



10-1-2012

Modernization or Westernization: the Muslim World vs. The Rest

Laina Farhat-Holzman
lfarhat102@aol.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr>

Recommended Citation

Farhat-Holzman, Laina (2012) "Modernization or Westernization: the Muslim World vs. The Rest," *Comparative Civilizations Review*: Vol. 67 : No. 67 , Article 7.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr/vol67/iss67/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the All Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Comparative Civilizations Review* by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Modernization or Westernization: the Muslim World vs. The Rest

Laina Farhat-Holzman

Lfarhat102@aol.com

The 20th century has been a time of rapid transformation, a continuation of a process begun in the West with the Scientific Revolution, Industrial Revolution, Religious Revolution, and Political Revolution. Other once-powerful empires, such as China, India, Ottoman Turkey, and Safavid Persia, had fallen into decline, while the West burgeoned.

By the dawn of the 20th century, the states in decline all became aware of their condition and the danger it posed to them. All have experimented with various aspects of modernization: modernizing monarchies, dictatorships, Marxism, and Fascism. Some have modernized without democracy—such as China and Singapore. The majority of Muslim states, however, have not succeeded even in economic development, which their Asian counterparts have. At this time, without the cushion of an oil economy, these Muslim societies appear headed for dysfunctional, if not failed states. The direst of these is Yemen, which is not only chaotic and dysfunctional but is also facing a population explosion accompanied by severe lack of water.

In this paper, I propose to explore the avenues selected by modernizing countries and explore why some have been successful while other choices have failed to bring these societies into the world system. Westernization (the world system) cannot happen without modernization preceding it.

Defining the Terms

Modernization has been a global process that we can observe in most of the major cities of the world, regardless of culture. Samuel Huntington says: “Modernization involves industrialization, urbanization, increasing levels of literacy, education, wealth, and social mobilization, and more complex and diversified occupational structures. These common elements may be present, even though the institutions that created them are not. Modernization can be borrowed or bought.” But to create and sustain it, one must look to Westernization, “which created the tremendous expansion of scientific and engineering knowledge beginning in the eighteenth century that made it possible for humans to control and shape their environment in totally unprecedented ways.” [Huntington, p. 68]

Most Muslim-majority countries have automobiles, skyscrapers, television, airlines, and young people dressed in blue jeans, bopping to the latest hip-hop or other commercial Western music. But while listening to Western pop music on their earphones, they may also be listening to a fiery *Jihadi* sermon that will persuade them to volunteer as a suicide bomber. They are modern, but not Western.

Furthermore, what one sees in the big cities may not be what we would find in the countryside or in the millions of villages in what we still call “the lesser developed world.” They are neither modern nor Western. A perfect example of this situation, of course, is Afghanistan, a model of unending misery. Kabul and Herat are seemingly modern cities, but the rest of Afghanistan is trapped in the very feudal dark ages.

Westernization is an entire complex of practices and values that have shaped the West over the 2,500 years from ancient Athens to today. These practices cannot be replicated overnight. Modernization may be seen as a civilization that emerged because of Westernization; however, a country may be modernized without being Westernized.

Toby E. Huff notes that the Scientific Revolution did not take root in any of the other great civilizations of the 17th century (Ottoman, Moghul, Persian, or Chinese). This revolution was exclusively the product of our Classical legacy, Roman law, Latin language, and Christianity (church law and a system of contracts). [Huff, p. 3]

Huntington adds the importance of rule of law, law that also constrains the exercise of arbitrary power of rulers. Social pluralism is also the product of Europe’s particular geography, which has always provided for rival power centers, unlike the great empires of Asia. Representative bodies (parliaments), individualism and a certain restlessness and curiosity distinguishes the descendants of the Indo-European peoples. [see Jared Diamond, *Guns, Germs, and Steel*; Ricardo Duchesne *The Uniqueness of Western Civilization*; and the work of a geographer, Barry Cunliffe, *Europe Between the Oceans, 9000 BC-AD 1000*.]

