



# WHAT IS THE NAME OF OUR PRESENT DAY CIVILIZATION?

ŞABAN TEOMAN DURALI\*

## I. THE FEAR TO DENOMINATE THE CONTEMPORANEOUS CIVILIZATION!

In my book “*Contemporaneous Global Civilization: its meaning and development*” I investigate, first of all, what ‘culture’ and ‘civilization’ mean. Then, I follow culture’s historical trail; and try to pinpoint how ‘civilization’ has grown out of some cultures. Historically the most remarkable civilizations have taken place on the huge Eurasian land-mass. Eurasian civilizations I arrange in two principal groups: *Oriental set of civilizations* —three ‘stars’: Ancient Chinese; Indian and pre-islamic Iranian— and *Occidental set of civilizations* —eight ‘stars’: Ancient Mesopotamian; Anatolian; Egypto–Mediterranean (Egyptian, Phoenician, Hebrew *and* Cretan–Mycenean); Antique Ægean; Mediæval Christian; Islamic; Modern Secular West European; Contemporaneous globalizing Anglo-Judaic.

With the demise of Western Roman Empire in 476 the Antique Ægean civilization —to which Romans belonged as well— ends and the Mediæval Christian starts to exist. The Modern secular West European civilization, which arises around in the 1500s, is not the successor to the Mediæval Christian one. Just to the contrary, it comes up to oppose the Mediæval Christian civilization.

In fact, religion had, throughout history, been the essence of all cultures and civilizations. The first not to depend on religion is the Modern West European. Instead it is basically a philosophical civilization. Philosophy’s foundation stone is rationality. In turn, rationality has become the corner-stone of this new civilization.

Rationality is the pure act of thinking. Within rationality, feelings are deliberately kept

\* Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey

stdurali@superonline.com

out of the process. In rationality the pure intellectual process is called ratiocination. During the process a clear-cut view can be gained about how the last-appearing thought proceeds from the former one. Thereby an overt demarcation line can be drawn between a correct conclusion and an erroneous one. Where we have a clear perception about the rules that define and govern correct thinking, we speak of formalized reasoning or, in short, formalization. Philosophy-science and especially Galilean-Cartesian-Newtonian, briefly, 'classical' mechanics is the culmination of formalization.

The founding fathers of Modern West European civilization took mechanics' analytical formalized frame out of context and tried to spread its explanatory power out to all holes and corners of nature and society. Moreover they maintained that every reasonable civilized person should think along the rules of ratiocination—that is, formalistic logic. The result is known as Rationalism.

God came to be replaced by 'rationality'—and not 'reason', which already exists in the Monotheistic religion. Rationalism took over the centre stage that had been evacuated by the Faith. This so-called 'liberation' from 'religion' is labeled as Liberalism.

Religion is a moral affair, whereas Rationalism is operative. Morality restrains. It is restrictive. Contrariwise, thanks to operation you can attain any possible purpose. Thus while morality inhibits, operability liberates you from restrictions and opens a wide range of prospects. Consequently, once, society steers clear of religion (Secularism), morality in the long run (i.e. through public education) will be kept at bay (political and economic Liberalism): "Laissez-faire, laissez-aller".

Modern secular West European civilization with Secularism-Liberalism as its central ideology was constructed after a paradigm derived from the Fifteenth to Seventeenth centuries—Humanist-Enlightened—French culture by certain philosophers<sup>2</sup> who leaned on *Descartes'* method-inducing Rationalist philosophy. The said civilization was the outcome of socio-politico-economic circumstances peculiar to European history—first and foremost the schism between clergy and lay; then, the ever-increasing divisions among the lay: socio-economic class structure (the nobility, land aristocracy, serfdom, bourgeoisie, and proletariat). This class structure was particularly prominent in two West European countries; the perpetual rivals, England and France. So, liberal winds, in differing degrees, were already blowing in England since *Magna Carta* (1215). As an ideology, however, coming over the English Channel, it

reached England in the mid-Eighteenth century. It received its final touches at the hands of British philosophers like Anthony Collins (1676 – 1729), David Hume (1711 – 1776) and Adam Smith (1723 – 1790) who concomitantly put down the ideological bases of Capitalism as well.

