

HUMANITIES

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2022.5.11>

AKTYWNE OBYWATELSTWO W WYZWANIACH ZRÓWNOWAŻONEGO ROZWOJU

*Xu Shishi**aspirantka Katedry Filozofii Społecznej,
Filozofii Edukacji i Polityki Edukacyjnej,**Narodowego Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego imienia M.P. Drahomanowa (Kijów, Ukraina)**ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6406-341X**super_shishi@ukr.net*

Adnotacja. W artykule opisano filozoficzne i polityczne podstawy interakcji obywatela i państwa, podkreślono naturę aktywnego obywatelstwa. W celu zbadania relacji jednostki i całości rozważano przykłady historyczne. Na przykładzie filozoficznych nauk amerykańskich postaci społeczno-politycznych epoki narodzin państwowości w USA rozważono zasady federalizmu, demokracji przedstawicielskiej i podziału władzy. Były stosunkowo podstawowe idee amerykańskiego działacza społeczno-politycznego Jamesa Madisonsa z ideami europejskich filozofów Johna Locke'a, Charlesa Louisa de Montesquieu, Thomasa Hobbesa i innych. Wykazano, że doświadczenie w budowaniu społeczeństwa obywatelskiego w Stanach Zjednoczonych jest pouczającym przykładem budowania teoretycznych konstrukcji aktywnego obywatelstwa. Badając naturę wolności aktywnego obywatela, rozważano podstawowe podstawy klasycznego liberalizmu. Rozważano idee Adama Smitha dotyczące altruizmu i korzyści. Idee te znalazły swoją logiczną kontynuację w ironicznej filozofii Richarda Rorty'ego, który w samej ironii znajduje podstawę empatii i aktywizmu obywateli.

Słowa kluczowe: filozofia polityczna, aktywny obywatel, państwo, federalizm, społeczeństwo obywatelskie, klasyczny liberalizm.

ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP IN THE CHALLENGES OF CIVILIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

*Xu Shishi**Postgraduate Student at the Department of the Social Philosophy,
Philosophy of Education and Education Policy Department**National Pedagogical Dragomanov University (Kyiv, Ukraine)**ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6406-341X**super_shishi@ukr.net*

Abstract. The article describes the philosophical and political foundations of the interaction between the citizen and the state; emphasizes the nature of active citizenship. To study the relationship between the individual and the general, historical examples were considered. On the example of the philosophical teachings of the American public and political figures of the era of the birth of statehood in the United States, the principles of federalism, representative democracy, and the division of power were considered. The main ideas of the founding father James Madison were compared with the ideas of European philosophers John Locke, Charles Louis de Montesquieu, Thomas Hobbes, and others. It has been demonstrated that the experience of building civil society in the United States of America is an instructive example of building theoretical structures of active citizenship. In studying the nature of the freedoms of an active citizen, the basic principles of classical liberalism were considered. The ideas of Adam Smith, which relate to altruism and self-interest, were considered. These ideas found their logical continuation in the ironic philosophy of Richard Rorty, who finds in irony itself the basis for the sympathy and activity of citizens.

Key words: political philosophy, active citizen, state, federalism, civil society, classical liberalism.

АКТИВНЕ ГРОМАДЯНСТВО У ВИКЛИКАХ СТАЛОГО РОЗВИТКУ

*Сюї Шіші**аспірантка кафедри соціальної філософії,
філософії освіти та освітньої політики**Національного педагогічного університету імені М.П. Драгоманова (Київ, Україна)**ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6406-341X**super_shishi@ukr.net*

Анотація. У статті описано філософсько-політичні засади взаємодії громадянина та держави, підкреслено природу активного громадянства. Для вивчення взаємовідносини одиничного та загального було

розглянуто історичні приклади. На прикладі філософських вчень американських суспільно-політичних діячів епохи зародження державності у США було розглянуто принципи федералізму, представницької демократії та поділу влади. Було порівняно основні ідеї американського суспільно-політичного діяча Джеймса Медісона з ідеями європейських філософів Джона Локка, Шарля Луї де Монтеск'є, Томаса Гоббса та інших. Було продемонстровано, що досвід побудови громадянського суспільства у Сполучених Штатах є повчальним прикладом для побудови теоретичних конструкцій активного громадянства. Під час вивчення природи свобод активного громадянина було розглянуто базові засади класичного лібералізму. Були розглянуті ідеї Адама Сміта, які стосуються альтруїзму та користі. Ці ідеї знайшли своє логічне продовження в іронічній філософії Річарда Рорті, який знаходить у самій іронії основу співчуття та активності громадян.

