

Integration Effect of Liberalism in Changing Regimes of America

NAKATANI Yoshikazu*

1. Introduction: genius of liberalism

The term of liberalism is a common word and has been regarded as an original concept from the foundation of America. But it is difficult to find it in the works of politicians and political thought in America until the era of Progressivism, because the concept of “liberal” was a vacillating notion in American values, although idea of “self-interest” was shared among white-male upper classes¹⁾. Its main causes arise from the fact that capitalism was not a dominant (re)production system in the founding time of the federal state. But now, liberalism is popularly used as a concept to identify the political regime, and pluralism is used as metonym of liberalism in recognition that American society is based on a diversity of values rather than uniformity or monism of them²⁾.

America is a typical capitalist state, and capitalism cannot enjoy an autonomy without a correlation with other ideology. It needs some correlative ideology to work as a capitalistic (re)production system. In this respect, capitalism and liberalism have an interrelated connection, although the latter is just latent in the beginning of capitalism, and capitalism has walked afterwards a meandering long journey with the latter until liberalism was settled down as a “legitimation discourse” for the capitalistic regime. Putting in other words, relation of both is symbiotic and has co-evolved in a correlation each other. Therefore, transformation of capitalism necessitates an alteration of liberalism. It means that liberalism is a conservative ideology to defend the capitalistic relations in the capitalist state.

There are plenty of political works on conservatism behind us. Many of them regard it to be a complex syndrome of psychological and political elements. As for the subject of conservatism, Karl Mannheim (1893-1947), one of “Knowledge Society” school, advocates its universal psychic inclination towards traditionalism which respects the preserved custom in a refusal of abstract reasoning. On the other hand, Edmund Burke (1729-97) has been

* Professor Emeritus of Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, Japan.

1) M. Kazin, ed., *The Concise Princeton Encyclopedia of American Political History*, Princeton University Press, 2011: 329.

2) John G. Gunnell, “Louis Hartz and the Liberal Metaphor, A Half Century Later,” *Studies in American Political Development* 19, Fall 2005: 196-205, at 202.

commonly regarded as a representative root of conservatism, because he repulses the French Revolution in an emphasis on the custom and tradition of political orders. But he should not be considered as a reactionary conservative, given the historical process of revolution and anti-revolution which terminated in the Third Republic. His fear of disorder arises from a social savagery induced by a cunning of reason. Although he is assumed to be a conservative based on traditional values and inherited institutions, he is not a retrospective reactionary, but should be regarded as an adherent of gradual progressive reform in history.

Although connotation of liberalism looks to be comprehensible, its expression assumes a multi-faceted and polysemic face in history according to the political movements and an ethno-cultural particularity of each country. This is illustrated by an appearance of liberalism in individualism, nostalgic reactionism, a variety of unprincipled utopianisms and a reformism of the extant regime.

Conservatism is an ideological apparatus to preserve the given social order and has a general propensity to conserve the existing regime. This is a general tendency of conservatism beyond time and space of all countries. Considering conservatism in history of political thinking, it appears as an ideology for conservation of traditional order of society. It may even contain a reactionary movement against a reform in favor of accustomed practice and abhorrence of change in the working of psyche. Conservatism has, in nature, a propensity to preserve the ongoing order of society. But transformation of social relations demands an alteration of prevalent ideology. Variegation of conservatism owes to a counter ideology toward progress in history. Chameleonic countenance of conservatism appears as a counter-tendency in the process of progressive tendency. In addition, idea and movement of reformism is multifold according to a time-space specialty of each country.

On the other, liberalism arises as a dominant ideology in opposition to a vassalage system of feudalism. Belief system of paternalistic feudalism was forced to change another one apt to a capitalistic production. Liberalism has a most strong valence in its relevancy to the nature and formation of capitalist society. Liberalism arised as an inevitable bulwark for the formation and conservation of the capitalist society and for fabrication of the state apparatus. In this context, conservation of liberalism is essential for maintenance and development of the capitalistic society. But ingredients of liberalism need to be transformed according to the changing conditions of capitalism. Put differently, development of capitalism interrogates a foregoing dominant model in an “ideology effect”. This means that liberalism can keep its applicability so long as it works as a conservative ideological apparatus of the capitalist society. In these presumptions, it is necessary to explore the changing nature of liberalism as a conservative ideology from the relational point of view.