I said Modern West European was a philosophically based civilization. To be precise, it stood on ideology. So what is, then, ideology? It is a close-circuit philosophy construction. Every independent thought-producing—and the product is called judgment—circuit of ratiocination is an inference. In an inference there is/are (a) starting term/s. (b) Through the middle term/s you reach a conclusion. (c) The 'end-point', that is, the conclusion of an inference, according to philosophy's principal methodology 'dialectics', will, eventually, assume the role of a 'starting-point'—or premise—of a freshly initiating inference. This process goes on and on. Therefore in philosophy-science no conclusion—in the form of judgement or knowledge—can be considered as final and definite. Conclusions are there to be transferred into premises. The conclusion reached, when submitted to an unremitting, harsh test, becomes the premise of the next initiating inference and serves thereupon as the thesis. 'Enquiring' or 'criticising' the 'thesis' yields its 'antithesis'. When these encounter the result will be a 'synthesis' (i.e. conclusion). If the synthesis (i.e. conclusion) is withdrawn from any further logical-empirical justification-exam, it turns into a 'dogma'. Dogma does not remain exclusively within the frame of philosophy. They are socio-politically involved.

The logically knit network of dogma forms a doctrine; and an ideology is made up of doctrines stemming from the same author (i.e. philosopher) and striving towards a common socio-politico-economic denominator. No way to question the dogma constituting the doctrine/s of the ideology. Each of them represents an aspect of the ultimate, undisputable truth. In religion there is always a certain space to move around (i.e. interpretation) within the various faiths which form the creed. After all, the faiths are believed to be God-given. Since they are trans-human, they can and even must be brought down to the level of reasoning. Otherwise they are left beyond human understanding. Most particularly the Monotheist religion possesses self-confidence. Especially Judaism and more vehemently Islam reject trans-human mediators in worldly human shape between God and man. Therefore no human can be considered infallible. This is not the case with ideologies. They are, in fact, reason-produced, man-made items that do not find their justification and legacy in sanctity. So, they are open to all sorts of interferences coming from others. In order to enforce their authority and legacy on all members of the society they have been mystified with a touch of miracle, encircled with

1 which the Humanist Enlightenment philosophers branded as 'ignorance'—

2 Montesquieu, Rousseau, Voltaire, Diderot, Helvétius—

some sort of a halo. This is done for strengthening the imposition of ideology's socio-political and economic hegemony (i.e. regime). Very often violent means have been on the agenda.

Now, after all these deliberations, it gets clear that ideology and freedom are not compatible. The degree of liberty limitations alter from one ideology to another. At the bottom line the most at-liberty-appearing ideology, as Liberalism, is a far cry from being liberal.

The first two rings of the chain of ideologies are Liberalism and Capitalism. The coming into being of both ideologies coincided. As told above, Liberalism's stuff was prepared by the Seventeenth-century free-thinking French philosophers. It was then taken over to Britain, where it got worked out into a fully fledged ideology, particularly by David *Hume* and Adam *Smith*. Coincidentally both—and to some extent Thomas *Hobbes*—laid Capitalism's foundation stone as well. Indeed, Capitalism was going to become the backbone of the newly arising Anglo-Judaic world civilization. This new civilization that appeared from the 1790s onward could be accepted as the direct successor to Modern secular West European civilization. Just like the latter, the former took Materialism-Mechanicism, derived from classical mechanics, as its background world view. It only differed from Modern West European that it was not overtly secular.

