



---

## The Ratio of Political Goodness and Negative Freedom in Berlin's Political Thought ( With Emphasis on Russian Communism )

---

Mahin Niroomand<sup>1\*</sup>, Hassan Abniki<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Political Science, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Department of Political Science, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

---

Received: 18 Jan 2018 ; Accepted: 20 May 2018

---

### Abstract:

The present article aims to examine Isaiah Berlin's views and ideas, and gives answers to the questions of how political goodness is linked to the concept of negative liberty in Berlin's thought, and how his view of political goodness has formed his critique looking toward the political system of the Soviet Union. Political goodness in Berlin's thought seems to be multiplied, and from the pluralist perspective links to the notion of negative freedom, which means the choice among values by the humans. Berlin believes that political goodness belongs to certain cultural and social contexts and criticize it for the fact that the Russian Communism has a monistic view of political truths in society. In other words (Namely), it can be said that negative liberty as a restriction of decision-making and human selection, is the most important and central element of the political goodness, and without it, other goodness cannot be raised considerably. According to Isaiah Berlin's pluralistic view, we find that the ruling party in the Soviet political system, based on Marxist ideology, is a monotonous and monistic party that did not allow growth and presence of other political ideas.

**Keywords:** Isaiah Berlin, Goodness, Political Goodness, Pluralism, Communism, Russia

---

### Introduction

Goodness and political goodness concepts are one of the most important philosophical topics that have always been considered by the human beings since the beginning of human life. These concepts are created in the

social life of humans and in their interaction with each other. From the long time ago, according to the requirements of the time and in the historical context, scholars have initiated their aimed political goodness. One of the oldest notions of goodness is the general

---

\*Corresponding Author's Email: Niroom\_1345@yahoo.com

interest that has been used since ancient times to this day. One of the main reasons for the creation of political goodness can be the deprivation feature of goodness in societies. In other words, against the evil in a society, good will for the order, integrity and security of that society be invented. From Socrates who lived in the ancient Greek vacuum thought, to the Isaiah Berlin, the mentioned thinker in our paper, they seek to offer the goodness for bringing peace, security, justice, and freedom in societies. The political goodness in the historical process has been operational in terms of elements such as virtue, human education, a dominant state, and general will, to as well as elements such as freedom, equality, justice and individuality. But have political goodness been able to be implemented equally in societies during history, or have the pursuit of political goodness been successful by the rulers for peace, security, and social justice? What is good for Isaiah Berlin? How does he link Charity to negative freedom and shape his critical look at Russian communism? These are questions that this article will answer.

The main idea of this article is that the goodness for Isaiah Berlin, which was pluralism or multiplicity in power and politics, was not under consideration due to the negative liberty of the local Soviet-rule political system. Isaiah Berlin, the Russian political philosopher, tended towards liberalism through the bitter experience of Nazism and Bolshevism, expanding and broadening the concept of pluralism in the sense of liberty. Through proving the inequities of values and goodness, he praised the negative freedom and, with the emphasis on this he introduced the Soviet Communist Party as a monistic party that did not give any chance to the other political party or dissident party.

### **The Notion of Political Goodness and Liberty**

What is political goodness, and in what historical context it is created, are both the most important issues we are looking at in this article. Before we recognize the merits and liberties of Isaiah Berlin, we need to look at the views of classical and modern philosophers and thinkers about these concepts.

From the social life of mankind in the early societies up to now, humans have always followed the good and goodness for their well-being, and they constantly seek to confront with things such as natural disaster, ignorance, wars, moral corruption, and other evil cases. In his book "what is the political philosophy.", Leo Strauss linked to the notion of goodness in political affairs and believe that all political acts inherently have a tendency toward knowledge of the good nature, that is, towards knowledge of good life or a good society because the good society is the same total political happiness (Strauss, 2012: 2).

In their interactions, humans have created valuable systems that have turned into goodness, and have become political goodness in the social realm. During the evolution of humanity, the concept of goodness and political goodness have also evolved and have infiltrated the wisdom of man's life. These concepts are developed in different historical periods according to the conditions of the time. For example, the notion of goodness in classical times, dominated by metaphysical views, is based on virtue, but with the onset of scientific and industrial revolutions in the modern era (virtuosity) has diminished and replaced by (right). Put differently, if we want to know the boundary between classical and modern times, we will face two compo-

nents of general interest and individual benefits. Concepts such as justice, equality, liberty, prosperity, security, etc. are political goodness.

Now, we will examine a number of different thinkers' opinions on the concept of political goodness.

### **A. Political Goodness in the Thought of Classical Philosophers**

As we have explained, scholars and philosophers of each period have been influenced by the circumstances of their time in seeking and inventing concepts in order to provide a solution to create order, peace, security, and similar concepts for the well-being of the community. We are now reviewing the views of a number of classical scholars who lived predominantly in ancient Greece.

Ancient Greece after the Sophists has been in a mental vacuum, and Socrates, therefore, sought to find knowledge and virtue in order to provide an answer to the theoretical and intellectual vacuums. In other words, he sought the goodness of the society in knowledge and his main slogan was: "know yourself". He always acknowledged that he did not know anything and emphasized to learning knowledge.

