

China/Russia/U.S. Cooperation Defuses British War Plans in Korea

by Mike Billington

Jan. 7—In the past month, a strategic alliance between Russia and China, working in close cooperation with certain forces in the United States, both publicly and privately, has defused a nearly successful campaign to provoke a new Korean war—a war much desired in London—whose primary target is China, and, in particular, was intended to disrupt any cooperation between China and the U.S. in combatting the rapid collapse of the world economy.

This strategic confrontation defines the factional forces very precisely, especially in the United States. On the one side, the British Empire's financial oligarchy, centered in London, with its primary assets in the U.S., led by the mentally unstable President Obama, together with Obama's close friend, the British-trained U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Susan Rice (see "Why Do We Call Susan Rice a Racist?," *EIR*, Dec. 25, 2009, <http://tiny.cc/l5wrq>). On the other side, China and Russia have closely coordinated their efforts to stop the war drive with forces inside both North and South Korea, and with U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Adm. Mike Mullen.

To understand the complex process now threatening a new war in Korea, it is necessary to look at the ideas imbedded in the long waves of history that are determining the actions of the parties involved—processes determined by the British Empire's effort to retain its colonial powers in Asia after World War II, and continuing today. First and foremost is Britain's hatred of President Franklin Roosevelt, and of FDR's alliance with Russia and China in World War II, which allowed for the defeat not only of German and Japanese fascism, but also for the potential elimination of the genocidal legacy of European colonialism in Asia. Roosevelt's early death allowed the British and their puppet, President Harry Truman, to restore their colonial operations, and, through the manufac-

ture of a Cold War against America's wartime allies in Russia and China, to launch 30 years of unnecessary, genocidal, and massively destructive wars across Asia.

Fulfillment of Roosevelt's intention for the United States to cooperate with Russia and China, to establish American-style development in the former European colonies of Asia and Africa, has never been so urgent as it is today. The British imperial banking system is careening into collapse, but London is determined to provoke wars wherever possible, to break up any cooperation among the U.S., Russia, China, and India (what Lyndon LaRouche refers to as the Four Powers), recognizing that these four nations represent the necessary power base to replace the bankrupt monetary system governing the world today, with a credit system based on the original, Hamiltonian, American System.

Thus, the British, in classic imperial style, are trying to get the U.S. and China to go to war over the Korean Peninsula.

The British Battle Plan

The current crisis began in March 2010, when the South Korean military vessel *Cheonan* split in two and sank in contested waters off the North Korean coast. The event immediately ended a promising process of moves toward restoring cooperation between North and South Korea initiated by South Korean President Lee Myung-bak and North Korea's military leadership. South Korea was instead induced to launch a so-called "international investigation," which was in fact a re-creation of the Western side of the old Cold War, with the U.K., Australia, and the U.S. (with Sweden added in) joining South Korea in a probe of the incident. When the team produced a report concluding that North Korea sank the *Cheonan* with a torpedo, based on only the weakest of circumstantial evidence, while North Korea denied any role whatsoever, China and

FIGURE 1



The straight line extending into the West Sea on the map **would** be the maritime border, if the Military Demarcation Line on land were extended. The Northern Limit Line was drawn unilaterally by a U.S. commander at the end of the Korean War in 1953, to include the five islands off the North Korean coast, but it is not in the Armistice, and was never agreed to by Pyongyang. The water to the north of the Military Demarcation Line is thus contested territory, even though the islands themselves are under South Korean sovereignty as stated in the Armistice.

Russia refused to endorse the results of the flawed investigation, and warned that it was fanning the flames of war.

President Lee was nearly trapped in a confrontational mode which was politically almost impossible to escape, especially due to the hue and cry by the imperial forces in the West demanding a hard-line response, or even a military attack on the North. However, over the Summer and Fall, Lee carefully moved toward restoring a dialogue with Pyongyang, and it appeared that the *Cheonan* incident would be overcome.

Then, on Nov. 23, North Korea launched an artillery attack on Yeonpyeong Island, killing or injuring both military personnel civilians, in the first direct attack on South Korean territory since the Korean War. The North claimed it was responding to South Korean live-fire ar-

tillery exercises from the island, from which shells landed in North Korean waters. Yeonpyeong Island is one of five islands off the North Korean coast that are under South Korean sovereignty, but lie in waters which are contested by the two sides (see **Figure 1**).

