The True Clash of Civilizations

Samuel Huntington was only half-right. The cultural fault line that divides the West and the Islamic world is not about democracy, but sex. According to a new survey, Muslims and their Western counterparts are still worlds apart when it comes to attitudes toward divorce, abortion, gender equality, and gay rights—which does not bode well for democracy’s future in the Middle East.

By Ronald Inglehart and Pippa Norris

Democracy promotion in Islamic countries is now one of the Bush administration’s most popular talking points. “We reject the condescending notion that freedom will not grow in the Middle East,” Secretary of State Colin Powell declared last December as he unveiled the White House’s new Middle East Partnership Initiative to encourage political and economic reform in Arab countries. Likewise, Condoleezza Rice, President George W. Bush’s national security advisor, promised last September that the United States is committed to “the march of freedom in the Muslim world.”

But does the Muslim world march to the beat of a different drummer? Despite Bush’s optimistic pronouncement that there is “no clash of civilizations” when it comes to “the common rights and needs of men and women,” others are not so sure. Samuel Huntington’s controversial 1993 thesis—that the cultural division between “Western Christianity” and “Orthodox Christianity and Islam” is the new fault line for conflict—resonates more loudly than ever since September 11. Echoing Huntington, columnist Polly Toynbee argued in the British Guardian last November, “What binds together a globalized force of some extremists from many continents is a united hatred of Western values that seems to them to spring from Judeo-Christianity.” Meanwhile, on the other side of the Atlantic, Congressman Christopher Shays, after sitting through hours of testimony on U.S.-Islamic relations on Capitol Hill last October, testily blurted, “Why doesn’t democracy grab hold in the Middle East? What is there about the culture and the people and so on where democracy just doesn’t seem to be something they strive for and work for?”

Huntington’s response would be that the Islamic world lacks the core political values that gave birth to representative democracy in Western civilization: separation of religious and secular authority, rule of law and social pluralism, parliamentary institutions of representative government, and protection of individual rights and civil liberties as the buffer between citizens and the power of the state. This claim seems
that is, until now. The cumulative results of the two Muslim societies exhibit deeply divergent values—has been scant empirical evidence whether Western and underlying beliefs of Islamic publics. Indeed, there Huntington correct, since it reveals nothing about the conducted in 1995–96 and 2000–2002, provide an core Arabic-speaking societies falls into this category. one fourth are electoral democracies—and none of the rankings, almost two thirds of the 192 countries North Africa. According to the latest Freedom House democracy to take root throughout the Middle East and everywhere. The empirical evidence that Islamic nations have remained the most traditional societies in the world. This gap in values mirrors the widening econom- ic divide between the West and the Muslim world. Commenting on the disenfranchisement of women throughout the Middle East, the United Nations Development Programme observed last summer that “no society can achieve the desired state of well-being and human development, or compete in a globalizing world, if half its population remain marginalized and dis- empowere.” But this “sexual clash of civilizations” taps into far deeper issues than how Muslim countries treat women. A society’s commitment to gender equal- ity and sexual liberalization has proved true and again to be the most reliable indicator of how strongly that society supports principles of tolerance and egalitari- ansms. Thus, the people of the Muslim world overwhelmly want democracy, but democracy may not be sustainable in their societies.

TESTING HUNTINGTON

Huntington argues that “ideas of individualism, lib- eralism, constitutionalism, human rights, equality, lib- erty, the rule of law, democracy, free markets, [and] the separation of church and state” often have little res- onance outside the West. Moreover, he holds that

The Cultural Divide

Approval of Political and Social Values in Western and Islamic Societies

The chart on the previous page draws on responses to various political and social issues in the World Values Survey. The percentages indicate the extent to which respondents agreed/disagreed or approved/disapproved of the following statements and questions:

**DEMOCRATIC PERFORMANCE**
- Democracies are inclusive and have too much quibbling. (Strongly disagree.)
- Democrats aren’t good at maintaining order. (Strongly disagree.)

**DEMOCRATIC IDEAL**
- Democracy may have problems, but it’s better than any other form of government. (Strongly agree.)
- Approve of having a democratic political system. (Strongly agree.)

**STRONG LEADERS**
- Approve of having experts, not government, make decisions according to what they think is best for the country. (Strongly disagree.)
- Approve of having a strong leader who does not have to bother with parliament and elections. (Strongly disagree.)

**RELIGIOUS LEADERS**
- Politicians who do not believe in God are unfit for public office. (Strongly disagree.)
- It would be better for this country if more people with strong religious beliefs held public office. (Strongly disagree.)

**GENDER EQUALITY**
- On the whole, men make better political leaders than women do. (Strongly disagree.)
- When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women. (Strongly disagree.)

**DIVORCE**
- Divorce can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between. (High level of tolerance for divorce.)

**ABORTION**
- Abortion can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between. (High level of tolerance for abortion.)

**HOMOSEXUALITY**
- Homosexuality can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between. (High level of tolerance for homosexuality.)