The Catholic version of the entire-humanity-embracing Christianity got split into pieces. Each piece assumed the shape of a national religion. Like Judaism the single portions of Protestantism evolved as legitimization of national interests and aspirations. So the way got opened for the two inevitable pillars of Capitalism, namely, Colonialism and Imperialism; and globalization is a continuation of Imperialism. This process is unique in history. We do not find an example or a model in the past. It started in Britain with the English sitting at the helm of the enterprise and the Jews financing the unheard novel undertaking with money and know-how. The firsthand laboratory where this original and ambitious hypothesis had been submitted to test was New England that would later become the United States of America. Continental Europe became the springboard whence Capitalism and in its wake Anglo-Judaic civilization started their unstoppable world conquering campaign. In Continental Europe France, the leading culture and heartland of Modern West European civilization, had become Anglo-Judaic civilization's primary world view export target. Thus the French Revolution, first of its kind in history. Surely enough, the French, particularly the Parisians rose up against despotism and corruption. That was the rebellion side of the coin. What about the revolution? This, in turn, is more complex in its composition than revolt or rebellion. It needs first and foremost financial backing in order to get organized and by that to seize the political power.

The French Revolution received the necessary financial support from over the channel. Mainly the Knight Templar<sup>3</sup> transformed version, Freemasons were ready to run for help.

Modern West European civilization's central ideology Liberalism bore a political character. It emphasized a politicized social order in the form of State —'civitas' in Latin; thence 'civilisation' in French. The State's political order was advocated to be laic Republicanism. Laicism is the contrary of theocracy, that is, the State ruled by a so-called God-sanctioned class. This class is known to be clerical. The political power yielded by the clerics is theocracy. Secularism is the education of the upcoming generations far from religious concerns and fervour. So, while Laicism is a political order, Secularism is a social, to be more precise, educational organization. Liberalism encompasses both Laicism and Secularism. Its Republicanism differs from what we understand today under that term. The enlightened republican French of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries translated, like the Romans, the Greek word 'democracy' into 'republic' —'res publica' in Latin—, meaning 'things public', that is to say 'public affairs'. Thus a monarchy could very well be republican, that is, democratic. The English and their north European followers, the Dutch, Swedes and Danes, did not conceive 'republic' in the Latin-French sense. They, naturally, switched over to the term 'democracy' and nurtured a special distaste for 'republic'.<sup>4</sup> They regarded it as the form of a State's regime, while 'democracy' came to mean the content of the socio-political order. America's philosophical founding fathers took over 'republic' and 'democracy' exactly in their Anglo-Saxon meanings. Hence the United States was to become a 'democratic republic' and not a 'monarchic' one.

'Democracy', nevertheless, is a tricky affair. It was applied in the true sense of the term only once in history, namely, by the Athenians and their allies. So we should not see democracy as something Greek. Though Greek as well, the Spartans were not inclined towards democracy. The Fifth and Fourth-centuries (B.C.) Athens applied democracy in its full sense. It was every male citizen's duty —not right, but duty— to participate in all political and judicial affairs. In normal circumstances he was not entitled to delegate his political and judicial duties to someone else. Representative democracy emerged long afterwards, during Rome's republican era. When, personally, I cannot directly take part in the political and judicial decision-making process, no way to speak about democracy any more. In short, to delegate democratic duties

3 Who vowed revenge against French monarchy after they were massacred by the order of Philip (IV) the Fair in 1307.

4 Among the factors of this 'distaste' we find the customary English antipathy towards the French.

and rights to someone else is undemocratic in it self. ‘Democracy’ as it is used and applied in our days within the frame of the Capitalist Anglo-Judaic civilization is, therefore, a far cry from the sense content of this term. Well, is it applicable under the existing socio-political and demographic circumstances? No. Then, why so much fuss about it? It is an efficient weapon thanks to which the Anglo-Judaic civilization can pursue its imperialist goals. Yesterday it used its gun-boats. Today it puts into practice smokescreen-concepts like democracy, liberty and human rights. Through these concepts and the like it seeks to dupe people all over the world. Concepts and ideas have become the most lethal weapons of our time. Not to forget that the global Anglo-Judaic one is, after all, a philosophically based civilization. Where concepts and ideas do not suffice, tanks, planes, battleships and all sorts of bombs are still there ready at hand to be put into practice.

