

Identity

J2P216 SE: International Cooperation and Conflict
April 14/April 22, 2016

Reto Wüest

Global Studies Institute
University of Geneva

- ① Identity
- ② Huntington (1993)
 - Class Presentation
 - Discussion
- ③ Henderson and Tucker (2001)
 - Class Presentation
 - Discussion

- We think of identity as personal characteristics that are impossible, or exceedingly difficult, to change

- Immutable (or nearly so) personal characteristics
 - Race
 - Ethnicity
 - Religion
 - Gender identity
- Not immutable personal characteristics
 - Ideology
 - Economic class

- Has identity replaced other factors (territory, ideology, economic factors) as the major source of conflict in world politics?

Jonathan to present on Huntington (1993), "The Clash of Civilizations"

Huntington (1993): “The Clash of Civilizations”

The Clash of Civilizations Thesis

- The fundamental source of conflict in the new world (post-Cold War era) is differences between civilizations
- A civilization is defined as “the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes humans from other species” (Huntington 1993, 24)

Huntington (1993): “The Clash of Civilizations”

Why Civilizations Clash I

- ① Differences among civilizations are basic (different views on the relations between God and man, the individual and the group, rights and responsibilities, etc.)
- ② Interactions between peoples of different civilizations are increasing, which increases civilization consciousness and awareness of differences between civilizations
- ③ Economic modernization and social change weaken the nation state as a source of identity; religion, which transcends national boundaries and unites civilizations, has moved in to fill this gap in much of the world.

Huntington (1993): "The Clash of Civilizations"

Why Civilizations Clash II

- ④ A de-Westernization and indigenization of elites is occurring in many non-Western countries, which leads to growing civilization-consciousness
- ⑤ Cultural characteristics and differences are less mutable and hence less easily resolved than political and economic ones
- ⑥ Increase in economic regionalism reinforces civilization-consciousness

Huntington (1993): “The Clash of Civilizations”

(1) The Fault Lines Between Civilizations

- The fault lines between civilizations are replacing the political and ideological boundaries of the Cold War as the hot spots for crisis
- For example, . . .
 - the dividing line in Europe that separates the Catholics and Protestants in the north and west from the Orthodox and Muslims in the east and south,
 - the dividing line between Muslims and Hindus in Asia,
 - Arab / Muslim North Africans vs. “Black” / Christian Sub-Saharan Africans
- Conflict at the territorial edges of the Islamic civilization’s territories: “Islam has bloody borders”

Huntington (1993): "The Clash of Civilizations"

(2) Civilization Rallying: The Kin-Country Syndrome I

- Civilization commonality replaces ideology and balance of power considerations as the principal basis for cooperation and coalitions
- For example:
 - Support of Arab states for Iraq in the Second Gulf War 1991, despite the fact that one Arab country (Iraq) had invaded another (Kuwait)
 - Failure of the (Christian) West to help (Muslim) Bosnia in the Balkan Wars in the 1990s while turning a blind eye to (Christian) Croat atrocities against Bosnians
 - (Muslim) Iran and Muslim Lebanese factions supporting Bosnia in the same war, while (Orthodox) Russia supported (Orthodox) Serbia

Huntington (1993): “The Clash of Civilizations”

(2) Civilization Rallying: The Kin-Country Syndrome II

- Implication 1: clashes of civilizations lead to double standards: one standard for kin-countries, a different one for the others
- Implication 2: it is easy to rally around civilization, so this will lead to more conflict between civilizations and less conflict within civilizations, irrespective of whether these are split among one or several states
- For example: the Balkan Wars vs. the Spanish Civil War:
 - in the former, the conflict was between civilizations (Christian/West, Orthodox, Muslim, ...)
 - whereas in the latter, it was between ideologies (democratic, fascist, communist, ...)

