B.J.Pol.S. **30,** 413–432
Printed in the United Kingdom
Copyright © 2000 Cambridge University Press

Patriotism Is Not Enough

MARGARET CANOVAN*

Some political theorists argue that patriotism differs from nationalism in being compatible with universalist liberalism. The theories offered range from the more cosmopolitan constitutional patriotism of Habermas to more rooted republican versions. Despite their rhetorical effectiveness in certain political situations, none of these variants stands up well to critical analysis, and none succeeds in delivering the promised reconciliation of universal humanitarian principles with limited and particularistic commitments.

A national identity which is not based predominantly on republican self-understanding and constitutional patriotism necessarily collides with the universalist rules of mutual coexistence for human beings.

Jürgen Habermas, *Die Zeit*, 30 March 1990[1]

The title of this article alludes to the words of Edith Cavell, the British matron of a Red Cross hospital in German-occupied Belgium during the First World War. Arrested in 1915 and shot for helping to smuggle wounded British and Allied soldiers out of the country, she became a convenient symbol of British heroism and Hunnish brutality. But Nurse Cavell had also cared for wounded German soldiers, making no national distinctions in her devotion to those in need of help. Her last words, widely reported, were: 'I realize that patriotism is not enough. I must have no hatred or bitterness towards anyone.' She therefore became for many in the post-war period a symbol of revulsion *against* patriotism in the sense of an exclusive and militaristic loyalty to one part of humanity.

I begin by invoking this ambiguous figure, symbol both of heroic patriotism and of the ideal of universal humanity, because my subject is the tense and ambiguous relationship between patriotism and universalism. For most of this century Western political philosophy has been dominated by universalist principles and unsympathetic to the claims of particular, limited loyalties. But in the past decade or so there has been a novel and interesting development. An

* Department of Politics, Keele University. Earlier versions of this article were presented to seminars at the universities of Keele and Exeter, and at the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, and I benefited greatly from the discussions. John Horton and David Miller read the draft and made particularly helpful comments and suggestions, as did the Editor and referees of the *Journal*.

[1] Jürgen Habermas, 'D-Mark Nationalism', *Die Zeit*, 30 March 1990, translated in R. T. Gray and S. Wilke, eds, *German Unification and Its Discontents: Documents from the Peaceful Revolution* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1996), pp. 186–205, at p. 198.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

increasing number of political thinkers with internationalist sympathies have begun to defend a form of patriotism, understood as something decisively different from nationalism. This article undertakes a critical examination of this new form of patriotism, sometimes called 'constitutional' or 'postnational' patriotism. I shall argue that despite its attractions the notion is open to a number of objections. I shall conclude (though my point will be different from Cavell's) that patriotism is indeed not enough.

WHY DO SOME UNIVERSALISTS DEFEND PATRIOTISM?

In view of patriotism's association with war and enmity, it may seem strange that any political theorist with universalist sympathies should advocate it. During the past half century internationalists have more often been wary of any kind of partial solidarity that might divert people from a sense of their common humanity. But although that suspicion continues to be powerfully voiced,[2] there has recently been a perceptible change of mood. Developments in theory and in practice have combined to make political theorists more aware of the attractions of particular loyalties. One reason for this is the impact of communitarianism in political philosophy. Communitarians have pointed out that the abstract and apparently rootless individuals who figure in much liberal political philosophy do not correspond to real human beings, to whom matters of communal identity, heritage and loyalty are vitally important.[3] A number of political philosophers have taken such arguments as a foundation on which to build more or less qualified defences of nationalism.[4]

Alongside those theoretical arguments, practical politics has turned the spotlight more dramatically on to matters of identity and loyalty. For one of the most striking recent political developments has been the resurgence of national claims and conflicts. That is not in itself an argument against universalist political theory: on the contrary, confronted by events in the Balkans and elsewhere, many internationalist liberals have been confirmed in their belief that nationalism is in all circumstances an evil, to be transcended by concentrating on universal human rights. But others have drawn a different and more complicated conclusion. For them, the lesson is that (at any rate for the present) the grand ideal of universal human community is too ambitious, being too

[2] See, for example, Martha Nussbaum's 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism', printed with sixteen responses in Martha C. Nussbaum *et al.*, *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism* (Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1996), pp. 2–17.

[3] Charles Taylor, 'Cross-purposes: The Liberal Communitarian Debate', in Nancy L. Rosenblum, ed., *Liberalism and the Moral Life* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 164–78; Alasdair MacIntyre, 'Is Patriotism a Virtue?' (Lawrence: The E. H. Lindley Memorial Lecture, University of Kansas, 1984).

[4] David Miller, *On Nationality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); Yael Tamir, *Liberal Nationalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993); Neil MacCormick, 'Is Nationalism Philosophically Credible?' in William Twining, ed., *Issues of Self-Determination* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1991), pp. 8–19; Avishai Margalit and Joseph Raz, 'National Self-determination', *Journal of Philosophy*, 87 (1990), 439–61.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

distant to mobilize popular support. People may be able to extend their sympathies to take in their fellow-countrymen, but few of them are capable of consistent solidarity with the entire human race.[5] It follows that if one is appalled by nationalist conflicts and 'ethnic cleansing', if one is concerned for minority rights and multicultural harmony, then denunciations of nationalism are not enough. It is necessary also to theorize and foster an alternative form of loyalty that will be compatible with universal values but will be able to attract the people of a particular territory, perhaps as a stage on the way to world citizenship.[6]

The conceptions of patriotism currently being developed by a number of political theorists are intended to fill this gap: to describe a form of loyalty different from and superior to nationalism, but able (in the words of Maurizio Viroli) 'to fight nationalism on its own ground'.[7] This reformulated patriotism is offered (to quote Viroli again) as an 'antidote' to nationalism, sufficiently akin to it to attract popular loyalty, but sufficiently different to be compatible with respect for universal human rights and to be more tolerant of ethnic and cultural differences. Clearly, current thinking about patriotism, and particularly the attempt to establish a distinction between 'patriotism', which is desirable, and 'nationalism', which is not, is more than a matter of intellectual curiosity. It also represents a rhetorical[8] and political strategy. This in itself should prompt us to look rather carefully at what we are being offered.

PATRIOTISM VERSUS NATIONALISM

What is it, then, that is supposed to differentiate 'patriotism' (which is desirable) from 'nationalism' (which is not)? As we shall see later, the distinction is used in subtly different ways to express a range of views, but for the sake of clarity it can be stated in ideal-typical form. The central claim is that patriotism means the political loyalty of citizens to the free polity they share, whereas nationalism is a matter of ethnicity and culture.[9] While nationhood is taken to be a

[5] This point is made in many of the replies in Nussbaum, *For Love of Country*.

