

# Liberalism as a Philosophy of the End of History

ADEWUNMI, Akinjide Omoniyi

Department of Philosophy  
Ekiti State University,

&

OLOIDI, Olugbenga Ebenezer,

Department of Philosophy.  
Ekiti State University,

## Abstract

*This paper provides the critical analysis of the concept of liberalism as the philosophy of the end of history, as proposed by Francis Fukuyama. It sets to examine the central arguments of Fukuyama's thesis, majorly the triumph of liberal democracy as the final form of government and the implications for global political development. The thesis challenges the idea of the liner progression towards a single endpoint in history, arguing that new challenges and ideology continue to emerge, and that the spread of authoritarianism and illiberalism calls into question the notion of liberal democracy as the ultimate form of human ideological evolution. The paper also explores alternative perspectives on future of political development and the ongoing debates surrounding the idea of the "end of history". Ultimately, this paper seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the complexities and uncertainties inherent in the concept of liberalism as a philosophy of the end of history.*

**Keywords:** liberalism, democracy, ideology, authoritarianism, illiberalism

## Definition of terms

**Liberalism:** Liberalism is a political and moral philosophy based on the idea of individual freedom and equality. It emphasises the protection of individual rights, rule of law, and a free market economy.<sup>1</sup>

**Democracy:** Democracy is a system of government in which power is vested in the hands of the people, either directly or through elected representatives. It is characterised by free and fair elections, the protection of individual rights and freedoms, the rule of law, and a system of checks and balances to prevent the concentration of power.<sup>2</sup>

**Ideology:** Ideology refers to a set of believes, values, and idea that form the basis of a political, economic, or social system. It encompasses a coherent and comprehensive set of principles that guide an individual, group, or society understands of the world and their approach to various issues<sup>3</sup>.

**Authoritarianism:** Authoritarianism is a form of government characterised by strong central power and limited political freedoms. In an authoritarian system, the government hold significant control over political institutions, the media, and civil society, often suppressing opposition and dissent<sup>4</sup>. Individual rights and freedoms may be restricted, and the value of law may be subordinated to the will of the ruling authority.

**Illiberalism:** Illiberalism refers to a political stance or system that opposes or undermines liberal principles and values, such as individual rights, freedom of speech, and the rule of law. Illiberalism may involve restrictions on civil liberties, the erosion of democratic institutions, and the concentration of power in the hands of ruling elite.<sup>5</sup>

## Introduction

In recent decades, the concept of the “end of history” has been closely linked with the philosophy of liberalism, positing that liberal democracy and free-market capitalism represent the ultimate and inevitable form of human societal development. However, this notion has sparked considerable debate and criticism. In this article, we will undertake a thorough critique of liberalism as the philosophy of the end of history, examining its underlying assumptions, potential shortcomings, and the implications of its widespread acceptance. By scrutinizing the complexities and contradictions inherent in this political framework, we aim to offer a nuanced understanding of the challenges and limitations posed by the idea of the end of history within the context of liberalism.

## Exploring the Philosophy of Liberalism

### The Concept of Liberalism

Liberalism, as a political ideology, takes liberty and equality of the individual as its major concern of the civil government.<sup>6</sup> A Liberal believes that personal freedom (autonomy) is the most outstanding qualities an individual can possess under democratic setting. Liberalism as a political ideology is divided into different types and competing visions, but the core commitment of the liberal is in the principles of autonomy and equality in relation to the individual in society. The liberal holds that an individual has a right to order his life as he deems fit.<sup>7</sup> However; the foregoing does not clearly show what constitutes liberalism. Thus, we still need an intelligible account of liberalism. But this is surely difficult to provide.

According to Alan Ryan:

Anyone trying to give a brief account of liberalism is immediately faced with an embarrassing question: are we dealing with liberalism or with liberalisms? It is easy to list famous liberals: It is harder to say what they have in common. John Locke, Adam Smith, Montesquieu, Thomas Jefferson, John Stuart Mill, Lord Acton, T.H. Green, John Dewey and contemporaries such as Isaiah Berlin and John Rawls are certainly liberals – but they do not agree about the boundaries of toleration, the legitimacy of the welfare state, and the virtues of democracy, to take ... rather central political issues. They do not even agree on the nature of the liberty they think liberal ought to seek.<sup>8</sup>

As shown in Ryan’s analysis, it is theoretically difficult to clearly pin-point what constitutes liberalism from the welter of accounts of it given by liberal thinkers. But this does not show that liberalism cannot be defined or properly conceptualised. Thus, we shall still analyse the concept of liberalism. We shall define liberalism as a social and political philosophy that advocates the freedom and equality of individuals that co-exist in a society. The two constitutive principles of liberalism are: liberty (autonomy) and equality. Liberty refers to the quality of citizens’ freedom to exercise their rights as guaranteed under the law of the land while equality refers to the political quality of subjecting all the citizens to the same treatment in the political sphere.

According to Ryan, we can only speak of the areas of agreement of individual liberals, because liberalism is divided into so many varieties. John Locke, one of the core liberals, argues that freedom of actions is a free gift of nature, therefore man is free to choose his actions and reactions without interference from any higher

authority, or depending on the whim of any other man.<sup>9</sup> In other words, “man qua man” is free to think and act as he likes. He also bears the responsibility of any result of his actions and reactions.

