Historical and contemporary conceptions of freedom are various and diverse. Some of this diversity is the result of linking freedom with other values, such as liberty, responsibility, autonomy, self-governance, self-realization, non-interference, non-domination, and respect. Some conceptions of freedom appear to represent competing conceptions of a common concept, as in the debate between compatibilists and incompatibilists about the truth of causal determinism and freedom of the will and responsibility or the debate between the liberal conception of freedom as non-interference and the republican conception of freedom as non-domination. But in some cases the diversity in conceptions of freedom might make us wonder if they are rival conceptions of a common concept or if they embody conceptions of different concepts. We may wonder if the best conception of freedom or responsibility, whatever it is, is really the same as autonomy, as that might represent an ideal of self-governance. We may wonder if freedom can be associated with self-realization, especially if that requires recognizing both negative liberty — as the absence of interference — and positive liberty — as realizing some ideal of self-governance. And we might wonder whether respect for persons tracks one of these kinds of freedom and, if so, which one.

It would be hopeless to try to examine the relations among all the different conceptions of freedom and related values in one essay. What I want to do is bring some prominent historical conceptions of freedom into dialogue with each other. In Section III of the Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals (1785) Immanuel Kant introduces three kinds of freedom that he claims are presupposed by moral requirements — negative freedom from determination by empirical motives, positive freedom or autonomy involving determination by practical reason, and transcendental freedom, which is his transcendental idealist response to the threat of incompatibilism. In the appendix to The Methods of Ethics (1874/1907) Henry Sidgwick criticizes the Kantian conception of autonomy as being unable to show how someone might be free and responsible for making the wrong choices, as well as the right ones. In his Prolegomena to Ethics (1883) T.H. Green develops an ethics of self-realization that is indebted in important ways to Kantian themes. In his lectures on Kant’s metaphysics and ethics, Green often finds himself defending the spirit, but not the letter, of Kantian commitments. In particular, he rejects transcendental freedom and agrees with Sidgwick that positive freedom or autonomy, as Kant formulates it, cannot explain how those whose will is not determined by practical reason can nonetheless be responsible for their wrongdoing. However, Green thinks that Kant could and should have identified freedom and responsibility with the capacity for determination by practical reason, rather than with the proper exercise of this capacity. In his posthumously published essay “On the Different Senses of ‘Freedom’ as Applied to Will and the Moral Progress of Man” Green defends his own tripartite conception of freedom — juridical freedom, which is the absence of compulsion and restraint by others; moral freedom, which is the sort of moral capacity that he thinks Kant should have identified; and real or perfect freedom, which resembles Kant’s own conception of positive freedom. On Green’s view, these three kinds of freedom are stages in the perfection of freedom. In his influential essay “Two Concepts of Liberty” (1958), Isaiah Berlin

---

1 This essay was composed during the COVID-19 crisis and quarantine in connection with a seminar Dick Arneson and I taught (remotely) on freedom and its limits. The irony of writing about freedom in the time of quarantine is not lost on me. But there are forms and degrees of freedom, including perfect freedom, that are possible during quarantine, even if more complete freedom is possible outside the constraints of quarantine. I would like to thank Dick Arneson, Samantha Berthelette, Zack Brants, Aaron Chipp-Miller, Min Heo, Kathryn Joyce, Jonathan Knutzen, Sam Ridge, Ahmed Siddiqi, Andy Sin, Manuel Vargas, and Eric Watkins for helpful discussion.
famously distinguished between *negative liberty*, as freedom from interference, and *positive liberty*, as a kind of self-realization, and criticized the legitimacy of positive freedom. Berlin included Green in his criticisms positive liberty.

As this summary makes clear, it is not so much that I am bringing these philosophers into dialogue with each other. They are already in dialogue or, at least, partial dialogue. Sidgwick is responding to Kant; Green is responding to Kant and Sidgwick; and Berlin is responding to Green. I think that it’s worth reconstructing and assessing this narrative about freedom, in part because it brings out different conceptions of freedom and their possible inter-relations. On my reading, Green is the hero of this narrative, but it’s a Green who defends recognizably Kantian commitments.\(^2\) I’m sympathetic with Green’s tripartition of freedom and his claim that these three conceptions of freedom, though distinct, can and should be seen as related by the way in which real freedom incorporates and perfects juridical and moral freedom. I also think that this gives Green a promising response to Berlin, who thinks that the only real freedom is negative freedom and that positive freedom illicitly smuggles moral goods into the concept of freedom. Finally, I will argue that Green’s distinction between moral freedom and real or perfect freedom fits nicely with the Kantian idea that *respect is a fitting response to freedom*. In fact, Kant distinguishes between *respect* and *esteem*. Respect is the recognition and fitting response to an agent insofar as she has capacities for moral responsibility, and it is the appropriate response to any agent with sufficient normative competence. Esteem is the recognition and fitting response to an agent insofar as she exercises her normative capacities well. Not all agents are equally virtuous, because they do not exercise their normative capacities equally well. As a result, the distribution of esteem should be variable.

This narrative about freedom, responsibility, and respect engages the views of Kant, Sidgwick, Green, and Berlin. As my summary suggests, it is a complex narrative, involving a number of parts, many of which are themselves complex. For the narrative to work, it must be possible to discuss the parts in a reasonably self-contained way that avoids over-simplification but eschews multiple layers of complexity that would be possible only in a longer or narrower study. My hope is that the benefits of seeing these texts and issues as part of a unified narrative compensates for the need to be selective in my coverage of some issues and debates.

1. **THEMES IN KANT’S ETHICS**

One of Kant’s most important discussions of freedom comes in the third and last section of the *Groundwork*. This comes after he lays out some of the most important elements of his ethical theory in Sections I and II. To appreciate the claims in Section III, we would do well to review some central commitments in Sections I and II.

In Section I Kant claims that the only thing good without qualification is a *good will* (4: 393-98), which is displayed when an agent conforms to duty and does so out of a sense of duty or under the guise of duty. The agent who displays a good will is *guided by* the demands of practical reason. Kant claims that only a good will displays moral worth (*sittlichen Wert*) and that esteem (*Hochschätzung*) is a fitting response to moral worth (4: 398).

In Section II Kant contrasts *hypothetical imperatives*, which represent action as necessary conditional on some aim or interest the agent happens to have, and *categorical imperatives*, which represent actions as unconditionally necessary (4: 414). Because moral requirements depend only on features of us as rational agents, and not on our contingent and variable interests and desires, they must express categorical imperatives (4: 416, 425).

