

The U.S., he said, is faced with a strategic choice: Either we acquiesce to this “Finlandization,” or we look for ways to offset what the Chinese are doing.

The report notes that the only state with a long-term potential for posing a serious challenge to U.S. power is China. It complains that China is not transparent enough about its own strategic intentions and that this is exacerbated by the fact that China is the only great power that still hasn’t embraced democracy. “Given these considerations, it becomes imperative to assess how the US military might sustain its ability to successfully project military power in the region in order to defend US interests and protect its friends and allies. This is key to maintaining the stable military balance that has preserved peace in the Western Pacific for a generation while also enabling China to enjoy a period of unprecedented peace and prosperity.”

While the report denies that the Air-Sea Battle concept implies that a future war with China is inevitable, its authors nonetheless regard China as a power to be handled by the controlled application of U.S. power, even if that application never rises beyond deterrence. Such a balance-of-power doctrine is a strictly British Imperial notion that flies in the face of the American military and diplomatic tradition stemming from the republican outlook that is the basis of the U.S. Constitution.

### **The Chinese Respond**

Some may think that the Air-Sea Battle concept is just that, perhaps with little chance of ever being applied, but such scenario-mongering has real world consequences. The Chinese People’s Liberation Army recently turned down a request from Secretary Gates to visit China. The ostensible reason was the latest U.S. arms sale to Taiwan, an offer of \$6.4 billion made by the Obama Administration, in January. The reasons for the strain in U.S.-China military relations runs much deeper, however. This was indicated by a tirade by Rear Adm. Guan Youfei, during the U.S.-China Strategic Economic Dialogue meeting in Beijing May 24. According to the June 8 *Washington Post*, Guan accused the U.S. of being a “hegemon” and of plotting to encircle China with a ring of strategic alliances.

U.S. officials dismissed Guan’s accusations as an “anomaly,” but a look at the strategic map since Sept. 11, 2001, tells a different tale. Since then, the U.S. has invaded Iraq and Afghanistan, established a military presence in Central Asia and Pakistan, vastly upgraded

military relations with both India and Singapore, sought military re-entry into the Philippines, and increased the level of its military activities elsewhere in the Pacific. All of this does, indeed, resemble a ring of strategic alliances aimed against China.

The Air-Sea Battle concept is the latest phase of the British “Ring Around China” that LaRouche warned against back in 1996. The British Imperial objective is to maintain its failed London-centered monetary system at all costs, and prevent the coalescing of any combination of powers that might replace it with something else. They fear a U.S.-China collaboration precisely because such a relationship between the U.S. and China, as the anchor to the Four-Power arrangement including India and Russia, as LaRouche has put forward, is the strategic combination that can defeat British Imperialism.

---

## Ring Around China

---

# Brits Attack Multiple Targets in Asia

by Mike Billington

June 10—British imperial policy in a time of crisis, as is the case with empires throughout history, is to pull every string, and activate every asset in a targeted region, to create as much chaos and disruption as possible, in order to undermine any effort of these nations to unite in a common defense of their sovereign interests. Thus, we see Asia today being subjected to a series of explosive disruptions and potential military mis-adventures, in a recurring pattern of a “ring around China,” all of which can be traced to British geopolitical instigation. Lyndon LaRouche compared these British operations to a serial rapist, who not only attacks his victims, one-by-one, but terrorizes the entire population in the process.

In the past months, while the U.S.-British war in Afghanistan was being escalated into a murderous “surge” to protect the opium trade, as part of the British opium war against Russia (see the article in this issue), the fol-



South Korean Navy

*Who sank the Cheonan (shown here)? While North Korea was immediately blamed, before any investigation was carried out, there is evidence that British subversion was responsible.*

lowing British-run destabilizations unfolded:

- The Korean peninsula was pushed toward a military conflict through a “made-in-London” sinking of a South Korean naval vessel, falsely blamed by the Western powers solely on North Korea, in an attempt to bring the world to the edge of a shooting war.
- Myanmar was accused of a secret nuclear weapons production program with North Korea, by the same institutions and the same methods used in the fraudulent campaign to justify the criminal war on Iraq;
- Thailand was turned into a fascist police state by a British-backed monarchical/military dictatorship.

