



Research Paper

Humanistic Capitalism: An Alternative Ideology for the 21st Century

Bailey Saleh, PhD

Department Of Political Science, University Of Maiduguri

ABSTRACT

Since the advent of modern civilization, man has come up with one form of government or the other to ensure a smooth running and orderly society. The creation of the modern state-structures indeed increases the tempo of the need for a just and orderly society. The imperialist Western Europe transformed feudalism into capitalism that served as a pacesetter in the quest for an ideology-driven system of government. All the tried ideologies from capitalism through socialism up to communism have failed to offer humans with the best system of government that will serve humanism better. It is for these consistent manifest failures that this study is offering humanistic capitalism as a viable alternative ideology for all countries in the 21st Century and beyond. Three theories such as Capitalist and Neo-Liberal Theory, Global Political Economy Theory, and Marxist-Socialist Theory have been clarified that served as frameworks/anchors for the study. The study is an exploratory one where document study was adopted and utilized to generate data. This was done through the scrutiny of secondary materials such as textbooks, journals and internet materials. The data generated was analyzed through discourse method. At the end of the discussion, the study recommended that the United Nations should pass a binding resolution for the adoption of humanistic capitalism by all countries of the world in the 21st Century.

KEY WORDS: Humanistic, Humanism, Capitalism, Socialism, Ideology, Communism, Cybernetics, Neo-Liberal.

Received 28 Jan, 2021; Revised: 10 Feb, 2021; Accepted 12 Feb, 2021 © The author(s) 2021.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. INRODUCRION

Operators of modern governance either as cybernetics (helmsmen) or crude dictators; right from the period of the calibration of a once fused world system into a global geographical state-structures, up to the present era of globalization have been groping in the dark to find a near-perfect system of government that will serve the purpose of man (humanism) better. In all the modern systems we have tried from liberal capitalism to communism, none has actually addressed the problems of man. Rather, each of the European ideologies (liberal capitalism [Western Europe] and Marxist-socialism [Eastern Europe]) and the Chinese ideology of communism have come out to represent the interests of the very few ruling 'Caucasus' through clique-oriented political parties hypocritically claiming to be operating in the interests of the greatest numbers of the society. These failures of past and present ideologies have been so monumental such that only one percent of the total world population controlled the entire global wealth; where the remaining ninety-nine percent are wallowing in poverty and human misery. The economic depression of the 1930s, 1980s and the recent one of 2008 have indicated a huge gap in the economic policies of the above tried but failed ideologies. The backlash of this failure is the resurgence of conflicts and violent crises all over the world as the result of agitations by the greatest numbers of the world population; who have been marginalized, alienated and confined to the fringes of human living/existence. It is for this reason that this study is offering humanistic ideology as an alternative ideology for the 21st Century and beyond (Cox, 1987; Wallerstein, 1989; Saleh, Gambo and Ochibo, 2011, pp.133-146; Saleh, 2016).

II. CONCEPTUAL / THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Concepts of Humanistic, Capitalism and Ideology as well as the Capitalist & Neo-Liberal theory, Global Political Economy Theory, and Marxist-Socialist Theory; have been defined and clarified as frameworks for the study:

HUMANISTIC –

The concept humanistic, which is derived from humanism, refers to a philosophy that extols the good of man as the purpose of all actions; as well as an active concern for his welfare as the central object of policy and ideology. When it is eventually adopted; and sanctioned as an Ideology by governmental frameworks, it will have wider legal application on humans. The central focus of humanistic capitalism is man (humanism); and how the human being can maximally benefit and enjoy from the fruit of his labour (Allen, 1999).

CAPITALISM –

Capitalism is a form of government as well as an ideology that guide the conduct of both the sovereign and the citizens under the social contract. It is an economic system that is driven by market forces; where private ownership and control of the means of production is the general rule. Government intervention and ownership is kept down to a minimum (i.e. limited government). The aim of the capitalist is profit maximization. Under this system, prices of commodities, are determined and settled by the forces of supply and demand. It emphasizes individualism in the ownership of property, whereby individual abilities are exploited to their maximum. Capitalism was a logical consequence of the post-feudal mercantilist Europe, especially the British society, where the renowned Scottish economist Adam Smith laid its philosophical basis. The outstanding work of Smith entitled, *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, published in 1776, provided the needed theoretical impetus and policy framework for the practical realization of his ideal society. He, in fact advocated for a *Laissez Faire* approach for governments towards their economies. That is, a free market economy where the prices of commodities are settled by the laws of supply and demand (Amin, 1974; Saleh, 2016).

