



A Socio-political Analysis work of John Stuart Mill's Theory of Liberty and his Utilitarian Premises

ID No.4030

(PP 340 - 347)

<https://doi.org/10.21271/zjhs.25.5.24>

Mahir Abdulwahid Aziz

College of Arts - Department of Social Work / Salahaddin University-Erbil

Received: 02/04/2021

Accepted: 07/10/2021

Published: 20/11/2021

Abstract

This theoretical study deals with the most influential British philosopher of the nineteenth century, namely John Stuart Mill (1806 – 1873). The study offers a socio-political interpretation of Mill's views on Liberty and Utilitarian Premises in a descriptive way. The objective of this study is to elaborate and discuss his major contribution in the field of liberal theory by focusing on his very well-known book *On Liberty* published in 1859. The aim of the study however, is to problematize the main points in which Mill focused in his philosophical argument on liberal thinking and liberty. The main argument of this study is that there is a clear inconsistency between Mill's theory of Liberty and his Utilitarian premises. In doing so, the study is divided into eight sections. Section one is devoted to the introduction. Section two shows the objectives of the study and the method in which applied. Section three raises the major questions in which the study tries to answer. Section four briefly assesses Mill's relationship to Jeremy Bentham. Section five analyses Mill's very famous work, *On Liberty*. Section six focuses on Mill's views on liberalism and humanism. Section seven discusses Mill's Utilitarianism, individuality and the inconsistencies in his theory of liberty. Section eight demonstrates the conclusion in a critical assessment. The objectives of this theoretical study are: firstly, to elaborate and discuss his major contribution in the field of liberal theory by focusing on his very well-known book *On Liberty* published in 1859, secondly, to problematize the main points in which Mill focused in his philosophical arguments on liberal thinking and liberty. *On Liberty* is well known as one of great classic texts in modern political theory. Methodologically, the study lies at the intersection of sociology, political science, and liberty theory. It should be emphasised that this study has been done according to a historical and an explanatory approach method, which applied in both fields of political theory and political sociology. The explanatory approach is a method to make us understand something by describing and illustrating. Its intents merely to explore the research questions and does not offer final and conclusive solutions to the exciting questions. Therefore, this study uses the literature research and text analysis as a tool for it.

Keywords: Liberty, Liberalism, Utilitarian, Humanism, Individualism.

1. Introduction

John Stuart Mill was born in a time when the Industrial Revolution was transforming England. Mill had no formal education and practiced no religion, but was schooled at home in order to become a perfect utilitarian. This led Mill to become very independent and get his first job as a Clerk by the age of seventeen. He was known as a radical reformer, and suffered a depression at the age of twenty which he bounced back by reading poetry. Mill believed in Liberalism where society was best served by the maximum number of people being free with minimal government. Hence, the Utilitarian does not wish to free individuals at the cost of happiness; whereas the Libertarian does not wish to restrict an individual's liberty regardless of whether the individual is happy or sad thereafter. To discuss the main argument that formed the inconsistency of Mill's theory of liberty and his utilitarian premises, it is useful to summarise, very briefly, the main strands of Mill's theoretical thinking throughout his most popular and best-known work *On Liberty*, published in 1859. Mill's central theme in this book is: what he calls the 'very simple principle' of liberty. He believed that people had the ability to make the right choice over the wrong one. However what Mill has become most well-known for was his concept of liberty and rights. He believed that people had the ability to make the right choice



over the wrong one, and he also helped support feminism, perhaps due to the influence of his wife Harriet Taylor (1807-1858). He believed that those who were knowledgeable should be able to vote; no matter their gender. However what Mill has become most well-known for was his concept of liberty and rights. (Watkins, 1966: 154 -157). In an essay titled *The Subjection of Women* Mill argues in favour of legal and social equality between men and women. He writes that 'the legal subordination of one sex to the other' is 'wrong in itself, and now one of the chief hindrances to human improvement' At the time that Mill wrote *The Subjection of Women*, women could not vote. A married woman was not a separate legal entity from her husband, and any property or money she owned came under his governance. (Mill, 1869: 1),

2. The Objectives of the Study and the Method

This study offers a socio-political interpretation of John Stuart Mill's views of Liberty and Utilitarian Premises in a descriptive way. The objectives are: firstly, to elaborate and discuss his major contribution in the field of liberal theory by focusing on his very well-known book *On Liberty* published in 1859, secondly, to problematize the main points in which Mill focused in his philosophical arguments on liberal thinking and liberty. *On Liberty* is well known as one of great classic texts in modern political theory. The main argument of the study is that there is a clear inconsistency between Mill's theory of Liberty and his Utilitarian premises. Mill's Utilitarian premises cannot be reconciled with his doctrine of Liberty.

