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ABSTRACT

In “At the ‘End of History’ Still Stands Democracy,” Francis Fukuyama proposes that there has been no serious threat to his idea that Western style democracy is the “end of history” and that the United States does not damage global stability. Through analyzing and criticizing the main ideas of Francis Fukuyama, the conclusion is drawn that the China model is a powerful proof against his view of the “end of history.” The tension in European and Asian regions is due to the instigation of the United States who in the 20 years since the end of the Cold War has wantonly launched wars under the excuse that human rights enjoy priority over sovereignty. Besides, a series of financial and economic crises in the Western world expose a set of disadvantages of capitalism, showing that human history has not ended up with the Western capitalist political system.
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In 1989, senior fellow at Stanford University’s Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies Francis Fukuyama, a Japanese American, published his “The End of History?” in the journal \textit{The National Interest}, asserting that Western freedom and democracy has gone beyond communism to be the final socioeconomic stage to which humanity can aspire. He also argued that all the politically related problems in human history are due to inadequate democratic freedom for which human beings are supposed to struggle (Fukuyama 2014b). With the fall of the Berlin Wall and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, it seems that the almost-half-century Cold War has ended with the victory of Western countries spreading their democratic concepts all over the world. Fukuyama enjoys quite a reputation as a result of these publications. Over the past 20 to 30 years since the end of the Cold War, it is reasonable to say that there have been many sudden changes in the international situation, with developed Western countries led by the United States launching wars wantonly over the world with a doctrine that propagates the primacy of democracy, freedom and human rights over sovereignty. While the Western financial oligarchy has been skillfully grabbing super-profits, the financial crisis of 2007 completely exposed the greedy nature and drawbacks of capitalism,
triggering suspicion in developing countries of the West’s superficially defined democracy and freedom in capitalism.

While the financial crisis is still being felt in the so-called free and democratic Western developed countries, Fukuyama has failed to advance with the times and refuses to revise what he has previously said about the “end of history.” Instead, he tries to shield the honor of the West from criticism insisting that “democracy still stands at the end of history” in the preface of the latest edition of his publication *The End of History and the Last Man* (Fukuyama 2014b). Reading through what he has said we easily find that Fukuyama uses the word democracy in an ideological and chauvinistic way. His article tries to misguide readers with an especially twisted view of history and reality, such as an inadequate review and reflection on the crumbling European and American model, and the prejudice against the China model that has been born in the course of China’s rapid development in the past years. Through analyzing and criticizing Fukuyama’s (2014a) “At the ‘End of History’ Still Stands Democracy,” this article proposes three questions for further discussion, and aims at correcting some misguided views.

1. Are there really no challenges to the idea of the “end of history”? 

Fukuyama’s end-of-history view proposed more than 20 years ago is still up to date. He insists that democracy still stands at the “end of history,”

   Twenty-five years later, the most serious threat to the end-of-history hypothesis isn’t that there is a higher, better model out there that will someday supersede liberal democracy; … Even as we raise questions about how soon everyone will get there, we should have no doubt as to what kind of society lies at the end of History. (Fukuyama 2014a)

In his article Fukuyama admits that numerous problems are confronting the world today, such as international territorial conflicts in some regions, unstable situations of some developing countries, financial crisis in developed democratic countries, and so on, but, in Fukuyama’s view, none of these are sufficient to render his “end-of-history” view implausible. This is actually specious and groundless.

First, Fukuyama’s view that his model of the “end of history” is the Western style free market democracy is just an expression of imperialist chauvinism. His argument, that capitalist freedom and democracy are the highest goal, implies that non-Western democracy is only a derivative of Western capitalist democracy. Does the West really own the patent for democracy? Historically, modern Western style democracy is said to be born out of the Enlightenment movement and promoted by thinkers who were under the influence of ancient Greek civilization. However, as Xin Xiangyang points out in *The Review and Analysis of Western Democracy Theory of the 20th Century*, “the earliest use of the word ‘democracy,’ the inception of democratic organization, and the first works of democratic thoughts all originated in the Orient rather than ancient Greece” (Xin 2011; quoted in Cheng 2012, 128). In *Reorient: Global Economy in the Asian Age*, Andre Gunder Frank (2008, 7), the famous German scholar, asserts that Europe and the West were not the center of the world economy and they were on the brink of the world by the end of the year 1800. He also proposes that the world system we live in has at least a 5,000-year history, and it was not until the discovery of the Americas as the source of valuable metals and wide overseas market did the West finally begin to occupy an important
position in the global economy, previously dominated by Asia. In other words, not until the Industrial Revolution did Western capitalist countries play a leading role in the course of global historical development. Some Western scholars put forward liberal democracy not because of the law of the development of human political civilization and inheritance of the past brilliant civilization, but in order to break the feudal fortress. Liberal democracy as an ideological tool is of progressive sense in breaking the feudal fortress and illuminating the uncivilized. However, from the outset of the establishment of capitalism, the bourgeoisie never realized true liberal democracy for all the people as they promised. Today, some Western scholars once again propagate the view that liberal democracy’s foundation lies in Western financial control of global interests, which means the essence of democracy does not lie in the people, but in money and oligarchs.