All major Eurasian civilizations have forged specific terms in order to denote that which does not conform with their cultural peculiarities and standards. In the Antique Ægean civilization it was the “Barbarikos”, in the Mediæval Christian “Paganus”, in the Islamic “Kâfir”, and the ancient Iranian civilization denominated the outsider, stranger as “Turani”. Whoever steps beyond the permissible social, political and most importantly economic limits of the Anglo-Judaic civilization is right away a ‘Terrorist’. This term, of course, has changed its meaning. In the Nineteenth century Terrorism was the name of a breakaway-ideology (from Anarchism). In the 1980s it began to assume within Anglo-Judaic civilization’s denotative context the meaning of “Barbarism”.

The main clear-cut distinction between Modern secular West European and Contemporaneous global Anglo-Judaic civilizations was brought about by the principal ideologies on which each of them depended. Of course, we already come across Capitalism’s ‘seeds’ in the extending and more and more liberalized trade connections between the Islamic world and late Mediæval Christian countries of south and north-west Europe in the mid-1200s. Especially the above-mentioned trend became more manifest from the 1300s onward in Italy, France, the Netherlands, England, Denmark, Sweden and North Germany (Hansa-league). As an ideology in its own right it came into being only in the mid-Eighteenth century.

Those who masterminded Capitalism did not put aside their obligation to lay out the scheme of an alternative as well. To plan for all possible options that lay ahead is the epicentre of English and Jewish genius. Just as Theodor Herzl (1860 – 1904) designed the anti-Zionist movement parallel to the Zionist one in 1897, so did the British philosophers draw up Socialism as an alternative to Capitalism in the mid-Nineteenth century. With that you do not wield full

control only over your own fabrication, but also on that which seems to be the opposite to it. In devising Socialism, Capitalism’s masterminds tried to imply, “o people, if you are not content with Capitalism, do not go far afield to look for an alternative; here is a legitimate one for you and that is Socialism”. Both stand on a common denominator: Materialist-Mechanicist world view.

Only Stalin was an unexpected road accident. He, I mean his political and economic legacy, was overcome some forty years later.

A direct challenge to the Contemporaneous Anglo-Judaic globalizing civilization and its two so-called rival ideologies, Capitalism and Socialism had come from another European ideology, namely Fascism. This derives from a world view called Romanticism which had been set up in order to oppose Materialism-Mechanicism. Just as we can trace Materialism-Mechanicism’s origin back to René *Descartes* (1596 – 1650) and Julien Offroy de *Lametrie* (1709 – 1751), likewise we follow Romanticism’s way up to the Italian philosopher Giambattista *Vico* (1668 – 1744). Out of it arose in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth centuries a new socio-political and economic system, Fascism, mainly in the hands of another Italian philosopher Vilfredo *Pareto* (1848 – 1923) It was materialized as a political and economic order by Benito *Mussolini* (1883 -1945) Although half-witted Leftists have branded every tyranny and military dictatorship as Fascism, this is not the case. It is not to be identified with National Socialism either. For Fascism national identity is to a great extent culturally based, whereas National Socialism particularly derives it from an ethnic or racial source. Unlike National Socialism, Fascism possesses a clear economic vision (Fascist Corporatism) which is anti-liberal and against finance Capitalism, so much so that it approaches sometimes the Marxist version of Socialist conception. Again unlike National Socialism, which sees Christianity as Judaism’s offshoot and therefore rejects it vehemently, Fascism bears a distinct religious, particularly a Catholic, colour. Fascism is not anti-Semitic<sup>5</sup> in nature. Although initially National Socialism took the basic ideological ingredients —most importantly the political governing form— from Fascism, it, eventually, succumbed to capitalist Anglo-Judaic civilization’s fundamental values and schemes against which, in fact, it, primarily, vowed to fight. This you can call the irony of fate. Before everything else it was immensely influenced by the Spencerian interpretation of Darwin’s evolutionary vision. This vision, essentially, is already a byproduct of Capitalism’s way of regarding the world and society. Constant material competition between and the

5 Although Arabic is also a Semitic tongue, anti-Semitism is exclusively being identified with intense hatred of Jewishness and has nothing to do with the Arabs.

relentless triumph scored by those who obtain the upper hand in the process of struggle. In this context I always claim that the ones who had to stand trial at Nuremberg in 1945 – 46 were not only a bunch of criminals but the whole group of those intellectual godfathers of the said civilization.

