To coerce a man is to deprive him of freedom — freedom from what? Almost every moralist in human history has praised freedom. Like happiness and goodness, like nature and reality, the meaning of this term is so porous that there is little interpretation that it seems able to resist. I do not propose to discuss either the history or the more than two hundred senses of this protean word recorded by historians of ideas. I propose to examine no more than two of the senses — but those central ones, with a great deal of human history behind them, and, I dare say, still to come. The first of these political senses of freedom or liberty (I shall use both words to mean the same), which (following much precedent) I shall call the ‘negative’ sense, is involved in the answer to 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?’ The second, which I shall call the positive sense, is involved in the answer to the question ‘What, or who, is the source of control or interference that can determine someone to do, or be, this rather than that?’ The two questions are clearly different, even though the answers to them may overlap.

THE NOTION OF ‘NEGATIVE’ FREEDOM

I am normally said to be free to the degree to which no man or body of men interferes with my activity. Political liberty in this sense is

simply the area within which a man can act unobstructed by others. If I am prevented by others from doing what I could otherwise do, I am to that degree unfree; and if this area is contracted by other men beyond a certain minimum, I can be described as being coerced, or, it may be, enslaved. Coercion is not, however, a term that covers every form of inability. If I say that I am unable to jump more than ten feet in the air, or cannot read because I am blind, or cannot understand the darker pages of Hegel, it would be eccentric to say that I am to that degree enslaved or coerced. Coercion implies the deliberate interference of other human beings within the area in which I could otherwise act. 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. This is brought out by the use of such modern expressions as ‘economic freedom’ and its counterpart, ‘economic slavery’. It is argued, very plausibly, that if a man is too poor to afford something on which there is no legal ban—a loaf of bread, a journey round the world, recourse to the law courts—he is as little free to have it as he would be if it were forbidden him by law. If my poverty were a kind of disease, which prevented me from buying bread, or paying for the journey round the world or getting my case heard, as lameness prevents me from running, this inability would not naturally be described as a lack of freedom, least of all political freedom. It is only because I believe that my inability to get a given thing is due to the fact that other human beings have made arrangements whereby I am, whereas others are not, prevented from having enough money with which to pay for it, that I think myself a victim of coercion or slavery. In other words, this use of the term depends on a particular social and economic theory about the causes of my poverty or weakness. If my lack of material means is due to my lack of mental or physical capacity, then I begin to speak of being deprived of freedom (and not simply about poverty) only if I accept the theory.

If, in addition, I believe that I am being kept in want by a specific arrangement which I consider unjust or unfair, I speak of economic slavery or oppression. ‘The nature of things does not madden us, only ill will does’, said Rousseau. The criterion of oppression is the part that I believe to be played by other human beings, directly or indirectly, with or without the intention of doing so, in frustrating my wishes. By being free in this sense I mean not being interfered with by others. The wider the area of non-interference the wider my freedom.

This is what the classical English political philosophers meant when they used this word. They disagreed about how wide the area could or should be. They supposed that it could not, as things were, be unlimited, because if it were, it would entail a state in which all men could boundlessly interfere with all other men; and this kind of ‘natural’ freedom would lead to social chaos in which men’s minimum needs would not be satisfied; or else the liberties of the weak would be suppressed by the strong. Because they perceived that human purposes and activities do not automatically harmonize with one another, and because (whatever their official doctrines) they put high value on other goals, such as justice, or happiness, or culture, or security, or varying degrees of equality, they were prepared to curtail freedom in the interests of other values and, indeed, of freedom itself. For, without this, it was impossible to create the kind of association that they thought desirable. Consequently, it is assumed by these thinkers that the area of men’s free action must be limited by law. But equally it is assumed, especially by such libertarians as Locke and Mill in England, and Constant and Tocqueville in France, that there ought to exist a certain minimum area of personal freedom which must on no account be violated; for if it is overstepped, the individual will find himself in an area too narrow for even that minimum development of his natural faculties which alone makes it possible to pursue, and even to conceive, the various ends which men hold good or right or sacred. It follows that a frontier must be drawn between the area of private life and that of public authority. Where it is to be drawn is a matter of argument, indeed of haggling. Men are largely interdependent, and no man’s activity is so completely private as never to obstruct the lives of others in any way. ‘Freedom for the pike is death for the minnows’; the liberty of some must depend on the restraint of others. ‘Freedom for an Oxford don’, others have been known to add, ‘is a very different thing from freedom for an Egyptian peasant.’

