

other classified intelligence output from the Cohen-Shelton crowd at the DIA and related Pentagon offices, and from CIA co-thinkers, showing a massed buildup by North Korea of dozens of missile launch sites and nuclear proliferation plants.

If the GOP treaty abrogation, which has been completely covered up by the media, provokes Pyongyang to reopen the Yongbyon reactor as predicted, the press will go into a frenzy, demanding a strike on North Korea.

Worried Korea analysts such as Clinton adviser Selig Harrison and longtime State Department North Korean Affairs chief Kenneth Quinones charge that these Pentagon hard-liners “have apparently decided to win the argument and scare the American public into changing policy toward North Korea, by leaking secret imagery intelligence to the American press,” as Quinones wrote recently.

What we have here is nothing short of a “coup threat” by Shelton, Cohen, DIA chief Hughes, and a related network allied to the GOP hard-liners, to take over Asia policy from President Clinton, a senior U.S. Asia analyst told *EIR* on March 9. They are using the power they gained from the impeachment weakening of Clinton to push a “nuclear Vietnam” in North Korea, he said.

“After Clinton had that successful trip to China last August, and the North Koreans made their missile launch, also in August, Shelton . . . and others went out of their way to tell Clinton that he would, in future, have nothing to say about East Asia,” the analyst stated. “Shelton went to see Clinton and told him point-blank, that after all the military commanders and officers who have been forced to resign because of marital infidelity in the last months, ‘Now, *you* are caught, and as Commander in Chief, we could make a hell of a stink out of this and you would be out—so you’d better do as we say.’ . . .

“There is an enormous danger right now of war with North Korea—but only because of the instability of the U.S. government,” he warned. “It’s worse than the U.S.S.R. during Gorbachov’s battle with Yeltsin—you could call it an insurrection. . . . Shelton basically threatened Clinton with a coup, to make sure the President understood he can have nothing to do with military policy, East Asia policy in particular. Since the impeachment, the Republicans have brought out their real agenda: Give the Pentagon its head, and have a war in East Asia, most likely with North Korea. They decide first that the policy should be war, and then they look for the reasons, such as the alleged North Korean missile threat.

“These people are dangerous lunatics,” the senior analyst said. “Not a single one of them know a thing about Asia or about North Korea, they can only see the good analogy to the 1980s Israeli strike at Osirak [against the Iraqi reactor] and how Israel ‘won.’ They’re thinking about how they all got promoted during the Gulf War and they need a rerun of that, that Korea could be a rerun of the Gulf War—and continue to erase the shame of failure in Vietnam.”

Seoul rings the alarm

The threat of a preemptive strike by the run-away Cohen/Shelton faction—alone or by manipulating its terrified dupes in the Japanese Defense Agency—was taken gravely by South Korean Defense Minister Chun Yong-Taek in a Seoul press conference on March 5. “We oppose any preemptive attack on North Korea without policy coordination among South Korea, the United States, and Japan,” Chun said, regarding JDA chief Norota’s remarks. “The peace and stability of the Korean Peninsula must be given the highest priority. . . . A unilateral preemptive strike without policy coordination with the U.S. and South Korea is inconceivable. As national Defense Minister, I will resolutely oppose it.”

Seoul officials are well aware that the impetus is coming not from Tokyo, but from the Cohen/Shelton lunatics in Washington. Seoul’s *Chosun Ilbo* newspaper reported on Feb. 27 that former Bush Defense Department officials “Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Armitage have published a plan to solve the North Korean problem based on ‘the supremacy of power’ . . . which reflects the growing view of defense experts and the [GOP] House of Representatives.” Unless North Korea agrees to at-will inspection demands, *Chosun Ilbo* cites Wolfowitz as saying, the United States “should have a major military buildup in South Korea,” a “blockade” of North Korea, and “prepare a preemptive strike on suspected nuclear facilities” in North Korea.

The issue of a U.S.-led preemptive strike is open enough to have become a topic of public debate in Congress. Rep. Duncan Hunter (R-Calif.), during testimony on March 8, asked Army Gen. John Titelli, commander of U.S. forces in South Korea, whether the United States should “take preemptive action against North Korea,” in light of all the information the House Republicans are receiving on the North Korean missile threat. Titelli, known to be one of the more level heads in the theater, replied that he does not want to use the term “preemptive.” However, he noted, “I do not believe that we should allow North Korea’s nuclear weapon program to come to fruition.”

Bush aide promotes wars in Mideast, Asia

by Mark Burdman

Diplomats, strategists, and government officials received a brutally frank indication of the policy of the British-American-Commonwealth policy bloc, during a March 4 conference in Bonn, Germany on “The Future of Euro-Atlantic Relations,” sponsored by the Center for European Integration

Studies. The message was delivered by Robert Blackwill, a senior lecturer at Harvard University. Blackwill was formerly Director of West European Affairs on the U.S. National Security Council, and, during 1989-90, he was the Special Assistant to President George Bush for European and Soviet Affairs.

