

THE GENERAL WILL AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR MODERN DEMOCRATIC THEORY: A STUDY OF ROUSSEAU'S CONCEPT OF COLLECTIVE SOVEREIGNTY

By

Jerry M. Johnson

Department of Philosophy, Akwa Ibom State University
Faithtemplen@gmail.com

Prof. Precious Obioha

Department of Philosophy, Akwa Ibom State University
preciousobioha@aksu.edu.ng

Dr. Moses Udoh

Department of Philosophy, Akwa Ibom State University
drmosesudoh09@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study critically evaluates Jean-Jacques Rousseau's concept of the General Will and its implications for modern democratic theory. Existing scholarship has explored Rousseau's notions of popular sovereignty, legitimacy, and the tension between direct democracy and representative governance, yet much of this literature either overlooks or only partially engages with the specific friction between the General Will and the realities of pluralistic, multi-ethnic representative systems such as those found in Africa, often offering fragmented treatments that lack a comprehensive philosophical synthesis. This gap leaves unresolved the question of how, and to what extent, Rousseau's vision of direct collective sovereignty can be adapted to the complex institutional structures of contemporary democratic states. The problem driving this research, therefore, lies in the inherent tension and difficulty of reconciling Rousseau's vision of collective sovereignty with the realities of modern representative governance. Consequently, the main objective is to analyze the philosophical foundations of the General Will and assess its adaptability in fostering inclusive, participatory governance in modern states, building upon and critically extending previous discussions to offer a more focused evaluation of its relevance to contemporary democratic theory and practice. Employing the qualitative philosophical methods of critical and analytic inquiry, the study deconstructs core concepts like popular legitimacy while interrogating the perceived universality of Rousseau's theory, while at the same time exposing its inherent limitations. The findings reveal that while the General Will remains a powerful normative tool to counter elite capture and majoritarianism, its practical implementation in large-scale pluralistic societies is severely hindered by institutional bureaucracy, voter apathy, and sectional politics—vividly illustrated within the Nigerian democratic framework. The study concludes that genuine democratic legitimacy must transcend

periodic elections to achieve continuous civic engagement. It recommends the cultivation of a robust civic culture rooted in public dialogue, institutional accountability, and inclusive participatory structures, ensuring that citizens act not merely as subjects but as active co-authors of the common good.

KEYWORDS: Sovereignty, Governance, Institution, Democracy, Freedom, General Will.

1. INTRODUCTION

Jean-Jacques Rousseau's idea of the General Will stands out as one of the most powerful and thought-provoking ideas in political philosophy, laying a strong foundation for understanding democratic rule and shared sovereignty. In his major work, *The Social Contract*, published in 1762, Rousseau argues that real political power does not come from divine authority or force, but from a mutual agreement made by free and equal citizens. This agreement, known as the social contract, requires that laws be made to serve the common good rather than individual desires. The General Will expresses the shared aim of the people working for the benefit of all, setting it apart from classical liberal thinkers like Locke and Mill, who focus more on individual rights and personal freedoms. Rousseau challenges these views by suggesting that real freedom comes when individuals follow the common good. Today's democratic debates still wrestle with this idea, especially as societies question the fairness and effectiveness of their political systems (Rousseau 54; Bertram 112; Canovan 200).

The importance of Rousseau's General Will lies in how it sheds light on the difficult balance between personal freedom and collective decision-making, a challenge that modern democracies continue to face. As democratic thought has developed, Rousseau's ideas have influenced newer democratic practices, especially deliberative democracy and participatory governance. These approaches promote open discussion, agreement, and inclusive decision-making, which match Rousseau's belief that people can, through reason and dialogue, identify and act on the common good. Still, it is difficult to tell the true General Will apart from majority opinion or the views of dominant groups. Critics warn that political leaders can misuse the idea by claiming to speak for the public while actually ignoring minority voices (Mounk 45; Levitsky and Ziblatt 132). This ongoing debate shows the complexity of the General Will and its potential to both strengthen democracy and justify authoritarianism.

There is no doubt that democracy has been widely accepted as the best system of government across the globe. Most of the world's more stable democracies laid their foundations on ideas of political reconstruction advanced by great political philosophers, and the French Revolution, carried out primarily to fight against arbitrary rule, owed much to Rousseau's doctrine of the general will (Okeke and Oginyi 14-15). Rousseau's political thought has deeply influenced revolutionary movements and the development of constitutions, and leaders invoking the General Will did so to justify the transfer of power from monarchy to the people, asserting that legitimate governance must reflect the collective interests and desires of the citizenry rather than the whims of a ruling elite.

Contemporary scholarship continues to return to Rousseau precisely because the tension he identified, between the freedom of the individual and the authority of the collective, has not been resolved by the passage of time. Recent commentators have read Rousseau's social contract as a moral and philosophical foundation for political obligation, one that explains not merely how states come to exist but why individuals are bound to obey the laws and authorities that flow from them (Kumar and Aahire 175). Others have applied Rousseau's insistence that political

authority must rest on the collective “will,” rather than on force, to societies still working out the practical meaning of democratic legitimacy, arguing that the principle of the general will offers a corrective to elite-driven politics wherever it takes root (Okeke and Oginyi 15). Still others have traced how Rousseau's peculiar synthesis of sovereignty and liberty, achieved through his theory of law as an exclusive expression of the general will, shaped the revolutionary vocabulary of later actors who invoked his name for purposes he himself might not have endorsed (Carruthers 2-3). This article joins that conversation, not by cataloguing the secondary literature exhaustively but by returning to Rousseau's central claims directly and asking what they demand of, and offer to, democratic theory today.

