

First of all, let me describe liberal democracy and its relation to freedom. Liberal democracy as Diamond describes is not only free elections but also horizontal accountability, active participation of people, the rule of law, and as it is important in this question; freedom of expression, establishing or attending to an association, freedom of protests, and belief. Clearly, freedom is one of the important building blocks of liberal democracy. Therefore, in an ideal world, liberal democracy requires the existence of freedom, and it should be enough for people to enjoy it.

In his book named *On Liberty*, Mill (1859, p. 218) first explains the people's understanding of liberty as limitations to the power of the ruler through some laws, rights, and institutions checking each other. In this way, as Mill emphasizes "tyranny" cannot exercise excessive power or laws on its subject and the people will be guarded against any such attempt with the help of predetermined rights. Later on, he mentions that democratic republics have emerged all around the world and this new trend is based on the majority of the people. Because the leader is chosen based on the elections and this implies that "the most active *part* of the people" will have the chance to impose their opinions more compared to the other parts of the society. Eventually, the majority will oppress the minority, and this gives rise to abuse of power. Therefore, as Mill (1859) points out, setting limits against the ruler was not enough anymore, the people especially the minority groups should have been protected against the dominant and majority part of the people in other words "the tyranny of the majority" (1859, p. 220). According to this point of view, Mill mostly **disagrees** with the statement of "liberal democracy ensures that people enjoy freedom". As I discussed above, even though there exists democracy in the country, this does not guarantee that majority, who are selected ones, will not abuse their power against the minority.

According to Mill (1859), some conditions should be met for people to enjoy freedom so that prevailing opinion does not create an oppressive force on individual opinions of people. He draws attention to the importance of the boundary of that limit to create a free and fair environment (p. 221). To do so, he suggests the existence of clear laws and rules so that people from minority groups will be free to have and share their own opinions by relying on predetermined laws. I agree with the fact that minority groups may hesitate to share their ideas even in liberal democratic countries. However, I am a bit confused about the suggestion of Mill because liberal democracy already provides the rule of law and rights for not only the majority but also for the minority.

To conclude, Mill is more likely to be against the liberal democracy being enough for freedom because of the dominance of the majority and he thinks that the "rules of conduct" are necessary to prevent the possible oppression of the majority over the minority (Mill, 1859, p.220).

REFERENCES

Mill, J. S. (1859). *On Liberty: Essays on Politics and Society*. University of Toronto Press 1977.