

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF FREEDOM AS A VALUE IN THE PROCESS OF INDIVIDUALIZATION

*Hushchyna Svitlana*

PhD student of Social transformations department,  
Doctoral School of Kyiv-Mohyla academy Kyiv, Ukraine

---

### Abstract

In the article the development of the value of freedom in European political thought is considered, the stages to its understanding in the context of group and individual rights are analyzed, the process of individualization and its connection with the freedom is revealed

---

**Keywords:** Freedom, liberty, state, governor, individual, rights

### Instruction

The consideration on idea of freedom have arisen since the Antiquity times. Freedom at that time was an attribute of the state. It represented the degree of interaction between society and monarch who personified the state. Then the state and society were inseparable, and freedom meant the implementation of laws by a society established by the state. The power of monarch was absolute and he was the only person who could have been free from execution of state laws. Society consisted of the privileged nobles close to the governor, on the one hand, who were endowed with the high status and role within the state and the rest of society, on the other hand, whose lives were managed by the state through subordination and compulsion, and were entirely dependent on the will of the monarch. At that time the inobservance of the laws and civil disobedience led to a person's imprisonment or loss of life and thus meant the deprivation of freedom. In the age of Antiquity relations of domination and subjugation were considered the basis for peaceful coexistence between human beings and guaranteed the sustainability of social order. The main advantage of freedom, according to Plato, is that it depends on the government as well as the child depends on his parents. Citizens do not obey the private individuals, they obey the state-based set of laws, and this is how they get honorable positions in the state. Every other kind of freedom is, according to Plato, the freedom from obeying the laws, which can only belong to governors. [1, 24].

Later, during the Middle Ages, the separation of the authorities from society have arisen. The governor aimed to strengthen his power, thus, the privileged members of society and the rest of society found themselves defenseless to the power of monarchs. Then the state was separated from the society. Trying to keep their power and authority within the state nobles began to appeal to the social needs and interests, and different parts of society rallied round them. So began to form caste society, which comprised of groups of individuals united by a common social background, goals and interests. Consequently, the absolute power of the monarch lost his inviolability due to loss of public support and new social classes did not want to subordinate to it anymore. Then gradually the primary social ties between the human being and his family ruined and the subordination of the person of parental care through the state eroded for the need to expand freedoms and remove the restrictions imposed by the state on the person. Thus began the process of individualization. An individual lost his primary social ties that bound him to the family and integrated with other individuals based on common interests, needs and goals [2, 72-80]. The interest groups began to formulate

their urgent demands and appeal to independence of different social classes, overcoming religious differences and the development of new forms of life. With the formation of interest groups in the period from the eleventh to the sixteenth century the freedom was no longer the embodiment of submission, it was rather determined by the presence of the private privileges that protected the interests of various social groups. For example, in England since the twelfth century the freedom within the law has been considered an inherent privilege of all English society. Since the thirteenth century, in England was formed the understanding that subjects of the state are under the authority of the ruler rather than the owner. The ruler obeys the law along with all other members of society and it cannot be abolished [3, 30]. For example, in the writings of Machiavelli the liberty was limited by the personal benefits and advantages which person used in terms of ordered rule [4, 18]. These liberties have been created over a long period; they were established and changed gradually. As such group privilege could be mentioned the abolition of serfdom. The freedom of the peasant stipulates that between him and the ground there is no any other property that is owned by a seignior, urban dweller or capitalist; the freedom of peasant meant also that the farmer is not dependent on anyone and can sell the excess of the products that he produces without any intermediaries [5, 312-313].

During the Renaissance the understanding of freedom changes due to the isolation of the individual, because his life is not guaranteed by his traditional status anymore, but depends on his own efforts. Getting free from the traditional economic and political shackles, a person gains her liberty, that presupposes the independent and active role of the person in the new system. At the same time, an individual is freed from ties that determined his sense of belonging, his confidence and security [6, 49].

Liberalism appears in Europe in the seventeenth century in response to the strengthening of absolute power of monarchs in order to put the limits of state power and establish the individual rights. It represents people's desire to expand freedom in political and economic spheres, defend their beliefs and thoughts. Liberals emphasized on the distribution of the powers of the state in order to prevent the misuse of power and limitation the privileges of social groups and individuals. They sought for the equality within the law and independence of judicial branch of power from the legislative and executive branches [3, 31].

