

Harvard's Huntington promotes descent into barbarism

by Mark Burdman and Scott Thompson

It is the obsession of leading geopolitical strategists in London, Washington, and other Western capitals, that there exists no greater priority than to mobilize the "Western world" for conflict with the nations that are central to the development of the Eurasian Land-Bridge. This is the region for which Sir Halford Mackinder, Britain's leading geopolitical theorist at the turn of the century, coined the term "Eurasian heartland," the battle for which, he said, would determine who would control the world. Now, in the late 1990s, their focus is being drawn to containing, combatting, and countering Russia, China, Iran, India, and other countries in Eurasia, whose combined population comprises three-quarters of the world's people. These geopolitical chessboard players would like to use "ethnic" insurgencies, to break Russia up into many parts.

Since 1993, when it was first popularized in an article in the New York Council on Foreign Relations magazine, *Foreign Affairs*, Harvard Prof. Samuel Huntington's "clash of civilizations" construct has been one of the most discussed variants of this obsession. With its faulty argumentation, obtuse academic style, and hallucinatory invocations of such nonexistent entities as "Confucian-Islamic states," one would have hoped that that original Huntington venture would have been treated with the contempt it deserved, and relegated quickly to the dustbin of history.

Instead, the article unleashed massive controversy. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* is the expanded, book-length version of the original polemic (see *EIR*, March 7, 1997). The academic language and multitude of footnotes lends a façade of erudition to a method that is as old as the Delphic Oracle of Apollo in ancient Greece. Simply put, it is the game of self-fulfilling prophecy: Repeat often enough, that so-and-so is your enemy, and you set in motion the processes that, sooner or later, make a conflict inevitable.

A geopolitical war plan

The "clash of civilizations" is not an article or a book, but a project that goes beyond Huntington himself. It is the "geopolitical war plan" for an influential, British-run faction in the transatlantic policy establishment. Hence, on the back



Samuel Huntington's "clash of civilizations" thesis is not the academic analysis it purports to be, but the geopolitical war plan of a British-run faction in the transatlantic policy establishment.

dust-jacket, there are two hyperventilating endorsements, from Sir Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski. Kissinger, as *EIR* has exhaustively documented, has spent his career promoting British balance of power, or geopolitical, doctrines. Kissinger was key in setting up the Harvard Department of Government apparatus, where Huntington is, today, a key figure. Not surprisingly, in the period immediately leading up to the "clash of civilizations" article, Huntington was parroting Kissinger's ideas.

In early 1991, just as the Bush-Thatcher Gulf War was giving a new shot in the arm to British geopolitical strategy, Huntington wrote an article for the January-February issue of *Survival*, the publication of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, in which he insisted that American policy toward Eurasia should premise itself on the British geopolitical theories of Mackinder and on the balance of power approach that Sir Henry's hero, Lord Castlereagh followed, at the 1815 Congress of Vienna.

As for Brzezinski, it was he, in his capacity as National Security Adviser to President Jimmy Carter in the late 1970s, who developed the so-called Arc of Crisis theory, that he now calls the expanded "Zone of Instability" (see article, p.35), according to which the region south of the Soviet Union,

would constitute a vast arena of instability (“Islamic fundamentalism,” etc.), which could be used as a geostrategic weapon against the Soviet Union. On Brzezinski’s National Security Council staff, in the Carter administration, was Samuel Huntington, as director of security planning.

Ending democracy

Brzezinski and Huntington, as had Carter himself, had come into the Carter administration from the Trilateral Commission, the organization founded and bankrolled in 1974 by David Rockefeller. In 1975, Huntington had co-authored a notorious Trilateral report, *The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission*, which called into question the viability of maintaining representative democratic and constituency-based institutions and movements, at a time when the imposition of austerity measures would “require” post-democratic, or non-democratic regimes. Huntington was one of three authors for the Trilateral Commission of *The Crisis of Democracy*, out of which flowed the “Project Democracy.”

In *The Crisis of Democracy*, Huntington argues that with the “post-industrial society” nations are becoming “ungovernable” by democratic means. However, he states that: “To become President a candidate has to put together an electoral coalition involving a majority of voters appropriately distributed across the country. . . . Since the 1930s, however, . . . once he is elected President, the President’s electoral coalition has, in a sense, served its purpose. . . . What counts then is his ability to mobilize support from the leaders of the key institutions in society and government.”

The argument in *The Clash of Civilizations* is based on a pair of simple, or, better, simplistic, contentions, presented as self-evident truths. He writes: “The Cold War division of humanity is over. The more fundamental divisions of humanity in terms of ethnicity, religions, and civilizations remain and spawn new conflicts.” Later, he states the same point more crudely: “Civilizations are the ultimate human tribes, and the clash of civilizations is tribal conflict on a global scale. . . . Relations between groups from different civilizations . . . will be almost never close, usually cool, and often hostile.”

Elsewhere, Huntington proudly claims he is drawing upon a field called “British international relations theory.” As for his general notion of the “history of civilizations,” Huntington frequently refers to the late Arnold Toynbee, one of the key cultural warriors in British intelligence in this century. At the macro level, the dominant division is between “the West and the rest,” with the most intense conflicts occurring between Muslim and Asian societies on the one hand, and the West on the other.

Too much economic growth, too many people

That is, we in “the West” are locked into conflicts with intolerant Muslims and assertive Chinese. Why must this be

the case? Huntington’s proof would be laughable, were the author not a distinctive member of a club of geopolitical pyromaniacs: The Asians are threatening us with their “economic growth,” and the Muslims with their “extremely high rates of population growth.”

How such conflicts should be coherent with “American interests,” is beyond any sane person’s comprehension. Needless to say, among Huntington’s goals, is to polemicize against any effort by the Clinton administration to achieve positive, viable relations with the countries along Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche’s proposed Eurasian Land-Bridge route to integrate Eurasia.

In essence, his “West” is the British imperial system and the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. He uses terms like “Euro-American civilization” and “Western Christendom” interchangeably with “Western imperialism.” Such an identification, of course, neatly fits into a “clash of civilization” construct, as it allows “the West” to be the perfect enemy-image for the other, “non-Western civilizations.” Hence, to demonstrate what he calls “European expansion” and the “onslaught of the West,” he writes: “In 1800, the British Empire consisted of 1.5 million square miles and 20 million people. By 1900, the Victorian empire upon which the sun never set, included 11 million square miles and 390 million people.”

The Way Out of The Crisis



A 90-minute video of highlights from *EIR*'s April 21, 1999 seminar in Bonn, Germany.

Lyndon LaRouche was the keynote speaker, in a dialogue with distinguished international panelists: **Wilhelm Hankel**, professor of economics and a former banker from Germany; **Stanislav Menshikov**, a Russian economist and journalist; Schiller Institute founder **Helga Zepp-LaRouche** from Germany; **Devendra Kaushik**, professor of Central Asian Studies from India; **Qian Jing**, international affairs analyst from China; **Natalya Vitrenko**, economist and parliamentarian from Ukraine.



Order number EIE-99-010. **\$30** postpaid.
EIR News Service
 P.O. Box 17390
 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
 To order, call **1-888-EIR-3258** (toll-free).
 We accept Visa and MasterCard.