

JOHN STUART MILL'S CONCEPTION OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY AND ITS IMPACT ON CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL SOCIETIES

Orji, Chidi Paul, Ph.D.

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

Nwagbara, Rufus Godswill,

Department of Philosophy, Joel Awoniyi School of Education and Humanities,
Babcock University, Ilisan Remo, Ogun State
godswillnwagbara@gmail.com

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.30799.70560

Abstract

In his theory of the free development of individuality, Mill focused on the preservation of individual liberty as an inherent value in democratic societies. The examination in this essay will focus on John Stuart Mill's Conception of the Free Development of Individuality. The method of critical analysis will be used in this research. This can be used in x-ray study by the researcher. Individual liberty is undervalued in society, and Mill's view on it shows how it might be used to change things. This is demonstrated by Mill's position on the subject. Mill attacked mass mediocrity and majority tyranny as serious threats to individuality and liberty in order to address the question of individual liberty. Mill reminds the government that a free society and individual flourish best in that setting. As indicated by Mill, liberty is beneficial in and of itself because it fosters the development of a morally upright, intellectual, and compassionate person. Understanding the collectivity required for the expansion and development of the state is crucial for having a viable democratic framework. This study acknowledges that a person is the foundation of society. According to the article, for Mill, being unique meant having the capacity for responsible and critical thought. It represented personal growth and exercising one's free will. John Stuart Mill stresses the value of religious, moral, and political freedom for the evolution of humanity.

Keywords: Individuality, Development, Human Progress, Liberalism

Introduction

Thinkers have been baffled by the ongoing enigma surrounding the fight for individual liberty throughout history. It has been a persistent problem that many great philosophers and intellectuals throughout history have come close to solving. A quick glance at the evolution of philosophy from the early Greek era to the present day reveals a wide range of ideas intended to address the persistent problem of individual liberty. To what extent does society possess the authority to regulate and restrict the ideas, convictions, and behaviors of individuals? Philosopher John Stuart Mill believed this subject to be of utmost importance in the 19th century. Mill foresaw that such an issue “is likely to make itself recognized as the vital question of the future” in his well-known essay *On Liberty*, which was written more than a century ago. In his writings, John Stuart Mill does a fantastic job of encapsulating this idea of liberty.

Without a question, John Stuart Mill is a liberal. In Mill's philosophy, all of the elements that collectively make up the liberal viewpoint are articulated in the clearest possible terms. We see in Mill a cautious assertion of the importance of individual liberty over other political objectives as well as a firm conviction that human situation may be perpetually improved via the careful application of critical reason. Mill is credited with coining the phrase "individual right to freedom". It suggests that society lacks the right to compel someone against their will unless it's essential for self-defense, which is a negative meaning. It is independence; all restraints are undesirable. It means offering individuals as much freedom as is feasible to follow their creative impulses, energies, and self-development. For example, according to Mill, if a person's opinion and the opinion of the community differ, that person is the final arbitrator unless the community can persuade the person without using threats or coercion. The foundation for allowable interference was created by Mill. The line beyond which neither coercive nor outside involvement was permitted was any action that served the individual alone. The region that served as the model for society was the one where coercion could be used to compel an individual to adhere to certain standards of behavior.

Although Mill acknowledged the danger that governments posed, he also conjectured that a more covert and intangible social force also undermines people's freedoms. Every culture eventually adopts practices, viewpoints, attitudes, and beliefs that are deemed by the majority to be the "correct" way of thinking and doing. The majority shuns and isolates those who exhibit signs of straying from this "right" way of life, which puts pressure on them to conform and take up the socially acceptable ways of thinking and living. The main producer of conformity, based on Mill, is this social force, which he referred to as the "tyranny of the majority." Mill distinguished between two sorts of behavior: self-regarding action and other-regarding action, in order to define when he believed it was permissible for society to exert control over individuals and when it was not. Any action that directly affects solely the person conducting it is referred to as self-regarding action. While Mill held that society should be able to take action against a person if their acts cause harm to others, he also believed that people should be allowed to have and express The ability to develop one's uniqueness results from having the freedom to think and conduct as one pleases. For Mill, the ability to be different and eccentric is crucial to the advancement of society. Mill suggested that people go through "experiments of living" when they choose to live unusual lives and reject the tyranny of both governments and the majority. It is these experiments that propel social and individual progress. Any beliefs they want.

