A Review of International Relations and (Civilizational Theorizing)

[1]Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR & [2]Dr. Mehmet Uçkaç, PhD,

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3198-5212   https://orcid.org/0009-0001-9488-9036

[1]Dean of the Faculty of Law, International Science and Technology University, Warsaw, Poland

[2]International Science and Technology University.

*Corresponding Author :Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR

"Dean of the Faculty of Law, International Science and Technology University, Warsaw, Poland"

Abstract: Theoretical evolution in international relations is one of the important topics in the knowledge of this field. In examining theoretical evolution, the central issue is how to create new theories, create scientific debates between theories, and ultimately the emergence of different or conflicting theories.

The introduction of the concept of civilization into the knowledge of international relations and the emergence of two readings of civilization have revealed the civilizational analysis of international relations in two different approaches. One approach considers civilization as a fixed and static "state", and the other approach considers civilization as a "process".

What both approaches have in common is that they both acknowledge the context-centered nature of this theory and accept civilization as a level of analysis and a political category, but their difference lies in providing a different definition of the nature of civilization, the international system, and the analytical outputs of the application of civilization as a level of analysis.

The hypothesis of the present study is that the existence of two conflicting approaches to civilization in international relations has shaped a civilizational perspective in international relations, and it seems that international relations is on the verge of the emergence of a civilizational theory.

This research attempts to present a clear picture of this debate and a meta-analysis of the requirements for theorizing international relations through a descriptive-analytical method, referring to the texts and meta-analysis of the data produced.

Keywords: *Theory, Meta-Theory, Level Of Analysis, Civilization, International Relations.*

Introduction

International relations, as a newly emerging science that has only been around for a century, has become one of the most popular fields of humanities with the expansion of global relations. The applicability of this field and attention to its various dimensions have led to continuous evolution and transformation in this field, a significant part of which has been reflected in theory.

The emergence of theories is due to debates that take place around the content concepts of a science. How is the formation of global power and order formed? What is the relationship between actors and the structure of the international system? What are the characteristics and features of the international system - such as anarchy and order - and what is their nature? And what is the best way for actors to confront these characteristics? These are questions that are raised in the space of theory-building.

To answer this set of questions, theorists of each theory first organize their meta-theory, and then, based on the conclusions drawn from it, describe and define the content concepts, and then explain the relationships between these concepts to shape the knowledge of international relations. It can perhaps be said that the

concept of civilization is one of the most important concepts that international relations theories have paid attention to in the post-Cold War era.

The introduction of civilization as a level of analysis in the science of international relations arose from Samuel Huntington's theory of the clash of civilizations, but it was not limited to this theory. The concept of civilization has been examined by many international relations theorists such as Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert K. Kass, Randall Collins, Martin Hall, Patrick Jackson, and others. Unlike Huntington's futures research approach, which focuses on predicting future relations between major global powers and the sources of conflicts and disputes, and deals with the international system with a pathological approach, the second group pays attention to civilization as a positive and affirmative concept in international relations. The result of this analysis is the attention to the important position of civilization as a player that can shape new concepts in international relations, such as the civilizational state. It can also provide a specific analytical mechanism that has the ability to analyze the positive action (focusing on peacemaking

solutions instead of the cause of war) of some actors in a more realistic way.

The emergence of this scientific perspective in the field of international relations has created a specific formulation, which the thesis of the present research is to present this formulation and to present a meta-analysis of the data produced. The present research attempts to show that both groups of theorists consider civilization as a political matter, and also consider the theory of international relations as the central context, and on this basis, they try to show the inevitable movement towards a civilizational theory.

But the two different readings lead to different analytical outcomes and consequences. The first approach leads to a conflictual picture of the world, and the second approach to a communicative and interactive picture between civilizations. The starting point of the first approach is the grounds of war, and the starting point of the second approach is how to spread peace. It seems that both groups have been able to establish civilization as a level of analysis, and today we can talk about the level of analysis of civilization or the civilizational approach, and if this scientific debate continues, perhaps in the near future we can talk about civilizational theory.

Conceptual Framework

The use of civilization as a conceptual framework requires a conceptual clarification of three fundamental concepts related to civilization studies. These three concepts are "civilization", "the guiding idea of civilization" and "the sphere of civilization validity" (Nowrozi Firuz 2015); that is, in order to use civilization as a minimal framework, at least these three categories must be removed from the initial ambiguity and then the relationship between these three concepts must be explained.

The nature of civilization - the word civilization itself refers to its definition and determining its limits and boundaries. The guiding idea of civilization examines the heart and focal point of civilization. The sphere of civilization validity also refers to how civilization is discovered, expanded and spread inside and outside its civilizational territory.

A; The nature of civilization

The discussion of the nature of civilization focuses on the internal view of civilization. Here, the sociological approach to civilization is considered; because civilization is considered a social matter. In other words, Civilization is a concept that is related to the field of human action and action. Therefore, it can be said that civilization has the ability to be concrete due to its impact on the operational space.

Therefore, the question of whether civilization is real or not? Behind this, it is understandable whether it is possible to extract indicators from the concept of civilization or not? To discover these indicators, first of all, it is necessary to specify what a civilization contains? And secondly, where are its boundaries (Jackson, 2010: 176-177)? Robert Kakás believes that civilizations represent a continuity in human thoughts and activities through which different human groups strive to They are to cling to their awareness of current issues (Cox, 2002: 32).

