

**PJ
PS** POLISH JOURNAL
OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Volume 2 Issue 1 (2014)

Working Papers

Polish Journal of Political Science. Working Papers

Volume 2 Issue 1

Editorial Board

Clifford Angell Bates Jr., *University of Warsaw*
Stephen Brooks, *University of Michigan*
Paolo Pombeni, *University of Bologna*
Bohdan Szlachta, *Jagiellonian University in Krakow*
Tomasz Żyro, *University of Warsaw*

Editor:

Jarosław Szczepański

Associate Editors

Kamil Aksiuto
Przemysław Biskup
Aneta Marcinkowska (Statistics)
Iwona Miedzińska
Krystian Pałyka
Maciej Sadowski
Łukasz Smalec
Jan Szczepanowski
Marta de Zuniga

Original version: e-book

Visit our site: www.pjps.pl

Submit your paper: submit@pjps.pl

Table of Contents

Łukasz Smalec

European Military Capabilities. History, Assessment, Practice and Perspectives p. 5

Kamil Aksiuto

Beyond Utilitarianism? Beyond Democracy? p. 37

Jan Szczepanowski

A Melting Pot in the United States of Europe? The Modern Concept of Multiculturalism reviewed by Feliks Koneczny and Oswald Spengler p. 61

Dorota Stasiak

Think Tanks in Poland: Policy Experts at the Crossroads p. 95

Iwona Miedzińska

The position and role of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy – selected issues p. 141

Jan Szczepanowski

Faculty of Journalism and Political Science, University of Warsaw

Center for International Initiatives

A Melting Pot in the United States of Europe?

The Modern Concept of Multiculturalism reviewed by Feliks

Koneczny and Oswald Spengler

Abstract

The matter of “cultural security” is an area often ignored by most analyses, concentrated instead on providing a broad explanation for the complex scheme of international security perceived in a broader systemic sense.

This article discusses one of the key hypotheses presented by Feliks Koneczny – the creator of a very persuasive theory on the synthesis of civilizations and multiculturalism; which seems profoundly up to date, while addressing the most lively issues of the modern European Union. Based on particular cases taken from world history, the Polish scholar attempts to illustrate, that it is nearly impossible to make multiculturalism work properly. Such a thesis must be submitted to thorough criticism with regard to other notable analysts operating within the same paradigm, such as for example Oswald Spengler. This dissertation presents a rather sceptical point of view upon the aforementioned issue and attempts to avoid arriving at a predefined simplified conclusion.

Keyword: Multiculturalism, Feliks Koneczny, Oswald Spengler, Historiosophy

Introduction

The complex matter of security concerning a specific entity observed on a global scale, has traditionally been viewed as the domain of cryptic calculations based on the paradigm of hard power. This rarely sparks serious opposition. It makes perfect sense to assess the level of security based on facts, numbers, statistics and diplomatic relations. This data seems to provide many sensible and by all means objective (or close) answers. It is not at all surprising that serious scholars prefer to prove their hypotheses by providing evidence that is as strictly “scientific” as possible, which may however turn out to be insufficient in order to obtain a coherent picture of reality. Without deeper and less „mathematical” insight one cannot expect to comprehend the full scheme of things. Sometimes the argument based on history, emotion or the subtle differences in the line of thought decides on how a group/nation/civilization will behave, whether it is vulnerable or not so, whether its values are susceptible to change and/or deterioration or whether they provide an example willingly followed abroad. The matter of “cultural security”, therefore seems like the perfect way to direct the reader’s attention to areas often ignored by the traditional approach.

1. Multiculturalism in its present (modern) shape.

The problem of European security does not look promising at all from the perspective adopted in this analysis. This could be illustrated by many internal problems derived from and associated with the doctrine of multiculturalism. It proved to be a failure, as opposed to for

example the success of the United States – the world's largest melting pot. Germany and France not only failed to turn many of their immigrants into western Europeans but managed to transform moderate thinking groups and societies into radicals (this term obviously does not concern everyone but is used solely as an image meant to illustrate the nature of the process), who on a large scale feel nothing in common with the countries they were born in. It would seem useful to provide a certain explanation for this occurrence – one which does not in any way boast absolute certainty or mathematical proof. The sensitive area defining culture or civilization is based largely on subjective feeling, but primarily depends on the past. It is in the depths of history that one should attempt to find the answer to why European culture as we know it may, to a certain extent, be in the danger of disappearing.

It would be useful in this context to mention a scholar long forgotten by science. Not many are aware that most of Samuel Huntington's views and theories were preceded by early 20-th century historiosophy. Amongst the myriad of minds concerned with this once popular area of study one may find such brilliant individuals as Karl Jaspers, Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee. One notable acquaintance of the latter was Felix Koneczny, author of "On The Plurality of Civilizations", published in English with a preface by Toynbee¹. The Polish historiosopher, being a severe opponent of an omnipotent state, was virtually banished from all bookshelves in times of communism, only to cautiously return many decades later (during the 90's). To those who ever heard of him (which is a rarity also in Poland)

¹ Koneczny F. [1935] 2002. *O wielości cywilizacji* [On the Plurality of Civilizations]. Komorów: Wydawnictwo Antyk.

the scholar is known for creating a complex theory based not only on rational arguments and pure logic but also on persuasive examples from world history. His concepts, even though from a different age, provide a sensible explanation on why Europe's cultural policy is failing today to such an enormous extent. They could prove helpful if one wishes to predict the shape that this continent will take as a possible effect of past mistakes. Before the above mentioned theory will be explained in regard to the issue of multiculturalism it seems necessary to provide some brief evidence on why it is currently believed by many that the West is so culturally vulnerable and why traditional European values seem to be under attack.

