

Janetta Charuta-Kojkoł

Liberal model of democracy and citizenship

Colloquium nr 1, 99-116

2015

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Janetta Charuta-Kojkol
Naval Academy in Gdynia

LIBERAL MODEL OF DEMOCRACY AND CITIZENSHIP

ABSTRACT

The article depicts main ideas of the model of liberal democracy and resulting civil obligations, as well as proves that values such as: freedom, equality, individualism, autonomy, self-determination, pluralism, tolerance and individual rights may constitute a valuable basis for social life. Moreover, the article contradicts the thesis representing the citizen as an isolated individual, deprived of moral directions and supported by values, by balancing it with an independent, self-reliant and responsible individual.

Keywords:

liberalism, democracy, individualism, freedom, equality, pluralism, tolerance, individual rights.

The model of liberal democracy, in other words of representative democracy, is a set of ideas as well as principles of ruling which result from essential features of liberalism and democracy. However, not all thinkers identify liberalism with democracy nor do they think that the first always

implies the second¹. On the level of defined actions, as says Giovanni Sartori, *the difference between liberalism and democracy is that liberalism is above all a technique of reducing state power, while democracy aims for the power of the people to infiltrate state structures*².

Moreover, liberalism is not homogenous, which makes it difficult to identify it theoretically. Talking about only one specific liberal current would be a misunderstanding. Jerzy Szacki recognises this cognitive dissonance by pointing to the theoretical variety of liberalism and its practical exemplifications³.

Alan Ryan has a similar idea, as he writes that it is easy to enumerate famous liberalists; it is harder to tell what is their common feature. John Locke, Adam Smith, Montesquieu, Thomas Jefferson, John Stuart Mill, Lord Acton, T. H. Green, John Dewey and contemporary authors like Isaiah Berlin or John Rawls are definitely not liberals, although they are not consistent about the limits of tolerance or about the foundation of the validity of protective state or about the values of democracy, not to mention more than these three fundamental political issues. They are not even consistent on the nature of freedom, which, according to them, liberals should seek⁴.

¹ Liberal and democratic countries may exist independently of each other. History knows examples of countries like 19th century England which was a liberal, but not a democratic country, as the majority of rights was granted to the elites. Currently, there are opposite examples like Iran where relatively honest elections make this country more democratic but the lack of freedom of speech exclude it from liberal countries. It seems that this thesis may be confirmed by examples of civil democracies. It needs to be remembered that liberalism refers mostly to the idea of freedom, whereas democracy – to equality. Hence some people conclude that liberalism may both favour and prevent democracy from development, especially that some of its concepts may threaten the realization of liberal freedoms. This interpretation is defied by those who explicitly identify democracy with liberalism and liberalism with democracy. See: Z. Drozdowicz, *Liberalizm europejski*, Wydawnictwo Forum Naukowe, Poznań 2005, p. 7, F. Fukuyama, *Koniec historii*, Zysk i S-ka Wydawnictwo, Poznań 1992, p. 78, B. Grabowska, *Samotny egoista czy odpowiedzialny obywatel? Rozważania na temat liberalnego ideału człowieka i obywatela*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń 2011, p. 8–9, A. Heywood, *Ideologie polityczne. Wprowadzenie*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2008, p. 57, M. Król, *Filozofia polityczna*, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 2008, p. 200–201.

² G. Sartori, *Theory of democracy*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1994, p. 472.

³ See: J. Szacki, *Liberalizm po komunizmie*, Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy Znak, Fundacja im. Stefana Batorego, Kraków – Warszawa 1994, p. 22.

⁴ A. Ryan, *Czym jest liberalizm*, [in:] *Przewodnik po współczesnej filozofii politycznej*, pod red. R. E. Goodina, P. Pettita, op. cit., p. 380.

The above statements imply various classifications and divisions of liberalism. The most frequent division is the one into classical liberalism, neoliberalism also called conservative liberalism and libertarianism. Almost equally frequent is the division to political and economic liberalism resulting from its role in the socio-economic life.

While understanding the validity of such classifications in historical and theoretical justification, it is important to note that liberalism, in its primal form, was a political doctrine. Its followers attacked absolutism and feudal privileges by supporting constitutive government, and later – representative government. Liberalism then found its way in economic life with its condemnation of all forms of state intervention and its praise of values of *laissez faire* capitalism.

The above divisions do not exhaust the problem discussed as they do not underline the fact that liberalism became part of culture in its wide sense, including the domain of education and upbringing, thus maximising individual freedom in social life. Those ideas may be found in such currents as rationalism, utilitarianism, *laissez-faire* and permissivism.

Although heterogeneous, the defined theoretical concepts allow to extract constitutive features of liberalism. Andrzej Szahaj fairly includes individualism – a conviction about the imperative value of human individuals in relation to any community, state or other above-individual instance⁵. According to Adam Chmielewski, individualism in this understanding is *a belief in the highest value of human being gifted with autonomy and personality, a unique identity and ability to formulate an individual, “private” idea of good*⁶.