This article revisits Rousseau's concept of the General Will and asks what it still has to offer modern democratic theory. It proceeds in four movements. First, it situates Rousseau's thought within its historical and philosophical context. Second, it reconstructs the logic of the social contract and the general will as Rousseau himself presented it, including his controversial account of collective sovereignty. Third, it takes stock of the principal criticisms levelled against the theory, particularly its vulnerability to authoritarian appropriation. Finally, it considers the implications of Rousseau's thought for participatory democracy, the rule of law, and popular sovereignty, closing with a brief reflection on what the Nigerian democratic experience illustrates about the General Will's promise and its limits.

2. ROUSSEAU IN CONTEXT

Jean-Jacques Rousseau was born on 28 June 1712 in Geneva. His mother died of puerperal fever nine days after his birth, and Rousseau was raised first by his father, a watchmaker who introduced him to classical literature, and then by relatives after his father fled the city following a dispute. His formal education was minimal; his intellectual formation instead came through self-directed reading and the patronage of Françoise-Louise de Warens, under whose guidance he encountered Descartes, Locke, and Malebranche (Cranston 15-20; Kelly 6-8; Leigh 22). Rousseau's engagement with the Enlightenment was similarly unconventional. Though he briefly contributed to Diderot's *Encyclopédie*, he grew sceptical of the movement's faith in science, progress, and reason as guarantees of human improvement, arguing instead that civilisation had corrupted an originally compassionate human nature (Bertram 17; Masters 33).

Rousseau developed his political thought against the backdrop of the Ancien Régime, whose rigid hierarchies of aristocratic privilege and clerical authority stood in tension with Enlightenment appeals to reason and human dignity. He concluded that political institutions of his day served the elite and perpetuated inequality, a conviction that shaped his insistence that legitimate authority must rest on the collective will of the people rather than hereditary privilege (Cranston 114). Philosophically, he positioned himself against both Thomas Hobbes, who had argued in *Leviathan* that individuals must surrender their freedom to an absolute sovereign in exchange for security, and John Locke, who in his *Second Treatise* grounded government in the preservation of natural rights, including property. Rousseau rejected Hobbes's absolutism and denied that property could ground political legitimacy, advancing instead the proposition, in the opening line of *The Social Contract*, that “man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains” (141).

Rousseau also drew on the classical republican tradition, admiring the civic virtue of the Greek polis, where citizens were expected to subordinate private interest to the common good, while remaining alert to the problem of scale: a form of government suited to a small city-state might not easily transfer to a large modern nation (Shklar 29). This tension between the ideal of

active citizenship and the practical difficulties of size and diversity runs through the whole of his political philosophy and reappears, as we shall see, as one of the central objections to his theory today.

3. THE SOCIAL CONTRACT AND THE GENESIS OF THE GENERAL WILL

Rousseau's Social Contract Theory remains one of the most influential contributions to modern political philosophy. His 1762 treatise proposes a model of legitimate political authority grounded not in force or hereditary privilege but in the collective will of the people. Where Hobbes held that individuals surrender all sovereignty to an absolute ruler, and Locke maintained that only limited sovereignty is transferred to government, Rousseau introduced the concept of the General Will to resolve what he saw as the central puzzle of political association: how individuals might unite with others while still obeying only themselves. His answer was that although each person surrenders all their rights to the collective, they receive back, through participation in the general will, a form of protection and moral freedom unavailable in the state of nature (Carruthers 2).

According to Udo and Inua, the social contract holds significant relevance as it offers a credible basis for understanding the origin of human political society. As they put it:

The contractual agreement that exists between a constituted authority and the citizenry as predicated by social contract model assumes various responsibilities and obligations as far as each party to the contract is concerned. The ability of contract to properly address the issue of the contract vitiation in an event of a party not living up to his responsibilities or obligations is an issue of serious concern to socio-political philosophers (14).

This reveals the harsh and intolerable conditions of life in the state of nature, demonstrating the necessity for individuals to adopt alternative strategies for survival. The concept highlights how personal survival is better secured within a collective societal structure. Furthermore, the social contract not only serves as the foundation of organised society but also affirms the distinct value of each individual within political relationships, ensuring that individual uniqueness is acknowledged and preserved in the broader political context (Udo and Inua 18).

Rousseau begins with the state of nature, a condition in which individuals are free and equal but exposed to the risks of self-interest unconstrained by law. To escape this condition, people enter into a social contract, an agreement to leave their pre-social state and form a civil society governed by shared rules and a unified purpose. Central to this agreement is the general will, which reflects the collective interest of the whole community rather than any private desire, and which serves as the moral and rational basis for law-making (Kumar and Aahire 174).