Relational view of the social structure in political science is a frame of reference in which society and state is analyzed in an interpersonal relation and an inter-relational point of view. In this approach, the state should be not understood as a political instrument or

constitutional apparatus to rule the given people, but as a relational totality in a territory, and government should be regarded as an agency or instrument to give an order to the inhabitants of the state. Ideology is a reflection in thinking of the dominant socio-economic relations and contains a moral discipline. It also works as the driving force to make a development of the socio-economic relations through the political power. Then, variants of liberalism should be analyzed in relation to their coexistence and coevolution with transformation of the capitalist state.

2. Genealogy and Odyssey of Liberalism

Sociological recognition of “individual” induces an ascertainment of its existence in society. In this reference, individual appears as a subject (nucleus) of society, and social formation of people is consequently understood as a totality composed of interpersonal relations. Society is, therefore, recognized to be a product of artificial contrivance, and political apparatus is perceived as a device involving a coercive power whose legitimacy should be founded on an accordance of individual subject. Government is a political apparatus whose power is delegated by the sovereign people and its power is, therefore, limited by the Constitution. Then, government is an artifice designed by a sense of purpose. This is the first principle of political liberalism.

The secondary element of liberalism is based on the principle of property rights. This principle has a close connection with an assumption of possessive instinct of individual. It emerges from a biological recognition of human nature which inevitably needs some space and foodstuff for living. Natural possessivism is transfigured into a concept of property by law, and living conditions are maintained in the socio-economic relations complemented by some political apparatus.

Capitalist society is a compound system based on an ideal of political and economic liberalism, and this society appears as an “acquisitive society” seeking for profit. Rule of “cost-benefit” calculation is nothing but a rational behavior of capitalism. Moreover, reproduction of labor force is produced by a labor employment, and transaction of economic subject is apparently intermediated through the free contract between the concerned who are substantially subsumed in these relations. Consequently, concept of possession is inverted into the concept of property by a legal-political apparatus to enforce the order of capitalist society, and government is regarded as a political instrument for these rights. Modern liberalism is mainly based on two propositions above. Capitalism has an adjoining connection with liberalism and cannot have a relational entity without the latter. Capitalism, in addition, is a system of pursuit for a private profit, whether by a living person or law person. Therefore, the characteristic ideology of capitalistic society is possessive individualism as C. B. Macpherson (1911-87) aptly elucidates. Capitalism, therefore, emerges as a socio-economic interpersonal relations based on “possessive

individualism”³⁾.

Liberalism arises at the period of conjunction of Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution, and the political revolution of 17th and 18th centuries. Its substantial creed is, in general, based on the principle of economic liberty to protect an individual property right in supposition that society has a relative autonomy from political regulation. The political contrivance is consequently limited, considering experience of despotism and conviction that self-development of socio-economic dynamics presuppose a relative separation between politics and economics. Capitalism rests on this dynamism of interpersonal relation based on a desire to expand economic actions for profits. The fundamental principle of American constitutionalism also derives from these doctrines.

General trends of analysis of American political thought have depended on the hypothesis that American political formation as a nation is a prototype of liberal democratic society. Its configuration is assumed to be free and equal, and democratic ideals have been prevalent throughout history. This proposition is based on a recognition that America has not a tradition of feudalism, so that there has not arisen anti-liberalism including reactionary ideal and socialist movement⁴⁾. This assumption is a proposition of liberal consensus in which liberalism has proceeded along the exclusive trajectory in history.

But liberalism certainly follows a meandering trajectory in response to a changing contour of the socio-economic conditions, because transformation of society necessitates to reform the idea of liberalism. Putting other words, as far as liberalism is a quintessential and indispensable ideology of capitalism, it is incessantly in need to be legitimated by variants of liberalism adaptable to a changing nature of capitalism, because contradictions inherent in capitalism leads to some struggles inspired by social forces in the given socio-economic formation.

<double-edged attributes> Liberalism has been certainly kept in a spiritual substratum as a sort of mythology of the nation. Founding of this federal state is based on a “Ideal Republic” in accordance with an ideology of classical liberalism, and this creed becomes a spiritual bandage of the nation. “Exceptionalism” is an expression of *raison d’être* of its existence in the world.