Second, while Fukuyama discourses eloquently on democracy, he seems to make no distinction between formal democracy and substantial democracy. While Western governments follow a foreign policy of formal democracy that instigates civil unrest in other countries, they ruthlessly crush such internal dissent within their own societies. In 2011, the US government employed police force to disperse the demonstrators that occupied Wall Street, which fully exposes the hypocrisy of American democracy. What’s more, the biggest achievement of US foreign policies that take strategic advantage of democracy is its rise to world hegemony after the corruption of the Soviet socialist regime. Former US president Nixon claimed in his 1999: Victory without War that freedom and democracy is the United States’ card in the ideological competition with the Soviet Union (Nixon 1996, 109). Because of their mistaken admiration for Western democracy, some Soviet political elites like Gorbachev were ideologically perverted to refute socialism, and went on to destroy the USSR, degrading its economy and people’s living standards, and warping the development of its unfortunate former members.

Furthermore, subjectivity and adaptability is the only standard of democracy. What appears as democracy in a developed Western country may be upheaval in a backward country. The establishment and commitment of a democratic system can only come on the foundations of national sovereignty and stability. After radical social changes in the former USSR and Eastern Europe, the United States has launched wars in Iraq, Kosovo and Afghanistan in succession, and provoked regional disturbances among the public in North Africa, the Middle East, and Ukraine. All of this was driven by selfish US motives: to choke off the development of others, and export American democracy by force. The United States under the guise of democracy protected its financial oligarchy’s interests at the cost of other nations’ stability. How could such world-peace-threatening democracy be held up as our ultimate goal?

Now see the issue from the perspective of adaptability. The democratic system in developed Western countries led by the United States, with its serious drawbacks, is in a radically different situation to developing countries. Some Latin American, African and Asian countries have imported from the United States the one-person-one-vote electoral system and employed it for a long time. However, these societies are still unstable with repeated catastrophes threatening people’s daily life, such as food and clothing. What lies at the root of this fact is a lack of stable core organization that operates consistently and forcefully throughout the country (He 2011, 2). Fukuyama notices this problem, admitting that “many existing democracies aren’t doing well either” (Fukuyama 2014a), but he does
not tell us the true reason. The long-term poor operation of Western democracy drives these countries to seek another way out with diverse ways to realize democracy.

Third, economic democracy comes before political democracy. Although Fukuyama likes to talk about democracy, he seems to have little comprehension that democracy is established upon economic equality. Where wealth is monopolized by oligarchy, there is no economic democracy. The Occupy Wall Street campaign involving almost 100 countries fully attests to the aspirations and indignation of a wide range of voters, with the “99% vs. 1%” slogan presented during the protests. In the course of the economic transformation of former USSR and Eastern European countries, East European countries’ GDP in 1996 decreased by 27% since their economic transformation in 1990. In the same period, GDP in Russia declined by 42% from 1990 to 1998, which was a loss larger than that in World War II (17%), and as great as that in World War I, the civil war and the great famine combined (44%) (Chen 2012b, 7). Although Fukuyama’s much vaunted Western style democracy models were all implemented in these countries with radical social changes, their people’s living standards have not improved correspondingly.