That modernization can exist without Westernization, unfortunately, is not recognized by many Western leaders who press countries aspiring to modernity to hold elections. This is the fruit of Woodrow Wilson’s “Democracy Project,” begun at the end of World War I with its collapse of empires. It was reinstated by the US after World War II and, once again, upon the collapse of the USSR. We are happy to see people voting, which the poor of the world are eager to do because they have never before had choices over anything. However, the choices they have made are not always encouraging.

Democracy in the West is not just voting. It includes institutions that must accompany participatory governance:

- More than 50% literacy, including women;
- Universal education, with broad training in critical thinking;
- Separation and balance of powers within the government;
- Independent courts;
- Military under the jurisdiction of the civilian government;
- Independent press;
- Independent judiciary;
- Rule of law;
- Protection of minorities from majority tyranny;
- Separation of religion and governance (no established church), which when united always results in tyranny;
- Concept of private property (the state cannot own everything).

The absence of any of these institutions endangers the continuity of a democracy.

The Relationship Between Modernization and Westernization

The West evolved from modernization to Westernization (democratic institutions) gradually. The 17th century scientific revolution led the way, but underlying that revolution were time-honored cultural practices that were our heritage from ancient Greece (critical thinking) and Rome (rule of law), as well as certain religious values that mandated that even kings could not violate certain human rights. The medieval period also established the Western principle of contract law: rights of the church, the state, cities, and universities. [Huff, p. 166.]

Western participatory governance did not happen overnight, nor did it come out of a vacuum. We forget this when we expect newly-emancipated feudal states to modernize and Westernize with the flick of a vote.

Different Models of Modernizing

It is instructive to track several countries that were recipients of independence at the end of World War II. India and Pakistan received their emancipation from the British Empire in 1947, as did Israel, as half of the British Palestinian Mandate established after World War I, in 1948. The United Nations offered independence to what were to be two nations in the former Palestinian Mandate: a Jewish state, Israel; and an Arab state, Palestine. The Palestinians rejected the offer and, along with all neighboring Arab states, attempted to stamp out the Jewish state in its infancy. They lost, and have not yet become the modern state they once aspired to becoming, whereas Israel, despite constant attacks from their neighbors, has become a vibrant democratic and economically thriving modern state. [For a detailed history and statistics, see Haim Harari: *A View From the Eye of the Storm, Terror and Reason in the Middle East*,

Regan Books, 2005, p. 186.]

It should be no surprise that India fragmented further, considering the scope of the underlying sectarian hatreds that burst full bloom when the colonial power was gone. India lost a large Muslim population upon the birth of Pakistan, followed by a horrific ethnic cleansing in northern India in which mobs attacked each other as they attempted to flee the Muslim- and Hindu-majority areas. Pakistan, with Muslim populations in the northeast and northwest of India, emerged as a country divided into two parts, west and east, separated by thousands of miles. Although both parts were Muslim, they differed culturally, historically, (and geographically). Within a few years, East Pakistan, much abused by West Pakistan, fought a war of independence that they won only because India intervened on their side. Now East Pakistan is Bangladesh.

India, which stumbled along for nearly 50 years with a socialist-based and often dysfunctional government, changed upon the collapse of the USSR (its patron) and is now producing a vibrant and relatively democratic society, at least in half of its country. The other half is still largely feudal, miserable, prone to violence, and lacking even modern sewage or water systems. It is slowly changing, but far from entering either modernity or Westernization yet.

Pakistan was founded by a secular Muslim politician who intended it to be, perhaps like Israel, a home for a population of Muslim descent (religious or not), whom he feared would be persecuted under Hindu rule. The country was designed with some Western institutions, but it did not take long before militant Islam managed to exert enough influence (with threats and violent acts) to hamper Westernization. The country has enough modernization to have produced nuclear weapons, but the rest of the institutions that go with Westernization are constantly under fire. Pakistan is not thriving.