IDEOLOGY –

Ideology simply refers to the body of ideas and beliefs, which form the basis for a social, economic or political system. It is the opinions, beliefs and ways of thinking that characterizes a particular person, group of people or a nation. It is an abstract or visionary speculation. The ancient definition of ideology simply means science of ideas as drawn largely from the position of a French ideologue/philosopher – Antoine Louis Claude Destutt De-Tracy that coined it during the French Revolution. Ideology is an inter-play of ideas, belief systems and opinions between the dominant class in the society and those that seek to displace them. All types of governments (ranging from the best of democracies to the crudest form of despotism), have some forms of animating ideologies (Allen, 1999). Rodee et-al (1976); defines ideology as the values or principles that those who exercise or seek political power refer and allude to, in order to lend legitimacy to their actions. The definition of the term Ideology offered by Reo M. Christenson and his colleagues which preceded those of Rodee and his colleagues, was more comprehensive where they viewed it as the belief system that explains and justifies a preferred political order for the society either existing or proposed, and offer strategy for its attainment. It includes a set of basic assumptions, both normative and empirical, about the nature and purpose of man and society (Christenson et-al, 1972). Their definition of Ideology is heavily tilted towards the employment of ideas for scientific inquisition into the problems of man and society, with a view of adopting the most appropriate strategy for solving them.

THE CAPITALIST AND NEO-LIBERAL THEORY –

Under the capitalist and neo-liberal approach, the social contract theories of John Locke (1632 - 1704) and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712 - 1778); as well as the theories of St Thomas Aquinas (1225 - 1274), Jeremy Bentham (1748 - 1832) and J. S. Mill (1806 - 1873); all provided sound footings for this study. Bentham and Aquinas were of the views that all laws made by the sovereign should be directed at safeguarding an individual's right to life, right to liberty and right to own property. Bentham further stressed that, to assure the upholding of these rights there must be the formation of a civil society to mitigate the inconveniences of the state of nature. While, for Rousseau, he added that law should come from all equally and apply to all equally. Mill on his part added that government regulation should serve as safeguard against abuse of both individual and majority liberty. Edmund Burke (1729 - 1773), though of the Conservatist creed, advocated that good government should provide liberty and order to its citizen. Scholars of this persuasion upholds that individuals are free to make as much money as they can and the role of government is to serve as an umpire to regulate these relationships.

Feudalism in Europe developed to a stage that it transmuted into imperialism with the central focus of the accumulation of capital. This crude accumulation as the result of the exploitation of surplus labour of the unfortunate class of the society gave birth to industrial revolution in Europe where machines substituted labour. This revolution created industries and factories which were owned by a few group called Capitalists; where those in majority (the proletariat or paid workers), work for them (capitalists). Hence, wage system was progressively developed and introduced. The relationship between the workers and the owners of capital is that of exploitation. This created a huge gap between the capitalist who owned almost all the entire wealth of the

society and the exploited class (greatest numbers) who had no wealth. Capitalism created an asymmetrical and diametrical relationship between owners of capital and the peasants who have nothing to offer but their labour (Amin, 1972, 1974).

Neo-Liberal Capitalism can be regarded as a ‘stone-faced’ ideology, which has no regard for the worth/value of human as long as that individual does not own capital. The exploitative capitalists unfortunately see the peasants as the lazy class of the society. Whereas it is, the so - ‘despised’ peasants that created the enormous wealth that promoted them to their affluent capitalist status. Thus, liberal capitalism has failed humanism since the advent of the modern state-system. Hence, it is a ‘failed ideology’, that can no longer guarantee the sanctity of humanism (Frank, 1967; Saleh, 2016).

III. GLOBAL POLITICAL ECONOMY THEORY

The Global Political Economy also called International Political Economy Theory was popularized by Robert Cox (1987), and Robert Gilpin (2001) who tread on the path of David Ricardo (1951) and Adam Smith (1776, 1984). It is a post-cold war political science theory. The theory looks at how power relations, international economics and politics interact in the international environment. The proponents of this theory maintain that there are three main strands of International Political Economy, which include Economic Liberalism, Mercantilism and Marxism. However, economic globalization is the fourth strand, which they omitted.

