

Stanisław KOWALCZYK¹

FREEDOM AND TYPES OF ITS DEFORMATION

Freedom appears in the very centre of human existence: it constitutes its „heart”, sanctuary, indispensable source of dignity, and mystery. Freedom makes man, homo sapiens, both a subject and a person. The history of humankind is a history of an unceasing struggle to conquer and widen the borders of its freedom, although often it is also a history of the betrayal of freedom, of enslaving others, or of an escape from freedom². Freedom is a foundation of man's activity, determining its purposefulness. It offers man a possibility of self-determination, internal development, though also of self-destruction. There are three main types of freedom: personalistic, individualistic and collectivistic.

The integral nature of the concept of freedom

Characterization of freedom is not easy since there is a multitude of aspects, planes of analysis and conceptions (models). Christian thought usually distinguishes ontological, psychological-moral, and social kinds of freedom³. The first one is the so-called freedom of will, which constitutes a natural attribute of every man, i.e. his ontological datum.

¹ Catholic University of Lublin.

² E. Fromm, *Escape from Freedom*, New York 1971, pp. 17 ff.

³ L. B. Geiger, *De la liberté* (in:) *Philosophie et spiritualité*, Paris 1962, vol. 2, pp. 61-96; J. Baucher, *La liberté* (in:) *Dictionnaire de la théologie catholique*, Paris 1962, vol. 9, col. 659-703; S. Kowalczyk, *An Outline of the Philosophical Anthropology*, Frankfurt am Main 1991, pp. 103-119.

Psychological-moral freedom defines man's internal autonomy, a result of a long-lasting educational and self-educational labour. Social freedom covers the freedoms of thought, conscience and religion, of publication, association etc. Today one often hears about „freedom from” and „freedom to”. Freedom „from” is placed in opposition to the theory of determinism by recognizing the possibility of choice of one of several alternatives which face man. Freedom „to” denotes an internal-moral maturity of man, having a keen sense of responsibility and sensitivity to higher values. The two types of freedom mentioned above emphasize its different aspects, negative and positive. They cannot be grasped in isolation but only in conjunction. The separation of both aspects of freedom inevitably leads to its deformation, first to doctrinal-ideological deformation and then to existential and social deformation. The freedom of social life, covering the so-called right to freedom, is a natural culmination of ontological and axiological-moral freedom.

The integral understanding of the idea of freedom demands a recognition of its personalistic character⁴. The world of objects-things (and animals too) is fully explicable through antecedents – laws of nature, its mechanisms and coincidence of natural circumstances. Things are only a passive result of the energy of cosmos: by themselves they are incapable of an active attitude and initiative. Only the human person is something more than merely a result of the operation of nature; man's activity goes beyond biological and social conditioning. Man is an active subject or a person, and for this reason both his existential structure and dynamics transcend the world of things. Man is not a fully determined element of material nature, a biologically programmed automaton or a product of social life. In human nature there are cognitive and aspiring, active capabilities which make it possible to recognize the existing situation and to make an autonomous choice. Only a person is rational and free in action, hence every explanation of the idea of freedom in separation from the context of the human person constitutes its falsification. There is no freedom beyond the realm of persons, and thus nonpersonalistic and antipersonalistic models of freedom provoke individual and social pathologies.

Freedom understood in the ontological sense („from”) makes man capable of self-determination. Freedom of will is a real possibility of choice which is realised in either the „yes – no” act or in the form of separating an object as an aim⁵. Man lives in the world of values and he is sensitive to them. However, there is a broad scope of aims, so that

⁴ St. Thomas Aquinas, *S.th.* I, q. 83, p. 1.

⁵ St. Thomas Aquinas, *De veritate*, q. 22, p. 6.

in a spontaneous mechanism of desiring the good there must function an element of conscious choice and selection. In the interpretation of Thomist philosophy, the ability to choose a specific value rests with a special ontic faculty known as free will⁶. The freedom of the human person, understood as a real possibility of choice, does not exclude the existence of determinants restricting the scope of alternatives. Freedom is only destroyed by internal or external compulsion, e.g. in the form of physical coercion, psychological disease, advanced addiction etc. Yet, man's freedom is not equivalent to a suspension of natural order and the functioning of laws of nature. Undoubtedly, they restrict the scope of intentions and choices but they do not destroy freedom⁷. Ontological freedom does not isolate man from the complex of psycho-physical determinants, the influence of the sphere of instincts, inherited inclinations, acquired habits etc. The idea of freedom does not mean an acceptance of indeterminism, though at the same time it is in opposition to the theory of determinism. Man's existential faculty consists in self-direction and self-determination connected with the possibility of realising the choice of one of the alternatives perceived. That is why one can speak about self-determinism as an action proper to man.

