

FIVE

The Formative Parameters of Civilizations

A Theoretical and Historical Framework

Ahmet Davutoğlu

What are the paradigmatic constituents of civilizations as historical structures? What makes “civilization” a unit of analysis in history? What explains the endurance of authentic civilizations under the pressure and dominance of modern Western civilization? These are some of the questions we have to address if we are to endorse the following three assumptions: (i) the plural use of civilizations, (ii) different experiences of globalizations, and (iii) the need for a global governance of civilizational plurality.¹

What follows has no pretensions to provide a complete answer to these grand substantive questions. Yet, here I will discuss civilizations as products of comprehensive processes pertaining to six fundamental dimensions of individual and collective life: (i) ontological re-definition of the self-perception (*selbstverständnis*) of individual human being, (ii) epistemological re-formulation of human knowledge, (iii) axiological re-valuation of human norms, (iv) re-construction of time consciousness and historical imagination, (v) re-shaping of space, particularly in the form of restructuring the city as a reflection of “being-knowledge-value” paradigm, and (vi) re-establishment of a world order as a new way of administering political and economic affairs.

These parameters are immanent to the formative processes of civilizations. Among them the first three constitute the philosophical and ethical foundations of the being-knowledge-value paradigm and the last three

represent the historical manifestations of particular being-knowledge-value paradigms in social, economic, and political structures. Now I want to elucidate what I mean by these categories.

1. ONTOLOGICAL DIMENSION: RE-DEFINITION OF THE SELF-PERCEPTION OF INDIVIDUAL HUMAN BEING

One of the main formative parameters of a civilization is its provision of a distinct comprehension of the ontological status of an individual human being. Through providing a new self-perception based on a new worldview, civilizations offer a meaningful basis of existence. A new self-perception is possible only with a new consciousness of being, which determines the relation between the ego, *lebenswelt* (where the ego perceives itself), and the Absolute Being (God or the association of God with the nature as in the cases of pantheism and materialism).

In *Upanishads*, for instance, the indwelling all-pervading Supreme Being, or *Brahman*, is identical with the individual self, or *Atman*, and through the cycles of birth every individual being moves toward the realization of the identity of *Atman* and *Brahman*. That main message in *Upanishads* formed the basis of a new self-perception as the constitutive and distinctive characteristic of Indian civilization. The realization of the identities of *Atman* and *Brahman* in Being (*Sat*), Consciousness (*Chit*), and Delight (*Ananda*), the belief in reincarnation, and the social order of the caste system can only be understood through this self-perception.² The doctrine of reincarnation and the doctrine of *varna*—which stipulates that all men are naturally divided into four castes—became the main sources of self-perception of an Indian individual person and the justification for the social order in Indian civilization.³

Similarly, the Jewish self-perception based on the covenant with God as a nation with a special mission and a privileged ontological status has been the unique characteristic and foundation of Hebrew civilization in history and also of Judaic tradition in different cultural zones. The great metaphysical and political order of King Solomon as the historical peak of Hebrew civilization was linked to such a strong Jewish self-perception as the biblically justified subject of the earthly order. The same self-perception became the source of resistance and protection in Judaic tradition when Jews were exiled and forced to live in ghettos under inimical political settings. As it has been underlined by Hans Küng, “Israel understands itself as the people freed by God and moreover ‘people’ (Hebrew ‘am, goy) is the term used most frequently by the Israelite tribes to describe themselves: God’s people—or in line with the logic of this experience—God’s chosen people.”⁴

Greek civilization provided a new self-perception for its citizens that differentiated them from slaves and foreigners not only politically but

also ontologically. In other words, the difference between a citizen and a slave was not only a difference in socio-political status but also a difference in ontological substance. The order of Greek city-states and the Hellenic civilization were a reflection of this self-perception of the Greek citizen. This exclusivist conception of the citizen, however, fell short of sustaining the legitimacy of political order when the ruling elite became a tiny minority in a society made up of many different ethnic, religious, and cultural communities reaching from Macedonia to India. The transformation from an organic city structure into a mechanic imperial structure was accompanied with a psychological transformation of self-perception. Stoic, Cynic, and Epicurean responses to this transformative process were illuminating examples of the relationship between self-perception and political order within a civilizational tradition. A similar process was at work in the Roman civilization. The transformation from city politics of Rome into the cosmopolitan politics of *Pax Romana* was linked with the transformation of Roman self-perception from polytheistic city religion into the sophisticated philosophico-theological self-perception of Marcus Aurelius, the Stoic philosopher Emperor.

The self-perception of the Islamic personality as a civilizational prototype is the psycho-ontological counterpart of a particular imagination of God, man, and nature. The Qur'anic monotheistic revolution and man's ontological status and role on earth formed a new consciousness of being. The ontological hierarchy and differentiation between the Creator and the created and Allah's absolute sovereignty has been persistently stressed by the Qur'an within a tightly knit monotheistic framework. Yet this emphasis on Creator's sovereignty never leads to a peripheralization of the human being since the human is the *raison d'être* of the entire creation. The Islamic doctrine of *Tawhid* (Unity) engenders a new civilizational self-perception founded on the principle that there is a clear ontological hierarchy between God and all creation, and that human beings share the same ontological level as vicegerents of Allah on earth (*Khalifatullah*).⁵

The Qur'anic conception of the ontological status of man in his relationship with Allah as his Creator and with nature as his existential environment influences both the individual consciousness of a Muslim and the institutionalization of his social relations. This new self-perception not only revolutionized the ontological consciousness of Muslims but also had a lasting impact on the intellectual and social life of the Islamic civilization. The inclusive, egalitarian, and easily accessible nature of Islamic self-perception was the main reason behind Islam's swift spread in different civilizational zones comprising different ethnic and sectarian communities. With the conquests of Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Iran during the reign of the Caliph Omar, Muslims became neighbors with the Indian civilization on one side and the Roman civilization on the other. Within that process, the Islamic belief transformed into a civilizational

form as a byproduct of the rapid expansion of Islam into almost all areas previously unified by Alexander the Great.

In the West, on the other hand, a new self-perception was in the making starting with the early Renaissance period. The radical intellectual transformations such as the Reformation and the Renaissance, the Copernican and the Newtonian Revolutions in cosmology, Mercantilism and Industrial Revolution in economy, and the American and the French revolutions in the political field have all contributed to the formation of a new self-perception in the West leading to a new ontological consciousness of being an *individual*: an intelligent agent who can comprehend and control the mechanistic structure of Nature, an ultimate factor of economic production and consumption, and a rational actor in political processes and administrative mechanisms.⁶

This new self-perception has generated a new hope to attain ontological security and freedom—the most fundamental objectives of human kind throughout history. That hope was best expressed in Enlightenment’s magical formula of “reason-science-progress”: reason as the source of ontological freedom, science as the instrument and form of its achievement, and progress as the deterministic future. Western civilization developed a new self-perception based on the idea of *the perfectibility of man* and hence contravened the authoritative character of the Christian conception of God and its institutionalized doctrine. The idea of a destined paradise of absolute freedom enabled by the control of nature (and man) with machines—“the new slaves”—reached its zenith in the nineteenth century. This Euro-Christian psychology of a secular paradise on earth was the motivating impetus for colonialism, which can be observed in its paradigmatic example, Rudyard Kipling’s *White Man’s Burden*.⁷

Thus, civilizational self-perception is one of the basic building blocks in the formation, development, and resistance capacities of civilizations. Civilizational self-perception fosters a civilizational prototype. A civilizational prototype arises less for the institutional and formal reasons and more for the worldview that provides an individual with a meaningful basis of existence. A civilization can become a living form only if it can assert its self-perception in a way comprehensive enough to influence *lebenswelt*. Western socio-economic constructs, Islamic cities, Chinese social order, or Indian social hierarchy are all closely linked with the differing self-perceptions of the respective civilizational traditions. Civilizations that can build a healthy relationship between their self-perception and *lebenswelt* experience revival, whereas those that cannot go through crises, get weakened, or may even vanish.

