

African Research Review

International Multi-Disciplinary Journal

Bahir Dar, Ethiopia

AFRREV Vol. 12 (4), Serial No 52, September, 2018: 77-86

ISSN 1994-9057 (Print) ISSN 2070-0083 (Online)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/afrrrev.v12i4.7>

Cultural Diffusion and The Unification Policies of Alexander the Great

Aneni, Monica Omoye

Department of Classics

University of Ibadan, Ibadan

Oyo State, Nigeria

Email: anenimonica@gmail.com

Phone: +2347039574581; +2348056501788

Abstract

Ancient and modern scholars have discussed Alexander the Great's prowess and intelligence even as a great leader and conqueror who stood out among his contemporaries. This paper is designed to examine Alexander's strategy in the process of administering his conquered territories. The argument being put forth here is that, while being a conqueror of nations and people, Alexander adopted stratagems to run a successful empire. The adoption of cultural diffusion was one of the strategies. Another was adopting unification policies that aided his governance of his empire. Alexander did not stop at being a mere conqueror, but his desire to unite the world seemed stronger than conquests which appeared paramount. Being properly educated and learned, he realized that the beauty and uniqueness of the culture of his subdued subjects in various territories were not to be discarded into the waste bin of history where it may be difficult or impossible to retrieve. These strategies are pointers to efforts of an effectual leader as enduring and vibrant as Alexander, who desired the amalgamation and prosperity of his known world. Further studies may examine the sustainability of this cultural diffusion and his unification ideology among his Diadochi.

Key Words: Alexander the Great, Strategies, Cultural diffusion

Introduction

Ancient authors such as Plutarch (1999), Arrian (2013) and Diodorus Siculus (1963), provided histories on the trajectory of the life of Alexander the Great even as they narrate his birth, growth and exploits and as king of Macedon and other territories in Asia, Africa and the Near East. Modern discussions on Alexander the Great have exponentially grown and border on arguments about the subtle or overt imperialistic tendencies displayed by this warrior of outstanding skills and ability towards the natives he subdued. Anson (2009), discussed this great warrior, even as he raises posers being debated by contemporary scholars with regard to the quests, desires and intentions of Alexander's so-called megalomaniac expressions. Several other contemporary scholars have continued to interrogate

Alexander's intentions and achievements in his dazzling successes. While, a school of thought views Alexander as an incredible warrior and thus the title "The Great" was indeed deserving, another school of thought assumes that the title was overly flattering, since adherents merely view Alexander as a brutal conqueror from Macedon over the other known and civilized world in Asia, Africa and the Near East. Bosworth (1998), argued that Alexander was a gruesome and ruthless generalissimo whose goal was a sovereignty that must be achieved through killings on a gigantic scale. O'Brien (1992), and Hamilton (1994) both viewed Alexander as a chronic alcoholic and therefore a bad ruler. Worthington (1999) assumed that Alexander went on an unnecessarily killing spree of foreigners in the bid to become their ruler.

While some of these modern scholars condemned Alexander and his move, some others deemed it fit to describe Alexander as indeed a great warrior, a leader and a unifying force. Wilcken (1967) noted that Hellenistic civilization in Africa and her environs was established by this great leader. Tarn (1950, 1958) wrote that Alexander the Great was indeed a great warrior, a strong harmonizer, a reconciler of his conquered world and one who changed the tone of the civilization of his territories to an encompassing and inclusive one. Hammond (1997) affirmed that Alexander the Great's rule was to benefit the people. Fox (2004) described Alexander as a great warrior with unparalleled achievement and a leader to his Generals. Alexander established eighteen new cities, spreading the Greek culture as he traversed the ancient world. Freeman (2011), while narrating the fascinating history of Alexander, notes that this great warrior of remarkable renown could be "petty and magnanimous, cruel and merciful, impulsive and farsighted and intensely competitive." The discussions on the Alexander Romance also continues to feature on the literary space of history in antiquity and modernity. This paper took an in-depth study of strategies adopted by this great warrior in uniting and administering his regions. In so doing the historical methodology is adopted. The study makes significant contribution to knowledge as it presents socio-cultural strategies adopted by Alexander to successfully administer his territories.