John Stuart Mill's Conception of Free Development of Individual Liberty: An Overview

Mill recognizes and endorses the aim as the "free development of individuality." Individuality is opposed by thoughtless obedience to the customs and standards of one's group. It's possible that the range of events from which customs evolved was too constrained, and even within that range, what is contained in customary behaviors may not be Mill describes and endorses the aim as the "free development of individuality." Individuality is opposed by thoughtless obedience to the customs and standards of one's group. As they may have developed within an experience spectrum that was too constrained to begin with, customary practices may not be the best reflection of particular experiences. Again, the wisdom and knowledge. Furthermore, while some men may be in a position to benefit from the understanding and wisdom inherent in their society's traditions, not all men are in this situation. An individual may stand out from others and

also experience highly bizarre circumstances. The best way to describe the encounter. Again, while the necessities of typical men living in normal circumstances may be addressed by the knowledge and wisdom found in one's society's traditions, not all men are in this situation. An individual may stand out from others and also experience highly bizarre circumstances. One was taught to (dis)approve using the first principle, adore or loathe using the second, and love, pity, or dislike using the third, according to Mukherjee and Ramaswamy. Mill noted that every human action has three components: (a) the moral element of right and evil; (b) the aesthetic component (or its beauty); and (c) the sympathetic component (or its likeability). In his opinion, diversity and personal development were the ultimate objectives, vital components of enjoyment, and the cornerstones of both individual and society advancement (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007:324).

However, Mill's fundamental criticism of blindly following tradition is that it prevents a man from having a choice if he accepts tradition simply because it is tradition. He hasn't been able to develop any of the special traits that characterize human nature, therefore in that sense; he is less of a human creature. Thus, as Harrison-Barbet argued, the expression of individuality is a requirement for human growth. Additionally, through cultivating his or her individuality, each person can become more valuable to themselves and more helpful to others (Harrison-Barbet, 2001:254). Therefore, for Mill, a key aspect of individuality is the freedom to select from a variety of worldviews and lifestyles, as well as the range and nature of those possibilities.

As Mukherjee and Ramaswamy accurately point out, Mill supported the right to uniqueness, which includes the right to choice. He emphasized the ways in which acts of self-regarding coercion would be detrimental to the formation of the self. First, using force had far more detrimental repercussions than beneficial ones. Second, coercion would be ineffective since people have such a diverse variety of needs and capacities for enjoyment. Because he was the best judge of his interests, the person had the knowledge and drives to pursue those (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007:326). Depending on the individual's personality type, the best option for them will vary from person to person. As long as they do not harm others or restrict their own development, each person should choose the lifestyle that enables them to live up to their full potential. He believes that freedom and a variety of conditions are necessary for this discovery to take place. Mill prioritizes the development of active people over inactive ones. By individuality, Mukherjee and Ramaswamy claim that Mill meant the trait in persons that permitted the investigation of ingrained ideas and habits and their subordination to the standard of reason. Freedom is the absence of limits as well as the ability to acquire some positive attributes. Without the ability to make choices, a person would not be distinguished from an ape (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007:329). With regard to Mill, individuals are different from one another and would behave differently if allowed the freedom to pursue their own life goals. The tyranny of dominating patterns creates the false reality of uniform behavior. He interprets this regularity in human behavior as proof that human nature has been forced to follow a predetermined set of routes and patterns. Some people's pathways toward self-development have been halted.

Therefore, he supports diversity and eccentricity not because he finds them good in and of themselves but rather because he believes that if uniqueness is allowed to thrive freely, human behavior will become more unique and eccentric. To John Stuart Mill, the idea of individuality is not elitist because it is a goal that each man can achieve. But he believes

that the affluent play a special role both here and elsewhere. He believes that just a small number of individuals have the ability to launch new practices. The ability to choose from a wide range of unfamiliar possibilities, however, allows the others to also become aware of their individuality. Mahanjan contends that everyone has good intentions and is capable of having his authentic self-expressed. Everybody has the ability to reason and use logic from birth. It is possible to determine what is right or wrong for oneself and for society as a whole. He has a long-term perspective and is conscious of his goals. Every person makes an effort to find happiness and stay away from pain. This results in the greatest happiness for the greatest number (Mahanjan, 2000:666–667).