2. EPISTEMOLOGICAL DIMENSION: RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PARADIGM OF KNOWLEDGE

The emergence and interactions of civilizations cannot be adequately understood without understanding their ways of constructing and reconstructing knowledge. In different civilizational traditions, differing answers given to the basic questions about (i) the sources of knowledge, (ii) the theoretical systematization of knowledge in the form of theology, philosophy and science, (iii) the practical use of knowledge in the sense of technology, and (iv) social hierarchy based on the authority of knowledge gave birth to different epistemological characteristics.

The question of the sources of knowledge necessarily brings up the issue of the ontological relation between man, god(s), and nature. The striking symbolic reflection of this epistemological question in Ancient Greece is Prometheus who steals the fire—knowledge—from Zeus. Some suggest that the name Prometheus etymologically comes from the combination of the Greek words *pro* (before) and *manthano* (learn), which carries the epistemological connotations of the myth. Similarly, In *Protagoras* Plato narrates that gods created humans and animals, but it was Prometheus and his brother Epimetheus who had the power to give attributes to them, and that Prometheus attributed fire and other arts to humans.

It is interesting to note that consubstantial stories of stealing fire/knowledge have been imagined in other civilizational traditions such as the Mataricvan myth in Vedic Indian tradition, Nanabozho myth in authentic North Mexican Ojibwa culture, and in several Northern American cultures. The similarity between mythological and etymological backgrounds of Greek and Indian traditions might be interpreted as an outcome of common challenges as well as an indication of civilizational interaction. The etymological connection between Prometheus and Vedic term *pra math* (to steal) and *pramathyu-s* (thief) is quite interesting from this perspective.⁸

The mythology that the knowledge of nature (fire) was stolen from god gives us three dimensions about sources of knowledge: god(s), man, and nature. Civilizations define sources of knowledge based on their ontological premises. Accordingly, some civilizations represent knowledge as being stolen from god(s) as a challenge to them and some others perceive knowledge as being given to humans out of divine grace. In that sense, the fundamental question of the compatibility between the divine and human sources of knowledge is addressed in all civilizational heritages.

The Abrahamic tradition in general, and the Islamic civilization in particular, posits the harmony between divine and human sources of knowledge as the epistemological backbone of the new civilizational paradigm. This had two broad consequences. First, various schools of Islamic thought have developed a common conception of knowledge based on

the notion of the unity of truth and harmonization of the sources of knowledge.⁹ This prevented religious knowledge from becoming a set of dogmas restricting observation and reason, and it did not allow the formation of a secular sphere that excludes religious knowledge. In other words, as opposed to Western historical experience, religious epistemology did not culminate in an anti-scientific discourse, and scientific epistemology did not lead to an anti-religious disposition; rather, they together constituted a common epistemological ground and discourse that underpinned Muslim self-perception.

One classic statement of Islamic civilization on the issue of the harmony between divine and human sources of knowledge is Ibn Tufail's *Hayy ibn Yaqthan*¹⁰ written in the twelfth century, which is a philosophical narrative of a man living alone on a desert island without any contact to institutionalized knowledge. *Hayy's* intellectual development from ignorance to knowledge/truth is achieved solely through his reason, and his later acquaintance with divine knowledge and civilization through *Absal*, a scholar of religion, aims to prove the ultimate compatibility of human and divine sources of knowledge. Almost all leading scholars from various intellectual schools in Islamic civilization paid special attention to the epistemological question of the harmony of divine and human sources of knowledge. The systematization of the epistemological paradigm in Islamic intellectual tradition has been congruent with its conception of the ontological status and role of the human being on earth.

The same question of the compatibility of divine and human sources of knowledge, however, created a long-lasting controversy between religion and science in the West and prepared the ground for the emergence of Enlightenment philosophies that formed the foundation of modern Western civilization. The Church's self-identification with the divine essence of Jesus, its claim to be the sole authority and source of knowledge, and its legitimizing role and central position in the socio-economic structures of the Middle Ages rendered the knowledge produced by it power-dependent and power-oriented. This led to the development of its own alternative, the scientific knowledge, as a challenge not only to the epistemological claims of the Church but also to the power structures it bolstered. While ecclesiastical epistemology legitimated feudalism and aristocracy, scientific knowledge developed in line with the rise of capitalism and bourgeoisie. These two paradigms of knowledge, in that sense, developed not in harmony but rather in binary opposition to each other.¹¹ Hume's categorical differentiation between the divine and human spheres of knowledge was transformed into a structure of linear and hierarchical historical flow under Comtean positivistic epistemology. Comte claimed that the human mind developed from a theological/fictional stage whereby facts were explained by supernatural powers to a metaphysical and abstract stage in which abstract notions were built without an empirical foundation, and finally reached to a positive and

scientific stage whereby the world started to be understood through observable facts. This axial shift from ecclesiastical dogmatism to scientific absolutism is an epistemological characteristic of the formation of modern Western civilizational paradigm, which distinguishes it from other civilizational experiences. The trinity of the Enlightenment philosophy—reason-science-progress—formed the backbone of the modernist epistemology that limits knowledge to human-based sources and claims to achieve absolute truth and constant progress.

The epistemological dimension of civilizational formations regulates the systematization of knowledge as a consistent intellectual paradigm and fosters the emergence of a new intellectual prototype. The transition from mythology to philosophy in Greek civilization marks the process of rational reconstruction of knowledge. The *Ayurvedic* Medicine as a scientific system originates from the Vedic metaphysics (*Charaka Samhita*) in Indian civilization. Taoist philosophy and Chinese traditional medicine form a holistic system in Chinese civilization. Similarly, in Islamic civilization the re-classification of both religious (*Tafsir*, *Hadith*, and *Fiqh*) and rational sciences (mathematics, medicine, physics, etc.) in a comprehensive framework around the principle of *Tawhid* (unity), and the emergence of modern scientific disciplines in Western civilization are but corollaries of the epistemological formations of civilizations.

The emergence of a new intellectual prototype as one who systematizes and carries the intellectual tradition is another dimension of the formative processes of civilizations. The figure of the *sophist* in Greek civilization, the *brahman/brahmin* in Indian civilization, the '*alim* in Islamic civilization and the *intellectual* in modern Western civilization attest to the formation of these respective civilizational entities. *Sophist* was the name given to the Greek Seven Sages including Solon and Thales in seventh and sixth centuries B.C., and had an ideal to carry *sophia* (wisdom). *Brahmin*, a member of the highest four major castes of traditional Indian society, was responsible for officiating at religious rites, for studying and teaching the Vedas, and had the epistemological potential to realize *Brahman*, that is the supreme cosmic spirit and absolute reality as the source and essence of material universe. The figure of '*Alim* is the special intellectual prototype of Islamic civilization who has the epistemological and axiological responsibility to understand, discover, and interpret '*ilm* (knowledge) that originates from one of the ninety-nine holy names of God ('*Alim*). The *Intellectual* of modern Western civilization, on the other hand, is the prototype who assumes the centrality of the "*intellect*" as the absolute and legitimate source of knowledge.

