

The End of History and the Last Man  
Francis Fukuyama

Fukuyama would like to believe that history one-way process, directed toward continual improvement of governments. No, unfortunately, evolution is only constant change. It is not constant improvement. And in fact evolution dictates that each species, and each system contains the seeds of its own eventual destruction. Liberal democracy will it is amazing that every example that Fukuyama gives of liberal democracies that emerged from dictatorships in the 70s and 80s seems at this point to have gone sour. Argentina is in serial default, although it remains a democracy. Venezuela is only a shell of a democracy, actually a dictatorship. Peru and Bolivia are likewise populist strongman rules, rather in the Latin American tradition, only this time with the parts I know of leftist socialism. Portugal, Greece, and Italy, the southern European states which emerged recently from dictatorship. Make that Spain and Portugal only, are vastly overloaded with dad and on the brink of collapse. They are Spain in particular is inundated with immigrants. Italy has its own perennial problems. Greece is likewise on the brinks of collapse, and stands to bring the euro down with it.

Russia abandoned liberal democracy after an unhappy decades experience calm. They elected the strongman, Vladimir Putin, who was exactly in the model described by Christine, who was quoted by Fukuyama himself. In other words, Russia came full circle rather quickly. More than that, it is resuming its empire building ways. Christine's characterization of the Russian people as not liking freedom, demanding a powerful autocratic leader, seems to be right on target.

Speaking about the areas in which the liberal democracy movement started and seems to have been best, northern Europe the United States Canada then the Anglophone world, we can see a different kind of problem. These countries were overwhelmed by their liberalism, and their belief in equality. The belief in equality led to the extension of the franchise to the entire population. Actually, it went further. The belief in the equality of all men led to an opening of the doors. The United States and Western Europe have been flooded with immigrants from the South. Despite a half centuries experience, during which none of these southern immigrant people have truly integrated themselves into their host societies, or acquired the levels of education and employment that would allow them to keep up with their host nations, the liberal Democrats still accept them still believe that any in their equality. There are many theater theories why it has not been achieved, chief among which is that they the immigrants are held back by white racism. This seems awfully frail, given that it is large classes of immigrants, and many many countries, none of which evidenced. Many of which did not evidence quite reason did not evidence racism during the colonial.

Too many philosophers, not enough scientists in this. Fukayama believes truth is to be found in the realm of philosophers such as Hegel, Kant, Hobbes, etc. Not so. It is more in the realm of sociobiologists, geneticists.

*The mere fact that human nature is not created "once and for all" but creates itself "in the course of historical time" does not spare us the need to talk about human nature, either as a structure within which man's self-creation occurs, or as an end point or telos toward which human historical development appears to be moving .*

The above is truer than the author would like to believe. Evolution happens in historical time.

Fukuyama, Francis (2006-03-01). End of History and the Last Man (p. 138). Free Press. Kindle Edition.

—G. W . F. Hegel, *The Phenomenology of Mind* 1 And it is solely by risking life that freedom is obtained; only thus is it tried and proved that the essential nature of self-consciousness is not bare existence , is not the merely immediate form in which it at first makes its appearance.... The individual, who has not staked his life, may, no doubt, be recognized as a person; but he has not attained the truth of this recognition as an independent self-consciousness.

—Alexandre Kojève, *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel* 2 All human, anthropogenetic desire— the desire that generates self-consciousness, the human reality— is, finally, a function of the desire for “recognition.” And the risk of life by which the human reality “comes to light” is a risk for the sake of such a desire. Therefore, to speak of the “origin” of self-consciousness is necessarily to speak of a fight to the death for “recognition.”

Fukuyama, Francis (2006-03-01). *End of History and the Last Man* (p. 143). Free Press. Kindle Edition.

The struggle for recognition is associated with culture. Go to Maslow (not cited). People want to be held in esteem by their peers. This is local. It does not require national political rights, which are far too abstract.