Some sort of legitimation discourse is in need for a national existence of any country. Legitimation discourse of America is a liberalism whose ideological functions have a double-edged work towards American integration: It serves to integrate the socio-economic relations and to make a foreign policy. Exceptionalism is a mythology of traditional folklore based on a creed of liberalism. This mentality assumes two faces in “ideology effect”. One

3) C. B. Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke*, Oxford University, 1964.

4) A representative model of this sort of liberal tradition is presented in Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution*, Harcourt Brace & World, 1955.

is isolationism in defense of an identified self-image and another an expansionism in the sense of its superiority over other countries. This means that liberalism appears in these two faces in history. Moreover, political liberalism contains two sided propensities. One is to conserve the extant dominant order, and another to encourage a reformation of inherited orders in contradiction.

Liberalism works as a conservative ideology in sense that it might force the given socio-economic conditions to be conserved as *raison d' être*, but in a variegated “legitimation discourse”. Liberalism not only appears in the terms of social liberal and neoliberal styled-conservatism, but also the lefts have used the term, because they recognize its potential power to reform the socio-economic relations in connotations of liberalism. History of transformation in capitalism inevitably goes in company with a metamorphosis of its liberal garb. In addition, it also induces the development of democracy, because liberalism involves a liberation from socio-economic restraints.

Liberalism is an axis of social formation and a fundamental element of American nationalism. Considering that it was compelled to revise liberalism at the critical juncture in history, its application requires incessantly to infer its significance from a unity in contradiction. Liberalism and capitalism are separable in concept, but capitalist society is based on a congregation of both, and capitalist society is fabricated through a formal contract among free individuals. Although such contract theory is just a fictitious idea, it has a potent influence on the concept of liberalism.

Negative view of government of classical liberalism is based on a unity of dichotomous veins of society and government. But concept of freedom of classical liberalism is unavoidably subject to a contradiction in the development of capitalism, for economic functions of capitalism create a growth of division of labor and brought about a contradiction of the ongoing production relations. These situations necessitate to change the production form into an adaptable one to the given conditions. This means that a self-propelling mechanism of capitalism may disfunction at the conjuncture of a tendency and counter-tendency in history. In addition, an uneven distribution of wealth incites a reform of the ongoing economic mechanism by an appeal to universal suffrage. These incidents were widespread in the developed capitalist countries at the end of 19 century. Transformation of positive liberalism from negative one happens in this circumstance. Next section is an outline of variants of liberalism in American political thought in history.

3. American Liberalism and Its Conservative Effects

(i) Prototype

“Declaration of Independence” (1776) manifests an independence from the United Kingdom after it enumerates many historical oppressions by it, and makes it clear that “Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness” is endowed by Creator as unalienable rights. The

essence of it is basically succeeded in the Constitution of the United States (1787). These two documents concerning the founding of nation shows the underlining principle of capitalistic formation of society which derives from a classical ideal of liberalism. In other words, these documents demonstrate universalism in sense that all should be treated equal before law.

Although liberalism is an undercurrent ideology of American body politics, it also invites a tendency and counter-tendency in thinking. It means that a compromise among different ruling class and geographic section conjures a conflict in some juncture of history. <“**Concurrent Majority**”> As for the framework of the federal government, the Constitution provides that political power is delegated by the people and is divided into three departments according to the function of government. In addition, Art 10 of the first amendments prescribes the reserved power of each state in terms of its equality. Therefore, national integration is founded on liberal constitutionalism and federal system by a compromise among ruling groups including planters.

John C. Calhoun (1782-1850) has been estimated to be a man of philosophical genius and was regarded as a “Marx of ruling class” by reason that he believed inevitability of class struggle in history⁵⁾. But his basic political thought is, in essence, founded on the principle of founding fathers rather than a deviation from it. In this historical view, he also defends the slavery of the South. This means that American liberalism appeared as a reactionary conservatism on the eve of critical time which directly linked to the Civil War. This is discernible in the theory of Calhoun who was a representative advocate of antebellum South.