A wise place to begin would be by quoting the words of the German Chancellor, Angela Merkel. She appears to be quite confident that the attempt to create a multicultural society in Germany, where people would "live side by side happily" has "utterly failed". Most importantly the leader of CDU puts the majority of the blame for such a state of things on immigrants, noting that it is they who failed to integrate and lack initiative – not even wanting to learn the language of the country they inhabit². According to some polls conducted in 2010 as much as 30% of the population believed that the "country was overrun by foreigners"³. Even the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung is sceptical. The world renowned think tank, known primarily for its leftist and "progressive"

² M. Weaver. 2010. "Angela Merkel: Multiculturalism has "utterly failed"". <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/oct/17/angela-merkel-german-multiculturalism-failed>. (January 18, 2014).

³ O. Decker, M. Weissman, J. Kiess, E. Brahler. 2010. „Die Mitte in der Kreise: Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2010“. <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/do/07504-20120321.pdf>. (January 18, 2014).

views states that about one third of the German populace believes that new citizens came to the country only for social benefits⁴. The 16 million immigrants appear to be viewed by both left and right as completely unassimilated and often unfriendly towards with the culture of the state they live in. In this context Angela Merkel's statement must be presented in more detail:

“In the beginning of the 60's our government called the foreign workers to come to Germany and now they live in our country [...] We kidded ourselves a while, we said: 'They won't stay, someday they will be gone', but this isn't reality. [...] The approach to build a multicultural society and to live side by side and to enjoy each other has failed, utterly failed⁵”.

The Chancellor was followed sometime later by Horst Seehofer, the leader of CSU who simply remarked that “multiculti is dead”⁶. The most

⁴ For more *vide*: speeches from the conference on “European Approaches to Multiculturalism and Integration” organized by The Smith Institute and The Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, London Office.

⁵ *Vide* for comments: D. Frum. 2010. “Germanys Merkel is Right-Multiculturalism Has Failed”. http://articles.cnn.com/2010-10-18/opinion/frum.merkel.multicultural_1_germany-s-merkel-chancellor-merkel-angela-merkel?_s=PM:OPINION. (January 18, 2014); J. Smee. 2010. “The World From Berlin: Merkel's Rhetoric in integration Debate is Inexcusable”. <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/the-world-from-berlin-merkel-s-rhetoric-in-integration-debate-is-inexcusable-a-723702.html>. (January 18, 2014); for entire speech: A. Merkel, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UKG76HF24_k.

⁶ H. Seehofer. 2010. “Multikulti ist tot”. <http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/deutschland/horst-seehofer-multikulti-ist-tot/3563806.html>. (January 18, 2014).

important, provocative and controversial voice in this debate was without a doubt that of Thilo Sarrazin. This figure, traditionally more associated with the left (member of the SPD) dedicated a whole book to proving a theory that Muslim immigration is a threat to the cultural identity and security of the *Bundesrepublik*. The former member of the German central bank wrote: “No immigrant group other than the Muslims is so strongly connected with claims on the welfare state and crime”⁷. Another interesting comment on the subject is that of Rene Cupercus, Senior Research fellow at the Wiardi Beckman Foundation a think tank of the Dutch Labour Party:

“When and why has the former Marxist, anti-religious, secular left become so respectful to religion, to Islam in particular, which in its core values and practices is not easily compatible (to put it mildly) with the anti-authoritarian cultural revolution of the 1960s and 1970s, the time when the world view of the left-liberals originated? Why did the cosmopolitan anti-patriotic left aggressively taboo and deny the idea of a national identity for European majority cultures (‘England or Holland does not exist’), but at the same time defend aggressively identity politics and ‘multi-cultures’ for non-western minorities?”

He goes on to say, that multiculturalism has produced the contrary effect to what was expected. Its fruits are no other then growing

⁷ “Merkel Says German Multicultural Society Has Failed”. 2010. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-11559451>. (January 18, 2014); For more on Thilo Sarrazin *vide*: 2010. *Deutschland schafft sich ab* [Germany Is Doing Away With Itself].

xenophobia, populist resentment and alienation⁸. The ideology behind immigration in Europe portrayed something different then for example in the United States, where many different nationalities and cultures live as “one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all”. The European model proved to be less successful. “You do not have to integrate”, should be rather interpreted as: “we do not want you here forever (reflected directly in Merkel's words)”. The rest of the population was told that they are the majority among others. The point is that such a situation already occurred in history and did not work. Pre-war Poland was a typical multicultural state, even more so then modern day Germany, France, the Netherlands or Britain. All societies lived relatively peacefully together, but they did not even try to integrate. Feliks Koneczny attempted to explain this situation historiosophically – many of his observations and hypotheses may prove useful as an argument in this debate⁹.

Rainer Baubock from the European University Institute in Italy provided quite a formidable theoretical argument against the concept of multiculturalism. While according to international law every nation has the right of self-determination and all minorities should be allowed to protect their culture against a particular majority “through pursuing their own projects of nation building”; it is difficult to oversee the fact

⁸ R. Cuperus. 2011. “Why the Left was Trapped Into Multiculturalism”. <http://www.social-europe.eu/2011/06/why-was-the-left-trapped-into-multiculturalism/>. (January 18, 2014).