This proposition derives its force from something that is both true and important, but the phrase itself remains a piece of political claptrap. It is true that to offer political rights, or safeguards against intervention by the state, to men who are half-naked, illiterate, underfed, and diseased is to mock their condition; they need medical help or education before they can understand, or make use of, an increase in their freedom. What is freedom to those who cannot make use of it? Without adequate conditions for the use of freedom, what is the value of freedom? First things come first: there are situations, as a nineteenth-century Russian radical writer declared, in which boots are superior to the works of Shakespeare; individual freedom is not everyone’s primary need. For freedom is
not the mere absence of frustration of whatever kind; this would inflate the meaning of the word until it meant too much or too little. The Egyptian peasant needs clothes or medicine before, and more than, personal liberty, but the minimum freedom that he needs today, and the greater degree of freedom that he may need tomorrow, is not some species of freedom peculiar to him, but identical with that of professors, artists, and millionaires.

What troubles the consciences of Western liberals is not, I think, the belief that the freedom that men seek differs according to their social or economic conditions, but that the minority who possess it have gained it by exploiting, or, at least, averting their gaze from, the vast majority who do not. They believe, with good reason, that if individual liberty is an ultimate end for human beings, none should be deprived of it by others; least of all that some should enjoy it at the expense of others. Equality of liberty; not to treat others as I should not wish them to treat me; repayment of my debt to those who alone have made possible my liberty or prosperity or enlightenment; justice, in its simplest and most universal sense — these are the foundations of liberal morality. Liberty is not the only goal of men. I can, like the Russian critic Belinsky, say that if others are to be deprived of it — if my brothers are to remain in poverty, squalor, and chains — then I do not want it for myself, I reject it with both hands and infinitely prefer to share their fate. But nothing is gained by a confusion of terms. To avoid glaring inequality or widespread misery I am ready to sacrifice some, or all, of my freedom: I may do so willingly and freely: but it is freedom that I am giving up for the sake of justice or equality or the love of my fellow men. I should be guilt-stricken, and rightly so, if I were not, in some circumstances, ready to make this sacrifice. But a sacrifice is not an increase in what is being sacrificed, namely freedom, however great the moral need or the compensation for it. Everything is what it is: liberty is liberty, not equality or fairness or justice or culture, or human happiness or a quiet conscience. If the liberty of myself or my class or nation depends on the misery of a number of other human beings, the system which promotes this is unjust and immoral. But if I curtail or lose my freedom, in order to lessen the shame of such inequality, and do not thereby materially increase the individual liberty of others, an absolute loss of liberty occurs. This may be compensated for by a gain in justice or in happiness or in peace, but the loss remains, and it is a confusion of values to say that although my 'liberal', individual freedom may go by the board, some other kind of freedom — 'social' or 'economic' — is increased. Yet it remains true that the freedom of some must at times be curtailed to secure the freedom of others. Upon what principle should this be done? If freedom is a sacred, untouchable value, there can be no such principle. One or other of these conflicting rules or principles must, at any rate in practice, yield: not always for reasons which can be clearly stated, let alone generalized into rules or universal maxims. Still, a practical compromise has to be found.