Alexander the Great: Brief History

Alexander the Great was born in Pella, the capital of Macedon on the sixth day of the ancient Greek month of Hekatombaion otherwise known as the 20th of July, 356 B.C. He descended from a royal and illustrious lineage, his father Phillip II of the Argead dynasty was the king of Macedonia, while his mother Olympias was the daughter of Neoptolemus, king of Epirus. His father, Phillip, a renowned king in his own right, possessed immense military skills and had an expansionist vision for Macedonia. His most important innovations were the army which he reformed and the phalanx infantry corps which at the time made his army the most efficient army corps of the time. Olympias, was a bold and fierce woman who was not afraid to speak her mind or have her way. The combination of these unique and eminent personalities created Alexander who was as bold as he was strategic. Alexander may have been a child of destiny for his birth heralded good news for Phillip his father. Plutarch (1919) opined that it was the day that the combined Illyrian and Paeonian forces were defeated by Parmenion, the General of Phillip. The same day Phillip's horses also won at the Olympic Games. Plutarch also mentions the legends surrounding Alexander's birth. He documents that a day before Phillip and Olympias consummated their marriage, Olympias dreamt that her womb was hit by a thunderbolt that resulted in a flame which spread far and wide and then died. Several days after the wedding, Phillip also dreamt that he secured Olympias' womb with a seal that has the engraving of a lion. Plutarch's explanations to these dreams are; that Olympias was already pregnant before the wedding; or that Alexander was the son of the god, Zeus. In other words, Alexander was going to become a great man in his adult life.

Early Years and Education

As a child, Lanike, the sister of Cleitus the Black (Cleitus the Black became one of Alexander's General), raised Alexander. Alexander's earliest education was under the tutelage of Leonidas of Epirus. Leonidas taught him math, horsemanship and archery. Lysimachus who also taught Alexander, adopted the role-playing tactic in imparting knowledge; Alexander was often delighted when he had to impersonate the warrior Achilles. At age ten, Alexander tamed a horse that couldn't be mounted. Plutarch (1919) stated that a trader from Thessaly wanted to sell that horse to Phillip for thirteen talents. And seeing that the horse refused to be mounted, Phillip lost interest. However, having noticed that the horse refused to be mounted because it was scared of its own shadow, Alexander requested to tame and mount the horse. He succeeded. Phillip his father was so pleased with him that he said; "My boy, you must find a kingdom big enough for your ambitions. Macedon is too small for you." Thereafter, he bought the horse for Alexander, who named the horse, Bucephalus.

At age 13 in 343 B.C, Phillip his father then engaged the services of Aristotle as Alexander's tutor. In 340, Alexander completed his education with Aristotle at the Temple of the Nymphs at Meiza. In 339, Alexander had become a soldier and defeated the Thracian tribes. The following year witnessed Alexander leading the Companion Cavalry and defeating the Athenian and Theban armies at Chaeronea. Alexander also assembled and united Greek states to create the Corinthian League. Bloom and Blair (2009, p. 385) stated that Alexander embarked on an unprecedented military campaign in Africa, Asia and the Near East, creating the largest empire stretching from Greece to north western India, (Golden, 2011).

At age 16, Alexander had proven to be an effective leader. He became regent and heir apparent as Phillip fought against Byzantium. It was during this time that the Thracian Maedi rose against Macedonia. In dealing with the revolt, Alexander drove them from their territory and colonised the territory with Greeks. Alexander founded the city and named it Alexandropolis. Alexander indeed proved his mettle such that when Phillip returned and having observed his exploits, deployed Alexander to quell the revolts in Southern Thrace (Fox, 1980 p.68; Renault, 2001 p.47; Bose, 2003 p.43). Alexander alongside his father, continued to carry out campaigns against the enemies of Phillip and Macedonia. He campaigned against Perinthus, dealt a crushing defeat on the Illyrians who invaded Macedonia. Through their campaigns, they won Thermopylae, Elatea and Amphissa. Alexander and Phillip his father finally subdued Athens and Thebes in the battle of Chaeronea.

Alexander went on exile after he quarrelled with his father during his father's wedding to Cleopatra Eurydice, the niece of Attalus his General. However, he returned to Macedonia after he reconciled with his father (Rosiman & Worthington, 2010).

