
FREEDOMS AND UNFREEDOMS: FROM RELIGION TO PHILOSOPHY

*Mubasher Abbas**

Development, from a state's point of view, is a long steady journey having no certain visible destination. It is an ever-growing concept, meaning, a process of positive change, involving, several other interdependent processes which, if made mutually supportive, can enrich the fate of the state, or hinder it from progress, otherwise. Scarcity of natural resources has always brought nations and states, face to face, to a never-ending competition, in which, they struggle for their survival and race for their existence. In this respect, the concept of development has no longer remained a goal, but a mean to achieve the status of a welfare state. To maintain their position, countries, must follow a steady path of development, by utilizing all their available resources. In these resources, the human resource, above all, is of utmost importance. It is therefore, quite necessary to be utilized on a higher efficiency and at full capacity, by making investments, in the form of human capital. This goal is at the heart of human development approach. Unlike traditional economics that followed the evolutionary course of economic development, human development field tries to explain an analytical understanding of the concept of human welfare, as a pathway to economic success instead of just being an outcome of economic growth. To grasp contemporary abstract connotation of Freedoms and Unfreedoms, the present paper takes a brief overview of their historic evolution. It will not only help to understand their already existing discourse but also enable to carve out further conceptual developments in relation to modern standards of futuristic debate.

Key word: *freedom, unfreedom, development*

Introduction

In the field of human development, Development and Freedom, two unanimously profound synonyms are often seen interchangeable, because the realm of human existence extends far beyond his observable framework, and therefore, requires a constant pursuit of freedom to follow the course of development. Basic needs which continue to seek satisfaction, if left unattended, share a large part of one's effort, for their gratification, making it almost impossible, for him to achieve his goals. In this sense, it is the lack of their fulfillment that accounts for one's underdevelopment more than the amount of effort itself. Unlike its counterpart "Freedom", the inabilities that inhibit people from utilizing their potential efficiently, are termed as "Unfreedoms". The term 'Unfreedoms', in the sense of "lack of capabilities", was first introduced, within the discourse of welfare economics and human development disciplines, by the work of a

* Lecturer in Lahore Law College, Lahore.

pioneer Indian economist, Amartya Sen, with the title of “Development as Freedom”, published in 1999.

Our world is a dynamic arena of limitless complexity. Social problems that appear to be the same, are often differ in their configurations, each demanding a unique solution. Same is the case with problems, concerning human development. No matter how identical they appear to be, they all emerge from a diverse situational background that makes them so difficult to observe, evaluate, understand and control as well. The problem of underdevelopment is perhaps the only one of its kind that undertakes all other issues regarding human society. It is the sole proprietor of United Nations’ Millennium Development Goals, since decades and still expected to remain in charge for few more. The complex processes behind the issue are yet to be discovered because of its ever-changing nature and evolving structure. We must focus upon the functional characteristics of the problem instead of just looking at its structural existence, because it keeps changing its structural properties along time and space while holding the functional properties intact. We have to find out that how, for what and for whom it remains functional and dysfunctional in each setting, despite of being different in its structure and nature. There is a range of possibilities in which a certain dimension of underdevelopment can be functional for some people on the expense of other people. This co-existence of functional properties of a system, beside its structural premises while perusing opposite goals, makes it a bit more complicated to understand and to deal with.

The Concept of Freedom

Story of freedom is too old to be told. The concept itself has gone through several different stages, in which it has not only spread from masses to individuals but also made a dramatic shift from a struggle oriented achievement to a grant oriented right.