Philosophers with an optimistic view of human nature and a belief in the possibility of harmonizing human interests, such as Locke or Adam Smith and, in some moods, Mill, believed that social harmony and progress were compatible with reserving a large area for private life over which neither the state nor any other authority must be allowed to trespass. Hobbes, and those who agreed with him, especially conservative or reactionary thinkers, argued that if men were to be prevented from destroying one another and making social life a jungle or a wilderness, greater safeguards must be instituted to keep them in their places; he wished correspondingly to increase the area of centralized control and decrease that of the individual. But both sides agreed that some portion of human existence must remain independent of the sphere of social control. To invade that preserve, however small, would be despotism. The most eloquent of all defenders of freedom and privacy, Benjamin Constant, who had not forgotten the Jacobin dictatorship, declared that at the very least the liberty of religion, opinion, expression, property, must be guaranteed against arbitrary invasion. Jefferson, Burke, Paine, Mill, compiled different catalogues of individual liberties, but the argument for keeping authority at bay is always substantially the same. We must preserve a minimum area of personal freedom if we are not to 'degrade or deny our nature'. We cannot remain absolutely free, and must give up some of our liberty to preserve the rest. But total self-surrender is self-defeating. What then must be the minimum be? That which a man cannot give up without offending against the essence of his human nature. What is this essence? What are the standards which it entails? This has been, and perhaps always will be, a matter of infinite debate. But whatever the principle in terms of which the area of non-interference is to be drawn, whether it is that of natural law or natural rights, or of utility or the pronouncements of a categorical imperative, or the sanctity of the social contract, or any other concept with which men have sought to clarify and justify their convictions, liberty in this sense means liberty from; absence of interference beyond the shifting, but always recognizable, frontier. 'The only freedom which deserves the name is that of
pursuing our own good in our own way', said the most celebrated
of its champions. If this is so, is compulsion ever justified? Mill had
no doubt that it was. Since justice demands that all individuals be
etitled to a minimum of freedom, all other individuals were of
necessity to be restrained, if need be by force, from depriving
anyone of it. Indeed, the whole function of law was the prevention
of just such collisions: the state was reduced to what Lassalle
contemptuously described as the functions of a watchman or
traffic policeman.

What made the protection of individual liberty so sacred to Mill? In
his famous essay he declares that, unless men are left to live as
they wish 'in the path which merely concerns themselves', civilisation
cannot advance; the truth will not, for lack of a free market
in ideas, come to light; there will be no scope for spontaneity,
originality, genius, for mental energy, for moral courage. Society
will be crushed by the weight of 'collective mediocrity'. Whatever
is rich and diversified will be crushed by the weight of custom,
by men's constant tendency to conformity, which breeds only
'withered capacities', 'pinched and hidebound', 'cramped and
warped' human beings. 'Pagan self-assertion is as worthy as
Christian self-denial'. 'All the errors which a man is likely to
commit against advice and warning are far outweighed by the evil
of allowing others to constrain him to what they deem is good.' The
defence of liberty consists in the 'negative' goal of warding off
interference. To threaten a man with persecution unless he submits
to a life in which he exercises no choices of his goals; to block
before him every door but one, no matter how noble the prospect
upon which it opens, or how benevolent the motives of those who
arrange this, is to sin against the truth that he is a man, a being with
a life of his own to live. This is liberty as it has been conceived by
liberals in the modern world from the days of Erasmus (some
would say of Occam) to our own. Every plea for civil liberties and
individual rights, every protest against exploitation and humilation,
against the encroachment of public authority, or the mass
hypnosis of custom or organized propaganda, springs from this
individualistic, and much disputed, conception of man.

Three facts about this position may be noted. In the first place
Mill confuses two distinct notions. One is that all coercion is, in so
far as it frustrates human desires, bad as such, although it may have
to be applied to prevent other, greater evils; while non-interference,
which is the opposite of coercion, is good as such, although it is not
the only good. This is the 'negative' conception of liberty in its
classical form. The other is that men should seek to discover
the truth, or to develop a certain type of character of which
Mill approved — critical, original, imaginative, independent, non-
conforming to the point of eccentricity, and so on — and that truth
can be found, and such character can be bred, only in conditions of
freedom. Both these are liberal views, but they are not identical,
and the connection between them is, at best, empirical. No one
would argue that truth or freedom of self-expression could flourish
where dogma crushes all thought. But the evidence of history tends to
show (as, indeed, was argued by James Stephen in his formidable
attack on Mill in his Liberty, Equality, Fraternity) that integrity,
love of truth, and fiery individualism grow at least as often in
severely disciplined communities among, for example, the puritan
Calvinists of Scotland or New England, or under military disci-
pline, as in more tolerant or indifferent societies; and if this is so,
Mill's argument for liberty as a necessary condition for the growth
of human genius falls to the ground. If his two goals proved
incompatible, Mill would be faced with a cruel dilemma, quite
apart from the further difficulties created by the inconsistency of his
doctrines with strict utilitarianism, even in his own humane version
of it.\(^5\)

In the second place, the doctrine is comparatively modern. There
seems to be scarcely any discussion of individual liberty as a
conscious political ideal (as opposed to its actual existence) in the
ancient world. Condorcet had already remarked that the notion
of individual rights was absent from the legal conceptions of the
Romans and Greeks; this seems to hold equally of the Jewish,
Chinese, and all other ancient civilizations that have since come
to light.\(^6\) The domination of this ideal has been the exception rather
than the rule, even in the recent history of the West. Nor has liberty
in this sense often formed a rallying cry for the great masses of
mankind. The desire not to be impinged upon, to be left to oneself,
has been a mark of high civilization both on the part of individuals
and communities. The sense of privacy itself, of the area of personal
relationships as something sacred in its own right, derives from a
conception of freedom which, for all its religious roots, is scarcely
older, in its developed state, than the Renaissance or the Reforma-
tion.\(^7\) Yet its decline would mark the death of a civilization, of an
entire moral outlook.

