

## **An Analysis of Theory of Jürgen Habermas and John Locke on Human Freedom**

Ali Bagheri Dolatabadi<sup>1</sup>, Somayeh Farokhi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor and Member of Department of Political Science at Yasouj University, Yasouj, Iran  
Email of Corresponding Author: abagheri@yu.ac.ir

<sup>2</sup>PH.D Student of Political Science at Yasouj University, Yasouj, Iran

---

**ABSTRACT:** *The concept of freedom is one of the key concepts in the field of political philosophy, political philosophers, so that most of political philosophers have sought to increase civil freedom in their political system. Individual political philosophers have attempted to reduce the power of the political system and government and in contrast, to increase the individual liberties. However, in modern political philosophy, freedom has been elaborated more than other concepts and most political philosophers of different philosophical approaches have attempted to expand individual liberties. One of such philosophers is the English empiricist philosopher, John Locke, who has tried in work to design a limited and constitutional government to provide background for individual liberties. Experimental knowledge, individualism, tolerance, indulgence and other concepts of philosophical system of John Locke indicate that he intends to expand individual liberty. In the modern era, due to the emergence of totalitarian governments and domination of instrumental reason in the sphere of individual life, human freedom has been faced with major constraints. The domination of political and economic system has subjected individual freedom to face a crisis. However, in modern times, there are many intellectuals in his philosophical systems who have tried in numerous ways to maintain the tradition of liberalism. Among such thinkers is Jürgen Habermas who continuing the tradition of liberalism of John Locke is trying to prepare ground for liberation of individuals from domination of capitalism and the world of contemporary system. The present research tried to analyze the attempts of these to thinkers as regards freedom and liberation within the framework of liberalism.*

**Keywords:** *freedom, government, John Locke, liberalism, Jürgen Habermas, communication action, political philosophy*

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Given the subject of this research that is analysis of the theory of John Locke and Jürgen Habermas on human freedom, the subject falls within the political philosophy and it is from this perspective that it was designed and studied. In other words, freedom is an issue that has been concern of the political philosophers over the past centuries. And the philosophy of John Locke and Habermas pays sufficient attention to this issue.

Political philosophy and historical discourse depends on the objective conditions existing in each period, the concept of the specific categories and their requirements in order to justify, or go beyond the situation have been created. In modern times the transformation of traditional metaphysics and ontology and philosophical tradition, nourishing affiliated branches of metaphysics were also witnessed a transformation. In other words the principal categories of thinking, theorizing knowledge, Also were changed the concept of displacement Process (priority). Political philosophy dependent to modern metaphysics are not an exception and in this period we have witnessed a new political ontology. It is one of the most important issues in the modern political ontology, Categories (freedom) in all its dimensions. Basically (freedom) can be called fundamental category of modern political philosophy and addressing the issue of study (human freedom) promptly enter from a political perspective to the field of political philosophy in this present text. Political philosophy as a way of philosophical thinking about politics is to understand and explain the nature of authority, obedience and subordination, the goal of society and the state, the government reasons, and the best way of organizing the political life of mankind in order to ensure freedom and justice basic goals of life. Each of the schools of philosophy in politics has explained these issues in a particular way (Bashiriyeh, 2007: 47).

In other words, political philosophy is an intellectual activity which aims to address the social and political problems and solve them, and came to existence when the people began to focus on their rights versus state authority. at the beginning of the modern era by the validity of Philosophers such as John Locke and the philosopher Jürgen Habermas as a contemporary (and defenders of the Enlightenment and Modernity) In his philosophical system have been worked In addition to emphasis on human freedom, providing some solutions in the political community. Locke emphasized on the concept of freedom in the first few minutes and the early modern era and Jürgen Habermas emphasized on this matter as a contemporary and today human sympathy. Show us the importance of this concept and efforts of idealism human for extensive achievement. In modern

times speak of rights and individual freedoms in the liberal form. There has been a product of the work of John Locke, in response to political theory of his time about government (Divine Right of Kings) and its relation to the rights of individuals (citizens) defend the rights and freedoms and the role of the individual. According to the political theory of the Divine Right of Kings the rights and powers that Citizens have that is what the king can choose to grant them. And they have no rights beyond what is not in the law. The king has earned his position from the divine right of kings (it is the basic human rights that Allah granted to the first king and moved to his descendants). The king position does not depend on the consent of those who are in subjection to him. So people have no right to challenge their king. In contrast the prevailing theory. Locke introduced theory of legitimate political authority. In other words, Locke theorized that what political authority and right to rule and is legitimate.

