

Huntington lobbies for Euro-U.S. axis against the Eurasian Land-Bridge

by Our Special Correspondent

On June 27, the Harvard Club of the Rhine-Ruhr area in Germany sponsored a gathering in Düsseldorf, of Harvard University alumni and Harvard Clubs from Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg. The guest speaker was Harvard University Professor of Government Samuel Huntington, whose thesis, that the global strategic and political situation is defined by a “clash of civilizations,” has become a focus of extensive discussion and controversy over the past four years, since the idea was first floated by him in a 1993 article in the New York Council on Foreign Relations’ magazine, *Foreign Affairs*.

In his speech, and during the question and answer period that followed, Huntington made clear that his goal, in speaking to a European audience, is to bring Europe into a common front with the United States, preferably with a President other than Bill Clinton, for combat with the two perceived “enemies” of what he calls “the West”: China, and most of the Islamic nations.

In substance, as Prof. Wolfgang Mommsen, an historian at the Heinrich Heine University in Düsseldorf, stated in the discussion period, Huntington’s construct is built on such absurd premises that it is hard to take it seriously. One such premise he pointed to, is that there is a direct correlation between “economic growth” and a nation (in this case, China) being “expansionist, hegemonic, and threatening.” Another is that there is a connection between the percentage of younger people (in the 18-25 age-group) in a nation, and how threatening that nation is. According to Huntington, the “threat from Islam” comes from “the high birth rates” and what he calls “the youth bulge.” Moreover, Mommsen charged, Huntington’s own charts and graphs demonstrate the opposite of what he asserts!

It would be tempting to dismiss Huntington as a charlatan. Regrettably, however, he is not a lone “quackademic,” but a leading spokesman for a geopolitical project cooked up in London and its clone-institutions in the United States, with Harvard in the forefront. The aim is to mobilize the “Western world” to destroy the program, promoted by China, Iran, and other countries in Eurasia, for developing infrastructure corridors along the Eurasian Land-Bridge railroad lines.

Huntington, who served for a period of time as a Research Associate at the International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS) in London over the past decade, has, in the past, propa-

gandized in favor of the United States adopting the policy of the British founder of geopolitics, Sir Halford Mackinder. Mackinder argued that the “maritime powers” (the British Empire and a United States brought under British sway) must aim to prevent any one country, or group of countries, from controlling what he called the “Eurasian heartland.” In Düsseldorf, Huntington acknowledged, privately, that his “clash of civilizations” pitch is perceived by some as a revival of the ideas of the main American advocate of Mackinderite geopolitics, the 19th century’s “naval power” doctrinaire, Adm. Alfred Thayer Mahan, who proclaimed China to be the United States’ main strategic adversary.

Today, Huntington is a board member of a wide array of institutions and publications that are priming for a conflict with China, including Freedom House, based in New York; the Washington-based American Enterprise Institute think-tank; and the leading magazine of the “neo-conservative” movement in the United States, *National Interest*. His own work at Harvard is funded by two of the leading funders of “neo-conservative” and Anglophile economic policy projects, the Smith Richardson Foundation and the John M. Olin Foundation.¹

Agreement with Kissinger

In his address, Huntington asserted that in the “post-Cold War era,” local politics is being increasingly defined by “ethnicity,” while global politics is increasingly “civilizational.” He endorsed the viewpoint of his erstwhile Harvard colleague, Henry Kissinger, that the next century will be dominated by six central powers: the United States, Europe, Japan, China, Russia, and India. With the United States and Europe forming one “Western” civilization, the other four are the “core states” in four of the main “civilizations” that matter, according to Huntington: Russian/Orthodox, Chinese/Sinic, Japanese/Buddhist, and Indian/Hindu. The key one omitted by Kissinger that Huntington adds in, is the Islamic world, which lacks a core power center. Africa is of zero relevance, he claims, while Ibero-America plays a tertiary role.

From this point, Huntington made the leap, with no expla-

1. See Mark Burdman’s review of Huntington’s new book, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, in the March 7, 1997 *EIR*, “Harvard’s Huntington Promotes Descent into Barbarism.”

nation, but as if it were a law of nature, that the more civilizations interact over the coming years, the more relations among them will be “distant and cool,” a kind of “competitive coexistence,” a “Cold Peace,” or a “Cold War.” In this matrix, “the most important axis” will be those relations involving “the West” and “the Rest,” and “two violent forms” of “West-Rest” relations are likely. One is that brought about by the “resurgence of Islam,” the other by the emergence, and growing “assertiveness” of China.