Synaptic pruning.

Fukuyama calls the Holocaust a unique and horrible experience, perhaps a one time experience in the history of the world. He notes that critics can have it one way or the other: uniquely horrible, or something that must be avoided happening again.

Fukuyama was

A lot has been learned about human evolution in the two decades since Fukuyama wrote. The human genome has been changing rapidly over the past several hundred thousand years, and the evidence is now that its pace of change has accelerated dramatically since the dawn of civilization only about 10,000 years ago. Moreover, human culture coevolved with the genome. Individuals are fitted to their culture and vice versa.

He decries the numbers of lives lost to totalitarianism. Speaking from an evolutionary perspective, there have been winning and losing genes in the gene pool, but there are enough of them to populate the earth with 7 billion people. The human animal has been extremely successful, despite the fact that many strains have been under negative pressure due to war disease and whatever, and many have actually died out. But the human race has to be seen at the end of the day is the most successful ever to evolve in the history of the planet. We are dominant.

Fukuyama suggests that there may be a history to the Holocaust, some sort of explanation. He says, however, that many would regard even attempting to explain it as somehow cheapening, making the event acceptable. The great Fukuyama is on to something. The resentment of the Jews certainly had a basis in German experience during the Weimar Republic. While one cannot whatsoever justify the Holocaust, one can explain it.

Also, the Holocaust is not unique. There was a similar genocide in Ukraine in the 1930s, the whole of the more. There were in following decades the genocide in Cambodia, the Armenian genocide in Turkey, and others. The Holocaust is simply had better better press coverage. Differences are in matters of degree, percentages and absolute numbers. But it would be hard to say that the Holocaust is absolutely at the extreme in any of these measures. Fukuyama concludes chapter 11 saying that we can continue to believe in the existence of a directional incoherent historical process. Historical is directional in the sense that history is never forgotten. Technological progress, scientific discovery is uniquely unidirectional. Newton's laws have been discovered and will not be forgotten. The atomic bomb exists and will not be lost.

The thesis that society the societal direction is unidirectional is harder to support. We have had in the past two competing theories, the circular history of the American Indians, who believe that everything was in a constant state of our revolution and that there was no forward progress. The alternative theory is that of linear history, that it is a process that builds on itself.

Evolutionary history is the third one. Evolution is a broad blind process. Evolution favors whatever is working at the time. Whatever organisms are able to fill the niche is available are the ones that thrive. When niche is disappear, or competition appears, they may she's to thrive. However, evolution is an amoral process. One would have to say that advocates of liberal democracy put on a pedestal. They think that the liberal democracy represents the end of a development. No, liberal democracy emerged as a superior competitor to the dictatorships of the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. But those liberal democracies have had have contained the seeds of their own destruction. These include a willingness a tendency to expand the franchise to people who do not contribute much to society and who depend on the society for handouts. It includes the belief the altruistic belief among western people in the end equality of all human races, and therefore, the support by these societies of human races of the reproduction, the population of races other than their own. It includes the acquisition of debt. The human animal is constitutionally unable to deal with that over long periods of time. The liberal democracies are all settled with that, because they are all addicted to present consumption at the expense of the future. Take a note here on one of Fukuyama's useful observations. Man is not satisfied by material alone. He wants recognition, self-fulfillment. Therefore he is driven not simply to eat sleep and reproduce, but to acquire some status. In the extreme he aspires to be a leader, and leaders aspire to dominate and direct the society. This lust of power is an end in itself, and it can be a can be useful in driving the society to heighten its production, but it can also lead to wars. The concept from Hegel which Fukuyama quotes is the struggle for recognition. One page 135 Fukuyama says that the struggle for recognition supersedes economic explanations of man strives.

The idea of the dialectic, that man progresses or history progresses through this process of contradictions, is a somewhat simpler version of the idea of evolution. As the niche is available to man change, with the changing civilization, technology, and surrounding such as climate, new forms of culture and new human genomes are favored. They will expand to fill the niche, succeeding in out reproducing again succeeding in producing more viable offspring in the culture than others.