The ultimate aim of the Contemporaneous globalizing Anglo-Judaic civilization is to homogenise all men. First, the socio-cultural entity human (*L humanus*) must be brought down to the biotic level of man (*homo*).<sup>6</sup> Since the human is a socio-cultural entity, in René Descartes' terms, a "Res cogitans", he himself cannot become an object of scientific research. If, after all, it is the human who conducts the said research, how could he be submitted to that?! He is, in epistemological terms, unnomologisable —i.e. the explanation of the human reality cannot be achieved through scientific law (nomology). Why? Because human is a 'psychic' (or 'soulful' or 'mental') being. Then, what is 'psychic'? Any 'event' that can be explained or described on time – space coordinates is a 'fact'. A psychic entity and thereby the human being is not there to be explained on time – space coordinates. It is impossible to point at and repeat a psychic happening. There is a force or better said an agent the result of whose activities we perceive in certain 'facts' which, themselves, are, of course, tangible, sensory, experiential, testable and repeatable.

An event that you are unable to sense (yet you can feel it!), test and repeat you will not be capable to subjugate. Such an 'event' is not a 'fact', but a 'case'. The soulful human is a case. It is impossible to explain him in terms of science. He is rationally an incomprehensible case and therefore indomitable. For the sake of exploitation, 'human' had to be reduced to the level of 'man'. The hitherto 'believing-warring human' —*humanus religiosus-bellicus*— was brought down to the biotic stratum of the 'consuming-straying man' —*homo economicus*

Capitalism is there to urge the individual to accumulate an ever increasing amount of material, or better, monetary assets through acquisition and then to invest them; and investment's purpose is to take the product onto the market. The span between procurement and sale is called 'profit', Capitalism's kernel. In Capitalism's view there is no other ideal except 'market' and 'profit'. Whatever is 'marketable' and 'profitable' that can be considered 'good' and 'acceptable'. The target object in the market is the 'mouldable biotic man'. He is not asked what

he wants or needs. On the contrary he is socio-culturally moulded and shaped along the lines the producer–seller wants him to be (cultural Imperialism). The more his whims are inflated (Consumerism) owing to a perplexing web of fabrications<sup>7</sup>, there will be further gains in the realm of production and sale. No halt to this vicious cycle. A virtual reality is constructed at the expense of the natural one. What the contemporary theorists of liberal Capitalism regard as the sublime urbanizing civilization devised by the Anglo-Judaic one is nothing else but the 'virtual reality'. The ceaselessly squandering man's consumerist whims and the vast scope of reckless enterprises are seen, again, by these theorists as liberal Capitalism's benign liberties. Indeed, anything beyond the indicated level is submitted to harsh restrictions. A bewildering series of prohibitions take place beneath the pretext of "how can you allow the destruction of the democratic Capitalist order!?" Every other ideological system, political order or regime sets the same assertion forth.

I was told in the summer of 1970 that in occupied France of September 1940 German military authorities distributed official forms to be filled and signed by the head of the family. The form contained three questions: 1) "are you Jewish?", 2) "Freemason?", 3) "homosexual?" or "are there persons in your family or among your relatives who comply with one or more of those questions confirming?"

In the summer of 1985 I received a grant from the United States government. In order to enter the United States I asked for an entry visa. In the application form there were three questions to be answered by the applicant: "are you or have you ever been a member of a 1) Communist, 2) Fascist party or 3) extreme religious —in its present day appellation 'fundamentalist'— community, brotherhood or order?" Thus, seen from the outside, the regimes seem to be different, while to the core no discrepancy between them. The Contemporaneous globalizing Anglo-Judaic civilization with its ideological backbone, Capitalism, is inevitably defiling the human constitution and irremediably destroying nature worldwide.