The criterion and indicator of being civilized is also the regulation of behavior or action based on civilized identity, not only based on micro-identities such as national identity or religious identity; Rather, all the factors that determine identity (civilizational identity) must play a role in that behavior.

Therefore, it seems that civilization is the sum of military power, economic power (including the meaning of the term economy, technology, etc.) and cultural power, and in this definition, culture is considered only one side of civilization, and if combined with other dimensions, it can participate in civilization; that is, culture becomes an element of civilization when that human or society, in the face of its surrounding environment, has both the possibility of survival (military dimension) and the possibility of interaction to meet the needs with the aim of improving its capabilities. In other words, civilization is the relationship of man with man, both its positive and affirmative aspect (interaction towards growth and excellence) and its negative aspect are considered (security aspect and ability to confront With otherness in military terms.)

By reviewing several definitions of civilization, it can be observed that civilization is both social and communicative, and also confirmed that it is concrete. Mirabeau I used the new term "civilization" to describe a society in which civil laws have replaced military laws (Quoted in: Mazlish, 2004: 14).

On this basis, a civilized society is a society in which civil laws, not military laws, are discussed to organize social life. Robert Cox, in strengthening this view, believes that the term civilization implies a growing civil process, that is, the equivalent of barbarism (Cox, 2002: 2).

On this basis, the higher the level of civilization, the further away that society is from barbarism. In other words, the effectiveness of civil society in promoting change depends on the degree of civil solidarity of that society. Cox, 2002: 16 (Alex de Tocqueville also believes that "among the laws that govern human societies, there is one law that is more precise and clear than all others, namely: in order for humans to become and remain civilized, the 'art of human association' must also grow in proportion to the increase in their level of equality" (quoted in Huntington, 1999: 11).

According to the previous definitions of civilization, it can be concluded that civilization is a society of ideas or ideas that generates and reproduces itself over time and space in order to meet the demands of historical progress. Answer. Therefore, any society that can reach a collective agreement based on a specific idea can be a civilization. This idea may give dominance to the material or the spiritual, but in either case, the formation of civilization requires a broad central idea.

B. The guiding idea of civilization

The concept of the guiding idea of civilization is another concept that is important in civilizational studies. The guiding idea of civilization is the discovery of the most important component of any civilization, which has been called by various names such as the focal element of civilization, the heart of civilization. Every civilization has a guiding idea and a driving engine that sets the civilization on the path to becoming a civilization.

Every civilization explains the guiding idea depending on the definition it gives of itself and others. Seyyed Hossein Nasr introduces the "guiding idea" as the "spirit" that creates civilization (Nasr, 2009: 9); that is, "every civilization has its own standard." The standard of Chinese civilization is different from the standard of Islamic civilization; just as the standard of European civilization is different from the standard of Indian civilization. In simpler terms, the standard of each civilization represents the identity card and DNA of that civilization. Moreover, the standard of civilization is a criterion for determining who is "uncivilized" and who is "civilized." "Uncivilized" in one civilization can be

considered "civilized" in another civilization and vice versa" (Mozaffari, 2002: 47). Attention to the guiding idea This means that the assessment of civilization should be based on the values of each of the societies under study and judgments should be based on the guiding idea within each civilization (O'hagan, 2007: 21). Generalizing a specific guiding idea to examine and assess civilizations leads to an incomplete understanding of civilizations.

C; Civilizational prestige sphere

The third concept that needs clarification is the concept of civilizational prestige sphere. Randall Collins (2007:132) believes that a civilization has one or more centers that determine the radius of influence of the civilization outside the civilization and refers to it as the civilizational prestige sphere and studies civilizations based on it.

These concepts and indicators provide us with the possibility of benefiting from the theory of civilization. Collins used the term "civilizational prestige sphere" to explain the power of civilization, and Peter J. Katzenstein also used the term "civilizational prestige sphere" (Collins, 2007: 132-147; Katzenstein, 2010: 151). Collins sees civilization as a realm of social prestige and connection. The meaning of the realm of civilizational prestige or the realm of civilizational prestige is the sphere of influence of civilization that is formed by relying on cultural power, because from Collins's perspective, civilization is a prestige that has one or more cultural centers. Therefore, civilization as a realm of prestige encompasses both social activity and cultural diversity (Collins, 2007: 133).

The realm of prestige of a civilization is the ability of a civilization to attract and attract its surroundings, and the greater the radius of this, the greater the power of the civilization. The sphere of civilizational credibility is placed on the elements that constitute the civilizational identity, such as language, religion, race, history, etc.; that is, everything that participates in the construction of a civilizational identity and, according to Davutoglu, creates strategic depth for a civilization.

In order to design a conceptual framework based on the above concepts, it is necessary to outline the logical relationships of the three concepts. Every civilization is shaped based on its guiding idea and competes with other civilizations through it.

The nature of this idea is very important in shaping the sphere of credibility. Every civilization expands based on its sphere of civilizational credibility, and the greater the cultural diversity and pluralism in a civilization, and the higher the degree of interdependence with the existence of this pluralism, the more civilization will be in the process of expansion.

