

**ATHENEUM**

**Civilization as the genetic code of civil society**

**David Botera\***

**Civilizations as “cultural entities”**

World politics, after the decline of Soviet totalitarianism, according to the introduction to the article by Samuel P., Huntington “The clash of civilizations?” has entered in a new phase of the era of struggles between the civilizations. Huntington believes, “the fundamental source of conflict will not be primarily economic” but, in the framework of the New World order, “the conflicts will be determined by clashes between the civilizations”.

According to Huntington’s assumptions, “the nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, and the principal conflicts in global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations”, while “the clash of civilizations will dominate global politics” (Huntington: 1993).

Civilization identity, which, according to Huntington, “will be increasingly important in the future”, is differentiated by him in large measure by the interactions among seven or eight major civilizations: Western, Confucian, Japanese, Islamic, Hindu, Slavic-Orthodox, Latin American and possibly African civilization.

Huntington argues: there is not to group countries in terms of political or ideological systems neither in terms of the level of their economic development, then rather in terms of their culture and civilization.

According to Huntington, the civilizations are differentiated from each other by their history, language, Culture, Tradition and most important, by their religion. This differentiation, as a concise concept of “cultural entity” finds its expression in an essential and global formulation of “civilization” as a prerequisite to the identification

of the relevant community, that according to Huntington is “the consequence of the achievements of humanity” (ibid.).

In this research the author supports the basic assumptions of Huntington even to agreeing to the argument of his thesis by historical events that negate of his theory.

Nevertheless, in this connection, the author retains a categorical objection to the notion of conceptual limitation of civilizations as historically or regionally restricted phenomena as a “cultural entity” as declared by Huntington. Furthermore, the author insists on defending a new theory: in the history of humanity there were differences principally between two basic civilizations that are incorporated in the consciousness of human nature and the civil society: the Atheneistic-secular civilization and the Archaic-fundamentalist-religious culture.

### **Archaic-fundamentalist-religious & Atheneistic-secular civilizations**

In the history of civil society, the socio-political process of change was dictated by the evolutionary development of the historic clashes between the two basic civilizations of humanity. At one extreme, there was the Archaic-fundamentalist-religious culture of the ancient world and, diametrically opposite there was the Atheneistic-secular-cosmopolitical civilization of enlightenment, humanism, Internationalism and of the values of the rule of law.

In the history of the whole of civil society, in marked contrast to Huntington’s opinion, these civilizations have never been limited by any regionally, geographic, national and religious differences, nor even by struggle between the social classes – as Marx maintained, nor by any economic or ideological restrictions. But these two main civilizations cross all the boundaries of the ethnic, ideological, geographic, national, religious, political, stratification or economic differences.

Huntington maintains that specific categories of social patterns that influence the role of civilization, as a “cultural entity”, and the clashes between them, are factors of the epochial changes in the history of the civil society, while, in to the author’s opinion, this are not the antecedents of the evolutionary process in the history of civil society, then such categories are obviously supplementary instruments in the moderated mediations which serve to accelerate the historic evolution of the clash in struggle between the two major civilizations: Atheneistic and Archaic, regardless of the institutional form of the consequences. The struggle between such categories of the cultural entities as described

by Huntington, is not the reason for the clashes, rather, they are the moderated results of the clash between the two basic civilizations: the Atheneistic and the Archaic. (As, for example: a regionally restricted, particular biological mutations can be a better consequence of climatic changes on earth, but it can never be a reason for the natural selection since it is merely a result of it).

One must accept imperatively that the roots of these two main civilizations are probably founded and predestined in the origins of human genetic codes and were developed in parallel within the history of the human race.

The first incident of the clash between the civilizations, in the modern history of civil society, is to be declared the confrontation of ancient feudalism of the Middle Ages with the emerging influence of the enlightenment movement in the era of the Renaissance. This may be regarded as the main source of the transformation of the archaic culture in the evolutionary, voluntary manner in Western liberalism, in response to the sincretic aspect of the needs of history. In Spartacus the political and ideological consciousness of the masses was still not mature enough to be able to take any considerable steps to achieve any immediate changes in human society. But in the history of civil society, the revolts of Spartacus will be remembered as the precedent for formation of the civil society, and for all the following clashes in struggle between the civilizations.

Practically, with the emergence of the Atheneistic culture in the consciousness of the large masses of civil society, the aspirations of the people and the demand for popular sovereignty increased, and “the wars of kings were over and the wars of peoples had begun”, not as a result of creation of nation states nor as consequence of the French revolution, as Huntington had thought, then, all of these components resulted from the cultural clash between the two main civilizations: the Atheneistic-secular, which emerged in the era of Renaissance and the Archaic-fundamentalist-religious culture that dominated the wars of Kings.