Methodologically, the study lies at the intersection of sociology, political science, and liberty theory. It should be emphasised that this study has been done according to a historical and an explanatory approach method, which applied in both fields of political theory and political sociology. The explanatory approach is a method to make us understand something by describing and illustrating. It intends merely to explore the research questions and does not offer final and conclusive solutions to the exciting questions. Therefore, this study uses the literature research and text analysis as a tool for it in which the study relies on.

3. The Major Questions of the Study

To achieve the objectives, the study tries to answer the following four vital questions:

- 1- To what extent can Mill's philosophical and socio-political thinking on liberty and utilitarianism as separate concepts, be inconsistent and self-contradictory?
- 2- Into which category does John Stuart Mill fall, was he a utilitarian or a libertarian, on the assumption that freedom and individuality are crucial components of Mill's Liberalism.
- 3- To what extent utilitarian ethic for Mill is compatible with the ideas of freedom and progress, as it is based on the majoritarian principle, which aims to maximise the quantity of happiness for the greatest number of individuals.
- 4- How then does he attempt to reconcile his theory of liberty and utilitarianism, did Mill have a consistent view of liberty and its limits?

4. John Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham

The British philosopher and legal theorist Jeremy Bentham (1748-1831) was the founder of the Utilitarian School, according to which pleasure maximizing; pain avoiding (the so-called felicific calculus) is the source of human motivation. (McClean, 1984: 33). His solution was the principle of utility, which maintained that the end of politics and legislation was human happiness, which in turn was based on maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain. This principle was first expressed in the book titled *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, published in 1789. For Bentham, it was essential to define happiness by referring to real things, i.e., sensations of pleasure and pain. In his view those who believed in the theory of natural law could base their judgments of right and wrong simply on their own feelings, not on an external standard. Bentham called their approach the principle of sympathy and antipathy. (Schofield, 2009: 28-31).



John Stuart Mill formed his political opinions at a very young age. This can be attributed to the fact that he was under the influence of his father, James Mill (1773-1836), - a recognised supporter of the Benthamite Utilitarian school of thought. His father who wished to mould his son's political and philosophical thought on Benthamite Utilitarian lines introduced the young Mill to the Utilitarian doctrine at an early age. But Mill developed political opinions of his own that deviated from what James Mill and Jeremy Bentham had taught. Mill refined Benthamite Utilitarianism on the criteria of quality, to suggest instead that quality of happiness is more important to an individual than is its quantity. (Schofield, 2009: 44-45). Bentham himself was always more interested in quality than quantity ... [his] analysis is qualitative rather than quantitative. (Harrison, 1983: 149 & 162). According to Bentham everyone should be allowed to pursue his own form of happiness in his own way. The increase of happiness became, therefore, the justification of for democracy in the utilitarian wing of the English radical movement at the beginning of nineteenth century. (Heater, 1960: 128).

To appreciate this form of happiness mankind needs to enjoy freedom. It can be argued that Liberalism of all political ideologies, contemporary to Mill's political writings, was particularly apt to his aim. Liberalism offered a suitable path for Mill to attain his objective. We can say that Liberalism considers individuals themselves as the seat of moral value and each individual as of equal worth. (Schofield, 2009: 45-47).

