

JOHN STUART MILL'S THEORY OF LIBERTY AS A PANACEA TO CONTEMPORARY DEMAND FOR LIBERTY DEMOCRACY

Orji, Chidi Paul, Ph.D

Department of Philosophy,
University of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, Umuagwo, Imo State
paul.orji@uaes.edu.ng, hipaulco@gmail.com

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.27419.68649

Abstract

The pursuit of happiness and fulfillment by man in the modern world is based on his liberty, which is one of the most important values that are essential to man. However, in a democratic society, how much freedom does a man have to exercise such freedom? This investigation looks at freedom. Democracy: how much a person is influenced by the government In this work, we seek to address the sociopolitical and economic issues that the individual faces in the current liberty democracy. We do this by applying John Stuart Mill's idea of liberty. Decisions concerning one's well-being can be made by logical people. There is almost never a good reason for the government to restrict someone's freedom. In contrast, Mill had another idea. He suggested that the ideal balance between individual liberty and governmental authority may be summed up in one straightforward principle: the only reason for which power can legitimately be employed over any member of a civilized community against his will is to avoid harm to others. The thesis of this essay is that John Stuart Mill's Theory of Liberty provides a cure-all for the modern demands for liberty and democracy. From the foregoing, this essay argues that the application of John Stuart Mill's Theory of Liberty a political arrangement that recognizes the need to grant a state's citizens a significant amount of freedom to develop themselves with few restrictions on the part of the state can, in the main, lead to a libertarian democratic society or state.

Keywords: individuality, development, liberty, democracy, liberalism

Introduction

The history of western moral and political philosophy places John Stuart Mill in an especially prominent position. When considered in the context of history, utilitarianism and liberalism both have had a significant positive impact on the range of moral concern, the structure of public institutions, the duties of the executive branch, and the interests and rights of the governed. John Stuart Mill fervently belongs to the group of political philosophers who have steadfastly expressed the instrumentality of the idea of the free development of individuals as a vital instrument for upholding a just democratic social order.

The concept of political liberalism here emphasizes the urgent requirement that the individual's place within the collective total be fully taken into account in all aspects of the governing structure or state administration. The individual represents the atomic unit of society, and we can explain the collectivity needed for the growth and development of the state in our quest to realize a sustainable democratic structure. Therefore, the individual versus collective interest dichotomy should not be seen as being inherently antagonistic.

For Mill, being an individual meant having the ability to think critically and responsibly. It stood for personal growth and exercising free will. He emphasized complete freedom of thought, conscience, and speech because these are essential to the advancement of humanity. Mill places more emphasis on developing active individuals than inactive ones. There are as many autonomous centers of improvement as there are people, thus men should not be seen as passive tools used by a select few enlightened men to reform and rebuild society.

For Mill, people are distinct from one another and would act differently if given the freedom to seek their own goals in life. Mill made an effort to balance the notions of personal freedom and political equality. He recognized the equality of all citizens, regardless of their social standing, and the fact that only popular sovereignty could confer legitimacy on the executive branch. Democracy was beneficial because it improved and made people happier. The common good of its citizens should be promoted by the government in order to uphold a free and democratic state, that's to Mill's ultimate political criterion.

John Stuart Mill's Theory of Liberty: An Overview

With regard to John Stuart Mill's Theory of Liberty, each individual has the right to pursue their own interests as long as they don't damage others. People are capable of making judgments regarding their wellbeing and selecting any religion they so desire. When it is necessary to defend society, the government ought to become involved. Liberty, in the words of Harrison-Barbet, was "protection against the tyranny of the political rulers." It became necessary to restrict these rulers' authority over the populace, and Mill claims that this was done through (a) the recognition of political liberties or rights and (b) "the establishment of constitutional check, by which the consent of the community, or of some sort of body, supposed to represent its interests, was made a necessary condition to some of the more important acts of the governing power" (Harrison-Barbet, 2001:253-254).

