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In the 21st century, two comprehensive views of politics exist that are diametrically opposed to each other. In his book, The End of History and the Last Man, Francis Fukuyama stresses that, in synchronization with the progress of natural science, humankind has found the optimal arrangement of society -- liberal democracy. And, despite the reverses that may occur in this country or that one, it is this social system that has triumphed in most countries, and therefore we are at the end of history. Samuel Huntington advocates the opposite view as he predicts a clash of civilizations in his book of the same name. Both authors are leading political philosophers, thus they utilize a scientific method of philosophy. From the perspective of a natural scientist who, as a government minister in the Czech Republic, worked for a short time as a professional politician and therefore came into contact with practical politics, this methodology differs from the one he has used all his life, the methodology of the natural scientist. This methodology can lead to different practical political conclusions.

Today there is no notable natural scientist who would not accept Darwin’s evolutionary theory. No one doubts that there are such differences between the functions of animals’ brains and the human brain that human psychology as a science cannot be advanced by experiments on animals or by observation of their behavior. On the other hand, we can see elements of human behavior in rudimentary form in our closest relatives, chimpanzees, and the study of the behavior of other animals living in groups, such as dogs, can also be instructive.

In all animals we encounter a survival instinct that leads us to avoid potentially fatal danger, a fear of pain and the attendant effort to avoid injury, and hunger forcing us to secure food. Besides this, animals living in groups are, in the form of their neuronal networks, genetically programmed for behavior that makes life in a group possible, and the group itself represents an evolutionary advantage that this genetic pool maintains and passes to further generations. The notion that the mutation of incipient deoxyribonucleic
acid (DNA) leading to behavior that threatens the group is eliminated from the genetic pool appears to be correct, because such a group dies out. On the other hand, positive mutations lead to propagation of the group, and a greater number of individuals increases the likelihood of survival. Evolution has therefore ensured that our brains are programmed in such a way that our psychology helps us to survive.

Thus there are several types of behavior reinforced by evolution that are characteristic of life in a group.

1. Respect for property. If human behavior did not include this element, it would mean permanent fighting among members of the group for food, and we do not see this in other groups of animals, for example, dogs in a pack.

2. The sense of freedom. This allows individuals to move freely while seeking food. With dogs as with children, we see that they take pleasure in freedom when it is allowed them. This feeling is the source of our enjoyment of exploration, of moving to other places, of independent decision-making. Advancement is tied to the sense of freedom. Every discovery has resulted from this feeling. Only when we freely decide upon a specific step can we discover new things. No one can give us an order to do this, because he does not know what that step is. We see in chimpanzees that some of them discover new things -- for example, how to fashion a stick for hunting termites -- and others are capable of learning from them.

3. The desire for acceptance by the group. This is closely connected with a feeling of friendship. Among chimpanzees, an individual displays an inclination toward another individual by grooming, patting and hugging. We encounter patting as an expression of a feeling of friendship among humans as well. A person sees from this that he is not alone. The feeling of loneliness is a negative emotion that an individual tries to avoid, and this, coupled with the positive emotion created by interaction resulting in a sense of belonging, strengthens the group’s cohesion.

4. A feeling of solidarity. An individual is willing to risk his life in the interest of the group. In a pack of dogs we see that, if one individual is threatened, the others defend him by attacking. This sense is very important for the survival of the group. The survival of peoples and nations has often hinged upon the bravery of
warriors. The courage to take a risk in the interest of the group is obviously at odds with the instinct of self-preservation. Evolution takes care to see that both feelings are balanced in the group. Those who are too courageous perish in the fighting, and they do not transmit genes of heroism (or the courage to take risks) to their descendants. A group in which there are no genes of courage whatsoever is extinguished, because it cannot defend itself. Evolution thus ensures a balance that we see in all human societies, and in communities of animals.

5. The desire to be led in the case of risk. Practically all groups are organized hierarchically. This is true of packs of dogs, groups of chimpanzees, and all human societies. In the case of a threat, liberal democracy transfers tremendous authority to the commander-in-chief of the armed forces. Frightened chimpanzees hide behind the male leader, and free movement in the surrounding area is put aside. Non-delegated command authority increases the group’s chance of victory.

6. The feeling of envy. We can observe this in dogs. Dogs in a room are lying about on the couch. We give one of them a treat. In the next moment, the others jump from the couch and beg for one as well. It appears that envy motivates members of the group to act. Most of the time this is positive. An envious individual tries to attain the success of the envied individual through activity -- in the case of humans, by working; in the case of animals, by searching for food even without any feeling of hunger -- which is a positive for the further existence of the group. Envy is a motive for hatred, and that is the negative price for a positive motor of activity.

7. The desire to apply one’s own talent. There are endless examples in the case of humans. In the case of chimpanzees, we have evidence of one talent: political talent. I will come back here to the descriptions of Jane Goodall, the greatest expert in the world on the behavior of chimpanzees, from whom I have taken all the information about chimpanzees that I mention here.³ Goodall describes how a male chimpanzee, Mike, seized control over a group, and she adds: “Mike had a strong desire to dominate, a characteristic that is pronounced among some individuals, and almost completely lacking among others.”

All the feelings and desires I have mentioned above are most probably a result of the arrangement within the brain of neurons modified by DNA mutations. The process of learning is rudimentary among animals, and all individuals essentially mature in the same environment. If such an arrangement of neurons is evident among chimpanzees, there is no reason to assume that it does not exist among humans. It will understandably modify our behavior, and no one doubts the influence of the psychology of leaders and the psychology of the masses upon political decision-making.

Here it is appropriate to pause and examine the controversy over Fukuyama, with whom, unlike Huntington, I mostly agree. Fukuyama considers, as does Hegel, the motor of social activity to be the yearning for recognition, which he labels with Plato’s term, thymus. Thymus is a human attribute. The concept of isothymia is described as the desire to be recognized as the equal of others, and the concept of megalothymia as the desire to be recognized as the leader, the desire for fame.