Alexander as King of Macedon

Alexander was proclaimed king of Macedon at the death of Phillip his father McCarthy (2004, pp.30-31), Renault (2001, pp.61-62) and Fox (1980, p.72). Phillip was assassinated in 336 at Aegae by Pausanias at the wedding of Phillip's daughter Cleopatra to Alexander 1 of Epirus, the brother of Olympias. Having become regent, Alexander took his campaigns to other parts of the world. In 336 he took his campaigns to Jonia; Media and Egypt in 333; Persia in 331 and India in 326 BC. He died in 323 at age 32 in the palace of Nebuchadnezzar II, in Babylon.

Having conquered several territories in the realm of the afore-mentioned regions, he adopted two major strategies in governing his conquered territories. These strategies are cultural diffusion and unification policies. These strategies went a long way in ensuring that these conquered territories demonstrated unity in diversity between the conqueror and the conquered. These strategies did attempt to paint Alexander in positive expressions even as a leader who went ahead to create an identity that formed the

bedrock of the emergence of aspects of neo philosophy and religion. This identity did not necessarily elevate a Greek's cultural status above others, neither did it downgrade a non-Greek status to that of a barbarian. Rather, it became synonymous with a new ideology in politics and philosophy that was concerned about, and prospered people and cultures; Greeks and non-Greeks in Alexander's sphere of influence and control. Hellenism no longer became associated with purely the Greek language, religion, customs and culture, rather it became an admixture of Greek and non-Greek cultures that produced a hybrid culture; it was a shift from Hellenism to Hellenistic civilization. Alexander encouraged this system to foster, some of his actions such as his marriage to Roxanne, the Bactrian princess went a long way to further inspire this.

Cultural Diffusion

Frobenius (1897/98) defined cultural diffusion as the spread of cultural ideas, styles, religions, technology and languages between individuals within a culture or between peoples of separate cultures. Herskovits (1964, p.170) defined cultural diffusion as the study of achieved cultural transmissions. War chariots and iron smelting in antiquity; automobiles and Western business suits in the 20th century are examples of cultural diffusion. There are five types of cultural diffusion. They include; expansion, relocation, hierarchical, contagious and stimulus diffusion. In expansion diffusion, an idea or innovation develops and remains rooted in an area and then spreads outwards to other areas. In relocation diffusion, the idea or innovation relocates from its source area and migrates to new areas. In hierarchical diffusion, an idea or innovation moves from larger to smaller areas. This is usually influenced by elites. An idea or innovation that spreads from person to person in a particular population is witnessed in contagious diffusion. An idea or innovation that spreads based on its attachment to another concept is seen as stimulus diffusion. There are also three categories of mechanisms of diffusion. They are; direct, forced and indirect diffusion. In direct diffusion two close cultures intermarry, trade, and form alliances in war against a common enemy. In forced diffusion, a superior or stronger culture subdues a weaker culture and enforces her own culture over the weaker one. In indirect diffusion, cultural traits and items are transported or transplanted by a middleman to another culture. In this discourse, an attempt to demonstrate this cultural diffusion Alexander may have inadvertently or deliberately adopted in administering his empire will be presented. It is important to note that the reasons for this strategy was an attempt by Alexander the Great to unify his empire. To ensure that this strategy became as effective as he desired, he adopted policies to rein in the strategy. These policies enabled him to effectively use this strategy and mechanism adopted to build an empire he so desired.

Alexander's Strategies

Lonsdale (2010, p.12), described strategy as a complex and challenging activity. According to him, this complexity is as a result of the desire to achieve a satisfactory end result at a reasonable cost and within a reasonable timeframe. Freedman (2015) and Simandan (2018) both agreed that strategy includes setting objectives, determining mechanisms to achieve the goals and organising means to implement the actions. Mintzberg and Quinn (1996), note that strategic planning and strategic thinking are parts and parcels of strategy. Gray (1999, p.143), defines strategy as the use that which is made of force and the threat of force for the ends of policy. Similarly, Beaufre (1965, p.234) defined strategy as the art of two opposing wills using force to settle their disputes. From the aforementioned definitions, it's safe to describe strategy as the art of using intelligent means which sometimes could resort to force, in order to achieve set goals or objectives.