For Mill, self-protection is the only reason that mankind has, either individually or collectively, to interfere with another person's right to pursue their own interests. That the only legitimate reason for using force against any member of a civilized community is to protect them from harm. His own bodily or moral wellbeing is insufficient justification. He cannot be legitimately forced to do or refrain from doing something just because it will benefit him, make him happier, or is morally right in the eyes of others.

Any person's only aspect of behavior that is acceptable to society is that which affects other people. Naturally, his independence is complete in the area that only affects him. The individual is sovereign over himself, over his own body, and over his own thinking. According to Mill, there are three different sorts of liberty, each of which must be acknowledged and honored in a free society. The liberty of thought and opinion comes first. The second type is personal freedom, also known as the freedom to design our own lives. Third, there is the freedom to associate with those who share your views in order to accomplish a good deed. Each of these liberties counteracts society's tendency to enforce compliance.

On the basis of Mill, what separates humans from the rest of nature is not rational thought or dominance over nature, but rather the freedom to experiment and make choices. Therefore, a society's interactions with individuals must be governed by a principle that is established in reason. The "harm principle" refers to just one, very basic notion. According to Mukherjee and Ramaswamy, although Mill believed that freedom was beneficial in and of itself since it contributed to the growth of a humane, civilized, and moral individual, early liberal's advocated liberty in the name of effective administration. Mukerjee and Ramaswamy (2007) stated that, it was "beneficial not only to the individual who enjoys them but also to the society that permits them."

The importance of individual liberty in a democratic society was emphasized by Mill. Mill envisioned a society without rules governing thought, opinion, behavior, etc., where each person lives his or her own unique life while using his or her own special skills. To Mill, liberty is crucial to ensure future advancement for both the individual and society, especially as society overtakes the state in importance. In a representative democracy, where the opposition between the rulers and the ruled vanishes and the rulers only serve to represent the interests of the ruled, this

condition of affairs would be obtained. Individual liberty might be feasible in such a democracy, but it would not be guaranteed. When society is liberated from governmental restraints, it starts to institutionalize the interests of a select and powerful few, posing a fresh threat to individual liberty.

Individual liberty must be restricted for social progress to occur, but such restriction must also be removed for the individual to be free. Unlike other liberal theorists, Mill does not use the concept of "abstract right" to support the damage principle. Accepting people's right to do what they choose as long as it doesn't significantly affect other people will advance "utility in the broadest sense, grounded on the long-term interests of man as a progressive being." Accordingly, adhering to the harm principle is a good idea since it supports what Mill refers to as the "free development of individuality," or the growth of our humanity. This is based on the notion that humankind is capable of development and that, given the correct circumstances, latent or underdeveloped talents and qualities can be realized. Human nature changes with time. It is not just repeated by people and generations.

Mill's on Human Action

In Mill's take on individuals are unique beings that desire freedom and will utilize it to maximize their potential as people. Affecting others versus merely oneself are two different types of activities, according to Mill. The former, according to him, may be restricted, but one should be allowed to act as they like. Additionally, there should be freedom of opinion and expression. Mill uses the term "liberty of action" in a broad sense that encompasses freedom of thought, feeling, and taste, as well as the right to have, express, and publish opinions on any topic and the freedom to associate with others, subject to the requirement that our actions do not cause harm to others. Whatever the form of governance, "no society is free unless these liberties are not, on the whole, respected; and none is completely free unless they exist absolutely and unqualified" (Harrison-Barbet, 2001:254).

As Harrison-Barbet puts it:

Mill makes the argument that until we have thought about and evaluated all the alternatives, we cannot know whether a notion is true or not. He makes the case for individual freedom of action by stating that only that person can choose what is in his or her best interests and that making decisions is what leads to the maximum level of human potential development. According to Mill, every human being aspires to be free and will make use of that freedom to maximize their potential as humans. In support of the idea that happiness should be seen as a combination of "higher" and "lower" pleasures, Mill argues that all human conduct should result in the greatest total enjoyment.

