principles of justice to help resolve disagreements about how to promote civic virtue and political participation. This means that disagreements about justice will spill over into disagreements about citizenship. Indeed, ‘new’ debates over citizenship are often ‘old’ debates over justice dressed up in new clothing. In any event, I will discuss theories of citizenship as an important supplement to, rather than a replacement for, theories of justice: theories of citizenship identify the virtues and practices needed to promote and maintain the sorts of institutions and policies defended within theories of justice.

In this chapter, I will examine some of the key issues relating to theories of citizenship. I will first try to clarify what sorts of virtues and practices are said to be required by democratic citizens (s. 1). In the literature, the term ‘civic republican’ is often used to describe anyone who takes seriously the need for civic virtue. But there are two very different forms of civic republicanism: a classical view which emphasizes the intrinsic value of political participation, and a liberal view which emphasizes its instrumental importance. I will compare these two views in sections 2 and 3, and then consider how liberal states can in fact try to promote the appropriate forms of citizenship virtues and practices (s. 4).

I. THE VIRTUES AND PRACTICES OF DEMOCRATIC CITIZENS

Before describing the new work on citizenship, it is necessary to quickly outline the view of citizenship that is implicit in much post-war political theory, and that is defined almost entirely in terms of the possession of rights. The most influential exposition of this post-war conception of citizenship—rights is T. H. Marshall’s ‘Citizenship and Social Class’, written in 1949. According to Marshall, citizenship is essentially a matter of ensuring that everyone is treated as a full and equal member of society. And the way to ensure this sense of membership is through according people an increasing number of citizenship rights.

Marshall divides citizenship rights into three categories which he sees as having taken hold in England in three successive centuries: civil rights, which arose in the eighteenth century; political rights, which arose in the nineteenth century; and social rights—e.g. to public education, health care, unemployment insurance, and old-age pension—which have become established in the twentieth century (Marshall 1965: 78 ff.). And with the expansion of the rights of citizenship, he notes, there was also an expansion of the class of citizens. Civil and political rights that had been restricted to white property-owning Protestant men were gradually extended to women, the working class, Jews and Catholics, blacks, and other previously excluded groups.
For Marshall, the fullest expression of citizenship requires a liberal-democratic welfare state. By guaranteeing civil, political, and social rights to all, the welfare state ensures that every member of society feels like a full member of society, able to participate in and enjoy the common life of society. Where any of these rights are withheld or violated, people will be marginalized and unable to participate.

This is often called 'passive' or 'private' citizenship, because of its emphasis on passive entitlements, and the absence of any obligation to participate in public life. It is still widely supported. When asked what citizenship means to them, people are much more likely to talk about rights than responsibilities or participation. For most people, citizenship is, as the American Supreme Court once put it, 'the right to have rights'.

It is quite understandable why people support this model of citizenship-as-rights. As Stephen Macedo puts it, 'the benefits of private citizenship are not to be sneezed at: they place certain basic human goods (security, prosperity, and freedom) within the grasp of nearly all, and that is nothing less than a fantastic human achievement' (Macedo 1990: 39).

Nevertheless, this orthodox post-war conception of citizenship has come increasingly under attack in the last decade. Many commentators argue that we need to supplement (or replace) the passive acceptance of citizenship rights with the active exercise of citizenship responsibilities and virtues, including economic self-reliance, political participation, and even civility. (Marshall’s view has also been criticized for failing to properly recognize and accommodate the social and cultural pluralism of modern societies. I will discuss these calls for a more 'multicultural' or 'group-differentiated' model of citizenship in the next chapter on multiculturalism.)

The first task for theorists of citizenship was to specify more concretely the sorts of civic virtues required for a flourishing democracy. According to William Galston’s influential account, responsible citizenship requires four types of civic virtues: (i) general virtues: courage; law-abidingness; loyalty; (ii) social virtues: independence; open-mindedness; (iii) economic virtues: work ethic; capacity to delay self-gratification; adaptability to economic and technological change; and (iv) political virtues: capacity to discern and respect the rights of others; willingness to demand only what can be paid for; ability to evaluate the performance of those in office; willingness to engage in public discourse (Galston 1991: 221-4).

