

# The Orientalist Legacy in Huntington's Clash of Civilisations Theory and Its De-Mythization

Mawloud Mohadi<sup>1</sup> and Elmira Akhmetova<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract:** This paper investigates Samuel Huntington's approach towards the nature of civilisation and its origins, as well as the Orientalist elements within the theory of Clash of Civilisations in particular and Huntington's thoughts in general. For this purpose, the paper first reviews the theory's historical background and theoretical basis. Then, it identifies and categorises the nature of the civilisational clash narrative and suggests that it has been used in academic literature since the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This paper also attempts to describe and analyse Huntington's paradigm and the Orientalist influence on his thought, particularly his idea that the future of the post-Cold War world would be dominated by civilisational conflicts triggered in the fault lines between the seven or eight major world civilisations. In addition, the paper makes an attempt at defragmenting the civilisational clash theory and gives an alternative paradigm. It concludes that the concept of the 'Clash of Civilisations' does not fit contemporary historical happenings, but could be considered as an attempt of US policy-makers to trigger rivalry to create potential foes. The article uses qualitative research based on historical, political and analytical methods, through which the authors have collected and interpreted data accordingly.

**Keywords:** Samuel Huntington, Clash of Civilisations, Orientalist legacy, Political Interests, Post-Cold War, Paradigm.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Mawloud Mohadi* is a PhD student in History and Civilisation at International Islamic University Malaysia. He can be reached at [mouloudmohadi@gmail.com](mailto:mouloudmohadi@gmail.com).

<sup>2</sup> *Elmira Akhmetova* is an Associate Professor in the Department of History and Civilisation, International Islamic University Malaysia, and Adjunct Associate Professor at University of South Australia. She can be reached at [elmira@iium.edu.my](mailto:elmira@iium.edu.my) & [eakhmetova@gmail.com](mailto:eakhmetova@gmail.com).

## **Introduction to Huntington's Clash of Civilisations Theory**

Huntington's *The Clash of Civilisations* was devised within the frame of his quest to define a new post-Cold War clashes, which in turn was de facto a quest for a 'substitution paradigm' to the dual ideological conflict that took place during the Cold War. The main argument in this new paradigm is that future conflicts will be due to religious and cultural differences, and as a result, they will be longer, bloodier, and more destructive (Huntington, 1997).

Huntington agitatedly relates that global peace is witnessing a serious menace of a so-called 'clash of civilisations', that will predominate international relations and world politics after the end of Cold World War. Huntington's timing is also relevant, for several parts of the world have been marginalised after the Cold War. Eventually, they are supposed to make their voices heard and their existence felt. Western universalism was rejected by those Third World countries which reached some level of self-sufficiency and cooperation. This spirit undoubtedly presents a challenge to the Western supremacy after it had done away with the threat of communism. The paradigm paved the way for the United States to re-establish a new mind-set different from that of the Cold War and present it to a new audience (Sajjad, 2013).

It is worth noting that in order to fully grasp Huntington's theory in context, one must understand the connection established by Huntington between his theoretical analysis of the clash of civilisations and his US policy making strategies. One also should regard the geopolitical interests behind the theory of civilisational clash. According to Professor Ahmet Davutoglu, the search for geopolitical goals and controlling international trade zones are key features of legitimising the civilisational clash theory (Davutoglu, 1997).

In addition to Fukuyama's *The End of History* vision for the post-Cold War world, two authors in 1993 suggested another vision concerning future world politics, Max Singer and Aaron Wildavsky declare the future existence of dual-zone world: peace and conflict zones. They envisioned that in the 21st century, some societies would be endowed with wealth, peace and democracy, while a huge number of people would be cornered in the zone of turmoil where they could be mutilated by wars, violence and terror. Nevertheless,

Huntington (1996) tried to discredit the theory of the End of History, as well as the dual-zone vision. Moreover, Huntington argues against Zbigniew Brzezinski's (1993) world in anarchy image. It fails, he says, considering the several existing institutions, governmental and non-governmental associations and organisations that conspicuously provide a remarkable order and could predict future of world systems (even though, it must be admitted, such order is sometimes inadequate, such as the world community's failure to act to prevent genocide in Rwanda or Bosnia) (Bell, 2002).

