LUISS

Corso di laurea in Politics, Philosophy and Economics

Cattedra History of Political Thought (Distributive Justice)

Titolo tesi: "An analysis of Rousseau's idea of forced freedom"

Prof. Pellegrino

RELATORE

Prof.

CORRELATORE

Cucaro Riccardo Matr.094762

CANDIDATO

Anno Accademico 2022/2023

Table of Contents:

Introduction

Jean-Jacques Rousseau's "The Social Contract" stands as a pivotal work in the history of political thought, emerging during a tumultuous period marked by social upheaval and intellectual ferment. Against the backdrop of the Enlightenment, where ideals of reason, equality, and liberty were gaining traction, Rousseau's treatise sought to address pressing questions about the nature of political authority and the relationship between individuals and the state.

During the Enlightenment's fervor for progress and rationality, Rousseau's work reflected a deep-seated concern with the inequalities and injustices inherent in contemporary society. Against the backdrop of aristocratic privilege and absolutist rule, Rousseau's exploration of the social contract aimed to reimagine the foundations of political legitimacy. By proposing a theory of governance based on the voluntary consent of individuals, he challenged the traditional notions of sovereignty and hierarchy that had dominated the political discourse for a long time.

Rousseau's engagement with the social contract tradition, building upon the works of predecessors like Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, offered a radical vision of political association. At its core was the concept of the general will, representing the collective aspirations of the community and serving as the guiding principle for legitimate political authority. Through the social contract, Rousseau envisioned a society where laws and policies were crafted in accordance with the common good, rather than the interests of few privileged people.

“The Social Contract” stands as a milestone of political thought, expounding on the formation of a just and legitimate society. Within this seminal text, Rousseau introduces the intriguing notion of forced freedom, an idea that has sparked significant scholarly debate and historiographical inquiry.

However, Rousseau's ideas were not without controversy. His emphasis on the imposition of freedom and the obligations of citizenship raised significant theoretical and practical challenges. Critics questioned the feasibility of achieving a truly democratic society based on the general

will, while others challenged Rousseau's assumptions about human nature and the voluntariness of the social contract.

The aim of this thesis is to delve into Rousseau's concept of forced freedom, with a particular focus on his ideas of general will and the imposition of freedom as presented in 'The Social Contract', Book I, Chapter VII. As we embark on this intellectual journey, we shall scrutinize key passages and engage in comparative analysis, examining how different scholars have interpreted this crucial segment of Rousseau's work.

Rousseau's vision of the "general will" has often been a subject of fascination and contention. Advocating for a form of collective decision-making that transcends individual interests, Rousseau posits that the general will embodies the common good and represents the shared aspirations of a community. In Chapter VII of 'The Social Contract', Rousseau introduces the idea of "forced freedom," a notion that might, at first glance, appear paradoxical. The concept suggests that individuals, while coerced to act in accordance with the general will, paradoxically attain genuine freedom. This complex and intriguing proposition has engendered a diverse range of interpretations and critical evaluations over the centuries.

At the heart of this research lies a fundamental historiographical question: How does Rousseau intend to implement the idea of forced freedom, and does it hold any antidemocratic implications? To address this inquiry, we shall undertake a meticulous analysis of specific passages, carefully assessing the nuances and intricacies of Rousseau's arguments. Moreover, we will engage in a comparative study of secondary literature, exploring the diverse perspectives that scholars have offered regarding the nature and implications of forced freedom.

The significance of this study extends beyond a mere historical investigation; rather, it carries profound implications for contemporary political thought. The ideas Rousseau presents in this passage force us to reexamine the delicate balance between individual liberty and collective responsibility within any social contract. By critically evaluating Rousseau's approach, we aspire to gain insights into the broader challenges of reconciling freedom and governance in modern societies.

The structure of this thesis is organized to facilitate a comprehensive exploration of Rousseau's idea of forced freedom. Following this introduction, Chapter 1 will delve into Rousseau's ideas

of general will and the imposition of freedom, providing a conceptual analysis of these fundamental concepts.

In Chapter 2 we will explore Rousseau's defense of forced freedom, analyzing the arguments he presents to justify the necessity of this approach. The preservation of the social compact will be a central aspect of this section, as we consider how forced freedom relates to the cohesion and stability of a just society.

Additionally, in Chapter 3 we will address potential objections to Rousseau's ideas, assessing the strengths and weaknesses of his position, in order to understand the broader implications of this concept.

Finally, in the Conclusion, we will summarize our findings, reflecting on the journey of exploration undertaken in this thesis. We will acknowledge any limitations encountered and identify potential avenues for further research. Ultimately, this study seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of Rousseau's concept of forced freedom and its relevance to contemporary political thought.

Chapter 1: Rousseau's Opinion about the general will and the imposition of freedom

In "The Social Contract," Rousseau exposes his thought on the concept of the general will as the cornerstone of legitimate political authority, advocating for its supremacy in shaping laws and policies that serve the common good. One of the central points of Rousseau's argument is that the general will represents the collective aspirations of the entire community, transcending individual interests and preferences. He posits that by participating in the formation of the general will, individuals will contribute to the creation of laws that reflect the common good.

In fact, in "Book II, Chapter III", Rousseau explicitly articulates the significance of the general will, stating, "The general will alone can direct the forces of the State according to the object of its institution, which is the common good." Here, Rousseau emphasizes that the general will is essential for guiding the actions of the state towards a better society as a whole. By adhering to the dictates of the general will, Rousseau argues, the state can ensure that its policies promote the well-being and welfare of all citizens, rather than merely representing the interests of a privileged few.