[6] Habermas, 'Citizenship and National Identity', p. 514. The essay is incorporated as Appendix II in Jürgen Habermas, *Between Facts and Norms*: C*ontributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1996). Cf. Benjamin R. Barber, 'Constitutional Faith', pp. 30–7 at p. 36, and Charles Taylor, 'Why Democracy Needs Patriotism', pp. 119–21 at p. 121, both in Nussbaum, *For Love of Country*.

[7] Maurizio Viroli, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p. 15. Cf. Attracta Ingram, 'Constitutional Patriotism', *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 22 (1996), 1–18; Stephen Nathanson, *Patriotism, Morality, and Peace* (Lanham, NY: Rowman and Littlefield, 1993); Mary G. Dietz, 'Patriotism', in Terence Ball, James Farr and Russell L. Hanson, eds, *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 177–93. One of the earliest examples was Schaar, 'The Case for Patriotism', in John H. Schaar, *Legitimacy in the Modern State* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1981), pp. 285–311.

[8] A sharp contrast between 'patriotism' and 'nationalism' has more rhetorical impact than the more defensible claim (made, for example, by Stephen Nathanson) that there are liberal and illiberal versions of both. Nathanson, *Patriotism, Morality, and Peace*, pp. 185–6.

[9] Habermas, 'Citizenship and National Identity', pp. 500, 507.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

'prepolitical' matter depending on ties of birth and blood, the bond that unites citizens in a patriotic polity is a matter of will, the free consent of citizens united by their commitment to liberal democratic principles. The distinction is among other things a contrast between art and nature.[10] Its defenders point out that republican political thought from the ancient Greeks to the French Revolution conceived of free polities as human foundations, deliberately built, whereas the post-revolutionary romantic nationalists introduced a deterministic model of national polities growing organically out of the nation's blood and soil.

According to its advocates the distinction has particular relevance for a modern world in which matters of ethnic identity are increasingly politicized, but in which the economic and demographic realities of globalization contradict the traditional nationalist ideal that each nation should have its own state. Faced with the problems of holding multicultural societies together in harmonious tolerance, supporters claim that patriotic loyalty to the principles and practices of a free state can provide a functional substitute for nationalism, with all its advantages by way of mobilizing loyalty, but none of its disadvantages. Unlike nationalism (it is argued), patriotism is not exclusive, uncritical or bellicose, and is therefore compatible with commitments to universal humanity. Unlike nationalism, patriotism does not expect or demand ethnic and cultural homogeneity, and is therefore tolerant of diversity.[11]

This is a composite portrait of a 'new patriotism' which has not so far undergone much theoretical elaboration. It is important because it chimes in well with a prevailing intellectual mood, but there are some difficulties in coming to grips with it. Not only are we concerned with a variety of statements by writers who have their own preoccupations; more interestingly, this new discourse of 'patriotism' covers a spectrum between positions that differ a good deal. At one end of the spectrum, heavily influenced by Kantian liberalism and most closely approximated by Jürgen Habermas, lies what I shall call 'cosmopolitan constitutional patriotism', the vision of a new form of loyalty to a new, supra-national polity.[12] This is balanced at the other end by what I shall call 'rooted republicanism', best represented by Maurizio Viroli's book, *For Love of Country*. Drawing on the classical republican tradition of patriotism which was displaced by nationalism from about 1800,[13] this version focuses on loyalty

[10] According to Attracta Ingram, 'constitutional patriotism … is part of the idea that the creation of political community is a morally transformative act in which human beings develop relationships as citizens that tie them together independently of their prior associational ties to family, religion and the like' (Ingram, 'Constitutional Patriotism', p. 2). Cf. Viroli, *For Love of Country*, p. 121; Schaar, 'The Case for Patriotism', pp. 290–1; Dietz, 'Patriotism', p. 189.

[11] Viroli, *For Love of Country*, pp. 1–2, 13–17, 183–5; Schaar, 'The Case for Patriotism', p. 293.

[12] Habermas, 'Citizenship and National Identity', pp. 500, 514; Ingram, 'Constitutional Patriotism', p. 14.

[13] Viroli and Dietz place themselves within this tradition. On the European transition (about 1800) from republican to nationalist discourses, see Martin Thom, *Republics, Nations and Tribes* (London: Verso, 1995).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

to one's own particular polity, but calls for this to be interpreted in terms of freedom rather than ethnicity.[14]

In practice, none of the theorists concerned can be located at any fixed point on this spectrum between Kantian universalism and classical republicanism, for there is a good deal of shifting back and forth in the middle ground. For example, although Viroli aims at a revival of patriotism in particular free polities and sets out explicitly to recover classical republican values, his reading of the republican tradition is censored by his modern liberal humanitarian and cosmopolitan conscience and by revulsion against Italy's Fascist past. As a result the stridently chauvinist and militaristic nature of classical patriotism drops out of view.[15] At the other end of the spectrum, too, appearances can be misleading, for Jürgen Habermas's apparently abstract and universalizable 'constitutional patriotism' is traceable to a very specific situation and a particular national history, raising questions about its wider relevance. The German term, *Verfassungspatriotismus*, was coined to denote attachment to the liberal democratic institutions of the post-war Federal Republic of Germany. Patriotism in those circumstances meant loyalty to a polity that was non-nationalist or even *anti*-nationalist in its structure. It was a truncated state, including only part of the nation, with a set of liberal democratic institutions imposed from without and designed to run counter to the political traditions predominant in Germany for the previous century. Furthermore, the Nazi past made the whole topic of loyalty (patriotic or nationalist) uniquely sensitive. Behind Habermas's abstract formulations, in other words, lies an attempt quite as specific as Viroli's to influence the political identity of a particular polity.[16]

One reason for the blurring between republican and liberal influences on the one hand, and cosmopolitan and local aims on the other, is that all concerned form a united front against a common enemy: ethnic nationalism. Another reason is that as well as sharing an enemy they share a model. The United States is frequently cited by new patriots as an example of a non-national polity held together by patriotism, and different aspects can be stressed according to taste: its classical republican elements or the liberal principles built into its constitution; its unique heritage or its universal significance as a gathering-place for immigrants from all ethnic groups. Later on we shall consider reasons for doubting the suitability of the United States as a model, at any rate for the more cosmopolitan versions of new patriotism. But the existence of this all-purpose example does much to bolster the plausibility of new patriotism's anti-nationalist discourse.

