Civilisation as a tool and level of analysis in international relations: A theoretical overview



BOULEMKAHEL Brahim

University of Constantine 03, Algeria, brahim.boulemkahel@univ-constantine3.dz

State, Public Policies and Government Strategies Laboratory

Received date: 24/04/2026 Accepted date: 24/05/2026 Publication date: 01/07/2026

Abstract:

This article explores civilisation as an analytical tool and level of analysis in international relations. It argues that the profound transformations of the post-Cold War international system have revealed the limitations of traditional state-centric and materialist approaches in explaining phenomena shaped by identity, historical memory, religion and symbolic structures. In this context, the civilisational dimension emerges as a significant interpretive framework for understanding patterns of conflict, cooperation and systemic transformation. Rather than treating civilisation as a fixed cultural backdrop, the study conceptualises it as a historically embedded and value-laden structure that informs collective identity, shapes perceptions of self and other, and influences the construction of interests, threats, alliances and foreign policy orientations. The article concludes that the Civilisational approach offers a broader and more nuanced understanding of contemporary international dynamics, particularly where geopolitical calculations intersect with identity-based and symbolic factors.

Keywords: *Civilisation; International Relations; Level of Analysis*; *A Theoretical Analytical Tool; civilisation-states.*

***Corresponding author: Boulemkahel Brahim, e-mail: brahim.boulemkahel@univ-constantine3.dz**

Introduction:

The field of international relations has experienced major theoretical and epistemological shifts, particularly in its levels of analysis and approaches to interpreting global phenomena. For a long time, scholarship remained state-centred, focusing on interests and strategic balances as the main drivers of international behaviour. However, post-Cold War transformations exposed the limits of these material explanations and highlighted the growing importance of non-material factors such as culture, religion, identity, and civilisational belonging.

In this context, the civilisational dimension has emerged as a key interpretive framework for understanding international dynamics, whether in explaining conflict and competition or in analysing cooperation and rapprochement. Rather than being a static cultural background, civilisation operates as an analytical level that shapes how actors perceive identities, define interests, identify threats, and form alliances and foreign policies.

Its relevance has increased with the rise of identity-based tensions and civilisational narratives in global politics. As a result, traditional realist, liberal, or narrow constructivist approaches appear insufficient on their own, making the civilisational dimension a necessary complementary tool for understanding contemporary international relations.

In light of the previous discussion, **the main research problem of the article** can be formulated as follows:

To what extent does the civilisational dimension constitute an analytical level and an interpretive approach for understanding the dynamics of international relations, and what are the limits of its contribution to explaining patterns of conflict, cooperation and transformation in the contemporary international system?

Study hypothesis:

The civilisational approach provides a more comprehensive understanding of the complexity of the current international phenomena, particularly those involving the intersection of geopolitical considerations and issues of identity, historical memory and civilisational belonging.

This paper adopts a theoretical-analytical approach to examine the role of civilisation in international relations as both an analytical level and an interpretive framework for contemporary global transformations. It is structured into three main sections: the first highlights civilisation as a level of analysis beyond material and state-centred approaches; the second reviews key theories that emphasise its explanatory role in international change; and the third evaluates its limitations in accounting for patterns of conflict, cooperation, and transformation in world politics.

1. Civilisation as a Level and Unit of Analysis: An Alternative Approach to Explaining the Behaviour of Actors and the Structure of International Interactions.

A. What is meant by 'the levels of analysis'?

In international relations, the level of analysis refers to the explanatory framework used to interpret international phenomena and state behaviour, whether through the individual and decision-maker, the state and its internal structure, the international system and its power distribution, or intermediate levels such as the regional, civilizational, and transnational levels

Therefore, the concept of the level of analysis is linked to the methodological question of which level the researcher should focus on to explain international phenomena (McClelland, March 20, 2026).

