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Introduction

The purpose of this study is to develop a comprehensive generic model of civilizations and world civilization, applying the cybernetic technique of analysis and synthesis. Particularly, the role of info-communication processes is important for this quest, because it is strongly influencing the civilizational progress at the beginning of the 21st century. Three models developed by Braudel (1993), Koneczny (1962), and Toynbee (1934-61) serve as both justification for this type of study and the foundation for a new defined model.

The spectacular progress in technology and living standards achieved by mankind at the beginning of the third millennium prompts research on the grand view of the human condition. Numerous questions need to be answered:

• What is a civilization?
• What types of civilizations can be recognized at the beginning of the third millennium?
• What are the relationships between any particular civilization and the world civilization?
• What is the role of information and communication in a civilization?
• What types of laws govern existing civilizations and which laws should govern the world civilization?
• What are the prospects for a world civilization?

Answers to these questions should help us to understand our current condition and the direction of its improvement or perhaps mankind's further well-being.

The Early Civilization Approach to Human Development

The study of human development involves the disciplines of anthropology, archeology, geography, history, sociology, political science, economics, art, literature, and cybernetics. Each of these disciplines develops its own methods of analysis and synthesis; however, only a few attempts exist toward the formulation of grand models of human development. The scientific tendency in historiography is more toward analyzing than synthesizing.
In historiography, there were six major attempts to define a grand model of human development history. These undertakings generated more criticism than applause, and the Polish study cited below is not widely known to the historical community.

The German philosopher, Oswald Spengler (1880-1936) published The Decline of the West, 1918-22, in which he reflected the pessimistic atmosphere in Germany after World War I. Spengler maintained that history has a natural development, in which every culture is a distinct organic form that grows, matures, and decays. He insisted that civilizations are independent from external influences. He predicted a phase of "Caesarism" in the future development of Western Culture, which he believed was in its last stage.

The English historian Arnold Toynbee (1889-1975) published his greatest work in the twelve-volume A Study of History (1934-61). He compared the history of twenty-one different civilizations and traced a cyclical pattern of growth, maturity, and decay in all of them. He believed that societies thrive best in response to challenges and that a society's most important task is to create a religion. He was less concerned than Spengler with characterizing civilizations, but more concerned with the criteria by which they are to be determined. Although he thought Western Civilization was in its decay phase, he saw hope for the future formation of one spiritually oriented world community.


Koneczny, who published 173 works, was an empirical theoretician who discovered (in contrast to Spengler's a priori model) that there is no one linear history of mankind. He perceived seven major civilizations and examined their common laws. A civilization for him was a method of organizing life for the collective. His main inquiry was to find factors differentiating civilizations. They are named the Quincunx: Truth, Goodness, Beauty, Health, and Prosperity. Also the Triple Law (family law, inheritance law, and property law) differentiates civilizations. Human attitudes towards the Quincunx and laws are the key to understanding the civilizational process. He did not believe in the cyclical theory of civilizations, instead formulating two laws of civilizations.
According to the first law, each civilization has a cause and purpose. The second law states that to endure, each civilization must harmonize interrelations among categories of existence and laws, otherwise a civilization may vanish. Mergers between civilizations lead to chaos, disintegration, and decay, since each civilization may have opposing attitudes toward categories of existence and the Triple Law. Toynbee, in a Preface to the English edition of On the Plurality of Civilizations, judged highly Koneczny’s contributions and called him “indomitable,” because the Polish historian wrote his last works during the German occupation of Poland, living in very poor conditions.

Russian-born Pitirim Sorokin, professor at Harvard in his Social and Culture Dynamics (1937-41, four volumes) quantified all conceivable components of a culture from the Classical-Western tradition. A.L Kroeber published Configurations of Culture Growth (1944), where he analyzed civilizations as anthropologically complex entities but not significantly different.

The French historian Ferdinand Braudel (1902-1985) was a “structuralist” who perceived human development to occur in three historical structures (“measures of time”): the quasi-immobile structure (la longue duree), the intermediate scale of “conjectures,” (rarely longer than a few generations), and the rapid time-scale of events. Each was applied in one of the three parts of La Mediterranee (1949, 1972-74). In his book on A History of Civilizations (French edition 1987, American edition 1993), he contrasted his own approach to history to the “over-simple theories” of Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee. He assumed that the history of human development is the history of civilization.