Ключові слова: політична філософія, активний громадянин, держава, федералізм, громадянське суспільство, класичний лібералізм.

Introduction. The study of the concept of an active citizen should be carried out in a multi-vector direction. Given the fact that a citizen is a person belonging to the permanent population of a state, he is under its protection, he has a set of rights and obligations. Each state has the right to decide how to build the relationship between the individual and the general. If the state recognizes a person as a citizen, then he is endowed with rights: political, social, civil, etc. There is a certain conformism in this, the recognition of one group of people as citizens, while the other is not.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of the article is the need to update the philosophical dialogue regarding the problem of citizenship, namely the activity of a citizen in a developing world. In the context of globalization and westernization, the question of the role and purpose of a citizen in a multinational global civilization becomes relevant again. This issue can be resolved by paying attention to the ideas of thinkers of the past, who, with their insight, were ahead of their time and predicted the features of the development of society. Thanks to their unique perspective, it becomes possible, based on their experience, to answer some vital questions.

Materials and methods. The research materials are presented both by classical texts of the thinkers of the past that are relevant today and by the works of contemporary political philosophers. Thanks to the method of historical and philosophical reconstruction, the main philosophical views on the role and relationship of an active citizen and society were reconstructed. Thanks to the comparative method, the main points of view of thinkers of the past and the present were compared. Special attention was paid to the texts of the past due to their unbiased look at the problems familiar today, in order to use the experience of the past in solving modern problems.

Main part. The history of the United States of America is an amazing historical experiment of humanity. At a certain moment in history, humankind had the opportunity to build a new society according to the utopian ideas of the best minds. In this society, it was possible to rethink a citizen's role and activities in the state. However, from the 18th to the mid-20th centuries, US law used racial criteria to establish citizenship rights. The Naturalization Act of 1790 was an act of the United States Congress that determined the rules for obtaining citizenship. The law prescribed the rules for granting citizenship by naturalization. This meant that the determining factor was the origin of a person. The law restricted naturalization to white people, excluding Native Americans, slaves, free blacks, and other people of color. "The first naturalization act, passed by Congress on March 26, 1790 (1 Stat. 103), provided that any free, white, adult alien, male or female, who had resided within the limits and jurisdiction of the United States for a period of 2 years was eligible for citizenship. Under the act, any individual who desired to become a citizen was to apply to 'any common law court of record, in any one of the states wherein he shall have resided for the term of one year at least'" (Bolger, 2013). The idea was that only the right people could have citizenship, and only the best of them, those who can benefit the state and society. The idea of an active and useful citizen had yet to overcome the prejudices that existed in the past. "Citizenship was granted to those who proved to the court's satisfaction that they were of good moral character and who took an oath of allegiance to the Constitution. Under the system established by the act, aliens could be naturalized not only in Federal courts, but also in State and local courts, and the children of successful applicants, if under 21 years of age, automatically became citizens" (Bolger, 2013).

When answering the question of how an active citizen should interact with the state, it is necessary to take into account the experience of the United States of America. President James Madison (1751–1836) was born in the colony of Virginia (the time of the existence of the colonies in North America) and died in the state of Virginia (the time of the appearance of the United States of America). He was a founding father, politician, and political philosopher. The first very interesting fact is that the first US presidents were not just politicians and administrators, but intellectuals, public figures, and political philosophers. This was the intuitive embodiment of Plato's dream of a philosopher ruler; the project which the ancient Greek philosopher was trying to realize in Syracuse. Despite the fact that James Madison was not a professional philosopher, he had a philosophical mind; he was influenced by the American Enlightenment. He published *The Federalist Papers* (1787–1788), a collection of 85 letters in support of the ratification of the US Constitution, to unite the 13 colonies. "I propose in a series of papers to discuss the following interesting particulars – *The utility of the UNION to your political prosperity – The insufficiency of the present Confederation to preserve that Union – The necessity of a government at least equally energetic with the one proposed to the attainment of this object – The conformity of the proposed constitution to the true principles of republican government – Its analogy to your own state constitution – and lastly, The additional security, which its adoption will afford to the preservation of that species of government, to liberty and to property*" (Madison, 1788: 5).

