

Liberty



Paper: Introduction to Political theory

Lesson: Liberty

Author: Pradeep Kumar

**College/Department: Motilal Nehru College, Dept of
Political Science, University of Delhi**

Liberty

Contents

- Introduction
- Meaning of Liberty
- Development of the Idea
- Nature of Liberty
- Civil Political and Economic Liberty
- Civil Liberty
- Political Liberty
- Economic Liberty
- Negative and Positive Liberty
- Negative Liberty
- Negative Liberty Summary
- Positive Liberty
- Positive Liberty Summary
- J.S.Mill on Liberty
- Libertarian View on Liberty
- Marxist View on Liberty
- Conclusion
- Exercises
- References
- Web Links

“Man is born free, but everywhere is in chains.” [Rousseau]

Liberty



Delacroix's best known painting, it is an unforgettable image of Parisians, having taken up arms, marching forward under the banner of the tricolour representing liberty, equality, and fraternity; Delacroix was inspired by contemporary events to invoke the romantic image of the spirit of liberty. The soldiers lying dead in the foreground offer poignant counterpoint to the symbolic female figure, who is illuminated triumphantly, as if in a spotlight.

[http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/a/a7/Eug%C3%A8ne_Delacroix -
_La_libert%C3%A9_guidant_le_peuple.jpg/800px-Eug%C3%A8ne_Delacroix -
_La_libert%C3%A9_guidant_le_peuple.jpg](http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/a/a7/Eug%C3%A8ne_Delacroix_-_La_libert%C3%A9_guidant_le_peuple.jpg/800px-Eug%C3%A8ne_Delacroix_-_La_libert%C3%A9_guidant_le_peuple.jpg)

An individual's "**liberty**" is his most cherished gift from heaven. But will he be allowed to enjoy this gift? Perhaps his surrounding environment: the village, the tribe, the society, the state, or his own family and friends would grant him little space for it.

For any human being Liberty is most important "value "as has been witnessed by the history. For centuries, mankind has used liberty as an instrument to fight against oppression and exploitation. A source of inspiration and hope for a better future, the idea of liberty has guided humanity to this day. That is why, it is said that the human history is a history of the struggle for liberty.

Liberty

The concept of liberty has been at the helm of modern discussions especially pertaining to liberalism. Liberalism recognizes liberty as one of the fundamental social values. Firstly this liberty is freedom from any authority that is capable of acting arbitrarily and secondly freedom of the individual to develop all of his capacities as a human being. It is a step forward of an individual to challenge the absolute authority of the state. Liberty is, therefore, a force behind social change: it is the voice of the oppressed, it is a sound of an individual against injustice, it is the demand to reestablish human values and thus it is a shield for the down trodden and the shelter for the poor and the lowly in the society.

In Biblical reading, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." [Mathew 11 28, KJV] In this context Jesus is talking about freedom from sin, liberation from social-evil, satanic acts and widespread inequalities.



Liberty

http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/d/d3/Statue_of_Liberty,_NY.jpg

Meaning of Liberty

According to the concise oxford dictionary, "being free from captivity, imprisonment, slavery, or despotic control; personification of this gap of liberty; civil being subject only to laws established on behalf of community; liberty of conscience of the press; of the subject, rights of subject under constitutional rule. In common parlance the terms, liberty and freedom are used in similar manner. There appears little difference in commonplace usage of the words. However, one would note that "freedom" is used for a wider idea which is more philosophical whilst the term "liberty" indicates a particular aspect of freedom. That is why liberal thinkers who are committed to the ideal of liberty use the terms "liberty" and "freedom" interchangeably but idealists, Marxists and others prefer to use the term "freedom." Sushila Ramaswamy in her book writes at the outset of her chapter on Liberty, Liberty and freedom are used synonymously and inter-changeably, though for many, freedom refers to a situation, while liberty symbolizes a state of mind." [Ramaswamy S. political theory: ideas and concepts, 2003, Macmillan India Delhi 252]

She further quotes Berlin, who declares that the two words 'mean the same' [Ramaswamy 252] whereas Cranston concurs with Berlin but clarified that 'liberty tends to be used in legal and political contexts, freedom in philosophical and more general ones' [Ramaswamy 252] The most succinct difference is provided by Pitkin, who points out that liberty implies protection from State interference while freedom implies active involvement in politics. [Ramaswamy 2003 252]

Heywood has generally used the term freedom instead of liberty. He says, "Confusion is also caused by the fact that freedom is often associated with a range of other terms, notably liberty, toleration and liberation. Most people treat 'freedom' and 'liberty' as interchangeable terms and they will be regarded as synonymous..." (As it is found in the chapter by Heywood [**Freedom, Toleration and Liberation**]).

[Heywood A. political theory an introduction, 2005, 252]

Now to find the distinction, suffice to say, Freedom, when applied to persons and their actions, refers to the ability of a person in a given set of circumstances to act in some particular way. "Liberty" refers to authoritative permission to act in some particular way. The contrast is a basis for the grammatical distinction between "can" and "may:", between "de facto" and the "de jure" perspectives, or between (overall) ability and permission.[Ramaswamy S.252] Freedom, as writes Ramaswamy, is a complex concept which contains within it two basic ideas, both independent and yet interdependent. One meaning of freedom is **autonomy** or **rightful self-government** or **independence** in the sense of **sovereign free nation** states. The other meaning is the **overall ability to do**, choose or achieve

Liberty

things that can be called "optionality". It is the freedom to do what one desires and wills. [Ramaswamy S. 252]

Then what is "liberty?" Immunity from arbitrary exercise of authority: political independence, Freedom of choice "liberty of opinion", "liberty of worship", "liberty--perfect liberty--to think or feel or do just as one pleases", "at liberty to choose whatever occupation one wishes" or Personal freedom from servitude or confinement or oppression. Thus Liberty is a path which permits one to develop his all skills, live life to the fullest, enjoy one's happiness. And to develop, to live and to enjoy this all, he would find an environment which is free from all types of control, be it social, psychological, (emotional), economical or political.

Heywood brings another important aspect of Liberty the "Toleration" in discussion, 'Toleration', however, is different from freedom but there is a sense in which it can also be thought of as a manifestation of freedom. Heywood describes it, as "the willingness to put up with actions or opinions with which we may disagree, toleration affords individuals a broader opportunity to act as they please or choose. In the eyes of many, toleration is an essential precondition for harmony and social stability, guaranteeing that we can live together without encroaching upon one another's rights and liberties." [Heywood 252]

Another expression of liberty which emerged in the last century or to say very recently is the "liberation" movements. National liberation, women's liberation and sexual liberation. This idea of liberation seems to promise a more complete and 'inner' fulfillment than more conventional terms like liberty and emancipation. [Heywood 252]

To sum up the meaning of liberty in the views of Hannah Arendt, "political action is an interruption of automatic process, either natural or historical. The freedom to begin anew is thus an extension of "the freedom to call something into being which did not exist before, which was not given, not even as an object of cognition or imagination, and which therefore, strictly speaking, could not be known." [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_freedom]

The development of the idea

Man in the past was a man perhaps with no limitations, at that time he led a life of absolute freedom, he was not worried about the needs of modern day, in fact his mind was busy in search of food, shelter and other physical needs. Most of his needs were fulfilled by the nature. But at the same time he received most of the threats from the nature itself. Gradually he realized the need of being together with other humans. Which forced the man to act according to the will of the group he was associated with. And from here on the primitive men and women came in to relationship to which they respected and accepted as a social norm.

