Issue VI , Vol. I (Indexed) | Peer Reviewed | ISSN : 2319 - 8648
June, 2026 | SJIF Impact factor | Impact Factor : 7.139

Impact Factor – 7.139 ISSN – 2319 - 8648

Current Global Reviewer

Peer Reviewed Multidisciplinary International Research Journal
PEER REVIEWED & INDEXED JOURNAL

June, 2026
Issue- VI, Vol. I

Chief Editor
Mr. Arun B. Godam

Editor
Dr. Vilas Surybhan Tale
Associate Professor,
Department of Political Science,
Coordinator, IQAC, Arts College Buldhana

Shaurya Publication , Latur

Issue VI , Vol. I (Indexed) | Peer Reviewed | ISSN : 2319 - 8648
June, 2026 | SJIF Impact factor | Impact Factor : 7.139

Index

1. A Study of Women's Political Participation in Panchayati Raj Institutions: With Special Reference to Latur District — 07
Prof**. Ajinkya Surendra Kadam, Dr. P. K. Nandeshwar**

2. A Comparative Review of the Concept of Liberty in the Political Philosophy of Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls and Robert Nozick — 13
Anshul C. Wankhede, Dr. Vedprakash Dongaonkar

3. Institutional Gender Parity and Policy Transformation: A Critical Inquiry into the Constitution (106th Amendment) Act, 2023 and Democratic Governance in India — 22
Akshay Govind Pawar Prof. Dr. Vilas S. Tale

4. Digital Governance and Last Mile Service Delivery- An Indian Context — 27
Prabodh Janardan Wankhade, Prof. Dr. Vilas Gaikwad

5. Role of Zilla Parishads in District Administration: A Study of Maharashtra — 35
Chaitanya Ashok Bagade, Dr.Vilas Gaikwad

6. Political Socialization and Democratic Citizenship in Indian Schools: A Conceptual Review — 40
Shubham Bhimrao Gawai, Prof. (Dr.) Vilas S. Tale

7. Women's Empowerment Beyond Borders: in Indian Diasporic Literature — 45
S.k. Mateen,[1] S.k. Nazeer[2]

8. अमरावती जिल्ह्यातील जिल्हा नियोजन समितीच्या योजनांचा विकासात्मक अभ्यास — 51
भारत सिताराम डोंगरे, डॉ. विलास गायकवाड

9. लोकसभा निवडणूक २०२४ मधील दिव्यांग मतदारांचा सहभाग : बुलडाणा तालुक्याचा एक विश्लेषणात्मक अभ्यास — 60
प्रशांत आनंदा हिवाळे, प्राचार्य, डॉ. सुरेश रामभाऊ बाठे

10. कृत्रिम बुद्धिमत्तेचा लोकशाहीतील निवडणुकांवरील प्रभाव : एक संशोधनात्मक अभ्यास — 62
डॉ. विलास एस्. टाले

11. संत गाडगेबाबांच्या कीर्तनांतील सामाजिक परिवर्तनाची संकल्पना — 75
गजेंद्र सोनबा टोम्पे, डॉ. विष्णू नामदेव लांडे

12. डॉ. गंगाधर पानतावणे यांचे वाङ्मयीन व्यक्तिमत्त्व व आंबेडकरवादी विचार — 81
कु. शुभांगी संजय चोथमल, डॉ. विष्णू नामदेव लांडे

13. 'बारोमास' या कादंबरीतील सुशिक्षितांच्या समस्या — 85
श्री विठ्ठल गणपत महाल्ले, डॉ. विष्णू नामदेव लांडे

CURRENT GLOBAL REVIEWER

Issue VI , Vol. I (Indexed) June, 2026	Peer Reviewed SJIF Impact factor	ISSN : 2319 - 8648 Impact Factor : 7.139

2 A Comparative Review of the Concept of Liberty in the Political Philosophy of Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls and Robert Nozick

Anshul C. Wankhede
Research Scholar
Research Center
Dept.of Philosophy,
Matoshri Shantabai Gote Arts, Commerce & Science College,Washim,
Affiliated to Sant Gadge Baba University Amravati

Dr. Vedprakash Dongaonkar
Research Supervisor

Abstract:

One of the core ideas of political philosophy is liberty. Three different views on liberty have been articulated by Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls, and Robert Nozick, and they still have an impact on modern political philosophy. Nozick uses the concept of the smallest state to protect individual liberty, Rawls integrates liberty with justice and equality, and Berlin makes a distinction between negative and positive liberty. This essay compares these three methods philosophically and assesses how applicable they are to contemporary democracies.

