

Introduction

I would choose the statement: 'The U.S. border with Mexico is a fault line of the clash of civilisations,' in accordance with the article by Samuel Huntington. The article by Samuel P. Huntington, titled "The Clash of Civilisations", assumes that the basic distinction between conflicts of the future will depend on culture. According to his understanding of the world, it has been divided into several major cultural units, including Latin American, Western, and Islamic ones, among others. Huntington claims that these units will differ in terms of different values. There are various people whose interpretation of the border situation depends on Huntington's theory. They posit that the border is nothing but a social sphere between Latin America and the U.S.

I disagree with this statement. The border between the United States and Mexico does not pose cultural struggles. The current issues regarding the border are the repercussions of the previous events, economics, and government policies, and not the cultural war. This essay would delve into my points where I would highlight the odds in Huntington's theory with the border realities, all the reasons behind immigration, and the manner in which the U.S. is dealing with the controversies involving immigration.

Arguments and Drawbacks of Huntington's Theory

The core principle of Huntington's theory assumes that cultural groups and not political systems or economic interests will demarcate the conflicts in the future (Huntington, 1993). According to his concerns about civilisation, it is a vast group of people who have shared the same past, values, and religion. His viewpoints show that two different civilisations come together, and a fight may arise. As Latin America and Mexico are mostly classified as the "Latin

American Civilisation" and the U.S. as the "Western civilisation", some people think that the border is one of those cultural fault lines.

Whatsoever, from the closer look, the history is different, and it seems that the border between the history of regions of the United States and Mexico is valid according to Huntington. The border has never shown up as some simple lines with a basic split between two different major civilisations. In fact, the border region is one of the most culturally sound regions in the world.

History of the Southwest Reveals the Cultures Are Connected

The documentary "*Latino Americans*", produced by PBS, reveals the most genuine truth about the Southwest part of America, which was part of Mexico before the Mexican-American War took place (PBS, 2025). With the acquisition of the land by the United States, the residents who were there continued their residence. Their languages kept on being Spanish, they maintained all the traditions and customs as before, and the region continued to develop. Both the cultural sides of the border remained interlinked.

From these historical settings, it has been unravelled that the border is not about the barricade between two different civilisations, but a place where different cultures sustain. For instance, businesses, families, and communities have lived across the intergenerational borders. Today, as per reality, lots of people reside in towns along the borders where being multilingual is normal, and the cultural traditions of both sides converge.

People Migrate for Economic and Safety Reasons

In case the border was really a clash of civilisations, a vigorous hatred would take place between them. The fights would have never stopped, and a common identity crisis would have

sustained. Rather, the document shows that the area has always had a history, culture, and communities in common. Also, they were not aligned with the claims of Huntington (PBS, 2025).

Another substantive point I have found against the theory of Huntington was the immigration patterns symbolising a cultural war. Research on migration unravels that the philosophy behind crossing the border was some real-world practice; culture cannot be included here. A sociologist, Douglas Massey, proclaims that the linchpin behind economic opportunities and migration which has been connected with violence, poverty, and family connections. Cultural confrontation does not get included in this (Massey, 2023).

For instance, the United States has trusted mostly on migrant labour to fill jobs in construction, agriculture, hospitality, and service industries. Wages in the United States are much higher than in many parts of Central America and Mexico. Many immigrants leave risk-prone areas where violence and gangs threaten their safety. Families frequently immigrate to reunite with relatives who live in the U.S. Due to these reasons, migration does not delve only into the civilisations that fight with each other. It is about survival, work, and family. From various research, it has been shown that immigrants are coming to substitute American culture or start a cultural battle.

U.S. government policies strongly influence migration patterns (Massey, 2023). With the boost in border enforcement, migrants take more dangerous avenues. With the change in asylum rules, the number of people waiting at the border rises or falls. This highlights that immigration is adjusted by the policy, instead of civilizational conflict.

Border tension comes from Government Policies.