The third characteristic of this notion of liberty is of greater
importance. It is that liberty in this sense is not incompatible with
some kinds of autocracy, or at any rate with the absence of self-
government. Liberty in this sense is principally concerned with the
area of control, not with its source. Just as a democracy may, in
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fact, deprive the individual citizen of a great many liberties which
he might have in some other form of society, so it is perfectly
conceivable that a liberal-minded despot would allow his subjects a
large measure of personal freedom. The despot who leaves his
subjects a wide area of liberty may be unjust, or encourage the
wildest inequalities, care little for order, or virtue, or knowledge;
but provided he does not curb their liberty, or at least curbs it less
than many other regimes, he meets with Mill’s specification.8
Freedom in this sense is not, at any rate logically, connected with
democracy or self-government. Self-government may, on the whole,
provide a better guarantee of the preservation of civil liberties than
other regimes, and has been defended as such by libertarians. But
there is no necessary connection between individual liberty and
democratic rule. The answer to the question ‘Who governs me?’ is
logically distinct from the question ‘How far does government
interfere with me?’ It is in this difference that the great contrast
between the two concepts of negative and positive liberty, in the
end, consists.9 For the ‘positive’ sense of liberty comes to light if we
try to answer the question, not ‘What am I free to do or be?’, but
‘By whom am I ruled?’ or ‘Who is to say what I am, and what I am
not, to be or do?’ the connection between democracy and indi-
vidual liberty is a good deal more tenuous than it seemed to many
advocates of both. The desire to be governed by myself, or at any
rate to participate in the process by which my life is to be
controlled, may be as deep a wish as that of a free area for action,
and perhaps historically older. But it is not a desire for the same
thing. So different is it, indeed, as to have led in the end to the great
clash of ideologies that dominates our world. For it is this – the
‘positive’ conception of liberty: not freedom from, but freedom to –
to lead one prescribed form of life – which the adherents of the
‘negative’ notion represent as being, at times, no better than a
spacious disguise for brutal tyranny.

II

THE NOTION OF POSITIVE FREEDOM

The ‘positive’ sense of the word ‘liberty’ derives from the wish on
the part of the individual to be his own master. 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. I wish to be a subject, not an object; to be moved by
reasons, by conscious purposes, which are my own, not by causes
which affect me, as it were, from outside. I wish to be somebody,
not nobody; a doer – deciding, not being decided for, self-directed
and not acted upon by external nature or by other men as if I were a
thing, or an animal, or a slave incapable of playing a human role,
that is, of conceiving goals and policies of my own and realizing
them. This is at least part of what I mean when I say that I am
rational, and that it is my reason that distinguishes me as a human
being from the rest of the world. I wish, above all, to be conscious
of myself as a thinking, willing, active being, bearing responsibility
for my choices and able to explain them by references to my own
ideas and purposes. I feel free to the degree that I believe this to be
true, and enslaved to the degree that I am made to realize that it is
not.

The freedom which consists in being one’s own master, and the
freedom which consists in not being prevented from choosing as I
do by other men, may, on the face of it, seem concepts at no great
logical distance from each other – no more than negative and
positive ways of saying much the same thing. Yet the ‘positive’ and
‘negative’ notions of freedom historically developed in divergent
directions not always by logically reputable steps, until, in the end,
they came into direct conflict with each other.