As Lord Acton states in *The History of Freedom in Antiquity* (1877):

“Liberty and good government do not exclude each other; and there are excellent reasons why they should go together. Liberty is not a means to a higher political end. It is itself the highest political end. It is not for the sake of a good public administration that it is required, but for security in the pursuit of the highest objects of civil society, and of private life.”¹

Quest for freedom began with the preconceived notion of oppression or any other constraint that could be seen external to its subject and thought to be retaliated, to get rid of its exertions. Young (1990)

describes it as freedom from oppression². With the passage of time as more and more people continued to become aware of their immense capabilities, the boundaries of constraints became visible and felt to be questioned from different angles. This exploratory expedition of human thought unleashed his desire to look beyond physical or direct checks into the invisible realm of restrictions that subsume a significant proportion of human expertise without being detected by the customary measures of freedom. The search has come to its contemporary destination with some extra ordinary findings about the expression of internal restrictions in the name of Unfreedoms.

As Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) wrote in *Leviathan*:

“A free man is he that in those things which by his strength and wit he is able to do is not hindered to do what he hath the will to do.”

Many different characteristics have been attributed toward freedom but some of them are worth taking because of their precise relevance with this ongoing discussion. These important considerations within the scope of Freedoms and Unfreedoms are as follows:

Greek Philosophy and Ancient Indian Traditions

Idea of being free from all restrictions is counterfactual in nature as the Existence itself is bounded under some natural laws of mutual existence which if made extinct will eradicate all Existence. In ancient Greece, two main dimensions of Freedom had prevailed. One of them was group centered while the other revolved round individuals. The concept of freedom was historically inseparable from political action³.

First originated long before ancient Greeks, the notion of Freedom at micro level has its roots deep inside the philosophical debate of Master and Slave. In Greek civilization, Freedom was referred as a counterpart of Slavery⁴. On the other hand, the idea of Freedom as a group was associated with its independence from the rule of an outside state or empire.

As writer Ralph H. Lutz, points out in *The History of the Concept of Freedom*:

“The original ideal of freedom in ancient Greece included the protection of the group from attack and the ambition of the group to develop itself as completely as was humanly possible, the concept of individual freedom was the creation of the Stoics, who defined the self-realization of the individual as the principal objective of human endeavor.⁵”

In Buddhist Empire of ancient India, all religious and ethnic groups had some rights to freedom, tolerance, and equality. Emphasis on

tolerance can be found in the teachings of Asoka, which had a great influence on the importance of tolerance by the government in public policy. Slaughter and capture of war prisoners was also condemned by Asoka.

Roman Republic and Early Christianity

According to Roman social thought, Freedom was a matter of collectivity. This treatment of the concept of Freedom was linked with the notion of social control. Since long, social control and individual freedom have remained apposite to each other. Individual freedom is a limitless concept which, if exercised wholly, can easily kill the freedom of others or even their basic human rights. While on the other hand social control, if exerted at its peak, is also a constant danger to humanity, as the history, speaks itself. Therefore, it is very essential to limit the field of freedom of every individual to protect other people's rights and to limit the parameters of social control to protect individual rights. Otherwise, lawlessness will result in anarchy and excessive control will result in mental devolution, while, both are harmful for human progress.

As a Roman emperor, Marcus Aurelius wrote: "A polity in which there is the same law for all, a polity administered about equal rights and equal freedom of speech, and the idea of a kingly government which respects most of all the freedom of the governed."⁶

Roman jurisprudence was concerned with securing collective freedom which was inherently imbedded in social control. Therefore, it was the measure of individual's personal space in relation to other people so that no one could infringe the rights of others while living in his social space. Focus during this age, was on the question that how to maintain balance between individual freedom and collective interests. In early Christianity, the same idea of social control was internalized to the individual instead of enforcing it from outside by the law.

According to Bible:

"You, my brothers and sisters, were called to be free. But do not use your freedom to indulge the flesh; rather, serve one another humbly in love."⁷

Medieval Ages and Early Islam

In Europe, the medieval period was dominated by religious belief system, but the authority of King and Church was almost unchallenged with respect to the interpretations of religious beliefs, therefore the concept of Freedom as well as its extent, defined by the religion, was present but its functionality was dependent upon church's

interpretation of religious commandments along with their circumstances for applicability.