At the heart of Rousseau's theory lies a distinction between natural liberty, which is unlimited but insecure, and civil liberty, which is bounded by law but guaranteed by the community. The general will is arguably the most distinctive and contentious element of this theory. Unlike the "will of all," which is simply the sum of individual preferences, the general will represents what citizens would choose were they to consider themselves as members of a single moral community rather than as private individuals. Rousseau insists that "each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will; and in our corporate capacity we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole" (61). Any law that reflects the general will, even one opposed by some individuals, is legitimate because it issues from the collective agreement of citizens as moral equals; and obedience to a law one has prescribed for oneself, Rousseau insists, is not subjugation but freedom (Dent 55).

It is worth pausing on how sharply this departs from Rousseau's two great predecessors. Hobbes, writing in the aftermath of civil war, argued in *Leviathan* that human beings in the state of nature exist in perpetual conflict, driven by self-interest and the fear of violent death, and that only the surrender of natural right to an absolute sovereign could secure peace (109-112). Locke, by contrast, held a more optimistic view of human nature, arguing in his *Two Treatises* that individuals in the state of nature already possess rights to life, liberty, and property, and that government exists to protect, not replace, those rights; should government fail in this task, the people retain the right to revolt (135). Rousseau accepted neither the pessimism of Hobbes nor the propertied individualism of Locke. Like Hobbes, he thought the state of nature unsustainable and in need of a contract; unlike Hobbes, he refused to see that contract as a one-way surrender of right to an unaccountable ruler. Like Locke, he grounded legitimate government in consent; unlike Locke, he denied that private property could serve as the foundation of political right, locating legitimacy instead in the moral transformation individuals undergo when they exchange natural liberty for civil liberty as members of a sovereign people (Bertram 28).

A further distinction, central to understanding what Rousseau meant by the general will, is his separation of it from the mere "will of all" (*volonté de tous*). The will of all is nothing more than the sum of private preferences and may, at any given moment, produce outcomes that reflect majority opinion without reflecting the common good. The general will, by contrast, is meant to emerge from public deliberation in which each citizen sets aside narrow self-interest to consider the welfare of the whole community; it is, in this sense, a normative rather than a merely empirical or statistical notion. As Rousseau puts it, "if, when the people, having been adequately informed, held its deliberations, the citizens had no communication with one another, the general will would always be the result of the great number of small differences" (72). For this convergence to occur, Rousseau insists, certain conditions must hold: rough equality among citizens, an absence of entrenched factions, and a citizenry educated enough to deliberate about the common good rather than merely aggregate private demands (Kelly 124). The general will, in other words, is not simply whatever a majority happens to decide; it is what a rightly constituted and rightly informed community would decide, which is precisely why identifying it in practice has proved to be Rousseau's most difficult legacy.

Rousseau's preferred political form, direct democracy modelled loosely on the Athenian assembly, follows from this account of legitimacy. He rejects representative government on the grounds that surrendering the right of self-legislation to any representative body amounts to a kind of moral abdication: "the moment a people allows itself to be represented, it is no longer free" (Rousseau 93). Government, for Rousseau, is merely the executive agent of the sovereign people, never the source of law. This is, admittedly, a demanding ideal, one Rousseau himself conceded was better suited to small, culturally cohesive communities such as ancient city-states than to large, modern nations (Masters 98; Shklar 47). Nevertheless, its core commitment, that legitimate authority derives from the consent of the governed and that freedom consists in participation rather than mere non-interference, remains central to democratic thought (Bertram 91).

4. COLLECTIVE SOVEREIGNTY: INDIVISIBLE AND INALIENABLE

Sovereignty is among the oldest and most contested concepts in political theory, broadly understood as the supreme authority within a political community, not subject to any higher power. Historically, the concept entered political reflection through Jean Bodin, who located sovereignty in the person of the monarch and defined it as "the absolute and perpetual power of a

republic,” constrained, if at all, only by divine and natural law (25). This absolutism was later hardened by Hobbes, for whom subjects were bound to surrender their rights irrevocably to an undivided sovereign whose word was simply law (Hobbes 109). Locke softened this doctrine by grounding sovereignty in the consent of the governed and insisting that the people retain the right to withdraw that consent should government violate their natural rights (111, 124). It was Rousseau, however, who most radically reconceived the idea, relocating sovereignty entirely within the collective body of citizens and severing it altogether from the person or office of any ruler.

For Rousseau, sovereignty is nothing other than the exercise of the general will; it cannot be represented, delegated, or divided without ceasing to be sovereignty at all. In one of the most quoted passages of *The Social Contract*, Rousseau writes:

I hold then that Sovereignty, being nothing less than the exercise of the General Will, can never be alienated, and that the Sovereign, who is no less than a collective being, cannot be represented except by himself: the power indeed may be transmitted, but not the will.... Sovereignty, for the same reason as makes it inalienable, is indivisible; for will either is, or is not, general; it is the will either of the body of the people, or only of a part of it. In the first case, the will, when declared, is an act of Sovereignty and constitutes law: in the second, it is merely a particular will, or act of magistracy—at the most a decree (83).