3. AXIOLOGICAL DIMENSION: RE-STRUCTURING OF VALUE SYSTEM AND STANDARDIZATION OF ETHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR

The axiological formation of civilizations has two major levels. The first level comprises the restructuring of a value-system as the foundation of a new relationship between ethics and law. The second level is about providing the individual human being with basic norms to standardize behavior in daily life. Constructing the categories of good and bad, ethical and unethical, legitimate and illegitimate is essential to interpret the meaning of life and to establish a social order. This normative foundation establishes a bridge between ontological and political existence of individual human beings as well as between natural and social order in and through providing a meaning for life. Such an attempt for meaningfulness is an indication of the emergence of a new civilization or of a re-awakening of an old one. Civilizations posit certain values that guide human behavior and constitute the normative basis of a legal system.

The philosophical tradition of the Greek civilization wrestled with this question extensively. In *Nichomachean Ethics*, one of the first systematic texts on ethics, Aristotle strives to demonstrate why happiness should be the goal of humans and why a virtuous character is necessary for it. The book begins with a clear statement about the relation between action and objective as an ethical issue and its relation with social and political order:

Every art and every inquiry, and similarly every action and pursuit, is thought to aim at some good; and for this reason the good has rightly been declared to be that at which all things aim. (. . .) since it (politics) legislates as to what we are to do and what we are to abstain from, the end of this science must include those of the others, so that this end must be the good for man. For even if the end is the same for a single man and for a state. That of the state seems at all events something greater and more complete whether to attain or preserve; though it is worth while to attain merely for one man, it is finer and more godlike to attain it for a nation or city-states.¹²

The rise of Stoicism within the process of the transition from Greek city-states to Alexandrian empire and its impact on the cosmopolitan structure of both Alexandrian and Roman imperial political orders is a striking example of the role of moral philosophy in interlinking natural and political philosophies and orders. Stoic doctrine of active relationship between cosmic determinism and human freedom became the foundation of individual moral well-being through the assumption that virtue consists in a will, which is in agreement with Nature. It is not a coincidence that Stoic belief in individual moral potential regardless of whether one is a citizen or a slave has been developed in a historical juncture

when Alexander the Great's empire aimed to establish a moral standard for a cosmopolitan political order. Epictetus' formulation in his *Discourses* that "each human being is primarily a citizen of his own commonwealth; but he is also a member of the great city of gods and men, where of the city political is only a copy" provided imperial structures in general and Roman Empire in particular with necessary moral premises. It is also not coincidence that Marcus Aurelius, a great Stoic philosopher-king, tried to revive and deploy this philosophy to respond to the crisis Roman Empire faced.

The Taoist and Confucian moral philosophies had a similar impact in the formation of Chinese civilization during Han dynasty. As the key concepts of moral philosophy, Greek *Logos*, Roman *Reason*, and Chinese *Tao* posited similar ethical norms for happiness, such as the stress on inner nature, human will, and virtue. The three jewels of Tao, namely, compassion, moderation, and humility, are the normative backbone not only of individual happiness but also of social harmony and political order. The conceptual web of *Tao Te Ching* and *Zhuangzi*,¹³ such as *wu-wei* (non-action), peace, vitality, kindness, and spontaneity, shapes the mind of the Chinese civilizational prototype and defines the standards of behavior in ordinary life.¹⁴ The harmony of the psychological and political—*nei-sheng wai wang*—as "the balance between inner cultivation and outer manifestation, on the other hand, is crucial to the flourishing of the empire."¹⁵

Confucius's re-codification of Chinese heritage from the time of Xia and Shang dynasties (twenty-first to eleventh centuries B.C.) was not solely a neo-traditionalist effort to reinvent a historical tradition, but also a purposeful futuristic attempt for theoretical and practical restructuring of Chinese moral philosophy. The Analects of Confucius became the standard canon of Chinese ethics till today: "Zizhang asked Confucius about humanity. Confucius said, 'if an individual can practice five things anywhere in the world, he is a man of humanity.' 'May I ask what these things are?' said Zizhang. Confucius replied, 'Reverence, generosity, truthfulness, diligence and kindness.'"¹⁶ Such examples of identification of humanity with moral norms created standards of behavior that guaranteed the continuity of Chinese civilization under different dynastic and ideological rules, including the destructive decades of Maoist Cultural Revolution.

The Indian civilization bears a distinctive characteristic in the history of civilizations in terms of the relationship between cosmological determinism, ontological existence, and ethical responsibility. The belief that human beings wander in *samsara*, the endless cycle of birth, suffering, death, and rebirth, brings up the question of human will. The doctrine of *karma*¹⁷ stipulating that actions in this life affect all future lives in the chain of reincarnation renders future ontological status dependent on the ethical attitude of the existing life, which in turn calls for human will to

lead to perfection through releasing from *samsara* (*moksha*), that is degradation via returning to life as animal. This dynamic possibility of stretching from the lowest ontological status to Brahma in Hinduism or nirvana in Buddhism provides the framework for individual norms of behavior, social hierarchy (caste system) and political order.

The ethical premises of Islamic civilization, on the other hand, originate directly from the special ontological status of human being as *khalifa-tullah* (vicegerent of God) on earth. Muhammad Iqbal, the leading Muslim thinker of the twentieth century, underlines three qualities of man's individuality and uniqueness with reference to the Qur'an: (i) that man is the chosen of God; (ii) that man, with all his faults, is meant to be representative of God on earth; and (iii) that man is trustee of a free personality which he accepted at his peril.¹⁸ This sense of special responsibility by virtue of being human provides the prototype of Islamic civilization with a strong self-perception filled with self-respect. In line with that, the doctrine of *tawhid* (unity) guarantees that a Muslim can perceive his being and fulfill his ethical responsibility without any intermediary institution or a group of clergy. The Qur'anic text and historical practices of the Prophet bestow clear codes of conduct that ensured the integrity and historical continuity of the moral dimension of Islamic civilization. Qur'anic concepts such as *al-khayr* (goodness), *al-'adl* (justice), *al-haqq* (truth and right), *al-'amal al-salih* (good action), *al-birr* (righteousness), *al-qist* (equity), *al-taqwa* (piety), and *al-hilm* (gentleness) are the benchmarks for Islamic normativity and social ethics. This normativist dimension has become philosophically more sophisticated after the encounter with the pre-Islamic traditions of Greek, Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Iranian, and Indian civilizations. The corpus of Islamic ethical philosophy centered around the concept of *sa'adah* (happiness) developed by al-Farabi, Ibn Sina, and Ibn Rushd testify to this sophistication.

