



The Tara Foundation magazine

June 2006

Contents

<i>Editorial: June 2006</i>	2
<i>China's New Great Wall</i>	4
<i>News Round-up</i>	6
<i>M.E. Patients get short shrift</i>	6
<i>The Hanrahan Judgement</i>	8
<i>1972 Supreme Court decision on Tara</i>	10
<i>The Casement Outlook – Crisis at Daechuri</i>	12

On 22nd May 2006, plans were announced by the Government for a liquid natural gas natural gas terminal at Tarbert, Co. Kerry. The project's cost is estimated at €400 million, is expected to commence construction in 2008 and begin operation in 2011. According to Kerry newspaper *The Kingdom*, the project "is expected to create hundreds of jobs for the local community as well as secure Ireland's long-term supply of natural gas", though the Minister for Enterprise, Trade and Employment, Micheál Martin, gave an estimate of 50 long-term jobs, and "around 350 construction jobs". However, considering that Shell (and the Government) in attempts to push through the proposed onshore gas processing terminal at Rossport Co. Mayo made the same promises, yet brought in contract labour from overseas and employed security guards at below minimum wage, these promises carry little weight. Minister Martin's assertion that this project will make a difference to long-term energy costs is puzzling, as under Ireland's energy regime, the State purchases any oil or gas, including its own, at the current market price.

The Amerada Hess Corporation, a US energy giant, has established a subsidiary, Shannon LNG, to manage the project. This should be of interest to residents of Long Beach, California, where a

dispute has been ongoing for some years between local residents, city officials, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) over who has statutory authority to decide on the scheme; the Federal Government wishes to grant permission to Mitsubishi to build an LNG terminal, thus bypassing city officials, and at least thirty other such LNG terminals are planned for various locations all over the US. As with the Corrib terminal, local opposition has been driven by safety concerns, which seem to be well founded in the light of an explosion on 19th January 2006, at an LNG export facility at Skikada, Algeria, which killed 27 people. The Bush administration is said to be enthusiastic about obliging energy companies by building LNG terminals, hence its concern to establish Federal jurisdiction over local authorities where such schemes are concerned.



Photo courtesy of
<http://www.suncor.com/>

This onshore LNG terminal comes at a time when the US Government has expressed interest in building such terminals across the US, and like the Long Beach terminal, it has the look of a precedent for similar developments. Neither the dangers of the proposal nor its nature as a policy precedent, not to speak of its siting in the environmentally sensitive Shannon Estuary, have been referred to by the media or political representatives who have all praised the project with one voice. It has not been explained why Ireland would need to import liquid natural gas, seeing that one of the justifications used by the Government for pushing through the Corrib gas terminal is that it will help secure energy supplies.

And yet, on the rare occasions when it has been suggested that altering Ireland's energy regime might be beneficial, the State mantra is intoned that there is "nothing there", that Ireland really doesn't have any energy reserves. One might wonder how the Corrib concession could provide any kind of energy security if there is really no oil and gas in Ireland. But even if the energy corporations, who are the sole source of information as to what is to be found in Irish waters, were telling the truth in their modest estimates of the resources gifted to them, they are still not required to sell this oil or gas back to Ireland.

This needs to be emphasized: whether in the case of Corrib or of Tarbert, just because a heavily taxpayer-funded facility is provided for the use of Shell or of Amerada, this does not mean the corporation in question is obliged to provide the country with the energy it produces: there is no legal requirement that the corporations cannot simply ship the gas or oil elsewhere. One might have thought that a State which subsidizes Big Oil to such an extent that the corporations can claim back their own expenses, backdated 25 years, would at least take legislative measures to ensure the security of supply they keep talking about. But it appears they are not willing to go this far toward making good on their promises.

China's New Great Wall

By Brian McGrath

This is a preview of a special report for the Environment Section of the Tara Foundation. See <http://www.tara-foundation.org> to read or download the full story.