Western efforts to promote these ideas provoke a violent backlash against “human rights imperialism.” To test these propositions, we categorized the countries included in the wvs according to the nine major contemporary civilizations, based largely on the historical religious legacy in each society. The survey includes 22 countries representing Western Christianity (a West European culture that also encompasses North America, Australia, and New Zealand), 10 Central European nations (sharing a Western Christian heritage, but also lived under Communist rule), 11 societies with a Muslim majority (Albania, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Morocco, Pakistan, and Turkmen), 12 traditionally Orthodox societies (such as Russia and Greece), 11 predominately Catholic Latin American countries, 4 East Asian societies shaped by Sino-Confucian values, 5 sub-Saharan Africa countries, plus Japan and India.

Despite Huntington’s claim of a clash of civilizations between the West and the rest, the wvs reveals that, at this point in history, democracy has an overwhelmingly positive image throughout the world. In every stable democracy, a majority of the population describes “having a democratic political system” as either “good” or “very good.” These results represent a dramatic change from the 1930s and 1940s, when fascist regimes won overwhelming mass approval in many societies; and for many decades, Communist regimes had widespread support. But in the last decade, democracy has become virtually the only political model with global appeal, no matter what the culture. With the exception of Pakistan, most of the Islamic countries surveyed think highly of democracy: In Albania, Egypt, Bangladesh, Azerbaijan, Indonesia, Morocco, and Turkey, 92 to 99 percent of the public endorsed democratic institutions—a higher proportion than in the United States (89 percent).

Yet, as bearing on these results may be, paying lip service to democracy does not necessarily prove that people genuinely support basic democratic norms—or that their leaders will allow them to have democratic institutions. Although constitutions of authoritarian states such as China profess to embrace democratic ideals such as freedom of religion, the rulers deny it in practice. In Iran’s 2000 elections, reformist candidates captured nearly three quarters of the seats in parliament, but a theocratic elite still holds the reins of power. Certainly, it’s a step in the right direction if most people in a country endorse the idea of democracy. But this sentiment needs to be complemented by deeper underlying attitudes such as interpersonal trust and tolerance of unpopular groups—and these values must ultimately be accepted by those who control the army and secret police.

The wvs reveals that, even after taking into account differences in economic and political development, support for democratic institutions is just as strong among those living in Islamic societies as in Western (or other) societies [see chart on page 68]. For instance, a solid majority of people living in Western and Muslim countries give democracy high marks as the most efficient form of government, with 68 percent disagreeing with assertions that “democracies are indecisive” and “democracies aren’t good at maintaining order.” (All other cultural regions and countries, except East Asia and Japan, are far more critical.) And an equal number of respondents on both sides of the civilizational divide (61 percent) firmly reject authoritarian governance, expressing disapproval of “strong leaders” who do not “bother with parliament and elections.” Islamic societies display greater support for religious authorities playing an active societal role than do Western societies. Yet this preference for religious authorities is less a cultural division between the West and Islam than it is a gap between the West and many other less secular societies around the globe, especially in sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. For instance, citizens in some Islamic societies agree overwhelmingy with the statement that “politicians who do not believe in God are unfit for public office” (88 percent in Egypt, 83 percent in Iran, and 71 percent in Bangladesh), but this statement also garners strong support in the Philippines (71 percent), Uganda (60 percent), and Venezuela (52 percent). Even in the United States, about two fifths of the public believes that atheists are unfit for public office.

However, when it comes to attitudes toward gender equality and sexual liberalization, the cultural gap between Islam and the West widens into a chasm. On the matter of equal rights and opportunities for women—measured by such questions as whether men make better political leaders than women or whether university education is more important for boys than for girls—Western and Muslim countries score 82 percent and 53 percent, respectively. Islamic societies are also distinctive in their treatment of homosexuals. In every stable democracy, a majority of the public disagrees with the statement that “men and women should not be permitted to have legal marriages to people of the same sex.”

make better political leaders than women.” None of the societies in which less than 30 percent of the public rejects this statement (such as Jordan, Nigeria, and Belarus) is a true democracy. In China, one of the world’s least democratic countries, a majority of the public agrees that men make better political leaders than women, despite a party line that has long emphasized gender equality (Mao Zedong once declared “women hold up half the sky”). In practice, Chinese women occupy few positions of real power and face widespread discrimination in the workplace. India is a borderline case. The country is a long-standing parliamentary democracy with an independent judiciary and civil control of the armed forces, yet it is also marred by a weak rule of law, arbitrary arrests, and extrajudicial killings. The status of Indian women reflects that duality. Women’s rights are guaranteed in the constitution, and Indira Gandhi led the nation for 15 years. Yet domestic violence and forced prostitution remain prevalent throughout the country, and, according to the wvs, almost 50 percent of the Indian populace believes only men should run the government.

