

Evolution of Ideology

Mohamed Rabie

Ideology appeared late in human history as a grand idea around which people cluster, and on whose ideas, ideals, and promises they built coalitions and movements whose objective was to change the social condition under which people lived. Therefore, we can say that ideology is a sociopolitical system to organize and educate people, motivating them to develop certain attitudes, adopt certain worldviews, and seek, through collective action, to achieve certain objectives. As such, ideology tends to govern a broad range of human relationships and influence the course of change in society. Since culture represents the social glue that holds society together, ideology has become the core of many cultures and the organizing principle of societies in distress.

The ideas, ideals, and promises of ideology are to be found in the great philosophies that appeared in older and modern times; namely religion, nationalism, and communism. While Christianity appeared about 2000 years ago, Islam appeared about 1500 years ago. As for nationalism and Marxism, they appeared in the 17th and 19th centuries, respectively. One can also argue that the adoption of the free-market philosophy by the major western democracies of America, Germany, and Britain in the 1980s had transformed democracy and capitalism into one ideological system. Since the great philosophies around which the known ideologies are built represent the core of every culture, ideology has become the major component of culture in most societies.

As a result, ideology tends to shape the attitudes and worldviews of people, causing them to feel different from others, sometimes superior to them, and sharpen their collective sense of identity and purpose. Ideology makes its followers more committed to the welfare of their group, and less tolerant of other groups' beliefs and convictions, giving the first group an excuse to be prejudiced, belittle others, and often discriminate against them. Where such a culture prevails, society is busy trying to limit the rights of its minorities rather than develop its country and make progress, particularly in areas related to human rights and social justice.

Throughout modern history, progress has been closely associated with the ideas of freedom and social justice, which provide an environment conducive to change and hope. While freedom facilitates individual initiative, political participation, liberal education, scientific research, technological innovations, and social justice motivate people to fight for their rights, be

compassionate and care for the poor and weak. Working together, freedom and social justice protect people's rights, allowing them to pursue personal goals, be creative, and engage in new activities and relationships that encourage cultural and political plurality.

This paper will try to follow the evolution of ideology throughout history and identify its impact on the fortunes of societies that adopted it and became largely ideological. An ideological society could be defined as a society that is attached to a certain philosophy and ruled by a leadership committed to implementing the ideas and ideals of the philosophy and reconstructing society to reflect the image envisioned by it.

Conflict and Change

Transformations in society are made at all times, at every level through a social process that has two sides, conflict and change. Change, by its very nature, undermines the balance of power that governs relationships between the major social actors, creating winners and losers and causing conflict. Conflict, which tends to be initiated by losers, causes relationships to become unstable, at times dysfunctional, creating a need to restructure them, which only change can do. But for change to succeed, it has to take into consideration the new reality created by the previous round of change and conflict. Therefore, the way conflict is managed tends to influence the nature and magnitude of change, and the way change is introduced and pursued tends to influence the magnitude and ramifications of conflict. Because ideology is a worldview with its values and goals, change instigated by ideology tends to influence most aspects of life.

Change driven by ideology tends to be predictable; the path it follows is revolutionary, and attitudes it nurtures tend to be radical. Violence is sometimes promoted by ideology and accepted by its followers as a legitimate means to effect change. Societies dominated by ideology often lack the social tools to deal with conflict and manage change peacefully. Germany under Nazism, the Soviet Union under communism, Israel under Zionism, Serbia under religious nationalism, and Afghanistan under religious fanaticism are examples of societies that were dominated by ideology and where violence and coercion were used to deal with conflict and manage change. In such societies, every deviation from the basic tenets of ideology is usually defined in terms that demand swift, uncompromising action. In contrast, open societies, where ideology is weak and political and cultural plurality exist, tend to have flexible rules and pragmatic tools to deal with conflict and manage

change. Such societies view conflict and change as social mechanisms to restructure fractured relationships and achieve desired goals.

Consequently, change is encouraged, conflict is managed, and compromise solutions are sought to maximize the number of winners and minimize the number of losers. However, if compromise solutions are invented to appease a growing ideology of a privileged class, they usually limit the number of winners, increase the number of losers, and cause the situation to deteriorate over time. Issues of conflict are divided into two categories, value-related and interest-related. Because values are closely associated with deeply held convictions, value-related issues, such as religious convictions and group identities, are viewed as existential, and therefore less amenable to compromise solutions. In contrast, interest-related issues, such as trade and labor disputes are normally viewed as circumstantial, and therefore more amenable to compromise solutions.¹

Ideology tends to view all issues of conflict as value-related, and thus existential, making violence and coercion the means often used to deal with conflict. The history of societies dominated by ideology, regardless of their place and time, has been shaped by war and colored by blood. No ideology has ever been able to perceive another ideology as legitimate, and no ideological state has willingly accepted a neighboring ideological state as equal. Ideologies were and still are viewed by their followers as mutually exclusive and inherently antagonistic: "Competing self-interests allow for compromise, whereas rigid moral arguments lead to war."²

Every relationship in society has at least two components that are interlinked and mutually reinforcing. One represents cooperation, the other competition. Relationships having only one component reflect either dependency or antagonism. Relationships that have too much cooperation due to sharing an ideology tend to be dull and mostly stagnant, and thus largely unproductive. Relationships characterized by too much competition because they lack shared interests tend to be unstable and largely conflictive. For a relationship to be viable and productive the level of cooperation must be perceived by most people as good or satisfactory; the level of competition ought to be perceived as desirable or tolerable. Relationships among individuals and organized groups are based either on interests or values, but mostly on both. Interest-related relationships encourage people to compete to maximize their gains when winning is possible and cooperate to minimize losses when losing is unavoidable. Acts to maximize gain and fame, and minimize loss and pain, are both causes of conflict and forces of change. However, because such relationships stem primarily from desires, and deal largely with material things, the change they usually cause and the conflict

they precipitate tend to be tolerable and often beneficial. In contrast, value-related relationships and ideologically inspired ones tend to induce people and organizations to cooperate more and compete less and advance their shared causes at the expense of others.

Ideologies can be divided into three general categories: sociocultural or religious, sociopolitical or national, and socioeconomic or materialistic. The ascendance of either ideology in society leads usually to the suppression of others and undermining their role in shaping society's culture and future. Since the dominant ideology opts almost always for continuity and stability, the subdued ideologies opt almost always for subversion and change. Nevertheless, it is possible to incorporate two ideologies into one state system. China and Cuba are cases where a state system based on nationalism and socialism has dominated society for decades. And Israel is another case where religion and nationalism have been incorporated into one state system, causing conflict to be lodged in the consciousness of society, and discrimination against the other to become a state policy.

