

London, Bush-leaguers target Clinton's Korea peace plan

by Kathy Wolfe

The British are moving to destroy President Bill Clinton's Oct. 21, 1994 nuclear power accord with North Korea, which contains the potential for a peace settlement between North Korea and South Korea. Just as London is furious at Clinton's Irish policy and at his Mideast peace plan, it does not want peace in Korea. London has repeatedly used terrorist incidents in the Mideast to try to set Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization at each others' throats, and is taking similar steps to obstruct peace in the Far East.

The United States and North Korea suspended talks in Berlin on the accord, to let delegations return home to consult on new "suggestions" which were made at the talks, Secretary of State Warren Christopher announced on March 28. Contrary to media reports that the talks have collapsed, Clinton administration officials believe they will restart soon.

The United States, South Korea, and Japan on March 9 formed the Korea Energy Development Organization (KEDO), to deliver \$4.5 billion in new light-water nuclear reactors to North Korea in exchange for a freeze of Pyongyang's plutonium program. The United States thought it was agreed that a South Korean-model reactor would be used, but the North said in February that it would not allow this. Clinton negotiators, however, believe that this difficulty is surmountable. "We certainly will not require the reactors be labeled in neon lights: 'Brought to you by South Korea, the Successful Korea, as Distinct from You Failures,' " as U.S. Undersecretary of Defense Walter Slocombe put it on March 13.

The stalled implementation has now given an opening to anyone who wants to create a foreign policy disaster for President Clinton. Anglophiles such as George Bush's National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft and Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) orchestrated an explosive crisis last spring by calling for preemptive bombing of North Korea, which was only halted when President Clinton sent former President Jimmy Carter to Pyongyang to meet Kim Il-sung. Now, another set of British assets, led by Bush's ambassador to South Korea, Donald Gregg, is trying to wreck the accord from within.

Bush submarines surface

"Beyond the Nuclear Crisis," a Washington conference at the American Enterprise Institute on March 13, illustrated

how this works. Organized by AEI Asia Director James Lilley, Bush's ambassador to Beijing, it featured Gregg, who worked with Oliver North in Iran-Contra; David Kay, who headed Bush's inquisition against Iraq's nuclear program; and Sen. Frank Murkowski (R-Alaska), a vocal anti-Pyongyang hawk.

Kay, Murkowski, and other speakers adopted the tack of House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), bashing President Clinton and Pyongyang. Then, Ambassadors Lilley and Gregg rose to play the "loyal opposition." It was the perfect Mutt and Jeff act. "We support the Clinton accord," they said. "We just want to help improve it." Lilley announced that he had been asked to write "suggestions" for Clinton negotiator Amb. Robert Gallucci, and that he will be consulting with him.

However, as Lilley told *EIR* later, they have one objective: to make sure that North Korea *never* receives nuclear reactors—or any other help—from the U.S.-led KEDO consortium. Lilley and Gregg are urging Washington and Seoul to insist that the label on the new reactors for Pyongyang must say "Made in South Korea" in big letters. They know it embarrasses North Korea no end.

If Pyongyang balks at this, that's just what we want, Lilley laughed. "We can argue for 12 years about the brand name—and we will never ship them the new reactors," nor allow any economic development, he said.

"We want things frozen right where they are now, as long as North Korea stops proliferating plutonium," Gregg's aide chimed in. "They have shut their reactors down."

"We don't want a reunified Korea; we don't need a second Japan over there!" an aide to Ambassador Gregg told *EIR*. "Nobody wants *that*." Former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher "was right to try to keep Germany divided," he said, because of the economic competition a unified Germany would pose for the British.

"Not as a military potential do we want unification, and not even Korea as a strong economy," Gregg's man said. "We need to *keep North Korea just as it is*. We need a new enemy to replace the U.S.S.R."

Britain more broadly seeks conflict in Northeast Asia for use against China. This is a typical Henry Kissinger "balance of power" game, playing one nation off against the other, leaving the manipulator in charge. Should China develop

into a modern industrial power as a U.S. ally, London's 200-year imperial plan to keep Asia backward is finished. "We don't want to have a really prosperous unified China, either, in 10 years," Ambassador Gregg's aide said. "That would be a big geopolitical threat."