And the relationship between political authority and their nationals (citizens) how should be. Locke justified his political theory, relying on two basic concepts (natural law) and (natural rights). By which humans have rights and freedoms that are the same divine origin and will remain under any circumstances and who do not have even the king the right to abolish it. Locke put emphasis on rights and human freedom, believed that we can theorized new political legitimacy for the ruling elite (government). This guarantees all the powers, rights and freedoms of individuals (ibid).

Thus, political philosophers such as John Locke and Habermas have attempted in his philosophical system to focus and emphasis on human freedom, and providing solutions to spread it in the political community. Thus, John Locke, the father of political liberalism in the West, has defended freedom in many ways and the importance of his work in this way is so important is so much that the early leaders of the United States of America founded the US constitution based on his philosophy of freedom (see: Wiley, 2005).

Also, Jürgen Habermas as one of the latest living philosophers continues the liberal tradition of John Locke, and has made great efforts to expand freedom and individual liberty in the light of the communicative rationality. Moreover, Habermas by emphasizing on the concept of human freedom, offer understanding beyond the initial concept to Lock. From the perspective of Habermas's intellectual tradition that belongs and the process of modernization in the West on the one hand has eliminated the old forms of domination and on the other hand has created its own forms of domination .

The main feature of this critical landscape does not know completely Modern and Enlightenment ideals unacceptable. What this view is criticized, the particular form of expression and the realization of the ideals of the Enlightenment not the entire Enlightenment. In other words, the critical tradition tries along with constructive criticism to Enlightenment also criticized the negative aspects of modern society, and keep the element of liberating enlightenment. In this sense, critical thought in the contemporary world is the continuation of unfinished enlightenment projects and its aim is to eliminate of not only forms that shaped by the dominance of pre-modern but all forms of domination.(haghighi,1383: 222)

Habermas has worked on his project in that way he rebuild the concepts of subjectivity and self-determination and freedom in the philosophical tradition of humanism which is consistent with the social dimension of individual identity.(Ibid,256) can be said Habermas, on the one hand is looking to live and description political modernity fundamental principles such as freedom, equality, humanism and critical rationalism, And the other hand critique of irrational distortions and strains of modernity. The possibility of emancipation and go beyond the current situation only exist in modernity. But main facing of Habermas to modernity as an unfinished project, in a review of the mechanisms that produced and reproduction and dominated the domination. This domination by instrumental rationality in its various epistemological, methodological aspects ensures the survival of system. For example, Habermas gives us a new look ahead, according to which explains how positivist social science that led to a one-dimensional system and in a one word will be totalitarian and hegemonic system. In this process, Habermas believes that positivist social science will become like a tool which enables some people to exert their power over others. Such an approach gave birth to positivistic wisdom in the formulation of modernity. In contrast to this kind of wisdom, Habermas emphasizes on critical and emancipatory modernity wisdom. (Ahmadi, 1383:198)

He claims that the abandonment of instrumental rationality and promoting understanding and dialogue between citizens can provide the groundwork for the expansion of individual freedom. In view of the importance of freedom for the people and philosophers, this paper then tried study theories of Jürgen Habermas and John Locke on human freedom from the perspective of political philosophy. This paper is organized as follows: will first methodology will be discussed, then the concept of freedom is examined. In chapter 3 then John Locke's theory of freedom is discussed; the fourth chapter checks Habermas's views on individual freedom and way to reach it. Finally, conclusions from the thoughts of these two thinkers about freedom are provided.

## **II. METHODOLOGY: POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY**

Domestic and international political phenomena and studying the connection between different variables are among the most important tasks of political science. Evidently, different methods and approaches

are used in such studies. However, apart from the study of political phenomena, including ontology and epistemology, it seems that one of the tasks of political science is to study methods used in the study of political phenomena, especially their sufficiency in political analysis, which is known as methodology.