The Islamic value-system has two distinctive characteristics, one theoretical and one practical. The theoretical one is the existence of very strong interlinkages between ontological, epistemological, and axiological premises that lead to the control of social mechanisms by the value-system. Al-Hazini's *Kitab al-Mizan al-Haqq* provides a typical example for this tight connection between being, knowledge, and value. The essential aim of this book is to explain how the mechanism of the water-balance works, but it begins with a very sophisticated part on the philosophy of justice and its relationship to the cosmic balance under the control of Allah's absolute sovereignty.

Justice is the stay of all virtues and the support of all excellences. For perfect virtue, which is wisdom in its two parts, knowledge and action, and in its two aspects, religion and the course of the World, consists of perfect knowledge and assured action; and justice brings the two (requisites) together. It is the confluence of the two perfections of that virtue, the means of reaching the limits of all greatness and the cause of

securing the prize in all excellence. In order to place justice on the pinnacle of perfection, the Supreme Creator made Himself known to the Choicest of His servants under the name of the Just; and it was by the light of justice that the World became complete and perfected, and was brought to perfect order—to which there is allusion in the words of the Blessed: “by justice were the heavens and the earth established.”¹⁹

The practical characteristic is the rhythm of rituals in daily, weekly, yearly, and life-long cycles which cultivates a sense of self-control through regularly reminding the human being his special responsibility on earth. Five times of prayer a day, weekly prayer on Friday, month-long fasting in Ramadan every year, and performing *hajj* (pilgrimage) once in lifetime provides a way of individual ethical control and socializes basic modes of behavior. These rituals and their social reflections unite Muslims from different ethnic origins in different parts of the world.

The axiological dimension of modern Western civilization, on the other hand, relies on the secularization of life through a rational value system that forms the basis of ethics and law. We can pinpoint three influential trends in this process: (i) Machiavellian and Hobbesian frameworks that understand politics as a subject of rational theory and practice; (ii) utilitarian approaches that take individuals as rational agents trying to maximize their own interests; and (iii) Kantian re-systematization of ethics through replacement of theological morality with moral theology, marking a clear departure from the traditional belief that morality is possible only with religion. This rationalist re-construction of the value-system was consistent with the historical context shaped by the rise of capitalism and industrial revolution, which necessitated a secular individualization of the human being as a factor in the cycle of production and consumption. This had a radical impact on both the codes of behavior of the civilizational prototype and his rhythm of daily life. The standardization of working hours and the weekly and yearly holidays are natural results of this axiological and socio-economic transformation. The formation of the rational value-system prepared a suitable axiological framework for the establishment of a socio-political order based on secular institutions and of an economic structure based on free markets. This is a distinguishing characteristic of modern Western civilization in the history of humanity.

4. TEMPORAL DIMENSION: RE-IMAGINATION OF HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Another formative dimension of civilizations is the development of a new perception of time within a new imagination of historical consciousness. The transition from mythological to historical imagination marks an

important stage in the construction of historical consciousness in traditional civilizations. Ancient Chinese, Indian, and Greek traditions share some similarities in that respect. Firstly, all these three civilizations presume a transition from the myths of timeless creation to historical experience through god-kings, semi-divines, or demigods. Chinese mythological rulers before the Xia dynasty, *The Three August Ones and Five Emperors*, aim to create a new imagination of continuity between heavenly (*Fuxi* or *Fu Hsi*), earthly (*Nuwa*), and human (*Shennong* or *Shen Nung*) sovereigns. Because of this ambiguity between mythological and historical phases, this era has been called “unknown centuries” by some historians.²⁰ The successor rulers such as *Huang Di* (Yellow Emperor), *Zhuanxu*, Emperors *Ku*, *Yao*, and *Shun* interlink natural and political orders and establish a sense of continuity from mythology to history in the minds of the Chinese civilizational prototype.

The *puranas* of the Indian tradition consisting the mythological narratives on creation, destruction, genealogies of the kings, heroes, and demigods had a similar function in terms of historical imagination.²¹ Five distinguishing marks (*Pancha Lakshana*) of *Matysa Purana*, namely *sarga* (the creation of the universe), *pratisarga* (secondary creations), *vamsa* (genealogy of gods and sages), *manvantara* (the creation of human race), and *vamsanucaritam* (dynastic histories) show sequential steps of this imagination in Indian civilizational self-perception.

For Greeks, on the other hand, it was almost impossible to make a categorical differentiation between mythology and history. Greeks resorted to mythology in explaining the natural order and justifying the socio-political order. Their sequential transition from the myths of the age of gods (theogonies) to the age of demigods (when gods and mortals mix and interact) and to the age of heroes resembles the Indian and Chinese experiences of transition from the mythology to historical existence. Varro’s three-fold classification of gods as gods of nature, gods of the poet, and gods of the city is a Roman reinterpretation of this sense of relationship between historical imagination and political order.

Second, the textualization of the transition from mythology to historical imagination occurred parallel to the formation of a large-scale political order. *The Three August Ones and Five Emperors* and following political history was recorded in *Shiji* (The Records of the Great Historian), and the magnum opus of the great Chinese historian *Sima Qian* (145–90 B.C.) was written during the rise of Han dynasty. The earliest textualization of *puranas* in Indian civilization took place during the rise of *Gupta* (*Maurya*) dynasty (third to fifth century B.C.) when India was united under one political order. It had a very important role in diffusing common perceptions and constructing historical imaginations, ideas, and identities that legitimized common political authority. The Greek journey from *Homer* (c. 850 B.C.) to *Herodotus* (484–425 B.C.) is another example of the shift from mythological oral tradition to textual historical tradition. *Herodotus*

had a similar impact on the rise of Hellenistic imperial order under Alexander the Great through contributing to the creation of a Greek historical consciousness especially through the textualization of the Greco-Persian wars. It is also not a coincidence that *Varro*, the compiler of the chronology of the Roman Empire, lived during the reign of Caesar who, as the leader of an imperial order, felt the need to identify Roman history with the history of humanity. "*Marcus Terentius Varro*, despite many military campaigns, found time during his eighty-nine years (116–26 B.C.) to synopsise nearly every branch of knowledge; his 620 'volumes' (some seventy-four books) constituted a one-man encyclopedia for his time."²²

Third, all these civilizational traditions identify their historical existence with the existence of the entire humanity. The pioneers of civilizations tend to reinterpret history in a way that places their own civilization at the center and they identify the future of humanity with the future of their own civilization. Their perception of the creation of the universe, beginning of human history, and foundation of a socio-political order assume that physical existence, metaphysical maturation, and historical evolution of humanity go back to their own civilizational experience.

The Abrahamic tradition, on the other hand, develops a sense of continuity and historicity through the lives of the prophets. The uniqueness of the Jewish tradition, in that sense, is the chronological flow of its history based on the narrations in Torah. Accordingly, the Jewish people is posited as the subject of this history and God's Chosen Nation. The Exodus from Egypt marks the beginning of the Jewish calendar, which, in a sense, identifies history with the historical mission of the Jewish people. Promulgation of Torah by Ezra in 445 B.C parallels the Greek, Indian, and Chinese textualizations of holy narratives, yet without marking the rise of a new imperial era.

Islamic civilization inherited Abrahamic tradition's sense of history based on prophetic continuity from Adam to Muhammad, which is referred to as the *Qisas-ı Enbiya* (Stories of the Prophets). Textualization started with the very emergence of Islamic belief as the Qur'an was assembled in the form of a text. The prophetic stories in the Qur'an provided the believers with a historical consciousness through the journey of all humanity and with ethical lessons derived out of these experiences.