Therefore, a close relationship will be formed in practice between the sphere of civilization credibility and the guiding idea of civilization. The guiding idea of civilization can cause an increase in the credibility of civilization or its weakness in relation to other civilizations.

If a civilization wants to emerge as an actor in the domestic or global arena and for its level of civilizational power to be comparable to other civilizations, it must have certain characteristics that can explain civilizational power. When civilization is used as a level of analysis in international relations, the analyst first tries to provide a definition of the nature of civilization and then, based on those, formulates two other concepts, namely the guiding idea of civilization and the sphere of civilizational validity, and finally interprets the level and type of

anti-civilizational activism in the context of the paranormal environment.

For example, Huntington considers the nature of Chinese or Islamic civilization as a fixed and static nature, without the possibility of interaction with the mundane environment, considers Confucius as its guiding idea for Chinese civilization and Islam with its orthodox reading, and then interprets its sphere of civilizational validity as based solely on military power.

As a result of the analysis, there will be a war between civilizations, and in the analytical section of the present study, these two approaches and the way in which their conceptual framework is applied will be mentioned in detail.

The Political Significance of Civilization and its Entry into the Science of International Relations

The beginning of the entry of civilization into political science and then international relations requires an initial consensus on the political significance of civilization. Although we have long witnessed attention to the category of "civilization" and "civilizations" in various parts of the social sciences - such as various works related to the history of civilization or Ibn Khaldun's analysis of how power circulates between barbarians and urban dwellers - in political science, this attention has been much less than in social sciences; because an important question has arisen in the field of civilization studies, namely, how its relationship with political science and its sub-categories can be formulated? And on what model can these studies be developed? Or, in better words, how can civilization studies be introduced as a new field in the field of political studies? This requires explaining the positions of civilization studies in relation to the views, models, and theories of this field.

Like other humanities, when political science witnesses a new phenomenon, two ends of the spectrum of supporters and opponents are formed in it. In the issue related to civilization studies and political science, we also witness that a group opposes the role of civilization in political studies, and some others consider the civilization model to be the solution to many existing problems in political science.

In their opinion, with the separation of political science from history, sociology, and philosophy, the term political science should be questioned. In this case, the entry of civilizational studies into political science will cause this separation to end and new analytical frameworks to emerge, because civilizational studies are an interconnected set of heterogeneous epistemological formats and different inputs (Saleh and Mahrous 2011:14, 15).

The second question in this context was: What is the distinguishing factor between political science specialists in general and international relations in particular, and other fields of the humanities, which do not study and research relations between civilizations? (Saleh and Mahrous 2011:15, 15).

The final answer to the lack of attention of the science of international relations to civilizational studies was that the science of international relations is basically known as an American science and most of the theoretical developments in this field are a function of scientific and political developments in the United States of America. This is also true in the case of civilizational studies in political science; that is, in order to reach the place of

civilization in the science of international relations, it is necessary to begin by analyzing civilization in the studies of international relations in the United States.

Patrick Jackson (2010:181-182) After presenting a report on the place of civilizational analysis in American international politics, he concludes that the category of civilization is one of the categories that is missing in American knowledge of international politics. Although the work of Samuel Huntington caused attention to be paid to the term civilization, this attention was paid more from the perspective of the public space than from the academic spaces of international relations.

Although civilizational analysis was very little developed in the knowledge of politics and international relations, the analysis The cognitive society compensated for this gap. In this approach, the authors, with a different look at the category of civilization, have presented a different reading of civilizational analysis that is also capable of applying the concept of civilization in the knowledge of international relations. While examining the theoretical position of the category of civilization in political science, he concludes that:

In principle, American knowledge of international relations has not paid attention to a category called civilization since its emergence in the twentieth century. For example, by examining the 99 years of activity (1906-2006) of the American Journal of Political Science, only one article with the word "civilization" in its title is observed. In the Quarterly Journal of World Politics, there is no article with the word civilization in its title from 1948 to 2005. (Ibid: 182)

Therefore, it is conceivable that the fundamental change occurred when international relations scholars, especially American scholars, reached a consensus on the existence of political implications for civilization. Of course, the lack of attention to the category of civilization is not unique to this word, and in general, such an approach has existed for most conceptual concepts. However, the term civilization is almost a part of the terminology that existed completely outside the studies of international politics until the late twentieth century.

However, unlike the science of international relations, more attention was paid to the category of civilization in the science of social sciences (Jackson, 2010: 181). However, in the field of international relations, the use of the level of civilizational analysis, such as in the social sciences, is limited.

This attention began in any case with Huntington and the theory of the clash of civilizations, and this trend continues, and has led to the fact that in the last two decades, political science and international relations have paid more attention to the concept of civilization (see: Cox, 2000: 217-224).

Among the most important civilizational works in this field, we can mention the book "The Twilight of the West" by Christopher Coker; the book "Theory and History in International Relations" by Donald Puchala. In the field of international relations, the most important theory that has addressed civilizational studies is the constructivist theory, and this theory can be considered the most important non-fundamentalist theory in international relations (Hall. & Jackson, 2007: 4) The third very important question is how to use civilization in political studies?

Ja Quintana and Hagan discuss civilization in international relations with the same concern and raise the question of how the semantic complexity of civilization shapes the way civilization is used in discussions and debates in the field of international

politics? Because this complexity has always influenced numerous interpretations of world politics.