In political science, different methods and approaches have been used to study political phenomena. In this regard, Andrew Haywood divided political studies approaches into philosophical tradition (focus on the musts), experimental tradition (description of facts), the scientific tradition (explanation of facts) and contemporary approaches (such as feminism, neo-institutionalism, Frankfurt school and postmodernism) (Hajiyousefi, 2005: 100). Marsh and Stoker also enumerated in their book *Approach and Methodology in Political Science* six methodological approaches: normative, institutional, behavioral, rational choice, feminism and discourse (see Marsh and Stoker, 2003). Accordingly, the present paper tried to observe the scientific and methodological standards and therefore it tried to use a methodological approach to the subject. This paper used a philosophical approach to the subject, and studied such political phenomenon as human freedom from view of thinkers using a philosophical approach.

### **III. CONCEPTUAL PROVISIONS: DEFINITION OF FREEDOM**

What gives proper validity to a research paper is its reliance on certain theoretical foundation; assessment of the research process and its findings with respect to such theoretical basis. This paper is no exception, and here, the theoretical framework is provided. The core concept in this paper is freedom. Freedom is no new concept and is as old as human history (Mill, 2006: 25).

Hardly anybody has difficulty understanding the complexity and ambiguity of the definition of freedom. There are as many definition of freedom as the number of people who define it. Freedom is a term with many instances and a signifier with a lot of signified. Dual, triple and quadruple definitions have been provided for freedom. The dual ones involve the positive and negative aspects of freedom, which are accepted by many thinkers including Isaiah Berlin (see: Berlin, 1999).

Triple concepts involve trilateral relations of freedom based on which the factor (a) is freedom from constraint, factor (b) is freedom to act freely and factor (c) is free. This relationship that was proposed by McCallum is widely accepted by scholars. Finally, the quadruple concept of freedoms that was proposed by Feinberg consists of four kinds of freedom (outer, inner, positive and negative) (Khalili, 2008: 504). Thus, triple and quadruple categorizations were criticized, and it seems that the dual concepts of positive and negative freedom are more acceptable. So in the following, the concepts of positive and negative freedom, and possibility of other concepts are discussed.

#### **3.1 Negative freedom**

According to some scholars, such as Berlin and Constantine, negative freedom is a new concept that is more in tune with modern times. For them, this concept of freedom is even older than positive concept of freedom. Isaiah Berlin defined negative freedom as negation and lack of intervention, or freedom from intervention of others (Gary, 2002: 34). Negative freedom has a long history in liberalism and is one of the issues that has received special attention from liberal intellectuals. However, negative freedom can prepare ground or the creation and consolidation of pluralism based on acceptance of diversity and commensurability of the human goods, thus preventing the formation of the monistic view that underlies the formation of authoritarianism (Gary, 2000: 23).

#### **3.2 Positive freedom**

The concept of positive freedom involves individual autonomy, acting according to rational requirements and participation in public power. So negative liberty requires non-intervention as much as positive freedom involves the rationality of the human mind. Positive freedom means authority and autonomy and is quite different from the negative freedom that means non-intervention of others (Berlin, 1999: 250). So the positive freedom can be called or the freedom of the powerful. The above definitions are related to the discussion of paper because John Locke's view of freedom can analyzed with reference to the said definitions, because he was a thinker who analyzed freedom in the light of liberation from the government and reduction of government's power.

#### **3.3 Liberation**

The concept of liberation is a synthesis of the concepts of positive and negative freedom. However, the concept of liberation is not simple that the product of negative and positive concepts of freedom, but it is broader and more extensive, and rather than relying on individual needs, it focuses on the lack of restriction and resistance to human needs as well as a critique of instrumental rationality that is the cause of metamorphosis of freedom. Therefore, the concept of liberation must be considered in connection with critique of instrumental

rationality and criticism of the nation-state. The concept of liberation is one of the essential concepts of theories based on critical approach.

This is because this approach, unlike positivism, is based on communicative rationality that is a liberating process. While maintaining the link between freedom and rationality, this approach questions a certain type of rationality, that is, instrumental rationality and thus arrives at a new concept of rationality and freedom (communicative rationality and liberation) (Bozorgi, 1998: 247). The most complete and accurate critical view of the link with the concept of communicative rationality and liberation is found in the thought of Jürgen Habermas. Reconstructing views of Marx, Weber, Lukacs and the Frankfurt School, he completes the unfinished project of modernity by going beyond the realm of necessity of domination to the realm of liberation and complete freedom (Habermas, 2002: 617-644).

