

RESEARCH ARTICLE	The Philosophy of reshaping the New World Order according to Samuel Huntington	
Battache Menana	Dr.	
	École Normale Supérieure de Bouzaréah	
	Algeria	
	Email: Battache.menana@ensb.dz	
Mounis Ahmed	Dr.	
	University Ali Lounici Blida 2	
	Algeria	
	Email: a.mounis@univ-blida2.dz	
Alla Mokhtar	Prof.	
	University of Djelfa	
	Algeria	
	Email: mokhtar.alla@univ-djelfa.dz	
Doi Serial	https://doi.org/10.56334/sci/8.6.73	
Keywords	New World Order, Conflict, Civilization, Ideology, Identity.	
Abstract		
World politics stands on the threshold of a new era characterised by significant intellectual, cultural, and political transformations. Intellectuals have put forward many perspectives regarding the nature of the new world order. Samuel Huntington, an American philosopher (1927–2008), argues that the primary source of conflict in this new world will no longer be ideological or primarily economic. Instead, the major divisions among humanity will be cultural and civilisational. He posits that conflict has become civilisational, meaning that clashes of civilisations will dominate global politics, and differences between civilisations will be fundamental rather than superficial. Therefore, according to Huntington, this new phase in human history will not be based on peace, coexistence, or dialogue but instead on confrontation and separation. The underlying and unchanging driving force is cultural and civilisational identities. Differences in religion, language, history, ethnicity, customs, and traditions will become the key criteria for human classification. Cultural entities that encompass groups sharing the same identity will take precedence. Consequently, every state must define its position in the new global political order based on its civilisational and cultural affiliation.		
Citation		
Battache M., Mounis A., Alla M. (2025). The Philosophy of Reshaping the New World Order According to Samuel Huntington. <i>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems</i> , 8(6), 667-672; doi:10.56352/sci/8.6.73. https://imcra-az.org/archive/364-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-6-volvi-2025.html		
Licensed		
© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Science, Education and Innovations in the context of modern problems (SEI) by IMCRA - International Meetings and Journals Research Association (Azerbaijan). This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).		
Received: 06.10.2024	Accepted: 09.01.2025	Published: 23.05.2025 (available online)

Introduction

The second half of the twentieth century was characterised by numerous intellectual and political events and transformations that led to a radical change in the fundamental rules defining the global order, such as the end of the European colonial era and the beginning of doubt towards the Western cultural heritage and the rejection of Western centrism. This centrism posited that Western modernity represented the pinnacle of human thought, social order, and the end of history. Consequently, some Western intellectuals called for thoroughly revising all European thought and advocated respect for other cultures. This development encouraged newly independent nations to write their histories, characterised by struggles for freedom and survival, to correct the distorted histories imposed by Western states.

Furthermore, the collapse of the Eastern bloc and the end of the Cold War, which altered the international balance of power, gave rise to civilisational and cultural forces opposing the West. This period witnessed the emergence of so-called multipolarity, compelling the West to delineate its geopolitical domain. After the Cold War, the world was divided into two parts: (a) a single Western world and (b) multiple non-Western entities competing with and opposing the West.

The transfer of awakening and civilisational consciousness from this multitude of independent peoples to the United States of America at the beginning of the 1990s led to youth movements of African descent demanding equality and civil rights. Furthermore, the publication of Fukuyama's article "*The End of History*" in 1992 had a significant impact on public opinion amid the gradual growth and spread of democracy as an alternative to dictatorial regimes since the only form of government that remained constant and unchallenged until the end of the twentieth century was liberal democracy.

In this climate charged with change, the question arose concerning the role of Western civilisation in leading human civilisation, its right to dominance, and its claim to be historically qualified to build a universal civilisation. This issue was debated between two opposing currents:

1. The American conservatives asserted the United States' rights over the world.
2. The progressives called for affirming other peoples' contributions in building civilisation and shaping history.

Amidst this debate regarding the historical legitimacy of the West to lead human civilisation in general and the United States right to global dominance in particular, Samuel Huntington initially published a new study titled *The Clash of*

Civilizations as a brief article. For three years, this work sparked controversy and elicited reactions from prominent thinkers, states, and governments. It was subsequently followed by a detailed book on the same issue, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the New World Order*. In this work, Huntington explained the fundamental transformation in international relations, which had shifted from being based on economic interests and ideological ideas to being founded on cultural and civilisational factors. He argued that conflict was no longer political, economic, or ideological but had become civilisational and cultural.