The way a society views homosexuality constitutes another good litmus test of its commitment to equality. Tolerance of well-liked groups is never a problem. But if someone wants to gauge how tolerant a nation really is, find out which group is the most disliked, and then ask whether members of that group should be allowed to hold public meetings, teach in schools, and work in government. Today, relatively few people express overt hostility toward other classes, races, or religions, but rejection of homosexuality is widespread. In response to a wvs question about whether homosexuality is justifiable, about half of the world’s population say “never.” But, as is the case with gender equality, this attitude is directly proportional to a country’s level of democracy. Among authoritarian and quasi-democratic states, rejection of homosexuality is deeply entrenched: 99 percent in both Egypt and Bangladesh, 94 percent in Iran, 91 percent in China, and 71 percent in India. By contrast, these figures are much lower among respondents in stable democracies: 32 percent in the United States, 26 percent in Canada, 25 percent in Britain, and 19 percent in Germany.

Islamic societies are neither uniquely nor monolithically low on tolerance toward sexual orientation and gender equality. Many of the Soviet successor states rank as low as most Islamic societies. However, on the whole, Muslim countries not only lag behind the West but behind all other societies as well [see chart on opposite page]. Perhaps more significant, the figures reveal that the gap between the West and Islam is even wider among younger age groups. This pattern suggests that the younger generations in Western societies have become progressively more egalitarian than their elders, but the younger generations in Islamic societies have remained almost as traditional as their parents and grandparents, producing an expanding cultural gap.

CLASH OF CONCLUSIONS

“The peoples of the Islamic nations want and deserve the same freedoms and opportunities as people in every nation,” President Bush declared in a commencement speech at West Point last summer. He’s right. Any claim of a “clash of civilizations” based on fundamentally different political goals held by Western and Islamic societies represents an oversimplification of the evidence. Support for the goal of democracy is surprisingly widespread among Islamic publics, even among those living in authoritarian societies. Yet Huntington is correct when he argues that cultural differences have taken on a new importance, forming the fault lines for future conflict. Although nearly the entire world pays lip service to democracy, there is still no global consensus on the self-expression values—such as social tolerance, gender equality, freedom of speech, and interpersonal trust—that are crucial to democracy. Today, these divergent values constitute the real clash between Islamic societies and the West.

But economic development generates changed attitudes in virtually any society. In particular, modernization compels systematic, predictable changes in gender roles: Industrialization brings women into the paid work force and dramatically reduces fertility rates. Women become literate and begin to participate in representative government but still have far less power than men. Then, the postindustrial phase brings a shift toward greater gender equality as women move into higher-status economic roles in management and gain political influence within elected and appointed bodies. Thus, relatively industrialized Islamic societies such as Turkey share the same views on gender equality and sexual liberalization as other new democracies.

Even in established democracies, changes in
countries to adopt the trappings of democratic governance, such as holding elections and having a parliament. Nor is it realistic to expect that nascent democracies in the Middle East will inspire a wave of reforms reminiscent of the velvet revolutions that swept Eastern Europe in the final days of the Cold War. A real commitment to democratic reform will be measured by the willingness to commit the resources necessary to foster human development in the Islamic world. Culture has a lasting impact on how societies evolve. But culture does not have to be destiny.

Samuel Huntington expanded his controversial 1993 article into a book, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996). Among the authors who have disputed Huntington’s claim that Islam is incompatible with democratic values are Edward Said, who decries the clash of civilizations thesis as an attempt to revive the “good vs. evil” world dichotomy prevalent during the Cold War ("A Clash of Ignorance," *The Nation*, October 22, 2001); John Voll and John Esposito, who argue that “The Islamic heritage . . . contains concepts that provide a foundation for contemporary Muslims to develop authentically Islamic programs of democracy” ("Islam’s Democratic Essence," *Middle East Quarterly*, September 1994); and Ray Takeyh, who recounts the efforts of contemporary Muslim scholars to legitimize democratic concepts through the reinterpretation of Islamic texts and traditions ("Faith-Based Initiatives," *Foreign Policy*, November/December 2001).

An overview of the Bush administration’s Middle East Partnership Initiative, including the complete transcript of Secretary of State Colin Powell’s speech on political and economic reform in the Arab world, can be found on the Web site of the U.S. Department of State. Marina Ottaway, Thomas Carothers, Amy Hawthorne, and Daniel Brumberg offer a stinging critique of those who believe that toppling the Iraqi regime could unleash a democratic tsunami in the Arab world in “Democratic Mirage in the Middle East” (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2002).

In a poll of nearly 4,000 Arabs, James Zogby found that the issue of “civil and personal rights” earned the overall highest score when people were asked to rank their personal priorities (*What Arabs Think: Values, Beliefs and Concerns*, Washington: Zogby International, 2002). A poll available on the Web site of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press (“Among Wealthy Nations . . . U.S. Stands Alone in Its Embrace of Religion,” December 19, 2002) reveals that Americans’ views on religion and faith are closer to those living in developing nations than in developed countries.
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