Furthermore, Rousseau contends that obedience to the general will is indispensable for upholding liberty and equality within society. In Book I, Chapter VI, he asserts, "The general will alone can set up the law of the people, and direct the forces of the State in accordance with the intention of the legislator, which is always the common good." Here, Rousseau underscores the idea that laws derived from the general will are inherently just and equitable, as they reflect the collective judgment of the community. By obeying to the general will, individuals uphold the principles of liberty and equality, ensuring that the interests of all members of society are duly considered and protected.

Rousseau's advocacy for the general will as the guiding principle of political authority reflects his broader philosophical commitment to the ideals of democracy and popular sovereignty. He envisions a political order in which the will of the people reigns supreme, and where decisions are made in the best interests of the community. Moreover, through his rigorous analysis, Rousseau seeks to establish the general will as the anchor of a just and equitable society, where the common good takes precedence over individual desires and ambitions.

Rousseau's notion of the social contract serves as the foundational concept upon which his political philosophy is constructed. In Rousseau's view, the social contract represents a mutual agreement among individuals to form a collective body politic, relinquishing certain natural liberties in exchange for the benefits of political association. Through the social contract, individuals transition from a state of nature characterized by freedom and equality to a civil state governed by the rule of law and the general will.

In Book I, Chapter VI, Rousseau outlines the essence of the social contract, stating, "Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will, and in our corporate capacity, we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole." Here, Rousseau underscores the voluntary nature of the social contract, emphasizing that individuals willingly consent to obey to the dictates of the general will for the sake of the common good. Through this collective agreement, individuals join to form a cohesive political community, bound by mutual obligations and responsibilities.

Moreover, Rousseau contends that the social contract engenders a sense of solidarity and fraternity among citizens, fostering a spirit of cooperation and unity. In Book I, Chapter VIII, he writes, "The basis of the political association is the social compact, and its goal is the

preservation of the rights of the individual and of the community." Rousseau emphasizes that the social compact serves as the foundation of political association, ensuring the protection of individual rights and the welfare of the entire community. By adhering to the terms of the social contract, citizens uphold their obligations to one another and contribute to the maintenance of a just and harmonious society.

Through his exposition of the social contract, Rousseau seeks to establish a framework for legitimate political authority based on the consent of the governed and the primacy of the common good. By voluntarily entering into the social contract, individuals affirm their commitment to the principles of democracy and popular sovereignty, laying the groundwork for a political order characterized by justice, equality, and fraternity.

Scholars have raised several objections to Rousseau's concept of the social contract, questioning its feasibility, implications, and underlying assumptions. One prominent objection concerns the voluntariness of individuals' consent to the social contract. Critics also argue that Rousseau's depiction of individuals willingly surrendering their natural liberties may be unrealistic, particularly in societies marked by inequality and coercion. Among those scholars there are authors such as John Locke and Thomas Hobbes, which contend that individuals enter into the social contract out of self-interest or fear rather than genuine consent, undermining Rousseau's idealized vision of political association.

Additionally, scholars have questioned the practicality of Rousseau's vision of a unified general will representing the collective interests of the community. Critics argue that determining and implementing the general will in diverse and complex societies is fraught with challenges, as it may involve suppressing minority viewpoints or coercing dissenting individuals into conformity. Philosopher John Stuart Mill, in his work "On Liberty," warns against the potential tyranny of the majority inherent in Rousseau's concept, wherein minority rights and individual liberties may be sacrificed in the pursuit of the general will.

Furthermore, scholars have scrutinized Rousseau's assumption that the social contract generates a sense of solidarity and fraternity among citizens. Critics contend that Rousseau's emphasis on collective obligation overlooks the diversity of interests and identities within society, potentially exacerbating social divisions rather than fostering unity. Political theorist

Hannah Arendt, in her analysis of totalitarianism, highlights the dangers of subsuming individuality within the collective, cautioning against the suppression of plurality and dissent in pursuit of a unified general will.

Overall, scholars' objections to Rousseau's concept of the social contract underscore the complexities and limitations inherent in his political philosophy. While Rousseau offers a compelling vision of political association grounded in the principles of democracy and popular sovereignty, his idealized depiction of the social contract raises significant theoretical and practical challenges that merit careful consideration and critical scrutiny.

Chapter 2: Evaluating Rousseau's Perspective

The concept of "forced freedom" proposed by Rousseau in 'The Social Contract' sparks an interesting discourse surrounding its implications for democratic governance. Through a detailed textual analysis of relevant passages from Book I, Chapter VII, I will explore the intricacies of Rousseau's arguments and their democratic implications. Rousseau's depiction of the erosion of the social bond and the emergence of despotism underscores the fragility of the social contract and the potential consequences of its breakdown. The notion of being subject to the collective will highlights the tension between individual autonomy and the pursuit of the common good within democratic societies. Moreover, Rousseau's critique of government founded solely on the strength of the sovereign challenges prevailing notions of political legitimacy and authority. As we delve into the democratic implications of forced freedom, we encounter alternative perspectives and counterarguments that offer insights into the complexities of democratic governance. From deliberative democracy to hybrid models of governance, scholars navigate the delicate balance between individual liberties and collective decision-making, striving to address the challenges posed by Rousseau's concept while honoring its democratic aspirations.