Political theory of Calhoun is epitomized in his unique doctrine of “current or concurring majority” which is a device to induce an accordance among the concerned interests. It derives from the theory of concurrence among minority interests against tyranny of majority rule. According to his awareness, government is a positive power which is legitimized by the majority rule and aggrandized by *the ultra vires* or implied powers theory. It is assumed that majority rule is just a sort of fictitious theory based on representative democracy, because dynamic of politics involves a hegemonic function of capitalist society.

Calhoun’s main works are *A Disquisition on Government* (1851) and *A Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United State* (1851), and both were published posthumously. In the former, he articulates of his political philosophy, sharing a view of human nature with T. Hobbes. In *A Disquisition* he epitomizes the theory of “concurrent majority” which is presented as a theory against a simple numerical majority in decision-making. In the latter, he characteristically proposed a dual executive at the head of federal

5) R. Hofstadter, *The American Political Tradition and the Men who made it*, 1957. As for the contribution of Hofstadter to American political tradition, next is suggestive. David S. Brown, *Richard Hofstadter*, University of Chicago Press, 2006.

government to represent the interests of two great sections of North and South. According to the theory of “current majority”, legitimacy of inclusive law-making is an indispensable prerequisite to an agreement through veto power of all participants. Practical application of his theory arises from an intention to induce a compromise between North and South in an apprehension of impending war between both. Furthermore, he called attention to requirement of political alliance between planters and industrial capitalists in his fear of inevitable rise of workers in near future and the rise of autocracy by them in principle of majority rule.

His theory of “concurrent majority” genealogically belongs to the ideas introduced by founding fathers, because federalists are absorbed to contrive a limited government by “check and balance” modeled after Newtonian mechanics as well as a federal-typed compromise among the extant states according to the principle of a balancing equilibrium model. The theory of “concurrent majority” reflects a situation of “hopeless minority” of the antebellum South, it is also a conservative reasoning based on the pluralistic body politics among dominant interests and sections. Its purpose is to make a contrivance to integrate the union by means of a compromise among hegemonic groups who was ruling in a different section. This means that a concocted contrivance among different ruling classes was destined to break down in some critical situation of history. Additionally, his theory was complemented by sovereignty of the state in his recognition of confederacy. Although state sovereign theory disappears from the controversy about the federal body politics of the United States, its remnant is the concept of “state rights” as an appeal against the centralization of federal government.

Although Calhoun tries to avoid the war between North and South in accordance with a political framework of founding fathers, his tragic flaw owes to a defense of southern slavery and to his misread of hegemonic power of industrialization in a period of capitalistic reconstruction in American history. But presumably it is not difficult to find a resemblance between the theory of “interest group liberalism” and his “concurrent majority”.

(ii) Conservative Effects of Liberalism in Transition of Society

It is necessary for the capitalist state to keep a certain degree of stable reproduction system supported by government and people. America stood at the socio-economic turning point from the end of 19th to the beginning of 20th century in a rapid industrialization and urbanization. It was a critical phase for a political unity of America under a social anomie. This phase of turning point of history was an initial stage of functional differentiation in the structural transformation of society. America changed its figure into a politico-economical reformation. The transmutation of socio-economic relations necessitates a transformation of governmental apparatus as well as a traditional ideology without a fundamental rupture of the pivotal social system. There emerges an interventionist liberalism in these circumstances. This is a conservative response to the situation by a modification of liberal

concept from classical one. America succeeded in transformation of its body politics by a revision of liberalism.

Era of Progressivism (1890-1920) was a structural transformation of socio-economic relations. Many Americans believed that existing institutions could no longer function well in the rapid industrialization and ethno-cultural diversification caused by immigrants from East Europe and Asia. The immigrants who have a particular ethno-culture brought about another diversification alongside of multidimensional articulation of the social relations by industrialization.

The structural change is inferable from comments by Frederic T. Turner (1861-1932), a famous introducer for his “Frontier Thesis”. He pointed out that America was under a rapid process of reconstruction of nation⁶⁾. In addition, Charles E. Merriam (1874-1953), political scientist, notes that “Unquestionably the most significant features of the period were the gradual tendency toward concentration of political and economic institutions, and toward the socialization of the state”⁷⁾. Given these remarks above, America was under pressure to reconstruct the socio-economic relations into the formation adaptable to their changing structure. Interventionism was a positive project in sense that it originated from the need of revisionism. It is concomitantly necessary to ameliorate an idea of classical liberal doctrine without losing its essence. Reform liberalism (or “new liberalism” in English counterpart) began to assume a new form in response to these conditions in purpose to integrate social forces without losing the capitalist system.