When asked about the reasons for Iran's lack of economic development, former Iranian president Mohammed Khatami said, "It is impossible to have economic development in a socially and politically underdeveloped society."³ While correctly linking the lack of economic development to the lack of social and political development, the Iranian president failed to link the failure of economic, social, and political development to the ideological superstructure of the state. Consequently, he failed to identify the actual forces responsible for creating and perpetuating the sad state of socioeconomic and sociopolitical affairs in his country. Ideology, regardless of its nature and objectives, tends to be deterministic; therefore, it tends to belittle people in general, depreciate their ideas and potentials, and ignore their feelings. Ideology considers the individual a tool to achieve lofty ideological objectives; an expendable piece of wood to light the fireplace of history. To every ideology and ideological leader, history glows only when it burns people, leaving their ashes behind to remind us of the fire, not of the tragic fates of the people who produced it.

But before talking about specific ideologies, their natures, objectives, and the roles they play in individual and group life, there is an important point to be made and emphasized. Ideologies are in essence social philosophies, or grand ideas, transformed by able, ambitious men into mass movements to change the reality on the ground. But as leaders transform philosophies into plans of action to change living conditions, the transformed philosophy becomes an ideology. To achieve their objectives, ideological leaders try to control politics, the media, and the state. And to guarantee popular support, they create mass movements by changing people's perceptions and convincing

them to subordinate their passions for the sake of what they are told to believe in. While philosophies concentrate on studying human behavior and world history to explain reality and provide guidance for a better life, ideologies are political movements meant to change reality by using the power of persuasion, deception, coercion, and oftentimes violence as well.

Religion, for example, is a grand idea meant to prescribe a way for man to reach God. If religion remains as such and concentrates on developing man's consciousness to do good deeds and stay away from bad ones, religion will render a valuable service to society and therefore humanity. But if religion concentrates on convincing its followers that it is the only true path to God, and tries to convert them into missionaries and worriers, it will become a mass political movement with ideological zeal. All social philosophies acquire zeal as they are transformed into ideologies meant to change reality to correspond to the ideological visions articulated by their leaders. Marxism is a philosophy to explain history and the role of social conflict in making it; it criticizes capitalism, condemns exploitation, and calls for social justice. If Marxism were to stay as such, it would render a valuable service to society and humanity. But as an ideology, Marxism has caused the killing of millions of people, denied entire nations their rights, and led to creating dictatorships that paved the way for the spread of corruption and fear. And if nationalism were to remain an idea to unite people and convince them to feel and act as free people with equal rights and responsibilities, it would become a humanist idea serving the interests of all peoples. But nationalism as an ideology has committed many massacres, ethnic cleansing of millions of people, and untold tragedies throughout the last three centuries.

Every noble idea acquires a negative, at times evil aspect in the process of being transformed into an ideology; it adopts an attitude that rejects competing ideas and peoples and cultures. And since the feeling of rejecting something is often stronger than the feeling of liking something else, all ideologies have become more negative than positive, which led them to foster hatred and enmity among the peoples. In fact, all rejectionist movements, throughout history, have demonstrated a capacity to define with clarity what they stand against, but failed to define with the same degree of clarity what they stand for, making them less able to do good deeds and more able to do bad ones.

Religion

Religion is a system of beliefs and rituals based on a conviction that a supernatural power or a god exists and has control over the world and its inhabitants. Most religions also believe that God is the

only power that can and does intervene occasionally to change the course of history and the fate of people. Believers, to reach their god and gain his blessing, are called upon to believe in certain myths, follow certain rules, adopt certain attitudes, and perform certain rituals; all of which are meant to strengthen their unity and deepen their belief. As a consequence, religions created distinct faith-based communities where members help each other as a matter of duty and view followers of other religions with suspicion or disgust. When human societies first appeared, people used their instincts to meet their basic survival needs. Lack of knowledge regarding the environment and the absence of tools made people products rather than masters of their environments. Meanwhile, people's apparent helplessness led them to discover the ideas of god and religion. Gods were the power that created the universe, and religion is the system that regulates human beings' relationship with the gods and with each other. People of ancient times constructed religion to suit their needs and calm their fears and give meaning to their lives.

Religion, therefore, is a social system invented by man to communicate with imagined gods, and religious leaders became mediators connecting man to God, represent God on earth, and ensure that man obeys gods' orders as prescribed by the same leaders. To do so, all religions imposed certain practices of worship and asked their followers to make certain sacrifices deemed necessary to please and appease the gods. People were willing to do whatever religion asked of them to gain the approval of their gods and avoid their wrath. And depending on the characteristics of the environment, people assigned different roles to the gods they invented and worshipped. Due to such a relationship, God became a power to be feared and obeyed, not loved or challenged, and man's unconditional surrender to God's will became the only path to attain happiness. Consequently, religious practices, rituals, and symbols became sacred, unifying the believers while ensuring their submissiveness. "Ancient societies were held together primarily by religion,"⁴ which shaped people's attitudes and worldviews, and regulated their relationships to one another and their gods.

Gradually, religion emerged as the institution representing the most sacred and feared force in life, and the only power entitled to speak in the name of the highest authority in the universe. Religion promised good life to believers and salvation to those who surrender their freedoms to it and accept its teachings. Consequently, religion became the core of every living culture, even cultures whose core was reduced to a set of basic values and traditions, like the Chinese; all cultures have continued to be influenced by religious beliefs and rituals and men.

Before the dawn of the agricultural age, every tribe had its god, religion, and rituals. As a result, religion and race went together, leading everyone to believe in one's own people's god.⁵ And despite the appearance of the monotheistic religions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam as universal faiths in the second half of the agricultural age, religion has continued to be associated with race. Judaism, which is the oldest monotheistic religion, was born as a religion for the Israelites who used it as a faith around which they built an exclusive culture and community. Jewish resistance to accepting converts has kept the number of Jews very small compared to the numbers of Christians and Muslims. According to the Jewish Virtual Library, the number of Jews in the world was 14.7 million in 2019, of which about 6.9 million lived in Israel and 5.7 million lived in the United States; the rest, estimated at 2.6 million, lived in other countries.⁶ Except for Christianity and Islam, all major religions are either race-related or region-related. Expansion to other races and regions has come with population migrations, not promotion and conversion.

The major world religions, namely Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam, and Taoism were born during the latter part of the agricultural age. While Judaism is the oldest, having been born around 1800 BC, Islam is the youngest; it arose in the seventh century AD.⁷ This means that all of the great religions of the world were born within less than 2,000 years, signifying that the same social and economic conditions were able to travel and transform most societies in the world in the same manner during a relatively short period. In fact, the Asian religions of Buddhism, Confucianism, Hinduism, and Taoism, as well as Islam, were born within 200–300 years of each other.