The metaphysics of liberalism is dominated by the debate between two major schools of thoughts generally identified as the ‘individualists’ and the ‘communitarians’. However, liberalism is often identified with belief that the protection of life, rights and properties of the individuals are the major duties of the civil government<sup>10</sup>. The society as a whole is made up of atomic individuals who possess certain inalienable rights by the virtue of being humans. John Rawls maintains that liberalism is necessarily individualistic. The individual is autonomous and free with major commitments towards self-determination.<sup>11</sup> The communitarians in contrast to the individualists, believe that society is the habitat of the individuals, the individuals cannot exist in total isolation of co-operation of the society.<sup>12</sup>

As a counter-thesis to liberalism, Communitarianism is a theory which sees the individuals as dependent and subservient to social groups, such as, state, a nation or a race. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in his book, *The Social Contract*, contends that the individual realises his real self and freedom only in conformity to the “general will” of the society in general.<sup>13</sup> Other communitarians such as Alasdair MacIntyre, Micheal Walzer and Micheal Sandel propose their ideas differently in their following works, MacIntyre in *After Virtue (1981)*, Walzer in *Spheres of Justice 1982*, Sandel in *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice (1982)* express their reservations and disagreements towards unbridled freedom the liberal identifies as an unencumbered self.

From the above, we could deduce that the individualist analysis of liberalism puts more emphasis on the idea of the unencumbered self, meaning that the person ontologically precedes any substantive attachment in the society. This atomistic understanding of the person is contrary to the communitarian understanding of human person. In view of this fact, the autonomy of the self and the equality of the self with the other are the core commitments of liberal philosophy.

### **Liberalism as a Theory**

As noted above, liberalism is a philosophical theory that is founded on the ideas of equality and liberty which is traceable to Western philosophy during the age of enlightenment. During this time, the liberals rejected all forms of absolute government which were prevalent. All forms of dictatorships such as absolute monarchy, state religion and the divine right of the King were replaced with democracy and civil rules.<sup>14</sup>

All the liberals agree that liberty is one of the highest values in ordering the life of community of men but they disagree on the content of liberty. Three major contents of liberty were identified. They are: Positive liberty, Negative liberty, and Republican liberty.

The idea of positive liberty was popularised by liberals such as Rousseau and Thomas Hill Green. In the work of Rousseau in *Social Contract and Discourses*, argues that a person’s freedom is guaranteed when he acts or reacts freely according to his or her true free will.<sup>15</sup> Green also argue that liberty in the positive sense, is to be absent from the compulsion of other person’s will; for the action to belong to the freewill of the agents. A person is said not to be free, if his or her action represent the will of another. An action must be autonomous to be free. No action that is forced on any individual could be judged as free.

The negative conception of liberty is popularly associated with Isaiah Berlin. Here, an agent is said to be free if his action is in the absence of coercion by others: one is normally said to be free to the extent to which nobody disrupts his personal freedom of actions. The logic of Political freedom in the Western liberal conception is an area within which a man acts without hindrances by others.<sup>16</sup>

The duty of the state is to ensure that nobody interferes negatively in the affairs of others. The state has the legislative duty of ensuring that individual should be allowed to do whatever they want, given that their activities do not temper with the liberty of anyone else.

The third conception of liberty is known as republican liberty or the new Roman conception of liberty. According to Pettet, a Roman usage of the word “Servus” means freedom, not to live in servitude to others, or subjected to arbitrary influence of other persons.<sup>17</sup>

The liberal theory is divided into two major types, namely; the classical and modern liberalism. The classical liberalism has a realistic view of the natural man, that is, the human person is conceived as a mixture of emotion and rationality.<sup>18</sup> The classical liberals hold that the real freedom is freedom from state’s intervention in the economy and freedom from coercion. They interpret the state control of the economic activities as a restriction on economic of individuals which should be avoided. Limited state power is recommended and recognised by classical liberalism.<sup>19</sup>

The modern liberalism believes that government has an active part to play in the redistribution of the national economic goods. The active freedom of the individuals depends on the state. The state guarantees the rights to education, housing, employment, health care and living wages. This modern liberalism is also called a welfare state or social justice liberalism. Personal freedom and economic liberty is closely linked.

### **Liberalism as a Doctrine**

Liberalism as a doctrine is divided to countless strands each with its own overall theory of value, epistemology and metaphysics. Liberalism as a theory could be improved upon, but as a doctrine, it has an almost permanent status. Gerald Gaus, while comparing doctrine of liberalism with liberal theory appeals to Rawls understanding of liberal doctrine, he states that Rawls maintained that his own brand of liberalism was not the comprehensive doctrine which encompasses an overall theory value or the metaphysical explanation of essence of an individual in the society. He further argues that the modern societies are already saturated with this aforementioned doctrine since they are characterised by a reasonable pluralism. He added that his own brand of liberalism is not for the purpose of adding another sectarian doctrine to the existing ones “but to provide a political framework that is neutral between such controversial comprehensive doctrines.”<sup>10</sup>

From Gaus’ comment above, it is lucid that liberal doctrine decides its nature in tune with neutrality to comprehensive doctrines. Liberalism as a doctrine is a body that is a complete whole which could not be improved upon. So, liberalism as a doctrine is absolutist in nature unlike liberal theory which is meant to be improved upon if it does not bring about desired results. Liberal doctrine is largely inflexible and of a permanent nature.

### **The Cores of Liberalism**

Liberalism as a theory has three major cores, namely: Economic Core, Moral Core and Political Core.