This philosophy presumes that the fundamental interest of every person is politics; but that is not how it is in reality. People with political talent are actively engaged in politics, and others are only interested peripherally, so long as they are satisfied with their lives. Conversely, they attribute dissatisfaction with their own lives to the political situation. I have already mentioned that politics sometimes determines people’s lives, and I offered the Holocaust as an extreme example. In a liberal democratic society, things are not that way, and a person capable of leveraging his political talent becomes a celebrity in the same way as people who are capable of maximizing their talent in sports, music, literature, acting or science. Again, there is no doubt that genetic disposition is responsible for at least some portion of talent; but environmental influences, especially those of childhood, make themselves felt as well.

Not much is written about the existence of talent variation among animals, but this is certainly the way it is. A racing horse is differentiated by his athletic talent, and some animals of the same species learn better than others, for example, dogs that are trained.

To exhort political talent above other talents in a form of megalothymia does not seem right to me. We encounter this because certain people have multiple talents. Their decision about which one to pursue is often not understood even by those closest to them.
In evolution, the existence of diverse talents within a group is desirable when there are changes to the surrounding natural environment. Sometimes the athletic talent of the warriors or hunters is needed; sometimes it is the extensive knowledge that some people accumulate. At other times there is a need to solve a problem, and here is where the talent for science pays off. There are people who are adept at establishing intimate relationships, and others who excel in music or acting. Political talent ranks with other talents. But just as there are many talented athletes, but only some of whom end up as national champions, so only a few of the many people with political talent occupy the highest offices in national government. Here external influences play a major role. If Napoleon had not been an artillerist, he would never have become an emperor. Not every artillerist becomes a Napoleon.

There is no politician without political talent, just as there is no musician without an ear for music. We can divide politicians into those with a vision, and those who are simply attempting to maintain the status quo. But history has not known a politician whose own vision changed the perceptions of society. Hitler’s vision of a Third Reich, of Lebensraum and the elimination of Jews from society was already in place before Hitler. Except for the murder of the Jews, it dovetails with the vision of Wilhelm II. Lenin’s vision is described in Marx’s writings, and Churchill’s vision of defeating Germany was attuned to the mood of Britons. The division of politicians into those with a vision and those without is, to some extent, artificial. People with political talent will always be with us, and their approach is similar to that of the chimpanzee Mike, who attains his position as the dominant male in the way described by Jane Goodall.

Mike, as Jane Goodall named him, initially held low status within the hierarchy of male chimpanzees. He was one of the last to get access to bananas, the primary food of chimpanzees, and he was threatened by practically all the other mature males, who even actually attacked him.

Mike’s later behavior is reminiscent of a planned advance on the path upward. For his shows of aggression, Mike began to use more frequently than the other males the empty kerosene cans that were strewn about Goodall’s camp where the chimpanzees went for bananas. Once, a group of mature males were grooming each other. It lasted for approximately twenty minutes. Mike was about 25 meters from them, often looking in their direction, and occasionally grooming himself. Suddenly he moved toward the
empty kerosene cans and returned with them to the place where he had been sitting beforehand. Armed with these cans, he continued to observe the other males. After a few minutes, he began to sway from side to side. He gradually swayed more vigorously, his hair sticking up, and then, quietly at first, he began a series of screams. As he did so, he stood up, combatively placing himself facing the group of males, and he began to smash the cans against each other over his head. This, along with Mike’s screaming, made such noise that the other males ran away. After a few moments there was silence. Some males returned to the group and continued grooming, but some remained further away out of apparent concern.

After a short interval, Mike’s screams and the smashing of cans rang out. The other males fled again. Before they could return, Mike aggressively placed himself facing Goliath. Goliath was the leader of the group, and he had not run away like the others. Mike remained in a combative stance. Suddenly, Rudolph came to him, making soft sounds of subordination, and he deeply bowed to Mike and began to groom him. Finally, the male David Graybeard came to Mike, placed his hand on his flank, and began to groom him. Only Goliath remained sitting off to the side, and he looked in Mike’s direction. It was clear that Mike had created a serious threat to Goliath’s heretofore unchallenged leadership. It took a year before Mike’s position was secured and he himself felt secure in it. Tension remained between him and the former leader, Goliath.

Goliath did not give up his position without a fight. He posed combatively in front of the other members of the group, and a confrontation with Mike was unavoidable. The confrontation began with Goliath jumping onto a tree near Mike, and then Goliath remained still. Mike looked momentarily at Goliath, and then he began to put on a show: He shook branches, threw stones, and finally jumped on Goliath’s tree and shook the branches. When he stopped, Goliath replied; he shook the tree and the branches. Finally, they both ended up on the ground. There they stopped, sat down and stared at each other.

Then, one after the other, they shook branches and faced off combatively. This lasted for about half an hour. Each subsequent performance was more combative than the last; but, aside from the fact that they occasionally hit each other with the branches they were shaking, they did not attack each other. After a particularly long break, it unexpectedly appeared that Goliath had lost his nerve. He ran toward Mike, bowed before him, and began to groom him intently. For a while Mike completely ignored Goliath. Suddenly he
turned and began to groom his defeated opponent. They sat and continuously groomed each other for about an hour. This was the last actual duel between these two males. Thereafter it seemed that Goliath had accepted Mike’s superiority.

However, Mike had to defend his leadership. Once, a chimpanzee male named David ran from Mike and screamed, running toward Goliath, whom he hugged before turning and screaming in Mike’s direction. The humans who were observing saw that he was angry. Suddenly, David started to run toward Mike, and Goliath followed him. Meanwhile, Mike was making a combative show in front of another group of males who retreated. When they saw that David and Goliath were running toward Mike, they joined them, and suddenly there were five fully mature males standing against a lone Mike. Mike screamed and jumped on a tree, and the other males pursued him. The observers were certain that Goliath was going to regain his status as the leader. But Mike suddenly turned and started shaking branches, and in the next moment he jumped headlong toward the five males. They were startled and hurriedly jumped from the tree to run away. When Mike sat with his hair standing up, the other males stood cowering at a distance. Mike had defended his status.