Besides, certain unique characteristics of Islamic civilization have brought about new dimensions to this historical consciousness. First, no nation, person, or institution has been privileged as the subject of history in the form of a chosen nation, caste, or space. Unlike previous traditions neither the Prophet of Islam nor his followers or institutions claimed a meta-historic existence. In other words, Islamic civilization did not face the kinds of issues such as the question of the divinity and historicity of Jesus in the Christian tradition and as the transition from mythology to history in ancient traditions.²³ Second, Islamic civilization encountered other civilizations immediately after the emergence of its belief system.

The expansion of Islamic teachings to almost all ancient civilizational zones such as Mesopotamia, Egypt, Iran, Syria, and India in a period of only two generations created a profoundly cosmopolitan context within which a much more universal and inclusive understanding of history was able to flourish. The internalization of Greek tradition by early Muslim philosophers and the re-interpretation of Indian cultural history by Muslim thinkers such as al-Biruni²⁴ are interesting examples of this inclusive understanding of civilizational experiences as being part of the same human history.

The Muslim political orders from Andalusia to India under Umayyad, Abbasid, Babur, and Ottoman dynasties theoretically and practically benefited from this cosmopolitan historical vision. The Ottoman use of *Kanun-i Kadim* (the Ancient Law) in its legal structure is a practical manifestation of a historical understanding that embraces previous civilizational experiences. Ottoman rulers, for instance, did not hesitate to use the titles of the rulers of different traditions such as the *Caliph* (Islamic), *Padishah* (Iranian), *Hakan* (Nomadic/Turanic), and *Kaiser-i Rum/Caesar* (Roman). The purpose here was not solely to legitimize their own political order but also to stress the historical continuity of their rule in the eyes of their subjects.²⁵

Modern Western civilization, on the other hand, has distinctive characteristics regarding time perception and historical consciousness such as the secularization of the perception of time leading to the idea of progress, Eurocentric conception of the flow of human history, and historical reconstruction of identities for the justification of the nation-state as a system of political order. The transitions from pagan mythology to Christian divinization of history, and from re-historicization of religion to secular understanding of history constitute the basic turning points in the transformation of Western time-consciousness.²⁶ Secularization of history in the sense of liberating it from theological axioms was a reaction to the meta-historic divinization of history through the imagination of a divine intervention into history through semi-divine beings such as Chosen Nation, Christ, or Church. This was a process in which “Christianity [became] historicized and history secularized,” as Voegelin puts it.²⁷ The Enlightenment idea of unilinear secular progress did not only reconstruct historical imagination of the Western mind but also developed a new perception for the future of humanity.

Accompanying this idea of unilinear progress is the Eurocentric understanding of history that ignores not only the contributions but at times even the existence of non-Western civilizations. In this view, Western civilization as the dominant civilization of the time has a special mission to bridge the past and the future. For instance, in Hegel’s periodization of history, humanity undergoes its childhood in the East, its adolescence in Central Asia, its youth in Greece, its manhood in Rome and its maturity in the Germanic races of Europe. This clearly identifies human

history with the adventure of a particular civilization or people. The monolithic representation of the historical progress of human thought in the existing educational paradigm in the sequence of Ancient Greece, Roman Empire, medieval era, Renaissance, Enlightenment, and Modern Age can be regarded as a reflection of this Eurocentricism.

5. SPATIAL DIMENSION: RE-CONSTRUCTION OF SPACE ON THE BASIS OF BEING-KNOWLEDGE-VALUE PARADIGM

There are two aspects of the spatial dimension of civilizational formations, one is about the perception of space, and the other is about the city as the geo-cultural form and the historical realization of being-knowledge-value paradigm in physical space. Civilizations develop a spatial perception in their process of formation through assuming the centrality of the locations in which they originate. Sometimes this is even reflected in the etymology of the names. For instance, the word “China” in Mandarin language, *Zhōngguo*, first appeared in sixth century B.C. during Zhou dynasty and means central/middle (*zhōng*) kingdom/country since they believed that China was the center of civilization. It is worth noting that the same concept also implied a claim for political legitimacy as a precondition of political order. The Chinese Wall, on the other hand, was seen as a boundary between the civilized spatial center and the uncivilized lands—the same concept continued to be used in modern times demonstrating the continuity of this perception.

Similarly, the Arabic name of Egypt, “*Misr*,” originally connoted civilization and metropolis parallel to the literal meaning of “the two straits.” It is also interesting that Egyptians have been using the term *Umm al-Dunya* (Mother of the World) for their land. Persians, on the other hand, divided the world into seven regions (*kishver*) composed of seven equal spheres, and located their own space on the fourth, which is the central sphere. The Greek had an Aegean-centered spatial perception extending from Sicily to Caspian Sea. *Homer*, *Anaximander* of Miletus and *Anaximenes* had the same visions of space but used different methodologies to describe it. However, this perception changed in the post-Alexandrian era. The city of Alexandria became the center of a new spatial perception developed by *Eratosthenes*, *Strabo*, and *Ptolemy* in a way that included Persia and India, bridging civilizational and political domains. The fact that Romans called the Mediterranean Sea *Mare Nostrum* (Our Sea) and the idiom “all roads lead to Rome” similarly reflect the relationship between the perception of space and political order. The Jewish term *ha-Aretz ha-Muvtahat* (promised land) gave a metaphysical meaning and spirit to a particular area as the center of spatial perception. Hans Küng’s comparison between Judaism, Christianity, and Islam is striking in that regard: “The land, or precisely a particular ‘holy’ land, does not have a

special saving significance either for Christianity, which understands itself as a universal people of God, tied to no ethnic or geographical frontiers, or for Islam, despite its Arab origin and character similarly does not make any distinction between the lands. However, for Judaism, which preserved its primal bond with the land of Israel (Hebrew *Eretz Israel*) even in the time of the 'dispersion' (Greek *Diaspora*), the relation to this particular land, the 'promised' land, is quite essential."²⁸

Jerusalem, on the other hand, became the spiritual and civilizational center for the entire Abrahamic tradition, including Christianity and Islam. Similarly, Cosmas Indicopleustes' *Topographia Christiana* was an attempt to develop a spatial perception compatible with Christian teachings.²⁹

Islamic civilization has developed a spatial perception reflecting its teachings and its domain of political order. Balkhi School's Mecca-centered globular terrestrial maps and al-Biruni's maps connecting the Atlantic and Indian oceans exemplify the influence of Islamic teachings and symbols and also mark the political domain of Islamic civilization.³⁰ Ottoman Empire's self-representation as "an eternal state sovereign over seven climates (regions)" similarly connects spatial perception with political order.

Modern Western civilization's spatial perception and claims for centrality were shored up by scientific developments especially in the area of geography. In his analysis of the mentality of the Western man (*homo Occidentalis*), Johann Galtung suggests that in the Western perception of the space, "the Occident, and particularly Western Europe and North America, constitutes the center of the world, the rest being the periphery, with the center as the prime mover."³¹ This Eurocentric conception of space formed the basis of the world maps where Europe is always located at the upper center of the world, and the categorical differentiation between the center and periphery later paved the way to the colonial world order.