Choice, as an indispensable element of man's freedom, is a rational act. That is why reason may be called „the root of all freedom”⁸, its foundation and prerequisite condition. Only a rational being can be free; animals lacking in intellectual reflection are not free. Intellect enables the apprehension of the world of nature and the domain of values as well as an evaluation of their usefulness for human life and man's personal aims. In consequence it makes possible the choice of ends and means of action. Mental recognition of the existing situation and of the pattern of real possibilities prepares man's decision but does not determine it. The final decision is an act of will which constitutes a new, mysterious domain of the human person⁹. Even a long, intensive, cognitive reflection does not foreclose a practical choice and that is why intellectualisation of the idea of freedom constitutes its deformation. It is a fault of both Hegelianism and Marxism that freedom is restricted to the fact of recognizing the necessity of laws of nature and social life. In this interpretation rationality is not so much a source of freedom but rather its end. Man does not act without cognitive penetration and motivation, yet ultimately the very act of decision is

⁶ *S.th.* I, q. 82, p. 3.

⁷ *S.th.*, I, q. 82, p. 1.

⁸ *De veritate*, q. 24, p. 2c

⁹ J. Maritain, *Freedom in the Modern World*, London 1935, pp. 9-10.

man's internal deed and his risk. Self-determination goes beyond the sphere of cognition and its essence is the mysterious act of choice of one of several available alternatives.

Freedom means not only a possibility of choice but also an ability to choose. Possibilities are a consequence of favourable external circumstances, while the ability to choose is an acquired, internal property of a spiritually mature man. External freedom does not yet mean freedom of the human person because the latter demands a development of internal freedom in oneself. In this way the negative and positive aspects of freedom are mutually complementary. The conception of internal freedom was popularized by the Stoics who claimed that even a slave can be free; his legal slavery does not exclude internal freedom thanks to which he can be psychologically detached from an actually and existentially experienced situation. The Stoics postulated the developing of freedom from fear, suffering, social dependences etc., which would make internal self-control possible. Their theory of freedom, undoubtedly noble, was too abstract and negativ. Internal freedom requires a personal entry into the world of natural and religious values. Such freedom is achieved by the liberation from moral evil. The connection between freedom and the absence of evil is emphasized by Christianity. Saint Paul wrote about freedom from sin whose opposite is fascination with evil¹⁰. Saint Augustine also understood freedom as being independent from moral evil¹¹. Saint Thomas Aquinas distinguished two kinds of freedom: lack of compulsion and liberation from moral misery¹². In later Christian writings the idea of free will dominated over the idea of internal freedom. The variety and at the same time the complementariness of both of them were emphasized by Jacques Maritain. The French Thomist perceptively stated that „man has freedom of choice in order to reach the freedom of autonomy, the ultimate freedom”¹³.

Internal freedom requires a deep-rootedness in values. Truth is the compass of all values and that is why it is an indispensable condition of freedom. This is emphasized by John Paul II in the encyclical *Redemptor hominis*, referring to the words of Jesus Christ: „Then you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free” (John 8, 32). Christ „brings man freedom based on truth” and „frees him from what restricts

¹⁰ Romans 7, 7-25; S. Lyonnet, *Liberté chrétienne de l'Esprit selon Saint Paul*, Paris 1954.

¹¹ S. Kowalczyk, *Człowiek i Bóg w nauce św. Augustyna* [Man and God in the Teaching of Saint Augustine], Warszawa 1987, pp. 119-128.

¹² *S.th.*, I, q. 83, p. 2, ad 3.

¹³ J. Maritain, *Freedom in the Modern World*, p. 30.

that freedom, what diminishes it, breaks it at its basis in man's soul, heart, conscience" (RH 12). There are several threats to the ethos of truth, both individual (lies, half-truths, fanaticism, compromises, sophistry) and social (lack of pluralism, various forms of dictatorship). Without truth, that is, without a possibility of identifying, proclaiming and defending truth, there is no freedom.