Though individual moral requirements are themselves categorical imperatives, they all have their basis in a single Categorical Imperative (4: 416). But the Categorical Imperative has several formulations. Kant’s discussion emphasizes three formulations.

---

\(^2\) The argument here develops brief and scattered remarks in Brink, *Perfectionism and the Common Good*. 
1. F1: Act only maxims that you can will to be a universal law of nature (4: 421). This is the Formula of Universal Law.
2. F2: Treat humanity, whether in your own person or that of any rational agent, always as an end in itself and never merely as a means (4: 429). This is the Formula of Humanity.
3. F3: Every rational being should be regarded as an autonomous legislator in a kingdom of ends (4: 431-33, 438). This is the Formula of the Kingdom of Ends.

These are the three main formulations Kant recognizes, and he takes them to be equivalent (4: 436). He illustrates the first two formulations by applying them to the same four examples: the duty not to take one’s own life, even in despair; the duty not to make false promises; the duty to develop one’s talents; and the duty of beneficence (4: 421-23, 429-30). In the process, he argues that moral personality or rational nature is the ability to set ends and is an objective end, indeed, the foundation of all other duties (4: 428-29).

It’s worth saying a bit more about Kant’s reasons for taking the three formulae to be equivalent. Kant treats rational nature as the ground of duty when he insists that duty must be knowable a priori. Moral requirements, Kant thinks, must depend upon essential, rather than contingent and variable, features of agents, which explains why moral requirements must express categorical, rather than hypothetical, imperatives (4: 416, 425). If moral requirements are not to be based on variable empirical conditions, then they must be universal. To achieve this sort of universality, Kant requires an agent to be able to will her maxims or principles to be universal. This yields F1 — the Formula of Universal Law (4: 421). We should interpret F1 as asking what rational beings can consistently will. But this claim is ambiguous. F1 might be interpreted as asking what rational beings can consistently will, that is, what someone who is rational can consistently will. This test can depend on the contingent interests and desires possessed by rational beings. But this makes it difficult to distinguish F1 from the Golden Rule, which Kant clearly wishes to do (4: 431n).

Alternatively, we can understand what a rational being can consistently will as what someone can will insofar as she is rational. On this interpretation, F1 asks what we can will, not insofar as we have particular contingent wants and interests, but what we can will insofar as we are rational beings.

What, if anything, would we will just insofar as we are rational beings? Kant thinks that insofar as one is rational one will make rational nature one’s end (4: 428). Happiness, he claims, can have only conditioned or instrumental value; rational nature alone has intrinsic value that does not depend on contingent and variable circumstances. So only rational nature could be valued regardless of one’s contingent circumstances and sentiments. Rational nature is the capacity to set ends and act for the sake of ends (G 4: 428, 430-31). But then a rational agent will value activities and lives that express rational nature. Moreover, if I choose rational agency solely insofar as I am a rational being, then it seems I choose to develop rational agency as such, and not the rational agency of this or that particular rational being (4: 427). If so, then F1 directs me to be concerned about other rational agents, as rational agents, for their own sakes. This is F2 — the Formula of Humanity (4: 429). This is how he gets from ground to content and from Universality to Humanity.

The transition from Universality and Humanity to the Kingdom of ends is more straightforward. If F1 represents a test for the permissibility of our maxims that we interpret in terms of the choice of a purely rational agent and, so interpreted, F1 is equivalent to or implies F2, then we get something like F3. We are free to act on those maxims that we, as rational beings, can

---

3 This simplifies a more fine-grained taxonomy of the formulae. Some commentators identify six formulae: (1) universal law (421), (2) universal law of nature (421), (3) the end in itself (429), (4) universal legislation by every rational being (431), (5) the kingdom of ends (438), and (6) autonomy (440). See Paton, The Categorical Imperative, p. 129 and Irwin, The Development of Ethics, vol. III §917. However the tripartite taxonomy does not oversimplify inasmuch as (1) and (2) are equivalent versions of F1, (3) corresponds to F2, and (4)-(6) represent different aspects of F3.
will to be universal and that treat other agents as ends in themselves and never merely as means. This is for each rational agent to be a sovereign member of a kingdom of ends. This is essentially F3.

2. KANT’S TRIPARTITE CONCEPTION OF FREEDOM

These ethical claims seem to stand or fall on their own merits, as Kant presents them in Sections I and II. This is why some readers of the *Groundwork* may be surprised to learn in Section III that Kant thinks that Sections I and II establish only the possibility of morality and the Categorical Imperative. For morality not to be an empty concept, agents must have freedom of the will (4: 448-49). This introduction of the concept of freedom may seem to come from nowhere. But it should not come as a surprise.

In Section II Kant has argued that the Formula of Humanity involves recognizing that moral personality and the capacity to set ends are objective goods. Rational nature is the basis of all other goods and duties (4: 428). The special position of rational nature in relation to all other goods shows that it has dignity. Kant contrasts things having a price and things having dignity.

In the kingdom of ends, everything has either a price or dignity. Whatever has a price can be replaced by something else as its equivalent; on the other hand, whatever is above all price, and therefore admits of no equivalent, has a dignity. [4: 434]

Kant goes on to say that happiness and things that produce happiness have a price but that humanity, understood as personality or rational nature, has dignity (4: 435-36). But moral personality and rational nature involve the capacity to set or determine ends. Hence, we should conclude that for Kant there is a sense in which morality does depend on the concept of freedom.

But what kind of freedom? Kant’s conception of freedom (*Freiheit*) plays an important role not just in the *Groundwork*. In the *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788) Kant makes related claims about freedom as the precondition of both morality and the highest good (esp. 5: 93-119). Moreover, his conception of freedom connects with his theoretical commitments to transcendental idealism in the *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781/1787), especially his discussion of the resolution of threat of incompatibilism in the Third Antinomy (*KrV* A532-58/B560-86). It is a complex and contentious topic in Kant studies on which much ink has been spilled.⁵ For our purposes, we can focus attention on Kant’s treatment in Section III of the *Groundwork*. Here, Kant introduces three distinct conceptions of freedom.

1. Negative Freedom
2. Positive Freedom
3. Transcendental Freedom

*Negative freedom* involves the absence of determination by empirical motives, independently of the operation of practical reason. An agent has negative freedom only if her desires do not compel or necessitate her will and her actions, independently of her moral judgments. Curiously, negative freedom focuses on the absence of *internal* compulsion, that is, necessitation by one’s own passions and desires. Kant’s conception of negative freedom in the *Groundwork* omits the need for the absence of interference by others.⁵ As we will see, this is the heart of Berlin’s conception of negative freedom.