Actual connotation of the concept of Freedom in early Islam was same as it was in Judaism. A supreme being holding the title of God was acknowledged as the center of all humanity and the rights of people were protected indiscriminately under the slogan of mutual existence. The ruler (Caliph) was forbidden from making any amendment or addition on behalf of religion and was equally subjected to trial in courts, in case of an alleged act. Individual Freedom was made limited and all laws were subjected for the good of the whole not any one individual or group. No political, economic or even religious institution itself could accede from the limit. Special attention was given to the idea of social justice and economic freedom as well as to the protection of basic human rights.

A verse from the Quran says:

“Had He willed (not giving humans the freedom of choice), He would have made every human being believe all together; would you then (O Muhammad) compel people until they become believers?⁸”

The Renaissance

Renaissance be freedom of thought at macro level. Reconciliation of ancient knowledge gave rise to another aspect of freedom, “Humanism” that had never been explored before on such a huge scale. The main idea behind this, was that human beings are the center of this universe, and therefore, should not be subjected to any skeptical ideology for any other supposed good instead of their own happiness. Moreover, ethical principles should base upon human natural tendencies and his take into consideration while making legislations.

Thomas Moor in his historic speech in the House of Commerce to King Henry VIII, 18 April 1523 said:

“It may therefore please your most abundant Grace, our most benign and godly King, to give to all your commoners here assembled your most gracious permission and allowance for every man freely, without fear of your dreaded displeasure, to speak his conscience and boldly declare his advice concerning everything that comes up among us. Whatever any man may happen to say, may it please your noble Majesty, in your inestimable goodness, to take it all with no offense, interpreting every man’s words, however badly they may be phrased, to proceed nonetheless from a good zeal toward the profit of your realm and honor of your royal person, the prosperous condition and preservation of which, most excellent Sovereign, is the thing which we

all, your most humble and loving subjects, according to that most binding duty of our heartfelt allegiance, most highly desire and pray for.”⁹

With the fall of supernaturalism, secular and humanistic interests began to emerge. Facts about human’s individualistic experiences became dominant than the shadowy concept of afterlife. “Provision” was replaced with “Fortune”; “Earning” became a universal frame of reference instead of “Grant” or God gifted rights. The world was an end in itself and Freedom became a struggle oriented achievement instead of a God gifted, pre-specified right that already existed in a system of predefined mandatory obedience.

Influence of Enlightenment

Period of Enlightenment can be expressed in words as freedom of action. A period in which collective interference in individual personal life was reduced and people got more freedom from unnecessary restrictions and coercions in matters related to their private life. It was the age of Individual freedom. Influence of church in routine practices of the individual was reduced and separation of church from the state gave rise to individualism, libertarianism and constitutional government by questioning contradictory belief systems.

It was the age of great individual struggle. People became enthusiastic in demanding Freedom from coercion in their private life. They earned their rights and showed resistance to any effort made to infringe their right of living a prosperous life. They not only demanded Freedom from coercion but Freedom from socio-economic exploitations and injustices.

As Locke wrote in, *Two Treatises on Government*:

"In the state of nature, liberty consists of being free from any superior power on Earth. People are not under the will or lawmaking authority of others but have only the law of nature for their rule. In political society, liberty consists of being under no other lawmaking power except that established by consent in the commonwealth. People are free from the dominion of any will or legal restraint apart from that enacted by their own constituted lawmaking power according to the trust put in it. Thus, freedom is not as Sir Robert Filmer defines it: 'A liberty for everyone to do what he likes, to live as he pleases, and not to be tied by any laws.' Freedom is constrained by laws in both the state of nature and political society. Freedom of nature is to be under no other restraint but the law of nature. Freedom of people under government is to be under no restraint apart from standing rules to live

by that are common to everyone in the society and made by the lawmaking power established in it. Persons have a right or liberty to (1) follow their own will in all things that the law has not prohibited and (2) not be subject to the inconstant, uncertain, unknown, and arbitrary wills of others."¹⁰

Early 19th Century

In the beginning of 19th century, with the emergence of a new discourse in human rights debate, two important terminologies emerged, and Freedom was categorized either Negative or Positive Freedom. In his ground-breaking lecture, Isaiah Berlin (1909–97), (philosopher and historian of ideas) distinguished between two fundamental characteristics of freedom, defended by philosophers from centuries. Although, each category has a wide range of positions; but most of the theories, fit quite easily into one of them. There are two main reasons behind Berlin's categorization:

1. It distinguishes between two types of freedom.
2. There comes an argument about the conflicting nature of positive freedom against negative freedom as well as against someone else's positive freedom in some cases.