## The Economic Core of Liberalism

The economic core of liberalism has to do with the organisation of the economy on the individualist line. That is, economic decisions are made by individuals. The individuals have rights to private property.<sup>21</sup> Economic liberalism may be supportive of government's regulation as the case of American new liberalism. Arthur Satz argues that when the core of liberalism is in operation the state allows individuals to engage in private business enterprise; with minimum intervention; it leads to competition among the citizens and the long effect is national economic development. In other words, freedom to engage in economic activities by individuals improves the lives of the society. The meeting place of all these activities is the open market where the forces of demand and supply determine prices of goods and services. Each as an individual would be encouraged to put in their best because of the personal gains. The collection of the personal gains is equal to societal gains in general<sup>22</sup>.

## The Moral Core of Liberalism

The moral core of liberalism consists in the innate quality of a man to be respected as a free individual. A man, as man, has a personal dignity and moral worth that should be respected as he is also expected to respect others. The rights of man represented in the declaration of the French Revolution in August 26, 1789. The French National Assembly has these articles:

The representatives of the French People organized as a National Assembly, believing that the ignorance, neglect, or contempt of the right of man are the sole cause of public calamities and of the corruption of governments, have determined to set forth in a solemn declaration of the natural, unalienable, and sacred right of men...Therefore, the National Assembly recognizes and proclaims, in the presence and under the auspices of the Supreme Being, the following rights of man and of the citizens.

Articles:

1. Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be founded only upon the general good.
2. The aim of all political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible right of man. These rights are liberty, property, and resistance to oppression".<sup>23</sup>

The moral rights of man are natural; they are made explicit in this French document. Man, by virtue of being, is endowed with certain rights by the Supreme Being. The rights are: freedom to equality, right to own property, and absence of oppression among others. The liberty of man consists in the freedom to act in accordance with his conscience. The action of man should by no means injure anyone else. No individual or group of individuals may exercise any power or authority without the permission of the state.<sup>24</sup>

The respect for man's liberty, freedom, equality and individualism constitute the moral core of liberalism. Similar notion of these rights are found in Locke, Hume and Rousseau's social contract. All agree that humans have certain worth to be respected by other humans. Thus respect for the human person runs through all the liberal doctrines, whether old or new, social or classical.

## The Political Core of Liberalism

The political core of liberalism could be broadly categorised under four principles: representative government, individual consent, constitutionalism and popular sovereignty.<sup>46</sup>

**Representative Government:** Earlier in this chapter, we have discussed representative government which is democracy. Arguably, the best form of democracy is direct democracy where every individual is personally present in the process of decision making. Due to population increase, this is no longer practicable. Indirect democracy affords the citizens (eligible citizens) to elect their representatives to legislate on politico-social-economic decisions, formulate and administer various programmes for the good of the populace.<sup>25</sup>

In representative democracies, throughout the world, all eligible citizens' interests are to be taken into consideration in decision making. Epistemologically speaking, democracy is deemed to be the most legitimate system of government in decision formulating since it is generally more reliable in making each participant finds the right decisions. Because democracy brings many people to the decision making process, it can take advantages of much advice supplied by these people to reach the right decisions. Democratic decisions seem to be more informed than any autocratic system. Also, the broad based decision that is common to democracy helps the critical evaluation of the various moral ideas and ideals that guide decision making<sup>26</sup>. However, decision making under democratic setting, most of the time, is cumbersome and slow.

**Individual Consent:** Individualism is the hallmark of liberalism. The liberal places more value on the right of an individual than any other privileges. By individualism, we mean that the life of an individual wholly belongs to him and he reserves the rights to live it the way he likes, acts on his own best judgment, and pursue the values of his choices.<sup>27</sup>

The individual is sovereign, an end in itself, and he keeps and uses the product of his efforts<sup>21</sup>. The ideal of individualism is what American's founding fathers sought to establish when they drafted their constitution and proclaimed their declaration on the rights and privileges of man. They evolved a human community in which the right to life, property, liberty, association and pursuit of happiness are to be recognised and guarded by the government. In fact, the government owes her existence to individual consent.

The act of voting during elections is one of the principal ways of obtaining individual's consent. When one votes during an election, referendum or one participates in debate that borders on national, local or personal issue, one is expressing his or her individualism. Voting means for one to freely give his or her consent to the decision taken by the government of the day.

The social contract theories are all means of obtaining individual consent. Thomas Hobbes in his social contract theory describes the natural state of man as time in which the rights of man was unlimited; this created an atmosphere of insecurity. In the primitive period, every man wishes he could control other men to the point that they would be too afraid to harm him. But every man is also aware that it was impossible for him alone to dominate all men perpetually, no man can dominate and be dominant forever<sup>28</sup>. Something was needed to be done if man was to live in peace and this was establishment of law. Man needs to establish law that would make men to be obedient; the fear of the penalty for violating the law would be strong enough to secure obedience.<sup>29</sup> Individual man finds it necessary to submit to the leviathan that in turn protects his rights.

