

Trilateral ideologue publishes guide for 'democratic' subversion

by Gretchen Small

The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century

by Samuel P. Huntington

University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Okla., 1991
366 pages, hardbound, \$14.95

There is a certain irony about Samuel Huntington's *The Third Wave*. Here is the Trilateral Commission ideologue, who penned the commission's 1975 call for fascism with a democratic face, putting himself forward as the mastermind of an international offensive on behalf of "democracy." The man who then demanded limits on democracy, today proclaims that "democracy is good in itself," with such "positive consequences for . . . the United States of America," that it must be the focus of U.S. policy.

The book jacket promotes *The Third Wave* as "a valuable tool for anyone engaged in the democratization process." The Trilateral Commission's first executive director, Zbigniew Brzezinski, calls the book "exceptionally important," and its author, "a democratic Machiavelli." Former Ambassador Edwin Corr hails it as "a blueprint for the achievement of democracy." Huntington, for his part, praises Corr's service as ambassador to Peru, Bolivia, and El Salvador in the 1980s as exemplary of the "new activist breed of 'freedom-pusher' U.S. ambassador."

While the book is written in a sociological style that borders on the inane, at five points, Huntington abandons "the role of social scientist," as he puts it, and assumes that of political consultant, setting forth "Guidelines for Democratizers." Here lies the meat of the book. Huntington's "Guidelines" are a manual for how to overthrow governments unacceptable to the would-be rulers of the new world order. These include instructions for "democratizers" to "develop contacts with the global media, foreign human rights organizations and transnational organizations"; for governments installed through international pressure to "purge or retire all potentially disloyal officers . . . make major reductions in the size

of your military forces. . . . If all else fails, abolish the military."

Dismantling the military is the focus of Huntington's strategy for "democratization," as it is for the Bush administration, which has made demilitarization of the developing sector a cutting edge of its global policies (see *EIR*, Jan. 11, 1991). Take note that Huntington also suggests that regional wars may be useful in distracting the military.

As patriots from Thailand to Peru and Nigeria have recently discovered, "Democracy!" has become the battle cry under which national institutions are being crushed, and the economic genocide of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) imposed. Because of who and what Huntington represents, his book is a must for anyone seeking to combat the assault on national sovereignty.

Who is Samuel Huntington?

Security matters and government are Harvard University Prof. Huntington's specialty, going back to his 1957 book on *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. Over the last two and a half decades, he has also never been far from U.S. government: He served as coordinator of security planning at the National Security Council under Brzezinski during the first year of the Carter presidency; sat from 1980-91 on the Advisory Board of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA, the domestic "action arm" of the NSC which functions as an unconstitutional parallel government); describes himself as a "sometime consultant" to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the NSC, the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, the U.S. Air Force and Navy, and the Agency for International Development; sits on the editorial board of the *Journal of Democracy*, the magazine of the quasi-governmental National Endowment for Democracy, which published advance selections from *The Third Wave* in its June 1991 issue.

In or out of government, Huntington has served as a top ideologue for David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission, the powerful policymaking group of the Anglo-American financial interests. This included helping draft one of the commission's most controversial works, *The Crisis of Democracy*, which reported the conclusions of the Trilateral

Commission's 1974 Task Force on the Governability of Democracies.

That work is of particular relevance to understanding what Huntington is up to in *The Third Wave*. In *The Crisis of Democracy*, Huntington and co-authors Michel Crozier and Joji Watanuki argued that the western world was entering into a period of economic scarcity in which an "excess of democracy" would make it extremely difficult for governments to impose the needed financial discipline and sacrifice upon the industrialized countries. Just as "there are potentially desirable limits to economic growth," they wrote, "there are also potentially desirable limits to the indefinite extension of political democracy. . . . Democracy is only one way of constituting authority, and it is not necessarily a universally applicable one."

The racist assumptions which underlie the Trilateral Commission's global program were fully displayed in *The Crisis of Democracy*. In the chapter on the United States, Huntington argued that "the effective operation of a democratic political system usually requires some measure of apathy and non-involvement on the part of some individuals and groups," adding that while "this marginality on the part of some groups is inherently undemocratic . . . it has also been one of the factors which has enabled democracy to function effectively." But, he complains, the once-marginalized black citizens have now been incorporated as "full participants in the political system," which threatens to "overload" democracy.