Before he spoke, the conference had been dominated by somewhat smug and self-congratulatory talk of the positive aspects of U.S.-European relations, of the emergence of a "new Atlanticism" that would supersede the various problems in U.S.-European relations, of the successes of the NATO alliance, and of the supposed benefits to the world brought about by the onset of the euro single currency in Europe (although the euro was continuing to collapse in value as the conference took place). Speakers included Karsten Voigt, Coordinator for German-American Cooperation at the German Foreign Office in Bonn; Elizabeth Pond, of the *Washington Quarterly* in Bonn; Dr. Karel Kovanda, head of the Czech Mission to NATO and the Western European Union (WEU) in Brussels; and Amb. Dr. Robert Wegener, Deputy Secretary General of the WEU in Brussels.

By contrast to the previous speakers, Blackwill's presentation was a rude wake-up call. He portrayed an imminent future, in which the United States would pursue war operations in the Middle East and East Asia, especially on the Korean Peninsula, irrespective of, and likely opposed to, European views. "There are serious reasons to worry about U.S.-European cooperation outside Europe," he darkly intoned. "The U.S. will gravitate to threats more proximate to its vital interests, in the Middle East and potentially East Asia."

Blackwill warned that "the trends are all dangerous in the Middle East," as he forecast the eventual deployment of American, and possibly British, ground forces in Iraq. He complained that the Europeans count on the United States to act in the Middle East, despite the fact that Europe is much more dependent on Mideast oil than is the United States, and is much more vulnerable to potential missile attack. But in Iraq, "Europe is unwilling to support us, except for the British." He charged that Europe had been "enormously relieved" by last year's peace efforts by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan around Iraq, even though, in his view, that was precisely the time to hit Iraq massively. The December 1998 bombing, he said, was "too little, too late," and what has happened since, with the continuing bombing raids, is not focussed around a clear policy objective. He declared: "I support sustained and serious aerial bombardment, combined with serious consideration of ground troops." Saddam Hussein, he said, represents a mortal danger, likely having nuclear weapons within ten years, and biological weapons within five.

Blackwill insisted that, as far as Middle East policy goes, "the Europeans have their head in the sand." In ten years time, missiles will have been developed capable of striking

Europe, "but Europeans think they have a papal bull protecting them from ballistic missile attack. Maybe the only thing that will wake Europe up, is when the first ballistic missile attacks Europe from foreign territory."

'A real chance of war'

In Asia, Blackwill insisted, the Americans "are by ourselves. European policy toward China can be summed up in one word: Airbus"—a reference to European sales of Airbus jets to China. "As we confront the rise of Chinese power," he said, "this could be very bad for the international situation. Don't be surprised about American unilateralism, and don't be surprised if we act against European interests." He informed his audience, that people in Europe were generally unaware, that "there is a good chance that the U.S. framework agreement with North Korea will collapse in the next months," returning the situation to what it was before the Jimmy Carter mission in 1994 that prevented a war then. Now, "there is a real chance of war between the U.S. and North Korea, a war on the Korean Peninsula that will have enormous economic consequences across Asia."

Blackwill charged, "The Europeans are complacent. This [Clinton] administration is not pushing Europe to change. But the European debate is so constipated, you want to send it to a good doctor." He demanded "a change in European strategic culture." Furthermore, he lambasted the French as "silly," in attacking "American hegemonism." He affirmed, despite his obvious comments pointing to the contrary, that there is no effort by the United States to be a "hegemon," and expressed surprise that certain Germans at the conference, such as Karsten Voigt, had expressed their opposition to "American hegemonism." Blackwill asserted that "the only places one hears that these days is Beijing or Paris."

Regrettably, the reaction to Blackwill's presentation by the Europeans in attendance was defensive. Dr. Wegener of the WEU pleaded that the Europeans require ten years to work out a coherent strategic/defense policy, to which Blackwill barked back, "We don't have ten years." Another participant insisted that Blackwill's criticisms toward Europe over Iraq went too far, given that Germany's response today is much more muted, and de facto supportive, than it was when the 1991 Persian Gulf War was launched by George Bush, when opposition was openly voiced for a time. Taking the cue, Blackwill singled out the Germans for praise, on this issue.

What was missing, as an effective counterweight to Blackwill's ravings, was discussion of the increasing activity of the "Survivors' Club" of nations in Eurasia, centered around China, and increasingly including Russia. Both Europe and a United States, freed from the kind of thinking (to use the word loosely) represented by Blackwill, should orient to that bloc of nations, if the world is to be saved from the kind of chaos and bloodshed that he promoted in Bonn on March 4.