According to Cecoco, Socrates's wisdom is just in his discovery of this self-ignorance. Others do not know, but they think they know, while Socrates knows he does not know. Although Socrates has no knowledge over the others in certain subjects -and even is backward from the craftsmen in this respect- in recognition of oneself he is ahead of all others. (Classical, 2015: 82)

Plato, who lived in the era of degeneration of Athens, disappointed with the social conditions of his time because of the defeat in the war with the Sparta, the execution of Socrates, the moral corruption of the rulers, the

degeneration of democracy, and ... raised the Idea theory, and spoke of Shah's philosopher; he has reason and indeed he leads the society towards good fortune and happiness. Simply put, Plato provided a new morality, the Idea theory, against the mythical and sophistic morality. He believes the political goodness of a society lies in virtue, and the highest form of virtue is the same. In this regard, he writes in his book:

The ruling and domination of philosophy are not impossible, and if the ignorant prejudices of the masses of the people go away, and they reconcile with philosophy, you will see that they will think the same way, too. (Plato, 1999: 366) Like Socrates, he also sought knowledge as a goodness, but he considered great importance to education in a way that constituted the basis of knowledge and virtue on education. Though Plato paid attention to the world of political goodness and Idea world as aristocratic virtues, Aristotle has more realistic view toward the goodness, and political goodness. He lived in a situation where the diversity of thoughts had boosted ancient Greece, and the city of Athens flourished in terms of economic business and had recovered the lost spirit of the war with the Spartans. Aristotle believes that goodness means a good start that has the ability to provide public benefits. In other words, his philosophy, welfare and public interest are so important. In fact, he believed in some kind of democratic government, as Murray wrote in the book of 'introduction to political philosophy: Perhaps the most important feature of politics is that Aristotle, despite living in a very different political and social environment (compared to the present time) in ancient Greece, raised some principles that today are widely recognized as the moral basis of democratic rule. He showed that he was a great philosopher since the discovery

of the above principles was required a perfect order to recognize them in the small town of the state of Greece and to recognize their performances; the principles that were adopted for centuries later as the mainstay of the democratic mode of life (Murray, 1959: 58). Hence, Aristotle considered general welfare as the political goodness.

After the ancient Greek era, philosophy came to the philosopher of Hellenistic philosophy. In the Greek Age or the Hellenism, due to the disappearance of the state - the city of Athens by Alexander the Great, the thought system was transformed and the origin of goodness was founded on the principle of appeasement or more simply, avoidance of pain. On the other hand, the individual in the congregation of the state-town lost his identity to the concept of a global citizen and this led to the formation of different schools such as Calbi3n, Stoics, and Epicureans. The philosophers of these schools became suspicious about all the phenomena and achieved to nihilism.

Their solution was to achieve inner calm and painless anesthesia caused by avoiding thinking and seeking peace of mind, attracting joy, and avoiding pain and suffering. The world correctly describes their vision and states: Stoic philosophy poses the question of what the meaning of goodness is in mankind? How can humans be good? The Stoic response was that goodness is being in a Harmony with nature. Nature is the force that calls for perfection through growth. A law that acts in everything and rules all living beings. It is always harmful to resist and oppose the natural law; doing so in accordance with the requirements of the natural law is always beneficial (Alam, 1997: 174).

Calbi3n, a part of whom lived in barrels, scoffed at the human relationship with nature, as well as social rules, believing that they are not citizens of a special country but are a cosmopolitan. Classco writes that the Calbians devoted their lives to pursuit of virtue which in their view was nothing but nature and natural things. They distinguished severely "natural" from everything that was caused by life in society. In addition, they believed that virtue was sufficient for happiness. Only virtue is good, and everything else is either disregarding or neutral, or it's bad, and the result was an extraordinary rude and simple life (Classco, *ibid* : 280).

Essentially Epicurean's first principle is the pleasure and peace of mind, in such a way they emphasized to avoid the political and social life and refuge in a private sphere that guarantees the inner peace of the individual. According to Alaam, Epicur trained his disciples the doctrine of spiritual happiness and said that the main purpose of man's life is to achieve personal happiness. Epicure argued that spiritual enjoyment and long-term prosperity would be best attained in the worrisome and painful aspects of life, such as participation in public works or in religion. Epicure avoided engaging in political affairs due to extremes of modesty and low self-esteem (Alam, *ibid*, 162).

The result of Alexander the Great's achievement was the emergence of Hellenistic thinking, or in other words, the originality of appeasement and the avoidance of suffering. But after this period, we are witnessed the beginning of a new era that lasts about a thousand years and includes the Middle Ages of Christianity.

### **B. Political Goodness in the Thought of the Medieval Philosophers**

After the Romans' domination over the ancient Greek, they became familiar with the thoughts of the philosophers of that country. Since the social system of the Romans was slavery, the teachings of the Greek schools were good for their taste. The Romans paid tribute to that part of the doctrine of Greek philosophy, which human beings are political animals and have a political responsibility to the state, but they did not like the desirable form of government for Greek philosophy. In this context, the scholars of the Church, by combining Greek philosophy and, the Christian religion, have promoted prosperity in that world in order to enable citizens to obey the government and the church. In fact, for the philosophers of that period, political goodness meant not to interfere in political affairs, and human salvation was achieved through sacred rituals led by clerics. The political thought of the first ancestors was tied to the advent of Christianity. But since Christianity was a religion, not a political movement, or institution, its purpose was the salvation of the human spirit. In other words, other scholars of this period interpreted goodness in the eternal welfare and faith in God. The most important thinkers of this age are Saint Augustine and Saint Thomas Aquinas.