Such defined individualism is expressed through the key concept of individual freedom, supported by the organization of public life. The rule of individual freedom was already presented by John Locke who wrote that *the human being is born with a proven right to complete freedom and unlimited use of all rights and privileges of law of nature to the same extent as all other human beings on the planet*⁷. He granted the individual the feeling

⁵ See: A. Szahaj, M. N. Jakubowski, *Filozofia polityki*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2005, p. 41.

⁶ A. Chmielewski, *Spoleczeństwo otwarte czy wspólnota? Filozoficzne i moralne podstawy nowoczesnego liberalizmu oraz jego krytyka we współczesnej filozofii społecznej*, Oficyna Wydawnicza ARBORETRUM, Wrocław 2001, p. 115.

⁷ J. Locke, *Drugi traktat o rządzie*, [in:] *Historia idei politycznych. Wybór tekstów*, pod red. S. Filipowicz, M. Mielczarek, K. Pielniński, M. Tański, tom I, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2002, p. 374.

of power and right to live, freedom, possession and to defend the laws arising from reason. It seems that Benjamin Constant was right writing that *we can no longer enjoy the freedom of the ancient people, freedom consisting of active and constant participation in collective power. Freedom that is our contribution consists in a quiet devotion to private independence. (...) The purpose of contemporary people is an undisturbed use of individual freedom benefits while institutions provide them a guarantee of their freedom*⁸.

John Stuart Mill developed the thought according to which freedom comprised firstly an inner sphere of conscience, in other words, *demand of a free conscience in its widest sense; freedom of thought and emotion; absolute freedom of opinion and judgement in all practical, philosophical, scientific, moral and theological subjects*. Secondly, freedom of preferences and occupations, which means *formulation of a life plan according to one's character; acting according to one's will with the condition of responsibility for one's actions, without impediment from other human beings until one's actions don't harm them, even if they considered one's actions stupid, subversive or irrational*. Thirdly, individual freedom to *associate for any purpose harmless to others*⁹.

Individual freedom defined above implies pluralism of values and beliefs, worldviews and lifestyles from which citizens can choose freely. Pluralism also assumes variety and distinctness of human beings as part of liberalism.

The concept of individual freedom was developed by Isaiah Berlin with his famous division on negative and positive freedom¹⁰. In his view, negative freedom is freedom "from" – interference with actions of particular being, which should let one to independently decide about one's life. People are free when no individual, group or state interfere with their actions. Such freedom results from the condition to liberate oneself from constraints and grants individuals a minimum of personal freedom. Positive freedom,

⁸ B. H. Constant, *O wolności starożytnych i nowożytnych*, przeł. Z. Kosno, [in:] *Historia idei politycznych. Wybór tekstów*, pod red. S. Filipowicz, A. Mielczarek, K. Pielński, M. Tański, tom II, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2002, p. 249.

⁹ J. S. Mill, *Utylitaryzm*, przeł. M. Ossowska, *O wolności*, przeł. A. Kurlandzka, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa 1959, p. 133.

¹⁰ The division on negative and positive freedom done by I. Berlin is subject of endless discussion, consideration and comment. Those discussions are dominated by the view that negative freedom is a sign of liberal approach as it doesn't force individuals to act in a specific way, especially in public life. See R. Wonicki, *Spór o demokratyczne Państwo Prawa. Teoria Jurgena Habermasa wobec liberalnej, republikańskiej i socjalnej wizji państwa*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2007, p. 53.

on the other hand, is freedom “to”, in other words, freedom to realize a political idea, self-fulfilment or authenticity, which may lead to the individual identifying with imposed ideas and, in consequence, to paternalism seen by I. Berlin as an insult to the concept of oneself as a human being who decided to live according to one’s own (not necessarily rational or righteous) goals and who, above all, has the right to be treated like that by others¹¹. In this context, negative freedom is seen as a minimal range of individual freedom. According to I. Berlin, it means that there must be a clear line drawn between private life and public power domain¹². I. Berlin refers critically to J. S. Mill’s beliefs, who, according to Berlin, mixed two distinct liberal views¹³. According to Marcin Krol’s interpretation, Berlin accuses Mill of being interested *only in freedom as such and not freedom in political society but private freedom*¹⁴.

Liberals’ inclination towards individual freedom may be justified by epistemic egalitarianism which claims, as writes Adam Chmielewski, that *every human is potentially able to gain knowledge about social reality, about himself and his own needs and that he has the right to aim at fulfilling his goals accordingly to his powers and with respect of this very right by other people*¹⁵.

However, Paul Kelly claims that epistemic liberalism was overshadowed by Rawls’ *political liberalism*¹⁶, in other words by such an approach which *combines concern about equal basic rights with request to equal access to basic economic resources – primal economical goods*¹⁷.

Indeed, John Rawls states that *the state of natural equality corresponds to the state of nature in the traditional theory of social agreement. It is understood as a hypothetical situation constructed in order to implement the idea of justice. The only important feature of this situation is that nobody knows their place, position or status in society, nobody knows what natural*

¹¹ I. Berlin, *Cztery eseje o wolności*, przeł. H. Bartoszewicz, D. Grinberg, D. Lachowska, A. Tanalska-Dulęba, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1994, p. 218.