The concept of different levels of analysis in international relations was first introduced by Kenneth Waltz. However, David Singer's 1961 article, 'The Levels-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations', remains the most well-known reference. Singer viewed the level of analysis as an approach that analysts use to handle problems: they can look either at the 'parts' or at the 'system' in international relations (Ingvild, Thomas , & Aleksandra F, n.d.). In this context, he called for a distinction to be made between the 'parts' and the 'whole', or the 'trees' and the 'forest'. He therefore distinguished between the micro/macro dichotomy and discussed the levels of the individual, the state, and the international system (Newnham, The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations (1st ed.), 2004, p. 413).

Subsequently, Barry Buzan revisited the debate on levels of analysis, arguing that the concept contains two distinct dimensions. The first relates to the analytical units themselves, which he classifies into five levels: the system, subsystem, unit, bureaucracy, and individual. The second concerns the sources of explanation, where he identifies three main dimensions involved in explaining international phenomena: structure, process, and the capacity for interaction. (Newnham, The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations (1st ed.), 2004, p. 414).

Scholars of international relations recognise the great methodological value of levels of analysis as a technical tool for organising research and as a basic entry point for developing scientific explanations of international phenomena (Newnham, The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations (1st ed.), 2004, p. 413). The levels of analysis are therefore a necessary methodological tool for organising the diversity, overlap and complexity found in international relations. (Gebhard, March 27, 2022).

B. Defining 'Civilisation': Meaning and Significations

The concept of civilisation has sparked extensive debate regarding its boundaries and meanings. There is no consensus among researchers on a single, unified definition. As different academic disciplines have treated civilisation as a central topic, determining its boundaries has become a key point of disagreement across studies and research.

In the Political, Economic, and Social Terms Dictionary, Civilisation is defined as: 'a particular pattern of material, intellectual, and spiritual development of a given society. It includes a set of economic, legal, cultural, moral and religious elements as realised within that society".

the definition found in the Land Philosophical Dictionary: 'Civilisation is a complex set of social phenomena of a transferable nature that has a religious, moral, aesthetic, technical and scientific character, shared across all parts of a very large society or across several connected societies. (Dhbayan & others, 1991, p. 208)'

In al-Muqaddimah, Ibn Khaldun addressed the concept of civilisation as an advanced stage in the development of societies. He saw it as both the pinnacle and the endpoint of urban/social development. (al-Rahman, 1989, p. 475)"

Arnold Toynbee, did not view civilisation merely as a level of progress or the outcome of material and intellectual achievements. Rather, he considered civilisation to be the comprehensive environment that contains and produces the manifestations of progress. (Masiʿid, January 2021, p. 796).

Samuel Huntington defined civilisation in his book The Clash of Civilisations as 'the broadest cultural entity'. According to this definition, civilisation encompasses the shared way of life of a group of people, including their shared values, norms, institutions, and common ways of thinking, such as language, religion, history, customs, and institutions, as well as the group's self-awareness (Huntington S. , 1998, p. 43).

As for the thinker Malek Bennabi, his view was distinctive and profound. He addressed Civilisation as a concept with multiple dimensions and discussed its conditions and historical development*. For him, Civilisation is not simply the possession and control of modern tools and the material signs that go with "progress." Instead, it is a way of life based on refined conduct, respect for laws, values, and the preservation of them. In its core, Civilisation is a human and ethical commitment before it is any material manifestation (al-ʿAttar, January 27, 2018).

Based on the historical development of the concept of Civilisation and the diversity of definitions offered by thinkers across different eras, we—within the aims of this article—can adopt a practical, functional, broad, and comprehensive definition of Civilisation as: A comprehensive historical, social and cultural

framework that transcends the material or technical dimension. It represents the overall entity produced by a human group over time through organised interaction between material, moral, and symbolic elements. This includes values, beliefs, religion, culture, language, memory, institutions, patterns of living and shared visions. In this sense, civilisation constitutes the broadest level of collective identity, where culture, religion, identity and ideology converge to create an overarching framework that shapes how actors perceive their interests and guides their behaviour within the international system.

C. The importance of civilisation as a level of analysis in international relations: a review of the literature

The Civilisational approach raises a methodological problem regarding its placement within the traditional levels of analysis. It does not belong exclusively to the level of the individual, the state, or the international system, but rather overlaps with all of them. It influences decision-makers' perceptions and is reflected in the identity of the state and its strategic choices. It also contributes to shaping patterns of interaction at the level of the international system , Within this context, Robert Cox supports this idea, saying: 'The Civilisational approach gains analytical value because it expands and enriches the study of international relations, opening new horizons for scholars in this field. It also takes other social facts into account' (Cox, 1995, p. 22).