Man wins full freedom only in consequence of maturing and realizing values. Freedom cannot be understood as a static and egocentric attitude of man, jealously guarding his external autonomy. Freedom cannot be treated as an aim in itself and the highest value but it should be apprehended in the context of the whole human person and its calling. Freedom should be subservient to such values as truth, good, love, friendship, community. The realization of these values is man's duty and this in the purpose of the command of love¹⁴. „God is love" (1 John 4, 8). God's love has created man and it liberates man. That is why Saint Augustine could say „Ame et quod vis fac"¹⁵. If man loves truly he will not abuse his freedom. Love gives full internal freedom and thanks to it we are transformed from the slaves of evil into free children of God. Freedom is a fruit of participating in the community of love. Freedom, combined with truth, good, and love, conditions the authentic liberation of the human person. External freedom and autonomy are man's rights, but only internal freedom means „taking possession of oneself"¹⁶. Real choice is a result of self-control and self-direction.

Freedom of will and moral-internal freedom entitle one to the freedom of social life. The latter cannot be restricted exclusively to the postulate of the so-called right to freedom; it would mean an impoverishment of the idea of social freedom, unavoidably connected with the juridical-institutional structures of every society¹⁷. Naturally, such structures limit the freedom of individual man, although it is dictated by the commun good of all the people. Extreme individualism suggests an opposition between freedom and law, civil, ethical, religious etc. Such an attitude disregards the fact that man is „a being with principles". Apart from laws of nature, the human person is also subjected to ethical norms permanently inscribed into human rational nature. Law does not need to mean a neutralization of freedom but it should constitute its confirmation as well as channelizing. Man does not exist solely for himself but he lives for others. That is why the right to freedom is

¹⁴ J. Maritain, *Freedom in the Modern World*, p. 32.

¹⁵ *In epist. Joan. ad Parth.* 7, 8 PL 35, 2033.

¹⁶ H. Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, tr. by A. Mitchell, London 1954, p. 281.

¹⁷ O. Höffe, *Freiheit in der sozialen und politischen Institutionen* (in:) *Wie frei ist Mensch?* Hrsg. von J. Splett, Düsseldorf 1980, pp. 54-81.

organically connected with the necessity of respecting the freedom of others. Thanks to law – provided it is just and voluntarily accepted – freedom does not turn into licentiousness.

Social limitations of freedom should not be turned into an enslavement of the human person. For that reason Christian personalism quite unequivocally stresses the right to freedom in social life. Man's internal „ego” is autonomous in respect to community, so freedom is not to be sanctioned by it and cannot be taken back from man. Social life can function properly only in the atmosphere of freedom, so state authority cannot infringe upon the indispensable rights of man. „The human person is and should be a principle, subject, and aim of all social institutions” (GS 25). The last Vatican Council postulated respect of the right to freedom – to religious freedom (GS 8), scientific-cultural freedom (GS 59) and political freedom (GS 76). In the encyclical *Redemptor hominis* John Paul II also urged for the respect of the rights of man and nations (RH 17). Human rights are by no means the rights of an egoist but the rights of a person involved in social life¹⁸. It is possible only on the basis of the common good which is a set of recognized values voluntarily accepted by the members of a community. Authentic society is experienced as a commonwealth of persons and „a brotherly community”¹⁹. Unavoidable limitation of freedom, dictated by the common good (rather than by the profits of the ruling elite or convenience of bureaucratic authority), do not deprive citizens of human face and of the rights belonging to the person.

Individualistic Deformations of Freedom

The category of „deformation” may be understood in two ways, as an individual or social fact and as a controversial doctrine. Existential-social deformations of freedom include, among others, psychological deviations (hereditary or acquired), advanced alcoholism, narcotic and drug addictions, captivating habits. Those kinds of anomalies of the human person are analysed by psychology, psychiatry, sociology and medicine. Further considerations will be limited to doctrinal deformations which distort the ideas of man and freedom in two ways, by extreme individualism and by extreme collectivism. Theoretical-

¹⁸ J. Maritain, *True Humanism*, New York 1938, pp. 127 ff.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 128-129; J. Splett, *Freiheit im Licht des Unbedingten* (in:) *Wie Frei ist Mensch?*, pp. 83-103.

ideological deformations usually bear fruit in the form of individual or social pathology.

Individualistic deformations of the idea of freedom are most often reduced to the following theories: indeterminism, individualistic liberalism, anarchism and nihilism. Theoretical indeterminism is usually connected with the postulate of man's absolute autonomy. The turning of the idea of freedom into an absolute is typical of F. Nietzsche and J. P. Sartre. The German naturalist, Nietzsche, offered humanity a rejection of „the broken plates of the Decalogue”, that is, a renouncement of all codexes, religious, moral or socio-political²⁰. It was a conception of freedom from religion and from God, from generally accepted morality, from social interference. In the place of the theory of free will the author proclaimed the postulate of „the will of power” understood as total autonomy in the domain of values. This autonomy also concerned the limits of the good and evil.

