

Huntington Raves Again: Watch Out for a New Cheney War!

by Gretchen Small

Harvard's disgusting Samuel Huntington, whose 1996 anti-Islamic *Clash of Civilizations* tract laid the groundwork for the Cheney gang's Middle East wars, is preparing the ground for new wars, this time throughout the Americas, and within the United States itself.

Huntington oft repeats that "we know who we are, when we know who we are not, and whom we are against." So who are "we" to be "against," now? Huntington proposes the new enemy image for the United States, is nothing less than the 15% of its own population which is of Hispanic origin. "We" are now to hate the largest ethnic minority in the country, and most especially of all, those who come from the United States' neighbor, Mexico.

Step back for a moment, to August 2003, when U.S. Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche's drive to oust Vice President Dick Cheney and his gang of synarchist killers from the Bush Administration had finally catalyzed a broader institutional move against Cheney, et al. On Aug. 9, LaRouche wrote a memo warning that Cheney and cohorts were likely to respond to the threat to their power, by attempting a new megaterrorist incident. With the "Arabs did it line" wearing politically thin, LaRouche warned Cheney's boys could turn to the new fascist international being formed in the Americas around the figure of Spanish Franco-ite Blas Piñar, to provide an "Hispanic" cover for their atrocity.

"Think of the effect of a terrorist attack on the U.S.A., comparable in psychological effect to 9/11, but blamed this time on Hispanic, rather than Arab populations! Think of the great benefit of that for resuscitating Cheney's re-election prospects!" warned LaRouche's memo, published in an Aug. 22 *EIR* cover story on the new fascist international, entitled, "When Cheney Spoke of Terrorism: Which Terrorists, Dick?"

Now along comes Huntington, declaring Hispanics in the United States to be the new enemy. The anti-Hispanic barrage was launched in the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace's *Foreign Policy* magazine, which published Huntington's call for a new race war as the cover story of its March/April issue, under the inflammatory title: "José, Can You See? Samuel Huntington on how Hispanic immigrants threaten America's identity, values and way of life."

Huntington's thesis is crude: "The persistent inflow of Hispanic immigrants threatens to divide the United States into two peoples, two cultures, and two languages. Unlike

past immigrant groups, Mexicans and other Latinos have not assimilated into mainstream U.S. culture. . . . The United States ignores this challenge at its peril. . . . In this new era, the single most immediate and most serious challenge to America's traditional identity comes from the immense and continuing immigration from Latin America, especially from Mexico, and the fertility rates of these immigrants compared to black and white American natives." (One wonders what kind of self-hating Quislings *Foreign Policy's* Hispanic Editor and Managing Editor, Moisés Naím and Carlos Lozada, might be, to publish such trash.)

The *Foreign Policy* article is taken from a new Huntington book, *Who Are We?*, whose publication by Simon and Schuster is upcoming. As intended, the splashy publication of the advance of that book in *Foreign Policy* has set off a national debate, as people take sides as to whether this racist drivel is true, false, or perhaps, as one "professor" has already written, part-true, and therefore to be entertained as a matter of discussion.

The real question is, what is Huntington up to? Or rather: What are the interests behind him up to? As anyone half-serious who has suffered through reading any of his works knows, Huntington is no independent intellect, but has always functioned as a hired hand for the financier interests who find his cultivated hatred of humanity useful to their cause. Read Huntington's latest article, therefore, as a signal piece, a declaration of intent by the interests who deploy him, in the light of LaRouche's warning.

Synarchists Agree Among Themselves

Huntington's "thesis" is premised on the bald historical lie that the United States was founded by settlers who were "overwhelmingly white, British, and Protestant," and that its culture is a product "of the distinct Anglo-Protestant culture," "English concepts of the rule of law," and the English language most emphatically. He asserts that there are "irreconcilable differences" between this "Anglo-Protestant culture" and Hispanic culture, shaped as it was by Catholicism. Appropriately enough, he cites former Mexican Foreign Minister Jorge Castañeda, Jr.'s 1995 declaration that there are "ferocious differences" between U.S. and Mexican cultural values, to buttress his case that other cultures could be assimilated into "Anglo-Protestant culture," but this one cannot.