Economic Liberalism, following in the tradition of Adam Smith and David Ricardo, stresses the value of a capitalist market economy that operates according to its own laws and, when freely allowed to do so, maximizes benefits for individuals, companies and nations. The World Trade Organization (WTO) embodies the values espoused by this strand of International Political Economy (Cardoso & Enzo, 1979).

Mercantilism holds that the economy should be used to enhance state power, and thus be subordinate to politics. Protectionist and other policies that minimize dependence on other states are promoted as deliberate policies of state-led development (Wallerstein, 1974; Todaro, 1979).

Marxism sees the economy as a crucible of exploitation and inequality between classes, one in which the dominant economic class also dominates politically. It holds that capitalist development contains contradictions that will eventually produce crisis conditions affecting both social classes and nation states. Within International Political Economy Theory, “world system theory” describes the capitalist international economic system as consisting of core, peripheral and semi peripheral areas defined by their modes of labour control and specializations. In doing so, these theorists promote greater recognition of how underdeveloped countries are exploited by those with the monopoly of global capital (Beckman, 1983).

Economic globalization is the fourth strand of the nascent international political economy, which the western worlds have devised through the New Global Agenda (NGA). The economic liberalization agenda was so fashioned by the industrialized north to further entangle the unfortunate underdeveloped countries of the Southern hemisphere by perpetually incorporating them into the traps of international finance and capital. With this subtle global economic policy, it will further open-up the economies of third world countries to more exploitation by the industrialized countries. This will further exacerbate the entanglement of their economies to International Finance Capital and of their perpetuation in the shackles of dependency (Gilpin, 2001, Saleh, 2008).

As such, as it was with economic liberalism and mercantilism, economic globalism shielded by the convergence theory, is an advance form and a more lethal instrument for the plunder and exploitation of the resources of third world countries. This is because the formulation of these NGA was exclusive to the Northern hemisphere. The unfortunate countries of the South were not consulted at the formulation stage; but were forced not only to accept, but also to domesticate these NGA at their perils. This is to further increase Western prosperity and their perpetual dominance of international affairs and to worsen penury for the Southern hemisphere (Wallerstein, 1989; Saleh, 2008).

The global political economy is nothing but an extension of the liberal capitalist ideology (in an advanced form), which has nothing different/new to offer to humanism. Hence, it is also a ‘failed ideology’; that has outlived its usefulness.

IV. MARXIST-SOCIALIST THEORY

The Marxist-Socialist theory was built largely on the philosophy of a German scholar Karl Marx (1818-1883), who had his tutelage under Hegel G. W. Frederick (1770-1831). Hegel’s central philosophy was the “*dialectics of history*” where the forces of history was seen to be propelled by a consumer desire; i.e. a desire for power as well as the currency/function to which power has been put to use. In as much as Marx accepts *dialectics* as a principle of transformation, he however believes that “*dialectical materialism*” is more significant than *dialectical history*. He went on to add that the philosophy of *dialectical materialism* offers the background for political economy approach. Marx gave three reasons for the emergence of *dialectical*

materialism, which includes; economic determinism, social stratification and political superstructure as outlined and discussed below:

1. Economic Determinism –

Karl Marx identified means of production to be the tools and implements for the production of economic goods, resources and services. From time immemorial, such tools existed in primitive forms, but the advent of the computer age with the advancement in technology, have witnessed a massive and progressive shift from primitive tools to more sophisticated modern machines and equipments. However, the acquisition, accumulation and access to the means of production; are not equally owned by the people. The relationship that existed between the producers and the owners of the means of production is exploitative by means of expropriation of surplus value where profits that accrue to the Lords (Capitalists) are disproportionate to the price of labour. Consequently, as soon as surplus values are expropriated, exploitation begins.