Keywords: Liberty, Political Philosophy, Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls, Robert Nozick, Justice.

Introduction

Isaiah Berlin's political theory focuses on the well-known contrast between positive and negative liberty, examining the differences between self-realization and self-mastery and non-interference. These two ideas influence current discussions about the boundaries of personal freedom and state authority. One of the most significant contributions to contemporary political theory is Isaiah Berlin's distinction between positive and negative liberty. The absence of outside impediments, obstructions, or interference with a person's chosen course is referred to as negative liberty. It focuses on defining a private domain where people can act without interference from the government or other people. "In what area am I subject to a person or group?" is the key question here [1].

In terms of politics, this idea of liberty calls for a minimum state whose function is restricted to defending individual liberties and averting oppression. Positive liberty, on the other hand, places more emphasis on the ability to act on one's basic desires, including self-mastery, rational control, and active engagement in public life. "What, or who, is the source of control or interference that can determine someone to do, or be, this rather than that?" is its central query. Achieving full autonomy and realizing one's higher rational potential are central to this concept of liberty [2].

Berlin cautioned that in the sake of "liberating" people from ignorance, poverty, or false consciousness an impulse that has historically resulted in totalitarianism positive liberty can legitimize governmental intervention, social engineering, or paternalism. Value pluralism the idea that basic human values like liberty, equality, and justice are numerous, incommensurable, and frequently at odds with one another is the foundation of Berlin's larger philosophical perspective. Value pluralism recognizes that no utopian social structure can simultaneously maximize all values, in contrast to monist traditions that look for a single overarching principle to harmonize society. Attempts to impose absolute systems run the risk of becoming hazardous, and trade-offs are unavoidable. This viewpoint emphasizes the intricacy of political life, where conflicting interests must be balanced rather than solved by a single formula [3].

Berlin's ideas of both positive and negative liberty, when combined with his dedication to value pluralism, offer a nuanced critique of both authoritarianism and oversimplified conceptions of freedom. They serve as a reminder that liberty is a contested area that calls for caution and humility in political practice rather than a single, unchanging ideal. In his Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy entry, John

Issue VI , Vol. I (Indexed) June, 2026	Peer Reviewed SJIF Impact factor	ISSN : 2319 - 8648 Impact Factor : 7.139

Rawls defines liberty in terms of the First Principle of Justice, which emphasizes linguistic equality over economic distribution. This framework is in stark contrast to communitarianism, libertarianism, and utilitarianism [4]. The foundation of John Rawls' theory of liberty is the idea that every individual has an equal right to a comprehensive set of fundamental liberties. According to Rawls, these liberties have lexical primacy, which means they cannot be sacrificed or given up for financial or social benefits. His dedication to upholding fundamental liberties as the cornerstone of justice is demonstrated by his insistence on priority. Furthermore, Rawls highlights the fair value of political liberty, guaranteeing that rights like voting and public participation are substantively accessible rather than just formal, protecting true democratic engagement from a comparison standpoint, utilitarianism and Rawls' theory disagree significantly. Rawls opposes utilitarianism, which aims to maximize happiness for all, frequently at the price of individual rights [5].

Rawls maintains that fundamental liberties must be upheld regardless of possible increases in welfare. Additionally, libertarianism, which emphasizes unrestricted market activities and property rights, is in opposition to his worldview. According to Rawls, inherited riches and natural aptitude are morally arbitrary, necessitating a controlled system to maintain equity and stop injustices from weakening justice. Rawls has been accused of assuming a "unencumbered self" cut off from social ties in response to communitarian criticisms, especially those made by Michael Sandel however, Rawls made it clear in Political Liberalism that his understanding of the individual is political rather than metaphysical, intended to uphold a just system of cooperation among free and equal individuals rather than to downplay the importance of community [6].

When taken as a whole, these ideas and discussions demonstrate Rawls' unique contribution to contemporary political philosophy: a conception of liberty that is equal, safeguarded, and integrated into a fair social structure while staying open to criticism from opposing traditions. In his seminal work Anarchy, State, and Utopia from 1974, Robert Nozick defined liberty as an unalienable moral right based on self-ownership. He argues that since liberty is essentially historical and non-patterned, any attempt by the state to redistribute wealth interferes with people's free will [7].