Karen Armstrong says, "Religious systems reflected the changed economic and social conditions. For reasons that we do not entirely understand, all the chief civilizations developed along parallel lines, even when there was no commercial contact."⁸ Judaism, for example, seems to have come in response to economic and social conditions that tolerated slavery in Egypt after that country had reached an advanced stage of the agricultural age. And when the Roman Empire arrived, at roughly the same level of development, Christianity emerged in Palestine to fight for equality and social justice. Within the next 600 years, other parts of the world, particularly China, India, and Arabia, arrived at the same stage, giving birth to new religions, including Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism. All peoples seemed at the time to have accepted religion as a faith and a set of values and customs to organize their lives around them, leading religions to play similar roles in the lives of all societies. But since no one could prove or disprove claims made by religion, magic and myth

became part of religious beliefs: “The priest as well as the magician has a role to play: to provide a systematic procedure of sanctification in order to accommodate the needs of believers with a meaningful worldview.”⁹

While almost every religion believes that it is the true path to God, Hinduism believes that each religion is a path to God. It claims that “God has made different religions to suit different aspirants, times and countries. One can reach God if one follows any of the paths with wholehearted devotion.”¹⁰ Hinduism, therefore, urges each person to follow the religion of his people, thus reinforcing the unifying role of religion in society and its affiliation with race. Hinduism claims that the Savior, be it Jesus, Muhammad, or Krishna, is one and the same; he appears in different places at different times but for the same purpose.

Religion and Agriculture

Religious teachings and rituals were meant to help individuals find the meaning of their lives and suffering. And since religion was a product of the age of agriculture, it had to “adapt itself to the demands and timetables of agriculture.”¹¹ Therefore, religion accepted agriculture as a worthy way of life, adopted most of its values and traditions, and promoted the notion of life after death. The life cycle of plants, by demonstrating continuous renewal, and other myths, apparently convinced the followers of Christianity and Islam of the existence of life after death, an idea not much different from that of reincarnation widely believed by the followers of Asian religions. But by adapting itself to the culture of agricultural society, religion tied its fate to that of the agricultural civilization. Judaism did not originally adopt the concept of life after death; however, some Jewish scholars developed the concept centuries later but failed to convince all believers to embrace it.

Long before the birth of Judaism, the Babylonians believed in an afterlife, as did the Egyptians of the Pharaonic era, who used mummification to preserve the bodies of the dead to enable them to resume life later on. The ancient Egyptians believed that “as long as the corpse, or at least a material image of it, subsisted, life continued.”¹² Friedrich Hegel cites Herodotus as having said, “The Egyptians were the first to express the thought that the soul of man is immortal.”¹³ They even believed that the soul goes first through a system of justice before the afterlife is resumed, and therefore they wrote the “*Book of the Dead*” instructing the soul how to defend itself on the Day of Judgment. Similarly, the Chinese talk about ancestors being living spirits, and about the need to

keep them happy. Even the Aztec, Inca, and Mayan peoples believed in an immortal soul, with the dead passing from one phase of life to another while becoming invisible.

People of the past, like people of the present, feared death and wanted to deny it, which led them to believe in immortality. Religions could do nothing but reinforce this belief through the idea of the continued life of the soul. However, religions in general claim that life after death would not treat people equally; there would be heaven for the good and hell for the bad. Being the path to both God and heaven, religion became the only institution capable of helping its followers prepare themselves for the heavenly life by doing good deeds and avoiding evil ones and thinking more about the promise of heaven than the material attractions on earth. But to care less about life on earth for the sake of a promised life beyond it is to ignore life's complexity and accept being subject to its whims.

Social stability maintained by agriculture, sustained by religion, and enforced by a state, made life seem motionless for countless generations. "However agriculture was organized, no serious change in the way of living occurred till after 1700."¹⁴ Meanwhile, lack of advanced technologies to transform economic conditions made ideas and charismatic leaders the major forces of change in society. Religion, despite having accepted the agricultural way of life and sanctioned its values was the only idea of change in older times. It introduced new values and rules for relationships among its followers, calling for social justice. But once established at the core of culture, religion became a formidable obstacle to social and cultural change. No real change was possible at the time, and no idea had a fighting chance unless sanctioned by the religious establishment. As agricultural society entered the transitional period leading to the industrial age, the emerging society began to adopt different, less religious values and attitudes. But neither culture nor religion was willing to accept change; they instead waged war against all ideas they perceived as threatening to their statuses.

Even after the Industrial Revolution began to transform the European social and economic landscape, primitive, semi-tribal enclaves sustained by religion, persisted in Europe for generations. "Hundreds of dialects and equally numerous local semi-barbaric religious cults sustained these [enclaves] of the past in the midst of modern centralized states."¹⁵ Nonetheless, science, technology, reason, and geographical discoveries exposed the fallacies of many religious claims and created doubt in the minds of enlightened people. By the time the transitional period had been completed, the old culture and its religious core had lost the battle. A new culture with its ideological core appeared to compete with the old one. Nationalism, which emerged as a sociopolitical ideology, began to transform state cultures and shape individual and group consciousness. The new age of

industry, anchored in science, technology, and reason, drove both magic and religion out of the cultural core, vastly reducing their role and influence in the industrial society.¹⁶

Societies that failed to embrace science and reason have continued to value magic and organize themselves around religion. Claimed miracles, as a result, have continued to perform in many societies some of the roles that technology and medicine perform in advanced societies. In the developing states where the traditional role of religion is preserved and revered, old values and traditions have survived the great transformations of our times with little change. Traditional elites in such societies, being exposed to both science and reason through travel and study abroad, are often forced to live a life of hypocrisy, pretensions, and contradictions. And this has made genuine transformation less likely while making sociocultural stratification and political polarization more likely. The decline of religion as a body of a sacred set of values at the core of culture is due primarily to the transformations experienced by Europe over the last 600 years. Among those developments are the following:

1. The increasing tendency of the Catholic Church hierarchy to live a worldly, affluent life and ignore the predicament of the poor. In the fifteenth century, the corruption of the Church was exposed as the popes began to do everything for money and nothing without money.
2. The expansion of trade and financial transactions that violated the Church's teachings led those who were benefiting from such activities to question the Church's authority and work to undermine its power.
3. The development of printing, which facilitated the spread of ideas and revolutionized intellectual interaction, while allowing critical voices to be heard.
4. The increasing collaboration between the emerging merchant class, city dwellers, and the kings, which led them to form a united block that challenged the Church's political authority and economic doctrine and free themselves from its hegemony.
5. The discovery of the New World, which fascinated people and exposed the fallacy of some convictions such as the idea that Earth was flat and opened new frontiers for the adventurers and the oppressed.
6. Increased competition among the major European states, which flooded some states with wealth causing interests and leisure to overshadow values and religious convictions.

7. The dawn of the age of reason and science, which served to undermine the logic of many religious ideas, forcing the Church to move forcefully and act irrationally to impede scientific and philosophical inquiry, causing its reputation to be tarnished.

8. The triumph of the Reformation movement, which promoted new work and business ethics, and split the Church into several denominations. The Reformation started in the 16th century with Martin Luther protesting the sale of indulgences by the Church, precipitating one of the bloodiest and longest wars in European history.