2. Social Stratification –

Marx strongly believes that the society is sharply divided into two unlike classes, which are mutually antagonistic to each other. On one hand, we have the ruling class, the bourgeoisies, or the exploiter class; and on the other hand, we have the ruled, the workers and the exploited class. These two unlike classes are mutually antagonistic because their interests are conflicting. The interest of the exploiter and dominant class is to continue to exploit, make more profit and dominate the other class. Whereas, the interest of the exploited and dominated class is to prevent or stop exploitation with a view of probably taking over power so as to have control of the fruit of its labour. These conflicts according to Karl Marx are historically rooted on the following stages:

(i)Communalism Stage –

This is regarded as the primitive stage where men generally produce for internal consumption; or where it can be regarded as subsistence means of production. Here, whatever one produces, is for himself and his immediate family (primitive mode of capitalism); but he is more and ever willing to share with any member of the community who is in dire need as the result of afflictions or other natural problems outside laziness. This can be regarded as a primitive mode of socialism/communism. The instruments and implements of production are largely rudimentary. Where necessary, part of, or the entire community will be involved in the production process on behalf of any member of the community who so require such assistance. This stage could at best be regarded as an admixture of capitalism and socialism which when refined, will be an ideal mode of production and relationships that will be most suited for humankind where laziness will be abhorred and hard work encouraged and rewarded.

(ii)Feudalism Stage –

Historically, as soon as the human population increases and implements of production become more modern and sophisticated, people began to acquire land disproportionately of each other. Hence, excessive goods are produced with a view for selling them. This process naturally leads to the Feudalist stage of production. This is the stage characterized by the existence of agrarian harmony under the Feudal Lords and the Serfs. The skills and labour of the Serfs or slaves are taken-over in the several plantations by the few Feudal Lords such that a relationship of exploitation develops which leads to the expropriation/appropriation of surplus value. The relations of production here is in favour of the Feudal Lords where they seek to qualitatively enhance their means of production and to expand the frontiers of their markets. The desire of the exploited (serfs, slaves or peasants) is to acquire their lands and have control over their means of production. The continuous expropriation of the labour of the serfs created huge profits for the Lords, which qualitatively lead to industrial revolution in Europe and of high industrialization thereof. At this stage, raw labour is gradually taken-over by capital leading to the next stage, which is capitalism.

(iii)Capitalism Stage –

The industrial revolution in Europe created industries and factories which were owned by a few group called Capitalists; where those in majority (the proletariat or paid workers), work for them (capitalists). Hence, wage system was introduced. The relationship between the workers and the owners of capital is that of exploitation. Hence, Marx believes that since the proletariat and the peasants are so exploited, they will develop a feeling of the protection of interest of a class of their own. This will make them (peasants and proletariat) develop class-consciousness. When class-consciousness has been created and fully developed; it will lead to class struggles where the peasants will organize themselves for a change through revolution and the eventual overthrow of the class of exploiters (bourgeois class). The revolution of the working class will lead to the next stage, which is Socialism.

(iv) Socialism Stage –

The successful upstaging of the bourgeois class by the proletariat gives birth to a worker state. This Socialist state owns the means of production on behalf of everybody. It is a class society of only one class and the economic principle of relationship is “*from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs*”. This stage creates a situation of peace and absence of conflict because there were no exploiters as well as the exploited. This society was dynamic such that everybody is expected to be given the chance to develop his talent. The society is expected to be qualitatively advanced such that the regulatory and potential rule of government would fade away leading to the last stage which is communism. This was indeed the ideal type; but events in the last lap of the 20th Century and the opening of the 21st Century pointed to the loose ends of socialism. Hence, *Glasnost* and *Perestroika* introduced in the USSR by President Mikhail Gorbachev, led to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the introduction of the current new variant of *capitalist-socialism*. This is the opening of the Russian economy to quasi-free enterprise but under a strict central control of the Kremlin.

Socialism is nothing but a socio-economic system that is based on the belief that the means and factors of production, distribution of goods and services in the society should be commonly owned and controlled by the whole citizens of the state. This system emphasizes collectivism in ownership of the means and factors of production. Through the public ownership of economic resources used in production and distribution; industries and commerce can be operated in the interest of all, rather than that of a few as obtains in a capitalist system. Under Socialism, equitable distribution of the wealth of the state can afford all the citizens to make the most of their special abilities.

(v) Communism Stage –

This is a stateless stage without any form of organization. Men are expected to have sufficiently developed to a stage when the assistance of nobody is required to survive. However, it is an ideal, but is a mere utopian concept and an impossible creation that practically existed in the figment of the imagination of Karl Marx and his followers. However, when *humanistic capitalism* is combined with a vibrant communalism plus realistic socialism, it will give birth to a more realistic and pragmatic economic system that houses the three. This new economic system could be code-named *communo-capitalism (Communist Capitalism)*.