---

⁴ One important discussion is Allison, *Kant’s Theory of Freedom*.
⁵ Kant might try to internalize external compulsion, claiming that coercion limits negative freedom insofar as it creates fear within the agent of the external threat, which is then the source of the agent’s unfreedom. But this won’t help. First, the fear need not be disabling to compromise the agent’s negative freedom. Second, fear is not necessary. I limit your freedom by wrongly locking you in your room or taking your car keys, even if neither prospect causes you fear.
On this view, it is coercion or otherwise wrongful interference by others that jeopardizes freedom. Perhaps negative freedom should be conceived in terms of the absence of compulsion or necessitation, whether internal or external.

*Positive freedom*, by contrast, involves the determination of the will by practical reason, rather than by empirical motives. (4: 446). Presumably, positive freedom is realized in the good will (4: 393-99). Whereas heteronomy is the absence of negative freedom, autonomy requires positive, and not just negative, freedom (4: 446-47; cf. KrV A534/B562, A553-54/B581-82; KpV 5: 61-62, 72, 87).

However, Kant believes that both negative and positive freedom require *transcendental freedom*. Transcendental freedom presupposes the transcendental idealist claim that the world can be divided into *phenomena* and *noumena* — how things appear to us and how they are in themselves. Kant is an incompatibilist, hard determinist about phenomenal freedom. The world of phenomena is casually determined, which precludes freedom of the will. However, the self as noumenon is not subject to the causal laws that apply to phenomena. Insofar as an agent’s noumenal self determines her will and actions, she will be free (4: 450-53; cf. KrV A534/B562; KpV 5: 3-4, 43, 46, 94-106).

Like Green, I regard transcendental freedom as a philosophical dead end. This is an issue we can’t do justice to here. But it’s worth mentioning some of the concerns Green expresses about transcendental freedom in his lectures on Kant’s ethics in *Works II*. Green thinks that transcendental freedom is neither necessary nor sufficient for freedom and responsibility. It is insufficient for two reasons. First, even if we could make sense of the noumenal self as an uncaused cause, it’s unclear why we should attribute uncaused decisions to the agent (*Works II* 95, 110). Causation does not threaten freedom and responsibility; in fact, causation is a condition of freedom and responsibility. Second, transcendental idealism seems unable to save Kant from the threat of incompatibilism and hard determinism. Noumena and phenomena, in particular, intelligible and empirical selves, are not two different things, but rather one thing under two different aspects, descriptions, or guises (*G* 4: 451, 456; 5: 96-97, 102; *KrV* A235-60/B294-315, A532-58/B560-86; *KpV* 5: 97). But causal determination is a referentially transparent relation. If an even is determined, then it is determined under all descriptions. If so, actions cannot be phenomenally determined but noumenally free (*Works II* 101-104).

Fortunately, Green thinks that transcendental freedom is not necessary for responsibility. Freedom does not require that actions lie outside a causal nexus with the agent. It requires that the agent’s will not be determined by her inclinations, independently of her deliberations about what reason requires. Determination by motives that are sensitive to one’s reasons is not only compatible with, but essential to, responsibility (*Works II* 95).

If Green is right, neither negative nor positive freedom requires transcendental freedom. That is a good thing — neither negative nor positive freedom is hostage to the obscurities and difficulties that transcendental freedom brings. They appear to be forms of freedom without dubious metaphysical baggage.

3. **SIDGWICK’S CRITIQUE OF KANT**

Kant claims that a free will and a will determined by practical reason and the moral law are one and the same (4: 447). This is positive freedom or autonomy. It is this conception of freedom that Sidgwick criticizes in the Appendix to *The Methods of Ethics* (*ME* 511-16). Sidgwick contrasts Kant’s conception of positive freedom as conformity to practical reason with freedom as responsibility. Here, Sidgwick accepts a traditional conception of free will as the ground for ascriptions of responsibility. He labels the first Rational Freedom and the second Moral Freedom

---

6 I’m sure that this verdict would horrify some, though not all, of my Kant colleagues and friends.
7 For discussion, see Irwin, “Morality and Personality: Kant and Green,” esp. p. 38.
8 More generally, this essay accepts, at least for the sake of argument, that there is an important kind of freedom that is the basis of responsibility. Some writers have denied the link between freedom and responsibility. For
Sidgwick thinks that there’s nothing objectionable per se about identifying freedom with rule by reason, but he insists that it’s a mistake to confuse that sort of positive freedom with the sort of freedom required by moral responsibility.

I should make no objection to the statement that ‘a man is a free agent in proportion as he acts rationally.’ But, what English defenders of man’s free agency have generally been concerned to maintain, is that ‘man has a freedom of choice between good and evil’ which is realised or manifested when he deliberately chooses evil, just as much as when he deliberately chooses good; and it is clear that if we say that a man is a free agent in proportion as he acts rationally, we cannot also say, in the same sense of the term, that it is by his free choice that he acts irrationally when he does so act. [ME 511]

The possibility of freely chosen wrongdoing — that is, wrongdoing for which the agent is responsible — shows that Kant’s conception of positive freedom, as conformity with practical reason, cannot be freedom of the kind required by moral responsibility.

4. GREEN’S DEFENSE OF KANT

In his lectures on Kant’s ethics, Green recognizes the same problem for Kantian freedom that Sidgwick identifies, though he does not cite Sidgwick as the source of this diagnosis. Green recognizes that the Kantian conception of freedom or autonomy as conformity to reason implies that wrongful acts are not free (Works II 107).

Though Green is not uncritical of Kant, he sees himself, rightly, as a Kantian. He thinks that many of the problems in Kant’s ethics are primarily presentational and concern the letter, not the spirit, of Kant’s claims (Works II 124). This is a case in point. Kant’s considered view, Green thinks, contrasts two kinds of positive freedom — (a) the capacity to conform to practical reason and (b) the exercise of this capacity. Freedom as responsibility requires (a), not (b).

If Kant had been asked what he meant by ‘rational’ in this definition, he would probably have said ‘capable of being determined by the consciousness of law’; and so far as rationality is understood to mean merely the capacity, as distinct from the actuality, of such determination the definition will be equally applicable to the will as it exists in the morally good and the morally bad .... [Works II 136]

The person who has the capacity to conform to practical reason and the moral law but fails to exercise it is just as free and responsible as the person who has the capacity and does exercise it (Works II 107-08, 119, 136).