Many of these virtues—particularly the general and economic virtues—are needed in virtually any political order, whether it is large or small, agrarian or industrialized, democratic or authoritarian, pluralistic or homogeneous. For this reason, the concern with civic virtue is in fact a very old one in the history of Western political thought, even when political communities were much smaller and more homogeneous. But modern theories of citizenship must
respond to the realities of contemporary pluralistic societies. The sorts of civic virtues required for a large, pluralistic modern society, and the appropriate means to promote them, may differ from those required for a small, homogeneous pre-modern city-state.

Thus much of the current debate has been focused on those virtues which are distinctive to modern pluralistic liberal democracies, relating to the basic principles of a liberal regime, and to the political role citizens occupy within it. These virtues include the ability and willingness to question political authority, and to engage in public discourse about matters of public policy. These are perhaps the most distinctive aspects of citizenship in a liberal democracy, since they are precisely what distinguish 'citizens' within a democracy from the 'subjects' of an authoritarian regime.

The need to question authority arises in part from the fact that citizens in a representative democracy elect representatives who govern in their name. Hence an important responsibility of citizens is to monitor those officials, and judge their conduct. The need to engage in public discourse arises from the fact that the decisions of government in a democracy should be made publicly, through free and open discussion. But the virtue of public discourse is not just the willingness to participate in politics, or to make one's views known. It also involves the willingness to engage in a conversation: to listen as well as to speak, to seek to understand what others say, and to respond respectfully to the views of others, so as to continue the conversation.

As William Galston notes, this willingness to engage in public discourse is a complicated virtue. It includes the willingness to listen seriously to a range of views which, given the diversity of liberal societies, will include ideas the listener is bound to find strange and even obnoxious. The virtue of political discourse also includes the willingness to set forth one's own views intelligibly and candidly as the basis for a politics of persuasion rather than manipulation or coercion' (Galston 1991: 227).

This is often called the virtue of 'public reasonableness'. Liberal citizens must give reasons for their political demands, not just state preferences or make threats. Moreover, these reasons must be 'public' reasons, in the sense that they are capable of being understood and accepted by people of different faiths and cultures. Hence it is not enough to invoke Scripture or tradition. Liberal citizens must justify their political demands in terms that fellow citizens can understand and accept as consistent with their status as free and equal citizens. It requires a conscientious effort to distinguish those beliefs which are matters of private faith from those which are capable of public defence, and to see how issues look from the point of view of those with differing religious commitments and cultural backgrounds.

It is not always clear how we are to identify what qualifies as a 'public reason'—this has been a subject of great dispute. And on most views, public
reasons will not always be able to resolve the disputes between adherents of different religious and cultural traditions. At some point, the public reasons may simply run out, and we will be left with conflicting claims based on religious or cultural beliefs that are not publicly shareable. In these circumstances, we need to cultivate the related virtue of accommodation or compromise. For example, some commentators have suggested that public reasons may not be able to fully resolve disputes over abortion, and that the only reasonable response is therefore some sort of compromise.\textsuperscript{10}

This particular conception of public reasonableness—one that requires citizens to consider which of their religious beliefs or cultural traditions are capable of public defence, and to seek honourable compromises when public reasons run out—is distinctly modern. Its prominence in the recent literature on citizenship is partly related to the recognition that modern societies are ethnically and religiously diverse.

But it also reflects another important shift in contemporary democratic theory, from ‘vote-centric’ to ‘talk-centric’ theories of democracy. In much of the post-war period, democracy was understood almost exclusively in terms of voting. Citizens were assumed to have a set of preferences, fixed prior to and independent of the political process, and the function of voting was simply to provide a fair decision-making procedure or aggregation mechanism for translating these pre-existing preferences into public decisions, either about who to elect (in standard elections) or about what laws to adopt (in issue-specific referenda).