The problem with democracy, these Trilateraloids complained, is "the democratic idea that government should be responsive to the people," because this "creates the expectation that government should meet the needs and correct the evils affecting particular groups in society." *Crisis of Democracy* argued that in this time of global economic crisis, the job of government is to ensure the survival of financial interests—such as those for whom Huntington speaks—at the expense of meeting the needs of the peoples of their nations. If that requires "limiting" democracy, so be it.

A similar argument put forward by Huntington in his 1968 book, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, still serves as the bible for "democratic" butchers grouped around Deng Xiaoping within the Chinese Communist Party. In *Political Order*, Huntington argued that dictatorship may be required to successfully impose upon developing sector countries the painful economic reforms required by "free trade" liberalism. This argument so suited the needs of communist free trader Zhao Ziyang—whose fanatic support for Milton Friedman's economic liberalism earned him the nickname "Chinese Milton"—that in the 1980s, he had Huntington's books translated and circulated widely in China to justify the imposition of what Ziyang called the "new authoritarianism," after Huntington's work.

How, then, did Huntington, the author of the "new authoritarianism thesis," suddenly become the new guru of the international democracy hit squads? The answer to that gets

to the heart of what the Anglo-American-run "democracy movement" actually seeks to impose.

Eradicating the principle of 'the common good'

Right at the outset of *The Third Wave*, Huntington includes a section defining what he considers to be "the meaning of democracy," which demonstrates that, for the Trilateral crowd, democracy is another name for administrative fascism, or what they themselves dubbed in the 1970s, "fascism with a human face." Huntington writes that since the 1970s, only a "procedural definition of democracy" is acceptable; "classical" theories which defined democracy as having as its purpose to provide for "the common good," and as its source of legitimacy, "the will of the people," have been rejected. The only "procedures" that confirm a democracy's functioning, writes Huntington, are "free and fair elections." These, he adds, have been made a more useful criterion "by the increasing observation of elections by international groups."

The question of economic development or standard of living is considered irrelevant. He specifies: "Democracy does not mean that problems will be solved; it does mean that rulers can be removed; and the essence of democratic behavior is doing the latter because it is impossible to do the former. Disillusionment and the lowered expectations it produces are the foundation of democratic stability. Democracies become consolidated when people learn that democracy is a solution to the problem of tyranny, but not necessarily to anything else."

The application of precisely this concept of democracy, that *procedure*—not truth and not an effort to achieve the common good—determines government, is what has transformed the United States into a lawless nation, marauding across the globe and applying fascist justice inside its own borders. It is this philosophy which underlies the Supreme Court's declaration that innocence is no reason to not execute someone who failed to file his papers on time. It is the same concept expressed by National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft, when he justified U.S. sanctions against Peru on the basis that it could not take extraordinary measures to defeat the Shining Path terrorists, because "the heart of democracy is that the rules are more important than winning."

Huntington is the same philosophical fascist today, when he offers his "Guidelines for Democratizers," as he was when he championed the cause of the "new authoritarianism," and the need to install crisis governments to limit democracy in industrialized nations. The "authoritarian" principle he seeks to eradicate from government, is precisely that concept of the common good, identified in the U.S. Constitution as the General Welfare, upon which the United States government was founded. For the same reason, when Huntington categorizes world history into three great waves of democratization, he identifies the beginning of the first wave, not as the founding of the republican government, but as 1828—the year

Andrew Jackson was elected President and unleashed the mobs against the dirigist economic program that had secured "the common good" until that time.

From Huntington's standpoint, politics is antithetical to religion, truth, and morality. Nowhere is this more explicit in *The Third Wave* than in his diatribe against Confucianism as "undemocratic or anti-democratic." This, he argues, is because "political legitimacy in Confucian China rested on the Mandate of Heaven, which defined politics in terms of morality." If that culture can be changed, however, Huntington writes, "democracy" can be made to function, as it has finally in countries under the dominance of the Catholic Church. Whereas previously Catholic culture was one which was "authoritarian, hierarchical, deeply religious," today he claims that this has been changed through the impact of liberation theology and its "People's Church."