As a political leader, Alexander had but one goal; to expand the frontiers of his empire and to unite his empire utilizing the strategy of cultural diffusion and creating a Hellenistic civilization that was eventually established throughout his empire. He had at his disposal the Macedonian armed forces

which was used to achieve this set policy. Alexander's father, Phillip, instituted a series of reforms that made the Macedonian army the best at the time, however though the battles were fought by the superior army of the time, there was an underlining strategy that made this possible, To the layman, Alexander's brilliant battles and sieges represent the glittery and shining headlines of his campaigns. However, when we closely examine his campaigns, we find out that these successes cannot be clearly understood without close reference to his performance at the grand strategic level. Alexander's grand strategic goal of unifying his empire was, to say the least, quite expansive. With this ambitious goal, Alexander could not rely solely on pure military force. In fact, Alexander's military campaigns were built on and were fully incorporated into a solid foundation of the grand strategy of cultural diffusion.

In the annals of strategic history, the French Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte stands out. As a military commander, he was considered a genius, he had the innate ability to process large amount of information and arrived at logical conclusions. He was endowed with both moral and physical courage. He was the master of counter attacks and was a precursor of psychological warfare. However, brilliant as he was, Napoleon had a tragic flaw, his inability to translate stunning military victories to lasting political outcomes which in turn led to his eventual downfall and demise. In comparing exploits of Napoleon with those of Alexander, one discovers that where Napoleon struggled, Alexander excelled. As a commander, Alexander understood two vital realities he was faced with. The first of which was that life was in a state of constant flux and a conquered foe was only vanquished for the time. This perhaps was what Clausewitz had in mind when he said: "Even the ultimate outcome of a war is not always regarded as final . . . the defeated state often considers the outcome merely as a passing evil, for which remedy may still be gotten in political conditions" (Clausewitz, 1908 p.231). The second reality was that he had a small force at his disposal to achieve his ambitious goal. David Lonsdale estimates that he crossed the Hellespont with 40,000 men into enemy territory (Lonsdale, 2010 p.19). With this minute number compared to the large forces the Persian King could field, Alexander could not rely solely on military force. He certainly had to implement other instruments to achieve his policy. And so, with his limited military forces, Alexander had to complement his military conquests with shrewd pre and post conflict policies.

The post conflict policies that Alexander implemented were varied and were chosen to suit the specific areas. Generally, Alexander pursued stability, development, religious freedom and economic growth. Stability was important to prevent rebellions and chaos once Alexander and the main body of his army had left an area. As regards development, this objective was achieved in the many cities that Alexander founded. These cities were created to foster economic, political and social development. This was in line with the grand strategic goal of creating a durable empire built on a foundation of Hellenistic cultural influences mixed with Persian culture to create a hybrid civilization. Here we see Alexander utilizing both cultural and his unification strategies to achieve his purpose of remaining the conqueror of these spheres.

Alexander's political organisation of the empire was of equal significance in terms of stability. Alexander was aware of the need to maintain the existing political structures as much as possible, as failure to do so will result in a power vacuum that will be exploited by rebellious states. To achieve his goal, he was prepared to pursue reforms, cement favourable political conditions through marriage or in some cases destroy whole cities to serve as warning to other cities. Hammond claims that Alexander's lack of any distinct political ideology gave him a substantial advantage (Hammond, 1997).

Having subjugated territories, Alexander desiring to preserve the Persian political and administrative culture, placed his own men over the existing satrapies. In this manner, much of the civil administration was left intact and under the control of local officials. Lane Fox notes that the existing Persian

bureaucracy and taxation systems were extremely complex, hence Alexander's maintenance of the status quo gave him the advantage of not being saddled with the burden of learning the Persian taxation system (Fox, 2004 p. 327). The Persians with their experience and knowledge freed Alexander from these administrative nuances and gave him room to concentrate on more important issues. Consequently, in this instance, cultural diffusion is witnessed even as Alexander tolerates the culture of the Persians with regard to the taxation system as it supersedes that of the Greeks. He was satisfied with the system and utilized the system to govern the Persians who of course, were not averse to the idea seeing that the King was content with what was Persian, rather than disparage and totally terminate the system. In a way, Alexander was permitting the Persians partake of leadership of their people although he was the ultimate leader. This magnanimity was uncommon of a great conqueror such as Alexander, and of course, appealing and acceptable to the Persians.