The argument for individuality is also an argument for a society that is open to a wide range of influences and ideas and does not seek to control and manipulate knowledge because only in such a society can men learn what they truly value and consider important, as well as what ideas and life plans they are willing to accept. In Mill's conception of individuality, these two significant schools of social and political thought have an alternative. Therefore, it is evident that Mill persuasively defends negative freedom at the outset of his argument. However, Mill also discreetly promotes positive freedom by placing a heavy emphasis on distinctiveness. It is currently difficult to pinpoint the exact limits of the state's authority over an individual (Harrison-Barbet, 2001:255). Despite the fact that Mill emphasizes self-improvement a lot, it is obvious that he is not supporting a philosophy of selfishness; rather, he argues that individualism is necessary for the welfare and advancement of society (Harrison-Barbet, 2001:255).

Mill's and Political Liberalism

The perception of modern liberalism has been greatly influenced by John Stuart Mill. His kind of liberalism emphasized the importance of the individual while denouncing collective weakness. He grounded his liberal ideals on the pragmatic and utilitarian, enabling the blending of individualized notions of liberty with a more rights-based perspective. Political Thought by J.S. Mills was essentially a trumpet call for political liberalism to be used as a practical or effective social engineering tool. As Gauba accurately notes, John Stuart Mill argued in his book Representative Government (1861) that the growth of democracy requires a mono-national state. There have been a lot of new states created all around the world since J.S. Mill wrote his book on representative government. Most of these states are populated by individuals of varied racial and religious backgrounds as well as nationalities and traditions. (Gauba, 1995:302-303).

In this regard, Mill maintains that an individual is free to act whichever he pleases so long as he doesn't do harm to others. His concept of the free development of individuality is predicated on the idea that people are capable of making rational decisions about their welfare and practicing any religion they choose while living under the control of the state (i.e., the government), and that the state (i.e., the government) should or frequently interferes when it serves the interests of preserving society. Is Mill's assertion not comparable to that of the minimalist? In this instance, the issue naturally arises. By encouraging utility in the broadest sense while undermining the long-term interests of man as a progressive being, the "harm principle," which functions through the state, has the effect of compromising the role of the government. The persistent and vehement devotion to the damage principle (accepting the freedom of individuals to act as they desire, so long as they cause least harm to others) is crucial to the assurance or realization of the "free development of individuality" or the growth of our humanity. Mill's claim is vividly detailed by the diverse political demands for political liberalism made by various political

theories and thinkers. Guaba contends that a number of these nations have effective democracies. Therefore, for democracy to flourish there must be a sense of belonging to a single nation, driven by a sense of sharing a common history, a common life in the present, a common future, as well as a shared center of loyalty (Gaub, 1995:303).

The human body has evolved abilities and qualities that can be achieved under the right conditions, as noted by J. S. Mills as well as the dynamic nature of human society. Human nature is thus demonic as opposed to static. And one can only realize their full potential as a human being and contribute to the social growth of the human race by making proper use of their freedom. Here, there are distinguishing characteristics of actions that affect other people.

Mill's conviction that political liberalism should be based on the principles of free speech and thought. He provided proof in support of his claim to freedom. Humans are exceptional beings who strive for freedom and use it to the fullest extent possible. The fact that bifurcating activities only affect one's self and others is added to this. The relationship between actions that enhance skills and those that enhance human capacities more generally has been deciphered by Mills.

Through promoting actions driven by freedom, the finest in human potential is realized. Because of this, every action our species takes should bring about the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people. What is morally right in this case is to ensure everyone's enjoyment while promoting the free development of individuality. J.S. Mill believed that liberty was more of a fundamental foundation for rights inside the polity and the state than it was an amendment. Furthermore, it is thought that free people may serve as the basis for political stability.

The dignity and equality of every person and the right to individual liberty, particularly the freedom to possess and manage private property, can clash when it becomes apparent that some people's property rights and other people's dignity cannot be reconciled. Conflicts within the state over individuals' rights to freedom as well as the issue of how much the government can restrict an individual's freedom of action are problems that worsen this line of demarcation.

