

# Alexis de Tocqueville and the Institutional Foundations of American Democracy: Trust, Polarization, and Administrative Centralization

Dr. Clayton H. Hawkins

Associate Professor, Political Economy, Signum Magnum College

## Abstract

Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* remains one of the most influential analyses of democracy in the United States, emphasizing institutions and civic participation rather than political leaders or policy outcomes. Tocqueville argued that the resilience of American democracy depended on local self-government, voluntary associations, and shared moral values that moderate individualism and political conflict. He also warned that democratic societies could drift toward administrative centralization, producing a condition he termed *soft despotism*, in which citizens retain formal rights but gradually lose their capacity for meaningful political influence.

This article revisits Tocqueville's institutional account while incorporating contemporary empirical research on political trust and polarization. Survey evidence indicates that Americans have greater confidence in local government than in federal institutions, while research on political behavior suggests rising partisan animosity and declining willingness to compromise. The article argues that Tocqueville's evaluation remains relevant today because it identifies institutional conditions that maintain democratic legitimacy and prevent political disagreement from becoming destabilizing.

**Keywords:** Tocqueville, American democracy, political trust, affective polarization, civic associations, administrative centralization

## Introduction

The resilience of American democracy has never depended entirely on constitutional rights or free elections. Instead, its stability has rested on citizen participation, public confidence in legitimate authority, and institutions that allow citizens to represent their interests without relying on centralized governance. In *Democracy in America*, Tocqueville sought to explain how the United States combined democratic equality with political stability, while warning of persistent risks common to democratic societies (Tocqueville, 1835/2000). Tocqueville viewed democracy not merely as a political system but as a social condition shaped by equality of circumstances. His analysis emphasized how equality alters expectations, incentives, and institutional arrangements. This institutional perspective is particularly relevant given declining trust in government and increased political polarization in the United States (Pew Research Center, 2024). While these trends are often attributed to cultural conflict or technological change, Tocqueville's work suggests that institutional design plays a central role in shaping democratic behavior and government legitimacy.

This article revisits Tocqueville's account of American democracy and incorporates contemporary empirical findings on trust and polarization. It argues that Tocqueville's analysis remains relevant not because he anticipated many of today's political outcomes, but because he identified the institutional conditions under which democracy can remain stable and free.

### **Democracy, Equality, and the Risk of Dependence**

Tocqueville defined democracy primarily in terms of equality of conditions. While equality weakens hierarchical status, it also encourages a form of individualism that can draw citizens away from civic participation and toward social isolation (Tocqueville, 1835/2000). Tocqueville warned that under these conditions, citizens may gradually exchange civic responsibility for government security, creating a subtle form of domination that preserves formal rights while eroding self-governance.

Modern scholars emphasize that Tocqueville's concern with the decline of local governance reflects a long-term democratic tendency rather than a rejection of democracy itself (Manent, 1996). Accepting democracy as an inevitable stage of social development, Tocqueville focused on how political institutions, legal frameworks, and local self-government could limit centralized authority and preserve liberty within democratic societies (Craiu, 2004; Rahe, 2009). His concern was that withdrawal from civic life would invite expanded administrative authority and diminish individual freedom.

### **Local Government and Institutional Learning**

Tocqueville regarded local government as a foundational component of American democracy. Townships and municipalities functioned as schools of citizenship, teaching individuals how to negotiate, compromise, and accept responsibility for collective decisions (Tocqueville, 1835/2000). Participation in local governance exposed citizens to practical constraints and competing interests, fostering cooperation and political moderation.

Contemporary research supports Tocqueville's assessment. Americans consistently report greater trust in local government than in federal institutions (Gallup, 2023). Similarly, Pew Research Center findings indicate that citizens view local governance more favorably than national political institutions (Pew Research Center, 2025). These findings align with Tocqueville's argument that democratic legitimacy depends in part on proximity, accountability, and participation rather than policy outcomes alone.

As policy authority becomes increasingly centralized, local institutions may lose both responsibility and legitimacy. Tocqueville warned that centralization intensifies national political competition by narrowing the arenas in which citizens can meaningfully participate, thereby contributing to polarization and reduced civic learning.