9. "The growth of new tastes, desire for comfort, and even love of ostentation among the rich. Medieval man had devoted much of his spare income and labor to building cathedrals, churches, abbeys, and castles. Early modern man has felt other possible attractive uses for his wealth";¹⁷ uses he could not pursue without abandoning adherence to Church teachings.

10. The involvement of the Church in war and its use of religion as a pretext to wage war against its enemies. The religious wars of the 17th century caused great destruction and untold human suffering; they ended in 1648 with the Westphalia Treaty, which called for the separation of state and religion and thus ended the Church's role in the political life of most European states forever.

In the age of agriculture, and among all traditionally less developed societies, life was one of religion; religion was, and to a great extent still is, a lofty ideal to live for and, if necessary, die for as well. In the age of industry, religion was reduced to a mere social system whose primary goal is to create and sustain communities of faith. In other words, the industrial age transformed religion into a social organization whose role is to meet the spiritual needs of its members. In the knowledge age, religion is rapidly becoming personal rather than communal. The church has become a place for those who lack spirituality and for others who need moral support, as well as for people marginalized by the breathtaking pace of scientific and technological developments. And while most believers still give money to churches, they seldom live or die for them or for what they represent; people also expect their personal needs to be fulfilled in return for what they give. The Church, as a result, is forced to tailor its services to the particular needs of its clientele, not to enforce God's orders.

Nationalism

Nationalism, like religion, is a social philosophy that espouses certain values and relationships meant to strengthen the unity of peoples and shape their cultures, particularly their political culture. Nationalism believes that peoples form nations, and nations have their own cultures, languages,

histories, and, above all, homelands. But unlike religion, nationalism is concerned with political, military, economic power, and foreign affairs, not issues of life and death. Although tension has dominated the relationship between religion and nationalism in modern times, both ideologies can coexist peacefully and even merge to form one state system. The affiliation of race and religion makes such a merger not only possible but also probable. And while the merger has made several societies more cohesive, it led them to become more aggressive and often racist as well.

Authority, which comes down from either God or state, has traditionally been used to convince or coerce people to subdue their passions and interests for the sake of either God or country. However, the affiliation of race and religion makes it quite possible to subordinate man's passions and interests to both God and country at the same time. Nationalism has been able to marshal the forces of religion to serve political ends, and religion has been able to marshal the political aspirations of people to serve religious ends. The history of religion and nationalism indicates that both ideologies were used by religious and political leaders to control people, mislead them, and stay in power.

The origins of nationalism can be traced back to the Spanish war against Spain's Arabs and Jews around the end of the 15th century. The Spanish leadership was able to marshal the forces of nationalism and Catholicism, unite Spaniards, and motivate them to fight Arabs and Jews, and evict them from Spain. Following their victory, the Spaniards carried out atrocities that included the killing, expulsion, and forced conversion of Muslims and Jews to Catholicism. Nationalism, therefore, was born as a racist idea believing in the superiority of one race and the righteousness of one religion.

As a nationalist consciousness develops among people, it makes them feel different from others. A feeling of cultural superiority, more than anything else, is what makes people feel different, convinces them that they are entitled to special rights, and encourages them to act to attain envisioned means of superiority. Armies are built, taxes are imposed, and people are asked to serve the homeland. New history books are written, and older ones are rewritten to glorify the past, belittle the historical legacy of others, and make claims, often unwarranted, on other people's land. Consequently, cultural, ethnic, and religious minorities are denigrated, discriminated against, and often attacked and denied their legitimate rights.

Nations usually claim that they need to be independent and have separate states to develop their economies and cultures and protect their identities. That is, they need to live their own

experiences, nurture their dreams, develop their languages, and build their economies and armies to defend their homelands. Consequently, the nation-state appeared in Europe as the embodiment of nationalism and the highest authority, demanding that people subdue their passions and interests for the sake of their country, as dictated, of course, by the nation's political leadership. Meanwhile, developments that caused the decline of religion served to enhance the appeal of nationalism as an alternative ideology.

The Reformation, which weakened the Catholic Church and caused its splintering into several factions, was instrumental in reviving old European languages. The development of printing was also helpful; it enabled intellectuals to write and publish in their native languages, and criticize Church teachings. And with the Church's influence on the wane, the Latin language began to lose its appeal and constituency. This loss was exacerbated by the 1648 Westphalia Treaty, which gave the head of each state the right to determine the religion of his people. Consequently, the head of the state, often an absolute king, acquired religious as well as political authority and used it to consolidate his powers.

The nation-state, aided by economic mercantilism, began to practice colonialism. And because nationalism was the ideology of choice, all social classes were happy to participate in the colonial enterprise. "From the mid-seventeenth century to the French Revolution late in the eighteenth, the idea that each state should seek its own economic independence by founding colonies and controlling large supplies of gold and silver shaped European policies and caused a series of imperial conflicts."¹⁸ Writing around the middle of the 19th century, Karl Marx criticized the colonial enterprise harshly and predicted that the working class would not support imperialism but rise against it. Max Weber, in contrast, argued that imperialism could not succeed without the industrial workers being a part of it and that they would not rise against it. Karl Marx underestimated the emotional power of nationalism and the lure of economic benefits generated by colonialism and overestimated the impact of class conflict on the consciousness of the industrial workers. A racist attitude toward the other nourished by nationalism, and economic opportunity created by owning colonies and controlling other peoples were enough to justify popular participation in imperialism. But for the colonized nations, imperialism was a catastrophe of immense consequences.

Spain and France were the first states to emerge in Europe with centralized regimes built around nationalism, ready to wage war and compete for influence within and outside Europe: "victory in war took precedence over all else. The common strategy was total offense."¹⁹ The new European

monarchies were happy to practice colonialism, repress their national and religious minorities, and ignore the legitimate rights of their peoples. The hallmark of a great monarchy at the time was to humble the proudest of its people. Nevertheless, the absolute monarchy of those times did not possess the means of power of the 20th-century totalitarian state, and thus it could not carry out large-scale atrocities or even total suppression of opinion. Although nationalism “sanctioned the monarch’s interference in every aspect of the national life, most of the kings lacked both the temperament and the actual power to dominate their subjects totally or crush out racial and cultural minorities like a Hitler or a Stalin.”²⁰ The modern state’s institutions of control and repression were still in their early formative stages.

Philosopher Thomas Hobbes wrote, “Violence was the natural result when nations either sought to conquer other nations or feared being themselves overrun. In the early seventeenth century every country of Europe fell into one or another of these categories, if not into both.”²¹ In fact, one can easily argue that most of the history of the nation-state was dominated by violence and colored with blood. Nevertheless, the nation-state idea has continued to gain support and be realized, largely because of its call for political and economic independence. By the end of the nineteenth century, most nations of Europe had claimed independence and achieved sovereignty over the claimed lands of their fathers. In the meantime, the collapse of each empire led to the formation of new nation-states.