Alongside the abovementioned perspectives which drew the most attention, other visions are worth mentioning, such as the New World Order initiated by the Bush administration and Paul Kennedy and Robert Kaplan's contributions in future conflicts. Benjamin Barber (1995) also promoted another perspective on the new order. He argues that though global economy is evident, cultural difference still exist, therefore they can cause conflicts. However, these conflicts will remain within states' boundaries and will not reach a global scale (Barber, 2001).

This article accordingly focuses on Huntington's Clash of Civilisations theory, viewing it as a continuation of prior theories that have explained world order as a conflicting interaction between ideological poles. The most important aspect of the Huntington's Clash of Civilisations is explicitly postulated in his works, as he argues that the clash would clearly be between the West and the East or the European/American civilisation and the Islamic civilisation. It is worth noting that the stereotypical ideas of prejudices and ethnocentrism have been embedded in Huntington's views. Edward Said, a robust proponent of Huntington's idea, ironically stated that the representation of massive units called 'the West' and 'Islam' is irresponsibly and unfairly represented, as immensely complex matters such as identity and culture are in the context of an animated domain in which characters cruelly attack each other, with a character represented as always superior and virtuous having the upper hand over his opponent (Said, 2001). Furthermore, Nefeily has expressed similar discontent against Huntington's representation and has urged modern researchers and intellectuals to propagate an anti-clash trend based on constructive dialogue that will create world of togetherness instead of division, segregation and demolition of world cultures. To achieve the concept of

dialogue, Nefeily indicated that a fair representation is required which should be dissociated from biasness and aggression (Nefeily, 2009).

### **Theoretical Bases of Huntington's Theory**

The Cold War theory that was based on the ideological collision of communism and capitalism that was irreconcilable is actually a simplification of the dynamics of happenings. Similar to Kennan's thesis that led to the policy of containment, Huntington searched for a reductive but effective paradigm in his post-Cold War mapping. This paradigm goes hand in hand with the ideas of neo-realist school that characterised US foreign policy.

In his new paradigm, Huntington's scheme of analysis derives heavily from Arnold Toynbee, who drew great attention in the first years of the Cold War (1947-48) with his work on Civilisations taken as a unit of study. Eventually, Huntington's *The Clash of Civilisations* suggested that 'civilisation' or 'civilisations' as terms were central in a study. Also, one can assume that the popularity of both Huntington and Toynbee was due to the sense that they were able to convey, in part through the language they employed, a depth of historical perspective and weightiness of theme (Sajjad, 2013).

In the theory's foundation, concerning the effects of cultures in conflicts among states, Huntington's Clash of Civilisations theory cannot be separated from the arguments that are extracted from world politics paradigms. Morgenthau, for instance, insists that the 19th century world wars and other conflicts were the results of differences on the interpretation of states norms or the inability to cope with them at all (Morgenthau, 2005).

Realistic and idealistic scholars from Morgenthau to Wright have debated the impact of cultural differences in aggravating world conflicts. Nevertheless, these scholars did not attribute conflicts to cultural differences as significantly as Huntington. In addition, Huntington, in terms of the enduring conflict between Islam and Christianity, is considered to base his work on the findings of Bernard Lewis. This leads us to the role of Orientalism in Huntington's formation of staunch attitudes towards Islam, in which Bernard Lewis is accredited to have had the greatest impact (Errol & Tucker, 2001).

The processes of conceptualising Islam and the West in mainstream literature are profoundly problematical. According to Edward Said, they both have been irrationally portrayed as entities that are bolted in an implacable struggle. These complicated and transforming societal entities are often considered monumental and unchanging in their structure. This idea of human grouping is similar to what Benedict Anderson (1983) has referred to as imaginary communities, conceptualised as presented in specific ways and structures by their own constituents and by others. The vague notion that the West is a monolithic civilisation with a cultural correlation to Western Europe's history shows cracks when analysed intently (Karim & Mahmoud, 2012).

