

Democracy in america (from tocqueville's work) assignment



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

However, the country also has bits and morals deeply integrated (brought about by the diverse immigration) and particularly powerful. Usually within a democracy, common opinion rules the world. Although, the Americans hold a very particular philosophical vision according to which, each individual, unique, judge things by himself. As a matter, everyone cannot put forward his own opinion about every subject because if it was the case, he would dedicate and lost most of his time to study and, seeing that everything couldn't be detailed, would go for some approximation.

That is why Destructive says that, or some special domain, such as religion for example, it is necessary for the human being to come to general ideas. The example quoted by Destructive is very forceful and makes us able to catch the consequences of the emanation of an individual thought on this point. Destructive clearly distinguishes the individuals from aristocratic society from the ones from democratic society. Thus, the first ones blindly follow the ideas and doctrine inculcated by a man considered as higher than the other.

To the contrary, the second ones, being considered all equals, will rather tend to believe he principles adopted by the mass. In this second case, the majority make the society exists and Destructive thought that this standard had to be restricted, so that it does not prevent diversity or individual actions. Nowadays, I tend to believe that the thoughts of Destructive on the individual of democratic society are still true. I would go even further, saying that this standard spread and that today, we are facing the abolition of the individual thought in the majority of the fields.

General ideas find their source in the XVIII century, but despite all of this, those of the English differ from those of the American or the French. I think that the reason of this can come owing to the fact that human being, increasingly equal, easily accept common general ideas. The majority of the subjects covered by Destructive in this piece of work are still the reflection of today's society, particularly in terms of religion, politics or high sciences in the United States.

Indeed, the Americans are still passionate by politics and very attached to religion and this is due to their own history but also to their faculty to accept the general ideas emanating from the majority. With regard to sciences, Destructive says that the individual wants to form his own opinion. Still, all current democratic society practices the "to believe it is necessary to see". Thus, I think that Destructive had not been mistaken when he said that the Man likes to check the theories before learning them.

However, Destructive allotted this principle to the Americans only, but I would generalize it to every populations evolving in a democratic society. However, I would moderate my matter by adding that in France, we take a particular care to learn the theory thanks to the development of the universities and to the accessibility of education, which is not the case of the United States (very expensive universities and elitist entrance examinations).

The matter of Destructive is more about a sociological analysis of the articulation of the social state with respect to the political regime and to the effects of the equality in our modern societies. Thus, it can show us the

individualism that is caused by modern democracies but also the necessity of freedom reduced by leveling passion and also the omnipresence of the State. The fight for the equality of Men raised crowd and contributed to a huge advanced of the world in what concern rights.

However, I think that inequality remains, within the society, and that is why our world is still perfectible. Each one fights in order to make so that his condition does not condition his life. Have to admit that this book requires patience and impartiality, as the ideas put forward are very generalist. On the other hand, we (as French citizens) are taught since childhood that one of the most important danger in politics is giving the power to one person. This book evokes the hypothetical consequences of the power of democracy, which is something UnUSUal for me, and as a matter of fact, interests Eng.