Man's freedom was explained analogically by Sartre. Although he was aware of man's social and existential conditioning, he still identified man's freedom with autonomy. He regarded freedom an man's essence (man being understood apersonalistically and asubstantively), and therefore man should assume full responsibility for his life²¹. Freedom and responsibility could not be ceded to anybody, God or people. Theists were accused of „bad will” since they were to transfer their freedom to God. Man is „condemned” to freedom and therefore he should be completely independent in his accepted ethos, life ideals, conduct etc. The morality of universal norms is not to be reconciled with man's absolute freedom and therefore its acceptance – similarly to religious faith – is described as self-betrayal. Arbitrary decisions about the categories of good and evil constitute a privilege of a free man; his autonomy could have no limits.

The conception of freedom, understood as indeterminism and man's absolute autonomy, raises objections. The theory of indeterminism departs from natural and social realities, which at the same time indicate man's contingency. Man is not the absolute and hence his freedom cannot be absolute. Autonomy is man's right but there are two autonomies, real and apparent²². The latter means an illusory liberation of man offered by various trends of modern naturalism and atheism. Recent history confirms the truth liberation from Transcend-

²⁰ F. Nietzsche, *Also sprach Zarathustra*, Stuttgart 1921, pp. 287 ff.

²¹ J.-P. Sartre, *L'être et le néant*, Paris 1979, pp. 614-615, 626; also his: *L'existentialisme est un humanisme*, Paris 1964, p. 36.

²² J. Maritain, *The Conquest of Freedom* (in:) *Freedom. Its Meaning*, ed. by R. N. Anshen, London 1942, p. 217.

dence is usually connected with lapsing into the slavery of the gods of immanence – violence, pleasure, the collective, money, race etc. Every attempt to deify man ultimately leads to a threat to his spiritual dignity or to instrumentalization on an individual or collective scale. Man's authentic freedom is an internal – moral freedom which has been won by great effort. Freedom cannot be realized outside of the realm of higher values, especially such as truth, good, love, or brotherhood. For that reason religious values should be regarded as a foundation of freedom rather than a threat to it.

The postulate of absolute freedom appears in the very centre of the ideology of individual liberalism. Already the very name „liberalism” (from Latin *liber* – free) emphasizes the role of freedom in human life, both individual and social. The emergence of the state community is interpreted as a result of a „social contract”²³. Liberalism is a trend of many currents and that is why one speaks of economic liberalism, socio-political liberalism, the liberalism of manners and morals, ideological-religious liberalism etc.²⁴ A philosophical exponent of the ideas of individualism and liberalism is found in the conception of freedom proposed by Sartre whose philosophical and literary writings reveal the characteristic features of this trend – egocentrism, ethical relativism, naturalism, departure from personalism. There have also been attempts to „Christianize” liberalism; a classical example is a book *The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism* by M. Novak²⁵. The author tried to demonstrate a compatibility between the liberal conception of freedom and Christian personalism and ethos. In the characterizations of the idea of freedom, central for liberalism, there is sometimes a distinction between two aspects, descriptive and normative. The former constitutes an answer to the question of what freedom is. The latter aspect seeks an answer to the question about the purpose which freedom should serve. It is suggested that the essence of freedom involves exclusively a possibility of choice, while the connection with values is already a matter of the pragmatics of freedom.

A critical evaluation of individualistic liberalism is an integral part of social science of the Church²⁶. Such an evaluation already appeared in *Rerum novarum* by Leon XIII and *Quadragesimo anno* by Pius XI, later on in the documents of Vaticanum II (especially in *Gaudium et*

²³ Cf. J. J. Rousseau, *Du Contrat social*, Paris 1964.

²⁴ E. Nawroth, *Die Sozial- und Wirtschaftsphilosophie des Neoliberalismus*, Heidelberg 1961.

²⁵ M. Novak, *The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism*, New York 1982.

²⁶ R. Coste, *Evangile et politique*, Paris 1968, chap. XI; also his: *Pour une charité libératrice*, Paris 1974.

spes, 65), and, more recently, in the teachings of John XXIII, Paul VI and John Paul II. At the moment we are not interested in a full evaluation of liberalism but only in its idea of freedom. Pope Paul VI in *Octogesima adveniens* warns against the idealization of liberalism when he writes: „In its foundations philosophical liberalism contains a mistaken claim about the autonomy of the individual in his action, motivation and use of freedom” (OA 35). What faults are there in the individualist-liberal conception of freedom?