On this account, sovereignty is not identified with government at all; the two stand opposed, and government's sole function is to enforce and respect a sovereign will it did not create. As Rousseau puts it, “each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will,” so that government becomes merely the agent, never the author, of law (61). This has clear moral as well as legal implications. Because sovereignty is legitimate only insofar as it expresses the general will, and the general will aims always at the common good, Rousseau's theory of sovereignty is inseparable from a substantive theory of justice: laws are binding not merely because a state apparatus enforces them but because they issue from the collective self-legislation of a moral community (Bertram 85; Dent 76).

It is precisely this totalising character that has made Rousseau's account of sovereignty controversial. Because the general will is held to be always right, individuals who deviate from it may, in Rousseau's notorious phrase, be “forced to be free.” Some scholars have read this as an opening to totalitarianism, in which the state claims to know citizens' “true” interests better than they do themselves (Berlin 134). Defenders respond that Rousseau's sovereign is not a ruler or a state apparatus at all but the citizenry itself, and that the general will, properly understood, functions as a standard against which the arbitrary exercise of power can be judged and resisted rather than as a licence for its exercise (Cranston 157; Kelly 127).

5. THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE GENERAL WILL

Rousseau's theory does not ask the individual to disappear into the collective; it asks the individual to become, in a specific sense, both author and subject of the law. The individual retains autonomy not by escaping the community but by helping to shape the laws that bind everyone, including themselves. Rousseau's famous declaration that “man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains” is not, on his own reading, a lament for lost liberty so much as a diagnosis: the chains that matter are illegitimate ones, and legitimate chains, those “forged by collective agreement,” are compatible with, indeed constitutive of, freedom properly understood (49).

This requires the individual to occupy two roles at once: a private person with particular desires, and a citizen with civic responsibilities. The general will is not simply the sum of these private desires; it is what citizens would will if they considered themselves as part of a whole rather than as isolated individuals (Shklar 41). Rousseau grounds the plausibility of this transformation in his account of human nature, arguing that human beings are endowed with a natural compassion, or *pitié*, that inclines them to recognise the needs of others and restrain purely selfish impulses. This moral sense, however, requires cultivation through civic education and public institutions if it is to be reliably expressed in political life (Dent 62). The individual's role in Rousseau's system is therefore not passive; it is the ongoing, active work of transforming private judgment into a contribution to collective deliberation, and of accepting the outcome of that deliberation as binding (Cranston 67, 127).

6. CRITICAL ASSESSMENTS: AMBIGUITY, COERCION, AND THE PROBLEM OF SCALE

Rousseau's concept of the general will has been a persistent object of critique in political philosophy, in large part because of its ambiguity. Rousseau offers no precise institutional mechanism for identifying the general will in practice, leaving the concept vulnerable to appropriation by anyone willing to claim to speak in its name. As Berlin observes, the general will can easily become a rhetorical instrument by which leaders justify authoritarian practice while suppressing dissent as a supposed betrayal of the collective good (32). Talmon goes further, arguing that the very indeterminacy of the general will paved the way historically for totalitarian appropriations of Rousseau's doctrine, most notably by revolutionary leaders during the French Revolution who invoked it to legitimise coercion in the name of unity (54). The tension is real: a principle designed to secure liberty and equality can, absent clear institutional safeguards, be transformed into an instrument for enforcing conformity.

A second and related difficulty concerns the relationship between individual freedom and collective authority. Rousseau's claim that a person who rejects the general will may be “forced to be free” has drawn sustained criticism for appearing to license coercion in the name of liberty. Bertrand Russell reads this as opening the door to authoritarianism, since governments may claim to defend freedom while in fact suppressing dissent (164). Berlin similarly warns of a form of “positive liberty run amok,” in which the state assumes authority to define citizens' “true” interests and compel them accordingly, thereby eroding the very autonomy Rousseau sought to protect (134). A doctrine conceived as one of emancipation can, under these conditions, become a mechanism of domination, particularly where obedience to authority is conflated with civic virtue.

A third criticism concerns Rousseau's assumption of a degree of moral and civic homogeneity that modern societies rarely possess. His model presumes citizens capable of setting aside private interest for the sake of a unified common good, an assumption that may have had some plausibility for a small, culturally cohesive city-state such as Geneva but sits uneasily with large, pluralistic, modern nations marked by deep divisions of class, religion, ethnicity, and ideology (Constant 19). Where such divisions are entrenched, the general will risks becoming indistinguishable from the “will of all,” the mere aggregate of competing private and factional interests that Rousseau himself was at pains to distinguish from genuine collective will. This distinction, however conceptually elegant, proves difficult to operationalise in practice, since it is exceedingly hard to separate concern for the public good from the overlapping, often competing interests of particular groups (Kumar and Aahire 175). The upshot is that Rousseau's

neat theoretical separation between the general will and the will of all provides little practical guidance for discerning, in any actual polity, when a collective decision expresses genuine common interest rather than the dominance of a particular faction.