Edward Said questions the perception of a stable well-identified area of the world, distinctive from others stating that:

How can one today speak of "Western civilisation" except as in large measure an ideological fiction, implying a sort of detached superiority for a handful of values and ideas, none of which has much meaning outside the history of conquest, immigration, travel, and the mingling of peoples that gave the Western nations their present identities? (Said, 1994, p. 374).

Aside from any biasness or reductionism, it is fair to say that the West as a civilisational entity must be recognised as having evolving, permeable, corresponding, multi-ethnic, and paradoxical composite characteristics that are also persistent in other world civilisations.

*The Clash of Civilisations* cites several academic fellows of Huntington who are specialised in political sciences and foreign policy making. He also cites various governmental strategists and statisticians' works to indicate cultural differences relevant to his theory of Clash of Civilisations. Concerning Huntington's basic arguments and his simplification of cultures and civilisations, he heavily utilised past events recorded by authors who observed and discussed cultural differences and civilisations. His thesis dealt with more recent events, such as the Cold War where he commonly quotes some contemporary diplomats, political scientists, and strategists such as Zbigniew Kazimierz and Kissinger. Finally, approaching the pinnacle of his

argument, he utilised his contemporaries' views such as Fukuyama and Lewis.

Although the initial focus in his text accentuates historical authors that have tried to define culture, ethnicity and civilisation from the eyes of social scientists, Huntington primarily singles out those authors from the Nixon era through the end of the Cold War period (essentially, his contemporary colleagues). In Huntington's defence, he does provide citations from Mahbubani and Mahathir, but only to substantiate or advance his arguments in support of his overall thesis since he avoided mentioning any non-Western figures presenting different perspectives which are contradictory to his thesis. He rarely quotes a non-Western academicians or scholars to provide a critical viewpoint that differs from his own, without dismissing it in kind (Said, 2001).

### **Origins of the Clash Concept**

There was but a little time between the show up of the theory of civilisational clash and its ascent to the peak of global political agenda. Many scholars relate the term Clash of Civilisations to Bernard Lewis. However, the intellectual debate about the Clash of Civilisations had started much earlier by Oswald Spengler in his book entitled *The Decline of the West* in 1918. Spengler defined history by civilisations (cultures) and made civilisation a term of reference for historical study.

Some date back the earliest development of the idea of Civilisational Clash to the late 1920s, when Basil Mathews, an Indian missionary, used the term in his book, *Young Islam on Trek: A Study in the Clash of Civilisations*. Ahmet Davutoglu relates that there is remarkable likeness between Mathews' and Huntington's analyses and approaches to cultures and civilisations. Furthermore, in a special issue of *The Congressional Quarterly* published in 1979 on the US Foreign Policy: Future Directions was an article entitled *Iran between East and West*. The paper discussed that the envisioned clash between the Eastern and the Western civilisations would continue after the Iranian Revolution (Teter, 1979).

There had also been a mention of the term Clash of Civilizations in 1990 by Bernard Lewis in his article entitled *The Roots of Muslim Rage*. In fact, the thesis articulated by Bernard Lewis in this article should be

seen as a turning point in Orientalist approach. Bernard Lewis and his Orientalist peers are by now different from the traditional Orientalists, because they emphasised on the inevitable clash with the Other. For the new Orientalists, their emphasis on the concept of civilisational clash took away the traditional Orientalism that used to view the East as the silent Other that had become more active and less mute. Thereby, Lewis pictured the Muslim civilisation as an active Other when he reductively defined Islam as an anti-Western religion.

The concept of Clash of Civilisations held by the new Orientalist trend can be characterised in three levels. Firstly, they ascribed the term civilisation with wider cultures such as Confucian and Islamic cultures. Secondly, they considered the Muslim civilisation as a more active Other alien from the Western civilisation by using the paradigm of us and them, self and other. Lastly, these authors viewed a civilisation as a one block-piece that could collide with others after the end of the Cold War. Their argument was that civilisations may clash among themselves in the same way that states do (Jiang, 2014).