The West’s relations with Islam and China will be “particularly difficult and antagonistic,” in his view. The resolution of how this antagonism will resolve itself, will, to a large extent, depend on how three “swing civilizations”—Russia, India, and Japan—act. These three must be wooed and cultivated, to be won over to the side of “the West.”

Privately, after his lecture, Huntington reported that he had been in Russia in June, for a lecture sponsored by the Russian branch of Harvard’s John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, of which Huntington is the director, and for discussions with Russian strategists. He affirmed that there is “great interest in the ‘clash of civilizations’ idea among the Russians. They really think in such terms. After all, they are really concerned about the threat from the Islamic countries, and they are very apprehensive about Chinese ambitions, demographic and otherwise, in Siberia, and about China in general. So, I don’t think these recent Russia-China agreements amount to much.”

What also doesn’t “amount to much,” in his view, is the continent of Africa and its population. In his speech, he differentiated between conflicts that matter to “the West,” and those that do not. What happened in the Balkans is of immediate, wider relevance. But, the “bloody clash of clans” in Somalia was of “no consequence” to anybody except those caught up in the clan warfare. Similarly, what has happened in Rwanda and Burundi, the Harvard racist went on, “has disastrous consequences for Rwanda and Burundi, and for the neighboring African countries directly affected, but does not have much further consequence for the rest of the world.”

Muslim ‘violence propensity’ and the ‘youth bulge’

Huntington devoted much of his address to a tirade against Islam and China, utilizing a bizarre variant of racist neo-malthusianism. For his predominantly European audience, the main bogeyman he conjured up was the threat from Islam. Muslims, relative to those in other civilizations, have a high “violence propensity,” he said. Of the various conflicts taking place along what he calls the “fault-lines” separating different civilizations, there is the heaviest concentration of such conflicts “along the boundaries of the Muslim world.” Muslims “engage in far more conflicts with other ethnic groups” than do other “civilizations,” and “Muslims fight other Muslims” more frequently than fights occur within non-Muslim civilizations.

Pressure on Germany

In April, Samuel Huntington visited Bonn, Hamburg, and Frankfurt, promoting the German-language version of his book, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. More recently, he was also in Munich and Berlin. In such locations, and in interviews with German media, he pressured Germany to move away from positive relations with key countries in Eurasia, such as Iran and China.

However, his efforts do not always meet with a positive resonance. German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel, at a commemoration for the 75th anniversary of the June 24, 1922 death of German Foreign Minister Walther Rathenau—who was assassinated two months after signing the German-Soviet “Rapallo Treaty”—denounced Huntington’s theses as “dangerous, because they endorse a historic fatalism, which does not exist and must not exist.” Kinkel charged that Huntington was creating “new enemy images,” and stressed that Islam “is gaining influence as a political-cultural factor,” and must not be equated with “aggressive fundamentalism.”

In Munich, Huntington was confronted by a team from the Schiller Institute, who labelled his theories “outrageous,” and a regurgitation of the geopolitical theories of Britain’s Sir Halford Mackinder and Nazi Germany’s Karl Haushofer.

At the Düsseldorf event, a significant percentage of the Harvard alumni attendees were seen reading an exposé of Huntington’s bizarre ideas and international connections that had been published in the weekly *Neue Solidarität*, the newspaper of the LaRouche movement in Germany.

Why this “violence propensity”? “High birth rates,” which have created a “huge youth bulge.” According to this profound thinker, throughout history, whenever the percentage of youth in the population exceeds a certain percentage, “there is a marked increase in conflict, instability, and wars.” In the Muslim world, the “youth bulge” produces “terrorism, militancy, migration, and pressure on neighboring states.” Hence, for the next few decades, relations between “the West” and the Muslim world will be “very difficult.”

Having painted this menacing picture, focussing on regions inhabited by Muslims that are geographically close to Europe, Huntington insisted on “the need for greater unity of Europe and the United States,” because of their “common values and institutions.” Europe and the United States have “far more in common with each other,” than the two do with

Asian, African, and Middle Eastern societies. He added, "I blame the Clinton administration, that the unity of the West is not what it should be." This has allowed China to "very adroitly" play Europe against the United States.

New 'spheres of influence'

Huntington concluded with a macabre geopolitical construct, in which "order, restraint, and discipline" would be achieved in the coming years, by prioritizing relations among the hegemonic "core states" within each individual civilization. In case his audience would not understand what this meant, Huntington stressed that what he was calling for, was a new system of "spheres of influence."