Therefore, based on these new premises, the question is: How can civilisation, as the highest form of identity expression, play a role in shaping the new world order, according to Samuel Huntington?

Samuel P. Huntington, an American philosopher (1927–2008), was a professor of political science at Harvard University, specialising in strategic studies. He became renowned for analysing the relationship between religious governments and the military, but his fame chiefly rests on his formulation of the *Clash of Civilizations* thesis.

His name emerged in the 1960s when he published his study, *Political Order in Changing Societies*. In it, he challenged the classical view that economic and social progress would inevitably lead to the establishment of democracy in all newly independent states.

His research provoked considerable controversy, especially his book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the New World Order*. The core of this theory is that future conflicts will not be between states, kings, rulers, ideologies or economic systems but rather between cultures and civilisations. Its objective is to provide a foreign policy grounded in conflict and the existence of an enemy.

Since the Russians and many Third World countries previously lost their role as threats, the fabrication of new enemies represented by people with non-Western identities became an urgent necessity for the Americans. This is regarded as the substitute for the Cold War. Many societies in the post-Cold War era began rediscovering and searching anew for their cultural identities. Samuel Huntington stated:

"The post-Cold War world is a world composed of differences that shape the interests, disputes, and convergences of states. The most important states of the world come from different civilisations. The conflicts most likely to escalate into broader wars are those between groups and states from different civilisations. The dominant forms of political and economic development vary from one civilisation to another, and

the major issues on the global agenda encompass many differences between civilisations.”¹

This text shows that the new phase in human history within the emerging world is not founded on peace, coexistence, dialogue, or tolerance but rather on conflict, confrontation, separation, and polarity. The primary driver of this conflict, which determines global politics, is neither ideology nor economic interests but cultural and civilisational identities. Cultural distinctions manifested in religion, history, language, customs, traditions, and so forth will become the decisive factors in classifying human groups. Cultural identity will be defined in opposition to the Other, and civilisation will become the broadest cultural entity encompassing groups linked by race, language, religious history, and similar ties through which people recognise themselves and affirm their identities.

According to Samuel Huntington, this can only be realised through the presence of enemies who affirm their differences. Thus, the central axis of the *Clash of Civilizations* theory is civilisation in its broadest sense, which will shape patterns of conflict, divergence, and fragmentation in the post-Cold War era. For the first time, the world has become multipolar and multicivilisational. Modernity does not equate to Westernisation, as it does not lead to the emergence of a universal civilisation, as some have believed; rather, it preserves the plurality and diversity of civilisations. Abbas Al-Ghali Al-Hadithi remarks:

“During the Cold War, the world was divided into the First, Second, and Third Worlds, but these divisions have lost their meaning. The more appropriate classification today is not based on political and economic systems or economic development levels, but rather on culture and civilisation.”²

It becomes evident that a new world order will emerge based on cultural and civilisational distinctions, whereby states will not cooperate based on shared ideology or unified economic interests but rather on belonging to the same civilisation. After conducting comparisons among what he identified as the eight existing civilisations: Western, Islamic, Japanese, Chinese, Latin American, Orthodox, Hindu, and possibly African, Huntington asserted that the forthcoming conflict would be between the Islamic and Chinese civilisations on one side and the Western civilisation on the other.

This implies that a new world order, grounded in cultural diversity and civilisational plurality, is beginning to take shape. The state will become merely a subsidiary political embodiment within the broader cultural and civilisational framework, and accepting cultural fault lines as the essence of future Cold Wars is inevitable.

What exacerbates the situation is that cultural and civilisational differences cannot be altered, unlike ideological affiliations, political tests, or economic systems. Therefore, the forthcoming conflict will be perpetual, as there is no room for coexistence or rapprochement amid such differences and diversity. Abbas Al-Ghali Al-Hadithi observes in this regard:

“The claims of universality or humanity advanced by the West place it in a competitive struggle with other civilisations, and more dangerously so with Islam and China.”³

However, why did Huntington focus on Islamic and Chinese civilisations as challenges to Western civilisation? A return to origins is a virtue and a universal characteristic, and what distinguished much of the twentieth century was the revival of various non-Western civilisations seeking their identities. However, this revival did not reach the level of rejection and confrontation with Western civilisation except from the Islamic and Confucian civilisations.