British war cries

Meanwhile, London mouthpieces are babbling that North Korea is about to invade the South, and that the United States must go to war, i.e., "let's you and him fight." Pyongyang created the reactor "label" impasse because it plans to break the deal, Michael Colvin, a former British Defense Ministry adviser to Thatcher, told a journalist on March 21. "We identify [North] Korea as very dangerous at the moment," he said. "Given their domestic economy is in such deep trouble, there's danger the leaders will look for an external adventure to deflect public opinion. That is why they complain about the South Korean reactors."

"That, coupled with cries for a war to reunite North and South, will form a heady cocktail which the people of North Korea may well swallow," he said. North Korean leader "Kim Jong-il has a million men under arms, another 4 million who could be called up at any time. He's got hundreds of thousands of special forces, which could be landed at any time and take over South Korea."

"The West must have a war contingency plan to put into operation at very short notice," he said. "We must ensure we've got anti-ballistic missiles there to counter the threat from North Korea's Scuds, because their range has now been extended to get as far as Japan without difficulty; that's an extreme worry."

Paul Beaver at *Jane's Defense Weekly* in London told a journalist that the Clinton accords are in trouble because "we're in the middle of a power struggle in Pyongyang." Whereas most analysts see North Korean leader Kim Jong-il's government as stable, London says it's falling apart. "One side [in Pyongyang] is doing this [refusing Seoul's reactors] to embarrass the other," Beaver claimed. "Otherwise there's no explanation why they'd endanger all the goodies from this agreement, not only the reactors they need, but all the oil they're getting. . . ."

"Part of the military is very unhappy with Kim Jong-il," he continued. "They don't like what they see and they don't think he's the man to lead. The power struggle is very intense between those who are for and [those who are] against Kim Jong-il. I don't think the Americans got a good deal from Pyongyang, but there are those in Pyongyang who think the Americans have gotten too good a deal. There is every possibility that Kim Jong-il could be deposed."

China 'grand strategy'

More broadly, Lilley, who has also been ambassador to Seoul, told *EIR*, "Of course, our strategy toward North Korea is only a part of a comprehensive 'grand strategy' toward

China." The Korean peninsula is just a tidbit to these gentlemen, a pawn in their "great game" to prevent China and Eurasia from becoming industrial powers.

What's afoot? Gerald Segal, China hand at London's Institute for International and Strategic Studies, has called for balkanizing China, starting by promoting Taiwan independence. Chinese nationalists on both sides of the Taiwan straits have always said that there is only one China, and talk of an independent Taiwan is a "red flag" to Beijing, which has said it would go to war if Taiwan were to secede.

Lilley and Gregg publicly discourage talk of Taiwan independence, knowing it would make them *persona non gratae* in Beijing. Privately, however, they are working along the same lines as Segal. "Gerald's got the right idea," Gregg's aide said. "That's why we're working on a 'Two China' policy."

Lilley, for example, is working closely with Senator Murkowski, one of the most vocal proponents of Taiwan independence. On March 7, Murkowski led a group of 35 congressmen in introducing a resolution into the House demanding that Taiwanese President Lee Teng-Hui be allowed to visit the United States. Ultimately, the Lee visa was not granted, but the incident caused enormous friction between Washington and Beijing.

Lilley is trying to sell Clinton the line that he can use his influence in Beijing to get China to manipulate North Korea. "We can do a lot with China to keep North Korea in line," he bragged. "Beijing says they're 'as close as lips and teeth' to North Korea; they go on about eternal friendship, while delicately sticking the knife in the North Koreans' back."

No new technology

According to Lilley, the Clinton administration should just "freeze" the situation as it is today, in which North Korea has shut down its old nuclear reactors, but receives no new technological investment from the West. He claims that Beijing wants this and will keep North Korea under control during the stall. "China feels the way we do," he claimed. "They don't want Korean reunification. They don't want another major economic power in the region."

If the accord is stalled, however, any delay falls right into the British trap, which is to create one crisis after another. Beaver of *Jane's* in London goes so far as to attack both China and North Korea as major threats to the West. "When I saw the Tokyo metro gassing," he volunteered, "my immediate thought was: 'Who in the area's got sarin gas?' The answer is: North Korea; or China. They would do it as a warning, not only to the Japanese, but to the South Koreans, to the U.S. They would do it to prove they can do it."

"The Chinese used to use Albania as a place to test weapons that way," he continued. "Of course, China is a threat, otherwise North Korea would have been long ago contained. China is *the* threat; that's what we're talking about, with North Korea."