A student should learn history as a whole, as only this whole is a civilization. Civilization for him is a process rather than a temporarily stabilized construct. It is a structure of transformational streams in a realm of daily activities of human life. He perceives one civilization as a human continuum or, depending upon the context, he may eliminate hundreds of civilizations (ex.: “Roman Civilization” or “Industrial Civilization”). He also, like Koneczny, developed his Triple-Structure idea during World War II, while he was a prisoner in Germany.

The “Contemporary Civilization” Approach to Human Development

Carrol Quigley in his The Evolution of Civilization (1961) analyzed the mechanisms of civilization as they rose and fall, claiming that a process of change was neither rigid nor single in any society, but
rather that each civilization is a confused melange of such processes in all types of human activities. Furthermore, he insisted that to recognize one decisive factor in this process would not be a description of reality. He also criticized approaches to periodizations of history, offering seven stages of human development from 950-1950: gestation, expansion, conflict, expansion, conflict, expansion, and conflict, and each stage divides into seven levels (two more than Toynbee's): intellectual, religious outlook, social group, economic control, economic organization, political, and military.

Matthew Melko, in his book *The Nature of Civilizations* (1969), defined some elements of a basic model of civilizations, such as their components (outlook, aesthetics, society, economics, government, international) and developmental stages (crystallization, transition, complete disintegration, ossification (a freezing at a crystal stage) and developmental macro-phases of feudal system, state system, imperial system, which he analyzes separately from stages. He thinks that civilizations are large and complex cultures, which can control their environments. Civilizations may have varying levels of different cultures integrated in them, but all of them have a basic pattern (of government, economics, war) that allow them to be distinguished from each other. Melko did not characterize any particular civilization. He recognized the civilization's ability to transform itself through its conflicts. His strong contribution is in providing an interesting model of civilizational development through three macro phases.

David Wilkinson proposes to analyze only one Central Civilization rather than several. For him, civilizations are not cultural groups but rather sociopolitical groups or *polycultures*. His civilizations are social units, larger than states integrated by political interest. Wilkinson insists that 13 major civilizations evolved in the last 3500 years into a Central Civilization, which today have been transformed into a single Global Civilization. This process began in 1500 BC, when Egyptian and Mesopotamian Civilizations merged. Later, the Central Civilization was swallowing other civilizations at different phases, such as Near Eastern (1500-500 BC), Greco-Roman (500 BC-500 AD), Medieval (500-1500 AD), Western (1500-2000), Global (2000). Of course, the penetration of ideas, people, and goods among civilizations takes place and influences internal dynamics of each one. However, particularly after September 11, 2001 the boundaries of different autonomous civilizations are obvious, and the civilization super-layer of
the Global Civilization is well perceived in all paths of mainstream human development.

The International Society for Comparative Study of Civilization (ISCSC) several times in the 1970s and 1980s tried to generate discussions on civilizations classification, their origin, and spatial and temporal boundaries. About 56 researchers offered their views on these topics in a post-conference book: The Boundaries of Civilization in Space and Time, edited by Melko and Scott (1987). As a result, we read “comments to comments,” and lack of clear agreement on most issues, with an exception of a definition of civilization which is perceived as a large and complex culture (super culture) with a history. This definition supports the Anglo-French-American view of civilization as a mono-elemental model because the United States is perceived by Americans as a melting pot of ethnic cultures, which blends them into one culture.

However, by the end of the 20th century the Americans have become “hyphenated:” African-Americans, Italian-Americans, Irish-Americans, Polish-Americans, and so forth. This means that the myth that the American culture (“super-culture?”) is truly a myth and that it is cohesive is no longer convincing.

Lee D. Snyder (1999) in his major book: Macro History—A Theoretical Approach To Comparative World History, which appeared by the end of the 20th century, had a chance to synthesize contributions of many the 20th century historians and scientists who made sense of world history. The author argues that the largest historic framework is a “culture-system,” called a Culture or Civilization by many. However, his basic unit of study is the Historic Cycle of 300 to 400 years, during which macro and micro-history can be analyzed within a framework of five dimensions: economic, socio-political, intellectual (insight, spiritual aspect, subjective side, ideas, “culture”), geographic, and expressive (art, literature, and music). Since his book is rather on “World Macro-History” than on “Civilization,” the author is mostly preoccupied with the timing of the historic cycle and how it is influenced by these five dimensions of culture-system. He is innovative in defining a role for the individual in a culture-system.