¹² Ibidem, p. 184.

¹³ See ibidem, p. 124.

¹⁴ M. Król, *Filozofia polityczna*, op. cit., p. 89.

¹⁵ See A. Chmielewski, *Spoleczeństwo otwarte czy wspólnota? Filozoficzne i moralne podstawy nowoczesnego liberalizmu oraz jego krytyka we współczesnej filozofii społecznej*, op. cit., p. 82.

¹⁶ P. Kelly, *Liberalizm*, przeł. S. Królak, Wydawnictwo Sic! s. c., Warszawa 2007, p. 13.

¹⁷ Ibidem, p. 99.

*characteristics or talents such as intelligence or power etc. would be given to them. Justice rules are chosen behind a curtain of ignorance*¹⁸.

He simultaneously indicated two rules of justice. One of them states that *every human being has the right to maximum freedom available to reconcile with freedom of other people*¹⁹. It also concerns freedom in the form of voting right, holding a public office, standing as a candidate for public offices, freedom of speech and right to consociate, freedom of conscience, thought and possession.

The second rule states that *social and economic injustice may happen so that (a) it could be anticipated that they would benefit everyone and (b) they would involve positions and offices equally available to everyone*²⁰.

It may be concluded that the first rule sees freedom as a priority. Every citizen should have equal access to the set of basic freedom. The second one, according to Magdalena Zardecka-Nowak, *sees all forms of special consideration or discrimination (persecution or exploitation) as unacceptable, while accepting some kind of injustice*²¹.

These rules are reflected in the idea of equal political rights of individuals and liberal postulates of freedom towards law and power. According to Edmund Wnuk-Lipinski, the first shape the liberal civil society seen as unity of morally autonomic individuals equipped with their own concept of a good life where the role of society is limited to providing individuals equality before the law²². It might be said that this view confronts civil society with state.

This idea may be found in John Locke's thought that the only way the human being can leave his state of nature is to conclude a social agreement forming a civil society to which individuals forward their rights. *Political society exists only where each of its members renounced their natural power and gave it to the community, nevertheless not giving up the possibility*

¹⁸ J. Rawls, *Teoria sprawiedliwości*, Biblioteka Współczesnych Filozofów, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1994, p. 24.

¹⁹ Ibidem, p. 87.

²⁰ Ibidem, p. 87.

²¹ M. Zardecka-Nowak, *Rozum i obywatel. Idea rozumu publicznego oraz koncepcja jednostki we współczesnej filozofii polityki*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, Rzeszów 2007, p. 30.

²² See E. Wnuk-Lipiński, *Socjologia życia publicznego*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR, Warszawa 2005, p. 132.

to question laws established by it²³. Zbigniew Rau sees in Locke that individual and natural rights of distinct citizens become individual and natural rights of citizens supported by communities²⁴. The individual is then the source of political power of a civil society by claiming this power and creating civil society.

Chmielewski claims that the idea of social agreement *has a fundamental character for liberalism as it allows to see political power and social relations as grounded on mutual voluntary agreement*²⁵. According to the liberals, political power and social relations should be constructed on respect and will to communicate.

The next important postulate of liberalism is meliorism²⁶. The belief in progress refers to the Enlightenment thought, especially to Antoine Nicolas Condorcet's belief. In his work entitled "Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind", he wrote that *there is no boundary of improvement of human talents, humans possess unlimited possibilities to develop, their progress is independent of all powers who would want to slow them down and their only boundary is the end of existence of the planet that nature put us on*²⁷.

A strong belief in progress is also visible in J.S. Mill's opinion. He gave individuals the right to choose their lifestyle and let them achieve not only independence and responsibility but also originality of the mind and individualism of character which, according to him, are the ingredients of both individual and social progress²⁸.

²³ J. Locke, *Drugi traktat o rządzie*, [in:] *Historia idei politycznych. Wybór tekstów*, pod red. S. Filipowicz, M. Mielczarek, K. Pielński, M. Tański, tom I, op. cit., p. 374.

²⁴ Z. Rau, *Umowa społeczna w doktrynie Johna Locke'a*, [in:] *Umowa społeczna i jej krytycy w myśli politycznej i prawnej*, pod. red. Z. Rau, M. Chmieliński, Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR, Warszawa 2010, p. 136.

²⁵ A. Chmielewski, *Spółczeństwo otwarte czy wspólnota? Filozoficzne i moralne podstawy nowoczesnego liberalizmu oraz jego krytyka we współczesnej filozofii społecznej*, op. cit., s.121.

²⁶ Meliorism claims that humans and institutions taking part in collective life are able not only of self-control but also of self-improvement. See A. Szahaj, M. Jakubowski, *Filozofia polityki*, op. cit., p. 41. Liberals are more optimistic as they believe in the possibility of self-improvement of individuals and of conditions of their lives and in actual improvements occurring throughout time. See Drozdowicz, *Liberalizm europejski*, op. cit., p. 9.