World War I was supposed to be “the war to end all wars,” but instead it turned out to be a European civil war, in which the seeds of future wars were planted. The treaty that concluded the war in 1918 sanctioned all of the claimed prerogatives of the nation-state. It acknowledged, either explicitly or implicitly, the right of each state to independence and sovereignty over the territories and peoples under its control but failed to repudiate the state’s colonial enterprise. One of the famous points of the treaty, introduced by President Woodrow Wilson, was to recognize the self-determination of nations as an internationally sanctioned right. This right, which was reaffirmed by the United Nations following World War II, was interpreted as the right of nations to political independence and the establishment of states.

Nonetheless, national, and racial minorities living within the borders of established states were not recognized as nations entitled to the same right; their grievances were considered domestic issues, not international ones. Consequently, minorities living under the hegemony of European states were denied their political, human, and economic rights; some were even subjected to

persecution and deportation. By sanctioning the nation-state idea and its prerogatives, the treaty to end all wars created conditions that allowed the extremes of nationalism to dominate some states and transform them into military machines committing war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Following the conclusion of World War II, the United Nations was established as an international forum for states to meet, discuss issues of common concern, resolve conflict, and manage the peace. The new organization, by reaffirming the inalienable right of national self-determination on the one hand and calling for an end to colonialism on the other, was able to strengthen the nation-state while moderating its behavior. The atrocities committed by Nazism, Fascism, Communism, and Japanese nationalism were not convincing enough to declare nationalism a bad idea and an inhumane experiment. The nation-state is the major actor on the international stage, and no replacement for it has been sought or emerged, leaving the right to national self-determination the only framework through which smaller nations and colonized peoples could seek freedom. The gradual termination of colonialism in Asia and Africa, and the disintegration of the Soviet Union led to increasing the number of nation-states while enhancing the appeal of self-determination.

As the nation-state was enjoying its golden age between the two world wars, changed circumstances were undermining its political legitimacy and economic rationale. The atrocities it committed against European Jews and Gypsies and the colonized peoples of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East were too much for many European intellectuals to accept. In the meanwhile, the imperialist enterprise was exposed as less economically rewarding than had previously believed, especially in light of the revolutions launched by the colonized peoples in the name of self-determination. Meanwhile, the rapid expansion of international trade, the deepening of economic interdependence, and new economic thought of promoting free-market were steadily undermining the economic rationale and political power of the nation-state.

Losing control of the national economy is probably the most significant damage the nation-state has sustained. The mobility of investment capital, the broad dissemination of information and knowledge, and growing economic and cultural globalization have weakened the ability of every state to manage its economy and deal successfully with domestic issues, such as inflation on its own. Multinational corporations no longer need permission from their states to do business in foreign countries. And because the management of such corporations has become separate from ownership and largely unanswerable to stockholders, most corporations no longer feel an obligation to an ideology, constituency, or community. As a result, the ability of the nation-state to protect claimed

political and economic prerogatives has been substantially eroded. And with that erosion, its capacity to care for its people declined, causing citizens' attachment to nationalism to wane. A state that cannot provide opportunity and security for its people cannot demand their allegiance.

Nationalism, by positioning itself as the organizing principle of the nation-state has unconsciously tied its fate to that of the state. Since this state is on the decline, as its economic power falters and its political prerogatives face challenges, nationalism is facing an uncertain future. In today's world of globalization, "the nation-state [has] become an unnatural— even dysfunctional—organizational unit for thinking about economic activity."²² In the United States, Congress has practically made US foreign policy an extension of domestic policy, which makes it nearly impossible to formulate a foreign policy without inference from business, lobbies, and other special interest groups, causing the national interest to become a big loser.

Because of its very nature and structure and ideological underpinnings, the nation-state tends to think of economic decisions in light of their political consequences, while globalization dictates that political decisions should be made in light of their economic ramifications. Instead of thinking globally and acting locally as multinational corporations do, nation-states in general still think locally and act globally. As more societies move into the knowledge age, nationalism will face the same fate that religion faced when society moved from the agricultural to the industrial age.

Marxism

George Friedrich Hegel and Karl Marx were responsible for advancing the idea that contradictions exist as an inherent characteristic of societal life, and that contradictions cause conflict, and conflict causes new social formations or syntheses to emerge where old contradictions are resolved and new, less severe ones are born. Both Hegel and Marx saw the continuous search for syntheses as a process reflecting the spirit of history and charting its course. This process would eventually lead to solving all contradictions and creating conditions for a life without conflict. Hegel argued that systems of thought and sociopolitical systems fall apart and disintegrate under the pressure of their internal contradictions; they are then replaced by new systems that contain fewer fundamental contradictions. This seemingly unending process of systemic change explains the notion of historical dialectics developed by the Hegelian and Marxist philosophies of history. However, the basic contradictions in society, according to Hegel, are related to human freedom, and, therefore, the conflict they cause and the syntheses they produce are largely political.²³ But for Marx, the basic

contradictions in society are related to the private ownership of the means of production, and therefore, the conflict they cause and the syntheses they produce are socioeconomic.

The mode of production, according to Marxist thought, includes two components: the social forces of production and the relations of production. The social forces of production represent man's relationship with nature, and the relations of production represent man's relationship with other men in the workplace. However, the forces of production do not include all people; they include only the proletariat or the laborers who do the actual work. While relations of production are the social ties that develop among people during the production process, as workers and capitalists perform their tasks, and this makes production relations a function of the ownership of the means of production at any given time. Property ownership, in other words, determines the nature of the relationships that tie the forces of production to the relations of production.

Marx argues further that when property ownership of the means of production is communal as it used to be in primitive societies and is supposed to be in communist ones, society is classless, and therefore no basic contradictions exist within its borders. But when property ownership of the means of production is private, social classes appear and contradictions and antagonisms between them arise, causing conflict. Resolving the basic contradictions requires economic change that leads to new syntheses or new societies. But since the new syntheses contain within themselves their contradictions, economic change would have to continue to create new social formations until all basic contradictions are resolved and private ownership of the means of production is abolished and a classless, communist society emerges.

According to Marxism, the identity of each social class is determined by its relationship to the means of production, which creates the conditions that enable capitalists who own the means of production to exploit the poverty-stricken working class. Marx identified the major classes in capitalist society as follows.

1. The proletariat, which represents the industrial workers who sell their labor to the owners of the means of production or the bourgeoisie to earn a living.
2. The Bourgeoisie, which owns the means of production and hires the proletariat to work for it. Members of this class exploit the proletariat by paying them less than what their work is worth and confiscate the difference. Marx divides this class into two subclasses: the bourgeoisie and the petit bourgeoisie.