The World-System Approach to Human Development

A discussion on the role of civilization in human development at the end of the 20th century looked as if it were saturated with jeu le mot that led nowhere. Immanuel Wallerstein understood this very well and offered the world-system concept as a new approach in analyzing
human development. *In The Modern World-System* (1974), he offered a tool for how to recognize what is the most useful interpretation of what happened historically. In his interpretation, “units of analysis” are “world systems,” which mean something other than the modern nation-state, something larger than the nation-state, and something that was defined by the boundaries of an effective, ongoing division of labor.

He was concerned about the special dimension of a world system, hence he later offered Einstein’s “Time-Space” concept to keep “historical systems” issues. When he was working on this new approach, it was during the Cold War, and he used the new computer-oriented management and political systems applications (for example PERT technique), which analyze only main events (world systems) of a given project to find a critical path that determines the success or failure of the whole project.

One such “world system” was North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a part of the capitalism world system, which was in conflict with the communist world system. Today we can add to them European Union (EU), North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA), the Internet, World Trade Organization (WTO), “geopolitics” (Moczulski 2000), and so forth.

The world system implies the hierarchy of a world core, semiperiphery, and periphery, which reflect the old issue of North versus South (Poverty War) or West versus East (Cold War). Of course, while this approach is a useful tool, it cannot substitute for the issues of civilization dynamics, governing human development at the small-scale, grassroots level. Wallerstein considers a concept of civilization only as it is useful for a long-term, large-scale social change analysis, but for a short-term analysis the world-systems approach proposed by him is a more useful technique of analysis.

The world systems analysis and synthesis became a popular approach, which is expanded by Christopher Chase-Dunn and Thomas D. Hall in their book *Rise and Demise, Comparing World-Systems* (1997). The authors’ goal was to trace the transformation of “modes of accumulation” from “kin-based” (based on “normative” social cohesion) to “tributary” (where “organized coercion of labor” predominates) to “capitalist” and “socialist” world systems.

David Wilkinson (1995) offers again a very interesting idea that “civilizations” are “world systems,” particularly if he thinks about his unique Central Civilization. To a degree he is right, but not all civiliza-
tions are "world systems." Nowadays we could classify only Global Civilization and Western Civilization as world systems, which rule the world through their critical paths.

Lauren Benton (1996) rejects the word-system concept as the "master narrative," because it is more important to understand social experience and its cultural perspective rather than the goal illuminating the structure of the whole. This position simulates the progress made in modeling physics, when the Bohr Solar Model (1913) was modified by the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle (1927), which states that we do not know the precise location or the velocity of any given atom. The new Charge-cloud Model (1950s) uses indistinct and overlapping "probability clouds" to approximate the position of an electron in the orbit (defined by Neils Bohr and kept in the 1950s model). Therefore, positions taken by Wallerstein and Benton should not be exclusive but additive as it is shown in Figure 1.

![Diagram of Intercivilization Dynamics and Their Driving Forces](image)
All these maneuvers with the issues of civilizations, macro-history and world-systems are limited, because we have to investigate more components of civilization through modern system and cybernetic tools that can be applied to complex entities. For example we have to recognize a role of technology-driven infrastructures that support human life and culture. A sign of this role is indicated in William McGaughey’s book *Electronic Civilization* (2001), which shows how civilization has moved from print to electronic culture, and its ideals have changed from the classic “truth, beauty, and good” to an elusive element called rhythm (the energy and control of the individual and of human society); and how self-consciousness (concentrating on ourselves), enemy of rhythm, underlines the complexity of modern life.

We who live today feel a strong presence of technology in our *modus operandi*, hence, technology can be considered as one of those world-systems. Neil Postman (1993) even insists that we live in technopoly, which surrounds culture with *technology*. A good sign of it is a statement that “distance is dead” (Cairncross 1997), because geography, borders, time zones are becoming irrelevant to the way we conduct our business and personal lives, courtesy of the info-communication revolution, which allows us to travel less to achieve the same results.