The primitive man was more concern with his individual happiness and peace, but with the realization of the idea of mutual reciprocity and social dependence, man

Liberty

came close to each other. Hannah Arendt traces the origins of the concept of freedom to the practice of politics in Ancient Greece. She finds, "the concept of freedom was historically inseparable from political action. Politics could only be practiced by those who had freed themselves from the necessities of life, so that they could attend to the realm of political affairs." [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_freedom] Further she says, "The concept of freedom became associated with the Christian notion of **freedom of the will**, or inner freedom," according to her, around the 5th century C.E. and since then, freedom as a form of political action has been neglected, even though, as she says, freedom is "the raison d'être of politics" (the raison d'être [reason for being]) [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_freedom]

In the early history, in the Greek city states a large population was not considered as citizen and this special status of citizenship was only granted to those who were virtuous to act politically and in the interest of the states. For Plato gave the idea of absolute authority to the Guardians his disciple Aristotle developed the idea of citizenship. For him, the citizen was to protect and work in the interest of the government and the state, thus a citizen was in the capacity to govern and to be governed. In Greek city states the privileged and propertied class having political acumen were citizens. To be free, to the Greeks, was to not have a master, to be independent from a master (to live like one likes). [<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberty>] For a citizen, exercise of power was duty for the benefit of both, the citizens and the others. But slaves, aliens and women were excluded from the folds of the citizenship. For example, in Athens women could not vote or hold office and were legally and socially dependent on a male relative. [<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberty>] Hence a large part of the people who were living in the city states was barred from exercising or expressing their freedom or liberty.

In the Persian Empire population enjoyed some degree of freedom. Citizens of all religions and diverse ethnic groups were provided with equal rights, and enjoyed freedom of religion. There was no discrimination based on gender. Slavery was abolished in (550 BC). [<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberty>]

In the Buddhist Maurya Empire, citizens of all religions and ethnic groups had some rights to freedom, tolerance, and equality. The need for tolerance on an egalitarian basis can be found in the edicts of Ashoka. Which emphasize the importance of tolerance in public policy by the government. Slavery was also non-existent in the Maurya Empire. [<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberty>]

After the decline of the Greek city states the idea of liberty was expanded, and more people in the Roman Empire were given the rights of citizenship. Although the citizenship rights in relation to performance were limited only to power owning class but these citizenship rights were also extended to the ordinary people. Yet this liberty was varying in nature. The people of lowest rank and women were excluded from the benefit of citizenship. Thus the idea of liberty for these people was non-existent.

Liberty

Roman practice was different from the Greek, as citizen was no longer defined to be the protector of law but as one who was under the protection of the laws. [Gaubu O.P. An introduction to political theory, 2009 322] Many of the liberties enjoyed under Roman law endured through the Middle Ages, but were enjoyed solely by the nobility, never by the common man. In the early Middle Ages or in the dark-age of Europe, political authority was eclipsed by church authority. The liberation of a man could only be granted by the church as he is sinner by nature, or any act against the church order will bring him to sin. Temporal citizenship was no longer considered to be important. In fact one's liberty was purely dependent on the fact that how much property one owns and how much political power he enjoys. The idea of inalienable and universal liberties had to wait until the Age of Enlightenment.

The new ideas on liberty were developed by the philosophers in the age of enlightenment. (A movement in Europe from about 1650 until 1800 that advocated the use of reason and individualism instead of tradition and established doctrine)

The Social contract theory, formulated by Hobbes, John Locke and Rousseau was among the first to provide a political classification of Rights, particularly through the notion of Sovereignty and of Natural Rights.

The thinkers of the enlightenment reasoned that law governed both the powers of the divine and the humans, and that law gave the king his power, rather than the king's power giving force to law. The divine Rights of king was thus opposed to the Sovereign's unchecked auctoritas. [<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberty>] (**Auctoritas** is a Latin word and is the origin of English **authority**).

Montesquieu further developed this conception of law in his idea that the relationship between individuals, rather than families, came to the fore, and with it the increasing focus on individual liberty as a fundamental reality, given by "Nature and Nature's God". which, in the Ideal state, would be as universal as possible. [<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberty>]

In **On Liberty**, John Stuart Mill sought to define the "...nature and limits of the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual," and as such, he describes an inherent and continuous antagonism between liberty and authority and thus, the prevailing question becomes "how to make the fitting adjustment between individual independence and social control". [<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberty>] here Mill introduces the question, how much freedom a man should have? In relation to the society he is living in.

Bodin finds that Rights and Liberty can not be equally granted to all citizens of a state, "As he rejects the idea of equal citizenship for all as no state ever recognizes its citizens to be equal in rights and privileges." [Ramaswamy S. 213] "Hobbes and Locke ignore the ideals of classical republicanism and citizen virtue. For both Hobbes and Locke consent plays a crucial role and Locke underlines the importance of individual rights as the basis of legitimate political authority." [Ramaswamy S.

Liberty

213] "Rousseau resurrects the ideals of public spirit, simplicity of life and desire for self-government of ancient Athens and Sparta and incorporates it with the modern notion of voluntarism and consent." [Ramaswamy S. 213]

Thus one finds that idea of Liberty developed through the ages and new ideas of nationalism, industrialization, modernization, right, equality, justice and democracy gave a new shape to the concept of Liberty. 20th century especially two world wars,, decolonization and changing world order in terms of end of imperialism and the end of cold war era, end of apartheid and changing social (racial and caste contradiction)and industrial relations (class differences) have all contributed to a new definition of liberty in this globalized world. And the man of 21st century is living in a age where social, economic and political discrimination is ideally erased.

The Nature of Liberty

In the age when individual liberty is of supreme importance, liberalism demanded liberty in every sphere, personal or social, political or economic. Thinkers in the liberal tradition have been discussing about the nature and proper limits of liberty. The appeal to the idea of liberty has been so engaging that in the modern political tradition both critiques and supporters recognize the centrality of the concept.

Liberty means man's right to do what he wants for the sake of making the best possible development of his personality by following a course that is good, or right, or moral, or lawful. In fact, the real meaning of liberty should be understood with the idea that the liberty of an individual is relative to that of the others. Thus in a social organization one has to respect the equal claims of the other individuals, so to avoid any kind of chaos in the society. The Individual in a social setup, in fact also keeps in mind that his life is surrounded by many social constraints and relationships, thus he is also bound to respect those aspects.