The Far East has done better. Korea secured its independence from Japan's Imperial Empire, Malaysia was freed from British control, Singapore from Malaysian control, and Indonesia from Dutch control.

Singapore, a city-state with a majority Chinese population, fought for independence from Malaysia because they knew what would happen if they did not. Malaysia is Muslim, and although dependent upon the talents of their Chinese citizens, when things go wrong, the Chinese population has no protection from persecution and victimization.

Singapore has become an amazing model of prosperity, literacy, modernization, gender equality, and thriving capitalism without the checks and balances of a Western modern democracy. It has benefited instead from one of those rarest of institutions (dreamed of since Ancient Athens), a "philosopher king," Lee Kwan Yu (not a king, but a most enlightened autocrat).

Indonesia went through the predictable process from decolonization to military dictatorship, and ultimately, to a modern and seemingly democratic state. Its progress toward increasing democratization is now being threatened by a well-funded Islamist resurgence, which has already challenged the legitimate government. If Indonesia goes the way of Malaysia, with increasing Islamist pressure, it will face the same future as that of all the other Muslim states that have grown more pious since the 1990s.

The newly emancipated Korea was one of the early victims of the Cold War. The country split along the fault lines of Communism and the West, with Russia and China dominating the North and the United States the South. These fault lines created a contradictory cultural transformation. North Korea, which under Japan's rule, was the industrial economy and South Korea, which was the agricultural sector, reversed roles in their subsequent development. North Korea now is no longer an industrial power, except for managing to produce nuclear weapons. Other than that, its population starves and produces nothing that anybody wants. From satellite views, South Korea is a sea of light and the North lies in almost total darkness at night.

South Korea, which suffered major destruction during the Korean War, is now a major industrial and commercial power and still grows enough food for its population. For much of the time since their freedom, they were run by a military dictatorship that eventually yielded power when the population became largely middle class and educated.

China is one of the best examples of modernization without Westernization, but we have already seen much Western ideology (human rights and local self-determination) beginning to play a larger role as China has become a global player. China, under Mao's Marxist dictatorship, rejected these Western notions and instead tried another model to jumpstart a very backward society---ruthless repression and ill-considered anarchy (the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution). Until China opened itself to the world once more, it failed to thrive. Today, this country is a very different and much more hopeful place, and these changes will probably continue.

Why the Rest and Not Islam?

Bernard Lewis famously asked *What Went Wrong?* In his book of this title, he explored what happened to the Muslim world that seemed once so advanced and is now exhibiting failure to thrive. Is it feudalism and authoritarianism that is the problem? It cannot be, since other feudal and authoritarian states from China and Japan to Korea and Taiwan have become successfully modernized and if not already Westernized, are moving in that direction. Why not Muslim states?

A recent paper by Eric Chaney, an economics professor, has offered what I think is the underlying problem that goes beyond being Arab, Muslim, Turk, or Pakistani. He makes an effective case that the Arab conquests belt (from Spain to the gates of China) is

responsible for the Muslim democratic deficit. Every country conquered by Arab Islam is on the list of those most deficient in democratic self-rule. (See “Democratic Change in the Arab World, Past and Present,” by Eric Chaney, prepared for the Brookings Panel on Economic Activity, March 2012.)

Even those regions that never converted to Islam but which lived under its rule for a prolonged period (Sicily, southern Italy, eastern Europe, Spain, and Portugal) have had great difficulties with decent governance. They are also doing the most poorly in sustainable economic development. These same regions have, until recently, been the most repressive toward women and some have been afflicted with ethnic violence (the former Yugoslavia), probably the legacy of Arab imperialism.

Two non-Arab Muslim societies, Turkey and Iran, had the good luck to have modernizing dictatorships that attempted also to Westernize. But today, one of them, Iran, lives under a strangling theocracy that frowns on even the most modest elements of Westernization. They hold make-believe elections, but these have become increasingly fraudulent as the leaderships clings to power well beyond its expiration date. Unfortunately, Iran’s secular population is outnumbered at the polls by the masses of villagers still living in medieval Islamic feudalism.