One way of making this clear is in terms of the independent
momentum which the, initially perhaps quite harmless, metaphor
of self-mastery acquired. ‘I am my own master’; ‘I am slave to no
man’; but may I not (as Platonists or Hegelians tend to say) be a
slave to nature? Or to my own ‘unbridled’ passions? Are these not
so many species of the identical genus ‘slave’ – some political or
legal, others moral or spiritual? Have not men had the experience
of liberating themselves from spiritual slavery, or slavery to nature,
and do they not in the course of it become aware, on the one hand,
of a self which dominates, and, on the other, of something in them
which is brought to heel? This dominant self is then variously
identified with reason, with my ‘higher nature’, with the self which
calculates and aims at what will satisfy it in the long run, with my
‘real’, or ‘ideal’, or ‘autonomous’ self, or with my self ‘at its best’;
which is then contrasted with irrational impulse, uncontrolled
desires, my ‘lower’ nature, the pursuit of immediate pleasures, my
‘empirical’ or ‘heteronomous’ self, swept by every gust of desire and
passion, needing to be rigidly disciplined if it is ever to rise to the
full height of its ‘real’ nature. Presently the two selves may be
represented as divided by an even larger gap: the real self may be conceived as something wider than the individual (as the term is normally understood), as a social ‘whole’ of which the individual is an element or aspect: a tribe, a race, a church, a state, the great society of the living and the dead and the yet unborn. This entity is then identified as being the ‘true’ self which, by imposing its collective, or ‘organic’, single will upon its recalcitrant ‘members’, achieves its own, and therefore their, ‘higher’ freedom. The perils of using organic metaphors to justify the coercion of some men by others in order to raise them to a ‘higher’ level of freedom have often been pointed out. But what gives such plausibility as it has to this kind of language is that we recognize that it is possible, and at times justifiable, to coerce men in the name of some goal (let us say, justice or public health) which they would, if they were more enlightened, themselves pursue, but do not, because they are blind or ignorant or corrupt. This renders it easy for me to conceive of myself as coercing others for their own sake, in their, not my, interest. I am then claiming that I know what they truly need better than they know it themselves. What, at most, this entails is that they would not resist me if they were rational and as wise as I and understood their interests as I do. But I may go on to claim a good deal more than this. I may declare that they are actually aiming at what in their benighted state they consciously resist, because there exists within them an occult entity – their latent rational will, or their ‘true’ purpose – and that this entity, although it is belied by all that they overtly feel and do and say, is their ‘real’ self, of which the poor empirical self in space and time may know nothing or little; and that this inner spirit is the only self that deserves to have its wishes taken into account.\(^\text{10}\) Once I take this view, I am in a position to ignore the actual wishes of men or societies, to bully, oppress, torture them in the name, and on behalf, of their ‘real’ selves, in the secure knowledge that whatever is the true goal of man (happiness, performance of duty, wisdom, a just society, self-fulfilment) must be identical with his freedom – the free choice of his ‘true’, albeit often submerged and inarticulate, self.

This paradox has been often exposed. It is one thing to say that I know what is good for X, while he himself does not; and even to ignore his wishes for its – and his – sake; and a very different one to say that he has \textit{eo ipso} chosen it, not indeed consciously, not as he seems in everyday life, but in his role as a rational self which his empirical self may not know – the ‘real’ self which discerns the good, and cannot help choosing it once it is revealed. This monstrous impersonation, which consists in equating what X would choose if he were something he is not, or at least not yet, with what X actually seeks and chooses, is at the heart of all political theories of self-realization. It is one thing to say that I may be coerced for my own good which I am too blind to see: this may, on occasion, be for my benefit; indeed it may enlarge the scope of my liberty. It is another to say that if it is my good, then I am not being coerced, for I have willed it, whether I know this or not, and am free (or ‘truly’ free) even while my poor earthly body and foolish mind bitterly reject it, and struggle against those who seek however benevolently to impose it, with the greatest desperation.

This magical transformation, or sleight of hand (for which William James so justly mocked the Hegelians), can no doubt be perpetrated just as easily with the ‘negative’ concept of freedom, where the self that should not be interfered with is no longer the individual with his actual wishes and needs as they are normally conceived, but the ‘real’ man within, identified with the pursuit of some ideal purpose not dreamed of by his empirical self. And, as in the case of the ‘positively’ free self, this entity may be inflated into some super-personal entity – a state, a class, a nation, or the march of history itself, regarded as a more ‘real’ subject of attributes than the empirical self. But the ‘positive’ conception of freedom as self-mastery, with its suggestion of a man divided against himself, has, in fact, and as a matter of history, of doctrine and of practice, lent itself more easily to this splitting or personality into two: the transcendent, dominant controller, and the empirical bundle of desires and passions to be disciplined and brought to heel. It is this historical fact that has been influential. This demonstrates (if demonstration of so obvious a truth is needed) that conceptions of freedom directly derive from views of what constitutes a self, a person, a man. Enough manipulation with the definition of man, and freedom can be made to mean whatever the manipulator wishes. Recent history has made it only too clear that the issue is not merely academic.