The United States, always regarded as the most economically and politically developed country, has been respected as a model by some other countries in the world. Although some fanciful capitalists and liberals depict the United States as a paradise, the truth of it is actually far graver than Fukuyama describes as, “the benefits haven’t been evenly shared, and the country’s polarized and partisan political system hardly seems a shining example for other democracies” (Fukuyama 2014a). On the one hand, in the past more than 30 years of neoliberalism’s ascendant, the domestic gap between the rich and the poor in the United States has reached an unprecedented level, with 1% of the richest holding almost 60% of GDP while 90% of the lower class live on less than 0.5% annual increase of income (Piketty 2014, 303). There is great irony to be found when this happens in a country that claims for itself inclusive liberty, comprehensive democracy, and a superior legal system. On the other hand, the essence of American democracy lies in money, oligarchy, and interest groups. As we all know, in order to aid the Wall Street financial oligarchy in financial crisis, the US government arbitrarily draws money from the taxes without the permission of tax-payers who should at least have had the right to a referendum on it. This is the evidence of hypocritical democracy. All these make people rethink the US model and American democracy.

Fukuyama’s attributing world economic development to American democracy comes without considering its essence: money politics, oligarchy politics and nepotistic politics. Only the opposite of people’s democracy can cause such developmental inequality and imbalance in the world as the United States does. From the perspective of property distribution, since 2010, the top 0.1% own almost 20% total value of the global wealth; the top 1% own almost 50%; and the top 10% own 80–90% (Piketty 2014, 451). From the
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1 Fukuyama, having little comprehension of the labor theory of value, opposes Thomas Piketty, and says,

The rich tend to get richer not just because of higher returns to capital, as the French economist Thomas Piketty has argued, but because they have superior access to the political system and can use their connections to promote their interests. (Fukuyama 2014a)

What he said expresses his admission that the Western political system serves money politics. In addition, we should ask: can the relations to political systems produce wealth?
perspective of resource possession, 10% of the population in Western developed countries plus Japan consume more than 40% of world resources, while the Chinese population, two times as large as that of all developed countries in sum, and 27 times as large as that of South Korea, possess 1.6 mu, that is, 0.0667 hectare, of arable land per person, only one fifth of that in the United States, and one seventh of that in Russia (Chen 2012a, 60). Fukuyama does not notice the high-level monopoly of developed capitalist countries over finance and technology as well as their extensive dependence on the global market. What kind of democracy would the West enjoy if it were limited to its demographic fair share of the world’s resources?

It is a superficial and shallow idea to attribute prosperity of the world economy in the last few years to American democracy, in line with which is the thought that “the emergence of a market-based global economic order and the spread of democracy are clearly linked” (Fukuyama 2014a). There has had more than 100 years of Western hegemony of a market-based global economic order, which is essentially unreasonable. This kind of order, representing Western hegemony’s interests at the expense of the rest of the world, is a reflection and expansion of Western countries’ monopolized interest groups and their undemocratic system. If this is not so, why is it that all of Fukuyama’s democracies are in the throes of the economic crisis while the countries he does not like are not suffering powerlessly from it? This kind of unfair and undemocratic global political economic order is criticized not only by numerous progressive non-government members and organizations such as the World Social Forum, but also by financial experts like George Soros and neo-Keynesians like Joseph Eugene Stiglitz.

So, it has thus long been proved by historical practice that “we are not supposed to have unrealistic expectations of democracy that actually plays a limited role in development” (Fang 2010, 10). Through analyzing the China model in the third part, we will make more criticism of Fukuyama’s view that Western style democracy is the “end of history.”

2. Who is threatening global stability?

Insisting on Western standards and seeing things from the perspective of Western democracy, Fukuyama draws a conclusion under a narrow framework that Russia and China are authoritarian regimes. What’s more, citing opinions from foreign policy analyst Walter Russell Mead, Fukuyama (2014a) holds that Russia and China, two undemocratic authoritarian regimes situated at the points of Europe and Asia, are threatening global stability. It is a reversal of right and wrong that what threatens world peace is not America but developing countries led by China who actually help preserve world stability.

2.1. The cause of instability in East Asia is not China but the United States and Japan

On December 11, 2001, China finished its 15-year uphill negotiation struggles, managing to become the 143rd member of WTO. Under the guise of trade liberalization, the WTO set lots of restrictive industry policies against developing countries. Large as China’s concessions were, China achieved success under the harsh terms that were set against its development. It took no more than 20 years for China to become the world’s second largest economy and the largest exporting country with a large number of Chinese
enterprises establishing branches overseas. Such success went far beyond the expectations of foreign countries.

Obviously, the restrictive policies of WTO did not hinder China’s development as much as expected. Today, facing China’s rise in international position, some Western countries adopt various restrictive policies and measures such as the following examples to contain China.