The collapse of the global financial system is now out of control, with a high probability of a full-scale crash in the June-July period. The international financial institutions demand that every nation on Earth submit to the kind of vicious austerity now being im-

posed on Europe and the U.S., while also frantically trying to disrupt the potential alliance of Russia, China, India, and the U.S.—which LaRouche identifies as the “Four Powers” required to create a new global credit system based on fixed exchange rates, writing off the derivatives bubble, and generating long-term credits for large-scale infrastructure development. China, as the nation whose leadership is most willing to adopt such a global policy, is a primary target of British subversion, motivating the imperial “Ring of Crisis” on its borders.

### **Who Sank the *Cheonan*?**

On March 26, the South Korean naval vessel *Cheonan* was hit by an explosive device in the Yellow Sea, near North Korean waters, which cut the ship in two, and sank it, killing 46 sailors. South Korea was at first extremely cautious about blaming North Korea, which absolutely denied any responsibility. LaRouche announced immediately that the incident “had the stench of British subversion,” and withheld judgment until more solid evidence emerged.

An “international investigation” was initiated, with experts from South Korea, the U.S., Britain, Australia, and Sweden. Certainly, the two other powers with obvious interests in the region, China and Russia, would have great difficulty accepting the conclusions of such a team, dominated by Western powers of the Cold War era.

Indeed, the evidence compiled by the five-nation investigation was entirely circumstantial in nature, based primarily on the idea that all alternatives to a North Korean attack had been eliminated! The team concluded that North Korea was responsible and called for a serious “response.” Initial stern steps by South Korea, shutting down all economic relations with the North, and renewing long-suspended psy-war ops, while announcing anti-submarine exercises to be conducted in the area together with the U.S. Navy, were rather quickly watered down; instead, South Korea asked the UN to consider the incident.

The Russians insisted on sending their own separate investigating team, which returned to Moscow on June 9. The formal report has not been released, but sources indicate that the Russian probe will not back up the five-nation investigation results. A spokesman of the

FIGURE 1



A joint U.S.-South Korean naval exercise called “Foal Eagle” took place during the days preceding the March 26 sinking of the *Cheonan*. Both the exercise and the sinking took place in the vicinity of Byeongnyeong Island, where a U.S.-South Korean anti-submarine warfare base is located.

Russian Navy’s Main Staff told the press: “With Russian specialists onboard, the results of the investigation into the incident could have been fuller and more impartial.”

China requested that a four-nation group—China, the U.S., North and South Korea—carry out a joint investigation, while North Korea also demanded the right to examine the supposed evidence on its own, but neither proposal has been accepted by Seoul. Officially, China is not saying anything on the *Cheonan* issue, not wanting to further irritate either side; it only states that peace on the Korea peninsula is its primary concern.

However, Yoichi Shimatsu, the former editor of *Japan Times*, drawing on a “technical assessment by the Chinese military, according to a Beijing-based military affairs consultant to the People’s Liberation Army,” reported that China believes the conclusion of the five-nation investigation to be false. In an article titled, “Did an American Mine Sink South Korean Ship?,” Shimatsu notes that a joint U.S.-South Korean naval exercise called “Foal Eagle” took place during the days preceding the March 26 sinking of the *Cheonan*. Both the exercise and the sinking took place in the vicinity of Byeongnyeong Island, where a U.S.-

South Korean anti-submarine warfare base is located (Figure 1). The exercise consisted of anti-submarine maneuvers by five missile ships and a mine-laying ship, the U.S. *NS Salvor*, with a crew of 12 Navy divers. In 2006, the *Salvor* had trained Thai Marine divers in mine-laying in the Gulf of Thailand. The *Salvor* is not part of the 7th Fleet, the Chinese source asserted, but under the U.S. Military Sealift Command tied to Naval Intelligence.

The area in question is guarded by the most sophisticated sonar and acoustic detection equipment available, Shimatsu wrote, and yet no submarine or torpedo was detected in the area on the day of the sinking of the *Cheonan*.

Shimatsu does not say that the Chinese accuse the U.S. of an intentional attack, but points to the possibility of an “inadvertent release” of a “rising mine” planted on the seabed and released to hit a ship dead center, splitting the target in half, as happened to the *Cheonan*.

He also notes that investigators found “chemical residues similar to German-produced advanced explosives,” as used by NATO forces.

“This is what I thought all along,” said LaRouche. “It’s not credible to me that it was a North Korean-based operation. It sounds more like a NATO-based operation, an incident created and exploited to destabilize the area of China, Russia, and Japan—and also Vladivostok.”