Anthony Giddens has argued that there are two basic categories of social differences. On the one hand the “fundamentalists”, who are not necessarily religious, but rather “products” of the contemporary epoch that reject all who oppose their opinion; on the opposite side, according to Giddens, there are the “cosmopolites” who receive the others and who recognize them as equal individuals. (Giddens: 1990). In contrast to Prof. Giddens, according to author, in the category of “fundamentalists” is falling each

member of every confession, which is demanding the hegemony of religious law on over the human society.

Such concepts as “fundamentalists” and “cosmopolites” in Giddensian interpretation are accepted by for author for marking a conceptual difference between both basic civilizations. But in contrast to Prof. Giddens the author is persuaded that the cultural differences of both main civilizations are neither characteristic of a specific epoch, nor are they appropriate for any group in human society, rather than are the differences which have throughout existed the whole history of the humanity.

The human neglect to the differences between the two basic civilizations, which probably are predestined by the human genetic codes, may be regarded as a global cultural contrast in differences between the ancient archaic values as culture and a secular, humanist thoughts and attitudes, as civilization.

As a consequence of the cultural struggle between these two basic civilizations, epochial evolution occurs; this is the determinant factor in the structuralization of different political systems in a civil society:

1. Through evolutionary sequence, and not by arbitrary means, if the clashes between both basic civilizations, are accompanied by the “volonte general” in the concerned civil society, the inevitable result of the clash is to be expected in the formation of Western liberalism in all its attributes. The author is defending this assumption nevertheless to his essentially agreement with “the theory of the stabile democracy”, introduced by Harry Eckstein (1973). According to Harry Eckstein; the level of political support by the masses is not sufficient to guarantee the stability of the democratic system.
2. Each form of cultural struggle which end in clash throughout arbitrary means (such as revolution, putsch, usurpation etc.), are determined to produce a political totalitarian dictatorship. The reason for such consequences lies in the depth of the applications of historical logic in civil society. According to this logic: the mutual – voluntary existence of these two main civilizations in the same entity of the same civil society can be dispensable to be realized only through an “historic compromise”. And the only socio-political institution that is in a state to offer such a compromise in the civil society, is the socio-political structure of Western liberalism, with all its inevitable characteristic attributes.

3. Within the framework of the tendency for forecast, can be drawn a conclusion that through the evolutionary level of the socio-political process, as part of the evolutionary consequences of the cultural clash between both civilizations, there are two possible options that are inevitable following the institutionalization of Western liberalism in civil society:

A. Because of and not despite the existence of the modern means of mass-communication, and because of and not despite the continual tendency of scientific and technological development in contemporary world, at the reason of the political invalidity of the Western liberalism, which is obliged to tolerate and to promote the expansion of the notions of the Archaic-fundamentalist-religious culture to assure the stability of the liberal – free market of the capitalist economy, while the values of the Atheneistic-secular-cosmopolitical culture are neglected and disappearing from the human and civil consciousness, the inevitable result of such degradation is expected to end in one of two possible scenarios:

a) Decline of Western liberalism and the emergence of history, in such a evolutionary fashion that would close the circle of the cultural struggle in the origins of the hegemony of the Archaic-religious era by the retrogradation in the socio-political institutionalization of the Archaic-fundamentalist-religious civilization as beginning anew the same “evolutionary history” of human society, in the same “historic circle” once again.

b) An additional variation of the consequence of evolutionary determined failure of Western liberalism, within the framework of certain political circumstances, is a possible probability of use of thermo-ballistic weapons as the inevitable means for the protection of political interests of certain political leaders, in which the extirpation of the whole humanity could be the immediate and the inevitable result.

The sphere of silent transformations in direction to democratization is a subject of affective contradiction by Tompson (2000) of the theory of the clashes between the civilizations of Samuel P., Huntington. Apparently, Tompson was not able to distinguish between “democratic revolutions”, as called by Tompson the concept of the “historic compromises”, and the “struggles and clashes between the civilizations”, as

conceived by Huntington, which, according to author, are responsible for such results as the “historic compromises”.