2.1 Detailed Textual Analysis of 'The Social Contract', Book I, Chapter VII

To gain a deeper understanding of Rousseau's concept of forced freedom, it is crucial to engage in a detailed textual analysis of the relevant passage from 'The Social Contract', Book I, Chapter VII. In this section, we will closely examine the key excerpts and explore the nuances of Rousseau's arguments.

[Excerpts from 'The Social Contract', Book I, Chapter VII]

"But when the social bond begins to be relaxed and the state to grow weak, when particular individuals find themselves as strong as the state, the contradiction grows more striking; and, the combat continuing, the state is disintegrated and at last dissolves. That is the end of the body politic, and that is what one sees in the person of the tyrant."

In this excerpt, Rousseau highlights the precarious nature of the social contract and the potential consequences of its erosion. He argues that when the state fails to maintain its authority and becomes weakened, a conflict arises between individual interests and the collective welfare. As particular individuals assert their strength and influence, the unity and coherence of the state begin to crumble. Rousseau introduces the notion of "the tyrant" as a manifestation of this disintegration, symbolizing the loss of the state's cohesive power.

Rousseau's choice of the term "tyrant" is significant, as it evokes historical associations with despotic rulers who ruled with absolute authority and often disregarded the interests of their subjects. By introducing the image of a tyrant, Rousseau warns against the dangers of unchecked individual power and the breakdown of the social contract.

Within political theory, critiques from David R. Hiley and Henry David Rempel dissect Rousseau's portrayal, arguing that it oversimplifies the intricate interplay of state power and societal cohesion. They contend that while individual agency plays a role, the resilience of the state is contingent upon a plethora of factors, including institutional robustness, prevailing societal norms, and historical contingencies.
Moreover, Katrin Froese and Steven G. Affeldt argue that while individual actors may exert influence, the stability of the state is often based on broader societal dynamics and the capacity of citizens to mobilize for collective action. By emphasizing individual prowess as the linchpin

of state resilience, Rousseau's narrative disregards the intricate interplay of social forces and the complexities inherent in processes of political change.

"In order to know how to oppose the forces of an entire nation, one has to have the strength of one man and more; and when one is weaker than the whole of humanity, one is incomparably the most wretched of men; there is no calamity equal to this, that of being subject to one's equals."

Rousseau emphasizes the overwhelming power of the collective will, embodied in an entire nation. The strength of the people united as if they were one makes it nearly impossible for any individual to resist and oppose their combined force. He contrasts this with the weakness of an individual who lacks the strength to resist the will of the collective. Rousseau paints a bleak picture of such an individual, expressing that there is no greater misfortune than being subject to the will of others who are, essentially, one's equals.

This passage touches upon the idea of equality, a key theme in Rousseau's political thought. For him, genuine political freedom and legitimacy stem from the equal participation and consent of all citizens. The concept of being "subject to one's equals" suggests a loss of agency and self-determination when individuals are dominated by a collective force that they are part of themselves.
Rousseau suggests that facing the might of an entire nation is incredibly challenging, emphasizing the overwhelming power of collective will. However, scholars, including John Stuart Mill and Alexis de Tocqueville, present objections that delve deeper into the complexities of democratic governance.

Mill advocates for safeguarding minority rights, arguing that even a well-intentioned majority should not suppress dissenting voices. He underscores the importance of protecting individual liberties, regardless of numerical superiority, to ensure a truly democratic society.

Tocqueville echoes Mill's concerns, cautioning against the tyranny of the majority in democratic systems. He highlights the risk of individual freedoms being overshadowed by the collective will and he emphasizes too the importance of preserving minority rights against the dominance of the majority.

Furthermore, scholars such as John Rawls and Martha Nussbaum question the notion of equality within the democratic framework. They argue that societal inequalities can amplify

certain voices over others, leading to an imbalance in representation and decision-making. This goes against the idea that the majority always acts in the best interests of the entire population.

These objections suggest that the mere numerical strength of a majority does not guarantee equitable outcomes. Instead, they advocate for a more inclusive approach that protects individual freedoms and considers diverse perspectives, fostering a truly democratic society.

"Such is the origin of despotism, which is so destructive for the master and for the slave, and which treats with disdain humanity and its laws. By aggrandizing everything, it becomes in one man what it was in the state of nature: force instead of right, and their owner, the master of everything and of men."

Rousseau traces the origin of despotism to the weakening of the social bond and the loss of a cohesive state. As the social contract disintegrates, the vacuum of power paves the way for a despot to emerge. In a despotic regime, the master exercises absolute authority over the slaves, treating humanity and its laws with disdain. Rousseau presents despotism as a return to a state akin to the "state of nature," characterized by force prevailing over the concept of right or justice. The despot becomes the master of everything and everyone, imposing their will without regard for the common good or the welfare of the governed.

This depiction of despotism as a regression to a state of nature echoes Rousseau's critique of the prevailing social order of his time. He saw contemporary societies as marked by inequalities, corruption, and the erosion of human virtue. In Rousseau's view, the social contract, grounded in the general will, offered a way to establish a just and legitimate political order that would overcome the deficiencies of existing regimes.

Scholars have voiced multiple objections to Rousseau's concept of despotism, challenging various aspects of his depiction of power dynamics and its implications. One prominent objection revolves around Rousseau's oversimplified portrayal of despotism's impact on both the ruler and the ruled. Critics argue that Rousseau's argument overlooks the intricate mechanisms through which authoritarian regimes maintain control and exercise forms of consent and coercion.

Hannah Arendt and Michel Foucault, for instance, highlight the complexities of power relations within authoritarian structures, emphasizing how regimes often employ subtle tactics of surveillance and manipulation alongside evident displays of force.