In this, Huntington is in full agreement with the synarch-

ists involved in reviving the new fascist international of which LaRouche warned in his Aug. 9 memo. They share a common outlook, and accept a common lie about what the United States is, who built it, and for what mission. This was revealed when the Blas Piñar networks identified in *EIR*'s Aug. 22 exposé, reacted with fury at having the spotlight turned upon them. Their public response was delivered by the Argentine duo of Víctor Eduardo Ordoñez and Antonio Caponnetto, collaborators in various publications, including their notoriously pro-Nazi magazine, *Cabildo*. The open letters sent to LaRouche's organizations by these self-proclaimed "anguished sons of a glorious Spanish empire," spat out the same lies as Huntington's latest drivel: that the United States is a creature of Calvinism, a bastion of Anglo-Saxon anti-Catholicism, and "the Enemy," with a capital "E," of Hispanic culture (*EIR*, Jan. 9 and 23, 2004).

As *EIR* documented, this brand of synarchists is run by a network of Spanish imperialists; specifically, crazed Carlists seeking to restore Spain's former colonies to the Spanish Crown. Caponnetto et al. are engaged in fomenting military coups and civil wars in various countries, threatening to bury the still-independent nation-states of the region in blood. It is instructive to keep in mind, that in his August warning on the terrorist capability represented by this network, LaRouche pointed to the impending referendum in Venezuela as among the pivotal points which should be watched as a potential pretext for unleashing the chaos which could cover for a ter-

rorist operation, to Cheney's benefit. With the March 2 announcement by Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez's regime that the referendum petition had failed, that referendum battle has entered a new, already-more-bloody phase, precisely at the point which Huntington's anti-Hispanic campaign was launched.

Huntington's 'Serbian' Solution

That the kind of red-neck racist garbage spouted by Huntington could be published as the cover story of a magazine which purports to be one of the leading policymaking journals of the United States, is in itself a scandal. Who is this Harvard professor, to write that Hispanics, and especially those Mexicans who so annoy him, have "little use for education," and like to be poor? Who is he to pontificate that these immigrants—many of whom risked their lives crossing jungles and deserts to get to a nation in which they hoped they could make enough to help their starving families back home, often by working 12 hour days, six and seven days a week, at the lowest wages—are characterized by "lack of initiative, self-reliance, and ambition"!

Huntington is no newcomer to this trash. In 1985, he advised Lawrence Harrison, a career U.S. Agency for International Development official then studying at Harvard, on a book which codified this "cultural determinism" drivel for Ibero-American policymaking. Harrison's book, *Underdevelopment Is a State of Mind—The Latin American Case*,

A Fanatic of Cultural War

For the neo-Malthusian ideas underlying the Clash of Civilizations doctrine, Harvard Professor of Government Samuel Huntington is the chief and most fanatical publicist, though the author of none of them. Time and again over decades, this racist ideologue has been chosen to unveil many of the ugly concepts, which now underlie the "Sept. 11 coup" of the bankers' faction behind Dick Cheney. Most famous, of course, is the Clash of Civilizations doctrine originated by British intelligence agent Bernard Lewis in 1990, but which has become Huntington's trademark since his 1993 *Foreign Affairs* article and book of that name, and the highly publicized writings, lectures, and interviews in



which he has promoted it. Already by 1997, Huntington had toured 20 countries to push the Clash of Civilizations doctrine and debate its opponents.

Like Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and McGeorge Bundy, Huntington was a spawn of Harvard's Prof. William Yandell Elliot, who represented the purely Anglophile hatred of American political economy and culture, of the so-called Nashville Agrarians and related pro-Confederacy "schools." Brzezinski brought him into the Trilateral Commission and the Carter White House ("the Brzezinski Administration") in order to have Huntington inject factional views so extreme that Brzezinski, as a current or prospective government official, could not espouse them.

Huntington's recent years' work has been funded by the ultra-conservative Olin, Bradley, and Smith Richardson Foundations. His rantings have become more openly cynical and shocking. He ended a 1999 speech at Colorado College by saying "The issue for Americans is . . . whether this country will be torn apart and fractured by those determined to undermine and destroy the European, Christian, Protestant, English culture that has been the source of our national wealth and power."

which Huntington praises as embodying his own worldview, made Harrison into a guru in some perverted, if powerful circles in the United States. He is invited to speak at U.S. defense institutions to discuss the “inherent” conflict between U.S. “Protestant” culture and “a Latin American culture that is anti-democratic, anti-social, anti-entrepreneurial, and anti-work” (and besides, Harrison adds, those Hispanics litter and don’t stand in lines).