The Three Gorges Dam Project when completed will be the largest hydroelectric dam in the world, with a length of 400 square miles. The construction phase was completed on June 6th 2006, with the temporary cofferdam demolished and the main concrete dam now holding back the full weight of the Yangtze River. The projected final date for completion is 2009. This dam has been the subject of great controversy; in the following article we outline just why this project is perhaps the most disastrous in a long series of 'aid' projects sponsored by international development agencies.¹

The origin of the great Yangtze River lies in Tibet, flowing 6,300 km to the Changjiang Delta and into the East China Sea. Known as the Golden Waterway, the Yangtze's silt-laden waters bring fertility to 24 million hectares of farmland. The so-called "Three Gorges" dam, (whose construction phase is now just completed) would submerge a magnificent 200-km stretch of the river. The proposal is to generate 13,000-18,000 megawatts of power for industry.

The Chinese state has also promoted the notion that the dam will prevent life-threatening floods downstream and improve major navigation arteries, such as the Jingjiang stretch of the Yangtze and the Chuanjiang River. The gargantuan concrete structure, over 150 meters high and 1,000 meters long, will create a reservoir 500 km long and include 26 turbine generators and two 80-meter ship locks. The price tag for the 17-year project is between US \$10 and \$20 billion, therefore providing a necessary shot in the arm for the troubled Western dam-building industry, with lucrative consulting contracts and machinery and equipment sales.²

Project Summary

"The Mother of all Dams" as environmentalists know it, is the World's largest hydroelectric project, the largest nation state project since the Great Wall, and by far the world's most environmentally and socially destructive infrastructure plan. On April 3, 1992, China's National People's Congress approved the Three Gorges dam, and in so doing set in train a process that will

¹ <http://www.irn.org/programs/threeg/>
<http://www.probeinternational.org/tgp/index.cfm?DSP=content&ContentID=15281>

² <http://209.200.101.189/publications/csq/csq-article.cfm?id=776>

displace 1.3 million people.³ According to a leaked Chinese government security document, the resettlement operation, which has already forcibly moved 100,000 people, is "spawning outrage among resettlers". The authors (public security cadres) recommend that the opposition be dealt with by a "swifter and heavier punishment policy."⁴ The dam, now at an advanced stage of construction, will be approximately 600 feet in height, creating a 1-mile (2km) wide, 400 mile (600km) long reservoir on the Yangtze, flooding hundreds of villages and displacing almost 2 million people before the aspirational completion date of 2009.⁵

Read the full story at the Environment section at <http://www.tara-foundation.org/>

³ http://www.ecawatch.org/problems/asia_pacific/china/index.html#3gorges

⁴

http://www.cato.org/pubs/policy_report/prop-pr.html

⁵

http://www.ecawatch.org/problems/asia_pacific/china/index.html#3gorges

News Round-up

By Claire McGrath Guerin

Westport Road: The route outlined compromises the integrity of the Railway Line Walk by bringing traffic, noise and other human activity along the side of the walk. This disrupts the peaceful nature of the walk, disturbs the wildlife of the area and destroys a wetland, which is home to Herons, Mallards, Cootes, Moorhens and many other species of birds.

See more at
<http://www.stopthisroad.com>

The South Central Farm in Los Angeles has been destroyed by police and developers. A massive force of police forced protestors and farmers out of the community garden that has used as such since 1992. More Details:

http://www.southcentralfarmers.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=12&Itemid=25

M.E. in Ireland: no treatment or assessment policies

By Claire McGrath Guerin

Although the Department of Social and Family Affairs practitioners willing to diagnose it, and even fewer (if any) who will treat it. The Tara Foundation proposes that Irish doctors adopt the Canadian diagnostic criteria⁶ for M.E. as a standard throughout the country. The vague diagnosis of C.F.S. and subsequent dismissal which is the lot of many sufferers is not only bad for patients but potentially dangerous. Chronic fatigue is a symptom, not only of M.E., but of several chronic illnesses but is also a feature of depression.

recognizes M.E. as a disability, there are few consultants or general

We support the Irish M.E. Trust belief

that a dedicated clinic for ME/CFS sufferers is needed in Ireland.

