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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to analyze concepts of diversity when applied at the level of such large entities as race, ethnicity, society, nation, empire, state, and civilization as compared to groups integrated by common values and/or interests, such as castes, elites, classes, and nets. Such social ideologies as nationalism, racism, and others will also be analyzed from the point of view of their roles in the evolution of civilization. This evolution will be analyzed in the stages of Early, Colonial, Imperial, Post-Imperial, Globalizing, and Universal Civilizations, which terms will be defined in the course of this paper.

Furthermore, benefits and costs of historic diversity solutions will be estimated as a base to create challenging diversity and multiculturalism-oriented policies in the 21st century. The latter will be analyzed in the context of these policies in the current nine civilizations (Western, Eastern, Japanese, Chinese, Islamic, Hindu, Buddhist, African, Global) in order to define an optimal solution (balancing assimilation and isolation tendencies) which eventually may eliminate the negatives of multiculturalism and address the concepts of state, global and world citizenships within a hybrid culture. Recommendations are offered to improve the current civilization's social dynamics.

Key words: clash of people, race, ethnicity, castes, classes, elites, nets, society, nation, empire, civilization, multiculturalism, diversity, nationalism, racism, hybrid culture, global citizenship.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to analyze concepts of diversity and evaluate their applications in the evolution of civilization. Furthermore, benefits and costs of historical diversity solutions will be defined as a base to create challenging diversity- and multiculturalism-oriented concepts in the 21st century. The latter will be analyzed in the context of the current nine civilizations in order to define an optimal solution which will eliminate the negatives of the current state of multiculturalism and address the issues of state, global and world citizenships.

It is important to notice that the United Nations declared on December 10, 1948 a Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR):

"Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world"
Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law....”

The ideas and values of human rights can be traced through history to ancient times and in religious beliefs and cultures around the world. European philosophers of the enlightenment period developed theories of natural law that influenced the adoption of documents such as the Bill of Rights of England, the Bill of Rights in the United States, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen in France. During the Second World War the allies adopted the Four Freedoms: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom from fear and freedom from want, as their basic war aims.

However, after 60 years of applying the UN UDHR, it is still true that the world is not free from the clash of people triggered by human ethnicity and diversity. This study will investigate (at the level of synthesis) the reasons for such a situation and the repercussions of multiculturalism through the development of civilization.

UNDERSTANDING DIVERSITY

Diversity is the foundation of life forms for the entire Earth. Biodiversity is often used as a measure of the health of biological systems. Biodiversity found on Earth today consists of many millions of distinct biological species, the product of four billion years of evolution. Hence, sociodiversity is one of the dimensions of biodiversity. This paper will propose that sociodiversity is a modern human elaboration of biodiversity. There is general understanding that biodiversity is necessary in the sense of one diverse group aiding another in developing resistance to catastrophes. In the political arena, the term diversity is used to describe social and political entities (neighborhoods, cities, nations, ethnicities, cultures, etc.) with members who have identifiable differences in their backgrounds, behavioral patterns, lifestyles, and positions on certain issues.

Population movements and the elaboration of social units (e.g.: cities, city-states, states, empires, nation-states, civilizations) from a family to a global level took millennia. This paper will propose that such elaboration was driven in the different cultures by their differing diversity concepts, which were central values of each culture. In this study we limit our scope of consideration to civilization, which in a broad and large-scale sense of space and time is composed of a large social, cultural and infrastructural system, creating an autonomous fuzzy reification (Melko 2008) that is not a part of a larger unit, excepting the World Civilization.

Figure 1 illustrates configurations of diversity elements, which are described in social and political science literatures. It indicates how complex is the social tissue of human civilization.
These diversity-oriented elements have been applied within an endless number of configurations at different stages of the evolutions of civilizations, of which some examples will be illustrated in the following section.