Manual for action

Huntington states that his goal is to ensure that "authoritarian nationalism" does not come to power either in Third World countries or in eastern Europe. He expresses particular concern that the revolutions of 1989-90 in eastern Europe were primarily anti-Soviet *nationalist* movements, and thus "authoritarian nationalist regimes might return." All means are justified to ensure this does not happen, starting with economic blackmail. "In the 1990s conceivably the IMF and the World Bank could become much more forceful than they had been in demanding political democratization as well as economic liberalization as a precondition for economic assistance," Huntington suggests. If that does not work, such methods as "the large American military deployments in the [Persian] Gulf" could serve as a "powerful external impetus" toward liberalization and democratization.

The core of the operation, however, is the orchestration of Jacobin "democracy" movements inside target countries, to be constructed along the lines offered in Huntington's cynical "Guidelines for Democratizers":

"Secure your political base. As quickly as possible place supporters of democratization in key power positions in the government, the party and the military. . . . Make symbolic concessions, following a course of two steps forward, one step backward. . . . Be prepared for . . . a coup attempt—possibly even stimulate [the military] to do so—and then crack down on them ruthlessly. . . . Create a sense of inevitability about the process of democratization so that it becomes widely accepted as a necessary and natural course of development even if to some people it remains an undesirable one. . . . Attack the regime on general issues that are of widespread concern, such as corruption and brutality. If the regime is performing successfully (particularly economically) these attacks will not be effective. . . . Make particular efforts to enlist business leaders, middle-class professionals, religious figures, and political party leaders, most of whom probably supported creation of the authoritarian system.

The more 'respectable' and 'responsible' the opposition appears, the easier it is to win more supporters. Cultivate generals. . . .

"Develop contacts with the global media, foreign human rights organizations, and transnational organizations such as churches. In particular, mobilize supporters in the United States. American congressmen are always looking for moral causes to get publicity for themselves and to use against the American administration. Dramatize your cause to them and provide them with material for TV photo opportunities and headline-making speeches."

Under the subhead "Curbing Military Power, Promoting Military Professionalism," Huntington adds:

"Promptly purge or retire all potentially disloyal officers, including both leading supporters of the authoritarian regime *and* military reformers who may have helped you to bring about the democratic regime. The latter are more likely to lose their taste for democracy than their taste for intervening in politics. Ruthlessly punish the leaders of attempted coups. . . .

"Make major reductions in the size of your military forces. An Army that has been running a government will be too large and, in all probability, have far too many officers. Your military officers think that they are badly paid, badly housed. . . . Use the money saved by reducing the size of the military to increase salaries, pensions, and benefits. . . . It will pay off.

"Reorient your military forces to military missions. For good reasons you may wish to resolve conflicts with other countries. The absence of a foreign threat, however, may leave your military devoid of a legitimate military mission and enhance their inclination to think about politics. Balance gains from the removal of foreign threats against the potential costs in instability at home. Drastically reduce the number of troops stationed in or around your capital. Move them to the frontiers or other relatively distant unpopulated places. . . .

"Give them toys. That is, provide them with new and fancy tanks, planes, armored cars, artillery, and sophisticated electronic equipment (ships are less important; navies do not make coups). New equipment will make them happy and keep them busy trying to learn how to operate it. By playing your cards right and making a good impression in Washington, you will also be able to shift much of the cost to the American taxpayer. You then gain the added benefit that you can warn the military that they will only continue to get these toys if they behave themselves because nasty U.S. legislators take a dim view of military intervention in politics.

"Because soldiers . . . love to be loved . . . [a]ttend military ceremonies; award medals. . . .

"Develop and maintain a political organization that is capable of mobilizing your supporters in the streets of the capital if a military coup is attempted."

Huntington adds a footnote: "The *Economist* [of London] has offered somewhat similar advice to leaders of new democracies in dealing with their military," which concludes, "If all else fails, abolish the army."