Happiness to Mill is the ultimate good, the one thing that every person desires, and the source of all other desires. For Mill, happiness is defined as pleasure and the absence of suffering, whereas sadness is defined as pain and the deprivation of pleasure. He was therefore a hedonist, holding the same view of pleasure as the ancient philosopher Epicurus. Every person strives to increase their own happiness and prevent unhappiness, according to Mill. This is not moral; it is natural.

When applied to all humans, not just ourselves, promoting happiness becomes an ethical notion. Thus, Mill's utilitarian calculus determines how many and what kind of individuals are impacted by a choice, as well as whether the choice is morally justified or incorrect.

Mukherjee and Ramaswamy argue further that:

As stated by Mill, social emotions and consciences are a person's psychological characteristics. Since the person was a social entity, he described society as being natural and ingrained. It was impossible to be anything less than social. Private and public good coincided more when these impulses were intensified (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007:325).

The Greatest Happiness Principle states that an activity is right inasmuch as it fosters happiness in all those touched by it and incorrect insofar as it results in unhappiness for those people. Mill claimed that joys could not be assessed objectively, according to Mukherjee and Ramaswamy. The calculus of felicity was ludicrous; one had to trust the expertise and wisdom of the knowledgeable and competent. In his description of the state, he referred to it as a tool for the change of the human being. An idea that found full expression in Green's ideology was that the state played a key role in influencing an individual's goals through education. The hyphen that connected Bentham and Green was Mill (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007:325).

Mill on Freedom and Liberty

The "principle of liberty" and Mill's concept of freedom are often misunderstood. This principle establishes a set of "self-regarding" decisions and activities that should not be subject to any restrictions on people's freedom of choice. In other words, the liberty principle tackles the question of whether or not to restrict an individual's freedom. His definition of freedom, however, reflects his understanding of what it includes. There are three fallacies concerning Mill's definition of freedom that result from confusing the principle of liberty with it.

First, it gives the mistaken impression that Mill views freedom in primarily negative terms, with the absence of limits or limitations on people's attempts to satisfy their present goals, whatever they may be, indicating the presence of freedom. Second, it ignores key areas where freedom involves engaging in communal self-government activities with others rather than limiting it to the decisions and deeds of free individuals. Third, it implies that Mill, like many other liberal theorists, views freedom and power as antagonistic rather than complimentary but occasionally at odds with one another.

Harrison-Barbet, 2001:257, puts it:

since the foundation of his idea of liberty was that one's activities should not damage others, Mill was concerned for the welfare of other people. It is debatable whether his vision of society was overly idealistic despite his admirable goal of eliminating prejudice and coercion. The weakest suffer the consequences of a laissez-faire mentality when individualism and self-centered behavior are prioritized, unless the state recognizes and defends their rights (Harrison-Barbet, 2001:257).

In ways that reflect the distinction between his principle of liberty and his vision of freedom, Mill uses the terms "freedom" and "liberty" indistinctly. It would be incorrect to overemphasize this distinction because he does not clearly differentiate between them. Nevertheless, he typically employs them in ways that reflect the implications resulting from the many histories, etymologies, and connotations associated with them. Mill frequently discusses more constrained practices of freedom using the terms "liberty" and "individual liberty." Whether they are external laws and regulations or the refined self-control of the liberal man, freedom involves a continual system of restrictions. That, without a doubt, contributes to its attractiveness to liberals and is one of the reasons John Stuart Mill chose to write his essay 'On Liberty' rather than 'Freedom'.

Mill is outlining what he terms "the principle of individual liberty," and the only freedom that is deserving of the name is the freedom to pursue our own good in accordance with our own preferences, provided that we do not try to deprive others of theirs or obstruct their efforts to get it. This freedom is appropriately constrained by our obligations to others, such as the respect we must show for their rights. It alludes to the legal right of action that every mature person has.