There are about 200 million computers installed and 7 billion chips embedded in smart products (more than there are people on the Earth), which lead to the emergence of the Global Digital Nervous System, or Global Digital Consciousness. Levy (1997) even perceives this trend as the birth of “collective intelligence” which develops a new world of mankind, which is based on the cyberspace. This new world is being planned to work as the computing utility, where computing power could be as simple to tap as juice from a socket. Sensor networks already begin to track everything from weather to inventory, stirring fears of government and corporate intrusion. The broad application of mobile devices, cellular phones, and wireless devices leads to the connected individual wirelessly (*Wi Fi*) anywhere and any time.

Furthermore, marrying electronics and biology promises new devices that could transform million of lives. Right now, most bio-artificial organs are meant as temporary solutions until the patient receives a human organ. Ultimately, scientists want to “grow” living tissue that will eliminate the need for a transplant. These new technologies will force us to change our approach toward how we define life, culture, and civilization. What is gained and what is lost by being digital is...
answered by the Krokers (1997) in their fascinating book under a very meaningful title “Digital Delirium.” Grossman (1995) thinks that we are even building the Electronic Republic, where democracy is being redefined by the info-communication processes.

Therefore, the role of technology cannot be ignored in discussions of civilization. One of the first who understood this role very well was Lewis Mumford (1966), who in his book “Technics and Human Development” goes back to the origins of human culture and does not accept the view that man’s rise was the result of his command of tools and conquest of nature. The author demonstrates how tools did not and could not develop far without a series of more significant inventions in ritual, language, and social organization.

Mumford and McLuhan (1962), both great philosophers of technology, did not live until the Info-Communication Revolution (late 1990s), and could not extend their findings about the role of electronic info-communication processes in civilization.

Figure 2 The World-System of Production at the Beginning of the 21st Century
The Empirical Model of Civilization Evolution

In this study of civilization, we begin with the construction of the empirical model of civilization development. Figure 3 illustrates this model and indicates that the world civilization has a continuous character and it can be also perceived as a mosaic of autonomous civilizations.

There is only one world civilization yet there are about 29 main autonomous civilizations that have been developed over the past 6,000 years. Perhaps, if one could find more autonomous civilizations or rather satellite civilizations (cultures), their number could possibly reach 100 or more. However, for the clarity of this synthesis, we would like to limit the scope of considerations to 29 of the autonomous civilization types. In this sense Toynbee, as well as Braudel, were right; there is one civilization and at the same time there are many civilizations.

The world civilization as a continuum never dies—only evolves from one stage to another. This evolution takes place through the life cycle of autonomous civilizations. At the very beginning of human civilization, there were several successful formations of living processes that could be considered initial autonomous civilizations. They took place in different parts of the world and created about eight cases.

The first autonomous civilization was the Sumerian in Mesopotamia and the next two were the Harappan in western India and
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the Egyptian, about 4,000 B.C. In the Far East, the first autonomous civilizations rose inland: Indic, about 2,500 B.C., and Sinic about 1,500. In Africa the initial civilization was the Berberic-Carthagean Civilization 600 B.C. and, in South America early autonomous civilizations included the Andean Civilization that emerged about 1500 B.C. In Central America the first autonomous civilization was the Meso-American Civilization which rose 1000 BC. Both civilizations fell about 1600 AD.

Autonomous civilizations rose in a response to physical challenges of nature (ecosystem). Humans began to organize themselves into a society, which provided exchangeable and specialized services, such as food hunting, food production, house building, road construction, transportation, health care, entertainment, and so forth. These services and growing human communication led towards the formation of cities. These types of autonomous civilizations we will call *societal* civilizations.

In addition to the environmental challenges, societal civilization as a whole was threatened by its own internal structure involving power, wealth creation, beliefs enforcement, family formation, leadership, and so forth. As societal civilizations evolved into more complex entities, they were managed by cultural manipulation. By culture, we mean a value-driven patterned behavior of a human entity. This type of autonomous civilization we will name the *cultural* civilization.

Ever since religion was transformed from beliefs in magic to beliefs in poly-gods and to then to a mono-god, the cultural civilization has applied religion as the main tool of cultural control. Religious and military force were the foundations of the power apparatus that maintained the society as a governed entity. These forces civilized the society and moved it into higher levels of organization.