Moreover, “the universal culture” as Naipaul declared, “the Western liberalism”, is nothing else but an “historic compromise” through which there is possible a coexistence for both basic civilizations: the Atheneistic-secular and the Archaic-fundamentalist-religious, but Western liberalism it self has never been represented in any way a form of culture. At best it can be formulated as an “imitation” or “an imperial fashion of the seasonable mode” decorated with the dialectic depth of the Atheneistic civilization and the pedantic dogmatism of the Archaic culture of ancient Orient.

The supplementary argument for the invalidity of Western liberalism is the logical assumption that:

Western liberalism being only the transitive and ephemeral phenomenon in the history of civil society is not in a state to be utilized for the guaranties of the stability of the world. Western liberalism cannot be “the final form of civil society in history”, as Fukuyama (1989) claimed gloriously after the fall of Soviet totalitarianism. Because Western liberalism is merely a simplified form of a simple compromise in the history of civil society and, like all other compromises, Western liberalism is doomed to failure, because, all forms of compromises are limited by time (ephemeral), by artificiality and are predetermined through evolution to fail. Because the nature is compromise less!

To be able to avoid such an apocalyptic scenario of natural selection, the factor of human intelligence is of the most effective importance by which:

B. Within the framework of the hypothetical assumptions of the clashes between the two basic civilizations, there can be supplementary proposition of an eventually possible result, which may be realized only through catapultation of the history of civil society from the “circulus diabolis” of the ancient, evolutionary determined, anachronistic process of the cultural struggle and clashes on the straight line of the whole history of civil society.

### **Atheneum**

Supported by the creation of the new era of the eternal evolution in the collapsed post-history of civil society, it is possible, through the recognition of the political idea of “Atheneum” to accelerate the historic victory of the Atheneistic-secular civilization of enlightenment of humanism and the rule of law.

This stage depends on the level of consciousness of the world Intelligentsia. Who have to recognize their power as the social class, according to the demand of Ivan Szelleny (1983), and it is more important, whether the world Intelligentsia will be in a state to mobilize all their electoral forces in the political elections all over the world to become the only organizational power with exclusive rights to conduct the political system of the civil society. Then, and only then will it be possible to realize the precedents for the expected probability to guarantee the eternal survival of humanity in the independent-undetermined evolution of the post – history of the civil society, and the final victory of the Atheneistic civilization.

According to Giddens, in framework of “the process of globalization” the humanity is moving in direction of the epoch in them “the world will be managed not by independent states then by a group of federations”. Among this process of globalization is Giddens clearing a wage space for the socialist idea as a “constructive phenomenon” that, according to Giddens, is in a state to contribute for a “protection of balance between social solidarity or ethic politics” on the one hand and “the urgency of supervision to the struggle against the fundamentalism”, on the other (Giddens: 1993).

The nature independently will never be in a state to provide any evolutionary guarantees for symmetric consolidation of the history of civil society in order to assure the survival of humanity. And in spite to resist against the obedience of the archaic fundamentalism, there is a real option for establishment of the socio-political idea of **ATHENEUM** – The world of educated people!

### **Reasons of decline of Soviet totalitarianism**

“Ideological and political failure of the East in struggle with the West”, according to Huntington, “is followed as the consequence of the inefficiency of the socialist ideology”. But “the origins of the cultural clash between the both superpowers had begun long time before the cold war”. An aspect of polarization between “the West and the East in the history”, according to Huntington, reaches to the sources of “territorial division across the boundaries of north line till to the south that has divided the Ottoman and the Slavic empires from the West since the fifth century until the world wars” (Huntington: *ibid.*).

Deluguian (2000), similar to Bzezinsky (1987), the reason for the collapse of Soviet totalitarianism is not looking for in inefficiency or in a failure of the socialist ideology

like Huntington and Giddens, than, according to Bzezinsky (and Deluguian), “the intellectual inability of the Soviet leadership” was responsible for the decline of the Soviet empire, because, intellectually the Soviet leadership was not in a state to adapt the Soviet system to the global revolutionary changes on the political, economic and the social levels.

According to Bzezinsky, political revolution is dependent to democratic institution of the state; while the social revolution is a subject of technological development and the acceleration of economic revolution is depended of installation of free market economy (Bzezinsky, 1987: *ibid.*)

On the other hand Deluguian is convinced that the “socialist ideology in its practical implementation, was just a variety of a modernization reform characteristic for the 20<sup>th</sup> century”. The reason for collapse of the USSR, according to Deluguian, was the tendency of the overspecialization in the course of preparation for waging the wars of the industrialization epoch (Deluguian: *ibid.*). In addition, Anthony Giddens, the reason for the collapse of Soviet totalitarianism thinks to have founded in the “inefficiency of the socialist ideology” which “is unable to be adaptable in a complex and reflexive society” (Giddens: 1992).