3. The petit bourgeoisie or the middle class in industrial capitalist society represents the small employers, such as business owners, who hire members of the proletariat to work for them but also work alongside their employees. Marxism argues that as the means of production advance and become more productive, they cause this class to lose its production base and be destroyed, forcing its members to join the ranks of the proletariat.
4. The landlords, which represent the remnants of the old land aristocracy that still has a good deal of wealth and power in society.
5. The farmers, who represent the small landholders. Since farmers live in transition, they cannot form a distinct social class; therefore, some farmers would eventually join the landlords' class, and others would lose their land and join the proletariat.

In fact, except for the petit bourgeoisie and the proletariat, no group of people in society can develop class consciousness and become aware of its interests and social role, and without such awareness, no group could be called social class and gain enough power to cause a change in its favor. The social class that owns the means of production usually rules society, and whoever rules society, his ideas influence policy and shape social change. The forces of the dominant societal process always claim most of the talent in society and employ it to serve their interests. But due to the appalling life and work conditions of the proletariat, Marx predicted that it would revolt against its capitalist masters and eventually take ownership of the means of production. The revolution to settle this class conflict will, therefore, be carried out by the industrial working class because it represents the most exploited people in the capitalist society, which makes its revolt against the existing relations of production inevitable, argues Marxism.

The exploitation of workers happens when the amount of labor one invests is larger than what one receives in compensation. Since all societies, starting with the agriculture one, have produced surpluses, exploitation has been a feature of every society since the dawn of the agricultural age. In capitalism, the labor theory of value considers the value of any good equals to the value of labor required to produce it. The difference between the value of labor needed to produce a certain good and the value of labor the worker is required to invest in work represents the surplus-value. While capitalism calls this profit, Marxism considers it exploitation. In pre-capitalist economies, exploitation of workers was achieved via physical coercion or slavery, but in the capitalist system, it is achieved through legal arrangements between the capitalists who own the means of production and the workers who need to work to survive. Because workers have the opportunity to choose which

capitalist to work for, the arrangement is considered voluntary and thus legal. However, the worker in reality has no choice; he has to work or starve to death. Thus, exploitation under capitalism is inevitable, regardless of the nature of the arrangement between capitalist and worker.

According to Hegel, progress in history is made as people gain more freedom, which is supposed to be “embodied in the modern liberal state.” The end of history would, therefore, come when freedom is universal, and the liberal democratic state is established to represent its people and implement their desired principles of liberty and equality. Marx, in contrast, rejects the vision of a liberal democratic state as the embodiment of liberty and equality, as well as the notion that the establishment of such a state causes history to end. For Marx, the liberal state had failed to resolve the fundamental contradiction in society, and the freedom it brought was only freedom for the bourgeoisie. Democracy, Marx argued, is the tool used by the bourgeoisie to protect its interests, which are at odds with those of the proletariat. Therefore, he envisioned the historical process coming to an end with the establishment of a classless society, in which class struggle ends and the state withers away.

Marxism says that class conflict, which dominated life throughout history, has manifested itself in different stages with distinct characteristics; it started with primitive communism and is supposed to end with a classless communist society. Marx defines these stages as follows:

1. Primitive Communist society, which tribal societies represent.
2. Slave Society, which emerged in the wake of the transformation of tribal society into urban and rural societies.
3. Capitalism, where capitalists form the ruling class and own the means of production and create and employ the proletariat.
4. Socialism, where the industrial workers gain class consciousness and revolt against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, replacing it with a dictatorship of the proletariat that carries out the socialization of the means of production.
5. Communist, where a classless, stateless society free of contradictions emerges and endures.

Marxism could be defined as a social philosophy or worldview that considers economics the major force driving history and causing societal transformations; it is a theory that describes the development of societal life, identifies the forces that cause conflict and change, and explains the

mechanism through which change is made. And due to its revolutionary nature, Marxist ideas have influenced economic as well as social, cultural, and political thinking everywhere, leading many theorists and political figures like Vladimir Lenin and Mao Zedong to play major roles in developing Marxist thought and its applications. Consequently, Marxism became, just like Christianity, one philosophy with several factions.

The failure of the socialist states and the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991 raised questions concerning the validity of Marxist ideas. While some thought that Marxism is not a practical economic system, diehard Marxists claim that the failure is due to people's inability to understand and implement Marxism correctly. Still, others claim that Marxism cannot succeed at the national level and that a world revolution is needed for Marxism to succeed. Critics of Marxism, however, say that the Marxist ideology itself is to blame for its failure. And with the end of the Cold War, radical Marxism ceased to be a political force in global politics

Capitalism and Free Markets

The concepts of capitalism and free markets are products of the same economic thinking. While the capitalist system has historically concentrated on the production of manufactured goods, the free market system concentrates on the production of services and information and nontangible things like financial products. Because early capitalism practiced exploitation of workers and monopoly of markets, Western governments were forced to regulate markets to facilitate competition, undermine efforts to create monopolies, limit the excesses of capitalism and capitalists, raise workers' minimum wages, and protect consumers and the environment. Nonetheless, regulations were not strong enough to protect workers from exploitation, or national economies from recessions and inflation. Nevertheless, capitalism was able to create jobs, a middle class, and facilitate social mobility in all industrial states.

In the wake of the collapse of communism and the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991, democracy and capitalism emerged as the most promising political and economic systems, if not the only legitimate ones. Consequently, proponents of free markets declared victory, and moved forcefully to convince, at times coerce, most other nations to follow their lead: "This triumph has inaugurated—for the first time in the history of humankind—the reign of a single, acceptable way of viewing things in the area of economics, which is considered by its proponents as being universally valid, in both its premises and applications."²⁴ Harvey Cox sees the market system through the eyes

of its promoters as a god; he says, “The market is becoming . . . the only true God, whose reign must now be universally accepted and who allows for no rivals.”²⁵

Globalization and the Internet, which followed the collapse of communism, have helped the forces of the free market to transform the concepts of democracy and free markets into an ideology. And though confidence in the major institutions of democracy and free markets has declined substantially since then, the American people’s attachment to both systems remains strong; no western state seems to imagine keeping one system and abandoning the other. And though the Great Recession of 2008 exposed the shortcomings of the free market system and the excesses of the people who manage it, lack of an alternative economic system has left the American people largely helpless; they cannot free themselves from either an increasingly dysfunctional democratic system or a largely inhumane free-market system.

While religion, nationalism, and communism pursue their objectives through coercion, discrimination, war, and fear, free markets pursue their objectives by corrupting politics and politicians, manipulating people’s fears and needs, and falsifying their consciousness. Because corrupting politics and politicians means corrupting the political system, keeping a functioning democracy requires the abandonment of the free market system; no state can protect the rights of its people, enable them to feel and act as free people and pursue their dreams, while markets work to corrupt politics and politicians. And while making money is the gold standard by which the value of everything in life is measured, the free market forces work diligently to confiscate people’s economic and political rights and thus their freedom.

