# Navigating the Intersection of Patriotism and Liberalism: A Critical Analysis of MacIntyre's Perspective

## Introduction

Alasdair MacIntyre's exploration of liberalism and patriotism presents a rather convincing dichotomy between two seemingly irreconcilable worldviews. According to his framework, patriotism is a moral stance that gives utmost importance to one's nation and it's values. On the other hand, liberalism, or cosmopolitanism highlights a universalist standpoint which permits the modification and critique of national norms based on the larger ethical principles. More specifically, MacIntyre's view about liberalism is that there are individual entities existing prior to communities. Therefore, the social centrist theory is precisely how things function in the broader scheme. In fact, political institutions and administrations exist because of individuals. Moreover, he specifies that there are individuals with exclusive interests and rights. Therefore, prior to communities there exists a generic human being with interests that are part of the larger community and scheme. Hence, liberalism is also rather identical to patriotism in the grand scheme.

In the lense of Macintyre's framework, these two ideologies are structurally incompatible. Therefore, argues that an individual is never able to identify as both a patriot and liberal simultaneously in the philosophical perception. Hence, this paper aims to put forth an argument which provides a convincing distinction between liberalism and patriotism, and therefore proving that his claim of their incompatibility is not of utmost absolute. Ultimately, draw upon a more nuanced and intricate approach which reveals the potential of a reconciliation between the two ideologies.

**MacIntyre's argument for Patriotism**

MacIntyre's argument for patriotism states and centers on the theory that political and moral identities are inherently formed with the help of one's community and historical background. He illustrates that individuals owe their ethical obligations, moral framework as well as identity primarily to their specific nations. This is because individuals grasp onto their moral responsibilities through the support of national traditions. MacIntyre posits that patriotism entails a sense of moral obligation and loyalty to one's nation that will not be simply subjected to external critique without undermining the very structure of moral life. Such a view compliments a communitarian perspective. A perspective that prioritizes and emphasizes the embeddedness of moral values within historical and cultural contexts rather than within universal as well as abstract principles.

MacIntyre makes various arguments and claims throughout his work. However one such central claim within this context is that patriotism fosters moral motivations and civic engagement. Through the concrete identification with one's nation and its teachings, individuals are more apparent to act within roles that promote the common good and uphold social cohesion. This argument urges the necessity of a patriotic stance in a stable political community. This is because otherwise poses a threat towards the sense of a collective responsibility and shared moral purpose. Likewise, MacIntyre poses a following argument which entails the idea that patriotism also offers a form of moral clarity that is absent within liberalism. Moreover, Liberalism's prominence over universal, abstract values can cause and lead to moral paralysis. A situation where individuals struggle to determine their duties and obligations in specific

situations. Contrastingly. Patriotism showcases a solid moral frame within which individuals can act assuredly in defense of their nations and its said values.

Additionally, MacIntyre also contends that patriotism involves a historical and cultural framework that requires moral decision making. In modern multicultural societies, where multiple national traditions coexist, this framework becomes complex at an increasing rate. Therefore, the more diverse societies become, individuals are forced to navigate overlapping identities that are influenced by the both cosmopolitan and patriotic state of mind. Hence, it raises the question whether or not in multicultural nations with varying historical and ethical narratives, moral obligations are met or not. MacIntyre states, "Patriotism is not to be confused with a mindless loyalty to one's own particular nation which has no regard at all for the characteristics of that particular nation. Patriotism does generally and characteristically involve a peculiar regard not just for one's own nation, but for the particular characteristics and merits and achievements of one's own nation" (MacIntyre 4). This distinction between an informed patriotism and uncritical nationalism is important and if not crucial for understanding MacIntyre's framework.