According to Hobbes, man in fear of losing his life finds it necessary to give his consent to a civil government in order for the civil government to offer him protection for his life. Although, it could be rationally argued that a natural man may not like to enter into a civil government. His selfishness would prevent him from doing so, instead, he would have wanted a situation in which he combines his power and resources with other rational egoists who would also think like him and control the machinery of the government. These facts being true, the condition of man in the state of nature is not only dangerous; it is miserable.<sup>30</sup>

According to Hobbes, the nature of man is odd, because he wants both safety and self-glories at the same time.<sup>31</sup> John Locke, contrary to Hobbes, argues that the state of nature was peaceful and social in a way nature was permitted to take its natural course. The Lockean state of nature was governed by natural law and it was relatively peaceful. By natural law, Locke means laws of God. God did not just create the universe and put people in it just for the sake of it, he wants them to live a pleasant life but Adam and Eve transgressed the law of God.<sup>32</sup>

After the transgression of God's law, man gives way to civil government. For Locke, the state of nature was desirable and naturally peaceful. He argues:

...life in the state of nature is naturally sociable, because the state of nature contains what we can easily recognize as the beginnings of economic interdependence and social stratification between rich and poor. And all this happens... before the invention of the state, and it would continue to happen, if all law enforcement were to disappear. Therefore, a return to state of nature is not the terrifying possibility which Hobbes had thought it was.<sup>33</sup>

The above quotation implies that the state of nature was naturally peaceful but when man started primitive accumulation of wealth, it brought about civil government to regulate the activities of man. Each man submitted his rights and freely gives consent to civil government and in return got a protection from the government. Each time man freely votes, he expresses his individual consent.

**Constitutionalism:** A constitutionalism is a government based on constitution, a system in which power is distributed, controlled and limited by a system of law that the ruler, or body of rulers must adhere to.<sup>34</sup> The idea of constitutionalism is popularly associated with the political philosophy of John Locke that the civil government should be legally checked in the exercise of its power, and that its legitimacy depends on its observation of these limitations.<sup>29</sup> Shannon Stimson sees constitutionalism as the rule of law, thus:

The rule of law, as the rule of reason, is often contrasted with a second, distinct archetype that emphasise institutional restraints on power holder, or forms of protective arrangement created so as to insulate civil society from oppressive action by the agent of government. This is the general understanding of rule of law most closely associated with Anglo-American constitution making. On this view, without a commitment to limited government, which is then identified as government under rule of law, jurisprudential thinker such as Charles McIlwain and James Bryce argued that a state might be said to have a constitution in the mechanical sense of offices and administration, but lack constitutionalism.<sup>35</sup>

It follows from Stimson's position above that the constitution sets a limit to the power of the ruler as to prevent them from becoming oppressive. Here, we have the principles of check and balance. The people elect their leaders (representatives and executive officer such as president or a prime minister as the case may be) who in turn administer justice in the society in order for the leaders not to become oppressive and consequently a return to Hobbesian state of nature, a constitution defines, describes and sets limit to the powers of the rulers.

**Popular Sovereignty:** Popular sovereignty is another principle that is closely associated with political core of liberalism. By sovereignty, we mean the belief that the state derives its legitimacy by the will of the people. These people are the "source of the political power" exercised by all the political office holders whether the chief executive, or the legislator.

Ozumba believes that the term *sovereignty* refers to supreme power and was seen in classical times as divinely ordained, of which "man is instinctively aware and which he seeks to obey."<sup>36</sup> The gods were regarded as the sovereign of that age. The supreme power is vested in the hierarchy of beings that supersede man, these beings are always in form of spirits.<sup>37</sup> In the medieval period, Aquinas and some other scholars saw the king as being the authority that exercised sovereign power, only if his actions were in line with the laws of God and natural laws.<sup>38</sup>

In the modern period, the term has been defined as the supreme legal power to make and enforce the law and this power resides in the state. Ozumba argues that the state possesses the supreme power. He states that:

...a well-ordered state must be that which has a sovereign ruler with unlimited powers. This is sharply contrasted with primitive societies where no such powers existed. What this means is that though, in the organized state, it is necessary to have a sovereign which has the right to make and enforce the laws in the primitive groups, the absence of order and well articulated system of government might make the executor of the sovereign will difficult.<sup>39</sup>

In the contemporary modern state, the final power is said to be vested in the electorate, because the people through their votes create and sustain the power which the state, or the government exercises. The people are the source of political power. This informed the famous statement of Benjamin Franklin that: "in free government, the rulers are the servants and the people their superiors and sovereigns".<sup>40</sup>

Liberalism, as a doctrine, allows for people's participation in government's decisions. Equality and freedom are hallmarks of liberalism; therefore participatory democracy provides one of the ways in which citizens express their freedom and equality.

In summary, the thrust of the discussion is that liberal philosophy consists of three major cores, political, economic and moral cores. The political core is concerned with the thinking that individuals have the right to participate in deciding who would rule them. Political liberty is consistent with other cores, since both moral and economic cores can only be realised, if there is a limited and participatory government. The economic core is concerned with the thinking that man has the right to pursue his economic activities, to own property and trade with them and keep the profit. Finally, the moral core has to do with inherent worth of man as man. Man has moral worth and dignity to be respected as man. Man should be treated equally. Man should be taken as an end in itself and not means to other ends.