Turkey changed from being the tyrannical Ottoman Empire (after losing World War I) into a modern authoritarian but relatively democratizing country. Half of the country modernized and adapted many elements of Western governance (a relatively free press, relative gender equality, universal education, and secularization); but eastern Turkey was largely left out of this process, much as the rural areas of Iran. Now the pressure of European idealists to reshape Turkey’s rather autocratic governance into a Western liberal model has opened the door for an unexpected element: a religious prime minister who is patiently re-Islamizing what was a secular state. They are economically thriving at the moment, but that may not last.

The Bad Fairy Invited to the Party

Throughout the Muslim world, and in all Muslim-majority countries, secularism is being stamped out by a return to religiosity. Even in the 1990s, Samuel Huntington noted that within that decade, all Muslim-majority countries had grown more Islamist and hostile to Westernization. This has been particularly noticeable in Turkey and Egypt, and by force in Iran.

The West is partly to blame for this because of the Cold War. We knew that organized religions were hostile to Marxist ideology and encouraged this sector, rejecting the socialist-leaning young students and intellectuals. Unfortunately, when the enemy of your enemy is your friend, you sometimes find yourselves with a future enemy. We have done just this.

What makes Islamism the enemy of Westernization? And even more important, what makes the combination of Islamism and Muslim feudalism more impervious to the changes required to genuinely modernize and Westernize than that of non-Muslim autocratic societies?

- **Rule of Law.** Secular law in countries emerging from feudalism has failed to function in transparency and with even the pretense of justice. Citizens of Muslim-majority countries know that the secular legal system is corrupt, and that money, not justice, determines the outcome. For simple village people, Sharia law seems much easier to understand and enforce. Theft is punished by amputation; female adultery or lack of chastity by stoning; and irreligious criticism of Islam or conversion to another religion by beheading. In addition to Sharia law is tribal law, in which a runaway wife is pursued and executed; where husbands may beat disobedient wives and daughters, and may kill womenfolk who bring "shame" to their families. Ordinary people prefer it to modern jurisprudence.
- **Work Ethic.** One of the most troubling differences between Asian non-Muslim countries and Muslim-majority countries involves the work ethic. Asian women, with the exception of the once bound-foot upper-class ladies in China, have always been expected to work—whether in the fields or in industry. And certainly since the advent of communism, girls have been educated as much as boys.

In the Muslim world, women have been sequestered, generally kept from education, enjoying almost no human rights. The exception to these customs in Muslim oil economies is that women are getting some education, and in Saudi Arabia, some work in gender-segregated enterprises. But in all Muslim-majority countries, women have been *de facto* property. There is as much reluctance among men to lose this control as there once was in the American south to lose the institution of slavery. Their main disdain for Westernization is the status of women, which is always a hot-button issue.

Max Weber in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* noted difference in work ethic between European Protestants and Catholics. Catholic societies appeared to believe that work was a necessary evil, to be borne by the lower classes with patience, and only relieved by numerous saints days and feast days for pleasure. In aristocratic medieval Europe, this view prevailed, with the exception of Catholic monks and nuns who worshipped God through works.

Protestants, however, particularly the Puritans who influenced the beginnings of America, considered doing work part of worship. This is today the predominant view in Western capitalism and those who model their economies after ours (including today's China). The only resistance to this belief arose out of Marxism, not in philosophy, but in practice. The much-repeated joke: "We pretend to work and they pretend to pay us" is too often not a joke in those countries in which socialized systems predominate.

Muslim Education Systems

The most popular Ph.D. degree in Saudi Arabia is Theology—Muslim theology, of course. Osama bin Laden, who benefitted from an excellent high school education in Europe, opted for a doctorate in Saudi Arabia and was transformed from an unremarkable Arab youth to a fanatic with global reach. The Saudis can afford to have their own Ph.D.'s study theology because they can afford to employ every other professional expert from the West. But what will happen to them after petroleum is replaced?