This description demonstrates what political talent looks like in a group of chimpanzees. I will relate two more interesting situations. Mike attacked an older female, Flo, grabbed a bunch of bananas from her, and struck her. Two hours later Mike came to Flo and started to play with her fingers. After a few minutes they were tickling each other and playing together. When a chimpanzee leader exerts his status, he usually very quickly calms the subordinate member of the group by touching and hugging.

Chimpanzees often move about in pairs. Some of these pairings are so stable that we can speak of friendship. While he was still in a subordinate position, Mike had a friend, J.B. J.B. was obviously subordinate to Goliath. When Mike became the leader, Goliath did not want to allow J.B. to get at his bananas. J.B. screamed, and after a while Mike arrived. He did not interfere in the squabble, but when Goliath saw him, he allowed J.B. to have some of his bananas. Friendship with the leader ensures higher social standing. These episodes are not intended to show that the politics of people and chimpanzees are the same; but I am writing about chimpanzees only to demonstrate the fact that some individuals have political talent, and some do not.
We see that Mike gained his position by convincing the others in the leading group that he is the right individual for the position of leadership. This is the politician’s approach whether in a dictatorship or a democracy. Just as an individual prefers freedom, but when endangered sacrifices it for security, there is no diametrical difference between a politician in a dictatorship and a democratic politician. Thus we are not surprised that communist politicians who helped create or sustain the communist dictatorship became supporters of democracy when they concluded that democratization would benefit society. This is true for Czech politicians who, after actively participating in the seizure of power by the communists in 1948, declared the policy of the Prague Spring in 1968. The same is true for Gorbachev, Yeltsin and Shevardnadze in Russia.

Sometimes Kant’s Categorical Imperative which I mentioned earlier is emphasized. Certainly neither German fascism with domination by Germanic races, nor the attitude of American settlers toward Native Americans -- or that of democratically elected politicians in the southern states of the Union toward slavery -- passes the test. On the other hand, the Crusades aimed at spreading Christendom, or the Muslim conquest to spread Islam, just as the communist revolution designed to turn all people into proletarians, are, from this perspective, debatable. The current conflict between the democratic left and the democratic right is also about what the supporters of both directions consider to be just. One group wants the same standard of living, the other the same starting position, augmented by socialized networks for medically impaired citizens. Each group considers its opinion to be fair.

I conclude this discussion of politicians with the observation that they will always be with us to carry out policy that is dictated by three main factors:

1. the factor of efficiency,

2. the factor of timing,

3. erroneous quantitative estimation.

I already addressed these factors in the introductory chapter. Now I will mention them in connection with criticism of Fukuyama and Huntington. Fukuyama cites Hegel’s theory about the first person and the beginning of history. According to this theory, there was a conflict between a master and a slave. The master was willing to risk his life, and he valued rulership more than life. The slave preferred life over an equal or ruling status,
and he decided to serve the master. This theory accepts inequality as a result of the victory of courage over cowardice. The last person refuses to accept this arrangement, and the result is liberal democracy and the end of history. I have tried to show that, from the perspective of natural science’s view of man, the situation is different. Slaves began as captives in war. The principle of efficiency dictated having an army to defend property, and when an army came into existence, efficiently making use of it to gain more property, including slaves. Democracy has a chance when there is security and safety. This condition existed for millennia after the advent of agriculture and very rare surpluses. Empires must defend themselves, and if they did so successfully, then they attacked so that they would be even more powerful. When a combination of factors weakened them, they were immediately attacked by neighboring empires taking advantage of the second factor, timing the attack for when the opponent is weak. Erroneous quantitative estimation led Napoleon to his campaign in Russia, Hitler to his attacks on all fronts, and Japan to an attack on the USA. The mistaken calculation that, if we redistribute the country’s wealth, the majority will attain a good standard of living led the poor into the communist revolution. When, after nationalization, they saw that it was an erroneous quantitative estimate, they continued in a revolution spurred on by hate.

Having criticized Fukuyama, I will move to criticism of Huntington. Huntington says that the divide between us (located in one civilization) and them (located in another) is a constant of human history. He indicates that differences in behavior toward people from the same or from a different civilization result from these causes:

1. from a feeling of superiority (sometimes as well from inferiority) over people considered to be fundamentally different;

2. out of fear and mistrust of these people;

3. from the difficulties accompanying communication with these people as a result of differing languages and norms of social behavior;

4. from a lack of familiarity with the prejudices, motivations, social relationships, and customs of these people.

These factors certainly appear in economic competition. But there is nothing wrong with that, because economic competition is the driving force for improving living
conditions, and all liberal democracies, including the American one, are founded upon it. Armed conflicts arise from entirely different causes.

In the past, wars were exclusively about property. The group that was militarily stronger found an ideology allowing it to be reconciled with inherent respect for the property of others (our enemies do not have any rights, because they worship other gods) and attacked. In agrarian societies, every war ended with territorial gains, or with the confiscation of arable land, the source of all wealth. In the present, I know one example: the occupation of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein’s Iraq.

Civil wars are a continuation of revolution, and they are about control over property within the nation.

It is more complicated with wars of liberation. The longing for liberation is connected with the longing for freedom. What is essential is that a group of people with political talent attempts to gain control by convincing the public in their own country of the advantages of independence -- the majority is looting us and outvoting us in the elections is the argument in democracies; or, in dictatorships, we want to rid ourselves of domination -- and obtains the financial means for war. What is more complicated is that, in some cases, the breakaway means economic advantage, and at other times there is only the result of erroneous quantitative estimation. A war for independence is a war to break away from a large state. The breakup means a weakening for both sides, and the state’s leaders will naturally try to prevent it. The war of North versus South is a typical case. The southern states mistakenly believed that the abolition of slavery would ruin them economically. Lincoln, by preserving the unity of the nation, created the conditions for the rise of the most powerful country on Earth in the following century.