One's liberty should not infringe other's freedom, as the Liberty of the other may prove an obstacle to the former. As an essential principle of liberalism, Liberty is generally regarded as "absence of restraints". At the core of the belief was the thought of a rational individual, capable of taking decisions which are supported by enough reason. It was thought that an individual was capable of self-determination, capable of taking decision, With regard to the respective claims of all individuals. Thenceforth personal autonomy and social harmony could only be attained with minimum conflict, hence it was deemed fit that a system of "Restraints and Regulation" is evolved and adhered to by all individuals.

To keep the things simple, freedom, according to Heywood means "to do as one wishes or act as one chooses." [Heywood A. 254] generally, for Heywood, "being 'free' suggests the absence of constraints or restrictions, as in freedom of speech: an unchecked ability to say whatever one pleases." [Heywood 254] However, only few people are there to support the removal of all restrictions upon the individual.

Liberty

As Heywood quotes R.H. Tawney, 'The freedom of the pike is death to the minnows.' [Heywood 254] Only anarchists, who reject all forms of political authority as unnecessary and undesirable, are prepared to endorse unlimited freedom. [Heywood 254]

Another view seeks distinction between "Liberty and license"; this may lead to some kind of confusion, as "it implies that only morally correct conduct can be dignified with the title 'freedom' or 'liberty'." [Heywood 254] However, as many political theorists employ "a value-free or social-scientific understanding of such terms, they are quite prepared to accept that certain freedoms — such as the freedom to murder — should be constrained." [Heywood 254]

Here on, the "liberty/license" distinction merely begs the question: which freedoms are we willing to approve, and which ones are we justified in curtailing? On one hand License gives excessive power and oppressive attitude to someone, which is destructive at least in terms of social relations. Further License is morally corrupt, which harms society. Thus license is an abuse of freedom and is undesirable. Whilst on the other hand, Liberty is constructive for the society and enlightening. It creates harmony and happiness; it is thus desirable for the humanity.

There is, however, controversy about the point at which liberty starts to become license. Libertarians, "seek to maximize the realm of individual freedom and so reduce to a minimum those actions which are regarded as license." [Heywood 254] Robert Nozick and Milton Friedman see freedom in essentially economic terms and advocate the greatest possible freedom of choice in the marketplace. An employer's ability to set wage levels, alter conditions of work, and to decide who to employ or not employ, can therefore be seen as manifestations of liberty. But the socialist would find this Liberty as a Licence in the hands of the capitalist. Fundamentalist socialists may go so far as to portray all forms of private property as license since they inevitably lead to the exploitation of the poor or property less. [Heywood 255]

If freedom is not to become an exclusive right of an individual, or of a group of individuals, it must be regulated in such a way that none shall use his freedom so as to destroy the freedom of others. As L.T. Hobhouse, in his ***Elements of Social Justice writes***, "The unchartered freedom of one would be the conditional servitude of all but one, and conversely a freedom to be enjoyed by all must impose some restraint upon all." [Gaubha O.P. 350] Ernest Barker, in his ***Principles of Social and Political Theory*** has sought to apply this principle in the wider socio-economic context; "The need of liberty for each is necessarily qualified and conditioned by the need of liberty for all." [Gaubha 350] The liberty of the owner of capital to determine the conditions of work in the factory which he owns is a relative liberty which must be adjusted to the liberty of the worker to do his work under such conditions. For the liberty of each is, thus, relative to that of others, and has to be adjusted to that of others, it must always be regulated.

Further it is argued that Freedom is closely related to the notion of rights. This occurs because the tendency is to treat freedom as a right or entitlement. Indeed, the two concepts become almost fused, as when 'rights' are described as 'liberties'. Heywood suggests, "One of the attractions of a rights-based theory of freedom,

Liberty

whether these are thought to be 'natural', 'human' or 'civil' rights, is that it enables a clear distinction to be made between liberty and license." [Heywood 255] He sums up, "liberty means acting according to or within one's rights, whereas license means to act beyond one's rights or, more particularly, to abuse the rights of others." [Heywood 255]

What do we understand by the phrase "Regulation of liberty?" It means the recognition of **authority** of the **state** over the individual. Preceding paragraphs have shown that individual Liberty can not be accepted as absolute, should we then assume authority of the state to become absolute? The debate between **authority** and **liberty** is going on for long in the scholarly discussions. If in case, the individual is not perfect, and because of which his liberty can not be taken as absolute, in the same manner, one should not accord absolute authority to the state because no state is perfect. D.D. Raphael, in his *Problems of Political Philosophy*, has illustrated: "Most political theorists recognize that individual liberty and State authority conflict with each other, and that a balance has to be struck between them and the values they represent." [Gaubha 351]

For Laski, referring to state-authority writes, if, in the last resort, the State cannot make me happy, certainly it can, if it so will, compel unhappiness. It can invade any private life in wanton fashion. It can degrade me as a political unit in a fashion which distinguishes me from other citizens. It can protect an economic order which "implicates", (in William James' phrase), unfreedom. [Laski H.J. a grammar of politics, 2005 Delhi Anamika Publications, 141] on one hand Hobbes gives more importance to state-authority, and wish to curtail individual liberty, whilst on the other hand, Locke and Mill would argue that State authority should be limited so as to leave as much room as possible for liberty. However, it seems necessary to put some restrictions for the state-authority as to control the overpowering nature of the state so to achieve social development and social aspirations. Thus it appears that state authority would be much more justified if it is backed by moral support and *legitimacy* (*Lawfulness by virtue of being authorized or in accordance with law*) instead of mere force. This is to say, that the Regulation, if it is not in favor of the society as whole, and repressive in nature then it may not be welcomed by the people. And is more likely to be violated and challenged. And further, in a democracy the Regulation will be subjected to scrutiny. Legitimacy comes from the people. A state is legitimate if people believe that it is necessary for them and is in favor of the people and beneficial for them. That its actions are lawful and valuable to society.

Laski says, "Liberty, therefore, is never real unless the government can be called to account; and it should always be called to account when it invades rights. It will always invade them unless its organization prevents it from being weighted in some special interest." [Laski 141-142]

Liberty

Having discussed various aspects of liberty it seems pertinent to quote the following words by Laski Liberty means "absence of restraint; it is essentially a negative thing. But regulation, obviously enough, is the consequence of gregariousness; for we cannot live together without common rules. What is important is that the rules made should embody an experience I can follow and, in general, accept. I shall not feel that my liberty is endangered when I am prohibited from committing murder. My creative impulses do not suffer frustration when I am bidden to drive on a given side of the road. I am reasonably restrained when the law ordains that I must educate my children. Historic experience has evolved for us rules of convenience which promote right living; and to compel obedience to them is a justifiable limitation of freedom." [Laski 139] he further says, "To permit such compulsion is to invade liberty; but it is not necessarily to destroy the end liberty seeks to serve." [Laski 139]

Philosophers like Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau in their theories of "Social contract" proposed the idea of liberty as "Absence of Constraints" or limitation to individual liberty, yet at the same time, they also considered the system within which individual freedom was to unfold. Thus, the idea of political community was based on a simultaneous recognition of the capacities and autonomy of individuals and the imperatives that all should be subjected to common set of constraints on their liberty.

