunt Botting, eds., *Feminist Interpretations of Alexis de Tocqueville* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009).
[7] Carl Boggs, "Social Capital and Political Fantasy: Robert Putnam's Bowling Alone," *Theory and Society* 30, no. 2 (April 2001): 281-2.
[8] Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2000), 173.

that collective problems are solved more easily, everyday business and social transactions are less costly, citizens are more tolerant of and empathetic of the misfortunes of others, citizens' personal goals such as employment are more likely to be achieved, and people would be better able to cope with health crises.[9] Overall, Putnam determined social capital "makes us smarter, healthier, safer, richer, and better able to govern a just and stable democracy."[10]

Putnam's work set off national debates about civil society and social capital. Social capital became such an important topic in the mid-1990s because it "became associated with the new types of questions after the end of the Cold War, such as why some democracies function better than others."[11] As Putnam became linked to Tocqueville, a new reception of Tocqueville took place.

> Guided by the assumption that building a vibrant and robust civil society is a prerequisite for successful democratization, in recent years civil society has become the focus of efforts by the United States to promote democracy abroad…This philosophical underpinning of these efforts is provided by an old and revered source: *Democracy in America*, Alexis de Tocqueville's classic treatise on American culture and institutions in the early part of the nineteenth century."[12]

After the cold war ended, proving democracy victorious, scholars and intellectuals continued to use Tocqueville to point out the flaws in democracy. Tocqueville became used not as a mere defense of liberal society, as the antidote to Marx, but as a way to understand how to create democratic societies in countries with undemocratic pasts, such as in Latin America and the former Soviet Union. Scholars also began to test out Putnam and Tocqueville's theories in

---

[9] Ibid., 289.
[10] Ibid., 290. Whereas Tocqueville found social power important to ward off despotism, Putnam valued associations for getting Americans jobs or warding off illness. That Putnam seemed preoccupied with the happiness of Americans and their ability to find a job through personal connections lent to a distorted image of Tocqueville.
[11] Frans J. Shuurman, "Social Capital: The Politico-Emancipatory Potential of a Disputed Concept," *Third World Quarterly* 24, no. 6 (December 2003): 991. Shuurman marked Putnam's *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* as the publication "which ignited the popularity of social capital."
[12] See Omar G. Encarnación, "Tocqueville's Missionaries: Civil Society Advocacy and the Promotion of Democracy," *World Policy Journal*, 17, no. 1 (Spring, 2000): 9.

India.[13] Their critiques gained new importance, as former communist and totalitarian states sought to create democratic governments and societies. Tocqueville was used to examine the viability of these new democracies. As the international focus has shifted from Eastern Europe to the Middle East, Tocqueville again gained new relevancy. In *Koran, Kalashnikov, and Laptop* (2009), political scientist Antonio Guistozzi argued that the Taliban gained strength due to inherent weaknesses in the Afghan state. Referencing Tocqueville, he stated, "The awareness that, as de Tocqueville first pointed out, reforming a 'bad' government creates a particularly dangerous situation is a source of caution."[14] In *Conversations with Tocqueville* (2009), Aurelian Craiutu and Sheldon Gellar showed the increasing relevance of Tocqueville to newly emerging democratic states.

Chapter Outline

In chapter one, "Truth and Timeliness," I argue that the reasons why Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* received preferential treatment in America changed drastically from the nineteenth century to the twentieth. In the nineteenth century, Tocqueville was favored over his contemporary European travelers because he was perceived to be an unbiased and honest investigator of American democracy. Viewed as timely in the twentieth century, intellectuals identified with and explored Tocqueville's biased attitude towards democracy. A handful of European and American scholars who saw the value of Tocqueville to contemporary society worked to reintroduce Tocqueville to the public. The Phillips Bradley edition of *Democracy*,

[13] For example, see Bishnu N. Mohapatra, "Social Connectedness and Fragility of Social Capital: View from an Orissa Village," *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36, no. 8 (February 24-March 2, 2001): 665-672; M.S. John and Jos Chathukulam, "Building Social Capital through State Initiative: Participatory Planning in Kerala" *Economic and Political Weekly*, 37, no. 20 (May 18-24, 2002): 1939-1948.
[14] Antonio Giustozzi, *Koran, Kalashnikov, and Laptop: The Neo-Taliban Insurgency in Afghanistan 2002-2007* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 8.

published in 1945 by Alfred A. Knopf, was largely responsible for promoting Tocqueville as a timely prophet for the postwar period. Scholars found Tocqueville instrumental to understand the new tensions between individuality and equality within democratic societies in the fifties. As totalitarian countries collapsed, Tocqueville's observations of the United States as a newly formed democratic society were considered useful as a way to understand how to build democracy from the ashes of dictatorship.

In chapter two, "Refitting the Flannel Suit: David Riesman and Louis Hartz's Tocqueville," I re-evaluate two extremely influential works of the 1950s: David Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd* and Louis Hartz's *The Liberal Tradition in America*. In addition to their striking theses, research methods, and writing styles, Riesman and Hartz's works gained attention for their heavy reliance on Tocqueville to support their arguments. The popularity of Riesman and Hartz's works spread new images of Tocqueville throughout academia and the general reading public. Through Riesman, Tocqueville turned into a thoughtful observer of the tensions between individualism and mass society. Through Hartz, Tocqueville seemed to become the ultimate defender of American exceptionalism. Increasing interest in Tocqueville in the 1960s led scholars to isolate and heighten the Tocquevillean aspects of *The Lonely Crowd* and *The Liberal Tradition*. Upon closer examination, though, Riesman presented a more nuanced image of Tocqueville than realized, while Hartz's reliance on Tocqueville was highly selective. I argue that both scholars found in Tocqueville solutions to the concerning issues of conformity and tyranny of the majority in America.

Analyzing Arendt's views on totalitarianism, revolutions, and desegregation in chapter three, "Writing to Understand: Hannah Arendt and Tocqueville," I argue that Tocqueville's influence on her is greater than previously thought. Due to the nature of her personal beliefs and

controversies surrounding her works, the Tocquevillean influences in Arendt's writing has been under-appreciated. Her reading of Tocqueville differed greatly from her American colleagues, which stemmed in part from her professional and personal background as a German Jewish scholar-refugee. Comparing modern democracy to ancient Greece, Arendt embraced and criticized Tocqueville for modern thinking. Associating modernity with unrestricted state violence and the horrors of the Holocaust, Arendt took from Tocqueville ways the populace could prevent ruthless totalitarian states from forming.

In chapter four, "Lost and Found in Translation: Leo Strauss and Tocqueville," I examine the reception of Tocqueville by another controversial German Jewish scholar-refugee, Leo Strauss. Strauss classified Tocqueville as a political philosopher who could judge society from above due to his unique position in society. Strauss remained preoccupied with how Weimar Germany proved to be an unstable liberal democracy. I argue that Strauss used Tocqueville to warn the U.S. not to become too complacent in the postwar period. Strauss held an extremely negative view of the masses and did not think the majority could make good political choices that would protect individual and political liberties. Since the masses cannot be taught to become great individuals who would help create the best regime, Strauss saw in Tocqueville ways to get the masses to realize their limitations and value inequalities in a democratic society. In this chapter I trace Strauss's interpretation of Tocqueville from Strauss's writings to Straussian scholars such as Marvin Zetterbaum, Allan Bloom and Harvey Mansfield.

In chapter five, "Ideas of Freedom: Tocqueville and the Cold War," I show how an anti-communist organization, president, and intellectual saw in Tocqueville the tools needed to defend democracy from the threat of an opposing ideology. The Council Against Communist Aggression, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and F. A. Hayek all applied Tocqueville's lessons to the

increasing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. The hawkish anti-communist organization Council against Communist Aggression admired Tocqueville's prophecy regarding the inevitable clash between Russia and America. Dwight D. Eisenhower appreciated Tocqueville's view of the mutual benefits of religion and democracy. Austrian economist Friedrich A. Hayek saw in Tocqueville a kindred spirit who valued minimal state interference as a safeguard against totalitarianism and communism.

The figures analyzed in this dissertation deeply admired Tocqueville. They appreciated his ability to detect the invisible workings of a democratic society. Their own fears often derived from experiences that stayed with them. Tocqueville validated these fears while encouraging them to see beyond them in a therapeutic and productive manner.

Chapter One
Truth and Timeliness

> Even when one has gained the confidence of a democratic people, it is still no small matter to gain its attention. It is very difficult to get men who live in democracies to listen to you unless you are talking to them about themselves.
>
> Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*

> The time is out of joint. O cursed spite that I ever was born to set it right!
>
> Shakespeare, *Hamlet*

During the early decades of the nineteenth century, Americans observed the constant arrival and departure of foreigners scrutinizing their country and writing about their experiences. "It was a poor month during the 1830s and 1840s that did not witness the publication of a new work on America by a British or European traveler."[15] American historian Ephraim Douglas Adams noted that "scores of English travelers and writers" visited America. He calculated that among the British alone, the average number of English travelers and writers to visit America was "better than one for each year and the resulting volumes number easily twice as many more."[16] How, then, did Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* overshadow the others and retain its privileged position? This chapter argues that in the nineteenth century, Tocqueville was favored over his contemporary European travelers because he was perceived to be an unbiased and honest investigator of American democracy, and in the twentieth century it was the portrayal of Tocqueville as timely that continued to capture new audiences.

---

[15] Charles S. Sydnor, review of *Democracy in America*, by Alexis de Tocqueville, ed. by Phillips Bradley, *American Political Science Quarterly*, 60, no. 3 (September 1945): 457.
[16] Ephraim Douglas Adams, "The Point of View of the British Traveler in America," *Political Science Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (June 1914): 244.

Traveling With Manners

When *Democracy* first appeared in America in 1837, two years following its publication in France and England, anti-French sentiments were high. Remarkably, then, reviews overall "were favorable, even enthusiastic" by journals and magazines such as the *United States Magazine and Democratic Review, New York Review, North American Review, Hunt's Merchant Magazine, Knickerbocker Magazine,* and *American Monthly Magazine.*[17] Standing apart from other works on America by Europeans, the work received lavish praise in both Democratic and Whig journals. In his review of *Democracy* for the conservative *North American Review*, Edward Everett wrote, "We regard his work…as by far the most philosophical, ingenious, and instructive, which has been produced in Europe on the subject of America."[18] *The United States Democratic Review* described Tocqueville's work as "decidedly the most remarkable and really valuable work that has yet appeared upon this country from the hand of a foreigner."[19]

Tocqueville's work represented a new type of travel account. His use of archival materials, interviews, and secondary sources gave *Democracy* the appearance of a scientific, scholarly work. Yet Tocqueville's writing style still made *Democracy* readable, which set him apart from and above other French writers. Sullivan wrote that Tocqueville "writes with great beauty, force and elegance; while at the same time, he

[17] Phillips Bradley, "Historical Essay," in *Democracy in America* by Alexis de Tocqueville, ed. Phillips Bradley (1945; New York: Vintage Books, 1957), 423.
[18] Edward Everett, review of *Democracy in America*, by Alexis de Tocqueville, trans. Henry Reeve, *The North American Review* 43, no. 92 (July 1836): 179. For perspective on Everett's politics, see Paul A. Varg, *Edward Everett: The Intellectual in the Turmoil of Politics* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University. Presses, 1992). Varg argued that Everett was foremost an intellectual caught in the turmoil of the age.
[19] "European Views of American Democracy," *The United States Democratic Review* 1, no. 1 (October 1837): 91. The review was most likely written by John Sullivan, co-founder and editor of the magazine.

avoids entirely the inflated and rhetorical tone, which is the besetting sin of the best French writers of the present day."[20]

More importantly, Tocqueville was perceived as a serious and unbiased investigator, which prompted Everett and Sullivan to embrace *Democracy* as an immediate classic. Everett and Sullivan appreciated Tocqueville's studious and serious attempt to understand American political and cultural institutions empirically. For Everett, Tocqueville's observations were "the first…of the kind which our institutions have yet elicited from any foreign mind; and are far more valuable, even in their errors, than the common-place truisms and boarding-school rhetoric of the every-day tourist."[21] Sullivan felt similarly, and wrote that Tocqueville's style was "highly worthy of commendation for its uniform tone of dignity, seriousness, and good faith…it contrasts advantageously with that of the great majority of foreign works on this country, in which the gravest interests of society are habitually discussed with the flippancy of the worst newspapers."[22]

For both reviewers, Tocqueville exhibited "a manly love of truth," and was regarded as unbiased and honest, with pure motives.[23] "If he has no partiality for the experiment [of the representative republics of America], he has at least no prejudice against it."[24] Tocqueville observed and analyzed Americans without describing them according to premeditated biases, a refreshing change for Americans in the nineteenth century.[25] Although many Europeans explored America with intentions to study

[20] Ibid., 92.
[21] Everett,179.
[22] "European Views of American Democracy," 92.
[23] Everett, 179.
[24] Ibid., 183.
[25] Subsequently, scholars such as James Schleifer have argued that Tocqueville had reached several conclusions about the United States and its citizens before setting foot on American soil.

democracy in the making, not all travelers came with open minds. In fact, as Adams noted in 1914, Americans believed most nineteenth-century British travelers "found the keenest satisfaction in malicious attack upon anything American…indeed that hatred of America so filled England that men deliberately journeyed to the new world to find new bases upon which to report the condemnation of the United States."[26]

The issue of bias was important, because Americans were aware of the great interest America held for European tourists and wanted their institutions and principles correctly understood and analyzed. In *John L. O'Sullivan and His Times*, Robert D. Sampson explained, "As exponents of democracy and the *Democracy*, the editors of the *Democratic Review* were sensitive to perceived slights to the national character and institutions. Though taking exception to some of his conclusions, the magazine generally praised Alexis de Tocqueville for his *Democracy in America*.[27] The American system differed in important ways from the British form of government, and only unbiased observers would be able to distinguish them as true differences and not attribute them to a degeneracy of British constitutions.[28] British writers failed, for example, to comprehend the importance town and county played in the American system of government. They also did not convey accurately the limits of the National and State jurisdictions.[29] Prejudiced British travelers such as Captain Hall and Colonel Hamilton were "not likely fully to comprehend to what extent the old names import new things; how far that which

[26] Adam, 244.
[27] Robert D. Sampson, *John L. O'Sullivan and His Times* (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 2003), 48.
[28] Everett, "De Tocqueville's Democracy in America," 183.
[29] Ibid., 182.

is wholly new, varies the action of that which is borrowed, and how far the absence of that which was not borrowed from England, changes the character of what was."[30]

Despite his good intentions, Tocqueville made factual and analytical errors. He misjudged the power of the executive branch of government.[31] He neglected to comment on new technological advancements. However, he was largely excused for his errors. "His residence among us was very short; the materials which he was able to collect as the results of his own observation were, of course, comparatively scanty, and often susceptible of much correction."[32] Tocqueville's company in America was blamed for purposely deceiving Tocqueville. "M. de Tocqueville has been led into errors…in part by the prejudices of some of the circles of society into which he naturally fell—in part by the mere effect of the imperfect observation and hasty generalization, which, to a certain extent, are almost unavoidable in this kind of writing."[33] The reviewer for *New York Review* wrote that Tocqueville's mistakes were "generally upon incidental or comparatively trivial topics."[34]

A comparison with the reception of Scottish author and traveler Thomas Hamilton shows why Tocqueville's work was so refreshing and further exhibits nineteenth-century Americans' appreciation of open-minded tourists. After gaining moderate success with the military novel *Cyril Thornton*, Hamilton turned his sights on American manners and political institutions. Setting out from Liverpool on October 16, 1830 he explored the east coast, visiting New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, New Orleans, and

---

[30] Ibid., 183.
[31] Ibid. For more about Tocqueville's errors, see George Wilson Pierson's *Tocqueville in America* (1938; reprint, Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 755-767.
[32] "European Views of American Democracy—No. II.," *The United States Democratic Review* 2, no. 8 (July 1838): 337.
[33] "European Views of American Democracy," 92.
[34] Quoted in Bradley, 429.

venturing north into Quebec. From the beginning of his travels, Hamilton viewed Americans through the prism of the British aristocratic class and saw Americans as a lesser form than their English counterparts. For example, while wealthy New Yorkers dressed in the latest English fashions, they looked and talked much differently. Americans, Hamilton noticed, slouched. Their speech affected him negatively. "Their utterance, too, is marked by a peculiar modulation, partaking of a snivel and a drawl, which, I confess, to my ear, is by no means laudable on the score of euphony."[35]

Traveling to Washington, Hamilton found much to complain about America. "The mail sleigh in which I found myself a passenger, was one of the most wretched vehicles imaginable…Our route lay through a country flat and uninteresting, which presented no object to arrest the attention of a traveler." Hamilton described the cabaret where he breakfasted as wretched.[36] Hamilton came to study democracy, but could not overcome his aristocratic background and prejudices. When a peddler stepped on him leaving the wagon in which Hamilton was riding, Hamilton expressed surprise and displeasure. "To be stretched alongside of my servant in straw on the bottom of a cart, and in such pickle to be trampled on by a common hawker of thimbles and pockethandkerchiefs! But travelling in America is like misery, for it occasionally brings a man acquainted with strange bedfellows."[37]

Hamilton found much in American social and political constitutions to critique and even despise. Discussing the federal government, Hamilton wrote, "it was my object simply to illustrate the fallacy of the leading and fundamental principles on which it is

[35] Thomas Hamilton, *Men and Manners in America* (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard, 1833), 15.
[36] Ibid., 209.
[37] Ibid., 210.

established."[38] He viewed the division of the legislature into two bodies as potentially dangerous.[39] He viewed the practice of excluding ministers from government office with derision. He called public men in America parasites who "must act, speak, and vote according to the will of their master."[40] Overall, Hamilton presented an unfavorable image of America.

He published his travel notes in two volumes as *Men and Manners in America*. *Men and Manners* received negative reviews from Americans. *The North American Review* felt so strongly that it published a sixty-page critique.[41] The reviewer, Everett's brother, Boston diplomat and Whig Alexander Hill Everett, called Hamilton's work "often unpardonably course, and…pervaded throughout by an affected pertness, and a silly air of pretension, which are offensive from the beginning, and finally by repetition completely nauseous."[42] However, the major complaint was not about the actual image portrayed of America, but that Hamilton established it before he even set foot on American soil.

> Every impartial and discerning reader must perceive, on the slightest Inspection of the work before us, that it did in fact occur in the present instance; that the disposition under which the author made his observations, and of course to a certain extent the character of their results, were determined by his political objects; and that his book, instead of being a real account of *Men and Manners in America*, as it purports to be, is in substance nothing more *than a long tirade against the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill*." [214]

Hamilton's unfavorable view of Americans did not derive from acts of hostility toward him by Americans. On the contrary, he found Americans welcoming and

[38] Ibid., 232.
[39] Ibid., 236.
[40] Ibid., 265.
[41] Alexander Hill Everett, review of *Men and Manners in America,* by Thomas Hamilton, *The North American Review* 38, no. 82 (January 1834): 210-271.
[42] Ibid., 211.

experienced a warm reception immediately. Although he brought with him over thirty letters of introduction, Hamilton only needed to use about half, and was welcomed in his lodgings by New Yorkers even before he used any. To his uncle he declared, "My society has been courted by the greatest men America can boast."[43] Rather, Hamilton harbored preconceived biases against American democracy. *Men and Manners* was "somewhat colored by British prejudice, and by the author's aristocratic distaste of a democracy."[44] Whereas Tocqueville purposely did not read other popular travelogues that attacked Americans for fear of being influenced in his own thinking, Hamilton situated himself in the lineage of writing critical travelogues in the fashion of Captain Basil Hall and Frances Trollope.[45] Working within this type of framework, Hamilton's own judgments seemed foregone conclusions. Therefore, his meetings with Americans were not conducted in good faith, which was taken as a personal and unexpected affront to those Americans who gave their time and knowledge. "If an English gentleman; who had hospitaly entertained an American, should find the confidence of his fire-side violated, and what was done and said in the unsuspicious frankness of the social board duly embalmed in the journal, and blazoned to the world, we are inclined to think he would express himself on the occasion, very much as an American gentleman does, when similarly situated."[46]

---

[43] Thomas Hamilton, *Men and Manners in America*, 2nd ed. (London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1843), xiv. This edition contains correspondence to close relatives during Hamilton's stay in America. Hamilton also wrote to his uncle describing his fame in America. "My reception every where in this country has not only been most cordial, but most flattering."

[44] "Hamilton, Thomas" *The Encyclopedia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, Literature and General Information* 11th ed., (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1910), 888.

[45] Hamilton also related his encounter with her and his high impression of her work. "I had then never heard of Mrs. Trollope; but at New York I had afterwards the pleasure of becoming acquainted with her, and can bear testimony to her conversation being imbued with all that grace, spirit, and vivacity, which have since delighted the world in her writings."

[46] Everett, review of *Democracy in America*, 180-1.

Even European writers who portrayed America quite favorably received criticism if their personal and political prejudices appeared in their work. For example, Francis Grund, a German who had lived in America for years and wrote an account of his adopted country, defended America from Hamilton's attack. Although Grund was praised for transmitting useful geographical information about America, with accompanying statistical tables, he was accused of letting his political biases pervade his work. "Mr. Grund is a devoted friend to the past and present administrations….He is welcome to his political partialities or prejudices. But he has done injustice to himself, and been false to truth, by allowing them to influence his opinions."[47] The reviewer then compared Grund to Tocqueville, reiterating Tocqueville's scholarly unbiased nature. "The difference between him and De Tocqueville, the masterly French writer on the democracy of America, is at once apparent. The Frenchman has surveyed our institutions from the serene heights of an unprejudiced philosophy, and produced a work, which, in brilliancy, condensation, and pregnant sense, will rank with the *Spirit of Laws* of his great countrymen."[48]

Tocqueville's unbiased inquiry endeared him to nineteenth-century American society. In the twentieth century, the idea and depiction of his work as timely propelled his reputation to new heights. The debate between Flora McDonald Thompson and Elizabeth Cady Stanton illustrates how the image of Tocqueville began to change at the turn of the century. This debate, which typically has been included in textbooks on the history of women's history, is also important to Tocqueville studies.

---

[47] "Grund's Americans," review of *The Americans, in their Moral, Social, and Political Relations* by Francis J. Grund, *The North American Review*, 46, no. 98 (January 1838): 113-4.
[48] Ibid.

Recasting Tocqueville

Early twentieth century women's rights activist Flora McDonald Thompson was unconcerned with Tocqueville's unbiased nature. Rather, she was more interested in how his observations foreshadowed present realty for American women. Judging him timely to her cause against political, economic and social equality for women, Thompson urged a refocusing of national priorities based on his observations.

Reading *Democracy* in 1900 caused Thompson to "gasp with astonishment" at the description of the condition of American women just fifty years earlier. "A strange people we are to ourselves, as we look backward to De Tocqueville's picture of us; and, compared with the American woman of De Tocqueville's time, the modern American woman is something more than strange."[49] Thompson used Tocqueville to support her argument that the status of women deteriorated due to shifts in technological and cultural values in the second half of the nineteenth century. She much preferred Tocqueville's version of the role and condition of women to her present reality, believing that the modern woman has become immoral.

> She has changed not alone with respect to outward form and manners, but in the whole underlying principle of her development she has so far departed from the ideals then logically set forth as indispensable to the continued growth of our national greatness, that the American woman of to-day appears to be the fatal symptom of a mortally sick nation."[50]

Thompson nostalgically reviewed Tocqueville's observations of American women. Tocqueville's notion of women as the bearers and transmitters of morals were used by Thompson to scold the suffragists' for favoring materialistic goals over morals.

[49] Flora McDonald Thompson, "Retrogression of the American Woman," *The North American Review* 171, no. 528 (November 1900): 748.
[50] Ibid.

"Fancy representing to the heralds of woman's suffrage that the political future of woman is in mere virtue, that the greatness of woman is to be good, without reference to being President or even to being a school trustee!"[51] Thompson contrasted the high number of divorces, and the fact that in most cases it involved "immorality of woman," to Tocqueville's observation that American woman view marriage as the path to domestic happiness.[52] Thompson wanted to emphasize the derailment of family values during the previous half-century, which was another example for her of the retrogression of the American woman.

To Thompson, the idea of progress and rights for women meant providing women with the means and support so they would not have to work outside the home. She approved of Tocqueville's assertion that American women "never manage the outward concerns of the family or conduct a business or take a part in political life" or that they would compete with men for a job requiring physical strength. She stated that women comprised over seventeen percent of the workforce, a drastic increase. She argued that the more women sought employment out of the home, the more removed they became from domestic happiness and morality. Thompson also pointed to the high number of women seeking political offices. "[W]e have realized precisely the condition De Tocqueville describes as existing in the misguided minds of certain people in Europe."

Thompson felt the modern condition of the American woman was much worse than in the America Tocqueville visited. For instance, she quoted Tocqueville's statement regarding the gentle treatment of women and morals in American literature. Tocqueville wrote, "In America all books, novels not excepted, suppose women to be

[51] Ibid., 749.
[52] Ibid., 749-50.

chaste, and no one thinks of relating affairs of gallantry." Thompson felt Tocqueville described a much more virtuous world and lamented the slide towards depravity over the next several decades. "From what, then, have you sprung, all you unnumbered hosts of American erotic writers, and all you scandal-monging daily papers of the United States? I know. Your morals and your manners are a disorder that American *nouveau riches* have contracted in traveling abroad…and once in the blood, the disorder has been transmitted to posterity."[53] Again, Thompson used Tocqueville as a timely reminder of the more virtuous, moral days for American women.

Strongly disagreeing with Thompson, women's rights activist Elizabeth Cady Stanton took a more optimistic view of the effects of the Industrial Revolution on women and the aim of the nineteenth-century suffrage movement. She replied to Thompson with her article, "Progress of the American Woman," published in the next issue of *The North American Review.* Stanton adamantly disagreed that women were better off in Tocqueville's time. She related how the Industrial Revolution led to new opportunities for women. Machines designed to aid in such tasks as laundry, sewing, dipped candles, and cooking allowed women to have more free time, and consequently led them out of the house and into the workforce. Women also "made their way into the schools and colleges, the hospitals, courts, pulpits, [and] editorial chairs."[54] For Stanton, this represented positive change.

Arguing against Tocqueville and Thompson's claim of degenerated morals in American society, Stanton noted that educated women possessed high moral quality, which benefited society. When women college graduates were "interested in all the

[53] Ibid., 750.
[54] Elizabeth Cady Stanton, "Progress of the American Woman," *The North American Review* 171, no. 529 (December 1900): 905.

reforms of their day and generation, superintending kindergarten schools, laboring to secure more merciful treatment for criminals in all our jails and prisons…we must admit that woman's moral influence is greater than it has ever been before at any time in the course of human development."[55] Education enabled women to become strong, independent, and intelligent members of society. Women's newfound access to colleges was useful, therefore, and a product of progress in America.[56]

Focused on the idea of progress for women, Stanton dismissed any notion of the usefulness of Tocqueville's work. Progress for women occurred after Tocqueville's time, and since Tocqueville only observed the state of women in 1831-32, advocates of progress should not cite Tocqueville. Stanton also suggested Tocqueville could not see beyond inherent male biases towards women.

> De Tocqueville cannot be impressed into the service of the writer, nor fairly quoted, even inferentially, as saying that the moral status of the American woman in 1848, owing to certain causes at work, was higher than it would be in 1900. Progress is the law, and woman, the greatest factor in civilization, must lead the van."[57]

For Stanton, progress was the combination of morality, independence, and education. Stanton linked morality and independence, asserting that the moral status of a woman

---

[55] Ibid.

[56] Stanton did not convince Thompson, who went on to call for the recognition of housewives as a viable employment, and therefore deserving of a living wage. In 1915 Thompson wrote to the Commission on Industrial Relations requesting that a report be sent to Congress stating that condition of housework should be considered as an element of the cost of living and that Congress create a National Maternity Commission "to report to Congress on the conditions of women's work in the house considered as a cause of infant mortality, race suicide, divorce and prostitution." For Thompson, encouraging women to compete with men for physically demanding work would endanger women's ability to have children, while forcing women to assume a subservient powerless position in the marriage would discourage women from being confident and financially secure enough to want more dependents in the household. By making it financially possible for women to stay home and manage the household women would want to and be able to contribute to the nation. Only then could they stay married, faithful, and raise the nation's birthrate. More concerned with personal fulfillment for women rather than their role as mother, Stanton argued for equality in public roles.

[57] Ibid., 907.

"depends on her personal independence and capacity for self-support."[58] Independence was connected to education in Stanton's view, and so the moral status of women increased during the second half of the nineteenth century as opportunities for higher education became available.

Thompson and Stanton's written exchange suggests that Tocqueville was no longer valued for his impartiality at the start of the twentieth century, but judged on his relevance to contemporary society. The next section focuses on the dramatic rise of Tocqueville's reputation as a timely prophet.

Tocqueville's Counsel and Caution

During the late teens and twenties, American and European scholars including George Wilson Pierson, Harold Laski, and J.P. Mayer developed a deep interest in Tocqueville. These scholars were largely responsible for the publishing effort of Tocqueville's work in the postwar period, which led to the dramatic rise in Tocqueville's status in the United States. Mayer, a political theorist who emigrated to England from Germany in 1936, especially helped set the tone for the Tocqueville revival by emphasizing *Democracy* as extremely timely. After a brief discussion of Mayer's influential work to show how the idea of a timely Tocqueville began, I turn to other meanings of Tocqueville's timeliness after the publication of the 1945 Alfred A. Knopf edition of *Democracy*. This edition, the first since 1904, has been credited with facilitating new interest in Tocqueville in the postwar period.

In *Prophet of the Mass Age*, a political biography of Tocqueville drawn from *Democracy*, *Souvenirs*, and *The Ancien Régime and the Revolution*, Mayer argued that

[58] Ibid.

Tocqueville had foreseen the modern mass-dictatorships a hundred years earlier. Mayer focused on Tocqueville's fear of individuals mistakenly putting their faith in a leader to protect their equality only to find their freedoms have been restricted instead.

> [Tocqueville] envisages a multitude of men, all equal and alike, working in order to procure for themselves petty and paltry pleasures…Above the race of mankind rises a monstrous tutelary power which 'provides for their security, foresees and supplies their necessities, facilitates their pleasures, directs their industry, regulates the descent of property, and subdivides their inheritance—what remains but to spare them all the care of thinking and all the trouble of living?' Thus each nation is reduced to the condition of a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the Government is the shepherd."[59]

Mayer noted how Tocqueville's fear came true, as evidenced by Hitler's Germany and other highly centralized fascist states of the 1930s. "Today, perhaps, de Tocqueville would call such a democracy 'a plebiscitary dictatorship,' and would recognize its living image in the Fascist States! The grandeur of his prophetic gift is impressed upon one by the fact that after the passage of a hundred years his words have proved an exact description of a present-day reality."[60] Mayer even credited Tocqueville with foreseeing feelings of isolation of individuals in mass society and dictatorships. He discussed Tocqueville's sense of melancholy and feelings of isolation from his contemporaries and attributed it to Tocqueville's keen insight into currents of French politics. "Three years of parliamentary experience had left de Tocqueville the victim of a profound melancholy, a comfortless sense of hollowness, even in the midst of practical activity."[61] Mayer related it to characteristics of current dictatorships. "Agonizing indeed is this loneliness

[59] J.P. Mayer, *Prophet of the Mass Age: A Study of Alexis de Tocqueville*, trans. M.M. Bozman and C. Hahn (London: J.M. Dent and Sons LTD, 1939), 51-2.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid., 63.

of the individual who refuses to surrender hope and belief in freedom in this our age of modern mass-dictatorship!"[62]

Mayer supported his argument of Tocqueville as a prophet by showing how his other prophecies regarding France came true. For instance, Tocqueville predicted France would experience a revolution shortly before the revolution of 1848. Mayer also noted that Tocqueville anticipated Napoleon's coup d'etat of 1851.[63] With these two situations, Mayer established Tocqueville's ability to prophesize. According to Mayer, Tocqueville not only foresaw the future, but also provided ways to "escape this new despotism," such as protecting secondary administrative bodies with elected officials, independent courts of law, freedom of the press, and parliamentary inviolability. The Government, believed Tocqueville, should also do more to make great men who would not be inclined to give up their freedoms so quickly and blindly.[64]

Prophet of the Mass Age was not unbiased, as Mayer's sympathies for Tocqueville were clear. For instance, in describing Tocqueville's relationship with his constituents in Normandy, Mayer wrote, "De Tocqueville never lost touch with his native place in Normandy, and his villagers loved him as grateful children love a kind father."[65] Mayer also defended Tocqueville's status and record as a politician. For example, even though Tocqueville pointed out his own faults as a politician, Mayer defended him resolutely. "His political career was wrecked, not because he was a failure as a statesmen—we have demonstrated the contrary—but because he lacked the hardness and ruthlessness of the political leader, and perhaps also because his high ethical valuation of

[62] Ibid., 127.
[63] Ibid., 72.
[64] Ibid., 52-3.
[65] Ibid., 56.

human dignity and freedom were bound sooner or later to conflict in principle with the categories that direct the modern mass-state."[66]

Mayer's objective for writing *Prophet* was to spur more interest in Tocqueville. Mayer lamented that even in France, Tocqueville was underappreciated. "To-day in his own country even the *Oeuvres Complètes* are out of print, and not one Frenchman has come forward to dedicate a new and more worthy edition of his works to one of the greatest sons of France." Mayer noted that his efforts were paying off. "Since this work was written Messrs Gallimard, Paris have decided to publish a new edition of de Tocqueville's principal works and letters."[67]

Mayer was not alone, however, in his admiration of Tocqueville and wish for a renewal of interest in the Frenchman's work. A year earlier, American historian George Wilson Pierson published his well-received work, *Tocqueville and Beaumont in America*. Using Tocqueville's unpublished letters, notes, diaries, sketches, and manuscripts, Pierson showed the intellectual beginnings of *Democracy in America*. In contrast to Mayer, Pierson viewed Tocqueville as a pioneer rather than a prophet. Although Pierson and Mayer interpreted Tocqueville and his American journey differently, both interpretations were positive and stimulated new interest in Tocqueville. They also became involved in getting more of Tocqueville's works published in America. They wrote during a time when Tocqueville's works were not widely available in bookstores, and the last new edition of *Democracy in America* had been published decades earlier.

English political scientist Harold Laski also showed his admiration of Tocqueville in his works, and wanted Tocqueville's works to be more widely known. Laski

[66] Ibid., 87.
[67] Ibid., 150.

advocated for a new edition of *Democracy of America*, which resulted in the 1945 edition of *Democracy of America*. In his introduction to the new edition, Phillips Bradley thanked Laski for his part in the realization of the new edition. "My friend Professor Harold J. Laski…[has] long encouraged me to carry out the task. His scholarship in the field of *Democracy in America* is one of the major roots from which the flowering of our contemporary interest in Tocqueville has sprung."[68]

Phillips Bradley, a professor of political science at Queens College during the 1940s, completely agreed with Laski on the need for a new edition and felt others shared that sentiment as well. "The utility of a new edition of this significant work is widely recognized."[69] Rather than provide a new translation of *Democracy*, Bradley decided to edit the Francis Bowen translation of the Henry Reeve text. Bradley reasoned, "[I]t would seem desirable to utilize the Reeve text—made by a friend and authorized translator of Tocqueville."[70] Bradley worked on the edition for over two years. He made several changes and additions to the Reeve text. He removed archaisms, restored Tocqueville's original footnotes, supplied a comprehensive bibliography of Tocqueville criticism, included an appendix of the variations in translation, and wrote an introduction of thirty thousand words. Knopf proudly announced that Bradley made more than 1100 corrections to the Reeve text.

Although Bradley's area of study was public administration with a specialty in labor and industrial relations, working on *Democracy* turned Bradley into a Tocqueville admirer and scholar. In *Alexis de Tocqueville and American Intellectuals*, American

---

[68] Bradley, intro to *Democracy in America*.
[69] Phillips Bradley, Memorandum Re: A New Edition of Tocqueville, May 6, 1943, Alfred A. Knopf Papers, Box 1282, Folder 1, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, The University of Texas at Austin (hereafter cited as Knopf Papers).
[70] Ibid.

intellectual historian Matthew Mancini described Bradley as a "restless, perhaps somewhat abrasive" scholar who did not settle at one university for any length of time.[71] Despite his restlessness, Bradley had great intellect characterized as having "the rare combination of a remarkably clear intellect, together with an ability easily to work with people who are temperamentally or culturally very different from himself."[72] A Quaker who joined the Society of Friends during the 1920s and grand-nephew of abolitionist Wendell Phillips, Bradley was highly regarded for his knowledge of international affairs, originality and lecturing ability. Bradley's ninety-eight-page historical essay on Tocqueville and *Democracy* reflect these qualities.

In his historical essay, originally included in Volume II as Appendix II, Bradley portrayed Tocqueville as a frustrated lawyer who realized his true passion was writing.[73] Bradley marveled at Tocqueville's success in presenting the social, political, and economic aspects of democracy.[74] Bradley emphasized Tocqueville's work as exceptional.

> The writings of practically all of his contemporaries, whether European, travelers to America or publicists, polemic and academic, when compared with the *Democracy*, are narrow in scope, biased in judgment, steeped in immediate comments and controversies. Beside them the *Democracy* stands out as a landmark in our progress towards an emergent liberal spirit and democratic thought, at once catholic in range, balanced in interpretation, and detached in the examination of every issue.[75]

Labeling Tocqueville a "prophet of democracy's future trends and potentialities," Bradley sorted *Democracy* into anachronistic and relevant observations and predictions.

---

[71] Matthew Mancini, *Alexis de Tocqueville and American Intellectuals: From His Time to Ours* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006), 167.
[72] Moses Baily to L. Hollingsworth Wood, December 3, 1934, Box 10, L. Hollingsworth Wood Papers, The Quaker Collection, Haverford College (hereafter cited as Wood Papers).
[73] Bradley, "Historical Essay," 396.
[74] Ibid., 443.
[75] Ibid., 443.

For example, Bradley remarked that Tocqueville's fears about equality under despotism appeared to come true in the form of fascism."[76] Bradley found Tocqueville's observation that democracy encouraged commercial and industrial enterprises among the more prophetic analyses of *Democracy*. Tocqueville also saw that free enterprise would lead to clashes between government and private businesses. Bradley cited the examples of the Agrarian Crusade, Big Stick of Theodore Roosevelt, Progressivism, and the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt as "different expressions of the struggle" that Tocqueville foresaw.[77] Discussing the competition between Small and Big Business, Bradley wrote, "The position of the individual, whether entrepreneur or worker, in the economic pattern we have carved out of the continent has been continuously and profoundly modified by the trends that Tocqueville foresaw."[78]

Bradley found Tocqueville's observation of the dual effects of centralized administration "among the most incisive, indeed prophetic, ever written" and therefore most useful to contemporary readers. For Bradley, Tocqueville had brilliantly determined the beginnings of the struggle between Federal and State administrative agencies as well as the increased reliance on the executive by the people to protect their interests. Agreeing with Tocqueville's belief that the majority could be unenlightened, tyrannical and unstable, Bradley shared Tocqueville's fears of a majoritarian democracy. Tocqueville's concerns about centralization, and fears of an executive dictatorship, were "all the more timely" because Tocqueville's belief "rested not on a conviction of the positive capacity of the majority, but on the lack of any alternative system which would

[76] Ibid., 436.
[77] Ibid., 476.
[78] Ibid., 477.

so well ensure a democratic society, economy, or polity."[79] Bradley also took from Tocqueville the ways to prevent an executive dictatorship, such as active participation by citizens in the government process. Active participation would force citizens to see beyond their individual worlds and encourage them to educate themselves enough to respond to the larger issues.

Tocqueville's analysis of the relationship between religion and democracy also held value for twentieth-century readers, argued Bradley. Tocqueville believed that religion could be useful to democratic citizens in its encouragement to reject materialism, but dangerous if religion became part of the political roots of a country. Referring to totalitarian states formed on State worship, Bradley asked, "Have we not had ample—and tragic—evidence in our time of the validity of Tocqueville's insight into the ultimate foundation of a democratic society as religious?"[80]

Bradley's long and detailed essay on Tocqueville indicates that editing *Democracy* became personal. Satisfied with the end result, Bradley wrote to Alfred Knopf, "If you are half as satisfied with the final product as I am, I know that you will find real happiness in the result."[81] Knopf shared Bradley's sentiments, and expressed his great satisfaction with the new edition. "We are publishing it with a tremendous sense of pride, for not only does the reissue of this work long out of print come at a peculiarly timely moment, but it now reappears in an edition likely-because of the new material to be found in it-to be regarded as the standard Tocqueville for many years to come."[82]

---

[79] Ibid., 472.
[80] Ibid., 485.
[81] Phillips Bradley to Alfred Knopf, March 20, 1945, Box 502, Folder 4, Knopf Papers.
[82] Press Release, March 29, 1945, Box 1282, Folder 1, Knopf Papers.

