

## CIVILIZATION AND UNIVERSAL HISTORY IN CONCEPTUALIZING GLOBALIZATION

*Dr. Davut Ateş*  
Dış Ticaret Müsteşarlığı  
[atesdavut@yahoo.com](mailto:atesdavut@yahoo.com)

---

### ABSTRACT

*This paper investigates the question of whether civilization and universal history analyses can provide us with theoretical tools in conceptualizing the current process of globalization. To this end, reference will be made to our understanding of civilization and universal history, with a further attempt to connect civilization and history analyses with analyses of globalization.*

**Keywords:** *Globalization, Civilization, Universal History, Global Civilization, Global History, Capitalism.*

---

## KÜRESELLEŞME KAVRAMLAŞTIRMASINDA MEDENİYET VE EVRENSEL TARİH

### ÖZET

*Bu çalışma, halihazırdaki küreselleşme sürecinin kavramlaştırılmasında medeniyet ve evrensel tarih incelemelerinin bize kuramsal araçlar sunup sunamayacağını sorgulamaktadır. Bu amaçla, medeniyet ve evrensel tarih anlayışları gözden geçirilecek, medeniyet ve tarih incelemeleriyle küreselleşme incelemeleri ilişkilendirilmeye çalışılacaktır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Küreselleşme, Medeniyet, Evrensel Tarih, Küresel Medeniyet, Küresel Tarih, Kapitalizm.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The world has been witnessing a globalization process at least for the last four centuries. Long before this time, grand civilizations, empires and economies had remained confined to certain regions. Mesopotamian Civilization was taking place around the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, Roman Empire was controlling environs of the Mediterranean, and Silk Road trade was confined to the regions beginning from China and India through the south and the north of Caspian Sea to the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. Neither of these big structures nor others was able to connect all parts of the world to each other in contrast to what we are experiencing today embodied in the term ‘‘globalization’’. This could be taken as a result of expansion of the western civilization all over the world approximately after the 17<sup>th</sup> century. If all parts of the world are, more or less, interconnected to each other in any sense -economy, society, politics, culture and values-, then it is a serious question today whether we can talk about emergence of global civilization of mankind.

One should approach civilizational and historical matters most probably by taking into consideration the fact that globalization -as far as its origins are concerned- has to be framed as the expansion of the West and equally it -as far as its results are concerned- is an autonomous and *sui generis* occurrence that can give way to the emergence of its own civilization and history.

There should be little debate on the western *façade* of its origins. World capitalist economy setting actual basis for global interconnections had began to take form in Western Europe and expanded to the whole world, required by the necessities of industrialization, colonization and wars. While it was expanding, the new mode of production did not carry out only its own material facilities but also its own culture, politics and reason. So in the early phases of globalization, it was certainly naked expansion of the West. However, in later stages, particularly after the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the process began to gain an autonomous character by producing its unique values and structures. This tendency became clear further with the end of the Cold War.

For that reason the end of the Cold War signified to some as the fresh beginning of globalization process, so of its history and unique civilization. But this is not true. Even before 1990s world economy had already been interdependent. Despite its rejection of capitalist system, Soviet Union and its allies had significant economic links with the western countries. Until its collapse, it was an exporter of arms to developing countries and of raw materials to the West, mainly petroleum and natural gas. So it is contradictory to argue that Eastern Block was out of the global market before its disintegration. The difference between the policies of the East and the West was not related to the globalization process, rather to define their ideological interests in a more favorable way in this process. World capitalist system based on free entrepreneurship was advocated by the West, while cosmopolitan

proletarian world was upheld by the East. The collapse of the Union removed just this ideological difference.

Intrusion of free market principles into the lands of the former Eastern Block has been considered by some scholars as the end of the history. Thus the last man was defined in terms of liberal principles denying any other alternative. The thesis of the last man seems plausible at first glance, since liberal values will soon be globalized and internalized by all human beings (Fukuyama, 1992:Part V). However, when we look at the dynamics of globalization -particularly capitalist mode of production depends on reproduction of its rival for survival-; it is very reasonable to expect that the composition of the last man may drastically change in due time. Clashes among the constituent parts of global phenomenon, reassertion of local cultures and probably new ideological division between the center and the periphery of the world capitalist system might challenge emerging liberal values and its servant so-called the last man.