⁹ For broader insight *vide*: Koneczny F. 2001. *Państwo i prawo w Cywilizacji Łacińskiej*. Komorów: Wydawnictwo Antyk; Koneczny F. 1997. *Prawa Dziejowe* [On the Laws of History]. Komorów: Wydawnictwo Antyk; Koneczny F. [1935] 2002. *O wielości cywilizacji* [On The Plurality of Civilizations]. Komorów: Wydawnictwo Antyk.

that this principle is virtually incompatible with the “basic Westphalian norm of territorial integrity of states”. There was an attempt to get around this obvious logical contradiction by defining “peoples” in a more narrow manner than “nations”¹⁰. This was a wonderful solution in theory, but requires very specific norms in order to be implemented in practice. Can norms solve such complexities as values that seem almost spiritual – those deriving from the concept of a nation, culture or civilization? Can a sheer formality put an end to a live entity that has been in existence for hundreds of years? Highly doubtful. It is impossible to regulate relations between cultures entirely, merely with the help of definitions and norms, simply because cultures are based on emotion, feeling and the soul to a much more significant extent than on written sheets of paper. If one wishes all people within a nation to live side by side in a state of peace, they simply must have more in common than just an identical system of law and bureaucracy. This was the American approach and Europe really should take example from that success story rather than attempt to write its own from scratch. The “multiculti” failure was foretold by scholars long before the contemporary implementation of the doctrine. It seems worthwhile to provide a short reminder of that criticism and divert the reader’s attention to the classical theory of the “synthesis of civilisations” and futility of “multiculturalism” presented by Feliks Koneczny.

2. A historiosophical analysis of the concept of multiculturalism.

¹⁰ R. Baubock. “What went wrong with liberal multiculturalism”. etn.sagepub.com/content/8/2/271.extract. p. 271-275 (January 18 2014).

It appears that not all types of multicultural entities and strategies should be perceived as identical. Some cultures bear more common traits than others and are thus prone to synthesis and/or the possibility of fruitful cooperation. Some of them are even members of the same civilization and creating a common ground between them resembles a natural process. American culture came into existence as the fruit of cooperation and common values shared by representatives of a myriad of nations – most of which were European. If another civilization would come into the picture the situation would become drastically different, simply because the primary reason for the birth of any social group is a single unifying purpose, without which the need for a mutually supportive society never comes into existence. And although some individuals fool themselves to think otherwise – not all groups of people think the same way and have identical needs, especially if they have lived apart for hundreds of years with little contact apart from an occasional war. The chances are that they will never get along very well nor will they even think according to the same pattern; even when an inquiry concerns the simplest of things. The primary characteristic for every social group is, therefore a common purpose – this purpose is not the fruit of a simplistic contract, it is the effect of a long process of historic and spiritual evolution. According to Oswald Spengler for example, the reason for the existence of a certain culture is not bound to the civilization itself; its purpose has to be an abstract ideal, simply because only something not yet in our possession provides the necessary motivation for movement, action and

the “feeling of longing”¹¹. Thus, the matter of purpose determines that a group forms (is created) not only as the fruit of biology but also due to a sort of higher calling. The specificity of each purpose predetermines the fact that a certain society is in fact a separate civilization. This simple theory suggests that mixing various cultural entities and thus attempting to create a sort of synthesis will always result in utter failure. The obvious reason for this is that various purposes show different paths to different places (various goals). How can a single group function in harmony if it is concentrated on separate and maybe even contradictory elements; if it wants (expects) different things from life? Such coexistence means nothing more than chaos and often leads to the decline of a certain or of all cultures concerned. The only way to merge two separate civilizations is by creating an alternative, much like it was done in the USA. Feliks Koneczny states that various civilizations are in a state of endless rivalry and a victory in war does not necessarily mean real victory in the field of culture – Rome and Greece are perfect examples. The reason for conflict lies in the mutual incompatibility of purposes and a popular feeling of certainty that “our goal makes the most sense”. This never ending rivalry is caused by the fact that societies naturally come into contact, they interact, live together or next to each other. As an effect some of them may cease to exist – and it is rarely the “better” (more developed, sublime) group that survives. Complexity is not at all attractive according to this hypothesis¹².

¹¹ Spengler O. [1959] 2001. *Zmierzch Zachodu* [Der Untergang Des Abendlandes]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo KR. p. 192-208.

¹² Koneczny F. *Prawa...* p. 237-260.

2.1 The issue of compatibility and synthesis of civilizations.

One of the most valuable elements of Koneczny's theory is probably the matter of compatibility (*współmierność*) and synthesis. Both terms are worth explaining in more detail. The scholar directs the reader's attention to cultures which at first glance seem to be almost analogous. When observed in more detail however, one may notice significant differences even amongst the closest (representing many features that are alike) and most similar civilizations. Even if genuinely subtle, in those differences lies the true character of any society. Rome and Greece are perfect illustrations of that thesis; the similarities between them without a doubt surpass any possible differences: their alphabets are fully phonetic; their religious systems were virtually identical etc. Interestingly enough, according to Koneczny both societies belong to entirely different civilizations. This is because the essence of every culture is based on "the common method of organizing a society". In the case of Greece in times of Hellenism, *ergo* the period after Alexander the Great its society can be characterized as oriental or Eastern. It resembles the original Hellenic civilization to a limited extent. The Roman model is personalistic, centred on the individual and on the classical rule of law. The attempt at synthesis was based on a common intellectual base. Unfortunately the basic line of thought turned out to be incompatible (*niewspółmierna*), which is the main reason for the splitting of the empire into two separate cultural entities. Both civilizations were without a doubt inspired by a similar set of abstract ideals, which derived from common sets of beliefs: first the classical, then Christianity. These, however can be interpreted in very different

ways and thus lead to the formation of various forms of practice, preferred ways of acting, dogma and moral duty. Orthodox and Catholic Christianity do not differ significantly (much less then for example Protestantism and Catholicism) in terms of the declared set of beliefs, but the practice of faith is entirely different. The dominating rule which requires one to follow in the footsteps of The Lord stays the same but the ways of realizing that rule vary significantly. Both religions value humility. In the West the mentioned trait is altruistic, centered on the individual and understood as helping others, actively combating injustice and evil, changing the world etc. This is precisely why we had schools, hospitals, poorhouses, universities and such – all established and ran by the clergy. In the East the world is also understood as imperfect, but the religious element simply implies that one has to accept imperfection and contemplate fate as God's will – similarly to Islam¹³. This is perfectly reflected in many works of art – for example architecture. Oswald Spengler sees the dome of an Orthodox Basilica as a sort of prelude or introduction to the quick spread of Islam in the former Eastern Roman Empire. The German historiosopher sees the Hagia Sophia as a perfect Mosque – built before the formal birth of Islam as a sort of prediction of the future. This example seems to illustrate how two almost identical societies – with common roots and similar beliefs can choose disjointing paths of development; the reason for which lies simply in the deep incompatibility of vision and purpose. A man of the West wished to experience objective beauty – paying special attention to both realism and symbolism in creating works of art.