A similar example is the breakup of Yugoslavia. For three nations the current post-Yugoslavia arrangement is advantageous: Slovenia, the level of whose economy could subsidize the rest of former Yugoslavia; Croatia, which can base its economy on tourism thanks to the Adriatic coast; and Montenegro, which was in no way oppressed by Serbia, but can profit from tourism thanks to a low population and beautiful beaches. Independent Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, independent Bosnia-Herzegovina, and independent Kosovo have no advantages from the breakup. Serbia would have won militarily without the intervention of the USA and the EU. The current situation works thanks only to the EU’s economic assistance in Bosnia, and the USA’s in Kosovo.
Bosnia could be a powder keg in the future. Kosovo’s independence was declared at a time when there was already a democratic government in Serbia willing to guarantee Kosovar Albanians all possible rights. The Americans decided to finance a military base there instead. This resulted from their flawed analysis that they had caused the collapse of the Soviet Union by force, and out of fear that Russia would later intervene militarily on behalf of the Serbs. Not even in Stalin’s time did the Russians intervene in Korea; they did not intervene in Vietnam (I will take note of Afghanistan later); and they were not preparing to intervene in Serbia after they had voluntarily departed from Eastern Europe, including the Baltic republics. The USA has a military base for a conflict with no one. If the Americans had created an independent Kosovo without Srpska Mitrovica by changing the borders, they would have gotten rid of the part of the population that does not like them and reduced future tension.

All other wars in the second half of the 20th century were wars under the rubric of “the wheels of the revolution must not stop.” These are the war in Korea, the war in Vietnam, the war in Afghanistan, Argentina’s war to liberate the Falkland Islands, and the wars of the Arabs against Israel. I will not take up the numerous wars in sub-Saharan Africa, because they are a result of a combination of the aforementioned causes (war for property, war for independence from a large state, and war to confirm the success of dictatorship).

It is worth mentioning two wars, in Vietnam and in Afghanistan. Communist Vietnam came into being as a result of a gross mistake by the French. The battle for the fortress at Dien Bien Phu is a textbook example of faulty strategy. It was not their own error that left the French to be defeated there. It was the strategic success of communist General Giap. The mistake was that the French were there at all. They were supposed to establish the defense of Hanoi, Haiphong, Hue and Saigon (the shield), and, through assaults supported by air cover, to attack communist administrative centers (the sword). That is the military aspect. It is my opinion that they should have formed a government along the lines of Norodom Sihanouk’s in Cambodia in a timely manner and departed. The American strategy was even worse. The Americans believed that, if they kill lots of Vietnamese communists, then they will give up the attempt at revolution. During senseless American offensive operations, many American soldiers lost their lives. In a training course for reserve officers one learns that, if both forces are roughly equal, losses to the attacker are higher than losses to the defender. Moreover, the Americans
constantly changed their strategy. If, with air superiority, they had organized the occupation of Hanoi and Haiphong by a South Vietnamese tank army, they could have obtained a better negotiating position. America’s engagement cannot, however, be unilaterally condemned. The Soviet Union would have continued in more proxy wars to keep the wheels of revolution from stopping, and to strengthen its own dictatorship.

The war in Afghanistan is proof of this. It began in classic fashion. The communists seized power in the capital, and a civil war broke out. Because Afghanistan was not a country of rich and poor, envy and the hatred resulting from it was not great, so the communist revolutionary army did not have many adherents. The Soviet Union arrived to assist militarily. American surface-to-air missiles destroyed Soviet helicopters, and the Red Army left the country in defeat. It seems that this defeat strengthened alternative ideas in the Soviet leadership and contributed to Gorbachev’s succession.

Samuel Huntington predicts dangerous clashes in the future that will apparently arise from Western arrogance, Islamic intolerance, and Chinese assertiveness. He sees three main problems dividing the West and the other societies. The West is trying: 1) to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; 2) to promote human rights; 3) to preserve its own culture, and social and ethnic integrity by limiting the number of immigrants or refugees it accepts.

The spread of nuclear weapons can only be prevented with difficulty. The technology was developed over a half century ago, but up to now it has held true that whoever possesses nuclear weapons is more powerful than others. For fifty years the USA and the USSR mutually threatened each other with such a quantity of missiles and bombers with nuclear payloads that it would have been enough to kill two-thirds of the population of both countries. Anyone would wonder about the danger of accidentally starting a nuclear war. Members of the military were all under time pressure, because the advantage of a first strike was obvious, and seconds counted. Nowadays, such danger has passed. All other nations have nuclear weapons more or less for reasons of prestige. The exception is Israel. If there was a threat of the Israeli military’s defeat by Arab neighbors with a total population twenty times larger than Israel’s, then the threat of the destruction of Cairo or Damascus might dissuade them from a further advance. Like Jordan, Egypt currently does not have offensive goals. Iraq has been pacified after the American intervention,
Iran is far away, and Syria is weak. But Israel correctly takes into consideration that future regime changes in neighboring countries could alter the situation.

North Korea has nuclear weapons for its own defense, but no one is attacking her. After the lessons from the unification of Germany, with money shifting from west to east for twenty years, South Korea does not much long for unification. North Korea itself is not dangerous for anyone, because it knows that a potential conflict would not cease. North Korea is driven only by the effort to maintain its own dictatorship.

Nuclear India and Pakistan are not preparing to wage war over Kashmir with nuclear weapons, and I will discuss China later.

Human rights are not the exclusive province of the West. Authoritarian regimes are focused upon the danger of chaos to which democracy leads. The freedom to vote is one thing, and the freedom to go out for a walk at night without becoming a victim of a criminal street gang is another. I think that the West has some catching up to do.