The three above-mentioned levels of characterisation have become so evident in Western literature, especially after Huntington had published his article entitled *The Clash of Civilisations* in 1993 by *Foreign Affairs*. Several writers started describing global politics of the post-Cold War era referencing to the Clash of Civilisations work and focusing on the Muslim world likely conflict with the West. This idea would dominate world politics and replace the lines of conflict drawn in the Cold War. Terms such as 'Islamic fundamentalism', 'Islamic terrorism', 'Islamic extremism' and 'radical Islam' are used to describe the Muslim 'Other' within the civilisational clash context (Balci, 2009).

### **Operationalising Huntington's Concept of Civilisations, Characteristics and Typology**

Scholars who held quantitative analyses on Huntington's theory, found difficulty in the operationalisation of the concept of civilisation, that is the categorisation of each majority and minority groups within

determined civilisations. This difficulty resides in the fact that Huntington divides the world into eight major civilisations based on religion. He seems uncertain about Buddhism; either it makes up an independent civilisation, or it is joined to the Sinic/Confucian one. Also, doubt was incurred by joining Israel to Western Civilisation, despite the disparate nature between Jewish and Christian cultures (Huntington, 1997).

Another problem raised by Huntington's definition and classification of civilisations is the difficulty of putting minority groups (Afro-Americans in the USA and Black Muslims in Africa, for instance) within the frame of any of the eight major civilisations. Indigenous people, in respect to Huntington's division, do not fit into any of his civilisations (Jonathan, 2002).

The Clash of Civilisations thesis claims that religions are the driving forces that would define a civilisation. However, Huntington's argument on religion and its lion-share in civilisation still questionable. According to Huntington, Christianity is the religion of Western, Orthodox and Latin American civilisations. But he puts apart Latin America as it is considerably Catholic neglecting that Spain, Portugal, Belgium, France and Italy are also mostly Catholics. Thus, for the sake of argument, if Huntington prescribes three Christian civilisations, what could have prevented him from dividing Islam into its sects or racial lines (Sunni and Shi'ah; Arab, African and Malay) (Alam, 2002).

Berger and other critics have claimed that the Clash of Civilisations theory failed to attribute West's homogeneous entities (Berger, 2003). In her article entitled *The Modernizing Imperative: Tradition and Change* published in *Foreign Affairs*, Jeane Kirkpatrick criticised Huntington by stating that:

Huntington's classification of contemporary civilisations is questionable ... If civilisation is defined by common objective elements such as language, history, religion, customs and institutions and, subjectively, by identification, and if it is the broadest collectivity with which persons intensely identify, why distinguish "Latin American" from "Western" civilisation? Like North America, Latin America is a continent settled by Europeans who brought with them European languages and a European version of



Judeo-Christian religion, law, literature, and gender roles  
(Kirkpatrick, Weeks, & Piel, 1993, pp. 1-2).

In his book, Huntington depicts civilisations as fragmented and internally ununited. He insists that Muslim countries are ethnically fragmented into Arabs, Africans, Malays, Persians, Pakistanis, and they all have distinct religious views. Thus, Huntington's categorisation as well as the delineation are not solid as he believed. For example, one could note that cultural differences between the Chinese and Vietnamese are less important than of the Japanese and Chinese. Nevertheless, Huntington considered China and Vietnam as a part of Sine Civilisation while the Japanese belonged to another separate one. It is also worth noting that Huntington had separated civilisations of the Western and Orthodox based on non-religious exclusion. What is notable too is that differences within Muslim communities are ignored as well.

Former Columbia University Professor Edward Said responded to the Clash of Civilisation thesis in his paper *The Clash of Ignorance*. He argued that the idea to limit the world civilisations to fixed bodies and entities obliterates the dynamism and interaction among world cultures, and noted that Huntington's paradigm could be the source of conflicts and collisions rather than peace or harmony. The idea promoted by Huntington that each culture is enclosed and distinct with special fate and psychology which could be used to determine the civilisation structure and geography may result the legitimacy of some self-serving geopolitical interests (Said, 2001).