This same idea of spreading the Greek culture, uniting diverse peoples and accepting what he could of his subdued territories that made Alexander to appoint Mazeaus, a Persian General who had fought against him at the battle of Guagemela as satrap of Babylonia (Arrian, 1983). This might seem paradoxical; one may argue that it seemed probable that Mazeaus' appointment as satrap was as a result of the benefits his appointment would give Alexander. Another school of thought may counter such argument with the thought that Alexander was formidable enough to defeat the Persians, therefore he could control the Persians whichever way he desired. Adopting this method was a pointer to the fact that Alexander appreciated some aspects of the culture of the Persians which he thought were necessary towards a successful administration of his large empire. As satrap, Mazeaus could bridge the language barrier between Alexander and his new subjects, furthermore, he would use his knowledge of the area to Alexander's benefit. Furthermore, this system was, more often than not, afford the Persians the opportunity to imbibe some Greek customs and vice versa; a situation where eventually, Greeks and Persians would relate as one and with Alexander as the ultimate king. Yet, Alexander instituted checks to curtail Mazeaus and put him in place. Alexander appointed two Macedonian generals and a Macedonian tax collector, hence the financial and military aspects of the city lay in the hands of men loyal to Alexander. With this, he forestalled rebellion by satraps. This method of dividing local control between Persians and Macedonians was replicated throughout the empire. With this system in place, Alexander could ensure stability and unity throughout the empire. More importantly, cultural diffusion in all its entirety would be witnessed. This kind of system may not have been deliberate from the onset; however, it was indeed going to occur sooner than later.

As stated earlier, Alexander was conscious of the limited military force at his disposal, hence he instituted various tactics to carry out his grand strategic goal of empire unification even through cultural diffusion. One of such tactics was the favour and power he granted to the satraps such as Darius who surrendered to him without bloodshed. To such men who had spared him the cost of a siege and battle that would have depleted his precious force, he made satraps and granted them self-governance under his personal authority, such men were answerable to him directly. Their lands were not pillaged and looted, rather they had more lands added to their previous frontiers. One of such men was Mithrenes, the satrap of Sardis, who surrendered the city of Sardis to Alexander without a fight. Alexander made him the satrap of Armenia. With this gesture, Alexander sent a message to the Persian ruling elite that those who surrendered without costing him men would be rewarded. This gesture was two-fold; Alexander preserved the number of his men while also gained legitimacy in the eyes of the Persians, as he was seen as one who had come to replace Darius.

Alexander's approach to the political administration was governed by a need for stability. This need was expressed through practical means that provided a stable environment for growth. Alexander's

founding of cities in Persia was to introduce Hellenistic culture, provide a garrison for his soldiers and to encourage intermarriage between Greeks and Persians to produce a hybrid empire. In addition, Alexander's maintenance of the existing political structure and system gave him considerable peace in the empire. His placing Greek men over Persians in delicate positions gave no room for rebellion and sedition. Summarily, Alexander adopted the strategy of cultural diffusion to administer his empire.

Alexander also bore in mind the need for peace and stability in mainland Greece. Discord and anarchy in Greece could undermine his position in Persia. To secure his position in Greece, he made use of the League of Corinth. Alexander owed the creation of the League of Corinth to his father, Phillip II. The League was an international body of Greek city states, it was a political union that served as a collective security platform for Greek city states. However, in reality, the League served as a shield for states loyal to Macedonia and provided legitimacy for Macedonian leadership of Greek city states. Alexander exploited the League to his advantage, as the League conferred on him the position of the legitimate avenger of the Greek honour against the Persians. In addition to this, Alexander used the League to restrict the ambitions and policies of member states. Thus, with the League, Alexander became the de facto head of the Greeks, with this backing Alexander was able to maintain peace and stability in Greece while he was in Persia, all in line with his grand strategic goal of unifying his empire even as he also adopted the other grand strategy of cultural diffusion.

Alexander took stability in mainland Greece quite seriously, as this was the foundation of his empire. He was shrewd enough to realise that unrest in Greece would affect his standing in Persia, hence the League served as his instrument of maintaining his hold on Greece. Through the League, he abolished mercenary service of Greeks in Persian armies, used the League as a court of arbitration for Greek states with Macedonia as the dominant member. At the beginning of his campaigns, the city of Thebes revolted against Macedonia leadership, Alexander contrived to have the League sanction Thebes and led a coalition force of Greek states to correct the erring city. Alexander had all the states participate in the destruction of Thebes, hence the act was seen as a combined effort of Greek states against a member state working with the enemy. Furthermore, he used Thebes to serve as a scapegoat to other members on the evils of revolting against Macedonia leadership.