At the end of the seventeenth century, it was formed the theory of the natural rights and freedoms of the personality. At this time freedom becomes a value. The idea of freedom as a value first became widespread in patristics, when person appealed to God and first called him as “You”. An individual began to perceive himself existentially, understanding his own freedom. For example, J. Milton in his work “Eikonoclastes” notes, “no one can disagree with the fact that a human being is born equal in the image and likeness of God” [7, 18]. At the same time the ways to the rights and freedoms of society are identified. The need to protect the individual from the arbitrary power of the state has led to an emergence of the new type of state, which is formed on the basis of the establishment of the rights, freedoms and the protection of basic human needs.

The right became the special complex of conditions that set the limits on actions of the one person towards another person that were determined by the general law of freedom. The concept of the natural law was acknowledged an absolute value of modern times and became the basis for development the rights and human reason, as a prerequisite for all other human rights. This concept has received some features such as inalienability, indigenoussness and unconditional belonging to individual. In times of antiquity and the Renaissance there was no reference to human rights, and philosophers of modern times have considered the freedom as an unlimited satisfaction of certain specified individual civil rights. Thus, freedom began to exist as a moral space between the ruling and the ruled.

According to J. Locke, in an ideal society the individual is subject of his own freedom being an independent employee within the state. Wherein the right within the state can serve

an instrument of congruence with freedom of the individual. J. Locke believes that "those who have the legislative or supreme authority in any state should govern according to established permanent laws, which are known to society but not only by the royal decrees. Activities of courts and public authorities should focus on peace, security and social welfare of the people" [8, 120].

T. Hobbes in his writings «De Cive» and "Leviathan" emphasizes that a citizen of a sovereign state is free as a member of the civil association, if he is not restricted in exercising his abilities to achieve his goals and realize interests. The government can only restrict a citizen in violation of the rights of others and do this by forcing the citizens to adhere to the laws equally. Where the law ends there the freedom starts. The person is free as long as the state law does not require the society to act in a violent way and allows the individual to act at his own discretion within the law. [9, 27-28; 10, 84].

J. Milton in his work the "Eikonoclastes" argued that in addition to religious freedom "the rest of freedom consists of civil rights and personal development" and that "it is possible to enjoy them fully only in a free country". The political body loses its freedom as well as the physical body of a human being, when it is deprived compulsorily of the ability to act at its own discretion. On his opinion, the use of such force leads to tyranny. Considering on the freedom of the majority and the minority of society, J. Milton emphasizes that the freedom of the minority should rather have been preserved than the majority was allowed to turn the minority into slaves. Those who seek for their legitimate freedom have to defend it in accordance with their own abilities no matter how many votes are against it [7, 20].

M. Needham points out that only by adopting laws that guarantee the freedom the government can provide high level of life, protect private property and set the good for society [6, 30]. M. Needham said that a free citizen who is the "keeper of personal freedom" is the basis for the formation of a free state, which is the highest form of the state. Later E. Sidney in his paper "Discourses concerning government" draws the analogy between the freedom of states and freedom of individuals. He distributes the well-known thesis, established by the French political thought that "everyone should do his business in its own discretion, and what is right for individuals is a fortiori right for the entire nations" [11, 118]. Hence, it follows a number of conclusions for the constitutional system of the state. At first, if the state or republic is considered free, the laws that govern it and define the rules of social behavior should be adopted with the consent of all its citizens, members of the political body as a whole. If there is no such a consent then the political body does not move as it should and this means that it lost its freedom. J. Harrington in his book "The commonwealth of Oceana: a system of politics" concludes, "the nation taken separately is a set of private interests of individuals, but if to take all the people together, they form the public interest" [12, 64]. However, at the same time in different social groups, there are different interests, so when the authors talk about the will of the people they usually refer to the will of the majority.

S. L. Montesquieu in his writing "The spirit of laws" distinguishes political laws from civil laws and makes a division between the state and civil society in contrast to views of T. Hobbes. Political laws are the laws of civil society, transformed into the state and consolidated by the law. They give to people some freedom of action within the state by limiting their natural freedom. Civil laws are not prescribed in government documents; they are formed by a set of generally accepted rules of social interaction within the society. He also distinguishes civil liberties from political liberties, and determines their protection the main task of the state. The philosopher considers the political freedom the opportunity to do everything that is permitted by the laws and do not do what is prohibited by the laws; otherwise, there is not a freedom. Among civil liberties, the author marks out the sense of individual security, protection of individual from his persecution of the state, humane

criminal law, strict adherence to the rules of justice of both authorities and citizens, preventing the abuse of power by officials [13, 32].

