

War or Development in Korea? Sanity Takes the Lead

by Mike Billington

Jan. 7—Korea is once again a target for regional warfare—not because of instability in North Korea, due to the death of its supreme leader Kim Jong-il, but because the financial oligarchy in the West, suffering from a terminal financial breakdown crisis, is attempting once again to use Korea as a possible trigger for global conflict.

As the trans-Atlantic financial empire collapses into chaos, the chosen strategy for the British Empire is to provoke global warfare, targeting Asia, both because the Empire cannot tolerate continued economic development in East, as the West disintegrates, but also because Asia is where a majority of the world's population lives, and a nuclear war in Asia would satisfy Prince Philip's maniacal dream of reducing the world's population to about 1 billion people.

War against Syria and Iran is the Empire's current first choice for provoking such a war with Russia and China, but the North-South Korea divide—the last remnant of the Cold War in Asia—has long served the Empire as a point of divisiveness and contention, especially by keeping the United States in a state of conflict with Russia and China.

Much to the dismay of these British warmongers and their puppets in the United States (both President Obama and his neo-con cohorts left over from the Bush-Cheney regime), a combination of Russian, Chinese, South Korean, and U.S. State Department officials has joined forces against the warhawks, posing joint economic development in North Korea as a basis for “peace through development.”

The death of Kim Jong-il on Dec. 17 intersected a period of dramatic transformation in the troubled relations between the two Koreas. Russia, which had played only a minor role in the Six-Party Talks launched in 2003 (with Russia, China, Japan, the U.S., and North and South Korea), largely because of the internal crisis in Russia, shifted gears in 2011, under the leadership of both President Dmitri Medvedev and Prime Minister Vladimir Putin. Moscow re-engaged in the region by



U.S. State Department/Michael Gross

The Clinton State Department, unlike the White House, has consistently posed the urgency of cooperation among Russia, China, and South Korea in solving the long-festering problem on the Korean Peninsula. Shown: Hillary Clinton and South Korean President Lee Myung-bak, in Washington Oct. 13, 2011.

renewing its earlier proposals for gas and oil pipelines to connect Russia with South Korea through North Korea, and integrating the Korean Peninsula into plans for development of the vast Russian Far East—a classic example of the “peace through development” concept, which is in fact the only means to successfully counter London's imperial “divide-and-conquer” techniques.

But crucial to this effort was support not only from China, but also from South Korea itself, and from the United States. Support was not to be expected from President Obama, whose tour of Asia in November was recognized across the region as an attempt to force a confrontation with China, both militarily and economically.¹ But other factions within the U.S. government,

1. See Mike Billington, “Obama's Asia Trip Had Only One Purpose: War on China,” *EIR*, Nov. 25, 2011.

centered on Hillary Clinton’s State Department, and among senior military and intelligence circles, recognize the insanity of provoking a confrontation with China, and have attempted to give backing to the “peace through development” approach promoted by Russia and China.

Hopeful Transition

With Kim’s death, and the rapid transition to the leadership of his 28-year-old third son Kim Jong-un, the warmongers were quick to pronounce that now was the time to push for regime change. Michael Green, who served on George W. Bush’s National Security Council, claimed, in a *Japan Times* op-ed on Dec.

26, that the new North Korean leader was responsible for the sinking of a South Korean naval ship, and the shelling of a South Korean island in 2010.

That line was echoed by the Heritage Foundation’s Balbina Hwang on a PBS News Hour interview. Green ranted that the danger of not preparing for Libya-style “regime change” in North Korea at this moment of transition would “outweigh any risk that intensified preparations might pose to our diplomatic outreach to the North.” Hwang described the incoming North Korean leader as a “great danger to the world.”

On the same News Hour interview, Donald Gregg, a former career CIA official and Ambassador to South Korea, who now directs the Korea Society in New York, called Hwang’s claims “absolute nonsense,” and expressed optimism that the recent appointment as Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs of Wendy Sherman, who was President Bill Clinton’s North Korea Policy Coordinator, working together with her Chinese counterpart Fu Ying, also a Korea expert, would facilitate using the transition as a moment of opportunity for dramatic progress on the Korean Peninsula.