The foundation of Robert Nozick's theory of liberty is the idea of self-ownership, which holds that people are complete proprietors of their bodies, skills, and the products of their labor. His entitlement argument, which maintains that properties are just if they are obtained by lawful initial purchase or voluntary transfer, is built upon this foundation. His concept of moral side restrictions, which underline that no one, even the state, may utilize a person only as a means to an end without that person's agreement, complements this. Together, these pillars create a framework that views liberty as unalienable individual sovereignty that is impervious to paternalistic meddling or forcible redistribution[8].

Nozick uses his well-known Wilt Chamberlain analogy to highlight the disruptive consequences of patterned theories of justice. In this instance, an initially equitable distribution of wealth is altered when spectators willingly pay an additional quarter to watch Chamberlain play. The ensuing inequity is not the product of injustice, but rather of free, voluntary choices. According to Nozick, measures to address such results such as taxing Chamberlain's extra income to maintain equality amount to coercion and equate taxation with forced labor. This comparison highlights his preference for a historical approach that evaluates justice based on the legitimacy of acquisition and transfer over end-state or patterned theories of justice, which concentrate on attaining a desired social picture [9].

Comparatively speaking, egalitarian ideas such as those of John Rawls are very different from Nozick's theory. Nozick maintains that justice is only dependent on how possessions came about, not on reaching a certain societal goal, whereas Rawls stresses fairness by regulating the distribution of natural skills and wealth. His vision culminates in the defense of the minimal state, a "night-watchman" state that only defends citizens against fraud, robbery, and coercion. He contends that any growth beyond this position

Issue VI , Vol. I (Indexed) | Peer Reviewed | ISSN : 2319 - 8648
June, 2026 | SJIF Impact factor | Impact Factor : 7.139

violates individual liberty by imposing duties that view people as tools for group goals. By basing justice on historical entitlement rather than social patterns, Nozick's theory challenges egalitarian and redistributive models and provides a bold defense of human freedom [10].

Research Methodology

Using textual exegesis, conceptual analysis, and critical reconstruction, a comparative philosophical investigation examines the development, divergence, and normative implications of liberty through the conceptual frameworks of Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls, and Robert Nozick.
This comparative philosophical investigation's study approach is based on a methodological framework that blends critical analysis and textual exegesis. The study aims to reveal the complex ways in which each thinker conceptualizes liberty by thoroughly examining foundational writings such as Robert Nozick's Anarchy, State, and Utopia (1974), John Rawls's A Theory of Justice (1971), and Isaiah Berlin's Two Concepts of Liberty (1958).

This is supplemented with a comparative conceptual mapping that contrasts Rawls's contractual egalitarian freedoms, Nozick's absolute libertarian rights of self-ownership, and Berlin's distinction between positive liberty (self-mastery/autonomy) and negative liberty (non-interference). Through a normative dialectic, the investigation assesses each philosopher's response to the persistent conflicts between equality, liberty, and state paternalism [11].

Each thinker's unique contributions are highlighted by the thematic elements of comparison. Berlin's value pluralism rejects the idea of a final harmonious state and presents liberty as a non-utopian option among incommensurable and conflicting human values. In contrast, Rawls maintains the lexical priority of equal basic liberties, which are protected by the veil of ignorance and counterbalanced by the difference principle against distributive justice. Nozick, on the other hand, develops entitlement theory, which bases liberty on unalienable self-ownership and actively subverts models of patterned distribution, making redistributive welfare regimes oppressive. When combined, these viewpoints shed light on the various philosophical underpinnings of contemporary discussions about liberty and provide a rich comparative framework for comprehending how freedom, justice, and the state interact [12].

Concept of Liberty: A Philosophical Overview

The thematic components of comparison draw attention to the distinctive contributions of each thinker. Berlin's value pluralism offers liberty as a non-utopian choice among incommensurable and contradictory human values and rejects the notion of a final harmonious state. Rawls, on the other hand, upholds the lexical importance of equal basic liberties, which are balanced against distributive justice by the difference principle and shielded by the veil of ignorance. Nozick, on the other hand, creates entitlement theory, which actively challenges theories of patterned distribution and based liberty on unalienable self-ownership, rendering redistributive welfare systems oppressive. When taken as a whole, these perspectives illuminate the many philosophical foundations of current debates about liberty and offer a rich comparative framework for understanding the relationship between freedom, justice, and the state [13].