Among cultural civilizations, one can recognize about 17 cases, such as the Egyptian Civilization, 3100 B.C.; Minoan, 2700 B.C.; Mycean. 1500 B.C.; Sinic, 1500 B.C.; Hebrew, 800 B.C.; Hellenic, 750 B.C.; Persian, 600 B.C to 600 A.D.; Canaanite Civilization 1100 B.C.; Hindu Civilization 600 B.C.; Roman Civilization, 31 B.C.; Eastern Orthodox, 350 A.D.; Hellenistic Civilization, 323 B.C.; Buddhist Civilization, 600 A.D.; Ethiopian Civilization 400 A.D., the Sub-Saharan Civilization 800 A.D., the Western Civilization 800 A.D., the Islamic Civilization, 632 A.D.; and the Maghrebian (Islamic Spain and North Africa), 1000 A.D.
The cultural civilization evolves into a civilization with challenges generated by intra and inter-civilizational issues of war and peace. These types of issues have been managed by technological means of domination. Such a civilization we will call the *infrastructural* civilization.

The *infrastructural* civilization’s purpose is to expand spheres of influence with the means of technology. Technology drives the development of infrastructural civilizations. The prime target of technology applications has been a war machine which supports the main values of a given civilization. By-products of military applications of technology affect the civilian part of its infrastructure. Among eight infrastructural civilizations one can recognize Sinic 1500 B.C., Hindu 600 B.C., the Japanese 650 A.D., Western Civilization 800 A.D., the Byzantine 350 A.D., Buddhist 600 A.D., and the Islamic Civilization (limited to Ottoman Empire) 1300 A.D.

By the end of the second millennium, infrastructural civilizations had become civilizations responsible for world and regional influence and domination. Hence, Western Civilization dominates the Western Hemisphere and Japan, Australia, and New Zealand; Hindu civilization dominates South Asia, Islamic Civilization dominates North Africa, the Middle East, and some parts of the Far East Hemisphere; the Chinese and Japanese dominate the Far East, with Buddhist civilizations influencing a small part of the Far East. In the majority of autonomous civilizations, one can differentiate more than one culture, with the exception of the Egyptian, Hittite, and Japanese Civilizations, which are monocultural. Figure 4 provides 75 examples of empirical civilizational cultures. By “empirical” cultures we would like to emphasize that their names have been created by historians along the discovery process. Of course, some names have been modified to read as they are perceived nowadays.
Methods of Civilizational Study

In my view, Civilization is an info-material structure developed by humans to effectively cope with themselves, nature, and their perceived creator. It is this vibrant "interface" that differentiates humans from animals. The mission of a civilization is to improve human existence. As Toynbee in his Study of History (1995, p. 87) writes, "the goal of mankind's continuous and increasing endeavors is still out of sight, we know, nevertheless, what it is."

What changed our pre-human predecessors into human beings is the attainment of awareness and problem-solving faculties. The cost of human independent thinking, learning, and quest for freedom is a mental and moral relativity. Hence, the goal of a civilization, or in general, of the world civilization is to minimize "hate" and maximize "love," two opposite forces driving the pulse of human relations.
A role of civilization is shown in Figure 5, which reflects in a graphic model of the "Universal System." This Universal System is composed of three subsystems: human, nature (ecosystem), and civilization. The fourth component is religion, the with a god or gods as steerer of the universe. Relationships among these four components are of two types. The first one contains imbedded relationships such as A, B, and D, that are rather beyond civilizational control, with some exception for sects (e.g. New Age) that define their own gods (the southern direction of the A relation). The second type of relationships, such as F, E, and C are controlled by the civilization.

To understand the control function of a civilization one must open the civilizational structure and analyze its purpose, components, and their relationships. In civilizational studies one can recognize so far two approaches to this task. The English, French, and American Mono-Element Model (MEM) of the humans' interface treats equally "civilization" and "culture." The German Bi-Element Model (BEM) subor-
ordinates "zivilisation" to "kultur."

The English-French-American concept of "civilization" contains all aspects of human life: religious, political, social, economic, and cultural. The German concept of "zivilisation" is limited to useful things, but nevertheless only to a value of the second rank. The value of the first rank is "kultur" which refers to religious, intellectual, and artistic achievements. The "kultur" controls "zivilization" and develops it as a continuous motion of material-driven human development. The German concept of "kultur" emphasizes differences among nations that may share the same "zivilisation."