Civil, Political and Economic Liberty:

the readers are generally have some knowledge about Two Types of Liberties, "Positive" and "Negative" Liberty, (which will be dealt in detail in a latter section) but before that it will be beneficial for the readers to examine the following three kinds of liberties; Civil Political and Economic liberty.

Civil Liberty

What is Civil Liberty? The word Civil generally understood as related to a Citizen of a state, a common man, or relating to or befitting citizens as individuals. Laski calls it Private Liberty. These Liberties are related to an individual and are legally given to him as he is a Civic citizen of the state. Private Liberty refers to the **opportunity to exercise freedom of choice** in those areas of life where the results of one's efforts affect the individual in the isolation with which the individual is surrounded. Religion is the best example of this kind of liberty. Private liberty is negative because it is that aspect of which the substance is mainly personal to man's life. In the modern state, Laski feels, "In the complex modern State invasions of private liberty may be more subtle. Private liberty may be denied when the poor citizen is unable to secure adequate legal protection in the Courts of Justice." [Laski 142] In short, private liberty is an opportunity to be fully himself in the private relations of life.

Liberty

Whilst discussing civil liberties Barker finds in his book, *Principles of Social and Political Theory*, civil liberty is the liberty of man in the capacity of an individual person his personal liberty. It consists in three somewhat differently expressed articles:

Firstly, physical freedom from injury or threat to the life, health, and movement of the body. Secondly, intellectual freedom for the expression of thought and belief. And thirdly, practical freedom of the play of will and the exercise of choice in the general field of contractual action and relations with other persons. [Gaubas 353]

Civil liberties are personal guarantees and freedoms that the government cannot abridge, either by law or by judicial interpretation. However, besides the above, civil liberty includes a variety of liberties or rights. the freedom from torture and death, the right to Liberty and security, Freedom of conscience, Freedom of press, Freedom of expression,, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, the right to privacy,, the right to equal treatment and due process and the Right to a fair trial, , and the Right to life. Other civil liberties include Right to own property, the right to defend oneself, and the right to bodily integrity. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_liberties]

Political Liberty

Whereas civil Liberty deals with individual affairs, the Political Liberty deals with one's participation in the issues of society. Where in one's actions are not limited to one's own but they influence other members of the community as well. Thus, Political Liberty is: people's participation in state activity, representation and decision making. According to dictionary.com political Liberty is, the right to express oneself freely and effectually regarding the conduct, makeup, and principles of the government under which one lives.

As says Laski, "Political liberty means the power to be active in affairs of State. It means that I can let my mind play freely about the substance of public business. I must be able without hindrance to add my special experience to the general sum of experience. I must find no barriers that are not general barriers in the way of access to positions of authority." [Laski 142]

For Laski, political Liberty requires two important conditions to be real: firstly, proper education to a point where one can express oneself in an intelligible manner, and secondly, provision of honest and straightforward news, which alone can be a reliable guide or source for political judgment. Distortion of news based upon propaganda prompts a distorted judgment and only a reliable supply of news is the basis of freedom. [Laski 142] The concept of political freedom is closely connected with the concepts of civil Liberties, and Human rights, which in Democratic societies are usually afforded legal protection from the State. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_freedom]

Liberty

To understand political liberty further, one should see the views of Hannah Arendt, "political freedom is historically opposed to sovereignty or will-power, since in ancient Greece and Rome, the concept of freedom was inseparable from performance, and did not arise as a conflict between the "will" and the "self." Similarly, the idea of freedom as freedom *from* politics is a notion that developed in modern times. This is opposed to the idea of freedom as the capacity to "begin anew," [which Arendt sees] as a corollary to the innate human condition of natality, or our nature as "new beginnings and hence beginners." [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_freedom]

Economic Liberty

For an individual, three most important things are: Life, Liberty and Property. Of these three, Property is amply relevant when we discuss Economic Liberty. Economic liberty means, as says Laski, **security** and the **opportunity** to find **reasonable** significance in the earning of one's daily bread. It means freedom from the constant fear of unemployment and insufficiency which saps the whole strength of the individual personality. A man must be safeguarded from the wants of tomorrow. Economic liberty does further imply democracy in industry. Here it provides two notions: firstly, the industrial government is subject to the system of rights which are obtained to the citizens, and secondly, the industrial direction must be of a character that makes it the rule of laws made by cooperation and not by compulsion. A system built upon fear is incompatible with liberty. [Laski 143]

Economic liberty or **right to economic liberty** denotes the ability of members of a society to undertake economic direction and actions. This is a term used in economic and Policy debates as well as a politico-economic philosophy. One approach to economic freedom comes from Classical Liberal and Libertarian traditions emphasizing free markets, free triad and private property under free enterprise. A second view finds that economic freedom extends the Welfare economics: study of individual choice, with greater economic freedom coming from a "larger" set of possible choices. Other conceptions of economic freedom include Freedom from want, and the freedom to engage in Collective bargaining.

The Free market viewpoint defines economic liberty as the freedom to produce trade and consume any goods and services acquired without the use of force, fraud or theft. This is embodied in the rule of law, property rights and freedom of contract, and characterized by external and internal openness of the markets, the protection of property rights and freedom of economic initiative. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_freedom]

Milton Friedman sees property rights as "the most basic of human rights and an essential foundation for other human rights." With property rights protected, people are free to choose the use of their property, earn on it, and transfer it to anyone else, as long as they do it on a voluntary basis and do not resort to force, fraud or theft. In such conditions most people can achieve much greater personal freedom

Liberty

and development than under a regime of government coercion. A secure system of property rights also reduces uncertainty and encourages investments, creating favorable conditions for an economy to be successful. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_freedom]

Besides these three kinds of Liberties, it appears pertinent to point out that for a human being, Natural Liberty is also very important. Rousseau is one of those philosophers who wrote on natural liberty. He says that man was fully free in the state of nature. In that condition,

He was very happy. There were no restraints on him. As the civilization developed; or as his needs increased, he was forced to organize the state and society.

In his social contract theory, he says, man got state, at the price of his liberty, which vowed to protect him. When Rousseau says that the man was born

Free but he is everywhere in chains, he meant that there should be no restriction on man. This is natural liberty which perhaps is the most crucial of the Liberties.

Negative and Positive Liberty

Negative Liberty

According to Stanford Encyclopedia of philosophy, "Negative liberty is the absence of obstacles, barriers or constraints. One has negative liberty to the extent that actions are available to one in this negative sense. Positive liberty is the possibility of acting — or the fact of acting — in such a way as to take control of one's life and realize one's fundamental purposes. While negative liberty is usually attributed to individual agents, positive liberty is sometimes attributed to collectivities, or to individuals considered primarily as members of given collectivities."