Augustine and his followers believed that man is with God, and the happiness of men would not be possible without divine inspiration. In their view, primitive humans are not capable of salvation and prosperity in the aftermath. The foundation of Augustean's political thought is the earthly society and the heavenly community. In his view, humans cannot find salvation in the earthly society because this society is full of evil. The good deeds are found just in the heavenly society,

and in order to reach that society, man has to avoid evil deeds so that he can achieve salvation in the community. In this regard, the Alaaam wrote in the history of western political philosophy : the earthly city and material interests are based on selfishness, and the city of God and the spiritual interests are based on love of God or Godliness. The earthly city is founded on the lower motives of mankind, but the city of God is based on the hope of heavenly peace and salvation of ghosts (Alam, *ibid*: 224).

Thomas Aquinas, the medieval philosopher, saw the end of life as prosperity and believed that it would only be possible to achieve it through faith in God. He combined Christian beliefs with Aristotle's philosophy, establishing relations between reason, and faith. According to Gilson, Aquinas believes that the rational knowledge begins with the feelings. In the book of the Spirit of Medieval Philosophy, he states : "from the Aquinas's point of view, human knowledge is not directly attributed to a reasonable thing. Man cannot, by means of concepts that abstract of tangible objects, produce a science of a reasonable substance, whereas the purely reasonable nature differs from the tangible ones. As long as we strive to comprehend the concepts derived from the senses, we can never make the knowledge of the mind through the senses to a level that is just as rigorous as it is. Of course, reasonable science, which is obtained through abstraction, is better than absolute ignorance, but such a science cannot substitute for our science reasonably enough in what is reasonable (Gilson, 1990: 397). Therefore, from the perspective of Thomas Aquinas, political goodness must be reliant on wisdom based on revelation and indeed, it is nothing more than a divine message transmitted through the Prophet of God to mankind.

With the end of the Christian age, the Renaissance begins in Europe, and European modernity begins a new era of generosity in terms of political goodness, which is this time focused on mankind.

### C. Modernity and Political Goodness

Following the Renaissance courses, the religious reform movements, the scientific revolution of the 16th and 17th centuries, and ultimately the Enlightenment era, modern societies have presented a different interpretation of political goodness or human prosperity. That is, with the diminution of institutional role such as religion, and limitation of monarchy, man becomes the main hero of society. On the other hand, by cutting off the relationship between man and religion, the church and the clergy men, he suddenly became lonely and this leads him to confront the experience of concepts such as anxiety, fear, depression, and so on. In such a context, philosophers of that period presented some concepts of goodness due to the conditions of the time. We will examine some thoughts of modern age thinkers.

Machiavelli, an Italian politician who lived in disintegration era, was looking for strong power to bring order and harmony to his homeland. He believed that human beings are selfish and evil by nature, therefore said coercion and force are necessary and goodness is equal to the formation of a powerful government. In –"The Prince", Machiavelli wrote : up to this day, hopes have been found by the emergence of prominent men of Italy. Maybe God evokes somebody to save the nation, to save it from the abundance of oppression, and with a passionate, raises the national flag to save it (Machiavelli, 2005: 146-147). In other words, he believed in the

formation of a powerful state to regulate his community and considered the government as an effective movement component towards perfection and prosperity.

Thomas Hobbes, another thinker of modern age, believed that man is a wolf in the natural state of human being and constantly lives in fear and insecurity, but because he has wisdom, he thinks of his security; and to achieve this security he devotes his will and freedom (Leviathan). In sixteenth century, when there were war and struggles in the England, he was there and referred to a political authority in order to get rid of the anarchy and chaos of the country. According to Spragens: In Hobbes's view, the main problem of the British political community was the power crisis. He writes : People are usually corrupt. They are so oblivious of their duty that perhaps even one in a thousand is ignorant of the rights of a human being and does not understand the need for a king or civil society (Spragens, 1394: 61).

The ultimate goal of human beings from Hobbes's perspective is, to live in safety, to preserve oneself, and to live more happily.

To live in safety, to preserve oneself, and to live more happily is the ultimate goal of human beings from Hobbes's perspective.

Therefore, in Leviathan's 17<sup>th</sup> volume, he states that humans say to each other that I donate my right to rule on myself to this person or to these group. They all consider his or their actions right, provided that you also give your right to him, and in the same way, you will be entitled to all of his actions and allow them to do so. Thus, the ruling power is formed (Hobbes, 2005: 192).

For John Locke, the powerful government of Hobbes and Bodin have limited freedom and have no sense of responsibility for pri-



vate property. In this regard, Locke has said: due to the rule of nature, humans have absolute freedom to exercise their sovereignty and to seize their property, and the only thing that governs them is the law of nature, and humans neither need permission from anyone nor follow anyone's will. Also, the rule of nature is the status of equality in which the power and domination of all peoples are the same; no one has anything more than the other; all human beings have the same class; and have the same natural wealth; they have the same amount of wisdom ; and no one follows others, except that God makes one person superior to the others and clearly gives him the right to monitor others (Locke, 2009: 79). John Locke believed that Leviathan's overwhelming authority was scary and gave rise to double authority that its absolute authority carries violence. He said that limitation of the powers of the state should be limited to prevent violence against Leviathan. In his opinion the private realm is respected and the government should not enter the personal realm of society.

Rousseau, a thinker who spoke of public goodness and public authority, was in the midst of a moral crisis in his society. He considered the corruption of society as a result of inequality and believed that the societies of the citizens encouraged them to suppress their desires and natural needs, which would lead to artificial behaviour. About inequality, in the *Social Contract*, Aristotle said that human beings are not naturally equal, some were created for servitude, and some for command. Aristotle was right but he also had taken the cause alternatively the effect.

It is true that someone who has been a slave must remain a servant. The slaves under the chains of captivity have lost all the great emotions, and even do not want to break their clause (Rousseau, 1989: 38).