According to the American political philosopher, people, as active citizens, need unity and power. By nature, the human being is weak, but it wants the freedom to achieve strength. In this dialectical question lies the essence of the desire for freedom, which was described by great thinkers such as John Locke, Charles Louis de Montesquieu, and others. Power, in its active state, controls people, but people also control power. Such a symbiosis allows both parties to be active for the common benefit without harming each other. If the activity of the state begins to dominate the citizens, it will give rise to dictatorship and tyranny. How to avoid it and how to preserve the rights of a citizen? James Madison's answer consists of several provisions.

Firstly, the principle of a federal system is necessary (states must have their own laws and power). An active citizen will not be able to exist in the model proposed by Thomas Hobbes – giving his power to the sovereign: "... the Power and Honor of Subjects vanisheth in the presence of the Sovereign" (Hobbes, 1968: 237). *Thomas Hobbes and political theory* (1990), a collection of essays dedicated to the 400th anniversary of the birth of the English political thinker, argues for the idea that Hobbes's writings were essentially political texts, not scientific, ethical, or logical. However, the author manages to show the ideas of the English philosopher in a new way, to emphasize the unknown about the known. Professor of Political Philosophy Mary G. Dietz states: "But if one of Hobbes's principal messages is 'That Subjects owe to Sovereigns, simple Obedience, in all things,' we should not take from that a simplistic conception of the subject. The Hobbesian subject can be more accurately depicted if we acknowledge what Hobbes certainly understood: that fear or force alone could not sustain long-term allegiance to a political regime. Other, more richly constituted qualities are required if citizens are to remain at peace and supportive of the sovereign state. These qualities, I shall argue here, are precisely what Hobbes had in mind when he characterized his civil philosophy as a 'science of Vertue and Vice' and deemed it fit for public instruction. Thus, Leviathan can be read not simply as a theory of sovereignty but as an exploration of the dispositions necessary to citizenship, and Hobbes himself can be read as a theorist of civic virtue" (Dietz, 1990: 91-92).

Secondly, in order to maintain the good of active citizens, representative democracy must exist in the state. This thesis causes constant controversy since direct democracy acquires special power. This form of political organization of society, in which decisions are made and executed directly by citizens. The people are fully vested with power – *Imperare sibi maximum imperium est*. James Madison believed that pure democracy is fruitless and good only as an abstraction. He proved this with examples of the fact that citizens will spend a lot of time making important decisions, that they will constantly vote, and will not mind their own business. In addition, it cannot be interesting to everyone, due to the peculiarities of the subjective interests of citizens. If one of the citizens does not fulfill his political duties, other citizens will do it for him, and he will be able to learn how to manipulate votes and achieve privileges as a result. For example, in the United States, there is no institution of direct democracy – a referendum; it is not provided for in the constitution. Despite this, the history of direct democracy among Americans in the United States dates back to the 1630s in the New England colonies (Zimmerman, 1999). Direct democracy received theoretical understanding already in antiquity in the works of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and other thinkers. The ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle wrote: "This then was the nature of his reforms in regard to the offices of state. And the three most democratic features in Solon's constitution seem to be these: first and most important the prohibition of loans secured upon the person, secondly the liberty allowed to anybody who wished to exact redress on behalf of injured persons, and third, what is said to have been the chief basis of the powers of the multitude, the right of appeal to the jury-court – for the people, having the power of the vote, becomes sovereign in the government" (Aristotle, *Const. Ath.* 9.1). Today, the people's initiative exists, for example, in Switzerland, a referendum can be held in it both on socio-cultural and strategic issues.

