

EIR: Can you tell us more about the slate of Nouvelle Solidarité candidates.

Cheminade: Because of limited financial and logistical means, we had to restrict the number of campaigns, but we did try to have candidates in different parts of the country in order to ensure a broad coverage for our ideas and our programs. We have one in Paris, three in the Paris suburbs, two in Lyon, one in Valence, one in Nice, and one in Strasbourg. What we notice is that many people are more interested in ideas than ever before. The endless questions over left-wing or right-wing labels have been dropped, they are recognized as totally meaningless. That is also because the so-called left-wing Socialist Party followed a policy of monetarism, which used to be considered right-wing.

Our problem, our big problem, is getting our voices heard by the population.

EIR: On a personal note, why did you decide to run in the 5th and 6th arrondissements [districts] of Paris, known to most Americans as the Latin Quarter?

Cheminade: I am running in the district that covers the 5th and part of the 6th arrondissements, the Latin Quarter, partly because of the intellectual tradition that is still to be found there and partly because, contrary to what Americans might think, there is a Christian tradition there, as well as an old socialist tradition. The RPR candidate has been the deputy since 1968, which means for 25 years, and he is considered no longer fit for the job.

He is also involved in a scandal, since he was the boss of the subsidized low-rent housing program (HLM) for the Paris administration, and he was giving these HLM to wealthy people who are the political clientele of the RPR.

This arrondissement is also interesting because there is an interesting combination of rather old and quite young populations. The older ones themselves remember what the Marshall Plan was all about, and they of course knew de Gaulle. So our campaign echoes the best periods they experienced in the past. Let me add that they also tend to be well educated.

Among the young people, there is a lot of enthusiasm but they are ill-informed. They find our poster very funny: it shows a Goya ink drawing of a donkey who is teaching from a book showing a generation of donkeys. The poster says, "If you don't want them for eternity, why not vote for Nouvelle Solidarité." So this is seen as a good polemic against the established figures.

I would just add one concluding remark. Jacques Delors, the President of the European Commission, said in a recent declaration that the West lacks vision and he fears that rising unemployment will lead to social exclusion, poverty, violence and racism. He is right in that, but he unfortunately has no policy for confronting such problems. We, from Nouvelle Solidarité and the LaRouche movement, are the ones who have that vision.

North Korea set up for Iraq-style showdown

by Mark Burdman

Will North Korea become the flashpoint for a major international strategic crisis by April-May? This possibility is signalled by a sensationalist propaganda campaign, labeling North Korea "the new Iraq," by the same institutions and media outlets which promoted both the Gulf war against Iraq in 1990-91 and the ensuing dismantling of Iraq's industrial capabilities by the "inspection teams" of the United Nations.

In late February, the London *Economist* warned that "North Korea is next in line for nuclear prevention" and "should expect a bloody nose." In testimony to the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee on Feb. 24, new CIA chief James Woolsey stated that "North Korea, as recent headlines suggest, is probably our most grave current concern," as it is producing and selling "weapons of mass destruction," and possibly has enough fissile material for "at least one nuclear weapon." U.S.-based "non-proliferation" loudmouth Gary Mulhollin told the Feb. 27 London *Guardian* that the situation is "far more serious than in Iraq. North Korea has already produced enough plutonium and spare fuel for several bombs. . . . North Korea could already have the bomb."

Under the title "West Rushes to Stop Korean Atom Bomb," the *Guardian* noted that the Russians are throwing fuel on the fire, with an "unusual" report by the Russian Foreign Intelligence Service (the successor to the KGB) to the U.S. Senate, claiming that North Korea is involved in building and testing biological weapons. In mid-February, the Russian intelligence services had "suddenly" made public that back in October 1992, senior Russian scientists were intercepted at an airport, as they were attempting to leave for North Korea to help the latter's military programs.

March 25 is now the date which the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna has set for North Korea to accede to IAEA demands for rights of "special inspection" of two secret reactor storage sites at Yongbyon, 60 miles northwest of Pyongyang. So far, North Korea has rejected that deadline as a violation of sovereignty. If Pyongyang does not comply, the IAEA will likely refer the matter to the U.N. Security Council, and an eventual military strike is not excluded. The IAEA's tone vis-à-vis North Korea has been uncharacteristically confrontational. In his testimony, Woolsey praised the IAEA's new "aggressive" posture.