The historical emergence of a civilizational space has three preconditions: a geopolitical zone suitable for the security and basic needs, geo-economic zone for the integrity of economic activity, and geo-cultural milieu for the consistency and continuity of cultural life. Historical civilizations emerged and rose in an integrated space where these conditions were met. The emergence of early civilizations in places where there are rich sources of water (Egypt/Nile, Mesopotamia/Euphrates-Tigris, India/Indus-Ganges, China/Yellow River) proves the necessity of provision of security and basic needs. The trade routes such as the Silk Road accelerated the spread of civilizational values and commodities. Cities, as geo-cultural units of civilizations, played an essential role in forming a micro-cosmic model for civilizational order and interaction.

The "pivotal cities"³² of civilizations serve as the milestones of the history of the rise and fall of civilizations since their fate gets identified

with the fate of the civilization within which they emerge. These cities stand as the structured historical realization of civilizational parameters in time and space, sometimes in the form of architecture or in the rhythm of music, sometimes in the continuity of intellectual tradition or an efficient market at the crossroads of trade, and sometimes as the center of a political order. These pivotal cities can be classified in six groups in terms of their relationships with civilizations.

(i) The Pioneer Cities of Civilizations as the First Founding Nucleus

These cities emerge historically before the rise of the civilization they belong to and form the model for the upcoming cities and social structures. The best examples of these cities are Pataliputra in Indian, Athens in Greek, Rome in Roman, and Madinah in Islamic civilizations. Arians established Pataliputra as a microcosm of their spatial perception of the universe and also of their vision of social structure (caste system). With this character it became the capital of rising Indian political order under Mauryans. During the reign of Asoka, it reached the peak of its prosperity paralleling the rise of Indian civilization and emerged as the world's largest city with a population of 150,000–300,000. Athens did not only have a city-state structure reflecting Greek cosmological and social imagination but also played a vital role for Greek colonies as the model of political order. The city of Rome reflected all characteristics of the Roman civilization and preceded its imperial order. Madinah was established by the Prophet Mohammad himself as the spatial nucleus of a new worldview and political order. The Prophet himself, for instance, specified the principles and the structure of the market in the city. The Madinah model has been imitated and replicated by many different states, races, and cultures in different parts of the world.

(ii) The Cities Established by Civilizations as the Model and Center of Political Order

These cities are established after the emergence and sometimes even after the rise of civilizations. Some examples of these cities are Beijing, Persepolis, Alexandria, Baghdad, Semerkand, Cordoba, Paris, London, Berlin, and New York. The basic parameters of the respective civilizations had already been shaped when these cities were established. Beijing originated as a garrison town during Chou dynasty and transformed into an imperial capital city. Persepolis was established by Cyrus and became the capital of Persian imperial order during Darius the Great.³³ Alexandria carried all the characteristics of the Alexandrian era. Baghdad was established by the Abbasids during the golden age of Islamic civilization as a cultural, economic, and political capital reflecting all of its achievements. Paris, London, and Berlin developed parallel to the cultural, eco-

conomic, and political transformations of the Western civilization. New York has risen as the spatial model of late modernity—an era in which Western civilization has established world hegemony.

(iii) The Transferred City After the Completion of the Civilizational Formation

These are the cities transferred to different spaces and rebuilt as stations of civilizational expansion and as agents of the “world order” vision of the originary civilization. The cities established by and named after Alexander during the Hellenistic era carried the same characteristics to different parts of the world.³⁴ Likewise, the Ottoman cities in Balkans exhibited the characteristics of the Anatolian city structure, which can be observed in the similarities between Bursa and Filipov or Sarajevo. Singapore and Hong-Kong stand as two examples of the contemporary version of transferred cities that imitate New York as the hub of financial flows.

(iv) The Cities Which Were Eliminated Together with the Civilization by the Spread of Another Civilization

The elimination of Dravidian cities Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa³⁵ after the Arian invasion in India; and the elimination of the cities of Maya, Inca, and Aztec civilizations after the invasion of Spanish conquistadores are the examples of the cities that are annihilated altogether with their home civilizations as a result of the invasion of another civilization.

(v) The Cities Which Were Built After the Elimination of a Civilization

The best example of this category is Mexico City, which was re-established by the Spanish conquistadors in the same area after totally destructing the previous authentic capital of the Aztec civilization, *Tenochtitlan*.³⁶ Today there are three layers of Mexico City; first the geological layer, second the underground layer composed of destroyed Aztec city, and third the modern Mexico City as we now see it on the surface. Hence, the destruction of *Tenochtitlan* in 1521 and the rise of Mexico City after rebuilding in 1524 embodied the civilizational history of the destruction of the Aztec civilization and the rise of Western colonialism.

(vi) The Cities That Had the Experience of Being the Center of Different Civilizations

Some cities have been shaped and reshaped along with the history of the rise and fall of civilizations and served as capitals or pivotal cities of different civilizations. Their diverse and robust historical backgrounds made them active subjects of history by equipping them with the capacity to transform cultures and reshape civilizations. Jerusalem, Damascus,

and Istanbul stand as the paradigmatic examples of such cities. Istanbul, for instance, is a product of three different civilizational prototypes: a polytheist Roman, an Orthodox Byzantine, and a Muslim Ottoman. A civilizational spirit moving from Rome established the city, and another civilizational spirit coming from Jerusalem as a reflection of Christianity transformed it. Finally another civilizational spirit that originated in Madinah and matured in Damascus, Baghdad, Cordoba, and Buhara reached to Istanbul and embedded its heritage in it. Hence, Istanbul became a civilizational mixture of Rome, Jerusalem, and Madinah as different pioneer cities. A similar trajectory can be observed in the histories of Jerusalem and Damascus both of which reflect spatial perceptions of different civilizations.

6. CONVENTIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL DIMENSION: CITY, STATE, AND "WORLD ORDER"

Civilizations do not emerge in spatial or temporal isolation, but rather the confluence of a system of being-knowledge-value with the time and space perceptions places mentality in a dialectical relationship with history, out of which civilizations flourish. This leads us to a certain notion of "order" as a conventional and institutional structure.

The cities in which law formed the foundation of social order, ethics and efficiency-based market formed the medium of economic order, and bureaucracy formed the mechanical instrument of political structure have been the focal places of order throughout history. States represent the translation of this order into a more sophisticated structure in an integrated geographical zone and cultural, economic, and political sphere. World order, in that sense, marks the most comprehensive realization of order in terms of internal social consistency, geographical prevalence, and historical continuity. Yet, it does not necessarily have to be prevailing everywhere in the world or throughout all times. Sargon's Akkadian, Darius' Achaemenidian, Alexander's Hellenistic, or Asoka's Mauryan imperial orders, Pax Romana, Abbasid Caliphate, and Pax Ottomana were all different world orders established by their respective civilizational traditions.

Establishing an order is a process of reflecting a worldview unto historical existence. The close relationship between "worldview" and "world order" is an indication of the existence of civilizations as historical actors. The history of civilizations shows us that serious philosophical and intellectual transformations lead to social, economic, and political transformations after a few centuries, and lay the ground for a comprehensive understanding of world order. For instance, Darius' imperial order of Persian civilization in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. was founded upon a revival and restoration of Zoroastrian tradition in the

previous centuries. Darius himself was not only a reformer of Persian administrative system, but also a devout believer in Ahura Mazda. Intellectual and spiritual restoration, in other words, preceded political and administrative restoration and led to a particular world order.