²⁷ A. D. Condorcet, *Szkieł obrazu postępu ducha ludzkiego poprzez dzieje*, przekład E. Hartleb dokończył J. Strzelecki [in:] *Historia idei politycznych. Wybór tekstów*, tom II, op. cit., p. 89.

²⁸ See J. S. Mill, *Utylitaryzm*, przeł. M. Ossowska, *O wolności*, przeł. A. Kurlandzka, op. cit., p. 197–198.

By accepting this view, Zbigniew Drozdowicz points out that liberalism will always insist on the need *to believe in the human being, in his natural and acquired talents, in his power to transform reality to make “today” better than “yesterday” and “tomorrow” better than “today”*²⁹. Meliorism understood in this way is visible in contemporary liberal society which, as Marcin Król writes, is still based on the idea of progress in most of social life areas, although not so vividly articulated, sometimes even not realized. Education on all its levels, science, economy, medicine and many other areas of our lives, including sports, are founded on the conviction that we will be able to achieve more and that our goal is unstoppable striving towards this “more”³⁰.

According to A. Szahaj’s opinion, liberalism may be called in this context an *emancipative orientation*³¹ which created space for individual’s initiative. That is why liberals are convinced of universality of their claims about maximising individual freedom, its rights and its place in society.

Hence the analysis of the model of liberal democracy emphasised by Z. Drozdowicz: *it leads, at least it should lead towards establishing relations between citizens and state*³².

In the model of liberal democracy, in private as well as in public life, the citizen acts according to his personal interest, goals and moral autonomy. That is why liberalism took as starting point especially protection of citizen’s rights, mostly his right to live, freedom and possession. They allow him to function according to his choices in private life, whereas in public life – to be subject to laws respected by the state capable of their verification.

Citizenship seen in this way is for liberalism – according to E. Wnuk-Lipinski – *as universal as people’s inclination to freedom and liberation from restraints imposed by various systems*³³. According to Jacek Raciborski, the citizen in liberalism does not have *to sacrifice himself for community or confront unfair law, nor does he have to engage in state’s affairs. He*

²⁹ Z. Drozdowicz, *Liberalizm europejski*, op. cit., p. 185.

³⁰ M. Król, *Filozofia polityczna*, op. cit., p. 114.

³¹ A. Szahaj, *Liberalizm wspólnotowość równość*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń 2012, p. 19.

³² Z. Drozdowicz, *Liberalizm europejski*, op. cit., p. 147.

³³ E. Wnuk-Lipiński, *Socjologia życia publicznego*, op. cit., p. 109.

is not threatened by being excluded from citizenship in the formal or in the moral sense³⁴.

Liberals such as Magdalena Zardecka-Nowak usually don't consider political activity a necessary condition of moral maturity³⁵. They usually treat morality as part of private sphere, which, as B. Grabowska points out, doesn't necessarily mean that moral rules become less important for people acting according to them³⁶. It is important to state that liberalism doesn't treat the character of its citizens as totally indifferent. According to many theoreticians, liberalism even encourages people to work out relevant features and civil virtues.

William A. Galston reminds that the liberal tradition formulated at least three various concepts of independent individual virtue with *one common feature: the vision of individuals somehow taking responsibility for their lives. Each of these concepts associates virtue to a kind of activity. All of them lead to the defence of individual's dignity and postulate of mutual respect*³⁷.

The first concept is *Locke's idea of perfection as rational freedom or self-determination*³⁸. Locke claimed that *one's independence and freedom of conduct according to one's own will relies on possession of reason capable of knowing laws and conscience about the extent of use of free will*³⁹. He conditioned the proficiency in use of the reason on the level of engagement in exercises: *the body is similar to the mind – practice makes it what it is*⁴⁰,

³⁴ Por. J. Raciborski, *Obywatelstwo w perspektywie socjologicznej*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2011, p. 32.

³⁵ M. Zardecka-Nowak, *Rozum i obywatel. Idea rozumu publicznego oraz koncepcja jednostki we współczesnej filozofii polityki*, op. cit., p. 128.

³⁶ B. Grabowska, *Samotny egoista czy odpowiedzialny obywatel? Rozważania na temat liberalnego ideału człowieka i obywatela*, op. cit., p. 168.

³⁷ W. Galston, *Cele liberalizmu*, tłum. A. Pawelec, Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy Znak, Kraków 1999, p. 252.

³⁸ Ibidem, p. 250.

³⁹ J. Locke, *Drugi traktat o rządzie*, przeł. Z. Rau [in:] *Historia idei politycznych wybór tekstów*, tom I, opracowany S. Filipowicz, A. Mielczarek, K. Pieliński, M. Tański, op. cit., p. 374.

⁴⁰ J. Locke, *Rozważania dotyczące rozumu ludzkiego*, tłum. B. J. Gawecki, tom II, Wydawnictwo PWN, Warszawa 1955, p. 608.

as well as on education and upbringing⁴¹.