3. Political Super-Structure –

Not all stages enjoy statecraft. That is to say that some stages have no super-structures because of the absence of a monetary state. In all the other stages where state structure must be put in place, Karl Marx asserts that the state in existence or the political super-structure represents and protects only the interest of the dominant ruling class. Consequently, the colonial structure was relevant to the Feudal Lords as well as becoming relevant to the capitalists in power. Liberal representative democracy can only represent the interest of the capitalist, which the existence of multi-party system is only to accommodate the intra-class interests of the bourgeoisies. Whereas, even though state structure exists in the socialist society, it serves as a regulatory mechanism for the enforcement of workers interests where no man exploits the other. However, the initial fine virtues of the Marxist-Socialist ideology became decadent when successive Soviet ruling class transmuted themselves into new variant of feudalists. This triggered a lot of agitations that culminated in the final demise of Socialism and the disintegration of the Soviet Union (Emmanuel, 1972; Gilpin, 2001; Saleh, et-al, 2014; Saleh, 2016).

Marxist-Socialist ideology just as those that preceded it, has also failed to support humanism due to its highly hypocritical nature where the few ruling class live in affluence; while the greatest numbers of the society live in penury. The extant asymmetrical and diametrical relationships in the Soviet society culminated in the collapse and eventual disintegration of the Soviet Union into splinters of republics in the early 1990s. This massive demise of the Soviet empire was either as the result of the betrayal of the 1917 Bolshevik revolution or as the result of the inability of succeeding Soviet governments to sustain the basic tenets of the original revolution, which was initially human-centered. Whatever may be the case, socialism as an ideology has failed to support humanism.

COMMUNISM

Communism as an ideology is nothing but an improvement on the Marxist-Socialist Ideology where its proponents sees it as a system in which there is common ownership of the means of production as in socialism; but the distinguishing feature is that, under communism, we have a classless society, where the state ceases to exist. The state withers away. It is the highest stage of socialism. Individual ownership of property under this system; is abolished. The distribution of goods and services to individuals according their needs and wants is the ultimate aim of Communist system of government. However, since the proposition of this form of government, it has remained hypothetical because it has so far not been practiced by any country. Even the People Republic of China (PRC) that prides herself as a communist country; has not been a classless society and the PRC has not

withered away for the past seventy-one (71) years. Rather China is gradually and is increasingly moving towards what will be regarded as a ‘*Communist Capitalism*’; because she is currently the World’s second biggest/largest economy after Capitalist USA (Paul, 1973; Galtung, 1980; Saleh, 2016).

Just as the Socialist ideology on which it grew, communism has also failed humanism because of the high speed with which it retreated into capitalism after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. This second baptism into capitalism by Communist China has catapulted it into the second biggest/largest economy of the world as at today (2020). As its economy grows by leaps and bound, its citizens continue to wallow under repressive conditions of denied human rights and abject poverty. Hence, just as other failed ideologies before it; communism has also largely failed to serve humanism.

Therefore, the massive failures of all the preceding ideologies informed the motivation for the presentation of humanistic capitalism as a very viable alternative to all of them by this study. Thus, the new humanistic capitalism ideology is as presented below for adoption throughout the world in the 21st Century.

V. PRESENTATION OF HUMANISTIC CAPITALISM AS AN ALTERNATIVE IDEOLOGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Humanistic capitalism can serve as a form of government (i.e. Humanistic Government) as well as an ideology. As an upcoming post-globalization economic system that is currently being advocated for adoption by the whole world; it will subsequently eliminate the asymmetrical and dialectical relationships between all classes of the society and between countries. The central focus of humanistic capitalism is man; and how the human being can maximally benefit and enjoy from the fruit of his labour. Functional state structures can be developed for communal-socialist capitalism, which of course serve as anchor as well as building block of humanistic capitalism. It will accommodate the fine virtues of the African traditional system where one is expected to be his brother’s keeper. It is a vibrant system devoid of exploitation, which was forcefully destroyed by the European colonizers when they invaded the continent and introduced slave trade. With this, the Europeans introduced Africans to the violent culture of inter-tribal wars to source for human commodities, which were slaves that helped in building enormous wealth for the capitalist west (Wallerstein, 1979; Abdellatif, 2003; Magaloni, Weingast, and Diaz-Cayeros, 2005).