Negative and positive liberty are two essentially distinct ideas of freedom that are distinguished in Isaiah Berlin's groundbreaking article Two Concepts of Liberty (1958). The private realm in which a person can behave without intervention from the state or society is known as negative liberty. It emphasizes the significance of shielding people from coercion and intrusion and is essentially "freedom from" external limitations. Positive liberty, on the other hand, is defined as the aspiration to be one's own master and is based on personal autonomy and self-realization. It emphasizes the importance of logical self-direction and personal fulfillment by providing "freedom to" realize one's potential [14].

Isaiah Berlin's seminal article Two Concepts of Liberty (1958) distinguishes between two fundamentally different concepts of freedom: negative liberty and positive liberty. Negative liberty is the private sphere in which an individual can act without social or governmental interference. It is essentially

Issue VI , Vol. I (Indexed) | Peer Reviewed | ISSN : 2319 - 8648
June, 2026 | SJIF Impact factor | Impact Factor : 7.139

"freedom from" outside constraints and highlights the importance of protecting people from coercion and intrusion. Positive liberty, on the other hand, is founded on individual autonomy and self-realization and is described as the desire to be one's own master. By granting "freedom to" reach one's potential, it highlights the significance of rational self-direction and personal fulfillment [15].

John Rawls' first principle of justice, which states that every person has an equal right to a fully adequate scheme of basic rights that must be compatible with the same system of freedom for all, forms the foundation of his theory of justice. Rawls presents the well-known "veil of ignorance" thought experiment to support this idea. In this hypothetical situation, individuals are required to create social norms without being aware of their own financial situation, social standing, or innate skills. Without any personal benefit, they are forced to make decisions based on values that protect fundamental liberties and equitable social structures, guaranteeing justice from an unbiased perspective [16].

Rawls's perspective on liberty is balanced as a result of this paradigm. He maintains that true liberty necessitates societal circumstances that enable people to genuinely use their rights rather than reducing freedom to simple non-interference. In order to allow everyone to effectively utilize their freedoms, Rawls advocates for a modest welfare state that helps the least fortunate while simultaneously defending fundamental liberties as unalienable. In this approach, Rawls offers a vision of society in which liberty and justice are complementary rather than antagonistic, fusing the liberal emphasis on individual rights with a concern for distributive justice [17].

Robert Nozick provides a thorough justification of libertarian entitlement and the minimum state in his seminal work Anarchy, State, and Utopia (1974). His Entitlement Theory emphasizes that justice is found in the process of acquisition rather than in any specific distribution pattern, stating that assets and riches are just if they come from a lawful initial acquisition or consensual transfer. From this vantage point, Nozick vehemently opposes redistributive taxes, such as that put forth by John Rawls, contending that it violates individual liberty by seeing citizens' property and labor as resources that the state can appropriate.

According to Nozick, this kind of redistribution undermines people's agency and amounts to compelled labor. As a result, he supports a minimal or "night-watchman" state that is limited to upholding contracts, safeguarding property rights, and averting violence. He argues that any attempt at welfare-based or planned distribution will unavoidably interfere with individual freedom and undermine the fundamental tenet of true liberty, which is self-ownership

Since you're examining Rawls and Berlin's ideologies on your current tab, would you like me to extend this into a comparative flow with them as well? In this manner, Nozick's ideas could be more clearly placed within the larger discussion of liberty [18].

Liberty in Isaiah Berlin's Political Philosophy

Robert Nozick, John Rawls, and Isaiah Berlin all have different perspectives on what constitutes liberty: Nozick advocates total libertarian self-ownership, Rawls strikes a compromise between social justice and equal basic liberties, and Berlin contrasts negative and positive freedom.

One of the most significant contributions to political philosophy is Isaiah Berlin's distinction between positive and negative liberty. Negative liberty is the state in which there is no outside intervention or coercion and a person is free as long as no one stands in the way of their chosen course. Positive liberty, on the other hand, places more emphasis on autonomy, self-mastery, and the ability to fulfill one's basic goals or rational potential. However, Berlin famously cautioned that, despite its good intentions, positive liberty bears a significant risk: authoritarian governments can exploit the desire to be one's "own master" by pretending to act in the best interests of the group while actually coercing people into obedience [19].