According to Locke, every human being had the right to uninhibited development and formulation, determination and inspection of their own life plans, beliefs and judgements. What is more, human life was to be complemented by pragmatic moral rules respecting above all tolerance of faith. This rule could be abolished only in relation to atheists and followers of dangerous religious fractions, because they didn't possess any permanent system of moral values and could break rules of social cooperation. According to Juliusz Iwanicki, *Locke postulates, for the first time in modern history of secular thought, the idea of religious pluralism*⁴².

The second liberal concept of independent individual virtue according to Galston is the *Kantian idea about the ability to act according to moral obligation*⁴³.

Immanuel Kant was looking for what determined human actions and what was autonomous but resulted from the mind itself. A moral human being shouldn't justify his good deeds by fear of God or promise of prize. Kant thought that the will was good when it fulfilled orders resulting from obligation. Therefore only actions coming from obligation were moral. He argued that obligation consisted of actions compliant with the law – with what was necessary and universal, a priori and independent from experience.

⁴¹ John Locke cared mostly about education of upper classes. He proposed a rich educational programme of future gentlemen supposed to become capable to serve their country to children of aristocracy and wealthy citizens; whereas to the poor, he proposed lessons about the Bible and professional courses. See B. Grabowska, *Samotny egoista czy odpowiedzialny obywatel? Rozważania na temat liberalnego ideału Człowieka i obywatela*, op. cit., p. 24. Władysław M. Kozłowski claims that Locke took into consideration the social class structure of the old world's society in which the privileged class had the only chance of gaining knowledge and mental development. He had in mind the thought that light could be spread from up downwards, therefore he imposed the duty of example and leadership on upper classes. See W. M. Kozłowski, *Stanowisko Locke'a w historii pedagogiki w świetle współczesnych jej dążeń [in:] Polskie badania nad myślą pedagogiczną w latach 1900–1939 Parerga*, oprac. S. Sztobryn, M. Świtka, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Gdańsk 2006, p. 246.

⁴² See J. Iwanicki, *Procesy sekularyzacyjne a filozofia sekularna i postsekularna. Tradycje i współczesność*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wydziału Nauk Społecznych Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań 2014, p. 38.

⁴³ W. Galston, *Cele liberalizmu*, tłum. A. Pawelec, op. cit., p. 251.

Obligation presents itself in relation to dedication being the cost of observing virtues, rather than with benefits resulting from it⁴⁴.

In Tomasz Zyro's opinion, *practical philosophy couldn't solve the problem of how moral reason could rule in political world until Kant formulated his doctrine of reason being the lawmaker for the world*⁴⁵.

The third concept of liberal individual virtue was developed by John Stuart Mill who *combined the Greek postulate of progress – through action – of human power with modern belief that in every man there was a mixture of these powers*⁴⁶. The concept of individual by Mill relies on the vision of a human as subject equipped with free will – *the human being is responsible only for the part of his behaviour that concerns others. In the part concerning only himself, he is absolutely free; he has sovereign power over himself, over his body and mind*⁴⁷. The individual according to Mill would also be responsible for his fate, critical towards convention, apt to take risk and most of all, striving for self-development and self-realization by making constant life choices and experiments. In this process, according to Mill, people should, as writes I. Berlin, *seek truth and develop certain features such as: criticism, originality, imagination, independence, non-conformism to the level of eccentricity*⁴⁸.

In Barbara Grabkowska's opinion, both Locke and Mill would *want to see in every man a reasonable, critical, able to plan, consistent in pursuing goals of his choosing and constantly self-developing individual*⁴⁹.

However, it seems that concepts of individual virtue proposed above by Locke, Kant and Mill are only for the few people ready to take the challenge of individuality, not afraid to be themselves and able to work on their character. Therefore Judith Shklar's opinion is valuable, as she claims that

⁴⁴ I. Kant, *O porządku: To może być słuszne w teorii, ale nic nie jest warte w praktyce. Do wiecznego pokoju*, krytyczne opracowanie, wstęp, uwagi, bibliografia i indeks, H. F. Klemme, przeł. M. Żelazny, Wydawnictwo COMER, Toruń 1995, p. 7.

⁴⁵ T. Żyro, *Wola polityczna. Siedem prób z filozofii praktycznej*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2008, p. 344.

⁴⁶ W. Galston, *Cele liberalizmu*, tłum. A. Pawelec, op. cit., p. 251.

⁴⁷ J. S. Mill, *Utylitaryzm*, przeł. M. Ossowska, *O wolności*, przeł. A. Kurlandzka, op. cit., p. 129.

⁴⁸ I. Berlin, *Cztery eseje o wolności*, przeł. H. Bartoszewicz, D. Grinberg, D. Lachowska, A. Tanalska-Dulęba, op. cit., p. 124.

⁴⁹ B. Grabkowska, *Samotny egoista czy odpowiedzialny obywatel? Rozważania na temat liberalnego ideału człowieka i obywatela*, op. cit., p. 137–138.

*liberalism is far from immoral freedom and is a system especially demanding and imposing boundaries, too difficult for those who are afraid of freedom*⁵⁰.