This strange situation is a consequence of the armistice ending the Korean War in 1953, which granted the five islands to the South, with the North's concurrence, but did not settle the maritime border in the West Sea (Yellow Sea). While the North contends that the border dividing North and South on land should be extended into the sea, which would grant the waters surrounding the five islands to North Korea, a U.S. military commander drew a crooked line extending up the North Korean coast, now called the Northern Limit Line, in order to include the five islands and the water surrounding them.

The North never agreed to this line, and, since there has never been a peace treaty, this issue is literally a leftover Cold War conflict which is ready-made for a British-designed provocation.

Although it is not known what actually motivated the North to shell the island, Lyndon LaRouche's immediate response to both the *Cheonan* sinking and the shelling of Yeonpyeong Island was the same: They had all the markings of a British operation, aimed at provoking a crisis over Korea, ultimately targeting China. In the *Cheonan* case, with North Korea denying responsibility, the British were unable to unleash their desired war. With the shelling of the Yeonpyeong Island, however, North Korea openly asserted its responsibility.

Following the shelling, LaRouche noted: "The obvious thing you're looking at here: What is the objec-

tive of causing this problem, from inside North Korea, next to China? Because obviously, China is the British target! The British and their fellow travelers hate China, and want to destroy it, or hurt it badly. . . . You have to look at this business with the British war, using the North Korean patsy, for a war whose target, immediate target, is China.”

Imperial Manipulation

Does this mean British agents are operating within North Korea? That is not ruled out, but the historic means for British operations within the communist movements in Asia dates back to the leading British intelligence agent of the 20th Century, Bertrand Russell. Russell spent a year in China in 1920, working with the emerging communist forces around Mao Zedong, in an effort to undermine the influence of Sun Yat-sen, the founder of the Chinese Republic in 1911. Sun was a brilliant advocate of the American System of Alexander Hamilton, and a fierce enemy of British free trade and imperialism.

Russell worked together with agents of the J.P. Morgan interests to forge factions within the international communist movement that opposed technological progress, glorified peasant backwardness, and degraded Classical culture, be it Chinese or Western, in favor of the “noble peasant.” These forces ultimately came to the fore in the Cultural Revolution of the 1960s, a dark age in modern Chinese history, which nearly destroyed the country.

In other words, British manipulation of communist forces in Asia has been of the nature of profiling and fostering backward tendencies, and playing them when needed for international imperial purposes. Such manipulation cannot be ruled out in this case.

The Near-War in December

In the recent case, the British were hellbent on provoking war during the first three weeks of December, using every lever at their disposal, but were outflanked by the cooperation among China, Russia, and forces in the United States.

The immediate trigger was the announcement by South Korea that it would repeat its earlier live-fire exercises on Dec. 19 or Dec. 20, in the same location that had led to the North Korean shelling on Nov. 23. North Korea announced that its response would be “deadlier than what was made on Nov. 23, in terms of

powerfulness and sphere of the strike.” The South defended its perceived right to fire shells into what it considers its own territorial waters, no matter how close to the North Korean mainland, and made clear that any further attacks from the North would result in an air assault in response. The process appeared locked in.

While the British and their assets in the U.S. began beating the drums for war, intense diplomacy by China, Russia, and sane elements within the U.S., was set into motion. Chinese State Councillor Dai Bingguo travelled to Pyongyang, meeting with supreme leader Kim Jong-il, while North Korean Foreign Minister Pak Ul Chun travelled to Moscow Dec. 12-15. South Korea’s envoy to the Six-Party Talks, Wi Sung Lac, went to Moscow on Dec. 15.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov was in daily contact with Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi in the days leading up to Dec. 20, “urging the parties involved to show restraint and solve all controversial issues by peaceful means,” according to the Russian news agency Novosti. The Russian Foreign Ministry issued a release saying: “We strongly call on South Korea to refrain from holding the planned artillery firing in order to prevent a further escalation of tensions on the Korean Peninsula.” China’s Foreign Ministry spokesman said: “If a bloody clash breaks out on the peninsula, the first to suffer will be the people on both sides of the peninsula, and it would also certainly wreck regional peace and stability, harming surrounding countries.”

