

Huntington's 'Clash Of Civilizations'

In the Summer of 1993, Samuel Huntington, who served as Zbigniew Brzezinski's Deputy National Security Adviser during the disastrous Jimmy Carter Presidency (1977-81), penned an article for the New York Council on Foreign Relations' journal *Foreign Affairs*, promoting the idea that, in the post-Cold War world, future conflict, up to the level of global warfare, would arise from the struggle between "the West" and "the rest," particularly the struggle against the spreading influence of Islam and China.

When Huntington's diatribe first appeared in *Foreign Affairs* — it would later be the subject of a book by the same author, *The Clash of Civilizations And The Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996) — leading officials of the Clinton Administration soundly denounced the idea of a clash between the West and Islam.

Other leading world figures, from LaRouche, to Pope John Paul II, to Iranian President Mohammed Seyyed Khatami and Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamad, counterposed a "dialogue of civilizations" to the crass geopolitical war schemings of Huntington, Brzezinski, Kissinger, and a gaggle of neo-conservative Zionist lobby loudmouths, typified by the *Washington Post's* Charles Krauthammer, the *New York Times's* William Safire, and the Hollinger Corp.'s Richard Perle, who propagandized for Huntington's "Clash."

Nevertheless, since the events of Sept. 11, the insane rantings of Huntington have been revived, with a vengeance, by the same Anglo-American-Israeli apparatus who are advocating a full-scale war against the 1.4 billion Muslims on this planet.

On Sept. 17, in an interview with Germany's weekly newspaper *Die Zeit*, Huntington warned that if "Islamic states show solidarity with the criminals, the danger will grow that there will actually be a 'clash of civilizations,' and not merely a struggle of civilized societies against the powers of evil." — *Jeffrey Steinberg*

the Afghansi networks, which he promoted, the *Time* story concluded with a clear signal of the operation Brzezinski et al. were in the process of unleashing: "In the long run there may even be targets of opportunity for the West created by ferment within the crescent. Islam is undoubtedly compatible with socialism, but it is inimical to atheistic Communism. The Soviet Union is already the world's fifth largest Muslim nation. By the year 2000, the huge Islamic populations in the border republics may outnumber Russia's now dominant Slavs. From Islamic democracies on Russia's southern tier, a zealous Koranic evangelism might sweep across the border into these politically repressed Soviet states, creating problems for the Kremlin."

Those "problems for the Kremlin" were certainly one included element in the background to the assault against the American people, launched on Sept. 11, 2001. But, now, as then, Brzezinski remains an enthusiastic advocate of the deployment of those dark age irregular-warfare forces — at minimum, against Russia. The cartoonish idea that the authorship of the Sept. 11 attack lies with Osama bin Laden, who was a mid-level paymaster for the U.S., British, and Israeli "Afghan mujahideen" operations, was thoroughly dispelled by LaRouche in his Sept. 11 radio interview with Salt Lake City host Jack Stockwell (see *EIR*, Sept. 21, 2001).

As we reported in a Sept. 10, 1999 *Feature* — nearly two years to the day before the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon — entitled "Brzezinski Plays Britain's 'Great Game' In Central Asia," Brzezinski has never aban-

doned his "Crescent of Crisis" policy. In his 1999 book, *The Grand Chessboard*, Brzezinski revised and extended his "crescent" idea to what he labelled the "Eurasian Balkans," a reference to the fault-line region of Central Europe that had been exploited by British geopoliticians to block continental cooperation from the time of World War I through the post-Soviet era. But, for Brzezinski, the oblong area defined as the "Eurasian Balkans" represents a far more important zone of world conflict.

In *The Grand Chessboard*, Brzezinski ranted, "In Europe, the word 'Balkans' conjures up images of ethnic conflicts and great-power regional rivalries. Eurasia, too, has its 'Balkans,' but the Eurasian Balkans are much larger, more populated, even more religiously and ethnically heterogeneous. They are located within that large geographic oblong that demarcates the central zone of instability . . . and that embraces portions of southeastern Europe, Central Asia and parts of South Asia, the Persian Gulf area, and the Middle East."

Brzezinski made no bones about Anglo-American efforts again to pursue a Great Game in that region: "The Eurasian Balkans form the inner core of that oblong . . . and they differ from its outer zone in one particularly significant way: They are a power vacuum. Although most of the states located in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East are also unstable, American power is that region's ultimate arbiter. The unstable region in the outer zone is thus an area of single-power hegemony and is tempered by that hegemony. In contrast, the Eurasian Balkans are truly reminiscent of the older, more familiar