These criticisms do not, on balance, dissolve Rousseau's contribution so much as clarify the conditions under which it remains useful. Rousseau's own defenders have long argued that his sovereign was never intended to be a state apparatus capable of arbitrary command, but the citizenry itself, bound together by equality, civic virtue, and habits of public deliberation that make coercion in the name of the common good less an imposition than a rational obligation freely accepted (Bertram 94). On this reading, the coercive edge of "forced to be free" presupposes precisely the conditions, equality, informed deliberation, absence of faction, that Rousseau elsewhere insists are necessary for the general will to exist at all; strip those conditions away, and what remains is not the general will misapplied but simply its absence, dressed in borrowed language. This does not fully answer the worry that the language of the general will can be, and repeatedly has been, invoked by those who lack any real claim to it. But it does suggest that Rousseau's theory functions best not as a blueprint for direct, unmediated collective rule, nor as a licence for whoever currently holds power, but as a normative standard, a way of asking, of any law, institution, or claim to speak for "the people," whether it could plausibly be endorsed by citizens reasoning as equal members of a shared political community rather than as partisans of narrower interests.

7. IMPLICATIONS FOR MODERN DEMOCRATIC THEORY

1. Participatory Democracy

Rousseau maintained that laws are just only when they are self-imposed by the community as a whole, reflecting a shared pursuit of the common good rather than the private interests of individuals or elites (60). This conviction resonates directly with the modern ideal of participatory democracy, which insists that citizens should not remain passive recipients of periodic elections but active participants in shaping the decisions that govern their lives (Pateman 21; Held 7). Where the general will is not grounded in genuine participation, it risks collapsing into an abstraction easily claimed by elites who assert to speak for "the people" without securing their actual consent (Held 45). Participatory mechanisms, whether citizen assemblies, town-hall deliberation, or referenda, can be understood as the institutional expression of Rousseau's theory: they give the general will a concrete procedure through which to be discovered and expressed rather than merely asserted.

At the same time, Rousseau's demand that citizens rise above private interest sits in some tension with the pluralism that participatory democracy is meant to accommodate (Dunn 118). The theorists who revived participatory democracy in the twentieth century, Carole Pateman and Benjamin Barber among them, argued that meaningful democratic legitimacy requires citizens to acquire, through ongoing participation in everyday institutions, precisely the civic capacities that Rousseau's theory presupposes rather than takes for granted (Pateman 55; Barber 116-117). John Dryzek's argument that participatory mechanisms should complement rather than replace representative institutions offers one plausible route toward reconciling Rousseau's ideal with modern institutional complexity: citizen assemblies and deliberative forums can check elite dominance and cultivate the shared civic orientation the general will requires, without pretending that a nation of many millions can convene as a single Athenian assembly (Dryzek 14, 89).

2. The General Will and the Rule of Law

The rule of law, the principle that no individual or institution stands above the law and that legal norms bind rulers and citizens alike, is deeply connected to Rousseau's account of the general will. For laws to be legitimate, in Rousseau's view, they must not merely reflect the will of the people procedurally but must also be general and impartial in application, binding all members of the community equally. This requirement of impartiality is precisely what links the general will to the rule of law: both insist that legitimate authority cannot be arbitrary, particular, or exempted from its own strictures (Dent 76; Bertram 85). Rousseau's account thus transforms political obedience from an external imposition into a form of self-legislation, in which citizens remain free precisely because they obey only laws they have had a hand, however indirect, in making.

This synthesis, however, faces real difficulty in pluralistic societies, where deep and legitimate disagreement over values makes consensus on the content of the “general will” elusive (Dunn 118). Deliberative institutions, inclusive forums, and citizen assemblies of the kind Dryzek describes offer one way of bridging this gap, ensuring that the general will is arrived at through fair deliberation rather than imposed by simple majoritarian force (Dryzek 89). On this reading, the rule of law is not a static barrier against politics but a living framework that requires constant renewal through participation, accountability, and civic deliberation if it is to remain an expression of collective self-rule rather than a mere instrument of the powerful.

The stakes of this connection become clearer once impartiality is taken seriously as a constraint on governance rather than a mere formality. A legal order that applies rigorously to the poor while shielding the powerful, or that is invoked selectively to punish dissent while excusing those with influence, does not simply fail at good administration; on Rousseau's terms, it forfeits its claim to express the general will at all, since a law that binds some citizens and exempts others has ceased to be general in the relevant sense and has become, in his words, “merely a particular will, or act of magistracy” (Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, III, XV, 83). The rule of law, understood this way, is less a technical achievement of legal drafting than a continuous test of whether a polity's laws still answer to the people they govern, or have quietly become instruments serving those who administer them.

8. POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY AND THE NIGERIAN EXPERIENCE

Collective sovereignty, for Rousseau, is inseparable from the practical question of how a people continually reasserts its authority over those who govern in its name; this is the terrain of popular sovereignty, the principle, sharpened during the Enlightenment and embedded in most modern constitutions, that all legitimate political power flows from the consent of the governed (Locke 124; Rousseau 72). Rousseau went further than Locke in this respect, remaining sceptical of purely representative arrangements on the grounds that they risk diluting the people's active role in governance, reducing sovereignty to an occasional and largely symbolic act of voting rather than an ongoing exercise of collective will (Rousseau 74; Dunn 141).