But it is increasingly accepted that this ‘aggregative’ or ‘vote-centric’ conception of democracy cannot fulfill norms of democratic legitimacy. For one thing, since preferences are assumed to be formed independently of and prior to the political process, it provides no opportunity for citizens to try to persuade others of the merits of their views, or the legitimacy of their claims. Similarly, it provides no opportunity for citizens to distinguish claims based on self-interest, prejudice, ignorance, or fleeting whims from those grounded in principles of justice or fundamental needs. There is in fact no public dimension to the process at all. While citizens may need to physically leave their homes to go to the ballot box, the aggregative vote-centric model does not expect or encourage citizens to meet in public to discuss and debate their reasons for the claims they make. Indeed, with new technology, it is quite possible to have a form of aggregative democracy in which citizens never leave their home, and vote through the Internet.

As a result, the outcome of the aggregative model has only the thinnest veneer of legitimacy. It provides a mechanism for determining winners and losers, but no mechanism for developing a consensus, or shaping public opinion, or even formulating an honourable compromise. Consider citizens who believe that their claims are based on fundamental principles of justice, yet
who are outvoted in an aggregative democracy. They have not been offered any reason for believing that they are mistaken about the justice of their claims. They have had no opportunity to persuade others of this claim, or to be persuaded by others that they are mistaken. They have simply been outnumbered. Many studies have shown that citizens will accept the legitimacy of collective decisions that go against them, but only if they think their arguments and reasons have been given a fair hearing, and that others have taken seriously what they have to say. But if there is no room for such a fair hearing, then people will question the legitimacy of decisions. This is particularly true for people belonging to a marginalized minority group, who know in advance that they have little hope of winning a majority vote. They may in effect be permanently excluded from exercising any real power within the system.

To overcome these shortcomings of the vote-centric approach, democratic theorists are increasingly focusing on the processes of deliberation and opinion formation that precede voting. Theorists have shifted their attention from what goes on in the voting booth to what goes on in the public deliberations of civil society. John Dryzek, one of the founders of this new model of democracy, calls this the ‘deliberative turn’ in democratic theory, which he dates to around 1990—not coincidentally, the same time as the turn towards theories of citizenship (Dryzek 2000: p. v).\(^\text{11}\) A more deliberative democracy would, it is hoped, bring several benefits for society at large as well as for individuals and groups within society.\(^\text{12}\) The collective benefits for society would include better decisions, since the decision-making process would draw forth the otherwise unarticulated knowledge and insights of citizens, and since citizens would test and discard those assumptions or beliefs which were found in public debate to be wrong or short-sighted or otherwise indefensible.\(^\text{13}\) It would also lead to greater unity and solidarity in society. For one thing, political decision-making would be seen as more legitimate since everyone would have a fair chance to have their views heard and considered. Moreover, the very fact that people share the experience of deliberating in common provides a tangible bond that connects citizens and encourages greater mutual understanding and empathy. In a deliberative democracy, we would seek to change people’s behaviour only through non-coercive discussion of their claims, rather than through manipulation, indoctrination, propaganda, deception, or threats. This is a sign of mutual respect (Dryzek 2000: 2), or indeed of civic friendship (Blattberg 2000).

We might even hope that this shared deliberation would sometimes lead to greater agreement on various important issues, as seemingly implacable disagreements turn out to be based on misunderstandings or incomplete information, and that we would converge on a ‘common ordering of individual needs and wants into a single vision of the future in which all can share’
(Barber 1984: 224). For most deliberative democrats, however, this sort of consensus is at best a happy but occasional by-product of deliberation, not its presupposition or goal—deliberating about our differences is not the same as eliminating our differences.\(^{14}\)

(This means, of course, that deliberative democracy cannot entirely do away with the sorts of ‘aggregative’ procedures emphasized by the earlier model of democracy. At the end of the day, after the arguments are duly considered, some voting or electoral procedure is needed for resolving the remaining disagreements.)