[<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberty-positive-negative>]

There are two contradicting ideas of thinking of liberty. On the one hand, one can think of liberty as the absence of obstacles external to the agent. You are free if no one is stopping you from doing whatever you might want to do. On the other hand, one can think of liberty as the presence of control on the part of the agent. To be free, you must be self-determined, which is to say that you must be able to control your own destiny in your own interests. In case if you are not in control of your own destiny, as you are failing to control a passion that you yourself would rather be rid

Liberty

of and which is preventing you from realizing what you recognize to be your true interests. One might say that while on the first view liberty is simply about how many ways are open to the agent, on the second view it is more about going through the right alternate for the right reasons.

In Berlin's words, we use the negative concept of liberty in attempting to answer the question "What is the area within which the subject — a person or group of persons — is or should be left to do or be what he is able to do or be, without interference by other persons?", whereas we use the positive concept in attempting to answer the question "What, or who, is the source of control or interference that can determine someone to do, or be, this rather than that?"

[<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberty-positive-negative>]

The negative view of liberty maintains state **as a necessary evil**. It is an evil because it restraints and all restraints are not good for the individuals. It is necessary evil because of the selfishness and capacity of individual, without state, there cannot be peace and order in the society thus it constitutes state activity. As the state is a highly limited state, for the individualist, the object being maximum liberty to the individuals. The state should concentrate only on its political functions for which it is created that is firstly, maintenance of law and order to protect individuals, secondly, to protect society from external forces and thirdly, to maintain the sanctity of contract between the individuals.

Sir Isaiah Berlin (British philosopher and historian) in his "Two concepts of Liberty" writes, liberty counts in doing what one desires to do without interference from other persons. He says "You lack political liberty or freedom only if you are prevented from attaining a goal by human beings. Mere incapacity to attain a goal is not lack of political freedom." [Arora N.D, .S.S. Awasthy, Political Theory, HarAnand Publication 2007 229]. Thus there is no lack of liberty, if a person is not able to use his rights because of poverty or ignorance. On the contrary, Berlin says there is an absolute loss of liberty if my liberty rests on some one's misery and my liberty is curtailed to relieve him of his misery and there is an increase in other person's liberty. [Arora and Awasthy 229] For Berlin, "I wish my life and decisions to depend on myself, not on external forces of whatever kind. I wish to be the instrument of my own, not of other men's acts of will." [Arora and Awasthy, 229]

Here we find that Negative liberty connotes freedom as the absence of restraints, at the same time Negative liberty asks the question what is the area within which the subject is or should be left to do or what he is able to be without interference by others. It allows us to accept the postulate that the individual knows and is the best judge of his own interest. It thrived at a time when the individual was struggling to free himself from the arbitrary power of the state and was trying to carve out a

Liberty

private space, both economic and political. Philosophers like Hobbes, Locke, Montesquieu, Bentham, Henry Sidgwick, Herbert Spencer, J.S. Mill, Hayek and classical and neo-classical economists are all negative liberty theorists.

Hobbes defines freedom as the private pursuit of the individual, which implies that each can create his own conception of freedom within a framework of state authority. In spite of his emphasis on total order, he defines liberty as whatever the law permits and wherever the law is silent, it signifies the absence of restraints and coercion. He accepts the right of private beliefs, for conscience is beyond the reach of the Leviathan. However, the Leviathan can command the individual to perform ceremonies that are necessary for public worship. [Ramaswamy S. 260] Bentham defines liberty crucial to his understanding of civil and political liberty is **security** that the legislator secures through the law, making it possible for the individual to enjoy liberty. At the level of civil law, a legislator secures the right to property, prevents interference, simplifies judicial proceedings and encourages healthy commercial competitiveness. [Ramaswamy S. 260]

Needless to say that negative Liberty stood for the argument **everyone knows his own interest best** and that the **state should not decide his ends and purposes.**" The protagonists of negative liberty believed in individual choice of resources and techniques and the choice of parties to deal with in their transactions. 'Freedom of contract' was recognized as an essential requirement of liberty.

The early liberal thinkers who defended liberty in all spheres insisted that law must enforce all contracts, since each man was the best judge of his own well being. And he used his judgment before entering into any contract. (But contracts of the nature of slavery were not promoted) The state was not allowed to impose its own conception of 'good' on the individuals in their mutual dealings. This idea led to the doctrine of *laissez-faire*, *the doctrine that government should not interfere in commercial and economic affairs*. Hence most of the advocates of negative liberty, such as Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham, and James Mill etc favored the minimal state.

Originally this liberal individualistic view was put forth by the protagonists of the new middle class the [merchant-industrialist] which sought to establish a **free market society** against the mercantile policies of the state. They argued that, in an atmosphere of non-intervention, the interaction between self-interest of each individual would result in the promotion of social interest as a whole. The advocates of *laissez-faire* individualism viewed society as an aggregate of atomized, alienated individuals, joined together by a bond of mechanical unity. In short Liberty was seen as the **freedom of trade, freedom of enterprise, freedom of contract, a free competition of the market forces of supply and demand**. The state was viewed as a necessary evil, which was required not to interfere with the natural liberty of men, but only to maintain their liberty. [Gauba 357]

Liberty

Negative Liberty Summary.

To sum up the concept of negative liberty in brief,

One would argue that Liberty in fact means **absence of restraints**, As Liberty is necessary for the development of individual's personality. Man's activity can be divided into two spheres – self regarding and other regarding. In self-regarding activity, man should be given full freedom, which include freedom to expression and thought, to assemble and to form association. The state as it is a necessary evil should have very limited functions. Liberty is to be protected from the tyranny of majority, external forces and for that matter from any arbitrary or authoritarian action. Mere incapacity to use liberty does not mean absence of liberty.

Positive Liberty

Positive liberty means self-mastery and the right of autonomy. Positive liberty asks the question what or who is the source of control or interference that determines someone to do, or be this rather than that. Certain positive accounts stress on the need to subordinate the lesser element within an agent by higher elements. Others emphasize the fact that a person can lead an autonomous life only as a member of a free political community.

In other words Positive liberty is the possession of the power and resources to fulfill one's own potential as opposed to Negative Liberty, which is freedom from external restraint. A concept of positive liberty may also include freedom from internal constraints.

The concepts of structure and agency are central to the concept of positive liberty because in order to be free, a person should be free from inhibitions of the social structure in carrying out their Free will. Positive liberty is enhanced by the ability of citizens to participate in their government and have their voice, interests and concerns recognized as valid and acted upon.