In order to deal with this rather amorphous discourse I shall concentrate most critical attention on the end of the spectrum where the most ambitious claims

[14] Viroli, *For Love of Country*, pp. 16, 183–4.

[15] On this aspect of ancient republicanism, see Paul A. Rahe, *Republics Ancient and Modern: Classical Republicanism and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992). For Viroli the key feature of ancient Roman patriotism was 'compassion' (*For Love of Country*, p. 20).

[16] This comes out clearly in Habermas's essay on 'D-Mark Nationalism', cited above.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

are located, that is to say on the notion of a universalistic and universalizable 'constitutional patriotism'. Having looked at its problems I shall turn to the other end of the spectrum, where we can find the more modest position identified here as 'rooted republicanism'. I shall argue that although this is more defensible it cannot actually solve the problem to which it is addressed.

COSMOPOLITAN CONSTITUTIONAL PATRIOTISM

Although the terminology of 'constitutional patriotism' arose out of the unusual circumstances of post-war West Germany, the notion has been generalized by Habermas, who suggests in his 1990 essay on 'Citizenship and National Identity' that multicultural and multinational societies might be unified at the level of politics by a liberal political culture supported by a '*constitutional* patriotism'. Patriotism of this kind, he says, gives its loyalty to the universal principles and practices of democracy and human rights. He concedes that in a future Federal Republic of Europe, 'the *same* legal principles would also have to be interpreted from the perspectives of *different* national traditions and histories,' but adds that,

> One's own tradition must in each case be appropriated from a vantage point relativized by the perspectives of other traditions, and appropriated in such a manner that it can be brought into a transnational, Western European constitutional culture. A particularist anchoring of *this kind* would not do away with one iota of the universalist meaning of popular sovereignty and human rights. The original thesis stands: democratic citizenship need not be rooted in the national identity of a people. However, regardless of the diversity of different cultural forms of life, it does require that every citizen be socialized into a common political culture.[17]

Perhaps characteristically, Habermas's discussion is complex, qualified and somewhat opaque. Those influenced by him tend to be less cautious, and a useful expansion of these ideas has been offered by the Irish philosopher Attracta Ingram.[18] In an essay entitled 'Constitutional Patriotism', she observes:

> The idea of post-national identity is of a political identity founded on recognition of democratic values and human rights as these are contextualized in a particular constitutional tradition. Citizens are thought of as bound to each other by subscription to these shared values rather than by the more traditional pre-political ties that nation-states have drawn on as sources of unity …
> A post-national identity has to accommodate difference and plurality. So it has to be an identity in which membership is constituted by recognition of a common system of authority erected and maintained by a constitution. Unity and legitimacy come from the constitution and the formal tie that holds people together is their

[17] Habermas, 'Citizenship and National Identity': all quotations in this paragraph are from p. 500, emphasis in the original. See also Jürgen Habermas, *The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism and the Historians' Debate* (Cambridge: Polity, 1989), pp. 256–61.

[18] Like Habermas, Ingram comes from a national tradition that has been heavily contested.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

continuing voluntary recognition of the constitution, their constitutional patriotism.[19]

Both Habermas and Ingram connect constitutional patriotism with hopes for the transcendence of existing nation-states. Besides looking towards supranational citizenship and constitutional patriotism at the level of the European Union, Habermas speaks of this as a stage on the way to 'world citizenship'.[20] Ingram suggests that 'it may well be feasible and desirable to build political identities that overarch several national identities', and develops a Kantian argument according to which liberal states actually have a duty to unite with their neighbours and extend the area within which peace and political justice can be enjoyed.[21]

There is in both cases a certain lack of clarity about the relation between these universalist projects and the particular polities and specific political identities that exist. Ingram makes greater concessions to particularism, suggesting that a common set of liberal democratic values can be customized within particular traditions: 'Our particular identity is constituted by *our* effort to institutionalize principles of justice. And that effort has a different history and a different shape in different bounded communities.'[22] We shall need to return later to that tell-tale possessive language ('our', along with 'we' and 'us'), for although it helps to give plausibility to the project of constitutional patriotism, it also signals far-reaching confusions about the implications of collective political identity. For the moment, however, let us concentrate on the vision of a post-national polity united by this new sort of loyalty. It is not difficult to understand its attraction, for in it the conflicting demands of universal liberal principles and particularistic communities appear to be satisfied. In what follows I shall argue that this triumph is illusory, for a number of reasons:

1. The project of avoiding the illiberal effects of nationalism by basing the state upon shared liberal values is self-defeating.
2. The claim that citizens can share loyalty to the polity rather than to their nation begs vital questions about the state.
3. The cases cited to show the plausibility of this kind of patriotism do not in fact do so.
4. The notion that constitutional patriotism can provide a substitute for ties of birth and blood is incoherent.

[19] Ingram, 'Constitutional Patriotism', p. 2.

[20] Habermas, 'Citizenship and National Identity', pp. 507, 514. Cf. interviews with M. Haller in Jürgen Habermas, *The Past as Future* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), pp. 163–5.

[21] Ingram, 'Constitutional Patriotism', pp. 11, 12–15.

[22] Ingram, 'Constitutional Patriotism', p. 14.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

CRITICISMS OF COSMOPOLITAN CONSTITUTIONAL PATRIOTISM

The Civic Faith

In their concern to replace the bond of nationhood with something less visceral and exclusive, constitutional patriots often suggest that citizens are better bound together by shared principles or values: for Habermas, a loyalty to 'abstract procedures and principles'[23] that amounts to a shared political culture into which every citizen will need to be socialized.[24] Despite the Kantian inspiration of constitutional patriotism, this acceptance of the need for deliberate political socialization echoes much older classical republican traditions. For unlike romantic nationalists (who believed that citizens of a true nation-state belong together by nature) earlier republicans always thought of polities and their citizens as creatures of artifice. Citizens were formed through patriotic education, and republicans were prepared to go to disconcerting lengths to achieve this. Adrian Oldfield, undertaking an 'exploration of what it would mean to take civic republicanism seriously in the modern world', observes that many of its aspects would be unpalatable to modern liberals, for the appropriate civic education means that 'minds have to be manipulated'.[25]

That may seem a rather highly-coloured description of what constitutional patriots would see as inculcation of universal truths. But it underlines the point that if shared political principles are actually to become the unifying bond of the state, then the principles in question must be authoritatively agreed and serious efforts must be made to inculcate them into the citizens. Just as earlier generations of political theorists took for granted that states had an interest in the religious beliefs of their citizens, so the patriotic polity seems also to be envisaged as a kind of confessional state.