Therefore, it is impossible to rephrase Mill's "principle of liberty" as a "principle of freedom" without changing its original meaning. Mill often defines "freedom" more broadly to include a broader range of individual and group self-government behaviors. According to him, an individual's "freedom of action" is their "right to govern their own conduct by their own sense of

duty and by such laws and social constraints as their conscience can subscribe to." This includes not just the decisions and deeds of free individuals but also democratic self-government techniques that allow people to participate in managing their own affairs within the major power structures that control their lives.

A key aspect of Mill's conception of political independence is the emphasis on reciprocal self-government. As Sargent notes, the terms "liberty," "freedom," and "right" are frequently used synonymously. Although some academics prefer to carefully separate the three nouns' meanings, doing so is not required. All three concepts allude to the freedom to act without limitations or to limitations that are at the very least limited in certain ways. The most inclusive concept is freedom. Typically, the term "liberty" alludes to social and political liberation (Sargent, 1981:39).

When Mill outlines the biggest barriers to freedom, he further clarifies his conception of that concept. Of course, he understands the importance of legal restrictions. Three additional significant constraints are also mentioned by Mill: psychological restrictions on people's "mental freedom" and autonomy that limit their ability to create their own desires and life plans; a lack of material resources and opportunities for people to pursue their chosen occupations and ways of living; and the lack of opportunities for people to participate in self-government with regard to their homes, workplaces, and political institutions that regulate their lives. On the basis of Harrison-Barbet's

To Mill's credit, he vigorously supported cooperative societies, the decentralization of the poor, and increased public engagement in local government. Additionally, he was a pioneer in the cause of women's rights (Harrison-Barbet, 2001:257).

Man, State, and Democracy

In a democracy, everyone has an equal voice in making decisions that have an impact on their daily life. This should ideally involve equal (and more or less direct) involvement in the formulation, creation, and enactment of legislation. As Gauba outlined, the term "democracy" has been used throughout the history of western political theory. Its origins are in the Greek words *demos*, which means "the people," and *cracy*, which means "rule" or "government." Democracy therefore literally means "the rule of the people" (Gauba, 1995:286).

It may also refer to the social, economic, and cultural frameworks that support the equally and freely exercised right to political self-determination. A few comparable types of administration and a political philosophy are referred to as democracy in political theory. Despite the fact that there is no one definition of democracy that is agreed by everybody, all definitions of democracy must adhere to two criteria. The first premise is that everyone in society has equal access to authority, and the second is that everyone has rights and freedoms that are widely accepted.

In Gauba's view:

Democracy is consent-based government. Persuasion is a method for gaining rational consent, and it is crucial for this process that there be room for dialogue. Even if a regime upholds certain democratic institutions, it does not qualify as a democracy if the agreement of the populace is tried to be secured without the freedoms of expression of opposing viewpoints (Gauba, 1995:291). There are various forms of democracy, some of which offer their citizens greater liberties and better representation than others.

A branch of the government can, however, amass power in a way that is detrimental to democracy itself if any democracy is not rigorously regulated to prevent an unequal distribution of political power using checks like the separation of powers. Although majority rule is frequently referred to as a hallmark of democracy, tyranny of the majority could potentially

violate the rights of a minority in the absence of responsible government. The holding of competitive elections that are fair both substantively and procedurally is a crucial step in representative democracy. Furthermore, it is essential for citizens to have access to information and the freedoms of speech and the press in order to be informed and cast their votes according to their particular interests. Although it is frequently used, popular sovereignty is not always the driving force behind the creation of democracies. According to Gauba, democracy has an additional benefit in that it encourages males to educate themselves because civic engagement broadens people's perspectives and tends to broaden their interests. Democracy is fundamentally based on this engagement. 'Rule by the people' is not really the case.