Within the framework of the illustrations of the presented theory, it is the author’s firm opinion that the dominant factor of the decline of totalitarianism in Warsaw Pact countries, was the classical example of the clash between the civilizations, that had been accelerated by Western intervention through the invasion and the expansion of the values of the Archaic-religious culture, which is approved as the most effective means of propaganda in a struggle against secular values.

With the same economic structure, the Soviet Union was able to continue to be functional as a totalitarian state for several additional generations. The reason of the decline of Soviet Empire is to be searched in the relevancy of the theory of struggle between the civilizations.

Through the invasion of the Archaic-fundamentalist culture and through expansion of religious – nationalist values in the former Soviet Union, without being aware, the antagonistic West from outside of Soviet territorial authority has achieved to cause the acceleration of the cultural clash by evoking the struggle between the civilizations. While the values of the Archaic-religious culture were frozen during decades under the



Soviet dictatorship, the Atheistic culture was by the Soviet state declared as the official ideology, and on the other hand, through the intervention of the West and through the expansion of Archaic culture among the Soviet society, the cultural clash in an evolutionary manner has become inevitable. As the consequence of this invasion of the West, by the world greatest super – power, the Soviet regime, fell like a tower of dominoes.

The beginning of Soviet totalitarianism was made possible through the authority and dominance of the Atheistic culture over the Archaic civilization. The process of such authority was made possible only in a very specific manner by the Bolshevik revolution. According to the presented theory of the struggle between the both main civilizations, there was no other option in the former Soviet Union, then the establishment of a totalitarian regime.

One should emphasize that with the decline of Soviet totalitarianism is disturbed not only the bipolar military balance of the world but, and more important, it disturbed the balance of the struggle between the civilizations. The only balance which was in a state to regulate the mechanism of the cultural struggle in an evolutionary manner. And it's a pity that the quality of the life standard of the people on over the world, intellectually as well as culturally and economically, has been devaluated and the world has become a one vast "refugee camp" of rabbles "made in China".

### **Cultural clashes in space of time and reality**

According to the assumptions of the theory of the struggle between the two basic civilizations – the Atheistic-secular and the Archaic-fundamentalist-religious –, the presented theory is to be adapted to every phase of history, to the chronological epochs as well as to every society in the history of humanity.

In making these assumptions concrete, we may assume examples from the history of different human societies in different epochs:

In the Ottoman Empire, for instance, Turkey under the leadership of Kemal Ataturk, in the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century, experienced an era of predominance of secular values over the religious clerocratic Ottoman Empire. Starcenkov (1998) explains this by the following argument: "in spite of the considerable achievements of Secularists, the struggle between the Islamists and Secularists in Turkey had increased from the 1950's" because of some leaders in the Turkish political milieu, after world war II were

interested in it. They attempted to expand the Muslim religion dominance in society to avoid the existing “danger” from the expansion of progressive development in social and economic reforms. According to this interpretation, these personalities, during the oil crisis of the 1970-s did not evade any circumstance to achieve an economic advantage from the oil producing countries.

According to Starcenkov, worldwide the religious leadership of Islam is exploiting the international aspect and the internal situation of Turkey for transmitting the Turkey to the Islamist Regime (Starcenkov: *ibid.*). This assumption of Starcenkov should be interpreted as relative to the concrete approval of the empirical note that is relevant for justification of the theory of struggle between the civilizations. According to the author, the Atheneistic culture was intervened by the political elite in the earlier 20<sup>th</sup> century among the Turkish society, which, until the middle of this century had become the dominant factor of education in the Turkish society under the direct influence of the Turkey’s national leader, Kemal Ataturk.

The consequence of such intervention in Turkish society became the reason for the beginning of the cultural struggle and for the clash between the both basic civilizations: Archaic-fundamentalist-religious and the Atheneistic-secular. This in some stages of their socio-political and structural culmination had achieved an advanced form of the historic compromise in sense of Western liberalism and the democratic system of political power.

After the death of Ataturk, according to Starcenkov, the leadership of Turkey changed political course, and supported by certain evidence of recent international economic and social aspects, the effectiveness and the urgency of expansion of Islamic values in the Turkish society were again tending toward an Islamic Republic (*ibid.*). According to the author, such regression in the Turkish society is a clear indication of gradual tendency of revival of the dominance of the Archaic-fundamentalist-religious culture that is determined to close there the “historic circle” by evolutionary route of the struggle between the civilizations.