Countries such as Tunisia spend 7.3 percent of their GDP on education, which is a higher proportion than the US, Finland, or Israel. The question no one asks is what kind of education are they getting? They, like Egypt, produce diploma mills that graduate students with no needed skills. Economists tell us that no Arab country produces graduates who can compete with their East Asian counterparts; the only Muslim country whose graduates meet world standards is Turkey.

Islam and Work

Islam has a curious history regarding work. In feudal societies such as that from which Islam arose, warlords ruled. Early Islam emerged from a new trading city (Mecca), but its roots lay more in Bedouin desert tribalism. The Bedouin, aside from goat and camel herding, depended upon raiding and theft of merchant caravans and holding hostages for money. We see this value even today in such wretched countries as Somalia, where piracy has become a growth industry.

Muslim texts glorify the military beginnings of Islam, in which the only worthwhile work was raiding, conquering, and looting, particularly of human beings for slavery or ransom. Loot was considered fair game, and some young unemployed Muslim youth in Europe have boldly ransacked stores, taking what they like without payment, and calling it a tax on the infidel. (See Bat Ye'or, *Eurabia The Euro-Arab Axis: Land of Dhimmitude*, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005-6.)

Of course modernized and urbanized Muslims do not pursue these activities anymore; but in rural areas, such as in the Sudan, raiding, looting, and slave markets are alive and well (Darfur and South Sudan, for example).

Even today in most Muslim countries, people with any pretense to wealth never even carry their own shopping bags. There are always penniless “porters” to do the heavy lifting. Academics in the Muslim world are very much aware of their status as “intellectuals” and would not think of doing any sort of physical work. In addition, when women are particularly barred from general society, an entire work force is missing.

Since most employment in Muslim states today is in the government, work becomes a

notorious joke. Government jobs are not designed to accomplish anything but to provide a salary to keep university graduates off the street. There are obviously not enough of even these jobs, and the unemployment rates in countries such as Egypt are devastating. Even worse, government jobs produce no economic benefit to the economy.

A particularly difficult situation is arising in the relatively least corrupt, but richest Arab state: Saudi Arabia. Joel Brinkley, Foreign Policy columnist of the San Francisco Chronicle ["Shariah law holds back Saudi youth," March 4, 2012] notes that the country went almost overnight from a fly-blown Bedouin culture to an enormously rich petromonarchy. The royals have managed to keep the country passive by lavishing largess on all sectors, cradle to grave. For those who might yearn for more freedom and independence, Sharia law, administered by the hated Religious Police, keeps things quiet.

The problem, however, is that the huge youth bulge is not happy. The majority of young men are unemployed (but get hush money). They learn nothing in Saudi schools that render them employable, except for the children of the elite, who go to school abroad. Since the country makes nothing anybody wants, these young men must get government jobs, and there are just not enough idle spots to absorb all of them.

In "Saudi Arabia Out of the Comfort Zone," *The Economist*, March 3, 2012, noted how growing unemployment and political tensions are buffeting the kingdom. The royals, they say, mainly see discontent as an economic problem, and rarely taken opinion polls show that unemployment and inflation are the deepest public concerns. However, even some elites strain at social rules imposed half a century ago when the country was rural and poor (and far more ignorant). The latest young people's game is to arrive near midnight at 24-hour supermarkets to meet and flirt with each other until the police arrive. Chatting on line isn't enough for them. Public anger is mounting at the religious police poking their noses into private lives.

Restless young Saudi women have been more diligent at getting educated, but they are permitted to work in women-only enterprises. However, Sharia law prevents them from driving. In addition, young people who want to marry cannot get mortgages to buy homes because Sharia law does not permit mortgages (they consider the practice usury).