In sync with MacIntyre's views and arguments, thinkers like Charles Taylor and Michael Sandel also advocate for similar views. Sandel's assessment of liberal individualism comes in par with MacIntyre's argument that moral values are rooted in specific traditions and cannot be entirely abstracted into universal principles. Likewise, Taylor also argues for the necessity and weight that cultural recognition holds. The author asserts that individual identity is deeply shaped by communal and national affiliations. Hence, these perspectives suggest that patriotism, when reflective and informed, plays a key role in shaping moral character and civic responsibility.

**Assessing the Validity of MacIntyre's Perspective**

There is not a doubt towards the compelling defense MacIntyre poses in favor of Patriotism. However, that is not to say that it comes in absence of significant weaknesses. A significant weakness or criticism that comes forth is that his argument, while impressive, does assume an overly rigid distinction between the moral frameworks liberalism and patriotism. It is necessary for one to allow necessary critical reflection of their shortcomings while also acknowledging the formative role of national traditions. A moderate position would most likely identify that moral identity is shaped by one's community but also recognise the necessity of ethical critique and reform.

Moreover, MacIntyre's framework does not sufficiently elaborate or address the presence of internal dissent within nations. Over the course of history, there have been numerous patriotic individuals known to have critiqued their own governments and social structures while also known to have maintained a deep sense of national loyalty. Historical cases include the American civil rights movement. The movement illustrated how patriotism can be compatible with moral reform specifically. Figures like Martin Luther King JR demonstrated that one could have the utmost respect and love for their country and also simultaneously actively seek to change a system that is corrupt and unjust. This suggests that patriotism does not necessarily inherently preclude external critique but can in fact motivate it.

Furthermore, a following issue with MacIntyre's argument is that it risks endorsing an uncritical form of nationalism. It is a risky situation where loyalty towards the nation is given more importance over concerns regarding justice as well as ethical accountability. In an

unusually extreme scenario, this could give rise to moral relativism. A situation where actions usually considered unjustifiable are defended primarily because they align with national traditions. Hence, this gives rise to the following question; Can a moral standpoint be valid if it lacks an external and universal point of view for critique.

**The Problem of the Absence of a Universal Perspective**

MacIntyre's conclusion that there is no universal point of view from which a nation's norms can be criticised acts as a crucial ethical challenge. If moral judgement is based solely on national traditions, then it becomes difficult to condemn practices such as authoritarian rule, systematic discrimination as well as any form of human rights violation in any given country. Hence, where there is a lack of external evaluative structure there is a lack of measure in the possibility of moral progress and risks entrenching injustices within national traditions.

A counterexample to this MacIntyre point of view is the global movement for human rights. The very existence and establishment of international human rights rules and regulations showcases that moral principles can go beyond national borders and boundaries. Hence, therefore act and take a role along the basis for critiquing unjust practices. Global efforts to address problems related to genocide, apartheid, and discrimination would lack legitmacy if there was no universal moral standpoint. This then suggests that while national traditions shape moral perspectives, there still must be the possibility for external critique to ensure ethical accountability.

Hence, in support MacIntyre notes, "If patriotism is understood as I have understood it, then 'patriotism' is not merely not the name of a virtue, but must be the name of a vice, since patriotism thus understood and morality incompatible" (MacIntyre 5). This stark and contrasting

claim underscores the tension between a nationalistic sense of moral obligation and a broader ethical framework that incorporates universal moral standards.

Even more so, it is important to consider the emergence of globalisation in the world. Globalisation and transnational institutions have formed a rather interconnected world where traditions no longer exist within the boundaries of isolation. The emergence of digital communication networks, international trade agreements, as well as global social movements and initiatives have led to an increase in the exchange of ethical and cultural values across borders and boundaries. For instance, the global environmental initiative of the Paris Agreement, showcases how nations are able to learn and adopt ethical commitments beyond their own tradition for the better of the global world. Moreover, international human rights organizations have also been successful in pressurizing governments to reassess and change certain national policies regarding freedom of speech, gender equality, as well as minority rights. These up and rising changes and developments proves the phenomenon that globalization fosters a dialogue between national identity and universal ethical principles. Therefore, challenging the notion that moral obligations are only ever fully understood within the context and confines of national traditions. International organizations along the lines of the United Nations, International Criminal Court, and Amnesty International provide frameworks through which national practices can be assessed and held questionable. Hence, this new reality questions MacIntyres view that patriotism can only exist in opposition to liberalism.

