

Empirical Perspective On Huntington's "The Clash Of Civilizations"

Posted on June 22, 2023

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/empirical-perspective-on-huntingtons-the-clash-of-civilizations/>

Introduction

Samuel P. Huntington's "[clash of civilizations](#)" thesis proposed that the end of Cold War ideological rivalry would make cultural and civilizational identity increasingly important in international conflict. States would remain major actors, but their alliances and rivalries would be shaped more strongly by broad groupings Huntington described as Western, Islamic, Sinic, Hindu, Orthodox, Japanese, Latin American, and possibly African civilizations. The thesis became influential partly because it generated testable expectations: cross-civilizational state pairs should experience more conflict, fault-line disputes should become more important after the Cold War, and relations between the West and Islamic or Sinic societies should be especially contentious. Empirical research has taken those expectations seriously rather than treating Huntington only as a political commentator. The resulting evidence does not show that culture is irrelevant. Religion, history, and identity can shape political mobilization and how enemies are framed. It does, however, raise substantial doubts about the stronger claim that civilizational difference independently displaced geography, state power, institutions, economic interdependence, and domestic politics as the dominant explanation of violent conflict.

The Measurement Problem Behind "Civilization"

Testing Huntington begins with a measurement problem. "Civilization" is not observed in the same straightforward way as a border, election, or military expenditure. Researchers must decide which civilization a state belongs to, what to do with countries containing large religious or linguistic minorities, whether religion should outweigh language or political history, and whether interstate and intrastate violence can be analyzed through the same categories. Turkey, Russia, Nigeria, Lebanon, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and India illustrate how classification can conceal mixed identities and changing political alignments. Broad labels also contain enormous internal diversity: Muslim-majority societies differ in ethnicity, institutions, theology, income, and foreign policy, just as historically Christian or Western states have often fought one another. These choices matter because statistical results can change when cases are classified differently. Researchers must also control for alternative explanations. Neighboring states may be culturally different and more conflict-prone because they share territorial disputes and strategic opportunities. Without accounting for geography, power,

alliances, democracy, trade, and institutions, a civilizational correlation could simply capture political conditions that happen to coincide with cultural difference.

What Interstate Data Show

Russett, Oneal, and Cox provided one of the best-known statistical tests by examining militarized interstate disputes from 1950 to 1992. They compared civilizational boundaries with established realist and liberal variables, including geographic contiguity, relative capabilities, alliances, democracy, economic interdependence, and participation in international organizations. Their analysis did not find strong evidence that state pairs from different civilizations were generally more likely to enter militarized disputes after those factors were considered. Geography and the familiar political variables explained conflict more consistently. Huntington responded that the dataset contained mostly Cold War observations and therefore could not adequately test a theory about an emerging post-Cold War order. That objection is methodologically important because a prediction about a new historical period deserves evidence from that period. It does not, however, resolve the theory's difficulties. If civilizational identities are historically deep and independently powerful, some effect might be expected before 1989, and the researchers also found no clear transitional surge in cross-civilizational conflict as bipolarity weakened. The dispute illustrates how the chosen observation period can shape conclusions about large historical theories.

Later Tests and Partial Support

Later studies extended the evidence without producing a simple verdict. Giacomo Chiozza examined international conflict involvement from 1946 through 1997 and did not find a consistent transformation in which civilizational difference became the dominant predictor after the Cold War. Jonathan Fox shifted attention to ethnic conflict within states and found that cross-civilizational disputes formed only a minority of ethnic conflicts and had not clearly become more intense than other conflicts. Andrej Tusicisny reported partial support for some expectations, including evidence that intercivilizational conflicts could be severe, but other findings did not support Huntington's predictions about duration or a uniquely post-Cold War shift. These mixed results matter because they show why the thesis should not be judged through one dramatic case. Wars in the Balkans, the Middle East, or elsewhere can appear to fit a civilizational narrative, yet a theory claims more than the ability to interpret selected events after they happen. It should explain systematic differences across many cases and perform better than alternative explanations under transparent definitions and time periods.

Why Shared Civilization Does Not Guarantee Peace

Conflict within supposedly shared civilizations is equally important evidence. Muslim-majority states

have fought other Muslim-majority states, and European history contains repeated wars among predominantly Christian societies. The Iran-Iraq War, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, rivalries within the Arab world, and conflicts among factions in Afghanistan demonstrate that broad religious similarity does not remove struggles over territory, regime survival, leadership, resources, ideology, or security. Western peace after the Second World War also cannot be attributed automatically to a common civilization because democracy, NATO, European integration, economic interdependence, and U.S. security commitments changed incentives simultaneously. Intrastate conflicts introduce still different mechanisms: political exclusion, discrimination, land rights, state capacity, and territorial autonomy often matter more directly than whether groups belong to different macro-cultural categories. Religion and civilization should therefore not be used interchangeably. Religious difference can overlap with political cleavage without being the original cause of violence. A theory that treats every conflict between differently identified communities as evidence of civilization risks turning description into explanation and overlooking the institutions and interests that actually produce escalation.

Culture as a Political Resource

A more defensible use of Huntington's insight is to treat culture as a political resource rather than an automatic fault line. Identities can become powerful when leaders connect historical memory, religion, language, or grievance to concrete disputes over authority, security, land, representation, or economic distribution. The same cultural difference may remain peaceful where institutions protect rights and provide credible conflict resolution, yet become explosive where governments discriminate, armed actors mobilize fear, or outside powers intervene. This conditional approach also explains why people possess several identities whose political importance changes over time. A citizen can simultaneously identify with a nation, religion, region, language, profession, ethnicity, or transnational community, and political entrepreneurs may emphasize different dimensions under different circumstances. Civilization can influence alliance rhetoric, public perceptions, or the symbolic framing of enemies without independently determining whether war occurs. Empirical research therefore points away from a deterministic map of coherent blocs and toward interaction: culture matters through political institutions, strategic incentives, socioeconomic inequality, leadership choices, and historical context rather than replacing them as a universal explanation.

Conclusion

Huntington's clash-of-civilizations thesis remains valuable because it forced scholars to ask whether post-Cold War identity would reshape international politics, but its strongest empirical predictions have not received consistent support. Quantitative studies have generally found that civilizational boundaries do not outperform geography, power, alliances, political institutions, and economic relationships as broad predictors of conflict. Later work addressing interstate and ethnic violence added nuance and some partial support without demonstrating that the world had reorganized into internally cohesive cultural blocs that chiefly fight one another. The measurement problem itself is

revealing because civilization labels compress substantial internal diversity and can obscure mixed or changing identities. The evidence therefore supports a conditional conclusion. Culture and religion can shape conflict when political actors activate them, when institutions distribute rights or resources along identity lines, and when historical narratives make particular rivalries meaningful. They do not automatically produce violence. Huntington is consequently more persuasive as a framework drawing attention to identity than as a deterministic prediction of twenty-first-century war. Civilizational difference belongs among the variables analysts examine, not above the political and material conditions that determine whether difference becomes conflict.

References

Huntington, S. P. (1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22–49.

Russett, B. M., Oneal, J. R., & Cox, M. (2000). Clash of civilizations, or realism and liberalism déjà vu? *Journal of Peace Research*, 37(5), 583–608.

Chiozza, G. (2002). Is there a clash of civilizations? *Journal of Peace Research*, 39(6), 711–734.

Fox, J. (2002). Ethnic minorities and the clash of civilizations. *British Journal of Political Science*, 32(3), 415–434.

Tusicsny, A. (2004). Civilizational conflicts: More frequent, longer, and bloodier? *Journal of Peace Research*, 41(4), 485–498.