Colleagues of mine who taught English at a private school in Saudi Arabia noted how difficult it was to stimulate young men to do schoolwork. The boys knew they did not need to do this to survive; they would be taken care of, and work was something that people from less fortunate countries were paid to do. There are similar observations from professors in such private schools as Menlo College in California, which has been a magnet for Middle Eastern students.

Population Issues

Because of Islamic culture, the majority of women do not work outside the home and their only avenue to prestige is childbearing, particularly of male children. The Muslim world had an explosion of population during the 20th century because of improved health conditions in urban areas and a broad system of government subsidies for childbearing. One particularly notorious case was that of the Palestinian territories, with United Nations financial support paid by the head for Palestinians in “refugee camps.”

These camps are unique in having had continued existence for the past half century, unlike any other such camps for temporarily displaced persons. The result of this care has produced a tripling of that population since the end of World War II. The late head of the Palestinian Liberation Organization, Yasser Arafat, once said that “the wombs of our women are our best weapon.” [David P. Goldman, *How Civilizations Die (and Why Islam is Dying Too)*, Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2011.]

Demographers have observed that if a population has doubled in a half century, the state can manage to keep up; if it triples or quadruples, unrest is guaranteed. There will be strains on education, jobs, infrastructure, housing, and governance, all of which we have observed in such countries as Algeria, Yemen, Egypt, and non-Arab countries such as Iran and Turkey. A glut of young men is always followed by spikes in violence in a society, a phenomenon observable from the beginning of recorded history everywhere. When this violence is encouraged by militant religions, the consequence is even worse.

But something new is happening today across the globe in all but a few outliers: a sudden population crash.

We already know about the drastic population crash in Europe, particularly in Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Germany, and Russia. Include in this severe decline Japan. One analyst, Claire Berlinski [Menace in Europe: *Why the Continent's Crisis is America's Too*, Three Rivers Press, 2006-7, p. 140] noted that population crash is most severe in those countries that experienced totalitarianism during the 20th century (fascism and communism). Perhaps so. But to suddenly see such decline in the Muslim world is a great surprise indeed. We still hear that the fertility rate in Yemen and Afghanistan is at horrific levels, but in such chaotic countries, who is counting? And with the health systems in these regions so primitive (except in major cities), one cannot expect very good outcomes from these pregnancies.

In the more developed parts of the Muslim world, however, we are now really seeing plummeting birthrates. Yasser Arafat's boast about Arab women's wombs is no longer holding. Furthermore, even some of these governments are acknowledging this fact. Iran, which was the first Muslim country to institute population control upon realizing that they were running out of water, now is alarmed that the average of two children that they had hoped to encourage is now only one.

The Turkish government is also worried. The Islamist prime minister of Turkey, Tayyip Erdogan, predicts national destruction by 2038 unless the low birthrate is reversed. He worries that Kurdish speakers will threaten to outnumber Turks in Anatolia. He has scolded women for remaining in the work force instead of having babies, but the women are not listening. The same phenomenon is apparent across the Muslim world. What is behind this precipitous drop in fertility?

David P. Goldman notes that the conflict between the Palestinians and the Israelis has undergone a change that demographers are only now noticing. Ten years ago, the Israelis were afraid that Arafat was right and that they would be overwhelmed by the Arab birthrate while theirs reflected modern practices. Today, however, the Israeli birthrate is on the rise and Palestinian on the decline.

Demographers will tell us that when girls received even a 7th grade education, they choose to have half the number of children that they would if illiterate. Furthermore, as women enter the workplace, they cannot do so with seven or eight children. They can scarcely manage with more than one.

It is also important to note that as societies grow more prosperous, they are more concerned about having fewer and better educated children. The movement of so many people from rural areas to cities ends the family need for child labor in the fields. In addition, life is healthier in the cities and more children survive childhood than they would in the countryside.

So, improved health, improved educational opportunity, urban life, and the underlying despair over no perceived happy future keeps people from reproducing as they had in the past.