Immigrants are not a problem of the country from which they departed. Their countries tell them to stay home. Most immigrants are motivated by a yearning for a material well-being that most religions either condemn, or at least do not favor. When they find out that everything in a liberal democratic society must be paid for, that the goods they can purchase are a symbol of status in their country of origin, but not in the country where they have arrived, and that they are on the lowest rung of the social ladder, they begin to envy and hate. This personal problem has no solution; but if the result is an insistence upon rights that contravene the historical rights of the majority of the population, then there must be a discussion. Demonstrations calling for outlawing cartoons of Mohammed are in accordance with the right of free speech; but calls for violence are not. I think that prohibiting women from wearing a veil in public is not in keeping with liberal democracy; but compulsory education, including physical education, with a standardized curriculum is. I think that sufficient use is not made of the “carrot and the stick.” More social services are needed. On the other hand, in the future it will be desirable to establish a region (an island near Africa, or a portion of purchased territory) where those who do not respect the laws -- including even those who have EU citizenship -- will be exiled. Sharia law could be enforced in this territory whose inhabitants would be adequately fed, and who would be able to leave for any other country willing to accept them. I do not think that the countries of the EU will find a way
to do this, so anti-immigration populists will get votes in elections for a long time to come.

According to Huntington, the clash of civilizations is more than just a clash of people of different races and religions. A more detailed analysis reveals that religion was always a secondary factor, though an important one. The Christian Crusades to the Holy Land appear to be a prototype of religious wars; but they culminate in the sack of Constantinople. The religious wars of the 17th century between Protestants and Catholics see participating rulers and military commanders switching sides from one camp to another, and the acceptance of the stricture that subjects will have the same faith as their lord is evidence of the fact that there was no great consistency in relation to faith. Ideology serves as justification for why the enemy has no right to his property. No one doubts that the driving force behind the conquest of the Americas by the Spanish and the Portuguese was not faith, but gold.

One area, however, is a strong argument in favor of the notion of a clash of civilizations: the attacks by Islamists. Some judge that this is connected with the religion of Islam; but there are several arguments indicating that this is not true. The great campaigns of conquest by Islamic armies were always marked by religious tolerance. This is true for the Arabs' conquests in North Africa and on the Pyrenean peninsula, as well as for conquests made by the Turks. In both cases, the rule was: “If you surrender without a fight, you can keep your own religion.” In other words, we want your taxes and a portion of your property, but religion is secondary for us. Islamic states on the Pyrenean peninsula tolerated Christians and Jews, and religious tolerance ceased with the victory of the Christians.

The second argument is also from history. Terrorist attacks are not a Muslim invention. We know more about this from the Baader-Meinhof group in Germany in the 1970s than from 19th-century anarchists. Under the banner of urban revolution, this group of young intelligent people terrorized German society for several years. A group had formed whose members were people inclined to risk their lives in the interest of the group. This is, as I indicated, a very important inherent characteristic in human evolution. The group in this case was neither an extended family nor a nation, but an armed cell. They were successfully defeated by crime-fighting methods, though they found a number of sympathizers around the world. We know the same about al-Qaeda. Religion is
secondary, and what is primary is the group and its victory in the form of spectacular terror. It carries out a series of attacks against citizens of its own faith and is entirely undisturbed by this. The problem in destroying al-Qaeda is not the USA or Europe where there are highly capable security forces, but countries where government efficiency is low. As happens everywhere in the world where there is not thorough oversight by the organs of a legal state, an authoritarian police force will certainly infringe upon human rights; but it seems that this is the only effective way of dealing with terrorism in these countries. Neither America nor Europe is threatened by a massive attack. On the other hand, murdering thousands of people in a shopping mall is not difficult now, just as it was not difficult in the past. Losses must be expected; but there is no alternative to detailed and deliberate police work.

Let us answer the question as to whether the USA and Europe are threatened by a clash of civilizations with China and Russia. After the enormous communist Chinese military swept Chiang Kai-shek from mainland China to Taiwan, it waged a war in Korea against the USA (operating with UN forces) that ended in a stalemate and many times higher losses for China, and later conducted a senseless and short war against Vietnam. However, China’s communist leader Mao Zédōng made a most important decision that positively affects life on this planet more than most people realize. He decreed the “One Child Policy” for Chinese families. Even in a poor family, one child will generally not go hungry, and the parents can usually invest money in its education. Mao wanted to prevent famine with his decree. Not only did he succeed, but at the same time he opened a path to prosperity for China. If we compare India and China, China achieves better economic results mainly because the rate of its population growth is slower than India’s. For example, in 1961 India’s population numbered 452 million, China’s 673 million. By 1977 the rate of population growth was the same percentage-wise (143% over 1961), but in 2001 India’s population had grown by 226% over 1961, and China’s by 192%. The annual per capita production of rice in India was 33 kg, just as in China. In 2001, the respective numbers were 76 kg for India and 115 kg for China. Similarly for wheat: in 1961, 28 kg for India, 22 kg for China; but in 2001, 57 kg for India and 78 kg for China. The production of meat in 1961 was 3.7 kg for India, the same as China’s 3.8 kg. In 2001, the production is 4.5 kg for India, and China’s is ten times greater -- 50.1 kg. China has ever more resources to devote to research and education, and prospects for
high-tech advancement that, as I have already shown, determines a country’s economy and the standard of living of its population as a whole.

Once child per family has one important psychological effect, however: The parents are worried for the child’s safety, and they do not want to lose him in a war. China is a communist dictatorship with a ruling group at its head. And all members of this group do not want to lose their only child in a war. China will thus not embark upon military adventures, even if its economy allows it to arm its military at a high technological level. The USA and Europe can feel secure in the face of the Chinese armed forces -- but not in the face of Chinese economic competition. Thus far, China is competing with low salaries for its workers, just as Japan did in the 1950s. China expects a destiny similar to Japan’s, the destiny of a wealthy country with a high level of technological advancement and a high standard of living. On the other hand, the vast Chinese market can consume high-tech products from the USA and Europe.

