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FOREWORD

This book is based upon the Seeley Lectures delivered in Cambridge in 2006. Pierre Rosanvallon, who is a Professor, both at the Collège de France and at the Raymond Aron Centre for Political Research in Paris, has attracted much attention in France and elsewhere for his work on the intellectual history of French politics since the Revolution, on contemporary questions of social justice, and on the definition and trajectory of modern democracy. His historical studies of French politics, incorporating a fundamental and pioneering re-evaluation of French liberalism, include Le Moment Guizot (1985). His examination of contemporary problems of social justice is most powerfully represented by La Nouvelle Question sociale: Repenser L’État-providence (1995), which was translated into English in 2000 as The New Social Question: Rethinking the Welfare State. His third area of concern, work most relevant to the present volume, has focused upon the intellectual history of democracy in France. This has been published as a trilogy: Le Sacre du citoyen: Histoire du suffrage universel en France (1992); Le Peuple introuvable: Histoire de la représentation démocratique en France (1998); and La Démocratie inachevée: Histoire de la souveraineté du peuple en France (2000).

Rosanvallon believes that there are significant differences between American and European conceptions of democracy, dating back to the second half of the nineteenth century. In the United States, democracy has been viewed from a
globally fundamentalist perspective and treated as a unique, universal, and intrinsically good political form, destined to spread throughout the world, once offered to its different peoples. This has been a vision not only articulated in works of political science, but also tirelessly preached by successive American presidents from Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt to J.F. Kennedy and George W. Bush. In this utopian and quasi-religious perspective, the supposed ethos and institutional form of democracy has remained relatively constant and uniform. So has the political ambition: to ensure a concordance between political practice and this pre-formulated democratic norm, and to further its diffusion throughout the world.

But such an approach has been beset by increasing pessimism. It has found itself confronted by an intractable set of problems, creating an apparently unbridgeable gap between the democratic ideal and a discouraging political reality. Numerous studies have lamented an endemic distrust of politicians, low levels of electoral participation, the decline of political parties, and widespread political apathy or passivity.

In Europe, by contrast, conceptions of democracy and expectations of its progressive improvement have from the beginning been more realistic and low-key. ‘Real democracies,’ Rosanvallon notes, have always involved ‘tension and conflict.’ The problem with the conventional notion of democracy, he thinks, is that it elides questions of legitimacy (abiding by the procedural rules of democratic representation) with questions of trust (the assumption that politicians will act for the common good). But according to Rosanvallon, not only is any convergence between legitimacy and trust ever more than purely temporary, but durable forms of distrust have been an
inherent component of all democracies, however legitimate. Therefore his alternative conception of democracy encompasses not only the formal, legal, and constitutional practices of democratic regimes, but also all those limiting and corrective devices – whether constitutional or extra-constitutional, including those which date from pre-democratic epochs – by which the people have attempted to impose control over the political processes carried out in their name. This is what Rosanvallon calls ‘counter-democracy’.

Rosanvallon believes that conventional definitions of democracy, which restrict it to the electoral process, are too narrow. A more adequate account would include the various ways in which the people are able to check or hold to account their representatives or the government, irrespective of the electoral process. In particular, he picks out for detailed discussion three ways in which distrust may be expressed: powers of oversight or ‘surveillance,’ forms of prevention, and the testing of judgments.

Conceived in this way, democracy, or rather the forms, which Rosanvallon assembles together as ‘counter-democracy,’ can be said to possess a history much longer and more multifaceted than that recognized by conventional democratic theorists. For such a history can include practices which enforce forms of popular control or veto, ancient as well as modern, extra-European as well as western. Such an approach also makes possible a more optimistic account of contemporary democracy than that found in many English-speaking accounts. For it suggests that a citizenry may be no less (or more) active than before, simply that it has chosen to exercise these ‘counter-democratic’ powers in different and less familiar ways.
But, as Rosanvallon concedes, there are also dangers in this account. Although the modern citizen may not be as ‘passive’ as the conventional account maintains, Rosanvallon accepts that levels of political distrust have increased, especially in relation to scientific expertise or economic forecasting, and that there now exists a great distance between civil society and political institutions. It is a situation in which there is a heightened danger of the unwanted appearance of all sorts of populism. Furthermore, if the price of enlarging the contemporary definition of democracy is to accord to all forms of ‘counter-democracy’ – whether institutional or extra-institutional – the status of ‘an authentic political form,’ it is difficult to see how such populism could be excluded from a recognized place in the formal political system.

How effectively Rosanvallon deals with this difficulty is for the reader to judge. Clearly, the implications of some of Rosanvallon’s arguments are controversial, but that is only to be expected of an arresting and original approach to the understanding of contemporary political life and of a more positive conception of the prospects of political change.

Gareth Stedman Jones