5. Analysis of John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty*

The book *On Liberty*, applies Mill's ethical system of utilitarianism to society and the state. Mill attempts to establish standards for the relationship between authority and liberty. He focuses on the importance of individuality, which he conceived as a prerequisite to the higher pleasures (the part and parcel of utilitarianism). Hence, the individual should be free to choose his or her own destiny. Liberalism may be morally neutral to the ends people choose for themselves, but it is not morally neutral in its view that such individual choice is desirable and must be safeguarded from unwarranted interference from the state. Mill's *On Liberty* is regarded by many as a great political work, which is remembered for many of its virtues, none more so than that "one very simple principle" upon which Mill set a high value whose introduction was the purpose for which he wrote *On Liberty*. "That principle is that the sole end for which mankind is warranted, individually or collectively, in the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any number. His interfering with the liberty of action of any of their members is self-protection. That own good either physical or moral is not a sufficient warrant" (Mill, 1946: 8). In *On Liberty* itself, Mill seems to indicate that the basis of his argument in the book is founded in the principles of utility: "is proper to state that I forgo any advantage which could be derived to my argument from the idea of abstract right, as a thing independent of utility. I regard utility as the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions; but it must be utility in the largest sense, grounded on the permanent interests of man as a progressive being. Those interests, I contend, authorize the subjection of individual spontaneity to external control, only in respect to those actions of each, which concern the interest of other people". (Mill, 1946: 10-11).

To judge *On Liberty* in the light of this principle alone would be to appreciate only one single part of his aim. This is not to say that this principle is of less importance than that of its desired effect. On the contrary, this principle is central to Mill's argument. Not only does it offer a defence for individual Liberty, for which it is commonly quoted, but also to view it without his argument for individuality is to see it exclusively as a defensive principle ignoring the value Mill placed on individuality, originality, self-development and progress (Williams, 1993: 255).

6. John Stuart Mill between Liberalism and Humanism

It is the defensive position that is the necessary means to attain the assertive position. The British philosopher and political theorist Alan Ryan who is recognised as the authority on the development of modern liberalism, and especially the work of John Stuart Mill, argues that to



think of Mill as a libertarian who wished to free the individual from the clutches of the state power and society, is to misinterpret the effect to which he wished his essay to be put. Mill's objective was to assert humanism - a mode of living for individuals in society by which they can all contribute to a nation's progress; however, this could not be attained in the absence of liberty, as liberty was the precondition to self-development and individuality. Likewise, progress could only be achieved through those in whom individuality was pronounced. It seems as though the utilitarian ethic is incompatible with the ideas of freedom and progress, as it is based on the majoritarian principle, which aims to maximise the quantity of happiness for the greatest number of individuals. (Ryan, 1974: 130). A utilitarian ethic based on the majoritarian principle will have to concede that there will be cases where people are made happier by giving them less freedom rather than more. (Ryan, 1974: 131). It is interesting to see the value Mill placed on freedom as a means to an end - the end being happiness. Freedom is not just the means, according to Mill but an essential element of the end itself. (Ryan, 1974: 133). This leads us back to Mill's refinement of Benthamite Utilitarianism to his theory of utilitarianism. According to Mill, the ultimate goal is the same as its predecessor but the quality of happiness is the same important. One can only seek higher pleasures if one has the liberty to do so, liberty being the central principle underlying Mill's ethical theory, Utilitarianism, and his political theory, Liberalism. It is by this principle, liberty that individuals are able to go beyond their habitual feelings: inquire into the validity of existing theories and opinions held by others and if this is not possible, then by adopting a devil's advocate strategy, one can question the validity of one's own opinion. In short, civilized individuals with the aid of freedom are able to employ their mental faculties to the extent their intellects allow them to. What follows from this is that each one of these individuals will be able to help him and also offer help to others, all in the pursuit of progress. The counter case may be made by asking how it relates to Mill's one very simple principle - the classic defence of liberty, and is there any benefit in being free and an unhappy person when one can be less free and happier? Mill's analogy is that of a pig who experience a large quantity of low-quality pleasure as compared to Socrates who experienced the highest quality of pleasure, but of scant amplitude. (Mill, 1962: 260). Mill argued that by enjoying freedom and attempting to question views hitherto accepted at face value, an individual would actually increase his powers of reasoning-which were at that time lacking in a large proportion of mankind. Mill considered the individuals who deliberately rejected knowledge and the power to which it gave access as an inhuman like. Likewise, Mill is interested in the Socrates type of happiness rather than the Pig - like quantity. Similarly, he suggested that if we took the opportunity to inquire into our reasons for not liking someone's behaviour, we might well discover that our dislike stemmed from something quite other than a moral reason (Ryan, 1974: 135).