After the Industrial Revolution and the development of factories, labour forces were employed cheaply for mass production in factories. The exploitation of the working class, through long working hours, low wages, and social inequalities, led to the emergence of socialist ideas from Simon's age to Marx. From Marx's point of view, work for the employer has led to alienation of mankind, and the general goodness is nothing but overcoming alienation and attaining a situation that everyone works for himself. By explaining the status of alienation, he achieved a solution that brings political goodness for the people that is communism, and he said : communism is going beyond the private ownership, namely the self-alienation of man and thus the actual possession of nature Human is by man and for man himself. Communism therefore means the complete return of man to himself as a social being : a conscious and complete return to framework of the whole wealth and prosperity derived from the development of society (Marx, 2003: 169).

By examining the notion of political goodness in the thought of classical and modern theorists, it can be seen that political goodness has different fundamentals in three stages: classical, middle ages, and modern times. For the Greek philosophers, political goodness was defined on the basis of public interest; but in the middle ages, it was mainly regarded with a religious attitude; and political goodness and public goodness were summarized in the satisfaction of God and the Church. In the new era, predominantly the political goodness is based on humanism and individual rights; and contemporary thinkers generally associate goodness with human consent and human society. Of course, in the left-wing attitudes, the category of social affairs becomes more intense and

every goodness for human beings return to expediency and social justice.

The concept of freedom is one of the most complex concepts of the history of thoughts and politics. Philosophers and thinkers have many different opinions about this concept. The exploitation of the concept of freedom is one of the features of the history of thought. According to Ramin Jahanbegloo, freedom is the oxygen of the history. Nelson Mandela says : "Freedom does not mean getting rid of chains, but is a way of life that respects and strengthens other's freedom." Rosa Luxemburg said, freedom is another freedom and Hegel believes it is a struggle for freedom. Sartre says that man is doomed to freedom. Humans are free because they act. The person who knows is constantly choosing and practice his choices. What causes a person to be chosen is his will and his interest (Meshkat and Fazeli, 2014: 106 - 107).

Humans always struggled to gain freedom. But, this struggle itself is to restrict the absolute freedoms of the tyrannical rulers. It means freedom can never be absolute, but has limitations by government or institutional agents. Institutions and organisations through laws and regulations, both advocate for the freedom of individuals in a society, and limit freedom with specific laws, to avoid chaos. Thousands of people devoted their lives and property and enjoyed personal and social freedoms. But, people of the societies that are dominated by tyrannical regimes, have the lowest level of freedom and sometimes lack of freedom, and actually their human life is undermined.

From the perspective of the liberal, freedom is a natural right, a fundamental condition for directing a true human being. This view also gave people the opportunity to pur-

sue their interests by applying selections : choosing a place of residence, an employer, shopping, and so on. Later liberals consider freedom as the only condition that allows people to develop their skills and capabilities and show their potential talents ( Hey Wood, 2014: 69).

Another important point is that the definitions interested in different thinkers sometimes are in contradiction with each other. Hegel believed that freedom is the essence of life, and Kant said that ethics would be destroyed if the rules governing the phenomena of the outside world were to be ruled out. In other words, with the notion of freedom based on the concept of moral responsibility, he has taken serious measures to protect freedom. But Berlin, defines freedom in a specific framework and limits it. On one hand, he believes people are free to choose, in the other hand he says there is a better framework for this freedom. Therefore, a precise definition or a consistent formula cannot be expressed for the interpretation of freedom, and this category is still subject to interpretation.

## **2. Political Goodness in Berlin Thought**

An important feature of Berlin's philosophy of politics is the inventiveness of goodness, which has been shaped by the critique of traditional political philosophy. In his view, the most fundamental questions about how to live with goodness should be the goal of political philosophy, because political philosophy has the ability to respond to the goodness, and basically, one cannot think about political life without relying on it.

As Mikhail Bakhtin, a philosopher of nineteenth century, believed that literature is an arena of plurality of ideas, Berlin believed



that philosophy is also multi-voiced and diverse. Berlin identified and expanded the political goodness of its views on the ideas of Jamatis vico, the Italian political philosopher in the Enlightenment era, and German Herder in Enlightenment era, which is the theme of pluralism and cultural pluralism. He believes that according to these two philosophers of the Enlightenment, the values that have been accepted in the West today, had not been local to the Arabs two thousand years ago. In his works of thought, he provides pluralism. In these works, he wants to answer the question whether there is an absolute value or goodness that ultimately is compatible with each other?

In other words, to answer the question of "how we should live" is, either a one solution that will answer all the questions in this respect, or there is no such a solution at all, and each question receives a different response that may not be consistent with other responses. The view that states that the absolute human values are not necessarily consistent with each other, or indeed there is no absolute value, is called the pluralistic view. From this point of view, the universe and the system of human values are not of the same gender and are considered to be contradictory in latter analysis (Berlin, 1998: 7-8).

The most important issues for Berlin have been freedom, pluralism, and liberalism. But, according to John Gray, a single thought with a great foundation, is the gospel of all the works of Berlin (Gary, 2010: 9). From this perspective, the value pluralism and the objectivity and plurality of the ultimate values of humanity are at the core of his thought, and this idea tells us that all human values are conflicting and often incompatible, and there is no single rational scale to measure them. In the West's intellectual tradition, it is often said that all genuine goodness are

compatible and interconnected. The ideas of Plato and Aristotle also emphasize the harmony of ideas and moderation and the unity of virtues. This unity has continued in the later thoughts of the West, and even in the Messianic tradition, moral and practical unity in the light of Allah's will have been raised; and in the new periods it has been emphasized on the natural law (Ibid, 61).