The view of civilisation as a level of analysis in international relations is a relatively recent development, reinforced by ideas such as Huntington's "Clash of Civilisations", as well as contributions from constructivist and critical approaches. This approach is based on the notion that civilisation is a broader unit of analysis than the state, encompassing human groups and states that share historical, cultural, religious and value-based ties. This makes international interactions more understandable through the lens of civilisational identity and belonging, since civilisations - rather than states alone - function as influential units that help shape patterns of global politics.

Several classical and contemporary perspectives view civilisation not simply as a cultural framework, but as a supra-state level of analysis that helps explain the evolution of international relations by shaping how states perceive themselves and others. Although civilisation has not yet been fully institutionalised as a methodological level of analysis in international relations, its various conceptualisations continue to enrich the ontological, epistemological, and methodological dimensions of the field. (Çilkoparan, February 6, 2021).

In this context ,Several thinkers, including Arnold Toynbee, Nuri Yurdusev, Raji Dutt Bajpai and Gregorio Bettiza, have proposed considering civilisations as an alternative unit of analysis in international relations (Çilkoparan, February 6, 2021).

Nuri Yurdusev argues that, historically, civilisations can be regarded as social identities based on very broad groups compared to other forms of identity, which represent smaller social entities. he describes civilisations as broad collective identities. Accordingly, civilisations can be treated as units not only for studying history, but also for understanding international relations Similarly, Braudel emphasised that 'civilisations are long-lasting realities', and Toynbee made a similar point when defining civilisations as societies that are broader in both place and time than nation-states or any other political communities (Çilkoparan, February 6, 2021).

Similarly, Samuel Huntington's work has become a key reference point for understanding the impact of civilisations on international relations. In 1993, he argued that in the future, the main source of conflict would be cultural differences rather than ideologies or economic interests. He claimed that cultural conflicts would dominate the agenda of the 'new world', with major conflicts occurring between civilisations, even though nation-states would remain the strongest actors in international politics (Huntington S. P., Clash of Civilizations, 1993, pp. 22-49).

Gregorio Bettiza emphasised the importance of the Civilisational dimension as a key level for understanding what is happening in the world. He promoted the concept of Civilisational politics and worked to expand and develop the field of Civilisational analysis in international relations, both theoretically and empirically. Bettiza argues that civilisations are not natural entities, but are instead socially constructed through discourse and ideological practices. Instead, he believes that Civilisations are the framework through which political actors and thinkers reformulate the international system around the concept of multiple Civilisations, In this context, he argues that: "Civilisational politics provides an important means for researchers with both theoretical interests and an empirical mindset to explore how social and political actors reach an understanding of global politics, change it, and build it in light of multiple Civilisations and their relationships." (Bettiza, 2024, pp. 1-28).

Christopher Dawson argues that major transformations in the global system, such as the end of colonialism, the rise of globalisation and the conclusion of the Cold War, have coincided with the interaction of international relations with civilisations. According to his definition, a civilisation is the largest and most significant historical social phenomenon, comprising many distinct and diverse cultures (Çilkoparan, February 6, 2021, p. 3).

Alongside Dawson, Martin Hall draws attention to the emergence of Civilisational identities in international relations. Hall asserts that 'Civilisational analysis is important because the concept of civilisation carries knowledge, as well as the associated preferences and policies'. (Çilkoparan, February 6, 2021, p. 3).

Similarly,Ravi Dutt Bajpai analyzes how the national and Civilisational identity of states such as China and India is formulated in the context of great-power competition and colonial history. One of his key works on Civilisation is: Civilisation-States of China and India: Reshaping the World Order (2024).) is one of the most prominent advocates of the importance of the Civilisational dimension in international relations. For him, civilisations differ from nation-states in terms of their territorial boundaries. Nation-states usually have clearly defined boundaries, whereas civilisations tend to transcend national borders (Bajpai, 2018).