On June 21, 2013, the signing in Shanghai of the Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA), that is the Cross-Strait Service Trade Agreement, by the Association for Relations across the Taiwan Straits was opposed by opposition parties led by the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), which tried to twist the agreement and spread rumors through various channels. On March 18, 2014, hundreds of Taiwan university students, led by Taiwan DPP members, broke through the security line without warning, broke into the Taiwan Legislature, and shouted anti-ECFA slogans. It surprised Taiwan society more when on the evening of March 23, students broke into the administrative council of Taiwan, calling on the government to withdraw from the ECFA. This incident in which Taiwan students and the DPP were manipulated and misguided by the United States is part of the US plot to restrict China (see Zhong 2015).

Besides hampering trade between China’s mainland and the Taiwan region, the United States, together with some other countries, has attempted to impose trade barriers against China, such as the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP) and other trade deals.

The free trade concept dreamt up by the United States that restricts China in domestic and international affairs under the guise of liberty is part of the US economic strategy. With China overtaking the United States and its rise to become the world’s biggest trading nation, the dominance of US dollars will be brought to an end by the RMB, which will become the biggest global settlement currency sooner or later. This will change the power dynamic of the global economy dramatically.

Besides sowing dissension among Asian countries in the field of trade and economics, the United States always incites countries like Japan to take provocative actions against China on territorial issues, damaging the peace and prosperity of East Asia and even the whole continent.

The 2012 dispute over Diaoyu Islands provoked by Japanese politicians has deep economic reasons. Statistics show that the Japanese government’s financial debts had increased up to 1,008.60 trillion yen by the end of June 2013, which is more than twice Japan’s GDP. It means that the average debt per person in Japan, a country of 130 million people, amounts to over 7 million yen. What’s worse, there are other serious problems confronting Japan, including a restricted domestic market, deficit of resources, and an aging population. It is reasonable to say that Japan’s economy has been in the doldrums for more than 20 years since the end of the boom of the 1980s. In line with Japan, the gloomy US economic situation has not significantly improved since the financial crisis of 2007, so the United States attempts to plunder other nations’ wealth such as Japan’s to overcome the financial crisis, as the Plaza Accord between the United States and Japan did during the 1980s: “The financial wars launched for plundering other nations’ wealth are one of the features characterizing international monopoly capitalism” (Cheng and Yang 2014,

---

110). In face of domestic and foreign pressures, some short-sighted Japanese and American politicians provoke disputes over Diaoyu Islands and the South China Sea, to restrict China’s peaceful rise, and to blame China for their own domestic financial, political and economic failures.

It will benefit the United States if there are disputes between China and Japan as its two biggest creditors in the world. It is a long-term US policy toward East Asia as well as the so-called Asia-Pacific pivot to undermine the integration of East Asia and provoke conflicts in the region. Actually, as early as in 2002, leaders of China, Japan and South Korea agreed to launch relevant non-governmental academic research about the FTA (Free Trade Zone). In 2010, decisions were made to initiate substantial negotiations among the three countries. However, due to the disputes over the Liancourt Islands between Japan and South Korea and over Diaoyu Islands between Japan and China, negotiations about a free trade zone between the three countries broke down. Through reflections on this piece of history, the US attempt to construct an oriental Yalta system stands out: “The process of integrating East Asia has always been blocked by the US hegemony” (Cheng and Zhang 2014, 27). Were it not for this imperialistic interference, the integration of East Asia would have been realized some time earlier.

At the moment, under the hypocritical influence of the United States, East Asia has been thrown into a dangerous situation. During the APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) conference launched in Beijing, November 9, 2014, the president of the People’s Republic of China Xi Jinping gave an address entitled “Seek Sustained Development and Fulfill the Asia-Pacific Dream” that proposed to maintain prosperity, stability and progress in the Asian-Pacific region (Xi 2014a). This speech could be seen as the most powerful defense of China against some of the charges made by scholars like Fukuyama that China has been threatening the stability of Asia.