So liberation should be considered as the third and at the same time the most developed concept of freedom, which contains the positive elements of the two previous concepts. Thus, there are three concepts of freedom, negative, positive and liberating freedom, and the present paper tried to analyze views of John Locke and Habermas with respect to these concepts.

#### **IV. JOHN LOCKE, CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT AND FREEDOM**

Generally, many theorists believe that each philosopher has a philosophical system and based on that philosophical system, they elaborate on various topics such as nature, art, knowledge, morality, economy, etc. Thus, different political issues such as freedom are studied in their own philosophical system. On this basis, John Locke is an empiricist philosopher that addressed various issues including freedom. In this paper, the author didn't aim to address all these issues, but referring to the general idea of John Locke, the main focus is on his political philosophy, in particular that about freedom.

John Locke was born in 1632 AD near the city of Bristol. His father was a court employee. Locke was admitted to famous school of Westminster at age fifteen, where he was acquainted with the spirit of the pro-monarchy. This period coincided with one of the most tumultuous decades of the seventeenth century in England, the period of civil war in this country, the war between supporters of limiting the monarchy in favor of the authority of parliament on the one hand and the king and courtiers on the other hand. He was first influenced by William Ockham's nominalism and substance doctrine of Rene Descartes. Then, he became one of the most influential empiricist philosophers of Europe.

Locke has valuable works on epistemology, science and education, as well as religion, economics and politics that have had an undeniable impact on entire philosophy of the Enlightenment in Europe. John Locke introduces a new route in European philosophy, with epistemology being at the center of it. Locke believed that to reach certainty in knowledge, one must first and foremost know human faculty of knowledge and its validity and boundaries. Therefore, many believe that his greatest contribution lies in importance of his theory for critical theory of knowledge, especially in the field of metaphysics. We can say with confidence that his most important philosophical work titled "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding" is the first comprehensive and theoretically coherent and critical writing on human knowledge. The human is the focus of theory of John Locke his descriptive-psychological method simultaneously makes his theory of knowledge into cognitive psychology (see: Sanaei, 1992).

To understand political thought of John Locke on freedom, one must consider such topics as human nature, the state of nature, the social contract and the manner of rise of government. This is because it is from the study of such topics that manner of rise of government and the level and type of human freedom from such government are identified. Locke's political theory is based on the human nature. To him, humans are moral beings who are subject to moral and social rules.

According to Locke, man hears and heeds the call of duty. For Locke, man is an altruist creature (Jones, 1991: 230). Thus, state of nature of Locke is very different from that of Thomas Hobbes, with underlying normal situation is very different. Unlike Hobbes, Locke believed that man doesn't naturally live in the state of perpetual war or fear of each other, but they are morally equal and free to do according to the law of nature. Locke believed that state of nature is based on the law of reason, and that that law teaches all how to live together equally and independently in peace and that no one is entitled to harm life, health, liberty, and property of other people.

Thus, the state of nature is not, according to Locke, situation of lawlessness or one existing before socialization, it is not the situation in which humans live in mutual hostility, but the situation where there is peace and wisdom and law of nature governs the human behavior in society, the law that specifies not only human rights but also their duties and obligations. In his view, state of nature is state of peace, benevolence and cooperation as opposed to as Hobbes's state of nature, which is that of enmity, malice and competition. In Locke's state of nature, man has natural rights to life and freedom and everybody shall not only respect his own rights but also others' right to life, liberty, and property, and everybody considers such rights and obligations as those provided for by the law of nature (Alem, 2008: 191).

According to Locke, although state of nature involves moral duties, there is a conflict in such state. Although there is no state of war of all against all, but there is a situation where there is no complete and guaranteed peace; although the rights are specified, but there is no final arbiter to ensure people's rights. So the state of nature has conditions in which although humans enjoy freedom, they are at permanent risk of others infringing their rights. This condition has caused many of human desires not be fulfilled, and therefore, this conditions must be changed (ibid: 192).