Democracy, according to Asirvatham and Misra, raises the general public's status. The foundation of it is the notion that a man will value something he has achieved for himself significantly more than something that has been handed to him by another person. It is the best means of fostering initiative, independence, and personal responsibility. Since democracy produces a higher and better form of national character than any other polity, it offers the greatest benefit, in J. S. Mill's opinion (Asirvatham & Misra, 2000:450). This section's defense of Mill's connection to individual liberty, which is held in high regard, provides the framework for elaborating his brand of political liberalism, which typically backs the freedom to disagree with the status quo in both political and religious matters and maintains that the protection of individual liberty is the purpose of government. It is obvious that man wants to change from conventional thinking. By laying forth in clear, particular detail a framework that demonstrates how and when a government should become involved in the private lives of citizens, Mill carefully articulates two essential positions. The restricted involvement of government in people's lives as a result of political liberalism is the first point. The core premise is that individuality is fundamentally one of the requirements for human well-being and that finding happiness is impossible without it.

Individual and Social Progress

Without a doubt, Mill argues that behaviors and thoughts should not be allowed the same degree of freedom and that both must be controlled when they will cause harm or annoyance to others. The expression of individuality, according to Mill, is essential for both individual and society growth. The importance of individuality for the growth of the self is mentioned by Mill. It is telling that Mill is concerned about the suppression of uniqueness in both the legal and social arenas. His views on social advancement are intimately tied to his views on individuality and conformity. Mill believed that political participation was the only way for citizens to acquire the cognitive skills of reason and judgment. Civic participation increases both autonomy and generosity: autonomy through self-government and altruism through identifying societal needs (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007:339). From Mill's theories, we may deduce that a person perfects himself by a free and dynamic evolution of himself and through connections with individuals who live in various ways; as a result, truth is upheld in society through discussion and dispute. It is audibly established that uniformity leads to social stagnation. In his political liberalism account, people are seen as naturally different and ought to be permitted to explore their distinctions. Individuality should be prioritized over group interests, notwithstanding how crucial they are. This will stop the more capable members of society from oppressing the less capable ones.

According to the circumstances offered by the conflict between individuality and societal growth, a society will be created by more effective governance by evolved citizens that is free to push new ideas and challenge the predominate viewpoint. The level of freedom a state grants its citizens allows them to actively pick a course that will ultimately lead to advancement for both themselves and society. Therefore, the government cannot prevent its citizens from advancing in society. According to the aforementioned point of view, fewer governmental constraints would stop an increasingly powerful majority from persecuting a person. The argument being made is that social progress is possible as long as the fundamental principles of individuality and personal development are respected for both the individual and society as a whole.

As stated by Mukherjee and Ramaswamy, people must have the freedom to participate in the management of their country, their place of employment, and to resist the dictatorship of modern bureaucracy. A sense of community can only exist if everyone has the opportunity to cast a ballot (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007:339). For Mill, social progress can only be thought of in a free society. Taking personal initiative is actually said to benefit in a person's mental development. This viewpoint vehemently opposes societal control and encourages individual initiative, both of which will eventually result in social progress or advancement. The overview of Mill's perspectives on individual and societal development restricts such governmental or social control measures, contending that they always pose a threat to liberty and must be carefully supervised to prevent unintentionally impeding the state's citizens from achieving adequate development. This paper presents the thesis that individualism increases liberty and that it is a crucial element of social progress in a free society, in accordance with political liberals with comparable temperaments. The unfettered development of individuality in terms of the presence and potential of personal initiative without interference from centralized governmental authority would lead to the realization of social progress. The realization of freedom and individuality in society requires both freedom and a variety of environmental conditions. However, how other community goals are to be achieved depends on the individual's ideal. The idea of uniqueness serves as the foundation for political life, and we must always

operate within that framework. Mill argues in favor of more personal freedom than was previously the case in society in his critique of political liberalism. In response to the foraging idea, we will argue that a stance of non-interference disposition on the part of government, with people's conduct, except to prevent certain unfavorable or hostile acts or actions of others, would hasten the realization of a situation in which a society experiences a significant level of protection, improvement, and development of the institutions that allow and encourage free discussion (where they already exist), as well as the development of the institutions that allow and encourage religious freedom. The development of a society that allows for open discourse in an African context, notably in Nigeria, is inevitably the outcome of political action's constant goal of establishing and maintaining a climate of tolerance.