Constitutional patriots may object that such socialization is not only politically necessary but philosophically justifiable, since the 'common political culture' is built upon the universal principles of democracy and human rights, which Habermas evidently regards as being of a kind to which 'all who are possibly affected could assent as participants in rational discourse.'[26] But the difficulties of achieving practical consensus on such principles should not be

[23] Habermas, *New Conservatism*, p. 261.

[24] Habermas, *Between Facts and Norms*, pp. 500, 514. Writing more recently about 'the transition of the European Community to a democratically-constituted, federal state', Habermas has stressed again the need to deliberately forge a new kind of 'abstract, legally mediated solidarity among strangers' through the development of EU-wide political communication. His answer to the linguistic barriers that at present stand in the way of any such shared public sphere is the promotion of English 'as a second first language'. Given Europe's existing level of integration, he maintains that, 'Given the political will, there is no *a priori* reason why it cannot subsequently create the politically necessary communicative context as soon as it is constitutionally *prepared* to do so.' (J. Habermas, 'Comment on the Paper by Dieter Grimm: "Does Europe Need a Constitution?"', *European Law Journal*, 1 (1995), 303–7, emphasis in the original.)

[25] Adrian Oldfield, *Citizenship and Community – Civic Republicanism and the Modern World* (London: Routledge, 1990), pp. ix, 6, 146, 153, 164.

[26] Habermas, *Between Facts and Norms*, p. 458.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

underestimated. Although the patriotic project is hailed by its advocates as an answer to the problems of increasingly multi-ethnic and multicultural societies, it may be precisely in such societies that dissent from liberal democratic principles is likely to occur.[27] Religious minorities are particularly liable to find themselves in disagreement with liberal orthodoxy. Such tensions are symbolized by the French 'affair of the headscarves', the controversy caused by Muslim schoolgirls whose determination to cover their heads was taken to conflict with the republican principles of secularism expressed within that vital agency of political socialization, the state school system.[28] French experience is relevant here because the French republican version of nationalism has a good deal in common with constitutional patriotism.[29]

Loyalty to principles, then, may not necessarily be an improvement on national loyalty as a basis for a multicultural polity. But some constitutional patriots may object that this discussion of beliefs misses the point; that despite talk of 'principles' by Habermas and others, what is crucial is a more practical loyalty to the constitution itself, in other words shared allegiance to the institutions and procedures of a liberal democratic state.[30] The important thing is that citizens should share a polity without sharing a nation. Unfortunately, this version of the patriotic project also has flaws, as I hope to show in the next section.

Whose State Is It?

Build a liberal democratic state that protects the rights of all its people and welcomes them on equal terms into a shared public arena, and national or ethnic differences can be transcended in what Habermas has called an 'abstract, legally mediated solidarity among strangers'.[31] Theoretical aspirations of this kind translate into visions of a future United States of Europe, of a non-sectarian polity of all Ireland, even of solutions to more intractable conflicts in the Balkans

[27] The controversy generated by John Rawls's parallel attempt to articulate a strictly 'political' liberalism illustrates the difficulty of settling even on an 'overlapping consensus' that can in practice be shared by the denizens of plural societies (John Rawls, *Political Liberalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993)).

[28] See Norma C. Moruzzi, 'A Problem with Headscarves: Contemporary Complexities of Political and Social Identity', *Political Theory*, 22 (1994), 653–72. Precisely because the dominant French version of nationhood is strongly imbued with elements of constitutional patriotism, it may be in some respects less tolerant of multicultural difference than less principled and more untidy versions.

[29] The tradition has been lucidly restated by Dominique Schnapper, who maintains that Habermasian constitutional patriotism (in so far as it is feasible at all) amounts to a belated German discovery of the true (French) idea of nationhood (Dominique Schnapper, *La Communauté des Citoyens: Sur l'Idée Moderne de Nation* (Paris: Gallimard, 1994), p. 182). Habermas himself evidently believes that socialization into citizenship does not imply French-style assimilation, contrasting this with US experience (Habermas, 'Comment on Grimm', p. 306). It may be objected, however, that unlike France, the United States has not yet had to face the challenge of deep ideological diversity presented by Islam.

[30] Ingram, 'Constitutional Patriotism', p. 2.

[31] Habermas, 'Comment on Grimm', p. 305.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

and further afield. Notice that this ideal goes well beyond more pragmatic schemes for coping democratically with the tensions between potentially hostile groups. In the face of communal conflicts in many parts of the world, a variety of ingenious constitutional arrangements have been devised to induce such groups to accept accommodation rather than confrontation, and some such attempts have been successful: the latest (its fate still in the balance at the time of writing) is the 1998 Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland. The hallmark of such arrangements is that communal divisions and mutual suspicions are not expected to go away, but the institutional mechanisms are designed to reward political bargaining rather than violence. Approaching the problems of South Africa in this spirit, Donald Horowitz speaks of 'harnessing self-interest to the cause of peace', stressing that his approach 'does not seek or need to change hearts or minds in order to succeed'.[32] Going beyond that kind of *modus vivendi*, constitutional patriots have higher hopes, aiming to lift individuals above their ascriptive identities into a shared public sphere where all are equal citizens with a shared loyalty to an impartial state.

The trouble with this appealing vision is its circularity. Supposing that a polity really does live up to Habermasian standards, then its citizens may seem to have such an obvious interest in supporting it that they may perhaps be expected to give it their loyalty regardless of national ties that pull them in a different direction.[33] But a polity needs to be strong and well integrated to be able to manifest those liberal virtues, and the states that come nearest to the ideal are in fact underpinned by something too easily taken for granted: a 'people', a trans-generational political community, members of which recognize the state as 'our' state and thereby confer upon it the legitimacy and power it needs.[34] The history of Northern Ireland illustrates the difficulties where this cannot be taken for granted. For Catholics, the state has not historically been 'ours' but 'theirs', and its corresponding lack of legitimacy has gravely weakened its authority and power, hampering attempts at impartiality in recent decades. The

[32] Donald L. Horowitz, *A Democratic South Africa? Constitutional Engineering in a Divided Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), p. 155. The large literature on constitutional engineering in divided societies contains some sharp disagreements, notably between supporters on the one hand of 'consociational' solutions that institutionalize group differences, and on the other side advocates of forms of majoritarian democracy that give politicians incentives to recruit voters across ethnic divides. For classic treatments, see Arend Lijphart, *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1977); and Donald L. Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985). Levels of optimism also vary, with Horowitz in particular stressing the very great difficulty of achieving stable democracy in the face of differences between ascriptive communities (Horowitz, *A Democratic South Africa?*, pp. 162, 241).