It could be that this individual had merely deviated from what is acknowledged as the norm in society. However, his action might still be within the legal framework of the state and also be morally acceptable in society. To give a modern example and in a very well-known short essay, the British political philosopher John Watkins (1924-1999), emphasises this, he revisits the objection to Mill's theory concerning drunkenness-that society had the right to stop men drinking because of the harm they do to others-by citing smoking. On the ground that smoking causes lung cancer, utilitarian could justify stopping people from smoking, Mill would say that this was 'society interfering with people for their own good, rather than to prevent them from harming others'. Thus, as pointed by Watkins "It seems to be not really men's outward actions but only their inward thoughts and feelings that Mill's principle safeguards" (Watkins, 1966: 158). Basically, by executing his action this person had not caused any harm to another person than himself. In that case, society should refrain from infringing on the liberty of this person, as the individual is sovereign over his own mind and body (Day, 1993: 226). It is here that Mill attempts to draw the distinction between the self-regarding and other-regarding actions. Given that, the number of actions available for a human being to take is in effect infinite, as are the



motives both for taking them or abstaining from doing so; one is also giving reason for the doubt and controversy in Mill's case in this matter. Mill admitted in the second chapter of *On Liberty* that liberty of discussion is connected somewhat awkwardly with 'the very simple principle'. Liberty of thought and the liberty of expressing and publishing opinions are 'practically inseparable'. Thus Mill gets to the desired conclusion in two steps. His 'very simple principle' demands liberty of private thought; and this in turn demands liberty of public expression. (Watkins, 1966: 159).

7. John Stuart Mill's Utilitarianism, Individuality and the inconsistencies in his theory of Liberty

It is interesting to learn how Mill's Utilitarian ethic that takes higher pleasure into account, offers a suitable training ground in matters that require reasoning. This ethic would enable all individuals in society to consider other people's actions in a reasonable way. They would think twice before doing anything that might be deemed to infringe on another person's liberty, more important, they would consider the nature of this action with an open mind. By employing their mental faculties, they would be able to differentiate between actions that entailed such infringement-i.e., that cause direct harm to others-from one, which did not. A sharp distinction would be made between moral and aesthetic judgments. Eccentric behaviour, for example, is usually subjected to the former. The notions of eccentricity and individuality are interrelated to such an extent that in the context of Mill, they mean one and the same thing. However, not all individuals in the society are eccentric or individualistic; on the contrary, these characteristics are recognised in only a small section of society- the elite minority as some commentators such as Cowling have contested. Mill praises the concepts of eccentricity and individuality throughout *On Liberty* considering them to be the fundamental element of progress, and considers individuals who identify themselves with those values worthy of respect. Alan Ryan suggests that the need for elite is stated unequivocally by Mill, and in such extreme terms that it is not surprising that commentators have thought of the *On Liberty* as a defence of "an elite corps of brave spirits". (Ryan, 1974: 142). "The initiation of all wise or noble things comes and must come from individual, generally at first from some one individual. The honour and glory of the average man is that he is capable of following that initiative, that he can respond internally to wise and noble things and be led to them with his eyes open" (Ryan, 1974: 142). This suggests that the elite are an asset as they are the initiators of all wise and noble things and the idea that an average man may be led to the wise and noble things with his eyes open calls for the need for freedom amongst all men. The purpose of this is that every man is able to appreciate the purpose and significance of an elite minority in whom individuality is pronounced. Mill is particularly sympathetic towards this minority group. He suggests that the majority ought to be grateful, rather than resentful of individuals who devote their lives on behalf of all sections of society in the pursuit of new truths through their varied approaches to their existence. Although it is apparent that Mill considered the new way of living discovered by individual members of the elite individually with much respect as he considered them to be progressive, he was yet more optimistic about a related view. (Ryan, 1974: 146).

This was the argument that if the elite were able to demonstrate the superiority of their mode of being despite hostility and hindrance of the majority, then the majority by observing an improvement in the quality of their own lives would appreciate the worth of the elite minority. Another inconsistency in Mill's theory, that the question of who is eligible for Liberty in the first instance. For there is no need to stress the value that Mill places on liberty, that it should be of utmost important to every civilized individual in society as it is fundamental to his or her well-being. Man is ape-like without it. Liberty is what distinguishes us from animals, in that we are free and have that freedom of choice to deliberate and act in the way we ourselves desire. According to Mill, one of the preconditions for being granted liberty is that of being civilized. Liberty is for the civilized and not for the barbarians. Presumably, the barbarians would have