The very emphasis placed on the idea of freedom is a positive element of this trend but objections are raised by the extremely individualistic and egocentric understanding of freedom. Freedom is an indispensable right of the human person but the maximization of individual freedom leads to the disintegration of social life²⁷. Individualism depreciates and sometimes even questions the idea of the common good which is a separate and higher value than individual interests. The basis of social life is to be found not only in freedom but also in social justice and equality and the latter often demand a restriction of the former (though it should be remembered that restriction does not mean abolition, even a temporary one). The postulate of a maximal, unrestricted economic freedom undoubtedly constitutes a threat to the demands of social justice whose realization is also a postulate of real humanism. Man's freedom is always realized in the context of social life and therefore it also means participation in duties and inconveniences. Our personal right to freedom requires an observation of the social norms which ensure the freedom of others.

There are still other debatable elements of the liberal conception of freedom. When freedom is narrowed down to a possibility of free choice, then this understanding is all too negative. Individualistic theory of freedom is purely formal and empty since it ignores the domain of values. Freedom „from” and freedom „to” should not be separated, i.e. the possibility of choice should be axiologically oriented. Freedom is given sense by truth, good, love, brotherhood and community. Freedom separated from values is transformed into licentiousness, whim and even nonsense. Freedom without values or directed against values annihilates itself, since authentically free will means good will. Freedom, instrumentalized as a cover of cognitive or ethical relativism and cynicism, is a caricature of freedom. Every depersonalization of freedom leads to pathology.

²⁷ J. Maritain, *Freedom in the Modern World*, p. 41; also his: *La personne et le bien commun*, Paris 1947, pp. 71-76.

The deformation of the idea of freedom is particularly evident in the ideologies of anarchism and nihilism. Their common property is the negative understanding of freedom and the orientation of freedom towards destructive purposes. Anarchism detaches freedom from the logos and ethos of man, identifying it with asocial attitudes – the destruction of the existing structures, ruin of social order, blind unjustified hostility towards people etc. A literary expression of the ideas of rebellion and anarchy may be found in a book by the French existentialist, Albert Camus, entitled *L'homme révolté*²⁸. He analyzes various forms of rebellion, in philosophy, art, literature, ideology, politics. Camus did not practise the apotheosis of anarchism but he revealed its existential sources connected mainly with the attitude of rebellion against evil. The ideas of nihilism are also evident in the writings of F. Dostoevsky. The protagonist of his novel *The Devils*, Kirillov, understands freedom as a rebellion against all moral-religious norms. For this reason he seeks a confirmation of his freedom in the fact of suicide, for thanks to it man-slave is transformed into man-god. Suicide is to be an acknowledgement of one's own autonomy and greatness while their source is the renouncement of the obedience to God. Elements of nihilism may also be found in the writings of Nietzsche who was convinced that the rejection of all authorities, religious, social, philosophical etc., was an attribute of freedom.

Anarchistic and nihilistic conceptions of freedom constitute evident pathologies. Characterizing models of freedom Paul Ricoeur distinguished „sane” freedom and „wild” freedom²⁹. The former combines the use of freedom with the acceptance of social structures and their proper institutions; it is man's constructive attitude. Wild freedom finds an outlet in negation, in barren protests, rebellions, violence, nihilism, absurd, destruction. Ultimately the latter kind of freedom turns against man; it destroys him as an individual person and it destroys his society.

Social Deformations of Freedom

The models of freedom analyzed above usually regarded as an absolute the role of the human individual. Yet, there are also such models of freedom in which the possibilities of realizing freedom are perceived only on a social scale. The latter perspective is characteristic

²⁸ *L'homme révolté*, Paris 1951.

²⁹ P. Ricoeur, *Wolność rozsądna i wolność dzika* [Sane Freedom and Wild Freedom], „Znak” 1970, no. 7-8, pp. 839-859.

of determinism, sociocentrism, totalitarianism and terrorism. Determinism appears in two variants, theological and philosophical. Extreme theological determinism is typical of Islam accepting fatalism. Theological motivation of determinism also appeared in the teachings of Luther, Calvin and Jansen, who were convinced that the original sin had caused a significant corruption of human nature. A consequence was „a theology of grace without freedom”³⁰. Protestantism also favoured the predestination theory which is an extremely pessimistic estimation of the scope of man’s freedom. In fact, it was practically a negation of freedom in the name of God’s omnipotence and grace, which obviously undermined the possibility of natural righteousness and goodness of man. Freedom without grace is no longer freedom.