### Myanmar Gets the Iraq Treatment

Sen. Jim Webb (D-Va.), who has played an important role in the new U.S. engagement policy towards Myanmar, cancelled a trip to Myanmar just hours ahead of his scheduled arrival on June 4, explaining that a new report claiming that Myanmar was building a nuclear weapon with aid from North Korea required further investigation before he would continue with the planned visit. Webb, a former Secretary of the Navy, admitted that he did not know whether or not “these allegations have substantive merit.”

As an astute former military officer, had he read the document before accepting the press accounts, he’d have quickly realized that the report was a piece of trash, concocted by known liars on behalf of the

British Empire—including the same institute used in Dick Cheney’s and Ahmed Chalabi’s Iraq “Weapons of Mass Destruction” (WMD) disinformation machine.

Webb was referring to a report titled “Expert Analysis: Nuclear Related Activities in Burma,” released by the Democratic Voice of Burma (DVB), an operation based in Norway and funded by speculator George Soros, a Rothschild agent and the world’s leading drug pusher, who has financed numerous anti-Burma operations ever since that government began wiping out the drug trade in the 1990s. Also funding the DVB is the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), the American branch of British intelligence responsible for running subversion operations against targeted nations in the developing world.

The author of the report, Robert E. Kelley, is a former investigator for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), who left that agency to work for the Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS), set up and run by David Albright, a notorious fabricator of accusations of covert nuclear weapons development programs in targeted nations. Scott Ritter, who played a crucial role in the IAEA inspection teams in Iraq in the 1990s, has denounced Albright and his ISIS for fabricating conclusions based on scanty evidence from satellite photographs and “defectors” who were later shown to be self-serving liars (see Ritter’s “The Nuclear Expert Who Never Was”).

As in Iraq, despite Albright’s lack of credibility, his work has served to justify colonial military operations by British, Israeli, and U.S. forces. Other targets of Albright’s and Kelley’s fabrications are Syria, and especially Iran, against which they are doing all they can to manufacture justifications for a new war.

The Kelley report on Myanmar argues that a machinist named Sai Thien Win had defected, bringing stories and pictures of the factories and machines he had worked on in Myanmar. Kelley admits that the defector knew nothing about nuclear power or nuclear physics, but, had worked on machine tools producing parts which could be used in missiles, nuclear power plants, or “potentially” for nuclear weapons, and had only “observed” facilities where nuclear projects were underway—concluding that this alone demonstrates Myanmar’s “intention” to produce nuclear weapons.

Kelley even admits that Russia is planning to build a 10 MW test reactor in Myanmar, and that the IAEA

itself is helping to train nuclear scientists and engineers there.

Nonetheless, with no evidence of any sort, he concludes that there needs to be a “thorough investigation of well-founded reporting,” and sanctions against “equipment for any weapons of mass destruction”—i. e., ban even machine tools for Myanmar, to drive it back to the Stone Age.

## Thailand

*EIR* has exposed the British hand in violently crushing the “Red Shirt” mass movement in Thailand in April and May, through a series of armed military assaults on largely peaceful demonstrators, and the deployment of snipers to kill demonstration leaders (see “Why the British Prefer Fascism in Thailand,” *EIR*, May 28, 2010).

The British born, bred, and educated Prime Minister Abhisit Vajjajiva, recognizing that the world is horrified at the arrogance and murderous nature of his administration’s actions against the opposition to his regime, deployed a close associate, Kiat Sittheeamorn, to Washington this month to attempt to “explain the false conceptions carried in the western press about the last two months in Thailand.”

Far from reassuring Americans that Thailand is in good hands, Kiat argued that Thaksin Shinawatra, the militarily deposed former prime minister, who is still supported by the majority of the population, was a “terrorist” who could never be allowed back in the country. Asked about the growing perception that Thailand’s powerful monarchical institutions, and the strict laws against any mere mention of changing that system, is an anachronistic throwback to feudal society, Kiat responded that the Monarchy was here to stay, that the government is searching out those who have been talking and writing about a presidential system, and that they would soon be arrested, along with those responsible for “inducing youth not to stand up at theaters when the King’s anthem is played.”

The British campaign for chaos across Asia can only be defeated by the U.S. itself adopting the anti-British policies used by Franklin Roosevelt to defeat the imperial bankers in the 1930s, and building the Four Power alliance to shut down the speculators and restore global physical development. In that context, imperial interventions to provoke chaos and war can be easily exposed and crushed.

*mobeir@aol.com*