As far as democracy is concerned, it appears to be a long way off. The ruling group is in favor with the people when prosperity grows, and there is no pressure from the public for a change of policy. Advocates of a hard-line communist dictatorship still exist within the ruling group, however. The West must not make mistakes giving them the opportunity to gain greater influence. This means accepting the formal One China Policy. If Western politicians say that Hong Kong is a part of China and that they are satisfied with this state of affairs -- and, when there is the occasional tension between Hong Kong’s municipal authorities and those of China, if they do not highlight the disagreement -- everything will be in order. If Taiwan accepted the notion of a One China Policy, stressing its autonomy and allowing for the possibility of full reunification in the 22nd century, it would help the economically-minded leadership of China in its struggle with the militaristic police-state wing of the Communist Party of China. Pressure to respect human rights is correct; but the release of a dissident from jail must be explained as the correct move of strong leadership, not as a retreat under pressure. The problem of Tibet it not entirely clear-cut. The suppression of human rights is connected with a rise in Tibetans’ standard of living resulting from Chinese economic assistance. I think that recognition of Chinese accomplishments must accompany the pressure for greater human rights, including religious freedom; but the demand for an independent Tibet damages relations with China. No one in China is flying the flags of Native American tribes and demanding that the United States abandon its territory and pay
reparations to Native Americans. The same is true in Europe. China does not interfere in the affairs of the Basques and the Irish in Northern Ireland. The outlook for cooperation with China in the future appears optimistic.

Under economic pressure, Russia has been carrying out a one child policy for a long time already. Russia did not leave Eastern Europe so that it could again try to occupy it. Non-Russian peoples in the Russian Federation should make demands for the economic development of their regions and investments in education and culture; but an attempt at independence is out of the question. None of these nations would subsequently be truly independent, but under the influence of another power, and the Russian Federation will not allow this. Cooperation between Europe and the USA and Russia in reducing international tension should be expanded, because both sides will profit from it. When the Americans put Patriot missiles in Poland, these missiles will not shoot down a single Russian missile, because Russia will not launch any missiles into Poland; but Russia will, under any pretext whatsoever, limit natural gas exports to Poland as a way of saying, “If you make problems for us, we will do so for you.” There will be no war, but it will be an argument for those politicians who are anti-American in their orientation, which could negatively impact cooperation between the USA and Russia in other parts of the world. It is a shame, because the USA, Europe and Russia all face the danger of Islamist terrorists, and therefore have common interests.

Conflict with the Arab world appears most serious. All Arab nations are authoritarian; rather, with the exception of Tunisia and Egypt and perhaps Yemen, they are dictatorships. Sometimes the ruling group is composed of military officers, in other places it is a classic monarchy. Dictatorships need an ideology with the threat of an enemy to justify their existence. For the Muslim world, the enemy is the State of Israel. Israel came into being on the basis of a historical argument: It was the original homeland of the Jews. Israel should never have come into existence. If the status of the Jews in the countries of Europe had corresponded to their education, industriousness and skills -- and if they had not lived under the threat of anti-Semitism -- they would never have emigrated to the Holy Land. Hitler excluded them from German society, and Western European democracies acted as if it was not their business. Here the quote cited earlier applies: “It is what it is.” Israel exists within territory where the Palestinian Arabs once lived. Israel has a most powerful friend in the USA, and is therefore indestructible. The dictators are able to foist upon their people the mathematical error that Israel is responsible for their
relative poverty. All presidents of Muslim countries in the region have been visible in the struggle against Israel, from Egypt’s Nasir to Iraq’s Saddam Hussein, Libya’s Qaddafi, Syria’s Assad, and the presidents of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Israel and the USA complete a picture of friendship: they are wealthy, and they do not recognize Allah. Petroleum producing countries conduct a policy whereby they are protected by the USA from their poorer, yet better armed and warlike Muslim neighbors so they can get the best price for their oil. The domestic policies of all of these countries are, with a few exceptions, the worst on the entire planet. They use their oil riches to finance social policies, but investments in education are relatively low. There is no widespread education oriented toward the natural sciences, despite the fact that it could be the foundation for the high technology that these countries need to develop a modern economy. This separates them from Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, China and India. Only Tunisia and Egypt focus on the tourist industry. The ideology of Muslim dictatorships contains religious elements condemning birth control. The result is large uneducated families, and uneducated women are the main factor in the population explosion. The intervention of the USA in Iraq, where the army of Saddam Hussein represented a permanent threat to Israel (with the danger that, when it least needed to be, the USA would be drawn into a war resulting in high American casualties) was certainly the right thing. The destruction of al-Qaeda’s bases in Afghanistan was similarly warranted. After the military victory, however, the Americans made a mistake when they naively assumed that establishing democracy would solve the situation. The greatest danger of democracy after the violent overthrow of a dictatorship is chaos. This is what happened in Germany after the First World War, and much of the population supported Hitler’s rise because he guaranteed the elimination of the chaos and rampant crime that the government could not handle. Czech politicians were aware of this danger after 1918, and in democratic Czechoslovakia they assumed control over the entire repressive apparatus represented by the Austro-Hungarian police and gendarmerie. It must be added that Austro-Hungary was an authoritarian legal state before the First World War, where the repressive apparatus was under the oversight of judicial authorities. The fact that the Americans underestimated the role of repression did not matter with the Kurds, who received the Americans as liberators; but, by not utilizing some of the elements of Hussein’s repressive apparatus (after removing Hussein’s fanatical supporters, of course), the Americans ended up harming democracy itself. People cannot feel free in a country where bombs explode daily, even if they have the
right to vote and freedom of speech. Another error of the Americans is their distaste for cooperation (meaning financial support) with socialists. They confuse them with communists, but even communists are not dangerous for America after the fall of the USSR. Their agitation in the same poor regions where the Islamists recruit most of their fighters would gain the support of many unpropertied citizens against the Islamists. The same applies for Afghanistan. Here there are groups from the time of the communist dictatorship that loath the Taliban, and the Americans could make use of these groups in the battle against them. It applies here as well that police work and a network of informers can yield positive results, mainly without the loss of American soldiers. The most powerful enemy of the USA in the region is Iran. The policy of sanctions can delay armament, but it strengthens the leadership of the Islamic republic. Under pressure from the USA, the leadership’s order is to close ranks and not produce any alternative ideas that lead to the self-destruction of the regime. In my opinion, an optimum strategy for Iran should recognize that it is an authoritarian state with elements of democracy such as multi-party elections, which automatically means an election campaign with the free dissemination of ideas. A major theme for the upper middle class could be “My home is my castle,” meaning a prohibition against the Revolutionary Guard entering someone’s home without the permission of a court, which would allow young people from these wealthier classes to live in the American lifestyle they crave. If politicians received financial support from these people, then these alternative ideas would spread. For addressing the poorer classes, financial support to socialist parties is important. Their platform of social welfare would gain the support of many, and would lead to pressure to limit militarization. Perhaps the leadership of the Islamic republic would react by restricting the democratic elements of the state. But this would radicalize the socialists for a revolutionary struggle against the Islamic dictatorship, and lead to a certain lessening of international tension.