## End of History

The “end of history” is a philosophical concept popularised by political scientist Francis Fukuyama in the early 1990s. Fukuyama’s thesis suggests that with the end of the cold War and the collapse of soviet communism, liberal democracy and free-market capitalism had emerged as the ultimate form of government and economic system. According to Fukuyama, this represented the “end of point of mankind’s ideological evolution” and marked the triumph of liberal democracy as the final form of human government. It is noteworthy that Fukuyama’s avowal of the end of history draws on Alexandre Kojeve’s submission on Hegel’s philosophy of history. Fukuyama presents Kojeve’s argument in the following words:

...as for the good Hegelians, understanding the processes of history requires understanding development in the realm of consciousness or ideas, since consciousness will ultimately remake the material world in its own image. To say that history ended in 1806 means that mankind’s ideological evolution ended in the idea of the French or American Revolutions. While particular regime in the real world might not implement these ideas fully, their theoretical truth is Absolute and could not be improved upon... if ideological development had in fact ended, the homogenous state would eventually become victorious throughout the material world<sup>41</sup>.

Kojeve’s and Fukuyama agree that the evolutionary history of ideologies terminate with the emergence of liberal democracy. And by liberal democracy, we mean the Western political ideology that emphasises the right of the individual to liberty:

...the individual has certain inalienable rights, which he possesses merely in virtue of his humanity, these rights include right to vote and be voted for, right to personal liberty, right to own property and pursuit of happiness<sup>42</sup>.

Fukuyama contends that liberal democracy has defeated all the competing ideologies in the world and therefore a homogeneous state of affairs would be the status of the victorious ideology. According to him, all political and economic contradictions could be resolved by modern liberal principles. He lists other competing ideologies and gives reasons for their failures.

According to Fukuyama, Fascism, as an alternative political ideology, saw the political weakness and materialism in European and American nations as major contradictions that can debar ideological formation and development, hence the need to recommend strong government. But World War II killed fascism as an ideology. The American attack of Japanese two cities of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, through atomic bombs as well as the destruction of the German chancellery, ruined the ideology both on the levels of consciousness and materiality.<sup>43</sup>

Another strong contending ideology, according to Fukuyama, is Communism. Marx contends that liberal society was unequalitarian in structure because of the last contradictions that could be resolved within liberal context, and these contradictions are that of labour and capital. The contradictions, according to Marx, can

only be resolved under Communism, which constitutes the completeness of humans' ideological struggle<sup>44</sup>. On the contrary, Fukuyama contends that that the class issues which was a fundamental contradiction within liberal ideology has been resolved through the application of liberal twin concepts of the freedom and equality. He states that the egalitarian modern life which the European and American countries are enjoying has adequately represented the Marxist's vision of classless society<sup>45</sup>. Marxism failed as ideology because of its inability to complete favourably with the West in the management of information technology.

### **Interrogating the Philosophy of Liberalism**

Liberalism as a political ideology takes its major concern as the freedom and equality of the individuals in society<sup>46</sup>. The core commitment of the liberal is in the principles of autonomy and equality in relation to the society. The liberal believes that there should be equality in both political and economic realms. There is a tension between political freedom of liberalism and that of economic freedom. In order to create equality in the economic realm, the liberals allow individuals to exploit their natural capacity to the fullest. This creates unforeseen contradictions of inequality of ownership, control and distribution of societal wealth. The inequality in economic realm necessarily affects the actualisation of freedom realm of politics. The capitalists own and manage the productive factors, therefore necessarily pushing the rest of the populace to look for various means of acquiring skills to compete for the little space given by the capitalists. This seems to inform Hegel's comment in 1821 about the wealth of civil society: "it hence becomes apparent that despite an excess of wealth, a civil society is not rich enough" i.e., its own resources are not sufficient to check excessive poverty.<sup>47</sup>

Alan Ryan observes that there is a tension between the old liberalism and the new liberalism. He expresses his thought in this way:

...just as there is a tension between classical and modern liberalism, the same tension reappears between pro- and anti-capitalist liberalisms. And just as most liberals would not wish to pursue the goals of the welfare state to the lengths of threatening the survival of the limited, lawful government, so they would not wish to restrain the operation of a capitalist economy to the point where it turns into a command economy.<sup>48</sup>

It is clear from Ryan's analysis above that liberalism has difficulty of equitable distribution of wealth. The old or classical liberalism believes that government should not interfere in the economic activities of an individual in the society.

Classical liberalism maintains that allowing citizens to own private property is the main effective way of protecting individual liberty. The argument here is that if a welfare state attempts to redistribute wealth, without doubt, it would infringe on the economic right (private ownership) of an individual.

The new liberalism believes that if there is no welfare state to redistribute the economic wealth, there would be economic inequality that would in the long run affect the political equality. Whatever ground you stand, liberalism faces inequalities.

Ryan also notes a contradiction between democracy and liberalism. If democracy is justly taken to mean the rule of the majority, he argues:

...it is a contingent matter whether the majority will generally subscribe to liberal views, if they do, there will be a liberal democracy; if not, various devices may be set up to restrain the majority, such as an entrenched Bill of Rights, but all such devices favour liberty by restricting democracy. They are intrinsically undemocratic insofar as they restrict the authority of the majority. On the whole, this view was the view of Jefferson, de Tocqueville and Mill, who were correspondingly anxious to educate the fledgling democracy of their day in order that democracy should not be majority tyranny.<sup>49</sup>

Here Ryan expresses fear for a situation where the majorities that make decision in democratic setting are illiberal, because it is possible for the majority that makes decision to be illiberal or the decision made by the majority may also be illiberal. In these cases, the democracy ceases to be liberal democracy and becomes illiberal democracy. The same fear is expressed by Jim Unah in his article titled “The Folly of Majority having its way”. In this article, he argues that:

...The events unfolding world-wide demonstrate beyond reasonable doubts that it is socially and politically very dangerous for the majority to celebrate the victory of the crowd and bank on it to ignore, trample upon and denigrate minority views, rights, position and sensibilities. What is the population of Boko Haram insurgent now killing people in thousands and challenging the authority of the Nigerian State? Insignificant! What is the population of the al Qaeda terror movement and the ISIS group now giving the U.S. government sleepless nights?<sup>50</sup>

Democracy is rightly defined as the majority rule where the minority has their right protected.<sup>41</sup> For any democracy to be liberal, the majority has the major assignment of protecting the rights of the minority group to prevent violence within the society.

