

# Can LaRouche's Four-Power Plan Prevent a New Korean War?

by Mike Billington

Sept. 22—Dramatic diplomatic measures have been taken over the past two weeks aimed at preventing a new war on the Korean Peninsula—a war greatly desired by the bankrupt London-centered financial empire and some of their assets within the United States. South Korean President Lee Myung-bak, Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Chinese President Hu Jintao, and North Korean leader Kim Jong-il are, each in their own way, acting to defuse the crisis which erupted when a South Korean naval vessel, the *Cheonan*, exploded and sunk in the sea lanes dividing North Korea from South Korea on March 26.

In separate visits taking place just days apart, President Lee traveled to Moscow for meetings with Prime Minister Vladimir Putin and President Dmitri Medvedev Sept. 9-12, while North Korean leader Kim Jong-il traveled to China Aug. 26 for meetings with President Hu Jintao and others. Two subjects were discussed in both sets of meetings: cooperative development of East Asia, especially the “great frontier” of the Russian Far East; and finding a solution to the impasse over the *Cheonan* incident, so that the Six-Party talks can be restored in Korea, and eventually, reunification can be established through peaceful means. Ironically, these two issues are inseparable (see below).

During the same period, Secretary Clinton called a meeting of top Korean analysts in late August, where she expressed “frustration” (according to reports from several participants) with the Obama Administration’s policy toward Korea, characterizing it as a continuation of the confrontationist approach of the Bush-Cheney regime, and said she wants to find a way to renew en-



president.go.kr

*Intense diplomatic activities, among the two Koreas, China, Russia, and the United States, aimed at preventing a new war on the Korean Peninsula, have taken place over the August-September period, including this meeting in Moscow, between South Korean President Lee Myung-bak and Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin on Sept. 9.*

gagement among all the parties involved. Clinton then sent U.S. special representative to North Korea, Stephen Bosworth, to the region, with the task of getting the Six-Party talks going again, while China’s chief nuclear envoy Wu Dawei was in Washington on the same issue.

And, most importantly, former President Jimmy Carter traveled to North Korea Aug. 25, as he had in a similarly tense situation, in 1994, under President Bill Clinton. On his return, Carter reported that “Pyongyang wants to restart negotiation on a comprehensive peace treaty with the United States and South Korea, and on the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.” He added that the components of a potential agreement were not significantly changed from 1994, when his visit defused the Western warhawks’ drive for war and

set the stage for President Clinton's General Framework agreement with the North. That agreement shut down North Korea's plutonium-producing nuclear plant, in exchange for fuel from the U.S., until new power plants could be constructed; established assurances of security on both sides; and set the course for normalization of relations. As Carter noted, that successful agreement was intentionally sabotaged when George W. Bush and Dick Cheney came to power, leading to North Korea's production of nuclear weapons.

## Imperial Manipulations

From the day of the still unexplained sinking of the *Cheonan*, imperial interests in London and Washington have been beating the war drums, demanding strong actions to punish North Korea for the "act of war." These interests have a problem, however: There has been no evidence presented, so far, that North Korea did the deed.

This reporter posed a question to a panel of U.S. military and intelligence experts who had gathered at the Quantico Marine Base in Virginia for a conference on Korea on Sept. 1, asking them how they would respond to the growing body of opinion, from Russia, China, and even from a majority of the South Korean population, that the evidence presented was wholly inadequate to conclude that North Korea was responsible. The tenor of the response was: "We don't need no stinkin' evidence."

Dr. Bruce Bechtol, who chaired the conference, is the former senior analyst for Northeast Asia at the Intelligence Directorate for the Joint Chiefs at the Pentagon. Dr. Bechtol responded to my question: "There is only circumstantial evidence, and no eye witnesses. But we don't need eye witnesses [!]. Just look at the history of the past 50 years. Look at how many provocations there have been by the North. And China has to be held responsible for refusing to condemn North Korea as the guilty party. If not North Korea, who?"

Lyndon LaRouche had answered that question on the very day of the *Cheonan* sinking in March. "This has the stench of a British operation," LaRouche said. While it is unknown how the sinking took place, he said, any investigation must start from the premise that the British, with the global financial system collapsing, will provoke every possible crisis to keep nations divided—and most importantly, to keep the U.S. and China divided. A conflict in Korea fits the bill precisely.

