

Free essay on politics and government

[Philosophy](#), [Freedom](#)



States governments are through legislations, responsible for various individuals' rights and freedoms. Over the years, individual liberty has been a topic of discussion among many state governments around the globe. Individual liberty is described as the freedom of citizens of a particular state to conduct various activities without interference from the government. The state government, usually, has less or no power over the individuals' conduct and behavior. Individuals under democratic governments, usually, have and enjoy varied social, political, and economic liberties in their undertakings. By contrast, some state governments have a complete control over individual liberties. The concept of individual liberty can be dated back during the 18th centuries in John Locke's writings. According to the natural law, John Locke postulated that all individuals are entitled to liberty. According to Locke, individual liberty, health, life, and property should not be interfered with by any persons. By contrast, the government is obligated to protect and preserve such individual liberties .

The United States constitution protects individual liberty through the Bill of Rights Act. Under the Bill of Rights, citizens are entitled to myriad freedoms and rights with the aim of protecting individual liberties. By contrast, the provision of such liberties by the federal government has some restrictions. The United States Supreme Court postulates that individual freedoms and rights can be restricted if necessary with the aim of facilitating some states' interests. Some of the compelling states' interests include national security, public safety and protecting other's rights. Individual liberty may be restricted in some cases where state interests are conflicted. For instance, the freedom of speech in public may be restricted if it has a compelling

government interest. According to the law, there are some items that are protected and preserved under the liberty of speech by full First Amendment. Public of speech may be restricted if such the regulated activity or the item is not protected under the full First Amendment protection. For instance, obscenity in freedom of speech may be followed by legal actions as a result of its restriction .

Individual liberty for association is provided by the government in order to allow free association of citizens. The individual liberty of association is, clearly, stipulated in the First Amendment of the United States' constitution. On the contrary, the federal state has also the right to restrict freedom of association for individual membership in an organization that undertakes illegal activities. Restriction of such liberty by the state is in the aim of protecting other individuals' rights, and safety. The state is, therefore, obligated to perform such functions at the interests of the general public. In such instances, individual liberty is confined as a result of compelling government interests .

According to the Supreme Court, decisions and perspectives of the majority group may not influence the minority belief in some social, political, and economic perspectives. This can be stipulated, clearly, under the religious liberty for individuals in a nation. All individuals are expected to join a religious group they deem right. The liberty to choose and exercise one's religion should not be influenced by other individuals. The freedom to exercise religion can, on the other hand, be terminated through infringement by another party. The federal state can also have some restriction on the freedom to exercise religion though various state practices. For instance, the

state government can impose some religious practices that are meant to restrict individual liberty to choose and exercise their freedom .

Among other rights and freedoms, the right of the press allows individuals to write down their opinions and views concerning any national issues.

Individuals are empowered to criticize state government's acts and their undertaking with the aim of streamlining their activities. On the contrary, individual liberty of the press is limited in a situation where the government practices dictatorial leadership. Under this condition, all powers are concentrated in the state government, and no individual is allowed to air his or her opinions. Criticizing government undertakings may lead to imprisonment. Freedom of the press, therefore, gives all individuals the liberty to air out their views and ideas about the state government. On the contrary, the Supreme Court has implemented some restrictions on the liberty of the press in order to prevent obscene and unethical language to the public. Defamation is another type of press restrictions that amounts to imprisonment and compensation as a result of tearing down one's reputation .

The liberty of assembly has also been approved by the First Amendment of the United States constitution. Individuals are allowed to hold meetings and discuss any myriad issues concerning their welfare and discuss problems. On the contrary, such meetings are expected to be, peacefully, held in order to prevent intrusion of other individuals' rights. Individual liberty is further extended in the ownership of property. The Fifth Amendment provides freedom of property ownership by all citizens. The liberty for property ownership ensures that the individual has rightful possession of their

property without seizure of any other party. The economic system is based on such rights in order to allow buying and selling of goods and services. There has been a conceptual issue pertaining individual liberty and security problems among various states. According to some researchers, provision individual liberty should be done accordingly in order to strike a balance with security. The society's need for protection should, therefore, be protected from activities that an individual may carry out for personal interests. The government, on this hand, has a major role to play in ensuring individual liberty does not adversely affect the community. Restrictions on certain individual rights and freedoms, therefore, becomes of crucial importance. The state government endeavors to encourage citizens' safety, rather than endangering individual liberty. It is under this perspective that the deduction of state government endangering individual liberty deemed to be false. On the contrary, state government intervention in individual liberty is of great importance to the public in general .