¹³ *Ibidem.* p. 237.

The Easterner sought perfection by deep introverted thought and meditation. According to Koneczny "various societies look upon good and evil, the idea of beauty, perfection, usefulness and uselessness in a completely different manner. They can have various points of view concerning the above elements, not to mention that even their vision (ideal) of truth (purpose) is never compatible or analogous. A certain goal is only analogous (mutually corresponding/correlating) within societies belonging to one civilization"¹⁴. *Ergo*, it is futile to expect the possibility of creating a synthesis of civilizations, since different cultures are by their very nature incompatible (they have different goals, dreams, ideals, interpretations of dogma etc.) Koneczny backs this thesis up by quoting one of the conclusions of an annual meeting held by The Ethnological Society of Religion in 1929: "one cannot imagine a crime that at some time or place could not have been interpreted as an honourable deed"¹⁵. This statement seems just as persuasive today as over 80 years ago. How can one hope to create a common society when the group concerned lacks a common system of ethics, morality; its elements (nations, peoples) act differently, represent various mythologies, traditions and abstract ideals? One could obviously create a system of do's and don'ts a priori- it would however certainly prove to be seriously impaired by the lack of a historical (realistic) foundation. Such artificial constructions rarely prove to provide sufficient value. How can one substitute years of experience and evolution by a baseless projection. It is certainly better to trust in the wisdom of past

¹⁴ *Ibidem.* p. 238.

¹⁵ *Ibidem.* p. 239.

generations then the meditations and projects of madmen with visions of transforming the true fabric of society.

Because faith is such an important element in creating a civilization there are attempts to, in a way, establish a common ground in this matter in order to bring the people of the world closer together. This tendency is evident for example in the form of ecumenism in Christianity, which is without a doubt a noble and romantic cause. Such sentimental ideals usually do not bear the expected fruits however. Is it worth losing the truth in the name of common and united error? It is better to be divided by truth than united in error. Only people that are religiously indifferent could think of an endeavour to synthesize beliefs in the name of abstract compatibility at all costs. If one perceives his/her own culture or civilization seriously and believes in its mission or purpose how can one simply sacrifice it on the altar of uniformity? What is the point of unity without passion and belief¹⁶?

Another important element worth mentioning is the fact that victory in the field of rivalry is rarely possessed by the most aggressive or warlike civilization. Cultural expansion derives from the strength of ideals, beliefs, abstract ideas, myths and traditions. Let us consider the initial expansion of Islam. Christians, at first, were not being converted by sword, but primarily in the form of economic discrimination. The mission of expansion takes place in the mind and soul, because civilization is based on emotion, feeling and the heart – it lays in the world of abstraction, which precedes physical matter. The heart is always closed to the material world, but that world is bound to reflect

¹⁶ *Ibidem.* p. 240-260; Spengler O. *Zmierzch...* p. 25-60.

the dreams and ideals of the former¹⁷. Most prominent and long lasting civilizations are in fact, as Koneczny describes them, sacred/spiritual in nature. They are characterized not only by ideological thought or doctrine but primarily by certain traditional customs (actions) reflected for example in liturgy, celebrating holidays, not eating meat (or certain types of meat) etc. Every element of life is filled with duties and obligations deriving from a certain religious system. It would be virtually impossible to merge these rules in the case of, for example orthodox Judaism and Hinduism, whilst maintaining their true form, nature and world outlook. Attempting synthesis would in this case seem barbaric and ignorant, would surely never work and most certainly be an act of sacrificing what both societies view as truth in the name of unifying them in error¹⁸.

The Polish scholar presents numerous examples from history which are meant to prove that attempts at the synthesis of cultures belonging to different civilizations are determined to fail. The vision of uniting mankind by merging its beliefs and traditions is not a modern invention it has been around since ancient times. The most notable example, no doubt directed by noble intentions was that of Alexander the Great, who was certainly one of the first great synthesizers of societies. The Macedonian king urged his soldiers to marry Persian women of which he gave an example by entering the eternal union with an Iranian dancer. He made numerous analogies between the Greek and

¹⁷ *Ibidem.* p. 405-417; About the relationship between spirit and matter *vide*: Plato, *Fajdros i Uczta* in: *Dialogi* [Plato, Dialogues]; About the hierarchy of matter *vide*: Arystoteles, *Metafizyka* [Aristotle, Metaphysics].

¹⁸ Koneczny F. *Prawa...* p. 240.