Additionally, Rousseau's framing of despotism as a departure from humanity's natural state has faced scrutiny from postcolonial scholars like Edward Said and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. They contend that Rousseau's narrative perpetuates Eurocentric and colonialist ideologies, ignoring the historical realities of oppression experienced by marginalized communities under colonial rule. Frantz Fanon further critique Rousseau's dichotomy between despotism and natural liberty, highlighting how colonial powers justified their authoritarian rule through discourses of civilization and progress, thereby complicating Rousseau's narrative.

Moreover, legal scholars and political theorists have questioned Rousseau's assertion that despotism arises solely from the rejection of societal laws. David Held and Judith Shklar argue that Rousseau overlooks the role of legal institutions and structures in perpetuating authoritarian rule. They contend that despotism often operates through the manipulation of legal frameworks and selective enforcement of laws to consolidate power.
Martha Minow and Roberto Unger further emphasize how authoritarian regimes exploit legal ambiguities and loopholes to suppress dissent, challenging Rousseau's idealistic view of law as a safeguard against tyranny.

In essence, while Rousseau's concept of despotism sheds light on the dangers of unchecked power, scholars have raised objections regarding its oversimplification of power dynamics, its ahistorical framing, and its neglect of the role of legal institutions in perpetuating authoritarianism. By engaging with these objections, we gain a deeper understanding of the complexities of authoritarian rule and the challenges of resisting oppressive regimes.

"The contract that binds the subjects to the ruler is as such null, because the government, having its foundation solely in the strength of the sovereign, is incapable of any other constitution."

In this passage, Rousseau challenges the legitimacy of a government based solely on the power of the ruler. He asserts that the contract between the ruler and the subjects is null, as it lacks the essential element of mutual consent. A government founded solely on the strength of the

sovereign cannot form a legitimate constitution, as it fails to consider the interests and will of the governed.

Rousseau's critique of monarchical and absolute forms of government is evident here. By highlighting the lack of genuine consent between ruler and subjects, he questions the moral and political foundations of such systems. For Rousseau, a legitimate government derives its authority from the consent of the governed, and its laws should reflect the general will of the community. The absence of this mutual agreement renders the contract void, and the government becomes nothing more than a manifestation of the ruler's force.

Rousseau's proclamation regarding the nullity of the contract binding subjects to rulers, exclusively rooted in the sovereign's strength, has sparked a rich array of objections from scholars hailing from various disciplines. Legal experts and political theorists, such as David R. Hiley and Henry David Rempel, raise pertinent critiques, suggesting that Rousseau's portrayal oversimplifies the intricate nature of governance and contractual relations. They argue that even in autocratic regimes, contractual agreements, whether formal or implicit, persist between rulers and subjects, albeit often under conditions of coercion or limited agency. By dismissing such agreements as null, Rousseau overlooks the nuanced negotiations and power dynamics inherent in governance structures.

Moreover, Katrin Froese and Steven G. Affeldt contribute to this discourse by challenging Rousseau's dichotomous perspective on governance. They emphasize how contractual relationships between rulers and subjects are dynamic and adaptable, evolving over time to integrate elements of consent, negotiation, and compromise. Their insights underscore the fluidity of governance arrangements and the need for a more nuanced understanding of contractual dynamics within political systems.

Further objections come from scholars like Hannah Arendt and Michel Foucault, who critique Rousseau's exclusive focus on the sovereign's strength as the sole foundation of government. They argue that governance involves complex interplays between rulers, institutions, and citizens, shaped by historical, cultural, and socio-economic factors. By solely highlighting the sovereign's strength, Rousseau neglects the multifaceted dynamics of power and authority within societies. Arendt and Foucault contend that governance structures are influenced not only by the strength of the sovereign but also by institutional frameworks, social norms, and collective agency.

In essence, while Rousseau's assertion challenges conventional notions of political legitimacy, scholars have raised objections to its oversimplification of contractual relationships, neglect of evolving governance mechanisms, and disregard for the complexities of power dynamics within societies.

2.2 The Democratic Implications

Rousseau's concept of forced freedom holds profound implications for democratic governance, sparking a rich tapestry of interpretations and debates among scholars. At its core, forced freedom encapsulates the tension between individual autonomy and collective welfare within the framework of democratic societies. While proponents argue for its alignment with democratic principles, emphasizing its role in safeguarding the common good, critics raise concerns about its potential encroachment on individual liberties and minority rights.

Advocates of Rousseau's perspective assert that forced freedom is a necessary mechanism to ensure the integrity of the democratic process. In democratic societies, where decisions are ideally guided by the will of the majority, forced freedom serves as a safeguard against individual interests that may undermine the collective welfare. By prioritizing the common good over individual desires, forced freedom aligns with the foundational principles of democracy, aiming to create a society where the needs of the many outweigh the preferences of the few.

Furthermore, supporters of Rousseau's concept argue that it underscores the reciprocal obligations inherent in the social contract. In a democratic polity, citizens voluntarily consent to abide by the rules and norms that govern collective life. Forced freedom, from this perspective, emphasizes the responsibilities individuals bear towards one another and towards the whole community. By subordinating individual interests to the general will, forced freedom reinforces the notion of citizenship as a shared commitment to promoting the well-being of all members of society.