Karl Marx defined religion as the opium of the masses (Marx & Engels, 2015 p.215). With this he meant that religion played a huge role in the life of the common man. Alexander was clever enough to understand the huge role religion played in the lives of man, and so he strived to conciliate the conquered lands and their religious beliefs. Alexander was particularly sensitive to the religious sentiments of the conquered lands, he often took pains to associate himself with the dominant gods and beliefs of the people. In Babylon, he ordered the restoration of local temples destroyed by Xerexes, he also sacrificed to the Babylonian god Bel – Marduk (Fox, 2004 p.325). In Egypt, he travelled across the desert to seek the oracle Zeus Ammon at Siwah, here he was confirmed as the son of Ammon, thus confirming his acclaimed divinity and his ascension as conqueror and liberator of Egypt.

He also made sacrifices to the sacred Egyptian god Apis, endearing himself to the Egyptian priestly elite and people. With this policy, Alexander confirmed his rule through his close affiliations with local gods and sacred traditions. Lane Fos had this to say about his religious policy in Egypt: *“By this one sacrifice, he reversed all the Persian insults and paid honor to Apis in form of the sacred bull, the most famous of Egyptian religious animals....in return, he was said to have been crowned Pharaoh of Egypt”* (Fox, 2004 p.327).

Alexander in line with his goal of cultural diffusion and empire unification, used the religious sentiments of the conquered lands to his advantage. Unlike previous commanders that destroyed the temples of their enemies, Alexander showed respect and reverence for the local gods, thereby endearing

himself to the populace. He also sought to seek confirmation of his conquests by associating with the strongest local gods. With this, he won the hearts and minds of his new subjects, taking the will to resist his rule out of them. All of which was totally in line with his grand strategic goal.

Another tactic that Alexander employed to achieve his goal of empire unification was through the economic policies he introduced in the conquered lands. Unlike Persian commanders, Alexander discouraged his soldiers from looting and pillaging conquered lands. He did not wish to be seen as a ravaging war lord, rather he wanted to be recognised as lord and master of Asia. In contrast when compared with the Carthaginian general Hannibal Barca, one sees the rationale behind this move. Hannibal was in Italy for 15 years, repelling Roman attacks after attacks, defeating consular armies and killing consuls, however Hannibal failed to secure the support of the Latin tribes because of his policy on looting and pillaging. He allowed his troops loot and pillage, this did not endear his cause to the Latin tribes who were not loyal to Rome. They saw Rome as the lesser evil and ready cast their lots with Rome. This was one of the major reasons Hannibal lost his war against Rome. Alexander on the other hand sought to conciliate the conquered lands. In some cases, he abolished taxes paid to Persian rulers, in others, he reduced them drastically. These moves paid off as Alexander was seen as a liberator from Persian yoke. With this, enemy tribes surrendered to him as they sought to enjoy the benefits of being under his rule conferred.

Alexander used taxes and tributes to reward loyal tribes, by abolishing taxes in some areas while reducing in others and maintaining in a few. All of these measures coupled with the cities founded in these states to foster a hybrid civilization brought a gradual stimulation of the economy. This helped to cement his control and influence. Neighbouring states which were his enemies looked on in envy at the level of peace, security and economic prosperity his empire and subjects enjoyed, and in most cases came over to his side to enjoy these benefits.

Conclusion

Alexander the Great was a unique leader; he was different from the regular leader in antiquity whose goal mainly was to subdue peoples and their cultures, burning conquered cities to the ground, leaving them desolate or replacing such burnt cities with another, designed according to the conqueror's specifications and expectations. He was indeed distinct from the regular Machiavellian Prince whose goal was to totally annihilate his enemy and assert his authority. Alexander the Great was a brilliant and intelligent conqueror, in the league of Cyrus of Persia who permitted the Israelites to go rebuild the walls of their country and even provided resources to execute the project. Alexander did not discard what he discovered in his conquered lands with regard to politics, religion, philosophy and other infrastructures, rather, he moderated what he could, absorbed what he could and hybridized what was necessary. In order to keep this system working, Alexander adopted other strategies to successfully administer his empire. These strategies may not have been deliberate from the onset. He appreciated some aspects of the customs and cultures of the Persians, Egyptians and other peoples he conquered. Adopting these cultures endeared him to his subjects who cherished his interest in and acceptance of their cultures by a warrior in the calibre of Alexander the Great. Alexander adopted the strategy of cultural diffusion and unification policies which saw the birth of a hybrid culture known as Hellenistic civilization. Hellenistic civilization as an era, was characterised by progress and hybridization in education, art, religion, philosophy and government. It gave to the world the Alexandrian Age. It was a period of gigantism; of art demonstrated in three dimensions; of intellection witnessed in the increase of volumes in literature; and of writing for wider audiences. It was also, a period that produced outstanding poets such as Callimachus and Theocritus; and a period that witnessed the preservation of the Greek culture, language and religion. Contemporary historians are grateful to this great warrior for,