Connotations of the formation of early capitalist relation within secure national borders -the crucial relation between the rise of capitalism and the formation of nation states in Europe, through which merchants, entrepreneurs, investors and bankers had sought for a secure area for profit and the rulers had needed taxable activities to finance their private armies, thus the aim of both parties overlapped, however, this formation was succeeded by revolutions between the social classes that resulted in redistribution of national wealth- imply that such a development might actually take place on global scale, if the earth is to become a single market like the national one. That means the world may undergo new series of rivalries, revolutions and wars because of many reasons -redistribution in terms of economy, security need of capitalism in developing and underdeveloped regions, emergence of possible reactions to the process from the local-

If the origins of globalization are associated primarily with the rise of capitalist world market that is a representation of modern European civilization and if it is still the most important road-maker to the process, but if the result of globalization in terms of identity, locality and culture demonstrate some degree of uniqueness; this means that we urgently need a new conceptualization to describe and to understand ongoing process in terms of civilization and universal history. It will be a serious fault to continue existing frameworks for civilizational and historical analysis. For classical formulations of universal history through divine will, nature or reason, and of civilization in terms of single progressive line or of relativity seem to be inadequate to define and describe globalization process.

In this paper, I will try to consider on whether civilization and universal history analysis provide us some theoretical tools in conceptualization of current process of globalization. For this aim, first I am going to refer to what we understand from civilization and universal history, and then how we can connect civilization and history analysis with that of globalization.

## 2. THE CONCEPT OF CIVILIZATION

The concept of civilization carries wide range of meanings for the readers of history. But here I will try to consider its most commonly used versions and find out to what extent they are useful to conceptualize current globalization, and if they are, in what ways.

*Civility:* Most common use of the word is related to the politeness of someone vis-à-vis other men -civility-. This means the lack of naked force or physical enforcement (Collingwood, 1992; Toynbee, 1957). Notwithstanding that people do not solve their problem always by talking and compromise, within civilized human life the relations among human beings are generally characterized as away from naked force. Relations are run more through discussion and force-free communication. Civil spirit emerges, which curtails and contains personal passions and tendency to use force.

*Law:* Obviously from the first meaning we encounter that relations among human beings in a civilized society are regulated with legal arrangements (Collingwood, 1992). Civility is associated with the existence of legal regulations, which imply the complexity of social, economic and political relations in contrast to tribal life. In fact complexity directly signifies city life. In historical retrospective we see that great civilizations took place within great cities or were associated with them. In this sense civilization is a conceptualization which refers to the life of citizens of the city.

*Civility versus Barbarity:* Lack or rareness of naked force and connection with city life brings a distinction between in-city and out-city, which implies that civility mean freedom from barbarity (Collingwood, 1992; Toynbee, 1957). This distinction is very valuable for the time of city-connected civilizations in the history, which was widely used by ancient Greek philosophers to distinguish Greek Civilization from the rest (Plato, 1987; Aristotle, 1941). Although city connection of civilization came to an end by the establishment of national political units -nation states- in the West, the same differentiation continued to be taken as a reference by the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century historians to separate the Western Civilization from the others. But when we think of modern wars and war-capacity of nation states throughout national lands, it becomes impossible to draw a sharp line between civility and barbarism. In modern times barbarity takes new forms within a civilized society. Every advance had a double face, inclined to both civility and barbarity. So civilization in terms of lack of naked force does not absolutely mean civility or polite manner.

*Moral and Material Development:* Another meaning of civilization is the development of human life both in moral and material senses (Collingwood, 1992:483-496). That's why some identify civilization with inventions, techniques, and widening intellectual capacity. While primitive man uses things without understanding its nature, civilized man uses things through which he reaches new things (Collingwood, 1992:484). Existence of scripture -it is vital to write laws-representing intellectual development and more exploitation of nature -changing the environment where civilized men live by constructing structures needed by the

citizens- representing material development are significant figures of civilization. Even building the city demonstrates how natural order might be changed by civilized men.

*Cyclical Nature:* By following Ibn Khaldun's analysis on civilizations (1980), some argues that civilizations are like human beings -birth, life and death-. Although every civilization has a chance to escape from the destined future of decline by reproducing itself and affiliating to other civilizations, in history there is no such an example (Toynbee, 1957:219-238). Cyclical analysis recognizes the plurality of civilizations.