There is no doubt that the German model is more elaborate than the Anglo-French-American model. However, the German model is still limited, since it does not recognize human entities that determine the whole civilizing process. A new model is needed which could integrate the contributions of these two historic models.

The new model of civilization recognizes the following elements (dimensions):

• **Human Entity** - organized humans in the pursuit of civilization; it is an existence-driven community,

• **Culture** - a value-driven continuous process of developing a patterned human behavior, and

• **Infrastructure** - a technology-driven additive process of acquiring and applying material means.
The comparison of these socio-genesis models of human development is shown on Figure 6. In the new Tri-Element Model (TEM), the German concept of "zivilisation" has been replaced by a concept of an "infrastructure," and the German concept of "kultur" has been kept intact only in reference to the infrastructure, since the English-French-American concept of civilization prevails as the developed, holistic, structure of human existence. The third component -- the entity--has been included in the concept of civilization. This model is somewhat similar to the Greek model called Paideia, that unified civilization, culture, tradition, literature, and education, and has been characterized by Jaeger (1945).

Figure 6 Sociogenesis Models of "Civilization" and "Culture"
Figure 7 The Components of Civilization as perceived in 2003

The 49 empirical components of civilization are categorized and shown in Figure 7. This list is a static model and is of course a product
of knowledge that we can apply now. In the past this list would have been much shorter. A list-hierarchy of entities requires some explanation. The world civilization began when human individuals organized themselves in a family, tribe, or ethnicity.

These entities created prehistoric, primitive civilization, since every human group civilizes itself, since it has a purpose, responds to challenges, and applies tools. Toynbee associates the beginning of a civilization with the emergence of a society. We could add that the emerged society triggers the outburst of an autonomous civilization and sui generis the world civilization.

These civilization components are self-explanatory. A dynamic model of relationships among these components is a subject of the further study. Most of these components have been developed or added along the 6,000 years of civilization history. The most recent components are those which belong to the Integrational Infrastructure and those which are emerging as the post-nation entities. The presented model’s infrastructure dimension allows for a more profound evaluation of the role of technology in civilization.

Based on the models shown in Figures 4 and 5 one can define civilization as an interface between organized humans, religion, and nature, which applies value-driven cultural behaviors and infrastructural tools to guide the purpose and quality of life and to control resources.

**Human Entities and Their Dynamics**

A human entity is a set of structured relationships among a group of humans that can be organized under several forms, ranging from less to more flexible ones.

**A family** – a set of parents and children or relations, biologically connected.

**A band** – a few dozen people who move continuously in the search for food. They are associated with a hunting and gathering form of subsistence economy. Bands have informal leaders who may provide guidance.

**A tribe** – a group of (especially primitive) families or communities, linked by social, economic, religious, or blood ties, and usually having common customs, dialect, and a recognized, informal leader. A tribe can be considered a segmented society devoted to horticulture or pastoralism rather than hunting and gathering.

**An ethnos** – a homogeneous community at an early stage of sharing the same culture and awareness of togetherness, striving for further
A chiefdom – an autonomous, socio-political unit comprising a number of villages or communities under the permanent control of a paramount chief with the aura of aristocracy, but without formal, legal apparatus of forceful repression, and without the capacity to prevent fission.

A society is an organized group of people on the same territory in order to support their own existence through the exchange of specialized, civilizational services. The society shares a common interest and responds to challenges. As a result, the society develops its civilizational means. Along with the development of power and economic infrastructures, the society transforms itself into a people.

A people is a politically and economically organized society, where one can distinguish a hierarchy of subordinated classes. At the beginning of 600 B.C., the Hindu Civilization’s people were divided into three honorable classes: priest (Brahman), noble warriors (kshatriya), and workers (vaisya), including both farmers and artisans, augmented by a fourth group, the slaves (sudra) consisting of non-Aryans.

At the beginning of 400 B.C., the Roman Civilization had people organized into two classes: patricians, who could belong to the senate and plebeians, or commoners. The patricians were more prosperous farmers who secured privileges for themselves. Without the access to power, plebeians became clients to the patricians, who protected them in return for attendance and service.