[33] Even this apparently modest assumption is cast into doubt by the strength of nationalist sentiment in Scotland and Québec, despite the relatively civilized political structures of Britain and Canada.

[34] For arguments that liberal democratic political theory has regularly taken for granted the existence of that collective power without acknowledging that its basis was nationhood, see Margaret Canovan, *Nationhood and Political Theory* (Cheltenham, Glos.: Edward Elgar, 1996).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

vicious circle is that a state is unlikely to be powerful enough to demonstrate the liberal democratic virtues that can attract constitutional patriotism unless it is very widely regarded by its population as our state rather than someone else's. Those who support patriotism against nationalism as a unifying bond dodge such questions of power and legitimacy, tending to assume that 'the modern state' *per se* will deserve the loyalty of its subjects, even if they are not bound to it by ties of nationhood.[35] But many actually existing states are feeble or unworthy of loyalty, while those that are powerful and most like the Habermasian model are overwhelmingly nation-states, the possession of a specific historic people. The institutions of the European Union are notoriously weak precisely because they lack that tie to a 'people'.[36] The claim that an impartial state can form a benign umbrella soaring above rival national or ethnic identities and attracting patriotic loyalty ignores the most crucial political question. Where is the state to draw its power from? What holds up the umbrella?[37]

Misleading Examples

Constitutional patriots may respond by pointing to a small number of effective states which (they claim) prove their point that nationalism can be replaced by constitutional patriotism. The implication is that if this can be done successfully in one place it should also be possible in others. Post-war West Germany, where the language of *Verfassungspatriotismus* was coined, is held by Attracta Ingram to show 'that a further uncoupling of state and nation is empirically feasible'.[38] But there is room for scepticism here. A more plausible conclusion to be drawn from German experience would be that this apparent 'uncoupling' was misleading, and that behind the handful of constitutional patriots who talked about the nature of their loyalty were a great many German nationalists who did not.[39] When the opportunity for unification arrived the political significance of that tacit identity became apparent. West Germans took for granted that they had a collective responsibility for the people of the German Democratic Republic (and not, of course, for Poles, Czechs, Hungarians and so on). Whatever the subsequent disillusionment in both parts of Germany, the power generated in 1989 by the sense of being *Ein Volk* was enough to transform the map of

[35] Cf. Bhikhu Parekh, 'Politics of Nationhood', in Keebet von Benda-Beckmann and Maykel Verkuyten, eds, *Nationalism, Ethnicity and Cultural Identity in Europe: Comparative Studies in Migration and Ethnic Relations I* (Utrecht: European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations, 1995), pp. 139–40.

[36] On the 'democratic deficit' see Jack Hayward, ed., *The Crisis of Representation in Europe* (London: Frank Cass, 1995).

[37] Failure to confront this question is a serious flaw in Yael Tamir's attempt to marry cultural nationalism with something like constitutional patriotism (Tamir, *Liberal Nationalism*, pp. 165–6).

[38] Ingram, 'Constitutional Patriotism', p. 7. Surprisingly, this was written after unification.

[39] For evidence of the topic's sensitivity see the documents collected in *Forever in the Shadow of Hitler?* translated by J. Knowlton and T. Cates (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1993), especially Habermas's contributions.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Europe.[40] The German example therefore tends to undermine rather than to support the new patriots' case. But what of the two prize exhibits always cited in this connection, Switzerland and the United States of America?[41] Do not they support the case for constitutional patriotism, demonstrating that loyalties that are political and universalistic can be constructed to hold together a multinational or multicultural society? I will try to suggest briefly why these examples should be treated with caution.

Within the Swiss Confederation, German, French, Italian and Romansch-speaking segments have long shared a political system and managed their disputes remarkably harmoniously. Indeed, the Swiss political scientist Wolf Linder claims that his country 'provides a model for finding political institutions and patterns of behaviour that enable peaceful conflict resolution in a multicultural society'. It turns out, however, that Swiss experience is not as encouraging as it might seem. For, as Linder goes on to point out, success in this field requires a lot more than a set of well-designed institutions, let alone a set of universal principles. 'Democracy and peaceful conflict-resolution ... need the social development of a political culture. Unlike technical innovation, this takes a long time to develop.'[42] Although Swiss political institutions owe a good deal to deliberate design, their success has had at least as much to do with special circumstances and a highly contingent series of historical events. One important point is that the component parts of Switzerland are deeply rooted communities defined by birth and blood as well as geography. These have grown together in the course of a shared history, producing a strong sense of pride in distinctive Swiss-ness, but local autonomy and local loyalties continue to be strong. The deeply historical and contingent character of Swiss unity gives little support to the project of cosmopolitan constitutional patriotism, and this unique polity might be better considered a candidate for the category of 'rooted republicanism' we shall be considering later.

The United States is a more plausible example, in that its political identity is indeed inextricably intertwined with the Constitution, and even with the political principles this articulates. To quote Benjamin Barber, 'The American trick was to use the fierce attachments of patriotic sentiment to bond a people to high ideals.'[43] This unusually ideological understanding of what it is to be American has no doubt helped the country to cope relatively successfully with immigration from all round the globe.[44] In one of the most eloquent defences

[40] David Miller makes the point in a private communication that while East German enthusiasm for unification could at a pinch be read as commitment to liberal democratic principles and squeezed into the model of *Verfassungspatriotismus*, the actions and motivations of West German politicians and people cannot be understood in terms of that model.

[41] Habermas, 'Citizenship and National Identity', p. 500.

[42] Wolf Linder, *Swiss Democracy: Possible Solutions to Conflict in Multicultural Societies* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1994). Both quotations are from page xviii.

[43] Barber, 'Constitutional Faith', p. 32.