The capacity to conform to practical reason is a capacity for reasons-responsiveness. As such, Green’s interpretation and defense of Kantian freedom is relevantly like contemporary conceptions

instance, Frankfurt argued that freedom requires alternative possibilities in a way in which responsibility does not, with the result that one can and should recognize that responsibility and causal determinism are compatible, even if freedom and causal determinism are not. See Frankfurt, “Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility.” However, it is arguable that moral responsibility requires alternate possibilities, even if not the ones that determinism precludes. If so, one can preserve the link between freedom and responsibility, denying that either freedom or responsibility requires the kind of alternate possibilities that determinism precludes.

Though Sidgwick and Green are correct that the Groundwork conception of positive freedom is in terms of conformity to practical reason, rather than the capacity for conformity, one passage in the Metaphysics of Morals identifies positive freedom with the capacity for practical reason (6: 214). This is additional evidence for Green’s view about the best statement of the Kantian conception of freedom.
of freedom of the will and responsibility in terms of reasons-responsiveness or fair opportunity, where fair opportunity factors into an agent’s normative capacities and opportunities.\textsuperscript{10}

Green sees Sidgwick’s criticism of Kant but thinks that Kant can meet it by introducing yet another conception of freedom — a capacitarian conception of positive freedom or autonomy. Green does not think that determinism threatens this capacity, and so he thinks that transcendental freedom is neither necessary nor sufficient for the sort of reasons-responsiveness required for freedom.

5. GREEN’S ETHICS OF SELF-REALIZATION

Green’s own conception of freedom grows out of his engagement with Kant’s conception. But we cannot properly appreciate Green’s conception of freedom, independently of his ethics of self-realization, articulated in his \textit{Prolegomena to Ethics}. Green’s \textit{Prolegomena} critiques empiricism and its ethical expression in hedonistic utilitarianism and defends a form of perfectionism that aims to synthesize the best elements in ancient and modern traditions in ethics. After a general attack on empiricist metaphysics and epistemology, he criticizes forms of ethical naturalism that ground morality in a science of desire and pleasure. Green rejects the hedonist conception of motivation, relying on Bishop Butler’s distinction in his Sermons (1726) between the \textit{power} and \textit{authority} of desire (II 14). Agents need not act on their strongest desires; they can and should act on the basis of a judgment about what it is best for them to do. This, Green claims, is to act on a conception of one’s own overall good. Here, Green aligns himself with the Greek eudaimonist tradition, which he interprets in terms of self-realization. Because Green derives the demand for self-realization from an understanding of agency itself, he regards its demands as categorical, rather than hypothetical, imperatives. He agrees with those Greeks, such as Aristotle, who claim that the agent’s own good requires a concern with the good of others, especially the common good. However, Green thinks that the Greeks had too narrow a conception of the common good. It is only with Christianity and enlightenment philosophical views, especially Kantian and utilitarian traditions in ethics, Green thinks, that the universal scope of the common good is made explicit. This leads him to claim that full self-realization requires a cosmopolitan conception of the common good in which every rational agent is a sovereign member of a kingdom of ends. Green thinks that moral progress consists in the gradual recognition and advancement of the common good.

The key components of Green’s ethics of self-realization, for our purposes, are his conception of moral personality, his perfectionist conception of the good, and his recognition of the common good as contributing to the agent’s own self-realization.\textsuperscript{11}

\textit{Moral personality} involves agency and requires capacities for practical deliberation, which require self-consciousness. Non-responsible agents, such as brutes and small children, act on their strongest desires or, if they deliberate, deliberate only about the instrumental means to the satisfaction of their desires (§§86, 92, 96, 122, 125). By contrast, responsible agents must be able to distinguish between the \textit{power} and \textit{authority} of their desires, deliberate about the appropriateness of their desires, and regulate their actions in accord with these deliberations (§§92, 96, 103, 107, 220). Here, Green shows the influence of Butler’s conception of human nature as involving the capacity to act on superior principles and his interpretation of Kant’s conception of freedom in terms an agent’s capacity to assess passions and desires and act for reasons. This requires one to be able


\textsuperscript{11} For somewhat fuller discussion of Green’s perfectionist ethics of self-realization, see my \textit{Perfectionism and the Common Good}. Also see Irwin, \textit{The Development of Ethics}, III, ch. 85.
to distinguish oneself from particular desires and passions and to frame the question about what it would be best for one on the whole to do (§§85-86).

Green thinks that the process of forming and acting on a conception of what it is best for me on the whole to do is for me to form and act from a conception of my own overall good (§§91-92, 96, 128).

A man, we will suppose, is acted on at once by an impulse to revenge an affront, by a bodily want, by a call of duty, and by fear of certain results incidental to his avenging the affront or obeying the call of duty. We will suppose further that each passion ... suggests a different line of action. So long as he is undecided how to act, all are, in a way, external to him. He presents them to himself as influences by which he is consciously affected but which are not he, and with none of which he yet identifies himself .... So long as this state of things continues, no moral effect ensues. It ensues when the man's relation to these influences is altered by his identifying himself with one of them, by his taking the object of one of the tendencies as for the time his good. This is to will, and is in itself moral action .... [§146]

Much as Kant thinks that rational nature provides both the ground and content of the moral law, Green thinks that moral personality as rational nature is not only a condition of agency but also a fitting object of the will. Green criticizes various forms of hedonism, denying that agents must aim at their own pleasurable consciousness and recognizing "ideal goods" that involve an agent's activities and her relations to other members of her community (PE §§159-61, 357). He believes that self-realization, rather than pleasure, is the appropriate object of the will (§176). Moral personality involves a will that is expressive of the self. But if this self is a rational self, capable of acting on superior principles, then an agent's will should aim at activities that reflect and realize these superior principles (§§175, 180, 199, 234, 238-39, 247, 283).

This justification of self-realization also explains why Green treats the imperative of self-realization as a categorical imperative. Like Kant, Green seeks an account of the agent’s duties that is grounded in her agency and does not depend upon contingent and variable inclinations. The goal of self-realization, Green thinks, meets this demand.