In a democracy, the people exercise their power in two ways: (a) by choosing the goals for their government, and (b) by keeping an eye on those who have been given actual administrative responsibility (Gauba, 1995:289). Equal rights serve as the intellectual foundation for democracy in several nations. Liberal democracy, which may also include other components like political pluralism, equality before the law, the right to petition elected officials for the resolution of grievances, due process, civil liberties, human rights, and components of civil society outside of the government, is often referred to as "democracy" in everyday speech.

In a representative democracy, the group being represented elects its representatives to office. The processes that are used most frequently entail electing the candidate who receives a majority or plurality of the votes. As Sargent notes, the representative system in a democracy is primarily intended to give voters a way to influence political decision-making when they are unable to do so directly themselves. This means that a system must be developed so that the people can keep or get rid of the Representative's front office as they won't necessarily be expected to serve for life. The institution of regular elections is this (Sargent, 1981:48).

In proportional systems, representatives may be chosen to represent the entire electorate or a particular area (or constituency), or they may represent a combination of the two. There are certain representative democracies that also use direct democracy practices, such as referendums. Representative democracies are characterized by the freedom of the representatives to make decisions based on their own judgments, even if they are chosen by the people to represent their interests.

The Representatives constitute an independent governing body (during an election period) tasked with acting in the interests of the people, but not as their proxy representatives and not always in accordance with their wishes, and endowed with sufficient power to take prompt and decisive action in the face of changing circumstances. It is frequently contrasted with direct democracy, in which representatives are either nonexistent or have little authority because they act as proxy representatives. Liberal democracies are representative democracies that place a strong emphasis on individual liberty.

Hampsher-Monk states that Mill remarked in *The Essay on Representative Government* that it exemplified the ideas he had "been working up during the greater part of my life." Among other things, we can draw the conclusion that it was an effort to show how Mill's two main contributions to utilitarian thought- the expansion of the concept of utility to include quality, moral development, and liberty- applied to political issues (Hampsher-Monk, 1992:385).

Another type of government is direct democracy, in which citizens make decisions collectively rather than having their political issues handled by representatives. Traditional terminology refers to direct democracy as "pure democracy." It might involve establishing laws, electing or removing officials, passing executive motions, holding trials, and so forth, depending on the specific system in use. Representative democracy, in which the final say is granted to a select

group of people, typically as a result of an election, contrasts with direct democracy. Referendum (plebiscite), initiative, and recall are three types of political action that are permitted in many democracies that are representational in nature.

A binding referendum on whether a certain law should be rejected can be held as part of a referendum. This basically gives the people, who have the right to vote, the power to veto laws. Initiatives, which are typically proposed by the public, compel the consideration of laws or amendments (typically through a subsequent referendum) without the approval of elected officials or even against their wishes. People have the power to remove elected politicians from office before the end of their terms through recall elections. Generally speaking, "direct democracy" refers to voters making decisions about laws and policies directly, without the assistance of legislators and representatives.

Man and the State: Individualism and Collectivism

Mill places a great value on individual liberty. He lays up a system that specifies when and how a government should intervene in the private lives of its people. Individuality, according to Mill, is one of the fundamental components of human welfare and is necessary for happiness. Mill examines the issue of whether individuals should be permitted to act on their beliefs without fear of repercussions from the law or societal rejection. Asserting once more that both actions and opinions must be restrained when they will harm or inconvenience others, Mill notes that deeds should not be as free as opinions. Many of the justifications for appreciating diverse viewpoints, however, also hold true for respecting others' conduct.

Different "experiments of living" are valuable since people are fallible. For both personal and societal advancement, originality must be expressed. The development of the self requires individuality. Individual spontaneity is not seen as having any inherent value and is not viewed as being crucial to wellbeing, according to Mill, which is a fundamental issue with society. Instead, the majority believes that everyone should follow its practices. While Mill agrees that children should be taught the accumulated wisdom of human experience, he also contends that adults should have the choice to interpret that experience however they see fit. He places a strong moral emphasis on choosing one's actions rather than blindly following traditions because only those who choose are making use of all of their faculties.