abused the privilege of being at Liberty. However, it is difficult to see to whom Mill refers when he mentions the terms "civilized" and "barbaric". More important is the criteria he uses to differentiate a civilized individual from one who was uncivilized or "barbaric". The British political philosopher Alan Ryan argues that the distinction drawn in *On Liberty* is not between the English elite and the English working class, but between the nineteenth century English as a whole and the Indian under Akbar (Ryan, 1974: 128). Hence, according to Ryan, Mill considered the English as a whole to be the civilized group and the Indian sub-continent to be barbaric, with the exception of China, of course, which Mill considered as a stagnant pool, a civilized nation that had ceased to progress as did any nation that was also on the verge of becoming uncivilized. That is the danger Mill feared most in the case of England which could also have fallen into the state China had done - a stagnant pool if the Liberty of all its subjects was not protected, as it was this group particularly in the case of the elite minority who were more likely than the multitude to have their Liberty infringed as a consequence of their unshackled actions. If Mill considered the English as the "civilized" and the Indian as the "uncivilized", what would be the justification for Mill granting Liberty to an ignorant Englishman and denying it to the most able of all Indians?

In addition to this, how can one reconcile Mill's second precondition for being eligible for Liberty - that is the Liberty should be granted to any individual who was able to demonstrate that he could improve himself by means of it, also to benefit others through the example of oneself, as Liberty is not just a self-fulfilling ideal. Placing the Englishman and the Indian in the context of the second precondition, we realise that whoever Mill considers as the civilised of the two, the Englishman is granted Liberty despite his failure to fulfil the second criterion, that of improving himself and benefiting others through himself; whereas he had argued to the contrary that an ignorant individual is incapable of performing either of these two tasks.

8. Conclusion: A Critical Assessment

In conclusion, it seems that Mill suggested something quite the opposite of Liberty for those he considered barbaric, which represent the inconsistency between his theories of Liberty with his utilitarian premises. Therefore, one can argue that Mill's theories of liberty, individualism and morality are applied to the reality of the burgeoning British Empire of his day." Utility" writes Mill," or the Greatest Happiness Principle, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness"(Mill,.1962). Mill's Utilitarianism as seems to be "a static philosophy", in that it fails to address the fundamental processes of human development and it is excessively simplistic in its attention to the pleasure principle.

Such a doctrine could never realistically be applied to a system of colonization such as advocated by one John Stuart Mill of East India Company; part and parcel of the colonization is to place the "Greatest Happiness Principle" of colonizer over that of colonized. In regards to India, Mill's opinion of the superiority of the Englishman is stated in no uncertain terms as he writes".... the conquerors and the conquered cannot in this case live together under the same free institution. Mill got admitted into his father's office in India House at the age of seventeen; he began his career in 1823 and continued till he succeeded Peacock as Chief Examiner in 1856. He retired in 1858 when the East India Company was abolished in the wake of the mutiny rebellion (Zastoupil, 1988: 32). Considering both Mill's theory of Liberty and his Utilitarian Premises, one can see that liberty is a right based idiom; whereas Utilitarianism is a paternalistic or Welfare based idiom.

Clearly, Mill's philosophical and socio-political thinking on liberty and Utilitarianism as separate concepts are too inconsistent and too self-contradictory, which frequently came into direct conflict. Utilitarianism, as a political and moral philosophy seems to be more of sociological interest, whereas Liberty is a matter of metaphysical Philosophy. The American Sociologist Alvin Gouldner (1920 – 1980) observes that "in the eighteenth century, utility emerged as a dominant social standard". (Gouldner, 1971: 61). As J. Day points out, John



Stuart Mill's theory of Liberty might have been clearer in arguments, if he had avoided some concept or terms like, happiness, well-being, pleasure, and utility and rested content with naming the specific ends of humanity that he thought important, like truth and self-development without trying to join them together (Day, 1993: 242-243). Perhaps the biggest problem for Mill is his notion of the "Tyranny of Majority". This is an era where his writings become complex and prone to misunderstanding. Nevertheless, there may be legitimate complaints regarding this area. Mill's dissatisfaction with tyranny was well documented in "*On Liberty*", but when considering utility or representative government he relies on just this concept. Therefore, many political theorists pointed out that Mill insisted that it is both inevitable and right that the majority should be the dominant power in a democracy. Finally, as the British political scientist Andrew Gamble pointed out that John Stuart Mill argued in *On Liberty* that 'only in those communities where opinion is free and rational argument and scientific research encouraged will progress in all things be swift and cumulative. The shifting of free citizen criticism was regarded by many early liberals in this way, as not only illiberal and a denial off individual freedom, but inefficient and therefore irrational. Rational choice between ends and the search for the most rational means of realizing ends would both be hindered'. (Gamble, 1981 :65).