Persian gods and dreamed of creating a common ideology encompassing his whole reign which was to be based on his individual persona. Alexander the Great believed it impossible to Hellenize the enormous and diverse East, which was no doubt a wise predicament. The problem, however was that he did not wish to accept the fact that people are by nature diverse and apparently could not understand that the existence of various cultures and states is a treasure of mankind instead of its burden. The king of Macedonia dreamed of unification and uniformity, which in turn ended up deeply changing the nature of his own civilization forever. The utopian vision of a single empire collapsed with ruthless consequence, what is worse is that even the Greeks themselves never again united (until the 19th century) – at least not in accordance with their traditional values and historical outlook. This is also proof that power politics and military conquest is not a sufficient method of successfully spreading certain values and beliefs¹⁹. The effect of such endeavours is usually contrary to expectations. Greeks (especially the elite) became increasingly “Eastern” (“oriental” if one prefers) – no one in their right mind would call Cleopatra (a Greek noble of the Ptolemaic dynasty) as an individual resembling Pericles, Demosthenes, Aristotle or Plato to a more significant extent than the Pharaohs of the Old Kingdom. The same can be said about distant Bactria. The only Greek element one could observe there would probably be the external design of money (coins), which in some manner resembles the traditional Hellenic model.

¹⁹ *Ibidem.* p. 250.

A very notable example of the madness of artificial “self-correction” carried out in order to look (seem) more friendly to a foreign culture could be perfectly portrayed by early Byzantine-Islamic relations. The empire wished to persuade the Muslims to convert to Christianity by incorporating some elements of their civilization. Images of God, the Saints and Angels- which were particularly revered by the Eastern Orthodox Church were banned and thus thousands of priceless works of art were barbarically destroyed. The fact that worshipping images is not allowed in Islam is in full accordance with the main principles of that religion. One can say that it is a fundamental logical outcome of the nature of that civilization. Allah is primarily characterized as all powerful and his will cannot be questioned or creatively reflected upon. The same cannot be said about Eastern Christianity, which is so strongly tied to the image as an important sacred element, that brings an individual closer to God – whose most important traits are centered on mercy and love. The Byzantine Greeks wished to solve the problem of an expanding Islam by cooperation, dialogue and compromise. They went ahead and decided to sacrifice one of the most important elements of their own world outlook only because they believed it would spark positive feeling towards them from their adversaries. The effect was contrary to their expectations: such an act can only be perceived as a display of weakness and decadence by young and dynamically expanding cultures. How can one motivate the destruction of something so dear? Could it be only because one does not have the will or strength to fight for what one believes in? Or perhaps that individual does not really believe in anything anymore? Every idealist thinks in the categories presented above and the only way

to gain his/her respect is to honourably fight (not necessarily in militaristic terms; by argument as well for example). An act that is hostile to something as dear as one's own civilization seems to be nothing more than the proof of its decadence and spoilage. It is a sign of its oncoming end²⁰. Thus it becomes almost obvious, that attempts at combining (by means of synthesis) entities as ancient and complex as civilizations does not reap the expected benefits.

In this context it would also be wise to mention a failed attempt of cultural synthesis, which concerns two protestant churches in Hohenzollern Prussia. Frederick I strove to centralize and unify the religious sphere which would give him the possibility to even further submit it to the dominance of the state. The theological dogma of Lutheran and Calvinist sects are fundamentally different. One cannot simply reconcile the two. This is precisely why they came into existence – Protestantism split into various groups for idealistic and philosophical reasons (The Anglican Church is probably the only exception), not practical ones. It is futile to hope to unite separate religious entities simply by administrative means. This depth of thought could not be achieved by the Prussian elites of that time (18th century). Their actions portrayed religion not as the foundation of civilization or culture but a means to an end – a sort of tool whose primary purpose was to further strengthen the formal institution of their state. In 1719, as an initiative of Frederick Wilhelm I, theologists from Tübingen put together 15 new articles of faith based on which both branches of Protestantism were supposed to be united. The king subsequently rejected the Calvinist idea

²⁰ *Ibidem.* p. 240.

of predestination and issued a directive for the newly unified church to stick to the Calvinist "Agenda" (means of administration). The only effect of this act was the growing indifference of the protestant religion towards matters of faith and could have been one of the many seeds of atheism and agnosticism in Europe. It would be useful to mention George Calixtus in this context. The 17th century theologian planned to create a synthesis of all protestant branches. This proved to be impossible and the fruit of his universalism was nothing more than a system of ethics without the proper motivation (roots). Thus one can observe that attempts at uniting cultures artificially usually lead to their significant decline²¹.

Civilizations differ in basically all forms of human existence. They even perceive science itself in a completely different manner. Both the scientific method and purpose of science vary drastically in the West and for example in China. According to Koneczny, in the former the main goal is learning the truth – no matter if mankind can reap its practical benefits. Within the latter culture one performs each action for the good of society, thus science has to be utilitarian and useful here and now²². It is difficult to leave this thesis without discussion. Practicality as the sole motive for invention is surely not a Chinese trait. Black powder, for example was put to religious/sacral use, it became an element of many festivities in honour of the emperor, which is no doubt a very abstract sphere. One can find many more examples of inventions that were meant to fulfill higher needs than just earthly and practical.

²¹ Koneczny F. *Prawa...* p. 244-245.

²² *Ibidem.* p. 246-248.