Amitav Acharya argues that international systems should be studied based not only on strategic political interactions, but also on cultural and civilisational interactions (Bajpai, 2018). He also notes that many concepts in modern international relations, such as economic interdependence, the balance of power and collective security management, are generally considered to be traditional European ideas and practices (Mohammed, August 2023, p. 3). However, these concepts actually originated from several sources, both inside and outside Europe. Accordingly, he asserts that adopting a broader approach to the study of international relations can allow for a greater consideration of history, culture, economic systems, and the contributions of non-Western civilisations and states (Mohammed, August 2023). He concludes that 'international relations are best understood as the product of interactions and mutual learning among all civilisations and states at different stages in history' (Acharya, December 10, 2017).

Meanwhile, Alexander Dugin views civilisation as a fundamental analytical level in international relations that transcends the nation-state and the traditional international system. For him, civilisation is an integrated system of religion, culture, values, geography and shared history. He considers civilisation to be a strategic actor with an identity and collective will that shapes the global order. In his Eurasian project, Dugin proposes "Civilisational multipolarity", in which each civilisation becomes an independent pole in opposition to Western dominance. In his book The Theory of a Multipolar World, he emphasises that the main actor in the world system is not the nation-state or a world government, but the 'state-civilisation', characterised by self-sufficiency, autonomy, and sovereignty — illustrated by examples such as Russia and China (Newsdesk, June 1, 2022).

2. The Significance of the Civilisational Dimension in International Relations Theory.

The Civilisational dimension is one of the key areas for understanding the behaviour of actors and the dynamics of international relations. Different theories of international relations offer different explanations of its role in shaping interests and identities.

A. The importance of the civilisational dimension within constructivism: towards a deeper social understanding of international relations

Constructivism focuses on the importance of ideas, social norms and identity to understand and explain state behaviour. According to constructivist scholars, external international behaviour is an extension of societal values, ideas and specific social discourses (Rose, 1998, p. 152). Accordingly, constructivists argue that international reality is fundamentally socially constructed (Merle, 1986, pp. 145-146). It also highlights, from a constructivist perspective, the role of socialisation in shaping states' external behaviour. In this view, state interests and goals are formed through social norms—such as culture, religion, and traditions—internalised within their social environment. (Rittberger).

constructivism does not ignore power and interest; however, it links them to individuals' cultural identity. Alexander Wendt argues that identity is the basis of interests and that interests interact with identity through social and historical processes. (Braspenning). In this sense, constructivism argues that interaction between states is not confined to fixed national interests or material and institutional constraints, but instead continuously shapes and reshapes identities over time (Martin & Terry , p. 108).

Constructivist approaches to international politics emphasize three key dimensions: the role of norms, values, and cultural patterns in shaping international relations; the construction of state identities as a basis for understanding interests and behaviour; and the study of normative interaction among international actors and the patterns of mutual influence that emerge from it. (Dehqani, December 2018, p. 193)

Constructivist methods provide valuable insights into the social construction of civilisations on this basis. Constructivists argue that civilisations are not fixed entities, but are instead socially constructed through shared meanings, systems and practices. (Mohammed, August 2023, p. 5). From this perspective, interactions between civilisations can become politically significant, particularly when they contribute to the formation of identities (Bajpai, 2018).

Civilisational identity as a guide to actor's behavior and interests

Constructivism argues that Civilisational identity plays an important role in drawing the boundaries of a society by identifying and highlighting differences between the self and the other. It can also help determine the self's position at global, regional, or individual levels, and it shapes how other actors are assessed (Bajpai, 2018). From a constructivist perspective, structural or cultural change occurs when actors redefine their identities and objectives based on cultural and Civilisational values and meanings acquired through the process of socialization (Hoffmann).

This is reflected in Turkey's foreign policy under Recep Tayyip Erdoğan since 2002, which draws on a civilisational and cultural framework rooted in the Ottoman–Islamic legacy, extending its influence across the Middle East, the Balkans, and North Africa. In Strategic Depth, Ahmet Davutoğlu conceptualises this as "civilisational depth," where language, culture, religion, and history serve as tools of soft power.