First one is important with respect to this ongoing debate as it highlights the most important notion of Freedom. Notion of negative freedom rests upon freedom from interference, while on contrary, the concept of Positive freedom is relatively a bit difficult to grasp than negative. In simple words, Positive Freedom means, freedom to do something while negative Freedom means to abstain from doing something. Negative freedom is just a matter of numbers and kinds of options which lies open, and their relevance in one's life. It is something that you are not revoked from doing. For example; doors which lie unlocked. Positive freedom, on the other hand, is a matter of what you are capable to actually do by utilizing already available resources on your own. John Stuart Mill (1806–1873), was the first who differentiated liberty as a freedom to act and the absence of coercion.

John Stuart Mill describes his views in his work, *On Liberty*:

"Nature and limits of the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual."¹¹

Hussain (2013), compares Mill's concept of freedom with Berlin's idea as:

"John Stuart Mill has differentiated two types of liberty, i.e. (a) absence of external coercion and (b) freedom to act. Isaiah Berlin also

differentiated two types of liberty, i.e. (a) negative liberty which is about absence of external restraints to one's action, and (b) presence of means and opportunities to act. Berlin described that a statement such as "I am slave to no man" is one of Negative Liberty, i.e. freedom from another individual's direct interference. He contrasted this with a statement such as "I am my own master" as one of Positive Liberty, i.e. freedom to choose one's own pursuits in life. Negative Liberty refers to 'freedom from' while Positive Liberty refers to 'freedom to'. Charles Taylor has distinguished Negative Liberty as 'freedom from external restraints' and Positive Liberty as 'freedom from internal restraints (such as fear, ignorance, weakness, etc.)' ¹²

At this point, the debate of freedom not only became complex but also got highly involved with different socio-economic, political and ideological point of views around the globe, where people linked with different ideologies began to take stance for the kind of freedom they found more suitable for their current socio-economic conditions ideological affiliations or some other circumstances instead of seeing it purely as a matter of conceptual debate.

Post-Modern Debate and Paradigm Shift

Before I start with post-modern part of this discourse, I would like to summaries those points which I have already mentioned above, to explain a paradigm shift in relation to existing course of discussion. These are:

1. In the beginning, Freedom was considered as the absence of explicit and deliberate external coercions on a group or state from an outside group, state or empire. It was a matter of collective understanding that whether a group or state is free from external influences. Individual freedom was not an issue at first because people were living in small groups and personal space was not the concern in those primitive societies.
2. Later it was seen as something to be valued not only in an out-group relationship but also among the members of a society, so that their individual social space could be protected against each other and they could live freely without posing threat to another people's freedom. Legislation was brought into action and external restrictions were made to limit one's free space so that others could have same amount of space for themselves. This was done using social control, but the nature of control was explicit and mostly run by the sovereign on behalf of (as well as because of the supposed Will of) a higher authority, mostly supernatural.

3. Individualistic concerns regarding Freedom were came on the surface afterword and since then, the debate changed its substantial arguments from “Freedom for all, for God’s sake” to “Freedom for all, just because it is valuable”. This kind of attitude toward freedom made it something that was not equally distributed from God but to be earned through struggle for its own sake. Because life worth it.

4. After adopting this attitude, human struggle brought freedom for some people at the expense of others and shatters the idea that freedom can be earned by everyone through its struggle because in a system that is already imbalanced, the flow of resources will always be directed toward more opportunistic on every level (Micro, Mezzo, Macro) at large, making the fortune of less opportunistic, ever descending.