Similarly, intellectual movements in Ancient Greece in the seventh to fifth centuries B.C. were translated into the Hellenic world order by Alexander the Great whose political system controlled the main civilizational basins of the time. The cities named after Alexander the Great in Afro-Eurasian mainland became both centers of power and locus of civilizational transfusion. In the Indian civilizational basin, an intellectual transformation that commenced in the seventh to fifth centuries B.C. and was symbolized in the personalities of Buddha and Jain created a new Indian self-perception and stirred the revival of Indian civilization. In so doing, it challenged the established order based on the previous civilizational structures. This intellectual transformation then provided the foundations for Asoka's Mauryan imperial order after two to three centuries. Likewise in almost the same period, Lao Tzu and Confucius in China created intellectual currents that prepared the ground for the rise of the order of the Great Han dynasty, which is symbolized in the building of the Chinese Wall. Roman transformation from an Italian city-state into an imperial order took place after the encounter of Roman polytheism with the sophisticated Greek philosophy, and especially with the Stoic tradition, which provided a cosmopolitan spirit to that transformation. Roman world order developed gradually in a melting pot blending the intellectual and institutional accumulations of previous civilizations and marked the pinnacle of a political order based on a common law. So much so that the succeeding traditions which tried to establish a world order adopted different versions of the name Caesar as the title of their rulers: Ottoman *Kayser-i Rum*, Russian *Tzar*, and German *Kaiser*.

The rise of Islam presents a further example of the relationship between worldview and world order. Islamic worldview based on the doctrine of *Tawhid* produced an intellectual/spiritual transformation and led to a new civilizational revival that brought together almost all authentic civilizational basins from Spain to India within a single political order. The transformation of the Islamic worldview into a civilizational world order happened as a consequence of its speedy spread. By conquering Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Iran in just a few years, Muslims, within a short period of time, took under their authority almost all areas formerly unified by Alexander the Great, and became neighbors with the Indian and Roman civilizations. Thus, they encountered with other civilizations and entered into a dynamic and profound process of civilizational interaction.

The Islamic being-knowledge-value paradigm was the basic motor force behind the new syntheses that emerged in and through civilizational interactions. Harun Rashid's Baghdad, and Cordoba and Granada in

the golden age of Andalusia were the most inclusive and accommodative examples of multiculturalism throughout human history, and they all have traces of multidimensional interactions between Islamic and other worldviews. The trade routes reaching from the eastern Mediterranean to China and Indonesia through the Silk Road contributed to that process by functioning as the artery of civilizational interaction.

The latest example of the transformation of ancient civilizational basins into a new world order through an Islamic worldview was *Pax Ottomana*. Ottoman concepts such as *kanun-i kadim* (ancient law reaching back to the beginning of humanity) and *devlet-i ebed müddet* (eternal state) are clear reflections of Ottoman vision of world order that brings together both history and future in its self-perception.

Modern Western civilization went through a comprehensive intellectual transformation between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, which induced a radical change in its being-knowledge-value system. In the first stage of this civilizational transformation, Renaissance and Reformation achieved an intellectual revolution and mercantilism generated an economic sea change, and together they created a new political order—that is the Westphalian nation-state system established after the collapse of the preceding traditional political order of the Holy Roman Empire. In the second stage, Newtonian, Industrial, and French revolutions transfigured the perceptions of natural, economic, and political order and led to two important developments: the Congress of Vienna as the European system of political order and colonialism as the new world order prevailing across the globe. The power structure of the European center expanded itself into the periphery through the colonial world order. The momentum that was brought about by these deep changes placed Europe at the center of international political and economic order in the nineteenth century.

The transition from European colonialism to *Pax Americana* took place through a new international legal system and institutional design. The declaration of the Wilsonian principles and the establishment of the League of Nations after the First World War were the precursors to the transition to *Pax Americana*, which was completed by the establishment of the UN and the Bretton Woods systems as the political and economic mechanisms of the new world order in the post-World War II period. The end of the Cold War with the fall of Berlin Wall was a strong indicator of the need for a new international convention along with the rise of globalization. The delay of this readjustment of the world order did not only lead to frozen conflicts in sensitive geopolitical, geo-economic, and geo-cultural zones, but also provoked a global level tension for power sharing.

We now stand in the midst of the most comprehensive civilizational transformation in history whereby almost all accumulated human heritage is becoming part of a complex process of interaction in the form of

globalization. With globalization, modernity's static nature has been dissolved, similar to the transformation Greek values went through when they were carried by Alexander the Great to Iran and India. On the other hand, Buddha statues began to be built like Zeus statues in India. We are now experiencing a similar process of differentiation and transformation. Globalization is for modernity what Alexander the Great's era is for ancient Greece. We see three reactions to this process. First is the Stoic reaction to give a new meaning to the expanding scale. This is an attempt to create a new cosmos through transitioning from the gods of Greece to one God and one single order. One can think of the discourse of the "New World Order" articulated after the end of the Cold War as a Stoic reaction. Second is the Cynic reaction epitomized in Diogenes' response to Alexander: "stand out of my sun." While Stoics seek to establish a universal order, Cynic reaction is inward-looking. Today's postmodernism can be seen as a Cynic reaction, as it posits the locality, personality, and subjectivity of reality in contrast to the universal reality of modernity. Cynic reaction fosters pluralism, but does not necessarily lead to an order. Stoic reaction, on the other hand, seeks to establish a totalistic order, yet at the expense of pluralism. The third reaction is the Epicurean search for happiness on the basis of physical existence and pleasure. It is the driving logic of global consumption culture epitomized in the worldwide symbols of consumer goods and chains.³⁷

CONCLUSION: CO-EXISTENCE OF CIVILIZATIONS WITHIN GLOBALIZATIONS: A COMPREHENSIVE CHALLENGE OF WORLD ORDER

The presumption behind the singular use of the term "civilization" for the entire humanity was that non-Western civilizations would vaporize from history in the course of modernization and globalization. This prediction did not come true. The authentic civilizational entities did not only survive but also began a new process of reawakening and revitalization. This impressive process of revival is taking place despite the transformative power of globalization toward monopolization and homogenization of human culture, transnationalization of economic and political institutions, de-traditionalization of the authentic social and cultural forms of civilizations, de-personalization of communicational links and institutionalization of the power-centric political hegemony. This leaves us at a productive paradox: we are witnessing the simultaneous rise of a monolithic global culture across the world and a revitalization of traditional worldviews, values, institutions, and structures of authentic civilizations—both in their traditional spaces and also at the very core of Western cities.

In light of this dynamic civilizational revitalization, there is a pressing need to reexamine the simplistic sequentialization of westernization, modernization, and globalization that operate within the framework of the idea of progress. The shift from westernization to modernization and from modernization to globalization also evinces a psychological shift that can be detected even in the semantic roots of these concepts. The spatial emphasis in westernization is no longer there in modernization, which instead has a temporal reference. Yet, modernization was still construed as a Eurocentric process flowing unidirectionally from Europe to other places. The transition from modernization to globalization is much more comprehensive in terms of time and space. Globalization mobilizes all societies across the world in a much more multidirectional way such that it renders one-dimensional accounts of civilizational difference insubstantial. In other words, the *globe* as a whole is becoming the arena of historical flow. Chinese, Muslims, Indians, Africans, and Latin Americans are once again participants in the making of history due to this dynamic character of globalization. The supposedly passive objects/followers of modernization are becoming active subjects of globalization. Hence, despite the similarities shared in the instruments of globalization, different civilizations are going through different processes of globalizations depending on their traditional structures and modern experiences. The instruments of globalizations in our age have created the conditions for an all-inclusive process in which different civilizational experiences interact in the same time and space.