Finally let us reiterate the fact, it should and even could not be overlooked that there is the vital necessity to explore mentally the possibilities of an alternative to the current globalizing civilization. Otherwise we are, indeed, standing on the verge of the end of history.

<sup>6</sup> While 'humanus' (human being) a religiously tinted designation, 'homo' (man) is a biotico-evolutionary term.

"When I have fashioned him (in due proportion) and breathed into him of My spirit... (...nafaktu fihi min Rûhî)..." —*Qur'ân*, *Al Hijr*, 15/29. Accordingly, contrary to 'homo' or 'bashar' in Arabic, 'humanus' (Ar. 'insân') is not the outcome of a biotico-evolutionary process. It is directly a God-conferred attribute.

<sup>7</sup> Schooling, propaganda (of which Joseph Goebbels (1897 – 1945) could be considered as one of the talented executioners), audiovisual advertisements, written publicity, the media.

## II. EVOLUTION THE EPITOME OF THE EMERGING CONTEMPORANEOUS GLOBAL CIVILIZATION

Although evolution as a term came to be used in biology and was primarily designated for the meaning of an exclusively biotic process, it gradually grew out of, and went even beyond, the bounds of this special domain. Eventually, it has become a kind of a trademark to a particular civilization; the one which we have been living over the past one hundred years; and moreover, the one which casts at present its spell over all nooks and crannies of our entire globe. The present civilization, in addition to the preceding one, namely the Modern Western European which was backed up by the Materialistic-Mechanicistic world picture and Laicist-Secularist world view, added to those already-mentioned elements the very conception of evolution. In the Materialistic-Mechanicistic world picture the religiously determined belief in necessity was still there, though it might be in a rather dormant state. But, with the occurrence of the post-Darwinian doctrine of evolution the last vestiges of necessity had also to vanish. Furthermore, thanks to the conception of evolution and also as a necessary outcome of the Modern Western European civilization's cardinal principle, Secularism, the idea that human is a God-granted sanctity, had to be thrown overboard. Stated in a different manner, the conception of evolution draws to the end the thought process set off by Secularism.

While Laicism is a doctrine about political conditions, Secularism refers to the inner state of the human. Again, Laicism is the outcome of the Mediæval Christian European civilization. Europe was twice divided into two. On the one hand, the old rift between Rome of the Ancient times and her North-eastern Germanic neighbours had been going on during the Middle Ages, while on the other the socio-political authority had been shared by two opposing power bases, namely, the clerics, who claimed a hierarchically ordered succession to Jesus, God in human shape, and the worldly laymen. The latter, in turn, were again divided among themselves into the ruling nobility —dynasties—, landlords, farmers, landless labourers, slaves and merchants —Jews among others— who at a later date formed a new class, the Bourgeoisie. A constant struggle between clerics and laymen went on for the supremacy over who would rule the Christian State. The scores were finally set by the 1789 revolution, at the end of which the laymen won a resounding victory over the clerics. Once the clerics were overcome, the laymen on continental Europe began to quarrel among themselves: Class struggle between, first, the Nobility and Bourgeoisie, afterwards, the Bourgeoisie and Proletariat.

The regime based upon the political power exercised by clerics is called Theocracy. Anyone disapproving this ruling class for some reasons is relentlessly charged of committing blasphemy, because the cleric regards himself and his peers as God-sanctioned and prolongation of the Divinity in the world. He is in a sense infallible.

Had there been no military, there would have never been any civilian. One who does not belong to the military establishment is a civilian. Likewise, one who is not a cleric, must necessarily be a layman. Furthermore, a regime, if not theocratic —i.e. political power held not by clerics—, must be laic. What would then, if you have no clerics? You cannot have a theocracy as a regime. This is exactly the case with the commonly accepted Islam. For there has never been a State bearing the adjective 'Islamic' or 'Muslim' and reigned by clerics in history, merely because a class as such does not exist in the fundamental creed of Islam.