Merriam also depicted the changing feature of the era of Progressivism in next passage that “Conception of liberty, justice, democracy was to a large extent interpreted in terms of the nation, rather than of the state or the city or the rural local government.”⁸⁾ From his remarks, it is discernible that reinterpretation of liberty based on liberal democracy was in need to be accelerated in a national scale.

The industrial structure was in the process of economic revolution in which railway networks were expanding nationally by a change of power-driven energy from coal to oil. These nationalizations of capitalistic (re)production system together with socio-economic relations radically reformed the formation of American society, and as illustrated in Spanish-American War (1898), America began to spread its internal expansionism to international relations as a “sea power”. Federal government was obliged to response to these historical changes by its internal reform, and international expansionism was justified by the logic of creation of a more efficient business world.

<Tendencies in politics> The phase of transformation of socio-economic relations

6) Frederic J. Turner, “Social Forces in American History,” *The American Historical Review*, 41 (2), 1911: 217.

7) Charles E. Merriam, *American Political Ideas: Studies in the Development of American Political Thought, 1865-1917*, Macmillan Company, 1920: 450.

8) Charles E. Merriam, *Ibid.*, p.457.

involves a social tension which awakens a sense of a gregarious group consciousness in a shared interest. The proclivity to make some group is unavoidable in human nature of social being, especially in a pluralistic society of America. Its characteristic appearance owes to a collaborative social composition and leads to the formation of “interest group” which is a trade association among the same interest. This remarkable incident happened distinctively during the Progressive era as called an “eruption of interest groups”. It was caused by a further division of labor and the industrialization. Changing society during the Progressive era has been imaged by “group” rather than atomistic individual. In these historical transformations, American socio-economic structure changed its individual self-employed configuration into the corporate one.

Federal government was in need to reform the executive organization under the pressure of interest group, and the awareness that individual is incorporated into some group began to be a general recognition. Concomitantly, it was necessary to ameliorate a configuration of traditional ideology. Interest group liberalism and interventionist liberalism happened to appear as a new liberalism of the pluralistic society.

Theory of interest group in political science is representatively *The Process of Government* (1908), which is written by A. F. Bentley (1870-1957). He epitomizes the political process as a dynamic equilibrium in which politics arises as a process among interest groups with a particular purpose in a pluralistic society, and the government is depicted to be a product of incessant compromise under the social pressure. This explanation represents an image of pluralism in which society is recognized as an articulation of multidimensionally diversified socio-economic relations. Process of government is also presented as a restless dynamic movement for equilibrium under the democratic social pressures. These lineaments not only show a synoptic model of an associational American society and realities of the governmental process, but also work as a functional effect of interchangeability between liberalism and interest group liberalism in political science. Interest group liberalism assumed a legitimation discourse and began to use as an alternative to a popular discourse of liberal democracy. Paradigm of interest group liberalism in Bentley was succeeded to *The Governmental Process* (1951) written by D. B. Truman (1913-2003).

Then, the concept of liberalism in the era of Progressivism is not a radical change of ideology, but just a conservative one in its reformed character. Putting differently, continuity of liberal socio-political system was kept in a complemented form by a reformed liberalism, and liberalism was regarded equivalent to pluralism. Interchangeability of both have increased in the process of the New Deal, and concept of liberal pluralism has been used as an identification against totalitarianism of socialism. But the theory of interest group politics has been afterwards criticized just as a power-elite model or a group-congressional complex paradigm from the managerial and the class perspectives.

Time from Progressivism to the New Deal is called “the Age of Reform.” Period of

Progressivism is the first stage of it. In this stage, there conspicuously emerged an awakening of nationalism and a positive intervention theory by executive power under the structural change of society in the national scale.

Nationalism based on democracy was representatively awakened by H. Croly (1869-1930) in his *The Promise of American Life* (1909) and a journal of *New Republic* edited by him and others. These recommendations had a deep influence on “New Nationalism” which was a campaign slogan of Theodore Roosevelt. Concretizing anxieties of the time, Croly asserted a new nationalism to master the drift of disorder of his time. He also insisted that nationalism was in need to be awakened by a progressive democracy in a changing world.