Taking on, except to this evaluation by Starcenkov, Bajat (1998) maintains that “Iran has known a religious revolution without strong Islamic movement, while in Egypt there was a strong religious movement without revolution”. In fact, the Archaic culture was imposed on the Iranian society by the leadership. Just as the Atheneistic culture was

imposed by Ataturk in Turkey. And because in the Iranian society there is still remained a large part of the people who reject Archaic- fundamentalist-religious persuasion, it is only a question of time when would experience Iran a clash between the two basic civilizations. This will accelerate an installation of the democratic system through an historic compromise.

### **Fledermauss Kultur**

Although Prof. Friedrich and Prof. Bzezinsky (1965) have correctly identified the six common characteristics as syndrome of the different regimes of the totalitarian dictatorships, the author is suggesting to take in attention a supplementary seventh, and the most important category of the above claimed syndrome which radically differentiates the Bzezinskian syndrome of totalitarian dictatorships in their attributes as well as in their political and institutional containment: while all the forms of totalitarian dictatorships on over the world are characterized by the six characteristics of Bzezinskian syndrome, in the totalitarian regimes like the Soviet Union or Iran, through the state political power, the society was dominated only by one of the both basic civilizations, the Atheneistic or the Archaic. In such dictatorships in them the society was not dominated by the hegemony of one of the basic civilization, those were dictatorial regimes, such as the nazi Germany, the most of Arab and Latin American states, in them the “Fledermauss Kultur” was the dominant attribute of the social constitution.

On the other hand, the political leadership of Egypt, as in several other countries in the world, temporarily has linked itself to a policy of secularization, which produced a mixture with religious values cultivated in the large masses of Egyptian society, similar to several Arab states in the Middle East and even in some countries of Latin America. In those cases there can't be spoken about the dominance of a certain form of any specific culture from one of the both basic civilizations, Atheneistic or Archaic. The cultural model in countries of both geographic areas, the Middle East and the Latin America, namely in Syria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon or Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, for instance, incorporated a different form of “culture”, which the author articulates in his concept of “Fledermauss Kultur”.

The principal characteristics of the “Fledermauss Kultur” are finding their expression in the global ingredients of the cultural structure of the both basic civilizations. While: the

“head” (the mentality) belongs to the Archaic culture; the “body” (technology and science) is associated with the Atheneistic civilization; and the “wings” (external appearance and consume of the capitalistic decadency) of the society are appropriate with the Western liberalism.

“Fledermauss Kultur” in its extreme form, had already frequently found expression in recent world history, such as in nazi Germany and in fascist Italy for example. Whereas the two main civilizations, Atheneistic and Archaic and Western liberalism were diffused in one cultural and ideological entity; and all this three cultural components have been incorporated in a global concept of the “Fledermauss Kultur”.

Nationalism, for example, is an attribute of ideological expression of individuals in the society, as a classical interpretation of the phenomenon of “Fledermauss Kultur”.

As a socio-political construction, the “Fledermauss Kultur” is a relatively new event in human history. And because the history of the Western liberalism as a social phenomenon is appearing only in past few generations, there is no adequate indication in history about the existence of nationalism until the clash between the both basic civilizations, taking place in the era of the Middle Ages.

This relatively late appearance of “Fledermauss Kultur” in history was derived from the logical conclusion that there could not have been diffused notions that had not yet existed. Till the Middle Ages there was no conceptual as well social structure of the democratic system.

The concrete indication of the difference between the “Fledermauss Kultur” and “Western liberalism”, as a diffusion of the cultural polarities in an “historic compromise” of democracy, consists in a very fine nuance of both basic civilizations, Atheneistic and Archaic being legitimated by the same entity of the same society as well as by the same political regime. In the case of “Fledermauss Kultur”, although the cultural differences are tolerated by the state, the society is not permitted to decide its representatives democratically through independent participation in the formation of the existing political power and all six parameters of the Bzezinskian “syndrome of totalitarian dictatorships” are there valid. The “historic compromise” there is constrained by the state power over the society. While, the “Western liberalism” in the democratic states is voluntarily accepted by the society.

The “Fledermauss Kultur” is to be regarded equally to the political dictatorship. Therefore, the six parameters of Bzezinsky and Friedrich could be declared as characteristic syndromes of political dictatorships. While the seventh supplementary attribute to the Bzezinskian syndrome - the dominance of one of the both main civilizations on the state structure and over the society, introduced by the author, makes the exclusive difference between a totalitarian regime and the political dictatorship. In the Soviet totalitarian regime, as well as in Iran for example, the state establishment has tolerated only one of each main civilization, Atheneistic in the U.S.S.R, and the Archaic in Persia.