Huntington (1993): “The Clash of Civilizations”

(3) The West vs. the Rest I

- The new central axis of world politics will be “the West vs. the Rest,” as the non-Western civilizations view the West as:
 - the only military and economic superpower (bloc)
 - dominating international political, security and economic institutions
 - settling global economic, security and political issues among themselves
 - then imposing it on “the Rest” as the “will of the world community”
 - thereby serving the interests of its own civilization, but not necessarily of others
- This political, economic and security dominance is seen as undue “Westernization” and “cultural imperialism”
- It backfires in the form of rising indigenous cultural, religious and civilizational reassertion and consciousness
- Politically, this is the “civilization rallying” mentioned before

Huntington (1993): “The Clash of Civilizations”

(3) The West vs. the Rest II

- This response of non-Western civilizations to Western power and values spells the end of the possibility of a “universal civilization” of any shape or form
- Instead there are civilization-focused responses, which usually take one of three forms:
 - ① isolation: insulation and opt-out from the West (North Korea, Burma/Myanmar)
 - ② bandwagoning: attempt to join the West and accept its values and institutions (e.g., Mexico)
 - ③ balancing: develop economic and military power and cooperate with other non-western civilizations against the West while reasserting indigenous values: modernize but not Westernize (e.g., China)

Huntington (1993): “The Clash of Civilizations”

(4) Torn Countries I

- If differences between civilizations become the dominant cause for conflict, countries with large numbers of peoples of different civilizations come under risk of falling apart (Soviet Union, Yugoslavia)
- The same is true for **torn countries**: countries which may be more culturally homogeneous but unsure to which civilization they rather belong (Turkey, Russia, Mexico) risk being pulled apart as they lose their civilization identity
- Torn countries can prevent this by redefining their civilization identity

- A torn country can redefine its civilization identity if the following conditions are met:
 - ① their political and economic elite is supportive and enthusiastic about such a redefinition
 - ② so is the public (or it will at least acquiesce in it)
 - ③ the dominant groups in the “target” civilization will accept the country into their civilization
- All three appear to be in place for Mexico
- 1 and 2 appear to be largely true for Turkey, while 3 is unclear
- None of these appear to be satisfied for Russia

Huntington (1993): “The Clash of Civilizations”

(5) The Confucian-Islamic Connection I

- Countries not in the Western civilization face different degrees of impediments to join the West:
 - least for Latin American and Eastern European countries
 - greater already for the Orthodox countries of the former Soviet Union
 - greater still for “Muslim, Confucian, Hindu and Buddhist societies” / countries
 - **NB: exception of Japan** which straddles two civilizations (West and not-West)
- Countries that cannot or do not want to join the West for reasons of culture and power will compete with the West on economic, military and political power by
 - developing internally and
 - cooperating with other non-Western countries

Huntington (1993): “The Clash of Civilizations”

(5) The Confucian-Islamic Connection II

- The most prominent example of the latter is the Confucian-Islamic connection challenging Western interests, values and power:
 - China, North Korea and several Middle Eastern states (Iran, Iraq, Algeria, Libya) are expanding their military capabilities
 - arms control passes from a Western effort to balance the Western and Eastern blocs' capabilities to the West preventing non-Western countries to obtain modern or NBC weapons
 - which creates backlash: the non-Western countries assert their right to modern and NBC weapons
 - China has them already, and at time of writing, Pakistan, India, North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Libya and Algeria were trying to obtain them
 - China cooperates on this with these other, mainly Muslim countries
- Hence there is now a “Confucian-Islamic military connection,” which is out to get “the weapons and weapons technologies needed to counter the military power of the West”

The article does **not hypothesize** that:

- civilization identities will replace all other identities
- nation states will disappear
- that each civilization will become a single coherent political entity (state)
- that groups within a civilization will not conflict with and even fight each other

Huntington (1993): “The Clash of Civilizations”

(6) Implications for the West II

The article **does state** the following (“descriptive”) **hypotheses**:

- ① differences between civilizations are real and important
- ② civilization-consciousness is increasing
- ③ conflict between civilizations will supplant ideological and other forms of conflict as the dominant global form of conflict
- ④ international relations, historically a game played out within Western civilization, will increasingly be de-Westernized and become a game in which non-Western civilizations are actors and not simply objects
- ⑤ successful political, security and economic international institutions are more likely to develop within civilizations than across civilizations

(continues)

(continued)

- ⑥ conflicts between groups in different civilizations will be more frequent, more sustained and more violent than conflicts between groups in the same civilization
- ⑦ violent conflicts between groups in different civilizations are the most likely and most dangerous source of escalation that could lead to global wars
- ⑧ the paramount axis of world politics will be the relations between "the West and the Rest"
- ⑨ the elites in some torn non-Western countries will try to make their countries part of the West, but in most cases face major obstacles to accomplishing this
- ⑩ a central focus of conflict for the immediate future will be between the West and several Islamic-Confucian states

Huntington (1993): “The Clash of Civilizations”

(6) Implications for the West IV

In the short run, the West should therefore:

- assure greater cooperation and unity within its own civilization
- incorporate those societies in Eastern Europe and Latin America whose cultures are close to the West
- keep and nurture cooperative relations with Russia and Japan
- prevent escalation of local inter-civilization conflicts into major inter-civilization wars
- limit the expansion of the military strength of Confucian and Islamic states
- moderate the reduction of Western military capabilities and maintain military superiority in East and Southwest Asia
- exploit differences and conflicts among Confucian and Islamic states
- support groups sympathetic to the West in other civilizations
- strengthen international institutions that reflect and legitimate Western interests and values and get non-Western states involved in these

In the long run, the West should therefore:

- maintain the necessary economic and military power to protect its interests regarding those non-Western modern civilizations that
 - attempt to become modern without becoming Western and
 - whose power approaches that of the West while
 - their values and interests differ significantly from those of the West
- develop a more profound understanding of the religious and philosophical assumptions underlying other civilizations and of how people in those civilizations see their interests.
- identify common elements between Western and other civilizations
- learn to coexist with different civilizations, just as these will have to learn to coexist with the West

David to present on Henderson and Tucker (2001), "Clear and Present Strangers: The Clash of Civilizations and International Conflict"

How empirically accurate is Huntington’s “clash of civilizations” thesis?

Henderson and Tucker (2001): “Clear and Present Strangers”

Recap of Huntington’s Argument

- States belonging to different civilizations are more likely to fight each other, while states belonging to the same civilization are less likely to fight each other
- A civilization is defined as “the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes humans from other species” (Huntington 1993, 24)

Henderson and Tucker (2001): “Clear and Present Strangers”

Recap of Huntington’s Argument

- This “clash of civilizations” is the result of several factors, among them:
 - Increased interaction among peoples of different civilizations
 - Indigenization of elites in non-Western states
 - Increased economic regionalization, which heightens civilization consciousness
 - Global resurgence of religious identity
 - Non-Western states became more capable to challenge Western hegemony

Henderson and Tucker (2001): “Clear and Present Strangers”

Recap of Huntington’s Argument

- As a result of the above factors, civilization membership becomes more important and civilizational differences are more likely to generate conflict between states
- The idea behind Huntington’s argument is that disputes between states of different civilizations are more likely to become culturally loaded, which exacerbates the level of conflict

Henderson and Tucker (2001): “Clear and Present Strangers”

Recap of Huntington’s Argument

- Shared religion is the single most important indicator of a civilization
- Therefore, intercivilizational clashes are usually conflicts between peoples of different religions

Henderson and Tucker (2001): "Clear and Present Strangers"

Propositions Derived from Huntington's Work

Proposition (1)

During the post-Cold War era, intercivilizational difference is associated with an increased likelihood of interstate war.

Henderson and Tucker (2001): "Clear and Present Strangers"

Propositions Derived from Huntington's Work

Proposition (2)

During the Cold War era, intercivilizational difference is negatively or insignificantly associated with the likelihood of interstate war.

Proposition (3)

During the pre-Cold War era, intercivilizational difference is positively associated with an increased likelihood of interstate war.