So ‘deliberative democracy’ promises benefits to the larger society. But it offers particular benefits to minority or marginalized groups. If such groups are to have any real influence in a majoritarian electoral system, and any reason to accept the legitimacy of the system, it will be through participating in the formation of public opinion, rather than through winning a majority vote. As Simone Chambers puts it, ‘voice rather than votes is the vehicle of empowerment’ (Chambers 2001). This seems clear from the recent advances made by groups such as gays and lesbians, the deaf, or indigenous peoples, who account for less than 5 per cent of the overall electorate. Their empowerment has largely come through participating in a public debate that has transformed the pre-existing assumptions held by members of the larger society about what is right and fair for these groups. If democracy is to help promote justice for these groups, rather than leaving them subject to the ‘tyranny of the majority’ (or the indifference and neglect of the majority), then democracy will have to be more deliberative. As a result, a wide range of theorists—liberals, communitarians, critical theorists, feminists, multiculturalists—have identified the need for greater deliberation as one of the key priorities for modern democracies.\(^{15}\)

Much more could be said about this new deliberative model of democracy. In particular, what are the appropriate forums for deliberation? At what levels should these forums exist—local, national, or supranational? Should these forums be issue specific or general? How do we ensure that all groups and views are adequately represented in these forums? Is the goal to make existing mechanisms of voting, referenda, electoral representation, and judicial decision-making more deliberative, or to create new forums for deliberation, such as ‘deliberative polls’, ‘citizen juries’, town hall meetings, or constituent assemblies? Theorists have just begun to address these complex questions about the implementation of deliberative democracy. And it has become clear that the answers to these questions will depend, at least in part, on our theories of justice.\(^{16}\) Libertarians and liberal egalitarians will differ, for example, on whether campaign financing should be regulated to ensure an ‘equal voice’ in democratic deliberations.

The key point for us, however, is that this shift to a more deliberative model
of democracy makes it even more urgent to attend to issues of civic virtue. On the aggregative model, citizens were assumed to act in a private and more or less self-interested way: any interaction with others was assumed to reflect strategic behaviour about how best to get one's way (e.g. through bargaining or log-rolling). On the deliberative model, however, citizens are assumed to act in public with the goal of mutual understanding, and not just to act strategically for personal benefit. This is obviously a more demanding picture of the requirements of democratic citizenship. Democratic citizens must be not only active and participatory, critical of authority, and non-dogmatic, but also committed to seeking mutual understanding through deliberation rather than exclusively seeking personal benefit through bargaining or threats. Without citizens who display these virtues, liberal democracy cannot fulfil its promise of justice, and may indeed slowly succumb to undemocratic or illiberal forces.

Of course, it is not necessary that every citizen display all of these virtues to a high degree. A liberal democracy may not be possible for a society of devils, but nor does it require a society of angels. It would be more accurate to say that liberal justice requires a critical threshold: there must be a sufficient number of citizens who possess these virtues to a sufficient degree. Where to set this threshold is obviously a complicated question, which cannot be answered in the abstract.

But wherever we set the threshold, there are many people who think that we are dangerously close to falling below it. Moreover, the trends do not look good. There appears to be a general decline in people's commitment to public participation, respectful dialogue, or critical attention to government (Walzer 1992a: 90). Many people today seem to be alienated from, or simply indifferent to, the political process. According to a recent survey, for example, only 12 per cent of American teenagers said voting was important to being a good citizen. Moreover, this apathy is not just a function of youth—comparisons with similar surveys from the previous fifty years suggest that 'the current cohort knows less, cares less, votes less, and is less critical of its leaders and institutions than young people have been at any time over the past five decades' (Glendon 1991: 129). The evidence from Great Britain is similar (Heater 1990: 215).

What we see, in short, is growing awareness of the importance of civic virtues, at the same time as there is growing fear that these virtues are in decline. We see a growing emphasis on the need for people to be active citizens who participate in public deliberation, at the same time we see a trend toward greater apathy, passivity, and withdrawal into the private sphere of family, career and personal projects.