Regarding identity and its role in shaping actors' behaviour and interests, Peter Katzenstein argues in his book The Culture of National Security (1996) that ideational structures emerging from shared values not only guide actors' behaviour. They also shape who actors are by building their identities and forming their interests — interests that are not predetermined, but developed through social interaction (O'Meara, 2008, pp. 182-183).

B. Samuel Huntington's 'Clash of Civilisations' thesis: cultural foundations for explaining international conflict.

In his Clash of Civilisations, Samuel Huntington argues that civilisations are the key units for explaining conflicts and interactions between states. He emphasises that civilisational identity can determine patterns of cooperation or conflict more profoundly than material interests or traditional power-balance calculations.

Huntington's central idea is that broad cultural identity, or Civilisational identity, will be the main factor behind cohesion and fragmentation in the post-Cold War world (Rahi, 2017, p. 40).

He also asserts that the primary source of conflict will be cultural rather than ideological or economic. Civilisations, shaped by religious, cultural and historical factors, will determine the pattern of international interaction (Çilkoparan, February 6, 2021, p. 2).

Although states will remain the strongest actors, the major conflicts will occur between peoples and groups from different civilisations (Newnham, he Penguin Dictionary of International Relations, 2004, p. 94). Although clashes can occur within a single civilisation, they tend to be less intense than clashes between civilisations, which are generally more dangerous and widespread because the parties' cultural, religious and identity references differ (Ghazzala, 1994, p. 116).

Huntington argues that in the post–Cold War world, the classification of countries should not be based mainly on political or economic criteria, but primarily on cultural ones (Ghazzala, 1994, p. 117). He distinguishes between seven or eight major Civilisations: the Western, the Chinese (Confucian), the Japanese, the Hindu, the Islamic, the Orthodox/Slavic, and the Latin American (Huntington S. , 1998, pp. 52-55).

He also believes that, of the factors that distinguish different civilisations — blood, language and religion — religion is the most important element of civilisational and cultural identity (Huntington S. , 1998, p. 54). He highlights its growing significance in world politics, particularly since the decline of political ideologies, as people have sought new sources of identity and moral principles to provide them with meaning and purpose (Hendrikson).

Based on this, Huntington argues that if we ignore broad civilisations as the widest cultural entities, we cannot fully understand the units they produce (Huntington S. P., The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order, 1996, p. 52). However, he also argues that civilisations shape national interests and policies by providing a cultural framework of reference. These cultural contexts influence actors' behaviour through their values, religions, traditions and various cultural components. Consequently, their influence is evident in the behaviour of political entities, which indirectly represent the civilisation to which they belong (Jackson, 2007, p. 1).

Overall, Huntington's model of Civilisational conflict provides a geopolitical framework through which to understand the intersection of cultural tensions and Civilisational differences with political, economic, and security issues, leading to international conflicts and alliances (Çilkoparan, February 6, 2021, p. 8).

C. The Theory of the Multipolar World: A Reading of Alexander Dugin's Civilisational Approach

Dugin is a contemporary non-Western thinker who seeks to reinterpret international relations from a civilisational and philosophical standpoint that departs from mainstream Western approaches. Unlike liberal and realist theories focused on power and material interests, his framework conceives the world as composed of multiple civilisational centres with distinct spiritual and cultural identities, or "civilisation-states".

Alexander Dugin develops his theory through a critical and in-depth engagement with rationalist, positivist, and post-positivist approaches to international relations (Dugin, The Theory of a Multi-Polar World, 2023, p. 43). arguing that Western hegemony is legitimised through universalist narratives such as "Enlightenment," "progress," "rationality," and "freedom," which, in his view, conceal underlying dynamics of power and domination.

From this perspective, post-positivist theories contribute to the theory of a multipolar world by challenging Western dominance and re-framing it as one civilisation among others rather than a global centre of power (ashiti, March 7, 2023). They also aim to move beyond ethnocentrism by revealing the underlying logic of power within Western, particularly American, discourse.