In his theory of justice, John Rawls centers fairness around liberty. He strictly prioritizes fundamental liberties like freedom of speech, conscience, and political involvement over other social advantages. Simultaneously, Rawls presents the Difference Principle, which permits economic and social

Issue VI , Vol. I (Indexed) | Peer Reviewed | ISSN : 2319 - 8648
June, 2026 | SJIF Impact factor | Impact Factor : 7.139

inequality only when it helps the most disadvantaged members of society. Crucially, he recognizes that material differences might restrict people's actual ability to use their liberties and makes a distinction between the legal extent of liberty, which must remain equal, and its practical worth [20].

Robert Nozick presents a very different perspective, based on Lockean concepts of self-ownership. He contends that since people are the absolute owners of their bodies, skills, and the products of their labor, any state-mandated transfer, like welfare taxes, violates negative liberty by viewing people as mere means rather than ends. According to Nozick, the only "night-watchman" state that is morally acceptable is one that is limited to defending property, upholding agreements, and avoiding coercion or fraud. He argues that any redistributive or structured system violates people's inherent rights to their property and compromises their freedom.

Together, Berlin, Rawls, and Nozick present a compelling argument: Nozick defends liberty as absolute self-ownership against any redistributive claims, Rawls aims to reconcile liberty with justice through structured equality, and Berlin emphasizes the conflict between freedom from interference and freedom as self-realization. Their divergent viewpoints shed light on the ongoing conflict between individual liberty and social fairness [21].

Liberty in John Rawls' Political Philosophy

In the political theories of Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls, and Robert Nozick, liberty is a step from understanding the fundamentals of freedom to balancing it with distributive justice or absolute property rights. Nozick developed a libertarian theory based on individual self-ownership and entitlement, Rawls combined equal basic liberties with equitable socioeconomic justice through the social compact, and Berlin established the fundamental contradiction of negative and positive freedom [22].

A key distinction between positive and negative freedom is highlighted in Isaiah Berlin's theory of liberty. The absence of outside intervention, compulsion, or restraint by others, which delineates a private realm in which the individual is sovereign, is known as negative liberty. The yearning for self-mastery, autonomy, and rational control—the internal ability to reach one's full potential is the expression of positive liberty, on the other hand. However, Berlin cautioned that positive liberty involves a historical risk: it can be abused by autocratic governments claiming to work "for the individual's own good," coercing citizens under the pretense of realizing a greater collective self [23].

According to John Rawls' notion of justice as fairness, liberty is the cornerstone of a just society. His first principle ensures that everyone has an equal right to a set of fundamental liberties that are compatible with everyone else's rights, including freedom of expression, conscience, and political involvement. According to Rawls, these liberties have lexical precedence and cannot be compromised for financial gain or utilitarian considerations. He also makes a distinction between the worth of liberty, which is the practical capacity to use it, and the scope of liberty, which must continue to be equal. By doing this, Rawls recognizes that even in cases where nominal rights are equal, economic disparities might reduce people's actual ability to use their freedoms [24].

On the other hand, Robert Nozick presents a libertarian criticism based on the idea of self-ownership. He makes the case that people are ends in themselves and hence fully possess their bodies, skills, and the results of their labor, drawing on Kantian and Lockean traditions. His Entitlement Theory rejects any predetermined social patterns of distribution and maintains that justice in holdings depends only on just acquisition, just transfer, and correction of past injustices. Nozick challenges Rawlsian redistribution from this angle, arguing that taxing welfare programs violates negative liberty and views productive persons as nothing more than tools to help others. He believes that the only "night-watchman" state that is morally acceptable without restricting individual freedom is one that is limited to safeguarding property, upholding agreements, and preventing coercion or fraud.

Issue VI , Vol. I (Indexed) | Peer Reviewed | ISSN : 2319 - 8648
June, 2026 | SJIF Impact factor | Impact Factor : 7.139

Together, Berlin, Rawls, and Nozick present a complex philosophical argument: Nozick defends absolute self-ownership against redistributive claims, Rawls aims to balance liberty and justice through structured equality, and Berlin highlights the conflict between freedom from interference and freedom as self-realization. Their divergent perspectives highlight the ongoing challenge in contemporary political philosophy to strike a balance between individual liberty, justice, and group accountability [25].

Liberty in Robert Nozick's Political Philosophy

In stark contrast to Isaiah Berlin's dual framework of negative and positive freedom and John Rawls' egalitarian-liberal balance of liberty and distributive justice, Robert Nozick's conception of liberty is based on total self-ownership and property rights.