[44] Note, however, that a strong commitment to the United States on the part of many immigrants may have more to do with what John Harles calls 'the politics of the lifeboat' – relief and gratitude

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

of patriotism as distinguished from nationalism, John Schaar has analysed its specifically American form, finding in the speeches of Abraham Lincoln what he calls a 'covenanted patriotism', 'actively guided by and directed toward the mission established in the founding covenant'. To adopt it is to accept one's inheritance from the Founding Fathers and one's obligation to carry on their work. According to Schaar, 'This conception of political membership ... decisively transcends the parochial and primitive fraternities of blood and race, for it calls kin all who accept the authority of the covenant'.[45]

It is easy to see why cosmopolitan liberals reacting against European experiences of nationalism might wish to emulate this kind of patriotism. But we should think twice before accepting the claim that it amounts to a non-national form of loyalty. For it does not really mean a gathering of all those across the world who are willing to commit themselves to Lincoln's principles. In the same breath as speaking of transcending those 'primitive fraternities of blood', Schaar articulates an almost Roman sense of ancestral piety towards the inherited 'mission established in the founding covenant'. The point is that the principles of the constitution are not just liberal principles but (for Americans) 'our' principles, handed down to us by our forefathers, biological or adopted.[46] To think of the United States as a society bound together by constitutional patriotism rather than by nationhood is to overlook inheritance – inheritance not only of citizenship, but of the Constitution, the principles, the national mission, the American Way of Life. Despite immigration in each generation, most Americans are so not because they willingly accept the Constitution, but because being American is in their blood. For many this is an inheritance of only one or two generations' depth, and if the United States were a less powerful and prosperous country, their simultaneous inheritance of diverse ethnic ancestries might pose greater political problems. But the fact remains that, like other nations, Americans are defined and united primarily by birth and inheritance,[47] and it is to these neglected considerations that we must now turn.

Ours by right of birth

As we have seen, some new patriots believe that they have discovered a form of solidarity founded upon acceptance by citizens of a liberal democratic constitution. Stressing the political links between individuals, they give the impression that 'subscription to shared values' and 'voluntary recognition of the

(F'note continued)

at finding sanctuary – than with understanding of or belief in the actual principles of the constitution, as in the case of the Laotian immigrants Harles studied (John C. Harles, *Politics in the Lifeboat: Immigrants and the American Democratic Order* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1993), pp. 144–98.

[45] Schaar, 'Case for Patriotism', p. 293.

[46] Michael W. McConnell, 'Don't Neglect the Little Platoons', in Nussbaum, *For Love of Country,* pp. 78–84 at p. 82; Taylor, 'Cross-purposes', pp. 166, 280.

[47] Schaar, 'Case for Patriotism', pp. 291–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

constitution' can be disconnected from the 'pre-political ties' thought to be characteristic of nation-states,[48] and thereby brought into harmony with 'the universalist rules of mutual coexistence for human beings'.[49] But this appealing vision owes its plausibility to a tacit reservation that undermines universalist aspirations. For despite the liberal language of individual commitments and abstract legal status, constitutional patriots (like everyone else) take for granted the existence of historic political communities, and therefore that the populations whom they seek to bind with political loyalties already owe their common citizenship to the most fundamental of 'pre-political' ties: familial inheritance. To the vast majority of citizens, even the most Habermasian polity is 'ours' because it was our parents' before us. One of the main purposes of the discourse of 'constitutional patriotism' is of course to play down this obvious point and to lay stress on the kinds of solidarity that settled populations can share with the increasing number of immigrants in their midst. But this leads Habermas and others to exaggerate the contrast between supposedly 'pre-political' ties of birth on the one hand and political relations between citizens on the other. Despite its prominence in the discourse, this dichotomy is in fact so implausible that even constitutional patriots themselves do not consistently stick to it. The confusion involved can perhaps be illustrated through a *reductio ad absurdam* on a Habermasian theme: citizenship of that purportedly postnational entity, the European Union.

European citizenship (something envied and desired by a great many people, especially in North Africa and Eastern Europe) is at present a secondary status added on to national citizenship within one of the component states. Some of these states are more generous than others in admitting immigrants to citizenship, but in all cases the vast majority of citizens simply inherit their status from their parents: it comes to them as a matter of birth, like a title to family property. Now imagine that 'pre-political ties' were really to be devalued in favour of 'voluntary recognition of the constitution'. Why should being born into a family of European citizens – a Spanish family, say, or a British family, or a German family – give one a privileged claim on European citizenship? Would not considerations of equal human rights imply that one should take one's chance alongside applicants from Albania and Algeria, from Slovakia and Sudan, perhaps by taking a competitive examination at the age of 18 to determine which of the applicants showed greatest understanding of and devotion to the constitution?

There may be some internationalists prepared to defend such an arrangement in principle, on the grounds that it is morally repugnant for rights to depend on the lottery of birth.[50] So far as I am aware, however, none of the theorists attracted by constitutional patriotism has advocated such an arrangement, and

[48] Ingram, 'Constitutional Patriotism', p. 2; Habermas, 'Comment on Grimm', p. 306.

[49] Habermas, 'D-Mark Nationalism', p. 198.

[50] Cf. Brian Barry and Robert E. Goodin, eds, *Free Movement: Ethical Issues in the Transnational Migration of People and of Money* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

it is clear that despite their rejection of 'pre-political ties' they take for granted (just as nationalists do) that citizenship is part of the ancestral endowment that makes 'us' a 'people' in collective possession of a polity.[51] Since constitutional patriots know very well that fusion of 'political' and supposedly 'pre-political' ties is inseparable from the continuing existence of a democratic polity, why are they so reluctant to acknowledge this? The explanation lies, I believe, in a fear of racism that makes them gloss over the political significance of family membership and present us with a false dichotomy. We are warned that unless the polity is understood as a community of liberal patriots, constituted and bound together by the individual choice of its members, then it must be a 'nation' defined by a particular kind of supposedly pure blood. Either we insist on a non-national, patriotic polity to which birthright is irrelevant, or we open the door to a national polity understood in racist terms.

But this analysis of the alternatives is misleading. The fact is that any polity, however liberal its ethos, is and must be an inheritance passed on from generation to generation. Indeed, one of the best recipes for a stable liberal democracy is a widespread sense among the population that the polity is a collective inheritance belonging to a 'people'.[52] Whether or not that 'people' is conceived in terms of theories about genetic make-up is a separate issue, but the crucial significance of collective political inheritance is undeniable, and is implicitly conceded by the constitutional patriots themselves. As we saw earlier, Attracta Ingram falls back on collective language (as in 'our political identity', 'our distinct political heritage', 'the constitution we made and continue to remake through the generations')[53] that reveals assumptions about the existence of political collectivities inherited through families. Even Habermas, while arguing for a 'liberal immigration policy' that would pave the way for world citizenship, concedes 'the right to preserve one's own *political* culture',[54] a formulation which assumes that the liberal democratic polity to which immigrants are seeking entry belongs initially to those who inherit it by right of birth. For the new patriots, in other words, just as for nationalists, the (supposedly non-national) 'people' is constituted and bound together primarily by birth. As we observed in the US case, even if such a 'people' welcomes immigrants into citizenship, the newly naturalized citizens themselves pass on their membership of the people to their children in the traditional manner. It is misleading for new patriots to assert that their polity can dispense with

[51] On Burke's articulation in *Reflections on the Revolution in France* of this fusion of the political with the familial, see Canovan, *Nationhood and Political Theory*, pp. 69–70.