Furthermore, as an admixture of communalism, socialism, communism and capitalism firmly built on egalitarianism; humanistic capitalism will usher-in an ideal mode of production and relationships that will be most suited for humankind where laziness will be abhorred and hard work encouraged. In fact, there should be no food for a lazy man under this system. Under humanistic capitalism, man is expected to be free from the webs of unjust laws, shackles of taxes and other levies imposed by a hitherto very lazy political class. The economic duty of man to the state under the social contract should be free from legalistic coercion; and should be a matter of voluntary compliance. The discovery of vital mineral resources such as gold, silver, diamond, petroleum oil, and other vital natural resources in any country should be regarded as a commonwealth that should automatically make the citizens free from paying any kind of taxes. Whereas, commensurate heavy taxes should be imposed on capitalists, entrepreneurs and multi-national companies engaged in the exploitation of these vital minerals and other natural resources; and who should automatically become the burden-bearers of all infrastructural requirements of the citizens and of the home country. Revenues earned from heavy taxes imposed on these companies should strictly be directed at the maintenance of a sustainable national security as well as the execution of all capital projects. Peasants, agrarian farmers, and bureaucrats (more especially public servants) and all vulnerable groups should unconditionally be free from any kind of tax payment (Fukuyama, 1992; Gilpin, 2001; Saleh, 2016).

Political leaders under humanistic capitalism; should be comprised of virtuous men that have been tracked for merit and good character right from childhood; and have been known to be transparent, accountable and of high integrity. They should be men that have risen in their chosen careers purely through hard work and merit. With this crop of leaders at the helm of affairs of their countries; the national wealth will be guarded, guided and directed towards serving the purpose of humanism (Cox, 2001; Saleh & Bailey, 2014).

Therefore, humanistic capitalism taking advantage of globalization can purge the international system of all impurities associated with liberal capitalism (which is so exerting and exploitative), and Marxist socialism & communism (which are so assuming, constraining and hypocritical). Whereas, out-rightly obnoxious ideologies, such as; fascism and totalitarianism should be outlawed by the United Nations (UN). The UN should, as of necessity; pass a binding resolution that will make all countries of the world to adopt and domesticate humanistic capitalism as the only ideology with universal application for the rest of the 21st Century. When humanism rules the world, the real freedom and rights of the human person, will be guaranteed in line with his cultural and religious practices. This will eliminate all elements of fundamentalism throughout the world. It will further eradicate all forms of agitations because all governments will be humanistic governments that are there to always encourage the releases of an individual’s potentials and to satisfy the needs

of their citizens. This is based on the fact that; a sated man is a happy man (Cranston, (1967; Wallerstein, 1989; Saleh, et-al, 2012).

Principles that should Guide Humanistic Capitalism

Humanistic Capitalism should be solidly hinged on the following principles that will in turn serve as inbuilt mechanisms for its maintenance and sustenance for centuries to come. These include:

1. *Universal Virtuous Systems of Governments* –

Government of all countries should be open and all-inclusive where the immunities of their operators should lie with the masses for as long their tenures of good behaviours last. Once a constituted government veers-off the track (path) of the social contract, their immunities automatically ceases. Governments should purely act as servants of the people that elected them into power. They are not to act as rulers. For acting as rulers by governmental frameworks has been the bane of most governments throughout modern history. In most cases, these failures have been attributed to the corresponding anti-people ideologies that guided the operations of such governments. Hence, the sole concern of a humanistic government is the upholding of the sanctity of humanism.

2. *Virtuous Political Leaders* –

Those aspiring for elective and appointive positions under humanistic governments should be men of cultural and religious virtues that have been so tracked from their childhood up to adulthood. This tracking should take into cognizance - their character, industry, hard work, academic prowess and excellence (merit). Elected leaders and all political appointees should spend most of their times in their constituencies to enable them have effective ears on the ground to listen to the complaints of their electorates. This will make them to truly represent their electorates very well; and not the situation of representing by proxy.

3. *Guaranteeing of Religious, Cultural and Socio-Economic Rights* –

Cultural, religious, socio-economic and other universally accepted rights and freedoms; should be guaranteed and accorded to all global citizens. There should be no overlapping of rights in any country. Whenever and wherever 2/3 of the population of any given country abhors any practice that runs contrary to their norms, culture and religion; such practice(s) should be criminalized by the country's statute books and correspondingly meted with appropriate sanctions (punishment). Under this condition, where the rights of an individual stops, there begins the right of another individual. The right of an individual or a very few cult-group, should not be offensive to the rights of over 2/3 of the members of the society. All unwholesome alien (imported) social practices under the guise of modernization (civilization) that runs contrary to the socio-cultural and religious practices of the greater numbers of the populace should be criminalized and punished as well as stigmatized.