This course continues to change. It is not that we bounce from contradiction to contradiction, but rather things are in a cycle. As an example, one could say that the rich were favored in the terms of reproduction or rather, the relatively well-to-do were well-positioned to reproduce in England of the 10<sup>th</sup> through the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. After that, having large families was considered counterproductive. With life in the city, children were not an economic asset but a burden, and a better off tended to have fewer of them. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, with the advent of birth control and cultural changes that elevated the desirability of sex introduced the desirability of the byproduct, children, the elements of society that reproduce themselves tended to be the poor and the immigrants. From a dialectical point of view you could say that it shifted. But it's really as more than a two-dimensional process, moving back and forth. So every element of society is in constant flux, and in this particular instance, the smarter and wealthier elements of society were favored for reproduction for a while, and then not favored.

On page 143 he says that you can have economic progress without freedom, as in Spain or South Korea or Taiwan. He attributes the push toward liberal democracy to a demand for freedom. It is more than that, it is a cultural current of our times. The minorities in any country will push for more of more suffrage, more of an enfranchisement, in the hopes it will give them a larger slice of the economic pie. What we were refused to recognize his biological differences, evolutionary differences, which bound their productivity, enhance their ability to earn wealth. It is misattributed to the political system, whereas it is in fact an intractable fact of there being. Nobody wants to admit this.

On page 143 he says that you can have economic progress without freedom, as in Spain or South Korea or Taiwan. He attributes the push toward liberal democracy to a demand for freedom. It is more than that, it is a cultural current of our times. The minorities in any country will push for more of more suffrage, more of an enfranchisement, in the hopes it will give them a larger slice of the economic pie. What we were refused to recognize his biological

differences, evolutionary differences, which bound their productivity, enhance their ability to earn wealth. It is misattributed to the political system, whereas it is in fact an intractable fact of there being. Nobody wants to admit this.

Page 147 he offers a simplistic view of primitive tribes, those with the warrior asked those. In their FO's was born know their origins – step people versus the people of fertile valleys. It was also a point in time, a point in human evolution. The horse peoples filled a niche, and exploited it as long as it was open. Eventually the settled people gain the upper hand by developing adequate defenses. The question of whether or not they were willing to risk their lives is answered by John Keegan's a history of warfare. Actually, the first people who were willing to go to the line and really put their lives at risk were the Greeks and the Romans with their feelings warfare. The horse warriors tended to make lightning strikes and in retreat, losing some lives, but largely as a matter of accident, and certainly avoiding pitched engagements when they had the opportunity to retreat.

In this, Fukuyama simply seems to have his history of little bit oversimplified.

He is taking it from Hegel, who was good of course bound by his time, but also was bound by his desire to put together a logically consistent explanation of human life. This is the problem of philosophers in general. In their desire to find logical consistency, they overlook the complexity of life. Therefore, it is better to go with scientists who are willing to keep their eyes open and simply describe things as they are, rather than philosophers who would like to describe things as they ought to be.

Okay, seems not to know anything of evolutionary psychology. This is the third science I should mention in my list. Evolutionary psychology certainly explains a lot of man's irrational behavior. Fukuyama talks about whether man is truly free or not. It is a question of degrees, and perception of freedom. We act as though we are free, but we are all constrained by our prior experience, and by our mental wiring, which comes both genetically and in the process of the brain's wiring itself after birth. I need to find the name for this experiential wiring of neural circuitry.

Send in the printing is the is one word for postnatal development of the brain. There are others. Check president logic hobbled, and also a playwright, who wrote the parable of the greengrocer. The greengrocer displays a sign "workers of the world unite" in his shop window. He does not believe any of it, but he does it as a means of protecting himself. In this way he humbles himself before the communist system, admitting its power over him.