**DIVERSITY EVOLUTION**

Table 1 illustrates the civilizational elements (society, culture and infrastructure), emphasizing the roles of key diversity elements and factors.
Table 1. The Evolution of Civilizational Components, Determining Social Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVILIZATION STAGE</th>
<th>SOCIETY</th>
<th>CULTURE</th>
<th>KEY DIVERSITY FACTORS</th>
<th>INFRA-STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Civilizational, 9000-4000 B.C.</td>
<td>Families, Tribes</td>
<td>Value of Territory</td>
<td>Family-Tribe</td>
<td>Nomads, Hunters-Gatherers, Settlers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Civilizations (Mesopotamian, Egyptian) 4000-3000 BC</td>
<td>City-State, Empire, Rulers, Warriors, Priests, Cultivators, Craftsmen, Traders</td>
<td>Interest of Castes, Patrimonial Rules</td>
<td>Wealth (Discovering and Protecting), Accommodation</td>
<td>Farms, Irrigations, Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Civilizations [Roman, Macedonian, Western (Portugal, Spain, Netherlands, U.K., France)] 500 BC-1800 AD</td>
<td>Empire Rulers, Military, Priests, Elites (aristocracy, specialists), migrants</td>
<td>Value of Ethnicity &amp; Slavery Colonial Law</td>
<td>Domination-Ethnocracy, Hierarchal Access to Power or Wealth Profiting</td>
<td>Merchant Capitalism Navy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What lessons of diversity might be learned from history? Here are some examples:

1) Early civilizations (4000-500 BC)

- Diversity was limited to a ruler and the ruled, interacting according to the patrimonial rule, organizing society within a framework of patronage and clientage under a caste system (Lamberg-Karlovski, Sabloff 1995).

- Differentiation was rising among the ruled, who began to specialize in certain crafts and administration, including the military. However, the society was ruled as one *corporation* bringing profit to the ruler.

- Rulers were less interested in people’s ethnicity as long they paid taxes and were ready to work and *accommodate* to the way of life in the civilization. (If one checks Mesopotamia, for example, there is some question whether people were even conscious of ethnicity. There is no evidence of discrimination between speakers of Akkadian and of Sumerian, and no one seems to have noticed the decline of the Sumerian language at the time in favor of Akkadian.)

- The Assyrians and Persians were quite happy imposing Aramaic as a language of government, and it isn’t even in the same language phylum as Persian. The Amarna archives about 1350 BC were in diplomatic Akkadian, barely in the same phylum as Egyptian, and the Egyptians were certainly conscious of the superior position of Egypt, (Lamberg-Karlovski, Sabloff 1995).

2) Colonial civilizations (500 B.C.-1800s AD)

- Diversity was welcomed mostly in respect to ethnicity, which led to a division of society into masters and slaves, The latter provided cheap labor, which led to a practical division into a financially exploiting master class and a financially exploited class of subjects and slaves who provided cheap labor. This led to ethnic consciousness based on imperial position and thus to domination of one ethnic group over another.

- Differentiation was rising within the society, triggered by emerging capitalism (of the mercantile kind), which was and still is based on competition. It led to rising hierarchies within society based on access to either power or wealth.

(The distinguishing characteristic of a mercantile economy is that it counts trade solely in terms of profit in monetary terms. To a mercantilist, “money in” is the preferred result, not “goods in.” Thus, for example, the Roman...
imperial economy was not mercantilist, because it heavily emphasized “goods in”).

3) Imperial civilizations (1800s-1900s)

- Diversity was limited, since each elite ruling an empire protected its homogeneity. These included: aristocracies and party leaders’ cliques (e.g., Nazis & Communists) which were closed systems ethnically, excepting a few such useful subjects as the princely class in India who were still kept at arm’s length. For example, Moscow did allow a few members of ethnic minorities into the top ranks, as witness Stalin and Beria, and expected that the ruled from different nations would rather accommodate or assimilate (the case in the Soviet Union) than fight the rulers.

- Differentiation was limited to labor specialization, which had to be productive and submissive.

- Uniformity was the rule since it was supporting law and order, including even ethnic cleansing. This factor usually led to the fall of empires, since as a closed system it was in fact producing social chaos and disobedience.