Nigeria offers an instructive, if sobering, illustration of the gap between this ideal and its practical realisation. Rousseau's theory presumes a rough consensus on the “common good,” yet in a society as ethnically, religiously, and regionally diverse as Nigeria's, such consensus is elusive, and political competition frequently organises itself around sectional loyalty rather than deliberation about shared interest (Okeke and Oginyi 15). Compounding this, corruption and the capture of public institutions by ruling elites erode the very trust on which the general will depends. As Umotong observes, ruling elites often infiltrate and subvert key institutions, from

the civil service to the judiciary, filling strategic positions with loyalists rather than the meritorious, a process that “undermines meritocracy, the rule of law, property rights, transparency, and administrative capacity” (Umotong 142). The consequences are severe: corruption of this kind “distorts economic growth, healthy competition, and innovation,” curtails the “voluntary contributions to public goods and services” on which a functioning polity depends, and “erodes positive societal values and norms” (Umotong 141).

Yet Rousseau's theory is not merely a diagnosis of failure in such contexts; it also supplies a normative vocabulary for reform. Okeke and Oginyi argue that Nigeria stands to benefit from embracing the principle of the general will as a corrective to extreme individualism and the political “godfatherism” that has dominated much of its post-independence democratic experience, offering a model of governance centred on the sovereignty of the people rather than the ambitions of a narrow elite (Okeke and Oginyi 15). Good governance, on this view, requires precisely the qualities Rousseau's theory demands of citizens and leaders alike: legitimacy, a demonstrated commitment to the public good, and an equitable, inclusive process for managing collective affairs (Obioha and Adegboyega 26-27). Where governance instead tracks ethnic, religious, or personal loyalty rather than the common interest, what is produced is not the general will in Rousseau's sense but its opposite: the aggregated, factional “will of all” that Rousseau warned against from the outset.

9. CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTING THE GENERAL WILL IN MODERN DEMOCRACIES: NIGERIA AS A CASE STUDY

Implementing the general will faces serious challenges in Nigeria. The foremost is the difficulty of defining a “common good” in a society as diverse and fragmented as Nigeria, where over 250 ethnic groups and deep religious, cultural, and regional divisions make consensus on what benefits all elusive. Human rights and social justice are constantly compromised by paradoxical power dynamics that fail to prioritise minority concerns (Ignatius & Denis 36). The Niger Delta conflict is illustrative: the Ogoni people's call for environmental justice in the 1990s clashed with the federal government's priority of maximising oil revenue, and the execution of Ken Saro-Wiwa and the Ogoni Nine showed how a regime-defined “national interest” could override minority rights (Udo et al 32-42). Such episodes reveal the divergence between state-constructed notions of the common good and community-centred perspectives, complicating any realisation of the general will.

This tension is compounded by entrenched ethnic and religious loyalty. Rousseau envisioned the general will as transcending private interest, but Nigeria's political landscape is fragmented along sectional lines, and the federal system is frequently manipulated by elites to reinforce ethnic patronage rather than inclusive policy (Ignatius and Umotong 54). Political competition thus becomes a contest of ethnic blocs rather than deliberation about the common good. Obioha's standard for genuine governance is instructive here: it demands a “true communitarianism which is inclusive of general human community based on the recognition of the humanity of all including those that do not have immediate and proximate relationship to the community but who are nonetheless accommodated by the community based on their humanity and as it were members of the world community” (“An Afro Communal Ethics” 32)—that is, every member affected by a decision should have a share in making it.

Institutional weakness deepens the problem. Azoro, Onah, and Agulefo note that the Nigerian state exhibits classic attributes of institutional weakness: minimal control over territory,

non-provision of basic services, pervasive corruption, displacement, and economic decline. As they put it:

A weak institution depicted a state of decline or powerlessness of government agencies to effectively discharge some of the fundamental responsibilities of the state such as the maintenance of law and order and the protection of its territorial integrity. Some of the manifestations of institutional weakness are losing control of territory or the sole power of using physical force therein, the crisis of legitimacy in which some part of the state seeks disintegration, inability to provide basic services to the citizens etc (62).

For Rousseau, legitimate law is an impartial expression of the general will, dependent on trust in institutions and leaders' accountability. In Nigeria, that trust is eroded by corruption and unfulfilled promises, and conflict often follows from weak institutions and inequitable governance (Adeleke 176). Adegboyega and Obioha observe that: "The political elites have remained the determinants of the country's fate. Other ideas, suggestions and criticism from the citizens and opposition parties do not count" (11). Umotong similarly argues that ruling elites infiltrate institutions such as the civil service, judiciary, military, media, and banking, undermining meritocracy and administrative capacity:

Strategic positions in the police and military are filled with personally loyal individuals, as political defeat could lead to exile, imprisonment, or worse. Economic reforms that would remove state controls and reduce scarcity are opposed because such controls are sources of rent extraction for the ruling elites. Those excluded from power often resort to violence, insurgency, and civil war (142).