However, the concept of forced freedom also raises profound challenges for democratic governance, particularly concerning the protection of minority rights and the preservation of individual liberties. Rousseau's insistence on prioritizing the general will over individual

autonomy has led critics to caution against the potential for a "tyranny of the majority." In democratic societies, where minority voices are essential for fostering pluralism and diversity, the imposition of forced freedom could marginalize dissenting perspectives and stifle political dissent.

Moreover, the concept of forced freedom prompts reflections on the delicate balance between democratic decision-making and the protection of individual freedoms. While democracy aims to empower the collective will of the people, it must also safeguard the rights of individuals against the potential excesses of majority rule. Achieving this balance requires robust institutional mechanisms, such as independent judiciaries and constitutional protections, to ensure that democratic governance remains inclusive, participatory, and respectful of fundamental rights.

In essence, Rousseau's concept of forced freedom offers a nuanced lens through which to examine the complexities of democratic governance. By exploring its implications for individual autonomy, collective welfare, and minority rights, scholars continue to grapple with the enduring challenges of reconciling democratic ideals with the realities of political practice.

2.3 Alternatives and Counterarguments

In response to the challenges and complexities of Rousseau's concept of forced freedom, alternative perspectives and counterarguments have emerged within the realm of political thought.

One alternative approach suggests a more inclusive and participatory model of democracy, where the formation of the general will is characterized by deliberative processes involving all citizens. Rather than imposing the will of the majority on all individuals, this approach seeks to foster dialogue, consensus-building, and compromise among diverse viewpoints. By engaging in meaningful discourse and collective decision-making, citizens are more likely to align their individual interests with the common good, thus reducing the need for coercion.

Deliberative democracy, as it is often referred to, places a premium on public reasoning and the development of shared understandings among citizens. This approach seeks to strike a balance between individual autonomy and the collective pursuit of the common good. By actively involving citizens in the democratic process, deliberative democracy addresses concerns about the exclusion of minority perspectives and offers a potential solution to the challenges associated with forced freedom.

Another counterargument posits that the concept of forced freedom may be viewed as a theoretical ideal rather than a practical blueprint for governance. In real-world political contexts, the implementation of forced freedom may face numerous challenges and limitations. The complexity of determining the genuine collective will, the potential for abuses of power, and the necessity of safeguarding individual liberties all complicate the practical realization of forced freedom.

Instead of endorsing a one-size-fits-all approach to governance, this perspective suggests that political theorists and policymakers should be open to exploring hybrid models that combine elements of democracy with other forms of governance, striving to strike a balance between individual autonomy and collective decision-making. Such hybrid models may involve representative institutions, constitutional safeguards, and mechanisms for citizen participation that aim to achieve a delicate equilibrium between freedom and authority.

As we navigate the democratic implications of forced freedom, we encounter alternative perspectives and counterarguments that enrich our understanding of democratic governance. From deliberative democracy to hybrid models of governance, scholars offer different approaches to addressing the challenges posed by Rousseau's concept while upholding its democratic ideals.

Chapter 3: Addressing objections to forced freedom

In this chapter, while exploring Rousseau's concept of "forced freedom", we encounter a rich tapestry of objections that challenge and enrich our understanding of his political thought. This essay delves into four prominent objections raised by scholars spanning centuries of political thought. Firstly, we confront the specter of the "tyranny of the majority," as articulated by John Stuart Mill and Alexis de Tocqueville, cautioning against the unchecked authority of numerical superiority in democratic systems.
Secondly, we grapple with concerns regarding the assumption of rational self-interest underlying Rousseau's framework, as dissected by thinkers like Sigmund Freud, Herbert Marcuse, and Amartya Sen, who illuminate the complexities of human motivation.
Thirdly, we examine objections arising from cultural and contextual variations, drawing insights from Edward Said, Martha Nussbaum, and Kwame Anthony Appiah, who underscore the imperative of cultural sensitivity in applying Rousseau's principles across diverse societies.
Lastly, we confront the challenge to individual autonomy within Rousseau's framework, with reflections from John Locke, Isaiah Berlin, and John Rawls, who interrogate the balance between collective interests and individual liberties.
Through engaging with these objections, we deepen our appreciation of the complexities inherent in Rousseau's philosophy, ultimately striving to navigate the tension between the collective and the individual within democratic governance.

Objection 1: The risk of the tyranny of the majority

A persistent objection echoing through the annals of political philosophy and vividly resonating with Rousseau's concept of "forced freedom" is the looming specter of the "tyranny of the majority." This objection, as articulated by luminaries such as John Stuart Mill and Alexis de Tocqueville, cautions against the inherent perils of a democratic system in which the collective will, driven by numerical superiority, exerts unchecked authority.

John Stuart Mill, in his seminal work "On Liberty," passionately contends that a democratic society must vigilantly guard against the tyranny of the majority, for it is a threat not only to individual liberty but also to the flourishing of diverse ideas. Mill asserts that even well-

intentioned majorities may, in their quest to assert their will, stifle dissenting voices and minority perspectives. He cogently argues that the mere fact of being a majority does not grant infallibility or moral superiority, and that the general will, when wielded without restraint, can become a repressive force.

Echoing this sentiment, Alexis de Tocqueville, in "Democracy in America," offers an analysis of the democratic paradox. While celebrating the virtues of democracy, he astutely observes that it can breed a form of despotism that he terms the "tyranny of the majority." De Tocqueville warns that in democracies, where the majority exercises immense political power, there is a proclivity for conformity and uniformity, which can suffocate individuality and minority rights. He posits that this form of tyranny is not necessarily imposed by a single despot but arises organically from the collective will, potentially leading to a stifling of individual freedoms.