The paradigm of liberty developed by Isaiah Berlin makes a clear distinction between positive and negative freedom. According to Berlin, negative liberty is the absence of outside intervention or pressure in a person's private domain, a barrier that prevents authoritarian intrusion. In contrast, positive liberty is the goal of autonomy and self-mastery the internal ability to reach one's full potential. However, Berlin cautioned that this ideal might be fatally distorted: authorities may use positive liberty as an excuse for compulsion in the name of the common good, claiming to know individuals' "true" preferences better than they do. Berlin's support of negative liberty is in line with Robert Nozick's libertarian ideology, but Nozick takes it a step further by rejecting collective balancing and demanding that outside intervention be kept to a minimum [26].

However, in A Theory of Justice, John Rawls presents an alternative view in which justice and liberty are balanced. His first principle ensures that everyone has equal access to fundamental liberties, including freedom of speech, conscience, and political engagement. According to Rawls, these liberties have lexical primacy, which means they cannot be compromised for utilitarian or financial benefits. However, his Difference Principle justifies a redistributive welfare state by allowing social and economic inequality only when it helps the most disadvantaged members of society. Using his "Wilt Chamberlain" thought experiment, Nozick notably criticizes this concept, claiming that any attempt to preserve regular wealth distributions necessitates ongoing, coercive interference with consensual transactions, so violating individual liberty.

When combined, Berlin, Rawls, and Nozick shed light on three different but related conceptions of liberty: Berlin cautions against the perils of positive liberty, Rawls uses structured redistribution to try to balance freedom and justice, and Nozick defends absolute self-ownership against any redistributive claims. Their conversation highlights the persistent philosophical conflict between justice, autonomy, and the state's influence on individual freedom [27].

Comparative Analysis of the Three Perspectives

Robert Nozick, John Rawls, and Isaiah Berlin all have different definitions of liberty: Nozick uses absolute self-ownership and property rights, Rawls uses equal basic rights along with just social cooperation, and Berlin uses the absence of outside interference (negative liberty).

Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls, and Robert Nozick all define liberty differently: Berlin utilizes the absence of outside interference (negative liberty), Rawls uses equal basic rights combined with just social cooperation, while Nozick employs full self-ownership and property rights.

. In A Theory of Justice, John Rawls attempted to balance justice and liberty. He maintained that everyone should have equal access to fundamental liberties like freedom of expression, conscience, and political engagement. Rawls developed the "veil of ignorance," a thought experiment in which people create social norms without being aware of their own place in society, to guarantee impartiality and protect fundamental liberties. Through the Difference Principle, which only permits inequality if it benefits the least advantaged, his system also included socioeconomic redistribution. Rawls grounded justice on both equal rights and equitable results by fusing liberty and justice in this way.

Issue VI , Vol. I (Indexed) June, 2026	Peer Reviewed SJIF Impact factor	ISSN : 2319 - 8648 Impact Factor : 7.139

Berlin, Rawls, and Nozick collectively offer three different but related perspectives on liberty. Berlin warns against the perils of positive liberty by highlighting the conflict between self-mastery and non-interference. Through redistributive justice and equal basic rights, Rawls aims to strike a balance between freedom and justice. Nozick, on the other hand, maintains that only a small state maintains true liberty and opposes redistribution in favor of total self-ownership. Their conversation highlights the ongoing philosophical conflict over what constitutes justice, freedom, and the role of the state [28].

Contemporary Relevance

In the writings of Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls, and Robert Nozick, the philosophical assessment of liberty focuses on the conflict between absolute property rights, egalitarian justice, and non-interference. These philosophers use entitlement-based libertarianism, structural distributive justice, and both positive and negative aspects to describe freedom. Within the framework of his larger commitment to pluralism, Isaiah Berlin's view of liberty is based on the dichotomy between positive and negative freedom. Negative liberty, which is defines the absence of outside intervention, denotes the private domain in which people can operate without hindrance from others. Berlin stressed the importance of this line in preventing the spread of authoritarianism.

On the other hand, positive liberty is the internal ability to reach one's potential and the pursuit of self-mastery and autonomy. However, Berlin cautioned that this ideal is historically susceptible to distortion because governments may assert that they know what citizens "truly" desire and use force in the name of the common good. His pluralist perspective also emphasized how fundamental human ideals frequently clash freedom, equality, and justice, for example and that these conflicts cannot be resolved by a single hierarchy.