Corruption, which permeates every sector of the Nigerian society, thrives openly and is rarely absent from public discourse. Its effects are severe:

Corruption distorts economic growth, healthy competition, and innovation, leading to reduced productivity and foreign direct investment due to inefficient contract allocation and bribing of foreign officials and tourists. Corruption curtails voluntary contributions to public goods and services owing to diminished trustworthiness, exacerbates inequality, brain drain, criminal activities, and institutional inefficiencies, while eroding positive societal values and norms. (Umotong 141)

Ologbenla and Babatunde add that corruption is fundamentally an abuse of public trust for private gain:

Corruption ensues when a citizen tries to influence the outcomes of the public affairs, events, contracts using monetary or pecuniary affluence... This is why corruption is usually defined as the abuse of public office for private gains... Corruption also connotes the extraction of bribes from the citizens by public servants or political office holders with a promise that the outcomes of public policy would be thwarted. (191)

The result is a culture of selective justice: the poor are punished for petty infractions while elites who embezzle public funds escape accountability and are celebrated as "successful," an inversion that turns law into an instrument of oppression rather than a safeguard of the general will (Ezeanya 131). Good governance, by contrast, requires managing public affairs for society's well-being, yet Nigeria's elections, the primary mechanism for aggregating the general will, are routinely undermined by ballot snatching, vote buying, and manipulation of results (Ojo 62). Nwankwo and Udeobasi describe this starkly:

The most disturbing and damaging form of corruption is made manifest in the succession of kleptocratic governments, which has produced extremely wealthy generals and political leaders. Similarly, electoral corruption is prevalent. This is a situation that includes the purchase of votes

with money, promises of office or special favors, coercion, intimidation, and interference with freedom of election, sale of votes, killing and maiming of people in the name of election, and a situation where losers end up as the winners (71).

Compounding this is "godfatherism," where political patrons dominate candidate selection and filter citizens' preferences through elite structures (Arowolo and Aluko 65), so that the general will is neither genuinely expressed nor effectively aggregated. Nigeria's sheer scale compounds the difficulty: Rousseau imagined small, participatory polities, but with a population exceeding 200 million, direct participation is nearly impossible, and youth and women alike face structural exclusion, leaving the "general will" shaped by a small minority. Governments have also invoked "national security" and "unity" to justify curtailing dissent in the Niger Delta and among IPOB, weaponising the language of justice to protect elite interests while excluding the vulnerable (Udo et al. 40), showing a vivid illustration of the authoritarian risk latent in Rousseau's own theory.

Thus, Nigerian democratic practice remains largely procedural, centred on elections rather than sustained citizen deliberation, accountability, or policy co-creation (Omotola 57). This weak civic engagement undermines Rousseau's vision of citizens as co-authors of the law, reducing democracy to elite-driven governance. Bridging the gap between Rousseau's ideal and Nigeria's realities will require not only institutional reform but a civic culture rooted in dialogue, inclusivity, and accountability.

10. CONCLUSION

Rousseau's general will, anchored in the social contract and the principle of collective sovereignty, reminds us that genuine democracy thrives when people participate actively in shaping the laws that govern them, and that freedom is found, paradoxically, in obedience to a law one has helped to prescribe for oneself. This insight speaks directly to the heart of democratic governance: legitimacy cannot rest merely on periodic elections but requires the continuous, substantive involvement of citizens in the decisions that affect their lives. Applied to contexts such as Nigeria, Rousseau's theory challenges societies to close the gap between leaders and the governed, to build institutional trust, and to ensure that collective decisions reflect the aspirations of the majority while still respecting the rights of minorities.

At the same time, the difficulties encountered in translating Rousseau's ideal into practice, the ambiguity surrounding how the general will is to be identified, the risk that appeals to collective unity will be used to justify coercion, and the sheer scale and diversity of modern political communities, should caution against treating Rousseau's theory as a ready-made institutional blueprint. Its enduring value lies elsewhere: as a normative standard against which existing democratic practice can be measured, and as a persistent reminder that political authority which does not, in some meaningful sense, belong to the people it governs has yet to earn the name of legitimate government. Read in this way, Rousseau's general will remains what it has been since 1762: not a finished system, but an unfinished demand, one that each generation of democratic theorists and citizens must take up anew.

What Rousseau ultimately offers modern democratic theory, then, is less a design for institutions than a criterion for judging them. Electoral procedures, constitutional structures, and deliberative forums all matter, but they matter, on Rousseau's account, only insofar as they succeed in making political authority genuinely traceable back to the people it governs. Where that traceability breaks down, whether through corruption, factional capture, or the quiet substitution of elite preference for popular will, democracy retains its outward form while

forfeiting the substance Rousseau thought essential to it. The task he leaves to contemporary theory is therefore not to resolve, once and for all, the tension between individual freedom and collective authority, but to keep building the institutional and civic conditions, participation, transparency, education, and accountability, under which that tension can be worked out anew by each generation of free and equal citizens.