In Islam, and for that matter in the unadulterated revealed religion, the Divine message and God's messenger —i.e. the Prophet— are followed, in a row of importance, by conscience and reason. The former is regarded as God's speech and the latter as our own faculty to interpret and attune it to each and every element we receive from the outside — via perception. With the onset of the Modern Western European civilization conscience was not seen any more as God's speech in us —human does not depend on any other being except her/himself: Humanism<sup>8</sup>— and Reason lost its status of being the link or junction of the cables, one coming from God to us and the other going from us to Him —the supreme decisive status in human life taken over by Reason: Enlightenment. So was the human individual bereaved of God's everlasting and caring presence —Koran 50/16: "Indeed We created the human, and We know the gloomy intentions his soul whispers to him; after all We are closer to him than his jugular vein"— and left all alone on to himself in an indifferent, dark world —Atheist Existentialism. An unremittingly self-propelling Reason has become the sole hold upon which he is constructing his existence: Secularism. Reason deprived of any inner sense is rationality. With this newly acquired apparatus Modern man regards nature as an engine-like functioning process —Mechanicism. The building-blocks of this engine must be determinable on the scale of time and space —Materialism. Anything that does not fit into the Materialistic-Mechanicistic scheme is to be immediately refused as speculative metaphysical junk —Positivism.

<sup>8</sup> After having denied conscience —con-scientia: to know together, who knows together with me my inner self— to be God's speech in ourselves, we, now, converse with ourselves. After all, is this mood not termed schizophrenic?

6- The human who accepts her/himself as consisting of a mechanically functioning being constructed from matter will not exceed the level of ‘manness’ —not, of course, in the sense of male— is the soulless biotic side of the ‘coin’ —in ‘man’ the ‘driving force’ is the ‘psyche’ (nafs in Koran’s language). When the ‘soul’ (K: rûh) enters the picture, ‘man’ (K: bashar) turns into ‘human’ (K: insân). Society, culture and history are achievements on the part of the human. In spite of the fact that the physical-chemical as well as biotic environments exercise their influences, they, nevertheless, play not so decisive a role in the formation of history, society and culture. ‘Man’ is the infrastructure of the ‘human’, so to speak. The science relevant to this subject, will of course be biology together with its subsidiary disciplines, physiology, morphology —and anatomy—, embryology, genetics and evolution, to name a few.

7- Evolution, having faced insurmountable difficulties concerning verification and falsification, due to its treatment in the past, hence epistemologically not yet well established, is however a member of life sciences in its own right, particularly with respect to its heuristic function.

8- Towards the end of the 19th century, evolution was seen as having grown out of a scientific hypothesis, though it might appear, especially to its fanatical adherents, rather as a theory. More and more it was taking on the gigantic dimension of a doctrine woven out of a triple of cardinal dogmas: random mutation, struggle for existence and natural selection, whatever ‘natural’ means in this context. It was no longer a modest attempt at describing the great variety of species, but a daring inquiry into the origin and formation of species. Towards the 20th century it had attained the status of a stronghold of the newly emerging present-day civilization, the one I would like to call the Anglo-Judaic global civilization. The clear-cut process of dehumanization of mankind, begun after the emergence of the Modern Western European Civilization in the 16th century, has been almost finalized by the Anglo-Judaic global one. The ultimate ideal of the *humanus religio-ethico-bellicus* was to overcome her/his biotically determined man side. The Koran calls this an all-out human struggle, ‘Jihad’. The purpose of life for the *homo biotico-economicus*, on the other hand, is to ‘hominize’ her/himself through constant and individually conducted strife, competition, exploitation —thence Imperialism— and material acquisition —the drive for profit: Capitalism.

Starting with Capitalism, the ‘centre-board’ of the Anglo-Judaic civilization, all coterminous ideologies, such as Communism, Fascism and National Socialism, have snatched their due share from the doctrine of evolution.

In spite of the fact that the physical-chemical as well as biotic environments exert their influences, they nevertheless do not play so decisive a role in the formation of history, society and culture. ‘Man’ is the infrastructure of the ‘human’, so to speak. The science relevant to this subject will, of course, be biology, together with its subsidiary disciplines of physiology, morphology, -and anatomy-, embryology, genetics and evolution, to name a few.