Contrary to what most people think, freedom in society is limited: when markets get more freedom, people get less. And when people get less freedom, the political system becomes less democratic. Since history indicates that every ideology has failed to protect people’s basic rights, the free market system is destined to fail and cause people to lose trust in both capitalism and democracy. In fact, the promoters of free markets moved after the Great Depression to change the name of the system to Market Capitalism. Nevertheless, High unemployment rates in Europe and many African, Asian, and Latin American states suggest that the free market system is not fit for the knowledge age. To renew the vitality of most economies and make them fair and equitable, drastic changes are needed in the spheres of politics, economics, and social policy.

The Future of Ideology

Ideologies, regardless of their nature and intentions, have had a poor record of delivering on their promises. One of the major promises of religion, for example, is to free slaves as well as masters from the chains of slavery and prejudice. Instead, religion imposes on people rigid values, rituals, and worldviews that engender discrimination and prejudice toward those who do not accept its dogma. “Every religion,” as Sigmund Freud once remarked, “is a religion of love for those it embraces, and each is disposed towards cruelty and intolerance against those who do not belong to it.”²⁶ The men and women of religion tend to judge nonbelievers harshly, impose rigid rules on themselves and others they control, and forego liberating ideas and knowledge. “God in his overweening love for man is destructive of man’s creative energy,” says Charles Van Doren.²⁷

Religion tells believers that there is an unseen order that is the order of all orders and that adjusting to that order and behaving according to its rules will make them happy. But “the means to realize such things as happiness are irrational in that there is no scientific basis of producing what is promised through prayer and ritual,” argues John Patrick Diggins.²⁸ A belief in fate, which religion emphasizes, is submission to certain invisible forces whose very existence is doubtful and whose designs diminish the humanity of men and women. Blind belief in fate makes people less free, less creative, less able to think and act to shape their destiny, and often less optimistic. Religion tends to crush the power of imagination and lead believers to accept subordination to people who claim to speak the word of God. And while religion in principle permits and sometimes invites people to negotiate with God, God’s self-appointed representatives on earth usually refuse to be questioned.

Religions in general and Christianity and Islam, in particular, are dedicated more to life after death than to life before death. They promise heaven to true believers in exchange for accepting the word of God as conveyed to them by his self-appointed representative and doing what is asked of them to do. But promising followers everything later and almost nothing today absolves religion of its responsibilities while leading people to mortgage the present for the sake of after-death rewards no one can guarantee. Religion, therefore, cannot fail; it will continue to make claims that cannot be proven and promises that cannot be tested without being challenged by its believers. In the process, however, religion makes committed believers less able to relate to reality in a meaningful way, because to do so means to sacrifice faith for the sake of science, life, and rational thinking.

The advancement of science, technology, and reason since the 15th century has led to the demystification of many things that were once sacred, causing an ideological vacuum to be created. This vacuum has facilitated the birth of new philosophical ideas such as nationalism, democracy,

capitalism, communism, secularism, and atheism. Yet despite this development, the ultimate question regarding the meaning of life and death has remained unanswered, enabling religion to continue as a social force to calm people's fears by a heavenly promise and claim the allegiance of billions of people worldwide.

Societies that are still socially, politically, and economically underdeveloped have become more dependent on the developed ones but estranged from them. Estrangement has caused the less developed nations to become suspicious and feel insecure. And to deal with their insecurities and preserve their traditional ways of life, these nations have moved toward religious conservatism and cultural nationalism. This suggests that ideology has developed two lives, one in the industrialized and knowledge societies, where it is dying of old age and loss of relevance, and the other in traditional societies and among alienated minorities, where it is being revived and pushed sometimes to its extremes.

Since religion grew out of a deeply felt need of agricultural society in the past, religion is expected to meet the same fate as that of the agricultural civilization. As the agricultural way of life is transformed and the logic of its history is terminated, its culture and religious core will be transformed as well. For religion to survive and remain viable, it has to transform itself to reflect the needs of the civilization it lives in. Otherwise, it will become an obstacle impeding economic and cultural transformation and human freedom and progress: "The part of religion in the transformation is the most important element concerned. Religion has often been, and is still often, an impediment rather than an encouragement to independent inquiry."²⁹

Societal transformations precipitated by economic and cultural globalization and the information and telecommunications revolutions have weakened the rationale of ideology. But the collapse of communism and the failure of Third World socialism have given a new life to religion and nationalism, enabling them to reemerge and claim the future. Small nations, ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities that lived under communism for generations, and others that lived under authoritarian dictators and colonialism for long, saw in religion and nationalism an opportunity to revive old identities and free themselves from oppression. However, the revival of old ideologies usually creates mass movements to effect change and enables certain individuals and groups to dominate society. This in turn creates super-leaders and national heroes that widen the gap between those at the top of the sociopolitical ladder and the rest of the population, causing the new relationships to reduce the humanity of everyone involved.

People at the top tend to develop a sense of superiority and divine inspiration that drives them to denigrate the value of those at the bottom. But sadly enough, most people at the bottom tend to feel that their lives are only worth what they can do in the service of their ideology and their largely deranged leaders. The bulk of the masses are thus led to accept the unacceptable like embracing death for the sake of mysterious causes and believing the unbelievable, like the power of miracles and prayer in healing the sick. Critics and free thinkers are treated as liabilities whose exclusion becomes necessary to maintain social harmony, ideological purity, and popular commitment to ideological zeal.

Concluding Remarks

Since history is irreversible, neither a traditional religious institution can reclaim lost social influence, nor can a weakened nation-state recover lost economic power; therefore, the revival of both ideologies will be temporary. Nonetheless, before they resume their impending decline, religion, nationalism, and cultural particularism are expected to cause poorer nations and religious and cultural minorities to suffer needlessly. When people are helplessly trying to deal with the unknown, understand the invisible, and rationalize the irrational, they are most vulnerable to the work of magic, the seduction of myth, and the false promises of miracles. But when people are free and in control of their living conditions, they are less vulnerable to such forces and more able to deal with the irrational, appreciate the invisible, and plan for the unknown. Wherever ideology dominates, people tend to develop a mindless mind and a false consciousness unrelated to reality; helplessness and ignorance tend to invite ideology, while ideology tends to perpetuate ignorance and helplessness.

Scientific research and philosophical inquiry, by their nature, present a challenge to the conventional wisdom based on history, tradition, myth, and ideology. Therefore, science, reason, and philosophy cannot thrive in a society burdened by ideology, because people cannot discover or develop their potentialities under authoritarian rule, be it national, military, or theocratic. The authoritarian rule that ideological systems impose on society, and the obedience they demand of people tend to suffocate freedom and limit individual initiative and human imagination. Being rigid and dogmatic, ideology is incapable of practicing the art of politics, which requires negotiating with adversaries and making compromises. And since we live in a dynamic world where reality is changing every day in front of our eyes, thinking in purely abstract terms inspired by ideology causes politics to lose touch with reality. Total commitment to a religious or national cause is no longer compatible with global economic activity, political and intellectual freedom, human rights, cultural

plurality, or scientific and philosophical inquiry. Likewise, the total commitment by the rich to creating and accumulating personal wealth has never been compatible with social justice, fairness, economic progress, freedom, or democracy.