Israel is behaving correctly when it limits risk by building a protective wall between Israel and Palestine, and it is unfairly criticized for it. However, it is not reasonable to make irreversible decisions about the access of Palestinians to a mosque in Jerusalem. Within the framework of a definitive peace settlement, the supporters of peace in the Palestinian state will have to demonstrate a certain symbolic success, and leaving the Temple Mount under Palestinian control does not impair the authority of the State of
Israel, just as the authority of the Italian state is not impinged by the fact that security in St. Peter’s Cathedral in Rome is handled by the Vatican.

I consider investment in Palestine by the wealthy oil nations -- for example, the establishment of modern firms -- to be an important element of stability. The USA would ensure that these enterprises do not become the target of Israeli reprisals for terrorist attacks on Israel. Palestine’s economic prosperity would automatically lead to an attempt to normalize relations with Israel, in similar fashion to China’s normalization of its relations with Taiwan. Peace in this region is possible, but the USA must rid itself of its incorrect notion that we are on the verge of a clash of civilizations. When it places Patriot missiles and radars on the border of the Russian Federation, it shows that it has not yet learned to do so.

I have tried to show that there will be no clash of civilizations. This does not mean that history has ended, and that liberal democracy is a kind of arrangement in which anyone who has tasted it will desire nothing else. There are great differences between liberal democracies. They are not just differences of per capita GDP. This is not too important for internal stability. People understand that there are wealthier nations; but they consider it to be unjust when some citizens possess enormous wealth, and others have trouble taking care of their basic needs. It is economists who consider the socialized state incapable of being financed, and therefore unacceptable. Statistics show that this is not so. The differences in the incomes of the rich and the poor are best shown by the Gini coefficient, named for the Italian economist who introduced it. His mathematical explanation is somewhat complicated, so I will content myself with a substitute solution offered by a calculation of the ratio between the average income of the 20% best educated and the 20% least educated. In some countries this ratio is around 3, in others 8 (e.g., 8 in the USA, 7 in the United Kingdom, 4 in Germany, Denmark, Austria, Finland and Sweden, 3.5 in the Czech Republic, and 3.4 in Japan). If it is 8 in a specific country, transfers can lead to the doubling of the income of the 20% poorest, while the wealthier will still have three times as much, which is just simple arithmetic. High taxes reduce business initiative, and we pay for this with a lower tempo of economic growth. Statistical data do not support this idea, however. They show that high taxes are not a curse, because a society that is more egalitarian enjoys more solidarity, and is thus more stable. Significant social stress does not occur. Simple calculation demonstrates that, if the 20% most poor are to have the same standard of living, then a country with a ratio of
8 must double its GDP, with all of the negative consequences for energy consumption and the resulting pollution of the environment. In the USA in 1966, the income of the 20% lowest-income households was 7,000 dollars, for the next 20% it was 20,000 dollars, for the next 20% 31,000 dollars, for the next 20% 44,000 dollars, and for the 20% highest-income households 79,000 dollars (with the income of the top 5% at 79,000 dollars). In 1998, for households with the lowest incomes it was 9,000, for the next group 22,000, for the next 37,000, for the next 58,000, and for the highest-earning 20% 123,000 (215,000 for the top 5%). This shows that thirty years of economic growth had a practically negligible impact on 60% of American households (the data are in dollars adjusted for inflation to reflect the same buying power). The highest tax rate in the USA around 1960 was 90% of one’s income; in 2010, it was 30%, which sheds more light on the aforementioned distribution of household incomes. The Cold War was at its height in the 1960s, however, and the rich did not protest against high taxes, because they realized that the money was going to armaments, and, if they lost against the Soviet Union, they would lose all of their property.

If the socialized state focuses on health care, education, and benefits for the elderly -- without interference in the private economy, and by financing its programs with higher taxes -- it brings no danger. (Data from 2009 show that tax revenues in the USA are 28% of GDP, but in the United Kingdom 39%, in Belgium 47%, in Austria 43%, in Denmark 50%, in Finland 44%, in France 46%, in Germany 40%, and in Sweden 49%.) In view of the environment, population growth, and limited energy resources, emphasis on economic growth is not without controversy. The relationship between the amount of income and the satisfaction index in the USA in 1973 rose sharply up through an income of 10,000 dollars annually per capita, and then stagnated. The differences between an income of 10,000 dollars and 25,000 dollars were minimal. Much more important is a sense of safety and security. Income is definitely an engine of progress, but not the only one. People whose creative works have contributed most to the advancement of society have not been among the poorest; but, with few exceptions, neither have they belonged to the wealthiest groups.