Thirdly, according to James Madison, the state needs a separation of powers. In the 51st letter, the political philosopher writes that a system of counterbalance is needed, on the one hand, it is necessary to protect citizens from the power that can monopolize forces. Only the division of power will not allow one of the branches to upset the balance. James Madison had the idea of having two houses of Parliament so that neither house would abuse power. In the 9th letter, the American thinker leads a philosophical discussion with the intellectuals of the past, revealing his historical and philosophical potential. Arguing with Montesquieu, he insists that small republics are not viable, but large countries with great diversity will exist for a very long time. Why does an American political philosopher insist on building large republics? On a large scale, a mathematical and statistical equation of citizens in terms of rights, freedoms, and benefits is possible.

All these ideas are an excellent illustration of how republics should be built; this experience, proven over the centuries, will come in handy for modern researchers.

If in the first part of the article federalism is considered as ensuring the freedoms of active citizens, then the question arises about the nature of freedom for a citizen. In this case, it is necessary to consider the philosophical foundations of classical liberalism. This is a political ideology that affirms the rights and freedoms of man and citizen. He emphasizes political freedom, pluralism, and the need for economic freedom.

Liberalism remains a very popular idea of our time, largely due to its idealistic attitudes, which do not become obsolete. Liberalism is based on the principle that the active citizen belongs entirely to himself, and no one can take advantage of him. A citizen personally determines the vector of his activity. Classical liberalism was developed in the 19th century in the United States of America and Europe. It is focused on a new type of state and public relations of active citizens. In response to the industrial revolution and urbanization, new types of power and relationships emerged. Classical liberalism is largely based on learned political philosophers such as John Locke, Thomas Malthus, and David Ricardo et al.

In his book *The Unvarnished Doctrine: Locke, Liberalism, and the American Revolution* (1990), researcher Steven M. Dworetz states: “Civic virtue, the preeminent value in republican ideology, can be incompatible with personal freedom, which only the banished liberalism seems to defend by instinct rather than merely for convenience. Militarism, imposed social and religious conformity, and even American slavery are known to have been justified in the language of civic republicanism. Indeed, although this republican tradition is presumed to be rooted in the ideals of the ancient polis, the acknowledged primary textual source of American republicanism too often reads (as we shall see) like a prospectus for the Leviathan” (Dworetz, 1990: 4-5). Steven M. Dworetz attempts to rethink the significance of John Locke’s teachings on state formation in America. Contrary to the popular interpretation by American thinkers of John Locke as a moral apologist for the capitalist worldview, based on the study of sermons and treatises of the New England clergy, the author argues that the colonists themselves perceived John Locke through the prism of theistic liberalism.

Active citizens, adherents of liberalism, are in favor of a ban on the death penalty since the state does not have the right to take away what it did not provide. Liberals are also in favor of allowing abortion and euthanasia, it all boils down to philosophical beliefs about the absolute freedom of the citizen. The question is how the citizens use this freedom. The foundations of the theory of liberalism were laid by John Locke in *Two Treatises of Government* (1690). In *First Treatise*, John Locke criticizes the idea that the unlimited power of the monarch is sanctioned by God. Acceptance of such theses will only lead to slavery. “The end of law is not to abolish or restrain, but to preserve and enlarge freedom” (Locke, 1690).

Adam Smith’s *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* was first published in 1776. He agrees that people are imperfect and that people are prudent, but he also believes that human selfishness can be useful if it is directed in the right direction. If you use it for good, then you can build a society of free and active citizens. However, this does not negate the existence of inequality among the society of citizens. If we take for example a poor and a rich citizen, can we equalize them in benefits? The question is not as simple as it seems at first glance. If this were the goal of liberalism, then institutions would be created that would distribute wealth, but there is no such goal. Otherwise, this force would find a way to subordinate more force to itself and would begin to enrich itself. From this, we can conclude that the inequality of citizens is the price of freedom. “It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own self-interest. We address ourselves not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities, but of their advantages” (Smith, 1965).