For example, the term civilization has been used to denote social education, a tool for measuring social change, a criterion for international law, and also to distinguish European societies from other societies. He continues that one of the things that is usually done to get rid of the disadvantages of this complexity and to standardize civilizational studies in international relations is to distinguish between civilization and other concepts (O' Hagan, 2007: 15).

This distinction allows us to approach the concept explicitly. For example, we can consider civilization as an actor or a meta-actor that, with an element called civilizational identity, achieves the creation of a civilizational state in a civilizational area and determines a specific behavioral action for individuals, institutions, societies and states located in specific geographical areas. Martin Hall also confirms that in the field of international relations, civilizational analyses can show new paths towards the study of history and the history of international relations (Hall et al., 2007: 199).

Robert Cox also sees the need to pay attention to civilization in international studies as the category of globalization, which is in fact the conflict between homogenization by globalization and the preservation of identities by civilizations (Cox, 2002: 1).

Therefore, the first requirement for the entry of the concept of civilization into the discipline of international politics is to prove the political implication of civilization. After this stage, we can talk about its analytical applications. Since international relations theorists have seen the concept of civilization as a contributor to the construction of power, it has been analyzed as an effective indicator.

Whether civilization has political implications or not? Both opposing sides in the civilizational approach to analyzing international relations believe that civilization has political implications and consider this to be a given, and without this assumption, it would be impossible for civilization to enter political science and international relations.

The necessity of contextual theorizing is essential to move beyond the mainstream of theorizing in international relations, which is based on the American tradition, and it requires accepting the principle of contextual theorizing.

The dominant paradigm in the knowledge of international relations is American, and existing theories of international relations have been produced based on the needs of the United States and the extent of its power and influence on the international system, and other regions and countries need to develop alternative theories that suit their own needs. The necessity of using theory and theory-based processing in social sciences is assumed and analyses are based on theories, and basically analysis outside of theory does not have sufficient validity and is even criticized, although there is no single definition of theory in social sciences and each theoretical tendency offers its own definition of theory (Blakely, 2005:185). Despite this, the most important and useful application of theory is that it helps us to have a more accurate picture of reality so that we can explain, understand and interpret it well (Marsh and Stoker, 2005:43).

In other words, theory is a tool for discovering causal relationships between phenomena and expressing the type and nature of these relationships, as well as discovering problems and dilemmas in the

current situation based on the relationships between phenomena (explanation), and ultimately the process and results of these relationships, as well as providing solutions to reach the desired situation (theorizing and crisis resolution).

In the discussion of theory and theorizing, the most important question is what kind of theory can a good theory be? And in the field of international relations studies, what assumptions or requirements are there for the success of a theory in international relations? (Thomas, 2005: 69). Perhaps the most important characteristic of a good theory can be considered its suitability to the case; That is, the two factors of theory and practice in the analytical process must complement and reinforce each other, and there must be mutual consistency between them.

One of the most important reasons why efforts to establish new theories in international relations have grown in the last few decades is that previous and existing theories of international relations have obvious shortcomings, the most obvious of which is their inadequacy for analyzing the behavior of other countries in the international system.

This makes it inevitable to develop new theories and move beyond existing theories and towards theories such as religious theories, civilizational theories, or indigenous theories of international relations (Abd-e-Khodai, 2012). The main question is whether existing theories of international relations are compatible with all regions, fields, and contexts in the international system? In other words, can existing theories be used for the transformation of different parts of the world, such as the Islamic world, East Asia, Africa, and so on? These questions have led to criticism of previous theories of international relations for failing to observe and consider many of the elements and components that influence international relations.

This has led to the emergence of multi-integrated approaches and the emergence of normative theories that have vigorously criticized positivist approaches. Also, unlike the mainstream of international relations, which emphasized hard power, the middle school emphasized the need to prioritize soft power in international relations (Thomas, 2005: 69).

Therefore, attention to the context of being central in civilizational theories is a prerequisite, and the theory of civilizational process must pay attention to the ecology of the theory. In this case, one can hope for the effectiveness of civilizational theory. Both approaches to civilizational studies in international relations, that is, both the approach of those who consider civilization as a state and the group that considers civilization as a process, emphasize the existence of a different analytical stream based on civilization; that is, both groups acknowledge the context-centeredness of theorizing in international relations, and both groups also agree on the ability of the concept of civilization to shape this context.

The Necessity of Using Civilization as a Level of Analysis

The third layer of the discussion of the formulation of the movement towards a civilizational theory is "the use of civilization as a level of analysis". In this topic, it is necessary to first point out the advantages of using civilization as a level of analysis. Then, the relationship between the metatheoretical foundations related to the concept of civilization, which is the turning point of the distinction between the two spectrums, originates from these foundations, and

then the relationship between the level of analysis and the civilizational theory of international relations should be mentioned.

A; The benefits of using civilization as a level of analysis

The use of the civilizational level of analysis is common in the social sciences due to its realist power (Hall et al.2007: 4). On the one hand, the civilizational perspective is a comprehensive and comprehensive perspective; that is, social changes are studied and researched on a large scale and in relation to other areas, and single-factor research is avoided. Also, the civilizational perspective is a perspective through which the effectiveness of thought systems occurs (a group of authors,2009:11), and this provides the opportunity to distinguish civilizational changes and their forms from each other (Koneczny, 1962: 317).