Bradley expected that the new edition would find "a small but steady sale both to the general public and among students."[83] Knopf targeted educated readers and sought approval from the academic world. Hoping to get printable quotes about the new edition in order to promote sales, the publishing firm sent free copies to distinguished scholars. Many scholars who received the complimentary volumes wrote back to Knopf, and responses reveal the enthusiastic reception Tocqueville had in the 1940s in academia. Alvin Johnson, an economist who helped found The New School for Social Research, heartily approved of the 'splendid' new edition for its timeliness and 'perfectly superb Introduction.' Johnson's exposure to Tocqueville had been minimal, and he admitted, "It is forty years since last I read his work."[84] Johnson's interest in the new edition was more personal than professional. He deemed Tocqueville appropriate and of immense value "for anyone who wishes to clear up his ideas on democracy."[85]

Fellow professor at The New School Albert Salomon also extended his congratulations and gratitude for the new edition of *Democracy*. Salomon had more of a connection to and knowledge of Tocqueville than Johnson. In 1935, Salomon wrote an article on Tocqueville in honor of the centenary of *Democracy's* first publication. Salomon recalled, "[I]t was impossible to buy a single copy of the book in New York."[86]

John M. Gaus, professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin, welcomed the new edition on behalf of other educators. "I can…say now that every teacher of political science and every scholar interested in American cultural history is in

[83] Ibid. However, there was some concern about the price of the book, which was set at $5.00. Benjamin F. Wright, a professor of Government at Harvard University, stated in a letter to Knopf Publishing firm, "My only regret is that the price will put it beyond the reach of most readers." March 29, 1945, Box 1282, Folder 1, Knopf Papers. Price was changed to $6.00 for the set. In his review, Thomas Cook called attention to the high price of the set.
[84] Alvin Johnson to Mrs. Carolyn Willyoung Stagg April 2, 1945, Box 1282, Folder 1, Knopf Papers.
[85] Ibid.
[86] Albert Salomon to Alfred Knopf March 1945, Box 1282, Folder 1, Knopf Papers.

debt to Phillips Bradley and to the publisher for making this classic available and in a format worthy of the books and of the editorial work which has been put upon this new edition."[87] American intellectual historian Merle Curti kept his remarks about the book general, simply admiring the format and typography while appreciating Bradley's 'illuminating and informative' introduction.[88]

Knopf wanted approval from academics in order to present *Democracy* as an academic text. He also hoped their recommendation would influence general readers. Knopf sought to gain a large mass readership, and sent the work to writer, critic, and judge for *The Book of the Month Club* Clifton Fadiman. Fadiman had worked in publishing and for *The New Yorker*, and had an interest in and knowledge of the public's reading habits. Like the academic scholars, Fadiman appreciated the new edition, which he labeled 'beautiful.' Viewing the new edition from a different perspective, though, Clifton Fadiman regarded the new edition as important for everyone. He declared, "[P]ublishing it is a true (though it will probably be an unacknowledged) service to every American citizen."[89]

Some scholars, such as William Anderson and Thomas Cook, deemed *Democracy* so important for postwar readers that they issued especially harsh critiques of Bradley's edition. Anderson and Cook did not agree with his decision to use Reeve's translation, as they felt the translation was flawed. Anderson explained that Reeve was a "brilliant young writer, but violently prejudiced against all things democratic, and lacking in

[87] John M. Gaus to Mrs. Carolyn Willyoung Stagg April 10, 1945. Box 1282, Folder 1, Knopf Papers.
[88] Merle Curti to Mrs. Carolyn Willyoung Stagg March 31 1945, Box 1282, Folder 1, Knopf Papers.
[89] Clifton Fadiman to Alfred Knopf April 10, 1945, Box 1282, Folder 1, Knopf Papers.

knowledge of the language and institutions of American politics."[90] For example, Reeve's unfamiliarity with the differences between creating legislation for the constitution and ordinary legislation led him to confuse Tocqueville's use of the term legislateur. Moreover, Phillips Bowen, who originally corrected the Reeve translation, "did not remove all the errors, nor has Professor Bradley done so."[91] Cook also believed Bradley or another translator should have retranslated *Democracy* completely rather than merely tamper with the existing translation.[92] Anderson and Cook called attention to the translation because they feared a poor translation would discourage a wide audience. Cook declared, "Indeed I venture to suggest that the widespread distribution and reading of this work, through a popular edition, is unlikely unless and until a really effective modern translation is made."[93]

All the scholars who reached out to Knopf privately or reviewed *Democracy* publicly agreed that the new edition was extremely timely. Dean of Columbia University Harry J. Carmen phrased it, "Never before in our history perhaps has there been a greater need for us to take stock of America…Those who would defend American democracy should not fail to imbibe of de Tocqueville's wisdom."[94] Sociologist Donald Pierce welcomed *Democracy* because it "has long been out of print in this country and for its salutary influence is needed to help combat current threats of despotism and anarchy

[90] William Anderson, review of *Democracy in America* by Alexis de Tocqueville, ed. Phillips Bradley, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 242, Building the Future City (November 1945), pp. 182-183, 182. See also Mancini, 171.
[91] Ibid., 182.
[92] Ibid, 182-3.
[93] Thomas I. Cook, review of *Democracy in America*, by Alexis de Tocqueville, ed. Phillips Bradley, *The American Historical Review*, 51, no. 1, (October 1945): 131.
[94] Harry J. Carmen to Mrs. Carolyn Willyoung Stagg March 24 1945, Box 1282, Folder 1, Knopf Papers.

throughout the world."[95] American literature professor Alexander Cowie praised the new edition both for Tocqueville's sociopolitical observations, which "have retained their relevancy so fully" and Tocqueville's "hard-to-define quality named literary charm."[96] In his foreword to the Knopf edition, Laski emphasized the appropriateness of Tocqueville to contemporary times. He urged others to view Tocqueville as vital to understanding the post-war period. "The citizen who has drunk deep of Tocqueville's wisdom will be well equipped for the battle in which this generation has, of its necessities, made him a soldier."[97]

Sociologist and German émigré Joachim Wach also agreed that Tocqueville's writings "should be much better and much more widely known than they are today" mainly because they had retained their relevancy.[98] Tocqueville's "personality and work are not…of purely historical or antiquarian interest," Wach felt, because while far-reaching cultural, social, political and economic changes occurred since Tocqueville's time, "certain attitudes and characteristics remain."[99] However, Wach viewed Tocqueville from a different perspective and related less to his political ideas than to the role of friendships in his life and his ideas of religion as expressed in his writings.[100]

Popular and influential magazines and journals agreed with the scholars, and praised the 1945 edition. Although "few political historians have dared to ignore

---

[95] Donald J. Pierce, review of *Democracy in America* by Alexis de Tocqueville, ed. Phillips Bradley, American Sociological Review, x (1945): 569.
[96] Alexander Cowie, review of *Democracy in America,* by Alexis de Tocqueville, ed. Phillips Bradley, *American Literature* 17, no. 3 (November 1945): 288.
[97] Bradley, foreword.
[98] Joachim Wach, "The Role of Religion in the Social Philosophy of Alexis de Tocqueville," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 7, no. 1 (January 1946): 74.
[99] Ibid., 75.
[100] Ibid., 74. Wach received considerable reception of his own, despite his untimely death in 1955. See Joseph M. Kitagawa, "Joachim Wach and the Sociology of Religion," *The Journal of Religion* 37, no. 3 (July 1957): 174-184.

Tocqueville" since his "masterpiece of political philosophy" first appeared in the nineteenth century, *Newsweek* called Knopf's decision to publish the work "an outstanding service" to the entire American reading public.[101] Calling Tocqueville a 'prophet with honor,' *Newsweek* acknowledged "even today his writings have a fresh pertinence."[102] However, Newsweek did not explain why Tocqueville was a prophet with honor, or why his writings had a fresh relevance.

Literary editor Margaret Marshall reviewed *Democracy* for *The Nation* in a two-part article series in February 1946.[103] Marshall began by conferring special status to the new edition due to its timeliness. "[T]o read it in the context of these days is to feel that its panoplied republication in America in 1945 was a providential advent devised by a higher and more witting power than Alfred A. Knopf."[104] She felt so strongly about Tocqueville's relevance that rather than provide a straightforward book review, Marshall used Tocqueville's "extraordinary insights as texts for comment on the condition of man in this democratic age."[105]

Marshall focused on Tocqueville's observation regarding the inclination of peoples in a democracy to acquire material objects to compensate for their feelings of inadequacy and individual weakness. Tocqueville noted that this type of materialism reflected and led to a restlessness, which Marshall regarded as "a wonderful example of the author's profundity and wit," as she saw it occurring in the aftermath of World War

[101] "Democracy: Time for a Change?" *Newsweek* 25, April 16, 1945, 93.
[102] Ibid.
[103] Margaret Marshall, review of *Democracy in America,* by Alexis de Tocqueville, ed. Phillips Bradley, *The Nation* 162, no. 5 (February 2, 1946): 130-131 and Marshall, *The Nation* 162, no. 6 (February 9, 1946): 170-172.
[104] Marshall, February 2, 1946, 130.
[105] Ibid.

II.[106] "One of the few certain results of the war will turn out to be, I think, increased worldwide preoccupation with things. In this country, after the past few years of privation, it has entered a new obsessive state." However, Marshall believed that the restlessness which accompanies prosperity would not "be assuaged though every home be fitted out with a deep-freeze unit, television, and an electric maid—if only because the passion for things is by its very nature insatiable."[107] In this way Marshall linked Tocqueville to the postwar period. She felt postwar society would become obsessed, but not fully satisfied, with buying non-essential goods after restraining during the wartime years.[108]

A week later, *The Nation* published the second part of Marshall's review. Marshall turned her attention to Tocqueville's pessimism regarding literature in democratic societies. Tocqueville had observed that although democracy provides the opportunity for all citizens to have access and become engaged with profound art and literature, reading preferences would not necessarily change since the market follows rather than dictates the crowd's reading habits. For Marshall, the war proved Tocqueville's dire warnings about the declining quality of literature in a democracy.

> One measure of what seems to me nothing less serious than a crisis of culture in this country is the very fact that culture is still regarded not only as something extraneous to life but also as a refinement, a decoration, which [Tocqueville] mentioned and true democrats can very well do without. (This attitude took a new lease on life during the war when the arts were looked upon, even by some 'enlightened' liberals as a branch of human endeavor which might be forgone until after the slaughter had ended.)…As a people we have still to learn that culture is not an outmoded aristocratic pastime but a life-giving, life-renewing force as essential to the welfare of the race as reproduction is to its continuation.

[106] Ibid.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Ibid., 131.

Marshall noted that a byproduct of the war, mass-production, led to the substitution of 'entertainment' for 'real culture.' Entertainment aimed to provide gratification "comparable to an easy chair or a warm bath" rather than function as a catharsis, which is what real culture did.[109] Overall, Marshall faulted publishers for creating apathetic readers. Publishers generally were "a breed of men quite as ruthless and greedy as the exploiters of [man's] physical needs, who on the one hand do their utmost to debauch the public taste and on the other excuse their highly profitable enterprise by affirming that the public taste is low."[110]

Marshall felt that Tocqueville's concern about the future of the arts cemented his relevance to contemporary society post-World War II, as they reflected her own postwar concerns and fears. "I have painted a dark picture, perhaps out of my own feeling of helplessness in the face of the mass-production and consumption of inanity."[111] Marshall linked two of Tocqueville's fears together to create a cause and effect. She feared the majority would lose their desire to digest stimulating contemporary works in the midst of the onslaught of mass-produced offerings. She used the 1944 best-seller romance novel, *Forever Amber*, as an example of such low-quality but high-volume book. By contrast, a second edition of *Democracy*, published in 1951, could not be considered a commercial success. In 1951, Phillips Bradley asked in a postscript in a letter to Alfred Knopf how the second edition was selling.[112] William Koshland, writing on behalf of Alfred Knopf,

[109] Marshall, February 9, 1946,170.
[110] Ibid., 172.
[111] Ibid., 170.
[112] Phillips Bradley to Alfred Knopf, January 10, 1951, Box 1282, Folder 1, Knopf Papers.

answered Phillips Bradley, "[It] is selling slowly but steadily and the overall figures now indicate a sale in excess of 11,000 copies."[113]

Modeling *Democracy*

The 1945 publication of *Democracy* gained national and international attention. Bradley viewed Tocqueville as a timely teacher who would be useful to non-democratic and emerging democratic societies. In December 1950, a professor of American Government and History at Tokyo University, Yasaka Takagi, contacted Phillips Bradley on behalf of the Keiso Shobo (Book Store) in Japan. Keiso Shobo was a small publishing house established after World War II ended, and specialized in publishing reference books for high school students.[114] Takagi requested permission from Phillips Bradley to publish a Japanese translation of *Democracy*. Bradley passed the request to Knopf, along with his complete support of the project, calling it "a distinctly worthwhile development."[115] Knopf agreed, called the matter urgent, and assigned it to William Koshland. In February 1951 Knopf and Keiso Shobo began working on a formal agreement.[116]

Financial reward was not the prime motivation for Bradley's enthusiastic support of the project. He urged for "as reasonable a royalty basis as possible."[117] Nor was the chance for personal recognition on a wider scale. Rather, he appreciated that "it would bring Tocqueville into a new language."[118] In his letters to his contacts at Knopf and in

[113] William Koshland to Phillips Bradley, January 16, 1951, Box 1282, Folder 1, Knopf Papers.
[114] William Koshland to Phillips Bradley, February 9, 1951, Box 100, Folder 4, Knopf Papers.
[115] Phillips Bradley to Alfred Knopf, January 10, 1951, Box 100, Folder 4, Knopf Papers.
[116] Roger Shugg to Phillips Bradley, January 16 1951, Box 117, Folder 7, Knopf Papers; William Koshland to Yasaka Takagi, February 21 1951, Box 117, Folder 7, Knopf Papers.
[117] Phillips Bradley to Alfred Knopf, January 10, 1951, Box 100, Folder 4, Knopf Papers.
[118] Ibid.

Japan, Bradley expressed genuine excitement about the project and warmly offered his support and aid in the project. Following up with Tagaki, Bradley articulated his pleasure at the proposed project. "I am delighted that you wish to have such an edition."[119] Bradley approved of the Japanese translation because he felt Tocqueville could be used to effect real change in postwar Japan. "I can think of no book which might be of greater significance in Japanese reorientation." To American readers, Bradley had called their attention to Tocqueville's fears about a developed democracy. To Japan, he wanted to relay Tocqueville's admiration of democracy.

Bradley saw Tocqueville as a useful guide to other non-Western countries as well. Teaching in India in the late 1950s, Bradley requested from Knopf a copy of *Democracy*, as he could not find any edition in the library at the Indian School of International Studies. Bradley regretted his decision not to bring a copy, as well as Tocqueville's overall absence in India. "I have wished a hundred times that I could use it here with my students—and with many people whom I meet here."[120]

Despite the early flurry of activity in the winter and spring of 1950-51, the translation project stalled. In June 1952, Bradley wrote to Koshland at Knopf to inquire about the progress of the Japanese edition. Koshland replied, "There has been no further word from our friend, Mr. Yasaka Takagi, nor any information from the Japanese publisher who he set forth for the possible outlet for the book in Japan." Koshland promised to follow-up on the project, which he did the same day.[121] A month later, Takagi replied regretfully, "I am at present no prospect of finding any ground of

[119] Phillips Bradley to Yasaka Takagi, April 27 1951, Box 117, Folder 7, Knopf Papers.
[120] Phillips Bradley to Alfred Knopf April 23 1958, Folder 1282, Box 1, Knopf Papers.
[121] William Koshland to Phillips Bradley, June 11, 1952, Folder 100, Box 4, Knopf Papers; William Koshland to Yasaka Takagi June 11, 1952, Folder 117, Box 7, Knopf Papers.

accepting the responsibility of preparing for a Japanese-language edition of the Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*." Listing the obstacles preventing the smooth progress of the project, Takagi cited personnel changes at Keiso Shobo. The new publisher's "attitude toward this undertaking" was "less congenial than his predecessor," which took months to find out. As a result, Takagi gave up on the project and took on other time-intensive projects.[122] Three decades later, a Japanese edition was published.

Presenting the image of Tocqueville as a timely prophet was limited to *Democracy*. Following the success of the Bradley edition, Alfred A. Knopf inquired by letter of Pierson whether it would be worthwhile to publish a new edition of Tocqueville's *Souvenirs*, his recollections of his experiences during the 1848 revolution. Pierson replied that it "would probably not be worth while bringing out an American translated edition" for two main reasons. For one, the new edition seemed to be a replica of the 1893 edition, and so not worth the time and expense. More importantly, however, Pierson deemed *Souvenirs* relevant but unappetizing to the American public. Pierson explained that *Souvenirs* "deal explicitly with a revolution that has never meant much to this country and with individuals most of whom Americans have never heard of. The events and personalities of 1848, therefore, get in between the readers and Tocqueville's personalities. It would take a mature and educated person to penetrate this surface. I doubt whether many Americans would succeed."[123]

American scholars and publishers generally have also overlooked Tocqueville's writings on Algeria. France had launched a war in 1830 to colonize the area.

---

[122] Yasaka Takagi to William Koshland, July 7 1952, Folder 117, Box 7, Knopf Papers.
[123] G.W. Pierson to Alfred Knopf, April 4, 1946, Box 26, Folder 8, Series II. Manuscripts Records and Reader's Reports, Rejected Manuscripts 1930-1937, Alfred A. Knopf Records, New York Public Library, New York, New York.

Tocqueville became directly involved as Foreign Minister and a rapporteur of a committee investigating the status of the French expedition. Tocqueville's writings on the subject include two letters detailing his opinions on the goals and nature of the war, both of which were read as speeches to the other Deputies. Tocqueville also recorded his travels to the area in his journal, and in a few letters to friends.

Although they have been published in French as part of the *Oeuvres Complètes*, Tocqueville's letters and writings on Algeria and colonization have only recently been translated into English.[124] Tocqueville staunchly advocated colonization, condoned violence in the Algerian War on the part of French soldiers, and referred to Arabs in outwardly racist terms. These ideas and thoughts seem to contradict completely his appreciation of equality and self-government.[125] These writings have presented difficulties for scholars and public figures in the early postwar period who portrayed Tocqueville as a liberal thinker.

Tocqueville's other main work, *The Old Regime and The French Revolution*, had also been less favored by American scholars for much of the twentieth century.[126] After Napoleon III's coup d'état in 1851, which landed Tocqueville in jail for a couple of days, Tocqueville retreated from public service and devoted himself to writing on the causes of Napoleon's rise. He wrote *The Old Regime and The French Revolution* to argue that the centralization process began before the revolution, and sped up as the aristocracy grew weaker. So, the revolution of 1789 was not a complete break with the past and should

[124] See Jennifer Pitts, *Alexis de Tocqueville: Writings on Empire and Slavery* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).
[125] See Margaret Kohn, "The Other America: Tocqueville and Beaumont on Race and Slavery," *Polity* 35, no. 2 (Winter 2002): 169-193.
[126] See Robert T. Gannett, Jr., *Tocqueville Unveiled: The Historian and His Sources for The Old Regime and the Revolution* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003); See also Irene Coltman Brown, "The Historian as Philosopher: Tocqueville, *Democracy* & Revolution," *History Today* 31 (September 1981): 27-31.

not be seen as a great watershed. Tocqueville died before finishing the second volume, but *The Old Regime and The French Revolution* still contains great insight concerning the power of individuals and classes in the face of a strong leader and bureaucracy.

American scholars and publishers ultimately preferred Tocqueville's *Democracy* to his other works because of its timely message to a postwar generation already concerned with alienation of the individual in a mass society and the weaknesses of democratic societies. With the new reader-friendly editions, which provided introductions explaining Tocqueville 's importance to contemporary times, a renewed interest in Tocqueville took place on a larger scale outside the academic world.

Conclusion

From the outset, Tocqueville's *Democracy* was singled out among all the travelogues and commentaries on America. In the nineteenth century, Tocqueville's preferential status reflected more of Americans' increasing sense of nationalism and growing insecurity of America's global image. Reviewers cherished Tocqueville's praise of America. Thompson and Stanton's exchange indicates that as Tocqueville became more widely read, his value changed. His observations became tested and judged as relevant or antiquated. Twentieth-century readers, who witnessed two world wars and the rise of totalitarian states, responded to Tocqueville's ambivalence about democracy.

With his essay, Bradley helped shape Tocqueville's image as timely and encouraged readers to use Tocqueville to understand current trends. His analysis of Tocqueville as an aristocrat who expressed fears of the majority and saw potential dangers of democracy resonated with postwar society. In the fifties, two scholars

especially helped raise Tocqueville's status with their influential works. In the next chapter I examine David Riesman and Louis Hartz's readings of Tocqueville. Their works, *The Lonely Crowd* and *The Liberal Tradition in America*, respectively, used Tocqueville to offer hopeful solutions to the contemporary concerns of the tyranny of the majority.

Chapter Two
Refitting the Flannel Suit: David Riesman and Louis Hartz's Tocqueville

> When once an opinion has spread over the country and struck root there, it would seem that no power on earth is strong enough to eradicate it…What struck me in the United States was the difficulty of shaking the majority in an opinion once conceived of or drawing it off from a leader once adopted.
>
> Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*

> Standing next to me in this lonely crowd,
> Is a man who swears he's not to blame.
>
> Bob Dylan, *I shall be released*

> If you want to know what the public wants, I'll tell you: great art on the extremely rare occasions when it's available, but no phony art—they'd rather have good honest blood and thunder. The public doesn't like fakers, and neither do I.
>
> Ralph Hopkins, *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit*

The 1950s gave rise to concerns that the increasing dependence by mass society on large bureaucratic organizations and the government would lead to a tyranny of the majority. Two extremely influential works of the decade, David Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd* and Louis Hartz's *The Liberal Tradition in America*, used Tocqueville to explore the possibilities, consequences and solutions to such a tyranny.

Hartz, a "small, energetic man who moved perpetually and spoke in rapid-fire fashion,"[127] became known for using Tocqueville to overturn the traditional concept of a

[127] David Margolick, "Louis Hartz of Harvard Dies; Ex-Professor of Government," *New York Times*, January 24, 1986.

conservative/liberal clash in American history.[128] His work, *The Liberal Tradition in America*, received an enormous reception upon its publication in 1955 and has been viewed as a cornerstone of the liberal thesis in American intellectual history.[129] One year after its publication, Hartz received the American Political Science Association's Woodrow Wilson Prize, and in 1977 he received the Association's Lippincott Prize.[130] Hartz changed the lens of history for political scientists, and was even invited by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to give a presentation on "The Nature of Revolution."[131] Although Hartz went on to publish another book, *The Founding of New Societies*, in which he examined world regions as fragments,[132] Hartz's reputation is linked to *The Liberal Tradition*. Hartz's work has been so intricately linked to

[128] Hartz was determined to argue for new interpretations of American history. Arguing against Turner, he wrote, "Consider that ancient question: the early triumph of American democracy. Turner's frontier, of course, has been advanced to explain this phenomenon but, discovering alas that frontiers are to be found in Canada where feudalism was originally imported and in Russia, historians have revolted against the Turner approach" (22). Later Hartz stated more bluntly, "In American social studies we still live in the shadow of the Progressive era. Historians have openly assailed Beard…But after all is said and done Beard somehow stays alive...The way to fully refute a man is to ignore him for the most part, and the only way you can do this is to substitute new fundamental categories for his own, so that you are simply pursuing a different path. Such categories represent the only hope for a genuine escape from the pervasive frustration that the persistence of the Progressive analysis of America has inspired" (28).

[129] There has been a backlash against Hartz. See Rogers M. Smith, "Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hartz: The Multiple Traditions in America," *The American Political Science Review*, 87, no. 3 (September 1993): 549-566. Unlike Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd*, however, Hartz's work was considered much harder to digest for the reader. One reviewer complained that it was more like a reading list. Another commented on the multiple 'of course's' throughout the work.

[130] The Woodrow Wilson Award recognized *The Liberal Tradition* as the best book on government, politics, or international affairs published in 1955. The Benjamin E. Lippincott Award indicated the sustaining reception of *The Liberal Tradition*.

[131] Paul Roazen, "The Nature of Revolution," *Society* 42, no. 4 (May/June 2005): 54-61. Roazen, a former student of Hartz's, wrote that despite the number of Harvard faculty members who had entered public positions "the fact of Hartz's testimony was in its own way extraordinary. I can think of no other example of a prominent political theorist being asked by Senators for his or her viewpoint; Hannah Arendt's own *On Revolution* had appeared in 1963, but it was a sign of Hartz's standing by 1968 that it was he who was to appear."

[132] Louis Hartz, *The Founding of New Societies: Studies in the History of the United States, Latin America, South Africa, Canada, and Australia* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964). *The Liberal Tradition* followed Hartz's earlier work, *Economic Policy and Democratic Thought: Pennsylvania 1776-1860* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948).

Tocqueville, that American historian Gordon S. Wood has written, "As Tocqueville's reputation goes, so will go the reputation of Hartz's book."[133]

A Harvard-educated lawyer who practiced and taught sociology rather than law, David Riesman engaged in several contemporary debates and published on a wide range of topics.[134] He is best known for *The Lonely Crowd*, which he coauthored with sociologists Nathan Glazer and Reuel Denney.[135] Riesman felt his work so relevant he designed and organized his work so he could appeal "to a wider audience than academic people."[136] Interesting and easy to read, *The Lonely Crowd* became extremely popular and found a wide audience.[137] In 1954, *Time Magazine* chose Riesman for its cover. Less than ten years after *The Lonely Crowd* was published, academics had already begun commenting on its enormous reception.[138] Riesman's work created a new vocabulary that made its way into marketing, textbooks, cocktail parties, and even a 1967 Bob Dylan

---

[133] Gordon S. Wood, "Tocqueville's Lesson," *The New York Review of Books*, May 17, 2001, http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2001/may/17/tocquevilles-lesson/.

[134] Most notably, Riesman 'academized' the study of higher education. For an overview of Riesman's professional trajectory, see Steven Weiland, "Social Science toward Social Criticism: Some Vocations of David Riesman," *The Antioch Review* 44, no. 4 *Tricks & Bones: The Piltdown Fraud* (Autumn, 1986): 444-457.

[135] Though co-authored, Riesman has been considered the main author. Even Nathan Glazer agreed that *The Lonely Crowd* was Riesman's. In a speech on Tocqueville and Riesman, Glazer stated, "[Riesman] conceived it, wrote most of it, and rewrote it for the final version. Contributions from the two listed co-authors in the form of initial drafts and research reports and rewritings of Riesman's first drafts may have spurred him to expand, revise, and extend his own thinking, but in the end it is his book." Nathan Glazer, "The David Riesman Lecture on American Society," *Society* 37, no 4 (May 2000): 26-33.

[136] David Riesman to Hannah Arendt, June 14, 1949, The Hannah Arendt Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. [Electronic Records] (hereafter cited as Arendt Papers).

[137] Despite its ultimate success, *The Lonely Crowd* had an inauspicious beginning. Yale University published only 1500 copies at first and many publications did not review it. Herbert Gans, Nathan Glazer, Joseph R. Gusfield and Christopher Jencks, eds. *On the Making of Americans: Essays in Honor of David Riesman*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979), foreword, viii.

[138] See Gans et al; Harold H. Kassarjian, "Riesman Revisited," *Journal of Marketing* 29, no. 2 (April 1965): 54-56. Riesman himself was surprised at the enormous reception of *The Lonely Crowd*. "I wrote it as an essay; it was published by a university press. I sent Friedrich the manuscript, and he wrote that it was interesting, but that he could only give it to graduate students."

song. By 1971, twenty years following its debut, it reached the million-copy mark.[139] *The Lonely Crowd* remains the only book written by a sociologist to sell over a million copies.

The popularity of Riesman and Hartz's works spread new images of Tocqueville throughout academia and the general reading public. Riesman's work set the image of Tocqueville as the prophet of conformity, while Hartz's work set the image of Tocqueville as the ultimate defender of American exceptionalism. However, the Tocquevillean aspects of *The Lonely Crowd* and *The Liberal Tradition* need to be re-evaluated due to the overwhelming receptions of their works. I argue that Riesman and Hartz deeply engaged Tocqueville and took from him a positive and hopeful outlook on the future of democracy. In Tocqueville, Riesman found the way to overcome the tyranny of the majority. For Hartz, Tocqueville showed the greatness of the American majority. Hartz also used Tocqueville to encourage America to gain a better self-understanding in order to help other nations fight communism.

Tocqueville and *The Lonely Crowd*

David Riesman held a deep appreciation of Tocqueville. Over the winter of 1980, David Riesman engaged in a transatlantic correspondence with French social and political theorist Raymond Aron.[140] Riesman, who had been recently chosen as the winner of The Tocqueville Society's annual Tocqueville Prize, shared his gratitude with Aron. He revealed, "No award or honor I have received gave me as much delight…as the

[139] Herbert J. Gans, "Best-Sellers by Sociologists: An Exploratory Study" *Contemporary Society* 26, no. 2 (1997): 131, 5. The only other book written by a sociologist to come close is Elliot Liebow's *Tally Corner*, which only sold 701,000 copies through 1995.
[140] For more on Aron's turn from social science to political theory, see Melvin Richter, "Raymond Aron as Political Theorist" *Political Theory* 12, no. 2 (May 1984): 147-151.

Tocqueville Prize."[141] The two sociologists found they had much in common, from their disorganized desks to their interest in Tocqueville and how his ideas helped frame contemporary debates. They discussed issues, as Aron phrased it, "in the shade of Tocqueville."[142]

In the letters Riesman acknowledged Tocqueville's influence on him. For example, he included with one letter to Aron a few articles he had written that were directly and indirectly related to Tocqueville. Riesman also included an article he wrote that had "Tocquevillean flavor."[143] In the article, Riesman noted that the practice of establishing small businesses, which he deemed necessary for a thriving democracy, should have been included in the Bill of Rights. He stated how important small businesses became during the recent Red Scare. "I made the obvious comment that, if the state becomes the sole employer, there cannot be freedom. And I observed that many of the people who were ousted from office or position by McCarthyism and its local counterparts found niches in small business, as Alger Hiss did, and Albert Wohlstetter, who had been a Trotskyite and who later became, as you probably know, a political scientist."[144] Riesman pointed out to Aron that small business "is not dead in the United States but flourishing."[145]

In 1990, which marked the fortieth anniversary of *The Lonely Crowd*, Riesman explained how critical Tocqueville was to the conception of his work.

---

[141] David Riesman to Raymond Aron, December 15, 1980, Boîte n° 171, Reel 99, Commissions Officielles, Commission Nationale Pour La Publication Des Oeuvres De Tocqueville, Raymond Aron Papers, Hoover Institution, Stanford, California (hereafter cited as Aron Papers).
[142] Raymond Aron to David Riesman, January 13, 1981, Boîte n° 171, Reel 99, Commissions Officielles, Commission Nationale Pour La Publication Des Oeuvres De Tocqueville, Aron Papers.
[143] David Riesman to Raymond Aron, December 15, 1980, Boîte n° 171, Reel 99, Commissions Officielles, Commission Nationale Pour La Publication Des Oeuvres De Tocqueville, Aron Papers.
[144] Ibid.
[145] Ibid.

> The climate of social science within which authors of *The Lonely Crowd* were working can be illustrated by our own and many of our colleagues' fascination with Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, which in 1945 had appeared in a new edition with a Foreword by Phillips Bradley. Tocqueville's example of amateur ethnography—his willingness to speculate about what the country might be like if it became even more egalitarian and democratic than the America into which he unevenly inquired in 1838—encouraged our confidence as we asked ourselves how the American metropolitan upper-middle class might be changing in both character and behavior.[146]

In a speech delivered to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences on October 20, 1999, Nathan Glazer also emphasized Tocqueville's influence on Riesman. Noting that Riesman read the 1945 Knopf edition of *Democracy*, Glazer stated, "[I]t was clearly much on his mind as he wrote *The Lonely Crowd*. There are many references to it, many quotations from it, in *The Lonely Crowd*, and they are far from merely formal: He is engaging with it."[147]

Some reviewers noticed Riesman's connection to Tocqueville immediately. In his 1951 review, sociologist Rudolph Morris stated, "Precisely as Tocqueville provides us with richer food and thus serves social science better than the researchers who keep strictly within the realm of quantitative and measurable facts, Riesman with his all-inclusive vision gives a greater impetus to the study of national characters, a field certainly beset with the most intricate methodological problems, than more prudent and apparently more 'scientific' investigators have done."[148] More often, though, scholars noticed Max Weber and Thorstein Veblen's influences in the work. For example, in 1956 Rudolf Heberle stated that Riesman's three categories "are nearly with Max

[146] David Riesman, "Innocence of *The Lonely Crowd,*" Society 27, no. 2 (January/February 1990): 78
[147] Nathan Glazer, "Tocqueville and Riesman," *Society* 37 (May 2000): 29.
[148] Rudolph E. Morris, review of *The Lonely Crowd* by David Riesman, *The American Catholic Sociological Review* 12, no. 2 (June 1951): 104.

Weber's types of orientation of social action: traditional, value rational (Riesman's 'inner-directed'), and purposive rational (zweckrational)."[149]

Within a decade, scholars began to analyze Riesman's reliance on Tocqueville. In 1963, historian Edward T. Gargan captured Riesman's optimistic reading of Tocqueville. Gargan believed Tocqueville "expressed his apprehension over modern man's destiny to become a member of '*The Lonely Crowd*.'"[150] More concerned with defining Tocqueville, though, Gargan argued that Tocqueville should not be perceived mainly as a prophet because Tocqueville himself "increasingly stressed the limits of historical prognosis."[151] Later that year, historian Carl Degler showed Riesman's incorporation of Tocqueville. "As we read in Riesman's pages the persuasive descriptions of our own other-directed world, the observations of Tocqueville keep nagging at the periphery of our minds."[152]

However, Degler critiqued the sweeping generalizations that Riesman and other sociologists had the habit of making in recent times. He argued Riesman's depiction of the nineteenth century was inaccurate and the nineteenth-century inner-directed and twentieth-century other-directed shared startling similarities. Degler deemed the 'soundest conclusion' of Riesman's work to be his depiction of the other-directed American, but emphasized that Tocqueville had described the type over a century before Riesman. Degler wrote, "There may be some accentuation of certain aspects of it in our own time, but what Tocqueville designated in the 1830s as '*democratie'* is essentially

[149] Rudolf Heberle, "A Note on Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd*," *The American Journal of Sociology* 62, no. 1 (July 1956): 34.
[150] Edward T. Gargan, "Tocqueville and the Problem of Historical Prognosis," *The American Historical Review* 68, no. 2 (January 1963): 334, 345.
[151] Ibid., 334.
[152] Carl N. Degler,"The Sociologist as Historian: Riesman's '*The Lonely Crowd*," *American Quarterly* 15, no. 4 (Winter 1963): 491.

what Riesman means by other-direction. Rather than a changing American character, the evidence suggests a remarkably stable one, at least since the early years of the nineteenth century."[153] As these reviews indicate, Riesman's reading of Tocqueville was not analyzed or appreciated completely.

From Tyranny to Freedom

Riesman's debt to Tocqueville is clear in *The Lonely Crowd*. The heart of Riesman's argument, that a tyranny of the majority has taken hold in postwar America, derived from Tocqueville's observation in *Democracy*. Although Tocqueville admired much in a democratic society, he also expressed his fear that the majority can exercise a tyrannous hold on society. As the epigraph to this chapter indicates, Tocqueville found in America the tendency of the majority to suppress dissenting views.[154] Since no elite classes exist in a democracy, Tocqueville studied the agents for change in a classless society. He found that in democracies, the number of advocates for a cause mattered. In order for democratic citizens to exert influence in society or government, they must take an interest in politics and deem it a necessary cause worthy of their time and effort. Tocqueville found this inclusionary form of democracy, in which every citizen is encouraged to participate, both a prelude to potential despotism and a safeguard against a despotic government.

[153] Ibid., 484.
[154] Tocqueville noted that this tendency has even affected poetry, which relies on the author's ability to discern subtle differences. Tocqueville stated, "In democratic communities, where men are all insignificant and very much alike, each man instantly sees all his fellows when he surveys himself. The poets of democratic ages, therefore, can never take any man in particular as the subject of a piece…Thus the principle of equality, in proportion as it has established itself in the world, has dried up most of the old springs of poetry."

Tocqueville did not have much faith that the public would act in its best interests. For one, equality did not mean equal individual enlightenment. So, Americans no longer could rely on a small elite class for universal truths, but had no substitute. "In times of equality, men have no faith in one another because of their similarity, but the same similarity gives them almost unlimited confidence in the judgment of the public, because it seems unlikely to them that, everyone being equally enlightened, truth should not lie with the greater number."[155] To Tocqueville, an unequally enlightened majority that devalued individual educated opinions displayed the characteristic of a mob. He declared that Americans banded together as a mob. Displaying a mob mentality, they shunned those with differing opinions. The human spirit, "having smashed all the shackles once placed on it by classes or individuals, would tightly chain itself to the general will of the majority."[156]

Such a 'tyranny of the majority' would be detrimental and dangerous to a democratic society politically and culturally. For instance, Tocqueville hypothesized that the lack of a freedom of spirit attributed to what he saw as a dearth of artistic genius and 'remarkable men' in American politics.[157] In an absolute monarchy, the ruler enforced stability through the threat of force and punishment. A democracy, however, relies upon its citizens to maintain stability. Tocqueville believed a democratic society as capable as a king in this respect, as the majority "is vested a force that is moral as well as material,

[155] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (New York: The Library of America, 2004), 491.
[156] Ibid., 492.
[157] Ibid., 295-6.

which shapes wills as much as actions and inhibits not only deeds but also the desire to do them."[158]

A consequence of the majority's self-imposed morals and inhibitions is the stifling of non-conformers. The majority "erects a formidable barrier around thought." Tocqueville explained that though free to express themselves in a democracy, writers instead would be isolated, criticized, stripped of glory, and remorseful for speaking the truth if their thoughts did not conform to the majority's frame of thought and morals.[159] Politicians who dared to go against the majority would not get elected. The majority acts as a master in a tyranny.

> He says: You are free not to think as I do. You may keep your life, your property, and everything else. But from this day forth you shall be as a stranger among us. You will retain your civic privileges, but they will be of no use to you. For if you seek the votes of your fellow citizen, they will withhold them, and if you seek only their esteem, they will feign to refuse even that. You will remain among men, but you will forfeit your rights to humanity.[160]

For Tocqueville, then, the threat of isolation by society in a democracy is as effective as a king's despotic rule. Fearful of this ultimate punishment, democratic citizens carefully toe the political and cultural line, and stifle their independent voices. Tocqueville also observed that the tyranny of the majority could lead to anarchy. "If America ever loses its liberty, the fault will surely lie with the omnipotence of the majority, which may drive minorities to despair and force them to resort to physical force.

[158] Ibid., 293.
[159] Ibid., 294.
[160] Ibid.

This may lead to anarchy, but to an anarchy that will come as a consequence of despotism."[161]

Influenced by Tocqueville, Riesman showed in *The Lonely Crowd* the causes and effects of the tyranny of the majority in postwar America. For Riesman, the unprecedented affluence in the postwar period represented a break with traditional American customs and morals. Authority figures, such as parents, were unprepared for such changes in society and began to look to mass media and even to their children for advice.[162] They turned toward other-directedness, as parents could not "help but show their children, by their own anxiety, how little they depend on themselves and how much on others."[163] Parents began to give approval to their children based on an outside group, "and the child learns from his parents' reactions to him that nothing in his character, no possession he owns, no inheritance of name or talent, no work he has done is valued for itself but only for its effect on others."[164]

Riesman developed this idea throughout his study, stressing that the peer-group assumed power in society, and individuals who achieve the greatest success in business, politics, and social settings were the ones able to manipulate the peer-group. These other-directed persons presented a threat to individualism, Riesman indicated, as they lost their ability to lead an autonomous life. Preoccupied with gaining the crowd's approval, other-directed persons shied from choosing unpopular careers or publicizing unpopular beliefs, even if they thought the crowd was wrong or heading on a detrimental path.

[161] Ibid., 299.
[162] Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd,* 47.
[163] Ibid., 48.
[164] Ibid.

Despite accepting Tocqueville's observations of the threats of tyranny and concerns about democratic citizens, Riesman detected hope in Tocqueville. Although society could not return to the America in which the inner-directed type was dominant, Riesman thought it could be possible for other-directed persons to retain the autonomous personality characteristic of inner-directed persons. For example, Riesman took from Tocqueville the value of associations. Echoing Tocqueville's concerns about democratic citizens, Riesman wrote in an article, "I fear…antipolitical or nonpolitical people when on occasion they do become mobilized; I do not see why everyone needs to be civic in the explicitly political realm."[165] Riesman added, "though I remain Tocquevillean in hoping that, for example, the students I work with will become engaged in some activity that connects them with others of similar interest, and that transcends the dailiness of their existence."[166] For Riesman, Tocqueville represented the belief that individuals can effect positive change by working together.

Riesman also incorporated Tocqueville into several of his other main arguments in *The Lonely Crowd*. Riesman began six chapters with quotes from *Democracy*, and referenced him within several chapters as well. Historian James Kloppenberg commented that Riesman "littered his book with quotations from Tocqueville."[167] However, all those quotes and references to *Democracy* reveal a deep and continuous engagement with Tocqueville. For example, Riesman used Tocqueville to show how different society was in the nineteenth century. Describing the progression of the social characters, Riesman stressed the newness of the other-directed type. "It is my impression

[165] David Riesman, "Dennis Wong and *The Lonely Crowd* Revisited," *Sociological Forum* 7, no. 2 (June 1992): 393.
[166] Ibid.
[167] James Kloppenberg, "Life Everlasting: Tocqueville in America" in *The Virtues of Liberalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 75.

that the middle-class American of today is decisively different from those Americans of Tocqueville's writings who nevertheless strike us as so contemporary, and much of this book will be devoted to discussing these differences."[168] Although Riesman noticed that inner-directed Americans of the nineteenth-century shared characteristics of the twentieth-century other-directed Americans, such as gregariousness and a subservience to public opinion, he argued that the main difference between the two types was the motive behind their behavior.[169]

> The inner-directed person...was in most cases very much concerned with his good repute and…with 'keeping up with the Joneses.' These conformities, however, were primarily external, typified in such details as clothes, curtains and bank credit…In contrast to this pattern, the other-directed person…aims to keep up with [the Joneses] not so much in external details as in the quality of his inner experience.[170]

For Chapter X, "Images of Power," Riesman began with an epigraph from *Democracy*. In the chapter, Riesman detailed how the emergence of the other-directed type led to a change in the power structure in politics, though the image of leaders remained associated with stereotypes of business leaders from the early twentieth century. Riesman chose a quote from Volume II of *Democracy*, in which Tocqueville discussed how free institutions warded off despotism.[171] Tocqueville felt that it was important that citizens take advantage of their political liberties, though he acknowledged the difficulty in getting others involved to support their causes. Tocqueville observed that in democracies, in which all citizens were equally politically, the wealthier citizens

[168] Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd*, 19.
[169] Daniel Bell also explored the tensions between modern and traditional capitalism in his 1976 work, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*.
[170] Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd*, 24.
[171] Full quote as follows: "In the United States the more opulent citizens take great care not to stand aloof from the people; on the contrary, they constantly keep on easy terms with the lower classes; they listen to them, they speak to them every day. They know that the rich in democracies always stand in need of the poor, and that in democratic times you attach a poor man to you more by your manner than by benefits conferred."

entered public service often to combat a threat to their private lives.[172] In order to get elected and remain in power, they needed to show their solidarity with the lower classes.[173] Tocqueville wrote, "Men concern themselves with the general interests at first out of necessity and later by choice. What was calculation becomes instinct, and by dint of working for the good of one's fellow citizens, one ultimately acquires the habit of serving them, along with a taste for doing so."[174]

Inner-directed leaders entered politics "to do a job," and resisting pressure from the public to change their course, retained the power needed to carry out their policies and programs. Other-directed leaders, however, became too concerned with what their constituencies and members of influential pressure groups thought, and in the process relinquished power to the emergent veto groups.[175] According to Riesman, the manipulation and 'the glad hand' that became the mark of leaders in the era of veto groups represented a real change.[176]

> Understandably, ideologies about who has power in America are relied upon to support these amiable fictions which serve…to provide the modern businessman with an endless shopping list, an endless task of glad-handing. This is a far cry, I suggest, from the opportunistic glad-handing of the wealthy on which Tocqueville comments at the chapter head; very likely, what was mere practice in his day has become embedded in character in ours.[177]

---

[172] Tocqueville used the example of a road proposed to be built at the end of a wealthy citizen's estate.
[173] Tocqueville wrote that the population did not "ask them for the sacrifice of their money, but of their pride."
[174] Tocqueville, Goldhammer, 594.
[175] Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd*, 211. Riesman defined veto groups as "The various business groups, large and small, the movie-censoring groups, the farm groups and the labor and professional groups, the major ethnic groups and major regional groups [who] have in many instances succeeded in maneuvering themselves into a position in which they are able to neutralize those who might attack them. The very increase in the number of these groups, and in the kinds of interests, practical and fictional, they are protecting, marks, therefore, a decisive change from the lobbies of an earlier day" (213).
[176] Riesman felt this new type of leader applied to politicians and businessmen6. Examples of inner-directed leaders included McKinley and Sewell Avery, for example.
[177] Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd*, 219.