Centuries ago, change in the state of mind inspired by grand ideas represented a great motivational force that united people and shaped the consciousness of nations. Religion and nationalism were probably the most effective of all such ideas. But by uniting individuals and tribes to create nations, nationalism and religion have widened the gaps separating nations and accentuated the real and perceived differences among them, causing countless wars. One can easily argue that probably 90 percent of all wars and victims of war throughout history were caused by religion, nationalism, colonialism, and communism. Globalization, in contrast, is gradually erasing the old political, cultural, and ideological divides, and tying individuals, rather than states or nations, together, creating a new reality that reduces the causes of conflict, but not the forces of exploitation and injustice.

George F. Kennan remarked in the early 1990s that the “ideologies of the early decades of [the 20th century] have today, in any case, largely lost their reality. The fact is that we live, at the moment, in an un-ideological age.”³⁰ This judgment was made too early because transitional periods from one civilization to another cause many people to become more conservative and seek refuge in the shadows of religious fundamentalism and old-fashioned nationalism. Social systems, regardless of their ideological nature, are creatures of life conditions that are themselves products of their times. As times change, life conditions change causing social systems to change as well. Every system has a life of its own that could be short, long, stagnant, dynamic, dull, or interesting, but never perpetual. Since continuous change is the only unchangeable fact of life, change is destined to cause all social systems to reach their limits, forcing them to restructure or lose relevance.

When life is largely static, convictions can and often do change conditions; but when life is dynamic, conditions can and often do change convictions. In the knowledge age, where change is unstoppable, changing conditions are destined to shape and reshape convictions without interruption. Ideology and its absolute values and belief systems are destined to change and, in the process, end the reign of ideology and the terror of ideological leaders.

Looking at the history of ideology, it is easy to conclude that all ideologies have produced more pain than gain and caused more harm than good; they narrow man’s choices to one choice only,

limit his freedom and independence, and suffocate his power of imagination. Ideologies encourage man to discriminate against his fellow men and women, and at times, hate them, because ideologies cannot survive without violence, and hate is needed to justify violence. And above all, all ideologies have failed to change any nation to correspond to their visions and died often violent deaths. Because religions tend to promise everything later and nothing today, religious ideologies have survived the transformations of our times, and therefore they continue to undermine rationality and destroy the creative human spirit.

Prof. Mohamed Rabie

www.yazour.com

-
- ¹ Mohamed Rabie, *Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity* (Praeger Publishers, 1994) 8–12
 - ² Robert D. Kaplan, “The Return of Ancient Times,” *The Atlantic Monthly*, June 2000, 16
 - ³ *World in Brief*, *The Washington Post*, September 4, 1999
 - ⁴ Hugh Thomas, *World History*, (Harper Collins, 1979) 29
 - ⁵ Thomas, *World History*, 32
 - ⁶ <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jewish-population-of-the-world>
 - ⁷ Huston Smith, *The Religions of Man* (Harper and Row, 1972) 58
 - ⁸ Karen Armstrong, *A History of God* (Ballantine Books, 1993) 27
 - ⁹ John Patrick Diggins, *Max Weber: Politics and the Spirit of Tragedy* (Basic Books, 1996) 106
 - ¹⁰ Smith, *The Religions of Man*, 86
 - ¹¹ Thomas, *World History*, 151
 - ¹² John A. Garraty and Peter Gay, editors, *The Columbia History of the World* (Harper and Row, 1972) 69
 - ¹³ Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *The Philosophy of History* (Dover, 1936) 215
 - ¹⁴ Garraty, *The Columbia History of the World*, 63
 - ¹⁵ Garraty, *The Columbia History of the World*, 727
 - ¹⁶ Diggins, *Max Weber: Politics and the Spirit of Tragedy*, 106–8
 - ¹⁷ Herbert Heaton, *Economic History of Europe* (Harper and Row, 1958) 217
 - ¹⁸ Garraty, *The Columbia History of the World*, 731
 - ¹⁹ Garraty, *The Columbia History of the World*, 725
 - ²⁰ Garraty, *The Columbia History of the World*, 727
 - ²¹ Garraty, *The Columbia History of the World*, 586
 - ²² Lenichi Ohmae, *The End of the Nation State* (The Free Press, 1995) 16
 - ²³ See Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History* (The Free Press, 1992) 59–69
 - ²⁴ Sophie Bessis, *From Social Exclusion to Social Cohesion: A Policy Agenda* (UNESCO, 1995) 13

²⁵ Harvey Cox, "The Market as God," *The Atlantic Monthly*, March 1999, 18

²⁶ Quoted in Michael Nicholson, *Rationality and the Analysis of International Conflict* (Cambridge University Press, 1991) 10

²⁷ Van Doren, *A History on Knowledge*, (Ballantine Books, 1991) 242

²⁸ Diggins, *Max Weber: Politics and the Spirit of Tragedy*, 106

²⁹ . Thomas, *World History*, 188

³⁰ George F. Kennan, *Around the Gagged Hill* (W.W. Norton, 1993) 93

Since my motto is, "Knowledge not shared is Knowledge wasted, and the more we share, the more we gain knowledgeable people" I ask all readers to recommend every article and book they like because it will help inform others. We all share the responsibility to make our world more hospitable to peace, social justice, and freedom; a lofty goal we cannot reach without spreading knowledge and awareness in every corner of our mother earth.

Prof. Rabie is a distinguished professor of International Political Economy; he attended 5 universities and taught at 10 others on four continents. He has published 52 books in addition to over 100 scholarly papers and 1,500 newspaper articles. Books are 15 in English, one in Albanian, and 36 in Arabic. English Books include four published by Palgrave Macmillan between 2013 and 2017: *Saving Capitalism and Democracy*; *Global Economic and Cultural Transformation*; *A Theory of Sustainable Sociocultural and Economic Development*; *The Global Debt Crisis and its Socioeconomic Implications*. Arabic Books include 3 poetry collections, 2 novels, and a story; the rest is mostly academic books and collections of ideas and reflections. Prof. Rabie is president of the Arab Thought Council in Washington, DC, a member of the Arab Thought Forum, and a fellow of the Alexander Von Humboldt Foundation since 1992. Grants and scholarships financed his education from high school to receiving his Ph.D. in 1970; grants covered studies in Jordan, Egypt, Germany, and America. He is the winner of the State of Palestine Lifetime Achievement Award for scholarly publications and several other awards. His writings and positions reflect a strong commitment to peace, social justice, freedom, human development, as well as social, cultural, economic, and environmental sustainability.