Adopting the level of analysis returns to the metatheoretical foundations - epistemology, ontology, methodology. At this stage, in the first step, we must answer ontological questions. Questions that enable us to know and understand the phenomenon. In ontological studies, the first question is: What is civilization?

That is, the question of what and the nature of civilization is a fundamental question. The nature of civilization can guide us to understand the fundamental difference between the "civilized" and the "uncivilized". Each theorist, with the definition of civilization it offers, takes the first step towards its own view of civilization and the issues it faces.

The second ontological question is: What components contribute to the formation of a civilization, and what are the most important components in building a civilization, and what differences will these components have in different civilizational areas, despite their similarities?

For example, if factors such as economy, culture, religion, morality, race, and language are involved in building a civilization, which factor can be the focal point and driving force for building a civilization, as well as the criterion for comparing or superiorizing that civilization to another civilization, or a criterion for distinguishing civilized from barbarism? In this article, the term guiding idea or leading idea (Seyed Hussein Nasr, 2009) is used to explain it.

The choice of any of the aforementioned factors as the guiding idea of civilization has its own consequences. For example, as John Esposito acknowledges, neither development theories nor international relations theories consider religion as an important variable for political analysis; because international relations theories assume that religion has been privatized in the process of creating modern government and, therefore, has been removed from the realm of power and authority in modern societies (Esposito, 1992: 200). Therefore, if religion, culture, and ethics are considered as a component of civilization, they should be considered in foreign and international policy studies, as both Huntington and his critical and rival movement have addressed.

The third ontological question concerns the nature of the structure of civilization and asks how a civilization is constructed. Should civilization be considered as something object-like, objective, and a state that is interpreted in an essentialist approach, or can civilization be considered as a process (post-essentialist approach) and a process that is constantly in the process of becoming?) (Hall et al.,: 2007)

On the other hand, can we provide a criterion for measuring the extent and possibility of survival or the cause of the return of a civilization in the event of destruction by an external force, or in other words, measuring the power of a civilization in the field of practice? In other words, how can we theorize about measuring the power of a civilization and in this capacity, what components and elements should be paid attention to?

B; Comparing the Different Ontologies of the Two Approaches

The two approaches and two spectrums of civilizational studies of international relations are completely separated from each other in the ontological discussion. In this section, a comparison is made between the situation-based and object-oriented approach of considering civilization with the approach of civilization as a situation. In other words, Huntington's approach and the approach of its opposing group are discussed:

B 1, Huntington's view of civilization

The first approach considers civilization as a realized and object-oriented thing, which is interpreted as the substantialist approach. In this approach, each civilization has an essence and substance and, as a result, has fixed characteristics that are static and unchangeable. (Hobson, 2007: 15) In this approach, civilization is a completely coherent and integrated cultural program that is organized around its central values in a hierarchical manner, which means providing a single criterion for each of the civilizations (Katzenstein, 2010: 1-2).

The most prominent example of the essentialist or essentialist approach, or better said, the fundamentalist approach, can be seen in the writings of Samuel Huntington and Fukuyama (Hall et al. 2007: 1-2). This approach divides the world into civilizational cocoons and, by treating civilizations as large aggregates, gives them their own unique personality (Karamustafa, 2003: 106), which is reminiscent of the Eurocentric (Western) approach.

This perspective forms the "Western self" that always considers itself superior to the "other" (Hobson, 2007: 150); because in this approach, civilization is a state in which Westerners are; returning to the previous state is also impossible and it is not clear that non-Europeans can also enter this state, therefore, the connection and interaction between those who are in this state and those who are outside this state seems very vague and unprovable.

Therefore, civilizations have fundamental differences that are rooted in the state in which they are located, and this is an obstacle to interaction and the source of permanent hostility between them, and as a result, basically there is no talk of peaceful relations and dialogue between civilizations. It means, and in this case, the first principle between them is war.

This situation exists both within civilizations and outside; that is, this war is within civilization that also extends to the external environment. Perhaps this European approach to civilization was formed because Western civilization is considered one of the most warlike civilizations.

We do not mean the numerous, bloody, and terrible external wars associated with Western colonialism and imperialism, but rather we mean internal wars such as the Hundred Years' War and the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), the Napoleonic Wars, World War I, and World War II.

Similarly, Greek civilization also experienced numerous wars; for example, wars related to the southern Greek peninsula between the Athenians and the Spartans, and wars among the Athenians themselves. Likewise, the powerful Roman Empire could not escape the fate of disintegration and the emergence of the Byzantine Empire as a new rival (Mozaffari, 2002: 28). Therefore, the fruit of the essentialist approach has been the constant conflict between civilizations and the victory of one civilization over the others, and it is not the case that civilizations can have civilizational definitions alongside each other, because each civilization has a specific civilizational identity and these identities are othering, and in this discursive analysis, it is placed against the other, not next to the other. This fundamentalism has its own specific indicators in each of the civilizational models. For example, in Western civilization, the separation between tradition and modernity, and the separation between the private sphere of religious beliefs and the secular and social realm, are considered to be the main characteristics of fundamentalism (Pasha, 2008: 67).