The consequences of distinguishing between two selves will become even clearer if one considers the two major forms which the desire to be self-directed – directed by one’s ‘true’ self – has historically taken: the first, that of self-abnegation in order to attain independence; the second, that of self-realization, or total self-identification with a specific principle or ideal in order to attain the selfsame end. ...
The French Revolution, like all great revolutions, was, at least in its Jacobin form, just such an eruption of the desire for ‘positive’ freedom of collective self-direction on the part of a large body of Frenchmen who felt liberated as a nation, even though the result was, for a good many of them, a severe restriction of individual freedoms. Rousseau had spoken exultantly of the fact that the laws of liberty might prove to be more austere than the yoke of tyranny. Tyranny is service to human masters. The law cannot be a tyrant. Rousseau does not mean by liberty the ‘negative’ freedom of the individual not to be interfered with within a defined area, but the possession by all, and not merely by some, of the fully qualified members of a society of a share in the public power which is entitled to interfere with every aspect of every citizen’s life. The liberals of the first half of the nineteenth century correctly foresaw that liberty in this ‘positive’ sense could easily destroy too many of the ‘negative’ liberties that they held sacred. They pointed out that the sovereignty of the people could easily destroy that of individuals. Mill explained, patiently and unanswerably, that government by the people was not, in his sense, necessarily freedom at all. For those who govern are not necessarily the same ‘people’ as those who are governed, and democratic self-government is not the government ‘of each by himself’ but, at best, of ‘each by the rest’. Mill and his disciples spoke of the tyranny of the majority and of the tyranny of ‘the prevailing feeling and opinion’, and saw no great difference between that and any other kind of tyranny which encroaches upon men’s activities beyond the sacred frontiers of private life.

No one saw the conflict between the two types of liberty better, or expressed it more clearly, than Benjamin Constant. He pointed out that the transference by a successful rising of the unlimited authority, commonly called sovereignty, from one set of hands to another does not increase liberty, but merely shifts the burden of slavery. He reasonably asked why a man should deeply care whether he is crushed by a popular government or by a monarch, or even by a set of oppressive laws. He saw that the main problem for those who desire ‘negative’, individual freedom is not who wields this authority, but how much authority should be placed in any set of hands. For unlimited authority in anybody’s grasp was bound, he believed, sooner or later, to destroy somebody. He maintained that usually men protested against this or that set of governors as oppressive, when the real cause of oppression lay in the mere fact of the accumulation of power itself, wherever it might happen to be, since liberty was endangered by the mere existence of absolute authority as such. ‘It is not the arm that is unjust’, he wrote, ‘but the weapon that is too heavy — some weights are too heavy for the human hand.’ Democracy may disarm a given oligarchy, a given privileged individual or set of individuals, but it can still crush individuals as mercilessly as any previous ruler. In an essay comparing the liberty of the moderns with that of the ancients he said that an equal right to oppress — or interfere — is not equivalent to liberty. Nor does universal consent to loss of liberty somehow miraculously preserve it merely by being universal, or by being consent. If I consent to be oppressed, or acquiesce in my condition with detachment or irony, am I the less oppressed? If I sell myself into slavery, am I the less a slave? If I commit suicide, am I the less dead because I have taken my own life freely? ‘Popular government is a spasmodic tyranny, monarchy a more efficiently centralized despotism.’ Constant saw in Rousseau the most dangerous enemy of individual liberty, because he had declared that ‘by giving myself to all I give myself to none’. Constant could not see why, even though the sovereign is ‘everybody’, it should not oppress one of the ‘members’ of its indivisible self, if it so decided. I may, of course, prefer to be deprived of my liberties by an assembly, or a family, or a class, in which I am a minority. It may give me an opportunity one day of persuading the others to do for me that to which I feel I am entitled. But to be deprived of my liberty at the hands of my family or friends or fellow citizens is to be deprived of it just as effectively. Hobbes was at any rate more candid: he did not pretend that a sovereign does not enslave: he justified this slavery, but at least did not have the effrontery to call it freedom.