The real agenda

Whatever is going on in the secretive Stalinist state of North Korea, the suddenness, intensity, and coordinated nature of the campaign about the "North Korea bomb" suggests that there is a not-so-hidden "agenda" beyond North Korea itself. Can Woolsey be serious when he describes the matter as "the most grave current concern" of U.S. intelligence, at a time when war and genocide are raging in the Balkans, or when Russia is at the brink of a process of implosion? He cannot be unaware that a new Korea flashpoint could have a dramatic effect on the world situation, possibly ushering in a new era of East-West confrontation. Is that result desired in certain circles in Washington and London and among imperial-restorationist circles in Moscow?

Minimally, it seems clear that the Anglo-Americans and their counterparts in Moscow are trying to unsettle the situation in Asia, to manufacture a crisis artificially that would place these powers at the center of a delicate crisis-management and balance-of-power strategy in Asia, with various Asian nations, particularly South Korea, Japan, and China being played off against each other (with the Chinese simultaneously in cooperation and conflict with the Anglo-Americans).

It seems clear that, if left to their own devices, the nations of East Asia could reach an arrangement with North Korea. North Korea is in desperate economic shape, and a mixture of economic aid offers and firm pressure, in the context of the ongoing probes around eventual Korean reunification, could probably work, especially as neither South Korea nor Japan, nor probably China (at least for the time being) would want an international crisis around the Koreans. But by insisting on backing Pyongyang up against the wall, especially in the middle of an ongoing succession crisis dictated by Kim il-Sung's age (he is 80), the Anglo-Americans may end up inducing the paranoid North Koreans to lash out. Perversely, in a self-fulfilling prophecy, that could give the Anglo-Americans the pretext they are looking for.

According to a source in the international "non-proliferation" complex, who is not sympathetic to the North Korean regime, the problem of its nuclear facilities was being effectively discussed on a South Korea-North Korea government-to-government basis, until the United States began issuing harsh ultimative demands toward Pyongyang. This stiffened Pyongyang's attitude into a hard intransigence, embodied in its rejection of IAEA demands.

This source feared that there are "non-proliferation" hardliners in Washington who want to adopt "the Iraq method," including possible use of cruise missiles, against several countries deemed to be "violators" of the global non-proliferation regime. North Korea would be a convenient whipping-boy now, in preparation for similar future campaigns against other developing nations.

The campaign against North Korea is meant less for North Korea as such, than it is to institutionalize "technologi-

cal apartheid" against the developing nations in general, and to do this under the "non-proliferation" buzzword. This is in fulfillment of the program of the late Bertrand Russell and the Pugwash Conference, for "one-world" centralized control over the nuclear cycle.

If the relevant agencies were really concerned with non-proliferation, their focus would be Israel, which has, by minimum estimates, 100 nuclear weapons, and the capacities for building scores more, and which, unlike North Korea, has not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

'Force, if need be'

The Russellite aspect of the campaign targeting North Korea is clear from the *Economist* editorial. Under the title "Getting Tough with North Korea," it wrote: "By refusing to let the inspectors check two suspect nuclear sites, North Korea is not just cocking a snook at the IAEA; it is threatening the whole international effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Which is why, if it cannot be persuaded to keep its promises by diplomatic means, it should expect a bloody nose."

The *Economist* conceded that this approach might, indeed, not be "fair," since there are other nuclear powers who have "got away with it," including Israel, Pakistan, and India, "but fairness is not the issue. The aim is to persuade the freelance bomb-builders outside the NPT that their security can be better guaranteed within it, not to let loose more nuclear nasties." It claimed "the stakes have never been higher," since if North Korea is "allowed to flout" the IAEA, "others will follow."

"And if persuasion and diplomacy fail?" the magazine asked. "Though North Korea is a test case for the newly toughened NPT, it is the NPT itself which is on trial. If North Korea can cheat on regardless, South Korea, Japan, and Taiwan will be tempted to build their own bombs. The Security Council should stand ready to use whatever it takes to uphold the NPT—economic sanctions, force if need be—or lose the entire treaty."

The *Economist* line was complemented by Woolsey: "Of the many issues that have emerged in recent years, few have been more serious, have more serious and far-reaching implications for global and regional security and stability than proliferation." He insisted that "the strengthening of the IAEA must go hand in hand with renewing and reinforcing the Non-Proliferation Treaty. . . . But the recent showdown between the IAEA and North Korea shows the fragility of the agency's mandate. Without strong international sponsorship and support, it cannot succeed. The United States can take a lead role in strengthening and supporting international organizations, but we cannot do it alone. Outspoken and forthcoming assistance from others, such as the Russians, Europeans and Japanese, is essential in giving the IAEA the credibility and accountability it needs to complete its mission successfully."