The creation of new cultures by synthesis is a futile task also because it is nearly impossible to even understand the motivation of another civilization without extensive knowledge about it (and even then it is difficult). A good example would be an illustration of the primary differences between Hinduism and western Christianity. The first is based upon religious acts (customs) – not ethics are important here but rituals. Even if someone would undertake the endeavour of collecting the meanings of all of them, the system would prove to be inconsistent and illogical. Christianity is mostly about reflecting upon a theologically (scientifically) organized dogma. The rituals are mostly introverted and in comparison to Hinduism there are very few of them. In Hinduism every day is a unique holiday which demands certain rituals (for example on the island of Bali). Each day is a cause for celebration and brings with it a certain mythical story, which often does not even contain a point (moral). The goal is to petrify certain ways of acting, gestures, mimicry and motivate life with tradition and myth. Hinduism brings one closer to the Deity with gestures. Christianity does the same with thought and ethics. It would seem wise to provide an example of Hindu myth as evidence of the hypotheses put forward above. While observing a play on a temple altar in Bali one could not help but wonder about the lack of its moral or philosophical value. The legend concerned a prince who failed to hunt down an animal. While looking for the pray he noticed an empty coconut shell and urinated inside it. On the next day a simple girl went into the forest, noticed what the prince left behind and drank it. She got pregnant, carried the baby for a year and gave birth to a frog. A certain princes fell in love with this (male) frog, who in turn asked Shiva to turn it into a human being. The

deity replied that the frog is in fact a prince and fulfilled his bidding. They lived happily ever after. One cannot help but address a question to Mahatma Gandhi, who stated that the Western mind is entirely materialistic and the Hindu is idealistic, what ideals the above legend contains? To be brief – it is just a meaningless story, with no abstract value, its strength is locked in the fact that it exists and is believed to be true – which is direct proof that Hinduism feeds primarily on tradition: classic forms of *sacrum*. How can one possibly hope to unify two societies as different from each other as the West and Hinduism? They think differently, have various motivations, believe in different things and have entirely disjoint purposes for existence according to their ways of thinking. To even consider synthesis is thus without a doubt entirely a waste of time, for the only way in which it could be successful is by destroying both societies and building something else in their place. Such barbarism should no doubt be avoided²³.

It would be worthwhile to also mention the subject of time itself. This too is perceived in an entirely different manner by various societies. The Hindu look upon time in an emanative and cyclic way. The energy of Brahma endlessly emanates from the deity but with each minute it becomes more and more unclean – polluted by actions that do not derive from it directly. This is the source of all suffering and the reason that the world is imperfect. Every once in a while evil energy starts to dominate over the good and the world collapses in on itself. The deity then builds a new world, thus beginning a fresh cycle. Every individual is trapped inside this cycle – this is known as reincarnation.

²³ Own observations and Koneczny F. *Prawa...* p. 247.

He/she can break free however by entering the state of Moksha and thus become “nothing”. This theory implies that existence is participation in something that lacks perfection and each Hindu should live in a state of conflict towards his/her being as well as the material world²⁴. The Latin civilization is based on creationism (not to be understood in its new meaning) a concept which leads one to believe that the world was created only once and does not undergo any significant change in terms of its nature and character. This formulated a bond of the individual and physical matter that he exists in, which in turn led to the evolution of modern empirical science²⁵.

When considering the concept of the synthesis of civilizations one cannot help but mention the Jewish people and their unique culture. Because of the complexities of history the Hebrew people can be found all over the world – always for the benefit of the place they inhabit. They do not wish to assimilate fully however and represent an elitist point of view upon their values and beliefs. They feel no particular need for spreading their outlook abroad either – it was meant solely for them. This is what makes the Jewish civilization strong and vital. No special longing for synthesis is typical for this culture – it is content with the respect it feels towards its ancestors and forefathers: “they stand on the shoulders of giants”, that is why they achieved so much. The belief in being the chosen people does not have to be abandoned just so other cultures feel better about themselves²⁶. This is

²⁴ Own observations; *Ibidem.* p. 52- 51; Koneczny F. *O wielości...* p. 289- 294.

²⁵ Koneczny F. *Prawa...* p. 47-72.

²⁶ *Ibidem.* p. 249.

no doubt an attitude that provokes respect from people of worth that remember their own heritage.

2.2 Multiculturalism and the theory of the crossroads.

Felices Koneczny also directs the reader's attention to the matter of multiculturalism and the theory of the crossroads. It is based on the predicament that cultures which exist at the crossroads of civilizations are predestined to be richer, more valuable culturally and stronger intellectually. He states that the lack of criticism in the many benefits flowing from that idea led to the birth of "one of the most absurd myths of modernity". Were it to make any sense, then Russia would prove to be the leader of the world. He meticulously identifies as many as seven cultures which can be found within the great country²⁷. Even if, sometimes it would be easy to disagree with the details, the Eastern giant was always, without a doubt a truly multicultural nation. Instead of making that trait the primary example set for humanity it was the source of a significant energy drain. Russia put so much effort during its long history in order to suppress internal nationality driven conflicts (Poland, Georgia, Ukraine, The Caucasus as a whole etc.). Much of its actions were driven by attempts to maintain unity instead of concentrating on more vital problems. This may be one of the reasons why the country is still quite backward. Civilizations simply have different goals, purposes and ideals, they cannot be merged or reconciled nor can they be conquered by sheer force. It is simplistically understood expansionism that made Russia what it is today.

²⁷ *Ibidem.* p. 35-36.

Finally it should be made clear that the matter of synthesis of civilizations was based purely on an *a priori* method of analysis. It was a premeditated romantic and sentimental ideal of creating a universal society in which everyone could live together in harmony. Such concepts are usually utopian in nature. How can you expect harmony from two groups of people who have conflicting goals? It is a child's wish that will probably never come true, for it is deemed impossible by philosophy and logic. Looking back at history one may easily notice that attempts at civilizational synthesis were always artificial and predestined to fail²⁸. A new civilization can come into existence as an effect of the emergence of a new purpose/ideal or it can undergo significant decline and be dominated by another culture. There is simply no alternative.

Multiculturalism is a somewhat different concept than the one described in detail above, when the main goal of analysis is the full explanation of certain occurrences which make it difficult for a given culture to realize its purpose or the mission it believes it is a set to fulfil. Synthesis means sacrificing some elements and truths of a given cultural order (system) and incorporating others in their place so that a new entity based on common methods of thinking, feeling and existence could be created – this group may otherwise be called a civilization. Multiculturalism is simply about incorporating foreign elements of existence into an entity (society) which are unable to correspond with the given order of life²⁹. These new methods of existence are unable to assist in achieving a certain cultures purpose if they were provoked into being by entirely different sentiments and beliefs. Incorporated elements

²⁸ *Ibidem.* p. 249.