*Civilization versus Culture:* Although culture is used as one of the criteria to delimit civilizations, others distinguish them from each other. The former refers to intellectual progress, the latter to the material life of human beings (Braudel, 1980:181). Proponents of this distinction identify culture with countryside and civilization with city life. Naturally civilization should be understood as a higher level of culture (Braudel, 1980:184). But the distinction between them is not so clear, because holders of the distinction state that it is too simple to talk about the western civilization without taking into account the distinctiveness of French, English, German or Italian civilization in the sense of culture (Braudel, 1980:201). This usage shows that culture and civilization are used sometimes interchangeably. Also delimitation of civilizations by most scholars shows that civilizations incorporate a multiplicity of cultures and languages (Melko, 1969:8).

There is another argument claiming that culture and civilization are in consequence. In this sense civilization is the decaying period of great cultures, which are absolutely destined to decline and perishing (Spengler, 1926:33-48).

*Progressive Approach:* Particularly after the expansion of the western civilization, the concept began to gain a singular character, meaning that there is an ideal type of society to that all human beings are destined. In this sense, progressive development is characterized as the exploitation of one class by another in Marxist theory (Marx and Engels, 1968). Notwithstanding to such claims, common wisdom accepts that civilization is the point towards which the civilizing process is directed, this is a kind of eternal development process towards an ideal type. For there is no in practice a fully-developed-civilized society, civilization is an enduring process of getting civilized. It is a collective (Collingwood, 1992:281-283) in terms of intellectual, material, technological, moral and social progress. (Braudel, 1980:180) The ideal of civilization was highlighted by the 19<sup>th</sup> century historical thought (Collingwood, 1992:488). When the word is taken in plural form, an ideal typology is corruptive; because history witnessed many civilizations. Relativity is inevitable while understanding their primary values and representations. Progressive analysis denies plurality of civilizations and imposes western civilization -reified in modernity- as the latest and the single one.

*Modernity versus Primitiveness:* Progressive approach to civilization, in terms of the western development, results in distinction between the modern and the primitive. Some argues that man was social before he was civilized. What makes

difference between civil and social is that; primitive man thinks what matters is to maintain the group or clan, while civilized -modern- man thinks the survival of the individual (Collingwood, 1992:484). Such a distinction highlights individualization of human being in modern societies. But it seems contradictory to argue that primitive man was oriented primarily to think and behave under the bonds of the social -clan or tribe-, while modern one thinks and behaves on individual account. It is true that individualism became an important value in modernity, but false to deny the fact that modern man, in most cases, thinks and behaves by taking into account for example his nation or class. This demonstrates that social basis shifted in modernity. However, it could be reasonable to argue that the man in the city thinks more by taking into account his own interests, because legal regulations and social stratifications in the city impose a kind of division of labor among citizens. Because such divisions does not exist or are not clear in tribal societies, man has to think for the survival of the tribe with that he is going to survive.

*Civilization and Universality:* Progressiveness of civilization and delimitation of history of mankind between primitive and modern tempted, from the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, European scholars to treat the western civilization as the universal one. In fact this was a discourse to subordinate others by revealing itself as destined civilization. However, universality claim is self-reflection. It is absurd for others to accept the universality of any civilization -there is no an ideal type of civilization- (Spengler, 1926:55). Nonetheless there exists relativity among the values of civilization, and appeal to universality is a tool to dominate the others.

*Civilization and History:* Universality claim takes history as a linear story of the development of mankind. Idea of progress occupies a central locus in terms of reason (Kavolis, 1987). Some object to the idea of eternal progress and refuse enlightenment periodization of human history as ancient, medieval and modern (Spengler, 1926:46). In this view, periodization might be just applicable to Europe rather than to all mankind; but civilization can be taken as the unit of analysis in historical research (Toynbee, 1957) to understand history of mankind in general or history of a single human collectivity, such as nation, state, empire or tribe.

*Singular versus Plural Conception of Civilization:* The concept of civilization is used both in plural and singular forms. The former usage implies the existence of many civilizations in human history, so delimitation could be required to separate one from another. The plural form is related to the cultural characteristics of particular societies scattered through time and space. The second usage implies just one kind of ideal form of civility and related to the humanity as a whole. So-called civilizations are the attempts to reach that ideal type. In singular sense history of civilization is closely related to the global history (Braudel, 1980:177-178).

*Delimitation of Civilizations:* Collingwood considers three senses of civilization. *First* is material definition. Being civilized in relation to the material world means being able to master the forces of nature and use them for one's own ends. Man feels able to control and manipulate the natural world. *Second* is social definition. Being civilized concerns a man's relation to the world of other human

beings. A civilized man is the one who treats his fellow men with civility, polite manner. *Third* is legal definition. A civilized society means a society governed by civil law (Collingwood, 1992:502).