Taylor explains that Negative Freedom is an "opportunity-concept": one possesses Negative Freedom if one is not enslaved by external forces, and has equal access to a society's resources (regardless of how one decides to spend their time). Positive Freedom, says Taylor, is an "exercise-concept": possessing it might mean that one is not *internally* constrained; one must be able to act according to their highest self

Liberty

– according to reason. Further he sums up, Positive Freedom entails being in a mature state of decision making, free of internal or external restraints (e.g. weakness, fear, ignorance, etc.). [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Positive_liberty]

It will be useful for the readers to think of the difference between the two concepts in terms of the difference between factors that are external and factors that are internal to the agent. While theorists advocating of negative freedom are primarily interested in the degree to which individuals or groups suffer interference from external bodies, Positive theorists are more attentive to the internal factors affecting the degree to which individuals or groups act autonomously. Provided this difference, one might be tempted to think that a political philosopher should concentrate exclusively on negative freedom, a concern with positive freedom being more relevant to psychology or individual morality than to political and social institutions. Given this, it depends how the following questions are answered: negatively or positively. *Is the positive concept of freedom a political concept? Can individuals or groups achieve positive freedom through political action? Is it possible for the state to promote the positive freedom of citizens on their behalf? And if so, is it desirable for the state to do so?* The classic texts in the history of western political thought are divided over how these questions should be answered: theorists in the classical liberal tradition, like Constant, Humboldt, Spencer and Mill, are typically classed as answering 'no' and therefore as defending a negative concept of political freedom; theorists that are critical of this tradition, like Rousseau, Hegel, Marx and T.H. Green, are typically classed as answering 'yes' and as defending a positive concept of political freedom.

In its political form, positive freedom has often been thought of as necessarily achieved through a collectivity. Perhaps the clearest case is that of Rousseau's theory of freedom, according to which individual freedom is achieved through participation in the process whereby one's community exercises collective control over its own affairs in accordance with the "general will". [<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberty-positive-negative/>]

For the readers it becomes confusing that why to see the concept of "Liberty" by two different lenses? The answer is provided by Gerald MacCallum, (the American legal philosopher) in his idea of "triadic relation". Two sides identified (the negative and positive Liberty) by Berlin disagree over which of two different concepts best deserves the name of 'liberty'. Does this fact not denote the presence of some more basic *agreement* between the two sides? How, after all, could they see their disagreement as one about the definition of liberty if they did not think of themselves as in some sense *talking about the same thing*? In an article, MacCallum (1967) put forward the following answer: there is in fact only one basic concept of freedom, on which both sides in the debate *converge*. What the so-called negative and positive theorists disagree about is how this single concept of freedom should be interpreted. Indeed, in MacCallum's view, there are a great many different possible interpretations of freedom, and it is only Berlin's artificial dichotomy that has led us to think in terms of there being two.

Liberty

MacCallum defines the basic concept of freedom — the concept on which everyone agrees — as follows: a subject, or agent, is free from certain constraints, or preventing conditions, to do or become certain things. Freedom is therefore a triadic relation — that is, a relation between *three things*: an agent, certain preventing conditions and certain doings or becoming of the agent. Any statement about freedom or unfreedom can be translated into a statement of the above form by specifying *what* is free or unfree, *from* what it is free or unfree, and what it is free or unfree *to do or become*. Any claim about the presence or absence of freedom in a given situation will therefore make certain assumptions about what counts as an agent, what counts as a constraint or limitation on freedom, and what counts as a purpose that the agent can be described as either free or unfree to carry out. [<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberty-positive-negative/>] Many political theorists along side MacCallum 1967, Feinberg 1973 and Rawls 1972 reject the division of freedom into negative and positive. [Ramaswamy S. 276]

Positive Liberty Summary

To conclude the idea of positive liberty one should see the following: Liberty is not merely absence of restraints, but it is more than that. Liberty includes private, political and economic liberty. Liberty cannot be realized where there is existence of special privileges, where there is no equality of rights and when state action is biased. Rights are necessary for liberty. The state activity should be extended to include welfare of the individuals. For the purpose, individual liberty may be curtailed. Finally the positive Liberty seeks self-realization and seeks something more than the individual Liberty for the society as whole.

J.S. Mill on Liberty

John Stuart Mill [1806-73] one of the greatest political philosophers of his time, profoundly influenced the shape of nineteenth century British thought and political discourse. The thinker, son of another great philosopher, James S. Mill [the utilitarian thinker], worked in east India company as chief examiner, which put him in charge of the memoranda guiding the company's policies in India. His substantial corpus of works includes texts in logic, epistemology, economics, social and political philosophy, ethics, metaphysics, religion, and current affairs. Among his most well-known and significant are *A System of Logic*, *Principles of Political Economy*, *On Liberty*, *Utilitarianism*, *The Subjection of Women*, *Three Essays on Religion*, and his *Autobiography*.

Liberty

Our discussion on Liberty will remain incomplete without Mill's mention and his contribution towards Liberty, to which he delved extensively in his "ON LIBERTY" [1859]. Whilst proposing the cause of liberty, Mill had a broad goal in mind: the Greek ideal of self-development. In fact the liberty Mill sought to defend was the liberty of the individual to develop, enrich and expand his personality. As such it is not surprising that he pleads that the individual should be left free to realize his own interests the way he likes provided he does not interfere with the similar freedom of others. He defines Liberty as pursuing our own good in our own way so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs or impede their efforts to obtain it. For Mill, "social rather than political tyranny is the greater danger for modern, commercial nations like Britain. This social "tyranny of the majority" arises from the enforcement of rules of conduct that are both arbitrary and strongly adhered to. The practical principle that guides the majority "to their opinions on the regulation of human conduct, is the feeling in each person's mind that everybody should be required to act as he, and those with whom he sympathizes, would like them to act." [<http://www.iep.utm.edu/milljs/>] as this feeling is self-justifying and self-evident, so it becomes particularly dangerous, therefore, there is a need for a rationally grounded principle which governs a society's dealings with individuals. This "one very simple principle"—often called the "harm principle"—entails that:

The sole end for which mankind is warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant. He cannot rightfully be compelled to do or forbear because it will be better for him to do so, because it will make him happier, because, in the opinion of others, to do so would be wise, or even right. These are good reasons for remonstrating with him, or reasoning with him, or persuading him, or entreating him, but not for compelling him, or visiting him with any evil in case he do otherwise. [<http://www.iep.utm.edu/milljs/>]

Liberty

It is, then, from this subtle ethical perspective that Mill proceeds to argue in On Liberty that the only justification that society has for interfering with the individual's freedom of action, against his will, is 'to prevent harm to others. More specifically, to prevent direct material harm being inflicted upon others. Mill develops this 'harm' principle further in terms of a distinction between self-regarding actions, (affecting only the individual) and over which that person should therefore have supreme control, and other-regarding actions, which adversely affect other people's interests. Mill explains, however, that both the 'harm' principle and this consequent distinction may only be applied to members of a 'civilized community', to people 'in the maturity of their faculties', who have reached 'the capacity of being guided to their own improvement by conviction and persuasion. The principle and distinction are thus not applicable, in his view, to children or invalids, whose behavior needs regulating by others, or to members of backward races. [Jones Tudor, Modern political Thinkers and Ideas, An Historical Introduction, London and New York, Routledge, 2002, 88-89]