### **Civic Associations and the Social Foundations of Democracy**

One of Tocqueville's most influential observations concerned Americans' tendency to form voluntary associations. These associations function as civil institutions that mediate between individuals and the state, enabling citizens to pursue shared goals without relying exclusively on government authority (Tocqueville, 1835/2000). In doing so, they reduce dependence on centralized administration while cultivating cooperation and shared responsibility.

Empirical research supports this insight. Declines in civic participation are associated with reduced institutional trust and diminished political cooperation (Putnam, 1995, 2000). Subsequent scholarship confirms that civic engagement strengthens democratic capacity and collective problem-solving

(Fukuyama, 2001; Ostrom, 2010). Tocqueville's insight was not that associations eliminate conflict, but that they make disagreement manageable by encouraging deliberation and cooperation.

### **Political Trust, Polarization, and Institutional Confidence**

Declining trust in government has become a defining feature of contemporary American politics. Pew Research Center (2024) reports historically low confidence in federal institutions, accompanied by rising partisan animosity. At the same time, citizens express greater trust in state and local governments, suggesting that proximity to governance enhances perceived legitimacy (Gallup, 2023).

Research on affective polarization demonstrates that political opponents are increasingly viewed as moral threats rather than legitimate competitors, reducing support for compromise and democratic norms (Iyengar et al., 2019). Comparative research further indicates that the United States exhibits higher levels of affective polarization than other democratic societies (Garzia et al., 2023). These developments align with Tocqueville's warning that centralized authority intensifies political competition by making national political outcomes more consequential, transforming disagreement into continuous struggle (Tocqueville, 1835/2000).

### **Administrative Centralization and Soft Despotism**

Tocqueville used the concept of *soft despotism* to describe a gradual expansion of administrative authority that weakens civic participation while preserving formal political rights. Unlike overt tyranny, soft despotism relies on dependency rather than coercion, as citizens defer responsibility for governance to centralized institutions (Tocqueville, 1835/2000; Rahe, 2009).

Tocqueville's warning was not a rejection of democracy but a caution about its potential evolution. His analysis remains relevant because it highlights how liberty may erode through institutional substitution—when self-government is displaced by bureaucratic management rather than eliminated by authoritarian force (Craiutu, 2004; Manent, 1996).

### **Conclusion**

*Democracy in America* remains foundational because it addresses enduring problems of democratic governance. Tocqueville's institutional analysis underscores the importance of local self-government, civic association, and limits on administrative centralization. Contemporary empirical research on political trust and polarization reinforces Tocqueville's view that democratic legitimacy depends not only on policy outcomes but also on how authority is structured and experienced by citizens.

In an era of declining public trust and rising political polarization, Tocqueville offers a framework for understanding how democratic societies can preserve liberty while managing conflict. Democracy, he reminds us, is not self-sustaining. It requires institutions that cultivate participation, moderation, and cooperation over time.

### **References**

1. Craiutu, A. (2004). The third democracy: Tocqueville's views of America after 1840. *American Political Science Review*, 98(3), 391–404. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055404001094>
2. Fukuyama, F. (2001). Social capital, civil society and development. *Third World Quarterly*, 22(1), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713701144>

3. Gallup. (2023). *Americans trust local government most, Congress least*. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/512651/americans-trust-local-government-congress-least.aspx>
4. Garzia, D., Ferreira da Silva, F., & De Angelis, A. (2023). Affective polarization in comparative and longitudinal perspective. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(15), e2218355120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2218355120>
5. Iyengar, S., Sood, G., & Lelkes, Y. (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22, 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051117-073034>
6. Manent, P. (1996). *Tocqueville and the nature of democracy*. Rowman & Littlefield.
7. Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond markets and states: Polycentric governance of complex economic systems. *American Economic Review*, 100(3), 641–672. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.3.641>
8. Pew Research Center. (2024). *Americans' deepening mistrust of institutions*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/trust/2024/americans-deepening-mistrust-of-institutions/>
9. Pew Research Center. (2025). *On issue after issue, Americans say things are going better locally than nationally*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/02/10/on-issue-after-issue-americans-say-things-are-going-better-locally-than-nationally/>
10. Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, (1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.1995.0002>
11. Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.
12. Rahe, P. A. (2009). *Soft despotism, democracy's drift: Montesquieu, Rousseau, Tocqueville, and the modern prospect*. Yale University Press.
13. Tocqueville, A. de. (2000). *Democracy in America* (H. C. Mansfield & D. Winthrop, Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1835).