Noting that these political customs were different in Tocqueville's time, it is even more significant that Riesman still believed Tocqueville was relevant to modern society. Above all, Riesman deemed Tocqueville's observation of the link between passion and success in America the most valuable.

A Passionless Existence

Discussing the rise of powerful unions and veto groups, Riesman noted that the roots of apathy had changed from Tocqueville's time to his. In the nineteenth century, Tocqueville saw increased centralization as responsible for feelings of isolation, political non-participation, and apathy by democratic citizens. In the twentieth, Riesman explained, the change from a clear-cut power structure of the pre-World War I era to "the amorphous power structure created by the veto groups" led to apathy. Riesman explained, "Probably, most of all it encourages the new-style indifferent who feels and is often told that his and everyone else's affairs are in the hands of the experts and that laymen, though they should 'participate,' should not really be too inquisitive or aroused."[178]

Tocqueville's observation on individuals and pride in a democracy especially resonated with Riesman. In fact, Riesman's tentative title for *The Lonely Crowd* was *Passionless Existence in America*.[179] In Chapter XI, "Americans and Kwakiutls," Riesman quoted Tocqueville's argument from *Democracy* that Americans, contrary to what the moralists of the day were saying, did not typically suffer from the vice of

[178] Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd*, 214-5.
[179] David Riesman to Hannah Arendt, June 14, 1949, Arendt Papers.

pride.[180] Rather, Americans suffered from a lack of pride, which stemmed from feelings of non-superiority to others in a society of equals. Tocqueville wrote that the American "willingly takes up with low desires without daring to embark on lofty enterprises, of which he scarcely dreams."[181] Pride and ambition would give them the self-esteem needed to give them more ambitious goals.

Using Tocqueville's observation, Riesman argued that the lack of pride and ambition created severe effects in America and would lead to a national economic crisis. By the 1940s, Americans shied away from showing off their wealth through material goods and their lust for such high-priced material products.[182] Riesman associated conspicuous consumption with inner-directed persons.[183] The other-directed person "oriented as he is toward people, is simply unable to be as materialistic."[184] Taught by their peers to shun materialism, as they associated materialism with business, students lowered their respect for businessmen and turned toward other professions.[185] Riesman explained the significance this would have. "Business will be forced to recruit from the less gifted and sensitive, who will not be able to take advantage of the opportunities for personal development business could offer and who, therefore, will not become models for younger men."[186]

---

[180] Quote came from Volume II, Chapter XIX: Why So Many Ambitious Men and So Little Lofty Ambition are to be Found in the United States America. Tocqueville stated that pride was not the ruling vice of the present, as moralists thought. Rather, pride should be shown more, as democratic manners led some Americans to harbor such a low opinion of themselves.
[181] quoted in Riesman, 235.
[182] Riesman did not explore the link between the Great Depression and the decline of conspicuous consumption. Rather, he explained that Americans "have turned away in boredom from attaching much emotional significance to the consumer-goods frontier" (228).
[183] Riesman, *Lonely Crowd*, 229.
[184] Ibid., 229.
[185] Riesman noted that Fortune has shown that the steady decline of interest in business correlated to "a growing interest in once peripheral matters, such as international relations, social science, and other accoutrements of the modern executive" (218).
[186] Ibid., 231.

Riesman ironically noted that by the late 1940s, "only small businessmen (car dealers or furnace repairmen, for instance) have many opportunities for the…sharply manipulative property-pyramiding of the Dobuan conoeists."[187] However, American college students held outdated images of business, and businessmen were too insecure to realize it and change it. All believed that since the media kept portraying the businessman as ruthless, competitive, individualistic, and even immoral, there must be some truth to it. Meanwhile, Americans were taught to value cooperativeness and calm dispositions. Since the media portrayed businessmen as anathema to cooperation, the other-directed preferred love to glory, social security to great achievements, and approval to fame. Riesman noted that Tocqueville "saw, or foresaw' the end result—that the other-directed person lacked great ambition.[188] More than simple career choices, this lack of great ambition affected negatively the nation's economy and culture.

For Riesman, the low esteem of the other-directed person was the most concerning problem of modern democracy, as it led to a vicious cycle in society. "The savage believes that he will secure more power by drinking the blood or shrinking the head of his enemy. But the other-directed person, far from gaining, only becomes weaker from the weakness of his fellows."[189] Riesman showed how low esteem led to negative effects for women in society as well as for race relations. Women, accustomed to taking their cues for behavior from others, did not know how to act in a postindustrial society.

---

[187] For this chapter Riesman leaned heavily on Ruth Benedict's book, *Patterns of Culture*, which compared three primitive societies: the Pueblo Indians, Dobu of the Pacific, and Kwakiutl Indians of the northwest coast of America. The Pueblo Indians were a cooperative society, the Kwakiutl rivalrous and materialistic, and the Dobu paranoid whose economic life "is built on sharp practice in interisland trading, on an intense feeling for property rights, and on a hope of getting something for nothing through theft, magic, and fraud." Using *Patterns of Culture* as a teaching tool, Riesman tried to show his students the discrepancy between their notions of power in America and their own experiences.
[188] Ibid., 235.
[189] Ibid.

Not sure whether aggressiveness or modesty were appropriate qualities, they did not exercise their own judgment. Riesman stated that this anxiety caused many middle-class women to revert to traditional female roles, "in a futile effort to recapture the older and seemingly more secure patterns."[190]

This would seem to indicate that Riesman favored affirmative action as a clear signal to women to set high professional goals. However, Riesman disapproved of judging applicants on anything but their ability to perform the job. Using race relations as another example, Riesman indicated that low esteem of the other-directed person leads to 'prejudice in reverse.' "Moral issues are befogged on both sides of the race line, since neither whites nor Negroes are expected to react as individuals striving for autonomy, but only as members of the tolerating or the tolerated race."[191] High self-esteem, or what Riesman called 'heightened self-consciousness,' would enable individuals to judge others as individuals and to set their own professional and personal goals.[192] One of the major themes of *The Lonely Crowd* was the rise of conformity in the twentieth century, as the new other-directed person received their cues from their peers and media. Riesman took the fear of conformity from Tocqueville.

More importantly, though, Riesman also saw much hope in Tocqueville's analysis of democracy. Setting up the last chapter of *The Lonely Crowd*, entitled "Autonomy and Utopia," Riesman quoted from the section of *Democracy* entitled 'Why Great Revolutions Will Become Rare.'[193] From his experience in America, Tocqueville found

---

[190] Ibid., 259.
[191] Ibid.
[192] Ibid.
[193] Full quote in Riesman as follows: "Time, events, or the unaided individual action of the mind will sometimes undermine or destroy an opinion, without any outward sign of the change. It has not been openly assailed, no conspiracy has been formed to make war on it, but its followers one by one noiselessly

that even though revolution would seem more likely in democratic societies, in which men appeared "always excited, uncertain, eager, changeable in their wills and in their positions," the principle of equality actually dissuaded revolutionary tendencies. The middle classes, for example, attached "an enormous value to their possessions" and, wanting to protect them, became less extreme politically. Commerce also discouraged revolutionary attitudes because "it gives democratic men a lofty notion of their personal importance, leads them to seek to conduct their own affairs, and teaches how to conduct them well; it therefore prepares men for freedom, but preserves them from revolutions." Tocqueville concluded, "Thus in democratic societies, the majority of citizens do not see clearly what they might gain by a revolution, yet in a thousand ways they are constantly aware of what they might lose."[194] For Tocqueville, this was a positive effect of democracy. Taking the French Revolution as the model revolution, Tocqueville saw revolutions as violent, destructive, and unproductive.

Significantly, Riesman was extremely optimistic in his concluding chapter.[195] Riesman provided suggestions to foster autonomy in a society of false personalization and enforced privatization. Connecting his argument to Tocqueville's observation on revolutions, Riesman indicated that changing America would not have to occur through violent or abrupt means. Though he believed that the middle class placed limitations on innovations, Riesman argued that the other-directed group could revolutionize America

---

secede; day by day a few of them abandon it, until at last it is only professed by a minority. In this state it will still continue to prevail. As its enemies remain mute or only interchange their thoughts by stealth, they are themselves unaware for a long period that a great revolution ahs actually been effected; and in this state of uncertainty they take no steps; they observe one another and are silent. The majority have ceased to believe what they believed before, but they still affect to believe, and this empty phantom of public opinion is strong enough to chill innovators and to keep them silent and at a respectful distance" (304).

[194] Tocqueville, Goldhammer, 749.

[195] This chapter was selected to be included in a Spanish Language Anthology. David Riesman to Irving Louis Horowitz December 18, 1958, AX/B40/HCLA/05225-Box 1, Irving Horowitz Papers, Penn State University, [Electronic Records].

by instilling fresh ideas in society. Riesman maintained, "[J]ust as there is in my opinion a greater variety of attitudes towards leisure in contemporary America than appears on the surface, so also the sources of utopian political thinking may be hidden and constantly changing, constantly disguising themselves."[196] So, even though other-direction became shorthand for conformity in mass society, which in turn acquired a negative image, Riesman did not hold an overly pessimistic view of modern mass society. "Modern industrial society has driven great numbers of people into anomie, and produced a wan conformity in others, but the very developments which have done this have also opened up hitherto undreamed-of possibilities for autonomy."[197]

Riesman's appreciation of Tocqueville continued after *The Lonely Crowd*. Preparing courses at the University of Chicago, Riesman found himself "more engaged by Tocqueville than by Veblen."[198] Teaching undergraduates at Harvard, he used texts such as *Good Fortune* to invite comparisons to Tocqueville as an ethnographer. Riesman took from Tocqueville his observations on equality, class envy, and resentment.[199] In 1956, economist Theodore Levitt noted that Riesman actually "criticizes nothing and no

---

[196] Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd*, 306.

[197] Ibid., 257. This theme is picked up in Sloan Wilson's 1955 work, *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit.* Wilson's work has become a codeword for 1950s conformity. However, the novel actually defies the depiction of the 1950s as stifling to individuality. The protagonist of the novel, Tom Rath, is a sympathetic figure stuck between four worlds—his childhood of privilege, his wartime experiences as a paratrooper, his domestic life with his wife and three children, and his business career. As the novel develops, Tom figures out he wants to be able to have enough money to support his family, while also being able to spend the maximum time with his family. Tom's ability to maintain this balance between work and home enables him to be a credible judge when describing others.

Rath speaks disparagingly of his new employer, the United Broadcasting Corporation, as he feels the company's purpose is to peddle consumer products. However, through Tom's boss, UBC president Ralph Hopkins, Tom begins to see the possibilities to explore his individual talents and interests. Initially hired to work on Hopkin's latest project, a National Committee on Mental Health, Hopkins appreciates Tom's honesty and offers him the position as his personal assistant. Hopkins explains that as his personal assistant, Tom can learn about the company in order to see where he would like to work.

[198] David Riesman, "On Discovering and Teaching Sociology: A Memoir," *Annual Review of Sociology* 14 (1988): 9-10.

[199] Ibid, 21.

one."[200] This, according to Levitt, was why *The Lonely Crowd* was so popular. Riesman was "a more persuasive and likeable critic [and so] he is likely to be more influential than his predecessors, if for no other reason than that he is more likely to be read and enjoyed."[201] In *The Lonely Crowd*, Riesman did not use Tocqueville to critique mass society, but to understand its complexity and how individuals could retain their autonomy.

Written for a different audience, Louis Hartz's *The Liberal Tradition* was much more contentious. Like Riesman, Hartz relied on Tocqueville. Hartz utilized Tocqueville to argue that the majority accounts for America's greatness and stabilizes democratic society. According to Hartz, individualism, not conformity, posed a threat in America.

Tocqueville and *The Liberal Tradition*

Louis Hartz "admired the great French liberals of the early nineteenth century…above all Tocqueville."[202] Expressing his deep admiration of Tocqueville in *The Liberal Tradition*, Hartz described Tocqueville as "the greatest foreign critic America ever had." Urging scholars to consider Tocqueville as a serious theorist worthy of his own school of thought, Hartz wrote, "[W]hile American students have lavished unlimited praise on Tocqueville, have indeed edited and re-edited him, they have deserted

[200] Theodore Levitt, "*The Lonely Crowd* and the Economic Man," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 70, no. 1 (February 1956): 96.
[201] Ibid., 97.
[202] Benjamin R. Barber, "Louis Hartz," *Political Theory* 14, no. 3 (August 1986): 355. Barber conducted his dissertation under Hartz's supervision. Barber's 1984 work, *Strong Democracy*, took much from Hartz's reading of Tocqueville.

him when they have come to serious work, gladly substituting the Beardian notion of social conflict for his famous notion of equality."[203]

In *The Liberal Tradition*, Hartz set out to show how American history should be viewed, employing Tocqueville to move American history beyond the progressive scholars' interpretation.[204] Hartz used Tocqueville for his fundamental argument that America was an inherently liberal country because it never experienced feudalism. Feudalism relied on an aristocratic class, which was conservative in nature. Feudalism gave rise to a radical backlash in the form of socialism, as the peasant classes rebelled against the aristocracy. Hartz took from Tocqueville the depiction of the American aristocracy as benign and even inferior. Hartz explained, "But after all this has been said, the American 'aristocracy' could not, as Tocqueville pointed out, inspire either the 'love' or the 'hatred' that surrounded the titled aristocracies of Europe."[205] Since a true socialist movement never occurred due to the absence of a feudal society, Hartz theorized that all clashes in American history have taken place between liberals of differing opinions.

Disagreeing with the progressive historian's method, Hartz noted that it allowed the historian to focus on only the positives in America. "The Progressives…always had an American hero available to match any American villain they found...Which means that the nation never really sinned: only its inferior self did."[206] Hartz lamented that the analyst of American liberalism was "not in so happy a spot, for concentrating on unities as well as conflict, he is likely to discover on occasion a national villain…whose treatment requires a new experience for the whole country rather than the insurgence of a

[203] Ibid.
[204] For a more recent example, see Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006).
[205] Hartz, 52.
[206] Ibid., 31.

part of it."[207] Hartz worried that that the liberal society analyst was "destined…to be a less pleasing scholar than the Progressive" because he offered criticism but not real and immediate solutions to national weaknesses.

Hartz's interpretation led American intellectual studies in a new direction.[208] Hartz's Harvard colleague Samuel H. Beer remarked on Hartz's revolutionary thesis, "What Hartz pointed out was that America's democratic capitalism was so powerful that it excluded any ideas of socialism…That idea is pretty well accepted today, but it was his creation."[209] Fifty years after the publication of *The Liberal Tradition*, the 'Hartz thesis' is still discussed, though there have been efforts to shift the focus away from his singular cause for American exceptionalism.[210]

Hartz believed Tocqueville's comparative method was effective for putting national phenomena into perspective. Employing a comparative method, Hartz sought to understand why America did not succumb to revolutionary extremists in the 1930s like European countries did. Even though the government took unprecedented control over economic life in America, America did not turn to socialism. Hartz looked to Europe to explain the enduring democratic ethos in America. Noting that his comparative method

---

[207] Ibid.

[208] A wide debate has raged over the idea of consensus history. Some, such as Robert Booth Fowler, have argued that America never reached or experienced a consensus. *Enduring Liberalism: American Political Thought Since the 1960s* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1999). See also James A. Morone, "The Struggle for American Culture," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 29, no. 3 (September 1996): 424-430. Morone stated that Tocqueville provided the foundation for the idea of a consensus, or liberal political culture in America. See also James T. Kloppenberg, "In Retrospect: Louis Hartz's The Liberal Tradition in America," Reviews in *American History* 29, no. 3 (September 2001): 460-476.

[209] David Margolick, "Louis Hartz of Harvard Dies; Ex-Professor of Government," *New York Times* January 24, 1986.

[210] See Rogers M. Smith, "Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hartz: The Multiple Traditions in America," *The American Political Science Review*, 87, no. 3 (September 1993): 549-566. For an overview of critiques and weaknesses of the Hartz thesis, see James P. Young, "The Hartz thesis revisited," in *Studies in US Politics*, ed. David Keith Adams (Oxford: Manchester University Press, 1989): 24-46.

represented a new turn in political science, Hartz stated, "A hunger has finally appeared for getting outside the national experience."[211]

Hartz found that America lacked a revolutionary background. He argued that the social upheavals and radical movements America experienced paled in contrast to those in Europe. The social upheavals of 1776, for example, were nothing compared to revolutions in Europe because America did not have to topple an ancien régime. In "the hotbed of revolutionary radicalism, Pennsylvania, the main lines of constitutionalism they created survived the impact of the American 'reaction.'"[212] Even the outbreak of the Civil War, according to Hartz, should not be considered a great conservative reaction because it did not have a large impact on American political thought.[213] Samuel P. Huntington cited Hartz's comparative research method as one of the reasons why Hartz's work stood above the other works of consensus history. Hartz "viewed the American experience from a European vantage point and argued, persuasively, that from that vantage point which had been the central theme of the progressives shrank to insignificance. Unlike Europe, America lacked both feudalism and socialism."[214]

Hartz's thesis relied so much on Tocqueville that scholars immediately noticed the connection. James Burnham commented that Hartz's book "is a set of elaborate variations on a theme by de Tocqueville: 'The great advantage of the American is that he has arrived at a state of democracy without having to endure a democratic revolution; and that he is born free without having to become so.'"[215] Overall, Burnham approved of *The*

---

[211] Hartz, 31.
[212] Ibid., 75.
[213] Ibid., 148.
[214] Samuel P. Huntington, "Paradigms of American Politics: Beyond the One, the Two, and the Many," *Political Science Quarterly* 89, no. 1 (March 1974): 9.
[215] James Burnham, review of *The Liberal Tradition in America* by Louis Hartz, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 301. Higher Education under Stress (September 1955): 235.

Liberal Tradition. "The author's development of his thesis, though rather tricky and doctrinaire, is intellectually interesting—or could be if it were not for some lamentable qualities of his style."[216] In the sixties more scholars began to notice the Tocquevillean influence. In 1963 Marvin Meyers argued that Hartz's thesis was at its strongest when shown in relation to Tocqueville.[217] In his critique of Hartz in 1963, Harry V. Jaffa agreed that the 'Tocquevillean formula' of Americans arriving at a state of democracy without having to endure a democratic revolution accounted for the differences between American political struggles and those of Europe."[218] Other scholars began discussing issues as they fit into the Tocqueville-Hartz thesis.[219]

Born Free and Equal

Hartz based his key argument of American exceptionalism on Tocqueville's analyses in *Democracy*. He placed much emphasis on Tocqueville's notion that Americans were born equal, meaning that they did not have to undergo democratic revolutions like European countries did to attain democracy. Choosing a quote from *Democracy* as the epigraph to *Liberal Tradition*, Hartz wrote, "The great advantage of

---

[216] Ibid., 235.
[217] Marvin Meyers, "Louis Hartz, The Liberal Tradition in America: An Appraisal," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5, no. 3 (April 1963): 261-268.
[218] Harry V. Jaffa, "Conflicts Within the Idea of The Liberal Tradition," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5, no. 3 (April 1963): 274-278.
[219] See John Patrick Diggins, "Knowledge and Sorrow: Louis Hartz's Quarrel with American History," *Political Theory* 16, no. 3 (August 1988): 355-376; Rogers M. Smith, *Civic Ideas: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); Frederic Cople Jaher, *The Jews and the Nation: Revolution, Emancipation, State Formation, and the Liberal Paradigm in America and France* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002).

the American is that he has arrived at a state of democracy without having to endure a democratic revolution; and that he is born equal without having to become so."[220]

Included in the chapter, "How Individualism is More Pronounced at the End of a Democratic Revolution Than at Any Other Time," Tocqueville meant that in the aftermath of a class-based revolution, individuals were unable to view themselves equal. Tocqueville wrote that Americans were born equal in order to distinguish the American Revolution from the French revolutionary experience. Citizens of a former aristocracy could not "suddenly forget their former grandeur," but also no longer felt bound to another by common interest. Citizens of the bottom of the social ladder felt "a sort of hidden anxiety about enjoying their newly acquired independence." Democratic revolutions, Tocqueville noted, encouraged men "to shun one another and perpetuate in the midst of equality hatreds originating in inequality."[221] Since America never had to endure such a revolution, no such hatred or anxiety existed in the American mind.[222] Hartz emphasized this point throughout the work, such as when discussing the failure of feudal experiments and the abundance of land in America.

> It is this business of destruction and creation which goes to the heart of the problem. For the point of departure of great revolutionary thought everywhere else in the world has been the effort to build a new society on the ruins of an old one, and this is an experience America has never had.

---

[220] Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1955).

[221] Alexis de Tocqueville, Goldhammer, 588-9. Even though Tocqueville praised America throughout *Democracy*, Hartz chose a quotation in a chapter in which Tocqueville had France, not America, in mind. This chapter appeared in Volume II, in which Tocqueville advanced a more negative view of democracy than in the first volume. The entire chapter, barely two pages, was intended to critique France rather than praise America.

[222] For Tocqueville, a democratic revolution had to be violent and completely uproot traditions. The French Revolution was a true revolution, as revolutionaries aimed to break completely all traditions and values. In the revolution that popularized the guillotine, political beliefs held life and death consequences. It was difficult for Tocqueville to view American politics on the same level as French politics. "To a foreigner, nearly all the domestic quarrels of the Americans seem at first glance either incomprehensible or puerile, and one is hard put to decide whether one ought to pity a people that takes such wretched trifles seriously or envy it the good fortune that permits it to do so" (Tocqueville, Goldhammer, 202).

> We are reminded again of Tocqueville's statement: the Americans are 'born equal.'[223]

In the first printing of *The Liberal Tradition*, Hartz wrote that Americans were 'born free.' The use of 'free' rather than 'equal' could have been simply a publisher's mistake. An errata slip "appeared in fresh copies of that first printing" of *The Liberal Tradition*.[224] However, Hartz used 'born free' in his 1952 articles, "American Political Thought and the American Revolution" and "The Reactionary Enlightenment: Southern Political Thought Before the Civil War," which formed the basis for Chapter Two, "The Perspectives of 1776," and Chapter Six "The Reactionary Enlightenment," respectively.[225] In all likelihood, then, Hartz's reading of 'born equal' as 'born free' was purposeful and significant.

Hartz's use of the word 'free' underscored his awareness of the Cold War tensions and his intention to distinguish America from communist nations. Several scholars reiterated that Hartz that Tocqueville wrote 'born free.'[226] In 1968 the confusion between phrases 'born free' and 'born equal' was discussed openly. "Hartz has taken

---

[223] Hartz, 66.
[224] Roazen. In subsequent editions, the word 'equal' was used. In the 1991 edition, with introduction by Tom Wicker, the ambiguity was not even mentioned.
[225] Louis Hartz, *The American Political Science Review* 46, no. 2 (June 1952): 321-342. Hartz used the 1873 Reeve-Bowen edition of *Democracy*, rather than the latest Knopf edition. Bowen used born equal. Louis Hartz, "The Reactionary Enlightenment: Southern Political Thought before the Civil War," *The Western Political Quarterly* 5, no. 1 (March 1952): 31-50. In this article, Hartz did not cite the source.
[226] See for example James Burnham, review of *The Liberal Tradition in America* by Louis Hartz, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 301. Higher Education under Stress (Sep., 1955): 235; Conway Zirkle, review of "Science and Freedom: Proceedings of a Conference Convened by Congress for Cultural Freedom, and Held in Hamburg on July 23-26th, 1953," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 301, Higher Education Under Stress (September 1955): 235-6; and H.C. Nixson, review of *The Liberal Tradition in America* by Louis Hartz, *The Journal of Southern History* 21, no. 4 (November 1955): 524. Arthur Schlesinger used born free in "Liberalism in America A Note for Europeans (1956)" in *The Politics of Hope: And, The Bitter Heritage: American Liberalism in the 1960s* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008). Marvin Meyers substituted the correct word without comment, in "Louis Hartz, The Liberal Tradition in America: An Appraisal," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5, no. 3 (April 1963): 262.

Tocqueville's 'born equal' dictum, however ambiguously phrased and neither original with Tocqueville nor central to his concern, and elevated it into an all-enveloping interpretation of American culture."[227] However, Marshall and Drescher were Tocqueville scholars. For non-Tocqueville academics and the non-professional reader, Hartz created the impression of Tocqueville as the anti-Marx.

Framing Tocqueville as the anti-Marx, Hartz stated, "If the Marxist calls him a peasant, an agent of 'barbarism within civilization,' he can reply, with Tocqueville, that he is an aggressive entrepreneur, buying 'on speculation,' combing 'some trade with agriculture,' making 'agriculture itself a trade,' indeed the leader of American progressivism."[228] Both farmers and industrial workers, Hartz argued, harbored entrepreneurial ambitions.[229] Hartz used Tocqueville to emphasize the absence of class-consciousness among Americans, stating, "The American liberal world practically led the small propertied liberal of America to a career of philosophic confusion. By making him, first of all, a huge and hybrid figure, he was never quite sure whether he was an 'aristocrat,' a farmer, or an urban worker, or whether in any of these roles he liked him himself in the others.[230]

Though Tocqueville did not use the term to connote communism, it could have been perceived as a politically charged term in the 1950s and era of McCarthyism. In the 1950s, individualism was held as one of the key differences between American society and communist societies in the twentieth century, and Hartz wanted to emphasize the clear difference between America and Russia. Labeling Communism as "the entire crisis

[227] Lynn L. Marshall and Seymour Drescher, "American Historians and Tocqueville's Democracy," *The Journal of American History* 55, no. 3 (Dec. 1968): 516.
[228] Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition,* 115.
[229] Ibid., 127.
[230] Ibid., 128.

of our time," Hartz stated that it "compels us to make that journey to Europe and back which ends in the discovery of the American liberal world."[231] Writing during the increasing tensions between Russia and the United States, Hartz placed his work within a cold war context.

The Problem of Being Exceptional

Concerned with the perception of America in European countries, Hartz wondered, "Can a people that is born equal ever understand peoples elsewhere that have become so? Can it ever lead them?"[232] He concluded, "America's experience of being born equal has put it in a strange relationship to the rest of the world."[233] This is another reason why Hartz attacked the Progressive scholars who focused on conflict. Hartz blamed them for America's inability to relate to other nations and to guide them away from communism. Hartz argued that by focusing on conflicts, Americans were taught to associate successful and heroic Americans with rugged individualism and capitalism. The idealization of America's rugged individualism as popularized by Horatio Alger did a disservice to America by creating a false image of America. Laissez-faire became associated with a mixture of nationalism, irrational liberalism and individualism to create Americanism. Americanism, Hartz explained, "tried to frighten the American democrat with his own absolute liberalism, tried to precipitate…an internal moral crisis whenever he turned to the instrument of the state. And the best way of doing this was to call him a 'socialist' which…was to make him perfectly 'un-American."[234]

[231] Ibid., 5.
[232] Ibid., 66.
[233] Ibid.
[234] Ibid., 208.

On the other hand, equating equal and free reveals another side to Hartz's reading of Tocqueville. In this light, Hartz used Tocqueville to advance his premise that no danger existed in mixing capitalist with socialist measures. Tracing how democracy became equated solely with capitalism in America, Hartz blamed Horatio Alger for promoting a mythical American whose outlook was a mixture of irrational liberalism and nationalism, which ultimately led to a vehement denunciation of socialism. For Hartz, Alger's description of Americans ran counter to historical trends. The freedom of American economic life, "instead of producing the laissez-faire fetish, had produced a pragmatic outlook toward economic policy before the Civil War which had inspired a whole series of public enterprises and controls."[235] Hartz also noted that capitalist European countries lacked this violent anti-socialist trend. Hartz remarked that Alger in Germany "was an even more alien figure than he was in England or France."[236] From Hartz's perspective, Americanism posed more of a threat to American democracy than Communism. Americanism, to Hartz, was an aggressive irrational individualism that sought to impose its will on the majority.

Engaging Tocqueville, Hartz pondered Tocqueville's fear that the majority could pose a threat to a stable democracy. Hartz steadfastly argued that the majority in America has received an undeserved negative reputation.[237] He stated, "What must be

---

[235] Ibid., 210.
[236] Ibid., 204.
[237] As the epigraph to this chapter indicates, Wilson's *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* should also be re-examined for the respect shown for the middle class. An encounter between Hopkins and his daughter, Susan, illustrates Wilson's faith in the majority, or public. Charged with the task by his wife to talk Susan into giving up her partying-going habits and go to college, Hopkins tries to impress upon Susan the greatness and responsibility his wealth has on her. In addition, he wants her to stop dating a playwright who he feels is a phony. Defending her playwright, whose play closed very quickly, Susan accuses the public for not appreciating great art. Hopkins refutes, "But Shakespeare didn't do badly in his time, and not many good plays today shut down as soon as they open. If you want to know what the public wants,

accounted one of the tamest, mildest, and most unimaginative majorities in modern political history has been bound by a set of restrictions that betray fanatical terror. The American majority has been an amiable shepherd dog kept forever on a lion's leash."[238] Hartz acknowledged that Tocqueville saw danger in a common ethic, but suggested that he was referring to the radical middle class in Europe, not America. He explained that Tocqueville's fears would not pertain to America's middle class. Leading the campaign for liberal reforms in Europe, the middle class has been viewed as revolutionary and unstable. Since the middle class in America did not need to fight to attain a democratic government and society, Hartz argued, their goals and methods were tame. "The remarkable thing about the 'spirit of 1776,' as we have seen, is not that it sought emancipation but that it sought it in a sober temper; not that it opposed power but that it opposed it ruthlessly and continuously; not that it looked forward to the future but that it worshipped the past as well."[239] Therefore, the middle class, which Hartz equated with the majority, could be trusted to make rational, balanced political decisions that would protect individual freedoms. In fact, Hartz suggested, the greatness of America has owed to the middle class.

Hartz felt the real threat in a democracy was not the tyranny of the majority, but a tyranny of opinion as expressed by a powerful, irrational minority. This tyranny of opinion, realized in the red scare hysteria of the fifties, was caused by Americans' "absolute and irrational attachment" to John Locke.[240] In *The Liberal Tradition*, Hartz spent much time discussing the two articulations of Locke in America. He associated

---

I'll tell you: great art on the extremely rare occasions when it's available, but no phony art—they'd rather have good honest blood and thunder" (207).

[238] Hartz, 129.

[239] Ibid., 51.

[240] Ibid., 11.

Locke's doctrine with moral rationality and individualism. When America faced threats to democracy, though, Americans turned Locke's doctrine into the right to terrorize citizens and deny them their rights.

Hartz's frequent references to Locke attracted the notice of Hartz's reviewers initially. Arthur Mann emphasized Hartz's Lockean approach, which Mann described as a liberal consensus rather than the progressive historians' preference for stressing conflict in American history.[241] Ralph Gabriel noted that Hartz defined liberalism in Lockean terms as "a popular government by a state of limited powers that is controlled ultimately by citizens through the institution of universal suffrage."[242] Gabriel also found significant flaws with Hartz's research procedure, which Gabriel saw as the thesis driving the evidence. "It is too simple to interpret American history wholly in terms of Locke."[243] He even faulted Hartz for ignoring Rousseau in his favoring of Locke, although he also found that Hartz has not provided a sufficiently detailed analysis of Lockean tradition in detail.[244]

Approving Hartz's determination that American social and political culture derived from one idea, Kohn noted it was a Lockean idea. "We are a nation the disciples and descendants of Locke in his victory over Filmer. From this [premise] Hartz deduces penetrating and in my opinion entirely valid conclusions for an understanding of American history and society."[245] Kohn felt Hartz could take his thesis further, and include Britain. "'The Lockian assumptions,' as Hartz brilliantly develops them,

---

[241] Arthur Mann, review of *The Liberal Tradition in America* by Louis Hartz, *The William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series 12, no. 12 (October 1955), 655, 653.
[242] Ralph Gabriel, review of *The Liberal Tradition in America* by Louis Hartz, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 17, no. 1 (January 1956): 136.
[243] Ibid.
[244] Ibid., 138.
[245] Hans Kohn, review of *The Liberal Tradition in America* by Louis Hartz, *The Review of Politics* 17, no. 3 (July 1955): 411. Original word was promise.

determined—from the end of the seventeenth century—English and American thought alike. They did it only in a more marked way in the United States, for the very reason which Hartz points out: the absence of the feudal past."[246]

Hartz chose Tocqueville over Locke as the authority of liberalism in America. In 1968, Lynn Marshall and Seymour Drescher wrote, "To Hartz, Tocqueville has demonstrated America's innate liberalism.[247] Tocqueville mentioned liberalism once in *Democracy* in a reference to European states that have undergone violent democratic revolutions.[248] In "Sovereign Power in Today's Nations," Tocqueville shared his fear that democratic revolutions would not lead to freedom from despotic sovereigns or more property rights. Tocqueville confessed, "I see clearly that nations today are turbulent, but I have no clear evidence that they are liberal, and I fear that when the agitations that are rocking every throne in the world are over, sovereigns may find themselves more powerful than ever."[249] Despite this one mention, Hartz placed great value on Tocqueville. "We find in [Tocqueville] a series of deep insights into the American liberal community."[250]

For example, Hartz drew upon Tocqueville to argue that Americans fundamentally shared a common philosophy, despite their personal politics. Hartz stated that another of "the basic insights Tocqueville had about the actual behavior of the

---

[246] Ibid.
[247] Marshall and Drescher, 516.
[248] There has been much scholarship on Tocqueville's personal attitudes towards liberalism. For example, see Pierre Manent's *An Intellectual History of Liberalism*, trans. Rebecca Belinski (1995; reprint, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); Alan S. Kahan's *Aristocratic Liberalism: The Social and Political Thought of Jacob Burckhardt, John Stuart Mill, and Alexis de Tocqueville* (1992; reprint, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2001); W. David Clinton, *Tocqueville, Lieber, and Bagehot: Liberalism Confronts the World*; Roger Boesche, *Tocqueville's Road Map: Methodology, Liberalism, Revolution, and Despotism* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006); Aurelian Craiutu, *Liberalism Under Siege: The Political Thought of the French Doctinaires* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2003).
[249] Tocqueville, Goldhammer, 815.
[250] Hartz, 31.

American people" was that the majority of people are bound to be capitalistic, and capitalism, with its spirit disseminated widely, was bound to be democratic.[251] Hartz used this statement to make his point that there were little differences between political parties, as capitalism co-existed with democracy. Using the example of the great nineteenth-century rivals, the Federalists and the Whigs, Hartz stated:

> The capitalist Whiggery of Hamilton was frightened of democracy, and the democratic tradition of Jackson, which was therefore able to destroy it, formulated a philosophy which seemed to deny its faith in capitalism. The result was a massive confusion in political thought, comparable to the one that we find in the constitutional era, and a set of victories and defeats, which the Americans who experienced them scarcely understood. One is reminded of two boxers, swinging wildly, knocking each other down with accidental punches.[252]

Hartz relied on Tocqueville to weigh the values and dangers of a nation born equal. Hartz argued that it was not the inherent liberal society that led to a dangerous, tyrannous form of nationalism in the twentieth but rather marginal individuals who went against the wishes of the majority.

Conclusion

Both Riesman and Hartz sought Tocqueville's guidance in understanding the pressures on the middle classes in a society boasting its egalitarian status. In *The Liberal Tradition*, Hartz wrote, "And so it was not always easy to be an 'American.' Half-articulated, lurking just beneath the surface of Carnegie's joy, there was a vivid pattern of anxiety, frustration, guilt."[253] Riesman explored the tensions between equality and

[251] Ibid., b89.
[252] Ibid., 89-90.
[253] Hartz, 225.

freedom, while Hartz used Tocqueville to understand how equality and liberalism could co-exist.

Riesman and Hartz's works share several similarities. Hartz aimed to understand the underlying reason for the tyrannical impulses of the crowd, while Riesman strove to understand the habits and life of the individual in the crowd. Both Harvard professors struck a chord with their works and became known for their reliance on Tocqueville. Their works even drew comparisons to one another. Sociologist Walter Williams believed Tocqueville's egalitarian liberalism unified Riesman and Hartz's work.[254] Williams wrote, "It will be held that both [inner- and other-directedness] can be traced to the same underlying ethos of egalitarian liberalism. The seeker syndrome has its roots in what Louis Hartz calls the liberal tradition in America—the absolutism so well characterized by Tocqueville phrase 'born equal.'"[255]

In the 1960s, the rise in interest in Tocqueville led scholars to notice the Tocquevillean influence and Tocqueville quotes spread throughout many works. The centennial of Tocqueville's death in 1859 helped account both for the increased attention on Tocqueville and subsequent re-evaluation of Hartz and Riesman. A two-day conference in Philadelphia, for example, encouraged scholars to redefine Tocqueville by discipline, political leaning, and religion.[256]

Considering the newfound popularity of Tocqueville by academics, Marshall and Drescher concluded, "The *Democracy* …conveys an enthusiasm for social observations

---

[254] Walter Williams, "Inner-Directedness and Other-Directedness in New Perspective," *The Sociological Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (Summer 1964): 195.
[255] Ibid.
[256] "Professional Conferences," *The American Political Science Review* 53, no. 1 (March 1959):272-274. Session (A): "Was Tocqueville an historian or a sociologist? " Session (B): "Was Tocqueville a Conservative or a Liberal?" Session (C) "Was Tocqueville a Catholic?"

and construction of imaginative hypotheses upon them, and it presents a variety of such hypotheses for possible test and further development. It might more profitably serve as inspiration for broad ranging historical exploration than as orthodox primary authority.[257] However, Riesman and Hartz did take Tocqueville's ideas seriously, and applied several of his key observations to their work. They engaged Tocqueville in serious debate about the effects of equality on the democratic mind.

Riesman and Hartz's perspectives were also shaped in part by economic factors. Riesman conceived his work in the optimistic period following World War II, when the economic depression that occurred after World War I did not happen after the Second World War. Rather, the economy surged and the returning soldiers were able to find employment. *Democracy*, read against this backdrop, was perceived as hopeful and optimistic. Ultimately, Riesman de-emphasized Tocqueville's fears about the masses submitting to the government, instead focusing on the possibility of middle-class urban Americans regaining their inner sense of direction to guide them through life. Hartz, meanwhile, affirmed completely America's future as a democratic nation. Ultimately, both American scholars ultimately took from Tocqueville hope and the idea of democracy as permanent.

The next two chapters focus on scholars with completely different perspectives. Forced to flee Germany, both Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss could not dismiss their experiences and resultant fears of democracy as fleeting. They looked to Tocqueville to find not just hope but affirmation that their fears were real. They found most valuable in Tocqueville suggestions to temper Americans' zeal for equality.

[257] Marshall and Drescher, 517.

Chapter Three
Writing to Understand: Tocqueville and Hannah Arendt

> No single event has a meaning of its own, but only insofar as I look upon it in the context of the whole.
>
> Hannah Arendt

> The hostility against me is a hostility against someone who tells the truth on a factual level and not against someone who has ideas which are in conflict with those commonly held.
>
> Arendt to Mary McCarthy

Born in 1906, German Jewish intellectual Hannah Arendt felt the repercussions of Germany's failure to stabilize in the twenties and its subsequent turn towards National Socialism in the thirties. Arendt's biographer Elisabeth Young-Bruehl recalled that Arendt was one of the earliest intellectuals to detect the dangerous link between the two events. "Few people shared Arendt's opinion that Hitler's way to power had really been opened in 1929, when he received support from the financier Alfred Hugenberg."[258] The Reichstag fire in February 1933 and subsequent illegal arrests confirmed Arendt's fear and spurred her to resist the new regime. In the spring of 1933, Arendt helped the Zionists fight the National Socialists by gathering information on the extent of anti-Semitism in Germany.[259] Arrested for conducting such research, Arendt spent eight days in prison. Upon her release, Arendt and her mother, who had been questioned about her daughter's activities, fled Germany. They eventually traveled to Paris.

[258] Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *Hannah Arendt: For Love of the World* 2nd edition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 98.
[259] Ibid., 105.

Arendt's eight years in Paris were productive and satisfying. Arendt fought anti-fascism and promoted Zionism through her work for various organizations, formed a diverse circle of peers, and even found her second husband, Heinrich Blücher. However, the Second World War uprooted her life, and "the peer group was dispersed…all began the frantic search for visas, new homes, safety."[260] Though Arendt and her husband managed to find refuge, work, friends and eventually citizenship in America, her experiences in Europe prevented her from believing in the wisdom and pure motives of the intellectuals, ability of the masses, and the permanence of a democratic regime.

It was this doubt that connected her to Tocqueville. Like Arendt, Tocqueville's life and career changed dramatically due to the change in regimes he abhorred. Drawing from Arendt's major works as well as her lectures, conference papers, and personal correspondence, I argue that Arendt took from Tocqueville his conflicted attitude towards modernity and the masses, as well as his positive attitudes towards associations in democratic societies. After discussing why Arendt's Tocquevillean influence was overlooked for decades, I show how Arendt used Tocqueville to understand the impact of revolutions in history, universality of racism, and the consequences of a government favoring equality over liberty. Arendt's writings reveal the consistent and significant Tocquevillean influences on her thinking.

Arendt and the Academic Realm

Hannah Arendt's life and work have attracted an increasing amount of attention since her death in 1975. Arendt scholar Margaret Canovan noted it was due "partly for reasons she would not herself have welcomed, such as interest in her gender, her

[260] Ibid., 113.

ethnicity, and her romantic relationship with Heidegger."[261] In 1974, Canovan published a brief work on Arendt's ideas. In 1982, Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, a student of Arendt's at The New School, published *Hannah Arendt: For Love of the World*, a sympathetic account of the intellectual. The first complete biography of the German-born philosopher, *Hannah Arendt* was hailed as exemplary.[262] The work won the 1982 Kenneth B. Smilen Present Tense Award for the best book in Biography/Autobiography and the 1983 Alfred Harcourt Prize Award for Biography and Memoirs.

More than a decade following her original biography on Arendt, Canovan felt Arendt's political work needed explanation and reinterpretation, because Arendt "has been much misunderstood."[263] For example, Canovan found Arendt's political thought was "rooted in her response to totalitarianism…not an exercise in nostalgia for the Greek polis."[264] Interest in Arendt's work increased, due to her ideas taking on new relevance.[265] Canovan felt Arendt's growing reputation owed to several factors: her writing foreshadowed "the analysis of communist regimes by dissident intellectuals in the years before the East European revolutions," the revolutions themselves "seemed to offer some confirmation of her claim that power is less a matter of weapons and resources than of people acting in concert," and her revival of the classic republican themes that "anticipated the recent interest in civic humanism."[266] Canovan believed the most important reason for her newfound popularity was the influence in Anglo-American

---

[261] Margaret Canovan, introduction to *The Human Condition*, by Hannah Arendt (1958, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), xvi.
[262] Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *Hannah Arendt: For Love of the World* 2nd edition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004).
[263] Margaret Canovan, *Hannah Arendt: A Reinterpretation of Her Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), i.
[264] Ibid., 2.
[265] Ibid., 1.
[266] Ibid., 1-2.

thought of Heidegger and Nietzsche and other thinkers in their vein, which appear in many aspects of Arendt's work.[267]

Other scholars have found Arendt intriguing because, contrary to the prevailing opinion, she did not fit this image. Political scientist Jennifer Ring has seen Arendt's political actor as the pariah, not the Greek hero of political action.[268] Political Scientist Jeffrey Isaac argued that Arendt deserved to be thought of as a defender of democracy in her vision of grassroots politics and relationship between the elites and the masses.[269] Mark Reinhardt surmised that Arendt's work was inspiring, and she "stands out from other major theorist for her promise that it still remains possible to chart a fresh course."[270]

Over the past couple of decades, there has been slight, but increasing attention to the Tocquevillean strains in her work.[271] During the 1980s, scholars made comparisons in passing, if at all, to Arendt and Tocqueville. *Between the Human and the Divine: the Political Thought of Simone Weil* (1988), Mary Dietz wrote, "The theorists I mention—Aristotle, Machiavelli, Tocqueville, Arendt—are not to be taken as uniform 'bloc' but merely as an 'alternative set of visions' in opposition to the ones embodied (against differently) by Plato and Rousseau."[272] Shiraz Dossa made no mention of Tocqueville in her 1989 work, *The Public Realm and the Public Self: the Political Theory of Hannah Arendt*.