Further on Mill identifies three basic regions of human liberty: the "inward domain of consciousness," liberty of tastes and pursuits (i.e. of framing our own life plan), and the freedom to unite with others. As Jones quotes Mill, "No society in which these liberties are not, on the whole, respected is free, whatever may be its form of government; and none is completely free in which they do not exist absolute and unqualified." [Jones 89] Mill, unlike other liberal theorists, makes no appeal to "abstract right" in order to justify the harm principle. The reason for accepting the freedom of individuals to act as they choose, so long as they cause minimal or no harm to others, is that it would promote "utility in the largest sense, grounded on the permanent interests of man as a progressive being." In other words, abiding by the harm principle is desirable because it promotes what Mill calls the "free development of individuality" or the development of our humanity. [<http://www.iep.utm.edu/milljs/>]

This rests the idea that humanity is capable of progress—that latent or underdeveloped abilities and virtues can be actualized under the right conditions. Human nature is *not* static. It is not merely re-expressed in generations and individuals. It is "not a machine to be built after a model, and set to do exactly the work prescribed for it, but a tree, which requires to grow and develop itself on all sides, according to the tendency of the inward forces which make it a living thing." Though human nature can be thought of as something living, it is also, like an English garden, something amenable to improvement through effort. "Among the works of man, which human life is rightly employed in perfecting and beautifying,

Liberty

the first in importance surely is man himself." The two conditions that promote development of our humanity are freedom and variety of situation, both of which the harm principle encourages. [<http://www.iep.utm.edu/milljs/>]

Now we are presented with a basic philosophical problem, "what counts as "harm to others?" Where should we mark the boundary between conduct that is principally self-regarding versus conduct that involves others? Does drug-use cause harm to others sufficient to be prevented? Does prostitution? Pornography? Should polygamy be allowed? How about public nudity?" [<http://www.iep.utm.edu/milljs/>] Though these are difficult questions, Mill provides the reader with a principled way of deliberating about them. "

Libertarian view

Latter decades of last century saw the Libertarian (Someone who believes the doctrine of free will) movement where in political philosophers like F.A. Hayek, Milton Friedman, Rothbard and Robert Nozic contributed extensively. It is the most radical form of individualism and advocates pure capitalist economy as the surest expression and defense of individuality. In the most general sense, as in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy "libertarianism is a political philosophy that affirms the rights of individuals to liberty, to acquire, keep, and exchange their holdings, and considers the protection of individual rights the primary role for the state." [<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/libertarianism/>] It asks the question that what the legitimate functions of the state are. The idea of Libertarians does not approve the social welfare state as welfare measures protected and proposed by the state may lead to the collectivist state.

"Libertarianism considers the state to originate in plunder and persist, because the groups who control and support it believe that they can do better for themselves by forcibly extracting resources than by the exchange in the market. The original political class consists of bandits who exhorted tributes from defenseless people, in return for some kind of protection against other gangs of bandits. Their position is regularized through legislation, thus, giving rise to the state. The state tries to gain support from financiers, landowners, merchants and industrialists by giving them economic favours." [Ramaswamy S. 100-101] libertarian regards the market, other than the state, to perform the economic functions including the defense of person and property, through a private form, which will supply protection for a fee. It is a radical form of laissez faire that rejects state intervention, for the system is capable of generating true prosperity. However, libertarians are deeply divided over the issue of the moral justification of a night-watchman state. Rothbard rejects it, even if it is sanctioned through free and informed consent of all members of a society. Libertarians strongly opposed the welfare state. [Ramaswamy S. 101]

Liberty

Though the Libertarian school found support from many scholars but the contribution from Robert Nozic is one of the utmost importance and relevance.

In his book **Anarchy, State and Utopia** (1974) where in he defined the "minimal state", where he talks about the state in the context of individual rights. Nozick justifies a minimal state as 'inspiring as well as right' and that 'any more extensive state will violate people's rights and is unjustified' The functions of the state are limited to protection against force, theft, fraud and enforcement of contracts. It follows from this emphatic assertion that the coercive state apparatus cannot be used for the purpose of getting some citizens to aid others and to prohibit activities of people for their own good or protection. He agrees with the anarchist assertion that the state is intrinsically immoral, for in course of maintaining its monopoly on the use of force and protecting everyone within its territory, it violates individual rights. [Ramaswamy 101]

Finally, perhaps under the influence of Nozic,, libertarianism is often thought of as "right-wing" doctrine., However, this can be contested at least for two reasons. First, on social—rather than economic—issues, libertarianism tends to be "left-wing". It opposes laws that restrict consensual and private sexual relationships between adults (e.g., gay sex, extra-marital sex, and deviant sex), laws that restrict drug use, laws that impose religious views or practices on individuals, and compulsory military service. (Some of the personal Liberties.) Second, in addition to the better-known version of libertarianism—right-libertarianism—there is also a version known as "left-libertarianism". Both endorse full self-ownership, but they differ with respect to the powers agents have to appropriate unowned natural resources (land, air, water, minerals, etc.). Right-libertarianism holds that typically such resources may be appropriated, for example, by the first person who discovers them, mixes her labor with them, or merely claims them—without the consent of others, and with little or no payment to them. Left-libertarianism, by contrast, holds that inappropriate natural resources belong to everyone in some egalitarian manner. It can, for example, require those who claim rights over natural resources to make a payment to others for the value of those rights. This can provide the basis for a kind of egalitarian redistribution. [http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/libertarianism/]

To conclude the idea of libertarians, one would like to see the following. First, it provides significant moral liberty of action, second, it provides significant moral protection against interference from others, and third it is sensitive to what the past was like (e.g., what agreements were made and what rights violations took place). It thus takes seriously the idea of persons as individually responsible agents each with their own life to live. Libertarianism faces, however, the serious objection that it gives too much protection from interference and not enough attention to the immediate consequences of their principles. [http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/libertarianism/]

Liberty

Marxist view on Liberty

Before we conclude the discussion on Liberty, one should also briefly reflect on the Marxist understanding of Liberty. Karl Marx (1818–1883) [a philosopher, economist, political scientist and a sociologist] is best known not as a philosopher but as a revolutionary communist, whose works inspired the foundation of many communist regimes in the twentieth century. **Marxist thought believes in Positive Liberty, whereas** liberals consider freedom as **the absence of restraints or coercion**, Marxism, on the other hand, belongs to a wider and richer view of freedom originating from such sources as Spinoza [Dutch philosopher who espoused a pantheistic system (1632-1677)], Rousseau, Kant [Influential German idealist philosopher (1724-1804)] and Hegel [German philosopher whose three stage process of dialectical reasoning was adopted by Karl Marx (1770-1831)] who conceived of freedom as self-determination, self-realization, self-development,

Self-fulfillment and self-creativity. Thus we find that this view does not advocate negative individualistic freedom.