Kroeber tries to set the criteria for delimitation of civilization, such as discontinuity in time and space, language, religion, political and military development, economy and technology and style. Some of these criteria may be useful to separate one civilization from others. But they are neither sole nor adequate to delimit them. To the student of culture, civilizations are segregated or delimited from one another by no single criterion, partly by geography, period, language, religion or government. Nevertheless he argues that style is probably the best indicator of civilizational delimitation. It is associated with cultural attributes (Kroeber, 1953).

### 3. CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF UNIVERSAL HISTORY

History deals with human groups and their interactions across time and space (McNeill, 1986:215). Universal history conceptualization was developed first by the authors of Semitic religions, which claims that history of mankind began with the creation of a single human being by God and it will end with the decision of God himself with the Day of Judgment. After the enlightenment period theological formulation of universal history was re-asserted by modern writers like Herder, Kant, Hegel and Marx on a natural-rational way.

Herder (Herder, 1968; Collingwood, 1961:88-93) sees history as evolutionary in character. An organism tends to develop itself so designed within itself to higher kinds of organism. Life, in its primitive form as vegetable life, is a further elaboration of a highly complex kind of material. Animal life is a further specialization of vegetable life. And human life is a higher specialization of animal life. Man is the perfect animal. In each case specialized form of life includes forms of unspecialized one -inferior positions- within itself. Evolution of life -specialization- reaches at perfection in human life, because man is an end in himself with his rational and moral life that justify his own existence. And universal history is the story of evolution of man from nature to rationality.

Kant (Collingwood, 1961:93-104) asks the question “why the nature had brought about a mind?” He believes that nature created mind because it has a purpose. The essence of man is mind that is associated with his reason. The nature made men in order that they should be rational. It is a peculiarity of the reason that it cannot be completely developed in the lifetime of a single human being rather it is the common asset of whole mankind in historical progress. Consequently the purpose of nature for the development of man’s reason is a purpose that could be fully realized only in the history of the human race. That is a naturalist-rationalist formulation of universal history destined to the full realization of the reason through which an eternal peace will be attained (Kant, 1991).

Hegel (Collingwood, 1961:113-122), in a similar way to Kant, exposes the philosophy of history as an approach to the universal history of mankind, in which a

progressive process takes place from primitive societies to the civilization of modern times. The main force of this progress is the reason that tries to develop itself. Development -realization of the reason- operates through the evil forces of dialectics. The process of history is so natural that eventually it will reach the desired end of realization of “*geist*”.

Marx (Marx and Engels, 1968; Collingwood, 1961:122-126), like Hegel, insists on the dialectical nature of historical process. The unity of history is not an organic one rather economic phenomenon lies on the basis of historical development. Political, social, religious or others kinds of characteristics are the reflections of basic economic structure. Economic motive is the motor of historical process, which creates its own rationality. Like enlightenment thinkers Marx takes history as a progressive line in economic sense from feudalism, to capitalism and then to communism in the last stage. The mere determinant of this progress is the contradictions within each economic structure. In Marxian theory forces of economics conduct the history of mankind. His understanding of history is a kind of idealism, like Kant and Hegel. Historical progress is destined to an eventually idealized society where there would be no evil forces of feudalism and capitalism.

The main determinant of historical process was God in theological formulation, and the main determinant of historical process is nature in Herder, reason in Kant, *geist* in Hegel and economy in Marx. Furthermore there is an end to the history in all of them. In theological model, history will be ended by God, while in rationalist writers history will be ended by the realization of reason or human potential. Again there is an idealization of the future in both views. In theological formulation, following the end of history there will be a paradise in which human beings will be eternally happy, while in naturalist-rationalist writers the end of history will be a promised one at this world. An eternal peace was projected by Kant, full-realization of self was formulated by Hegel and a communist society was promised by Marx. All naturalist-rationalist writers purported that the end of the history will come when all human beings become happy and in peace.

Enlightened thinkers did not drastically change the view of theological conceptualization of history rather they grounded the motor of historical process as nature and the potential of human being in contrast to God -God replaced with reason-. Like theology naturalist-rationalist formulation seems to be a-historical, because it is not bounded by time and space. Without time and space the narrative becomes away from being historical. Naturalist-rationalist views were further strengthened by social positivism in 19<sup>th</sup> century. Positivist sociologists held the view that human history is divided among savagery, barbarism and civilization, the last one of which deserves the most attention (McNeill, 1986:216). Occupational specialization and diversity of personal life experience are two obvious characteristics of civilized societies (McNeill, 1986:221). Such a segregation among historical periods resulted in a priority acceptance of history as a continuous progress toward an ideal type of society that is civilization.