J. J. Rousseau in the book “A discourse upon the origin and foundation of the inequality among mankind” noted that “it is not the nature of things that disturbs us, but the bad will of the people” [14, 78]. Thus, the criterion of violation of personal freedom is interference of other people into the person’s free will. So, the higher non-interference is, the higher is degree of freedom. Freedom, in his opinion, should be limited, since people would be free to throw the obstacles in ways of others that would cause social chaos and lead to the fact that even the smallest human needs could not be met without causing harm to another person and violating his freedom. In this case, it would become impossible to achieve the equality between people while unlimited freedom would provide the same rights to the poor and powerful persons. Hence, the poor would be definitely abused by the powerful. Human interests and needs can never become completely the same and come in absolute harmony. The values of justice, equality, welfare, safety and culture are essential to freedom, because they contribute to its shape and definition and that is why freedom can be limited for them.

J. Bentham supposed that concept of freedom is purely negative, because its presence always means the absence of something else, namely a certain degree of restrictions or containment. It is taken for granted that the use of violence or threat of use it through coercion relates to the kind of restriction, which implies the violation of individual freedom. However, the freedom occurs not only as aspiration to get rid of coercion, but also as desire to get free from dependence [15, 56].

F. Voltaire in the work “Philosophical Dictionary” takes a person as a free social being which is surrounded by other free social beings. The individual as a social being is equal to others, and he has the right to exercise his freedom. Individuals granted the state the functions of general management in order to guarantee their rights. Among all the values F. Voltaire asserts the freedom as the biggest gift of God to a human being, as it is “an ability to think what a human being wants and do in accordance with his own will”. To preserve the freedom the society should reform constantly, because the stagnation or rejection of reforms leads to a revolutionary explosion of the masses, leading to the destruction of the political system [16, 205].

G. Hegel in the “The philosophy of right” reveals the division between the civil society and the state, arguing that civil society is a realm of freedom, while the state is the area of law and government rule. Thus, the interaction between society and state in terms of values appears in the opposition of “freedom” and “power”. Due to this opposition, there were formed different types of political regimes. Since totalitarianism is the personification of the highest concentration of power in one hands, it is characterized with the lowest degree of freedom. Authoritarianism is a transitional type that is described by the struggle between society and state while the level of concentration of state power depends on the rigidity of the regime. Democracy assumes that the state manages only mechanisms of control of laws enforcement in accordance with the rule of law. Also, the state authorities provide a wide range of public freedoms that are independent of each other. And anarchy is considered by complete and all-encompassing freedom and lack of power and the state as such at all [17, 120].

The idea of freedom inspired revolutions in Europe and social development of the national governments. One of peculiarities of freedom was the problem of aligning the diverse goals of people. Individual goals differ considerably; they cause the conflicts at both the individual and the social levels. That is why freedom of choice and need to choose are necessary to avoid conflicts. J. E. Acton considers the freedom an intrinsic value of human, rather than temporary need that arises under the influence of ideas of disordered life.

Freedom is not a disease that can be treated with panacea. In each society the understanding of freedom derives from the moral, religious, intellectual, economic, and aesthetic values that are associated with our understanding of good and evil, the nature of human being and his needs [18, 33-35].

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the freedom was perceived as a "reconciliation" of group interests, such as different denominations. In the end of the eighteenth century the idea of freedom, which theoretically developed from the Renaissance, the Reformation and the French Revolution, gets its consolidation in the Declaration of human rights that was adopted in France [19]. Since then during the nineteenth century the freedom as a value becomes the basis of the ideology of liberalism. In the twentieth century the freedom serves as an alternative to communist and fascist dictatorships. During all that period of time the liberals were looking for the type of political regime that could be compatible with freedom [5, 325; 3, 48].

European history and the history of USA were marked by a constant struggle for different types of freedoms in the political, economic and spiritual spheres. Social classes at a certain periods of time sought for universal freedom, then when they acquired more power, they got new privileges that they had to defend. The desire for freedom was realized in the principles of economic liberalism, democracy, individualism, separation of the church from the state. The elimination of external interference of the state in the functioning of the most important spheres of public relations was not only necessary but also sufficient way to achieve the freedom of every member of society. However, it is important to understand that as long as a person keeps in contact with the outside world he/she is not free. This connection guarantees to a person a sense of belonging to something, as it ensures the safety and security through the values, attitudes and interests shared with others. This correlation between the human being and the external reality can be called the "initial communication". It is natural bond, as it follows from the natural forms of human existence and development. This type of communication is characterized by lack of individuality, however it gives to a person the confidence and stable life orientation. It connects the child with his mother, links ancient people to their tribes, and the citizens of medieval cities to the church [6, 97].