Fukuyama has an entire chapter on this, the time most, THY MOS, making it so subservient to an overwhelming power. The interesting thing is that this is happening in the West through political correctness. We in the West cannot state self-evident truths about race or sex or immigration without being attacked by the powers that be. Out of fear for our jobs and career for being fired from our jobs, and certainly out of concern for advancement in our jobs, we are forced to other things we know they're not truth.

This is certainly true as well in Putin's Russia. Putin has approval ratings as I write this of any percent plus. I am quite sure that the Russian people despite the propaganda are not that universally confirmed in the conviction that Ukraine is run by fascists. Nonetheless, it is very advisable to agree with the party line at this point in history.

There's another example, a rather good one, of the psychology of labor unions. The question is not the absolute value of the wage package, but the workers conviction that he is worth more than management is paying.

Fukuyama and sex to the thymus argument. We want sex, not merely for the feeling of gratification, but for the recognition that we are sexually desirable. The ratification could be done without an opposite number. What we want is the confirmation that we are sexually desirable by another person.

This is a very valuable argument, time I take man, in confrontation with the bureaucracy. The examples that Fukuyama uses are from the communist world primarily, but they certainly are instantiated today by the confrontations between libertarians and the state. The Monday ranch standoff is a pretty good example. It also exemplifies the irrational hatred expressed by Blacks against whites. The riots in person Missouri this month our typical. The Blacks do not have any rational, articulated desires. They are simply frustrated with the status quo. Is status quo in which they have no place to go. The fact that it is due to their own limitations is an argument that they cannot accept. It is a drama that must be played out. I am looking for a word for this, it is a set piece drama? There must be a tie-in with the irrationality arguments of Kahneman and others. Is a part of man's psychological makeup that he values himself above his real worth. This is fundamental to our sense of well-being, and to our competing successfully. On the other hand, it leads inevitably to conflict. That conflict has been essential in evolution. Tribe against tribe, nation against nation, we have competed and we have squeezed out or exterminated the van quick. Whether we do it on the basis of purely rational grounds or not does not matter. The superior side, by some measure or another, comes out on top and exterminates the other.

Page hundred and 90. Fukuyama talks about iso Damien the desire the militant desire for equality. He says that this drives animal rights activists, antiabortion activists and so on.

Putting an evolutionary twist on this, I would say it is altruism run amok, and it is especially prominent among northern Europeans. There other kinds of idiocies, megalomania and so on, among all peoples. Milton do globalism's northern European. It is a modern manifestation of the 19<sup>th</sup> century missionary thrust. No other societies on earth seem to be affected.

Fukuyama makes a lot of Hegel's master and slave. The master so yearns to be free that he will fight rather than submit the bondage. The sleeve values life more than freedom.

This is the kind of argument it begs for empirical proof. Hegel and Fukuyama point to certain tribes as certain points in history. The evidence that these things occur is not evidence of why they occur. There needs to be some root in evolutionary psychology. So far no evolutionary psychologists that I know of has mentioned it. Altruism seems like a more real concept. It is a is that it makes evolutionary sense.

Speaking about slave ownership, it appears the slave ownership was pretty much universal 2000 at the time of Christ. It fell into disuse in Europe not because of any moral repulsion, but because it did not not make economic sense. Other institutions such as vassalage took its place. Marie Leo Segovia, writing about Brazil, says that when the Portuguese found slaves for sale along the African coast in the latter part of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, they bought them. The Roman laws on how to deal with them were still in effect. The question was, there was no good use for them and. The Portuguese started to use them when it made economic sense – in Madeira and Brazil.

Therefore it is not a question of slave and master, but rather a question of economics. It is true that the Indians in the New World did not make good slaves. I do not think that one can attribute this to their particularly ferocious nature, but rather to their class entity.

They they were in fact enslaved under the income and the system by the Spanish, when there were no African slaves. Says that the Africans made better slaves for number of reasons.