In contrast to rationalist-naturalist views Ranke developed historicist approach to the phenomenon of history. In this formulation, universal history is a sequence of centuries that each with unique essence but all with together (Butterfield, 1955). In that sense universal history is the comprehension of past life of mankind within a totality, and abstract categorizations are rejected.

Although conception of universal history implies some keys for current process of globalization, I will try to develop an analysis on how we can use civilizational approach in history in order to conceptualize globalization. History of mankind is generally associated with history of civilizations (Toynbee, 1957; Spengler, 1926), because civilizations are understood as the representation of human development both in material and intellectual senses. So, current process of globalization should have some implications to construct a new vision of human civilization, which forces people to think more closely to each other in the sense of historical development, but by keeping the reserve whether we would have multiplicity of civilizations or not in the future.

#### **4. GLOBAL CIVILIZATION AND HISTORY?**

Phenomenon of globalization has recently emerged as a unit of analysis in various disciplines of social sciences, such as sociology (Robertson, 1992; Spybey, 1996; Sklair, 1991), politics and international relations (Cox, 1997; McGrew, 1992; Youngs, 1999), and economy (Wallerstein, 1974). But few of them grounds current process on historical and civilizational analysis, even if there are some arguments claiming that coming representation of power will take place among civilizations (Huntington, 1996). In fact, in terms of civilization and universal history, globalization should force people to think on the possibility of a single civilization and history of all human beings as a whole. Although the process in most cases is easily associated with the expansion of western civilization, we need to ask what were the characteristics of it, for example few centuries ago, or what are the enduring characteristics of globalization that direct us to think it as a prolongation of western civilization. I think the answers to these questions embody many complications and uncertainties. In order to contribute current conceptualization of globalization, concept of universal history and civilization may provide useful instruments.

It may be considered that the motor of globalization is primarily world capitalist system, and could be associated with the latest stage of capitalism (Thomas, 1997) that necessitates a new division of labor within global economy (Amin, 1997:31). In terms of political economy it is defined as a process whereby power is located in global social formations and expressed through global networks rather than through territorially based nation-states (Thomas, 1997). As a process, it is still supported by the western hegemony and its liberal ideology. For liberalizations in trade, finance and investment are tools for the attainment of a secure environment for the entrance of western capital into the underdeveloped areas of the world. Under the new circumstance, as a unit of analysis of history and international relations, states are becoming unable to manage national economies.

They are required as long as they could truly respond the necessities of global economy (Amin, 1997:64-70). People search for local identity and for global identifications in terms of economic and political values, which depreciates national identity. While the main impetus behind globalization is economic concerns (Friedman, 1995), its implications reveals itself in the form of an emerging civilization going beyond western affiliation. Thus it is an urgent task today to think whether we are experiencing the rise of “global civilization”.

By global civilization, I mean the existence of general characteristics of being a civilization mentioned before in globalization process. In terms of ideal and instruments of material development, politics, economy, technology, law and values shared by most of the people on the earth, globalization may echo, to a certain extent, some signals for the new civilization. Also it is necessary to state that because globalization is a process, so-called global civilization is not a completed one, rather its formation is currently going. Early civilizations were geographically bounded and had peculiar characteristics differing from other civilizations in other parts of the world. However, globalization that we are experiencing today began to emerge after the industrial revolution and appeal to an ecumenical world system. Commercialization of war in Europe and the creation of the ecumenical world capitalism based on material values seem to be the basis of emerging global civilization.

Certainly there is a close link between civilization and power. Military, political and economic dominance of a certain society plays crucial roles in emergence of the civilization of that particular society, for example Rome and Roman civilization or Arabs and Islamic civilization. Beginning from the 16<sup>th</sup> century rising power of the Western Europe has brought pervasiveness of western civilization. Is it making itself globalized or is it currently transforming into another kind of civilization?

There have been always interactions among civilizations, which gives historical supports to both cyclical and progressive conceptualization of civilizations. In terms of the cyclical, it may be argued that since there exists separate civilizations, we can talk about interactions between them. In terms of the progressive, it is argued that there is only one human civilization that progresses in different hands and geographies. Progressive vision denies cyclical nature of human civilizations rather purport that what is cyclical is the dominance of a certain community. In this sense, knowledge and techniques are accumulated along the holders of human civilization and transferred to another. But we, mistakenly, describe civilizations according to the holders, which gives an impression of multiplicity of them.