The Marxist philosophy regards freedom in terms of removal of obstacles to human emancipation that is to say to the manifold development of human powers and the bringing into being a form of association worthy of human nature. Notable among such obstacles, are: , the conditions of wage labor, where the proletariat has no control over his life, family, other social relations and his equipments, machines, earnings and even his yearnings. The following argument in Marxist analysis is worthy of mention, "Any work the worker does above this [necessary labour] is known as surplus labour, producing surplus value for the capitalist." [<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/marx/#3>] Surplus value, according to Marx, is the source of all profit. [<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/marx/#3>] In Marx's understanding "labour power is the only commodity which can produce more value than it is worth, and for this reason it is known as variable capital. Other commodities simply pass their value on to the finished commodities, but do not create any extra value. They are known as constant capital. Profit, then, is the result of the labour performed by the worker beyond that necessary to create the value of his or her wages. This is the surplus value theory of profit." [<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/marx/#3>] In the light of this argument we find that a worker having put all his labor for the production is alienated from himself, his family, society and his belongings, in fact the worker finds no worth for his contribution as a producer. Here the labour is victimized and feels detached from the profit and even from his labour. Thus we see that the liberty of a worker is limited and of little use.

Freedom means living life to the fullest, enough opportunities to meet the needs of the body vs.-a vs. adequate food, clothing and shelter, with effective means to cultivate the mind, develop one's personality and assert one's individuality. With this idea of freedom, it appears necessary to ponder that if the idea of equality is fully recognized? Although political and legal equality is ensured in the industrial

Liberty

societies, but economic and real equality is not available to large section of the society, and especially to the peasants and workers in real sense Thus one comes to the point that the real Liberty is enjoyed only by the rich and the strong, and the **have nots are** alienated from equality and liberty. In Marxist thought an individual ought to be liberated from all kinds of alienation (loss of personal identity or a feeling of personal identity [The feeling of being alienated]), oppression, exploitation and domination.

Marx summarized the **historical materialism** (the term initially coined by Engels and further popularised by Karl Kautsky and Georgi Plekhanov), in the 1859 preface to **A contribution to the critique of Political-economy** "In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely **Relations of Production** appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material Forces of Production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the **real foundation**, on which arises a **legal and political superstructure** and to which correspond definite forms of **social consciousness**. The Mode of Production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness." [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marxist_philosophy] In this brief popularization of his ideas, Marx emphasized that social development sprang from the inherent contradictions within material life and the social superstructure. This notion is often understood as a simple historical narrative: primitive communism had developed into slave states. Slave states had developed into feudal societies. Those societies in turn became capitalist states, and those states would be overthrown by the self-conscious portion of their working-class, or proletariat, creating the conditions for socialism and, ultimately, a higher form of communism than that with which the whole process began. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marxist_philosophy]

this: "a higher form of communism" where in state (which in a capitalist society protects and favours exploitation of the proletariat [A social class comprising those who do manual labour or work for wages]) will wither away and a classless society will emerge free from all kinds of struggles, exploitation, alienation, inequality and slavery. In this state the man will enjoy not only economic, social, legal and political freedom, but will also enjoy equal opportunities, in the society of free equals.

Conclusion

After having discussed various aspects and views on Liberty it appears that the question what is liberty? Can never be answered. As it depends on two different factors: firstly, liberty is unalienable and so universally regarded as desirable that people will go to any extent to show that their idea of liberty is the only real Liberty. Secondly, there are philosophical differences over the issue of Liberty. Throughout the history of modern political thought, different political thinkers have

Liberty

been not only advancing their own preferred theoretical accounts of freedom, developed within distinctive philosophical and ideological traditions, but also critically evaluating other competing accounts or interpretations of freedom. The protagonists of negative liberalism believe that the essence of man is that he is an autonomous being, master of values and an end in himself. Thus this school favours individualism. On the other hand, positive liberals thought considers that the essence of man lies in his being a social animal, deriving his values and ends from the community to which he belongs. Thus, this view believes in a collectivist idea.

A long-running theme in these accounts of liberty or freedom has been the realization that absolute freedom is both unattainable and undesirable in an ordered society, and that there must be certain agreed limitations on individual freedom. Indeed, without the imposition of such limits, liberty seems unrealistic. However, if one wishes to understand the true meaning of liberty, then it appears that one is mistaken if one supposes to commit to one aspect of liberty to the exclusion of the other. It would be certainly wrong to exclude the negative concept of liberty because this is how the terms was used in its initial stage and will continue to be used in our daily discourse. The case against negative liberty is that it is not wrong or undesirable but that it is insufficient as a guide to the various meanings that liberty has acquired in the contemporary world. The concept of positive liberty is a complex one because the nature of positive freedoms to be granted to the people and the kind of community needed to be built may be interpreted in more than one ways by different schools of thought. The negative and positive aspects represent two kinds of liberty. In real world of political practice, an individual wants some of both, and if both sides make these concessions, the arguments would be more realistic in understanding the meaning and significance of liberty. However, the question of Liberty will continue to be discussed not only by a common man but by kings and the cabinets, and by the priest and the paupers alike in the future.

Liberty

Exercise

1. Give a brief understanding of the concept of Liberty?
2. Briefly discuss the development of the idea of Liberty.
3. Briefly discuss the Civil Political and Economic Liberties.
4. What do you understand by Negative and Positive Liberty?
5. Write a brief note on two of the following:
 - J.S.Mill on Liberty
 - Marxist View on Liberty
 - Robert Nozic
 - Harold .J.Laski

References

- Arora N.D, .S.S. Awasthy, Political Theory , Har Anand Publication 2007
- Gauba , O.P ,An Introduction to Political Theory Fifth Edition,Macmillan Delhi 2009.
- Heywood Andrew: Political Theory and An Introduction, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005
- Jones , Tudor , Modern Political Thinkers and Ideas ,An Historical Introduction , London and Newyork, 2002
- Laski , Harold J, A Grammar of Politics, Anamika , 2005 Delhi.
- Ramaswamy S. political theory: ideas and concepts, 2003,Macmillan India Delhi

Liberty

Other References

- McClelland ,J.S , A History of Western Political Thought , T.J.International ,Cornwall, 1996.
- Held , David Ed.Political Theory Today , Polity Press, 1991.
- Farrelly , Colin Ed. Contemporary Political Theory A Reader , Sage Publication New Delhi 2004.
- Laski ,H.J , Political Thought in England from Locke to Bentham, www.gutenberg.net 2005

Web Links

- [http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/a/a7/Eug%C3%A8ne_Delacroix - La libert%C3%A9_guidant_le_peuple.jpg/800px-Eug%C3%A8ne_Delacroix - La libert%C3%A9_guidant_le_peuple.jpg](http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/a/a7/Eug%C3%A8ne_Delacroix_-_La_libert%C3%A9_guidant_le_peuple.jpg/800px-Eug%C3%A8ne_Delacroix_-_La_libert%C3%A9_guidant_le_peuple.jpg)
- [http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/d/d3/Statue of Liberty, NY.jpg](http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/d/d3/Statue_of_Liberty,_NY.jpg)
- [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_freedom]
- [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_liberties]
- [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_freedom]
- [<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberty-positive-negative>]
- [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Positive_liberty]
- [<http://www.iep.utm.edu/milljs/>]
- [<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/libertarianism/>]
- [<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/marx/#3>]
- [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marxist_philosophy]