4) Post-imperial civilizations (1776 AD – the present day)

- Failure to accept diversity in ethnicity in a given region was the driving force in creating nation-states, oriented by monoculturalism, and leading to the triumph of ethno-nationalism in modern Europe, as follows:

  i) In Eastern Europe, ethnic groups with largely peasant backgrounds, such as the Czechs, the Poles, the Slovaks, and the Ukrainians, found that key positions in the government and the economy were already occupied – often by the ethnic Armenians, Germans, Greeks, or Jews. Therefore, they came to demand nation-states of their own, in which they would be the masters, dominating politics, staffing the civil service and controlling commerce (Muller 2008).

  ii) During the Balkan Wars of 1912-13 Muslims departed from regions under control of Bulgarians, Greeks, and Serbians; Bulgarians deserted Greek-controlled areas of Macedonia; Greeks fled from regions of Macedonia that were annexed by Bulgaria and Serbia.

  iii) After World War I (1914-18) strong ethno-nationalism was unleashed. For one example, mass deportations and ethnic cleansing of Armenians took place in the declining Ottoman Empire, and the Greek government invaded Turkish territory in 1919 to expand a “greater Greece” to Constantinople. This was stopped by the Turks and was followed by both sides’ policy of ethnic cleansing and the transfer of 1.5 million Greeks and 400,000 Turks to their core territories as the result of the 1923 Treaty of
Lausanne, even when the apparent Greeks and Turks no longer spoke their supposed native languages.

iv) The National Socialists (the Nazis), who came to power in Germany in 1933, based their policy on an Aryan ancestry in contrast to “Jewishness,” according to which the latter group was eliminated by the genocide of the Jews. The Germans also used local ethnic minorities to control Central and Eastern European states.

v) After World War II, in 1945-47 (Muller 2008):

(1) Five million ethnic Germans fled from Eastern Europe westward to escape the conquering Red Army and seven million Germans were expelled from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia in response to their collaboration with the Nazis. It was the largest forced population movement in European history, with hundreds of thousands of people dying en route.

(2) 200,000 Jews left Central and Eastern Europe due to still existing anti-Semitism, despite the fact that this region had been a center of Jewish life since the 16th century.

(3) 1.5 million Poles were transferred from eastern Polish territories that had been annexed by the Soviet Union and 500,000 Ukrainians were transferred from Poland to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Slovaks were transferred out of Hungary and Magyars were sent away from Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia and Serbs and Croats were moving in opposite directions.

vi) After the fall of communism in 1989-91:

(1) East and West Germany were reunified,

(2) Czechoslovakia was split peacefully into Czech and Slovak republics,

(3) The Soviet Union broke apart into several nation-oriented states,

(4) Germans in Russia moved to Germany,

(5) Some Magyars in Romania moved to Hungary,

(6) Jews in the Soviet Union (about one million) moved to Israel.

(7) Yugoslavia broke into mono-ethnic states (with exception of Bosnia-Herzegovina).

- Differentiation was limited to economic competition if capitalism was applied. At the level of the society: differentiation was replaced by homogeneity, leading to the assimilation of like-minded people, so as to create a common culture and identity within an integrated nation-state. Differentiation was tolerated in some countries if a definition of the nation was based on blood, kinship, and language. Based on this criterion, the Czechs were rejected from...
the unifying Germany of the 19th century. In the 20th and 21st centuries this criterion has been in use in some Muslim countries.

- However, most Muslim countries west of Iran were so heavily Arabic that minorities were simply not recognized, as witness the Kurds, Assyrians and Chaldeans in Syria and Iraq. One, Lebanon, was multi-religious but single-ethnic and so was organized on that basis.

- In the Maghreb the Berber minority (which may not even be a minority) was variously mistreated. Iran has numerous tribal minorities, assimilation of which has proceeded in fits and starts beginning under Reza Shah Pahlavi. One could not apply ethnic purity in Indonesia; so they actually invented a new language, Bahasa Indonesia, declared it to be the national language within the territorial boundaries, and declared everyone who spoke it (really or supposedly) to be Indonesian.

- The ethno-nationalist program was largely accomplished in Europe; for the most part, each nation in Europe has its own state.