According to Locke, people who live in state of nature face three major problems: 1. the rules are not clearly defined, (2) there is no public authority that will guarantee enjoyment of natural rights, 3. finally, there is no generally accepted known referee to settle the dispute between people (Locke, 1988: 351). Hence, people who live in the state of nature agree for the purpose of getting rid of this pathological state to establish a government or civil society to preserve and protect their rights, including the right to life, freedom and property, all of which were considered by Locke as "property rights". Locke says in this regard: "Although the human enjoys the right to freedom in state of nature, access to it is not certain, and such right is always subject to infringement by others, because like him, all are kings and equal. Thus, in such state, enjoying such property is not guaranteed at all. This causes the human to abandon that state despite it is close to freedom because it is affected with permanent fear, and to try to join other communities where his life, freedom and property, all of which I call "property" would be placed under public security (ibid: 131). So you can see that in the eyes of Locke, the main reason to obey the government is protection of property and such rights as the right to life, liberty and property. In other words, obeying the government and its legitimacy is for the sole purpose that the government would protect the people's property. However, social contract of Locke is concluded between people, with no one excluded, because people conclude it between themselves. Under these conditions, people agree to transfer their executive power to the benefit of an authority that will then be responsible for maintaining social order. So people don't transfer all of the natural rights they had in the state of nature, but they only transfer the right to interpretation and application of natural law or the right to delimitation of natural rights to the newly established government.

The establishment of the government is according to Locke the natural result of the emergence of a competitive society and is a sign of evolution of the wisdom potential existing in the human. Accordingly, the rational nature of man makes him institutionalize his natural rights or property (right to life, liberty and property) by the social contract (Sabzei, 2008: 79- 81). The basis of such contract that is aimed at ensuring the individual freedom according to law is property, property that according to Locke is always associated with freedom. According to Locke, the freedom is always associated with the individual's property. Freedom means having the individual's power of taking action with no one having the right to infringe or limit it. To Locke, the first right is the right to property, without which no other right may be sustainable (Colletti, 1999: 39). If Hobbes proved rationality of absolute ruler, Locke accepted Hobbes's design and presumptions, but he made changes to them so that absolute ruler is turned to constitutional ruler, and linked the goal of civil society or government to protection of productive property. So, according to John Locke, the main reason to obey the government and therefore the legitimacy of the government is that government tries to protect human property. Locke's theory of property is the heart of his political theory. In his view, the main purpose of the government is to protect property and property precedes the political society and hence the legitimacy of the government should support and protect the property, that is, the right to life, liberty and property (Pouladi, 2005: 85-116).

It can be seen from the above discussions that unlike Thomas Hobbes who had security concerns, John Locke was concerned focused on freedom limited and constitutional government. Hence, people who live in the state of nature agree for the purpose of getting rid of this pathological state to establish a government or civil society to preserve and protect their rights, including the right to life, freedom and property, all of which were considered by Locke as "property rights". So it is obvious that John Locke is the philosopher of freedom, and is rightly called the father of liberalism and liberal tradition. John Locke is the philosopher of reason and freedom and his political thought started in the seventeenth century with viewing man as a rational and free creature. Therefore, Locke's view of freedom originates in the human decision-making reason. Finally, it can be said that John Locke is a liberal political theorists per se in the modern world.

## **V. .HABERMAS, COMMUNICATIVE RATIONALITY AND LIBERATION**

After discussing the issue of freedom in political thought of John Locke and identifying ways to ensure that in civil society, and the importance of human freedom in many aspects of life, it is now time to address the issue of freedom in political and social thought from view of one of the world recent thinkers, the German Jürgen Habermas. However, remarkable thing is that in the light of recent conceptual developments in the social sciences, including political science, the scope of the concept of freedom has encountered with another new concept called "liberation", which concept has received the attention of many scholars and critical schools, including a thinker called Habermas. Therefore, in review of Habermas's thought, the concept of freedom is considered here as a synonym for freedom.

Jürgen Habermas, born June 18, 1929 in Düsseldorf, Germany, is among philosophers and social theorists of the Frankfurt School whose works fall within the tradition of Critical Theory. In the 1950s, Habermas read Lukács and was very impressed. He then studied the writings of the other early members of Frankfurt School. Between 1956 and 1959, he was assistant of Adorno and so much learnt from his teacher and all these led him to write his first work *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* in 1962. From 1961 to 1964, Habermas, taught philosophy at the University of Heidelberg; from 1964 to 1971, he taught sociology and philosophy at the University of Freiburg. From 1972 to 1981, he was manager of the Max Planck Institute at Starnberg. After returning to Frankfurt in 1981, his greatest work, the *Theory of Communicative Action* was published.