---

[267] Canovan, *Hannah Arendt: A Reinterpretation,* 1-2.
[268] Jennifer Ring, "The Pariah as Hero: Hannah Arendt's Political Actor," *Political Theory* 19, no. 3 (August 1991): 433-452.
[269] Jeffrey C. Isaac, "Oases in the Desert: Hannah Arendt on Democratic Politics," *American Political Science Review* 88, no. 1 (March 1994): 156-168.
[270] Mark Reinhardt: "Review: What's New in Arendt?" *Political Theory* 31, no. 3 (June 2003): 444.
[271] Shiraz Dossa's *The Public Realm and the Public Self: the Political Theory of Hannah Arendt* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1989).
[272] Mary G. Dietz, *Between the Human and the Divine: the Political Thought of Simone Weil* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield ,1988), 194, FN 14.

In the 1990s, scholars began comparing the two theorists. Judith Marcus divided Toqueville's aristocratic critique of mass society from Arendt's liberal-democratic critique.[273] Suzanne D. Jacobitti noted the common links between Arendt and Tocqueville's thinking, but ultimately concluded that their differences were more important than their similarities. She argued that Tocqueville and Arendt came "to different conclusions about how to solve the problems of liberal society."[274] Tocqueville looked to the habits of the heart—family, religion, and local community—to maintain the democratic spirit, while Arendt found the solution to be political participation.[275] Roger Boesche's 1993 article "Tocqueville and Arendt on the Novelty of Modern Tyranny" emphasized the 'key differences' in their views was the use of terror by totalitarian governments.[276]

Jacobitti's comparison between Arendt and Tocqueville was most likely a product of the new timeliness of Tocqueville's observations on community, civic engagement and association. *Habits of the Heart*, originally a phrase taken from *Democracy*, became the title of Robert Bellah and his coauthors' extremely influential 1985 work. Bellah, and later Robert Putnam in *Making Democracy Work* (1993) and *Bowling Alone* (2000),[277] significantly changed the discourse of Tocqueville from the prophet of conformity and

---

[273] Judith Marcus, "Ideas and Intellectuals in the Age of the Masses," *Contemporary Sociology* 9, no. 4 (July 1980): 482.
[274] Suzanne D. Jacobitti, "Individualism and Political Community: Arendt and Tocqueville and the Current Debate in Liberalism," *Polity* 23 (Summer 1991): 585.
[275] Ibid.
[276] Arendt viewed terror as the essence of totalitarian dictatorships, "but Tocqueville clearly did not" (174). Originally published in Peter Augustine Lawler and Joseph Alulis, ed., *Tocqueville's Defense of Human Liberty: Current Essays* (New York: Garland Pub., 1993), and subsequently in Roger Boesche, *Tocqueville's Road Map: Methodology, Liberalism, Revolution, and Despotism* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006). In his 1980 article, "The Prison: Tocqueville's Model for Despotism," Boesche mentioned in a footnote, "Here Tocqueville anticipates Arendt," quoting her thoughts that totalitarianism were new in that totalitarianism sought to destroy private life, as it based itself on loneliness.
[277] Putnam's essay, "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital" appeared in *Journal of Democracy*. 6, no. 1 (January 1995): 65-78.

tyranny of the majority to the seer of associational life in America. In the introduction to his 1998 work, *Hannah Arendt: An Introduction*, John McGowan remarked that "both Tocqueville and Arendt allow us to see the destruction of local associations and their replacement by relations to the ruling party and/or the state are primary tactics of totalitarianism."[278] In her article, Jacobitti linked Bellah and Tocqueville.

> Alexis de Tocqueville's criticisms of modern individualism have been a major inspiration for one of the most interesting of the recent communitarian critiques of liberalism. Robert Bellah and his fellow authors fear that the individualism prevailing in contemporary America undermines the moral and civic 'habits of the heart' which were once inculcated through family, religion, and local community and which once sustained American democracy."[279]

In her article, "In Tocqueville's Shadow," political scientist Margie Lloyd disagreed with Jacobitti, arguing that Tocqueville's habits of the heart actually did refer to politicized space, and therefore was more aligned to Arendt's solution to the problem of modernity than previously sought. Lloyd's important article sought to re-identify Arendt. "What is missing from the contemporary scholarship on Arendt is her articulation of the tension between the community and the individual in terms reminiscent of such early modern thinkers as Montesquieu, Madison, Kant, and especially Tocqueville. None of them are what Arendt derogatively referred to as professional philosophers or professional politicians; instead they possess the gift of thinking *politically*."[280]

---

[278] John McGowan, *Hannah Arendt: An Introduction* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998). Again, McGowan noted the similar view of Tocqueville and Arendt instead of Tocqueville's influence on Arendt.
[279] Jacobitti, 585.
[280] Margie Lloyd, "In Tocqueville's Shadow: Hannah Arendt's Liberal Republicanism," *The Review of Politics* 57, no. 1 (Winter 1995): 35.

Around the turn of the twenty-first century, scholars shifted their focus to study Arendt's reception of Tocqueville. In *Attack of the Blob: Hannah Arendt's Concept of the Social*, Hanna Pitkin wondered whether Arendt read *Democracy* as a student in Germany, refugee in France, or newcomer in America.[281] Sheldon Wolin saw contradictions in Arendt's thoughts, and traced antidemocratic strains in her thought to Nietzsche and Tocqueville's intellectual traditions. "Tocqueville, whose general influence on Arendt, particularly in her understanding of the founding of the American republic and of the nature of the French Revolution, has not been fully appreciated, not only anticipated Nietzsche's nostalgia for a politics on a heroic scale, but was the first nineteenth-century theorist to revive the ancient notion that certain forms of tyranny might have a popular basis."[282]

In his 2003 work studying the contradictions between Tocqueville's public and private life, Wolin again noted that Arendt "explicitly followed Tocqueville on the threat of equality to freedom," and directed readers to *On Revolution*.[283] Tocqueville's influence, Wolin wrote, "appears throughout Arendt's discussion of the French and American revolutions."[284] In her 2003 work, *The Reluctant Modernism of Hannah Arendt*, Seyla Benhabib commented that Arendt's observation that totalitarianism sought to break even the ability to form associations "was indebted to Tocqueville's reflections in the second volume of *Democracy in America*."[285] In *Hannah Arendt: A Biography*

---

[281] Hannah Fenichel Pitkin, *The Attack of the Blob: Hannah Arendt's Concept of the Social* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 116.
[282] Sheldon Wolin, "Hannah Arendt" in Lewis P. Hinchman and Sandra K. Hinchman, ed. *Hannah Arendt, Critical Essays* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), 291.
[283] Sheldon Wolin, *Tocqueville Between Two Worlds: The Making of a Political and Theoretical Life* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), 574, FN 12.
[284] Ibid.
[285] Seyla Benhabib, *The Reluctant Modernism of Hannah Arendt* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003).

(2003), Julia Kristeva argued that Arendt took from Tocqueville a positive image of America, cited him liberally in *Origins*, and specifically relied on him for the connection between hate, power and wealth explicated in *Origins*.[286] Also in 2003, Lynn Hunt stated that Arendt, in her analysis of the French Revolution, was more Tocquevillean than was Furet.[287]

The repositioning of Arendt as an historian in *Hannah Arendt and the Uses of History* (2007) illustrates even more ways in which Tocqueville influenced Arendt. For example, Steven Douglas Maloney argued in "Hannah Arendt and The Old 'New Science'" that *Democracy in America* played " a critical role in Arendt's *On Revolution*, perhaps Arendt's most concentrated effort to comment on the politics of the world at the time she was actually writing."[288] The increase in interest by historians did not, however, mean a corresponding decrease in interest by political scientists. In *Public Freedom* (2008), Dana Villa argued, "Arendt's interpretation of American democracy and its discontents is deeply indebted to Tocqueville."[289] Echoing Jacobitti's argument that Tocqueville's nonpolitical civil society fundamentally differed from Arendt's public realm, Villa used the similarities between Arendt and Tocqueville to critique Jurgen Habermas' vision of the bourgeois public sphere.[290]

---

[286] Julia Kristeva, *Hannah Arendt: A Biography* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 114, 124, 136.
[287] Lynn Hunt, "The World We Have Gained: The Future of the French Revolution," *The American Historical Review* 108, no. 1 (February 2003): 1-19.
[288] Steven Douglas Maloney, "Hannah Arendt and The Old 'New Science'" in *Hannah Arendt and the Uses of History: Imperialism, Nation, Race, and Genocide*, ed. by Richard King and Dan Stone, (Berghahnbooks, 2007), 218.
[289] Dana Villa, *Public Freedom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 87. "I also contend (perhaps somewhat controversially) that this debt extends to the most dubious part of Tocqueville's analysis, namely, his insistence that religion (or something like it) is required to underwrite manners, mores, and responsible citizenship in a democracy."
[290] Ibid., 85-6.

The Tocquevillean influences were not noticed or commented upon until relatively recently for a few reasons. Matthew Mancini has attributed the silence of Tocqueville's impact on Arendt to Arendt's own silence of Tocqueville's impact on her. "She never paid special tribute to Tocqueville or acknowledged his influence on her."[291] Compared to Riesman and Hartz, Arendt's appreciation of Tocqueville might have seemed muted. She did not use quotes from *Democracy* to introduce her works or chapters, for example.

In her private correspondence, such as in her response to Seymour Drescher in March 1959, Arendt did acknowledge that Tocqueville had greatly influenced her thinking. Admitting she never dealt with Tocqueville extensively, her main point of the letter was to answer Drescher's specific request for a complete bibliography of all her works so he could find where she dealt with him extensively.[292] Arendt responded that sending a complete bibliography would be impossible and that she did not think he needed it. Rather than end her letter there, however, she added, "I wish I could fulfill your other request and send you something on de Tocqueville. Unfortunately, I never dealt with him extensively, even though he had a great influence on my own thinking."[293] Arendt's use of the word thinking is revealing, as it indicates she did have considerable involvement with Tocqueville's texts. Tocqueville helped her formulate several of her theses in her major works such as *Origins of Totalitarianism, The Human Condition*, and *On Revolution*, and articles such as "Reflections on Little Rock."[294] Her quotes and

[291] Mancini, 229.
[292] Drescher wrote, "I should appreciate especially knowing of any writings in which you might have dealt with him more extensively than in the paragraph in 'History and Immortality.'" Drescher to Arendt, February 18, 1959, Arendt Papers.
[293] Arendt to Seymour Drescher, March 12, 1959, Arendt Papers.
[294] As Mancini cautioned, however, "surely the contention that Tocqueville was one of the three most profound influences on Arendt went too far" (230).

references to him in her writings should not be seen as added stylistic flourishes.[295] It also indicates the presence of Tocqueville's influence in her writings.

Controversial Thinker

Not easily classified by traditional political labels, Arendt has been called "both a liberal wanting change and a conservative desiring stability, and [has] been criticized for harboring an unrealistic yearning for the past or for being a utopian revolutionary."[296] Foremost, Arendt has been classified as an original thinker. In the 1950s, prestigious universities such as Princeton, Berkeley, and Chicago "were keen to be associated with this strikingly original mind."[297] Conference organizers and journals also courted her.[298] Norman Podhoretz recalled of her uniqueness:

> Of all my elders in the Family, there was none for whom I had a higher regard than Hannah. The intellectual quality I prized most at that stage of my life was brilliance, by which I meant the virtuosic ability to put ideas together in such new and surprising combinations that even if one disagreed with what was being said, one was excited and illuminated. Everyone in the Family had this ability…but I thought Hannah had it to a greater degree than anyone else.[299]

Her originality guided her in her stances on current issues and movements, which often shocked and angered many. Arendt's claim in *Origins* that Nazism and Bolshevism were both forms of totalitarian dictatorships angered communist-sympathizers. In the

---

[295] As Arendt had said, writing for her was a way to understand, a personal engagement with ideas and texts. See also Hannah Arendt, *The Portable Hannah Arendt*, ed., Peter Baehr (New York: Penguin Group, 2000), 5.
[296] Jerome Kohn, introduction to *Essays in Understanding 1930-1954* by Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken Books, 1994), x.
[297] Peter Baehr, introduction to *The Portable Hannah Arendt*, xxxvii.
[298] Ibid.
[299] Norman Podhoretz, *Ex-Friends: Falling Out with Allen Ginsberg, Lionel and Dana Trilling, Lillian Hellman, Hannah Arendt, and Norman Mailer* (New York: The Free Press, 1999), 143. By Family, Podhoretz meant the "writers and intellectuals whose work once appeared mainly in *Partisan Review* and *Commentary*."

1950s, National Socialism was accepted as totalitarian. Stalinism, though, was still under consideration.[300] Also, her "attempt as early as 1945 to uncouple German culture and traditions from what came…to be called the Holocaust was an unlikely position for any writer to take, most of all a Jewish one."[301]

In the 1960s, scholars were too focused on her overall analysis of the Holocaust to pay close attention to her use of Tocqueville. In 1963, the Tocquevillean notes in Riesman and Hartz's works had started gaining attention. By contrast, Arendt's work with the most direct quotes and references to Tocqueville, *On Revolution*, was overshadowed by the controversy over her 1963 work, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*. In his February 7, 1964 letter to Hannah Arendt, attorney Thomas K. Gilhool lamented this negative effect:

> Since our meeting for lunch in mid August last summer I have been disturbed by the fact that discussion of your Eichmann book has displaced the attention I would have expected On Revolution to draw. On Revolution has seemed to me, for reasons academic, political, and personal to be among the most important books of recent years. This is an opinion shared by a growing group of my confreres here at the law school, in the graduate political science department, and in the civil rights movement.[302]

There has also been substantial attention on her affair with Martin Heidegger, the German philosopher and Nazi supporter. Since the affair became public knowledge a few decades ago, political theorists sought to understand how Heidegger had influenced

[300] Young-Bruehl, 407.
[301] Baehr, xvii.
[302] Thomas K. Gilhool to Hannah Arendt February 7, 1964, Arendt Papers.
Gilhool urged her to discuss *On Revolution* during her upcoming talks and "to pursue [her] gracious and hurried agreement of last summer [of offering] the thesis of *On Revolution*—the importance of small groups, of neighborhood organizations—for publication in such a popular journal as Harpers."

her thinking.[303] Young-Bruehl, in tracing Arendt's work, showed how several of Arendt's writings had Heidegger in mind. Compared to the looming presence of Heidegger and its pressing significance, the influence of Tocqueville on Arendt was overlooked. However, the subtle yet persistent use of Tocqueville can be detected in her writings in her first two decades in America.

Origins of Experience

Reading David Riesman's manuscript of *The Lonely Crowd* in the spring of 1949, Hannah Arendt could not help but compare his work to her own work on totalitarianism. She wrote, "I should have answered right away your two letters if I had not been absorbed in your long *Memo* (No XII), wondering all the time about the similarities of the and the differences between the phenomena which you describe and those of my own work."[304] Riesman's *Memo*, in which he analyzed the children's story of Tootle, the train that was gently forced by his peers to stay on the track and to repress his yearning to run free in the grass, particularly resonated with Arendt. She revealed, "I am now, maybe, even more frightened than I was about Tootle, and what shocks me most in your description, which is so extremely convincing...is that these phenomena indeed arise here simply out of society, without as it were anybody doing anything about it."[305]

For Arendt, Riesman had articulated the hidden anxieties of citizens living in a society based on equality. "The reason why you can quote Tocqueville time and again," she stated, "is of course that he thought through the inherent implications of a society of

[303] See Richard Wolin, *Heidegger's Children: Hannah Arendt, Karl Löwith, Hans Jonas, and Herbert Marcuse* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Ron Rosenbaum, "The Evil of Banality: Troubling New Revelations about Arendt and Heidegger" *Slate* October 30, 2009, http://www.slate.com/id/2234010/.
[304] Hannah Arendt to David Riesman June 13, 1949, Arendt Papers.
[305] Ibid.

complete equality."[306] One of these inherent implications tied Riesman's other-directed type in America and Arendt's mass-man in Europe. Both, Arendt noted, were "lost in the world." She elaborated, "What struck me in your paper is that people are not…satisfied with respect in their community, that they want more; they want here again the impossible, they want the active approval, amounting to friendship, of exactly everybody."[307]

Arendt suggested the human qualities Riesman described are universal and so her warnings about the relation between mass democracy and totalitarianism, therefore, was relevant to Americans. In her own work, Arendt relied on Tocqueville to explore the tensions between individualism and equality in a democracy. Viewing individuals as lonely, Arendt saw them as vulnerable and eager to become part of a group or movement. Her experience in Germany led her to focus on the dire consequences produced when the movement is formed from above. Even though Arendt appreciated her American citizenship she received in 1951, she still "clung to her European background" and surrounded herself with European academic peers and German friends.[308] This mixture gave her a unique vantage point of being able to see weaknesses in democracy that her American colleagues overlooked.

The *Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951) was Arendt's first major work published in America. In *Origins*, Arendt recognized that Nazi Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union represented new, modern forms of despotism. Dividing the work into three parts, Arendt considered the causes to be anti-Semitism, imperialism, and the disintegration of the nation-state. After reading only one and a half chapters of the manuscript, David

[306] Ibid.
[307] Ibid.
[308] Young-Bruehl, xliii.

Riesman wrote to Arendt, "I have the feeling that nobody understands our times so well as you, that nobody has such an extraordinary acute sense of what has changed and that the book should lead an entirely new impetus to political science."[309] Reading more chapters, Riesman believed Arendt "really touched genius."[310] More than a week after reading the entire manuscript, Riesman admitted he thought of her haunting work all the time.[311] In his memoirs, Norman Podhoretz recalled the dramatic effect *Origins* had on him.

> Reading it threw me into so fevered a condition of intellectual exhilaration that I had to keep putting it down every few pages in order to regain the composure to go on. It seemed to me—and I was far from alone in this—that Hannah Arendt had uncovered the interrelations among all the terrible things that had happened and were still happening in the twentieth century and that in tracing the development of these connections she had arrived at a new understanding of how they culminated in the greatest evil of all.[312]

Though she did not directly refer to Tocqueville nearly as often as Riesman or Hartz did, Tocqueville's influence on Arendt's thinking in *Origins* was significant. She quoted Tocqueville a few times. For instance, Arendt used Tocqueville to support her argument that anti-Semitism in Germany intensified when Jews lost their positions of power, but retained their wealth. Acknowledging the difficulty in isolating the main factor for the rise of anti-Semitic movements at specific moments in history, Arendt noted in the first section of *Origins* the few general guideposts.

> Foremost among them for our purpose is Tocqueville's great discovery (in *L'Ancien Regime et la Revolution*, Book II, chap. 1) of the motives for the violent hatred felt by the French masses for the aristocracy at the outbreak of the Revolution…According to Tocqueville, the French people hated aristocrats about to lose their power more than it had ever hated them before, precisely because their rapid loss of real power was not

[309] David Riesman to Hannah Arendt, June 7, 1949, Arendt Papers.
[310] David Riesman to Hannah Arendt, June 13, 1949, Arendt Papers.
[311] David Riesman to Hannah Arendt, September 22, 1949, Arendt Papers.
[312] Podhoretz, 143.

> accompanied by any considerable decline in their fortunes…When noblemen lost their privileges, among others the privilege to exploit and oppress, the people felt them to be parasites, without any real function in the rule of the country. In other words, neither oppression nor exploitation as such is ever the main cause for resentment; wealth without visible function is much more intolerable because nobody can understand why it should be tolerated.[313]

Arendt applied this concept to 1930s Germany, after German Jewry's rapid descent in social status and numbers.[314] Only after Jews had lost their public positions of power did anti-Semitism peak, not before. She also noted that the Dreyfus Affair occurred during the Third Republic, when Jews had "all but vanished from important positions."[315] Arendt took from Tocqueville, then, a new way of looking at Hitler's persecution of the Jews. Arendt explained, "Persecution of powerless or power-losing groups…does not spring from human meanness alone. What makes men obey or tolerate real power and, on the other hand, hate people who have wealth without power, is the rational instinct that power has a certain function and is of some general use."[316] Hitler stripped Jews from their positions to then depict them as parasites.

The unasked question of *Origins*, perhaps because the Holocaust was too recent to articulate, was how should the powerless group act in the face of such persecution. Again, Tocqueville provided the answer and guide:

> Even after their power was gone, the nobles preserved some relic of the pride of their ancestors, who rebelled alike against servitude and against law. They took no thought for the liberty of the masses, and willingly allowed the government to lay its hand heavily on them; but they had no notion of submitting to it themselves, whatever resistance might cost. At the outbreak of the Revolution, the language and tone of the nobility toward the king and his agents were infinitely more haughty than those of

[313] Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1948, New York: Schocken Books, 2004), 12.
[314] Ibid., 13.
[315] Ibid.
[316] Ibid.

> the Third Estate, though the latter was on the point of overturning the throne, by whose side the former were to fall. The nobility claim the invention of nearly all the guarantees of the rights of the subject that were enjoyed during our thirty-seven years of representative government. Their old *cahiers*, in spite of their errors and prejudices, breathe the spirit of a great aristocracy."[317]

Arendt understood from Tocqueville that resistance to a despotic regime could occur by any group. This link between the French Revolution and Nazi Germany can be detected in her controversial *Eichmann in Jerusalem*. In *Eichmann in Jerusalem,* a series of articles on the trial of Adolf Eichmann written for *The New Yorker*, she argued that Eichmann was not a monster driven by anti-Semitism. Arendt explained in a letter to Mary McCarthy her revised view of ideology in Nazi Germany:

> If one reads the book carefully one sees that Eichmann was much less influenced by ideology than I assume in the book on totalitarianism. The impact of ideology upon the individual may have been overrated by me. Even in the totalitarian book, in the chapter on ideology and terror, I mention the curious loss of ideological content that occurs among the elite of the movement. The movement itself becomes all important, that is the context of anti-semitism for instance gets lost in the extermination policy, for extermination would not have come to an end when no Jew was left to be killed. In other words extermination per se is more important tha[n] anti-semitism or racism.[318]

Bureaucrats, not ideologues, were responsible for the deaths of the six millions Jews. Arendt thus attacked Germans such as Eichmann who could have refused to implement the Final Solution. However, her description of evil as banal infuriated Jewish populations in the United States, Israel and Germany, who felt by separating Eichmann's actions from his personal beliefs she took responsibility away from Nazis and placed it on the Jewish population. Her critics believed she thought that the Jewish

[317] Ibid., 139-40.
[318] Arendt to Mary McCarthy, September 20, 1963, Arendt Papers.

population contributed to their suffering by acquiescing to Nazi demands.[319] Labeled a 'self-hating Jewess,' organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, newspapers, and scholars launched their own campaigns to denounce her work.[320] Her supporters have explained that Arendt's flippant tone, use of irony, and unfortunate subtitle, *A Report on the Banality of Evil,* led to misinterpretations of her intended argument that the leaders of the Jewish councils did have limited powers to help other Jews.

In *Origins*, Arendt also employed Tocqueville to show that racism was a universal phenomenon rooted in modern thinking. In Part II, Chapter 2, entitled "Race-Thinking Before Racism," she quoted Tocqueville's comment to Arthur de Gobineau regarding the latter's theories on characteristics of different races. Gobineau believed the world population could be sorted into a hierarchy of races, each with its own set of specific physical characteristics and mental abilities. Tocqueville had written to Gobineau in 1853, "I believe them to be very probably wrong and certainly pernicious."[321] Arendt took from Tocqueville's statement that race-thinking was not widely accepted in the mid-nineteenth century. She concluded that it gained importance and dignity at the end of the nineteenth century "as though it had been one of the major spiritual contributions of the Western world."[322]

Arendt published "Race-Thinking Before Racism" as an article in *The Review of Politics* in January 1944. Tocqueville's comment to Gobineau appeared in the article,

---

[319] See Jennifer Ring, *The Political Consequences of Thinking: Gender and Judaism in the Work of Hannah Arendt* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1997).
[320] Baehr, xxvi.
[321] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Selected Letters on Politics and Society*, ed. Roger Boesche, trans. James Toupin and Roger Boesche (Berkeley: University of California, 1985), 298.
[322] Baehr, 210-211.

though in a footnote and not translated.[323] In his letters to Arendt, Riesman repeatedly urged her to translate all footnotes.[324] Finally responding to this point, Arendt asked, "Must I really translate quotes in the notes?? Many authors don't and German and French are usually read by people who will take the bother to look up quotations. I am too lazy, to tell the truth."[325] As a sign of Tocqueville's pertinence to her argument, Arendt did bother to translate the quote. She also moved Tocqueville from the footnotes to the main text. Arendt wanted to give emphasis to Tocqueville's statement in order to show that racism was a European phenomenon, and not just specific to Germany. Arendt invoked Tocqueville to show that racism was a relatively new phenomenon, and therefore not inherent in German nationalism.

In *Origins*, Tocqueville also helped Arendt understand the psychology behind the use of propaganda on the masses. She argued that under Nazism and Stalinism, propaganda attained a scientific component to convince the masses that they were on the right 'train of history.'[326] Questioning the motives behind the spokesmen of the propaganda, Arendt referred to Tocqueville's view of the causes of history. She stated, "There is of course a great appeal to the masses in 'absolutist systems which represent all the events of history as depending upon the great first causes linked by the chain of fatality, and which, as it were, suppress men from the history of the human race' (in the words of Tocqueville)."[327]

---

[323] Hannah Arendt, "Race-Thinking Before Racism," *The Review of Politics* 6, no. 1 (January 1944): 37, FN 2.
[324] David Riesman to Hannah Arendt, June 8, 1949, Arendt Papers.
[325] Hannah Arendt to David Riesman, June 13, 1949, Arendt Papers. In the margins of Riesman's letter of June 8, 1944, she wrote, "Must I really?"
[326] Arendt, *Origins*, 454. Arendt explained, "The scientificality of totalitarian propaganda is characterized by its almost exclusive insistence on scientific prophecy as distinguished from the more old-fashioned appeal to the past" (455).
[327] Ibid.

In this way Arendt applied Tocqueville to totalitarianism. Though fascism and communism in Germany and the Soviet Union, respectively, were described as inevitable, the masses had to be convinced. Her frustration with the German intellectuals for not foreseeing the rise of Hitler and for not taking political action against him led her to see the masses as crucial to the success or failure of a totalitarian system. Arendt warned that any set of masses could be manipulated, so totalitarian systems could form from any government. This pessimistic way of viewing the masses as susceptible and naïve derived from her experiences with fascism in Germany.

In America, Arendt re-examined her perspective of the masses. Arendt found Tocqueville's description of this type of historical narration so compelling, she used it again in her lecture at Berkeley on Political Science in 1955.[328] However, in her lecture she removed the totalitarian context and instead used it to show Tocqueville's conflicting views regarding democracy. In parentheses, she wrote, "His predicament in a way is that he does not know a way out either, because the alternative seems to be a view of history in which 'everything that happens must be attributed to particular accidents and that their petty daily string-pulling represents the forces that move the world.'"[329] From Tocqueville's observation about the nature of the process of history, Arendt saw uncertainty in a historian too close to his subject.

Her interpretation of Tocqueville's position on history differed markedly from her American colleagues, who believed that his inevitability thesis covered ulterior motives. For example, Marvin Zetterbaum argued that despite the appearance of neutrality,

[328] Wording differs slightly—"the absolute system which make all the events of history depend on great first causes by a chain of fatality, and which, as it were, exclude man fro the history of mankind."
[329] Arendt, "History of Political Theory," Lectures, Alexis de Tocqueville, Courses, University of California, Berkeley, Calif, Arendt Papers.

Tocqueville actively promoted the cause of democracy.[330] This may be due to where scholars took Tocqueville's statement from, as it appeared in both *Recollections* and *Democracy*.[331] Arendt attributed it to *Recollections*, in which Tocqueville's more passionate, indecisive personality appeared due to his personal involvement with the events.[332] Aware of its appearance in *Recollections*, Zetterbaum read it in the context of *Democracy*, declaring that Tocqueville abhorred such an absolute state.[333] In his memoirs, Tocqueville did voice his opposition to such an absolute state. However, he also argued against the assessment by French historian and statesman Adolphe Thiers that the February Revolution was purely accidental. Rather, Tocqueville believed general and particular causes were responsible for the February Revolution and other events in history. He stated, "I am firmly convinced that chance can do nothing unless the ground has been prepared in advance."[334]

As Arendt expressed in *On Revolution*, wars and revolutions have "determined the physiognomy of the twentieth century."[335] Their treatment by historians was of the utmost concern for her. She reiterated her doubts about Tocqueville's version of the inevitability of the revolution. She stated, "What seems to be beyond doubt and belief is that no historian will ever be able to tell the tale of our century without stringing it 'on the

[330] See Marvin Zetterbaum, "Tocqueville: Neutrality and Its Uses," *The American Political Science Review* 58, no. 3 (September 1964): 620. Zetterbaum's Straussian interpretation of Tocqueville will be discussed in the next chapter.
[331] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Recollections* ed., J.P. Mayer and AP Kerr, trans. George Lawrence (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1971), 78; Goldhammer, *Democracy*, 569-573.
[332] Arendt, History of Political Theory, Introduction, Lectures, 1955, Courses, University of California, Berkeley, Arendt Papers.
[333] Zetterbaum, 616.
[334] Tocqueville, *Recollections,* 78.
[335] Hannah Arendt, *On Revolution* (1963; reprint, New York: Penguin Books, 2006), 11.

thread of revolution'; but this tale, since its end still lies hidden in the mists of the future, is not yet fit to be told."[336]

This subtle use of Tocqueville shows Arendt's deep concern about the narration of history. As Jerome Kohn phrased it, "I believe it was Tocqueville's extraordinary sensitivity to the events in his own times that Arendt most admired."[337] Tocqueville, like Arendt, was caught in such a momentous time that not enough time or distance could allow for an objective view of the events that shook their worlds. Tocqueville was one of the thinkers Arendt "returned to again and again" because of the questions he asked about his times.

New Experiences, Old Beliefs

The staunch reaction to Communism in the form of McCarthyism in America seemed to confirm Arendt's belief that any democratic system could crumble when mass movements gain momentum. Despite Jaspers' assurance and her own admission that 1950s America was not 1930s Germany, Arendt "remained very frightened, particularly by the confusion among American intellectuals—so reminiscent to her of the Weimar 'elites' who had allied with 'the mob.'"[338] The censure of McCarthy, which became official in early January 1955, signaled the end of McCarthyism for Arendt. In a letter to Jaspers on August 6, 1955, Arendt described the change.

> The shift that took place within a few weeks at the beginning of the year here in America is one of the most interesting and strangest phenomenon I know under the heading 'public opinion.' Only Tocqueville had the slightest inkling of such a story. Heinrich and I related exactly the same

[336] Arendt, *On Revolution*, 248. Lynn Hunt proposed an alternative view of the French Revolution in "The World We Have Gained: The Future of the French Revolution."
[337] Email to author, September 24, 2009.
[338] Young-Bruehl, 289.

> stories to each other from our respective institutions, separated by the whole continent. The atmosphere in the country is again what it was before, hardly changed at all; extremely pleasant and reasonable. Even Eisenhower, who, as an individual, is truly just a plain idiot, is as rational as anyone could hope for. The political tradition of the country has come through again; and we—thanks and jubilation be to God—were wrong.[339]

To Jaspers, Arendt indicated Tocqueville deserved special status for his insight into the power of public opinion. Throughout *Democracy*, Tocqueville analyzed the causes and effects of public opinion in America. Tocqueville noted that despite the existence of executive rule and a legislative body to make rules, in America public opinion "is in effect the dominant power."[340] Tocqueville was impressed by the citizens' ability to affect the decision-making of the president, and noted that this could be both detrimental to and beneficial for the nation.[341] Arendt followed Tocqueville, noting that the majority was responsible for helping to create and destroy the oppressive environment that arose as McCarthy led his public search for Communists hiding in America. Her comment that Eisenhower, by himself, "is…a plain idiot" shows her faith in majority decisions.

At the root of her analysis of public opinion in America was Arendt's concern with the tensions between equality and liberty in a modern age. In this instance as well, Tocqueville influenced Arendt's thinking. To her political science class at Berkeley, where Arendt taught as a Visiting Professor during the spring semester of 1955, Arendt lectured on the importance of Tocqueville's observations of public opinion in a society based on equality. In her seminar course, "History of Political Theory," in which she

---

[339] *Hannah Arendt Karl Jaspers Correspondence 1926-1969*, ed., Lotte Kohler and Hans Saner, trans. Robert and Rita Kimber (New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1993), 263-4.
[340] Tocqueville, Goldhammer, 140.
[341] See Tocqueville's analysis on the temperance movement as an example of the majority providing a positive good for the nation, and his chapter, "On the Omnipotence of the Majority" for the danger of public opinion.

assigned *Democracy in America* (the Paper Edition by Vintage Books) and J.P. Mayer's *Prophet of the Mass Age* (London, 1939), Arendt outlined Tocqueville's fundamental observation:

> His central experience is equality as seen in America and the French Revolution. He called for a new science of politics and was the first who knew that the old categories won't do any more. He understood that equality never was realized before and did not understand in what it resides. Saw it merely as a social relationship between men, not as a new hierarchy of human activities."[342]

In her lecture, which foreshadowed *The Human Condition*, Arendt explored the consequences of equality as Tocqueville had witnessed. She used him to draw important connections between equality, public opinion (and no-man rule), and actions. Looking at history through Tocqueville's view of it as a process leading towards a grand result, rather than a series of accidents, Arendt agreed with Tocqueville that the actor of this process was "Society under the condition of equality, where there is one ruling force: Public Opinion."[343] The flip side of public opinion was, according to Arendt, the rule by Nobody. "No-body commands or Everybody. This Everybody is the equal citizen and he is a Nobody. Because the moment you take him to task, he vanishes."[344]

Wondering who, then, would move the process of history forward, Arendt focused on Tocqueville's two answers that meant the difference between living together and acting together. A society based on equality signified the end to special groups, and thereby produced isolation. When citizens merely lived together, they viewed themselves as weak and insignificant compared to their fellow citizens. Arendt associated living together with stagnation, constant motion, impotence, and servitude. In acting together,

[342] Arendt, History of Political Theory, Introduction, Lectures, 1955, Courses, University of California, Berkeley, Arendt Papers.
[343] Arendt, History of Political Theory, Tocqueville, Marx, and Conclusion, Arendt Papers.
[344] Ibid.

by contrast, citizens formed new groups continually. Arendt associated more positive effects for a free society with acting—power, freedom, and progress.[345]

Arendt viewed non-action normal, as "most of our lives are spent in this 'social' way." She even approved of it in antiquity, as in this social realm, citizens shared their opinions based on their unique perspective. However, modern equality erased this uniqueness, or, as Arendt quoted Tocqueville, Aspect. "Nobody now even has an opinion," Arendt lectured. The result has been the rise of public opinion and opinion of nobody. Arendt noted Tocqueville's struggle as he lived through this transition to modern equality. Understanding democracy to be extremely fragile, Arendt used him to emphasize the need for politics and associations in society. On the left-hand side of her lecture notes, space reserved for important points, she wrote:

> Tocqueville finds himself constantly caught between these two experiences of equality: I can act only among my equals: All other acting is spurious because it relies on Command & Execution, Rule and being ruled whereby the Commander does not act as all. In Acting we find only archein, the one who usually elected is the first and the others who see the enterprise through with him: T. knew that America was the greatest modern example for this Action in the foundation of the Republic. Yet, he asked, what happens when the action is over? People no longer retire into the privacy of their households; Acting has given them an appetite for living together. Another equa[lity] interferes. This in many respects what happened in Greece: This [is] the basic distinction between the earlier times and the polis-time. Polis is where people live together, not act. This [is] the reason why action plays such a minor role in ancient philosophy which speaks out of the polis-experience. Only the Romans had transformed the Act (Foundation) into Activity (Preservation).[346]

In her depiction of Tocqueville, Arendt articulated his apprehensions regarding equality in post-revolutionary societies. His aristocratic background kept his enthusiasm for modern equality in check. Arendt saw genuine curiosity in Tocqueville's question of

[345] Ibid.
[346] Arendt, History of Political Theory, Tocqueville, Marx, and Conclusion, Arendt Papers.

what would happen after the revolution in America. He saw the revolution as the ultimate association, which worked to strengthen bonds between citizens. In her 1958 work, *The Human Condition*, Arendt returned to the differences in ancient and modern equality. Echoing her Berkeley lecture, Arendt explained "to be free meant to be free from the inequality present in rulership and to move in a sphere where neither rule nor being ruled existed."[347] As seen from her use of Tocqueville in her private letter to Jaspers, work on *Origins*, and Berkeley lecture, Arendt used Tocqueville to flesh out her theories and to apply them to current events.

She developed her ideas on the reversal between living and action and the rule of nobody in *The Human Condition*. Arendt viewed equality as the absorption of the family unit into corresponding social groups. The heads of the households lost their authority, and no singular authority figure was able to direct public opinion. Arendt even referenced the human condition and amour mundi, her original title, in her lecture.[348] Though Arendt only mentioned Tocqueville once, his concepts and theories shaped her argument.

In *The Human Condition*, Arendt focused on the actions of humans. Beginning with a discussion of the concept of *vita activa*, the active life, Arendt traced its original meaning to Ancient Greece. Arendt often exercised a phenomenological approach, believing that "meaning becomes a function of process."[349] Explaining why the term *vita activa* underwent a drastic change in meaning, Arendt drew from her 1955 lecture.[350]

> The chief difference between the Aristotelian and the later medieval use of the term is that the bios politicos denoted explicitly only the realm of

[347] Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), 33.
[348] Arendt, History of Political Theory, Tocqueville, Marx, and Conclusion, Arendt Papers.
[349] Ibid. Handwritten on side of lecture. Words *meaning* and *function* underlined.
[350] Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 13.

> human affairs, stressing the action, praxis, needed to establish and sustain it…That the political way of life escaped this verdict is due to the Greek understanding of polis life, which to them denoted a very special and freely chosen form of political organization and by no means just any form of action necessary to keep men together in an orderly fashion. Not that the Greeks or Aristotle were ignorant of the fact that human life always demands some form of political organization and that ruling over subjects might constitute a distinct way of life; but the despot's way of life, because it was 'merely' a necessity, could not be considered free and had no relationship with the *bios politikos*.

Before *The Human Condition* and *On Revolution*, Arendt published *Between Past and Future*, a compilation of essays questioning modernity as it manifested itself in areas such as education, authority, culture, and politics. In his introduction to *Between Past and Future*, Jerome Kohn explained Arendt's viewpoint. "In Arendt's thought the present is…a gap in the continuum of time, a gap that appears to the human mind as an abyss when there is no longer a bridge of inherited concepts to traverse it."[351] For Arendt, the French Revolution of the eighteenth century represented that breaking point, and she looked to Tocqueville for capturing the essence of that break with tradition and facing an uncertain future. Arendt began her introduction to *Between Past and Future* with a quote by French poet René Char, but related it to Tocqueville. Tocqueville "was well aware of the fact that what Char called the 'completion' of act and event had still eluded him; and Char's 'Our inheritance was left to us by no testament' sounds like a variation of Tocqueville's 'Since the past has ceased to throw its light upon the future, the mind of man wanders in obscurity.'"[352]

---

[351] Jerome Kohn, introduction to *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought* by Hannah Arendt (1954; reprint, New York: Penguin Books, 2006), xiii.

[352] Hannah Arendt, *On Revolution*, 6. In the complete sentence, Arendt praised *Democracy*. "When Tocqueville returned from the New World, which he so superbly knew how to describe and to analyze that his work has remained a classic and survived more than a century of radical change, he was well aware of the fact that…"

For Arendt, Tocqueville provided an important historical perspective on the implications of modernity. In her writings, Arendt expressed her disbelief that modernity itself provided stability or led to progress. Even after the end of McCarthyism, Arendt detected potential dangers to democracy that Tocqueville predicted. For instance, in her 1954 article, "Dream and Nightmare," Arendt feared that the rise of anti-Americanism in Europe would produce a Europeanism that could lead the way to the rise of another Hitler.

> The line between this anti-American Europeanism and the very healthy and necessary efforts to federate the European nations is further confused by the fact that the remnants of European fascism have joined the fight. Their presence reminds everybody that after Briand's future gestures at the League of Nations it was Hitler who started the war with the promise that he would liquidate Europe's obsolete nation-state system and build a united Europe. The widespread and inarticulate anti-American sentiments find their political crystallization point precisely here… Americanism on one side and Europeanism on the other side of the Atlantic, two ideologies facing, fighting and, above all, resembling each other as all seemingly opposed ideologies to—this may be one of the dangers we face.[353]

She argued that Tocqueville should be read because he saw that Americanism did not pose a threat to Europe. She described Tocqueville as the greatest author of the nineteenth-century who viewed Americans as Europeans who happened upon a new nation. "Europe, he was sure, if not the whole world, was about to be Americanized; but he would never have thought this process could be somehow in opposition to the European development, as though America and Europe were different in origin and historical destiny."[354] Europe and America, accused Arendt, have ignored this past to their detriment. She faulted Americans for their thinking that any nation could become

[353] Ibid., 417.
[354] Hannah Arendt, "Dream and Nightmare," *Essays in Understanding 1930-1954: Formation, Exile, and Totalitarianism* , ed. Jerome Kohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1994), 411.

wealthy if they adopted American institutions. She blamed the lower classes in Europe, many of whom found themselves denied access to America due to the curtail of immigration after World War I, for the rise in anti-American sentiments. Although Tocqueville could not have predicted America's 'stupendous' wealth following World War II, Arendt still believed Tocqueville's core thesis remained relevant to modern society. Ignoring his insight would hold the real possibility of another world war fueled by ideologies.

Arendt also saw threats to democracy occurring within America. Influenced by Tocqueville's warning that the preference for equality could produce negative consequences for individual liberties, she opposed the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education to desegregate schools and the subsequent use of federal troops to escort students to school. Though she only mentioned him once in her controversial 1957 article, "Reflections on Little Rock," Arendt's position on race in America drew directly from Tocqueville's cautious attitude towards maintaining the balance between liberty and equality.