Some poorer nations in South America have gotten into trouble, however, because they have placed emphasis on state enterprises, on protectionist policies of high customs

---

duties, and on intervention in the financial sector. The result was stagflation: high inflation with imperceptible growth. This is a disadvantageous approach. The right thing is for the state to just collect taxes and intervene against speculators. If companies are producing to obtain a profit, there is no need for economic interference by the state, though the participation of labor unions in the management of the companies -- as we know it, for example, in the Federal Republic of Germany -- is desirable. If, however, the owners attempt to influence government policy in their favor -- for example, before elections they halt the delivery of medicine to harm the socialist government -- the state has a responsibility to intervene on behalf of its citizens by imposing temporary receivership. Moreover, the state should not relent in its intervention against speculators. The American crisis of 2008 was caused by a crisis in the mortgage market. This crisis would never have occurred if the government had reacted to the fact that the price of real estate was rising so high that the difference between investment costs and sale prices were reaching tens of percentage points. A proper reaction for communities in this situation is to start developing and selling real estate for a profit of about 10%. The home building industry can only react by reducing its prices as well to an acceptable level in relation to the builders' costs. The state should intervene as little as possible; but in some cases intervention is its responsibility. The proposal I offer is, for now, from the realm of science fiction. On the other hand, I am familiar with a practical case with which I became acquainted during my first trip to Sweden in 1964. At that time, the largest Swedish labor organization owned a chain of shopping centers and a number of industrial firms that supplied them. This was when the use of household automatic washing machines was getting started, and they needed new powder detergent. Foreign firms were selling the detergents in Sweden at a high markup, though it could not be proven that there was a price-fixing agreement. The labor unions established their own industrial firm that began to manufacture the detergents and sell them at a much lower price. The foreign firms reacted by setting their prices even lower, and the labor unions' firm went bankrupt. This loss was compensated, however, by a savings for all Swedish households.

The socialized state, as it occurs in various forms in developed European countries, has three main tasks: to ensure quality, modern health care to meet the needs of all, regardless of income; to ensure education for all, regardless of income, who have skill and determination to apply themselves; and to ensure a dignified life for the elderly, and for those with medical problems. The rest will be taken care of by the market economy
that, through taxation, is a source of financing for the state’s tasks. As for other interventions in the economy -- for example, support for research, infrastructure improvements, agricultural subsidies, subsidies for culture, for urban renewal and for environmental cleanup -- a democratic discourse must occur to select the path of compromise which leaves all participants equally dissatisfied. Everyone wants security and rights; everyone knows that these areas must be financially covered by taxes; but each person wants those taxes to be paid by others.

If nations select American liberal democracy as their model, it will lead to ecological catastrophe. The planet does not have energy resources for everyone on the scale that they are consumed per capita in the USA. On the other hand, if the model is the Swedish socialized state, where the 50% poorest inhabitants -- more than three times lower GDP per capita than in the USA -- have a higher standard of living than the 50% poorest Americans, then the victory of liberal democracy on our planet is possible.

My conclusion is thus a conditional end of history.

Summary

From the perspective of the natural sciences, humans are animals living in a group. Thus, in addition to forms of behavior common to all animals -- obtaining food, fear of death and pain, sexual behavior -- we find with humans those forms of behavior allowing us to live in a group, and which facilitate the success of the group in the struggle for survival. These are: respect for property that prevents constant fighting between members of the group over food; the desire for freedom that makes it possible for individuals to search for food and relocate to new areas; the need to take refuge under authority in the case of danger; the attempt to be accepted by the group; the willingness to risk one’s life in the interest of defending the group; envy that motivates individuals to activity beyond that which is essential for simply staying alive; and the effort to develop one’s own talent. Because talent varies among different members of the group, the development of talent is a positive when there are changes in life’s circumstances and a different situation calls for different skills. All of these forms of behavior have been observed in animals living in groups, with chimpanzees being closest to humans. All of the aforementioned forms of behavior have developed over the course of millions of years of evolution through natural selection of mutations that influenced the arrangement of neurons in the brain. At the same time, all of these methods of behavior are applied in
politics. Respect for ownership requires an ideology that established reasons for confiscating property (e.g., religious ideology, or the ideology of class struggle). The desire for freedom leads to a preference for liberal democracy, the desire for protection to dictatorship. The effort to be accepted by the group leads to reactions of the masses. The willingness to risk for the group leads to heroic deeds, and to suicidal terrorist attacks. Envy and the hatred that flows from it are the driving engine of the proletarian revolution. One talent, political talent, is a talent also observed among some chimpanzees. Individuals with this talent take advantage of it to persuade the group of their abilities to lead, whether in a dictatorship or a democracy.

A dictatorship is justified by the existence of a threat, and for its survival there are four essential conditions. There must be an ideology emphasizing the need for ownership transfers and for protection against real or imaginary enemies. The declaration of successes is necessary for justifying the individual actions of the leading group in the dictatorship (Lenin’s wheels of the revolution that must not stop). Rewarding followers is an essential condition, because without it the supporters of the dictatorship would become the advocates of freedom. The last condition is the suppression of alternative ideas in the ruling group. The formulation of alternative ideas always occurs upon the death of the dictator, because the struggle for the leading position in the ruling group is conducted as arguments about alternative ideas. The fall of a dictatorship is only possible militarily (the fall of fascism in Germany) or when the condition of suppressing alternative ideas is not respected (the fall of communism in the Soviet Union, and also the Prague Spring of 1968). Thus, from the outside, the fall of a dictatorship can be orchestrated militarily, or by clandestine support for alternative ideas in the ruling group (promoting the American way of life in films and books).

Political decisions are determined by three principles. The principle of efficiency has been applied since the onset of agriculture, when surpluses had to be protected. Armed forces are most efficiently used for attack, and for the seizure of property from neighboring groups. The result is the rise of empires. The principle of timing is used by the ruling group when a judgment is made that an opponent is temporarily weak (campaigns into neighboring empires, such those of the Egyptians, the Persians, the Macedonians or the Romans, predated today’s quick-strike warfare). The principle of erroneous quantitative estimation explains the failure of a number of political steps (assuming weakness of the enemy in the case of Napoleon’s and Hitler’s campaigns; the
inability to develop without living space and without raw materials in the case of Germany and Japan at the end of the first half of the 20th century; the assumption that the redistribution of the wealth of the rich will lead to wealth for all as a basis for the communist revolution).

In the future, it is possible that there will be a world without wars if there is a halt to rapid population growth, and if there is support for a system of liberal democracy allowing more equality in the distribution of pensions.