5) Globalizing civilizations (2000 + AD)

- Diversity is strongly welcomed due to the active global migration of people, which brings in needed knowledge and skills. To be more effective, those individuals should rather quickly become socialized in the targeted country's society rather than remain members of isolated minorities (connecting by wireless technology with families/friends in previous countries, rather than interacting with new local partners, who would involve their lives more in local affairs) (Miller 1998). By "more effective" one can understand performing jobs requiring higher skills and carrying with them higher pay.

- Differentiation is supported by a policy of multiculturalism in a multiethnic country; this supports inclusiveness but cannot stop the emergence of ethnic ghettos and gated communities. Hence, the noble aim of inclusiveness is deconstructing the nation and transforming it into societies of fragmented ethnic groups (Miller 1998).

- Differentiation in life styles is developing freely along the lines of subcategories such as gender.

- Of course, the success of a further globalization process will depend upon how governments put multiculturalism into practice.

6) Universal Civilization (2000 + AD): This civilization does not yet exist and ideally should avoid the challenges of the previous civilizations. Its attributes will be presented toward the end of this study.

Table 2 summarizes lessons learned from diversity evolution in civilization.
Table 2. The Evaluation of Diversity’s Impact on Human Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVILIZATIONS</th>
<th>DIVERSITY</th>
<th>DIFFERENCES</th>
<th>POSITIVE IMPACT ON HUMANITY’S DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>NEGATIVE IMPACT ON HUMANITY’S DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Civilizations</td>
<td>Ruler vs. the ruled</td>
<td>Increased through crafts &amp; administration specialization</td>
<td>Beginning of social complexity</td>
<td>Privileged castes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4000-500 BC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Civilizations</td>
<td>In ethnicity, Masters vs. Slaves</td>
<td>Increased through competition in wealth creation</td>
<td>Competition leading to higher complexity</td>
<td>Slavery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(500 BC-1800 AD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Civilizations</td>
<td>Homogeneity of elites</td>
<td>Minimized through accommodation and assimilation</td>
<td>Accommodation &amp; assimilation within empire</td>
<td>Closed state system, racism, Fascism,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1800s – 1900s AD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>or increased by racism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communism, totalitarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Imperial Civilizations</td>
<td>Regional diversity of ethnicity</td>
<td>Minimized through accommodation and assimilation</td>
<td>Development of monoculture within a nation-state</td>
<td>Too much homogeneity leading to rejection of others, ethnic disaggregation from population transfer to genocide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1776+AD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalizing Civilizations</td>
<td>Immigrants, minorities &amp; multiethnicity</td>
<td>Increased through multiculturalism</td>
<td>Inclusiveness &amp; tolerance, civil &amp; human rights</td>
<td>Segmentation and transformation from nation to political society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2000+AD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Civilization</td>
<td>Immigrants, minorities &amp; multiethnicity</td>
<td>Balanced through some shared, complementary values of ethnic groups</td>
<td>Inclusiveness, tolerance &amp; dialogue, multiculturalism controlled, hybrid human family</td>
<td>Less eager? Nation or Global Society?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2000+AD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, regarding the historic evolution of diversity one can state the following:

A. Diversification, as a way of making society more complex and sophisticated, has been applied through the whole development of civilization, beginning with caste formation and job specialization and ending with multiculturalism in the present day.

B. Opposing diversity is a policy of homogeneity of elites and nations, which led to closed systems which were very often hostile internally and/or externally through acts such as slavery, racism, nationalism, and ethnic cleansing. These acts, which should be rejected forever by humanity, were endorsed by Nazism, Fascism, Communism, and other forms of totalitarianism.
C. Forced migrations of peoples generally penalize the expelling countries and reward the receiving ones (Muller 2008).

D. So far none of the mentioned diversity tendencies are securely established for the optimal development of humanity. Even promising multiculturalism leads to serious failures; thus, the quest for better social solutions is a task for all of us.