This should be the position of all who advocate for the rights of M.E. patients in Ireland, while taking into account that the government shows no sign of backing such a move, and that doctors would likely try to

manoeuvre themselves into pivotal roles at management committee

⁶ <http://www.co-cure.org/cccd1.htm>

meetings. As a consequence, clinics now established in the UK are geared towards a regime of exercise programs and cognitive behavioural therapy and are usually staffed by a doctor, occupational therapist and psychologist.⁷

7

http://www.imet.ie/imet_website/the_iri_sh_position/a_clinic_for_ireland.html

The Hanrahan Judgement:

State, Big Pharma and the Future of Incineration

By Andrew McGrath

In July 1988, the Supreme Court ruled in favour of a farming family from Co. Tipperary, the Hanrahans, and against the American pharmaceutical giant Merck, Sharp and Dohme, who operated a bulk chemical factory beside the Hanrahans' farm. Justice Henchy's ruling found that Merck Sharpe and Dohme were liable to the Hanrahans on three counts: 1. for damages for offensive smells; 2. for injury to John Hanrahan's health; and 3. for the ill-health of Mr. Hanrahan's cattle in so far as this was caused by factory emissions, for which the "probable cause" was the on-site incinerator.

This victory was won at great personal expense to the family, both financially and health-wise. What was most noteworthy was the extent to which State agencies collaborated with Merck every step of the way. After the Industrial Development Authority invited Merck to set up the plant at Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary, the IIRS (Institute for Industrial Research and Standards) submitted a favourable environmental impact statement. When animals began to fall ill at the Hanrahan farm, Merck's claims that the problems were caused by farm mismanagement were backed up both by State agencies and local authorities. The State agencies (IIRS, An Foras Forbartha and An Foras Taluntais) which responded to further deterioration in animal health in the area by setting up

investigations failed to make any link with Merck's activities. The outcome of the Supreme Court action taken in desperation by the Hanrahans, who were facing £1m. in expenses from their failed High Court challenge, establishes beyond doubt that the State was collaborating with Merck so far as to mount a cover-up of the damage being done by incineration at the plant.

m

The collaboration by the State continues to this day: under the EU agricultural subsidy regime then in operation, the Hanrahans should have been compensated for the fall in price of the milk their animals produced, but this has never been done. Freedom of Information requests have established that the Dept. of Agriculture knew as far back as 1986 that dioxins were present in the milk from their farm. To admit this knowledge would, of course, be to admit that State agencies were also liable for the harm caused by Merck.

In March 2006, the Department of Agriculture removed up to 355 cattle from the Hanrihan farm on "animal welfare grounds", that they were not being fed. Despite claims of ongoing health problems with animals, including four out of seven cattle being born deformed, the Dept. of Agriculture has stated that Mr Hanrahan is responsible for the ongoing husbandry of his animals. It is not a function of this

department.” The State’s readiness to continue persecuting the family is well worth noting, given how the Supreme Court ruling implicated not only Merck but also the State agencies that collaborated with Merck in hiding the damage being caused by the incineration of toxic chemicals. The current regime’s passion, not just for building toxic waste incinerators but ones which are grossly in excess of domestic requirements, must be seen as another case where the facilitation of heavy industry (and not for the benefit of the native population but for the benefit of multinational capital) is the number one priority, one which supersedes considerations of health and safety, environment, heritage and even the law itself. The State and Merck alike both continue to pretend as if the 1988 ruling did not happen.

But, pretence or no, the Supreme Court has established a precedent wherein incineration of toxic chemicals is, in law, to be understood as the most likely explanation for any appearance of ill health in the immediate area of operation, even if, as has been the case in every instance so far, the offending corporation and the State are singing from one hymn sheet. A challenge to the construction of the Ringaskiddy incinerator, for example, could invoke the 1988 Supreme Court ruling as a clear instance where the law can make a finding of probable cause, and the protestations of the offending party (as well as the bogus findings of State agencies) can be disregarded.

The 1972 Supreme Court Judgement on Tara

By Andrew McGrath

The decision delivered by the Supreme Court on 21st December 1972 was not only relevant to deciding the specific issue of the State's purchase of land in close proximity to the Hill of Tara, but is of lasting significance with regard to what exactly is to be regarded as a national monument.