In A Theory of Justice, John Rawls attempted to ground liberty in a framework of justice. His first principle ensures that everyone has equal access to fundamental liberties including freedom of speech, conscience, and political involvement, with lexical primacy guaranteeing that these rights cannot be compromised for utilitarian or financial benefit. Additionally, Rawls made a distinction between the value of liberty, which is dependent on social and economic resources, and the scope of liberty, which must remain equal. Understanding that material disparities might reduce one's actual ability to exercise freedom, he used the Difference Principle to justify redistributive policies, allowing disparities only when they help the most disadvantaged. Rawls thus combined welfare and redistribution into a framework that strikes a balance between justice and liberty [28].

However, Robert Nozick presented a libertarian critique that was very different from Rawls's ideas. He supported the minimal or "night-watchman" state in Anarchy, State, and Utopia, which was limited to defending civilians against fraud, theft, and force. The idea of self-ownership, which holds that people are rights-bearers who own their bodies, skills, and the results of their labor, is fundamental to his ideology. According to his entitlement theory, establishing a specific end-state distribution is not necessary for fairness in holdings; rather, just acquisition and voluntary transfer are. From this vantage point, Nozick opposed redistributive taxation, comparing it to forced labor as it takes money away without permission. As long as they uphold individual rights, voluntary market exchanges are acceptable even if they result in significant disparities [29].

These three viewpoints still influence discussions today. While Nozick's defense of absolute property rights opposes redistributive justice, Rawls's framework serves as the foundation for welfare state policies and conversations about social democracy. Berlin's critique of positive liberty affects current debates concerning autonomy, paternalism, and state control, ranging from public health mandates to behavioral nudges. Debates over universal basic income and global justice frequently follow Rawlsian lines of fairness vs Nozickian entitlement in international contexts. Berlin's pluralism serves as a reminder that no single ideal can prevail without running the risk of coercion. When taken as a whole, their ideologies shed light on the

Issue VI , Vol. I (Indexed) | Peer Reviewed | ISSN : 2319 - 8648
June, 2026 | SJIF Impact factor | Impact Factor : 7.139

ongoing battle in contemporary political philosophy to strike a balance between justice, equality, and freedom [30].

Conclusion

A comparative study of Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls, and Robert Nozick concludes that liberty is a contentious spectrum characterized by absolute self-ownership, egalitarian distribution, and negative non-interference rather than a single concept. The conceptual conflicts between freedom, justice, and state power are reflected in the starkly different ideas of liberty expressed by Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls, and Robert Nozick. Berlin argued that the lack of external barriers and coercion is the primary definition of liberty and that this boundary is necessary to protect personal autonomy. He cautioned that when the government believes it knows what people "truly" desire, positive liberty which is defined as self-mastery can quickly turn into paternalism and authoritarian rule.

In contrast, Rawls' idea of fairness aimed to combine liberty with justice. He emphasized that formal negative freedom is meaningless without the practical and social resources to express it, combining equal basic liberties with socioeconomic reciprocity. His Difference Principle justifies redistributive welfare programs by allowing inequality only when it benefits the least fortunate. According to Rawls, liberty must be both safeguarded and given substantial significance through just social structures.

Nozick advanced a libertarian defense of entitlement and self-ownership in opposition to this synthesis. He maintained that fairness in holdings depended only on historical acquisition and voluntary transfer, and that people have unalienable rights to their bodies, skills, and property. He believes that redistributive taxes violate fundamental liberty by using people as tools to further the interests of others. As a result, he only supported a minimal state that was limited to defending against fraud, theft, and force.

These intellectuals' disagreement exposes long-lasting trade-offs. Rawls prioritizes fundamental rights while permitting redistribution to provide true equality of opportunity in an effort to strike a balance between liberty and justice. Nozick insists on absolute property rights and rejects any patterned distribution as being incompatible with individual rights. Berlin, on the other hand, supports both viewpoints with his pluralist insight: no single political structure can claim ultimate harmony without stifling choice, and ultimate human ideals ultimately clash. When taken as a whole, these ideas shed light on the ongoing conundrum of how nations should balance equality, justice, and liberty in both theory and practice.