At the same time, because it [self-realization] is the fulfillment of himself, of that which he has in him to be, it will excite an interest in him like no other interest, different in kind from any of his desires and aversions except such as are derived from it. It will be an interest as in an object conceived to be of unconditional value; one of which the value does not depend on any desire that the individual may at any time feel for it or for anything else, or on any pleasure that ... he may experience. ...[T]he desire for the object will be founded on a conception of its desirableness as a fulfillment of the capabilities of which a man is conscious in being conscious of himself. ... [Self-realization] will express itself in [the] imposition ... of rules requiring something to be done irrespectively of any inclination to do it, irrespectively of any desired end to which it is a means, other than this end, which is desired because conceived as absolutely desirable. [§193]

Because the demands of self-realization depend only on those very deliberative capacities that make one a responsible agent, they are categorical imperatives.

Self-realization is, at bottom, an egocentric doctrine. But Green insists that proper self-realization should aim at a common good, which includes the good of other rational agents. A self-realizing agent does not act on passing whims or passions but acts for the sake of ends perceived as valuable and perseveres on their behalf, making short-term investments and sacrifices for the sake of these ends. This is to value goals and projects in which I am involved that have some degree of permanence. Green thinks that the right sort of association with others extends this permanence in
a natural way (§199). Indeed, Green regards interpersonal permanence as a kind of counter-balance to mortality or surrogate for immortality.

That determination of an animal organism by a self-conscious principle, which makes a man and is presupposed by the interest in permanent good, carries with it a certain appropriation by the man to himself of the beings with whom he is connected by natural ties, so that they become to him as himself and in providing for himself he provides for them. Projecting himself into the future as a permanent subject of possible well-being or ill-being — and he must so project himself in seeking for a permanent good — he associates his kindred with himself. It is this association that neutralises the effect which the anticipation of death must otherwise have on the demand for a permanent good. [§231]

Green claims that interpersonal permanence is an extension of intrapersonal permanence, implying that the right sort of interpersonal association makes the good of one’s associate part of one’s own. Interpersonal association undermines the popular contrast between self-love and love of others (§232) and gives each associate a reason to pursue a common good (§202). On Green’s view, proper self-realization implies that the good of each includes in part the good of others. We should view those with whom we participate in such associations as "alter egos," for whom we care as we care about ourselves (§§191, 200). We should weigh their interests with our own and see ourselves as compensated when we make what would otherwise be sacrifices to them for the sake of the common good (§376).

So far, this extension of the agent’s interests outward is limited to family members and those with whom one has close associations. But Green thinks that agents have reasons to seek interpersonal permanence with wide scope. He believes that Aristotle recognized the way in which justice is connected with a common good, but he thinks that the Greeks had too narrow a conception of the common good.

The idea of a society of free and law-abiding persons, each his own master yet each his brother’s keeper, was first definitely formed among the Greeks, and its formation was the condition of all subsequent progress in the direction described; but with them … it was limited in its application to select groups of men surrounded by populations of aliens and slaves. In its universality, as capable of application to the whole human race, an attempt has first been made to act upon it in modern Christendom. [§271]

Green sees moral progress as consisting in the gradual extension of the scope of the common good, which is only complete when each respects the claims made by other members of a maximally inclusive community of ends (§§214, 216, 244, 332). In this respect, Green’s belief that an egocentric concern with self-realization can and should support cosmopolitan concern for others may seem closer to the Stoic than the Aristotelian view.12 Green interprets this cosmopolitan conception of the common good in Kantian terms as requiring that every rational agent be respected and treated as an end in herself, as part of a kingdom or community of ends.

6. GREEN’S TRIPARTITE CONCEPTION OF FREEDOM

Freedom is not a concept that looms large in Green’s perfectionism in the Prolegomena. However, Green focuses on freedom in the posthumously published essay “On the Different Senses of ‘Freedom’ as Applied to Will and the Moral Progress of Man” (Works II). This essay is dense and, at times, obscure. But he clearly distinguishes different senses of freedom, including the absence of

---

12 For some discussion of Greek commitments about the scope of the common good, see Brink, “Eudaimonism and Cosmopolitan Concern.”
coercion and interference, the freedom that makes moral personality and the will possible, and the freedom involved in good or perfect willing. If we also draw on his discussion of Kant’s conception of freedom in his lectures on Kant’s ethics and in the Prolegomena, we can make out a tripartite conception of freedom.

1. Juridical Freedom
2. Moral Freedom
3. Real or Perfect Freedom

*Juridical freedom* is the absence of compulsion or restraint by others. This is freedom as non-interference prized by Locke and other liberals. *Moral freedom* is the sort of freedom required for responsibility, which is manifested in both praiseworthy and blameworthy conduct. Moral freedom, Green believes, requires the capacity for reasons-responsiveness. This is the kind of freedom he proposes as a response to Sidgwick’s criticism of Kant. *Real or perfect freedom* exists insofar as an agent exercises her moral freedom properly, pursuing her own personal good and its constitutive commitment to the common good. This sort of freedom just is self-realization or the perfection of one’s agency.

Though each form of freedom is valuable, both juridical and moral freedom are subordinate to real and perfect freedom (*Works II 308-09*). Real freedom is the regulative ideal of agency and cannot be achieved without juridical and moral freedom, but neither are sufficient to produce real freedom (*II 324*). Green ends up endorsing a version of the Hegelian view that freedom is a matter of degree, and moral progress can be understood as the progressively more perfect realization of real freedom (*324-30*).

7. BERLIN’S CRITIQUE OF POSITIVE LIBERTY

In “Two Concepts of Liberty” Berlin famously distinguishes between *negative* and *positive* liberty and criticizes various conceptions of positive freedom, including Green’s (esp. 132-33, 141-54). Written in the aftermath of WWII and in the midst of the Cold War, Berlin associates negative freedom with liberalism and positive freedom with totalitarianism and authoritarianism. Freedom should be associated with negative freedom. When authoritarian systems restrict liberty for the sake of other values and claim that they are doing so in the name of freedom, they abuse the concept of freedom, with pernicious results.

Berlin is reasonably clear about what negative freedom is — it is the *absence of interference and coercion by others* (121-22). For the most part, he regards Locke and Mill as liberal champions of negative freedom. It’s not clear if any interference by others compromises my negative freedom. A rival firm in a competitive but fair market may interfere with my ability to sell my inventory. But it’s not clear that my rival deprives me of negative freedom. Perhaps it’s only *wrongful* interference by another that jeopardizes my freedom. If so, it seems negative freedom must be moralized. Berlin does not explore the issues that this possibility raises.