Ruling on the intention of the State, represented by the Commissioners for Public Works (forerunner to the Office of Public Works), to acquire by Compulsory Purchase Order a 400-acre site at the foot of the Hill of Tara, Cearbhall Ó Dálaigh stated in his judgement that "the Hill of Tara is properly to be regarded as a single unified site and not a series of separate archaeological monuments". This statement implies that any effort on the part of the State, or of bodies empowered by the State, to claim that sites designated as national monuments are only that insofar as they can be shown to possess evidence of artefacts or structures of heritage value, are by law null and void.

In other words, any region designated as being a national monument is such as an entire unified site or region and not merely only as regards the actual presence therein of artefacts or structures of heritage value, thus precluding any possibility that the site could be interfered with in any part. The Commissioners for Public Works anticipated this aspect of the

judgement with their statement, under oath, that "Tara was a complex but unified site and not merely a site of royal settlement but probably an extension of the grave system more extensively investigated on the Boyne. The burden of the evidence showed the importance of the whole site, with the Hill of Tara which could not be chopped up".

The State seems to have forgotten that it ever held this view, and is now busy sitting back while private archaeological contractors are engaged in soil-stripping and test-trenching using heavy machinery, followed by a mere visual inspection to determine whether "artifacts" are present. Where test-trenching does not occur, these contractors are satisfied with skimming over the ground with a metal detector. None of these activities would be recognized by any bona fide archaeologist as excavation, because quite apart from the destructive methods which are employed, none of it is aimed at research, at determining what structures are present and what relationship the various individual sites bear to the larger context in which they are found, but merely salvaging whatever loot looks to be worth saving before the sites themselves are bulldozed to make way for what really matters.

In any case, even considering the possibility that the contractors were to discover

nothing of value in the course of their activities, this would not make any difference to the legal position. The 1972 judgement goes on to define what is to be understood as a “national monument”: “The expression 'national monument' means a monument or the remains of a monument the preservation of which is a matter of national importance by reason of the historical, architectural, traditional, artistic, or archaeological interest... The word 'monument' is not defined in the strict sense: it is stated that it 'includes' certain things. It does not have to be of archaeological interest; historical or traditional interest will suffice”. What is being stated here

is that a site does **not** have to have heritage value (or as the State would doubtless put it now, “artefact” value) to qualify as a national monument: if it is associated with a historical event or person, or tradition, it likewise qualifies for national monument status, and the legal protection that such a monument would be given. That, ultimately, is why the National Monuments Act 2004 is unconstitutional, and why the State is likely to find itself in deep trouble, as it is now allowing private parties to undertake the destruction of a heritage region that qualifies for protection as a national monument.

The Casement Outlook



Crisis at Daechuri – the latest phase of the Korean War

By Brian McGrath

In South Korea, since March 6th 2006, South Korean military riot police have begun an outright and sustained attack upon the autonomous village of Daechuri. For four years, Daechuri and the nearby community of Doduri have resisted the seizure of their homes and fields for the expansion of a US army base. Inside the local elementary school, elderly residents, local farmers, peace activists and students were holding out against frequent attacks by Korea's crack military police force.

Far more intensive international activism and pressure is required if the South Korean Government's brutal activities are to be halted.⁸

The farmers used tractors as roadblocks. People acted as human shields by chaining themselves to the Daechuri village school gates. These events are an example of the outstanding courage of farmers battling for their property and lives. For some time they were able to

⁸ <http://targetwto.revolt.org/node/308>

resist the repeated waves of attacks by hundreds of military riot police. The local residents and peace activists faced beatings and arrest. Inside the school, activists desperately attempted to upload news updates to the outside world and issued pleas for immediate aid. Thanks to the indifference of the international media, their pleas were ignored, and the South Korean Government was able to intensify the attack with renewed savagery. On March 15th, elderly farmers were evicted from their homes to enforce the Government eviction notice known as “eminent domain”. Several farmers were struck and suffered grievous injuries.⁹

On April 7th, 6000 police and mercenaries launched a massive assault, which lasted from 9 am in the morning until 5 pm in the afternoon. The village was invaded from four separate directions, targeting various zones inside the huge agriculture area, in a tactic to divide and break down protesting groups. The riot police escorted bulldozers, cement trucks and backhoes.