Reflections

In "Reflections on Little Rock," Arendt focused on the desegregation crisis that made world news.[355] Despite the *Brown v Board of Education* ruling in 1954, which made separate schooling constitutionally illegal, public schools in Arkansas remained

[355] Controversy surrounded the publication of the article. See Young-Bruehl, 313-315. Arendt decided to publish it a year later untouched because she felt the article was still relevant. Indeed, the entrance of the nine African-American students led to a heated anti-desegregation response. In 1958, public high schools in Little Rock closed due to opposition to integration. Schools re-opened, desegregated, in August 1959.

segregated.[356] For three years, attempts to desegregate the schools in Little Rock failed. Federal District Judge Davies ordered desegregation to begin September 9, 1957. The Arkansas National Guard physically prevented the nine African-American students chosen to attend Central High School from entering the school. When they did enter on September 23, they were forced to leave the school through a side door for fear of physical harm by a mob of white students. Eventually, President Eisenhower sent 1,000 members of the 101st Airborne Division to protect the students as they entered the school.

In "Reflections," Arendt fleshed out Tocqueville's concept of equality to understand where and how equality should be enforced in a democratic society. Arendt viewed the issue as one Tocqueville predicted. Noting that equality before the law was crucial for the survival of the American Republic, Arendt stated, "Tocqueville saw over a century ago that equality of opportunity and condition, as well as equality of rights, constituted the basic 'law' of American democracy, and he predicted that the dilemmas and perplexities inherent in the principle of equality might one day become the most dangerous challenge to the American way of life."[357]

Arendt divided society into the public (political) realm, social realm, and private realm. In the political realm, all citizens should be considered and treated as equals. Indeed, "Only there are we all equals."[358] In the social realm, though, discrimination should be allowed. By allowing discrimination, Arendt was not siding with the

[356] She opposed desegregation because she believed that the states should have the final decision whether to desegregate, not the federal government. She also suggested that the focus of Civil Rights should be shifted from integration to repealing miscegenation laws. This suggestion was regarded as untimely, and "struck her readers as either wrong or completely impractical," because the momentum of the Civil Rights' movement was with the integrationists. Arendt's suggestion, unpopular in the 1950s, gained validity in the 1960s. In the 1960s, there was more of an effort to repeal the laws forbidding blacks from marrying whites. In 1967, the Supreme Court ruled in *Loving v. Virginia* that Virginia's miscegenation laws were unconstitutional.
[357] Baehr, 234.
[358] Ibid., 237.

segregationists. She clarified her view in a response to two of her most vocal critics, "as a Jew I take my sympathy for the cause of the Negroes as for all oppressed or under-privileged peoples."[359] Rather, her main concern was to maintain freedom of association in society, as "her great fear was the stifling effect of mass conformity."[360]

Like Tocqueville, Arendt questioned the role of the Federal Government. For Arendt, schools serve a social function, and therefore not entitled to federal interference. In the private realm, according to Arendt, citizens should be allowed to hold any belief. Parents were even free to pass along their intolerant or racist attitudes. Arendt feared that by forcing schools to comply with beliefs dictated by the federal government and not coming from the parents and teachers, the government would unwittingly undermine the authority of parents and teachers. Keeping in mind Nazi Germany, Arendt maintained that this replacement of authority would hold dire consequences.

Though "Reflections" did not attract as much attention as did her other works, those who did comment on the article remarked that she held a judgmental and imperious tone. Young-Bruehl explained that Arendt's anger was not directed toward the desegregation advocates, but toward mass society. Arendt's "most pungent remarks were reserved for issues about which others had kept silent for reasons she could not accept; whenever she suspected a conspiracy of silence, she wrote furiously and sometimes disdainfully.[361] Arendt saw similarities between those silent Americans in the case of Little Rock and the German intellectuals who followed Hitler. Kohn explained, "A certain distrust of the tendency of intellectuals to let themselves be swept along by

[359] Ibid., 232.
[360] Richard King, "American Dilemmas, European Experiences," *The Arkansas Historical Quarterly* 56, no. 3, 40th Anniversary of the Little Rock School Crisis (Autumn 1997): 319.
[361] Young-Bruehl, 308.

political currents in whatever direction was to remain with her throughout her life."[362] In "Reflections," Arendt linked Americans who remained silent on the harassment of the nine students to German intellectuals who did not oppose Hitler.

"Reflections," therefore, does not represent a complete shift in attention from her earlier studies on totalitarianism and anti-Semitism. Arendt "hoped…to illuminate the issues raised in Little Rock by bringing in her own experience, as well as what she had learned about totalitarianism and the catalyzing role anti-Semitism had played in Germany, to bear on it."[363] Kristeva also noticed the connection between "Little Rock" and *Origins* and *The Human Condition*, positing that because Arendt's ideas "were recast into concrete terms that were contemporaneous with a pressing current event, her essay proved very controversial."[364] In *The Human Condition*, which she was simultaneously writing, and *On Revolution* (1963), Arendt explicated themes present in "Reflections."[365] Commenting on the connection between *Democracy* and *On Revolution*, Villa pointed out the thematic continuity and narrative structure between the two works. She asserted, "The debt to Tocqueville is large: privatism, atomization, materialism, the elimination of local spaces of freedom (the townships)—all come into play."[366]

On Revolution

In *On Revolution*, Arendt sought to understand what accounted for the different trajectories of the American Revolution and French Revolution. She argued that in the

[362] Kohn, xii. This echoes Tocqueville's feelings about politicians who did not stand up for their convictions.
[363] King, 315. For discussion of *Reflection's* reception, see 316, FN 4.
[364] Kristeva, 114.
[365] Young-Bruehl, 309.
[366] Villa, 101.

former, politics remained a priority while in the latter, social issues such as poverty upstaged political questions. The French Revolution "had changed its direction; it aimed no longer at freedom, the goal of the revolution had become the happiness of the people."[367] Echoing Tocqueville's fear of the mob, Arendt deemed the destitute mob responsible for changing the course of the French Revolution from the Rights of Man to the Rights of the Sans-Culottes. "When [the multitude of the poor] appeared on the scene of politics, necessity appeared with them, and the result was that the power of the old regime became impotent and the new republic was stillborn; freedom had to be surrendered to necessity, to the urgency of the life process itself."[368] Focusing on the "seemingly objective course of revolutionary events," Karl Marx became the theorist of the French Revolution and all revolutions that followed. Arendt noted that the Marxist theory of revolution was powerful for Tocqueville, "whose main concern was to study in America the consequences of that long and inevitable revolution of which the events of 1789 were only the first stage. In the American Revolution itself and the theories of the founders, he remained curiously uninterested."[369]

In *Origins*, Arendt relied on Tocqueville to show, pessimistically, how modern revolutions could lead to totalitarianism. In *On Revolution*, Arendt used Tocqueville to show, optimistically, how revolutions could lead to true democratic regimes. In his introduction to *On Revolution*, Jonathan Schell described the difference between *On Revolution* and Arendt's earlier works. *On Revolution* "seems to represent a new world of political thought, a new mood, almost a new temperament, and the question is what the

[367] Arendt, *On Revolution*, 51.
[368] Ibid.
[369] Ibid.

relationship is with her earlier work and how and why the change occurred."[370] Schell argued that events directed Arendt's thoughts. Just as the news of the concentration camps led her to study totalitarianism and write *Origins*, the Hungarian Revolution in 1956 led to *On Revolution*. Responding positively to the events against the Soviet Union, Arendt believed it was the beginning of more anti-totalitarian movements. As Kohn phrased it, "In short, for Arendt, the Hungarian Revolution was like a torch thrust into the otherwise impenetrable darkness of the totalitarian dungeon."[371]

Writing *On Revolution*, Tocqueville was such an important part of her thoughts that Arendt originally included him in the introduction. Arendt originally opened by discussing the connection between wars and revolutions that existed since the 'frightening story of 1789.' Incorporating Tocqueville, she wrote, "Since then it has been tempting to see, with Tocqueville, the French Revolution as the climax of 'that irresistible revolution which has advanced for centuries in spite of every obstacle' and to consider all subsequent revolutions as the stages in which the French Revolution unfolded, spreading first to the European continent and from there all over the world."[372] Arendt did not agree completely with Tocqueville's assessment, feeling instead that the revolution "had been the outcome of specific deeds and events." Ultimately, Arendt decided it was up to future historians to view the revolution in terms other than its inevitability. Perhaps uncomfortable with her new perspective, in her final version she hid her divergence from Tocqueville in chapter six, "The Revolutionary Tradition and its

[370] Kohn, xvi.
[371] Ibid., xix.
[372] Arendt, On Revolution, First Draft, Introduction, Arendt Papers.

Lost Treasure."[373] Her disagreement with Tocqueville reflected her new optimism in the fight against totalitarian movements.

The idea of Action was again important in her theory of Revolution. In 1960, Arendt explained that in the eighteenth century, despotic governments took power from men of letters in France. The men of letters, and their American colleagues, felt their leisure was a burden that was imposed on them. They would have preferred acting in the public realm, which they believed was their right due to their birth, talent or inclination. Arendt took from Tocqueville his description of the public realm as closed off and invisible to the men of letters.[374] This concept was crucial to Arendt, as it marked for her the key moment when the men of letters turned to Greek and Roman authors to learn how to solve their problems. Arendt explained, "It was their search for political freedom, not their quest for truth, that led them back to antiquity."[375]

In a paper she delivered before the American Political Science Association in New York in 1960, Arendt expanded their search to include public happiness, and specified that both eighteenth-century France and America searched for public freedom and public happiness.[376] The conclusion to her speech emphasized Tocqueville's influence.

> It will…appear that revolutions have been the time-space where action, with all its implications, was discovered or rather re-discovered for the modern age, —an event of tremendous importance if one remembers for how many centuries action had been overshadowed by contemplation, and the realm of public affairs, in Tocqueville's telling phrase, 'had been invisible' to rich and poor alike. It is for this reason that every modern

[373] Arendt, *On Revolution*, 247.
[374] Hannah Arendt, Action in the Pursuit of Happiness, Lecture, American Political Science Association, New York, N.Y., 1960, Arendt Papers. Arendt quoted, "the world of public affairs was not only hardly known to them but was invisible' (Tocqueville)."
[375] Arendt, *On Revolution*, 114.
[376] Hannah Arendt, Action in the Pursuit of Happiness, Arendt Papers.

> theory of politics will have to square itself with the facts brought to light by the revolutionary upheavals of the last twohundred years, and these facts are of course vastly different from what the revolutionary ideologies would like us to believe…the rediscovery of action and the re-emergence of a secular, public realm of life may well be the most precious inheritance the modern age has bequeathed upon us who are about to enter an entirely new world. But our position as heirs to this inheritance is far from being untroubled; the trouble was expressed most succinctly by Rene Char, the French poet and writer in the Resistance…'Our inheritance was left to us by no testament.'"[377]

Dismissing Hegel's notion that the French Revolution was more about the fulfillment of historical destiny, Arendt countered with Tocqueville's view of the French Revolution as the ushering in of a 'new science of politics.' Arendt argued that even "the very notion of world history was born from the first attempt at world politics, and although both the American and the French enthusiasm for the 'rights of man' quickly subsided with the birth of the nation-state…the fact is that in one form or another world politics has been an adjunct to politics ever since."[378] Though they were not aware of it, the changing discourse of American and French revolutionaries led to unintended actions that reached far beyond their initial limited goals of constitutional monarchies.[379]

Arendt also found Jefferson's wards the institutionalized model of political freedom. In *Hannah Arendt: An Introduction*, John McGowen linked Arendt's concept of the ward to Tocqueville's appreciation of the New England town hall meetings.

> What Jefferson had in mind was the institutionalization of something like the local meetings that accompanied ratification of the Constitution—meetings in which public debate precedes casting one's vote…There seems to be no reason—in either principle or practice—not to extend this idea of local public sites to include associations we normally do not think of as political—from Rotary clubs to food co-ops to sports clubs. The key element here is a public grouping in which members deliberate and then

[377] Ibid.
[378] Arendt, *On Revolution*, 52, 53.
[379] Ibid., 125.

> decide on a collective course of action. Such an extension brings Arendt's views even closer to Tocqueville's, which they already resemble…Certainly, both Tocqueville and Arendt allow us to see that the destruction of local associations and their replacement by relations to the ruling party and/or the state are primary tactics of totalitarianism; hence Arendt's insistence that multiplying sites of power is actually the best safeguard against the abuse of power—or, more correctly, against the destruction of power by force."[380]

Compared to *Origins*, *On Revolution's* effect was "mixed and muted."[381] Students in the mid and late-1960s interested in political theory "responded to Arendt's advocacy of what the American Students for a Democratic Society called 'participatory democracy' and what Rudi Dutschke of the German SDS…called 'Democracy at the bottom'—councils of people everywhere, discussing and deciding."[382] While many accepted the last part of *On Revolution*, 'The Revolutionary Tradition and its Lost Treasure," they discounted the first part, "with its critique of the social revolutionaries' overriding concern with 'the Social Question." Academics were mainly concerned with Arendt's phenomenological method. Young-Bruehl explained, "her claim that a revolution is characterized, essentially, by a rebellion and then an act of political foundation for the preservation of freedom was called idealistic, metaphysical, antisocialist, antiprogressive, anti-Marxist."[383] Arendt's engagement with Tocqueville in the 1960s went under-noticed because her critique was considered untimely to students and advocates of revolutionary politics.

[380] McGowan, 92.
[381] Young-Bruehl, 404.
[382] Ibid.
[383] Ibid., 405.

Conclusion

Hannah Arendt's disappointment with German intellectuals' silent complicity with Nazism "was so severe, the sense of betrayal so acute, that for a period of twenty-five years she renounced philosophy and insisted on being referred to as a 'political thinker.'"[384] She also began to view herself as a historian, and was even referred to as a historian.[385] With this turn from philosophy to history, she found Tocqueville. Like Tocqueville, she found herself on the precipice of a new world. For Tocqueville, the French Revolution and his experience in America shaped his views on modernity and equality. Similarly, Arendt's experience with Nazism and America also shaped her views on modernity. In her writings in the 1940s and 50s, Arendt searched for the causes of phenomena such as totalitarianism, racism, and revolution. Essentially, she used Tocqueville to argue against Hegel's theory of inevitability, Rousseau's concept of the private sphere, and Marx's idea of the social and political sphere.

Arendt understood and appreciated Tocqueville markedly different than her American colleagues. This is in part because she took inspiration from all of Tocqueville's published writings and personal correspondence, not just *Democracy*. Even her reading of *Democracy* differed from her contemporaries. Riesman and Hartz, for example, described him in terms of the prophet of mass society and conformism. Arendt, however, turned her attention to the powerful effects of associations. She also invoked Tocqueville in her endorsement of a non-political social sphere to combat the

[384] Richard Wolin, *The Frankfurt School Revisited and Other Essays on Politics and Society* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 115.
[385] Riesman and Young-Bruehl, for example.

danger of mass conformity.[386]

Despite Arendt's own acknowledgement of the ties between her work and that of Riesman's, such as their uses of Tocqueville, their academic and literary peers largely missed the connections.[387] Furthermore, as Tocqueville's impact on Riesman was emphasized, Tocqueville's influence on Arendt has been overlooked. Hannah Arendt especially deserves reconsideration for her reception of Tocqueville.

Scholars have begun to emphasize the continuity in Arendt's works, especially those written in the late 1950s.[388] Arendt's published and unpublished writings reveal her subtle yet persistent use of Tocqueville to understand the social realm in societies. In the next chapter, the writings of Leo Strauss will be examined to understand the origins of the emphasis of Tocqueville in Straussian works.

---

[386] In 1964, German journalist Gaus asked Arendt whether a government based on the idea of political inclusion would sustain itself under her argument that 'the ability to act is restricted to a few people.' Arendt replied that regarding the masses, when men came together, their interests led them to action. "In America where there are still spontaneous associations, which then disband again—the kind of associations already described by Tocqueville—you can see this very clearly. Some public interest concerns a specific group of people, those in a neighborhood or even in just one house or in a city or in some other sort of group. Then these people will convene, and they are very capable of acting publicly in these matters—for they have an overview of them…the difference between the statesman and the man in the street is in principle not very great." Hannah Arendt*, Essays in Understanding 1930-1954*, 21-22.

[387] For more about Arendt and Riesman's correspondence, see Peter Baehr, "Of Politics and Social Science: 'Totalitarianism' in the Dialogue of David Riesman and Hannah Arendt." *European Journal of Political Theory* 2 (2004): 191-217. Interestingly, Baehr never mentioned their references and use of Tocqueville. See also Wilfred M. McClay, *The Masterless: Self and Society in Modern America* (North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 255-7; John Plotz, "The Return of the Blob, or How Sociology Decided to Stop Worrying and Love the Crowd," in Jeffrey T. Schnapp and Matthew Tiews, ed. *Crowds* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006).

[388] Margaret Canovan went the furthest, viewing *The Human Condition* as a continuation from *Origins*.

Chapter Four
Lost and Found in Translation: Leo Strauss and Tocqueville

> And the philosopher, always holding converse through reason with the idea of being, is also dark from excess of light; for the eyes of the soul of the multitude are unable to endure the vision of the divine.
>
> Plato, *Sophist*

> Leo Strauss whose influence in the United States is quite remarkable; he is the only one who succeeded in founding a 'school.'
>
> Hannah Arendt to Margaret Canovan

This chapter focuses on the interpretation of Tocqueville by German Jewish political philosopher Leo Strauss and the students of the Straussian school. Whether they took courses with Strauss or not, the political scientists featured in this chapter have been influenced deeply by Strauss's teachings. Their reading of Tocqueville also reflects Strauss's. Strauss held an extremely negative view of the masses. He did not believe the majority was capable of making good political choices that would protect individual and political liberty. Strauss believed that only in a society that valued liberty over equality would greatness flourish. In Strauss's view, the masses stifled great individuals by their preference for equality over liberty. The preference for equality was the problem of democracy, Strauss determined. In Tocqueville, Strauss found that the solution depended on the masses' ability to realize their limitations and to accept and value inequalities in a democratic society.

Strauss's conclusions derived from his struggle to reconcile his intellectual fascination with fascism with his experiences as a German Jew forced to flee Nazi Germany. Similarly, an aristocrat whose parents and other family relations suffered due

to their class, Tocqueville's fascination with democracy caused great internal confliction. Tocqueville helped Strauss validate his concerns about democracy and search for the best regime.

I argue that the Straussian reading of Tocqueville created a new image of Tocqueville as a liberal conservative who promoted undemocratic means to protect liberal democratic regimes. Allan Bloom, Marvin Zetterbaum, Harvey Mansfield, and Steven B. Smith, for example, have shared a common view of democracy that was influenced by Strauss's teachings. Though their analyses of Tocqueville began with their critique of the masses, their uses of Tocqueville have differed from Strauss's. American Straussians have inherited Strauss's critique of modernity but lacked his unique perspective, which was rooted in his experiences. I show how the Straussian interpretation of Tocqueville changed from Strauss's German-centric analysis to more modern post-totalitarian American-centric analyses of Tocqueville and *Democracy*. I focus on Strauss's original understanding of Tocqueville, Marvin Zetterbaum's analysis of Tocqueville in the *History of Political Philosophy*, which Strauss edited, and Harvey Mansfield's translation of *Democracy*. These are the key moments in which this change can be detected.

No chapter on Leo Strauss would be complete without understanding how his controversial legacy affected the reception of his ideas or those of his followers. Strauss was a polarizing figure even before his death in 1973. As Steven B. Smith in *Reading Leo Strauss* explained, unlike other thinkers such as Habermas and Arendt, Strauss evoked "an intense, almost visceral response from critics...To know him is to either love

him or hate him. There is no middle ground.[389] Scholars have argued whether Strauss was a fascist, conservative, neoconservative, liberal, or even apolitical.[390] Straussians have also come under increasing scrutiny over the past few decades.[391] They have been depicted as neo-conservatives situated in the highest places of power in government and influencing the foreign policy of the United States. In other accounts, they are victims of conspiracy theories and discrimination, especially within academia.[392] In other words, they are either described as the extreme insiders, or seen as outsiders.

The controversy surrounding Strauss's beliefs and the Straussians' influence on American politics and culture has greatly affected the reception of Tocqueville. This is illustrated best by the controversy over Harvey Mansfield and Delba Winthrop's introduction and translation of *Democracy*, published in 2000. Mansfield has been considered the 'consummate American Straussian" and "perhaps the leading Straussian

---

[389] Steven B. Smith, *Reading Leo Strauss: Politics, Philosophy, Judaism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006), 56-7. Smith identified himself as a Straussian, meaning he has read and appreciated Strauss's works since his undergraduate days, and has been taught by Strauss's students and their students.

[390] George H. Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America Since 1945* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2006), 93. Nash claimed Strauss was a conservative who revived one aspect of the Great Tradition—ancient or classical political philosophy. Straussians have typically defended Strauss from charges that he was a fascist like Heidegger. Anti-Straussians most often point to Shadia Drury's *Leo Strauss and the American Right* (New York: St. Martin's Press,1997) to indict Strauss as a fascist, claiming for instance that he studied with eminent fascist thinkers. Straussians either deny or ignore the charges, or argue that Strauss admired qualities of fascism based on the Roman model that were realized in Mussolini's regime, not Hitler's. For a Straussian defense against Drury, see Catherine Zuckert, Michael P. Zuckert, *The Truth About Leo Strauss: Political Philosophy and American Democracy* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2002). For nuanced views of Strauss's fascism, see Leo Strauss, *Leo Strauss: The Early Writings 1921-1923*, trans. and ed. Michael Zank, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), 46, FN 83; Nicholas Xenos, *Cloaked in Virtue: Unveiling Leo Strauss and the Rhetoric of America Foreign Policy* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 21. The relevant fact to this chapter is that Strauss opposed Hitler and Nazi Germany.

[391] There are real and fundamental differences among Strauss's students and admirers in their personal, political, and professional interests and beliefs. As Smith pointed out in *Reading Leo Strauss*, Strauss' former students range widely in their political and philosophical beliefs. Smith concluded that Strauss did not leave behind one defining, unifying legacy.

[392] For example, American political philosopher and Strauss student Thomas Pangle was denied tenure at Yale in 1982. Pangle's supporters charged that he was denied because he was a Straussian. See "Yale and the Pangle Case," August 1982, http://www.commentarymagazine.com/viewarticle.cfm/yale-and-the-pangle-case-13385?page=2. For Pangle's view on Straussians, see Leo Strauss, *The Rebirth of Rational Political Classicism: An Introduction to the Thought of Leo Strauss,* ed. Thomas L. Pangle (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

of the late twentieth-century," even though he never took a course with Strauss. Mansfield and Winthrop's eighty-six-page introduction to *Democracy* offers the modern Straussian interpretation and use of Tocqueville.[393]

Between Belief and Practice

Strauss' critique of modernity was fueled in part from his experiences as a Jew. He became aware of anti-Semitism at a very young age.[394] His father helped a family who fled from the 1903 Kishinev pogroms, and Strauss heard their chilling tales of the persecution. Although he was only 4 or 5, the stories of the persecution made a deep impression on the young Strauss. They "shook his previous feeling of security: for the first time he countenanced the possibility of such an event occurring in his native Germany."[395] Although he was too young to comprehend fully the situation or to articulate his fears, this experience would lead him to conclude that modernity does not necessarily lead to progress, humane action, or liberty. In this way he related to Tocqueville, whose family suffered during the revolution intended to bring about liberty, equality and fraternity. Less than thirty years later after the pogroms, Strauss's fear seemed to come true. Upon the collapse of Weimar, Strauss left Germany and spent five years traveling between France and England. Unable to secure a long-term academic

[393] Mancini, 209; Scott Horton, "Will the Real Leo Strauss Please Stand Up?," *Harpers Magazine,* January 21, 2008, http://harpers.org/archive/2008/01/hbc-90002212.
[394] Eugene R. Sheppard, *Leo Strauss and the Politics of Exile: The Making of a Political Philosopher* (Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England, 2006), 12.
[395] Ibid. Strauss described his experience in his lecture, "Why We Remain Jews," delivered at the Hillel House at the University of Chicago in 1962.

position, Strauss emigrated to the United States in 1937 at the age of 38 with the promise of a position waiting for him.[396]

His disillusionment with modernity also grew as a result of his experiences serving in the German Army in the First World War. In *Leo Strauss: An Intellectual Biography* (2007), Daniel Tanguay marked the 1920s as the "formative period… decisive for the subsequent evolution of his thought in more than one respect."[397] Strauss's dissertation on F.H. Jacobi, completed in 1921, challenged several of the great Enlightenment-champion Ernst Cassirer's claims of the greatness of modernity.[398] Strauss also came to see that modern science was not the origin of the positive mind, but possibly the consequence.[399] This major reinterpretation of the Enlightenment gave new importance to philosophers, indicating they were more important than scientists. In the traditional view of the Enlightenment, the philosophes fed off scientists' achievements in math and astronomy, and began questioning the nature and role of God, government, and men in a society.

Strauss's critique of modernity, therefore, did not begin with the rise of Hitler. "A cynical view would be that Strauss suffered from a persecution complex…But the case of Strauss is striking precisely because he was *not* a liberal assimilationist who later became disillusioned with the ideal of an egalitarian, tolerant, and enlightened society."[400] Rather, his critique began with his observation in the discrepancy between rhetoric and practice. Strauss also questioned how persecution of a group based on

[396] In 1931 he was awarded a Rockefeller Fellowship to study in France and England. When Hitler dissolved the constitution of the Weimar Republic in May 1933 and effectively began the Nazi rule, Strauss was in London, not Germany.
[397] Daniel Tanguay, *Leo Strauss: An Intellectual Biography* . trans. Christopher Nadon (New Haven: Yale University, 2007), 10. Tanguay has been labeled a 'Formidable Straussian.'
[398] Cassirer was Strauss's dissertation supervisor.
[399] Ibid., 29.
[400] Sheppard, 84.

religion could occur when the Enlightenment supposedly promoted the rights of all. He saw the discrepancy between policy and practice during the 1920s in Weimar Germany. A liberal democratic government that ostensibly granted all rights to the Jewish population was unable to protect the Jews. Incidents such as the assassination of Jewish Minister of Foreign Affairs Walter Rathenau in 1922 deepened his skepticism of liberal democracy.[401]

Despite his experiences as a Jew, Strauss subjected Judaism to criticism. Although he grew up in the rural area of Kirchhain in an Orthodox Jewish family, Strauss always questioned the meaning of Jewish traditions before deciding whether to practice them. Reading 'non-Jewish Jewish' philosophers such as Spinoza and Maimonides, Strauss looked for ways Jews could assimilate while preserving the core of their Jewish beliefs, namely that of revelation. Strauss believed Zionism, a growing movement in Germany, was not an appropriate response to the issues modernity posed for Jews.[402]

Strauss also remained critical of democracy. Though he took a position in 1938 at The New School for Social Research, Strauss did not fit the mold of the European refugee-scholar who attacked Nazism or turned to critical theory. Instead, Sheppard argued, Strauss "wanted to recapture the philosopher's awareness of his or her precarious existence under a totalitarian regime and instill this need for circumspection within the confines of a liberal democracy."[403] Like Tocqueville, Strauss saw the future of liberal democracy. Strauss's experiences taught him that freedom and democracy were fragile. He considered Weimar Germany as the prime example of a liberal democracy founded on

[401] Ibid.
[402] For a discussion of Strauss's view and critique of Zionism, see Tanguay, chapter 1, "Zionism, Orthodoxy, and Spinoza's Critique of Religion."
[403] Sheppard, 81.

the principles of equality and inclusion as expressed by the Enlightenment and French Revolution. He saw this type of democracy leading to the German historicism cultivated under Hitler in the 1930s. He saw how this in turn led to political changes such as the Nuremberg Laws, which officially stripped citizenship rights from Jews and paved the way for future, and worse, persecution such as Kristallnacht and the Holocaust.

Hitler's rule affected Strauss greatly, and his experiences as a German Jew and refugee shaped his perspective of democracy.[404] Due to his background, his analysis of Tocqueville differed sharply from that of his contemporary American scholars who, by comparing America to the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany, stressed the positives of democracy. Instead, Strauss offered his uneasy suggestion that democracy was so tenuous that Nazi Germany could represent the future of America, a not uncommon view among émigrés. Tocqueville was extremely valuable to Strauss for understanding how America could be so complacent and for conveying his fears to an audience that had never experienced such a drastic change in regime.

Tocqueville and Natural Right

Strauss's most influential work, *Natural Right and History,* was his warning of how quickly a stable liberal democracy could fall apart. Strauss argued that modernity created the conditions that led to Hitler. Stressing the difference between natural right

[404] Strauss experienced heavy personal losses closely together that were related to Hitler's rule. Within a few months, Strauss lost his only sibling, Bettina, and his father Hugo. Bettina, in Cairo on a university fellowship, died giving birth. Hugo Strauss died just before the deportation of Kirchhain's Jewry. Strauss's stepmother and the rest of his immediate family that stayed in Germany were deported to death camps in the east, where they were killed. Strauss suffered the loss of his brother-in-law, Paul Krauss, who committed suicide in 1944. Strauss adopted Paul and Bettina's daughter. For an understanding of how emigration affected Leo Strauss, see Alfons Söllner, "Leo Strauss: German Origin and American Impact" in *Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss*: *German Emigrés and American Political Thought after World War II*, ed. Peter Graf Kielmansegg et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

and natural rights, Strauss blamed modern philosophers such as John Locke for promoting the idea that every individual is equal and therefore unable to judge another. According to Strauss, relativism begins when judging ceases. Arguing against Max Weber's thesis that values are relative to each society, Strauss referenced the Holocaust.

> The prohibition against value judgments in social science would lead to the consequence that we are permitted to give a strictly factual description of the overt acts that can be observed in concentration camps and perhaps an equally factual description of the motivation of the actors concerned: we would not be permitted to speak of cruelty. Every reader of such a description who is not completely stupid would, of course, see that the actions described are cruel.[405]

Later in the work, Strauss argued that an ideal society would not discriminate based on citizenship, or indigenousness. "In order to be truly just…civil society must be transformed into the 'world-state.'"[406] Strauss gave the example of citizenship laws as prerequisites for holding high political offices in the United States to warn of potential weaknesses in this type of system. This was a thinly veiled reference to the legal discrimination against non-Aryans during Hitler's rule.

In his political science course, "Natural Right and History" at the University of Chicago, Strauss used Tocqueville to further explore the meaning and value of natural

---

[405] Leo Strauss, *Natural Right and History* (1955; reprint, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), 52. Strauss also had Nazi Germany in mind when he argued against Locke's theory of natural law. Strauss objected to Locke's teaching that an ethical civil society can be created without using religion. Making a veiled reference to Nazi Germany (230), Strauss wrote, Locke "means, in the first place, that men actually lived, and may live, without being subject to a common superior on earth. He means, furthermore, that men living in that condition, who are studiers of the law of nature, would know how to set about remedying the inconveniences of their condition and to lay the foundations for public happiness. But only such men could know the law of nature while living in a state of nature who have already lived in civil society, or rather in a civil society in which reason has been properly cultivated. An example of men who are in the state of nature under the law of nature would therefore be an elite among the English colonists in America rather than the wild Indians. A better example would be that of any highly civilized men after the breakdown of their society. It is only one step from this to the view that the most obvious example of men in the state of nature under the law of nature is that of men living in civil society, in so far as they reflect on what they could justly demand from civil society or on the conditions under which civil obedience would be reasonable."

[406] Ibid., 148.

right. Expressing his enthusiasm for Tocqueville, he marveled, "I believe in no other case in regard to any other country; that a man after such a short sojourn in a county could give such a comprehensive and profound analysis."[407] He also declared "it is of course simply necessary to read Tocqueville's work by every student of political science."[408] Strauss especially valued Tocqueville for his depth and conservative perspective:

> Tocqueville is, we can say, the greatest, the classic of a conservative democracy. He accepts democracy, democratic institutions, the democratic temper, but combines that with the spirit of moderate, conservative, evolutionist, however you might call it, and definitely anti-revolutionary democracy. All of what we call liberal democracy today has never been so soberly analyzed, and so sympathetically, as it was by Tocqueville."[409]

Above all, Strauss appreciated Tocqueville's acceptance of natural right. The discourse of American exceptionalism, which emphasized the positive aspects of democracy in America in order to explain why it did not fall to communism or socialism during the 1920s and 30s, disturbed Strauss. He deemed it false confidence, as Strauss did not think America was in serious danger of falling to communism or fascism. Rather, he urged his students to follow Tocqueville's example. "Tocqueville's analysis is guided, as every analysis must be, by an awareness of alternatives, but whereas in present-day analyses of democracy the alternatives considered are usually communism and fascism, that is to say, to put it mildly most unattractive alternatives from which we learn nothing

---

[407] "Leo Strauss on Alexis de Tocqueville," 1, Autumn1962, http://www.archive.org/stream/LeoStraussOnAlexisDeTocqueville/Strauss-OnTocqueville#page/n0/mode/2up, August 24, 2009. (hereafter cited as "Strauss on Tocqueville"). Strauss proceeded to compare Tocqueville to Lord Bryce's *Modern Democracy*, stating that Bryce's work was "not comparable in depth to Tocqueville book though it may be correct in many points where Tocqueville was wrong."

[408] Ibid., 3.

[409] Ibid., 6.

except self-complacency."[410] Strauss noted that Tocqueville regarded unrestricted state power as a danger for democracy itself, but "of course he was not thinking of totalitarianism."[411] In comparing American democracy to European forms of totalitarian government, Strauss indicated that the former by far represented the better system and that criticisms of democracy would seem extremely minor. Strauss suggested that modern scholars have perverted Tocqueville's pure and wise intent to critique democracy using an appropriate comparable type of society. As a result, Americans took their superiority for granted and failed to look for any weaknesses to fix. This complacent attitude, Strauss believed, was dangerous. Influenced by Tocqueville's method of comparing aristocracy and democracy in order to show the weaknesses of democracy, Strauss compared America to Weimar Germany.

Strauss indicated that Tocqueville should be read because he was one of the first to understand the dangers of modernity. Like Tocqueville, Strauss was caught between two worlds. He appreciated Tocqueville's acknowledgement that the present reality was not necessarily the right or best one. For Strauss, Tocqueville provided the way back to natural right, which is to encourage inequality in society. Strauss lectured to his class, "Equality means that everyone is the judge. But we can't leave it at that because men obviously need intellectual authority."[412] Finding Tocqueville's analysis of how equality leads to the political omnipotence of the majority extremely relevant and important,

[410] Ibid., 4.
[411] Ibid., 8.
[412] Ibid., 5.

Strauss read two pages from *Democracy* to his class.[413] Strauss believed that Tocqueville correctly feared the masses becoming the intellectual authority.

Strauss also appreciated Tocqueville's ability and tendency to judge, and attributed this to Tocqueville's nature as a philosopher. Strauss stated, "Tocqueville…has the heritage of a great eighteenth century philosophic analysis."[414] In his 1945 article, *On Classical Political Philosophy*, Strauss classified Tocqueville as a pre-modern, classical political philosopher. Comparing a classical political philosopher to an umpire par excellence who attempts to settle political controversies, Strauss wrote, "This view of the function of the political philosopher—that he must not be a 'radical' partisan who prefers victory in civil war to arbitration—is also of political origin: it is the duty of the good citizen to make civil strife cease and to create, by persuasion, agreement among the citizens."[415] In the footnote to this statement, Strauss quoted from *Democracy*, "J'ai entrepris de voir, non pas autrement, mais plus loin que les partis." (I have tried to see things, not differently, but further than the parties.)[416] Strauss's footnote is important, as it shows his respect for Tocqueville. Strauss placed Tocqueville in the ancient tradition of classical political philosophy, a high honor for Strauss.

French theorist Raymond Aron described Strauss's interpretation in his 1965 work, *Main Currents of Sociological Thought*, "Tocqueville remains closest to classical

---

[413] Ibid. "Men living in aristocratic periods are therefore naturally induced to shape their opinions by the standard of a superior person, or a superior class of persons, while they are averse to recognizing the infallibility of the mass of the people…And I perceive how, under the dominion of certain laws, democracy would extinguish that liberty of the mind to which a democratic social condition is favorable; so that, after having broken all the bondage once imposed on it by ranks or by men, the human mind would be closely fettered to the general will of the greatest number." Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Vol. II, ed. Phillips Bradley, (1945; reprint, New York: Vintage Books, 1957), 11-13.

[414] "Strauss on Tocqueville," 1.

[415] Leo Strauss, "On Classical Political Philosophy" in Leo Strauss, *What is Political Philosophy? And Other Studies* (1959: reprint, Chicago: University of Chicago, 1988), 81.

[416] Ibid., FN 2.

philosophy, as interpreted by Prof. Leo Strauss."[417] In a footnote to this statement, Aron directed readers to Leo Strauss's *On Tyranny* (1948), *Natural Right and History* (1953), *Persecution and the Art of Writing* (1952), and *The Political Philosophy of Hobbes: Its Basis and its Genesis* (1952).[418] As Aron suggested, Strauss viewed Tocqueville above all as a classical political philosopher. Robert Eden also put a lot of importance on Strauss's interpretation of Tocqueville as a classical political philosopher.[419] In "Tocqueville and the Problem of the Natural Right," Eden stated, "[In] the sole mention of Tocqueville in his published work, Strauss adumbrates a twofold approach, to and from classical political philosophy, from and to Tocqueville."[420] Eden thus linked Tocqueville to Strauss's most influential work, *Natural Right and History*.[421]

---

[417] Raymond Aron, *Main Currents of Sociological Thought*, (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2007), 262.
[418] Ibid., FN 6.
[419] Eden himself had ties to Strauss, as he studied with him on the Committee at Chicago. Eden also studied under Mansfield at Harvard, where he earned his Ph.D.
[420] Robert Eden, "Tocqueville and the Problem of Natural Right," *Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy* 17, no. 3 (Spring 1990): 389-400.
[421] By natural right, Strauss meant that a society's values and morals are hierarchical and dictated by a higher being in the tradition of Judeo-Christian religion. Natural right belongs in the tradition of the ancient Greeks. Nash explained, "The best of ancient political philosophy (particularly Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero) was grounded in rational natural law and emphasized the duties of man…The ancients sought to discover the best regime" (93). Societies that follow this natural right allow the philosophers to lead them to the best regime.

Natural rights, on the other hand, are the belief that every individual deserves the same access to the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This preference for equality leads to relativism, as individuals are led to believe that, as equal citizens, they cannot pass judgment on another individual's actions or beliefs. Strauss believed that this would lead to negative results. Rather, a society needs to hold some absolute truths in common, even if it meant some inequalities in society. Strauss charged that natural rights replaced natural right as modern thinkers such as Hobbes and Locke's ideas of equality gained currency in society. (Strauss, *Natural Right and History*, 248).

Strauss also rebuked thinkers such as Max Weber for promoting rationalism, the idea that using reason alone would lead to good decisions. Strauss viewed rationalism as the seed for cultural relativism and nihilism. Applying reason to all aspects of their lives, Strauss asserted, distorts the distinction of good from evil, bad from good. Actions justified by reason alone do not make them right. Societal norms agreed upon by the masses do not make them correct norms. Strauss argued that cultural relativism, in which societal practices are analyzed within the context of the norms of the society in which they were practiced, is dangerous and leads to nihilism and immorality.

To Strauss, a classical political philosopher represented the ideal authority figure in society who would seek to guide society to the best political order.[422] Strauss referred to philosophers in antiquity, whose morality and perspective derived from theology and helped in their quest to find the best way to govern.[423] Modern philosophers, according to Strauss, lacked absolute morals and thus were not able to lead society to the best regime. They also did not possess the ability to transcend their specific political and cultural environment. Philosophers needed absolute morals and a global perspective, Strauss believed.

For Strauss, Tocqueville was an example of a philosopher to follow because he strove to stay above the parties. Even though Tocqueville did serve as a deputy under Guizot, Strauss did not see him as a politician. Strauss's experience taught him the importance of being able to remain critical of political parties. Although Strauss described himself as a conservative, he carefully maintained his distance from the conservative party so he would not lose his ability to judge.[424] He warned his students, "Conservatism is now the fashion, which doesn't say that it is wrong; I personally have always been conservative, but I begin to loathe after to see the nonsense which is frequently written about that."[425] Smith altogether dismissed the notion of Strauss as a conservative. "Although he came to be associated with conservatism, it is probably more accurate to say that he saw politics neither from the Right nor from the Left but from

[422] For a discussion of the difference between classical political philosophy and modern political science, see Pangle, chapter 4.
[423] Straussian student-turned Straussian critic Anne Norton wrote of the Straussians, "They read the same books over and over: Plato's *Apology*, the *Crito*, and the *Symposium*; Aristotle (the *Ethics*, not the *Politics*); Thucydides, Machiavelli, the *Federalist Papers*, Tocqueville." Anne Norton, *Leo Strauss and The Politics of American Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 33.
[424] "Strauss on Tocqueville," 6-7.
[425] Ibid.

above."[426] Like Tocqueville, Strauss sought to be the umpire par excellence. Eden suggested that the two philosophers shared the same perspective. In viewing the problem of modernity, Strauss and Tocqueville "were in the same boat." Eden described how they both sought to transcend party conflicts in their attempt to show the value of natural right.

> As a man of science, Strauss…sought to recover the social responsibility of classical thought. If Tocqueville practices a socially responsible Socratic rhetoric, as adumbrated by Strauss, it would be a classic way to frustrate the attempts which society will always make, according to both Tocqueville and Strauss, to tyrannize thought…To understand this is to learn why the classical political philosopher became 'the umpire par excellence,' mediating the claims of political parties. Strauss introduces us to classical philosophy by intimating that one may learn this by imitation or example from Tocqueville.[427]

In Tocqueville, Strauss also found the solutions to the problems of democracy. For instance, Strauss noted to his students Tocqueville's observation that religiosity was a corrective to the dangers of democracy. "Whatever the fundamental difficulties may be, democracy can be and remain compatible with freedom and dignity of man only if it is religious. That goes through the whole book. The difficulty is of course that the age of democracy is an age of skepticism and incredulity."[428] Strauss favored spiritual sentiments over formal religion, believing the former could teach the masses morality. "Tocqueville gives all kinds of advice…especially to religious leaders of the democratic age. They must put greater emphasis on morality than on ritual and dogma and so on."[429] Strauss argued that morality and religion would induce the masses to believe in

---

[426] Smith, 179.
[427] Eden, 385. See also James Ceaser, *Reconstructing America: The Symbol of America in Modern Thought* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997). Ceaser drew a straight line from Tocqueville to Strauss as an umpire. "Thanks either to fate or to a natural human capacity to grasp perennial problems, a voice has always emerged to respond to the threats to political science. This task, which was assumed by Publius at the end of the eighteenth century and by Alexis de Tocqueville in the nineteenth century, fell in the twentieth century to Leo Strauss."
[428] "Strauss on Tocqueville," 10.
[429] Ibid.

something greater and wiser. This belief in absolute morals and a higher authority is key for getting them to realize their limitations and to accept inequalities in a democracy. Strauss's admiration of Plato's *Republic*, an authoritarian state, can be seen in his discussion of democracy.[430] Strauss aimed to apply aspects of an authoritarian state described in Plato's *Republic* to the United States.