---

13 For a helpful discussion of Hegel’s conception of freedom, see Neuhouser, *Foundations of Hegel’s Social Theory: Actualizing Freedom*. Though Green endorses the Hegelian idea that progress consists in the gradual realization of true freedom and the claim that true freedom can only be realized in a state that promotes the common good, he resists the Hegelian idea that the state has ontological or normative primacy. He claims that the primary kind of freedom is a property of individuals, even if it can only be fully attained through the institutions and laws of the state (*Works II 312-14*). Though there are several Hegelian elements in Green’s view, I agree with Sidgwick’s assessment that Green is principally a Kantian. See Sidgwick, *Lectures*, p. 3. Perhaps more accurate still is Ritchie’s assessment that Green “corrected Kant by Aristotle and Aristotle by Kant.” See Ritchie, *The Principles of State Interference*, pp. 139-40.

14 It’s also not clear why the only impediments to negative freedom involve interference by other agents. We could imagine external constraints imposed by nature, as when a sudden flood prevents one from leaving one’s
Berlin thinks that Mill is an inconsistent friend of negative liberty. He says that Mill sometimes understands freedom as the “ability to do as one wishes” (139). Whether or not Mill held this conception of freedom, it runs up against a problem of adaptive preferences. (135-41) Individuals can and do adapt their preferences to their circumstances. Sometimes, this is innocent or even salutary, when one adjusts one preferences to be more realistic about one's capacities and opportunities. I may dream of becoming a professional hockey player, but if my philosophical abilities far outstrip my athletic abilities, it might be best for me to adapt my preferences, pursuing an academic career in philosophy and a purely avocational interest in beer league hockey. However, at other times, people acquiesce in unreasonable constraints that others unjustly impose. Adaptive preferences can be problematic in the happy slave or the deferential spouse. If freedom were simply the ability to do as one wants, with no concern for the way in which preferences are formed and maintained, then both the happy slave and the deferential spouse would be free.

Notice that negative liberty, for Berlin, is focused exclusively on the absence of external compulsion by other individuals or the state. This, we saw, marks a stark contrast with Kant’s conception of negative freedom in Section III of the *Groundwork*, which is focused exclusively on the absence of inner compulsion. If we recognize only negative freedom in Berlin's sense, we have no resources to say that the person subject to irresistible impulses is unfree. If an addict lacks control over her cravings and is a slave to her addiction, she is perfectly free, under Berlin’s conception of negative liberty.

By contrast, positive freedom is more elusive. It begins with the idea of self-determination or self-governance in which the rational part of one’s soul is controlling. But the rational self is the true self, and the true self is realized in the perfection of one’s rational nature (131-34, 141-53). Perfecting one’s true or higher self may require limitations on negative freedom; liberty as license may be inimical to the development and expression of people’s rational natures. If positive freedom is found in the development of our rational natures, then these forms of interference can be justified by appeal to freedom. Jean-Jacques Rousseau illustrates this paradox of positive freedom when he claims in *On the Social Contract* (1762) that when individuals leave the state of nature and agree to civil government that the general will “forces them to be free” (I 7). Though Berlin focuses primarily on the defense of positive freedom in Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, and Fichte, he clearly includes Green’s perfectionism and “humane liberalism” within this tradition (133n, 150).

Berlin is a pluralist about value, recognizing that (negative) liberty is not the only value (169). As such, he recognizes that we must accept some limitations on liberty as noninterference for the sake of other goods, such as equality, justice, or happiness (125). But these are best understood as permissible ways of achieving other important goods, despite the cost in freedom, rather than as means of promoting (positive) freedom.

---

15 This conception of negative freedom as freedom from internal compulsion is also present in the *Metaphysics of Morals* (6: 213-14). But a conception of negative freedom as freedom from external compulsion is an important part of Kant's political philosophy, both posing a problem for justifying the state’s use of coercion and providing a solution in terms of a system of equal basic liberties. Kant makes these claims in his discussion of the Universal Principle of Right in the Doctrine of Right in the *Metaphysics of Morals* (6: 230-31, 237) and in his essays “Theory and Practice” (8: 289-90) and “Perpetual Peace” (8:349-50). They are discussed in Ripstein, *Force and Freedom: Kant’s Legal and Political Philosophy*. 

house. This sort of external interference is not wrongful, as coercion or duress are, but it’s not clear that this moral difference affects how the two forms of interference bear on one’s freedom. This issue is related to an issue about how best to conceive of duress. Duress is excusing. It’s common to conceive of duress as involving hard choice caused by the wrongful interference of other agents. As such, hard choice caused by natural circumstances cannot provide a duress excuse. But one might think that the duress excuse should be broadened to recognize hard choice, over which the agent has little or no control, no matter whether the source is man-made or natural.
This monstrous impersonation, which consists in equating what X would choose if he were something that he is not, or at least not yet, with what X actually seeks and chooses, is at the heart of all political theories of self-realization. It is one thing to say that I may be coerced for my own good which I am too blind to see: this may, on occasion be for my benefit; indeed it may enlarge the scope of my liberty. It is another to say that if it is in my good, then I am not being coerced, for I have willed it, whether I know it or not, and am free (or ‘truly’ free) even while my poor earthly body and foolish mind bitterly reject it, and struggle against those who seek however benevolently to impose it, with the greatest desperation. [133-34]

As I read Berlin, he thinks that justifying interference in the name of positive freedom is, at best, misleading and, at worst, dishonest. It is misleading if it leads us to overlook the real costs to freedom of pursuing other goods, even when that interference is justified on balance. It is dishonest if it claims that positive freedom is true freedom and denies the costs to negative freedom in pursuing other goods. Dishonesty is pernicious insofar as makes us acquiesce in authoritarian measures in the name of freedom.

8. DEFENDING GREEN AGAINST BERLIN

Though we should certainly not underestimate the importance of negative freedom, Berlin’s critique of positive freedom and Green’s conception of freedom is problematic. We get a fuller appreciation of Green’s conception of freedom if we supplement his discussion in “Senses of Freedom” with his discussion in “Liberal Legislation and Liberty of Contract” (1881).

First, Green does not say that interference, when permissible, involves no costs in terms of freedom, because he does not eliminate negative freedom in favor of positive freedom. For Green, as we have seen, negative liberty as noninterference is embodied in juridical freedom, and juridical freedom is an important and legitimate part of freedom.