From 1982 to 1998, he was a lecturer at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University in Frankfurt and now is retired. Believing in the continuation of the Enlightenment beyond postmodernism, Habermas seeks to solve the problem of modernity and postmodernism skeptical objections through a systematic theory of communicative action in public space (Asgarkhani et. al, 2009: 293 -294). In fact, criticizing some aspects of modernity, Habermas has a sympathetic understanding of it, and calls it "unfinished project", which is capable of reconstruction. More clearly speaking, Habermas argues that modernity has gone in two directions, one being cultural and communicative rationality and another being instrumental rationality and technical communication. Claiming dominion over nature became human in the modern era to conquer nature and human rationality, ultimately, their skirts were my own people have the human, the technology was mastered by man.

Man in the modern era claim to domination of nature and nature and instrumental rationality affected the human as well, the creature of the human, technology, took control of the human. But Habermas believes that Western modernity has yet aspect, which is communicative rationality. So if cultural – communicative rationality had continued, the human beings would have become rational and conscious, but in the middle of the way, cultural - communicative rationality was overcome by instrumental rationality. In other words, the system prevailed over the life-world.

Habermas's fundamental criticism of the Frankfurt School was derived from this: he believed that the Frankfurt School thinkers have confused system rationality and action rationality, which means that it is true that instrumental rationality has taken control of the social world in form of science and technology and contemporary capitalism, this does not mean that no area is left for the resistance. In other words, Habermas believes that the members of the Frankfurt School were not differentiate between system and life-world and confused them.

Thus Habermas provides a different perspective from those of other members of the Frankfurt School, a new vehicle for the transition from modernity crisis and unlike them, taking into account the possibility of transition from system to life-world, he considers the possibility of liberation from the power and capital and achieving freedom, knowledge and individuality (Nazari, 2004: 390-391) Habermas doesn't see modernity which is currently prevailing the world as real modernity and believes that cultural modernity and its elements such as communicative rationality, action of understanding, rationality of life-world, the verbal ideal condition, public sphere, etc. and constitute the foundation of modernity and by way of the proper and unambiguous functioning, cultural – communicative modernity and its elements such as communicative rationality, modernity can continue its path (Rabbani et al., 2009: 68-69). One thing in which the thought of Habermas about freedom can be very well found is the critique of practical reason and a revival of communicative rationality. He believes that rationality leads to the domination over the human, so that the human is now captured. Now, given the other aspect of rationality, that is, the rationality of action, one can hope to revive freedom and human liberation. While postmodern thinkers such as Lyotard believe in the transition from modernity and the emergence of the postmodern era, Habermas doesn't believes in such an era. Because Habermas believes that modernity is the only way to liberation and human liberation has gone wrong direction and its false face that is now dominating the world must be rebuilt.

The failure of modernity lies in the fact that influence of power and wealth through the ideology has reduced the role of man and his freedom and disrupted liberating inter-subjective communication. Thus, seeking to address these shortcomings and find solutions to this situation, Habermas suggests dialogue in public sphere, communicative rationality and deliberative democracy, and it is these areas that will provide for human liberation (Alem&PourpashaKasin, 2011, 154).

The main problematic Habermas is that of modern society has deviated from its original path of rationality; the society that sought to bring freedom to human but was caught in the trap of domination and oppression, while it seemed modernism and enlightenment should necessarily lead the human to freedom and progress (Habermas, 1989: 106). Thus, Habermas places economic and social reality in the context of historical and philosophical idea to show how modern capitalist state undermines genuine social relations through injecting false consciousness into the bourgeois civil society, thus suppressing the historical and philosophical truth of the modernism so that the modern subject experiences domination rather than freedom at this historic moment in modern Western society (Ibid: 88).

Deviating from freedom of enlightenment, capitalist system brought about domination. According to Habermas, such deviation is rooted in positivist philosophy based on which the object takes control of subject and human relations become mathematical (Habermas, 1972: 313). Habermas also believe that the positivist doctrine of separation between value and reality is another root of crisis of modernity deviation. He brought this issue to the community level and for this purpose, he uses interpretative sociology of Weber to show how the rule of the objective, instrumental rationality dominate social and human relations and thus how modern human is trapped bureaucracy and his freedom is undermined (Tavana, 2011: 56). ).