Sargent claims that Mill believed that individuality was important because nonconformists might teach people something. Dissidents might find new products while preserving the life of old ones. In spite of the fact that genius is uncommon, it is nevertheless true that "genius can only breathe freely in an atmosphere of freedom" (Sargent, 1981:51). People that lack creativity frequently do not appreciate its benefits and favor mediocrity over genius. According to Mill, democratization and popular control of society increase the natural inclination for conformity in society. Mill is concerned about the suppression of uniqueness in both the social and legal spheres.

He contends that the individual is prevented from making meaningful decisions and, thus, from personal development in the face of social pressure to conform and the institutionalized power of overreaching legislation. To John Stuart Mill, a dynamic exchange between opposing ideologies is necessary for societal progress. The way that Mill feels about individuality and conformity is directly related to how he feels about social progress.

As Mukherjee and Ramaswamy rightly argue:

As indicated by Mill, a person's psychological characteristics include their social conscience and feelings. Since the individual was a social person, he described society as being natural and habitual. It was impossible to be less than social. The greater the

intensity of these emotions, the more closely private and public interests matched (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007:325).

Mill thought it was important to let people explore their differences because they are essentially unique. Making everyone the same is detrimental to their distinctive qualities because people succeed and fail in the same situations. He holds to that spontaneous action isn't given enough credit by society as a whole. He believes that individuals should balance their self-interest so that the more capable members of society don't step on the less capable; he does not, however, believe that individuality should come at all costs. Even if people reject this conception of spontaneity and freedom, according to Mill, they will gain knowledge from being exposed to environments that support such actions. A society where people are free to express fresh ideas and disagree with the dominant viewpoints would also lead to a more effective government of evolved citizens.

In contrast to being obliged to conform to the weak passions of the majority, Mill claims that this kind of evolution will result in a better society where people are free to pursue their interests. According to Mill, strong passions are diverted toward less productive tasks as a result of suppressed impulses. According to Mill, putting a focus on individuality would be beneficial for society as a whole since it would keep things from settling into a risky status quo (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007).

Mill favored total individual freedom in areas unrelated to the community. The community had a good reason to solely restrict personal choices with negative social repercussions. Mill distinguished between an individual's self-regarding and other-regarding behaviors, and he granted complete freedom in the latter category. The importance of individual liberty in a democratic society was emphasized by Mill. As Mukherjee & Ramaswamy pointed out, Mill prepared the way for legal intrusion. The area over which no coercive involvement, either from the government or from other individuals, was allowed was any action that pertained to the individual alone. Coercion might be employed to force an individual to adhere to some code of conduct in the sphere that pertained to society or the general public (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007:326).

Mill envisioned a society without rules governing thought, opinion, behavior, etc., where each person lives his or her own unique life while using his or her own special skills. The basic argument of *On Liberty* is that, when society becomes more significant than the state, liberty is necessary to ensure future progress for both the individual and society. This state of affairs would be attained in a representative democracy in which the opposition between the rulers and the ruled disappears and the rulers only represent the interests of the ruled. Individual liberty might be feasible in such a democracy, but it would not be guaranteed.

When society is liberated from governmental restraints, it starts to institutionalize the interests of a select and powerful few, posing a fresh threat to individual liberty. Mill struggles with how to foresee society developing in a way that prevents the suppression of the individual by an ever-more dominant and self-assured majority. Individual liberty must be restricted for social progress to occur, but such restriction must also be removed for the individual to be free. For Mill, a civilized person is one who understands and does everything in their power to understand.

Mill supports individual initiative over social control and extends this approach to everyone, not just the exceptionally skilled. He contends that actions taken by people are preferable to those taken by governments. Mill emphasized the importance of human growth and argued persuasively for each person to have the most freedom possible. He regarded it as a fundamental right to be free from the tyranny of governmental authority or the tyranny of mob rule. Since the government's job is to advance happiness, it is not acceptable for it to interfere with minorities'

happiness by suppressing their opinions, even while a sizable majority of men hold opposing beliefs.