There is also philosophical determinism which was accepted by Spinoza, Hegel, creators of Marxism and Freud. Freedom was attributed only to the deity by Spinoza, although even in the deity he understood freedom as an immanent necessity of self-development. Hegel combined the conception of freedom with the conception of necessity, acknowledging their dialectical relation. In his theory of Being there was no distinction between God’s freedom and man’s freedom, so in consequence is „a single freedom, which is man’s; man in whom will come to Being the God that lies in Becoming in the world and in history”³¹. Through its connection with pantheism the Hegelian conception of freedom actually undermines the freedom of the individual man for the sake of the necessity of the process of the self-development of the Deity included in the visible world. Extreme determinism also constitutes an integral element of Marxist philosophy as a consequence of its materialism. Matter knows no duty or prohibition, nor does it distinguish between good and evil. It cannot be surprising, therefore, that Friedrich Engels described freedom as a mutual recognition of existing biological and social determinants³². The idea of freedom was also weakened in consequence of Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution. He undermined the previous belief about the exceptional status of man in the animate world. Darwin also provides an important reference for S. Freud for whom man was merely a web of vital – instinctive forces, among which sexual drive predominated. The Austrian psychiatrist reduced consciousness to the subconscious which again resulted in the negation of freedom.

³⁰ J. Maritain, *True humanism*, p. 10.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

³² F. Engels, *Herrn Eugen Dührings Umwälzung der Wissenschaft (Anty-Dühring)*, Berlin 1953, p. 138.

Theological and philosophical determinism provokes some essential objections. The former is guilty of extremism since for the sake of the omnipotence of God's grace it undermines freedom, man's significant attribute. In that interpretation man is in fact compelled to do good or evil. As was justly observed by Max Scheler, philosophical determinism is „a product of the horror of freedom”³³. Proponents of determinism are afraid of man's freedom in which they perceive an alternative of disorder and chaos. In fact, it is a result of their mistrust of man-person. The mistake of determinists lies in exaggerating the role of determinants whose effect, after all, is by no means absolutely enslaving for man. Human mind can perceive a number of possible ways of action and free will chooses one of them. The idea of freedom is also confirmed by inner experience and the phenomenon of conscience whose evidence cannot be peremptorily questioned. Man feels he is the cause of his own deeds and he qualifies them by ethical categories. He is aware of the fact that his internal „I want” differs from „I am willing to”. At any rate, determinism undermines the sense of moral-social norms, the possibility of education and self-education, the idea of responsibility etc. Since we say about man that „he should” or „he should not”, we thus assume his existential „may”.

The pathology of the idea of freedom is noticeable in the collectivist theory of society, also known as the organicist theory. According to the suggestions of Hegel and Marxism, community is existentially more fundamental than human individuals who are merely constituents of the social „organism”. Marx distinguished abstract freedom and concrete freedom, combining the latter with the ownership of the private means of production. Thus, he thought that the freedom of all the people requires an abolishing of such property, i.e. its socialization (today, practically it means turning it into state property). The theory of collectivism significantly affects the explication of freedom which is then interpreted as a product of social life. In the pre-social stage man was to be a merely material-biological being, while personality and human attributes were to be derivative effects of beginning to live in society. Thus, according to this interpretation man's freedom is actually created by the collective and it does not constitute an existential datum of human nature. Since community is an original and fundamental being, then it is also justified in limiting the freedom of individual people. Sociocentric understanding of humanity, characteristic of Marxism,

³³ M. Scheler, *Zur Phänomenologie und Metaphysik der Freiheit* (in:) *Schriften aus dem Nachlass*, Bd. 1, Bern 1957, p. 158 ff.; B. Welte, *Determination und Freiheit*, Frankfurt am M. 1969, especially pp. 111 ff., 123-129.

is logically connected with the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The theory postulates an institutional, though – in assumption – only temporary, limitation of the freedom of social life in the domains of science, culture, ideology, economy, politics etc.

The conception of freedom implied by collectivism is controversial both in its assumptions and conclusions. Doubts are also raised by the thesis that social life creates man as a rational and free being. In this anthropology man by his very nature is not a person since he is to owe his humanization to society. In such a case an individual man would merely be a manifestation of such a community, especially of a given social class. This understanding of man reduced him to a particular exemplification of the collective, thus questioning the possibility and sense of man's freedom³⁴. It is an instrumental treatment of the human person, excluding his status of a subject and a possibility of taking decisions about himself. The theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is also controversial since every institutionalization of the restriction of man's freedom – regardless of its name – is ethically doubtful. This theory is motivated by the idea of man's liberation, yet it is difficult to speak about liberation when justifying measures which enslave man. Excessive limitations of the freedom of social life may lead to totalitarianism which allows a violation of man's fundamental rights³⁵.