### **The True Nature of Huntington's Civilisational Conflict**

Huntington claims that after the Cold War, state conflicts would be based on disparate levels of wealth among countries. He states that poor countries lack the political unity, economic power, and military capability to challenge the rich countries (Huntington, 1997). Ironically, this idea opposes the main objective of his thesis about the most threatening menace to the West coming from Islam and China. He perhaps deliberately ignores the fact that several Muslim countries, even the most populous ones such as Indonesia, are considered among the world's poorest countries. The same could be said about China;

despite two decades of rapid growth, if compared with the West, it still looks quite poor. Additionally, the Muslim world has no unity in terms of politics, and it is divided into more than fifty nation-states. Ironically, to this point Huntington seems to have contrasted his civilisational clash thesis, which argued that most clashes generate from cultural differences when he explained the genesis of conflicts among civilisations (Alam, 2002).

Huntington often justifies his stand by relying on Bernard Lewis' ideas, as he believes that to define self-identity one needs an enemy. In order to assert his views, Huntington states that there could be no real friends without real enemies, and without hating what we are not, we are unable to appreciate what we are. These for him are the traditional truths we are sorely re-experiencing; he continues that people who repudiate such truths they are eventually denying their family, heritage, culture, birth-right and their very selves! (Huntington, 1997).

The author articulates his belief that, the unfortunate truth in these old truths cannot be ignored by statesmen and scholars (Huntington, 1997). While the claim appears ingenuous by academicians, Huntington desires to promote the perception that adversaries and enmity are vital for those who seek identity. In doing so, he echoes Lewis, who firstly suggested that the Western civilisation has always had its probable enemies. In his argument, he claims that after the Cold War, the enemies of the West are Islam and its civilisation as well the Chinese civilisation (Huntington, 1997).

Islam has always been identified as one of the chief religions. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Muslims themselves and the Muslim world were politically unrecognisable. Even though historically, Islam has a very deep and powerful political tenets and guidelines, Muslim countries have failed to embark and effectively participate in the international political grounds. The September 11 terrorist attack in 2001 came to allegedly confirm the theory of Huntington, and in light of that, Huntington repeats himself in his article entitled "The Age of Muslim Wars," claiming that Muslim countries have an excessive sense of hatred, spite and resentment toward the wealth, might, and Western culture (Huntington, 1997).

If we try to examine the nature of civilisational clash, one could clearly see the misconceptions and wrong assumption on several

civilisations. For instance, the lion share of Huntington's clash was between Muslim and Western civilisations, the wrong statements pose a question on the soundness of his arguments. To explicate and expand his theory, Huntington distorted the history of both Muslim and Western civilisations, he claims that even though people of the West argued that they have no problems with Muslims and Islam, except the trend of violent extremists, the long history of Islam reveals the opposite, as Muslims and Christians' relations have been tempestuous and each has been an adversary to the other (Huntington, 1997).

As a large part of Huntington's book was devoted to inner enmity between Islam and the West, the study of the relationship between Muslims and Christians is not an objective of this paper. However, for the sake of argument, some deliberations on history are required to prove that Huntington's claims for both religion and civilisations is no less superstitious. Even someone with a basic knowledge of the Holy Qur'an understands that Islamic teachings never promote enmity between Muslims and Christians. Essentially, Muslims are advised to engage in intellectual and friendly relations with their fellow Christians, as they believe in the existence of the God and consider the coming of prophets throughout history. Perhaps, Huntington does not know that the Christians of Ethiopia immensely contributed in preserving Islam in its cradle.

In brief, the nature of civilisational clash has no sound foundation, particularly when investigating international relations between the Muslim and Western countries. Most recent Islamic fundamentalist incidents were conducted by individuals who had lived or studied in the West. He emphasises that religious or cultural identities are not the cause of conflicts, but rather certain philosophical beliefs or political dogmas (Bell, 2002).