Glowing, Cheney-like, that Mexicans are out to *reconquistar* the southwest United States, Huntington puts two responses to the Hispanic “threat” on the agenda: an abrupt cut-off of Mexican immigration (Huntington seems fond of the eugenics-sponsored 1924 anti-immigration legislation which kept “them furriners” to a minimum), and the building of a new KKK of “white nationalists” prepared to take action into their own hands.

The latter is elaborated by Huntington in a box accompanying his main article. He declares—oh, so academically—that “a plausible reaction to the demographic changes underway in the United States could be the rise of an anti-Hispanic, anti-black, and anti-immigrant movement composed largely of white, working- and middle-class males, protesting their job losses to immigrants and foreign countries, the perversion of their culture, and the displacement of their language. Such a movement can be labeled ‘white nativism.’ ”

Huntington compares the changes in U.S. demographics caused by rising Hispanic population, to the rise of the Muslim population in Bosnia and Hercegovina, to which the Serbs “reacted with ethnic cleansing.” That, of course, would never happen in the United States, Huntington demurs, even as he plays up a book written by Vanderbilt University professor Carol Swain in 2002, entitled *The New White Nationalism in America*, which argues that white nationalism is “the next logical stage for identity politics in America.” These white nationalists believe that “culture is a product of race. . . . They contend that the shifting U.S. demographics foretell the replacement of white culture by black or brown cultures that are intellectually and morally inferior,” making the United States “increasingly at risk of large-scale racial conflict unprecedented in our nation’s history.”

It is long past time that Huntington be treated to the time-honored American Revolutionary tradition of riding Tories out of town on a rail. The United States was never an “Anglo-Protestant” project, but was founded upon the concept that *all* men are created equal. We have had successes and setbacks in our continuous battle to make that concept effective in practice; but out of that commitment has emerged a distinctive melting-pot culture, which, as LaRouche emphasized in his beautiful campaign pamphlet, *The Sovereign States of the Americas*, is the essence of our national character. It is this concept which informs the peaceful approach to our friends embodied in John Quincy Adams’ efforts to create a community of principle among the sovereign nation-states of the Americas. That is the policy to defeat terrorism.

Battle Lines Drawn in Argentina-IMF Showdown

by Cynthia R. Rush

There’s no question that alarm bells went off on Wall Street and in the City of London, over the Feb. 27 report from Caracas, Venezuela that Argentine President Néstor Kirchner and Brazilian President Lula da Silva had agreed to meet March 10 in São Paulo, Brazil, to define a “common strategy” for dealing with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and other multilateral lenders.

Following a private meeting between Lula and Kirchner, held on the sidelines of the Feb. 27-28 Group of 15 developing nations’ conference in Caracas, Argentine Foreign Minister Rafael Bielsa announced that Lula had offered “his broadest solidarity” to Kirchner in his negotiations with the IMF, a statement immediately seconded by Bielsa’s Brazilian counterpart, Celso Amorim.

President Kirchner also indicated in Caracas that he sees Argentina’s alliance with Brazil as an important step toward creating a “great South American Union.”

The agreement to meet with Kirchner is a shift for Lula. To date, he has faithfully imposed IMF policy dictates domestically, taking a terrible toll on the Brazilian economy, while avoiding showing any public backing for the Argentine President in his battle with the IMF and the G-7 (the Group of Seven industrialized nations—United States, Britain, Canada, Germany, Italy, Japan, France), around the plan to restructure \$99 billion in defaulted debt with a 75% writedown.

There is no predicting what will come out of the March 10 meeting, particularly whether Lula will show any willingness to challenge the forces he is now allowing to loot Brazil’s economy. Having so far straddled the fence, he has already told the Argentines that he may not be able to move as fast or as aggressively as they would like. Nervous that the showdown between Argentina and the Fund could force him to get off the fence, he called up George W. Bush on March 2, to ask for support for Argentina, because it is acting “so responsibly.”

The very fact of the meeting, however, is enough to rattle the Synarchist banking circles that are monitoring this very volatile region of South America on a daily basis. They fear the impact on Brazil of President Kirchner’s firm resistance to the IMF.

Nor has the significance of the March 10 date escaped anyone’s attention. It comes one day after Argentina must pay \$3.1 billion to the IMF, and two days after the Fund is scheduled to vote on whether to approve the second review of the government’s compliance with the loan accord signed