An instance of flagrant pathology of social life is to be found in socio-political totalitarianism which violates man's freedom in both individual and social dimensions. The model of totalitarianism in society and state is characterized by Erich Fromm who carries out an interesting analysis of the process of enslaving man³⁶. He distinguishes three main elements of „the escape from freedom” of modern man. People of the Middle Ages had no freedom in the contemporary sense of the word but they did have an established place in their society and they felt needed. Modern people have an acknowledged right to freedom but they experience feelings of frustration, loneliness, desolation and emptiness. They are free but lonely and often hopeless, so they are looking for an authority. If they find it, they willingly forsake their and voluntarily conform to the commands of a fascinating impervious individual or an elite. A consequence of this appears hostility towards people who think or act differently, a desire to dominate over them and quite often a will to destroy. Another feature of the enslavement process is a mechanically

³⁴ J. Maritain, *True Humanism*, p. 25 ff.

³⁵ J. Maritain, *Freedom in the Modern World*, p. 25 ff.

³⁶ E. Fromm, *Escape from Freedom*, passim.

accepted conformity, i.e. an attempt to become similar to others. Since man loses his identity, he must continuously accept others. Blind obedience to a leader, racial or class hatred, nationalism, depreciation of ethics for the sake of force – are all consequences of the loss of freedom in a totalitarian model of social life. Instead of natural authorities (family, school, ideological groups), an uncritical cult of power elites is postulated and accepted.

Fromm perfectly exposes the mechanism of renouncing freedom by people existentially and socially lost but he overlooks the anatomy of enslavement employed by totalitarian states. Totalitarianism means social integrism: it is not limited to one domain of human life but attempts to cover all of them. That is why socio-political totalitarianism is connected with dictatorship in the domains of science, culture, philosophy, education, ideology etc. Proponents of totalitarian rule make an absolute of their model of government, arrogating to themselves infallibility and omnipotence, calling themselves a voice of history, the will of the people, messengers of progress. Proponents of totalitarianism grant themselves a monopoly of truth, hence they are enemies of pluralism in any realm. For these reasons a system of this kind of social life restricts access to full truth, limits the possibilities of popularizing it, proclaims half-truths and biased simplifications, imposes propaganda evaluation in the place of honest information and so on. The system of dictatorship is particularly ill-disposed toward men of science and culture, not excluding their biological extermination in case of „need”. The point is to destroy historical, national, ideological and moral awareness since it is then easier to manipulate the human mass. The totalitarian system demands monopoly in the domain of pedagogy, restricting here the rights of the parents and religious-ideological communities. Other measures employed by totalitarianism include: inspiring fanaticism, employing moral, economic and physical coercion, discrimination of independence of thought and action, enforcing blind obedience. Although „escape from freedom” is undoubtedly psycho-sociologically conditioned, it is skillfully directed in a totalitarian state. Although in the modern world slavery is forbidden, totalitarianism is in fact a covert form of slavery. Resignation from freedom is a „selling out” of oneself, while direct or indirect enslavement of man is equivalent to the destruction of man as a person.

Dictatorship exists thanks to violence. It is quite openly referred to by various forms of terrorism, such as individual-anarchic, racial, class, ideological (including religious fanaticism as its variant), social and state terrorism. Usually only individual forms of terrorism are condemned, while other forms are overlooked. Such a selective-negative evaluation of terrorism is illogical since the evil of terrorism results

from its essence and methods and not from its declared purposes. Terrorism is a threat to humankind, to individual man and society, to biological existence and to freedom of taking decisions about oneself.

Individualist and collectivist models of man are undoubtedly mutually opposed and they are also separated by mutual dislike and permanent struggle against each other. Yet, the opposed character of both trends does not undermine the fact that they share many common features in their approach to man and the problem of his freedom. The first similarity is the depersonalisation of freedom, i.e. its separation from the existential context of the human person. However, thus conceived freedom becomes a misunderstanding since it is then lacking in ontic foundations and an existential sense. Another feature shared by individualistic and sociocentric conceptions of freedom is the separation of freedom from the background of fundamental human values, such as truth, love and solidarity. Freedom cannot exist for itself and even the ideas of social equality and justice do not vindicate the right to suspend it. Other common features of the theories of freedom of individualism and Marxist collectivism are economism and naturalism, i.e. connecting it with a rejection of God (in Marxism quite openly and in individualism – often indirectly or implicitly). Freedom ceases then to serve the human person and Transcendence, being reduced to the matter of guarding the material interests of the individual or society. In its nature freedom has a personal-dialogic character and, hence, it is mortally threatened by both individualistic egoism and ideological glorification of the collective.