In the 16th-17th centuries, Poland’s people were divided into three strata: aristocracy (1%), szlachta (knights and land owners) (10%), and plebs (89%). France organized people in three estates: nobles, clergy, and commons. Every state or empire had its own social hierarchy in which people at the top were in charge of a state’s affairs. The remaining people were oppressed and indifferent to the state’s well being. The force of the civilizing process was coming from a very limited group of people, who were, however, very much interested in the creation of wealth and all means leading to it.

In the 19th century, just after the American Revolution (1775-1783) and the French Revolution (1789-99), the concept of a nation began to emerge. A Frenchman and an American no longer served a king but rather the French or American “nation” (patrie). The nation became an entity as a result of a pact between the sovereign people and the state. The whole 19th century is the history of rising nation-states, such as the
U.S., Germany, Italy, France, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Romania. In the 20th century many more nation-states were formed, such as Poland (after 123 years of partitioning), Czechoslovakia (after 300 years of Austro-Hungarian rule), Hungary, Yugoslavia, and so forth.

A proto-nation is an entity ruled mostly by an empire. It is an entity that may eventually evolve into a nation. Although this entity is at the stage prior to nationhood, it is a result of the formation of the nation concept. An example of a proto-nation is Hungary, which self-ruled within the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the 19th century. In the modern sense, Hungary became a nation in 1919, when its state had been established. Czechoslovakia passed through the same process in 1919 and Slovakia in 1995. The fall of Yugoslavia in 1995-97 led to the same results with Slovenia and Croatia creating their own nation-states.

The disintegration of the USSR in 1991 led to the creation of such nation-states as: Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turmenistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. Proto-nations were Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, DDR, and Mongolia under the rule of the Soviet Empire from 1945 to 1989. However, their states did not develop the Polish nation, or the Hungarian nation, since they were promoting the Empire's interest which was in conflict with these nations' interests. From the civilizational point of view, proto-nations are arrested mini-civilizations. Almost 50 years of Soviet domination over Central-Eastern Europe led to the flawed development of this sphere.

A nation is an entity which has a common language, culture, memory of historic events, and "national consciousness." It does not mean that the nation must share a common territory. This condition is applied toward a state rather than toward a nation. In this model a state is a category of a power infrastructure. However, the state may create the nation. It means that emigrants from the nation-state may claim the origin of their nationality from the nation-state, which may be thousands of miles away. They may say that they belong to the Irish nation, living in the U.S. or even having its citizenship. This new affiliation, however, should mean that an emigrant transforms (voluntarily or involuntarily) him/herself into a member of a new nation since the emigrant is a "subject" of a new state. This leads at times to complex and contending visions.

The combination of nation-with-state is a strong force, which
drives the civilizing process. The World Wars in the 20th century were experimental ranges for the civilizing process, inspired by strong nationalism, even declaring the superiority of one nation-race over another, as was the case of Nazi Germany. The Cold War in 1945-89 was a case of the rivalry between the American nation and the Soviet “nation”-empire. Although the USSR was a federation of tens of proto-nations, it was enforcing the continuous development of the “soviet” nation, even a “homo sovieticus.” Likewise, the German Democratic Republic was also developing the “GDR” nation.

A state is an autonomous political unit, encompassing many communities within its territory and having a centralized government with power to draft men and women for war or work, levy and collect taxes, and decree and enforce laws.

An empire is a state of large size that has exercised political dominion over other states, with or without latter’s consent.

A power is a state that is militarily or economically strong. For example in 2003, China is militarily strong and Japan is economically strong.

A superpower is a state that in its military arsenal has atomic bombs and is politically very influential. For example, during the Cold War, the superpowers were the U.S. and USSR.

A hegemonic power is a state that dominates the world politically, militarily, economically, and scientifically. For example, at the beginning of the 21st century, the U.S. plays such a role in the world (Rome III).

A political society is a multi-ethnic entity which evolves from a nation. A good example of it is the United States at the end of 20th century. During WW II the U.S. fought as one nation-state, very proud of its heritage and values. Afterwards, along with the development of American democracy, minorities (of all types, including ethnic but mostly race and gender-oriented) evolved into strong interest groups that influenced politics (elections) and led to the transformation of the American nation into the American political society.