while desiring to preserve both the Greek and other cultures, Alexander adopted, deliberately or inadvertently, such strategies that aided in birthing the Hellenistic civilization.

References

- Anson, E. M. (2009). Alexander the Great in current scholarship. *History Compass*. 7/3: 981-992.
- Arrian, translated by M Hammond, J Atkinson (2013). *Alexander the Great: The Anabasis and the Indica* Oxford University Press.
- Arrianus L. F. (1983). *The Annabasis of Alexander* with English translations by P.A. Brunt. London: Loeb Classical Library.
- Beaufre, A. (1965). *An introduction to strategy*. New York: F.A. Praeger.
- Bloom, J. M.; Blair, S. S. (2009). *The grove encyclopedia of Islamic art and architecture: Mosul to Zirid, Volume 3*, p. 385. Oxford University Press Incorporated.
- Bose, P. (2003). *Alexander the Great's art of strategy*. Crow's Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Bosworth, A. B. (1998). *Alexander and the East: The tragedy of triumph*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Clausewitz, C.V. (1908). *On war*. Translated by James John Graham. UK: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Company.
- Diodorus Siculus translated by C. Bradford Welles (1963). *Bibliotheca historia* (Library of world history) (Books 16.66-17).
- Fox, R. L. (1980). *The search for Alexander*. Boston: Little Brown & Co.
- Fox, R. L. (2004). *Alexander the Great*. Penguin Books.
- Fox, Robin Lane. (2004). *Alexander the Great*. Pg. 237. London: Penguin Books.
- Freedman, L. (2015). *Strategy: A history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freeman, P. (2011). *Alexander the Great*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Frobenius, L. (1897/98). *Der westafrikanische Kulturkreis*. *Petermanns Mitteilungen* 43/44, pp. 225-271.
- Golden, P. B. (2011). *Central Asia in World history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gray, C. (1999). *Modern strategy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hamilton, J. R. (1974). *Alexander the Great*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Hammond, N. G. L. (1997). *The genius of Alexander the Great*. University of North Carolina.
- Herskovits, M. J. (1964). *Economic transition in Africa*, page 170.
- Karl, M. & Freidrich, E. (2015). *Communist Manifesto*. Translated by Samuel Moore. Penguin Classics.
- Lonsdale, D. J. (2010). *Alexander the Great: Lessons in strategy (Strategy and History)*. New York: Routledge.
- McCarty, N. (2004). *Alexander the Great*. Pp 30-31. Camberwell, Victoria: London: Penguin

- Mintzberg, H. & Quinn, J. B. (1996). *The strategy process: Concepts, contexts, cases*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
- O'Brien, J. M. (1992). *Alexander the Great: The invisible enemy*. New York, NY/London: Routledge.
- Plutarch, (1919). *Parallel lives: Life of Alexander, Book 1*. Retrieved from http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Lives/Alexander*/3.html
- Renault, M. (2001). *The nature of Alexander the Great*. pp 61-62. Penguin
- Roisman, J., Worthington, I. (2010). *A companion to ancient Macedonia*. John Wiley & Sons
- Simandan, D. (2018). Iterative lagged asymmetric responses in strategic management and long-range planning. *Time & Society*, OnlineFirst, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X17752652>
- Tarn, W.W. (1950). *Alexander the Great, Vol. 2, sources and studies*. Cambridge University Press:
- Tarn, W. W. (1958). Alexander the Great and the unity of mankind. *Historia*, 7: 425-444.
- Wilcken, U. (1967). *Alexander the Great*. New York: W.W Norton and Company.
- Worthington, I. (1999). How "Great" was Alexander? *Ancient History Bulletin*, 13: 52.