The communitarians have criticised the liberal individualist understanding of the society. According to them, the “society is not just a heap of individuals but it functions as an organism with a complete internal life.”<sup>42</sup> Communitarianism is a theory which sees the individual as subject to a social collectivity such as a nation, a state, or a race. Jean-Jacques Rousseau in his book *The Social Contract* argues that the human person can only be free when he submits to the general will of his community.<sup>51</sup>

Michael Walzer, a communitarian, describes liberalism thus:

...As if Marxist’s account of ideological reflection were literally true, and exemplified here, a contemporary Western societies (American society especially) are taken to be the home of radically isolated individuals, rational and divided by their unalienable right. Liberalism tells the truth about the asocial society that liberal creak-not, in fact, ex-nihilo as their theory suggest, but in a struggle against tradition and communities and authorities that are forgotten as soon as they are escaped, so the liberal practice seem to have no history...each individual imagines himself absolutely free, unencumbered, and on his own- and enter society, accepting its obligation, only in order to minimize his risks. His goal is security, and security is, as Marx wrote, “the assurance of his egoism”. And as he imagines himself, so he really is.<sup>52</sup>

The liberal laid emphasis on individualism as if every individual exists without attachment to his parents-father and mother- tribe, race or nation. The liberal emphasis on individualism has destroyed family ties and neighborhood concept. The individualist life of the West informs what Walzer describes as what leads to political apathy, solitude divorce, privacy and withdrawal.<sup>53</sup>

Walzer's argument shows the implication of the atomistic conception of person by the liberals. This by implication cuts man away from the larger society and leads to isolationism, divorce, single parenthood and other related vices.

The communitarians are critical of the freedom expressed by the liberal individualism. Their argument is presented thus:

...the liberals are free to choose, and we have a right to choose, but we have no criteria to govern our choices except our own wayward interests and desires. And so our choices lack the qualities of cohesion and consecutiveness. We can hardly remember what we did yesterday; we cannot with any assurance predict what we will do tomorrow. We cannot give proper account of ourselves. We cannot sit together and tell comprehensible stories; we read only when there are fragmented narratives, without plots, the literary equivalent of atonal music and nonrepresentational art.<sup>54</sup>

The Muslim attempts a critique of liberalism based on the assumed view of Western public arena. By public arena, we mean a sphere of deliberation and debate concerning the formation of the identity of the individuals. The principle of identity formation, conventionally, in the Western view, is supposed to be guided by individual's freedom of action because the state is assumed to be a neutral agent, as Habermas states in his work:

...the public sphere is an arena of deliberation and debate involving rational subjects. The underlying premise is that of neutrality and equality: neutrality towards identity and equality of all subjects in some sense, subject of the public sphere are presumed to be non marked, equal and universal.<sup>55</sup>

The Western public sphere has a double standard, in principle there is equality of all citizens and the government is assumed to be neutral, but in practice the government is not neutral. By neutrality of the government, we mean that the government does not interfere in the affairs of the citizens. The citizens, under liberal setting enjoy liberty of actions to the extent that their actions do not negate the freedom of others. Also, by equality, the liberal principle assumes that all citizens either natives or aliens are to enjoy status of equality before the law. But in practice, this is not always true, the public subject is deeply fragmented in the West, we have female black, white, upper and lower class.<sup>56</sup>

Salwa Ismail points out that "the idea that in public sphere impartial reason stands above and against differential moral subjects serves to sanction particular subject and invalidate others".<sup>49</sup> In other words, the public sphere is implemented by the Western policy of "exclusion, stigmatization and repulsion of subjectivities falling outside its confines".<sup>57</sup>

The Muslim mode of public separation between male and female veil for woman, according to this scholar, is because the religious activities has been banished to the private realm. The individual Muslim can practise their religion without interfering with the lives of others. Muslims identity formation in Muslim- minority societies is affected by secular interactions. In the Muslim dominated societies, identity formation process is not complex, but in the secular society of the West, Salwa Ismail has this comment about modernisation:

The object change and reform identified in the project of modernization were shaped by the sensibilities articulated in Western accounts and critiques of local traditions and practices. For example, the idea of the liberation of Muslim women through education and unveiling emerged as a necessary condition of modernization that most often was modelled after Western experience. Muslim intellectuals subscribed to the view propagated in colonial discourse about the condition of Muslim women as a reflection of the backwardness of Muslim society...<sup>58</sup>

The Western assumed neutrality concerning identity formation in public sphere is questionable considering comments of Salwa above.