5. At this point, the concept of freedom had to split into two, negative and positive freedom in order to put this imbalanced situation into a conceptual framework to deal with. By this, one can see the conflicting nature of these freedoms that is a constant source of trouble in its implementation, while both being equally important and inevitable.

It is important to mention here that throughout all these stages, the notion of freedom took start as a struggle oriented achievement; shifted its nature to a grant oriented right confirmed by supernatural; transformed its argument to a reasonable humanistic value, attainable through human struggle; turned out to be dual natured, in shape of Positive Freedom in relation to its Negative counterpart.

Unfreedoms

Now on one hand the discussion of positive and negative freedom is heading toward achieving a balance between both of these contradictory necessities of life in developed countries because of their well-developed institutions and resources that can easily manage to keep these opposing drives in balance, while on the other hand there is another debate started with the work of Amartya Sen (Development as Freedom, 1999), in which he argues the case of developing countries in general and underdeveloped countries in particular that unlike developed countries, the people of developing countries shares a substandard living that lowers their ability to make a significant contribution in the development. This argument is an important theme of Capability Approach. With all their efforts consumed in securing necessities of their life, they cannot take a single step toward the betterment of their own lives as well as toward the development of their countries. Sen describe five kinds of basic deprivations and he names them as “Unfreedoms”, which hinders people from progress by

keeping the vicious cycle intact. Sen terms the lack of following provisions as Unfreedoms:

Political freedom

It means the number of opportunities that citizens have, in determining, not just who governs them but also decide the principals which govern. There is a fundamental right imbedded in the opportunity; right to criticize and evaluate the authorities; the right to have freedom of expression and right to have active participation in politics. In near past, different kinds of so called democratic governments have behaved in such a way that has posed a huge threat to the prospects of human development in some countries. Recent human rights abuses throughout the third world and Myanmar, for example, have posed serious question on the state of human freedom. But despite of these facts, progress has been made at large scale.

Freedom of Economic facilities

The freedom to choose from multiple economic opportunities can be helpful in improving the standard of living. Freedom of different economic facilities includes the availability as well as accessibility to finance. Having a productive livelihood requires enough supportive facilities. Lack of these facilities is called economic unfreedom, which hinders development.

Freedom of Social opportunities

Arrangements, made by administration, for opportunities of health, education and other essential facilities are crucial in evaluating country's level of development. Provision of equal opportunities to all citizens is an important responsibility of the state. Much of this progress has been achieved.

Transparency guarantees

People need guarantees for openness and disclosure of matters regarding their opportunity structure that whether or not it is free from corruption. They must aware of their rights to information to access tangible evidences, so that the trust between the state and its citizens always remain intact.

Protective security

It is the responsibility of state to provide the necessary freedoms to its inhabitants, in order to attain the protection of social security networks which could reduce the suffering of poor citizens, enabling them to raise voices for their rights without any fear of losing their jobs or sacrificing their existing benefits while struggling for a better future. In this respect, the state is liable to provide support to the sufferers of

natural disasters, epidemic diseases and war. To redefine the goals of development, aligned with these new definitions, we need new evaluation methods and fresh data to keep the information about citizen aspirations up to date instead of just relying on government perceptions. Such useful information should be collected through open public debates and democratic discussions so that the choices of citizens can be evaluated to enable them for leading a life according to their own wishes and values.

Yee describes in his review of *Development as Freedom*:

“Freedom is both constitutive of development and instrumental to it: instrumental freedoms include political freedom, economic facilities, social opportunities, transparency, and security, which are all different but inter-connected.”¹³

According to Sen:

“Political rights, including freedom of expression and discussion, are not only pivotal in inducing social responses to economic needs, they are also central to the conceptualization of economic needs themselves.”¹⁴

He describes in detail that how these Unfreedoms are linked with socio-economic underdevelopment:

“Development requires the removal of major sources of Unfreedoms: poverty as well as tyranny, poor economic opportunities as well as systematic social deprivation, neglect of public facilities as well as intolerance or over activity of repressive states. Despite unprecedented increases in overall opulence, the contemporary world denies elementary freedoms to vast numbers, perhaps even most people. Sometimes the lack of substantive freedoms relates directly to economic poverty, which robs people of the freedom to satisfy hunger, or to achieve sufficient nutrition, or to obtain remedies for treatable illnesses, or the opportunity to be adequately clothed or sheltered, or to enjoy clean water or sanitary facilities. In other cases, the Unfreedoms link closely to the lack of public facilities and social care, such as the absence of epidemiological programs, or of organized arrangements for health care or educational facilities, or of effective institutions for the maintenance of local peace and order. In still other cases, the violation of freedom results directly from a denial of political and civil liberties by authoritarian regimes and from imposed restrictions on the freedom to participate in the social, political and economic life of the community.”¹⁵

Now I will discuss in detail, the differences between the situation of developing countries and developed countries in relation to the path of development they have followed as well as the need of this great paradigm shift.

Some Important Considerations

Some important factors, one need to consider for setting up development goals in underdeveloped countries, are:

Social factors

Considerations of social factors include the evaluation of social relationships that how strongly or weakly people are related to each other and what kind of strategy should be adopted that can work with such relationships. For example, in a country like Pakistan, the role of social networks is instrumental in distribution of resources and any kind of foreign investment in public welfare sector cannot be made effective without undertaking appropriate measures to assure transparency throughout the whole process, or it cannot reach at grass root level, otherwise. Most of the times, corruption intakes all points of check and balance in order to remain intact, therefore, public complaints should be sought at higher levels so that the risk of corruption within check and balance mechanism can be reduced.

Cultural realities

In this dimension, there is a growing need of changing standards of hero-ship in such societies. Due to long periods of economic and social de-growth, an air of mistrust and short term personal gain become a part of societal norms which than gradually transform into cultural values and with the passage of time, people forget their standards of morality given by their ideal culture because of harsh living condition, they have to face in order to survive. Selfishness; short term unlawful personal gains; trust deficit; and materialistic values become so ruthless that it intakes all other things that were once regarded valuable in the same society.

Class difference is a vital part of promoting materialistic values because it promotes want over need and when people met such dual standards, they cannot simply get away with this without being affected. Once prevailed, this air of discrimination and inequality becomes a driving force for those profitable businesses related with class oriented goods or services. No matter how committed you are, but you cannot make a successful intervention for human development until or unless you try to confront all those systems and barriers which are getting benefit from the division of humanity based on class, race,

religion, sect etc. Any effort that is not subjected to confront these anti humanistic systems and their subsystems of divide and discrimination can just be a part of that entire mechanism of exploitation but not a solution. In simple words, people must be taught to live with each other in mutualism or commensalism instead of parasitism.

Economic feasibilities

Consideration of economic feasibilities is equally important. It contains the evaluation of possible economic resources; their values; pros and cons of their utilization and their compatibility with existing means of economy. All developmental efforts, whether they are economic or uneconomic, must encompass the generalized perception of economic growth. Every country has a unique potential that is to be explored and made functional instead of giving foreign aid on conditions favorable to the geopolitical interests of powerful countries or starting with capitalistic model of development. For instance, in a country that has immense supply of human resources, development is the effective utilization of those human recourses instead of making economic decisions which promote something else.

Ideological affiliations

Intervention must consider the already existing ideology of the people, it is subjected towards. What is human development if it is not recognized among those for whom it is intended to be? This is a key question, fundamental for designing an intervention plan. Before taking any decision regarding intervention, one must consider the ideology of that particular region and acknowledge a fact that what will be the response of people if our intervention plan involves the dissection of their fundamental belief system. Will it work like this? Although, all intervention efforts intend to change some dysfunctional norms of the society, but they must assess the reasons behind those existing norms and values to which they are going to intervene, so that their eradication may not result in some other kind of problematic situation.