The ideal of human being in liberalism hasn't always been equivalent to the ideal of a good citizen. Kazimierz Dziubka acknowledges that *the transfer of rules defining the sphere of private behaviour on norms of moral code of a citizen would result in a duality. On the one hand, citizens were expected to conscious self-constraint of their demand for freedom (rule of just conduct) and becoming law-abiding (to written or unwritten rules), on the other hand, they were praised for their actions aiming at maximizing private benefits calculated on the basis of loss and gain*⁵¹.

Moreover, classical liberals claiming freedom of all before the law were also denying to grant political power to all citizens. They would condition it on a high material status, taxes and education. In their understanding, state power should serve among all to defend private property, hence it should reside in rationally acting representatives' hands⁵². According to Constant, *representative system is a mandate given to a limited number of people by the nation willing to defend its interest but has no time to always defend it itself*⁵³. Only Mill didn't exclude poorer social classes, what is more, he postulated giving women voting right, which, in D. Held's mind, *was a breakthrough in ending the masculine liberal thinking, by seeing women as "fully mature adult persons", worthy of being "free and equal" individuals*⁵⁴.

Nevertheless, it doesn't mean that liberalism was founded on a passive idea of citizenship, consisting only on granting rights and observing them. It came up with civil ethic postulates such as: observing the law, paying taxes, defending the homeland, actively participating in decision-making

⁵⁰ J. Shklar, *Zwyczajne przywary*, przeł. M. Król, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 1997, p. 13.

⁵¹ K. Dziubka, *Teoria demokratycznej obywatelskości – zarys problemu*, [in:] *Spółeczeństwo obywatelskie*, pod. red., W. Bokajło, K. Dziubka, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław 2001, p. 111.

⁵² Por. K. Trzeciński, *Obywatelstwo w Europie*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR, Warszawa 2006, p. 170–171.

⁵³ B. H. Constant, *O wolności starożytnych i nowożytnych*, przeł. Z. Kosno, [in:] *Historia idei politycznych. Wybór tekstów*, pod red. S. Filipowicz, A. Mielczarek, K. Pielniński, M. Tański, tom II, op. cit., p. 253.

⁵⁴ D. Held, *Modele demokracji*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 2010, p. 114–115.

process about community matters, even civil disobedience⁵⁵. It also paid little attention to the importance of civil education, proven by Benjamin Constant's view *that institutions should complete moral education of the people. With respect to individual rights, they should take into consideration their independence and, without disrupting their daily activities, they should devote a part of their power on public matters, call for cooperation in performing duties by giving their determination and votes, grant them right to control and supervise through opinion making and thus shaping their noble functions, give them both the desire and ability to perform them*⁵⁶.

As Dorota Sepczynska points out, liberals also defended *the necessity of existence of civil, not military virtues*⁵⁷. Stephen Macedo thinks alike, underlining the fact that *liberal politics require a certain level and quality of civil virtue, while life in a reasonably fair, tolerant and open political system favours development of this virtue*⁵⁸.

Yet, liberalism denies the thesis about independent value of civil virtue. According to Andrzej Szut, *liberal country cannot favour civil virtues as necessary part of good live, as it would mean, in the light of existence of plural concepts of a good life, choosing only one concept at the expense of others. With the assumption of liberal rules of justice (equality and freedom), it would automatically mean unjust treatment of those who didn't accept such a concept of good life*⁵⁹.

Moreover, liberals claim that understanding about individual value of political life cannot be achieved. That is why, although civil virtues are essential in liberalism, they frequently have a purely instrumental character,

⁵⁵ John Locke, in his *Two Treatises of Government*, justified citizens' right to express their disobedience and political consequences of such an act. He claimed that if the lawmaker disregarded the basic law of inviolability of private property or gave somebody absolute power over life, freedom or property of the nation, the power would come back to the people. See J. Locke, *Drugi traktat o rządzie*, [in:] *Historia idei politycznych. Wybór tekstów*, pod red. S. Filipowicz, M. Mielczarek, K. Pieliński, M. Tański, tom I, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2002, p. 380–384.

⁵⁶ B. H. Constant, *O wolności starożytnych i nowożytnych*, przeł. Z. Kosno, [in:] *Historia idei politycznych. Wybór tekstów*, pod red. S. Filipowicz, A. Mielczarek, K. Pieliński, M. Tański, tom II, op. cit., p. 255.

⁵⁷ D. Sepczyńska, *Katolicyzm a liberalizm*, Wydawnictwo NOMOS, Kraków 2008, p. 260.

⁵⁸ S. Macedo, *Cnoty liberalne*, tłum. G. Łuczkiwicz, Wydawnictwo Znak, Karków 1995, p. 14.

⁵⁹ A. Szutta, *O cnotach obywatelskich na przykładzie koncepcji instrumentalnego republikanizmu Williama Kymlicki*, „Diametros”, 2012, nr 32, p. 213.

which, according to Szut, could result the process of civil education in compromising the possibility of effective propagation of those virtues⁶⁰.