4. *Transparency and Accountability in Public Live* –

Operators of the governance framework should be transparent, open and accountable to the greatest numbers that elected and consented collective powers to them. Salaries, allowances and other emoluments of all elected and politically appointed public officials must be gazetted and made public to the citizens. This is to enable the citizens independently gauge their levels of accountability as they disburse public funds and other resources. This will make it easier for the public to notice and question lack of financial discipline once public officials begins to live ostentatious life styles. Probity, integrity and virtuous living should be the watchwords of public officials (whether elected or appointed). Effective and objective anti-corruption crusade with sincerity of purpose must be waged in order to sanitize the body polity. This will block all leakages of the public treasury and direct all public funds for developmental purposes that will subsequently impact positively on the lives of the populace.

5. *Egalitarian Societies* –

Citizens (more especially the peasants, agrarian farmers and vulnerable groups of the society), should constitutionally be guaranteed the right to live egalitarian live-styles where they will be free to enjoy the fruits of their labours unhindered. They should be automatic '*exempts*' of all public taxes because they have nothing to be taxed except their labours. Rather, progressive tax system should be adopted where taxes should be imposed on the very lazy and exploitative political class and technocrats; as well as business entrepreneurs and multi-national corporations (MNCs). Taxes from these classes of exploiters; should be judiciously directed and channeled towards funding national security and for the provision of basic infrastructures for the citizens.

6. *Mass Mobilization of the Society for National Services* –

Under a very virtuous government operated by transparent and accountable leaders, citizens should be constitutionally compelled to come out in mass (en-mass) to implement public projects, programmes and render services. This should be considered as civic responsibilities to their countries. Citizens under humanistic governments will be willing and easily mobilize at short notice for national services (actions). Such sensitive services include wars and disasters (natural and manmade).

7. *Part-Time Legislators* –

All members of parliaments at all levels under humanistic governments should be on part-time basis, where they will meet once (monthly or fortnightly) as the case may be. This will cut down the cost of housing them in

quarters and of other expenses associated with permanent membership. Realistically, two-third (2/3) of their stay should be in their constituencies where they will serve as effective sounding boards for collating the demands of their electorates for inclusion in governmental agenda. This actually will serve as a safeguard for effective and result-oriented representation.

8. Popular and Realistic Accountability –

Here Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), trade unions, intellectuals and other social groups should serve as effective watchdogs for all elected and appointed public officials. These ‘*eyes of the society*’ should be free from political party influences or foreign manipulations. They should through active mobilization of the citizens, ensure that no immunity clause is enshrined in their countries constitution. Objectivity, fairness and justice should be the watchwords of these watchdogs whenever they are evaluating the performances of those entrusted with public funds and resources. Where there is a general consensus among most of these ‘watchdogs’, that there is a grievous/flagrant breach/violation of the country’s constitution by both elected and appointed political office holders, they should cry out against it. Whereby the culprits remained recalcitrant to voices of reasoning, then these watchdogs can mobilize the constituent populace to recall such political office holders. In an extreme case of administrative recklessness and culture of impunity, these watchdogs can call-out the people to the streets for a mass action against those stone-faced political office holders.