2.2. The cause of Europe’s instability is not Russia but the United States

Europe, on the other side of the world, is also confronted with instability. After the end of the Cold War, the United States realized its ambition to become the undisputed hegemon of the world. However, during the Cold War, while the United States benefited from the Cold War for as long as almost 20 years, China and Germany, two great countries, were growing rapidly. Up to today, China has risen to the world’s second largest economy, and Germany has reunited, integrating the European continent once again. As a result, the United States, sticking to Cold War thinking and unwilling to lose its power as the global hegemon, considers China and Germany as the biggest threats to its position in the world. That is to say, as far as the US strategists are concerned, Russia is not the real enemy. The long-term strategy of the United States is to restrict China and split Europe, with the Kosovo War being most powerful evidence of US determination to contain the euro so as to maintain the US dollar’s position as the world hegemon (see Min 1999). Taking advantage of the eastward expansion of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), the United States has provoked direct conflicts between Russia and Europe and poured oil over the flames of the Ukraine crisis in an attempt to weaken the EU (European Union). After the disintegration of the USSR, not until the twenty-first century has Russia recovered some of its national status by virtue of increased global oil prices and abundant domestic natural resources. Competitive as Russia is in its
nuclear power for self-defense, it is relatively weak if compared with America and the rest of the Western world economically. Thus, Fukuyama is actually speaking utter falsehoods when he claims that “Russia is a menacing electoral authoritarian regime fueled by petrodollars, seeking to bully its neighbors and take back territories lost when the Soviet Union dissolved in 1991” (Fukuyama 2014a). By contrast, what has actually happened is that Russia has been encircled by America’s missile system and repeated uprisings launched to disturb regional stability. During the recent incidents of Ukraine, Russia has had no choice but to take defensive actions against the US support of anti-governmental power’s illegal subversion of the presidential election in Ukraine.

2.3. Where there are benefits for America, there are conflicts for the rest of the world

War, in the eyes of Western capitalist countries, is of strategic significance for raking in large benefits and dispensing with economic crisis. The Iraq War, Afghanistan War, and Libyan War are all launched for the sake of Western monopoly capitals’ fight for global resources. According to Fukuyama, the Iraq War launched in 2003 by the United States brought about democracy and a market economy, and overthrew Saddam’s dictatorship in Iraq. If Fukuyama was correct then the words of numerous US presidents about the economic benefits of Western style democracy shouldn’t be at odds with other nations’ experiences. However, anyone with the slightest political knowledge understands that it is in the interests of the United States to launch wars or provoke regional conflicts, such as the US interference in the Libyan civil war against the Gaddafi government under the guise of helping the Libyan people.

Directly or indirectly, politics is at the service of the economy. As early as the 1970s, the then Secretary of State Kissinger stressed the importance of oil in the US foreign strategy. The evolutionary course of historical events shows that the United States has always dedicated itself to controlling oil.

From Kabul to Bagdad, from Darfur to Cairo and Tripoli, the wars under US manipulation are increasing in number with overwhelming public opinion. People are informed that wars are launched for democracy and freedom’s sake, but the truth is that the United States intends to control petrol oil resources as it is the most important commodity in the world. Where they know there is oil, they fight for it. (Engdahl 2011, 4; translated from Chinese)

Oil price manipulation guarantees the value of US dollars that serve as the core of the US interests and the cornerstone of the US hegemonic control over the world. The US government will do anything at any cost to defend its hegemony. For example, one of the reasons for the Iraq War was Saddam’s proposal that the euro take the place of US dollars as the settlement currency for oil. In line with what America has done to Saddam is its cracking down on Gaddafi, who not only opposed US dollars as the settlement currency of oil, but also tried to establish a new currency system in Africa and the Middle East. In 2014, oil prices experienced a decline that was manipulated by the United States to restrict Russia’s political and military action in Ukraine. What surprises us more is Fukuyama’s indifference and coldness toward social dislocation and the heavy casualties of the innocent during the Iraq War and Cairo clash, which, ironically, is seen as thrilling revolutionary days in Fukuyama’s eyes.
3. Is the China model a negation of the “end of history”?

3.1. The China model as a negation of the “end of history”

Fukuyama thinks that “in the realm of ideas, moreover, liberal democracy still doesn’t have any real competitors. . . . The only system out there that would appear to be at all competitive with liberal democracy is the so-called ‘China model’” (Fukuyama 2014a). What’s more, in Fukuyama’s opinion, the China model is not sustainable. We have analyzed Western style democracy and exposed its hypocrisy. We draw the conclusion that the significance of the socialist democratic model of China should be looked at in the light of the deep crisis affecting the Western world at the moment due to their structurally unsound socioeconomic models.