Cultural Practices That Hinder Modernization and Westernization

The widespread Muslim practice of first-cousin marriages produces a gene pool with problems. Although in some cases intelligence can be amplified by the doubling of good genes, it can also go the other way with many children born with birth defects, many of them mental. The *Economist* (March 3, 2012) notes that a phenomenon is being observed in Tyre, Lebanon, a region of very poor farmers where only about half the people ever have enough to eat.

The strange phenomenon is that the people suffer simultaneously from malnutrition and obesity. The women are predominantly obese yet are also malnourished. They are giving birth to children who are stunted in height and mental ability because the mothers are malnourished. They have plenty of calories, but not enough micro-nutrients. Scientists have also learned that when female fetuses do not get enough nutrition in utero, their fat cells are honed to store fat whenever they can, which results in obesity when enough calories are available.

The old Arab custom of permitting the men and boys to eat first, with what is left for the women and girls, is a custom that adds to this problem. Not much protein is ever left.

Predictions for the Future

The entire world is on the cusp of a new paradigm: going from a growth model to a sustainability model. This will be very difficult to do, but human societies have undergone paradigm changes before, each an improvement over what they replaced. We have had the paradigm of the nation state ever since the Treaty of Westphalia (1648), but that paradigm is undergoing severe stress. In Europe where the nation state supported a stable and improving society for much of the 19th century evolved into a poisonous sort of ultra-nationalism that brought about two world wars in the 20th century.

Today, the Muslim world is in the midst of paradigm change as well. The concept of nationhood is in conflict with a notion of pan-nationalist Islam. If the latter wins (which is exceedingly unlikely), there will be a range of failed states in the Muslim world. But if it fails, there is an ultimate hope that this region will slowly change their long-time Muslim paradigm and accept the benefits of Westernization. Iran is already moving in that direction, which will become obvious once the Islamic governance is gone. So far, Arab states are not moving in this direction, and Turkey is on the precipice.

But in a note of warning, Huntington quotes from Michael Dibdin's novel, *Dead Lagoon*, in which a nationalist demagogue says: "There can be no true friends without true enemies. Unless we hate what we are not, we cannot love what we are. These are the old truths we are painfully rediscovering after a century and more of sentimental cant. Those who deny them deny their families, their heritage, their culture, their birthright, their very selves! They will not lightly be forgiven."

The Islamists today believe this, but many in the Western world are still living in the perilous cant of one-worldism, discarding their identities for an imagined peaceful internationalism. Internationalism does not produce the distinctly Western civilization from which the whole world has begun to benefit. The intellectually chic movements to discredit Westernization could slow the process for the Muslim world to catch up with the rest and could well damage Western civilization itself in the interim. The nation state does not have to be inherently evil. It can be the ground on which we stand, which internationalism cannot be for decades to come.

Bibliography

- Eric Chaney, "Democratic Change in the Arab World, Past and Present," prepared for the Brookings Panel on Economic Activity, March 2012. Discussed in *The Economist*, April 7, 2012 and *Time*, April 7, 2012.
- Barry Cunliffe, *Europe Between the Oceans, 9000 BC-AD 1000*, Yale University Press, 2008.
- Jared Diamond, *Guns, Germs, and Steel, The Fates of Human Societies*, W.W. Norton, 1998.
- Ricardo Duchesne, *The Uniqueness of Western Civilization*, Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- David P. Goldman, *How Civilizations Die (And Why Islam is Dying Too)*, Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2011.
- Haim Harari, *A View From the Eye of the Storm, Terror and Reason in the Middle East*, Regan Books, 2005.
- Toby E. Huff, *Intellectual Curiosity and the Scientific Revolution—A Global Perspective*, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Bernard Lewis, *What Went Wrong? Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response*, Oxford, 2002.
- Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic & the Spirit of Capitalism*, New Translation and Introduction by Stephen Kalberg, Roxbury Publishing Company, 2002 (Expanded Edition, 1920).