Stanisław KOWALCZYK

WOLNOŚĆ I TYPOWE JEJ ZNIEKSZTAŁCENIA

Streszczenie

Wolność stanowi centrum bytu ludzkiego i oś ludzkiego działania. Istnieją trzy główne typy wolności: personalistyczny, indywidualistyczny i kolektywistyczny. W koncepcji integralno-personalistycznej wyróżnia się trzy jej rodzaje: ontologiczną, psychologiczno-moralną i społeczną. Wolność ontologiczna to tzw. wolność woli, dzięki której człowiek jest zdolny do autodeterminizmu, czyli wyboru celów i środków. Jest to wolność od przymusu zewnętrznego i wewnętrznego. Bytowa wolność człowieka nie jest ani determinizmem, ani indeterminizmem. Jej podstawą jest umysłowe poznanie i deliberacja intelektu, lecz to nie one decydują o wyborze jednej z wielu możliwych alternatyw. Wolność woli uzdalnia człowieka do nabycia wolności psychologiczno-moralnej, która poprzez zakorzenienie w wartościach wyższych (prawdzie, dobru, miłości) jest wewnętrzną dojrzałością osoby ludzkiej. Jest to wolność finalna, wyzwolenie od moralnego zła, dzięki czemu człowiek uzyskuje autentyczną autonomię. Wolność moralna jest oparta przede wszystkim na prawdzie, co akcentuje papież Jan Paweł II, a także na miłości. Wolność w znaczeniu osobowym ma zawsze profil prospołeczny, dlatego niesie z sobą potrzebę dobra wspólnego oraz norm prawnych, etycznych i religijnych. Życie społeczne nie może jednak naruszać moralnej autonomii indywidualnych ludzi oraz ich praw.

Wolność człowieka może ulegać różnorodnym zniekształceniom: egzystencjalno-społecznym lub doktrynalnym. Teoretyczno-doktrynalne zniekształcenia idei wolności to jej koncepcje indywidualistyczna i kolektywistyczna. Skrajnie indywidualistyczna koncepcja wolności jest powiązana z teoriami: indeterminizmu, indywidualistycznego liberalizmu, anarchizmu i nihilizmu. Absolutyzacja wolności jest charakterystyczna dla Nietzschego i Sartre'a. Ich koncepcja wolności była apersonalna i antyspołeczna, dlatego wolność sprowadzali do opozycji wobec etyki normatywnej, religii i reguł życia społecznego. Liberalno-indywidualistyczną koncepcję wolności przyjmuje M. Novak, który jednak pragnie ją uzgodnić z personalizmem chrześcijańskim. Indywi-

dualistyczny model wolności jest krytycznie oceniany przez społeczną naukę Kościoła, w tym przez papieży. Jego wady to: egocentryzm, maksymalizacja wolności jednostkowej, neutralność aksjologiczna prowokująca relatywizm, a nawet nihilizm i anarchizację życia społecznego. Elementem pozytywnym tej koncepcji jest jednoznaczna obrona praw człowieka.

Deformacją idei wolności jest także jej model kolektywistyczny, który jest powiązany z teoriami determinizmu i socjocentryzmu, a prowadzi często do totalitaryzmu. Determinizm filozoficzny przyjmowali: panteiści (Spinoza, Hegel) i twórcy marksizmu (Marks, Engels). Ci ostatni uznali indywidualnego człowieka za produkt życia społecznego, dlatego opowiedzieli się za absolutnym prymatem kolektywu przed jednostką. Konsekwencją kolektywistyczno-marksistowskiej koncepcji wolności była teoria dyktatury proletariatu, która w sposób instytucjonalny sankcjonowała istotne ograniczenia wolności obywateli. Totalitaryzm polityczno-państwowy był tego nieuchronną konsekwencją. Psychologiczno-społeczny proces „ucieczki od wolności” opisał E. Fromm. Ideologia totalitarna podważa człowieka, pluralizm polityczny i społeczny, autonomię kultury i nauki, wolność myśli i sumienia, sankcjonuje terroryzm państwowy. Chociaż modele wolności liberalno-indywidualistyczny i kolektywistyczno-marksistowski są opozycyjne wobec siebie, to jednak mają niektóre rysy wspólne: depersonalizują ideę wolności, izolują ją od fundamentalnych wartości ludzkich (prawdy, miłości), wyjaśniają naturalistycznie i są skażone ekonomizmem.