### **The Orientalist Legacy in Huntington's Idea**

Orientalism is the lens through which the Westerners have historically, religiously, and politically observed the East in ongoing process. Orientalism is a paradigm of the West that it utilises to understand Eastern people and their cultures. Such studies frequently alienate

people and turn them into a threat through a well-organised and systematic stereotyping.

It is crucial that one must examine Huntington's definition and representation of the Muslim faith in modern Orientalism for Islam appeared to have been the dominant concern in his Clash of Civilisations thesis. The Orientalist discourse has established an integral relation between foreign policy and Orientalism itself. Therefore, Orientalism became a driving force in the nature of foreign policy practiced by the West. The American Pentagon was largely influenced by Huntington's hypothesis, as is clearly evident in American foreign policy towards the Muslim world.

In a clear Orientalist gesture, Huntington had noticeably borrowed the ideas of Bernard Lewis who he considers the embodiment of new Orientalism. It is worth noting that even the book title of Huntington is simulated from Lewis's article entitled *Roots of Muslim Rage* published in 1990, in his paper, Lewis tellingly related that by then, it was clear that the world was facing a new phenomenon in the arena of politics and states, he insists that Islam is the one rival against Judeo-Christian heritage that could threaten secularism and Western expansion. He continues that it was clash of civilisations. A few years after the *Atlantic Monthly* article written by Lewis, Huntington brought up somewhat different arguments with similar ideas (Sajjad, 2013).

Huntington's thesis seems questionable in several ways. It is erroneous, simplistic and imprecise, due to his desperate attempt to defend the idea of bloody Islam, this is indeed blasphemous, as it is based on inaccurate generalisation. Huntington relates that there is no reason of conflicts and chaos within Muslim nations except because of Islam itself and its nature. Additionally, his ideas establish a wrong picture of a sword-based, barbaric civilisation that its interest is mainly destruction of the West and its civilisational heritage. Such ideas deserve more thorough analysis and immediate refusal (Sajjad, 2013).

### **The De-Mythization of the Clash Notion and Emergence of an Alternative Paradigm**

Considering the current world situations, one can possibly identify a couple of arguments against the allegedly inevitable clash of civilisations. The current conflicts are not based on civilisational

reason but rather on states' interest, argued Ajami and Davutoglu who recognised ideas such as the separation of civilisations into entities.

The other argument is that some scholars have tried to weaken the dichotomy of self/other which have made the clash inevitable by considering the 'Other' as something related to 'Self' while asserting the 'Other' as a corner stone in the making of the 'Self'. Edward Said and some of his peers have supported the idea of a complete refusal of both self-other, us/them as well as the Clash of Civilisations thesis. Said notes, "rather than the manufactured clash of civilisations, we need to concentrate on the slow working together of cultures that overlap, borrow from each other, and live together in far more interesting ways than any abridged or inauthentic mode of understanding can allow" (Said, 2001, p. 2).

Considering a defragmentation of the civilisational clash theory, an alternative paradigm is offered by Seizaburo who basically argued that conflicts are highly to happen not because of human differences within religions and cultures, but due to the levels of development and economic achievements. Seizaburo holds the same views as the Japanese scholar Akihiko Tanaka, who insists that not civilisational differences but socio-economic element that lie the foundation of clash. Well-known Kenyan scholar Ali A. Mazrui considers the theory of Clash of Civilisations as a racist exposition utilised by the West in an attempt to marginalise the East to legitimise Western policies towards it. Mazrui argues that it has been always the racial paradigm that inspired the Westerns in their approaches especially towards Africa and Asia. He asserts that the Western countries have repeatedly been civilisational aggressors against numerous world civilisations for centuries (Adem & Mazrui, 2014).

Notions such as dialogue of civilisations, dialogue between civilisations, and alliance of civilisations did not newly appear in the era of post-civilisational clash thesis. These ideas were rediscovered as an argument against the clash-based thesis, re-invented accordingly and popularised since the 1990s.