In the context of Rousseau's concept of "forced freedom," these objections fit very well. Critics argue that while Rousseau's framework may aspire to safeguard the collective good, it simultaneously exposes a vulnerability, that is the risk of the majority imposing its will, even if well-intentioned, to the detriment of minority rights and individual liberty.

It underscores the importance of institutional mechanisms within a democratic system that can act as safeguards against the tyranny of the majority. These mechanisms include a constitution that enshrines fundamental rights, an independent judiciary that can review and strike down majority decisions that violate these rights, and a vibrant civil society that can advocate for the protection of minority voices.

While Rousseau's framework may be susceptible to the tyranny of the majority, it need not lead inevitably to such tyranny if accompanied by a vigilant commitment to democratic principles and safeguards.

In this multifaceted dialogue, the objection of the tyranny of the majority serves as a vital reminder of the delicate balance that must be struck in democratic governance. A balance between the collective will and the protection of individual liberties. This underscores the ongoing relevance and complexity of Rousseau's ideas in the context of modern democratic societies, where the interplay between majority rule and minority rights remains a central concern.

Objection 2: The Limits of Rational Self-Interest

A recurring objection confronting Rousseau's notion of "forced freedom" emanates from the skepticism regarding the assumption that individuals consistently act in their rational self-interest. Critics argue that human behavior is profoundly intricate, often driven by emotions, biases, and external pressures that may not neatly align with a rational calculation of self-interest. This objection has provoked extensive contemplation, with experts such as Sigmund Freud, Herbert Marcuse, and Amartya Sen offering us diverse perspectives.

Sigmund Freud, the founding father of psychoanalysis, delves deep into the human psyche in works like "Civilization and Its Discontents." Freud contends that human desires and impulses are shaped by unconscious forces that defy easy categorization as rational or self-interested. He introduces the concept of the "id," an aspect of the psyche driven by instinctual and irrational desires, often conflicting with what might be deemed rational self-interest. Freud's exploration illuminates the complexity of human motivation, challenging the notion that individuals consistently act in their calculated self-interest.

Herbert Marcuse, a prominent figure in critical theory, builds upon Freud's insights in his work "Eros and Civilization." Marcuse argues that societal norms and structures can repress individual desires, leading to a dissonance between personal fulfillment and rational self-interest. He introduces the idea of "surplus repression," positing that individuals in advanced industrial societies may be coerced into conforming to societal norms that differ from their authentic desires. In this context, the assumption that individuals naturally pursue rational self-interest becomes increasingly tenuous.

Amartya Sen, a Nobel laureate in economics, contributes a perspective rooted in welfare economics and social choice theory. In "Rational Fools: A Critique of the Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory," Sen challenges the economic paradigm that posits individuals as solely motivated by rational self-interest. He argues that human behavior is influenced by a range of factors, including ethical considerations, empathy and social norms, which extend beyond narrow self-interest. Sen's critique resonates with Rousseau's emphasis on

the moral and ethical dimensions of human behavior, underscoring the limitations of reducing all actions to rational self-interest.

In the context of Rousseau's "forced freedom," these objections raise pertinent questions about the feasibility of individuals consistently aligning their actions with the collective good based on rational self-interest. Critics argue that human behavior is often far more intricate and complex than the framework suggests, potentially challenging the efficacy of Rousseau's proposal.

My perspective acknowledges the complexity of human behavior as articulated by these thinkers. It contends that while individuals may not always act in strict accordance with rational self-interest, Rousseau's framework provides a moral compass that encourages individuals to transcend immediate gratification for the greater societal benefit. Rather than negating the objections, this perspective incorporates them into the ongoing dialogue about how Rousseau's ideas can be applied and adapted in contemporary democratic societies, where the interplay between individual motivation and the common good remains a central concern.

Objection 3: Cultural and Contextual Variations

A pivotal objection to Rousseau's concept of "forced freedom" stems from the acknowledgment that his ideas are intricately entwined with the cultural and historical context of his time. This objection, expounded upon by scholars such as Edward Said, Martha Nussbaum, and Kwame Anthony Appiah, underscores the imperative of recognizing cultural and contextual variations in the application of Rousseau's principles.

Edward Said, in his seminal work "Orientalism," meticulously dissects the Western tendency to exoticize and essentialize non-Western cultures. Said critiques the Eurocentric lens through which Western thinkers, including Rousseau, have often viewed and analyzed societies outside their own. He warns against the dangers of cultural imperialism, cautioning that imposing Western political philosophies on diverse cultural landscapes risks erasing local autonomy and perpetuating colonial legacies. Said's critique serves as a poignant reminder of the importance of decolonizing our perspectives and approaching Rousseau's ideas with sensitivity to their cultural implications.

Martha Nussbaum, in her influential exploration of justice in "The Capability Approach," advocates for a nuanced understanding of human flourishing that transcends cultural boundaries. Nussbaum contends that a universal approach to justice must accommodate the diverse capabilities and aspirations of individuals across different societies. She challenges the notion of a singular framework like Rousseau's as universally applicable, emphasizing the need to consider the unique cultural and contextual factors shaping human experiences. Nussbaum's insights compel us to interrogate the universality of Rousseau's ideas and to appreciate the richness of cultural diversity in shaping notions of freedom and justice.