Habermas's solution to get rid of this situation is to focus on the communicative rationality, which is discussed further later. Habermas's communicative rationality has two main characteristics: first, the limiting of reason to instrumental rationality is not acceptable; second, he provides a two-level conception of society, with one of them being based on the life-world, and other on system. Thus, given the communicative rationality, Habermas believes in full defense of liberation potential of reason in continuing struggle for freedom, communicative rationality has signs by which different participants overcome their purely subjective point of view and thanks to mutual rationality of their views, they make sure about the unity of the objective world and their inter-subjectivity.

Thus, communicative action has an essential role in establishing agreement and consensus through creating grounds for understanding the historical past and by establishing connection between contemporary groups and cultures. Communicative rationality involves the interaction between human minds and involves multilateral dialogue on rules about the truth that has a bilateral logic. According to Habermas, the existential and main core of communicative rationality is optional and causes unity and consensus in the two-sided dialogue. It is by engaging in a debate that people can become aware of each other's views and debates involving participation are based on equality and are free (Habermas, 2005: 49-50).

Given what was said about the thoughts of Habermas, it can be said that Habermas is a thinker who is still thinking in the modern age and, unlike the post-modern philosophers who believed in the transition from modernity, he sees modernity as an unfinished project that should be rethought and completed. He believes that the instrumental rationality led to domination crisis led for modern humans and deprived the humans of freedom. To escape from the said crisis, Habermas focused on rationality of action and dialogue in the public sphere. He considered mutual understanding and dialogue as being liberating.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

This paper aimed to explore the concept of freedom in the political thought of John Locke and Jürgen Habermas. Freedom is not a new concept, but it is as old as the human history and it can be said that it has somehow divided the human. For this reason, John Locke and Jürgen Habermas have paid special attention this concept in both theory and practice although they lived in two different times, but the emphasis of both scholars on concept of freedom have united them. But it should be noted that the conceptual tools used by them to reach freedom is quite different. John Locke tried to provide philosophical argument in support of freedom through emphasis on human nature, natural conditions, social contract and constitutional government while Habermas seeks to cause human liberation from the domination of the modern capitalist economic system through criticizing enlightenment, instrumental and mathematical reason, and by focus on such concepts as communicative reason, deliberative democracy and public sphere. It seems Habermas emphasizing the concept of human freedom and withdraws the basic concept beyond to Locke.

What is criticized in this view, the particular form of expression and the realization of the ideals of the Enlightenment, not Enlightenment in its universality? In other words, this critical tradition tries to along with constructive criticism Enlightenment and also criticized the negative aspects of modern society, maintain element of liberating enlightenment. In this sense, critical thought in the contemporary world is the continuation of unfinished Enlightenment projects, and its aim not only is to eliminate shaped of dominance in pre-modern but also all forms of domination. So it is obvious that John Locke is the philosopher of freedom, and is rightly called the father of liberalism and liberal tradition, because he tries to justify constitutional government and prepare ground for freedom of individual from government. It seems Habermas emphasizing the concept of human freedom and withdraws the basic concept beyond to Locke. What is criticized in this view, the particular form of expression and the realization of the ideals of the Enlightenment, not Enlightenment in its universality? In other words, this critical tradition tries to along with constructive criticism Enlightenment and also criticized the negative aspects of modern society, maintain element of liberating enlightenment. In this sense, critical thought in the contemporary world is the continuation of unfinished Enlightenment projects, and its aim not only is to eliminate shaped of dominance in pre-modern but also all forms of domination. In addition, locke look to the meaning of human freedom from the Maximum concept of ownership that includes the right to the exclusive use of all the assets and belongings. Locke believed that people in the natural state have exclusive property right on all things that belong theirs. Therefore, it can be said in Locke's view concept of ownership, in broad terms, it is equivalent to the concept of freedom and this concept has proceeded of the government and any political