In this approach, which is based on historicism, civilizations are considered pre-social entities, and the result of the analysis is clear from the beginning. Historicism affirms Western superiority by promoting the idea that non-Westerners are imperfect, and hegemony is a project to establish leadership in a process called civilizing others, freeing non-Westerners from their imperfections (Pasha, 2008: 69).

In this approach, civilization is used in its plural form, i.e. civilizations. In this approach, civilization is a way of determining interests, identities, and benefits, and is therefore considered a criterion for distinguishing societies. In fact, in this approach, civilization is a container on the basis of which its contents are interpreted (O'Hagan, 2007: 16-17).

In this approach, the contexts of the emergence of a civilization are also ignored. For example, the proposition that Western civilization is indebted to Easterners can hardly be criticized, but Westerners insinuate that they could have reached this position without the help of Eastern civilization. This is what caused Westerners to introduce Easterners with the nickname "savage other". This view is based on Eurocentrism, according to which the West is the only model of world civilization, and this is unique to the West and has not been influenced by other civilizations (Hobson, 2007: 151).

This is a view that Western civilization has highlighted today, and in fact, as in Mirabeau I's definition and Simon Marden's explanation of the West's view of past civilizations, which is known as the European concept of civilization, the possibility of communication between civilizations, the transfer of cultural concepts, and discussions related to political development is not possible; because civilizational thinking in the West considers the phenomenon of modernization to be a product of the exceptionality of Europe; that is, it was a phenomenon specific to the West and Western civilization, and it is the original version with which other cultures can be compared.

Mustafa Pasha argues that cultural fundamentalism outside the West brings with it colonialism, and the spread of a negative image of Islam and Muslims is not separate from this project. The symbolic and material power of the West promotes a specific version of Islamic civilization (Pasha, 2008: 62-66).

This view divides the world into two parts: the civilized West and the barbarian East, and in the most optimistic case, it sees the world as a "more civilized" and "civilized" world, and therefore,

attempts are made to use the means of colonialism to push other nations towards Europeanization. In this definition of civilization, the positioning of one against another is such that there is never any possibility of interaction between the two (cf. Merden,2004: 1026- 1027; Hobson, 2007:16-17)

and the relations are regulated in a linear manner. This colonization is carried out from various dimensions, which apart from economic and political issues, can also be observed in areas such as international law. In this area, international law is based on a series of colonial roots that led to the development of European civilization and its classical civilizational standards. This situation has also been implemented in projects titled progress and peace in the non-Western world, but in reality globalization was the European measure of civilization (Bowden, 2004)

In the words of the Great Gang, the confrontation that occurred as a result of European expansion into the non-European world in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was not merely a political and economic confrontation, and certainly not only a military one.

It was essentially a confrontation of civilizations with their own cultural systems. At the heart of this nineteenth-century clash were the criteria of civilization by which they identified other civilizations different from themselves and regulated their international relations.

In the nineteenth century, activities that were generally acceptable to civilized European countries were also accepted by the international system centered in Europe. As a result, as this international system expanded, these activities also acquired an increasingly global nature and their own legal nature. The civilizational criterion that defined the international community of the nineteenth century provided a seemingly legitimate way both to define the boundaries of "civilized" societies and to distinguish between "civilized", "barbarian" and "savage" countries in the international arena (Gong, 2002: 79).

In this approach, the world civilizational system is depicted as a hierarchy, entailing a kind of hierarchical order, in which civilizations interact longitudinally and in some way carrying with it the concept of subordination to the superior. In other words, how we talk about civilization matters; For there is not just one type of civilizational discourse, but rather a variety of forms. This does not mean, of course, that there is no model for them, but that different types of civilizations can be examined in different ways (Best, 2007: 181).

Ahmad Qara Mostafa mentions this approach to the silkworm cocoon theory. What makes the silkworm cocoon theory popular is the temptation to think of civilizations not only as natural entities, but more specifically as biological entities full of life and purpose. The naturalization of the concept of civilization does not stop at the idea that civilizations resemble natural entities: since civilization has a beginning and an end and is subject to growth and decay, it can naturally be assumed that civilization must be alive and that it must function like any living organism. This is another misconception about civilization that needs to be cleared up and interpreted as a characteristic of civilization (Karamustafa, 2003: 103).

B 2; Process Approach to Civilization

The process approach considers civilization as something in the process of becoming or as a relationship. In this approach, civilization is considered as a set of social activities that are constantly changing and not fixed (Hobson, 2007: 150). This approach, like the first approach, also considers civilizations to have independent natures, but their boundaries are not in a way that makes a complete distinction between them. Therefore, regardless of the fact that civilizations have different natures, to explain this approach, one must ask how and where can their boundaries be drawn? In the first step, it must be said whether they have any boundaries at all? (Karamustafa, 2003: 103).

In this approach, civilization is not a single criterion with a strict moral hierarchy, but rather a category that contains within itself numerous and diverse elements that interact with each other. In this view, civilization is dynamic, not static. At least in this approach, the first principle about civilizations is their dynamism, and staticity is a special and exceptional situation (Hall et al.,0 2007: 8 0). In other words, civilizations are complex and pluralistic entities that encompass a range of possibilities that are expandable (Melleuish, 2004: 235).