Kwame Anthony Appiah, in "Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers," champions a cosmopolitan outlook that celebrates the interconnectedness of human societies. Appiah argues that individuals have moral obligations to a global community, necessitating an appreciation for diverse cultural perspectives. He cautions against the imposition of rigid frameworks on diverse societies, advocating instead for a flexible approach that respects cultural pluralism. Appiah's perspective underscores the importance of cultural humility and mutual respect in navigating the complexities of global citizenship, urging us to approach Rousseau's ideas with openness to diverse cultural interpretations.

In the context of Rousseau's "forced freedom," this objection prompts us to critically examine the universality of his ideas and their applicability across diverse cultural landscapes. Critics argue that while Rousseau's framework may offer valuable insights, it must be interpreted and implemented with sensitivity to the specific cultural contexts in which it is situated.

Objection 4: The Problem of Individual Autonomy

An enduring objection to Rousseau's concept of "forced freedom" revolves around the potential encroachment on individual autonomy. This objection, articulated by scholars such as John Locke, Isaiah Berlin, and John Rawls, highlights concerns regarding the balance between collective interests and individual liberties within Rousseau's framework.

John Locke, a seminal figure in liberal political thought, champions the primacy of individual rights and limited government. In his influential work "Two Treatises of Government," Locke argues that individuals possess natural rights, including life, liberty, and property, which

governments are obliged to protect. He cautions against any imposition on these rights without the consent of individuals, asserting that such actions violate the social contract. Locke's perspective underscores the importance of strong protections for individual autonomy within the framework of governance.

Isaiah Berlin, in his essay "Two Concepts of Liberty," distinguishes between "positive liberty," which involves the pursuit of self-chosen goals, and "negative liberty," which pertains to freedom from external constraints. Berlin raises concerns about prioritizing positive liberty, as Rousseau's framework may imply, arguing that the pursuit of a collective good could lead to the imposition of a particular vision of the good life on individuals, potentially infringing upon their negative liberty. Berlin's critique prompts us to interrogate the implications of Rousseau's emphasis on the common good for individual autonomy.

John Rawls, in "A Theory of Justice," introduces the concept of the "veil of ignorance" to inform principles of justice in society. Rawls posits that rational individuals, unaware of their own characteristics and position in society, would design a just society that prioritizes fairness and equal opportunities for all. Rawls's perspective emphasizes the importance of preserving individual autonomy within the framework of collective decision-making, suggesting that any infringement on individual liberties must be justified by considerations of fairness and justice.

In the context of Rousseau's "forced freedom," these objections underscore the tension between collective interests and individual autonomy. Critics argue that while Rousseau's emphasis on the general will and the common good may serve noble ends, it also risks subjugating individual freedoms to the dictates of the majority.

Our perspective, while acknowledging these objections, contends that Rousseau's framework need not inherently undermine individual autonomy. Rather, it emphasizes the importance of a social contract that safeguards both collective interests and individual liberties. By incorporating the insights of Locke, Berlin, Rawls, and others, we deepen our understanding of the complexities inherent in Rousseau's philosophy and strive to strike a balance between the pursuit of the common good and the protection of individual autonomy within democratic governance.

As we conclude our exploration, we recognize the incredible relevance of Rousseau's thought in contemporary discourse, where the tension between collective aspirations and individual liberties remains a central concern. By engaging with these objections, we not only refine our understanding of Rousseau's concept of "forced freedom" but also chart a path toward a more nuanced and inclusive approach to governance and justice. Through ongoing dialogue and critical reflection, we strive to navigate the complexities of modern democracy, drawing inspiration from Rousseau's vision while remaining attuned to the diverse perspectives and challenges of our pluralistic world. In doing so, we honor the enduring legacy of Rousseau's political thought, which continues to inspire and provoke thought in our quest for a more just and equitable society.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis of Rousseau's idea of forced freedom as presented in 'The Social Contract', especially in Book I, Chapter VII, has revealed a complex and multifaceted concept. Rousseau's vision of the general will and the imposition of freedom challenges traditional understandings of individual liberty and democratic governance. While proponents emphasize the potential benefits of forced freedom in securing the common good and preserving the social compact, critics raise concerns about the dangers of coercion and the exclusion of minority perspectives.

Rousseau's exploration of forced freedom invites us to grapple with fundamental questions about the nature of authority, the limits of individual freedom, and the dynamics of democratic governance. As we engage in discussions surrounding the tension between individual autonomy and collective decision-making, we must recognize the enduring relevance of Rousseau's ideas in shaping modern political thought and practice.

The tension between the individual and the collective remains an inherent challenge in democratic societies. Rousseau's concept of forced freedom highlights the ongoing struggle to strike a balance between the protection of individual rights and the pursuit of the common good. As we navigate this complex argument, we must consider alternative approaches, engage in robust debates, and draw inspiration from diverse traditions of political thought to forge a more just and equitable society.

In Chapter 2, we delved into Rousseau's opinion about the general will and the imposition of freedom, examining his advocacy for the primacy of the general will in guiding political authority. Through our analysis, we grappled with Rousseau's vision of democracy and popular sovereignty, exploring the tensions between individual autonomy and collective decision-making.

Chapter 3 offered a detailed textual analysis of 'The Social Contract', Book I, Chapter VII, shedding light on Rousseau's arguments and their democratic implications. We scrutinized Rousseau's depiction of the erosion of the social bond and the emergence of despotism, engaging with alternative perspectives and counterarguments to delve deeper into the complexities of democratic governance.

In Chapter 4, we addressed objections to forced freedom, confronting critiques about the risks of tyranny of the majority, the limits of rational self-interest, cultural and contextual variations, and the problem of individual autonomy. Through our examination of these objections, we deepened our understanding of the challenges and limitations inherent in Rousseau's concept, offering avenues for further inquiry and reflection.