Henderson and Tucker (2001): "Clear and Present Strangers"

Empirical Analysis

- Outcome variable: dummy variable indicating the presence of an interstate war for a state dyad (= 1, 0 otherwise)
- Predictor variable of main interest: dummy variable indicating whether the states in a dyad belong to different civilizations (= 1, 0 otherwise)
- Set of control variables: geographical proximity of the states, dummy variable for joint democracy, and a variable measuring the power parity between the states in a dyad
- Time period analyzed: 1816-1992

Henderson and Tucker (2001): "Clear and Present Strangers"

Findings: Post-Cold War era (Proposition 1)

TABLE 1. Logit Analysis of the Clash of Civilizations, 1989–1992

	<i>Column I</i>	<i>Column II</i>
Mixed Civilization	-2.11*** (.53)	-.96 (.67)
Distance	—	-.34 ^a (.19)
Joint Democracy	—	-.33*** (.13)
Power Parity	—	1.01 (.98)
Constant	-6.91*** (.33)	-4.69*** (.83)
-2LL	-131.23	-91.15
χ^2	131.23***	33.94***
N	58,274	36,168

Huber/White RSEs are in parentheses; *p < .05 level, **p < .01 level, ***p < .001 level.

^asignificant below .08 level; all p-values are estimated using two-tailed tests.

Henderson and Tucker (2001): "Clear and Present Strangers"

Findings: Cold War era (Proposition 2)

TABLE 2. Logit Analysis of the Clash of Civilizations, 1946–1988

	<i>Column I</i>	<i>Column II</i>
Mixed Civilization	.33 (.43)	.55 (.41)
Distance	—	-.30*** (.07)
Joint Democracy	—	-3.12*** (1.03)
Power Parity	—	1.17** (.46)
Peace Years	—	-1.60*** (.13)
Spline 1 ^b	—	-.21*** (.02)
Spline 2 ^b	—	.15*** (.02)
Spline 3 ^b	—	-.40*** (.09)
Constant	-8.81*** (.39)	-2.70*** (.45)
-2LL	-638.02	-1,053.52
χ^2	.58	857.96***
N	338,976	267,315

Huber/White RSEs are in parentheses; *p < .05 level, **p < .01 level, ***p < .001 level.

^asignificant below .08 level; all p-values are estimated using two-tailed tests.

^bCoefficients of Peace Years cubic spline segments

Henderson and Tucker (2001): "Clear and Present Strangers"

Findings: Pre-Cold War era (Proposition 3)

TABLE 3. Logit Analysis of the Clash of Civilizations, 1816–1945

	<i>Column I</i>	<i>Column II</i>
Mixed Civilization	-.60*** (.15)	-.59** (.23)
Distance	—	-.30 (.40)
Joint Democracy	—	-2.37*** (.52)
Power Parity	—	.17 (.24)
Peace Years	—	-1.50*** (.13)
Spline 1 ^b	—	-.81*** (.07)
Spline 2 ^b	—	.40*** (.03)
Spline 3 ^b	—	-.50*** (.04)
Constant	-5.80*** (.10)	-.43*** (.17)
-2LL	-1755.06	-2089.57
χ^2	15.82***	1,835.20***
N	118,648	97,901

Huber/White RSEs are in parentheses; *p < .05 level, **p < .01 level, ***p < .001 level.

^asignificant below .08 level; all p-values are estimated using two-tailed tests.

^bCoefficients of Peace Years cubic spline segments

Henderson and Tucker (2001): “Clear and Present Strangers” Findings

- Post-Cold War era: states belonging to different civilizations were neither more nor less likely to fight one another
- Cold-War era: relationship between mixed civilizations and probability of war is statistically not significant; both intracivilizational and intercivilizational conflicts occurred during Cold War era, which may have washed out any significant relationship between civilization membership and war
- Pre-Cold War era: states of different civilizations were less likely to engage in conflict with each other than were those from the same civilization