Throughout the nineteenth century liberal thinkers maintained that if liberty involved a limit upon the powers of any man to force me to do what I did not, or might not, wish to do, then, whatever the ideal in the name of which I was coerced, I was not free; that the doctrine of absolute sovereignty was a tyrannical doctrine in itself. If I wish to preserve my liberty, it is not enough to say that it must not be violated unless someone or other — the absolute ruler, or the popular assembly, or the King in Parliament, or the judges, or some combination of authorities, or the laws themselves — for the laws may be oppressive — authorizes its violation. I must establish a
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are ordered to denounce their parents, friends to betray one another, soldiers to use methods of barbarism; when men are tortured or murdered, or minorities are massacred because they irritate a majority or a tyrant. Such acts, even if they are made legal by the sovereign, cause horror even in these days, and this springs from the recognition of the moral validity – irrespective of the laws – of some absolute barriers to the imposition of one man’s will on another. The freedom of a society, or a class or a group, in this sense of freedom, is measured by the strength of these barriers, and the number and importance of the paths which they keep open for their members – if not for all, for at any rate a great number of them.11

This is almost at the opposite pole from the purposes of those who believe in liberty in the ‘positive’ self-directive sense. The former want to curb authority as such. The latter want it placed in their own hands. That is a cardinal issue. These are not two different interpretations of a single concept, but two profoundly divergent and irreconcilable attitudes to the ends of life. It is as well to recognize this, even if in practice it is often necessary to strike a compromise between them. For each of them makes absolute claims. These claims cannot both be fully satisfied. But it is a profound lack of social and moral understanding not to recognize that the satisfaction that each of them seeks is an ultimate value which, both historically and morally, has an equal right to be classed among the deepest interests of mankind.

IV

THE ONE AND THE MANY

One belief, more than any other, is responsible for the slaughter of individuals on the altars of the great historical ideals – justice or progress or the happiness of future generations, or the sacred mission or emancipation of a nation or race or class, or even liberty itself, which demands the sacrifice of individuals for the freedom of society. This is the belief that somewhere, in the past or in the future, in divine revelation or in the mind of an individual thinker, in the pronouncements of history or science, or in the simple heart of an uncorrupted good man, there is a final solution. This ancient faith rests on the conviction that all the positive values in which

society in which there must be some frontiers of freedom which nobody should be permitted to cross. Different names or natures may be given to the rules that determine these frontiers: they may be called natural rights, or the word of God, or Natural Law, or the demands of utility or of the ‘permanent interests of man’; I may believe them to be valid a priori, or assert them to be my own ultimate ends, or the ends of my society or culture. What these rules or commandments will have in common is that they are accepted so widely, and are grounded so deeply in the actual nature of men as they have developed through history, as to be, by now, an essential part of what we mean by being a normal human being. Genuine belief in the inviolability of a minimum extent of individual liberty entails some such absolute stand. For it is clear that it has little to hope for from the rule of majorities; democracy as such is logically uncommitted to it, and historically has at times failed to protect it, while remaining faithful to its own principles. Few governments, it has been observed, have found much difficulty in causing their subjects to generate any will that the government wanted. ‘The triumph of despotism is to force the slaves to declare themselves free. It may need no force; the slaves may proclaim their freedom quite sincerely: but they are none the less slaves. Perhaps the chief value for liberals of political – ‘positive’ – rights, of participating in the government, is as a means for protecting what they hold to be an ultimate value, namely individual – ‘negative’ – liberty.

But if democracies can, without ceasing to be democratic, suppress freedom, at least as liberals have used the word, what would make a society truly free? For Constant, Mill, Tocqueville, and the liberal tradition to which they belong, no society is free unless it is governed by at any rate two interrelated principles: first, that no power, but only rights, can be regarded as absolute, so that all men, whatever power governs them, have an absolute right to refuse to behave inhumanly; and, second, that there are frontiers, not artificially drawn, within which men should be inviolable, these frontiers being defined in terms of rules so long and widely accepted that their observance has entered into the very conception of what it is to be a normal human being, and, therefore, also of what it is to act inhumanly or insanely; rules of which it would be absurd to say, for example, that they could be abrogated by some formal procedure on the part of some court or sovereign body. When I speak of a man as being normal, a part of what I mean is that he could not break these rules easily, without a qualm of revulsion. It is such rules as these that are broken when a man is declared guilty without trial, or punished under a retroactive law; when children