References

1. Coser, I. (2014). The concept of liberty: the polemic between the neo-republicans and Isaiah Berlin. *Brazilian Political Science Review*, *8*(3), 39-65.
2. Lyons, J. (2020). *The Philosophy of Isaiah Berlin*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
3. Haus, M. Berlin, Isaiah (1958). Two Concepts of Liberty. Oxford: Clarendon. gerlin, Isaiah (2o13):“The Question of Machiavelli”. In: New York Review of Books, 4 November 1971; shortened reprint 7 March 2013; www. nybooks. com/50/Machiavelli.
4. Let, A. (2025). Democracy, Justice, and Freedom: A Study of John Rawls and Contemporary Political Thought. *Research Review Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, *1*(3), 110-116.
5. Brennan, J. (2018). Libertarianism after Nozick. *Philosophy Compass*, *13*(2), e12485.
6. Tiwari, N. (2017). *LIBERTARIAN POLITICS OF ROBERT NOZICK* (Doctoral dissertation, UNIVERSITY OF LUCKNOW LUCKNOW).
7. Giorgini, G. (2013). Three visions of liberty: John Stuart Mill, Isaiah Berlin, Quentin Skinner. In *John Stuart Mill: A British Socrates* (pp. 207-229). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
8. Ricciardi, M. (2016). Liberty. In *A Companion to Political Philosophy. Methods, Tools, Topics* (pp. 149-159). Routledge.
9. Matsui, S. (2022). Liberty. In *Socialism as the Development of Liberalism: Marxist Analysis of Values* (pp. 47-76). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Issue VI , Vol. I (Indexed) June, 2026	Peer Reviewed SJIF Impact factor	ISSN : 2319 - 8648 Impact Factor : 7.139

10. Plaw, A. (2001). Isaiah Berlin's pluralist thought and liberalism: a re-reading and contrast with John Rawls.
11. Schaefer, D. L. (2007). *Illiberal justice: John Rawls vs. the American political tradition*. University of Missouri Press.
12. Ferrell, J. (2012). Isaiah Berlin as Essayist. *Political Theory*, *40*(5), 602-628.
13. Spisiak, B. D. (2023). *Isaiah Berlin's Liberal Humanism* (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University).
14. Gustavsson, G. (2011). *Treacherous liberties: Isaiah Berlin's theory of positive and negative freedom in contemporary political culture* (Doctoral dissertation, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis).
15. Yeh, H. (2006). *History, method, and pluralism: A re-interpretation of Isaiah Berlin's political thought*. London School of Economics and Political Science (United Kingdom).
16. Hill, J. L. (2001). A third theory of liberty: The evolution of our conception of freedom in American constitutional thought. *Hastings Const. LQ*, *29*, 115.
17. Ripstein, A. (2012). Political philosophy. *Routledge History of Philosophy Volume X*, 194.
18. Bejan, T. M. (2021). Rawls's Teaching and the "Tradition" of Political Philosophy. *Modern Intellectual History*, *18*(4), 1058-1079.
19. Crowder, G. (2009). Pluralism, liberalism, and distributive justice. *San Diego L. Rev.*, *46*, 773.
20. Nozick, R. (1973). Distributive justice. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, *3*(1), 45-126.
21. Jin, O. S. (2012). Preliminary Philosophical Questions of the "Democratization of the Economy": An Insight from the Debate between Rawls and Nozick. *53*(4), 263-288.
22. García, J. F. (2009). Two Traditions of Liberty? Confronting Dworkin and Hayek's Legal and Political Philosophy Dos Tradiciones Sobre la Libertad? Confrontación de la Filosofía Jurídica y Política de Dworkin y Hayek). *Revista de Derecho de la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso*, *33*(2).
23. Drugge, O. D. (2013). *Moral conflict, tragedy and political action in Isaiah Berlin's political thought* (Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia).
24. Chachine, I. E. (2008). *Community, justice, and freedom: Liberalism, communitarianism, and African contributions to political ethics* (Doctoral dissertation, Tros-och livsåskådningsvetenskap).
25. McManus, M. (2020). The Limitations of Liberalism and Liberal Rights. In *A Critical Legal Examination of Liberalism and Liberal Rights* (pp. 137-165). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
26. WEINSTEIN, D. (2004). English Political Theory in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. *H a ndbookof*, 410.
27. Lacey, A. (2014). *Robert Nozick*. Routledge.
28. Forst, R. (2013). A Kantian republican conception of justice as nondomination. *Republican democracy*, 154-168.
29. Farris, J., & Edmundson, W. A. (2017). Political Theory.
30. Rothbard, M. N., Hoppe, H. H., & Rothbard, M. N. (1982). *The ethics of liberty* (Vol. 181). Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.