William A. Galston presented a catalogue of instrumental civil virtues, seen as empirical hypothesis concerning the relation between individual character and social institutions. It is worth noticing that not all citizens need to have them. There are four categories of liberal civil virtues: universal virtues, social virtues, economic virtues and political virtues. The author underlines the fact that they don't require such a dedication as ancient, republican or Christian virtues, but it is easier to achieve success with their aid. Also, in his view, *although the concept of liberal virtues doesn't invoke any specific moral psychology, it clearly implies rejection of the thesis about universal egoism*⁶¹.

In Galston's view, a liberal citizen should have three universal virtues: bravery, rule of law and loyalty. Citizen should be able to defend his country, with a few exceptions when refusal to fight would be justified. Citizen should be law-abiding, although he may also express civil disobedience. Citizens intending to break the law should present their reasons for doing so. Most of all, citizen should be loyal, thus able to *understand and accept fundamental rules of his own community*⁶². Loyalty is an elementary virtue in liberalism, as liberal countries are not grounded on a firm idea of national, ethnic or religious community but on *abstract rules*⁶³.

In a liberal society governed by individualism and pluralism, citizen should act according to two virtues: independence and tolerance. In Galston's opinion, independence consists of showing the will to care about oneself and taking *responsibility for one's faith* as well as avoiding situations of *unnecessary dependence on others*⁶⁴. Tolerance is not shown through belief that every choice is equally good, but that the *choice of a better way of conduct should be (and on many occasions has to be) the consequence of education or persuasion, not enforcement*⁶⁵.

In liberal market economy, citizens should express work ethics *which combines belief that one's own effort should lead to independence and will to honest fulfilment of accepted duties*⁶⁶. Moreover, they should be able

⁶⁰ Ibidem, p. 213.

⁶¹ W. Galston, *Cele liberalizmu*, tłum. A. Pawelec, op. cit., p. 242.

⁶² Ibidem, p. 243.

⁶³ Ibidem, p. 243.

⁶⁴ Ibidem, p. 243.

⁶⁵ Ibidem, p. 244.

⁶⁶ Ibidem, p. 245.

to resign from immediate meeting one's desires and have the skill to adapt to economic and technological developments.

The author also includes the ability to differentiate and respect other citizens' rights, to keep reasonable demands, to judge performance of people in power and readiness to participate in public dialogue among political virtues. Citizens should differentiate and respect other citizens' rights *because liberal system is based on individual rights*⁶⁷. They should judge performance of people in power as liberalism assumes representative government⁶⁸. Citizens should keep reasonable demands and remain disciplined in order to accept harmful actions whenever they are required in a liberal state and finally, citizens should be ready to participate in public dialogue⁶⁹.

It is visible that live according to liberal and democratic procedures has a great impact on citizens' character and predispositions, although they cannot serve as model of moral perfection. Citizens in this model are most of all bound to respect rules of democratic and liberal procedures, while all concepts of individual virtues stated above and concepts understood instrumentally don't need to be adequate for all citizens. Liberals underline the fact that people have radically different views on the essence of good life. On the other hand, those high expectations about human and civil role in liberalism rather show this ideal as elitist and discredit its attractiveness to contemporary individual. Such slogans as individuality, freedom, autonomy, self-determination, self-fulfilment and especially one's own choosing of a good life vision are not attractive for contemporary consumers as it is easier and safer to live according to ready-made standards and authorities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Berlin I., *Cztery eseje o wolności*, przeł. H. Bartoszewicz, D. Grinberg, D. Lachowska, A. Tanalska-Dulęba, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1994.
- [2] Chmielewski A., *Spółczeństwo otwarte czy wspólnota? Filozoficzne i moralne podstawy nowoczesnego liberalizmu oraz jego krytyka we współczesnej filozofii społecznej*, Oficyna Wydawnicza ARBORETRUM, Wrocław 2001.

⁶⁷ Ibidem, p. 246.

⁶⁸ Ibidem, p. 246.

⁶⁹ See ibidem, p. 248.