Evaluation of Mill's Conception of Free Development of Individual Liberty

This would be carried out, but in light of both its advantages and disadvantages, to make Mill's theoretical concept of free development practicable in a democratic society.

Liberty, the Individual, and the State

Realizing the value of liberty for citizens of a state is essential. The existential freedom that places people in a state of realizing their potential in a good position to experience self-realization and development gives them greater practical viability. Mill's persuasive defense of the concept of the free development of individuality liberates one from constraints that prohibit people from freely developing their identities. Despite the apparent differences, the state could act in a negative way toward the person. Mill sets out to qualitatively argue for a position that emphasizes the quality of life for the individual in order to advance the realization of a social and political arrangement that takes into consideration the need for the individual in the state to enjoy a large amount of space to freely develop positively. An appeal for political liberalism, a political theory that affirms the defense of individual liberty as the goal of government, is made by John Stuart Mills' clear statement that different people require different surroundings for their growth and that no single style of living will fit everyone. Individuality, according to Mukherjee and Ramaswamy, is the capacity for responsible thought and critical analysis. It represented developing oneself and exercising one's free will. Because these freedoms were crucial to the development of humanity, he placed a strong emphasis on them (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007:327–328). Due to the foregoing, it thus focuses on how society might be shaped by people in ways that gravely endanger the traditional state structure.

A significant obstacle to the ossifying tendencies of conforming to custom is the idea that such uncritical acceptance of custom typically depicts the failure of the individual persons in the state to make choices and, in the end, falls to confirm his being a human person who is free to act, choose, and initiate new things aimed at his development and that of the state. When a person is able to make judgments that would be exceptionally advantageous to him and the state as a whole, it demonstrates that their goals and sentiments are the result of their own conscious choices and are not passively created products of external factors. The aforementioned viewpoint further clarifies J.S. Mill's assertion that individuality is comprised of one's readiness to make deliberate, purposeful decisions among many worldviews and ways of living, as well as of the extent and nature of those options. Mukherjee and Ramaswamy claim that Mill only applied the idea of liberty to adults, ignoring children, those with disabilities, those who are mentally ill, and societies that were deemed savage because of how race was perceived. Lack of education may limit people's freedom. According to him, more advanced civilizations should be free, whereas

less advanced civilizations should adhere to strict authoritarian or paternalistic rules (Mukherjee & Ramaswamy, 2007:328). Mill's idea of free individuality produced the necessity for the state to acknowledge the apparent distinctions that marked the numerical makeup of people in the state. Here, liberty should establish a setting where each person is free to select a manner of living that would allow them to reach their greatest potential, with the caveat that they do not injure others or obstruct their own development in the process. It is now clear that Mill's concept of the free development of individuality seeks to prevent liberty and the imperative necessity for the development of the individual person in a state from being diminished under the pretense of defending the state's general interest. In this case, the individual's rights within the state shouldn't be sacrificed on the altar of the greater good unless doing so would successfully advance and safeguard that individual's freedom and development within the state. It should be noted that in his philosophical thinking on the free evolution of personality, Mill places more emphasis on the realization of active individuals than passive people. In this case, the individual is depicted as an active participant or instrument in the reform and reconstruction of the state.

As Mahajan pointed out, Mill made a strong case for the greatest amount of personal liberty while emphasizing the necessity of human development. To be free from the tyranny of the state or the tyranny of the mob, in his opinion, is a fundamental right. According to him, the government lacked the power to crush divergent points of view (Mahajan, 2000:665). The significance of this contribution is demonstrated by the requirement that societies advance in accordance with individuals' meaningful contributions to the development of the state. The state must not oppress people or force them to act in ways that are regularly at odds with their natural tendencies from J.S. Mill's anthropological perspective on the person or man. Given the foregoing, it follows that certain avenues for self-development would be obstructedly blocked if a person's or a human being's ability to chart out or launch new routes is limited. This makes it obvious that Mill believes that the possibility and reality of free individual growth must exist in order for the state to naturally function well without being constrained by organic structure. Admittedly, Mill's focus on the importance of allowing personality to grow unrestrictedly clarifies why it is crucial for a state to support abnormalities and idiosyncrasies in human conduct because these are seen as evidence of individuality. As a result, we will advance the notion that a democratic state, as understood and promoted by J.S. Mill in his writings, does not lead to a society that is structurally classed, ultimately preventing the people of the state from effectively contributing to the progress and development of the state. An open society is one in which a variety of influences and ideas are permitted to be aired without the ossifying attempt to seek control and manipulate knowledge as depicted in several closed societies where individual freedom and views are appallingly stifled or stunted. J.S. Mill's audacious defense of individuality (in terms of the free development of individuality) is a pass-make for such a society. In the light of Mills' theory, it makes sense that a society that values individuals' freedom to develop their unique selves would foster a friendly environment where men (individuals) could discover what they truly value and regard as significant, as well as what ideas and plans they are willing to accept. Mahajan contends that no outside influence can prevent a person's faculties from developing in the best way possible. Government interference usually erodes a person's sense of freedom and limits their ability to make responsible decisions on their own (Mahajan, 2000:667).