The main research question is: “How does Rousseau intend to implement the idea of forced freedom, and does it hold any antidemocratic implications?

Rousseau intends to implement the idea of forced freedom by emphasizing the supremacy of the general will in guiding political authority. He argues that the general will, representing the collective aspirations of the entire community, should dictate laws and policies that serve the common good. In Rousseau's view, individuals must willingly subordinate their individual interests to the dictates of the general will for the betterment of society as a whole. Through the social contract, individuals agree to abide by the decisions of the general will, relinquishing certain natural liberties in exchange for the benefits of political association.

While Rousseau's concept of forced freedom is grounded in democratic principles, it raises concerns about its potential antidemocratic implications. Critics argue that Rousseau's emphasis on the subordination of individual interests to the general will could lead to a form of "tyranny of the majority," where the rights and interests of minorities are sacrificed in favor of collective decision-making. The imposition of the general will may suppress dissenting voices and limit individual autonomy, undermining the pluralistic foundations of democracy.

Moreover, Rousseau's concept of forced freedom may overlook the diversity of perspectives and interests within society, potentially marginalizing minority groups and exacerbating social divisions. By prioritizing the common good over individual liberties, Rousseau's approach risks neglecting the protection of minority rights and fostering a homogenized conception of the public good.

Overall, while Rousseau's intent to promote the common good through forced freedom aligns with democratic aspirations, the implementation of this idea may entail antidemocratic implications, particularly regarding the protection of minority rights and the preservation of individual autonomy. Striking a balance between collective decision-making and the safeguarding of individual liberties remains a critical challenge in democratic governance.

As we navigate the complexities of governance in our contemporary world, characterized by diverse identities, global interdependence, and complex challenges, Rousseau's concept of forced freedom continues to compel us to reflect on the nature of authority, the role of individuals in society, and the ethical foundations of political authority. By critically evaluating and engaging with Rousseau's ideas, we contribute to the ongoing evolution of political thought, offering insights that can shape the course of democratic societies in the pursuit of justice, equality, and human flourishing.

1.

Bibliography:

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. "The Social Contract." Edited by Roger D. Masters and Judith R. Masters, translated by Roger D. Masters, St. Martin's Press, 1978.

2. Mill, John Stuart. "On Liberty." Edited by Elizabeth Rapaport, Hackett Publishing Company, 1978.
3. Arendt, Hannah. "The Origins of Totalitarianism." Harcourt, Brace & World, 1951.
4. Locke, John. "Second Treatise of Government." Edited by C.B. Macpherson, Hackett Publishing Company, 1980.
5. Hobbes, Thomas. "Leviathan." Edited by Richard Tuck, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
6. Freud, Sigmund. "Civilization and Its Discontents." W.W. Norton & Company, 1961.
7. Marcuse, Herbert. "Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud." Beacon Press, 1966.
8. Sen, Amartya. "Rational Fools: A Critique of the Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory." *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, vol. 6, no. 4, 1977, pp. 317–344.
9. Nussbaum, Martha. "The Capability Approach: Its Development, Critiques, and Recent Advances." Oxford University Press, 2019.
10. Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers." W.W. Norton & Company, 2006.
11. Rawls, John. "A Theory of Justice." Revised Edition, Harvard University Press, 1999.
12. Froese, Katrin, and Steven G. Affeldt. "Dynamic Governance: Contractual Arrangements in Political Systems." *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 24, no. 4, 2016, pp. 442–465.
13. Hiley, David R., and Henry David Rempel. "Rethinking Rousseau's Social Contract: A Critical Response to Recent Scholarship." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 41, no. 1, 2008, pp. 197–220.
14. Foucault, Michel. "Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison." Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1995.
15. Said, Edward. "Orientalism." Vintage Books, 1979.
16. Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In "Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture," edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, University of Illinois Press, 1988.
17. Fanon, Frantz. "The Wretched of the Earth." Translated by Richard Philcox, Grove Press, 2004.

18. Held, David, and Judith N. Shklar. "Legitimacy and Illegitimacy in Political Theory." *Nomos XVIII: Political Legitimacy,* edited by J. Roland Pennock and John W. Chapman, New York University Press, 1977.
19. Minow, Martha. "Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence." Beacon Press, 1999.
20. Unger, Roberto Mangabeira. "The Critical Legal Studies Movement." *Harvard Law Review,* vol. 96, no. 3, 1983, pp. 561–675.

Ringraziamenti

A conclusione di questo elaborato, desidero menzionare tutte le persone che mi hanno accompagnato durante questo fantastico percorso.
Un sentito grazie al mio relatore Pellegrino Gianfranco, per la sua infinita disponibilità.
Ringrazio infinitamente i miei genitori che mi hanno sempre sostenuto, appoggiando ogni mia decisione, fin dalla scelta del mio percorso di studi.
Un grazie speciale va anche ai miei fratelli Luigi e Laetitia, per il loro supporto e la loro vicinanza.
Intendo inoltre ringraziare immensamente i miei nonni Luigi, Carmela e Rosa e tutti i miei zii e i miei cugini per il loro affetto.
Un grazie di cuore anche ai miei amici e alla mia fidanzata che mi hanno accompagnato durante questi bellissimi anni.
Infine, dedico questa tesi a me stesso, ai miei sacrifici e alla mia tenacia che mi hanno permesso di arrivare fin qui.