Peter J. Katzenstein (2010:18) believes that civilization is not a state, but a process that arises from human action. Therefore, those who consider themselves civilized today were uncivilized in the past and there is a possibility and risk that they will become uncivilized in the future, and it is not the case that being civilized is a fixed, static, permanent and unattainable state for some. The sum of these actions of human society in the process of civilization is Americanization, Chineseization.

It is from human behavior that the production and reproduction of civilization occurs. This occurs through the production and reproduction of behavioral and symbolic boundaries. In today's world, this civilizational process takes place within the discourse of modernity. Trans-civilizational connections and intra-civilizational confrontations can be observed in the civilizational process and in terms of different and diverse actions.

Rendon Collins, (2007:133) () believes that civilizations are not static, but rather active and dynamic; because around them, places are created that possess social values at the highest level of their influence. Therefore, civilization is not just something static and unchanging, but there is the possibility of change and transformation in it. Bruce Mazlish says about the process of civilization: "The truth is that civilization is an act, a movement, or a process, and it is necessarily always changing" (Mazlish, 2004:15).

Robert W. Cox also believes that civilizations should be understood as a process, not as fixed entities with limited and specific boundaries (Cox, 2000: 229). In this view, civilization is similar to terms such as society and nation, rather than a term such as politics, which can be operationalized as a state. Viewing civilization as an ongoing, evolving category provides a better understanding of it. Thus, civilizations can be said to be ongoing processes through which boundaries are continually produced and reproduced. These processes are necessarily power-oriented and, therefore, must be analyzed in the appropriate social context (Hall et al. 2007: 8). Edward Said (2001) uses the expression "the clash of ignorance" in a beautiful and literary way, as a critique and refutation of Samuel Huntington, because he believes that the partial character of civilization under concepts such as the West, Islam, causes us to gain a wrong perception of civilizations, the West, and Islam, and it is from within this ignorance that we will present a different version of the type of relationship between civilizations. In other words, contrary to the popular idea that civilizations have protective shells around them that protect their core, a close examination of each civilization shows that

civilizations have permeable zones instead of solid and interconnected boundaries.

Civilizations are independent entities; but comprehensive and impenetrable units They are not, and their stories are often completely interconnected and even incomprehensible when told in isolation, that is, apart from the stories of other civilizations.

What makes the cocoon theory so popular is the temptation to think of civilizations not just as natural entities but, more specifically, as biological entities full of life and purpose. The naturalization of the concept of civilization does not stop at the idea that civilizations resemble natural entities. Since civilization has a beginning and an end and is subject to growth and decay, it is natural to assume that It is said that civilization must be alive and that it must act like any living organism. This is another misconception about civilization that must be cleared and interpreted as a partial personality of civilization (Karamustafa, 2003: 103).

As a result, it is very natural that in a civilized arena, we witness uncivilized behavior, and vice versa, in an uncivilized arena, we witness examples of civilized behavior, and ultimately it is these behaviors that reveal civilization and barbarism. These behaviors also exist in international relations. Appropriate behaviors (interactions and convergence) are part of that civilization, and inhumane encounters and behaviors are a symbol of barbarism (ignorance) (Salter, 2002).

Paying attention to the floating or non-static view of the concept of civilization in this approach allows it to provide a more realistic interpretation of civilization. The existence of a full-fledged debate in the field of ontology leads us to face two completely different levels of analysis. The different outcomes and outputs of these two levels of analysis are evident in the field of foreign policy and the confrontation of governments with the international system, as well as situations such as globalization.

Conclusion

This study attempted to present a clear formulation of the debates that have taken shape under the concept of civilization in the science of international relations. The debates related to civilization in international relations initially began with two different approaches. Then the debate was extended to the ontological field, and the two approaches, while utilizing civilization as a level of analysis, reached different analytical outputs.

One approach ultimately portrays the international system as a hierarchy and attempts to place civilization in a winning longitudinal structure of the field of conflict. What both approaches have in common is that civilization is accompanied by political implications, and both approaches also emphasize the need for international relations theory to be context-oriented and to move beyond previous theories at the micro level of analysis (agent-centered theories) and the macro level of analysis (system theory). However, ultimately, the two approaches are distinguished from each other in terms of the image of the external world and its constituent elements and take two different paths. Given that the process approach to civilization adopts a positive and flexible analytical mechanism, it seems to have a high potential for establishing a civilizational theory in international relations.

A civilizational theory begins by adopting civilization as a level of analysis, but it does not necessarily involve the analysis and

interpretation of international politics. Internationalism in its broad sense, i.e., the analysis of relations in the entire world; that is, contrary to Huntington's view, civilizational theory will have useful applications for specific regions or specific actors.