It is significant to remember that Mill rejected the views and wants of men as they are today as the ultimate foundation for political reasoning in his concept of the free development of

individuals. The reason for this is that according to Mill, attempting such a course without considering how these beliefs are formed would be to surrender to the tyranny of contemporary orthodoxies. On the other hand, paternalism happens when such notions (the current attitudes and wishes of individuals) are completely discarded in favor of trying to force enlightened norms on everyone despite their explicit inclinations. Paternalism, by its very nature, inhibits human liberty and freedom. The claim made here is that Mill's conception of individuality articulates the need for alternatives to those two significant traditions of social and political thought that attempt to either recognize and uphold the existing traditions or create a new order that doesn't take into account the existing views and desires of men but intends to impose a new standard on everyone. According to Mukherjee and Ramaswamy, Mill wanted to protect the person's private area. He has the right to bring out the fact that a society can be just as oppressive as a political one.

Implications of Mill's Notion of the Free Development of Individuality

This section will begin by making it clear that the importance of the individual in question cannot be undervalued if a society is to experience true progress. However, a number of philosophical questions keep coming up when we read Mill's philosophical arguments for the free development of personality. How much autonomy should citizens of a state have? What is the very least that the government could do to better the lives of its citizens? What institutional or operational policies should be followed when there is a conflict of interests between members of society in order to end the impasse and pursue a common objective for social development and advancement? We need to underline that the aforementioned concerns can and should not be downplayed for a variety of reasons in order to realize the ideal society that Mill envisioned. This segment would mostly concentrate on how little restraint should not be imposed on him, even though the person should be free. The aforementioned shows that Mill begins his case by eloquently advocating negative freedom; nevertheless, Mill covertly advocates positive freedom by placing a significant emphasis on uniqueness. It is currently difficult to pinpoint the exact limits of the state's authority over an individual (Harrison-Barbet, 2001:255). A lot of the arguments made by proponents of individualism, especially those put forth by J.S. Mill and founded on the notion of the free development of individuality, have occasionally been mistakenly believed to be faultless, undermining the role of the state in governing or managing the lives of those who reside in the state. Philosophers and political theorists of various temperaments have responded to the dominant claim of the individualists and worked to demonstrate how important it is to permit the individual to be at least minimally conscripted by the state in order to achieve social progress in the pursuit of realizing a just social order.

Those who accept the counterargument to individualism reject the notion that the state is a necessary evil and instead believe that it is the result of man's social instinct. Academics assert that J.S. Mill's theory of the free evolution of individuality must concur with the contemporary notion that the state should be a welfare institution whose primary goal is to promote human personality development. According to JS Mill, expanding state activities (powers) would always result in more laws, which would eventually reduce personal freedom. Strong or moderate criticism of various kinds has been directed at specific individuals. It is stated that no person is as intelligent as individualism proponents have continuously claimed to be, hence it is almost certainly true that no person is the greatest judge of his or her own interests. Additionally, while how magnificently high Mill's theories may appear to be individualist, it has been noted that they really favor open competition, which has been said to be detrimental to society. Because it encourages

exploitation, it has been proposed that trade, industry, and other fundamental parts of society should be governed and regulated by the state. Planning has been said to have substantially benefited society and not at all impeded individual freedom (as far as the state is concerned).