One of the famous philosophers of the twentieth century N. Bobbio in his book "Liberalism and democracy" suggests two main interpretations of the concept of freedom. First is the "positive" or inner freedom and second is "negative" or external freedom. The "positive" freedom means that people obey only those laws that were accepted with their participation. In other words, this internal freedom can be called "freedom for". The "negative freedom" means that people are released from the constraints imposed on them by the state or nature and this is called the "freedom from," which can not be occupied by any authorities or government. Within this type of freedom it is recognized the human right to avoid activities authorized by the state, on the one hand, and maintain the right of others to do their activities on their own discretion. The "negative freedom" formed the basis of liberal political tradition and "positive freedom" made an impact on establishing of democracy. N. Bobbio argues that liberal is a person who seeks to expand the scope of human actions which are not prohibited by the state law. This implies that liberal affiliates to external "freedom from". The democrat is that who aims to increase the number of actions that are managed by the state regulation, thus democracy is trying to create conditions under which it is possible to expand the inner freedom without violating the freedom of others. Both liberalism and democracy are individualistic political theories that determine an individual their main driving force. Liberalism scrutinizes the freedom as a method of activity of isolated individual whereas democracy examines the individual within the group. These two types of freedom are complementary, because the civil liberties are protected by liberalism while the political freedom is guaranteed by democracy. In conditions of absolute regimes these two types of

freedom disappear at the same time. The modern European countries are liberal democracies mainly, they are dominated by the four major types of freedom: personal freedom, freedom of speech and press, freedom of assembly and communication. These values stipulate the functioning of such important values for modern political system as universal suffrage and political pluralism [20, 76; 78-80].

Famous English philosopher I. Berlin, in his paper "Liberty: incorporating four essays on liberty" asserts that freedom should not be mixed up with equality and independence. The freedom, on the author's point of view, is the ability to enjoy something until other people prevent an individual from doing it, that is, as long as others do not interfere in the sphere of human action. However, personal freedom can be realized only in self-organized society. Preservation of freedom does not depend on whether it is concentrated in one hands or not. It depends on the amount of power and authority that is in charge of government officials [21, 96].

Despite the fact that individual is free by his nature, he gives a part of his freedom to authorities and also loses part of his freedom because of his own desire for power. The level of individual freedom requires the freedom of space between society and the state and the legal mechanisms that would guarantee the freedom. The more a person is free within the community the more he/she supports own freedom and independence. Cohabitation with other members of community also imposes obligations on people and restricts their freedom, because the right to swing one's fist ends where the other man's nose begins [22, 160-162].

To be a part of the society and at the same time to be free of it is impossible, thus the public law states: "Do no harm and do not disturb another person". Anyone who violates the freedom of others is not free not only in relation to them, but also in relation to himself. The source of the freedom of modern society is the freedom of each individual. In this sense respect to the law leads to the fact that people within society feel free [23, 49-50].

The modern Western world names itself the world of freedom, thus implies the existence of various kinds of freedoms even to excessive ones. Different freedoms often are in opposition or in conflict with each other, some of them are restricted and might be changed by other freedoms. This interchange of freedoms can be considered one of the secrets of progress in Europe. For example, absolute human rights are reflected in the Universal declaration of human rights of the United Nations Organization on 10th of June, 1948 and in the Charter of human rights of the Council of Europe. These provisions became an integral part of majority of democratic constitutions in Europe [22, 46].

The next level of freedom of self-determination was conceptualized in postwar Europe and actualized during the Cold War period (1946-1991). This degree of freedom is not aimed at gaining power, but on the development of interior potential of a person. Freedom becomes a person's ability to make decisions about his life, change it creatively and determine who he wants to be as a personality. His work thus does not rely on pure consumption, but also on his creative abilities. In a developed civil society, the freedom of choice of profession and creative work are among the most considerable expressions of human freedom.

According to J. Messner, the individual freedom is founded on the rights of self-determination, on identifying the objectives of person's life, his life goals without any interference of other individuals or society as a whole. Only the common good may measure a person with pursuing his own interests. As noted by J. Messner, the source of human freedom lies in existential purposes such as rights and personal development. Therefore, freedom is based on the rights rather than the rights are based on the freedom [24, 85-88].

F. von Hayek in his work "The Road to Serfdom" believes that the value of freedom is in its essence, in what it guarantees and what it opposes. The main issue here is how this freedom can be implemented. In Britain freedom is guaranteed by the institutions that monitor the implementation of laws and guarantee the rights to citizens. Universal freedom

consists of other freedoms that supplement each other: it is a consequence of the separation of church from the state, the rule of law and protection of private property, the parliamentary government and independence of judicial branch of power; it is a consequence of the lack of concentration of power [25,181].