²⁹ Koneczny F. *Prawa...* p. 260.

of a foreign origin can only disrupt a given culture from achieving a certain goal (or attempting to achieve it). They can tear the delicate fabric of a unique way of life, change the nature of a civilization and interrupt its sense of direction (movement, dynamism). The greatest risk of creating a multicultural environment artificially is that society will transform into an uncultured, chaotic mass without a certain unique purpose. Such a state would ensure its decline.

Oswald Spengler for example describes civilization as a living organism. It is difficult to fully agree with such Neo-Darwinist statements but society is surely something more than just a mechanism or group of people who agreed upon a „social contract“. It is also not merely founded on pure instinct, which transforms the actions of a group based on changes of the outside environment in accordance with a certain system. The German scholar presents the opposition between what “is alive” (as opposed to “dead” mechanical creations) and what is not. He believes that live entities are defined by their spiritual element and thus cannot be understood as machines put into movement by matter. In this case the term organism does not contain its typical meaning. Spengler uses it as a metaphor; if society is an organism then it contains an element of escaping the curbs of science and the possibility of empirical description – it is more complicated than a regular mechanism. It does not react in a given, predefined manner towards external change; its actions, in a way, cannot be predicted; they seem almost metaphysical³⁰. The metaphor of an organism was also used by scholasticism in the Middle Ages in order to describe purpose

³⁰ Spengler O. *Zmierzch...* p. 115-142.

in nature. This term is obviously very useful also when analysing the goal of every society, as long as it is understood purely as a metaphor³¹. The existence of a given entity has meaning only when it has a certain predefined goal that it strives to achieve; in other words it should act in accordance with the platonic „intention of existence”. Simply put: every element of a certain organism has to fulfil its purpose according to the goal of the whole. The head is responsible for leadership, the legs for walking etc. Their actions are brought into life automatically, simply because the mentioned body parts have been designed (by nature or God) to do so. The same could be said about a society, culture and civilization. It should be allowed to act based on instinct (which is the fruit of historical development), in accordance with its character and purpose. Its representatives should realize that when two legs move in an unsynchronized manner this may bring about the risk of tripping. Oswald Spengler is positive, however that each society is determined to grow and develop to a certain moment and is bound to deteriorate one day anyway. Every civilization must face decadence, nihilism and die of natural causes.³² Feliks Koneczny is sceptical towards such theories. His argument is based on the fact that many ancient civilizations still exist and did not disappear whilst some were short-lived and fell into a period of decadence and decline. *Ergo*, societies do not simply die of old age as people do but are able to carry their traditions with them almost endlessly – unless of course they lose their sense of purpose and meaning – this in effect leads them to a state of adaptation: they either

³¹ St. Thomas Aquinas [1265?] 2006. *O Królowaniu...* [De Regno...].Kraków: Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej. p. 43-61.

³² Spengler O. *Zmierzch...* p. 205-224.

yield to another civilization or fall into a state of deep depression and cease to exist³³. According to Koneczny the primary reason for the fall of a society is the loss of its unique goals – this happens most often as an effect of multiculturalism, where a variety of unfamiliar ways of understanding reality are introduced. It is impossible to believe and/or acknowledge two contradicting truths/ points of view/ purposes of life etc. When the representatives of a society begin to do so it just stops being a society and becomes a group of different people united by one law and government – nothing more. This is also predetermined to be temporary. Every culture understands the concept of law differently; every civilization has different sets of rules based on various historical and/or religious traditions/predicaments rooted in thousands of years of practice. It is naive and sentimental to believe that many cultures can happily live in a “modern”, “liberal” state – this is possible only in the case of its inventors; no one else will understand it nor truly acknowledge its purpose.

When certain elements of a given organism are motivated by disjointed sets of hopes, purposes and truths, then the whole entity is unable to achieve the originally intended goal. When a society completely loses its predefined traits and thus the purpose for its existence it becomes pointless to even analyse it.

A civilization can lose its unique direction as an effect of the simplest events, which by themselves should not under any circumstance, be subject to criticism. In neighbouring societies cultural contact between them as well as mutual impact are inevitable and

³³ *Ibidem.* p. 115-142.

profound. Some “foreign cultural elements” are not a danger to the civilizational fabric of a society at all – inventions, simple customs and technical details can exist in full correlation with its purpose and goal³⁴. The adaptation of external elements has to, however be in full accordance with the „law of proportion”. Feliks Koneczny notices (at the beginning of the 20th century) that occurrences typical for frontiers and border areas can now be found virtually everywhere. “We can now observe that two members of the same family can now belong to two different civilizations, even ones hostile to each other. This is evidence of a growing instability of beliefs, views – even terms and ideas, as well as the growing uncertainty of purpose and the meaning of existence of individuals³⁵”. Not so long ago we could witness the disappearance of ancient and noble families of the past. Each owed its allegiance to one stable and continuous meaning for ages, which could be decrypted for example from their medieval coats of arms. They were loyal to the traditions of their ancestors. One could expect a certain predefined way of thinking and analysis from a given noble family for decades, even though they married representatives of the aristocracy from many different nations (but usually within one civilization). Today, the respect for tradition and duty has virtually disappeared and one can observe that individual views are no longer shaped by the family.

It looks as though Feliks Koneczny attempts to blame the decline of Western Civilization on different cultures. This is no doubt a serious mistake. Dadaism, turpism, surrealism, futurism etc. were not the fruits of foreign thought. The relativist point of view is uniquely Western, no

³⁴ *Ibidem.* p. 260.