WORKS CITED

- Arowolo, Dare E., and Olurola A. Aluko. "Democracy, Political Participation and Good Governance in Nigeria." *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, vol. 1, no. 3, 2012, pp. 797–809.
- Azoro, Chukwubuike, Chinedu Onah & Queen Agulefo. "Weak Institutions and Poor Governance in Nigeria: A Socio-Legal Perspective." *African Journal of Law, Political Research and Administration*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2021, pp. 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-5IUFPFRU>.
- Berlin, Isaiah. *Freedom and Its Betrayal: Six Enemies of Human Liberty*. Princeton UP, 2002.
- Bertram, Christopher. *Rousseau and the Social Contract*. Routledge, 2004.
- Bodin, Jean. *Six Books of the Republic*. Translated by M. J. Tooley, Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Canovan, Margaret. *The People*. Polity Press, 2005.
- Carruthers, Stephen. "The Concept of the General Will in the Writings of Rousseau, Sièyes, and Robespierre." 2008. *Articles*, Paper 22.
- Constant, Benjamin. *Political Writings*. Edited by Biancamaria Fontana, Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Cranston, Maurice. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Citizen of Geneva*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Cranston, Maurice. *Jean-Jacques: The Early Life and Work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1712–1754*. University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- Dent, Nicholas. *Rousseau: An Introduction to His Political Philosophy*. Blackwell, 1988.
- Dryzek, John S. *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Dunn, John. *Setting the People Free: The Story of Democracy*. Atlantic Books, 2005.
- Grimsley, Ronald. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: A Study in Self-Awareness*. University of Toronto Press, 1961.
- Held, David. *Models of Democracy*. 3rd ed., Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by Richard Tuck, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Ignatius, I. & Iniobong Umotong. "Nietzsche's Will to Power: The needed drive for Political Participation in Nigeria". *AKSU Journal of Social Science*, 5 (1), 2024, pp. 47-56.
- Ignatius, Itohowo & Michael Denis. "The Prevalence of Criminal Victimization among Nigerian Populace". *Journal of Global Peace and Conflict*, vol. 11, 2024, pp. 36-43.
- Kelly, Christopher. *Rousseau's Exemplary Life: The Confessions as Political Philosophy*. Cornell University Press, 1987.
- Kumar, Vimlesh, and Aashutosh Kumar Aahire. "Revisiting Rousseau's Social Contract Theory through the Lens of Politico-Moral Philosophy." *International Journal of Political Science and Governance*, 2024, 6(1): 173–176.
- Leigh, John. *Rousseau and the Problem of Tolerance in the Enlightenment*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Levitsky, Steven, and Daniel Ziblatt. *How Democracies Die*. Crown Publishing Group, 2018.

- Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Edited by Peter Laslett, Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Masters, Roger D. *The Political Philosophy of Rousseau*. Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Mounk, Yascha. *The People vs. Democracy: Why Our Freedom Is in Danger and How to Save It*. Harvard University Press, 2018.
- Nwankwo, Ignatius Uche, and Obianuju Chinyelu Udeobasi. "Path to Good Governance in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects." *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*, vol. 1, no. 6, 2017, pp. 68–73.
- Obioha, Precious and Adegboyega, Oluwayemisi. "Karl Popper's Critical Rationalism and the Quest for True Democracy". *AKSUJA: Akwa Ibom State University Journal of Arts*, 2023, pp. 1-13.
- Obioha, Precious U. "An Afro-Communal Ethic for Good Governance". *Acta Universitatis Danubius (AUDA)*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 2021, pp. 20-38.
- Obioha, Precious, and Oluwayemisi Adegboyega. "Partiality in African Ethics and its Implications for Good Governance." *AMAMIHE: Journal of Applied Philosophy*, vol. 20, no. 2, 2022, pp. 24–42.
- Okeke, V. C., and G. I. Oginyi. "Rousseau's General Will and Democracy in Nigeria: A Hermeneutic Study." *NAJOP: Nasara Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 14–34.
- Ologbenla, Derin, and Waziri Babatunde Adisa. "Money-Bag Politics, Rent-Seeking and Flawed Elections in Nigeria: A Theoretical Statement." *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2012, pp. 188–207. Macrothink Institute, <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v2i1.1682>.
- Omotola, J. Shola. "Elections and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria's Fourth Republic." *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, vol. 45, no. 5, 2010, pp. 534–53.
- Pateman, Carole. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract*. Translated by Christopher Betts, Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Russell, Bertrand. *A History of Western Philosophy*. George Allen & Unwin, 1946.
- Shklar, Judith N. *Men and Citizens: A Study of Rousseau's Social Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Starobinski, Jean. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Transparency and Obstruction*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer, University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Suberu, Rotimi T. *Federalism and Ethnic Conflict in Nigeria*. United States Institute of Peace Press, 2001.
- Talmon, J. L. *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy*. Secker & Warburg, 1952.
- Udo, I., Emmanuel Ette & Itohowo Ignatius. "True Federalism and Resource Control in Nigeria: The Niger Delta Experience". *IDEAS: Uniuyo Journal of Philosophy and Multi-Disciplinary Studies*, 2 (2), 2025, pp. 32-42.
- Udo, Inameti Lawrence, & Inua, Ubong. "Hobbes' Social Contract Theory: Implications for Citizens Cum Government Relationship in Nigeria." *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, vol. 18, no. 3, 2020, Department of Philosophy, Imo State University, pp. 13-25.
- Umotong, Iniobong. "The Hypocrisy of Value and the Fight Against Corruption." *GNOSI: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis*, vol. 6, issue 2, 2023, pp. 138-151.