He rejects this fundamental Western belief and denies that genuine virtues are in peaceful coexistence; Rather, they are rivals of each other and are even indistinguishable. The doctrine of value pluralism acknowledges that these contradictions are not solvable by theoretical and practical reasoning and their internal complexity leads to their asymmetry and hence leads to value and cultural pluralism.

The doctrine of Berlin's pluralism has been raised at three levels. First, Berlin acknowledges that in any ethics or behavioral rules such as our ethics and rules of conduct, there are contradictions between its ultimate values that cannot easily be resolved. For example, in the area of our liberal ethics, freedom and equality, fairness and prosperity are all recognized as inherent goodness.

Berlin believes that this goodness often is crossed in practice, and naturally has intrinsic competition, and we cannot judge against their contradictions without any comprehensive criteria (ibid 61). Secondly, each of this goodness or values has intrinsic complexity and are inherently pluralistic and contain contradictory elements, some of which are inherently incompatible. Third, different cultural forms bring different morals and values that undoubtedly have many overlapping characteristics but, at the same time, the virtues and privileges of the concepts are different (ibid 62).

Berlin was always liberal, and the defense of liberalism had a pivotal position in his thought, but gradually he came to the idea of multiplicity of values. Hence, pluralism on the general level of culture and traditions and concepts of virtue that accompanies them is raised. Different forms of life may produce different morals. The ethics of the Renaissance, which is a vivid example, can be found in the works of Machiavelli, which was incompatible with many Christians and ancient moral concepts. Berlin believed that Plato first practiced Monotheism and then proceeded by philosophers such as Aristotle, Stoicius, Aquinas, and finally led to Hegelian and Marxist's historical oppression. Pooladi writes about the uniqueness of Plato's philosophy : A true or a complete state is the state in which the philosopher is one who has the greatest benefit of virtue and has received a certain education, who is from a world of sensible and discriminating to the world of fixed reason (Idea), as the most trusted coach in the community, to take on the affairs of society and bring the state into a training institution for the development of human personality (Pooladi, 2014 : 52).

The thought of Berlin lies in the plurality of political goodness and its multiplicity. He believes that all the ideas of political philosophers have long been the subject of political analysis and analysts of political goodness; so that everyone has tried to emphasize to reconcile and adapt the concepts of goodness such as justice, freedom, public and private interests, properly ads security. But he offers a different view from these categories; in other words, his notion of goodness is a diverse and pluralistic subject, which depends on the specific cultural and social contexts.

He believes that many goodness compete and conflict with each other, and peaceful coexistence among rhymes is rarely seen. On the other hand, he believes that as long as competition between these goodnesses takes place, it is impossible to resolve the tensions between them, using rational criteria. This idea of Berlin is the very doctrine of its pluralism. Gary correctly states : "Virtues recognized in every moral, often can not be united in a single person. Justice and compassion, mildness, and courage, cannot be fully realized in one person because they require different moral abilities that are not easy to associate with (Gray, *ibid* : 63).

Berlin believed characteristics of goodness include :

1. goodness is not absolute;
2. goodness depends on the evil;
3. goodness is for human's self-creation;
4. Political goodness is multiple and diverse;
5. Political goodness is contradictory;
6. Any goodness is in conflict even in itself;
7. Political goodness is unpredictable;
8. Goodness is incomparable;
9. All goodness does not come together in one person;
10. To balance between political goodness is a difficult task;
11. The contradictions of goodness cannot be solved by any national criteria;
12. It is difficult to achieve any goodness by immoral means;
13. No goodness is higher than freedom;
14. Negative freedom is more important than positive freedom.

Berlin believes that the goodness of liberty, equality, and prosperity are incompatible with each other, and there are conflicts within each one of them. From this perspective, the goodness category is incomparable and focuses on the cultural, social, and political context of each society. Berlin here comes to the concept of political cultural pluralism. To describe and interpret of human, Berlin like philosophers defines humanity as its essence, and considers the distinction of human being in the ability to choose and to have the purpose of regulating his life. By way of explanation, according to Berlin, the main nature of man is independence and autonomy. From the point of view of Berlin, human life is shaped and continued on the basis of a set of values, and these values, in interaction with each other, create value systems that assert the purpose of human life.

In other words, human beings in the midst of their social life, create the values and goodness that will be changed by color and form throughout the ages. Indeed, due to Berlin, political goodness is a dynamic affair which depends on time and place. It is produced by social life and its shape and status are not stable and predictable.

Hence, Berlin's base of thoughts is in the multiplicity of political goodness. It means, political goodness is multiple and diverse and depends on specific cultural and social contexts.

### **3 - Berlin and Negative Freedom**

Another important concept in Berlin's political thought, which is under the concept of political goodness, is negative freedom, and among the main values emphasized by Berlin is freedom, since freedom brings about the creativity of mankind. When Berlin speaks of human nature, leads the mind to cultural differences. But, there is a limit to differences.

From Berlin's point of view, the concept of freedom is the choice, as in explanation of political freedom, in his book named as "Four Articles on Freedom," he says : there is a point in political and social liberation which is more or less similar to the issue of historical and social determinism. It is assumed that we need a minimum realm for free choice, which rationally disagrees with what is reasonably called political (or social) freedom. The belief in the lack of determinism does not require that you cannot deal with human beings like animals or objects. Political freedom is like selective freedom that is not considered a human being, but rather is considered to be the fruits of its historical growth, and it is an area that has boundaries at any rate (Berlin, 2015: 45).