³⁵ *Ibidem.* p. 260.

one else thought of it but us. Every civilization has a profound feeling of righteousness – it is absolutely sure that the direction which it chose over the centuries is the right one. There are certain implications based on which one may call a society a civilization. They are inspired by a belief in a certain purpose and meaning. The West seems to have lost its sense of direction. Instead of reflecting upon the matter of multiculturalism and the synthesis of cultures one should rather create a new category: anticivilization. This entity did not evolve as an effect of an energy drain caused by the influx of foreign cultures as Koneczny would like but as the fruit of The French Revolution. It is without a doubt that attempts at synthesis or creating a multinational state may have an effect on the feeling of purpose of a given society, but living next to someone of a strong sense of identity can also serve as an inspiration to revive our own sets of values. In practice a more diverse society can lead to stronger feelings of civilizational patriotism and self-definition. It often happens that a given culture can incorporate foreign elements and thus enrich its heritage. In the case of Hinduism for example there is no doubt that without its special characteristic, based on the ability to provide a unique way of understanding others and giving meaning to cultural values stemming from the outside, it would not last for such a long time. If not for the fact that each foreign truth could not be meticulously and quite accurately (with broad understanding) added to the system, that system would probably decompose. Its tolerance should not be understood in the modern meaning of the word, *ergo*; everyone has their own truth and we should respect that because we do not really know what truth is. The Hindu civilization says rather – every truth is in accordance with our truth; if it

is not, then we will make it so. Instead of attacking it tries to prove the futility of the classic form of conflict. It fights rather in the intellectual and mystic spheres. This special kind of tolerance makes the mentioned culture very resilient and powerful; it takes what it can, enriching its heritage without in any way destroying its foundations – everything is modified in accordance with its main set of beliefs. However, one should mention the fact that Hinduism never could really incorporate or tame Islam. The conclusion can be twofold therefore: the “law of history”, as Felix Koneczny calls it, concerning the futility of multiculturalism and the synthesis of civilizations is not entirely accurate. Sometimes multiculturalism provides the best results for a given culture, but it is very often the other way around as well. Historiosophy does not really give a certain answer, but provides a broader spectrum which enables an individual to really understand the meaning of such words as tolerance, diversity and multiculturalism; instead of just repeating them aimlessly as an element of fashionable modern propaganda³⁶.

3. Conclusion

There are numerous examples in history which prove that multiculturalism as well as its other form based on the synthesis of civilizations are ideals that are incredibly difficult to achieve in practice. If a given society really wishes to put them to life its elites should feel obliged and compelled to rely not only on empty words and goodwill but also on historical evidence and experience stemming from the past.

³⁶ *Ibidem.* p. 118-124; Koneczny F. *Prawa...* p. 261.

It is possible for different cultures to live together happily, whilst enriching their heritage, but in order to do that all of these cultures have to believe in a certain form of truth. If one of these societies is decadent and increasingly nihilist it is bound to be spiritually conquered by others. This is a conclusion, which cannot be ignored when attempting to bring such ideas to life – for with noble ideals it is always profoundly difficult to do so.

Bibliography

1. St. Thomas Aquinas [1265?] 2006. *O Królowaniu...* [De Regno...]. Kraków: Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej. p. 43-61.
2. Arystoteles, *Metafizyka* [Aristotle, Metaphysics].
3. R. Baubock. "What went wrong with liberal multiculturalism". etn.sagepub.com/content/8/2/271.extract. p. 271-275 (January 18 2014).
4. R. Cuperus. 2011. "Why the Left was Trapped Into Multiculturalism". <http://www.social-europe.eu/2011/06/why-was-the-left-trapped-into-multiculturalism/>. (January 18, 2014).
5. O. Decker, M. Weissman, J. Kiess, E. Brahler. 2010. „Die Mitte in der Kreise: Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2010“. <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/do/07504-20120321.pdf>. (January 18, 2014).
6. D. Frum. 2010. "Germanys Merkel is Right- Multiculturalism Has Failed". http://articles.cnn.com/2010-10-18/opinion/frum.merkel.multicultural_1_germany-s-merkel-chancellor-merkel-angela-merkel?_s=PM:OPINION. (January 18, 2014).
7. Koneczny F. [1935] 2002. *O wielości cywilizacyj* [On the Plurality of Civilizations]. Komorów: Wydawnictwo Antyk.
8. Koneczny F. 2001. *Państwo i prawo w Cywilizacji Łacińskiej*. Komorów: Wydawnictwo Antyk; Koneczny F. 1997. *Prawa Dziejowe* [On the Laws of History]. Komorów: Wydawnictwo Antyk; Koneczny F. [1935] 2002.
9. "Merkel Says German Multicultural Society Has Failed". 2010. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-11559451>. (January 18, 2014).
10. Plato. *Fajdros i Uczta* in: *Dialogi* [Plato, Dialogues]

11. H. Seehofer. 2010. "Multikulti ist tot".
<http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/deutschland/horst-seehofer-multikulti-ist-tot/3563806.html>. (January 18, 2014).
12. J. Smee. 2010. "The World From Berlin: Merkel's Rhetoric in integration Debate is Inexcusable".
<http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/the-world-from-berlin-merkel-s-rhetoric-in-integration-debate-is-inexcusable-a-723702.html>. (January 18, 2014)\
13. Spengler O. [1959] 2001. *Zmierzch Zachodu* [Der Untergang Des Abendlandes]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo KR. p. 192-208.
14. M. Weaver. 2010. "Angela Merkel: Multiculturalism has "utterly failed"". <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/oct/17/angela-merkel-german-multiculturalism-failed>. (January 18, 2014).