Secretary Clinton, forced to work under the constraints of British asset Obama in the White House, and overt British agent Susan Rice at the UN, repeatedly gave her public backing to Chinese diplomatic efforts to restrain actions from North Korea, while privately taking measures to restrain the war hawks in the West, warning that a war would be a disaster for the U.S. and the world.

Russia called an emergency meeting of the UN Security Council, which met for over eight hours on Sunday, Dec. 19, the day before South Korea’s planned live-fire exercise. Russia and China wanted a resolution calling for restraint by both sides, including postponing the live-fire exercises. But, as became clear during and after the marathon UNSC meeting, Susan Rice demanded that the draft proposed by the British, which held North Korea solely responsible for the crisis, was

the only acceptable resolution. China refused, and Rice declared the effort dead. Russian Ambassador Vitaly Churkin pleaded for the UN to at least send an emergency delegation to Pyongyang and Seoul, since, as he said, “We now have a situation of very serious political tension and no gameplan on the diplomatic side.” Rice refused.

A source in Washington told *EIR* that Rice had acted without consulting either the State Department or the Defense Department, which were as shocked as the Russians and Chinese that Rice was willing, or in fact intended, to let hell break loose.

Clinton and Robert Gates had another operation underway, however, which ultimately played a crucial role in stopping the war. New Mexico Governor (and former U.S. Ambassador to the UN) Bill Richardson had travelled to Pyongyang. He was visiting as a private citizen, he said, not as an official representative of the government, but sources told *EIR* that he had coordinated his work closely with the National Security Council, and that Secretaries Clinton and Gates, as well as Admiral Mullen, were closely engaged with the process. Richardson had been to Pyongyang several times and was trusted as an honest broker there.

Richardson took reporter Wolf Blitzer of CNN with him, thus giving international viewers a first-hand report on what was going on. While Richardson met with top North Korean military and government leaders, he relayed back home via CNN, that the North had offered various concessions, including the return of monitors from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to the North’s nuclear sites, setting up a hotline to the South, and a military commission to monitor the contested area in the West Sea.

Richardson, speaking live on CNN, said that he was hoping for the UN to pass a resolution calling on both sides to step back, which, he said, would “provide a cover” for South Korea to call off the live-fire exercises. Even after the UN effort failed, he said on CNN: “I am encouraged. The outcome is a good one. We pushed the North Koreans not to react. Maybe we had a little impact. . . . Maybe this will open a new chapter in North-South relations, with negotiations for North Korea to end its nuclear [weapons] capability, for South Korea to preserve its security, and for the U.S. to be able to act as an honest broker.”

Given Richardson’s long association with the Clin-

tons, there is no question that the North received this message as saying that, with China and Russia in agreement, the U.S. would return to engagement and reject the British drive for war.

The North Breaks Profile

The moment of truth arrived on Dec. 20, when the South carried out a brief live-fire exercise, as announced. The North did not take the route expected by the British profile, but instead, did nothing. Pyongyang issued a statement saying that it “did not feel any need to retaliate against every despicable military provocation, like one taking revenge after facing a blow.”

Indeed, the Richardson message is thus far being realized. State Department special envoy to Korea Stephen Bosworth was in Beijing on Jan. 6, and is also visiting Seoul and Tokyo, trying to revive the Six-Party Talks. Asked by reporters in Seoul whether he would be setting demands for new talks, he responded that he “had no list” of demands for North Korea, as preconditions to get the talks going again.

President Lee also took steps to reduce tensions, and to move towards his long-range intention of using the South’s extraordinary technological and industrial expertise as a basis for building relations with the North, and achieving peaceful reunification. The President’s New Year’s message stated that South Korea “has no choice but to resolve the problem of dismantling North Korea’s nuclear program diplomatically through the Six-Party Talks,” while Pyongyang’s message called for dialogue and cooperation to “achieve peace in Northeast Asia and denuclearization of the whole of the Korean Peninsula.”

The United States, South Korea, and North Korea all reduced their military alert levels on Jan. 7.

Chinese President Hu Jintao will be making a state visit to Washington Jan. 18-21, a visit whose potential for yielding increased cooperation with the U.S. has been significantly increased by China’s role in cooling the Korea crisis. War was avoided, demonstrating what cooperation among Russia, China, and the U.S. can accomplish, but tensions remain high. While Obama remains in the White House, and Rice at the UN, the British gameplan for war remains a grave threat.

mobeir@aol.com