This society emphasizes its immigrant roots and uses its services and resources for its own segmented aims in disregard of the common interest. In this type of entity the civilization process is guided by the priority of infrastructure over culture. This society has become very productive but without a sense of how to aim for a meaningful life. The best solution for the U.S. is to sustain its one-nation model and prevent
fragmentation along the lines of race and ethnicity.

A transnational community is a regional entity that organizes itself against the challenges of the global economy. Examples of this entity type are: the Association of Eastern Alps, the Celtic Arc, the European Port Cities Network, Working Communities and the Pyrenees, the Rhine Hub including Nordrhein-Westfalen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Bayern, Baden-Württemberg, Switzerland, Lombardy, and Eastern France (encompassing Burgundy, the Rhone Valley, Cote d'Azur, and Languedoc). These centers will rival the centers in America: Montreal-Boston-Philadelphia, Pittsburgh-Detroit-Toronto-Chicago, San Diego-Los Angeles-San Francisco, and Miami-Latin America.

The Asian regions are emerging around: Tokyo and Osaka and Shanghai-Guangzhou-Hong Kong. Changes after the Cold War in Central and Eastern Europe created the following regional communities: Vienna-Budapest-Prague (neo-revival of the Hapsburg Empire), Northeastern Europe: Copenhagen-Hamburg-Szczecin-Gdansk-Klaipeda-Liepaja-Riga-St.Petersburg-Helsinki, and so forth. The civilizational process of this entity type is strong since it is based on voluntary cooperation and respect for either partner's achievements or for their potential. Priority is placed on infrastructure development within a shared culture. The regional community is a very strong force in leveling disproportions of civilizational developments among partners.

A supranational community is a cross-whole-national entity, which removes states’ borders in a formal sense and also in a sense of economical and political barriers. An example of this entity type is the European Union (perhaps even NATO) that step by step slowly expands toward a multi-national super state with the common market, currency, economic policy, and military. This entity's civilizational process leads to the development of a strong common infrastructure, which may result in the homogenization of cultures.

In a very long perspective, this development may lead to the formation of the political society. At the end of 20 century, leaders of EU states just became aware of it and are looking for solutions that could prevent the homogenization of national cultures. They would like to guide EU development by the policy of "unity in diversity." They are aware that the homogenization of cultures leads to lower cultural standards and eventual vulgarization of existence.

Since the introduction of one legal language in the EU is impossi-
ble, it is therefore unfeasible to create one European nation. If this is true, the supra-national community must protect different cultures as the prerequisite of meaningful life. However, this life's comfort depends upon commonly shared infrastructures, which sooner or later will trigger the homogenization of cultures. This is the dilemma of the current EU.

A spheric community is an entity of several nations from the same civilization. Examples of this entity are three states, U.S., Canada, and Mexico that are united by the NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) treaty. The civilizational force of this entity type lies in the area of infrastructural development.

The global society or the post-national society is the entity that emerges from the development of a global economy and global culture. This is an entity of stateless and post-national individuals and groups as well as organizations that promote free trade and free flow of ideas and people as a prerequisite of world peace and "happiness." This entity is a strong civilizational force that leads towards the most effective civilizational solutions particularly in the area of the integrational infrastructure (the Internet, airlines, CNN) as well as its leisure time indulgence culture (Coca-Cola and Nike).

The global political society is an entity that may emerge from the global society. An example of this entity is G-7+ group of the most developed nations that promotes a common economic policy. This is an inter-civilizational group of seven nations plus Russia (from three civilizations), which has been included in this group as a reward for the inclusion of Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary to NATO. This entity's civilizational power lies in the promotion of global standards of products and services as well as in promotion of democracy and peace. This action leads toward the modernization of world civilization and the reaction against the Westernization of the world. Both challenges are positive.

Utopia is an entity of calm and stagnation or perhaps even the beginning of civilization death. It seems at the first glance that utopia is the desired state of the world civilization; however, it may be just its end.

Conclusions
The presented Tri-Element Model of Civilization should further allow the development of more components (beyond those presented 49 components) at lower levels of a civilization system. Consequently it
can be possible to convert the static model of civilization into a dynamic one to better analyze civilization dynamics and compare different civilizations.
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