Trends toward the executive state appear in science of public management theory in the works of Goodnow and Wilson. F. G. Goodnow (1859-1939) is famous for a founder of public management by division between the formations of state will and execution of it and advocates the efficiency of the latter in reformation of its apparatus. W. W. Wilson (1856-1924) also advocated to improve the efficacy and rationalization of public management in an analogy of private organizations and accorded positively the introduction of merit system as a substitute for spoils system. Merit system was adopted in Pendleton Act (Federal Civil Service Act, 1883).

<New Deal of liberalism> The era of progressivism ended after the entry of World War I, and war time hysteria brought about the concept of “100 percent American”. Progressivism was succeeded to the prosperity of 1920s under Taylor system and Fordism. Trends of government regulation during the Progressive era began to be institutionalized into American politics, and looking backward, reform liberalism in the Progressive era was a turning point of liberalism in the American political ideology under the changing structure of American capitalism.

The second stage of reform liberalism is the New Deal. Its aim is symbolized in a slogan of “Relief, Reform, Recovery” during the Great Depression. Its main purpose was based on a recovery and reconstruction of American capitalist system. The program, also, includes welfare policy called the Second Bill of Rights.

Policies to relieve from the Great Depression and to recover the capitalistic system necessitate an intervention by the federal government against a defy and a negative approval made by big business at the beginning. This policy was gradually approved among business circle, and it includes employment for the unemployed. In such hard conditions of socio-economic relations, liberalism changed its figure and interventionism by government was accepted positively, because governmental policies were extended to enlargement of welfare and improvement of infrastructure for a motive power of capitalist economy. Given trends above, discourse of liberalism had to transform itself in the conservation of capitalism. Putting differently, although liberalism is an undercurrent in American ideology which is an essential element for the function of capitalism, its attribute is forced to change the configuration of the socio-economic relations in a changing condition of capitalism. It

means that response and resolution to the eruption of contradictions in capitalistic production was, even if a temporary measure, a *sine qua non* for continuation of capitalism, and that it is necessary to conserve a capitalistic liberalism as a dominant ideology, as is discernible in an introduction of the New Deal liberalism and Keynesian fiscal policy.

4. Trends of Neo-liberalism

After the World War II, American political economy enjoyed an immense prosperity for about 25 years, and Fair Deal was a new version of the New Deal. This belle époque was supported by a built-in structure of Fordism-Taylorism typed (re)production system which was coupled with mass consumption under international monetary system. Under the cold-war liberalism and economic prosperity, there appeared a consensus school which subsume American history under one-dimensional portrait of liberalism. But American economy experienced a stagflation in the 1970s, and a neo-liberalism emerged as a counter ideology to a reform liberalism in politics and economics under the background of “legitimation crisis” whose cause was attributed to the “overloaded government”.

One of the dominant attributes of neoliberalism is a counter discourse to the welfare liberalism. Its project is a political secularization of capitalistic spirit to transform the welfare regime in principle of capitalistic fundamentalism. This “state project” emerged as a contrivance to extend a market frontier by a reconstruction of socio-economic relations in the principle of market fundamentalism. Therefore, it was necessary to reinforce the deregulation of socio-economic relations through the political regulation. Consequently, disparity of income enlarged in the conditions of a decreasing ratio of organized labor.

Diffusion of neo-liberalism provoked a populist movement in anxiety and irritation among the people, especially among the middle or lower classes in the declining districts of Middle West. This phenomenon is called to be a “global syndrome” induced by the globalized economy. Neo-populism is closely related with neo-liberalism, for these classes expect a “trickledown effect” by the neo-liberal economic policies. But they felt a strong irritation caused by alienation from expectation. Such irritation is discernible in an appeal of “Make America Great Again” in connection with exclusive nationalism. This appeal especially invokes an affinity to the inhabitants of declining districts in industry.

Populism is unavoidable in a transition period, especially in a representative democracy. Its contemporary form has a complex of two faces in its political propensity. While a sense of impending economic crisis awakens a market fundamentalism. On the other, it appeared as a counter-ideology to welfare liberalism, for example, in a rebuff of welfare to refugees.