organization. In such a narrative of human freedom Citizens of political community have exclusive right to own property As long as they do not infringe on the rights and property of other citizens of the community. it seems Habermas through the lens of conflict between the two concept of system and sphere word, analysis and criticism of its commitment to human freedom in the modern era. Habermas emphasizes on liberating element of language and communicative action in relation to human freedom. As we said in John Locke's view, what makes a government legitimate is the he concept of universal consent that means consent of all nationals and citizens of rulers While Habermas political theory of legitimacy is more analytical than Locke view. Habermas is still faithful to John Locke the three centuries after him and tries to prepare ground for individual freedom in the era of capitalism. Criticizing instrumental reason, he tries to highlight the liberating aspect of action rationality. Overall, the results of this paper showed that they both have certain commitment and concerns as regards the freedom and their political philosophy is an attempt to revive human freedom.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Bashiriyeh , H. (2007 ) . Education of political science. Tehran: Negah-e- Moaser Press.
- [2]. Weil, M.J.C. (2005). Politics and government in the US. Edd. Ganji G., Tehran: Ghomes Press.
- [3]. Haji Yousefi , A. (2005). Typology of political sociology study in Iran. Journal of Political Science, 1(1).
- [4]. Marsh, D.; Gerry, S. (2003). Theory and methods in political science. Amir Mohammad Hajiyousefi. Tehran: Center for Strategic Studies.
- [5]. Khalili, R. (2008). Security and freedom: in search of sustainable development focused approach. Journal of Strategic Studies, 11(3).
- [6]. Berlin, I. (1989). Four essays on freedom. Edd. Movahhed, M., Tehran: Khawrazmi Press.
- [7]. Mill, J.S. (1979). A treatise on freedom. Edd. Shaykholeslami. Tehran: BongahTarjomehwaNashr-e Ketab.
- [8]. Gray, J. (2002). Liberalism. Edd. Savoji, M., Tehran: Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press.
- [9]. Gray, John (2000). Political philosophy of Isaiah Berlin. Edd. Deyhimi, K. Tehran: Tarhe Now.
- [10]. Bozorgi, V. (1998). New theories of international relations. Tehran, Ney Publishing.
- [11]. Habermas, J. (2002). Way out of the philosophy of the subject: communicative reason vs. subject-centered communication. Edd. Bashiriyeh, H. A paper in the book: From modernism to postmodernism, Edd. Rashidian. A. Tehran: Ney Press.
- [12]. Sanaei, M. (1992). Individual freedom and state power. Tehran: Hermes Press.
- [13]. Jones, V.T. (1991). The lords of political thought. Ramin, A., vol. II, Tehran: Amir Kabir Press.
- [14]. Abdolrahman, A. (1999). The foundations of politics. Tehran: Ney Press.
- [15]. Sabzei, M.T (2007). Civil society as a social contract: comparative analysis of the ideas of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. Journal of Researches in Law and Politics, 9(22).
- [16]. Pooladi, Colletti, Lucio (2009). Rousseau and criticism of civil society. Edd. Shamsavari, H., Tehran: Markaz Press.
- [17]. Kamal (2005). From authoritative to rational government. Tehran: Markaz Press.
- [18]. Nazari, A. (2004). Critical views and the transition from modernity. Rahbord Journal, No. 34.
- [19]. Asgarkhani, A.; Janbaz, D.; Abbaszadeh, M. (2009). Postmodernity and analysis of sovereign national state in international relations theories. Journal of Politics, 39(3).
- [20]. Rabbani, R.; SeyyedMoradi, A.; Karimi, D. (2009). Globalization and place of culture from the perspective modern and post-modern sociologists. Journal of political-economic data, 24 (3 & 4).
- [21]. Alam, A.; and PourpashaKashin, A. (2011). Dialogic democracy of Habermas: the relation and the factors. Journal of Politics, 41(1).
- [22]. Tavana, M. (2011). Critical theory of Habermas: an example of interdisciplinary thinking in the present day. Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 3(4).
- [23]. Habermas, J. (2005). The theory of communicative action, Edd. Pooladi, K., Tehran: Iran Newspaper.
- [24]. Locke, J. (1988), two treatises of government. ed. peter Laslett, Cambridge university press.
- [25]. Habermas, J. (1989), The structural of Transformation of the public sphere, Cambridge: polity press.
- [26]. Habermas, J. (1972), Knowledge and Human interest, London: Heinemann.