Isaiah Berlin always defends of negative freedom in his various writings. He says that preventing others from freely choosing should not be considered as interfering others, by force and coercion, but the responsibility of that conscious person should be considered, too.

In other words, what threatens negative freedom is not the intent of individuals, but is the social behaviors and the individual's responsibility to that freedom. Berlin praises the negative freedom because this freedom is achieved through choice. The choice is from the inner side of the person which is selected by the free man, so the value of negative freedom is due to the value of self-creation. Choosing from the inner-self of human being is, in point of fact, a mean to human flourishing. Goodness and negative freedom are important for Berlin, because it represents choice : people are creative and they make choices for their lives. The negative freedom for Berlin is based for liberal political ethics. The pluralism that Berlin speaks about is not just the pluralism of good and goodness, but it has its own bad and

worthless values. This choice of man is autonomous and independent, which can separate good from evil. Generally, Berlin's negative freedom is intrinsically valuable, even if it does not lead to a good choice, because they will be able to rethink their circumstances.

In this view, definite definition of freedom by Berlin is the same freedom with a rival and uneven values that one has to choose and prioritize in this context. As we have mentioned, the most important political goodness for Berlin is freedom. But a negative freedom, not a positive one. According to the definition of Berlin, negative freedom (or freedom from) means not imposing an obstacle or limitation by the others, and positive freedom (or freedom to) means the ability (and not just possibility) to pursue and achieve the goal, and on the other hand means independence or self-control over dependency on others (Berlin, the same: 30). It can be said that he creates positive and negative concepts for freedom of action to prevent unconditional freedoms that cause chaos and confusion of the community. Gary correctly wrote : everyone knows that Berlin is cautious about the positive concept of freedom, which he considers it to be based on rational autonomy, and warns, and he does this in favor for negative freedom. That is, the absence of the constraints imposed by others (Gary, 2010: 14).

Therefore, we find that Berlin believes in freedom so much that it does not lead to the loss of freedom or to be in conflict with the freedom of others. Therefore, freedom is limited in the interpretation of Berlin and is Subject to other freedoms or the freedom of others.

#### **4. The Ratio of Political Goodness and Negative Freedom in Communist Russia**

For this, we need to see that due to Berlin's attention to the communism in the territory of

Soviet Union, and his presence in the field of diplomatic and cultural affairs in Moscow in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, how his political thought (believing in pluralism) formed his critical look toward the political system of the Soviet Union.

In the case of Russia of the nineteenth century, various views were presented, including that Marx saw Russia as a place of all kinds of backwardness, oppression, and repression, which made it almost impossible to achieve freedom and democracy. Berlin's picture of Karl Marx from Russia of the nineteenth century is an undesirable picture: Russian state throughout the nineteenth century was the largest manifestation of darkness, tyranny, oppression, and repression in Europe, a vital reservoir that reactionary of other nations were able to use it on their own benefits. Hence, it was a source of trouble and concern for the various types of Western liberals (Berlin, 2013: 108).

Now, to have a clearer understanding of the intellectual developments in Russia, let's take a look at the history of thought in that country. It is better to start this analysis from the eighteenth century with the reform of the Great Peter, which led to the emergence of the henceforth intellectual currents. According to Dancus : Peter claimed that we need Europe for some decades, then we can leave them up (Dancos, 1992: 174). He published the first newspaper in his country, codified the legal system of the country, and noted the concept of political interest, but his method contradicted a lot. On the one hand, there was a great distance between the actual government's design and method, and on the other hand, there was a gap between the interests of the state and the interests of Tsar (Dances, *ibid*: 178- 9).

Simply put, the open -windows culture for Europe was opposed to the traditional Russian culture. Russia in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries was formed on the orbital transformation that began from Saint Petersburg and Peter the Great, and separated it from Russia in the seventeenth century and earlier. During this period, the aristocracy and upper classes of Russia were drawn to philosophical theories such as Voltaire and Diderot. According to Brydyayev, Radshev was the first Russian intellectual who studied French philosophy in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and benefited greatly from Voltaire, Diderot, and Rousseau's writings, and in his mind, he combined French thoughts with Russian spirits (Berdyayev, 2004 : 30).

Subsequently, Slavic Thought, which itself was the product of the civilization and the culture of Peter's time, always prevented the entry of Western culture, or even the combination of Russian culture with the Western culture. The Slavs considered Peter's performances as betray to Russia's national foundations. On the other hand, the influence of Hegel's and Schelling's thoughts in the nineteenth century, which were more consistent with the intellectual and thought of Russian classes, propagated religious ideas in the Slavic. Khomyakov transformed the Christian faith in such a way they the motives of the philosophy of the originality of conception in Germany (idealistic) were transformed and adapted to the Russian environment. The originality of the Slavic people was that they tried to think in the direction of Christian Orthodox of the Orient, which was the basis of history of Russia, as well as the principles of monarchy. There was a difference between the official Russian nationalist system and the understanding of the Slavic people from the nation and society. The principles of the

Slavic religion included Orthodox Christianity, monarchy, and nation.

They believed in the superiority of religion, and were in search of the Orthodox Christianity which have been refined of any pollution and devastating effects of history, especially since the Peter the Great era. They wanted the Russians to take a facade away from the rational and Western distortions, and expected the Tsar to take the heavy responsibilities of the country (Karami, 2014: 104-105). That is, the Slavic people disagreed with civilization and urbanization, and considered rural life as originality.