The main objective was the destruction of the irrigation system, whose gates had been opened the day previously for an annual irrigation ceremony. While the mercenaries, wearing civilian clothes, attacked the protestors, fertile soil from the rice fields was cleared out using the mechanical equipment and used to fill the irrigation canals. Cement was then poured in to seal up the canals.

9

<http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/EN/GASA250012006>

These tactics continued throughout the day, despite fierce resistance from the elderly farmers and supporters who were present. Despite the dispersal of the protestors as they attempted to halt an assault proceeding from different directions, two backhoes were halted. The plain-clothes operatives, hired so that the government would not be implicated in their acts of vandalism and criminal violence, attacked first, while the police observed and defended the equipment. Later in the afternoon, the police enthusiastically joined in the attack. One union member was hospitalized with a broken back, another suffered head injuries and lost consciousness, and one villager had his leg broken by the riot police.¹⁰

Following this incident, on May 4th, 2006, 4000 police and army units attacked Daechuri village outright. The soldiers and police outnumbered the protestors. The local people were driven inside the elementary school by the assault. The attackers engaged in systematic destruction of local property as they proceeded. 150 people went upstairs, but were easily cleared by the police; special units removed the priests and politicians who had occupied the roof. Meanwhile soldiers were occupied in installing barbed wire barriers around the rice fields. Then the elementary school, the

¹⁰ <http://www.indymedia.ie/article/75361> ; <http://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2006/04/338056.html> ; <http://targetwto.revolt.org/node/308>; <http://www.saveptfarmers.org/Daechuri-background.html>

very symbol of resistance of Daechuri village, was demolished.¹¹

The situation at present is that the village is now surrounded by troops and barbed wire, with the inhabitants sealed off from the outside world. The Korean Ministry of Defense is engaged in pouring more troops into Daechuri itself; residents however remain in their homes, but have been given their eminent domain notices (eviction orders) by the South Korean state.¹² The resistance however is unbroken, and is continuing, with protests planned throughout Korea.¹³ It is apparent that the South Korean Government will not succeed in clearing the village of its inhabitants without a great deal of further resistance.

The origin of the situation in Daechuri lies in the “Global Posture Review” outlined by President Bush on November 11th 2003, calling for restructuring of US bases across the world.¹⁴

The planned US military facility in Okinawa for instance is simply a part of this process.¹⁵

11

<http://www.saveptfarmers.org/May5fotos.html> ;

http://saveptfarmers.org/blog/2006/05/at_nightfall.html

12

http://saveptfarmers.org/blog/2006/05/the_current_situation_in_daech.html

¹³ <http://saveptfarmers.org/blog/>

14

http://www.saveptfarmers.org/Daechuri_background;

<http://antigizi.or.kr/english/nobasept.htm>

15

http://www.fpif.org/briefs/vol5/v5n22okinawa_body.html;

http://www.jpri.org/publications/critiques/critique_IV_2.html

In respect of the Korean Peninsula, the South Korean government and the US agreed to centralize the US military infrastructure inside South Korea, with over 101 bases scattered nationwide, including the 2nd division which is deployed close to the Korean Armistice Line and DMZ (Demilitarized Military Zone), therefore enhancing the military capability of the US Military Forces inside Korea. In September 2004, South Korea and the US agreed to merge and eliminate some US military facilities, including the large Yongsan Seoul garrison, relocating them to Pyeongtaek under the so-called Land Partnership Plan (LPP). The order of eminent domain is a form of compulsory purchase order, under which the South Korean State grants itself the right to seize agricultural land for military purposes. The Pyeongtaek US military facilities (including the Daechuri base) are to be extended by 1153 hectares, including the replacement site for the Yongsan (Seoul) base. The city of Pyeongtaek has 360,000 residents, and is located one and a half miles from Seoul. 3734 acres have already been appropriated in the city for US facilities; the US will require another 2851 acres. Pyeongtaek faces China across the Yellow Sea. This city is a geographical stronghold, simultaneously facing both North Korea and China, and potentially able to dominate both by concentrating the Army, Navy and Air force: the Air force base K55, the Army base Camp Humphreys (Daechuri) and the Pyeongtaek Port currently used by South Korean forces. As part of this plan, Camp Humphreys, at Daechuri currently 3,734 acres, is to be

greatly expanded in size by 2,851 acres.¹⁶

The Camp Humphreys facility was originally a Japanese base, established in 1941. It is located next to the city of Anjung-ri and about 5 miles from the city of Pyeongtaek. The local inhabitants were evicted their land by Japanese troops and then utilized as forced labor to construct the base.¹⁷