Strauss did not think it was possible for democracy to cultivate greatness in the average citizen. In the absence of greatness, Strauss believed virtue would encourage citizens to strive to lead a good life. By good, Strauss did not mean a life devoted to achieve materialistic goals. Like Tocqueville, Strauss believed that religious sentiments encouraged democratic citizens to make virtuous choices. Strauss did not feel religion should be used to promote political agendas, but believed that a functioning civil society required religious citizens. Tocqueville's analysis of religion was why Strauss ultimately accepted Tocqueville's cure for democracy.[431]

Strauss almost rejected Tocqueville for historicist thinking. Strauss called historicism, or the belief that the meaning of movements and theories need to be understood within the milieu of their time, "self-contradictory or absurd."[432] In *Natural Right and History*, Strauss argued that historicism has led men to confuse facts with morals, virtuous with debased actions. Tocqueville's presupposition in *Democracy* was that conditions of equality in America led to new practices and theories of democracy. In essence, the founding of America preceded democratic sentiments. This view completely opposed Strauss's view that historical events occur within "an unchanging framework

[430] In his 1962 work, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, Karl Popper argued that twentieth-century fascist movements derived in part from Plato's views of Sparta.
[431] See also Strauss's lectures on Plato's Meno 1, (1966), in which he labels Tocqueville a historicist. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LpZKKmVZ1DY. Mention in video appears 5:20.
[432] Strauss, *Natural Right and History*, 25.

which persists in all changes of human knowledge of both facts and principles."[433] Arguing that democratic sentiments did not originate with the founding of America, Strauss wrote, "There is a very clear line from Europe to some of the American founding fathers."[434] For Strauss, Tocqueville's observation that conditions of equality led to new theories of democracy was an example of historicist thinking.

Strauss pointed out that Tocqueville did not apply a set of objective criteria to the two social systems to determine the better regime, but accepted democracy as superior because he felt that Providence declared democracy victorious over aristocracy. Strauss found this argument "obviously insufficient because the fact that a great social movement is victorious does not prove that God willed it for men to accept it for the good. It could very well be divine punishment inflicted on men for their sins."[435] Strauss deemed Tocqueville's method as dangerous as Weber's value-free social science, since Tocqueville "doesn't see any criterion for deciding the ultimate superiority."[436] Without applying values, Tocqueville's analysis of the inevitability of democracy was flawed. "It goes without saying that the same argument which favors democracy in Tocqueville's argument would favor any successful anti-democratic movement in a later age very obviously."[437] Modern democracy did not, Strauss argued, fulfill "the will of the New Testament on political things."[438]

However, Strauss ultimately concluded that because "someone else had decided for him,"[439] Tocqueville could provide a critical analysis of democracy. Tocqueville

[433] Ibid., 23-4.
[434] "Strauss on Tocqueville," 4.
[435] Ibid., 8-9.
[436] Ibid., 9.
[437] Ibid.
[438] Ibid.
[439] Ibid., 8.

"confronts democracy with aristocracy in order to bring the dangers to which democracy is exposed."[440] The grave dangers that Tocqueville observed, Strauss explained, was the growth of state power, replacement of a small elite group by the masses as the intellectual authority, and the threat to human greatness. Strauss considered these developments as dangers because they restricted citizens' abilities to lead their society to the best regime. He also appreciated Tocqueville's judgment that religion benefited democracy, and believed Tocqueville's endorsement of religion was an unexpressed belief in natural right.

Strauss understood Tocqueville as a wise aristocrat who feared the masses, equality, and secularism. Strauss's followers took from this interpretation that democracy faced constant threats, which could be combated only by a powerful, virtuous, and elite leadership.

The Straussian Tocqueville

Described as one of Leo Strauss' most prominent students, Allan Bloom alluded to the Straussian teaching of Tocqueville in his influential and controversial 1987 work, *The Closing of the American Mind*.

> Tocqueville taught me the importance of the university to democratic society. His noble book, *Democracy in America*, gave voice to my inchoate sentiments. His portrait of the 'Intellectual Life of the Americans' is the mirror in which we can see ourselves. But, because the broader perspective he brings is alien, we do not immediately recognize ourselves. In my experience, students at first are bored by Tocqueville's account of the American mind, but, if they are really made to pay attention, they are finally riveted and alarmed by it.[441]

[440] Ibid., 7.
[441] Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1987).

Bloom could have been referring to Marvin Zetterbaum, a political scientist who received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1960. Taking Bloom's suggestion to conduct a study of Tocqueville for his dissertation, Zetterbaum wrote *Tocqueville and The Problem of Democracy*. Part of his study appeared as the chapter "Alexis de Tocqueville" in *History of Political Philosophy* (1963), edited by Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey. Relating the essential points of *Democracy* for an educated public, Zetterbaum described a resigned and pessimistic aristocrat whose misgivings about democracy outweighed his positives. This reading of Tocqueville is the most detailed published article on Tocqueville with such a close association to Strauss. Zetterbaum reiterated several points that Strauss had made on Tocqueville in his lectures. He also situated Strauss's Tocqueville in an American context. Tocqueville was still lauded for his disapproval of the leveling of society in a democracy, but the consequences of equality changed from Strauss's fear of another Holocaust to Zetterbaum's concerns about the middle classes' lack of intellect and business acumen.

For Zetterbaum, Tocqueville insightfully connected self-interest and soft despotism. Zetterbaum explained that though equality holds out the promise that every individual can attain the material goods they inherently desire, not everyone has the ability to succeed in a competitive business environment. Zetterbaum contended that Americans looked to government to safeguard their possessions, as they feared their loss at the hands of more successful competitors. He stated, "Man's soul is thus constantly excited, forever battered, and hopelessly wearied in the struggle…He seeks a solution which will satisfy his most intense desire while relieving him of the anguish to which it

gives rise."[442] Therefore, they willingly gave up individual liberty to safeguard their property. Zetterbaum remarked, "Equality thus prepares man to surrender his freedom to safeguard equality itself."[443] Already, the German context of Strauss's analysis of Tocqueville is removed. Zetterbaum took from Strauss's reading of Tocqueville that equality was to be feared because it could lead to loss of property and profits, not because it could lead to Hitler. For instance, Zetterbaum argued that property rights would never be secure because of the eternal struggle between the rich and poor.[444] Zetterbaum blamed soft despotism on the envy of the masses.[445] He explained how Tocqueville "despairs of instructing the poor to realize that it is against their own interest to impoverish the rich."[446] The middle classes were also "frightened at the prospect of losing what they have to those more able than themselves [and] turn to the government as the only power of protecting their rights and goods and restraining the ambitions of the few."[447]

---

[442] Marvin Zetterbaum, "Alexis de Tocqueville," in *History of Political Philosophy*, ed. Joseph Cropsey and Leo Strauss, 3rd ed. (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1987), 769.
[443] Ibid.
[444] Compare to Charles Taylor's description of soft despotism in "The Dangers of Soft Despotism," in *The Essential Communitarian Reader,* ed. Amitai Etzioni (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. 1998). Taylor actually described soft despotism as a tyranny of the minority—ordinary citizens want to be heard, but cannot due to powerful lobbies and 'big government.' Taylor described the Press, which Tocqueville maintained was the only way for ordinary citizens to address themselves to the nation, as controlled by influential but narrow interest groups that block access for ordinary citizens. Taylor also argued that citizens do protect their freedoms in other ways, pointing to specific examples of the reaction to Watergate, and judicial decisions "in the light of the Constitution, not legislation," such as Brown vs. Board of Education and Roe vs. Wade. Taylor stated, "All this makes for a lot of activity. A society in which this goes on is hardly a despotism." 47-8.
[445] Paul Rahe's recent work, *Soft Despotism, Democracy's Drift: Montesquieu, Rousseau, Tocqueville & the Modern Prospect* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009) relied on Zetterbaum's reading of Tocqueville. Concerned with the lack of enthusiasm displayed by democratic citizens after the triumph of democracy in the world wars and Cold War, Rahe turned to eighteenth and nineteenth-century French philosophers for an explanation. Arguing that the idea of natural rights led to a soft despotism in democracy, Rahe used Tocqueville's observation of an inequality of the intellect as an explanation why democratic citizens accepted and encouraged state centralization (262).
[446] Zetterbaum, 771.
[447] Ibid., 772.

Like Strauss, Zetterbaum saw in Tocqueville the ways to get the masses to value inequalities in order to combat soft despotism. For instance, Strauss impressed upon Zetterbaum the importance of religion for instilling morality into its citizens. Zetterbaum declared, "Tocqueville affirms that freedom is impossible without morality, and morality impossible without religion."[448] Religion reminded materialistic citizens to help their fellow citizens, and that they should not conduct social or business affairs with just the short-term in consideration.[449] Zetterbaum also found Tocqueville's endorsement of associations and free institutions valuable. Describing how the main use of associations and free institutions would be the 'enlargement of view' of the masses, Zetterbaum wrote, "Tocqueville saw in associations a means… of overcoming that mediocrity to which democracy was prone."[450]

Like Strauss, Zetterbaum considered defining Tocqueville as a modern thinker. He detected in Tocqueville "fundamental agreement with the presuppositions of modern political thought; despite apparent departures, Tocqueville follows in the tradition originating with Machiavelli and continued in the natural right teaching of Hobbes. The political problem of man is solved by lowering one's standards—the doctrine of self-interest rightly understood does not aim at lofty objects."[451] Zetterbaum also showed that Tocqueville's thoughts on morality were precursors to relativism. "Tocqueville

---

[448] Ibid., 779.
[449] Ibid., 777. Straussians stressed the importance of "postponing the immediate gratification of their desires in the expectation of a more certain or greater degree of satisfaction at a later time…" (776). For a modern argument on this theme, see David Brooks' article, which argued that the American system of meritocracy that replaced the power elite has failed because unlike the 'men who drink with their lunch,' the new business elite does not make business decisions based on long-term goals. In *Tocqueville and the New Science of Politics* (2009), John Koritansky viewed civil religion as the solution to modern society. Koritansky, part of the Chicago school, cited his indebtedness to Zetterbaum, and his teachers Bloom and Cropsey.
[450] Ibid., 775.
[451] Ibid., 777.

argues…that moral obligation derives from two sources—either from the wants and interests common to men, or from the particular needs of a specific nation or ruling group."[452] His reading reflected Strauss's fear that cultural relativism would lead to low standards in modern society, which would in turn lead to atomization and centralization.[453]

Zetterbaum's reading of Tocqueville also reflected Strauss's fear of the stifling of the intellectually gifted. In a society of equals, the majority believes it conveys more wisdom and intelligence than individual citizens. Zetterbaum described the effect of this on society:

> The authority of the majority is such that even the minority at last assent to this assault upon the intellect. This, Tocqueville observes, marks a new phenomenon in the history of mankind. The majority not only demand conduct that conforms but strive also to make it impossible for individuals to conceive of nonconformity. To hold an opinion on an important matter contrary to that of the majority is not merely imprudent or unavailing but even dehumanizing…The tyranny of the majority over the minds of those who are its intellectual superiors absolutizes the disposition of democracy toward mediocrity.[454]

Again, Zetterbaum took Strauss's reading of Tocqueville to a new direction. Strauss feared that the loss of an influential elite minority would mean another Holocaust, not just mediocrity. Zetterbaum's article on Tocqueville Americanized Strauss's

---

[452] Ibid., 781.

[453] Though Tocqueville did believe that extreme centralization of political power "ultimately enervates society and thus in the long run weakens government itself," he did not agree that its cause was so singular. Rather, Tocqueville stated, "This gradual weakening of the individual vis-à-vis society manifests itself in a thousand ways." Tocqueville found that centralization occur in events beyond the control of individuals and "has grown everywhere in a thousand different ways. Wars, revolutions, and conquests have contributed to its development."

Also, Tocqueville did not specifically mention the United States in his analysis of hyper-centralization. Instead, he referenced Europe and France quite often. Scholars have argued that Part II, published five years after Part I, was not even about America. They note the few mentions of America, as compared to Part I. Even in "What Kind of Despotism Democratic Nations Have to Fear," in which Tocqueville observed the rise of a frightening, new tyranny, America is not mentioned. This is the chapter on which Zetterbaum and Bloom based their Tocquevillean critique of modernity.

[454] Zetterbaum, 772.

Tocqueville. Without the context of Hitler and the Holocaust, the fears of equality lost their dire consequences. Strauss also influenced self-described Straussian-Tocqueville scholar Harvey Mansfield's reading of Tocqueville. Mansfield applied those fears to contemporary American political debates.

Mansfield and Winthrop's Tocqueville: A Liberal with Depth

Although Harvey C. Mansfield never took a course by Leo Strauss, he has identified himself as a Straussian.[455] He has been described as "[p]erhaps the leading Straussian at the end of the twentieth century."[456] Though she never publicly identified herself as a Straussian, Winthrop's work on women and race indicate she also held Straussian beliefs.[457] Together, they translated *Democracy in America* (2000). Outspoken academics with strong conservative political beliefs, Mansfield and Winthrop's translation attracted intense scrutiny, in part because it could influence thousands of readers of *Democracy*. Their translation has been the source of intense controversy within the educated reading public. Their eighty-six-page introduction to their translation has offered a post-totalitarian Straussian reading of Tocqueville.

Mansfield's analysis of Tocqueville largely echoed that of Strauss. Deeming the aristocracy more capable than the masses to determine just and unjust, Mansfield and Winthrop depicted Tocqueville as a capable umpire to judge the new system of

[455] Mancini, 204. Mansfield was finishing college and beginning his Ph.D. work at Harvard when *Natural Right* was published.
[456] Ibid., 209.
[457] For example, see Delba Winthrop, "Tocqueville's American Woman and 'The True Conception of Democratic Progress,'" in *Feminist Interpretations of Alexis de Tocqueville*, ed. Jill Locke and Eileen Hunt Botting (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), 177-197; Delba Winthrop, "Race and Freedom in Tocqueville" in James W. Muller, ed., *The Revival of Constitutionalism* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1988), 151-171.

democracy.[458] Mansfield wrote, "When Tocqueville wrote his book, it was to speak reprovingly, and sometimes severely, to the partisans of his day for and against democracy."[459] Mansfield and Winthrop, like Strauss, viewed Tocqueville as able to judge the new democratic system because he came from aristocracy. Mansfield also labeled Tocqueville a historicist. While Aristotle argued that democracy and aristocracy "offer an open choice ever present to human beings always arguably equal and arguably unequal, Tocqueville describes them as distinct historical epochs; once there was aristocracy, now we have democracy."[460] They were frustrated that Tocqueville only went 'halfway with Aristotle,' meaning that Tocqueville never decided whether democracy or America came first.[461]

Mansfield and Winthrop used political terms to classify Tocqueville. They decided Tocqueville was a liberal conservative. In "A Plea for Constitutional Conservatism," Mansfield asserted that conservatism is so closely related to liberalism, it "is liberalism's little brother."[462] Since they are part of the same family, conservatives "must take on the task of defending liberalism."[463] He argued that to protect democracy, reforms must be made slowly. Also, rather than make decisions in the name of liberalism, the consequences of each proposed reform on an individual basis must be considered. To

[458] In response to this line of argument—quality of virtue and ability to judge due to aristocratic background, a recent trend by authors' introductions to *Democracy* has been to portray Tocqueville as immoral with innate superior intelligence. Deemphasizing Tocqueville's aristocratic background, Joseph Epstein in *Alexis de Tocqueville: Democracy's Guide* (Eminent Lives, 2006) portrayed Tocqueville able to produce such a masterpiece because he was a wunderkind with superior intelligence. Epstein and Isaac Kramnick, in his introduction to *Democracy in America* (2003), noted that Tocqueville was not faithful to his wife, Mary.
[459] Harvey C. Mansfield, introduction to *Democracy in America*, by Alexis de Tocqueville eds. and trans. Harvey Mansfield and Delba Winthrop (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000), xviii.
[460] Ibid., xxvi.
[461] Ibid., xlvi.
[462] Harvey C. Mansfield, "A Plea for Constitutional Conservatism," in Charles W. Dunn, ed. *The Future of Conservatism: Conflict and Consensus in the Post-Reagan Era* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2007): 43.
[463] Ibid., 45.

this end, statesmen should be above politics. Mansfield saw in *Democracy* "the conservative spirit of distrust of liberal theory in partnership with an appreciation for the customs and mores of democratic liberty in the actual practice of a particular regime."[464] Echoing Tocqueville's framing of democracy as a 'continuous democratic revolution,' Mansfield cautioned that a liberal democracy "hurtles forward toward more democracy without considering whether more democracy is in the interest of a liberal regime."[465] In the end, though, the actual examples that Mansfield used as reforms that should be rejected—affirmative action, equal rights for women and homosexuals—have typically belonged on the conservative platform.

In their introduction to *Democracy*, Mansfield and Winthrop methodically tore down the image of Tocqueville as a liberal. They portrayed him as more conservative than other liberals of his day such as Mill, Guizot, and Constant. Mansfield and Winthrop then showed how Tocqueville's influences—Pascal, Montesquieu, and Rousseau—were all critics of modernity.[466] Tocqueville, Mansfield and Winthrop noted, "has none of the enthusiasm of modernity in the heyday of its founding ambition."[467] Resonating Strauss, Mansfield argued that Tocqueville was a conservative because he believed that democracy required virtue.

---

[464] Ibid., 52.
[465] Ibid., 51.
[466] Referencing Allan Bloom and John Koritansky, Mansfield and Winthrop remarked on the connection between Rousseau and Tocqueville, "Of the Rousseau in Tocqueville there are also interpreters, one of whom considers him so close to Rousseau that the problem is more to distinguish them to assimilate them…Tocqueville does not direct attention to the 'intimate relation' he had with Rousseau, it is suggested, because he wanted to reconcile his readers in Europe, the well-born and well-educated, to democracy; and to use Rousseau's name, which was anathema to such people, was not the way to do that…They share the general outlook that aristocracy is dead, democracy is inevitable, and the question of modern politics is between egalitarian democracy and egalitarian tyranny" (xxxvi).
[467] Ibid., xxx. Mansfield stated, "Pascal was not a liberal, and it is strange to see plain marks of his influence in the thought of a liberal…Pascal tells of the vanity of human knowledge and of the misery of the human soul, conclusions in which Christianity and his philosophy converge. They are also matters that liberalism, with its faith in applied science and confidence in the self, would generally rather avoid or ignore…Thanks in good part to what he learned from Pascal, Tocqueville is a liberal with depth" (xxxi).

> Formal liberalism relies on institutions instead of virtue…Tocqueville believes that the working of institutions requires virtue, not lofty virtue but the virtue available in democracy ranging from raw intractability to active self-interest to moderate ambition. Formal liberalism does not appreciate that formal practices and institutions in a democracy have to be defended against the laziness and impatience of a democratic people."[468]

Mansfield and Winthrop also took from Strauss the understanding that greatness is inseparable from freedom, and that the masses are incapable of attaining greatness.[469] The masses' preference for equality leads to a vicious circle, as they look to the federal government to protect their equality, but do not consider how their individual liberty becomes diminished. The majority, Mansfield and Winthrop contended, "cannot be expected to discern a common good…even if they should sincerely desire it; much less can they see the means to effect it."[470]

For Strauss, the next best alternative was to guide the masses to not hurt America: if they cannot be taught to make informed choices based on self-interest well understood, they hopefully can at least be taught to not make bad choices based on self-interest wrongly understood. Writing in the 1940s and 50s in America, Strauss witnessed the rise of consumerism and materialism. Spiritualistic religion would show them the value of virtue and the value of delaying immediate gratification. Strauss was also concerned that individuals are too weak and apathetic to fight off a dangerous leader. Writing with the experience of Weimar Germany in mind, Strauss presented the threats to democracy as immediate.

Writing in a post-totalitarian environment, Mansfield and Winthrop did not share this fear. The German context was not present, and so their Straussian interpretation led

[468] Ibid., xlix.
[469] Ibid., xxiv.
[470] Ibid., lv.

to new directions. They were not worried that America would fall to fascism or communism, but feared it would lose its 'greatness.' Greatness to Mansfield and Winthrop meant superior intelligence and the ability to make informed choices based on what is good for the common good. This takes reason and virtue. The new upper class is intelligent but based on modern thinking about equality. This type of thinking is wrong for America, Mansfield and Winthrop explained. Influenced by Strauss, they argued that not everyone has the intelligence, virtue or ability to make well-informed choices that would benefit America.

Mansfield and Winthrop showed that Strauss's reading of Tocqueville was useful in a variety of political climates. The Civil Rights Movement and Women's Rights Movement replaced the importance of totalitarianism to Mansfield and Winthrop. Like Strauss, they wanted the masses to become aware of the inequalities among citizens. In her work on women in America, Winthrop used Tocqueville to argue that equality between the sexes would not lead to the happiness or self-fulfillment of women. Describing the separate spheres of men and women as an intelligent and effective division of labor, Winthrop believed equality posed a serious threat democratic life. In "Tocqueville's American Woman and 'The True Conception of Democratic Progress'" she argued that Tocqueville "fears that 'the simple and natural' pleasures experienced at home will be lost to both men and women. With these natural, private pleasures the inclination and opportunity to appreciate virtue for what it is and to see the limitations of democratic justice and of public life as such may also be lost."[471]

For Mansfield and Winthrop, the first step in accepting inequalities would be to get the masses to love political liberty. For Mansfield, political freedom is the most

[471] Winthrop, "Tocqueville's American Woman and 'The True Conception of Democratic Progress,'" 194.

important quality of a democracy.[472] However, the appreciation of liberty is not inherent in individuals, and so must be taught. "Tocqueville commends America's numerous local governments and nongovernmental associations not for their efficiency or even their justice, but because they develop citizens' attachments to political freedom."[473] Mansfield and Winthrop gave the example of Tocqueville's analysis of the freed slave in America to argue that love of liberty is not inherent.

Once citizens gain the taste for political freedom, they should then be taught to recognize their own limits in securing and protecting liberty. Following Tocqueville, Mansfield and Winthrop emphasized the benefits of the jury system. Tocqueville appreciated the idea of average citizens serving on juries because they were forced to come out of their self-centered circle and think about issues larger then their own. Mansfield and Winthrop inferred from Tocqueville that the jurors also learned to accept inequalities in a democracy.

> It teaches responsibility; in having to form a judgment and then defend it, jurors are forced not only to think but also to act like sovereigns. But since this can be hard to do, they may want to listen to the arguments of lawyers and to the views of other jurors, as well as to the judge's instructions. Because the final say will still be their own, they can accept without resentment the guidance of others, some of whom may be wiser than they are.[474]

Mansfield, a long-time conservative, has been known for being outspoken and for his right-wing views.[475] He has used Tocqueville to argue in favor of a strong executive

---

[472] See Harvey C. Mansfield, "What Obama Isn't Saying: The Apolitical Politics of Progressivism," *The Weekly Standard*, February 8, 2010, http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/what-obama-isnt-saying?page=3. Mansfield stated, "Next to liberty of the mind, there is no more important liberty than political liberty."

[473] Mansfield, *Democracy*, lxxiv.

[474] Ibid., lxxv.

[475] For instance, speaking on behalf of former Harvard president Lawrence Summers, who drew national attention in 2005 when he made disparaging comments about women scientists as less intelligent than their

branch, which has meant a president willing to disregard the will of the majority and sacrifice civil liberties of his country's citizens for a larger and noble cause. Mansfield has noted that Tocqueville saw signs of weakness in a president who solely led by following the wishes of the public. Tocqueville "contemptuously regarded Jackson as weak for having been 'the slave of the majority.'"[476] With such a politically driven view of Tocqueville, it is no wonder that Mansfield and Winthrop's translation of *Democracy* caused more debate and drama than did the other three new translations published with a few years.

Lost (or Found) in Translation

The Mansfield-Winthrop edition of *Democracy* followed George Lawrence's translation, published thirty-four years earlier. The George Lawrence translation, edited by Jacob Peter Mayer, began by promising readers that Tocqueville was still relevant and important figure in America. As a result of talks with scholars such as Stanley Hoffman, Daniel Lerner, Anne Freedgood and David Riesman, Mayer became further convinced of Tocqueville's use to contemporary society. "I have been strengthened in my conviction that Tocqueville's view of socio-historical phenomena has still many unexplored lessons for us."[477]

---

male colleagues, Mansfield argued that 'feminist' women professors used intimidation tactics to bully Summers into apologizing for his remarks. "[Summers'] accusers were relentless, and always with feminists, humorless. They complained of being humiliated, but they took no care not to humiliate a proud man. They complained too of being intimidated, but they were doing their best to intimidate Summers—and they succeeded." Harvey Mansfield, "Fear and Intimidation at Harvard," *The Weekly Standard*, March 7, 2005, http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/005/297gfbih.asp.

[476] Harvey Mansfield "The Case for the Strong Executive," *Claremont Review of Books*, Spring 2007. Reprinted in the *Wall Street Journal* May 2, 2007.

[477] J.P. Mayer, foreword to Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* trans. George Lawrence and ed. J.P. Mayer (New York: HarperPerennial, 1966).

To help readers learn Tocqueville's lessons, the George Lawrence translation offered Tocqueville as an author able to be read easily by general readers. The Mansfield-Winthrop translation, however, targeted a more serious audience. Aiming for a literal but readable *Democracy*, they chose to translate word-for-word, which they hoped would prompt readers to try harder to understand better Tocqueville's original intentions and thoughts. Also, Mansfield and Winthrop chose not to write annotations to help explain Tocqueville better to a larger audience. Remarking on the few annotations that appear throughout the edition, American intellectual historian Gordon Wood mused that the editor "seem to have designed those few for undergraduate use—limiting them mostly, for example, to such things as dating the invention of the printing press or identifying Raphael as an Italian Renaissance painter."[478]

Despite, or perhaps due to the admonition by the editors for readers to study the book rather than pick out quotations at random, the reception by general readers and popular literary critics was overall positive. Reviewing the work for *The Partisan Review*, Peter Wood called it "an excellent translation" and "an excellent opportunity to read what has seemed a thoroughly familiar book with fresh eyes."[479] For Wood, Mansfield and Winthrop's literalism was worth the extra time needed to access Tocqueville's thoughts. "We are meant to be reminded that…Tocqueville breathed a more rarified air than we; that they achieved insights more profound than can be combed from the sumptuous interpretative traditions in which they have been wrapped; and that, as with all powerful and original thinkers, they sometimes expressed themselves in odd and difficult ways."[480]

[478] Wood, "Tocqueville's Lesson."
[479] Peter Wood, "The Ultimate Tocqueville," *The Partisan Review* 68, no. 2 (Spring 2001): 329, 331.
[480] Ibid., 331.

Wood's only major complaint concerned Mansfield and Winthrop's appropriation of Tocqueville as a political theorist. An anthropologist, Wood made the case for Tocqueville as an anthropologist, arguing that Tocqueville integrated various methods that anthropologists use, such as historical research, texts, first-hand observation, and careful analysis. Wood especially approved of Tocqueville's goal of understanding society as a whole, an interest replaced by an interest in specific groups in society seen to have suffered under majority rule in a democracy.[481] By drawing Tocqueville into the discipline of anthropology, Wood hoped to stir renewed interest among other anthropologists in studying society as a whole as opposed to the lasting trend of focusing on the 'margins' of society. "Perhaps Mansfield and Winthrop's new translation of *Democracy in America* will inspire a new Tocqueville to write a *Democracy* in Russia or an ambitious account of the laws and mores of one of the other distinct societies emerging in our globalized economy."[482]

Gordon S. Wood also wrote approvingly of the new edition. He downplayed the bold translation style of Mansfield and Winthrop and instead focused on the significance of Mansfield and Winthrop's contextualization of Tocqueville. "It is not the translation…that makes this new version vastly different from other editions; it is the editors' substantial seventy-page introduction." This introduction, "political theory of a very high order," placed Tocqueville's thought into historical reality, of which Gordon Wood approved.[483] After summarizing a few of the main features of Tocqueville's new type of political science such as *l'etat social* (the social state) and *semblables* (those like themselves or fellow men), which the translators highlight in their introduction, Gordon

[481] Ibid., 331, 332.
[482] Ibid., 332.
[483] Wood, "Tocqueville's Lesson."

Wood wondered why Tocqueville as a great political theorist has remained relevant in the twenty-first century. Wood expanded Joyce Appleby's argument on the power of the culture of equality that dominated American life in 1830, extending that power through today.

> The Jacksonian era was the period that defined the basic elements of America's individualistic and egalitarian get-up-and-go materialistic culture. Tocqueville came to America at the very moment when Americans were constructing their sense of nationhood—a sense of free and scrambling moneymaking individuals pursuing their happiness. This conception of the liberal American dream remains alive and influential even today…This is why Tocqueville's great work of political theory, even though it grew out of the peculiar circumstances of Jacksonian America, still retains its power.[484]

Other reviewers have focused mainly on Mansfield and Winthrop's translation choice. Steven Holt approved of the word-for-word translation approach, deeming their efforts successful. "Tocqueville…would welcome the care and application shown by Mansfield and Winthrop in providing a renewed means of access to his ideas."[485] Reviewing the work for *Wilson Quarterly*, Michael Novack also praised the new translation.

> In retrospect, I am glad that I was introduced to this classic in the melodious, freer translation of Reeve and Bradley. But I would now direct new readers to Mansfield-Winthrop, where they are assured of getting much closer to the original thought. A rare spirit such as Tocqueville's, after all, induces respect; one wishes to fit one's mind as exactly as possible into the nuances of his thinking. It is not often that scholars of high stature show such reverence for greatness in others that they submit their own egos to full and faithful service, but that is the gift Mansfield and Winthrop render Tocqueville, and the noble service they render us.[486]

---

[484] Ibid.
[485] Stephen Holt, "Democracy in America/The Ideal of Alexis de Tocqueville," *History Today* 51, no. 5 (May 2001): 58.
[486] Michael Novack, "History," *Wilson Quarterly* 25, no. 2 (Spring 2001): 123.

Reviewers took Mansfield's political beliefs into consideration. Reviewing the work for *The New York Times*, Caleb Crain announced, "Tocqueville has joined the Neocons!"[487] Mansfield and Winthrop did not label Tocqueville a neocon anywhere in their introduction or translation, and made an effort to assure readers that they were not offering their own interpretation of Tocqueville. Knowing their conservative views and taking into consideration Mansfield and Winthrop's public thanks in their acknowledgements to two right-wing foundations,[488] Crain made the case of Tocqueville as neocon for them.

> After all, Tocqueville praised America's lack of a centralized government, thought religion was salutary for democracy, believed that unfettered capitalism rewarded the deserving better than any communistic system could…and worried about the 'tyranny of the majority,' which, if its members were poor, tended to be prodigal with the government's money.[489]

Crain saw evidence in the introduction and text of Mansfield and Winthrop's underlying political agenda. For instance, the translators' reluctance to include an index and urging of readers to read Tocqueville better indicated for Crain that this was "a translation for the few, rather than the many," and should only be read by educated English-speaking conservatives.[490] He also highlighted a few instances in which word choices indicated political leanings as well. "The French word vulgaire has probably

---

[487] Caleb Crain, "Tocqueville for the Neocons: A New Translation of the French Social Philosopher that the Political Right Can Embrace," *The New York Times*, January 14, 2001, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/01/14/books/tocqueville-for-the-neocons.html?scp=1&sq=Caleb+Crain%2C+%93Tocqueville+for+the+Neocons%3A+A+New+Translation+of+the+French+Social+&st=nyt.

[488] Mansfield and Winthrop thanked the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation and John M. Olin Foundation for financial help. They also thanked Robert S. Krupp through the American Council of Trustees and Alumni. Although the two foundations do not tote themselves as right wing or conservative groups, several political watchgroup organizations such as Media Transparency, Rightweb.com, and People for the American Way brand their programs, missions, and language as right wing and conservative.

[489] Crain.

[490] Ibid.

been translated as 'vulgar' because of Mansfield and Winthrop's interest in the feudal undertones that survive in modern language, but the choice is distracting to a lay reader."[491] Like Gordon Wood, Crain believed in Tocqueville's relevance to contemporary society. However, Crain limited Tocqueville's relevance to conservatives. "What has most likely attracted conservatives of late is Tocqueville's notion of mild despotism. If a democracy went bad, Tocqueville thought, it would probably deprive its citizens of freedom not by bullying but by cozening."[492]

By 2003 this new translation had received such attention that the journal, *French Politics, Culture and Society*, devoted a section to translating Tocqueville, with special attention paid to the Mansfield-Winthrop translation. In that section, Tocqueville scholars focused more on the translation method and style by Mansfield and Winthrop, and held a more negative view of the product than reviewers such as Holt and Wood. Arthur Goldhammer, whose own translation of *Democracy in America* was about to be published, set aside the political leanings and intentions of Mansfield and Winthrop to focus on the actual translation. Using various passages throughout the book, Goldhammer highlighted about twenty-five examples of cases in which Mansfield and Winthrop provided inappropriate, confusing, or wrong translations.

Political Scientist and Tocqueville scholar Melvin Richter issued a harsh critique of Mansfield and Winthrop's objectives and results. Richter disagreed with their goal of producing a translation that provides a literal translation of Tocqueville's words into English. Richter, like several other reviewers, noted that this style leads to 'stylistic

[491] Ibid.
[492] Ibid.

awkwardness' and confusion for the readers.[493] Comparing a passage from the French text edited by Jardin, Lamberti and Schleifer to the Mansfield-Winthrop edition, he argued that the passage, which in English contains four 'its' in a sentence, obviated the meaning of Tocqueville's original thought and demanded much needless effort from the readers to understand the English edition. For Richter, translators should always keep in mind the value and use of the work, which Mansfield and Winthrop did not.

> What gives Tocqueville's style its vigor and flavor are his rhythms, contrasts, and metaphors. These cannot be approximated by word-for-word translation and by following French sentence structure…Those who attempt to do so risk alienating readers either by making Tocqueville seem archaic or else by causing dismay through their own insufficient mastery of a style and rhetoric once practiced fluently in another time and place.[494]

Richter also pointed out that favoring literalness leads to errors in translating certain words and concepts, such as *tuteur*, *pays police*, and *l'état social*, and alters Tocqueville's meaning in a dramatic fashion. For example, Richter explained how Mansfield and Winthrop's choice of translating *l'état social* as social state, could connote for contemporary readers socialism or the welfare state, ideas which held different meanings in Tocqueville's time. Richter attributed these errors to the translators' disregard of Tocqueville's personal notes of his readings. If they had read his notes on Guizot's lectures or personal correspondence, for example, they would have understood better the pedigree of Tocqueville's thought and had better insight into how he thought. Overall, Richter argued that Mansfield and Winthrop not only had misplaced objectives, but also failed, or as Richter phrased it 'tank,' in their attempt. Richter's final judgment stated this explicitly.

---

[493] Melvin Richter, "The Mansfield-Winthrop 'Democracy in America': a literal translation and its consequences," (Forum: translating Tocqueville) *French Politics, Culture and Society* 21 (Spring 2003): 125.
[494] Ibid.

> In my judgment, this translation fails in its attempt to turn the text of *Democracy in America* into English prose approximating Tocqueville's style in French. Because of the translators' insistence upon rendering Tocqueville's text word for word, and by retaining his word order and sentence structure in French, they have created a style that is neither English nor French. Nor have they achieved their principal goals: 'to convey Tocqueville's thought as he held it,' while maintaining consistency in translating his key concepts and terms. Much of this translation remains opaque and imprecise. Because of the translators' unqualified commitment to a literalness divorced from historically situated French usage and political context, many English-speaking readers will not [sic] fully comprehend what Tocqueville intended to tell his carefully-targeted French audience.[495]

Political Scientist Cheryl Welch agreed with Richter's critique of the Mansfield-Winthrop translation. She accepted the translators' goal of removing themselves from the author-reader relationship, but argued that doing so led to what Welch termed unexpected consequences. She provided the example of the translators' misguided choice of equating the French term *inquiet*, which "means never being at rest, feverish, agitated" to the English word restive, which "derives from the idea of not moving or refusing to move" but has since been associated with political rebelliousness.[496] Welch felt the word *restless* fit better with Tocqueville's description of how Americans remained personally unsatisfied despite material wealth. She subtly argued that by choosing to use *restive*, the translators fashioned political meaning out of Tocqueville's musings on family and personal life in America.

The controversy surrounding the Mansfield-Winthrop translation indicates there are high stakes in interpreting and translating Tocqueville. Strauss believed that readers should have direct access to authors' ideas, and favored literal translations. He also

---

[495] Ibid., 127.
[496] Cheryl Welch, "A New 'Democracy in America," (Forum: translating Tocqueville) *French Politics, Culture and Society* 21 (Spring 2003): 132.

believed it was the philosophers' role and ability to understand the direct ideas of other theorists. Strauss also concluded from reading classical authors such as Sophocles and Plato that the most important messages of the work were often imbedded and hidden in the middle, rather than beginning or ending, of the text. Careful reading would uncover the hidden and true intent of the author. Anti-Straussians have expressed their concern that Mansfield and Winthrop's Straussian beliefs impacted their translation of Tocqueville. Critics believed that thousands of readers would get a wrong interpretation of Tocqueville's ideas, and wrongly associate him with a political party. They would also misunderstand the historical context and instead read him as a twentieth-century conservative.[497]

Conclusion

Strauss's reading of Tocqueville reflected his unique perspective of democracy and America. Like Arendt, Strauss was unable to understand how a country could feel so lucky when it should be preparing for the worst. Both believed Tocqueville felt similarly. As in Arendt's case, America was not Strauss's first choice of a country in which to live. However, Arendt continually made an effort to re-evaluate her belief system in light of new experiences. Her concerns about democracy stemmed from the exceptional historical experience of Nazi Germany. Her faith in the majority eventually overcame her fears of the majority. Strauss' sober analysis of American democracy, however, revealed an underlying distaste for majoritarian democracy. Although he escaped Nazi

[497] See Melvin Richter "Tocqueville and Algeria," *The Review of Politics* 25 (July 1963): 362-398. This article also marked one of the first serious attempts in the twentieth century to offer an unbiased critique of Tocqueville. Using Tocqueville's writings on Algeria, Richter showed how Tocqueville could maintain a liberal ideology while enforcing an anti-liberal agenda.

Germany, Strauss did not shed his interest in fascism. Strauss took from Tocqueville that qualities of fascism, such as strong authoritarian leadership, social hierarchy, spiritualism, and rejection of materialism could strengthen democracy.

Strauss's view on the majority in America differed greatly from other critics of democracy. His influential thinking led to a new interpretation of Tocqueville as a classical political philosopher. His students reinforced this view, and broke contemporary scholars' efforts to situate Tocqueville in his own time. Zetterbaum's analysis of Tocqueville brought this Straussian interpretation of Tocqueville to a wider audience. Mansfield's translation marked the first time that an outspoken academic with a strong political belief and controversial reputation undertook the effort of translating Tocqueville, and thereby having the chance to influence the reception of Tocqueville to thousands of new readers of *Democracy*.

Riesman, Hartz, Arendt and Strauss influenced thousands with their books, speeches, course lectures and articles. In most cases, they found a wider audience than academia with their personal fears about the meaning of modernity and role of individuals in the postwar decade. This period also witnessed the rise of tensions between America and the Soviet Union. In the next chapter I turn to the uses of Tocqueville in the beginning of the Cold War.

Chapter Five
Ideas of Freedom: Tocqueville and the Cold War

> *Democracy in America* began as a piece of reportage, metamorphosed into a work in political philosophy, and became, at last, a book of prophecy.
>
> Daniel T. Rodgers

> Though the world is torn and threatened by the conflicting prejudices and ambitions of little men and of big, of great nations and small, yet somehow or other I think that through the ages the good qualities of men have, on the average, exerted more influence than have his baser ones. I believe this will continue and so I keep struggling to better myself, in a small way, to grapple with the questions that daily come before me for some kind of answer.
>
> Eisenhower to Churchill, 1956

> Each generation wants new symbols, new people, new names. They want to divorce themselves from their predecessors.
>
> Jim Morrison

In the previous chapters, I showed how intellectuals used Tocqueville to understand how their worlds have changed due to political events and cultural shifts. Their readings of Tocqueville kept the complexity of Tocqueville's thoughts and arguments, but revealed their personal biases. Riesman, Hartz, Arendt and Strauss engaged with Tocqueville's thoughts and words, which meant at times disagreeing with him. They also employed him to point out unsavory aspects of American democracy.

In this chapter I examine the ways in which Tocqueville became extremely valuable during the emergent Cold War. Tocqueville's comparison between Russia and the United States in *Democracy* has been hailed as prophetic, and important for understanding how he became the anti-Marx. In addition, his French origin, status as a

philosopher, and pro-democratic attitudes made him the ultimate authority figure. I examine the Council Against Communist Aggression, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and F.A. Hayek's readings of Tocqueville during this period. Each saw in Tocqueville the key to America's defense against the Soviet Union. The Council Against Communist Aggression and Alexis de Tocqueville Society, which supported an aggressive course of action, was drawn to Tocqueville's views on foreign policy. I argue that Tocqueville's observations about the spiritual strength of Americans and importance of enlightened self-interest resonated deeply with Eisenhower. Unpublished correspondence and public speeches indicate that Eisenhower saw that he could use Tocqueville a way to motivate Americans to think beyond the current political climate and do what is best for America long-term. Drawn to Tocqueville's views on individual economic freedom, Hayek used him in his academic works and postwar society to argue for minimal state interference.

Tocqueville's Prophecy

In the last several paragraphs of the first volume of *Democracy in America*, Tocqueville pitted the United States against Russia. He observed that these two countries, which "grew in obscurity, and...abruptly vaulted to the first rank among nations," were rising in importance and would, someday, "sway the destinies of half the globe."[498] Tocqueville noted the difference in national characteristics of Americans and Russians. Americans were focused on immediate needs and ensuring their basic survival and did not concern themselves with international domination. Since America's struggle for survival was new and defined by individual actions, individuals took responsibility for their success. Tocqueville concluded from this that the success of Americans depended

[498] *Democracy*, Goldhammer, 475-6.

on their force and intelligence, as well as their ability to act freely. Russia, on the other hand, was already an established country. In order to expand further, it needed to overcome its civilization. Tocqueville was less certain how the Russians would attain this goal, noting that it "in some way concentrates all the power of society in one man." Russia's continued growth depended on a strong tsar who would impose change from above. Summarizing the differences between Russia and America, Tocqueville remarked, "The American's principal means of action is liberty; the Russian's, servitude."[499]

America proved a natural comparison to Russia in the nineteenth century due to their numerous similarities. Both countries "possessed vast territories and inexhaustible resources, both faced the task of populating an empty interior and the problem of slavery."[500] However, it was their common goal to create social equality that especially prompted the comparison between the two nations. The "extreme democracy and social equality of the Americans in one sense paralleled the general leveling of Russian society which the Romanovs had accomplished."[501] In America, Tocqueville saw a population that inherently valued equality. When Tocqueville remarked that Russia had to overcome its civilization, he was referring to the political, educational, and social reforms the Russian tsars adopted to unify and equalize the disparate Russian population.