[52] Other kinds of polities have been less dependent on family inheritance among the subject population. Monarchies could preserve dynastic continuity even though territories and subjects were lost and gained, while organizations like the Catholic Church and the Communist Party survived wide-ranging recruitment of personnel. It is democratic polities that need lasting collective identity on the part of their citizens.

[53] Ingram, 'Constitutional Patriotism', pp. 14–15.

[54] Habermas, 'Citizenship and National Identity', p. 514, emphasis in original. Cf. Bernard Yack, 'The Myth of the Civic Nation', *Critical Review*, 10 (1996), 193–211, p. 200.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

'pre-political' ties. But this raises a further question. Must 'the people' who inherit the polity form a 'nation'? Is it not possible for the inherited bonds that unite them to their political heritage and to one another to be patriotic without being national? That is the claim explicitly made by another group of new patriots, those I have referred to as 'rooted republicans'.

ROOTED REPUBLICANISM

Even within the discourse of the new patriotism, the Habermasian version has come in for criticism on the grounds that it is too abstract and too ambitious.[55] Conceding the arguments advanced above, such critics might maintain that the real strength of the discourse lies with those who set themselves a more limited task, counterposing to nationalism a type of patriotism drawing on the classical tradition of love for one's own inherited polity. The most prominent spokesman for this strand in the discourse, Maurizio Viroli, advocates a 'patriotism of liberty' that is explicitly particularistic, but nevertheless free of illiberal characteristics because it is a 'patriotism without nationalism'.[56] This sort of patriotism has two particularly salient characteristics. In the first place, although it may arise out of 'ethnocultural unity', it is a 'political culture of liberty' which puts its stress squarely upon the republican tradition of active citizenship and civic virtue.[57] Secondly and in consequence of this, it is a critical love of country, dedicated to making sure that one's polity lives up to its highest traditions and ideals, if necessary at the cost of unity.[58]

These are attractive sentiments: the obvious question they raise, however, is why they should be regarded as exclusively patriotic rather than national. It is interesting that Stephen Nathanson, who argues in favour of what he calls a 'moderate patriotism' that would be 'worthy of support by morally conscientious people', does not make a sharp distinction between (good) patriotism and (bad) nationalism, observing instead that each of them comes in different versions, some acceptable to modern liberals and some not.[59] It is hard to avoid the suspicion that the sharp distinction offered by new patriots has more to do with rhetorical impact than with cool analysis, and that it is convenient to call particularistic sentiments one approves of 'patriotism', while heaping all the blame on to nationalism, 'patriotism's bloody brother'.[60] In Viroli's account, for example, nationalism is taken to mean 'unconditional loyalty or an exclusive attachment', contrasted with the 'charitable and generous love' of country that is patriotism.[61] When an example of nationalism seems to show liberal

[55] Viroli, *For Love of Country*, pp. 172–5.
[56] Viroli, *For Love of Country*, pp. 17, 161. 'Patriotism without Nationalism' is the title of his epilogue.
[57] Viroli, *For Love of Country*, pp. 175–6, 184.
[58] Viroli, *For Love of Country*, pp. 178, 183–4; cf. Dietz, 'Patriotism', pp. 187–9.
[59] Nathanson, *Patriotism, Morality, and Peace*, pp. 185–6, 197.
[60] Schaar, 'Case for Patriotism', p. 285.
[61] Viroli, *For Love of Country*, p. 2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

characteristics, it turns out to have been patriotism all along.[62] This propensity to blacken the name of nationalism goes along with an inclination to play down the more illiberal aspects of patriotism. Either these are admitted *sotto voce*,[63] or else they are dismissed with the implication that bad patriotism is virtually equivalent to nationalism.[64]

The weakness of the 'rooted republican' version of the new patriotism is therefore than it trades on a caricature of nationalism as a bigoted and racist commitment to ethnic and cultural homogeneity. That caricature ignores the huge complexity of national loyalties, the differences between different national traditions and changes within specific traditions over time. This is not the place to explore those complexities,[65] except to point out that while there is plenty of evidence of racist versions of nationalism (as of chauvinist versions of patriotism), there is also a long-standing association between some nationalisms and liberal democracy.[66] The most distinguished recent defender of liberal nationalism, David Miller, denies that national loyalty has to imply ethnic or cultural homogeneity, and envisages an open-minded, inclusive national political culture that seems virtually indistinguishable from Viroli's conception of patriotism.[67]

It is relevant here that (to quote David Miller) 'national identities are not cast in stone'.[68] One reason for the convergence between the more liberal recent statements of nationalism and the more particularistic versions of new patriotism is that (at any rate among Western intellectuals, though not among militants elsewhere) nationalist discourse has been shifting further away from the nineteenth-century Romantic conception of nations as natural entities, towards the belief that nations are (in Benedict Anderson's indispensable phrase) 'imagined communities'.[69] A charge traditionally raised against nationalism is that it teaches the false doctrine that human beings are naturally divided into separate (and probably unequal) nations. But sophisticated nationalists have recognized for a long time that their nations are in fact contingent outcomes of historical events, and that the sense of naturalness is

[62] Viroli, *For Love of Country*, p. 7.

[63] Schaar, 'Case for Patriotism', p. 296.

[64] Viroli, *For Love of Country*, pp. 184–5.

[65] See, for example, Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983); Canovan, *Nationhood and Political Theory;* Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992); Miller, *On Nationality*; Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin, 1991).

[66] As Habermas admits in 'Citizenship and National Identity', p. 493. It may be argued that without nationhood (which can incorporate a population into a single 'people') liberal democracy would never have come about (Greenfeld, *Nationalism*, e.g. p. 10). Cf. Canovan, *Nationhood and Political Theory, passim.*

[67] For example, see Miller, *On Nationality,* p. 127. Cf. Schnapper, *Communauté des Citoyens, passim.*

[68] Miller, *On Nationality*, p. 127.