According to Dahrendorf in his book "The modern social conflict: the politics of liberty" creation of an open and free society requires a notion of chance, which is more than the prerequisite of action, but less than the action itself. The conflicts of modern society are associated with life chances of people. The purpose of the policy of freedom should be to provide more chances for more people [26, 33].

At whatever public, group or individual degree the freedom was, people support it because of understanding that some way of life is true and not only for its abstract nature. To realize his own freedom the person always takes into consideration his own values, ideals and goals. Building the life in the conditions of liberty, person should realize the limits of his own activity on the basis of observance of laws and obligations in relation to others. So, a person can realize his freedom successfully and develop it through the adherence to his values, interests and goals, respect of rights of others and be responsible to the state according to the law.

### References:

- Plato. (2000). *The republic*. (Dover thrift editions). Mineola, N.-Y.: Dover Publications.
- Fromm, E. S. (1994). *Escape from freedom*. N.-Y.: Holt Paperbacks.
- Green, D. (2000). *Reinventing civil society: rediscovery welfare without politics*. (Choice in welfare). Civitas: Institute for the Study of Civil Society.
- Machiavelli, N., Constantine, P. (Tran.) (2007). *The Essential Writings of Machiavelli* (Modern Library Classics). N.-Y.: Modern library.
- Braudel, F., Maine, R. (Tran.) (1995). *A history of civilizations*. London: Penguin Books.
- Skinner, Q. (2012). *Liberty before liberalism*. (Canto Classics). Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Milton, J. (2010). *Eikonoclastes. In answer to a book intitled, Eikon Basilike, the portraiture of his Sacred Majesty in his solitudes and sufferings. A new edition, corrected by the late Reverend Richard Baron*. Farmington Hills, Mich.: Gale.
- Locke, J. (2002). *The second treatise of government and a letter concerning toleration*. (Dover thrift editions) Mineola, N.-Y.: Dover publications.
- Hobbes, T. (2010). *De Cive*. (Kessinger legacy reprints). Whitefish, Mon.: Kessinger Publishing.
- Hobbes, T., Bramhall, J., Chapell, V. (Ed.). (1999). *On liberty and necessity*. (Cambridge texts in the history of philosophy). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidney, A., West, T. G. (Ed.). (1996). *Discourses concerning government*. (Series: Liberty Fund Studies in Political Theory). Indianapolis, Ind.: Liberty Fund.
- Harrington, J., Pocock, J. G. A. (Ed.) (1992). *The commonwealth of Oceana; a system of politics*. (Cambridge texts in the history of political thought) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Montesquieu, Ch. Baron de, Nugent T. (Ed.). (2011). *The spirit of laws*. N. – Y.: Cosimo Classics.
- Rousseau, J. J. (2009). *A discourse upon the origin and foundation of the inequality among mankind*. Charleston, South Carol.: BiblioBazaar.
- Bentham, J. (2007). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. (Dover philosophical classics). Mineola, N.-Y.: Dover publications.
- Voltaire, F., Besterman, T. (Tran.). (1984). *Philosophical dictionary*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Hegel, G. W. F., White, A. (Tran.). (2002). *The philosophy of right*. (Focus philosophical library). Newburyport, Ma.: Focus Publishing/R. Pullins Co.

- Acton, J. E. (2010). *The history of freedom and other essays*. Charleston, South Carol.: Nabu Press.
- The universal declaration of human rights*. Retrieved from: <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>
- Bobbio, N., Ryle, M., Soper, K. (Trans.) (2006). *Liberalism and democracy*. (Radical thinkers). N. – Y.: Verso.
- Berlin, I., Hardy H. (Ed.). (2002). *Liberty: incorporating four essays on liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Langes, H., Neyhaus, N. (2011). *Werte der christlichen Demokratie*. Kißlegg, Germany:Fe-Medienverlags GmbH. (in German).
- Yushchenko, L. (2009). *Liudyna i vlada*. 2-e vyd. dopov. Chernigiv, Ukr.: Rus. (in Ukrainian)
- Messner, J., Doherty, J. J. (Tran.). (1965). *Social ethics: Natural law in the Western World*. Freiburg im Breisgau: B. Herder Book Co.
- Hayek, F. A. (2007). *The road to serfdom: Text and documents – the definitive edition*. (The collected works of F. A. Hayek, Vol. 2), 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dahrendorf, R. (2012). *The modern social conflict: the politics of liberty*. 2nd ed. Piscataway, N.- J.: Transaction publishers.