### **Theory of convergence as part of cultural clash**

The Author agrees with Huntington’s assumption: “the economic and the military crisis and instabilities are the incubators of the accelerations of cultural clashes” (ibid.).

Therefore, supplementary to integral assessment of the theory of convergence, is the author’s firm opinion that an engagement of the political economics in the world economy through the enforcement of the purchasing power of the currency is necessary for efficacy and for efficiency of the global economic structure.

For the enforcement of the purchasing power of the currency it seems inevitable to adopt a new economic method according to them, the total profit of an economic enterprise is to be distributed in favor to subvention of the reduction of prices and for acceleration of the enforcement of purchasing power of currency proportionally to the restriction of the trade cycle.

Through the proportionally distribution of the profit as capital, there is expected to guarantee the stability and functionalism of the mixed market economy by the protection of the value of purchasing power of both parties, investors as well as governmental statutory and especially of employers.

This economical method should consist according to the following mathematical formula:

$$E_2 = \{[T_1 - (T_1 - T_2)] + P_2\}$$

$$E_2 = \{T_2 + (P_1 : 10)\} = T_2 + P_2$$

$$T_2 = \{[(W_1 : 1.5) + (Q_1 : 3)] + Z$$

$$P_2 = \{E_1 - (E_1 - E_2)\} = E_2 - T_2$$

$$Q = H + G$$

---

E = trade cycle (turnover)

Q = total generally operating expenses

H = historic cost

G = general operating expenses

P = profit

Z = factor costs

T = total expenses = full cost pricing

W = taxation

This mathematical formula of the economical model is probably supposed to be in a state to guarantee the protection of the purchasing power of the income of investors similar to the purchasing power of contemporary profits, nevertheless to the fact that according to the presented method the profit of investors will retain only ca. 10% of total amount. But, the purchasing power of the income of employers should retain in the similar amount and will increase ca. 8 times more.

Nevertheless of relatively low rate of inflation in the industrialized countries on over the world, the purchasing power of currency in the beginning of the years of 1970's was approximately 12 times stronger than 30 years later. And there is no reason for not being capable to reverse the world economy to the similar aspect of the economic capacity.

This economic method, according to author, can be adapted at regionally, as well as at the global international economic systems.

### **The Middle East and the “evolutionary magistralle of historic circle”**

To return to our theory of cultural struggle, in the nation states like: Argentina, India, Malaysia, Philippines and in several former dictatorial countries, adoption of Western liberalism as an historic compromise, was primarily achieved, not because of the objective needs of the society's cultural and political maturity but, if may we use the theoretic model of Mackov Jerzy (1999): because “the political elite” there, exclusively were in a state “to form the process of transformation of the society to the democratic system”. (In other words: in those countries which never experienced a cultural clash

between both basic civilizations, those societies are not yet mature enough for an historic compromise and the accumulation of the values of the democratic system there seems to have an artificial character; something between the historic compromise of Western liberalism and the “Fledermauss Kultur”).

Moreover, the citizens of the U.S.A. and Australia or Israel for example, like all the other immigrant countries, experienced political socialization in the original state regimes of their native countries through usual circumstances of political agenda that created urgency in the immigration states to create an atmosphere for the cultural clash between the both basic civilizations.

In the author’s opinion, similar to this approach of “the cultural meeting” as the immediate factor of creation of an aspect of urgency for acceleration of an historic compromise, in case of achievement of an mutual agreement in the Middle East, principally between the state of Israel and the Palestinian authority, there will inevitably arise a groundwork and a reason for the urgency of the acceleration of a cultural clash between the both main civilizations.

Palestinian society consisting of by individuals with different experiences in political socialization under different regimes over the world will inevitably demand the creation of a democratic system in the newly created state of Palestine. Such an agreement would accelerate a cultural clash between the both basic civilizations in the whole region of the Middle East, because peoples of Arab states in the region are already mature for an explosive eruption of a cultural clash.

The supplementary option of the continuation of the “circle of history”, is the invention of an method for slowing the “evolutionary magistralle” of history by freezing the existed status quo of the equally balanced distribution of opportunities between the both main civilizations among the society. One of these methods is a process of enhancement of religious expansionism, and instead, promotion of secular values. As an immediate result of such intervention in the “evolutionary magistralle” of the “circle of history” is the retaining of the whole democratic system throughout the world expected which may continue for several additional centuries.