According to the aforementioned facts regarding restriction of individual liberty by the government, the actions are usually meant at the interest of the general public. For instance, isolation and restriction of civil liberties in order to prevent public health emergencies is aimed at curbing further spread of disease. The state government is obligated with the responsibility of protecting the general public. Restriction of individual liberty is thus in line with the state's objective to protect and preserve individual interests. On the contrary, there are some dangers that can be accompanied by the restriction and isolation programs carried out by the state government. For instance, in preventing an outbreak of communicable diseases, the responsible authority

may ineffectively carry out the procedures. As a result, unintended individuals may be subjected to the quarantine and isolation program. This could lead to a widespread of diseases as a result of states inefficiency .

The intervention of the state government into individual liberty, usually, has a lot of benefits as compared to the demerits. The liberty of speech and the press are provided to all citizens in a nation with the aim of criticizing and streamlining government's functions. On the contrary, the state government has set some restrictions on such individual liberties in order to prevent infringement of other individuals' rights and freedoms. The restriction of individual liberty of speech is restricted to avoid defamation and the use of obscene words to other people. In the aforementioned incidence, it is evident that government intervention to individual liberty of speech is aimed at protecting and preserving the individuals' reputation .

In a democratic state government, individuals are provided with various liberties as compared to a dictatorial form of government. Individuals are offered the opportunity and liberty to criticize the government, under the democratic government. Dictatorial government, on the other hand, provides no room for criticism by citizens. The state, in the later form of government, undertakes extreme and adverse measures on individual liberty. Individual liberties are, therefore, limited to a greater extend under dictatorial relative to a democratic government. On the contrary, the state government under democratic rule carries out its operations in line with the general public interests. Restriction of such civil liberties is meant for the good of the public in general .

In conclusion, the state government does not endanger individual liberty,

rather protect and preserve their rights and freedoms in line with the constitution. The Bill of Rights, under the United States constitution has facilitated the improvement of individuals' liberties. Individual liberties can, therefore, be negatively or positively be affected by the state government. The implementation of certain rules and regulations can limit or strengthen individual liberties. States objective on individual liberty restriction is, usually, to protect citizens' interests in general. Through various studies, it is evident that the state government has a crucial and vital role in the determination of individual liberty. On the contrary, individual liberties are streamlined according to government interests in order to prevent infringement of other individuals' rights. According to the law, the state government is responsible for outlining individual liberties. As aforementioned, the state carries out its undertakings in favor of the general public. It is, therefore, right to state that the state government involvement in individual liberties is for the betterment of the general public.

Works Cited

Bolick, Clint . Grassroots Tyranny: The Limits of Federalism. Washington: Cato Institute, 2000.

Carver, Terrell and Jens Bartelson. Globality, Democracy and Civil Society. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Casas, Jose Pardo and Pedro Schwartz. Public Choice and the Challenges of Democracy. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2007.

Dimitrakopoulos, Ioannis G. Individual Rights and Liberties Under the U. S. Constitution. Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2007.

Hoveyda, Abbas . Indian Government And Politics. New Delhi: Pearson

Education India, 2011.

Rappaport, Julian and Edward Seidman. Handbook of Community Psychology. New York: Springer, 2000.

Rothbard, Murray Newton . For a New Liberty: The Libertarian Manifesto. Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute, 2011.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques . Social Contract. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.

Shari, Belalla. " Individual Liberty Versus State Security." Pakistan Horizon (2013): 2.

Spencer, Richard . " Individual Liberty vs. Government Authority." Caesar Rodney Institute (2012): 3.