After the collapse of the USSR and Warsaw Pact, under pressure from Western imperialism, China has unswervingly blazed a path of development with Chinese characteristics, releasing the productive forces, improving people’s standard of living and advancing the great cause of socialism in China with great success. The China model keeps to the path of political development under socialism with Chinese characteristics, and integrates the leadership of the Party, the position of the people as masters of the country, and the rule of law. Meanwhile, it upholds and improves the system of people’s congresses, the system of multi-party cooperation and political consultation under the leadership of the CPC (Communist Party of China), the system of regional ethnic autonomy, and the system of grassroots autonomy. It is reasonable to say that a series of innovations of the China model is not only necessary for dealing with the relationship between economic development, national solidarity, and social stability, but also serves as a fundamental economic guarantee that upholds the principal position of the people, realizes people’s democracy and resists attempts to impose other democratic models of hypocritical forms such as the Western money-driven democracy. Major systemic innovations involve the basic economic system in which public ownership is dominant with other forms of ownership developing side by side, the basic distribution system whereby distribution according to work remains the predominant mode that coexists with various other modes. According to Martin Hart-Landsberg and Paul Burkett’s “China and Socialism: Introduction” (2004), the rapid development of China indicates that there is an accessible and implementable economic development model in the existing world system dominated by capitalism.

The China model appears as a negation of the “end of history.” As President Xi Jinping notes, shoes do not have to look the same but each pair must fit with the feet of the one who wears them; governance does not have to follow a uniform style but must benefit the people to be governed (Xi 2014b). The one-person-one-vote democracy is not necessarily the synonym for real democracy and it is the actual outcome that determines the fineness of any form of democracy. China pursues people’s democracy that ensures the people’s position as masters of the country, thus taking a different path from the West. China’s rapid and stable development in the past few years shows,

China has blazed a democratic path with Chinese characteristics and thus developed the China model of democracy. China’s democratic development and the democracy of the China model, which reflect both the general democratic development of human beings and China’s specific situation and characteristics, are a political guarantee of China’s economic development and progression today. (Fang 2009, 6)
3.2. China’s model is to be perfected

Fukuyama correctly notes that, “China has accumulated huge hidden liabilities by poisoning its soil and air” (Fukuyama 2014a). Considering the problems corresponding to the rapid development of China, we should keep perfecting all the policies concerning economy, politics, culture, society, and eco-environment. Actually, the problems that came with the primitive accumulation of capital in the West were more serious than China’s problems nowadays. Take eco-environment as an example, it is partly some Western countries who are to blame for the environmental destruction of developing countries, including China. It is due to Western countries’ economic policy of neo-imperialism that we cannot solve these complicated problems by simply depending on the so-called advanced Western model. Instead of being blindly pessimistic and underestimating ourselves, we should keep perfecting the China model. Take the perfection of China’s economic model for example, we should transform our way of economic development both abroad and at home under the guidance of the concept of the “new normal.” Up to today, under the wide exertion of economic globalization dominated by Western capitalist countries, our initial task is to transform the mode of export-oriented economic development and improve the degree of autonomy. Only through independently opening up could we get through the dilemma of excessive dependence on foreign assets (Chen 2015, 19). Only through the transformation of the mode of economic development could we rise to the cutting-edge position in industry, improve our economic development quantitatively and qualitatively, break out of Western countries’ financial hegemony and monopoly on intellectual property, finally lay solid foundations for realizing people’s democracy and national rejuvenation, and respond to Western scholars’ suspicion with facts. That is to say, it is a matter of practice rather than theory to see whether or not the China model will outperform the European-American one. We agree with Fukuyama in that “when observing broad historical trends, it is important not to get carried away by short-term developments” (Fukuyama 2014a). It is important and it is a fact. But we should see China’s development from a long-term perspective. Let history speak for itself on the question of whether the China model will continue to thrive in 50 years, and whether China’s political development will resemble Europe and America more or less in the future.

4. Conclusion

The significance of the analysis and comments on “At the ‘End of History’ Still Stands Democracy” goes beyond the article itself. Since China’s reform and opening up, some Western scholars—by taking advantage of China’s mistakes that arose with economic development, depending on the powerful “cultural strength” of the West, and propagating fallacies like neoliberalism, the “end of history,” and constitutional government—have tried to undermine China’s culture, manipulate the nation’s will, draw Chinese people away from their belief in socialism and denounce what China has achieved in the past 60 years since the establishment of the People’s Republic of China. Due to a lack of confidence and awareness for the Chinese developmental path, system and theory, some Chinese scholars have been led astray by Western academic colonialism in the social sciences in China. We should thoroughly study and apply what President Xi Jinping
has said in his speeches about Western constitutional government, democracy and the China model, so that we understand the historical trend of democracy and the manner of global historical development.
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