References

1. P. Jackson (Eds.), Civilizational Identity: The Production and Reproduction of 'Civilizations', In: International Relations, Culture and Religion, Palgrave Macmillan.
2. A group of authors (2009), Theoretical Essays on Civilization, Qom: Published by the Research Institute of Islamic Sciences and Culture.
3. Abd-Khodai, Mojtaba (2012), Introduction to the Theory of International Relations, published by the Quarterly Journal of Foreign Relations, No. 16, pp. 235-276.
4. Blakey, Norman (2005), Designing Social Research, translated by Hassan Chavushian, published by Tehran: Ney Publishing House.
5. Bowden Brett (2005), "the Colonial Origins of International Law. European Expansion and the Classical Standard of Civilization", Journal of the History of International Law 7: 1–23.
6. Bowden, B. (2004), "In the Name of Progress and Peace: The "Standard of – Civilization" and the Universalizing Project", Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 43-68.
7. Collins, R. (2007), "Civilizations as Zones of Prestige and Social Contact", In: Saïd – Amir Arjomand and Edward A. Tiryakian, Rethinking Civilizational Analysis, Sage Publications.
8. Cox, R.W (2002), Civilizations and the Twenty-First Century: Some Theoretical – Considerations, In: Mehdi Mozaffari (ed.), Globalization and Civilizations, Routledge.
9. Cox, R.W. (2000), "Thinking about civilizations", Review of International Studies, – 26, pp.217–234 .
10. Esposito John L., (1992), The Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality? New York: Oxford University Press, 2nd Ed.
11. Gong, G.W. (2002), Standards of civilization today, In: Mehdi Mozaffari, Globalization and Civilizations, Routledge, pp77 -97.
12. Hall, M. & Jackson, P. (Eds.) (2007), Civilizational Identity: The Production and Reproduction of "Civilizations," In: International Relations, Palgrave Macmillan.
13. Hobson, J.M. (2007), "Deconstructing The Eurocentric Clash of Civilizations: De- Westernizing the West by Acknowledging the Dialogue of Civilizations," In: M. Hall
14. Huntington, Samuel (2009), The Clash of Civilizations and the Reconstruction of World Order, translated by Mohammad Ali Hamid Rafiei, Publisher. Tehran: Cultural Research Office.
15. Jackson, P. (2010), "How to Think about Civilizations?" In: Civilizations in World Politics: Plural and Pluralist Perspectives, Routledge.
16. KaraMustafa, A. (2003) "Islam: a civiliational project in progress", In: Progressive Muslims—Defining and Delineating Identities and Ways of Being a Muslim, Omid Safi (ed.), Oxford: One world Publications,98-110 .

17. Katzenstein, P.J. (2010), Civilizations in World Politics: Plural and Pluralist Perspectives, Routledge.

18. Koneczny, F. (1962), On the Plurality of the Civilizations, London: Polonica Publications.

19. Marden, Simon (2004), "Culture in World Affairs," in: The Globalization of Politics: International Relations in the Modern International Era, Vol. 2, translated by a group of translators, Tehran: Abrar Moaser.

20. Marsh, David; Stoker, Jerry (2009), Method and Theory in Political Science, translated by Amir Mohammad Haj Yoosefi, 5th edition, Tehran: Publisher. Strategic Studies Research Institute.

21. Mazlish, Bruce (2004), Civilization in a Historical and Global Perspective, in: Saïd Amir Arjomand and Edward A. Tiryakian (Eds.), Rethinking Civilizational Analysis, SAGE Publications.

22. Melleuish, G. (2004), "The Clash of Civilizations: A Model of Historical Development?", In: Rethinking Civilizational Analysis, Edited by Saïd Amir Arjomand & Edward A. Tiryakian, SAGE Publications.

23. Mozaffari, M. (2002), "Globalization, civilizations and world order: a world- constructivist approach", in: Mehdi, Mozaffari (Ed.), Globalization and Civilizations, Routledge

24. Nasr, S.H. (2009), "Civilizational Dialogue and the Islamic World," In: Al-Idrus Mohamed Ajmal Bin Abdul Razak (Ed.), Islam Hadhari: Bridging Tradition and Modernity, Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization (ISTAC).

25. Nowrozi Firouz, Rasul (2015), Civilization as a Surface of Analysis, Publisher. Quarterly Criticism and Opinion, Year, Issue 20, 80 pp. 101-131.

26. O'Hagan, J. (2007), "Discourses of Civilization Identity," In: M. Hall & P. Jackson (Ed.), Civilizational Identity: The Production and Reproduction of 'Civilizations' in International Relations (Culture and Religion), Palgrave Macmillan.

27. P. Jackson & Best, J. (2007), Discussion: The Politics of Civilizational Talk, In: M. Hall – (Eds.), Civilizational Identity: The Production and Reproduction of 'Civilizations' in International Relations (Culture and Religion), Palgrave Macmillan

28. Pasha, M.K. (2008), "Civilizations, Postorientalism and Islam," In: M. Hall & P. Jackson (Eds.), Civilizational Identity: The Production and Reproduction of 'Civilizations' in International Relations (Culture and Religion), Palgrave Macmillan.

29. Said Edward W. (2001) "The Clash of Ignorance, available", at: www.thenation. com/article/clash-ignorance/October 22.

30. Saleh, Amani; Mahrous, Abdul-Khabir Ata (2011), International Relations: A Religious and Civilizational Approach, translated by Vahid Moradi, published by Tehran, Imam Sadegh University (AS).

31. Salter, M.B. (2002), Barbarians and Civilization in International Relations, London, Pluto Press.

32. Thomas, S. (2005), The Global Resurgence of Religion and the Transformation of International Relations: The Struggle for the Soul of the Twenty-first Century, Reviewed by G. John Ikenberry, Palgrave Macmillan.