Thus, the increasing confidence, rejection, and opposition to Western civilisation led Huntington to position these two civilisations as the opposing poles in the conflict with the West. Dieter Senghaas explains:

“This is because the Islamic world has long regarded Western culture as a starting point for cultural marginalisation. Western programmes were introduced during the collapse of Marxism, socialism, the Ottoman state after colonialism, nationalism, and other diverse doctrines of development, which forced Islamic societies to seek their path through a dead end.”⁴

The Islamic challenge is represented by the rise of the Islamic awakening, which is characterised by a return to Islamic origins and principles and has spread throughout much of the Arab and Islamic world.

The factors that have contributed to the spread and resilience of this awakening are:

- a) Social mobilisation
- b) Rapidly increasing demographic growth

Huntington states:

“While Asians grew confident as a result of economic progress, Muslims, with their vast numbers, were simultaneously turning to Islam as a source of identity, meaning, stability, legitimacy, power, and hope that hope expressed in the slogan ‘Islam is the solution.’ This Islamic awakening, in its breadth and depth, represents the latest stage in the adaptation of

Islamic civilisation to the West, seeking a solution not in Western ideologies but in Islam. It embodies acceptance of modernity and rejection of Western culture, coupled with a return to commitment to Islam as a guide for life in the modern world.”⁵

The result has been that protest, reform, demonstration, jihad, and similar actions have become the slogans of Muslim youth who believe that all solutions lie in a return to Islamic origins.

The Chinese challenge, more broadly the Asian challenge, lies in economic development, which has fostered self-confidence within these societies. Economic progress has given these people a sense of moral and cultural superiority. The Chinese view Confucianism as a source of pride and revival. At the same time, the Japanese have realised they can excel without becoming Westernised, drawing strength and superiority from their values of discipline, order, loyalty, work ethic, responsibility, and collective spirit. This demonstrates that economic prosperity generates moral and cultural superiority, self-confidence, and a sense of distinction.

Huntington states:

“The Islamic challenge manifests in the cultural, social, and political awakening of Islam in the Islamic world, accompanied by a rejection of Western values and social institutions. The Asian challenge is evident in all Eastern Asian and Islamic civilisations, each standing separately in its increasing confidence and assertion against the West, and sometimes standing together. There are causes related to these challenges, but they differ: the Asian affirmation of roots derives from economic growth, whereas the Islamic affirmation largely stems from social mobilisation and population growth. All these challenges will continue to impact the instability of global politics in the twenty-first century.”⁶

1. Results of Global Civilisational Interaction

The nature of conflict in the twentieth century shifted from a unipolar Western civilisation to a multipolar world of multiple civilisations and cultures. Consequently, previous civilisational and cultural characteristics disappeared, giving rise to new features, including:

- a) The decline of Western civilisation's influence and rebellion resulted from the end of Western expansion and the independence of most of its colonies. Evidence of this is the radically different world map of 1990 compared to 1920.
- b) The collapse of Western ideological systems, such as socialism, Marxism, fascism, anarchism, and others, replaced by

ideologies based on religion, language, history, and culture. This transformation led to a multipolar world of civilisations after Western civilisation had previously dominated the global stage.

2. Characteristics of Global Civilisational Interaction

As previously noted, future conflicts will not be between states, governments, economic systems, or ideologies but between civilisations and cultures. Thus, global politics will change significantly, governed by convergence and attraction based on similarities and homogeneity between two or more civilisations and divergence and antagonism based on differences and contradictions between two or more civilisations. Consequently, the alignment of peoples will be founded on cultural and civilisational grounds, not economic or ideological ones. This will render political borders subordinate to cultural determinants such as religion, language, history, ethnicity, and so forth, which may be sources of conflict and confrontation between diverse peoples or sources of coexistence and peace among similar peoples.

It is clear from the foregoing that every state must determine its position in the new global politics and distinguish between its friends and enemies based on its civilisational and cultural affiliation. Therefore, individuals must define "who they are," know their identity and affirm their belonging.