Both cyclical and progressive approaches have convenient considerations in understanding history of civilization(s). Nonetheless western civilization has unprecedentedly come to dominate the planet without frontiers that culminates in growing uniformity (Braudel, 1980:203-211). Whether we take it as an extension of western civilization or a new occurrence, globalization connected all parts of the world to each other and created a sense of new world with its own prescriptions and

values. Today there seem, to a certain degree, adequate criteria to accept the emergence of a new structure on the globe in civilizational terms with some deficiencies.

*Material Life:* The existence of a uniform material life that is represented in buildings, engineering, techniques, roads, clothes is the most important demonstration of global civilization. In earlier civilizations material works were used as instruments of distinction of one civilization from another. However the whole material life is currently uniformed all over the globe.

*Knowledge:* Just one kind of science and technology is dominating all over the world today. All people share similar approaches to technical facilities and exploitation of natural resources. Innovations and inventions are not confined to a certain region, rather once when they are found out they became common good of all people within a short time. Although there are some attempts to construct alternative epistemology, actually they are not alternative to the mainstream rather a kind of cultural representation originating from the archaic local.

*Politics:* In terms of government more or less all states commit to base their legitimacy on the consent of people -democratic principle-. It is exactly true that there are authoritarian regimes in some of the third world countries. But even they need to refer to the democracy as the ultimate form of government, and elections are held. Democracy became a common ideal, even if its application might fundamentally differ from one country to another.

*Shared Values:* Values like human rights and freedom are globally adopted and became terms of reference in case of disputes. Today all people appeal to the fundamental human rights that are genuinely expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights accepted by the United Nations. Any society that breaches human rights is accused of on global scale, and such few governments could defy. Human rights became a defining ideal backed by some international conventions.

*Economy:* Majority of states and nations attempt to apply the principles of free market economy, like free entrepreneurship and fair competition. Moreover, the world is on the way of becoming a single market through liberalization in international trade, finance and investment. Even if we put aside liberal faces of current economic policies, in terms of goals of industrialization, increase in employment and welfare we have to assign that all human societies, whether it is liberal or not, have uniform approaches towards economic issues.

*Culture:* In all aspects of civilization -economy, politics, material life, knowledge and techniques- there is emerging a new culture globally shared. Architecture, fashion, music, and way of life are commonly shared by the all, despite the fact that their origins rest in this or that nation. Locality of cultural values is challenged by the emerging market economy that forces all people to have similar preferences or tastes. For example, in the field of architecture, cement and steel became decisive elements in constructing the main structure of building,

though simple covering, with wood, stone or iron, might sometimes reflect local architectural characteristics.

Despite the fact that emerging commonalities give an impression to us as if we are having enough criteria for defining global civilization, actually two important issues still lack for us to have such a civilization -law and civility-.

*Law:* As it is required by their national interests states commit into formulating some bilateral and multilateral arrangements in various fields among them. But these are not enough to ascribe globalization as a civilization, because international regulations are not considered as genuine laws. Globalization is connecting people through different channels. But it still lacks a legal basis globally defined.

*Civility:* Because there is no genuine law on global occurrences, we often witness cases where states or societies do not treat each other in civil or polite manner. Wars among states or civil wars within societies are representations of the lack of civility. Without civility it is too hard to describe globalization process as an emergence of global civilization.

Although it seems possible to treat globalization as an emerging civilization by taking into consideration rising commonalities among societies, deficiencies impede on us to go forward seriously in conceptualization of global civilization. Nonetheless, by thinking on some common threats like environmental pollution, rapid exploitation of depletion of natural resources and ozone depletion, we may assume that we will witness severe developments in deficient points in near future. For that reason, it will not be wrong to envisage a vision of global civilization. In this process local cultures and religions are turning into representation of plurality, even if they currently seem to cause to serious conflicts in certain parts of the world.

It may be too early to assert the existence of global civilization, but globalization as a process seems to be destined to such a globally single civilization. Under the new circumstance, local cultures certainly will not disappear. But phenomenon of “great cultures” that is sometimes replaced with civilization by certain thinkers (Spengler, 1926) will demise. Meaning and frame of culture might be solely confined to the representation of locality. Civilization is getting a singular character while culture is keeping its plurality.

Narrative of global civilization will inevitably require another narrative of global history that should focus on the history of formation of its common characteristics and values. Obviously the main topic of this new historical approach will be the story of the emergence of modernity. Anthropology and historiography will make their own jobs to enlighten the history of pre-modern era. Global history on the other hand should interest in the history of the formation of global civilization.