One success that could not be denied of liberalism is the failure of Marxist regime universally. The Marxist regimes derived their legitimacy from the argument that Marxist superiority to their liberal counterparts; the total failure of Marxism is interpreted in the West to mean the victory for the Western liberalism. Since the balkanization of the old Soviet Union into splinter states in the early 1990s, and the subsequent demise of the socialist philosophy, the liberal philosophy has been on the ascendancy since most hitherto socialist states are now embracing political liberalism. Put differently, liberalism has firmly established a foothold in the political lexicon of the contemporary state.

On a more critical note the idea of the “end of history” tends to universalize Western liberal democratic values and institutions as the ultimate end point of political development. This overlooks the principles of cultural relativism, which emphasize that different cultures have their own values and norms that should be respected. It fails to acknowledge that diverse cultural contexts may lead to different conceptions of governance and political organization. It also imposes a singular narrative of progress and development, which is based on Western ideas and historical experiences. This overlooks the idea that cultural relativism recognizes the validity of multiple cultural perspectives and paths to political development, rather than a single, universal endpoint.

Fukuyama’s historical endism tends to overlook the rich and diverse political traditions and philosophies in non-Western societies. It fails to recognize the cultural relativism suggests that different societies may have their own legitimate forms of governance and political organization that are rooted in their unique cultural and historical contexts. It also overlooks the importance of local values, norms, and traditions in shaping political systems. Cultural relativism emphasizes the need to understand and respect the cultural context of different societies, rather than imposing a universal model of governance based on Western ideas.

Moreso, in the recent years, the rise of populist movements, the resurgence of authoritarian in some regions, (Countries like China, Russia, and even North Korea are increasingly modernising their economy, political and military influences thereby challenging the dominance Western liberal capitalists) and the challenges to liberal democracy undermine Fukuyama’s thesis about the inevitable triumph of liberal democracy as the endpoint of human ideological evolution.

The work has failed in some critical areas of consideration of the global impact of technological advancements, environmental changes, and shifting global power dynamics on the future of political and social development, which were not extensively addressed by Francis Fukuyama.

## Conclusion

Fukuyama's work is overly optimistic and deterministic and in view of the future and thereby overlooking to potential of the new challenges that may arise in the future. Additionally, the work underestimates the resilience of non-liberal ideologies and the potential for authoritarianism and the other forms of governance to persist and even thrive in the modern world. Ideological development is a continuum, no one can possibly imagine what can be the end of human rationality, as human thinking abounds, ideological formulation increases also. Making an ideology to pre-empt the end of history for humanity looks rather presumptuous and hypothetical. Human beings are unpredictable and somewhat inconsistent in their approaches to the different endeavours. The situation a man is confronted with determines how he reacts. It would not be out of place to aver that liberalism plays out in the life of man as a way of reacting to the impending political situation at the very instance. To make a hypothetical assumption as Fukuyama did would raise a lot of intellectual dust.

## References

- 1 Christino, Tom and Sameer Bajaj, "Democracy", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2022 Edition), Edward M. Zalta (ed.) URL= <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2022/entries/democracy/>>
- 2 Cortland, D, Genald Gaus and Daud Schinittz "Liberalism", The Stanford encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2022 Edition), Edward M. Zalta (ed) URL=<<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2022/entries/liberalism/>>
- 3 <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/illiberal>
- 4 <https://www.britannica.com/topic/authoritarianism>
- 5 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ideology>
- 6 Taylor C.. 1979. "What's wrong with negative liberty". *The Ideas of Freedom*. Ryan (ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 175-193.
- 7 Locke, John. (1960). *The Second Treatise of Government*. Peter Lashett (ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 283-444.
- 8 Ryan, A. (2007). "Liberalism". *A companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy* Robert E. Goodin, Philip Pettit and Thomas Pogge (ed.) U.S.A.: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 360.
- 9 Mill J.S.: *Collected Work of Mill*. (2000). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- 10 Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as Fairness. A Restatement*. Erin Kelley (ed.) New York: Columbia University Press.
- 11 Rousseau, J. J. (1993). *The Social Contract and Discourse*, G. D. H. Cole (trans.) New York: Duffon.
- 12 Cranston, M. Liberalism. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. An internet article accessed on 26 May, 2016. From <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberalism> 4/19.
- 13 Rousseau, J. J. (1993). *The social contract and discourses*, G. D. H. Cole (trans.), New York: Dutton.
- 14 Cranston, M. Liberalism. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. An internet article accessed on 26 May, 2016. From <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberalism> 4/19.

- 15 Berlin, I. (1969). "Two concepts of liberty". *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 122.
- 16 Edwin Van da Haar. (2015). "The meaning of liberalism". An internet article accessed on 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2015. From <http://www.libertarianism.org/>.
- 17 Edwin van da Haar (2015). The meaning of liberalism . An internet article accessed on 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2015. From <http://www.libertarianism.org/>.
- 18 Gerald, G. (2014). Liberalism. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. An internet article accessed on 26 May, 2016. From <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberalism>.
- 19 Economic Liberalism Retrieved from [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=economic\\_liberalism&oldid=712420619](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=economic_liberalism&oldid=712420619) on 29 May 2016.
- 20 Satz, A. (2016). "Economic liberalism reinterpreted". *Social Research*, Vol. 8, No.3 (September 1941), P. 375 Published by: The New School [http://www.jstor.org/stable 140981791](http://www.jstor.org/stable/140981791)
- 21 Lillian, G. (2008). *Declaration of the Rights of Man – 1789*, Lillian Goldman Law Library 127 Wall Street, New Haven. CT06511.
- 22 William, G. (2008). Declaration of the rights of man.
- 23 Roy, M. (1989). *Contemporary Political Ideologies: Movements and Regimes*, (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), Glenview, Illinois: Foresman and Co, 23.
- 24 Douglass, F. (2016). Individualism vs. Collectivism: Our future, Our Choice. *The Objective Stanford*, Vol. 7. No. 1.
- 25 Douglass, F. 2016. Individualism vs. Collectivism: Our Future, Our Choice . *The Objective Stanford*, Vol. 7. No. 1.
- 26 McClelland, J. S. (1996). *A History of Western Political Thought*. United States of America: Routledge. 195.
- 27 McClelland, J. S.( 1996). *A History of Western Political Thought*. United States of America: Routledge. 196
- 28 McClelland, J. S. (1996). *A History of Western Political Thought*. United States of America: Routledge. 196
- 25 McClelland, J. S.(1996). *A History of Western Political Thought*. United States of America: Routledge. 185.
- 26 McClelland, J. S. (1996). *A History of Western Political Thought*. United States of America: Routledge. 185
- 27 McClelland, J. S. (1996). *A History of Western Political Thought*. United States of America: Routledge. 187