The passage in *Democracy* attracted notice when first published. One reviewer commented on the rising threat of Russia, which expanded and continued to spread despotism over conquered lands. "But still, while we believe the principle of democracy to be established firmly and forever as the political faith of the whole western continent,

[499] Ibid., 476.
[500] G.J. Thurston, "Alexis De Tocqueville in Russia," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37, no. 2 (April-June 1976): 290.
[501] Ibid.

and as destined, at no distant time, to obtain the ascendancy in the west of Europe, we cannot but cherish the hope that it is destined also to conquer to itself, with a certain, though slow and toilsome progress, the eastern half of that continent."[502] Although hope existed for the triumph of democracy over despotism, an epic battle between Communism and Democracy could not even be imagined in 1837. Rather, this passage was used to highlight Tocqueville's wide scope. He "keeps his eye chiefly on France, where the tendency is strong towards democracy [but] does not lose sight of the opposite tendency in another quarter."[503]

In the twentieth century, this passage helped crystallize Tocqueville's image as the ultimate defender against Communism. As Françoise Mélonio phrased it in her groundbreaking work on the nineteenth-century French reception of Tocqueville, "Tocqueville's contrast between Russia and America was transformed into a contemporary ideological confrontation between Western liberal capitalism and Eastern Marxian socialism. At its crudest, Tocqueville became the adopted champion of the free world against Marx in the ideological equivalent of a Western showdown."[504] Tocqueville has been considered the main prophet who foresaw the Cold War by others as well. Historian Louis Halle, for instance, opened chapter two of his work, *The Cold War as History*, by quoting Tocqueville's prediction that America and Russia would one day sway the destinies of half the world. Looking at the situation on a macro level, Halle sympathized with both sides. Using the example of a scorpion and tarantula together in a bottle, Halle emphasized that each side merely wanted to survive, and needed to fight to

[502] "European Views of American Democracy," *United States Democratic Review* 1, no. 1 (October 1837): 94.
[503] Ibid., 95.
[504] Françoise Mélonio, *Tocqueville and the French* trans. Beth G. Raps (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998), ix.

the death in order to do so. "The situation is tragic. The proper attitude for the observer, therefore, is one of sympathy for both parties."[505]

Despite the sympathy, Halle believed a right and wrong side existed and used Tocqueville's prediction to further his own position in the Cold War. Presenting the traditional interpretation of the Cold War, Halle placed blame on the Soviet Union as the aggressor and considered the United States a reluctant participant and innocent in world affairs that acted purely to defend world freedom and liberty. Despite Tocqueville's own uncertainties, Halle took Tocqueville's words and observations as fact. Halle drew from Tocqueville's prediction that the split between Russia and America following World War II was inevitable. "Nothing is surely predictable except as it is bound to happen. If it may or may not happen, then one cannot predict its happening with authority; one can only guess and gamble that it will happen. But de Tocqueville was not guessing or gambling."[506] Halle not only viewed Tocqueville as an authority on Russo-American relations, but as a prophet.

For Halle, the Cold War represented "an historical necessity to which the Communist movement is incidental rather than essential."[507] However, the repressive and secretive nature of the governing communist regime could be seen in the policies of nineteenth-century tsars from Nicolas I through Nicholas II. Halle believed that Russia did not change drastically following the Russian Revolution. "Under the Communists Russia has continued to behave essentially as it behaved under the czars. There has been the same conspiratorial approach to international relations. There has been the same

[505] Louis Halle, *The Cold War as History* (1967; reprint, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1991), xvii.
[506] Ibid., 10-11.
[507] Ibid., 12.

profound mistrust of the outside world."[508] The only significant change was "a new, vigorous, and ruthlessly determined authoritarian dynasty."[509] To Halle, then, Tocqueville's foresight was even more incredible considering that communism and the Communist Revolution was not inevitable but rather was due to the actions of individuals. "[W]hen he wrote his prophecy, [he] knew nothing of a young university student in Germany called Karl Marx, or of an unborn revolutionary called Lenin."[510]

Tocqueville had become so known for predicting the growing importance of Russia and America that scholars began to note that Tocqueville was not alone in issuing such a prophecy. In 1966, Philip Merlan suggested Tocqueville's prophecy was not original, as Edmund Dana "saw the future of the globe from a perspective essentially identical to that of Tocqueville" in 1819.[511] In 1976, G.J. Thurston observed that the physical and social similarities between the two countries had already been discussed before Tocqueville published *Democracy*.[512] Theodore Draper also disabused the notion that Tocqueville's prophecies were original. In his 1979 article in *Encounter*, Draper wrote, "There were others who preceded him and who came much closer to the basic idea, and they also help to put into better perspective what Tocqueville actually did say about the destinies of Russia and America."[513] According to Draper, the idea of Russia

[508] Ibid., 11.
[509] Ibid.
[510] Ibid.
[511] Philip Merlan, "A Precursor of Tocqueville," *The Pacific Historical Review* 35, no. 4 (November 1966): 468.
[512] G.J. Thurston, "Alexis de Tocqueville in Russia," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37, no. 2 (April-June 1976): 289-306.
[513] Theodore Draper, "The Idea of the 'Cold War' and its Prophets: On Tocqueville & Others," *Encounter* (1979): 34.

and America growing powerful and expanding at a time when other countries had nearly exhausted their reserves was common.[514]

In 1988, Daniel Rodgers observed the sustaining and enduring image of Tocqueville as a prophet. Rodgers, however, felt that in order to read *Democracy in America* "afresh" this idea needed to be reevaluated. "[T]here are many ways to admire Tocqueville's achievements other than as a tea-leaf reader for another century's discontents."[515] Reading *Democracy in America* for the few "particularly startling passages" that seem to predict the future condensed the work to detrimental consequences for understanding Tocqueville's complete work. Some of Tocqueville's predictions or 'hunches' about democracy proved to be wrong. For example, Tocqueville foresaw citizens' love for equality leading to dictatorships and tyrannous states. However, as Rodgers pointed out, two of the modern, 'bureaucratically centralized' states included France, "riven with inequalities," and Wilhelmine Germany, "where war discipline and Junkerism, not egalitarian democracy, held the reins."[516] Rodgers concluded that studying Tocqueville's "deep flaws" as a prophet would not diminish the thinker's stature.

> The timelessness of *Democracy in America* comes not from its prevision of the future of democracy, or from its occasional lucky guesses, but from its untarnished moral seriousness. As long as politics endure, there will be

[514] Draper focused on nineteenth-century writers John Bristed, Abbé de Pradt, Alexander Hill Everett, and Michel Chevalier, indicating their works proved to be more incisive, clear, and correct regarding the correlation between Russia and American in the nineteenth century and the Cold War. For example, American diplomat and author Hill foresaw the domination of Russia. Writing about foreign affairs and population, Hill published *Europe* in 1822. Europe comprised of surveys of European countries, "with conjectures on their future prospects." Hill, considering Russia superior to the other European countries, "even welcomed Russian domination" as he felt it would help unify a divided Europe. Draper noted, "Americans did not need Tocqueville, thirteen years later, to tell them how close Russia was coming to holding the destinies of the European world in its hands."
[515] Daniel T. Rodgers, "Of Prophets and Prophecy," in Abraham S. Eisenstadt, ed. *Reconsidering Tocqueville's Democracy in America* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 194.
[516] Ibid., 203.

> a need for Tocqueville's warnings against the mob, the Gleichschaltung of the mind, the bloated structures of state power, the erosion of public life and public commitments. Where the pleasures of private life triumph, the horsemen do not always ride in, but life surely decays. In that moral alone, in the example of a man thinking hard and engagedly about public life, there is more than enough in *Democracy in America* to sustain another century-and-half's reading.[517]

However, the idea of Tocqueville as the prophet who foresaw the Cold War will most likely will continue. The Council Against Communist Aggression saw such value in Tocqueville's prophecy that its members added Tocqueville's name to the title of their organization.

Tocqueville, Cold War Warrior

Founded in Philadelphia in February 1951, during the "dark days of the Korean War," the far-Rightist Council Against Communist Aggression regarded international Communism as "the greatest threat to our national security [America has] ever faced" and that war must be waged against it everywhere.[518] Formed as "a new center of anti-Communist common sense information and correspondence" by the Upholsterers' International Union, the Council added "and Alexis de Tocqueville Society" to its name in December 1961. Using Tocqueville to support their quest to root out the deep, subversive, and anti-democratic elements in society, the Council was drawn to Tocqueville's prophecy of the rise of America and Russia and portrayed him as a Cold Warrior.

---

[517] Ibid., 206.

[518] Council Against Communist Aggression Pamphlet of History, Programs and Activities, Council Against Communist Aggression, 1950-1987, John Davis Lodge Papers, Box 164, Folder 5, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford, California. (hereafter cited as Lodge Papers). CACA changed to Council for the Defense of Freedom in 1980.

The Council took a hard line against Communism and refused to endorse any policy or action seen in any way as conciliatory with Communist leaders. They opposed establishing connections with Eastern leaders. "These bridges, however well-intentioned the motives of the builders may be, can only lead to our destruction. At the other end of the bridge are our executioners."[519] The Council did not believe the destruction would come by war, but through political and psychological warfare, "a field in which the Communists preempted and…where the free world is weakest."[520] The Council saw the struggle as amateurs fighting professionals—the "well trained Communist cadres versus the untrained amateurs" of the West.[521]

> We don't have amateur military officers. Nor do amateurs manage our huge industries. Yet we have thousands of amateurs who are trying their untrained best to resist the attacks of the highly trained professional Communists. If you wish to know what a professional Communist is, take a look at the No. 1 example—Khrushchev. In his youth he went through Lenin's colleges of Bolshevik training."[522]

The Council believed intense communist training centers existed in South America, Central Europe, Eastern Europe, and even the United States, in which students were exposed to communist ideology and propaganda dissemination techniques. These training centers were covered in 'supersecrecy,' which fueled fears of American anti-communists.[523]

---

[519] Ibid.
[520] Ibid.
[521] quote from Thomas J. Dodd*, Free World Amateurs Fighting Against Communist Professionals: Importance of Establishing a Freedom Academy*, Speech delivered in the United States Senate, Washington, D.C., August 26, 1960, Box 164, Folder 5, Lodge Papers.
[522] "The Freedom Academy Bill Should Pass!," Editorial, *Saturday Evening Post* February 18, 1961. By trained communists, the Council had in mind Lenin's vision, outlined in his 1902 pamphlet entitled *What is to be Done?* Lenin envisioned creating a small, well-organized, well-educated and highly-trained elite group of members of the Communist Party to educate the masses about communism and lead Russia on its path to become a communist country.
[523] Senate Committee on the Judiciary, *Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy*, 84th Cong., 1st Sess., 1959, S-1689, 15.

In 1959, the Council sponsored a Freedom Commission Act to combat these professional enemies. The Freedom Commission Act was a bill "[t]o create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war." [524] The bill sought to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 by enacting more stringent defense tactics. The language of the bill reflected the extreme fear of communist infiltration. "In this total political war the Soviets permit no neutrals. Every citizen, every economic, cultural, religious, or ethnic group is a target and is under some form of direct or indirect Communist attack. The battleground is everywhere, and every citizen, knowingly or unknowingly, through action or inaction, is involved in this continuous struggle."[525]

Through this bill, the Council sought to establish a Freedom Academy, an advanced training and development center "to train people both in the government and private sectors in the art and science of political and psychological warfare."[526] The real motivation behind S-1689 was to create informed American citizens who were capable of recognizing and fighting communist agents. The stoning of Nixon in Venezuela in 1958 and developments in Iraq convinced members of the need to be more pro-active to

[524] Ibid.
[525] Ibid.
[526] History, Programs and Activities, Council Against Communist Aggression, 1950-1987, Box 164, Folder 5, Lodge Papers. The Orlando Committee for the Freedom Academy devised the basic proposal for S-1689 in 1951, and worked on the draft through the next eight years. The initial idea for the Freedom Commission Act occurred during the late summer of 1950, when American forces in Korea were pushed all the way back to the Pusan Perimeter in the southeast Korea. "[M]ore important, it had by then become plain that the Soviets had thrown an across-the-board challenge at the West which would test our national character and every part of our free society as it had never been tested before. The stakes were national survival and the challenge would continue indefinitely conceivably for the remainder of this century, or longer."

counter the "vague and as yet inarticulate fear that the situation was getting beyond our ability to control and that the United States was gradually being pushed into a corner."[527]

The Council became further convinced of the need of the Freedom Academy in 1960, when members witnessed proof of what it perceived as the trained enemy in front of City Hall in San Francisco on May 13, 1960. The House Un-American Activities subcommittee was in San Francisco to question Communist agitators and witnesses, such as Longshoreman Archie Brown. Students from Berkeley and other universities gathered to protest the hearing of the House Un-American Activities subcommittee. The police turned fire hoses on the students, arrested several, and used force to push them off the steps in front of City Hall. "We have no idea of managing the masses in the same way [as the Communists], but it is important to know the symptoms of Communist mass management—as in the San Francisco rioting at the hearing of a Committee of Congress."[528]

Representing the Council, as well as the Upholsterers' International Union, Arthur Gladstone McDowell provided his testimony to the Committee on Un-American Activities on February 19, 1964.[529] Gladstone spoke of the struggle to resist Communist infiltration of trade unions such as the Upholsterers' International Union. The threat was

---

[527] Ibid. The framers of the bill compared the Academy to West Point and Annapolis. A commission of seven members, appointed by the President, would establish the Freedom Academy. Those who attended the Academy would learn how to influence and organize a large number of people, as the Communists have been able to achieve. The intended purpose of learning such methods was not to practice it in the United States but to be able to recognize it during mass demonstrations.

[528] "The Freedom Academy Bill Should Pass!"

[529] U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Un-American Activities, *Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy—Part I*, 88th cong., 2d sess., 1964. The Senate had passed the bill, but the House did not, leading the reintroduction of similar bills in both houses in 1961 and 1963. Although the bill remained largely the same, Gladstone requested permission to appear before HUAC "and add fresh testimony." Ultimately, the Johnson administration opposed the idea "on the ground that it would duplicate and conflict with the work of existing government schools and agencies." A Freedom Studies Center, funded largely by private corporations, "wealthy patriots and right-wing foundations "was established in 1966 by the American Security Council as a tax-exempt educational institution.

so real, Gladstone explained, that the AFL-CIO had taken the initiative to train fellow trade unionists in Central and South America to destroy totalitarian infiltration.[530] Gladstone felt drastic measures needed to be taken, arguing that the Soviet Union would continually achieve political and diplomatic victories "simply because they are in a political war with us and we are at political peace with them."[531] To support the Council's agenda, Gladstone called upon Tocqueville in his statement.

> The proposed Freedom Commission and Academy is the first proposal to actually establish equality between the Free World, led of necessity by the United States, and the Communist slave world, still led by Soviet Russia, as Alexis de Tocqueville, as true a prophet for democracy as Marx was a false one for his dictatorship, actually foresaw would inevitably be the case, one hundred and thirty years ago."[532]

In its quest to discover and silence anti-Communists, the Council sought to impose anti-democratic measures. Gladstone implied that Tocqueville foresaw the necessary use of aggressive tactics such as propaganda and the Freedom Academy in the fight against Communism. From Tocqueville's prophecy, the Council promoted intense military training and action as the best defense against the communist threat.

However, Tocqueville saw the United States moving forward on its path to greatness by using strength, but also by using liberty and reason. In the same prophetic passage, Tocqueville noted that to achieve their goals Americans allowed individuals "to exercise their strength and reason without guidance." More optimistic about the strength of democracy in America than CACA was Eisenhower, who valued Tocqueville's observations on religion and enlightened self-interest. Using Tocqueville, Eisenhower focused on the peaceful ways Americans could build immunity to communist ideas.

---

[530] Ibid., 1058.
[531] Ibid.
[532] Ibid.

Tocqueville: Hawk of Peace

Dwight D. Eisenhower, the war hero turned reluctant politician, appreciated Tocqueville's instinctive understanding that religion encouraged Americans to be better citizens. Appreciating Tocqueville's observations on religion and democracy, Eisenhower used Tocqueville to gain support for his national programs meant to strengthen America's defense against Communism, focus on the positives of American democracy, and persuade America to keep in mind that the ultimate goal should be peace, not war. Eisenhower was the first president to quote Tocqueville in public addresses. He first referred to Tocqueville publicly on November 3, 1952, the eve of the national election at the Boston Garden, which was "jammed to the roof with a boisterous crowd."[533] Considered his best speech of the election, Eisenhower relayed how he learned from his experiences dealing with Nazi Germany the true meaning and value of peace.[534] He also shared his fears of the challenge to combat 'Godless communism.' Turning to the importance of unity and faith, Eisenhower referred to Tocqueville as a wise philosopher who searched for the key to America's greatness. Eisenhower stated:

> Many years ago a wise philosopher came to this country seeking the answer to this same question: Wherein lie the greatness and genius of America? This was his answer: 'I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers—and it was not there. I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her fertile fields and boundless forests—and it was not there. I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her rich mines and vast world commerce—and it was not there. I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her democratic Congress and her matchless Constitution—and it is not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power.

[533] James Reston, "General Asks End of all Prejudices," *New York Times*, November 4, 1952, 22.
[534] Ibid.

> America is great because America is good—and if America ever ceases to be good—America will cease to be great.[535]

Eisenhower's choice to include Tocqueville in his speeches was significant and purposeful. Not wanting to deliver a speech 'just to hear [his] tongue clatter,' Eisenhower avoided using unnecessary oratorical flourishes and superfluous material, valuing substantiveness, brevity, simplicity, and precision.[536] From 1930 to 1933, Eisenhower had the task of drafting speeches for Frederick Huff Payne, Assistant Secretary of War. In 1956 upon re-election, Eisenhower recalled to Payne, "I remember very well the difficulty I had—and the seriousness with which I took my task." Eisenhower proceeded, "Incidentally, I am still taking speeches just as seriously—unfortunately, they are my own, these days."[537]

The quote about the greatness of America did not come from Tocqueville or from *Democracy*.[538] Several other politicians have included parts or all of it in their own speeches, and have attributed the quote to Tocqueville. The source for the quote was a secondary source published in Sherwood Eddy's 1941 work, *The Kingdom of God and the American Dream: The Religious and Secular Ideals of American History*, in which

---

[535] "Text of Eisenhower's Speech Ending with Appeal for National Unity," *New York Times*, November 4, 1952, 23. In Eisenhower's copy of the speech, he wrote CLIMAX-SLOW from "Not until I went…American will cease to be great." Eisenhower November 3, 1952, Speech in Boston, Speech Material—Pres. Eisenhower, Speeches, Statements, Box 3, Speech Series, Speech Material Subseries, Papers of Fred A. Seaton, Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, Abilene, Kansas (hereafter cited as Eisenhower Library).
[536] Kurt Ritter and Martin J. Medhurst, *Presidential Speechwriting: From the New Deal to the Reagan Revolution and Beyond* (Program in Presidential Rhetoric, 2003), 82.
[537] Eisenhower to Frederick Huff Payne, October 10, 1956 E.M, AWF, Administration Series, C.D. Jackson Corr., The Papers of Dwight D. Eisenhower, Library of Congress, Washington, DC [Electronic Records] (hereafter cited as Eisenhower Papers).
[538] John J. Pitney, Jr., "The Tocqueville Fraud," *Weekly Standard*, November 13, 1995, http://www.tocqueville.org/pitney.htm.

the phrase was included.[539] Eddy might have taken the phrase from an earlier source that attributed it to Tocqueville.

Eisenhower, however, believed he was quoting Tocqueville. One of Eisenhower's speechwriter, C.D. Jackson, recalled that the head of the speech-writing team, Emmet Hughes, "included the quotation…either having recalled it himself or having gotten it from the little research group available to us. The statement is definitely by Alexis de Tocqueville, although he is not mentioned by name in the speech."[540] Trusting the secondary sources and not having ready access to Tocqueville's works, Eisenhower's speechwriters concluded from their research that Tocqueville was the original source of the quote.

Eisenhower's approval of the inclusion of the quote is an indication of his long-held appreciation of Tocqueville. Eisenhower's mentor, General Fox Conner, was likely the source of his interest in Tocqueville. Initially impressed with Eisenhower's thoughts on tank warfare at a dinner at General Patton's house in the fall of 1920, Conner asked him months later to serve as his Executive Officer in Panama, which he did from 1922 to 1924. Conner was not impressed, however, with Eisenhower's lack of knowledge of military history or philosophy. Eisenhower admitted in his own memoirs, "I didn't think of myself as either a scholar whose position would depend on the knowledge he had

[539] Sherwood Eddy, *The Kingdom of God and the American Dream: The Religious and Secular Ideals of American History* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941), 6.

[540] C.D. Jackson to Bernard McChesney Suttler, September 7, 1961, Eisenhower Library. Jackson continued: "The reason is that when the speech was being finally polished, Emmet and I tried every conceivable source in an attempt to discover exactly when and where de Tocqueville had made the statement. As I recall, in the short time available to us we were able to find all kinds of references to it, and all kinds of references to de Tocqueville's having said or written it, but we were defeated in our efforts to trace its actual source. So we finally took it somewhat on faith and shot it up to Boston, slightly less than fully checked. As I say, we were under some considerable pressure, and probably could check it quite easily today, but this is an account of this little bit of history as I remember it." Jackson was responding to Suttler's request to ascertain if the quotation was St. Jean de Crevecoeur or de Tocqueville. Suttler stated, "I did not have access to these ancient volumes." Bernard McChesney Suttler to Mr. C.D. Jackson, August 31, 1961, Eisenhower Library.

acquired in school."[541] Conner began lending Eisenhower books from his library, and discussing them with him at length. In *At Ease*, Eisenhower revealed their talks about these books and thoughts excited him, and inspired him to read other historical and philosophical works. [542]

It is most likely that Tocqueville was one of those authors discussed and remembered. For instance, on April 9, 1954, St. John's College presented Eisenhower with a collection of the great books that comprised the core of its liberal arts curriculum. Upon receiving the gift, Eisenhower "ran his eye down the catalogue list and paused at de Tocqueville's 'Democracy in America.'" He then remarked, "There's the one I've looked for a long time."[543] In a personal letter to Chairman of the Republican National Committee Meade Alcorn on May 22, 1958, Eisenhower wrote, "Tocqueville has long been one of my favorite—and most quoted from—authors."[544]

Perhaps not a Tocqueville scholar, Eisenhower read enough of Tocqueville to associate him with certain beliefs. Eisenhower responded to the quote about the greatness of America due to its clear belief in Americans' religious strength. In *Tocqueville and the French,* French scholar Françoise Mélonio stated, "Though falsely

---

[541] Dwight David Eisenhower, *At Ease: Stories I Tell My Friends* (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967), 12.

[542] According to the Eisenhower Presidential Library's website, "On long horseback rides into the Panamanian rainforest, Conner quizzed Eisenhower about his readings—sparking lengthy, lively, engaging discussions. Among the works they discussed and debated, in addition to books on military history, were books by Plato and Alexis de Tocqueville and a collection of essays called *The Federalist*." No source was given, so I contacted the library's archivist. In an email the following day, the archivist wrote after consulting their collections, various secondary sources, and other staff archivists, he could not verify that Eisenhower and Conner discussed Tocqueville. The staff member responsible for writing the passage said the mention was probably a mistake. However, Eisenhower could have meant Tocqueville when he stated, "Excited by these talks and thoughts, I read in the works of authors strange to me: Plato and Tacitus of the Roman nation, and in historical and philosophical writers among the moderns" (*At Ease*, 187).

[543] "St. John's College Gives Eisenhower Great Classics," *Special to The New York Times*, April 10, 1954, 13.

[544] Eisenhower to Meade Alcorn, Eisenhower Library. Eisenhower's sole purpose in writing the brief letter was to respond to a Tocqueville quote Alcorn had sent him. Eisenhower continued, "But I confess the passage you sent me had escaped my notice. Many thanks."

attributed to Tocqueville, the saying is instructive nonetheless." Understanding the reference to Tocqueville as the Americanization of Tocqueville, Mélonio explained that the quote "aims to reinforce an American identity based on moral values and said to derive from an initial promise to which the nation is urged to remain faithful or perish. The invocation of Tocqueville expresses the 'manifest destiny' of the American Union, which becomes more manifest, apparently, when admired by Europeans."[545] The invocation of Tocqueville by Eisenhower sheds light on how his personal beliefs shaped his political agenda.

Tocqueville's message of the value of religion in a democracy resonated with Eisenhower. Deeply religious, Eisenhower was drawn to Tocqueville's observation of the importance of religion to democratic citizens.[546] Foremost, religion engendered optimism, a vital quality for a healthy civic society. Eisenhower distinguished America from the 'Godless Communists,' showing Americans that they were on the winning side due to their belief in a higher power. In a 1951 letter to a soldier undergoing basic training at Fort Dix, Eisenhower reassured him of democracy's inevitable victory. Of Russia, Eisenhower wrote, "The practice of their Godless doctrine of Communism carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction, because it suppresses the natural and decent aspirations of men. If we can be strong enough, if we can endure enough, we can wait for the inevitable explosive process to take effect."[547] The religious overtones suggest

[545] Françoise Mélonio, "Tocqueville and the French," in Cheryl Welch, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Tocqueville* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 337.
[546] For more on Eisenhower's civil religion, see Jack M. Holl, "Dwight D. Eisenhower: Civil Religion and the Cold War," in Mark J. Rozell, Gleaves Whitney eds., *Religion and the American Presidency* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).
[547] Eisenhower to Gabriel N. Stilian, August 23, 1951, Eisenhower Mss. Eisenhower Papers.

that for Eisenhower, religion helped individuals remain optimistic and confident as new fears about the Soviet Union spread.

Belief in a larger power also encouraged them to focus on the long-term goals, rather than become too engaged in anti-Soviet hysteria. Fear, Eisenhower believed, would lead to decisions not based on America's best interest. Eisenhower's focus on spiritual strength ties in to his other focus, enlightened self-interest, which was another of Tocqueville's main themes in *Democracy*. In a personal and confidential letter to steel and rubber executive George Arthur Sloan on March 20, 1952, Eisenhower stated, "We should remember that the aggregate of all resources available to the free nations—spiritual, intellectual, scientific, industrial, material, and leadership resources—vastly outweighs the total sum available to the relatively backward areas in which the Soviet despotism holds sway."[548] The language of the last phrase parrots that of Tocqueville's prophecy, and was an oblique reference to *Democracy*. It is significant, then, that in the same paragraph Eisenhower argued that nations should clearly understand their own enlightened self-interest.[549] Eisenhower explained that during his years as a commander of the American and Allied Forces, as the Army's Chief of Staff, President of Columbia University, senior military adviser to the Secretary of National Defense, and as President, "all my decisions of necessity have been made within the frame of America's enlightened self-interest."[550] Eisenhower spoke of enlightened self-interest in several personal and official letters, political speeches, and even his 1953 State of the Union Address.

[548] Eisenhower to George Arthur Sloan, March 20, 1952, Eisenhower Mss. Eisenhower Papers.
[549] Ibid.
[550] Eisenhower to Arthur Ellsworth Summerfield, March 11, 1952, 712, Eisenhower Mss., Eisenhower Papers.

To Eisenhower, enlightened self-interest meant free trade, liberal foreign and military aid to weaker nations, and mutual cooperation among free nations in the form of organizations such as NATO.[551] He saw enlightened self-interest as the reason to become involved in world affairs and to reject blind isolationism or narrow nationalism. Enlightened self-interest also meant for Eisenhower that weapons would not win the war against communism. Eisenhower saw the acquisitions and building of weaponry necessary to soldiers actively fighting communists, and as a measure to defend America and to impose peace settlements. However, he was greatly concerned with America's belief that more weapons would better guarantee victory against the Soviet Union. In an October 11, 1950 letter to Andrew Wells Robertson, Eisenhower wrote, "*permanent* peace would have as its basis a general respect for decency, fairness and justice and a common understanding that these can never be promoted by might alone."[552]

Due to his religious upbringing and experiences as a soldier, Eisenhower viewed war as the last possible option. In the same letter to Robertson, he remarked, "I say all this as one who probably hates war more than any person who is not classed as a fanatic. I consider it not only the greatest cancer that continues to consume the substance of human society, but I think that it is completely stupid and futile."[553] Eisenhower's position on weapons did not change throughout his presidency, even as new threats from the Middle East arose. In 1956 Eisenhower wrote to Winston Churchill:

> Of course the Mid East is merely the most important and bother-some of the problems that currently confront our nations. Moreover,

[551] See, for example, Eisenhower's Address at IBM Corp Factory Buildings, Endicott, NY July 14, 1948. On how America's military and economic aid program essential for its own enlightened self-interest, see Eisenhower to Joseph Bracken Lee, December 30, 1953, EM, WHCF, Official File 116-B; Eisenhower to Winston Spencer Churchill, March 29, 1956, Eisenhower Papers. On connection between enlightened self-interest and NATO, see Eisenhower to George Arthur Sloan, March 20, 1952, Eisenhower Papers.
[552] Eisenhower to Andrew Wells Robertson, October 11, 1950, Eisenhower Mss., Eisenhower Papers.
[553] Ibid., See FN 2 and 3 for background of Robertson's letter.

> the welfare of each of the fourteen NATO countries, as well as the fate of those many other nations that still live in freedom because of our strength, will eventually be determined by our success in making the processes of voluntary cooperation more effective than is a Gestapo in a dictatorship. When we consider all of these difficulties against a back drop of scientific development that has brought to man the power of destroying an entire enemy nation—possibly at the cost of suicide—it is no exaggeration to say that each of us should pray earnestly for a bit more wisdom, a bit more understanding, a bit more capacity for dealing with these problems of limitless scope.[554]

Eisenhower's reference to praying suggests that he believed enlightened self-interest required religious faith. Eisenhower strove to temper America's contention that more weapons equals greater security with the need for morality and spirituality. Tocqueville's words about finding America's greatness in its churches, rather than in natural resources that could be used to manufacture weapons, stayed with Eisenhower.

Eisenhower also relied on Tocqueville to argue that America was secure enough in its strength to be able to follow a course of free trade and to provide economic aid with no strings attached. Eisenhower stressed that spiritual strength of the people was a prerequisite for the country's physical security. In the same letter to Sloan, Eisenhower described spiritual strength as a blend of "patriotism, self-confidence, intellectual capacities, integrity and forthrightness, courage and stamina—in short, all those qualities that mark man as a spiritual being."[555] Sloan was concerned that giving economic aid without qualifications would engender dependence on America and discourage the recipients from taking corrective military and fiscal control measures.[556] Eisenhower, however, argued that America's physical security required free trade in order for

[554] Eisenhower to Winston Spencer Churchill, March 29, 1956, 1813, EM, AWF, International Series: Churchill, Eisenhower Papers.
[555] Eisenhower to George Arthur Sloan, March 20, 1952, Eisenhower Papers.
[556] Ibid., FN 1.

American companies to retain access to raw materials such as manganese, uranium, platinum, many drugs, copper, lead, zinc, and oil.[557] Without access to these raw materials of production, located in areas vulnerable to Russian invasion such as Southeast Asia, India, and Iran, the United States could not produce "either the items and materials that are necessary to our living standards or the munitions used in development of security forces."[558]

Eisenhower also wanted America to reach its full economic potential in order to help out nations vulnerable to communist infiltration. In order to do so, Eisenhower believed collective security in the form of NATO to be the answer. Without protection, the Soviets would take over weaker nations and block access to free traffic. In the same letter, Eisenhower wrote, "there is no true basis for complete separation of so-called economic from military factors when we are considering the great problem of defending ourselves against a powerful, aggressive dictatorship."[559]

In order to enact his policies to win the Cold War through peaceful measures, Eisenhower needed to unite the Republican Party. Eisenhower had narrowly won the nomination by the Republican Party on September 21, 1952. He also had to deal with discordant views within the party. The party, explained Michael S. Mayer, "was deeply split along geographical and ideological lines, and the conservative wing of the party was particularly strong in Congress."[560] Eisenhower, therefore, had the tough task of relaying the necessity of an internationalist policy while trying to assert his authority over a resistant and disunited party. He aimed "to remake the Republican Party in his own,

[557] Eisenhower to George Arthur Sloan, March 20, 1952, Eisenhower Papers.
[558] Ibid.
[559] Ibid.
[560] Michael S. Mayer, *The Eisenhower Years* (New York: Infobase Publishing, 2008), xii.

moderate image."[561] In a diary entry on April 1, 1953, Eisenhower revealed that he was approached the day before about forming a new party known as 'The Middle Way.'[562] Hesitant about the idea, he wrote, "if we can possibly bring about a greater solidarity among Republicans, if we can get them more deeply committed to team work and party responsibility, this will be much the better way."[563]

For this purpose, Eisenhower again looked to Tocqueville's religious inspiration. Eisenhower wanted his message of spiritual strength to push the Old Right faction of the Republican Party, which pushed for a policy of isolationism, to accept the idea that America should play a pivotal role in international affairs and needed to lead the policy of containment. Before a live audience of five thousand people and a nationwide television and radio audience in September 1953, Eisenhower again quoted Tocqueville's observation about finding the greatness and genius of America in its churches. He used the quote to urge the party to welcome change and criticism, and to warn the Republicans not to become too insular or partisan. Eisenhower stated of Tocqueville's words, "The utter truth they held for me [in 1952], they hold today."[564] Listing all the changes the Republican Party enacted since its founding almost a century earlier, such as the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments, the first Homestead Act, and the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, Eisenhower described these changes as 'wild and wondrous.' The Republican

---

[561] Ibid.
[562] For more on the Middle Way, see Stephen Wagner, *Eisenhower Republicanism: Pursuing the Middle Way* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 2006).
[563] Eisenhower, Diary, April 1, 1953, 118 EM, Diaries, Eisenhower Papers. Eisenhower's diary entry was largely concerned with the Bricker Amendment, which aimed to limit the power of the President in making international agreements. The Bricker Amendment, in essence, aimed to force a policy of nonintervention and isolation. Eisenhower viewed the Bricker Amendment as the result of a the Republican party being in the minority for twenty years. For such a long time the party "has been opposed to, and often a deadly enemy of, the individual in the White House."
[564] "Text of Eisenhower's Address at Republican Party Dinner Held at the Boston Garden," *New York Times* September 22, 1953, 22.

Party, at once liberal, progressive and conservative, should look out for all Americans. Eisenhower also warned them of democracy's fragility. Tocqueville's words, Eisenhower stated, "contain not only a promise but a warning. And as they apply to America, so they must apply no less to the political party which is America's chosen servant in these days."[565]

The 1956 election was a much different experience for Eisenhower. Eisenhower expressed pride in his record, and sought the presidency in order to enact more positive change. Increasing threats in the Middle East, namely the Suez Crisis, made campaigning across country especially difficult.[566] In one of his few campaign trips, he again deemed it important to invoke Tocqueville. In a re-election speech at the Civic Auditorium in Portland, Oregon on October 18, 1956, Eisenhower commented on Tocqueville's observation, "I have always remembered. This is the truth by which America must ever live—and if she does so, she will grow ever stronger."

In the address, Eisenhower acknowledged the importance of natural resources to the Northwest, and listed all the measures enacted by the Federal government under his presidency to protect them, such as the Pilot Watershed Act, the Soil Bank, and the addition of more than 400,000 acres to the park systems. However, Eisenhower then reminded the audience, using Tocqueville's quote, that natural resources were not the

[565] Ibid.

[566] In a letter to Hubert Reilly Harmon on October 2, 1956, Eisenhower wrote, "I would hope that eventually our people would make it mandatory that an incumbent President, if he seeks reelection, rests his case on the record and takes no active part in the campaign activities. I realize, of course, that this is probably but a dream." EM, WHCF, President's Personal File, Eisenhower Papers. Eisenhower viewed it extremely difficult to provide good government while away from Washington due to the large lapse in communication. To General Mills Chairman Harry Amos Bullis on the same day, Eisenhower wrote, "A campaign trip is a far cry from establishing a summer headquarters somewhere away from Washington. On a campaign trip a man literally has almost no chance to conduct government business; because of that it is simply impossibly to be away from Washington—or from government contacts and advisers—for longer than two or three days at a time.

source of America's greatness. Eisenhower explained, "As we cherish and guard the resources of our people and of nature itself—even as we strengthen the security of our aged and the education of our children…yet we know that the ultimate source of our strength lies beyond, far beyond all these things."[567] He proceeded, as he did in November 1952, to read Tocqueville's answer about the greatness of America.

In addition to increasing America's role in containing world communism, Eisenhower also valued Tocqueville's appreciation of Americans' initiative. The launching of Sputnik in 1957 and Sputnik II in 1958 caused widespread panic in America, as the nation feared Communist attacks from space. Eisenhower reacted by urging better education in the sciences and also reinforcing the concept of state and private initiative. Encouraging private organizations to sponsor scientific research rather than rely heavily on the assistance and initiative of the Federal Government, Eisenhower referenced Tocqueville on May 14, 1959 during a symposium on basic research. "It is very much worth noting, I believe, Tocqueville's comment of 125 years ago in some notes just published for the first time, that what makes the American such an intelligent citizen is that he does a little of everything. This he thought was an important reason for the superiority of the American in the ordinary business of life and the government of society."[568]

---

[567] Eisenhower held a deep admiration for Tocqueville, but did promote him for political purposes. He was proud of his record as president, and wanted to continue as president. Unlike the 1952 campaign, Eisenhower was generally satisfied with the campaign. He wrote to Virgil M. Pinkley on October 13, 1956, "Actually, I find this business of relying on the record of the Adminstration much less distasteful (and I am speaking purely personally) than I did the type of campaign we had to wage in 1952. I am proud of what we have done, while at the same time I am the first to admit there are a great many problems still to be tackled." Eisenhower to Douglas McKay, June 4, 1956, EM, AWF, Administration Series, Eisenhower Papers.

[568] Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Science: Handmaiden of Freedom," New York City, May 14, 1959, http://www.eisenhowermemorial.org/speeches/19590514%20Science%20-%20Handmaiden%20of%20Freedom.htm.

With this quote, Eisenhower used Tocqueville to support his decentralization plans, as he believed that Americans should take initiative themselves rather than wait for the Federal Government to sponsor projects. During his presidency, Eisenhower implemented policies designed to stimulate initiative by reducing federal controls and give more power to the business community. Initiative would serve Americans by building confidence and therefore reducing fear of a more prepared enemy. Eisenhower saw in Tocqueville a way to inspire Americans to engage in business ventures that would also serve the public.

Referring to the notes recently published, Eisenhower most likely meant *Journey to America*, a collection of Tocqueville's interviews he conducted in America and notes he made which formed the basis of *Democracy*. Translated by George Lawrence and edited by J.P. Mayer, Yale University Press published *Journey to America* in 1959. Tocqueville noted after his interview with John Quincy that in the absence of government, individual strength ripens. Tocqueville gleaned that Americans, not used to relying on an outside power, took action when they saw the need for a social improvement project such as a road or school.[569] Tocqueville concluded that "the general result of all these individual strivings amounts to much more than any administration could undertake; and moreover the influence of such a state of affairs on the moral and political character of a people, would more than make up for all the inadequacies if there were any."[570] From this Eisenhower stretched Tocqueville's words to flatter his American audience as intelligent and superior. For Tocqueville, though, intelligence implied completing an

[569] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Journey to America*, ed. J.P. Mayer, trans. George Lawrence (1959; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), 51.
[570] Ibid., 51-2. In the second volume of *Democracy*, Tocqueville wrote, "But what most astonishes me in the United States is not so much the marvelous grandeur of some undertakings as the innumerable multitude of small ones."

aristocratic education that emphasized the classics. Tocqueville actually deemed the middle classes' intellect inferior, due to their specialized education that deemphasized the classics. However, his observation on the initiative of Americans resonated with Eisenhower.

Eisenhower based much of his national and foreign policy on Tocqueville's ideas regarding religion, enlightened self-interest, and initiative. Eisenhower needed to strike the right balance between conveying the importance of America in containing communism and discouraging the other extreme of creating an anti-Soviet frenzy among Americans. Tocqueville's message about the spiritual strength of Americans helped Eisenhower understand and relay to Americans the importance of both action and patience.

For Austrian economist Friedrich August Hayek, Tocqueville's beliefs and observations on the need for individual economic freedom were the most important. Hayek used them in his works and as the philosophical underpinning of his postwar organization. Intended originally to help Germany emerge from the damage caused by Hitler, his views and organization transitioned seamlessly to include nations facing the Soviet threat. For Hayek, Tocqueville's solutions to the threat of government were appropriate both to fascism and communism and bridged the war years to the emerging Cold War period.

Tocqueville the Libertarian

F.A. Hayek viewed Tocqueville as a classical liberal in the tradition of Adam Smith and John Locke.[571] However, he also detected in Tocqueville the appreciation of true individualism, which appealed to Hayek. True individualism, or libertarianism, as expressed by Hayek, rested on the belief that individuals were not created equally in terms of ability and were not omniscient. Since their worldviews were typically limited, individuals could not be expected to make good judgments as a group. The best course of action in a democracy, according to Hayek, was to allow minimal powers of an organized state so group decisions would not cause great damage.

Influenced by Tocqueville's theory that equality could lead to servitude, Hayek argued in his seminal work, *The Road to Serfdom*, that totalitarian politics and regimes such as Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia resulted from socialist practices. *The Road to Serfdom,* which experienced an enormous reception, was Hayek's warning to democracies such as the United States and Great Britain to reexamine their policies of nationalization, marriage of big business with government, and overall creation of a welfare state. Hayek argued that as soon as individuals allowed their government power to limit competition in the market, they would start down a slippery slope of giving up their individual rights. Individualism, Hayek believed, was the fundamental difference between democracy and socialism. He admired Tocqueville for his insight comparing the two systems. "Nobody saw more clearly than de Tocqueville that democracy as an

---

[571] Born in Austria in 1899, Hayek had strong connections to the United States. He spent a short amount of time in America during the early 1920s. He again visited in spring 1945, 1946, and 1948. Each visit was for at least a couple of months. In 1949 he came for a conference, divorce, and teaching position at the University of Chicago. He stayed in the United States until 1962, when he moved to West Germany. For more on Hayek's ties to America, see Alan Ebenstein, *Friedrich Hayek: A Biography* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003). See also Philip Mirowski and Dieter Plehwe, eds., *The Road from Mont Pèlerin: The Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2009).

essentially individualist institution stood in an irreconcilable conflict with socialism."[572] Hayek viewed Tocqueville as a prophet who foresaw the danger of socialism. "Although we have been warned by some of the greatest political thinkers of the nineteenth century, by de Tocqueville… that socialism means slavery, we have steadily moved in the direction of socialism."[573] Hayek even named *The Road to Serfdom* in reference to Tocqueville's idea that equality could lead men on the road to serfdom.[574]

Hayek felt that some governmental intervention was justified in a limited number of cases, such as establishing a maximum number of working hours or overseeing projects that would benefit the majority of the people, such as building roads and railways. Ultimately, though, Hayek wanted to allow the greatest chance for economic competition.[575] Both Hayek and Tocqueville opposed a strong central power, but for different reasons. While Hayek valued individualism as the core of a free society, Tocqueville saw danger in the excess of individualism. Rather than lead to freedom, Tocqueville saw rampant individualism and self-interest leading to political apathy, which could enable a despotic government to rule. Hayek felt centralization would lead to socialism, and Tocqueville feared it would encourage political apathy.