Some interpreters of globalization understand global civilization in terms of universal history as a process from traditional to industrial and to informational society (Featherstone, 1995). It is a natural consequence of modernity in which there exists homogenizers and heterogenizers (Robertson, 1995). In fact to analyze history

of pre-modern and of modern era together is a repetition of naturalist-rationalist view of eternal progress from barbarity to civility. However, by global history we should understand that unit of analysis of historical researches would be the phenomenon of globality. It is necessary to distinguish two periods, i.e., pre-modern era and modern era, not in terms of a progress from tradition to modern or from barbarism to civilization, but in terms of unit and scale of the analysis, i.e., changing from geographically restricted levels to a higher level of analysis on global scale (Robertson, 1987). In both periods there is some degree of barbarism and civility. Then history could not be associated with a progress towards more civility. Because civilization is one of the most important frames of analysis in historical research, its importance will sustain. However, since scale of the definition of civilization enlarged -geography of global civilization is the whole globe-, unit and level of historical researches dramatically began to change.

Unity of the world history is required for conceptualization of globalization. A-historical formulation of universal history is not a useful paradigm to analyze its history. For in global paradigm it does not seem possible to formulate the final emancipation of mankind. Although unification of the world sometimes forces us to adopt universal history (Barraclough, 1962:83), this should not misdirect us to think that globalization is the final stage of human development. Emergence of global civilization requires a different conceptualization of universal history. This should include the history of all mankind. Global civilization does not seem to be the civilization of a single part of the world rather it is a culmination point where all past civilizations contributed to its emergence. Consequently global history should be based on historicist approach, which aims to clarify the interactions among past civilizations and to analyze the processes through which global civilization is welcomed.

Global civilization necessitates a kind of cumulative approach to the civilizations. Conceptualization of global history might fulfill this job, because all civilizations in the history influenced each other and they all culminated in global civilization. It represents the highest point of integration among earlier civilizations, in which unique characteristics (Melko, 1969:9-11) of each civilization turned into cultural attributes. Civilization in material sense could be understood as liberation of human being from the nature (Melko, 1969:27), and integrated global civilization in intellectual sense implies liberation of the individual from local-cultural determinations in his/her efforts.

We can not formulate a universal history to conceptualize the history of global civilization, just because universal history goes beyond the earth on which we live. Such a formulation will inevitably be a-historical. Nonetheless, if we interact with other parts of the universe in terms of life, reason, civilization, then we can talk about universal history and civilization. But for the time being our civilization and history are bound up with just our globe.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Societies, states, organizations and markets are becoming more and more dependent on each other within the global context. It seems that the motor of globalization is the capitalist world economy that forces liberalization of national markets. Liberalization brings enormous integrations worldwide. This integration certainly results in approximation in other fields such as social, political, security, environmental, human rights so far and so on. Political, cultural and social interactions follow the forces of global market. This seems to be natural, because once the world capitalist system began to take shape in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century it produced its own structures all over the globe through international trade, investments, center-periphery relations and international rivalry. Within global civilization survival of human beings and the security of states are so interdependent. Interest of any state, society or individual could not be defined through isolating others'. Environmental pollution, nuclear weapons and deterioration in ozone layer are not the problems of any single formation, rather of the mankind as a whole.

In globalization primarily economic interactions and mentality are globalized. Any value other than economic could enter into this process just it could be supplied to the global market. This means that values-products, which could be indicated in terms of money has right to take part in global civilization. This explains also to a certain extent how faces of globalization have been continuously being reshaped. Civilization by most scholars is defined in terms of material life and existences. Other values those are not transferable in terms of money cannot be a part of global civilization (Gill, 1995). They seem to remain as the cultural attributes of the locality. From this point of view, culture refers to the non-material possessions that could not be turned into payable goods of the civilization.

Globalization, by definition, is an enduring process which has brought intensification of time and space over the globe, so as characterized as making the earth a giant village. With new developments, time has gained a paramount importance, while distance in any meaning lost its restrictions on human activities as a result of rapid transportation and communication facilities. That whether emerging phenomenon of globalization should be equated just with the expansion of the western civilization or it is an unprecedented phenomenon in human history seems to occupy important focus and locus in any discipline of social sciences in near future; because civilizational and historical references set significant frameworks for any research program.