This is a problem with philosophy in general. It is able to speak airily about all sorts of abstract ideas. Philosophers are often negligent in pointing out particular examples to support their case. For the llama is guilty of the same.

Fukuyama's characterization of the sleeve on page 193 and elsewhere is very one-dimensional. He treats the sleeve as if he had no personality and got no respect. Throughout history many slaves have been respected by their

masters. In the American South challenges slaves were often allowed to work his bookkeepers or clerks in town, where they had a great deal of freedom. They were often menu method. Manumission has a history as all this time. Aesop was a manumission slave. To characterize master slave relationship since in any all or nothing sense is simply wrong. Another historical fact that Fukuyama totally overlooks is the existence of sleeve armies. He says that the sleeve does not risk his life. Absolutely untrue. Throughout Islam, sleeve socialism am Luke's fourth and died as slaves. It is curious that Fukuyama continued on page 200 continues to talk about dignity, Hegel's rational recognition of the individual as the faces of society. These values are collapsing in modern America. We have material plenty, but individuals are increasingly constrained from speaking what they believe to be the truth about such things as race, sexuality, intelligence and other topics the matter. Ironically, it is the liberals – put that in quotations – that are the most strident in putting down dissent, in squelching the freedom of expression in these areas.

To determine the true rulers of any society, all you must do is ask yourself this question: Who is it that I am not permitted to criticize? Voltaire.

<http://www.amren.com/news/2014/08/iq-scores-are-decreasing-and-some-experts-argue-its-because-humans-have-reached-their-intellectual-peak/>

She quotes Russell Kirk, who said eloquently that society is a community of souls, joining the dead, the living, and those yet unborn

This striving for power is not affected by the internal characteristics of states— whether countries are theocracies, slaveholding aristocracies, fascist police states, communist dictatorships or liberal democracies. Morgenthau explained that “it is the very nature of politics to compel the actor on the political scene to use ideologies in order to disguise the immediate goal of his action,” which was always power. 6 For example, Russia expanded under Tsarist rule, much as it expanded under the Bolsheviks; what was constant was the expansion and not the particular form of government. 7 The expectation is that a future government of Russia, shorn completely of Marxism-Leninism , will remain equally expansionist because that expansionism represents an expression of the Russian people’s will to power. 8

Fukuyama, Francis (2006-03-01). End of History and the Last Man (p. 247). Free Press. Kindle Edition.

Page 207 4 PM and goes on at length about the need for recognition. It makes a couple of errors. He assumes that the formal recognition by the state, voting power and so on, is what people want. No, they don’t vote. What they may want his recognition such as black Swan in the United States, freedom from disrespect. The state cannot award that. Respect has to be earned.

Fukuyama is also optimistic about what education can do to equalize people. He does not recognize that some people simply cannot take advantage of an education.

On page 216 Fukuyama talks about the different peoples. This makes a lot of sense. There are cultural obstacles to democracy in the various nationalities. Nationstates do all right. He gives counterexamples such as Peru, were only 11% of the people are white, the rest Indian. He mentions the Soviet Union, we should not have much chance until it broke up into 11 separate states, which can have some nationalism in their first national unity.

Fukuyama mentions Hacienda agriculture. That would be the income in the economy and the system on page 217. In other words, he does understand that there was something similar to slavery practiced in the Spanish possessions of the New World.

Page 221. Fukuyama is correct in saying that it's ColdFusion not static phenomena like laws of nature there are human creations that undergo a continuous process of evolution. They can be modified by economic development, wars, and other national traumas, imagination, or by conscious choice. Hence, cultural "prerequisites" for democracy, will definitely important, need to be treated with some skepticism.

Let me add to the above that it can go backwards. A country such as the United States which evolved to be suited to democracy, appears to be heading the opposite direction. Widespread immigration, and the decreasing educational aspirations of the rising generations, makes it rather unsuited for democracy. Democracy is under pressure in the United States, with increasing intrusion from, among other things, police departments, government spying, and intrusive Internal Revenue Service.