But juridical freedom does not exhaust freedom for Green, as it does for Berlin. Green, we saw, also recognizes moral freedom and real or perfect freedom. Moral freedom is the capacity for reasons-responsive conduct, and real or perfect freedom is the proper exercise of this capacity, resulting in self-realization and its commitment to the common good. These forms of freedom involve positive freedom. Even if Green does not ignore negative freedom, his recognition of positive freedom may seem potentially misleading or dishonest.

However, Green thinks that all three kinds of freedom are aspects of self-determination (“Senses of Freedom,” Works II 315-16). First, self-determination requires juridical freedom, because it requires the absence of external compulsion. Coercion or duress interfere with self-determination by impairing an agent’s opportunities to exercise the normative capacities that make her morally free. Second, self-determination also requires moral freedom, because it requires the absence of internal compulsion or determination by one’s impulses and passions. If the self is a rational agent, capable of setting ends and conforming to them, then irresistible impulses and passions prevent self-determination. Slavery to another is incompatible with self-determination. But, equally, slavery to one’s own passions and desires is incompatible with responsible agency. A self that is free in the sense of morally responsible must be capable of stepping back from her passions and desires and conforming her conduct to reasons.

Both juridical freedom and moral freedom are essential to responsibility. Responsibility depends on an agent’s normative capacities and her opportunity to exercise them free from undue interference with others. We can see this because significant impairment of either the agent’s capacities or her opportunities is excusing. Whereas juridical freedom depends on the agent’s opportunities, moral freedom depends on her capacities. If so, then self-determination as responsibility requires both juridical and moral freedoms.

Third, if self-determination involves determination by my rational self, then it requires self-realization and real freedom. Here, we should remember Green’s Kantian claim that rational nature
provides not only the ground of duty but also its content. Moral personality and freedom involve a will that has reasons-responsive capacities. But then self-determination should be expressed in activities that reflect and realize these superior principles (PE §§175, 180, 199, 234, 238-39, 247, 283). Full or complete self-determination requires not just the capacity to be guided by reasons but its exercise. This is the aretaic sense of self-determination. On Green's view, this kind of self-determination and self-realization involve a constitutive commitment to a cosmopolitan concern for the common good.

In these ways, Green believes that juridical freedom, moral freedom, and real or perfect freedom all involve aspects of self-determination. Full or complete self-determination involves real or perfect freedom, which itself requires both moral and juridical freedom. Negative liberty is juridical freedom, and it is only one part of self-determination. Self-determination also requires positive freedom in the form of the normative capacities constitutive of moral freedom and in the form of the aretaic exercise of these capacities in real or perfect freedom. Positive freedom is not oxymoronic, as Berlin alleges. It refers to demands of self-determination that go beyond negative freedom.

Juridical freedom and, hence, negative liberty is an aspect for freedom, but it does not exhaust freedom. This can be seen in Green's contributions to liberalism. Green is a liberal, because he is committed to a largely secular state, democratic political institutions in which the franchise is widespread, private property rights, market economies, equal opportunity, and a variety of personal and civic liberties. The Old Liberalism that dominated British politics in the first half of the nineteenth century prized negative liberty. It sought to undo state restrictions on liberties and opportunities and was expressed in the repeal of the Corn Laws, opposition to religious persecution, and several electoral reforms that extended the scope of the franchise to include the rural and urban poor. By contrast, the New Liberalism that developed in the second half of the nineteenth century thought that the defense of liberty and opportunity had to be supplemented by social and economic reforms in labor, health, and education to address the effects of social and economic inequality. Green was viewed by many as an important intellectual source for the New Liberals. He supported (1) regulation of labor contracts to limit workplace hours and factory conditions (II 515; III 365-69, 373), (2) measures to provide greater opportunities for agricultural workers to own land (II 515, 532-34; III 377-82), (3) public health and safety regulations (II 515; III 373-74), (4) education reforms, improving access to elementary, secondary, and higher education, regardless of socioeconomic status (II 515; III 369, 387-476; V 285-86, 326-28), and (5) the improvement of educational and economic opportunities for women (PE §267; Works V 326-28). Many of these parts of the New Liberal platform restrict negative liberty, either directly or indirectly. Green can and does think these liberal reforms are necessary to promote real or perfect freedom (III 370-71).

Green's liberalism is a perfectionist liberalism in which the state aims to promote the self-realization of its citizens, and this gives the state a number of positive duties in relation to its citizens. But the importance of juridical freedom to self-realization means that the state's positive role is restricted to enabling its citizens to perfect themselves. In “Liberal Legislation” Green insists

[[It is the business of the state, not indeed directly to promote moral goodness, for that, from the very nature of moral goodness, it cannot do, but to maintain the conditions without which a free exercise of the human faculties is impossible. [III 374]]

---

Here, we might compare Green’s claim with Kant’s insistence in the *Metaphysics of Morals* (1797) on a self/other asymmetry in which we must aim at our own perfection but at the happiness, rather than the perfection, of others. In explaining this asymmetry, Kant writes:

So too, it is a contradiction for me to make another’s perfection my end and consider myself under an obligation to promote this. For the perfection of another human being, as a person, consists just in this: that he himself is able to set his end in accordance with his own conception of duty; and it is self-contradictory to require that I do (make it my duty to do) something that only the other himself can do.” [6: 386]

Green makes sense of Kant’s admonitions against aiming at the perfection of another by interpreting them as constraints on how we aim at the perfection of others. Given the role of one’s own agency in one’s perfection, I can’t perfect others any more than I can win competitive races for them. But just as I can help another to win a race by training with her, discussing strategy, and sharing nutritional tips, so too I can help others perfect themselves by helping them develop their normative competence and deliberating with them, identifying options, discussing the comparative merits of these options, and providing them with opportunities to exercise their normative powers. I can help others perfect themselves, just not in ways that bypass their agency. In this way, the form that perfect freedom takes will reflect the importance of juridical freedom.

Though the Old Liberals see themselves as the advocates of freedom, Green thinks that the New Liberals have a claim to beings liberal in the fullest sense, because only a mix of negative and positive reforms can enable the perfection and self-realization of its citizens and, hence, true freedom. It’s not that one has to employ positive freedom to endorse the New Liberalism. A libertarianism founded on negative liberty must reject the reforms of the New Liberalism. But Berlin is a pluralist, not a libertarian. He thinks that negative liberty can sometimes be restricted for the sake of other values, such as equality, justice, security, and happiness. Berlin must claim that the reforms of the New Liberalism are justifiable, if at all, in spite of its costs to freedom. But if we think that negative freedom is incomplete and only a proper part of freedom as self-determination, then we can defend the reforms of the New Liberalism in terms of the very same value that animated the Old Liberalism.