Civilizations were the most important unit of analysis of historical research in the past. However, nowadays because it is getting a single uniform character, we need its history. As a result the emerging single global civilization as a higher unit of analysis imposes a kind of global history. Conceptualization of global history is not a-historical approach to the history of mankind rather an attempt to clarify the history of globalization and foresee the future of this process. Materials of global history shall be historical facts related to interactions among old civilizations, nations, states and societies.

Someone could see global civilization as the expansion of the western civilization over the whole globe and so associate the global history with the history of the western civilization. But such an approach is a simple reduction of the unprecedented globalization process to the degree of national historicism. It is quite true that western civilization is one of the most constituent parts of global civilization, but does not represent the whole. For this reason so-called western civilization is not as the same as the civilization in the West two or three centuries ago. The difference even within the western civilization between centuries stems from its encountering with others and its internalizations that were taken from the others.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amin, Samir (1997), *Capitalism in the Age of Globalization*, Zed Books, London.
- Aristotle (1941), *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, New York.
- Barracough, G. (1962), "Universal History", in *Approaches to History: A Symposium*, edited by H.P.R. Finberg, Routledge, London.
- Braudel, Fernand (1980), *On History*, translated by Sarah Matthews, Weidenfield and Nicolson, London.
- Butterfield, H. (1955), *Man on His Past: The Study of Historical Scholarship*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Collingwood, R.G. (1961), *The Idea of History*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Collingwood, R.G. (1992), *The New Leviathan or Man Society Civilization and Barbarism*, edited by D. Boucher, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Cox, K. Robert (1997), *Spaces of Globalization: Re-asserting the Power of the Local*, Guilford Press, New York.
- Featherstone, Mike (1995), "Globalization, Modernity and Spatialization of Social Theory: An Introduction", in *Global Modernities*, edited by Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson, Sage, London.
- Friedman, Jonathan (1995), "Global System, Globalization and the Parameters of Modernity", in *Global Modernities*, edited by Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson, Sage, London.
- Fukuyama, Francis (1992), *The End of the History and the Last Man*, Macmillan, New York.
- Gill, Stephen (1995), "Globalization, Market, Civilization, and Disciplinary Liberalism", *Millennium*, Volume 24, Issue 3, pp. 399-423.
- Huntington, Samuel (1996), *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remarking of World Order*, Simons&Shuster, New York.

- 
- Kant, Immanuel (1991), *Kant: Political Writings*, edited by Hans Reiss and translated by H.B. Nisbet, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kavolis, V. (1987), "History of Consciousness and Civilization Analysis", *Comparative Civilizations Review*, Volume 17, pp.1-19.
- Khaldun, Ibn (1980), *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*, translated by F. Rosenthal, Princeton University Press, New York.
- Kroeber, A.L. (1953), "The Delimitations of Civilizations", *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Volume 14, Issue 2, pp. 264-275.
- Marx, K. and F. Engels (1968), *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Selected Works, Lawrence, London.
- McGrew, Anthony G. (1992), *Global Politics: Globalization and the Nation State*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Melko, Matthew (1969), *The Nature of Civilizations*, Porter Sargent Publisher, Boston.
- McNeill, H. William (1986), "Organizing Concept of World History", *Review*, Volume 10, Issue 2, pp. 211-29.
- Plato (1987), *The Republic*, translated by Desmond Lee, Penguin, London.
- Robertson, Roland (1987), "Globalization Theory and Civilization Analysis", *Comparative Civilizations Review*, Volume 17.
- Robertson, Roland (1992), *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, Sage, London.
- Robertson, Roland (1995), "Glocalization: Time and Space Homogeneity-Heterogeneity", in *Global Modernities*, edited by Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson, Sage, London.
- Sklair, Leslie (1991), *Sociology of the Global System*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Spengler, Oswald (1926), *The Decline of the West, Vol.II*, translated by C.F. Atkinson, Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- Spybey, Tony (1996), *Globalization and World Society*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Thomas, Caroline (1997), "Globalization and the South", in *Globalization and the South*, edited by Caroline Thomas and Peter Wilkin, Macmillan, London.
- Toynbee, Arnold (1957), *A Study of History, Abridgement of Volumes VII-X*, edited by D.C. Somerwell, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Von Herder, J.G. (1968), *Reflections on the Philosophy of History of Mankind*, Abridged by F.E. Manuel, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1974), *The Modern World System*, Academic Press, New York.

---

Youngs, Gillian (1999), *International Relations in a Global Age: A Conceptual Challenge*, Polity Press, Cambridge.