Based on this understanding of prevailing theories of international relations, Dugin believes that the West rejects the idea of multipolarity because it

relies on two dominant liberal and realist ideas that reinforce Western hegemon (Dugin, The State-Civilization, June 1, 2022).

The concept of multipolar world order based on recognising the existence of multiple civilisational and political centres (Dugin, 2023, pp. 203-215), as well as creating international alliances and blocs that reflect a realistic balance among civilisations and other global powers (ashiti, March 7, 2023).

Dugin considers civilisation to be a fundamental analytical level in international relations, one that transcends the nation-state and the traditional international system. In his view, civilisations form comprehensive systems that include religion, culture, values, geography and shared history. civilisation is not reduced to its cultural dimension alone; it is also a strategic actor with identity and collective will, which affect the shaping of the multipolar world. based on acknowledging the particularities of each civilisation and its ability to organise itself politically, culturally and economically without submitting to Western hegemony

He emphasises that the nation-state (realism) and world government (Liberalism) are not the main actors in a multipolar world order. Rather, the main actors are the 'State–Civilisation' (Dugin, 2023, p. 514).

Accordingly, the main outcome of multipolar theory is the emergence of a new actor in international relations. This actor is the 'State-Civilisation'. Vladimir Putin has employed this concept in his speeches as part of the new Russian foreign policy vision articulated in the 2023 Foreign Policy Concept document.

Alexander Dugin classifies civilisations as potential poles of a multipolar world into two groups: six established civilisations—Western, Orthodox (Eurasian), Islamic, Hindu, Chinese (Confucian), and Japanese—and three emerging ones—Latin American, Buddhist, and African—each potentially shaping future global order dynamics. (Dugin, 2023, pp. 112-115).

3. Challenges and critique:

Despite growing interest in civilisational factors in international relations, several theoretical approaches—especially realism, liberalism, and Marxism—question their explanatory value, arguing that material factors such as power, interests, and the economy remain the primary drivers of international politics, while civilisation and culture play only a secondary role.

Realism assigns limited importance to identity and other non-material factors, including civilisation, in explaining international relations. Instead, it focuses on structural variables such as power, national interest, balance, and security considerations (Rajab, 2011, p. 6). From this perspective, the international system is inherently anarchic, leading states to behave as rational actors seeking survival and the maximisation of power through self-help strategies. Consequently, foreign policy is shaped mainly by a state's position within the international system

and the distribution of power, rather than by its identity or civilisational affiliation (Hammond, 2007).

Within the same broad context, liberalism argues that international relations are organised primarily through economic interdependence, international institutions and international law, rather than civilisational affiliations. In this framework, material factors — geopolitical and economic — remain the most prominent in explaining the dynamics of power, alliances and conflict.

Overall, the main critiques directed at the Civilisational approach in international relations can be summarized as follows:

- Tendency toward oversimplification and excessive generalization.One major criticism is that this approach tends to treat Civilisations as homogeneous and fixed entities. This can lead to overlooking internal diversity and historical, social, and political complexities—thus producing cultural rigidity by reducing Civilisations to rigid, fixed identities (Mohammed, August 2023, p. 6).

- Methodologically, the Civilisational approach encounters difficulties due to the absence of accurate instruments with which to measure the impact of identity and values on state behaviour. This makes it susceptible to broad generalisations or ideological exploitation.

- Treating civilisation as both a unit and a level of analysis raises ontological challenges, particularly regarding the unclear spatial and temporal boundaries of civilisations—an issue acknowledged even by Samuel P. Huntington (Mohammed, August 2023, p. 7). As a result, critics question the validity of civilisation as a stable analytical category compared to more established levels such as the state, the international system, and international society (Çilkoparan, February 6, 2021, p. 3).

- There are not enough empirical studies providing solid, concrete evidence of the effectiveness and usefulness of using civilisation as an analytical framework. Therefore, there is a need for empirical research examining real-world cases and assessing the applicability of the civilisational approach to understanding and addressing global conflicts, diplomatic relations and peacebuilding efforts (Mohammed, August 2023, p. 7).