- [3] Drozdowicz Z., *Liberalizm europejski*, Wydawnictwo Forum Naukowe, Poznań 2005.
- [4] Fukuyama F., *Koniec historii*, Zysk i S-ka Wydawnictwo, Poznań 1992.
- [5] Galston W. A., *Cele liberalizmu*, przeł. Andrzej Pawelec, Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy Znak, Kraków 1999.
- [6] Grabowska B., *Samotny egoista czy odpowiedzialny obywatel? Rozważania na temat liberalnego ideału Człowieka i obywatela*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń 2011.
- [7] Held D., *Modele demokracji*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 2010.
- [8] Heywood A. *Ideologie polityczne. Wprowadzenie*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2008.
- [9] *Historia idei politycznych. Wybór tekstów*, pod red. Filipowicz S., Mielczarek M., Peliński K., Tański M., tom I, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2002.
- [10] *Historia idei politycznych. Wybór tekstów*, pod red., Filipowicz S., Mielczarek A., Peliński K., Tański M., tom II, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2002.
- [11] Iwanicki J., *Procesy sekularyzacyjne a filozofia sekularna i postsekularna. Tradycje i współczesność*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wydziału Nauk Społecznych Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań 2014.
- [12] Kant I., *O porządku: To może być słuszne w teorii, ale nic nie jest warte w praktyce. Do wiecznego pokoju, krytyczne opracowanie, wstęp, uwagi, bibliografia i indeks*, H. F. Klemme, przeł. M. Żelazny, Wydawnictwo COMER, Toruń 1995.
- [13] Kelly P., *Liberalizm*, przeł. S. Królak, Wydawnictwo Sic! s. c., Warszawa 2007.
- [14] Król M., *Filozofia polityczna*, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 2008.
- [15] Lock J., *Rozważania dotyczące rozumu ludzkiego*, tłum. B. J. Gawęcki, tom II, Wydawnictwo PWN, Warszawa 1955.
- [16] Macedo S., *Cnoty liberalne*, przeł. G. Łuczkiwicz, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 1995.
- [17] Mill J. S., *Utylitaryzm*, przeł. M. Ossowska, *O wolności*, przeł. A. Kurlandzka, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa 1959.
- [18] *Polskie badania nad myślą pedagogiczną w latach 1900–1939 Parerga*, oprac. S. Sztobryn, M. Świtka, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Gdańsk 2006.

- [19] *Przewodnik po współczesnej filozofii politycznej*, pod red. R. E. Godina, P. Pettita, Wydawnictwo Książka i Wiedza, Warszawa 1998.
- [20] Raciborski J., *Obywatelstwo w perspektywie socjologicznej*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2011.
- [21] Rawls J., *Liberalizm polityczny*, przeł. A. Romaniuk, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1998.
- [22] Rawls J., *Teoria sprawiedliwości*, Biblioteka Współczesnych Filozofów, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1994.
- [23] Sartori G., *Teoria demokracji*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1994.
- [24] Sepczyńska D., *Katolicyzm a liberalizm*, Wydawnictwo NOMOS, Kraków 2008.
- [25] Shklar J., *Zwyczajne przywary*, przeł. M. Król, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 1997.
- [26] Szacki J., *Liberalizm po komunizmie*, Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy Znak, Fundacja im. Stefana Batorego, Kraków – Warszawa 1994.
- [27] *Spółczesność obywatelska*, pod. red., W. Bokajło, K. Dziubka, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław 2001.
- [28] Szahaj A., Jakubowski M. N., *Filozofia polityki*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2005.
- [29] Szahaj A., *Liberalizm wspólnotowość równość*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń 2012.
- [30] Szutta A., *O cnotach obywatelskich na przykładzie koncepcji instrumentalnego republikanizmu Williama Kymlicki*, „Diametros” 2012, nr 32.
- [31] Trzciniński K., *Obywatelstwo w Europie*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR, Warszawa 2006.
- [32] *Umowa społeczna i jej krytycy w myśli politycznej i prawnej*, pod. red. Rau Z., Chmieliński M., Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR, Warszawa 2010.
- [33] Wiktorska-Święcka A., *Od obywatela dobrego do dojrzałego. Koncepcje kształcenia obywatelskiego w Niemczech po 1989/1990 roku ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem systemu szkolnictwa*, Oficyna Wydawnicza ATUT, Warszawa 2011.
- [34] Wiłkomirska A., *Wiedzieć i rozumieć, aby być obywatelem. Studium empiryczne*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2013.
- [35] Wnuk-Lipiński E., *Socjologia życia publicznego*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR, Warszawa 2005.

- [36] Wonicki R., *Spór o demokratyczne Państwo Prawa. Teoria Jurgena Habermasa wobec liberalnej, republikańskiej i socjalnej wizji państwa*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie i Profesjonalne Spółka z o.o., Warszawa 2007.
- [37] Żardecka-Nowak M., *Rozum i obywatel. Idea rozumu publicznego oraz koncepcja jednostki we współczesnej filozofii polityki*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, Rzeszów 2007.
- [38] Żyro T., *Wola polityczna. Siedem prób z filozofii praktycznej*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2008.

LIBERALNY MODEL DEMOKRACJI I OBYWATELSTWA

STRESZCZENIE

W artykule przedstawiono główne idee modelu demokracji liberalnej i wynikające z nich powinności obywatelskie, oraz ukazano że takie wartości jak: wolność, równość, indywidualizm, autonomia, samostanowienie, pluralizm, tolerancja i prawa jednostki mogą stanowić dobrą podstawę życia społecznego. Ponadto zaprzeczono tezie przedstawiającej obywatela w modelu demokracji liberalnej jako jednostkę izolowaną, pozbawioną ukierunkowania moralnego i oparcia w wartościach, przeciwstawiającej tej wizji jednostkę samodzielną, niezależną i odpowiedzialną.

Słowa kluczowe:

liberalizm, demokracja, indywidualizm, wolność, równość, pluralizm, tolerancja, prawa jednostki.