Presumably, there are two major regions, the Middle East and the Far East that by the skillful political intervention of the world leaders can be influenced through the acceleration of democratization of the whole of civil society.

Because the Middle East features a cultural struggle, as the epicenter of the mondial clash, between the both basic civilizations, the Atheneistic and the Archaic, it has validity of categorical imperative in his importance for guaranties for social stability, not only in the Middle East or in the contemporary world order, as a determinant factor, but it can be responsible for the continuation of the “historic circle” as a whole.

This depends on the results of the peace process between Israel and the Palestinian authority. If the peace process should fail, it is expected that the archaic culture will dominate the hegemony on all over the world. While the resolution of the Palestinian problem by mutual agreement, according to the author, depends exclusively on the comprehensive intervention of the international community as arbitrator in the Middle East conflict, through the rights of constraintment on the both parties (Botera: 2.6.2001). Through such an intervention of the international community there is expected the creation of an political aspect of acceleration of the cultural clash in struggle between the main civilizations because of the enforcement of the values of the Atheneistic culture. As a consequence there is expected an achievement of the political aspect in them the urgency of an “historic compromise” will be inevitable.

Without a political solution of the Middle East problem, and without the intervention of human intelligence, the “historic circle” is supposed to be closed by the evolutionary magistralle of history!

The Israeli Government has to recognize the inevitability of the intervention of the international community as arbitrator in the Middle East conflict. All the forms of separation or occupation will inevitably conduct to destroy of whole democratic system and to a total failure of the values of Atheneistic-secular civilization on over the world.

In the name of the entire Archaic-fundamentalist-religious culture, struggle of Islam is directed not only against the state of Israel or against the U.S.A., nor against the Western values, but it is a declaration of war against the whole of human Race. That is a clash between the both basic civilizations. And in an attempt to dominate the Atheneistic civilization, in the name of the entire Archaic-fundamentalist-religious culture the Muslim fundamentalism, presumably by supports of the entire fundamentalist movement, has declared a “jihad” against all who think different and who accept or tolerate secular values.



The “civilized” world has to understand that: as a consequence of domination of the Middle East by Muslim fundamentalism, the question of the destiny of “noble” Europe and the “modern” U.S.A. will arise as the next supplementary chapter in the cultural struggle. Because, the Archaic-fundamentalist-religious culture as whole demands back the world hegemony on over the whole of human kind, according to the obligations of “the evolutionary magistralle of the circle of history”.

The creation of a democratic-secular-sovereign state of Palestine should be of common interest to the state of Israel and to the democratic world as whole. Because through an achievement of an “historic compromise” in the newly established state of Palestine, it may be possible to conduct a process of democratization in all the countries of the region. Such a result will be an origin for stopping the expansion of the Archaic-religious values at least for the next half century.

In the People’s Republic of China, the clash had begun already before the decline of Soviet totalitarianism but in contrast to the “Commecon” countries, the Chinese political leadership took all necessary precautions in view for slowing the tempo of escalation of the clash between both civilizations. But, despite these precautions, the cultural clash between the both basic civilizations is to expect to be followed by an evolutionary development of the historic magistralle and the establishment of a democratic system in People’s Republic of China will probably be inevitable.

## **Conclusion**

As a conclusion there is to admit that, the most important difference between a “cultural entity”, as thought Huntington to have found among the several cultures on over the world, and the both main civilizations, introduced by the author, consists in a factual assumption of the contrast between several regionally restricted “cultural entities”, as described by Huntington which by their origin are a product of the environmental influence of the human history and in space of centuries became an inseparable component of the human genetic program, and on the other hand, the origins of both main civilizations, Atheneistic and Archaic that the differences between them as an human neglect to one of the both basic civilizations are probably determined by the human genetic codes from the Genesis of the natural selection. Those attributes are

probably not possible to change even by scientific intervention (genetic engineering). It is to underline that, according to the recent archeological discovery in the African continent, the both skulls of Neanderthals which lived there ca. 120,000 years ago, anatomically were interbred and especially physiognomically had no similarities with no one of the in the contemporary era existing human races (Wong: May 2003).

Even the Jewish Mythology is annotating the objective of differences between the two ancestors for human kind, Abel and Cain, as origins of the both main civilizations.