‘Big Change Is Expected’

South Korean President Lee Myung-bac, who had carefully collaborated with the Russian government



Korea Overseas Information Service

Optimism in the Koreas today is, in part, based on a commitment to building the Pyongyang-Seoul rail connection (shown on the map), as part of the “New Silk Road” Eurasian Land-Bridge. The photo shows a June 2003 ceremony for linking the North-South rail line.

and the Russian energy firm Gazprom to bring North Korea into cooperation on the pipeline project before Kim Jong-il’s death, has looked at the transition of North Korean leadership to Kim Jong-un as an opportunity to move the project forward even more rapidly. The South Korean President visited Russia in November to discuss the broader implications of the pipeline deal (just three months after Kim Jong-il met with Russian President Medvedev in Siberia on the same subject). Lee will visit Beijing on Jan. 9.

A source in the Korean government told *EIR* that it is their government’s view that the shift toward cooperation and development with Moscow and Seoul under Kim Jong-il over the past year is “institutional”—that there is no significant faction in North Korea which does not wish to continue the

process—including a willingness to give up nuclear weapons, over time, in exchange for aid and development.

President Lee, in a New Year's statement, went so far as to say, "I have expectations that this year will set a milestone for resolving the North Korean nuclear issue. We are ready to provide the necessary support to ease North Korea's security concerns and resuscitate its economy based on what will be agreed upon at the Six-Party Talks." He said the situation on the Korean Peninsula "is now entering a new turning point . . . a new opportunity amid changes and uncertainty."

Kurt Campbell, U.S. Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, has visited China, Japan, and South Korea over the past week, focused largely on the North Korean situation. The Clinton State Department, unlike the White House, has consistently posed the urgency of cooperation among Russia, China, and South Korea in solving the long-festering problem on the Korean Peninsula. President Lee's cooperation with Russia has been coordinated at every step with his American ally, working through the State Department rather than the White House.

Russia and China

Alexander Vorontsov, head of the Institute of Oriental Studies and of the Department for Korean and Mongolian Studies at the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia's foremost expert on Korea, published an article in *38 North*, the publication of the U.S.-Korea Institute in Washington's School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), warning against careless warmongering by U.S. politicians.

"US conservatives," wrote Vorontsov, "such as Mitt Romney, are urging greater pressure on North Korea in connection with the inexperienced Kim Jong-un's taking charge, with regime change as the end goal." He counters that the reality is that "now is an opportune time to turn the page on past conflicts and to start cultivating contacts with the young North Korean leader." He argues that while Kim is young, he has learned quickly, and that, in any case, "combining the leader's singular status with collectivism in top-level decision-making is a long-standing tradition in North Korea, though the balance between the two elements fluctuates." The hysterical warnings of chaos and infighting (coming from the neo-con crowd advising Obama on foreign policy) is "completely groundless,"

says Vorontsov—similar to the view of the South Korean government.

Importantly, Vorontsov notes that Hillary Clinton "has engaged in intense consultations with representatives of the countries neighboring North Korea. In particular, she had several phone conversations with the foreign ministers of Russia and China." He suggests that there may be a "bold initiative" in the works, like that of Clinton's recent visit to the once-demonized Myanmar, adding that "an analogous breakthrough in dealing with North Korea may yet be brewing."

Creating a Pretext

Just as President Obama's secret advisory team on Syria has proposed finding a "pretext" for an invasion of that country (as explicitly stated by the London-sponsored "opposition" in their recent document "Safe Area for Syria"), so the imperial forces are working to create a pretext for a war on North Korea. The Japanese newspaper *Yomiuri Shimbun* recently quoted "diplomatic observers" claiming that the UN is about to launch an investigation into supposed North Korean exports of chemical weapon inputs to Syria, calling it a case of a "close relationship between North Korea and Syria in the development and production of weapons of mass destruction." The suspect shipment goes back to November 2009!

Another "informed Western diplomatic source" told Kyodo News that an Iranian defense delegation that visited North Korea was pursuing "advanced centrifuge technologies related to uranium enrichment"—not that such arrangements would be illegal under any sane international regulations, but the intention of such undocumented leaks is abundantly clear.

The real target of this disinformation from British sources is their hatred of the growing cooperation between the East Asian nations, and especially the "danger" that the U.S., with Obama removed from office, would join ranks in great development projects across Asia, as Franklin Roosevelt would have done. Lyndon LaRouche noted in this regard that the optimism in the Koreas today stems from the fact that all the regional parties are involved in the process of connecting the two Koreas with China and Russia, completing the historic "New Silk Road" rail connection from Pusan to Amsterdam, and cooperating on the development of the Eurasian Far East.

mobeir@aol.com