[69] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*. This does not imply that they are imaginary.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

largely mythical, part of the way in which nations are imagined. The understanding of nations as 'imagined communities' is currently attracting attention not only because it chimes in well with the post-modern sense of the shifting, kaleidoscopic quality of 'reality', but also because if nationhood is something imagined, then (so its supporters often believe) it can be re-imagined in a more palatable form. Instead of trying to replace national identities with patriotic loyalties, therefore, some political theorists moved by very similar concerns are suggesting the reinvention of existing national identities to make them more consonant with liberal concerns. The implication of this may seem to be that the new patriots are actually pushing at an open door: that their fear of nationalism is exaggerated and their concern to distinguish patriotism from it unnecessary, since nationalism can itself be reinvented in a form that all good liberals can endorse. But any such conclusion would be simplistic, for two reasons. In the first place, political identities cannot be made to order; and in the second place, even if they could be, that would still not solve the dilemmas of liberal patriots.

On the first point, some writers suppose that (as Richard Kearney says) 'nations and states are of our own making and can be *remade* according to other images'.[70] But this reasoning commits the fallacy (pointed out by Hannah Arendt) of mistaking 'action' for 'work'.[71] As Arendt showed, politics is not a matter of moulding passive material. Free politics means action engaged in by plural actors, and no one can control or predict its outcome. Encouraging citizens to debate matters of common identity[72] *may* generate more enlightened and cosmopolitan views, but it could just as well provide opportunities for populist mobilization that might reinforce entrenched conceptions of 'us' and 'them', or lead to re-imagined identities of an even less palatable kind. The increasing success in Western Europe and elsewhere of political parties hostile to immigration is a reminder of these possibilities. Faced with the wilderness of contingency that is the real world of politics, liberals cannot find a short cut to universal harmony through new concepts of patriotism or nationalism.

Suppose, however (to move on to our second problem) that we really *could* remould a political identity within a given territory to conform to the best new patriotic or civic nationalist model: would that solve the problem we started from? Remember that our problem was the tension between particular loyalties and universal principles. In the uncompromisingly cosmopolitan words of Martha Nussbaum,

> To count people as moral equals is to treat nationality, ethnicity, religion, class, race, and gender as 'morally irrelevant' – as irrelevant to that equal standing ... What

[70] Richard Kearney, *Postnationalist Ireland: Politics, Culture, Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 69.

[71] Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), pp. 220–30.

[72] As proposed, for example, by David Miller in *On Nationality*, pp. 179, 181.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123400000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

I am saying about politics is that we should view the equal worth of all human beings as a regulative constraint on our political actions and aspirations.[73]

Traditionally it was in warfare that patriotism clashed most stridently with such commitments: the soldier could not treat his country's friends and enemies as moral equals.[74] It is highly characteristic of the new discourse of patriotism (bearing witness to changed political conditions in the West) that the military concerns that loomed so large in the past have almost dropped out of view. The first duty of a patriot is no longer to lay down his life for his country; in the eyes of new patriots it may instead be to campaign actively to make that country live up to its pretensions by respecting human rights. But the demilitarization of borders in many parts of the developed world does not overcome the tension between particular and universal commitments and loyalties. Instead, a dramatic new source of conflict (still focused upon borders) has replaced the old one: immigration and the problem of its limits. Given the never-ending streams of would-be immigrants to prosperous parts of the world such as the United States and the European Union, there is an apparently irreconcilable contradiction between universalist humanitarianism on the one hand, and commitment on the other to the persistence of a polity (national or patriotic) belonging to a privileged subsection of humankind – 'our people'.[75] New patriotism does nothing to help solve this dilemma. As we saw, even the most apparently cosmopolitan constitutional patriotism does not alter the fundamental truth that citizenship is first and foremost an inherited privilege, and must be so if a democratic body politic is to be able to persist.

CONCLUSION

Despite the claims made for it, new patriotism does not provide a coherent solution to the problem of reconciling universal humanitarian principles with limited and particularistic political commitments, and has no advantages in this respect over nationalism of the more liberal sort.[76] The dilemmas to which it is addressed do not yield to philosophical solutions, and can be managed only by more or less messy political compromises. That said, there is no doubt that the discourse of new patriotism can on occasion aid such political compromises, and may in some circumstances make up in political effectiveness for its deficiencies in philosophical cogency. It is evident (as I suggested earlier) that variants of

[73] Martha C. Nussbaum, 'Reply', in Nussbaum, *For Love of Country*, pp. 131–44 at p. 133.

[74] Alasdair MacIntyre has written provocatively that because of the particularistic demands of patriotism, 'good soldiers may not be liberals' (MacIntyre, 'Is Patriotism a Virtue?' p. 17).

[75] Cf. Barry and Goodin, *Free Movement*; W. Rogers Brubaker, ed., *Immigration and the Politics of Citizenship in Europe and North America* (London: University Press of America, 1989); Thomas Hammar, *Democracy and the Nation State: Aliens, Denizens and Citizens in a World of International Migration* (Aldershot, Hants: Avebury, 1990).

[76] The critique of new patriotism offered here does not imply an endorsement of nationalism, which has problems of its own that cannot be addressed here. Cf. Canovan, *Nationhood and Political Theory*, chaps 9 and 10.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press

this discourse have been elaborated and adopted at least in part for rhetorical reasons, as political moves intended to gather support for liberal humanitarian commitments. Consciously or not, its supporters are employing the traditional tactics of the rhetorician, such as using familiar terms in altered senses, redescribing the political situation and shifting the battle lines to maximize support for their own position.[77] The German discourse of *Verfassungspatriotismus,* for example, should be seen as a way of managing tensions between traditional understandings of national loyalty and the post-war constitutional arrangements of the Federal Republic. As a rhetorical response to that situation it seems to have been quite successful, partly no doubt because its local resonances were decently clothed in the language of unpolitical generality. Habermasian abstraction can make it possible to talk about highly specific problems while apparently not talking about them.

There is nothing particularly unusual about this situation, for it is in the nature of political thinking to be on the one hand the elaboration of a general theoretical position and on the other a move in a political game.[78] Furthermore, it sometimes happens that arguments that are intellectually weak are rhetorically effective and politically constructive. The large issues raised by the overlaps and tensions between political rhetoric and philosophical argument cannot be discussed here. Faced with the discourse of new patriotism, however, it is possible to sympathize with the intentions it embodies (and even to commend its use as a political strategy in some circumstances), while still concluding that as a coherent theoretical solution to the problems its adherents claim to confront, patriotism is not enough.

[77] For an exhaustive survey of the traditional rhetorical techniques, see Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), Part I.

[78] Cf. Margaret Canovan, 'The Eloquence of John Stuart Mill', *History of Political Thought*, 8 (1987), 505–20.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000017X Published online by Cambridge University Press