References

- Day, J. (1993), "John Stuart Mill: On Liberty", in M. Forsyth, M. Keens-Soper and J. M. Hoffman (Eds), *The Political Classics: Hamilton to Mill*, OUP, Oxford.
- Gamble, Andrew, (1981), "An Introduction to Modern Social and Political Thought", The Macmillan Press Limited, London.
- Gouldner, Alvin. W. (1971), "The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology", Heinemann, London.
- Harrison, Ross, (1983), 'Bentham', Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley, pp.149 and 162.
- Heater, D. B., (1960), *Political Ideas in the Modern World*, George G. Harrap & Co.Ltd, London.
- McLean, Iain, et al (Eds), (1984) "Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics", OUP, Oxford.
- Mill, J. Stuart, (1946), "On Liberty and consideration on representative Government", (Eds), McCallm, R.B, Oxford.
- Mill J. Stuart, (1869), 'The Subjection of Women', Second edition, Longmans, London. <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/the-subjection-of-women-by-j-s-mill>. Accessed on 1/10/2021
- Mill J. Stuart, (1962), "Utilitarianism" (Ed). Mary Warnock, The Fontana Library, London.
- Ryan. Alan, (1974), "J. S. Mill", Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Schofield, Philip, (2009), "Utility and Democracy: The Political Thought of Jeremy Bentham". Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Watkins, J. W. N, (1966), "John Stuart Mill and Liberty of the Individual", in Thomson, D., *Political Ideas*, (Ed), Penguin, London.
- Williams. G. L., (1993) "Mill's Principle of Liberty", in Lively J. & Reeve. A, (Eds), *Modern Political Theory from Hobbs to Marx*, Routledge, London.
- Zastoupil, Lynn, (1988), "J. S. Mill and India", *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 32. No.1, pp.31-54.

تحليل سوسيو-سياسي لنظرية جون ستيوارت مل في الحرية ومقدماته النفعية

ماهر عبدالواحد عزيز

كلية الآداب - قسم الخدمة الاجتماعية - جامعة صلاح الدين- أربيل

ملخص

تناول هذه الدراسة النظرية الفيلسوف البريطاني الأكثر تأثيراً في القرن التاسع عشر، وهو جون ستيوارت ميل (1806 - 1873). تقدم الدراسة تفسيراً اجتماعياً وسياسياً لوجهات نظر ميل حول الحرية والمبادئ النفعية بطريقة وصفية. الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو توضيح ومناقشة مساهمته الرئيسية في مجال النظرية الليبرالية من خلال التركيز على كتابه المشهور جداً حول الحرية والذي نُشر عام 1859. ومع ذلك، فإن الهدف من الدراسة هو التشكيك في النقاط الرئيسية التي كان ميل ركز في حجته الفلسفية على التفكير الليبرالي والحرية. الحجة الرئيسية لهذه الدراسة هي أن هناك تناقضاً واضحاً بين نظرية ميل عن الحرية ومقدماته النفعية. وبذلك، تنقسم الدراسة إلى ثمانية مباحث. المبحث الأول يتناول المقدمة. يوضح المبحث الثاني أهداف الدراسة والطريقة التي طبقت بها. يعرض المبحث الثالث الأسئلة الرئيسية التي تحاول الدراسة الإجابة عليها. يقيم المبحث الرابع بإيجاز علاقة ميل بجيريمي بينثام. في حين يحلل المبحث الخامس عمل ميل الشهير "عن الحرية". يركز المبحث السادس على آراء ميل حول الليبرالية والإنسانية. يناقش المبحث السابع مذهب النفعية والفردية والتناقضات في نظريته عن الحرية. يعرض المبحث الثامن الخاتمة في تقييم نقدي بناءً على أهداف هذه الدراسة النظرية هي: أولاً، تفصيل ومناقشة مساهمته الرئيسية في مجال النظرية الليبرالية من خلال التركيز على كتابه المشهور جداً عن الحرية المنشور عام 1859، ثانياً، مناقشة إشكالية النقاط الرئيسية التي ركز فيها ميل في حججه الفلسفية على التفكير الليبرالي والحرية. يُعرف كتاب عن الحرية بأنه أحد النصوص الكلاسيكية العظيمة في النظرية السياسية الحديثة. من الناحية المنهجية، تكمن الدراسة في تقاطع علم الاجتماع والعلوم السياسية ونظرية الحرية. يجب التأكيد على أن هذه الدراسة تمت وفق منهج تاريخي وتفسيري مطبق في مجالي النظرية السياسية وعلم الاجتماع السياسي. النهج التوضيحي هو طريقة جعلنا نفهم شيئاً ما من خلال الوصف والتوضيح. مقاصدها مجرد استكشاف أسئلة البحث ولا تقدم حلولاً نهائية وحاسمة للأسئلة المثيرة. لذلك، تستخدم هذه الدراسة الأدبيات والدراسات المطروحة في هذا المجال وتحليل النص كأداة لها.