In his book *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity* (1989), Richard Rorty questions human beliefs. He suggests admitting to ourselves that our beliefs are spontaneous and random, and if so, then other citizens have them spontaneously. It is easy to agree with the author, a person does not choose the place and time of birth, he finds himself thrown into a world alien to him. Saving irony comes to the rescue, which gives an acceptable assessment of reality. Treating other citizens with a touch of irony is a sure path to the truth, and understanding the relative nature of people’s beliefs contributes to a sense of empathy and solidarity.

Conclusions. As a result of the study, the philosophical and political foundations of the interaction between the citizen and the state were described, and the nature of active citizenship was emphasized. Thanks to the main methods, research materials were researched. The relationship between the individual and the universal was studied, and historical examples were considered. The history of the United States of America was taken as an experimental base, as a unique experiment of humankind. On the example of the philosophical teachings of the American socio-political USA of the 18th century, the principles of federalism, representative democracy, and the separation of powers were considered. A comparison was made of the main ideas of the American public and political figure James Madison with the ideas of European philosophers John Locke, Charles Louis de Montesquieu, Thomas Hobbes, and others. The basic foundations of classical liberalism, the ideas of Adam Smith, Richard Rorty, and others were studied.

Bibliography:

1. Aristotle A., Rackham H. *The Athenian Constitution; the Eudemian Ethics; on Virtues and Vices; with an English Translation* by H. Rackham. London; Cambridge : Harvard University Press; W. Heinemann, 1952. 505 p.
2. Bolger, E. Background history of the United States naturalization process. URL: <https://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/federal/naturalization-process-in-u-s-early-history/>
3. Dietz M. G. *Thomas Hobbes and Political Theory*. Lawrence, KS : University Press of Kansas, 1990. 211 p.
4. Dworetz S. M. *The Unvarnished Doctrine: Locke Liberalism and the American Revolution*. Durham, UK : Duke University Press, 1990. 264 p.
5. Hobbes T. *Leviathan* / Ed. by C. B. Macpherson. Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin, 1968. 729 p.
6. Locke J. *Two treatises of government: in the former, the false principles and foundation of Sir Robert Filmer, and his followers are detected and overthrown ; the latter is an essay concerning the true original, extent, and end of civil-government*. Clark, NJ : Lawbook Exchange, 2010. 358 p.
7. Madison J. *The Federalist: a Collection of Essays*. Vol. 1. New York, NY : J. and A.M Lean, 1788. 227 p.
8. Rorty R. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. Cambridge, UK : Cambridge University Press, 1989. 201 p.
9. Smith A. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. New York, NY : Random House, 1965. 976 p.
10. Zimmerman J. F. *The New England Town Meeting: Democracy in Action*. Westport, CT : Praeger, 1999. 231 p.

References:

1. Aristotle, A. & Rackham, H. (1952). *The Athenian Constitution; the Eudemian Ethics; on Virtues and Vices; with an English Translation by H. Rackham*. London; Cambridge : Harvard University Press; W. Heinemann.
2. Bolger, E. (2013). *Background history of the United States naturalization process*. Retrieved from <https://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/federal/naturalization-process-in-u-s-early-history/>
3. Dietz, M. G. (1990). *Thomas Hobbes and Political Theory*. Lawrence, KS : University Press of Kansas.
4. Dworetz, S. M. (1990). *The Unvarnished Doctrine: Locke Liberalism and the American Revolution*. Durham, UK : Duke University Press.
5. Hobbes, T. (1968). *Leviathan* / Ed. by C. B. Macpherson. Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin, 1968.
6. Locke, J. (2010). *Two treatises of government: in the former, the false principles and foundation of Sir Robert Filmer, and his followers are detected and overthrown ; the latter is an essay concerning the true original, extent, and end of civil-government*. Clark, NJ : Lawbook Exchange.
7. Madison, J. (1788). *The Federalist: a Collection of Essays*. Volume 1. New York, NY : J. and A.M Lean.
8. Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. Cambridge, UK : Cambridge University Press.
9. Smith, A. (1965). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. New York, NY : Random House.
10. Zimmerman, J. F. (1999). *The New England Town Meeting: Democracy in Action*. Westport, CT : Praeger.