VI. CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATIONS

From the discussion so far, conclusion can be drawn that in spite of the introduction of so many ideologies with their accompanying economic systems that produces corresponding systems of government, the world is still plagued with myriads of socio-economic problems as well as disarticulated systems of governments that are mostly anti-people (against humanism). The study has established that up to date (2020); pro-poor governments that wear humanistic faces are non-existent on the surface of planet earth. The study has further revealed that what we have today (2020) in the world, are ‘*stone-faced*’ governments (i.e. inhumane governments of a very few cliques) that are permanently asymmetrical and dialectical to the greatest numbers of their societies (which for most part, are largely poor) whom they hypocritically professed to serve. It is in view of the failures of all past ideologies and their economic systems; that this study offered humanistic capitalism as the most viable alternative ideology for humanistic governments worldwide for the rest of 21st Century. The study recommends here that the United Nations should adopt this ideology by passing a binding resolution for it to be domesticated by all countries of the world. This in the belief of the study will produce pro-poor governments with humanism as their thrust all over the world; which will eradicate all elements of agitations and conflicts in the global society. It will subsequently ensure a stable global environment and a sustainable international security.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abdellatif, A. M. (2003). “Good Governance and its Relationship to Democracy and Economic Development,” Paper Presented at Workshop IV: *Democracy, Economic Development and Culture; Global Forum III on Fighting Corruption and Safeguarding Integrity*. Seoul, Korea: May 20-31, <http://www.pogar.org/publications/governance/aa/goodgov.pdf>.
- [2]. Allen, R. et-al (1999). *Chambers 21st Century Dictionary*. Revd Ed. Edinburg: Harrap Publishers Ltd.
- [3]. Amin, S. (1972). “Underdevelopment and Dependence in Black Africa: Historical Origin”. *Journal of Peace Research*, 9(2), pp. 105-120
- [4]. Amin, S. (1974). *Accumulation on a World Scale*. New York: Monthly Press Review, Trans Brian Press.
- [5]. Beckman, B. (1983). “Political Science and Political Economy”, In Yolamu Barongo (ed.), *Political Science in Africa: A Critical Review*. London: Zed Press.
- [6]. Cardoso, F. H. (1979). & Enzo, F. (1979). *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [7]. Cox, R. (1987). *Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- [8]. Cranston, M. (1967). “Human Rights: Real and Supposed.” In: Raphael (ed.) *Political Theory and the Right of Man*.
- [9]. Edmund Burke (1729 - 1773).
- [10]. Emmanuel, A. (1972). *Unequal Exchange: A Study of the Imperialism of Trade*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- [11]. Frank, A. G. (1967). *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- [12]. Frank, A. G. (1979). *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment*. New York & London: Monthly Review Press.
- [13]. Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. England: Penguin Books.
- [14]. Galtung, J. (1980). Self-Reliance, Concepts, Practice and Rationale, in Galtung, J., O’Brien, P., Preiswek, P. (eds), *Self-Reliance: A Strategy for Development, Development Studies*, Geneva.
- [15]. Gilpin, R. (2001). *Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Economic Order*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- [16]. Hegel G. W. Frederick (1770-1831).
- [17]. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712 - 1778).
- [18]. Jeremy Bentham (1748 - 1832).
- [19]. John Locke (1632 - 1704).
- [20]. J. S. Mill (1806 - 1873).
- [21]. Karl Marx (1818-1883).

- [22]. Magaloni, B., Weingast, B. and Diaz-Cayeros (2005). *Why Authoritarian Regimes Sabotage Economic Growth: Land Reform in Mexico*. London: Longman.
- [23]. Paul, B. (1973). *The Political Economy of Growth*. New York: Penguin Books.
- [24]. Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Washington D. C.: Bogle Louverture Publication.
- [25]. Saleh, B. (2008). *New Global Agenda and the Role of United States of America in World Politics*. Jos: Midland Press Ltd.
- [26]. Saleh, B., Gambo, A. N., & Ochibo, A. (2011). "Examining the Differences between Military and Civilian Regimes as the Result of Political Instability in Nigeria". *Maiduguri Journal of Arts and Social Sciences (MAJAS)*, 9(2), p. 135.
- [27]. Saleh, et-al. (2012). "Domestication of the New Global Agenda by Nigeria." *International Journal of Administration and Development Studies (IJADS)*, 3(2).
- [28]. Saleh, B. & Bailey, A. S. (2014). "A Paradigm for Politico-Spatial Interactions under Globalization", *National Development Studies*, No. 8. Pp. 205-216.
- [29]. Saleh, B. (2016). "The Dependency Theory and its Pitfalls: A Re: Appraisal", *African Journal for Security and Development*. 2(1), Pp. 83-90. Dec.
- [30]. Smith, A. (1984). *The Wealth of Nations*. Middlesex: Penguin Books. First published in 1776 under the caption; *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*.
- [31]. St Thomas Aquinas (1225 - 1274).
- [32]. Todaro, M. P. (1979). *Economic Development in the Third World*. (3rd Ed.). London: Longman.
- [33]. Thomas, C. (2001). "Global Governance Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links." *Third World Quarterly*, 22(2).
- [34]. Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.
- [35]. ----- (1974). "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 16(1), pp. 387-415.
- [36]. ----- (1979). *The Capitalist World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [37]. ----- (1989). *The Modern World System III: Capitalist World Economy, 1730-1840s*. New York: Academic Press.