Despite these research gaps and methodological and ontological inconsistencies, the Civilisational approach remains important for expanding the field of analysis and integrating new explanatory variables (Mohammed, August 2023, p. 5). Additionally, a recent wave of studies has deepened our understanding of Civilisational identity policies by treating Civilisations as meaningful social constructs rather than fixed entities that are destined to clash. This orientation has generated alternative approaches that are likely to influence the future orientation of scientific debate (Laruelle, 19 January 2021.).

Conclusion:

In light of the above, the civilisational dimension represents an important analytical lens for understanding contemporary international relations, especially amid ongoing transformations in the international system. Purely material explanations based on power and interests are no longer sufficient to capture the complexity of global interactions. Instead, civilisational approaches highlight the role of identity, culture, religion, historical memory and shared values in shaping actors' perceptions of interests and behaviour, thereby enriching analysis with symbolic and normative dimensions alongside geopolitical and economic factors.

Moreover, civilisational analysis can help explain the origins of conflicts, support peace and reconciliation efforts, and enhance cultural diplomacy by fostering dialogue and mutual understanding (Mohammed, August 2023, p. 4). However, it remains limited by conceptual ambiguity, difficulties in measurement, and the risk of oversimplification or ideological use. Despite these challenges, its value increases when applied flexibly and in combination with material and institutional approaches, especially in light of the rise of non-Western perspectives that challenge Western-centric interpretations of global politics. Ultimately, civilisation should be seen not as an alternative to other approaches, but as a complementary framework that deepens the understanding of international relations.

Bibliography:

- Acharya, A. (December 10, 2017). *Towards a Global International Relations?* Available at: https://www.e-ir.info/2017/12/10/towards-a-global-international-relations.
- al-ʿAttar, H. (January 27, 2018). The Concept of Civilization and Its Characteristics According to 'Malek Ibn Nabi. *Elaph Electronic Daily*, available at: https://elaph.com/Web/Opinion/2018/1/1187834.html.
- al-Rahman, A. Z. (1989). *Ibn Khaldun: The Muqaddimah.* Beiru: Dar al-Qalam.
- ashiti, S. (March 7, 2023). *A Reading of the Book: Theory of a Multi-Polar World.* Katehon Research Center (Katehon): available at: https://katehon.com/ar/article/qrat-fy-ktab-nzryt-alm-mtdd-alaqtab.
- Bajpai, R. D. (2018). *Civilizational Perspectives in International Relations and Contemporary China-India Relations.* Available at: https://www.e-ir.info/2018/04/26/civilizational-perspectives-in-international-relations-and-contemporary-china-india-relations/ .
- Bettiza, G. (2024). Civilizational Analysis in International Relations: Mapping the Field and Advancing a 'Civilizational Politics' Line of Research. *International Studies Review 16, no. 1* , https://doi.org/10.1111/misr.12104 .
- Braspenning, T. (s.d.). *Constructivism and Reflexivism in International Relations Theory.* Available at: https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/actions-france_830/etudes-recherches_3119/annuairefrancais-relations-internationales.../FD001435.pdf .