الكلمات الدالة: الحرية، التحررية، النفعي، الإنسانية، الفردانية

شيكردنه وهیکی سۆسیو-سیاسی بۆ تیۆری جۆن ستيوارت میل سه بارهت به ئازادی وپيشه کييه سوودگه راييه که ی

ماهر عبدالواحد عزيز

به شی کاری کۆمه لایه تی - زانکۆی سه لاهه دین-هه ولیر

پوخته

ئهم توێژینه وه تیۆریه شیکردنه وه و هه لسه نگاند یکی سۆسیو سیاسیانه ی فه لسه فه ی فه یله سو فی بریتانی جۆن ستيوارت میل (1806 - 1873) له مه پ تیۆری ئازادی، ته وه ری سه ره کی شاکاره که ی میل واته کتیبی (وتاریک له مه پ ئازادی) یه که له سالی 1859 به چاپی گه یاندوو به وردی شوؤفه ده کات. ئهم کتیبه ده فیکه که تیایدا نه ندیشه ی ئازادی به باشی په ره ی ستاندوو. ره سه نایه تی کتیبی "وتاریک له مه پ ئازادی" له م راستیه دا هه شاره که چه مکی ئازادی کۆمه لایه تیش زیاد ده کاته سه به ستینی ئازادی سیاسی. میل به هه مان شیوه ی پیشینه کانی خۆی باوه ری قورسی به ئازادی له به ندی ده ولت هه به، به لمر له هه ر شویتیک که له م باوه ره ی ده دوت پ له سه ر ئهم خاله داده گرئ که ئازادی هه ر به و راده یه بایه خداره که جه بر و زه رووره ته کۆمه لایه تیه کان.

ئهم نو ئۆینه وه یه شیکردنه وه هه لسه نگاندیکه که میتۆدی چۆنیتی له خو ده گرئ. ئه م توێژینه وه یه هه شت ته وه ر له خو ده گرئ. ته وه ری یه که م ده روازه یکه بۆ توێژینه وه که. ته وه ری دووه م به کورتی باس له ئامانجی توێژینه وه میتۆدی به کارهاتوله توێژینه وه که ده کات. ته وه ری سیه م پرساره سه ره کیه کانی توێژینه وه له خو ده گرئ. ته وه ری چواره م به کورتی باس له په یوه ندی ژبانی میل له گه ل فه یله سو فی جیرمی بنسام ده کات. ته وه ری پینجه م شیکردنه وه ی کتیبه که ی میل (وتاریک له مه پ ئازادی) ده کات. ته وه ری شه شه م باس له هه ردوو ریازی لیبرالیزم و هیومانیزم لای میل ده کات. ته وه ری چه ته م سیکردنه ویکه ورده بۆ هه ردوو ریازی سوودگه رای و تاکه گه رای لای میل ده کات که له گه ل پرینستی ئازادی ناگونجیت. ته وه ری هه شته م تابه ته به ده ره ئه نجامی توێژینه وه که که به هه لسه نگاندیکه ره خه نی شوؤفه ده گرئ.

دهسته واژه کللیه کان: ئازادی، ئازادپه وی، سوودمه ندی، مروّفايه تی، تاکره وایی.