Page 223. Fukuyama notices the Spain, South Korea, and Mexico bloomed when they opened up, and that Argentina collapsed when the nationalized industries.

There is a footnote to this, which is that Spain is in trouble, and Mexico not looking so healthy.

Page 223. Fukuyama says "and yet, one gets the sense of policy differences are only part of the story, and the culture affects economic behavior in certain critical ways just as it affects the validity of the people to sustain stable democracy." Another way of saying this, which Fukuyama does not dare, is that some people are more capable than others. IQ and the wealth of Nations makes this case quite brilliantly.

Another good quote "generalizations about national character also run counter to the relativistic and egalitarian temper of our times, because they almost always contain implicit value judgments concerning the relative worth of the cultures in question. No one likes to be told that his culture promotes laziness and dishonesty; and indeed, such judgments are liable to considerable abuse."

He quotes some Thomas soul, noting the differences between West Indian immigrants and native Blacks.

Page 229 appears to be prophetic. "The divorce of the capitalist work ethic from his spiritual roots and the growth of a culture stressing in the legitimacy and desirability of a media consumption, have led any number of observers to predict the sharp decline in the work ethic and therefore and undermining of capitalism itself." Page 237 an assessment of the situation of Blacks in America, in which they no longer aspire to become mainstream, to become like white Americans, but rather to assert their dignity despite the fact that they are different, and are not achieving at the same levels as whites.

Page 241. Fukuyama seats that Japan is at a disadvantage because it is unable to accept low-wage immigrants. This looks to be an advantage rather than a disadvantage from the vantage of 2014. His quote "Japan no less than the United States these low-wage workers for certain occupations, but is perhaps the least able to accommodate immigrants because of the fundamentally intolerant nature of its constituent groups. The out domestic liberalism of the United States by contrast is the only conceivable basis on which large immigrant populations can be successfully integrated and assimilated."

Democratic societies, dedicated to the opposite proposition, tend to promote a belief in the equality of all lifestyles and values. They do not tell their citizens how they should live, or what will make them happy, virtuous, or great. 8 Instead, they cultivate the virtue of toleration , which becomes the chief virtue in democratic societies.

Fukuyama, Francis (2006-03-01). End of History and the Last Man (p. 305). Free Press. Kindle Edition.

According to the Anglo-Saxon version of liberal theory on which the United States was founded, men have perfect rights but no perfect duties to their communities. Their duties are imperfect because they are derived from their rights; the community exists only to protect those rights. Moral obligation is therefore entirely contractual. It is not underwritten by God or fear for one's eternal life or the natural order of the cosmos, but rather by the contractor's self-interest in fulfillment of the contract by others.

Fukuyama, Francis (2006-03-01). *End of History and the Last Man* (p. 323). Free Press. Kindle Edition.

But democratic societies constantly tend to move from simple tolerance of all alternative ways of life, to an assertion of their essential equality. They resist moralisms that impugn the worth or validity of certain alternatives, and therefore oppose the kind of exclusivity engendered by strong and cohesive communities.

Fukuyama, Francis (2006-03-01). *End of History and the Last Man* (p. 324). Free Press. Kindle Edition.

. Raising children or making a marriage work through a lifetime requires personal sacrifices that are irrational, if looked at from a cost-benefit calculus. For the true benefits of strong family life frequently do not accrue to those bearing the heaviest obligations, but are transmitted across generations. Many of the problems of the contemporary American family— the high divorce rate, the lack of parental authority , alienation of children, and so on— arise precisely from the fact that it is approached by its members on strictly liberal grounds. That is, when the obligations of family become more than what the contractor bargained for, he or she seeks to abrogate the terms of the contract.

Fukuyama, Francis (2006-03-01). *End of History and the Last Man* (p. 324). Free Press. Kindle Edition.