J.S. Mill's thesis on the free development of individuality would lead to a situation where the person prefers to seek higher aims regardless of whether his activities are useful to the state, if it were to be applied in this situation. Unrestrained individuality causes issues, and at the absolute least, a state ought to exert tighter control over its citizens' daily life. Hampsher-Monk contends that there is a crucial distinction between "self-regarding" and "other-regarding" activities, which affects what we should be able to condemn or outlaw (politically through government or informally as a society). How interrelated we believe people to be affects, among other things, whether this restriction is viable. One viewpoint holds that there might not even be any self-centered activity (Hampsher-Monk, 1992:377).

Even while J. S. Mill's idea of the free development of individuality has been criticized for promoting free competition, history has shown that this method primarily worsens the conditions of the state's inhabitants rather than improving them. The outcome is a system where the wealthiest become richer and the poor get poorer, and it appears to operate as a basis for unfettered capitalism. As a result, the state is mentioned in order to act as a brake on competition for the good of society at large. As explained by Harrison-Barbet: For Mill to have a right, it would seem to be to have a distinct and specific expectation of behavior on the part of another person (an expectation derived from positive law, custom, desert, or agreement), the failure to fulfill which could materially affect one's identifiably beneficial interest (and not just one's feelings). These rights outline the line separating selfish and altruistic behavior (Harrison-Barbet, 1992:379).

The overall guideline, according to Harrison-Barbet, is that people should be free to act however they like as long as they respect these rights. Although this justification helps to clarify Mill's stance slightly, it also presents him with fresh problems (Harrison-Barbet, 1992:379). According to experience, regulation has frequently aided people in developing their personalities, which runs counter to the idea advanced by individualists like J.S. Mills that intervention impedes or slows individual features or development. As a result, the concept of a welfare state, which has the potential to greatly benefit its citizens, should be permitted. The objection to government regulation or control is dismissed as being unpersuasive. The core argument presented by the opponents of atomism and advocates of state control has always been that society is organic and cannot be ignored, and that each person is not an atom but a valuable component of the whole. The individualist claim made by the state that its acts are less successful than those of people has traditionally been one of the key arguments made by political liberals against governmental authority.

Conclusion

The main goal of this essay has been to critically analyze John Stuart Mill's Notion of Free Development of Individuality with a focus on the rationale for government control put forth by individualists. We assert that neither private nor public action is inherently harmful or advantageous. Everything depends on the nature of the activity; most importantly, the machinery of the state can be utilized to promote growth and development, while in other cases, the duty can be assigned to independent, private groups or businesses to effectuate behavioral changes.

In some circumstances, society may be better able to guide and safeguard man than he is able to do on his own and alone. Man will now more than ever want to do only what will be to his greatest advantage, which serves as evidence of this. This is seen when the government places restrictions on the construction of new buildings. For instance, people may be required to get immunizations to protect themselves from certain diseases, drinking water may only be obtained from specific sources, and certain building types may not be allowed in certain state jurisdictions if they would impede the expansion and development of the jurisdiction. This essay has shown how really concerned Mill was for both the people and the state. Thus, he makes the unambiguous argument that the only justification for people to interfere with another person's ability to pursue their own interests, whether individually or collectively, is for self-protection. The only justification for using authority against the desire of any member of a civilized community is to protect others from harm. This work established the correlation that individualism is not entirely unfounded because it is based on the belief in an individual's right to liberty, which is consistent with the current demand for individual liberties. This connection will be made despite the shortcomings in the various defenses of state control put forth by opponents of individualism. People encourage self-reliance (concerning the actual development of individuals in the state) by highlighting the dangers of government involvement. It underlines how important individual development is for the welfare of society and people in general.

References

- Asirvatham, E. & Misra, k. (2000). *Political Theory*. S. Chand & Company Ltd.
- Gauba, O. (1995). *An Introduction to Political Theory*. MacMillan.
- Hampsher-Monk, I. (1992). *History of Modern Political Thought*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Harrison-Barbet, A. (2001). *Mastering Philosophy*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kato, C. (2000). *Democracy in Nigeria: Continuing Dialogues for Nation- Building*. Bulls Tryckeri.
- 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.
- Onigbinde, A. (1999). *What is Philosophy?* Frontline Resources pub.
- Rasure, E. (2022). *Who Was John Stuart Mill?* Investopedia.
- Sargent, L. (1981). *Contemporary Political Ideologies*. The Dorsey Press.