We can point to Dostoevsky. Being the symbol of the spiritual and inner revolution, he wanted the revolution to be with God and Christ. He was a socialist based on Orthodox Christianity. In fact, he hated progress. In the second half of the eighteenth century, various movements and intellectual movements emerged in Russia which were influenced by European revolutionary thoughts. But, the difference between these revolutionary groups and the European movements were mainly about freedom of speech and action for people who were politically and socially lagging behind the European people. Fundamentally, the people of Russia were satisfied with their hard-working conditions, and before the modern changes and the emergence of new ideas, this state of the society was considered natural.

From the eighteenth century onward, the two forms of thoughts in the 1840s were Slavic and Western thoughts. Koolaei believes that the Slavic people were Nationalists who demanding a return to the Russian state, as before the reforms, Petre and his successors were in the direction of Westernization of Russia. Their ideal was an isolated state based on rural communes, pure Ortho-

dox churches and authoritarianism without bureaucratic interventions (Koolaei, 1997: 7).

It is possible to be in same nature with the thought of Berlin that refers the anti-liberal roots of Russian thought in the nineteenth century to the violence and repression of the first Nicolai, and says in "*Russian Thinkers*" book : The first wave of rational optimism followed by war Religious sects came up against the brutality of the French Revolution and the political tyranny and economic and social misery. There was a similar story in Russia, but this wave fell down due to the intense actions of Nikolai I to suppress the consequences of the uprising of the Desem-briists in the first, and about a quarter of a century later, to repel the effects of the revolutions of 1848-49. In addition, the material and artificial results of the Crimean War's disgrace that came a decade later must also be taken into account. In both cases, the absolute power eliminated a great deal of subtle and elegant ideals and brought different kinds of realistic and stubbornness, including material socialism, tyranny neo-feudalism, ironical nationalism, and a variety of other methods, which were severely anti-liberal (Berlin, 1998: 102).

An important fact about Russia is that the Russians generally do not pay attention to the principle of categorization and the division of objects and phenomena on the basis of the categories; but they see the issues black and white and turn up to absolutism and become idolatrous. Therefore, we can see the unilateral and dogmatic veins of this type of thinking after the October Revolution among the Bolsheviks. In other words, th Russian communism, criticized by Isaiah Berlin, has built such a culture and is a one-sided look that can be found in the uniqueness of a backward

Russia, and on the other hand without a middle-class and civic institutions. According to Berlin, in 1846, Blensky wrote to his friends that, people need potato, but they do not need a constitution. The Russian revolt of 1848 occurred in 1905, at which time the middle-class of Western Europe was neither a revolutionary nor even a hard-core reformer, and this fifty-year-old backwardness was itself a powerful factor in creating the final split between liberals and powerful socialists in 1917, and the separation of Russian route from Europe in future years (Berlin, *ibid*: 25).

Based on this paradigm, Berlin believed in dogmas of the Bolsheviks under the communist rule. In his opinion, one must always seek the truth, and grow up habits like criticism, thinking, independence, and concealment of the congregation, even if this dissimilarity causes knowing him discordant. The acquisition of that truth and growth of that habits are possible just when freedom is dominated (Berlin, 2007 : 245).

Our claim at the beginning of this article was based on the plurality of political goodness in Berlin's thought which, from a pluralistic point of view, was linked to the concept of negative freedom; and Berlin considered it to be dependent on specific cultural and social contexts, and therefore, Russian communism was criticized due to a monistic look at the human community.

Essentially, political systems based on inclusive ideologies were one of the important phenomena of the first half of the twentieth century, and among them, Russian communism as a unique political phenomenon had its roots, function, continuity, and decline. In fact, Russian communism was not a military one formed on an incident, but rather a



process of a mixture of interactions and reflections at the level of philosophical, intellectual, political and social, and many deep-seated analysts believe that its roots are in developments in Russia after the French Revolution, but more and more previously, they are linked to the European modernization of the Peter era.

The social changed that started from 18th century's modernization and the effects and consequences of the French Revolution, and the movements of the Decemberists to the Narodnists and Constitutionals, and the failures of the intellectual reformers in Russia, have paved the way for acceptance of the Left Thoughts which were the most radical and sharpest ideas of that day of Europe, in Russia. Berlin's idea was opposed to communism which arose from the unity of the Russian Communist Party and the lack of life of political parties and other institutions in Soviet Russia. Soviet-dominated communism involves confronting dissent and intolerance of critical thinking, which originated many of the works and ideas for him.

Berlin believes that Russian communism is different from Western communism. He makes a comparison between the two, and concluded that Russian communism is stemming from the subordinate culture of the Russian people who had always been dominated by the Mongols and Cossacks, with Western communism, based on the advent of scientific and social progress Renaissance events and thinkers of the Enlightenment, there are a huge difference. He says, Bolshevism founded that there is a big difference between him and his father, Western Marxism. With this, Bolshevism became not only a set of beliefs with political or social or economic guidelines, but also a kind of lifestyle, inclusive and imperative, with full controls by the party or the central committee of the

party. So that, even in the most radical terms of Marx or Engels, there cannot be any support for it (Berlin, 2013: 243).

In Berlin's studies of political goodness, there is also a conflict between two ideal values and the ultimate political goodness of freedom in West and justice in East. And these two are not simply crowded in any society. From Berlin's point of view, however, Russian communism sees political goodness of justice so absolute in the framework of the class system, which leads to diminishing or elimination of goodness or other value, named as freedom. As Berlin's belief in the conflict between values, and ultimately weakening of one in comparison with another, it can be concluded that in Russian communism, attention to justice is greater than the component of freedom.