Due to the different time and geographical periods in which they lived and wrote, Hayek's perspective of capitalism and individualism contrasted starkly with that of

---

[572] Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (1944; reprint, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press), 77.
[573] Ibid., 67.
574 Hayek, *Individualism and Economic Order*, 16, FN 17. "Perhaps I may be allowed to add that it was this phrase of de Tocqueville's [nouvelle formule de la servitude] which suggested to me the title of a recent book of mine."
[575] Tocqueville, however, saw more reasons for government interference in capitalist economies. He "despised the bourgeois economy for the poverty and degradation that he thought invariably traveled with it, a degradation always pretended to be an accident, but which, like an embarrassing little brother, was a blood relation." See Roger Boesche, *The Strange Liberalism of Alexis de Tocqueville*, 135. Tocqueville's favoring of wage regulation is an example of a strain of utilitarianism in Tocqueville's thought, which stood in opposition to Hayek's limitation of government involvement in industry.

Tocqueville. Writing in the early period of industrialization in France, Tocqueville feared the effects of rampant capitalism and the emergent individualist ethos. Witnessing the rise of totalitarian states and experiencing the results, Hayek prioritized preserving capitalism over focusing on its defects. Hayek, therefore, emphasized Tocqueville's endorsement of individualism and democracy over Tocqueville's critiques and concerns about democratic governments and societies.

Seeing the potential in Tocqueville, Hayek took Tocqueville's theories beyond academia. He used Tocqueville as the philosophical underpinning of his postwar society. In 1944, he moved to form an international association of economists, historians, and political philosophers who would discuss the moral and intellectual postwar climate. Still active, the society's object is "solely, by facilitating the exchange of views among minds inspired by certain ideals and broad conceptions held in common, to contribute to the preservation and improvement of the free society."[576] The group has shared, as Hayek intended, libertarian values. Hayek depicted Tocqueville as a libertarian who stressed individual liberty and promoted minimal State powers.

Regarding enlightened intellectuals as the group best able to influence opinions in society and politics, Hayek envisioned recruiting scholars who felt that "not only the whole relation between governmental coercion and individual freedom requires re-examination, but also that current views of recent history will have to be revised if the dominant beliefs and misconceptions are not to drive us ever further in a totalitarian direction."[577] Hayek stipulated that the group must share a common outlook. "There must be certain common values beyond the sacredness of truth: an agreement, at least,

[576] Robert Boggs, "Fifty Years of the Mont Pelerin Society," *Independent Review* 1, no. 4 (Spring 97): 624.
[577] F.A. Hayek Memorandum, December 28, 1946, Hayek Papers, Hoover Institution, Stanford, California (hereafter cited as Hayek Papers).

that the ordinary rules of moral decency must apply to political action, and beyond that also a certain minimum agreement on the most general political ideas."[578] He specified that general political ideas meant belief in individual freedom, "an affirmative attitude towards democracy without any superstitious deference to all its dogmatic applications, particularly without condoning the oppression of minorities any more than that of majorities, and, finally, an equal opposition to all forms of totalitarianism, whether it be from the Right or from the Left."[579] This guideline for participation relied on self-identified classical liberals who valued true, anti-rationalist individualism.

When he first publicly shared the idea of creating such a society, Hayek's vision of its activities was ambitious. The historians could work to 'revive and popularize" works of past German political writers to replace the influence more recent political philosophers had over German society. They could create a journal to discuss recent history and to redirect the discussion from "'war-guilt' bickerings." They also could work on including the general public in the discussion. Above all, Hayek envisioned the society as a channel for open discussion on an international level. "The society as such would…never presume to decide any of the controversial questions, but in providing a forum for the discussion and opportunity for collaboration between historians of different countries it would probably perform a very useful service."[580]

Hayek gave considerable thought to the name of the society in which the collaboration of historians would take place. He specifically chose a thinker who would represent the common beliefs of the participants and rally the group. "It seems that much more effective than any such programme designed ad hoc would be some great figure

[578] Ibid., 6.
[579] Ibid.
[580] Ibid., 10.

who embodies in an especially high degree the virtues and ideals which such an association would have to serve, and whose name could serve as a flag under which men who agree could unite."[581] Initially, Hayek chose to name the society the Acton Society, for the nineteenth-century English thinker Lord Acton.

> There are many features united in the figure of Lord Acton that make him almost uniquely suitable as such a symbol. He was, of course, half German by education and more than half German in his training as a historian, and the Germans, for that reason, regard him almost as one of themselves. At the same time he unites, as perhaps no other figure, the great English Liberal tradition with the best there is in the Liberal tradition of the Continent—Lord Acton expressed it, for the 'defenders of secondary liberties' but for one to whom individual liberty is of supreme value and 'not' as a means to a higher political end.[582]

Hayek proceeded to point out additional qualities of Lord Acton that made him the most suitable representative figure for the society. By suitable, Hayek looked for a figure Germans would accept and respect. For one, Acton was a devout Catholic. Hayek noted that Catholics staged the greatest opposition to Hitler, and so choosing a Catholic figurehead would represent the group's dedication to truth over venerating the power state. Hayek also admired Acton's ability to remain unbiased when analyzing the Roman Catholic Church.[583] Furthermore, Hayek approved of Acton's commitment to finding practical solutions to problems of national unity without becoming entangled in contemporary political movements.

Hayek hesitated to rely solely on Acton, though, because he did not think Acton held wide appeal.[584] Looking for other nineteenth-century historians, Hayek thought of

---

[581] Ibid., 6.
[582] Ibid.
[583] Ibid., 7.
[584] See, for example, F.M. Stenton to F.A. Hayek, August 8, 1944, Hayek Papers. Stenton disagreed with Hayek's choice of Acton as the patron scholar. Stenton's only suggestion to Hayek was for him to choose another representative:

Jacob Burckhardt. Hayek observed that like Acton, Jacob Burckhardt opposed centralism, favored small and multi-national state, and most importantly, saw power as the 'arch-evil.' He also suggested Tocqueville, emphasizing the similarities between Acton and Tocqueville. For instance, Tocqueville was also a Catholic who believed in maintaining the integrity of scientific analysis.

> It might indeed be desirable to couple with the name of Acton, though not in the name, yet in the programme of the society, not only the name of Burckhardt, but also that of the great French historian who has so much in common with both of them, de Tocqueville. Jointly, these three names indicate probably even better than the single name of Acton the kind of basic political ideas under whose inspiration history might give the future Europe the political re-education which it needs.[585]

Hayek's proposal of such a society was received well. Professor of British history at The University of Reading, F.M. Stenton agreed "it would be desirable to form some kind of association which would express to the coming generation of German historians the principles which instinctively govern English historiography."[586] Stenton viewed the society as a chance to teach German historians how to divorce political propaganda from historical research. He compared the "English attitude towards history, which…seems remarkably disinterested" to the "tendentiousness which was coming over German history long before 1914."[587]

German sociologist Ernest Kohn Branstedt wanted the name to mean something to Germans. Advising against using Acton as the representative symbol, he wrote, "It is

---

> I am doubtful whether, at any rate to the younger generation of English historians, [Lord Acton] stands out as a representative figure. [H]is main practical interests related to the church of which he was a member, and to problems which are not of the first significance today. The chief objection to him as your patron is the fact that he never wrote a book expressing his ideas in a consecutive and systematic form…I think you would perhaps be wise to cast about for some other name more familiar to those whom you wish to bring into your Society."

[585] F. A. Hayek, "Historians and the Future of Europe," Hayek Papers.
[586] F.M. Stenton to F.A. Hayek, August 8, 1944, Hayek Papers.
[587] Ibid.

to be doubted if the impressive figure of Lord Acton means anything to 99.9% of the German population finding itself, as it does, between the devil and the deep sea after twelve years of dictatorship."[588] Meaning, who would be meaningful and able to provide a safe alternative for Germans after Hitler's dictatorship?[589] He threw out the names of Pestalozzi and Leopold von Ranke instead, which he thought would mean more to Germans.

Branstedt thought the society's symbol should be more than just a recognizable name. Like Hayek, Branstedt saw the name of the society as shorthand for the society's beliefs. For this reason, he also advised against using Burckhardt, who although better known in Germany than Acton, was "hardly suitable as a leader for moral reconstruction owing to his general pessimism and individualism."[590] Only a more optimistic thinker who worked for the common good should represent the society, which Branstedt considered "a supra-national research and publicity institute."[591] He envisioned the society as being comprised of scholars and publicists from Germany and Allied countries such as England and America. Together, they would present "a fair and balanced presentation of contemporary history." They could publish their work in a journal, which hopefully would "help to counter the danger of new nationalist legends."[592]

---

[588] Ibid.
[589] Branstedt had other points of criticism concerning Hayek's proposal. For one, he thought it was important that school teachers as well as university history professors be included, stating that it would be "pitifully insufficient if a number of university professors would teach 'objective' history whilst most of the teachers in the elementary and secondary schools could still dish up their own brand of historical nationalist bias." In his second point, Branstedt advised Hayek to include in the minimum moral standards held by the society participants the value of 'social responsibility of the individual for the common good.'
[590] Ibid.
[591] Ibid., 3.
[592] Ibid.

By December 1944, Hayek had followed the advice given to him and added Tocqueville's name to the proposed Society.[593] Since he could not easily sum up the philosophy of freedom on which the society would be based, Hayek "found the suggestion widely acceptable that the ideals underlying the works of Lord Acton and Alexis de Tocqueville might serve as the agreed foundation from which such a common effort might start."[594] British historian David Matthiu favored creating the proposed society, and especially approved of linking Acton with Tocqueville. "I am entirely of your way of thinking as to the value of Acton's name and the association with de Tocqueville is very attractive to me."[595] Matthiu, who was interested in "disentangling the various threads in Acton's early life," noted that the two had been greatly influenced by Burke and so had much in common. Matthiu wrote to Hayek, "all that was explicit in de Tocqueville's approach to the bourgeoisie was to a large extent implicit in Acton's outlook."[596]

Although Hayek officially called the society an International Academy for Political Philosophy, he believed that "the general ideals which such an Academy of political philosophy ought to serve could not be better expressed than by calling it the Acton-Tocqueville Society."[597] According to Hayek, Acton best foresaw the dangers of German nationalism to European civilization. However, Tocqueville would capture Hayek's goal of moving forward. He wrote, Tocqueville "was of course the first great

[593] David Mathiu to F.A. Hayek, December 1, 1944, Hayek Papers.
[594] Letter from F. A. Hayek, December 28, 1946, Hayek Papers.
[595] David Matthiu to F.A. Hayek, December 1, 1944, Hayek Papers.
[596] Ibid.
[597] Ibid.

student of American democracy."[598] In a 1945 memorandum outlining the Academy's infrastructure and purposes, Hayek expanded on his choice of Acton and Tocqueville:

> I have…been long casting my eyes around for a great figure of the recent past whose ideas would embody the aims for which such a society would stand, who would equally appeal to scholars of different nations and sympathy with whose ideals would in itself be proof that a person is the kind of person on whose support we want to lean. In view of the central position which problems of recent history will play in many of the activities of the society I have particularly been looking for men who have been at the same time great historians and great political philosophers and I have become convinced that there are two names which jointly represent more perfectly than any others the ideals to which I wish the society to be devoted, those of Lord Acton and of Alexis de Tocqueville.[599]

In the aftermath of World War II, it was even more crucial for scholars to meet and work toward preventing the 'immediate disintegration' of civilization in Europe by reestablishing basic moral and political values.[600] Hayek had observed that if the isolated efforts to rethink the relation between individual freedom and governmental control were combined in the arena of his proposed society, countries would be better able to prevent the creation and return of totalitarian governments. Opportunities for international collaboration would occur through international meetings, through the society's journal, and at a permanent home or hostel on neutral ground where scholars could live, work, and re-establish international contacts.[601] Although Hayek, who had the initial idea of the society and drafted the official proposal by himself, lived and worked in London, he did not envision England as the society's base. In fact, he thought it best for the society's home to be located on neutral ground such as Switzerland or Tyrol. Seeking American

---

[598] Ibid.
[599] Ibid.
[600] F.A. Hayek Memorandum of the Proposed Foundation of an International Academy for Political Philosophy Tentatively Called "The Acton-Tocqueville Society," August 1945, Folder 8, Box 61, Hayek Papers, 1.
[601] Ibid., 4.

participation, he also thought it preferable for the trustees of the society, who would administer the funds to members and act as the organizing committee of the society, "be all or mostly Americans."[602] Hayek believed that Tocqueville's positive view of American democracy would appeal to American participants.

By 1946, Hayek had made a few modifications to his proposals and had a more specific outline of the society, or what he now labeled an academy. For instance, the role of historians became less prominent. The task of defending individual freedom from governmental 'coercion' in order to prevent future totalitarian states now fell upon scholars from several disciplines. "It is clearly a task on which the economists and historians, political philosophers and publicists of the different countries who share the same basic convictions could profitably collaborate."[603] This shift reflects the change in context of the organization to reflect the new communist threat.

In April 1947, in the "lovely village" of Mont Pèlerin in Switzerland, thirty-nine members of the new society met. At that first meeting, their first disagreement centered on the name. Some members deemed Tocqueville too much a representative of Catholics and noblemen, which "might seem unfair to non-Catholics and commoners."[604] At least one other member, however, persisted with the use of Tocqueville, linking his name to that of Adam Smith.[605] Ultimately, though, the group chose to name their group for the Swiss landscape and officially named the group the Mont Pèlerin Society. Since its creation, the society "has prospered and remained steadfast in adherence to its initial

[602] Ibid., 6.
[603] Letter from F.A. Hayek, December 28, 1946, Hayek Papers Hoover Institution.
[604] Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., *Intellectual Pilgrims: The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Mont Pèlerin Society* (Washington, DC: Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., 1999), 11.
[605] Ibid.

statement of aims."[606] Its membership has grown to over five hundred, and includes Asians, Latin Americans, and even Eastern Europeans. Members are elected by the society, and "membership has become a badge of honor among classical liberals."[607]

In the 1940s Hayek chose Tocqueville for his analysis of American democracy. During the 1990s, Tocqueville was praised for his prescient analysis of the welfare state, of which Feulner called the "gravest threat to liberty."[608] The Society focused on moving past the welfare state in order for citizens to live in a truly free society. "We believe that strong families, vibrant neighborhoods, thriving communities, multiple levels of self-government, and a society informed by the spirit of competitiveness, free enterprise, and respect for long-standing institutions are the surest antidotes to what Alexis de Tocqueville singles out as the gravest threat to liberty: that 'immense and tutelary power' of the central government."[609] Despite its official name and change in agenda following the end of the Cold War, the society's connection with Tocqueville has remained and with it, the image of Tocqueville as a libertarian.

Conclusion

As totalitarian dictators fell, and tensions between America and the Soviet Union rose following World War II, Tocqueville gained new importance. Already gaining attention in the academic realm, Tocqueville made his debut on the national political scene and as the representative of new anti-Communist organizations. In the name of democracy, politicians and anti-communist organizations invoked Tocqueville publicly

[606] Ibid.
[607] Ibid.
[608] Feulner, 39.
[609] Ibid.

during the emergent Cold War period. In Tocqueville, they found the perfect combination of qualities needed to raise America's reputation abroad and at home. Despite their misunderstandings of Tocqueville's ideas, they felt connected to him in some way. They also valued his reputation as an authority figure, and used him to promote their respective policies and agendas. Those agendas were diverse, and I have shown three distinct interpretations of Tocqueville.

Eisenhower, the Acton-Tocqueville Society and Council Against Communist Aggression viewed democracy as fragile, and acted according to their own principles to protect against totalitarian and communist threats. The Council Against Communist Aggression had a hawkish agenda, and saw Tocqueville as an authority figure respected for his aggressive attitude towards non-democratic elements. The Council deemed it necessary for Americans to learn how to identify and deter Communist infiltrators in American unions and organizations. The Freedom Academy Bill showed how Tocqueville was used to endorse such an aggressive course of action during the Cold War.

Optimistic and religious by nature, Eisenhower believed that the Cold War could be fought and won by more peaceful measures. He wrote to Churchill, "I am by nature so optimistic that at times I am forced to laugh at myself in the thought that I am as inconsistent as is the most blatant of Soviet propaganda."[610] This optimism derived from his religious nature. Promoting permanent peace, Eisenhower valued Tocqueville's observation on the need for spiritual strength in a democracy. He also took from Tocqueville the appreciation of individuals by taking the initiative to form associations to complete projects. Eisenhower saw the fight against communism taking place on a

[610] Eisenhower to Winston Spencer Churchill, March 29, 1956, Eisenhower Papers.

federal, state and local level. He saw the best medicine against communism to be a healthy economy.

Hayek also believed that individuals must protect themselves against the federal government in order to prevent democracy from falling to communism. Like Eisenhower, Hayek saw in Tocqueville the appreciation of long-term thinking. Hayek took from Tocqueville his fears of an encroaching government and his praise of individual economic liberty. Despite their difference in perspectives, CACA, Eisenhower and Hayek greatly appreciated Tocqueville's ideas and saw in Tocqueville a way to inspire a world weary of war to maintain the strength to wage yet another war.

Conclusion

This dissertation has shown how the decades following World War II produced extremely influential responses to revolutionary and critical ideas. The Holocaust, beginning of the Cold War, rise of anti-Americanism, fear of conformism, and racial tensions divided Americans. In their search to understand and explain these new developments, intellectuals took into account their own experiences and perspectives. They also found comparisons to developments that occurred from the late eighteenth through the nineteenth century useful. Tocqueville's insights provided a basis for intellectuals in the mid-twentieth century to understand American-European relationships, the effects of World War II, and political and social changes within America. Engaging with him, they each took something different from Tocqueville's analyses of democracy, equality and modernity. In some cases, Tocqueville even changed perspectives.

They also used Tocqueville to work through their perspectives of the masses. For example, David Riesman's critique of the masses derived from his underlying belief that individuals were strong and had the ability to become great. From Tocqueville, Riesman believed the answer was to encourage Americans to dream big and become more ambitious in their goals. Hannah Arendt was more skeptical of the intellectual capacity of the masses, but believed in their ability to provide good government. From Tocqueville, Hannah Arendt found associations best led to informed and involved democratic citizens. Leo Strauss found in Tocqueville the ways to encourage democratic citizens to value inequality and to respect strong leadership.

In the mid-twentieth century, American and European intellectuals valued Tocqueville for his biases. They appreciated Tocqueville's predicament to judge a modern, democratic society as a member of a class traditionally opposed to a society based on equality. Like Tocqueville, Riesman, Hartz, Arendt and Strauss did not fit easily or neatly into defined political categories. They were liberal, conservative, republican, and democratic. They appreciated Tocqueville because of his struggles to adapt to modernity. They related to his ability to analyze democratic society. Like them, Tocqueville was an outsider. For example, Arendt's opposition to desegregation seemed to confirm for many that she was an elitist foreigner with antiquated notions. Her tale of caution did not elicit positive responses in the fifties and sixties by revolutionaries, who viewed sweeping changes to America's political, cultural and social traditions as progress. Additionally, Riesman's belief that individual greatness could exist in an equal society seemed to contradict his position on affirmative action.

They also shared another important quality with Tocqueville. In Tocqueville they detected optimism and a strong belief in democracy. Riesman, Hartz, Arendt and Strauss's critiques of American democracy rested on hope. They were quick to point out the defects in the democratic system and mistakes of a voting majority, but did so only because they deemed the defects fixable and the mistakes reversible.

Tocqueville has always enjoyed preferential status in America. His critics for the most part overlooked and excused any of Tocqueville's unfavorable views on American society and politics. In the nineteenth century, American literary reviewers and critics welcomed Tocqueville as an unbiased European with a sincere interest in and appreciation of American habits, values, and institutions, as compared to other European

travelers such as Madame Trollope and Thomas Hamilton. Even negative receptions of Tocqueville and those who publicly critiqued Tocqueville made no attempt to malign his entire reputation or body of works. For instance, Elizabeth Cady Stanton based her argument that Tocqueville should not be used as an authority on American women during the turn of the twentieth century, on the fact that Tocqueville only met and studied women in the mid-nineteenth century. She did not attempt to discount Tocqueville's entire analysis on democracy, leaving his respectability and authority in place.

Tocqueville remained a presence in universities and was read by the educated reading public since *Democracy* was first published in 1835. Despite the number of editions and translations of his work, though, from the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth, scholarship on Tocqueville remained limited at best. In the nineteen-thirties, a few key works on Tocqueville were published and achieved critical success. These authors placed much emphasis on the goodness, originality, and astuteness of Tocqueville. There were not many other works that teased out the complexities of his works and thinking, however.

Tocqueville's writings reached a wider audience in the forties and fifties. Presidents and intellectuals saw in Tocqueville a personality they could use to galvanize support for their anti-Communist causes. Cold War groups incorporated Tocqueville into their official names as a way to bring intellectual weight to their anti-Soviet stances. On the surface, the name of an organization's name and how the founders arrived at the name might seem trivial. However, in the case of The Council Against Communist Aggression, adding Tocqueville to their name indicates a much bigger and more organized effort by the Right to appropriate Tocqueville than previously thought.

Examining the unpublished papers of an organization such as the Acton-Tocqueville Society has revealed that a significant amount of attention and focus was paid to choosing the right name to reflect the founders' agendas and political biases.

The effort by a handful of Tocqueville enthusiasts to introduce his ideas to a larger American audience by publishing new editions of his work led to astonishing immediate and long-term results. Although Tocqueville had always been included in disciplines such as history and political science, newer disciplines such as sociology quickly appropriated Tocqueville to their field's contemporary focus on individual alienation within a modernist society. Within a couple of decades, presidents began using Tocqueville to support their domestic and international agendas. Tocqueville's entry into the mainstream media occurred years after the initial mid-century push to publish Tocqueville's works, but took place on a large scale with millions of viewers in mind. Tocqueville was even placed in a starring role in the 1993 film *Born Yesterday*. Tocqueville's name has begun to appear in the most unexpected places. Sitting in services for a recent Yom Kippur, the holiest and most solemn Jewish holiday, I was astounded when the Rabbi delivered a short sermon on Tocqueville's idea of community participation. That moment reflected how Tocqueville has truly become integrated into all aspects of American culture.

I have also shown how Tocqueville was integral to the thinking of intellectuals. In a letter to Fred Al. Clemente II, Transaction publisher Irving Louis Horowitz wrote, "I don't mean to sound unkind or ungenerous, but just about everybody writes about the United States in a kind of Rorschach style, perhaps saying more about the writer than about the country. About the only time I feel that this has not been true, is in the work of

Alexis de Tocqueville and Harriet Martineau. But since then...instead of analysis, there is therapy."[611] For Arendt and Strauss, writing was therapy to overcome their experiences with Nazi Germany and to understand their new home. Riesman also placed much importance on writing as a way of thinking. Riesman explained his writing style in a light-hearted manner, "I write casually, often late at night, often in snatches. And what I write even for intended audiences is often cryptic!"[612] Of Hartz, Benjamin R. Barber wrote, "He felt the world deeply, and engaged it no less than its literary surrogates in his work."[613] For these intellectuals, Tocqueville helped them understand the changes in their world.

[611] Irving Louis Horowitz to Fred Clemente II October 15, 1970, Horowitz Papers.
[612] David Riesman to Irving Louis Horowitz December 18, 1958, AX/B40/HCLA/05225-Box 1, Irving Horowitz Papers.
[613] Benjamin R. Barber, "Louis Hartz," *Political Theory* 14, no. 3 (August 1986): 355-358, 355.

Bibliography

Archives

The Hannah Arendt Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. [Electronic Records].

Raymond Aron Papers, Hoover Institution, Stanford, California.

The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Library of Congress, Washington, DC [Electronic Records].

Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, Abilene, Kansas.

F.A. Hayek Papers, Hoover Institution, Stanford, California.

Irving Horowitz Papers, Penn State University, PA, [Electronic Records].

Alfred A. Knopf Papers, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, The University of Texas at Austin.

John Davis Lodge Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford, California.

L. Hollingsworth Wood Papers, The Quaker Collection, Haverford College. Haverford, Pennsylvania.

Books and Articles

Adams, Ephraim Douglas. "The Point of View of the British Traveler in America." *Political Science Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (June 1914): 244-64.

Anderson, William. Review of *Democracy in America*, by Alexis de Tocqueville. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 242, Building the Future City (Nov., 1945): 182-183.

Arendt, Hannah. "Race-Thinking Before Racism." *The Review of Politics* 6, no. 1 (January 1944): 36-73.

—. *The Human Condition*. 1958. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

—. *The Promise of Politics*. Edited and Introduction by Jerome Kohn. New York: Schocken Books, 2005.

—. *Eichmann in Jerusalem*. 1963.

—. *On Revolution*. 1963. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.

—. *Essays in Understanding 1930-1954: Formation, Exile, and Arendt, Totalitarianism*. Edited by Jerome Kohn. New York: Schocken Books, 1994.

—. *The Portable Hannah Arendt*. Edited by Peter Baehr. New York: Penguin Group, 2000.

—. *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought* by Hannah Arendt. Edited by Jerome Kohn. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.

Baehr, Peter. "Of Politics and Social Science: 'Totalitarianism' in the Dialogue of David Riesman and Hannah Arendt." *European Journal of Political Theory* 2 (2004): 191-217.

Barber, Benjamin R. "Louis Hartz," *Political Theory* 14, no. 3 (August 1986): 355-358.

—. "Louis Hartz." *Political Theory* 14, no. 3 (August 1986): 355-358.

Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. 1985. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

Benhabib, Seyla. *The Reluctant Modernism of Hannah Arendt*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003.

Berkowitz, Peter, ed. *Never a Matter of Indifference: Sustaining Virtue in a Free Republic*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2003.

Bloom, Allan. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1987.

Boesche, Roger. *The Strange Liberalism of Alexis de Tocqueville*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

—. *Tocqueville's Road Map: Methodology, Liberalism, Revolution, and Despotism*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006.

Burnham, James. Review of *The Liberal Tradition in America*, by Louis Hartz. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 301. Higher Education under Stress (September 1955): 235.

Canovan, Margaret. *Hannah Arendt: A Reinterpretation of Her Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Caputi, Mary *A*. *Kindler, Gentler America: Melancholia and the Mythical 1950s*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

Ceaser, James W. *Reconstructing America: The Symbol of America in Modern Thought*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Cook, Thomas I. Review of *Democracy in America*, by Alexis de Tocqueville. Edited by Phillips Bradley. *The American Historical Review*, 51, no. 1 (October 1945): 131-133.

Cowie, Alexander. Review of *Democracy in America,* by Alexis de Tocqueville. Edited by Phillips Bradley. *American Literature* 17, no. 3 (November 1945): 288.

Craiutu, Aurelian. *Liberalism Under Siege: The Political Thought of the French Doctinaires*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2003.

Craiutu, Aurelian and Sheldon Gellar, eds. *Conversations with Tocqueville: The Global Democratic Revolution in the Twenty-First Century*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009.

David, Clinton, W. *Tocqueville, Lieber, and Bagehot: Liberalism Confronts the World*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.

Degler, Carl N. "The Sociologist as Historian: Riesman's '*The Lonely Crowd*.'" *American Quarterly* 15, no. 4 (Winter 1963): 483-497.

Dietz, Mary G. *Between the Human and the Divine: the Political Thought of Simone Weil*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1988.

Diggins, John Patrick. *The Proud Decades: America in War and Peace, 1941-1960*. New York: Norton & Company, Inc., 1989.

Dossa, Shiraz. *The Public Realm and the Public Self: the Political Theory of Hannah Arendt*. Waterloo, ON: Wifred Laurier University Press, 1989.

Draper, Theodore. "The Idea of the 'Cold War' and its Prophets: On Tocqueville & Others." *Encounter* (1979): 34-45.

Drury, Shadia. *Leo Strauss and the American Right*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Dunar, Andrew J. *America in the Fifties*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 2006.

Ebenstein, Alan. *Friedrich Hayek: A Biography*. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 2003.

Eddy, Sherwood. *The Kingdom of God and the American Dream: The Religious and Secular Ideals of American History.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941.

Eden, Robert. "Tocqueville and the Problem of Natural Right." *Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy* 17, no. 3 (Spring 1990): 389-400.

Eisenhower, Dwight David. *At Ease: Stories I Tell My Friends*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967.

Eisenstadt, Abraham S., ed. *Reconsidering Tocqueville's Democracy in America*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988.

Encarnación, Omar G. "Tocqueville's Missionaries: Civil Society Advocacy and the Promotion of Democracy." *World Policy Journal*, 17, no. 1 (Spring, 2000): 9-18.

Epstein, Joseph. Introduction to *Democracy in America* by Alexis de Tocqueville, xix-xlii. Translated by Henry Reeve. New York: Bantam Dell, 2000.

—. *Alexis de Tocqueville: Democracy's Guide*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2006.

Etzioni, Amitai, ed. *The Essential Communitarian Reader.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. 1998.

"European Views of American Democracy." *The United States Democratic Review* 1, no. 1 (October 1837): 91-107.

"European Views of American Democracy—No. II." *The United States Democratic Review* 2, no. 8 (July 1838): 337-356.

Everett, Alexander Hill Everett. Review of *Men and Manners in America,* by Thomas Hamilton. *The North American Review* 38, no. 82 (January 1834): 210-271.

Everett, Edward. Review of *Democracy in America*, by Alexis de Tocqueville. Translated by Henry Reeve. *The North American Review* 43, no. 92 (July 1836): 178-206.

Fowler, Robert Booth. *Enduring Liberalism: American Political Thought Since the 1960s*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1999.

Gabriel, Ralph. Review of *The Liberal Tradition in America*, by Louis Hartz. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 17, no. 1 (January 1956): 136-138.

Gans, Herbert J. "Best-Sellers by Sociologists: An Exploratory Study." *Contemporary Society* 26:2 (1997): 131-5.

Gans, Herbert, Nathan Glazer, Joseph R. Gusfield and Christopher Jencks, eds. *On the Making of Americans: Essays in Honor of David Riesman*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979.

Gargan, Edward T. "Tocqueville and the Problem of Historical Prognosis." *The American Historical Review* 68, no. 2 (January 1963): 332-345.

Giustozzi, Antonio. *Koran, Kalashnikov, and Laptop: The Neo-Taliban Insurgency in Afghanistan 2002-2007*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Glazer, Nathan. "Tocqueville and Riesman." *Society* 37, no 4 (May 2000): 26-33.

"Grunds Americans." Review of *The Americans, in their Moral, Social, and Political Relations*, by Francis J. Grund. *The North American Review*, 46, no. 98 (January 1838): 106-126.

Halberstam, David. *The Fifties*. New York: The Random House Publishing Group. 1993.

Halle, Louis. *The Cold War as History*. 1967. Reprint, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1991.

Hamilton, Thomas Hamilton. *Men and Manners in America*. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard, 1833.

Hannah Arendt and Karl Jaspers Correspondence 1926-1969. Edited by Lotte Kohler and Hans Saner. Translated by Robert and Rita Kimber. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1993.

Hartz, Louis. *Economic Policy and Democratic Thought: Pennsylvania 1776-1860*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.

—. "The Reactionary Enlightenment: Southern Political Thought before the Civil War." *The Western Political Quarterly* 5, no. 1 (March 1952): 31-50.

—. "American Political Thought and the American Revolution." *The American Political Science Review* 46, no. 2 (Jun. 1952): 321-342.

—. *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1955.

—. *The Founding of New Societies: Studies in the History of the United States, Latin America, South Africa, Canada, and Australia*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.

Heberle, Rudolf. "A Note on Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd*." *The American Journal of Sociology* 62, no. 1 (July 1956): 34-36.

Holl, Jack M. "Dwight D. Eisenhower: Civil Religion and the Cold War." In *Religion and the American Presidency*. Edited by Mark J. Rozell and Gleaves Whitney. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Hunt, Lynn. "The World We Have Gained: The Future of the French Revolution." *The American Historical Review* 108, no. 1 (February 2003): 1-19.

Huntington, Samuel P. "Paradigms of American Politics: Beyond the One, the Two, and the Many." *Political Science Quarterly* 89, no. 1 (March 1974): 1-26.

Isaace, Jeffrey C. "Oases in the Desert: Hannah Arendt on Democratic Politics." *American Political Science Review* 88, no. 1 (March 1994): 156-168.

Jacobitti, Suzanne D. "Individualism and Political Community: Arendt and Tocqueville and the Current Debate in Liberalism." *Polity* 23 (Summer 1991): 585-604.

Jaffa, Harry V. "Conflicts Within the Idea of The Liberal Tradition." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5, no. 3 (April 1963): 274-278.

John, M.S. and Jos Chathukulam. "Building Social Capital through State Initiative: Participatory Planning in Kerala." *Economic and Political Weekly*, 37, no. 20 (May 18-24, 2002): 1939-1948.

Kahan, Alan S. *Aristocratic Liberalism: The Social and Political Thought of Jacob Burckhardt, John Stuart Mill, and Alexis de Tocqueville*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Kassarjian, Harold H. "Riesman Revisited." *Journal of Marketing* 29, no. 2 (April 1965): 54-56.

Kerber, Linda K., ed. *Toward an Intellectual History of Women*. Chapel Hill, NC: The Univeristy of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Kielmansegg, Peter Graf, Horst Mews and Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt, eds. *Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss*: *German Emigrés and American Political Thought after World War II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

King, Richard. "American Dilemmas, European Experiences." Special Issue, *The Arkansas Historical Quarterly* 56, 3 (Autumn, 1997): 314-333.

Kloppenberg, James T. "Life Everlasting: Tocqueville in America." In *The Virtues of Liberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

—. "In Retrospect: Louis Hartz's The Liberal Tradition in America." *Reviews in American History* 29, no. 3 (September 2001): 460-476.

Koritansky, John. *Alexis de Tocqueville and the New Science of Politics: An Interpretation of Democracy in America*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press, 1986.

Kort, Michael. *The Columbia Guide to The Cold War.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.

Kristeva, Julia. *Hannah Arendt: A Biography*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Lawler, Peter Augustine and Joseph Alulis, eds. *Tocqueville's Defense of Human Liberty: Current Essays*. New York: Garland Pub., 1993.

Levitt, Theodore. "*The Lonely Crowd* and the Economic Man." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 70, no. 1 (February 1956): 95-116.

Lloyd, Margie. "In Tocqueville's Shadow: Hannah Arendt's Liberal Republicanism." *The Review of Politics* 57, no. 1 (Winter 1995): 31-58.

Locke, Jill and Eileen Hunt Botting, eds. *Feminist Interpretations of Alexis de Tocqueville*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.

McClay, Wilfred M. *The Masterless: Self and Society in Modern America*. North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

McGowan, John. *Hannah Arendt: An Introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Maloney, Steven Douglas. "Hannah Arendt and The Old 'New Science'." In *Hannah Arendt and the Uses of History: Imperialism, Nation, Race, and Genocide*. Edited by Richard King and Dan Stone. Berghahnbooks 1997.

Mancini, Matthew. *Alexis de Tocqueville and American Intellectuals: From His Time to Ours*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006.

Manent, Pierre. *An Intellectual History of Liberalism*. Translated by Rebecca Belinski. 1995. Reprint, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Mansfield, Harvey, and Delba Winthrop. Introduction to *Democracy in America*, by Alexis de Tocqueville, xvii-lxxxvi. Translated and edited by Harvey Mansfield and Delba Winthrop. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Mansfield, Harvey C. "A Plea for Constitutional Conservatism." In *The Future of Conservatism: Conflict and Consensus in the Post-Reagan Era*. Edited by Charles W. Dunn. Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2007.

Marcus, Judith. Review of *Ideas and Intellectuals in the Age of the Masses*, by Michael D. Biddiss. *Contemporary Sociology* 9, no. 4 (July 1980): 482-486.

Marshall, Lynn L. and Seymour Drescher. "American Historians and Tocqueville's *Democracy*." *The Journal of American History* 55, no. 3 (December 1968): 512-532.

Mélonio, Françoise. *Tocqueville and the French*. Translated by Beth G. Raps. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998.

Merlan, Philip. "A Precursor of Tocqueville." *The Pacific Historical Review* 35, no. 4 (November 1966): 467-8.

Meyers, Marvin. "Louis Hartz, The Liberal Tradition in America: An Appraisal." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5, no. 3 (April 1963): 261-268.

Mirowski, Philip and Dieter Plehwe, eds. *The Road from Mont Pèlerin: The Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective.* Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Mohapatra, Bishnu N. "Social Connectedness and Fragility of Social Capital: View from an Orissa Village." *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36, no. 8 (Feb. 24-Mar. 2, 2001): 665-672.

Morone, James A. "The Struggle for American Culture." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 29, no. 3 (September 1996): 424-430.

Morris, Rudolph E. Review of *The Lonely Crowd* by David Riesman. *The American Catholic Sociological Review* 12, no. 2 (June 1951): 104-106.

Nash, George. *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America Since 1945*. 3rd ed. Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2006.

Nixson, H.C. Review of *The Liberal Tradition in America*, by Louis Hartz. *The Journal of Southern History* 21, no. 4 (November 1955): 523-525.

Norton, Anne. *Leo Strauss and The Politics of American Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Patterson, James T. *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Pierce, Donald J. Review of *Democracy in America* by Alexis de Tocqueville. Edited by Phillips Bradley. *American Sociological Review*, x (1945): 568-569.

Pierson, George Wilson. *Tocqueville and Beaumont in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Pitkin, Hannah Fenichel. *The Attack of the Blob: Hannah Arendt's Concept of the Social*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Plotz, John. "The Return of the Blob, or How Sociology Decided to Stop Worrying and Love the Crowd." In *Crowds*. Edited by Jeffrey T. Schnapp and Matthew Tiews. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.

Podhoretz, Norman. *Ex-Friends: Falling Out with Allen Ginsberg, Lionel and Dana Trilling, Lillian Hellman, Hannah Arendt, and Norman Mailer*. New York: The Free Press, 1999.

Putnam, Robert D. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy*. 6, no. 1 (January 1995): 65-78.

—. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2000.

Rahe, Paul. *Soft Despotism, Democracy's Drift: Montesquieu, Rousseau, Tocqueville & the Modern Prospect*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Reinhardt, Mark. "Review: What's New in Arendt?" *Political Theory* 31, no. 3 (June 2003): 443-460.

Richter, Melvin. "Tocqueville and Algeria." *The Review of Politics* 25 (July 1963): 362-398.

Riesman, David Riesman. "On Discovering and Teaching Sociology: A Memoir." *Annual Review of Sociology* 14 (1988): 1-24.

—. "Innocence of *The Lonely Crowd*." *Society* 27, no. 2 (Jan/Feb 1990): 76-79.

—. "Dennis Wong and *The Lonely Crowd* Revisited." *Sociological Forum* 7, no. 2 (June 1992): 391-396.

Ring, Jennifer. "The Pariah as Hero: Hannah Arendt's Political Actor." *Political Theory* 19, no. 3 (August 1991): 433-452.

—. *The Political Consequences of Thinking: Gender and Judaism in the Work of Hannah Arendt*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.

Roazen, Paul. "The Nature of Revolution." *Society* 42, no. 4 (May/Jun 2005): 54-61.

Schlesinger, Arthur Jr. *Liberalism In America: A Note for Europeans from The Politics of Hope*. Boston: Riverside Press, 1956.

—. *The Politics of Hope: And, The Bitter Heritage: American Liberalism in the 1960s*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Sheppard, Eugene R. *Leo Strauss and the Politics of Exile: The Making of a Political Philosopher*. Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England, 2006.

Shuurman, Frans J. "Social Capital: The Politico-Emancipatory Potential of a Disputed Concept." *Third World Quarterly* 24, no. 6 (December 2003): 991-1010.

Smith, Rogers M. "Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hartz: The Multiple Traditions in America." *The American Political Science Review* 87, no. 3 (September 1993): 549-566.

Smith, Steven B. *Reading Leo Strauss: Politics, Philosophy, Judaism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. "Progress of the American Woman." *The North American Review* 171, no. 529 (December 1900): 904-908.

Strauss, Leo. Leo Strauss on Alexis de Tocqueville, 1962. http://www.archive.org/stream/LeoStraussOnAlexisDeTocqueville/Strauss-OnTocqueville#page/n0/mode/2up.

—. *Natural Right and History*. 1953. Reprint, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

—. *What is Political Philosophy? And Other Studies*. 1959. Reprint, Chicago: University of Chicago, 1988.

—. *The Rebirth of Rational Political Classicism: An Introduction to the Thought of Leo Strauss*. Edited by Thomas L. Pangle. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Strauss, Leo and Joseph Cropsey, eds. *History of Political Philosophy.* 3rd ed. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1987.

Sydnor, Charles S. Review of *Democracy in America*, by Alexis de Tocqueville. Edited by Phillips Bradley. *American Political Science Quarterly* 60, no. 3 (September 1945): 457.

Tanguay, Daniel. *Leo Strauss: An Intellectual Biography*. Translated by Christopher Nadon. New Haven: Yale University, 2007.

Thompson, Flora McDonald. "Retrogression of the American Woman." *The North American Review* 171, no. 528 (November 1900): 748-754.

Thurston, G.J. "Alexis De Tocqueville in Russia." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37, no. 2 (Apr.-Jun., 1976): 289-306.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. Edited by Phillips Bradley. New York: A.A. Knopf, 1945.

—. *Recollections.* Edited by J.P. Mayer and AP Kerr. Translated by George Lawrence. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1971.

—. *Democracy in America*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. New York: The Library of America, 2004.

Varg, Paul A. *Edward Everett: The Intellectual in the Turmoil of Politics*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University. Presses, 1992.

Villa, Dana. *Public Freedom*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Wagner, Stephen. *Eisenhower Republicanism: Pursuing the Middle Way.* DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 2006.

Weiland, Steven. "Social Science toward Social Criticism: Some Vocations of David Riesman." *The Antioch Review* 44, no. 4 *Tricks & Bones: The Piltdown Fraud* (Autumn, 1986): 444-457.

Welch, Cheryl, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Tocqueville*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Wilentz, Sean. *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006.

Williams, Walter. "Inner-Directedness and Other-Directedness in New Perspective." *The Sociological Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (Summer 1964): 193-220.

Wilson, Sloan. *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit*. 1955. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2002.

Wolin, Richard. *Heidegger's Children: Hannah Arendt, Karl Löwith, Hans Jonas, and Herbert Marcuse*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

—. *The Frankfurt School Revisited and Other Essays on Politics and Society*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Wolin, Sheldon. "Hannah Arendt." In *Hannah Arendt, Critical Essays*. Edited by Lewis P. Hinchman and Sandra K. Hinchman. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.

—. *Tocqueville Between Two Worlds: The Making of a Political and Theoretical Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Xenos, Nicholas. *Cloaked in Virtue: Unveiling Leo Strauss and the Rhetoric of America Foreign Policy*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Young, James P. "The Hartz Thesis Revisited." In *Studies in US Politics*. Edited by David Keith Adams. Oxford: Manchester University Press, 1989.

Young-Bruehl, Elisabeth. *Hannah Arendt: For Love of the World*. 2nd edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Zank, Michael, ed and trans. *Leo Strauss: The Early Writings 1921-1923*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.

Zetterbaum, Marvin. "Tocqueville: Neutrality and Its Uses." *The American Political Science Review* 58, no. 3 (September 1964): 611-621.

Zuckert, Catherine and Michael P. Zuckert, *The Truth About Leo Strauss: Political Philosophy and American Democracy*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Zunz, Olivier and Alans S. Kahan, eds. *The Tocqueville Reader: A Life in Letters and Politics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2002.