**Are Patriotism and Liberalism Incompatible?**

MacIntyre's claim that liberalism and patriotism are mutually exclusive is an oversimplification. It is true that patriotism and liberalism in their extreme form can prove to be

a challenge. However, moderate versions of these two perspectives can prove against that notion and coexist. A more nuanced approach recognizes the idea that an individual is morally obligated to both their nation and the broader humanity as a whole. One possible reconciliation is the notion of cosmopolitan patriotism. This in theory allows individuals to be loyal to their nation while also simultaneously being in the position to recognise universal moral values. In support to which MacIntyre suggests, "To act morally is to act in accordance with such impersonal judgements. Thus to think and to act morally involve the moral agent in abstracting him or herself from all social particularity and partiality" (MacIntyre 6). This therefore, highlights the issues and difficulties in regards to the reconciliation of patriotism along the moral universality promoted by liberalism.

Historical figures such as Nelson Mandela and Mahatma Gandhi exemplify this balance. Specifically through the advocations they performed in the face of their nation's independence and dignity while also keeping heed to the border ethical commitments in regard to human rights and justice. On the same note, movements like the European Union also encourage and promote both national identity and supranational cooperation. Ultimately, demonstrating that cosmopolitan values and patriotic allegiance can coexist successfully for the most part. This viewpoint recognises and acknowledges that national identity is a crucial segment of one's moral framework but does not necessarily preclude critical engagement alongside national practices based on broader ethical principles.

Figures such as Martha Nussbaum, Jurgen Habermas and Kwame Anthony Appiah have argued for this middle ground where there is critical engagement between national practices as well as the border moral principles. Nussbaum argues that ethical responsibilities should extend beyond national affiliations emphasizing a universalist approach deep seated within human

dignity. Habermas on the other hand, through his discourse ethics highlights that moral legitimacy is a product derived from rational deliberation that goes beyond the physical boundaries of states and nations. Therefore, it is possible for one to be committed to both local and global justice.

Moreover, Democratic societies also prosper when citizens choose to engage with their national traditions on a deeper level. A level that is more critical than uncritical. In this sense a liberal form of patriotism, that encourages civic participation while allowing for ethical critique, can ultimately strengthen national identity rather than the opposite. Historical examples where we can evaluate such an instance is the civil rights movement in the United States. The movement illustrated how patriotic individuals can challenge national injustices in pursuit of higher ethical ideals.

**Conclusion**

To conclude MacIntyre's argument for the incompatibility of patriotism and liberalism provides an important and valuable framework for understanding the tensions between national loyalty as well as universal ethical commitments. However, his claim that patriotism and liberalism cannot coexist is entirely too rigid. In reference to the above reasoning it is rather apparent that there are ways to go around that notion. Therefore, while patriotism does foster civic engagement and moral identity, it all also tempered by the ability to critique national traditions from a border ethical perspective. It is necessary that individuals recognise that there is a moderate stance that welcomes elements of both liberalism and patriotism. Elements which eventually allow national loyalty while upholding universal moral principles. Hence, ultimately offers a more balanced and ethically responsible approach to political identity.

Bibliography

Macintyre, Alasdair. 1984. “IS PATRIOTISM A VIRTUE?” *The University of Kansas*.

Nussbaum, Martha C. “Toward a Globally Sensitive Patriotism.” *Daedalus*, vol. 137, no. 3, 2008, pp. 78–93. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40543800. Accessed 21 Feb. 2025.

Care, Norman S. *Noûs* 19, no. 3 (1985): 459–67. https://doi.org/10.2307/2214956.