This situation led to the emergence of the identity issue at the end of the twentieth century in many countries such as Algeria, China, Germany, India, Iran, South Africa, Ukraine, Turkey, and many others. Identity became the focus of research, protests, and struggles among the peoples of these countries, primarily revolving around ethnicity, language, religion, history, and so forth. Huntington states:

"Modernisation, economic development, urbanisation, and globalisation have led people to rethink their identity and redefine it in narrower, more intimate, and sectarian terms. Cultural and regional identities of subnational groups take precedence over broader national identities, and people feel affinity with those who resemble them and whom they perceive as sharing common ethnicity, religion, traditions, and myths tracing their shared origin and history.”⁷

This civilisational identity has become a criterion for either rapprochement or divergence among peoples. What we observed immediately after the end of the Cold War was the emergence of new enmities and friendships of a non-strategic nature. At this level of fundamental transformation in relations between peoples, the question arises: Why do cultural and civilisational differences lead to conflict and discord rather than coexistence, dialogue, and cultural exchange?

3. Cultural and Civilisational Differences as a Source of Conflict

1. Humans across all societies share specific fundamental values, such as condemning crime and abhorring theft, which explains the existence of some constants in human behaviour. However, this does not explain the history, which consists of changes in human behaviour, nor does it explain religious unity or imply that civilisation is universal. Instead, each human group is distinguished from others by its cultural identity. Therefore, difference is the origin of conflict and the source of divergence.

2. Social and economic modernisation generates a need to cling to identity and revive the past and original cultures within the individual or group.

3. Cultural identity, whether at the level of the individual, tribe, or civilisation, can only be understood about the Other. Therefore, affirming cultural selfhood necessarily implies the existence of a distinct Other. This indicates the presence of the Self and the Other, and the relationship between them is based on factors that invariably lead to conflict, namely:

- a) A sense of superiority or inferiority towards the Other.
- b) Fear and mistrust of the Other.
- c) Difficulty communicating with the Other for various reasons, such as language.
- d) A lack of congruence in aspirations and visions.

This situation has created alienation among these peoples because non-Western peoples perceive this cultural proselytism merely as invasion and indirect colonisation, which inevitably provokes a rejecting and sometimes violent reaction. The West's objective behind this cultural invasion is:

- 1. To maintain its superior position.
- 2. To defend its economic interests wherever they may be.
- 3. To confer global legitimacy upon its interests wherever they exist.
- 4. To link the world's economies to a global system controlled and dominated by it through international economic institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Free Trade Organisation, and others.
- 5. To strangle economic freedoms and impose unfair conditions on non-Western peoples.

6. To apply double standards in dealing with global politics; for example, weapons are prohibited for some parties but permitted for others, Israeli aggression is considered self-defence, and Palestinian resistance is labelled terrorism.

Non-Western states, Asia, and Islamic countries, in particular, seek to liberate themselves from this global Western tutelage, cultural invasion, and economic and military domination by developing mechanisms and strategies to achieve balance with the West. This has resulted in the following:

- 1. The decline of Western civilisation's influence and its decreasing appeal as a civilisational model to emulate.
- 2. The increasing confidence of non-Western peoples in their own cultures and their commitment to them.
- 3. The United States' endeavour to spread a global culture through its liberal system and globalisation inevitably leads to an escalation of conflict between the West and non-Western peoples seeking to assert their identities and the legitimacy of their civilisations and cultures.

These facts underscore the extent of tension in relations between the West and others under this new world order at the levels of:

- a) Civilisational and cultural interpenetration.
- b) Political and economic interdependence.

5. The Driving Force of Civilisational Conflict and the Future of Civilisations

Huntington contends that the new world order will be characterised by conflict rather than dialogue. This is evidenced by the centrality and rigidity of cultural identities, which were once peripheral but have become central and rigid, potentially giving rise to identity wars.⁸ The key criterion in defining relationships and conflicts will be the distinction between "us" and "them," with all disputes classified according to civilisational and cultural affiliation.

A global civilisational war is unlikely but possible at the level of civilisational divisions, which manifest as groups with different cultural and civilisational allegiances. The active powers in these conflicts belong to distinct civilisations: Islam, China, and the West. The shifting balance of power is the principal driver of conflict between civilisations over global dominance. This is fundamentally rooted in identity and the emergence of civilisational consciousness, wherein the cultural identity equation of "us" versus "them" is central to the new world order.

Group cohesion becomes fundamentally rooted in loyalty to their religion, language, and history, taking precedence over any economic or political issue. Each group resorts to methods and means to assert its identity and emphasise its difference from others, thereby dividing groups into forces of good and evil. The embodiment of these identities ranges from moderate to extremist; however, what characterises the relations between these identities is tension and violence. Spiritual allegiance provides the psychological justification for every action against the Other, for example, good versus evil or unbelief versus faith, such as the notion: “In the name of good, we fight evil,” and so forth.