From the legal research, it has been seen that the concerns at the border stem from the decisions of the U.S. government. The illustration of Kowalski (2017) exemplifies how border militarisation, the addition of more walls, agents, surveillance, and checkpoints, impacted the everyday life of people living in the border regions. The changes have been derived from the militarisation, which scared and angered people, especially those who go across the border for school, work, or to visit their families.

Conflicts run high when the government authorises policies that are severe, slow, and perplexing. Contrarily, conflicts arise when the government inaugurates policies that are humane and transparent. This symbolises the border situation, which is the aftermath of the government's handling of migration, and not the cultural differences.

If the matter delves only into the clash of civilisations, policies would seem absurd. Though the evidences show something different, the policies are highly important. Hence, the border is not a cultural rift. It is an economic and political challenge shaped by human decisions.

Oversimplification Culture

Another pressing matter from Huntington's theory is that he treats the entire civilisation with hasty generalisation. Huntington's model makes the cultures seem like teams locked in permanent conflict (Azizbek, 2024). Though in reality, culture and diversity are different inwardly. For instance, "Latin America" encompasses more than 20 countries with numerous foods, accents, histories, and traditions. Even within Mexico, culture differs around the region. The theory presented by Huntington serves with unreliable fears, which are caused by the cultural differences that seem larger than reality. It does not motivate the overall understanding;

instead, it splits people into them and us (Azizbek, 2024). Applying them to immigration produces stereotypes and makes it difficult to develop some realistic and fair responsive policies.

In reality, people from various cultures are different; instead, their daily reactions at the border are without conflicts. This makes me disagree with the notion of civilizational clash.

Treatment of Immigration as a Political Issue

The genuine, present political controversies show that the leaders do not delineate immigration as a clash of civilisations. Just like the immigration platform launched by the Democratic Party concentrates on enhancing the asylum process, showing a path to citizenship, and protecting the border in a loyal way (DNC, 2024). "The Republican Party" concentrates more on strict border control and enforcement. Though the solution displayed by Huntington has been disagreed with by them, still both sides of the immigrants are framed as a matter of security, law, and resources, not a cultural battleground.

This alludes to the fact that the political leaders consider immigration as a political challenge, not a civilizational dispute. The framing strengthens the argument that the theory produced by Huntington cannot be applied to the borders of the U.S. and Mexico.

Better Way of Understanding and Improvement

Whether the border is the clash of civilisations or not determines whether the United States approaches immigration. A humane, realistic approach should concentrate on the genuine reasons for immigration.

1. Assisting to diminish violence, impoverishment, and imbalance in Latin America that will reduce the pressure to migrate.

2. When migrants can apply for work visas or asylum legally, fewer people cross the border improperly.
3. Recruitment of more judges and staff would diminish the waiting times and overcrowding.
4. More resources should go toward processing migrants, not only constructing walls or adding weapons.

These solutions depend on evidence from history, research, and economic data. None of them necessitates thinking about civilisations fighting each other. They simply necessitate good policy.

Conclusion

The U.S.-Mexico border is not a clash of civilisations. Huntington's concept does not match the ancestry of the Southwest, the financial reasons behind migration, the political dimension of border enforcement, or the slant of people who live in the border area. Rather, the border is influenced by policy decisions, human stories, and economic realities. Having a succinct knowledge about this grants the U.S. to construct a more competent, just, and humane immigration system, one that depends on facts, not fear.

References

- Azizbek, Q. (2024). SAMUEL HUNTINGTON CONTEMPORARY CONCEPTS OF THE CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS. *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, 4(7S), 692-695.
- Democratic National Committee. (2020/2024). Democratic Party platform (immigration section). Retrieved from: <https://www.democrats.org/party-platform>
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22–49.
- Kowalski, J. (2017). The effect of militarization of the United States–Mexico border. Seattle University School of Law.
- Massey, D. S. (2023). The shape of things to come: international migration in the twenty-first century. In *Migration and integration in a post-pandemic world: Socioeconomic opportunities and challenges* (pp. 29-81). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- PBS. (2025). *Latino Americans [Television series]*. PBS. <https://www.pbs.org/show/latino-americans/>