Populism entails generally a reformistic physiognomy, because it assumes a countenance of movement from below in politics. But it does not necessarily mean to be progressive, because it may appear as a counter movement under the guise of reformism.

Direction of contemporary populism (Neo-Populism) is to conserve the interests of white middle and lower classes caused by anxiety or dysphoria among them, and it can act in concert with neo-conservatism. Additionally, a discourse to defend national interest has a strong affinity, so long as some alternative does not seem to be relevant. In this respect, neo-populism during the 1990s and the first decade of the twenty-first century was caused by a fear of the globalization in economy and society like an agrarian populism at the turning time towards the former century. We are in a transitional period toward a realignment of the world. It is certainly discernible in the crisis tendencies of the international relations, especially in the war of Middle East and East Europe. Then, we face a need to reconsider the positive aspect of liberalism from the development of democracy in a global public space.

5. Concluding Remark

Liberalism has acquired a valence, although it assumes a multiple connotation since the foundation of American Federal Republic State. Transfiguration of its meaning has been called for in relation with a changing visage of socio-economic relations in capitalism. Variants of its discourse have emerged in a contingent necessity which arises in an alteration of capitalistic socio-economic relations in history. But the spiritual kernel of it has been kept as an angle stone of capitalism.

Capitalist state is a relational entity in each bounded territory, even though intangible. Government is an unavoidable element to keep a cohesiveness of interpersonal relations in the state. In addition, political ideology is an idealistic tenet for an inducement toward a cohesion among the people. From these reasoning above, it is easy to discern a particularity of the American capitalist state, because its political resume is based on a federal republic and on the principle of liberal democracy. In addition, configuration of the Union changed in its expansion of territory and development of capitalism, although in the limit of a “unity in contradiction.” These changing figures have been inscribed in forms and functions of the political apparatus under the pressures of liberal democratic representative system.

Liberalism is an “ideal-type” which is represented in the socio-economic relations and is inscribed in political institutions. In addition, capitalism, at least in the developed capitalist state, necessitates liberalism for its economic functions. Put differently, liberalism is a legitimation discourse for the capitalistic society. It works diachronically and synchronically around capitalist countries as a prevalent phenomenon and is generally a hegemonic ideology for the socio-economic integration in the normal state. Then, the liberal democracy has a double function for integration of the society by the mechanism of representative institutions in politics, and for functions of economic system in the capitalistic (re)product relations. But it has a changeable proclivity as mentioned above.

Liberal democracy is a product of “a unity in contradiction” in sense that national

integration is a complex of political liberation and economic freedom. This means that as a political shell, liberal democracy involves a further development of human capacity or capability in a connotation of emancipation or liberation. The reason is traced back to the fact that its physiognomy was forced to change its features according to the changing relations of capitalistic system, because political liberalism demands to transform the articulation of capitalistic relations. From these remarks, changing form of liberalism in American political thought draws a trajectory along a continuum of belief from political liberalism to economic freedom in capitalism, and integration by liberal capitalism unavoidably accompany with a reform of socio-economic relations. In this respect, globalization has also a great influence, because it demands a close interrelation beyond boundaries.

Liberalism certainly infiltrates into American political thinking. But its appearance has changed in tendency and counter-tendency inherent in the capitalistic socio-economic relations over and again, as is repeatedly set out in this paper. Today, America is supposedly facing another turning point after the collapse of the Soviet Union, rise of China and Global South. These tendencies were brought about by the globalization of political and economic radical changes in international relations. The world supposedly faces a crossroad in history and is in need to response to the present global risk by some vision of global democracy.

Liberalism is a cultural stratum of American society as an element of cohesion of capitalistic socio-economic relations. But it is worth calling that liberalism is also an essential spirit in public philosophy and ideal of democracy. American people is incessantly searching for liberal democratic form in the present and future.

Representative democracy embraces a sort of “dilemma,” because it is a “control” system by means of political “participation”. But participation can induce to confront to the emerging problems, because consciousness of dilemma inspires to solve the problem. It is without saying that the way and method to solve the problem leads to different directions, whether reactionary or progressive. In this respect, the application of “developmental democracy” will be likely to be a pioneering clue for future democratization by expansion of liberal democracy in the internal and external perspective. The concept of liberal democracy is a very significant clue for further theorization of democracy.