Therefore the main challenge we are facing today is one of establishing a new vision of world order that will accommodate and harmonize different histories, experiences, and understandings of reviving civilizations. What is called for to achieve this coexistence is inclusive and pluralistic civilizational interaction, not hegemony.

NOTES

1. For the analysis of these assumptions see my foreword in this book, entitled "Civilizational Revival in the Global Age."

2. For the philosophy of Upanishads, see F. Max Muller, ed., *Upanishads, The Holy Spirit of Vedas* (Delhi: Vijay Goel, 2007); and Will Durant, *Our Oriental Heritage: The Story of Civilization I* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954), 410-415.

3. For a detailed analysis on the rise of Hinduism and the building up castes, see William Wilson Hunter, *The Indian Empire: Its People, History, Products* (first published in London: 1886; re-printed in New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 2005), 191-228.

4. Hans Küng, *Judaism: Between Yesterday and Tomorrow* (New York, Continuum, 1999), 40.

5. I analyzed the ontological hierarchy and differentiation between the Creator and the created in Islamic paradigm in a detailed way in *Alternative Paradigms: The Impact of Islamic and Western "Weltanschauungs" on Political Theory* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1994), 47-78.

6. For the analysis of the relationship between modernity and the transformation of Christianity see Ahmet Davutođlu, "Bunalımdan Dönüşüme Batı Medeniyeti ve Hıristiyanlık (Western Civilization and Christianity: From Crisis to Transformation)," *Divan*, No. 9 (2000): 1-74.

7. Original title: "The White Man's Burden: The United States and The Philippine Islands," *McClure's Magazine*, No. 12 (Feb., 1899).

8. Benjamin Fortson, *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction* (Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 27.

9. I explicated this conception of knowledge in another article, "İslami Düşünce Geleneğinin Temelleri, Oluşum Süreci ve Yeniden Yorumlanması," *Divan*, No. 1 (1996): 28-30. I also analyzed the conception of knowledge in the Islamic tradition under the title of "Epistemological Unity of Truth: Harmonization of Knowledge" in *Alternative Paradigms*, 78-82.

10. "When he understood the condition of mankind, and that the greatest part of them were like brute beasts, he knew that all wisdom, direction and good success, consisted in what the messenger of God had spoken, and the Law delivered; and there was no other way besides this, and there could be nothing added to it." Ibn Tufayl, *The Improvement of Human Reason Exhibited in the Life of Hayy Ibn Yaqzan*, translated into English by S. Ockley (Cairo: Al-Ma'aref Printing Office, 1905), 68.

11. I analyzed the conception of knowledge in the Western paradigm under the title of "Epistemological Particularization of Truth: Secularization of Knowledge," in *Alternative Paradigms*, 34-39.

12. Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics*, in *Great Books of Western World*, Mortimer J. Adler, ed., vol. 8 (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1990), 339.

13. For this textual and conceptual web, see Henry Rosemont, Jr., ed., *Chinese Texts and Philosophical Contexts* (La Salle: Open Court, 1991).

14. For the conceptual and historical analysis of Taoist philosophy see Will Durant, *Our Oriental Heritage: The Story of Civilization I* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954), 653-658.

15. Harld Roth, "Who Compiled *Chuang Tzu*?" in Henry Rosemont, Jr., ed., *Chinese Texts and Philosophical Contexts*, 102-103.

16. Patricia Buckley Ebrey, *Chinese Civilization: A Sourcebook* (New York: Free Press, 1993), 19.

17. For Buddha doctrine of *Karma* see: William Wilson Hunter, *The Indian Empire: Its People, History, Products*, 141-142.

18. Muhammad Iqbal, *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* (Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture Club Road, 1986), 76.

19. Al Khazini, *Kitab Mizan al-Hikmah*, translated into English by C.N. Khanikoff as "Book of the Balance of Wisdom: An Arabic Work on the Water-Balance," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 6:1-128 (1860): 3-4, cited in Ahmet Davutođlu, *Alternative Paradigms*, 84.

20. For example, Will Durant, *Our Oriental Heritage: The Story of Civilization I*, 642-645.

21. See Romila Thapar, *The Penguin History of Early India from the Origins to AD 1300* (New Delhi: Penguin, 2002), 98-100.

22. Will Durant, *Caesar and Christ: The Story of Civilization III*, 159.

23. See my article regarding this comparison, "Philosophical and Institutional Dimension of Secularization: A Comparative Analysis," in *Islam and Secularism in the Middle East*, Azzam Tamimi and John Esposito, eds., (London: Hurst and Company, 2000), 190-201.

24. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Biruni, *Alberuni's India*, edited and translated into English by Edward C. Sachau (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1910; re-printed in New Delhi: Rupa and Co., 2002).

25. For a detailed analysis, see Ahmet Davutođlu, "Tarih İdraki Oluşumunda Metodolojinin Rolü: Medeniyetlerarası Etkileşim Açısından Dünya Tarihi ve Osmanlı (World History and Ottoman Empire)," *Divan*, No. 7 (1999): 1-91.

26. Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Philosophical and Institutional Dimension of Secularization," 190-191.
27. Eric Voegelin, *From Enlightenment to Revolution*, John Hallowell, ed. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1975), 18.
28. Hans Küng, *Judaism: Between Yesterday and Tomorrow*, 45.
29. See Lloyd A. Brown, *The Story of Maps* (New York: Dover, 1977), 89-91.
30. For Islamic cartography, see S. Maqbul Ahmad, "Harita," *DİA*, v. 16 (Istanbul: TDV, 1997), 205-210.
31. Johann Galtung, "On the Dialectic Between Crisis and Crises Perception," in *Europe at the Crossroads*, S. Musto and J. F. Minkele, eds. (New York: Praeger, 1985), 11.
32. I first used the concept of "pivotal city" in "Eksen Şehirler: Medeniyetlerin Kader Göstergeleri," *İzlenim* (May-June, 1996).
33. See Ali-Sami, *Persepolis (Takht-ı Jamshid)* (Shiraz: Musavi Printing Office, 1970).
34. See P. M. Fraser, *Cities of Alexander the Great* (Oxford: Clarendon Press: 1996).
35. For the importance of the cities of Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa in Indian civilization see Herman Kulke, Dietmar Rothermund, *A History of India* (Croom-Helm Australia, 1986), 2, 17- 29.
36. See Hugh Thomas, *Conquest: Montezuma, Cortés, and the Fall of Old Mexico* (New York: Toucstone Rockefeller Center, 1993).
37. I provide a more comprehensive discussion of these reactions in the process of globalization in my article entitled "Globalization and the Crisis of Individual and Civilizational Consciousness," in Hans Köchler, ed., *Globality versus Democracy?: The Changing Nature of International Relations in the Era of Globalization* (Vienna: International Press Organization, 2000).