- 28 This definition is from *The Free Dictionary* retrieved on 5<sup>th</sup> June, 2016. From <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/constitutionism>
- 29 Waluchow, W. (2012). Constitutionalism. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* retrieved on 5<sup>th</sup> June, 2016.
- 30 Waluchow, W. (2012). Constitutionalism. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* retrieved on 5<sup>th</sup> June, 2016.
- 31 Shannon C. S. (2006). Constitutionalism and the rule of law. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 322.
- 32 Ozumba, G. O. (1994). ‘Sovereignty and the Doctrine of the Separation of Powers.’ *Reading in Social and Political Philosophy*. Ibadan: Claverianum Press, Publishers and printers, 122.
- 33 Ozumba, G. O. (1994). Sovereignty and the Doctrine of the Separation of Powers. *Reading in Social and Political Philosophy*. Ibadan: Claverianum Press, Publishers and printers. 122.
- 34 Ozumba, G. O. (1994). Sovereignty and the Doctrine of the Separation of Powers. *Reading in social and Political Philosophy*. Ibadan: Claverianum Press, Publishers and printers. 122.
- 35 Franklin, B.( 2003). *The Political Philosophy of Benjamin Franklin*. Ralph Ketch ed.
- 36 Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and Last Man*. London penguin.199.
- 37 The Summary of Fukuyama’s work given above is derived from C.O Paul’s paper, a review of the end of history and the last man and trust by Francis Fukuyama. Access on the 13<sup>th</sup> May 2006 From <http://members.cox.net/oxcxedphilosophy/fukuyama.htm>”. par.32.
- 38 Fukuyama, F.( 1992). *The End of History and Last Man*. London Penguin. 65-66.
- 39 Thomson, D. (1996). *Political Ideas*. London: C.A Walt & Co Ltd. 176-179.
- 40 Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The History and the Last Man*. London Penguin. 199-211.
- 41 Maurice, C. Liberalism. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. P 1 of 1 Accessed on 30<sup>th</sup> October, 2005, from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberalism>.
- 42 Taylor, C. (1970). *Hegel and Modern Society*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- 43 Ryan, A. (2007). Liberalism. *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Limited, 372.
- 44 Ryan, Alan.( 2007). Liberalism. *A companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- 45 Unah, J.( 2016). The folly of majority having its way. *Sunday Mirror* vol. 6 No 24 Sunday June 19, 2016 [www.nationalmirroronline.net](http://www.nationalmirroronline.net)
- 46 Owolabi, A. O. (1999). *The Quest for Democracy in Africa: A theoretical Explanation*. Lagos: Obaroh & Ogbinaka Publisher Ltd, 5.
- 47 Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as fairness: A Restatement*. Erin Kelly ed. New York: Columbia University Press.
- 48 Rousseau, J. J.(1993). *The Social Contrasts and Discourse*, G. D. H. Cole ed. New York: Duffon.



49 Walzer, M. "The communitarian Critique of Liberalism". *Political Theory*. Accessed on 02-06-2016 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/191477> Vol. 18, No. 1 (Feb., 1990) . 7

50 Walzer, M. "The Communitarian Critique of Liberalism". *Political Theory*. Retrieved on 02-06-2016 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/191477> . Vol. 18, No. 1 (Feb. 1990). 8.

51 Walzer, M. The communitarian Critique of liberalism. Retrieved on 02-06-2016 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/191477> . *Political Theory* Vol. 18, No. 1 (Feb. 1990) .8

52 Salwa, I. (2006). "Muslim Public Self-presentation: Interrogating the Liberal Public Sphere". *Political Science and Politics*. Vol. 41, No 1 pp. 25 – 29. Accessed on 14-06-2016 17:20UTC from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20452105> p. 25.

53 Salwa, I. (2006). "Muslim Public Self-presentation: Interrogating the Liberal Public sphere". *Political Science and Politics*, 26.

54 Salwa, I. (2006). "Muslim public self-presentation: interrogating the liberal public sphere." *Political Science and Politics*, 26.

55 Salwa, I. (2006). "Muslim public self-presentation: interrogating the liberal public sphere". *Political Science and Politic*. . 27.

56 Salwa, I. (2006). "Muslim public self-presentation: interrogating the liberal public sphere., *Political Science and Politics* . 27.