**DIVERSITIES COMPARED IN THE 21ST CENTURY**

The state of diversity and multiculturalism in current civilizations in the 21st century is compared in Table 3. This Table contains a comparison or synthesis of intuitively perceived levels of attributes of current civilizations, which can be treated as an introduction to further research.

**Table 3. A Comparison of How Diversity and Multiculturalism Are Practiced in Civilizations in the 21st Century**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVILIZATION</th>
<th>DEGREE OF DIVERSITY</th>
<th>ROLE OF MULTICULTURALISM</th>
<th>IMPACT ON A CIVILIZATION</th>
<th>IMPACT ON WORLD CIVILIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Negative-disintegrating nation</td>
<td>Positive-right tendency in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not practiced</td>
<td>Negative-hostile toward other ethnic minorities</td>
<td>Negative-spreading xenophobic attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not practiced</td>
<td>Positive-strengthening sense of own nation</td>
<td>Negative-isolating from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Moderate (hierarchical)</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Positive-rights to coexist for minorities</td>
<td>Positive-easy assimilation/cooperation with/within other nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Moderate (castes)</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Positive-rights to coexist for minorities</td>
<td>Positive-easy assimilation/cooperation with/within other nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Negative-hostile toward others</td>
<td>Negative-spreading only one worldview as the right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mostly monoculturalism is practiced</td>
<td>Positive-helps in game of survival</td>
<td>Not much impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Positive-helps in game of survival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What lessons of diversity and multiculturalism might be learned from their state in the 21st century? Here are some examples:

1. Diversity is well established only in Western and Global Civilizations (the latter being a derivative of the former). Other civilizations may practice low or moderate social complexity and enjoy diversity but eventually they give up the quest for progress in economic/technological innovations, leaving that to Western Civilization.

2. Multiculturalism as political correctness is practiced in Western Civilization but eventually leads to disintegration of a nation. It is also practiced in the Hindu Civilization. This policy is practiced in Chinese and African Civilizations not as a political doctrine, but as a *modus operandi* in the struggle for survival. Multiculturalism is not practiced in Eastern Civilization due to xenophobic and superior attitudes towards others.

Further, Japanese Civilization also does not practice multiculturalism, mostly due to that nation’s deeply closed-off concept of itself. (The Meiji revolution for example was as multi-cultural a voluntary transaction as any other in recent history. Certainly modern Japan looks nothing like the Tokugawa version. Japan has been divided between Confucianism, Buddhism, Shinto, and several western schools of ideas for so long that an educated Japanese simply uses whichever one best fits the circumstances).

3. The success of ethnic nationalism in Europe after World War II removed some sources of conflicts within and between countries; hence, more internally integrated nations may seek more transnational cooperation at the level of the European Union (Muller 2008).

4. It appears that none of the contemporary civilizations may provide the optimal example how diversity and multiculturalism should be balanced. The quest for such a solution is very urgent since the state of civilization in the 21st century is troublesome.

**COMPLEMENTARY MULTICULTURALISM IN THE 21ST CENTURY**

In the 21st century, globalization is leading to a massive worldwide movement of people, with at least three percent of the world’s population now living outside their country of birth. This mass migration is driven by the inequality between nations; people from poor countries who are seeking an income for their families are drawn towards richer countries that require cheap labor.

This migration trend to the Western Civilization, also called the IVth Globalization Wave (Targowski 2008), triggers opposite views on multiculturalism:

- Immigrant minorities in Europe are very unhappy with multiculturalism as currently practiced, particularly in France (as evidenced by protests in which cars are burned), Holland (as evidenced by the killing of people who criticize societal segmentation), the United Kingdom (as evidenced by the presence of
terrorist cells), and Germany (as evidenced by the presence of ethnic ghettos).

• The U.S. is accepting multiculturalism as a politically correct social solution, but some elites are against it since it disintegrates the nation.

If globalization and immigration cannot be stopped in the near future, then one must find a new solution which could address the issues of assimilation, isolation, and national homogeneity in general.