In the discussion period, Huntington expanded on his anti-China views. He warned that "if the economic development of China continues, China will become more assertive and difficult." When Professor Mommsen challenged this view, pointing, correctly, to the classical, optimistic American view that economic well-being generally makes a nation and its population more peaceable, Huntington, visibly destabilized, mumbled that there is a direct correlation, in history, between "economic growth," "assertiveness," and "expansion." Among the examples he cited, was the United States itself!

Huntington insisted that relations with China will be "the central and most difficult" challenge facing the United States

in coming decades. The greatest disaster, would be an economically prosperous China establishing "hegemony" in Asia, therefore undermining the supposedly traditional American commitment to preventing one or more powers from becoming hegemonic in the European-Asian theater. He reported that there is a growing school of thought in the United States, which sees today's China as posing the same threat as "Wilhelmine Germany" did 100 years ago, and noted that the view is spreading in certain U.S. circles, that war with China in the coming years is "inevitable." He claimed not to be in complete agreement with either of the latter two assertions, but some in the audience were drawing quite a different conclusion.

He said: "I don't think the Clinton administration has done a good job" in managing this challenge from China. He claimed that Clinton and his team were sending conflicting messages to China, and, in effect, appeasing the Chinese, thereby ensuring that China was becoming more, rather than less, threatening.

In a private discussion, Huntington said that he thought that the U.S. President was succumbing to "business interests" in his policies toward China. He pointed favorably to the increasingly vocal campaign of "religious conservatives, both Christian and Jewish," against China, and cited the *New York Times's* A.M. Rosenthal as a key figure promoting the anti-China propaganda campaign in the media.

LISTEN TO LAROUCHE ON RADIO



*Frequent Interviews with
Lyndon LaRouche on the
Weekly Broadcast "EIR Talks"*

ON SATELLITE
Saturdays
4 p.m. ET
Galaxy 7 (G-7)
Transponder 14.
7.71 Audio.
91 Degrees West.

SHORTWAVE RADIO
Sundays, 5 p.m. ET
2200 UTC
WWCR 5.070 mHz

**Cassettes Available to
Radio Stations**

**Transcripts Available to
Print Media**

Local Times for "EIR Talks" Sunday Shortwave Broadcast on WWCR 12.160 MHz			
Adis Ababa	0100*	Little Rock	1600
Amsterdam	2300	London	2200
Anchorage	1300	Los Angeles	1400
Athens	2400	Madrid	2300
Atlanta	1700	Manila	0600*
Auckland	1000*	Mecca	0100*
Baghdad	0100*	Melbourne	0800*
Baltimore	1700	Mexico City	1600
Bangkok	0500*	Milan	2300
Beijing	0600*	Minneapolis	1600
Belfast	2200	Montreal	1700
Berlin	2300	Moscow	0100*
Bohemian Grove	1400	New Delhi	0330*
Bogota	1700	New York	1700
Bonn	2300	Nogales	1500
Bombay	0330*	Norfolk	1700
Boston	1700	Oslo	2300
Bretton Woods	1700	Paris	2300
Bucharest	2400	Philadelphia	1700
Buenos Aires	1900	Pittsburgh	1700
Buffalo	1700	Prague	2300
Cairo	2400	Rangoon	0430*
Calcutta	0330*	Richmond	1700
Caracas	1800	Rio de Janeiro	1900
Casablanca	2200	Rome	2300
Chattanooga	1700	St. Louis	1600
Chicago	1600	St. Petersburg	0100*
Copenhagen	2300	San Francisco	1400
Denver	1500	Santiago	1700
Detroit	1700	Sarajevo	2300
Dublin	2200	Seattle	1400
Gdansk	2300	Seoul	0700*
Guadalajara	1600	Shanghai	0600*
Havana	1700	Singapore	0530*
Helsinki	2400	Stockholm	2300
Ho Chi Minh City	0600*	Sydney	0800*
Honolulu	1200	Teheran	0130*
Hong Kong	0600*	Tel Aviv	2400
Houston	1600	Tokyo	0700*
Istanbul	2400	Toronto	1700
Jakarta	0500*	Vancouver	1400
Jerusalem	2400	Vladivostok	0800*
Johannesburg	2400	Venice	2300
Karachi	0300*	Warsaw	2300
Kennebunkport	1700	Washington	1700
Kiev	2400	Wellington	1000*
Khartoum	2400	Wiesbaden	2300
Lagos	2300	Winnipeg	1700
Lima	1700	Yokohama	0700*
Lincoln	1600	Yorktown	1700
Lisbon	2300		* Mondays