9. FREEDOM, RESPECT AND, ESTEEM

Negative or juridical freedom is not valuable for its own sake; it is valuable for what it permits us to do. But both moral freedom and perfect freedom are valuable for their own sakes. Both are aspects of moral personality or rational nature. We saw that for Kant this makes them objective ends (4: 428-29), and objective ends grounded in moral personality have dignity, and not just price (4: 434-35). Respect (*Achtung*) is the attitude that is fitting for something that has dignity, an idea expressed in the *Metaphysics of Morals*.

But a human being regarded as a *person*, that is, as the subject of a morally practical reason, is exalted above any price; for as a person he is not to be valued merely as a means to the steals of others or even to his own ends, but as an end in itself, that is, he possesses a dignity (an absolute inner worth) by which he exacts respect for himself from all other rational beings in the world. He can measure himself with every other being of this kind and value himself on a footing of equality with them. [6: 434-35; cf. 6:436, 462]

---

17 I discuss this comparison between Green and Kant a little more fully in Brink, “Normative Perfectionism and the Kantian Tradition.”

18 [I’m reasonably confident that this analysis of the relations among freedom, respect, and esteem is *Kantian*, though I’ll need to attend more carefully to his various remarks about respect and, especially, esteem.]
Agents who have moral freedom in the form of moral personality and capacities for reasons-responsiveness possess this sort of dignity and are owed respect (5: 76-87).

The ground of respect is moral freedom, in Green’s sense, or the capacity for positive freedom, in Kant’s sense. Because Kant thinks that all normal adults have sufficient capacities for recognizing and conforming to the requirements of practical reason, he is an egalitarian about respect. In particular, he thinks that an agent merits respect whether she exercises her capacities for practical reason well or not (6: 462). So moral freedom, in Green’s sense, is sufficient for respect.

While respect is tied to moral freedom and capacities for reasons-responsiveness, esteem (Hochschätzung) is tied to real or perfect freedom and how well the agent exercises those capacities, in particular, how much her choices and conduct conform to and are guided by practical reason. How well someone exercises her capacities for practical reason and, hence, how much she is guided by practical reason determines her level of moral worth (sittlichen Wert) or virtue (Tugend). Because moral worth or virtue is the ground of esteem, an agent deserves more or less esteem depending on how well she exercises her reasons-responsive capacities and how much real freedom she achieves (4: 398).19 Real freedom is the aretaic dimension of freedom.

Whereas moral freedom appears to be a binary concept, real freedom is scalar, not binary.20 This means that whereas respect is owed equally to all moral persons, esteem is variable.21 We see this difference, Kant thinks, in fitting attitudes towards agent. Any agent with sufficient moral powers is owed respect, and we have the same reason to respect the sinner as we do the saint. Both have a special moral status as persons.22 But although the sinner and saint possess moral freedom equally, the saint makes better use of it than the sinner. The saint exhibits more real freedom than the sinner and deserves greater esteem. Because agents do not exercise their normative powers equally well, the distribution of esteem should be variable.

These two kinds of freedom and their fitting responses capture two different kinds of value that freedom or self-governance can have. Moral freedom confers a special status on those who possess it. Other animals have negative or juridical freedom. But only beings with moral personality and reasons-responsive capacities are moral agents. This is an important status and an important form of self-governance. But it is a limited kind of value. If someone never exercised her capacities for practical reason or always exercised them poorly, she would not display real freedom and we should regard her form of self-governance as imperfect. Her virtue would be imperfect (6: 409). For freedom as self-governance to be a virtue and an accomplishment, moral freedom must be exercised well.

10. PERFECTING FREEDOM

We’ve been reconstructing and assessing a complex historical narrative about different conceptions of freedom and their value. Kant offers a tripartite distinction between negative freedom, positive freedom, and transcendental freedom, claiming that negative and positive freedom

---

19 In "Two Kinds of Respect" Darwall distinguishes recognition respect and appraisal respect, which tracks this Kantian distinction between respect and esteem.

20 On plausible conceptions of moral freedom in the reasons-responsible and fair opportunity traditions, it comes in degrees as well. See, e.g., Nelkin, "Difficulty and Degrees of Moral Praiseworthiness and Blameworthiness" and Brink, "Partial Responsibility and Excuse." This means that freedom and responsibility are not essentially binary concepts, but it doesn’t settle the question whether there are pragmatic reasons for recognizing thresholds. For some relevant discussion, see Arneson, "What, If Anything, Renders All Humans Morally Equal?"

21 In his discussion of autonomy, Feinberg distinguishes between autonomy as capacity and as condition or ideal and claims that even if autonomy as capacity is a threshold concept, autonomy as condition or ideal is scalar and variable. See Feinberg, Harm to Self, pp. 28-31. He does not link these different aspects of autonomy with different fitting attitudes.

22 Connections among personality, respect, and punishment are explored in Morris, "Persons and Punishment."
require transcendental freedom. Fortunately, neither negative or positive freedom requires transcendental freedom. Sidgwick criticizes Kant’s conception of positive freedom as conformity to practical reason, because it cannot explain how the sinner and saint are equally free and responsible. However, Green defends the spirit, if not the letter, of Kant’s conception of freedom by identifying freedom as responsibility as consisting in the capacity to conform to the requirements of practical reason. Green contrasts this kind of moral freedom with juridical freedom and real or perfect freedom. Both juridical and moral freedom are parts of real freedom. Berlin endorses only negative or juridical freedom, resisting conceptions of positive freedom, such as real or perfect freedom. However, Green’s view does not eliminate negative freedom in favor of positive freedom. In fact, it treats juridical, moral, and real freedom as different aspects of self-governance. This is manifest in his defense of the New Liberalism on perfectionist grounds as making possible the fullest form of self-governance and freedom. Finally, we can connect these different conceptions of freedom — in particular, moral and real freedom — with different fitting attitudes and values. Respect is the recognition and fitting response to an agent insofar as she has capacities for moral responsibility, and it is the appropriate response to any agent with sufficient normative competence. Esteem is the recognition and fitting response to an agent insofar as she exercises her normative capacities well. Whereas the distribution of respect among the morally free should be equal, the distribution of esteem among the morally free should be variable, reflecting differences in how well or fully they exercise their normative capacities. Moral freedom is necessary and sufficient for having the status and value of a moral agent, whereas the aretaic dimension of self-governance requires real freedom.
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