Political rivalries

Where there is underdevelopment and backwardness, there exist some conflicting groups of political rivalries along with their private bandits, competing for power and resources. Intervention efforts cannot go further without satisfying their private interests. For this purpose, proposals should be made with precision, keeping in view how to negotiate with these power groups better and on more favorable conditions, so that the aim can be achieved in the long run and the

exploitative system can be taken from within, without any direct confrontation.

The discourse of policy making debate plays an important role in this respect. The more implicit and far reaching the content of intervention, in its implications, will be, the less problematic the situation will become. Aim of intervention efforts must revolve around long term change because in most of the cases, large proportion of short term efforts is taken by these power structures and less is left for the needy. Intervention in this sense is a political struggle for the rights of the oppressed.

Conclusion

The notion of Freedom is embedded in the eradication of Unfreedoms. A comprehensive preview of literature has been discussed above, focusing upon different aspects of Unfreedoms, but the main question of interest is; how to eliminate these Unfreedoms? To answer that question on world level, I would like to add another part into it, to make it relevant, also for the third world; and that part is; how to eliminate the “Sources” of Unfreedoms? In developed countries, the first part of that question is more understandable in its basic sense, as it has an answer in public policy debate of the state because of being its internal affairs and because these developed states can do it.

The second part is more controversial because it subsumes the question of capacity, capability and willingness of developing states to bypass external constraints with or without eradicating internal constraints as well as to eliminate internal constraints with or without the removal of external restrictions. In simple words, will there always remain a need of external help or intervention from some of the most prestigious international socio-economic or socio-politic institutions like World Bank, IMF and United Nations etc., for determining the path of development as well as setting up goals, procedures and indicators for evaluation, or someday, people from these underdeveloped countries themselves will recognize their responsibility to take charge of their own destiny.

In current geopolitical situation, some developing countries have fewer external influences on their economic decisions and internal affairs while others are more concerned with setting up their geo-political affiliations with different strategic alliances. Similarly, in case of developed countries, some of them have fewer influences of big corporations and industries on their policy making while others have already been sold from top to bottom, long ago. At this point, one can

take the debate of Freedoms and Unfreedoms to a whole new level by incorporating the freedoms and unfreedoms of the states by critically analyzing it from the point of view of Global Social Governance.

REFERENCES & NOTES

¹ Online Library of Liberty. (n.d.). Retrieved August 13, 2016, from <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/acton-the-history-of-freedom-and-other-essays>

² Hobbes, T., & Lindsay, A.D. (1914). *Leviathan*. London: J.M Dent & Sons.

³ Hannah Arendt, "What is Freedom?", *Between Past and Future: Eight exercises in political thought* (New York: Penguin, 1993).

⁴ Rodriguez, Junius P. (2007) *The Historical Encyclopedia of World Slavery: A-K; Vol. II, L-Z*,

⁵ *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors (1915-1955)*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (Spring, 1950), pp. 18-32

⁶ Marcus Aurelius, "Meditations", Book I, *Wordsworth Classics of World Literature*, ISBN 1853264865

⁷ Galatians 5:13-14

⁸ Al-Quran Surah 10: Verse 99

⁹ William Roper, *Lives*, pp. 8-9,

¹⁰ *Two Treatises on Government: A Translation into Modern English*, ISR, 2009, p. 76

¹¹ Mill, J.S. (1869), "Chapter I: Introductory", *On Liberty*. <http://www.bartleby.com/130/1.html>

¹² Liberty and Freedom. (2013). Retrieved August 12, 2016, from <http://quranicteachings.org/liberty-and-freedom/>

¹³ Development as Freedom. (n.d.). Retrieved August 13, 2016, from http://dannyreviews.com/h/Development_Freedom.html

¹⁴ Development as Freedom. (n.d.). Retrieved August 13, 2016, from <https://books.google.com/books?id=Qm8HtpFHYecC>

¹⁵ Amartya Sen (1997). *Human Rights and Asian Values*. ISBN 0-87641-151-0.