There have also been some politically motivated attempts to initiate the notion of dialogue among civilisations in accordance with the scholarly literature. Mohammad Khatami, former president of Iran, proposed the idea of dialogue among civilisations that later in 2001

would be the slogan for the United Nations (UN). During his speech at United Nations General Assembly, Khatami expressed hope that a move towards such dialogue would replace hostility and confrontation with discourse and understanding.

After some notorious incidents, and as an attempt of the UN General Assembly to foster the idea of civilisational dialogue, in November 2001 the UN General Assembly embraced a resolution, entitled *Global Agenda for Dialogue among Civilisations*. The programme included a talk invitation to UN systems, organisations and states advocating dialogue of civilisations. This initiative was not the only of its kind, the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) and the European Union (EU) conducted a Joint Forum in Istanbul, February 2002, to promote and nurture the spirit of civilisational harmonisation (Balci, 2009).

## **Conclusion**

The tragedy of 11 September 2001 was a turning point for the success of the clash of civilisations hypothesis, which envisages the cultural and religious identities of people to be the main factor for recent conflicts and bloodshed. However, the weaknesses of Samuel Huntington's explanation of the current world order are quite apparent. The findings of this article could thus be summarised into three main points.

First, the term Clash of Civilisations based on cultural and religious classifications is not an invention of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century but it has been envisaged by many Orientalist writers and policy-makers prior to the publication of Huntington's *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order* in 1996. Yet, these early suggestions did not see any danger emanating from cultural and religious differences to world peace and security. For earlier Orientalists, the 'Other' was weak, silent and obedient. The end of the Cold War produced a huge vacuum for the creation of a new enemy as the contemporary world order is based largely on conflict and severe attention to differences. The Persian Gulf War of 1990-1991 played a vital role in providing such alternative division of the world based on cultural and religious differences. Quite quickly, Islam became an enemy of everything related to progress, well-being, development, peace and security. When the tragedy of September 11 happened, the world was already

primed to accept a direct link between Islam and 'terrorism,' creating a lot of pre-judgement, unfairness and discrimination towards Muslim citizens, both in the West and Muslim world. Thus, this article suggests that the clash of civilisations due to religious identities is an artificial ideology that disturbs world peace, security, well-being, and the human rights of citizens.

Additionally, the Clash of Civilisations theory is well-established and widely used today. However, it seems that this theory is incapable of explaining the existing conflicts or predicting the coming ones. Instead of bringing solutions to problems and providing world security, it directly contributes to spreading of enmity and conflict as one can witness in the parallel rise of racism, Islamophobia, xenophobia and hatred in modern societies. Thus, the world should recognise the weakness caused by seeing humanity as in constant conflict and look for other alternative explanations.

Finally, there are several alternative explanations of civilisational differences and the role of religions in current scholarship. Academic and applied activities to establish a dialogue among different civilisations may be considered one of these. However, such activities have not been made known to the public due to poor coverage by the media, while the mainstream description of the world in constant conflict due to cultural and religious differences is accessible everywhere, from kindergarten textbooks to state policy recommendations.

The abovementioned statements are the main ideas dealt with in this article. It is worth adding that the clash paradigm motivated the 'Other', as well as the 'West' to devise alternative paradigms. The notions of 'dialogue' and 'alliance' among civilisations are only the highlighted examples. Additionally, the analysis and discussion in this research paper on the clash of civilisations has drawn attention to the search for measures to avoid such clashes in order to live in a peaceful world. Thus, the article recommends encouraging alternative ideas and worldviews to be heard in creating a better and more secured world.