### **Conclusion**

Berlin was born in Russia and migrated to another country in turmoils such as World War I, then the October Revolution, and always thought about fascism and communism. From the beginning to the end of his life, he lived in this turbulent life and his main problem was communism.

Berlin's bitter experience of Bolshevism and fascism caused that he raises a new concept of pluralism, and this concept is used to avoid conflicts of values. He believes that there are many values in the world that are in conflict with each other and that the difference between these values will never diminish. He was a defender of principles such as difference, free action, choice, authority, plurality, and so on. Considering what Berlin says about political goodness, he ultimately finds the true goodness only in choosing, which is the most valuable goodness. Therefore, the notion of benevolence in Berlin's view is not a fixed definition but is a con-

structive concept lacking a permanent and stable. It is a container that finds its own substance due to the time and place, and through human interaction.

According to Berlin, people have a fundamental right for freedom of choice, and the conflict of values and the conflict between different styles of life requires people to choose. Due to him, political goodness must be consistent with negative liberation, and if absolute freedom will be applied in society, in such a way that allows people to interfere in others life, the society will be mired in anarchy and providing the minimum needs of people will be impossible, and automatically political goodness will diminish or disappear.

Naturally in this conditions, freedom of the weak or poor people will be violated by the owners of power. But, if freedom is to be positively dominated in societies, there will be formed many problems for justice, security, general will, and prosperity that will provide a good fit for ideologies such as fascism or communism, which in practice, in the years between the two world wars with such a situation, we have encountered.

Berlin has a totally negative view toward the Russian Communism, and considers it by the Fascism and Nazism and on the contrary to political goodness of liberty, and this attitude comes from two important resources : one is Russian political culture and the other one is Marxist ideology. Berlin combines these two as a catastrophic tragedy that has led to the betrayal of the political goodness of freedom. Therefore, the hidden eschatology in Russian history and its reinterpretation by the Russian Communists provided the conditions for the emergence of a centralized political system and ,on the other hand, the authoritarian world's political conditions between

the first two World Wars and the Second World War played an effective role in shaping the Soviet-oriented political system. Essentially, the hidden eschatology in the ideas of communism, and in particular the interpretation and interpretation of Lenin, and then the hard structure of the Party during the period of Stalin, was such that negative freedom could not have any way in it. Therefore, what dominated on the fate of Russian man and Soviet society was many different from what Berlin's mean of political goodness.

Since Berlin believes that there is a conflict between values, one can conclude that communist Russia, in order to establish a value named as justice, has limited another value named as freedom, and due to oppression and unrest in the Soviet Union, no more ideas were grown up, so today we see extremist movements in the former Soviet republics after the collapse.

In other words, with the opening of political space, the way to the birth and spread of ideas and extremist movements was paved.

## References

- Alam Abdolrahman (1997), *History of Western political philosophy*, Tehran, State Department Publication
- Berdyaev Nikolai (2004), *The Origins of Russian Communism and its Concept*, translated by Reza Enayatollah, Tehran, Khorshid Afarin publication
- Berlin Isaiah (1998), *Russian thinkers*, Translated by Najaf Darya bandari, Tehran, Kharazmi publication
- Berlin Isaiah (2007), *Freedom and betrayal to freedom*, Translated by Ezatollah Fooladvand, Tehran, Mahi publication

- Berlin Isaiah (2013), Karl Marx, translated by Reza Rezaii, Tehran, Mahi publication
- Berlin Isaiah (2013), Russian mind in Soviet system, translated by Reza Rezaii, Tehran, Mahi publication
- Classco George (2015), History of the political philosophy of the classical period, translated by Khashayar Deihimi, Tehran, Ney publication
- Dunces, Helen Caro (1993), Russia's misery, translated by Abdolhossein Nik Gohar, Tehran, Alborz publication
- Gary John (2008), Liberalism, translated by Mohammad Savoji, Tehran, Department of State publication
- Gilson Ethan (1990), The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy, translated by A, Davoodi, Tehran, Scientific and Cultural publication
- Heywood Andrew (2004), An Introduction to Political Ideology, translated by Mohammad Rafiee Mehrabadi, Tehran, Political and International Affairs Office
- Hobbes Thomas (2005), Leviathan, translated by Hossein Bashirieh, Ney publishing house
- Karami Jahangir (2014), Contradictory Models of Development in Russia: Three Centuries of Search and its Achievements, Quarterly Journal of Political Science, Volume 10, Number 28.
- Koolaei Elahe (1997), Politics and government in the Russian Federation, Tehran, Department of State publication
- Locke John (2009), 1. Second Treatise on Government, Translated by Shahram Arshadnejad, Tehran: Roshangaran and women's studies publication
- Machiavelli Nicola (2005), Shahriyar, translated by Mahmoud, Tehran, Attar publication
- Meshkat Mohammad and Mohsen Fazeli (2014), A critical review of the concept of freedom from Isaiah Berlin's point of view, Fundamental westology, Human Sciences Research and Cultural Studies, Fifth year, No.2, Fall and Winter
- Plato (1989), Republic. Translated by Fouad Rouhani, Tehran, Scientific and Cultural publication
- Pooladi Kamal (2014), Political Thought in the West from Succurra to Machiavelli, Tehran : Markaz publication
- Rousseau John-Jacques (1989), Social Contract, Tehran : Adib publication
- Spragens Thomas (2015), Understanding Political Theories, Translated by Rajae Farhang, Tehran : Agah publication
- Strauss Leo (2012), What is the political philosophy? Translated by Rajae Farhang, Tehran, Scientific and Cultural publication