But according to the principal assumptions of thesis: differences between the both basic cultures, the Archaic-fundamentalist-religious and the Atheneistic-secular are probably predetermined by the human genetic codes, and among the human society they are probably the original source of cultural struggle in the entire history of the human society. And the establishment of different political structures in civil society is excepted by cultural clashes between the Archaic-fundamentalist-religious culture and the Atheneistic-secular civilization.

This for, nevertheless to the principal assumption of this research, according to them, in the cultural struggle between the both main civilizations finally only one of the both basic civilizations will dominate the world, the Atheneistic or the Archaic, a periodic installation of the democratic system in the states of “Fledermauss Kultur”, like Iraq or Afganistan and Syria for example, could be possible only in two principal routs:

1. An evolutionary way: as first step, through the imposition of one of the both main civilizations on the concerned society – suitably the Atheneistic-secular civilization, because of the abbreviation of the incubation process of transformation -, and as next, acceleration of a cultural struggle, for achieving an historic compromise, as a consequence. (Like in Turkey, the Warsaw Pact Countries or possibly in Iran before the clerocratic revolution).

2. An artificially rout: the historic compromise will be imposed over the concerned society by the state political power (like most of Latin American and African countries or like in Japan or G.F.R. after the world war II).

While the struggle of the West against totalitarian dictatorships with a secular or religious-fundamentalist identification such as South Korea or Iran, shouldn't be principally based on the military activity then, primarily it should be based on the

intervention of the West by propaganda means of expansion of suitable culture. Atheistic in Iran and Archaic in South Korea for example, for evoking a cultural struggle there, that only is in a state to create an atmosphere of urgency of the historic compromise, that as an immediate result will be in a state to provide the conditions for installation of the democratic system, at least in the principal stages of the transitional era of the world political structure, in the whole of civil society on the straight line of the current millennium.

- \* The Author is a Doctor in Political Science

-

### **Notes:**

Bayat, Asef, "Revolution without movement, movement without revolution: Comparing Islamic activism in Iran and Egypt", Comparative studies in society and history, 40(1), January 1998: 136-169.

Botera, David, "Advises to the Israeli Government", The voice of Israel, Israeli Radio Net 2 in Hebrew, 2.6.2001.

Bzezinsky, K., Zbigniew, "The crisis of communism: the paradox of political participation", Washington Quarterly, vol. 10, no 5-11, winter 1987.

Deluguian, G., Krishenie sovetskoy sistemy i ego potentsialniye sledstvija: bankrotstvo, segmentatsija, vyrozhdenie , ( The soviet collapse and its potential consequences: bankruptcy, segmentation, involution ) Politicheskie Issledovanija, 2000 (10).

Eckstein, Harry, "A theory of stable democracy", in H., Eckstein, Devison and cohesion in democracy, 1973, pp. 225-288;

Friedrich, J., Karl, Zbigniew, K., Bzezinsky "The general characteristics of totalitarian dictatorship" Totalitarian dictatorship and autocracy, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1965: 15-27.

Fukuyama, Francis, "The end of history?" The national interest, No: 16 , 1989.

Giddens, Anthony, The consequences of modernity, Cambridge, U.K. Polity press, 1990.

Giddens, Anthony, Modernity and self - identity: self and society in late modern age, Cambridge, U.K. polity press, 1992.

Giddens, Anthony, "Dare to care, conserve and repair", New statmen and society, Cambridge, No. 6, 1993.

Huntington, P., Samuel, "The clash of civilizations?", Foreign Affairs, Vol. 72(3-4), 1993.

Mackow, Jerzy, "Der Wandel des Kommunistischen Totalitarismus und die Postkommunistische Systemtransformation: Periodisierung, Problematik und Begriffe", Zeitschrift fuer Politikwissenschaft 9 (4), 1999: 1347-1380.

Starcenkov, G., I., "Turcija: Islamskij factor v svetskom gosudarstve" (Turkey: the Islamic factor in a secular state), narody azii i afriki, 1998(2): 25-34.

Szellenyi, Ivan, "The intellectuals in power?", After the fall, London / Boston / Sydney, 1983.

Thompson, R., Mark, "Demokratische Revolution statt Kulturkampf. Eine Erwiderung auf Huntingtons Thesen", Internationale Politik 55(4), April 2000: 47-54.

**Wong, Kate, "Who were the Neanderthals? - New look at human evolution", Scientific American, Vol. 288 (5), May 2003.**

Among the other authoritative Personalities, the author expresses his appreciation to Dr. Ilan Pappé, as well to Dr. Abraham Wolfenson, Prof. Karl Flanner and to my honest spouse, Dr. Maya Botera, for their instructive contribution.

---