## The 'Cold War' Investigation

The *Cheonan* crisis was exacerbated by the choice of participants for an "international investigation." Rather than asking the members of the Six-Party talks (Russia, China, the U.S.A., Japan, and South Korea) to investigate, as would have been most obvious, an alliance of the former "West Bloc" nations, from the Cold War era, was given the task—the United States, the U.K., Australia, and South Korea, with Sweden thrown in to give the appearance of "neutrality." This "international" investigation concluded that North Korea sank the vessel with a torpedo from a mini-submarine. Essentially no evidence of North Korean involvement was produced, not even sonar evidence of the existence of a submarine or a torpedo in the area, even though the incident took place adjacent to a U.S.-South Korean anti-submarine base, with the most sophisticated equipment in the world.

Instead, the final report focused on ruling out other possibilities, and, like the intelligence officer at Quantico, concluded: "If not North Korea, who?"

In fact, Sweden, the neutral member of the team, refused to sign the final report's conclusion blaming North Korea, concurring only with that part of the report which identified the cause of the sinking to be an external explosion.

The Russians, who were allowed to send an independent team to examine the evidence, let it be known that they did not believe there was sufficient evidence of North Korean responsibility, although they have refused to officially release their report. Former CIA officer and ambassador to South Korea Donald Gregg, in an op-ed in the *International Herald Tribune* Sept. 2, said he had spoken to Russian friends, who told him the report was not being released because "it would do much political damage to President Lee Myung-bak and would embarrass President Obama."

## Development as a 'War Avoidance Strategy'

In 2007, the Russian government sponsored a conference in Moscow calling for the construction of a tunnel under the Bering Strait, connecting Russia and Eurasia, with the Americas, by high-speed rail. The underlying theme was that of war-avoidance through cooperative economic development for the betterment of all. The Bering Strait tunnel has been given a new life, through the campaign now being spread across the Americas by the LaRouche political movement to adopt the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA), a massive program to transfer water from

Alaska and Canada to the deserts of the U.S. Southwest and Mexico, transforming the climate and the economy.

Within this framework also lies the necessary solution to the last festering sore left behind by Britain's creation of the Cold War—the division of Korea. With the focus of global development shifting to the Pacific, the self-interest of the United States and all the Asian nations lies in cooperative development of the vast “new frontier” in the Russian Far East.

This was the subject of the September visit by South Korean President Lee to Moscow, where the two nations pledged cooperation on the development of the Far East, including the building of rail connections between South Korea and Russia, through North Korea (completing the historic “Eurasian Land-Bridge,” from Busan to Rotterdam), as well as oil and gas pipelines through North Korea to the South. Obviously, this requires solving the deadlock between North and South Korea—and cooperative development is precisely the platform on which such peace can be established.

As LaRouche noted in this regard, the South Korean ties with Russia are also critical with respect to the role of Japan. Lingering historical issues from World War II make it difficult for Japan to fully realize its potential in the development of Eurasia, utilizing its powerful technological base. South Korea doesn't have that problem; with South Korea opening the door, Japan can more easily come along.

Similarly, North Korea's Kim Jung-il, during his late August visit to China, offered to restart the Six-Party talks, while holding extensive discussions on the question of developing both North Korea itself, and China's northeastern provinces on Korea's border. This region was the industrial heartland of China in the 1950s and '60s, with aid from the U.S.S.R., but is now something of a rust-belt, in need of large-scale reconstruction to perform its historic role in the development of East Asia.



UN/Mark Garten

*In late August-early September, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, meeting with top Korean analysts, expressed “frustration” with the Obama Administration policy toward Korea.*

This “Great Projects” approach to developing East Asia was also the primary subject of discussion at the Baikal Forum in Siberia in early September, attended by 17 nations, including Russia, China, Japan, and South Korea. According to China's *People's Daily*, the participants “mainly discussed enhanced coordination to invigorate or rejuvenate northeast China and Russia's Far East.”

Combine all these efforts, and you have London's nightmare—Asia united around vast infrastructure development, with full support and cooperation from the United States. The British Empire would finally die its long overdue death.

### Thaw in North-South Relations

President Lee and Hillary Clinton's circle in the U.S. foreign policy establishment have moved to break out of the box

they found themselves in as a result of the hard-line response to the *Cheonan* incident. While both the U.S. and South Korea had insisted that no progress could be made in the Six-Party framework until North Korea “apologized” for something they adamantly deny having done, both Washington and Seoul are now backing away from this impossible position. South Korea's Foreign Minister Yu Myung-hwan said that an apology is not a precondition for talks, while the *Washington Post* reported on Sep. 16 that the U.S. State Department had reached an agreement with South Korea and Japan, that a North Korean expression of “regret” for the incident would allow the talks to begin again.

Both North and South have also eased tensions by renewing emergency food supplies to the North, and arrangements for divided families to visit each other, while also maintaining military-to-military discussions. President Lee also offered to build a second South Korean industrial park in the North modeled on Kaesong, the brightest remaining symbol of the progress made towards reunification in the 1990s.