Mill's Defense of Individuality for Liberty Democracy

While laying out the case for freedom of expression, Mill emphasizes inter-personal issues of concern to all about what is right or wrong, true or false, good or bad in "morals, religion, politics, social relations, and the business of life." This contrast with Mill's defense of individuality, which is concerned with those personal ideals of life that, if followed, do not cause harm to others. Numerous of these later topics include our shared social obligations and liabilities, the benefits and drawbacks of social institutions, and the pursuit of effective social policies.

Freedom and a range of circumstances, in Mill's thoughts, are necessary elements for the development of uniqueness. Because individuality requires making one's own decisions, freedom is essential. There must be a diversity of circumstances since the range of potential choices one can imagine greatly influences how real their decision is.

As Nwoko puts it:

"The qualities of human beings composing the society over which the government is exercised" are what determine a good system of government. Virtue and intelligence are some of these traits. The people's government will fall if their overall demeanor is one of greed, ignorance, stupidity, and vile prejudice. A government that works to advance the virtue and intelligence of its citizens is the best (Nwoko, 1988:170).

As seen in the prerequisites outlined for democracy's successful operation, democracy as a political system provides the framework for personal growth. We are emboldened to assert that any democracy that does not fundamentally reconcile the individual and collective interests of the state is likely to hinder individual development and advancement in the state. Given the preceding, we avow the belief that democracy is a way of life that necessitates the abolition of authoritarianism at all levels, including the level of the home and the classroom.

Nwoko states that:

The two main tenets that underpin the superiority of a popular government- particularly a representative democracy- are (a) the promotion of the rights and interests of all able and willing individuals and (b) the idea that "the general prosperity attains a greater height and is more widely diffused in proportion to the amount and variety of the personal energies enlisted in promoting it" (Nwoko, 1988:171).

In addition to promoting each person's uniqueness, a decent society will also aim to achieve other objectives. However, the approach taken to achieving these other objectives is dictated by the principle of individuality. This ideal establishes the framework for political activity, within which other objectives are to be pursued. The liberalism of Mill does not aim to address all of the current political issues. Individuality, however, provides a useful framework for political action in two respects. It establishes restrictions on what can be done in order to achieve other objectives, to put it broadly. It is not a goal that should be abandoned when we begin our search for other things.

Second, by arguing that avenues for its realization should be offered, it itself makes more precise claims. It's crucial to refrain from interfering with another person's actions unless necessary to protect others. The preservation and enhancement of those institutions that permit and support free speech where they currently exist, as well as the development of such institutions where they do not yet exist, are equally important. A persistent component of political action's goals is the development and preservation of a climate of tolerance. Individual people, according to Mill, are accountable for their own thoughts, feelings, preferences, and aspirations while society should

only be focused on advancing societal interests.

The state is only justified in restricting or regulating an individual's behavior when doing so is the only way to stop them from harming others by breaching their rights. Even if it is obvious that the conduct in question hurts the person who engages in it, the state has no business even attempting to repress the way that person has decided to be. As a result, according to Mill, any policy that aims to encourage moral behavior or stop people from hurting themselves is bad. Mill took careful note of many ostensible departures from the overall rule. Even in circumstances where it would be justified, interference by the government is not necessary.

For Mill, there may be other valid reasons to avoid government participation in certain aspects of a citizen's life, even if doing so does not violate their right to personal freedom. The state shouldn't be allowed to get involved if the behavior that needs to be regulated can be accomplished more effectively by individuals themselves, if doing so is more desired, or if regulation would greatly increase the social establishment's already hazardous authority.