- Çilkoparan, H. (February 6, 2021). *Civilization as an Alternative Unit of Analysis in International Relations.* Available at: https://www.e-ir.info/2021/02/06/civilization-as-an-alternative-unit-of-analysis-in-international-relations/ .
- Cox, R. W. (1995). *Civilizations: Encounters and Transformations.* Studies in Political Economy 27 .
- Dehqani, A. (December 2018). The Cultural and Identity Dimension in French Foreign Policy: A Study According to the Constructivist Perspective in International Relations. *Al-Majalla al-Jazaʾiriyya li al-Ḥuquq wa al-ʿUlum al-Siyasiyya, Institute of Legal and Administrative Sciences, Ahmed Bin Yahya University—Tiaret?, Algeria, Vol. 3 / No. 6 /* , 193.
- Dhbayan, S., & others. (1991). *A Dictionary of Political, Economic, and Social Terms.* London: Riyad Al-Rayyis Books and Publishin.
- Dugin, A. (2023). *The Theory of a Multi-Polar World* (1 ed.). (T. Z.-D. hatim, Trans.) Beirut: Dar Su'al Publishing and Distribution.
- Dugin, A. (June 1, 2022). *The State-Civilization*. Récupéré sur europeantimes news: https://europeantimes.news/2022/06/alexander-dugin-the-state-civilization/
- Gebhard, C. (March 27, 2022). *Levels of Analysis in International Relations.* Available at: https://www.e-ir.info/2022/03/27/levels-of-analysis-in-international-relations/ .
- Ghazzala, S. H. (1994). The Clash of Civilisations. *Siyasat Shʾun Journal, Baghdad, No. 1*, 116.
- Hammond, P. (2007). *Cultural,Identity andIdeology*. Available at: https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Cultural-Identity-and-Ideology-Hammond/db3cb705a348024920a482efbe6a4d418f3e4f9a
- Hendrikson, H. (s.d.). *Summary of The Clash of Civilizations and The Remaking of World Order by Samuel P. Huntington.* Available at: https://www.beyondintractability.org/bksum/huntington-clash?utm_source=chatgpt.com.
- Hoffmann, A. R. (s.d.). *A Synthetic Approach to Foreign Policy.* Available at: http://www.isanet.org/noarchive/hoffmann.html .
- Huntington, S. (1998). *The Clash of Civilizations: Remaking the World Order.* (T. al-Shayib, & Qansuwa, Trads.) Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). Clash of Civilizations. *Foreign Affairs, Vol. 72, No. 3*, Council on Foreign Relations, https://www.jstor.org/stable/20045621.
- Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Ingvild, B., Thomas , D., & Aleksandra F, f. (n.d.). *levels of Analysis," in Key Concepts in International Relations.* Retrieved from https://sk.sagepub.com/dict/mono/key-concepts-in-international-relations/chpt/levels-analysis#_

- Jackson, M. H. (2007). *Civilizations as Actors: A Transactional Account.* Available at: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9780230608924_3 .
- Laruelle, H. E. (19 January 2021.). *A New Wave of Research on Civilizational Politics.* Cambridge University Press: Available at: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/nationalities-papers/article/abs/new-wave-of-research-on-civilizational-politics/02DD1E75853C169A1DEE226F5C128764?utm_source=chatgpt.com.
- Martin , G., & Terry , O. (s.d.). *Key Concepts in International Relations.* (G. R. Center, Éd., & G. R. Center, Trad.)
- Masiʿid, N. (January 2021). The Philosophy of Civilization According to Arnold Toynbee. *In: Al-Ihyaʾ Journal University of El Hadj Lakhdar, Batna 01 Algeria, Vol. 21, No. 28*, 796.
- McClelland, C. A. (March 20, 2026). *Structures, Institutions, and Levels of Analysis," in International Relations.* Encyclopaedia Britannica: https://www.britannica.com/topic/international-relations/Structures-institutions-and-levels-of-analysis .
- Merle, M. T. (1986). *Sociology of International Relations.* Cairo: Dar al-Mustaqbal al-ʿArabi.
- Mohammed, S. S. (August 2023). *Civilization as an Analytical Tool in International Relations: Exploring Historical, Epistemological, and Ontological Considerations.* Available at: http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/7224/ .
- Newnham, G. E. (2004). *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations (1st ed.).* Dubai, United Arab Emirates: Gulf Research Center.
- O'Meara, D. (2008). *Constructivism: Its Place, Role, Contribution and Debates'. In: International Relations Theories: Contestations and Resistances.* Quebec: Athena Editions and Centre d'Etudes des Politiques Etrangères et de Sécurité.
- Rahi, Q. N. (2017). *The Clash of Civilisations: A Critical Study in the Genealogy of the Concept', Series of Contemporary Terms.* Iraq: Islamic Center for Strategic Studies, 1st ed.
- Rajab, I. A. (2011). Identity or Interest: What Governs States' External Relations?", In: International Relations Analysis. *International Relations Journal, Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies, Cairo, Vol. 46, No. 186*, 7.
- Rittberger, V. (s.d.). *Approaches to the Study of Foreign Policy Derived from International Relations Theories.* Available at: http://www.isanet.org/noarchive/rittberger.html .
- Rose, G. (1998). Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy. *World Politics, Vol. 51*, 152.