Huntington views Islamic society as a living example of this problematic equation, as evidenced by events in the Soviet republics. His objective is to present a new map for managing conflicts and an agenda that rearranges priorities, placing economic and political concerns last in the interests of tiny peoples. This, he argues, contributes to the distortion of citizens' consciousness, anchoring them in human enmity so that those with vested interests may devote themselves to their affairs and the management of the world.⁹

Conclusion:

Samuel Huntington focused on the social conflicts and disputes that emerged after the Cold War, relying on a new and old premise: the clash of civilisations. He explained the conflict that became the defining characteristic of the realities faced by societies and peoples. He shifted the locus of conflict from the political, economic, and ideological realms to the cultural and civilisational spheres. Following the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Eastern bloc, and the rise of civilisational consciousness among newly independent peoples striving to assert their distinctiveness, the source of conflict became everything cultural and civilisational language, religion, history, ethnicity, and so forth.

It is clear from this that Huntington denies the existence of any harmony or coexistence among peoples, embodying a culture of alienation and divergence. Conflict and confrontation intensify as the West insists on its dominance in global politics and its leadership of universal civilisation. On the other hand, non-Western peoples cling to their identities and defend their distinctiveness. This has resulted in the following:

1. The existence of a multipolar universal culture or multiple civilisations, with no single universal civilisation and no possibility of excluding the other.

2. The resistance of non-Western societies to Westernisation and its replacement with modernisation.

3. The demographic explosion of Islam and the economic growth of Asian civilisations have led to the decline of Western influence over non-Western peoples.

4. The emergence of a new world order based on civilisational and cultural data, whereby the alliance of peoples is founded on civilisational and cultural affiliation rather than economic and ideological choices.

5. The persistence of Western selfishness and centralism, alongside its attempts to lead a universal civilisation, has resulted in conflict with other non-Western societies that have become conscious of their distinctiveness.

6. Avoiding a global civilisational war depends on accepting the distinct Other and recognising a multipolar world of civilisations, including Islamic, Chinese, Indian, African, Latin American, and others. Their relationships must be based on harmony, coexistence, and dialogue. Otherwise, the outlook for global politics and the new world order would be pessimistic.

Reactions to Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations* theory sparked extensive debate and controversy among prominent thinkers, governments, and states. Instead of humanity working towards coexistence and dialogue among religions to live in peace, Samuel Huntington embodied and justified conflict. He urged the West, particularly the United States, to be wary of the challenges the Islamic and Confucian civilisations posed.

As for Islam, we suffice to mention this noble verse from the Qur'an:

“O mankind, indeed We have created you from male and female and made you peoples and tribes that you may know one another.” (Qur'an 49:13, Surah Al-Hujurat)

Huntington was particularly criticised on the issue of immigration when he refuted the hypothesis that the United States is a country of immigrants. He clarified that the founders of the United States were not immigrants but settlers because when the English arrived in America, they aimed to establish a new society with standards different from the existing ones rather than integrate into it. Those who came later to live in these settlements were immigrants.¹⁰

Endnotes and references

1. Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*, trans. Talaat Al-Shaib, 2nd ed. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), 48.
2. Abbas Ghali Al-Hadithi, *Theories of Strategic Control and the Clash of Civilizations* (Amman: Dar Al-Salam for Publishing and Distribution), 71.
3. Ibid., 69.
4. Dieter Senghaas, *Clash Within Civilizations: Understanding Cultural Conflicts*, trans. Shawqi Bilal, 1st ed. (Cairo: Dar Al-Ain for Publishing, 2008), 91.
5. Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*, 180–81.
6. Huntington, *Clash of Civilizations*, 169.
7. Samuel P. Huntington, *Who Are We? The Challenges to America*, trans. Ahmed Mukhtar Al-Jamal (Cairo: National Centre for Translation), 46.
8. Ibid., 47.
9. Salah Qansouwa, “For Critical Reflection and Fertile Dialogue,” introduction to *The Clash of Civilizations* by Samuel P. Huntington, trans. Talaat Al-Shaib (Baghdad: Al-Hindawi Publishing House, 2017), 22.
10. Frank J. Lechner and John Boli, *Globalization: The Great Tide or Salvation?* Trans. Fadel Jatkar, 63.