The reality that the state is pursuing a course that is not intended to develop the individual to be able to effectively contribute to the development of the state without coercion or subjecting the individual to the preponderating influence of social collectivity, which is likely to adversely strangle the individual from developing appropriately within the state, serves as the primary foundation for this discussion of the role of the individual in forming the collective mass to move the state forward (Nwoko, 1988:172).

This means that Mill is firmly in favor of liberty; government action is only justifiably justified when it is required to safeguard other individuals from the direct harm that the conduct in question may produce. The individual's right to freedom should be unaffected by any other circumstance.

Conclusion

The development of individuals in the state, or what can also be considered as the development of human wisdom, as advanced in the idea that it engenders the emergence of self-conscious groups within society, depends on the achievement of liberty in democracy to a considerable extent. In short, the mere existence of a liberal democracy does not guarantee that it embodies democracy; rather, the true measure of democracy is the extent to which the state's members are afforded possibilities for personal growth, or better yet, individual growth.

Democracies have been embraced as a form of government in a great number of nations today, though it should be noted that this has not always been the case. In this paper, we refer to these conditions as contemporary conditions. These conditions include: (a) the primacy of civil authority over military power; (b) a high degree of equality in social and economic conditions; (c) a thriving agricultural and industrial economy; and (d) a democratic culture or mode of thought. It is noteworthy that Mill believed that what is required for democracy to succeed lies in the people having a sense of belonging to a single nation motivated by the idea of a shared center of loyalty.

In this regard, national pride, a culture of tolerance, high moral standards, universal education, economic security, and equality, to name a few, are some of the crucial prerequisites for the achievement of a just democratic society. According to the definition of democracy in this section of the paper, it does not mean that leaders and supervisors should no longer provide direction or oversight; rather, it simply means that the state's decisions should come from a procedure that enables decision-making in consultation with and with the consent of those who will be impacted by the decision. At this point, we will acknowledge the necessity for modern nations to implement representative democracy because of its strong propensity to foster the expansion and

development of individuality inside a state, which in a sense sums up the concept of civil liberty. It substantially lessens government authority over the populace and leaves them with the means to engage in political life. When the populace participates more actively in state governance, a sustainable democracy is practically feasible. Another way to put it is that representative democracy moderately provides the individual with a better possibility for intellectual, moral, and social responsibility development. The person views themselves as an unencumbered, indispensable, and integral member of the state. Individuals who participate have a decent chance to distinguish between their own interests and the interests of the state or society at large. Given the aforementioned, it is reasonable to say that in a democracy, it is necessary to safeguard the individual from the tyranny of the majority opinion and sentiment against the tendency of society to enforce harsh or undemocratic laws against those living in the state.

The position that an ideal polity is one in which there is the best possibility to establish effective administration and promote a high national character created or conceived to promote the greatest amount of beneficial effects to the people on the polity will be advanced in unambiguous words. Liberty democracy, as portrayed in democratic government, especially representative government, is one that advances the rights and interests of all able and disposed individuals while also being able to reconcile the various individual interests in the state in one common pool of consensus fabricated to facilitate or hasten the realization of an ideal society, as perceived in a democratic order that is just and sustained by the recognition of the individuality.

References

- Gauba, O. (1995). *An Introduction to Political Theory*. MacMillan.
- Hampsher-Monk, I. (1992). *A History of Modern Political Thought*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Harrison-Barbet, A. (2001) *Mastering Philosophy*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Lenard, P. (2016). *John Stuart Mill and the Importance of Individuality*. Policy Network.
- MahanJan, V. (2000). *Political Theory: Principles of Political Science*. S. Chand & Company Ltd.
- Mukherjee, S. & Ramaswamy, S. (2007) *A History of Political Thought: Plato to Marx*. Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited.
- Nwoko, M. (1988). *Basic World Political Theories*. Clarctians Institute of Philosophy.
- Rasure, E. (2022). *Who Was John Stuart Mill?* Investopedia.
- Sargent, L. (1981). *Contemporary Political Ideologies*. The Dorsey Press.