The following solutions can be the answers to these problems:

• Development of middle culture - the full assimilation of immigrants, particularly in the first generation is difficult. Therefore, in order to minimize their isolationist tendencies, one must require that these individuals accept the given state's culture, which is referred to as the middle culture. This kind of culture includes awareness and skills of a State Citizen:
  - National values (expressed in the Constitution),
  - National symbols (expressed, for example, in the pride of a national flag and military service),
  - Official language as a mean of communication out of the original culture,
  - Inter-cultural communication skills to communicate with another culture,
  - Cross-cultural communication skills to communicate with many cultures,
  - Other

(It is normal for the first immigrant generation to speak the home language almost exclusively, the second generation to speak the new language almost exclusively and the third generation, if still cohesive, to take the old language up again almost as a social fad).

• Development of global culture – to avoid isolation and ghetto tendencies, minorities as well as local people should acquire the awareness and skills of a Global Citizen:
  - English as “Globish”
  - Applying e-mail, e-commerce, e-news and so forth by having access to the Internet,
  - Traveling abroad,
  - Cross-cultural communication,
  - Other
- Development of *complementary culture*, which would allow for peaceful coexistence among civilizations. In the 21st century these may be religion-oriented and have strong sets of their own values, very often competing among themselves. Therefore, this new culture should be based on selected values from each civilization and shared by them. Table 4 provides only an example of a *possible* set of complementary-shared values (Targowski 2008) applied by a World Citizen. Certainly, this set of complementary values should be a subject of further discussions and agreements.

Table 4. The Common Universal – Complementary Values of Universal Civilization of a World Citizen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civilization</th>
<th>Contributed Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN</td>
<td>Ancestral Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDDHIST</td>
<td>Morality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN</td>
<td>Self-sacrifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDU</td>
<td>Moderation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLAMIC</td>
<td>Reward and Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td>Cooperation and Nature Cult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE</td>
<td>Authority Cult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN</td>
<td>Freedom and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
<td>Free Flow of Ideas, Goods, Services, and People according to <em>Pax Orbis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSAL-COMPLEMENTARY</td>
<td>Wisdom, Goodness, Access, Dialogue, Agreement (on main principles), Forgiveness upon Condition, Human and Civil Rights, International Law, Green and Self-sustainable Planet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 illustrates a concept of complementary multiculturalism in the United States.
Figure 2. A Concept of Complementary Multiculturalism in a Multi-Civilization State—The U.S.

Figure 3 depicts the same concept for the multi-state and multi-civilization configurations.
Figure 3. A Concept of Complementary Multiculturalism in the Multi-States and Multi-Civilizations Configuration

The key solution in promoting social peace among different civilizations and their culture is a hybrid culture which includes middle (national), global, complementary, and other cultures as shown in Figure 4.
CONCLUSIONS

1. Contacts between cultures and civilizations are always a source of both tension and reward, and it will be such in the future. However, they should lead to a peaceful level of coexistence on this small and same planet as “many in one.”

2. The clashes of peoples driven by “ethno-nationalism” are not a detour in human history; they led to the creation of modern states in one form or another and will remain for many generations to come. One can only profit from facing it directly. (Muller 2008:35).

3. When communal clashes escalate to ethnic cleansing (as in Kosovo in the 1990s), then such a community may seek independence, since the return to the pre-conflict state is not practical (as in Kosovo, which proclaimed independence in February 2008, despite a very strong protest by the Serbs, who perceive this region as the site of their original homeland).
4. A rewarding outcome of social interactions depends on the inner resources and confidence of the participant cultures, on the "social capital" of their members, and on the presence of knowledge, wisdom and skills concerning how to develop middle, global, and complementary cultures steered by environmental, technological, economic and governmental circumstances.

5. When social and cultural capital and self-confidence decline, the capacity to benefit from cultural exchanges also declines and leads to dangerous conflicts and declines of civilizations and states.

6. Political and religious leaders who want to promote multicultural exchanges and understanding ought to avoid creating incentives that set members of different groups against each other, emphasizing only one "best" solution.

7. Teachers must teach students about how to develop and behave in national cultures within the scope of middle, global, and complementary cultures, which all together create hybrid culture.
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