Several historical and cultural concepts should be inclusively re-addressed and re-interpreted in an integrative manner. Additionally, certain notions of global communication, sharing, and interaction ought to be brought to light. These measures present a hopeful perception of a clash-exempt world. Their accomplishment requires

political willingness and sincere mobilisation in the East as well as in the West. Unfortunately, pragmatism is becoming the sole determinant of political, geopolitical, economic, ideological measure in the international relations between the states and civilisations of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## References

- Adem, S & Mazrui, Ali A. (2014). The Postcolonial Theorist. *African Studies Review*, 57(1), 135-152.
- Alam, M Shahid. (2002). *A Critique of Samuel Huntington: Peddling Civilisational Wars*. Retrieved from <http://www.counterpunch.org/alampeddle.html> (Assessed 10 July 2019).
- Ashraf, Mian Muhammad Tahir. (2012). The Clash of Civilisations? A Critique. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, 32(2), 521-527.
- Balci, Ali. (2009). The Alliance of Civilisations: The Poverty of the Clash/ Alliance Dichotomy? *Insight Turkey*, 11(3), 95-108.
- Barber, Benjamin. (2001). *Jihad vs McWorld: Terrorism's Challenge to Democracy* (1st ed.). United States of America: Random House Publishing Group.
- Bell, Wendell. (2002). The Clash of Civilisations and Universal Human Values. *Journal of Future Studies*, 6(3), 1-20.
- Burns, Nathan L. (2007). Turkey, the Caspian Region, and the Clash of Civilisations. *Undergraduate Research Journal*, 2(1).
- Davutoglu, Ahmet. (1997). The Clash of Interests: An Explanation of the World (Dis) Order. *Perception Journal of International Affairs*, 2(4).
- Fox, Jonathan. (2002). Ethnic Minorities and the Clash of Civilisations: A Quantitative Analysis of Huntington's Thesis. Cambridge University Press, 05 June 2002. Retrieved from: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/british-journal-of-political-science/article/ethnic-minorities-and-the-clash-of-civilizations-a-quantitative-analysis-of-huntingtons-thesis/85A9699D564116ED2EC38FB0E4385B64>.
- Fukuyama, Francis. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: The Free Press.



- Henderson, Errol A, & Tucker, Richard. (2001). Clear and Present Strangers: The Clash of Civilisations and International Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 45, 317–338.
- Hoge, James F. et.al. (2010). *The Clash of Civilisations: The Debate* (2nd ed.). United States of America: Foreign Affairs.
- Hovgaard. (2010). *Huntington and the Clash of Civilisations*. Antarctica: University of Antarctica.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1997). *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order*. United States: The Free Press, Simon and Schuster UK Ltd.
- Jiang, Zhewen. (2014). Civilisation in International Affairs, Rev. of Clash of Civilisations by Samuel Huntington. *Journal of Political Inquiry*, Spring 2014 Issue.
- Kaptan, Yeşim. (2013). *A Conceptual Perspective to Media: Cultural Globalisation, Clash of Civilisations*. İzmir: İzmir University of Economics.
- Karim, Karim H. & Eid, Mahmoud. (2012). Clash of ignorance. *Global Media Journal*, 5(1), 7-27.
- Kirkpatrick, J., Weeks, A., & Piel, G. (1993). The Modernising Imperative: Tradition and Change. *Foreign Affairs*, 72(4), 22-26.
- Morgenthau, Hans. (2005). *Politics Among Nations: Struggle for Power and Peace*. U.S.A: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Nefeily, Salah Ed-din. (2009). *It is a Dialogue not a Clash*. Cairo: Dar An-Nashr Liljami'at.
- Norris, Pippa, & Inglehart, Ronald. (2002). Islamic Culture and Democracy: Testing the 'Clash of Civilisations' Thesis. *Comparative Sociology*, 1(3), 235-263.
- Rivers, J. (2019, December 24). "Clash of Ignorance" by Edward Said [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://ivypanda.com/essays/clash-of-ignorance-by-edward-said/>.
- Said, Edward. (1994). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Said, Edward W. (22 October 2001). The Clash of Ignorance, *The Nation*, Retrieved from <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/clash-ignorance>.
- Sajjad, Memoona. (2013). *A 'Non Western' Reading of the 'Clash of Civilisations' Theory: Through the Eyes of 'The Rest'*. *Academic Research*, 1(2).

Teter, D. (1979). *Iran between East and West*. Editorial Research Report. Washington, DC: CQ Press.