Evidence of the long-term US policy of sustaining intense military activity inside Korea itself is visible 50 miles from South Korea's capital city, Seoul. At Maehyang-Ri, US forces were long engaged in using this coastal area for continued aircraft bombing practice; it was the largest US bombing range in Asia. It was created, as at Daechuri, through direct land seizure. It is located next to agricultural land and a bay from which many derive their livelihoods by fishing; these frequent tests were carried out on populated villages. It was observed that Depleted Uranium (DU) ammunition was frequently used in these bombing and strafing runs by aircraft, with napalm also employed. Villagers have been killed and wounded by fire in the past, while thousands of bombs litter the countryside. The exercises

have now at last been terminated, through intense struggle by the local inhabitants, but the US military is demanding that South Korea provide yet another firing range.¹⁸

South Korean farmers have long been known as the most 'militant' of protestors against the World Trade Organisation-mandated 'liberalization' of the world food market. To accelerate this process, which involves vast profits for the US state-subsidized agricultural industry, the US demanded, and gained, access to Korea's agricultural markets, a process accomplished with considerable state violence directed against those whom the international media describes as troublemakers. This will of necessity involve the destruction of South Korea's indigenous agricultural base and its replacement by US agribusiness and affiliates. South Korean producers are, however, fighting back, with plans to diversify South Korean agriculture into the organic sector, and in particular, they have moved to establish a food bank to supply North Korea itself, to aid with relief of the ongoing famine, which is estimated to have killed up to 1-2 million people.¹⁹

16

<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/camp-humphreys.htm>;
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Camp_Humphreys;
<http://antigizi.or.kr/english/nobasept.htm>;
<http://usacrime.or.kr/maybbs/view.php?db=us&code=english&n=25&page=2>;
<http://earthfirst.org.uk/actionreports/?q=node/1265>

17

<http://antigizi.or.kr/english/nobasept3.htm>;
<http://www.workers.org/ww/2002/koreamtg1212.php>

18 http://icpj.org/article_korea.html
<http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=8656>;
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/news/rok/2004/rok-040426-kcna01.htm>;
<http://usacrime.or.kr/maybbs/view.php?db=us&code=english&n=25&page=2>;

19

<http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/VOCHARUAllLatestEmergencyReports/6DAE1E492715A0C7492571290006EB16>;
http://www1.korea-np.co.jp/pk/207th_issue/2004071704.htm;

This recent development has the potential to be an important first step in enabling the Korean peninsula to become a totally independent and self-sufficient food-producing region in its own right, and is a move to counter the importation of cheaper rice into South Korea from outside producers.²⁰

The battle for Daechuri and Dodori therefore, then takes on a wider significance. It is not merely a battle over the seizure of farmers' land for a military base. It is a symbolic battle for the food supply of Korea itself, of the right of the nation's farmers to be self-sufficient in the provision of food. This is contrary to the objectives of US global policy; therefore at Daechuri / Doduri, it is being established that the South Korean state has the right, under the eminent domain order, to seize Korean ancestral land for its imperial master. South Korea will have no right to control its own economy or its own food supply, it can not ask the US to leave South Korean territory, and the Daechuri/Doduri facilities can be expanded whenever the US wishes, which will be the case at the proposed Okinawa facility, as the United States moves for overall control over the oil and gas resources of the South China Sea.²¹

<http://www.womennews.co.kr/ewnews/news48.htm>

²⁰

<http://www.organicconsumers.org/organic/southkorea082805.cfm>

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/3284049.stm>

<http://times.hankooki.com/lpage/nation/200512/kt2005121922294111990.htm>

²¹

<http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/VO>

The recent land clearances in Daechuri, therefore, are an extension of the battle over land sovereignty in Asia that has intensified since World War II. Land clearances were a central plank of the US "pacification" of Vietnam, which remains the model for the latest plank of counter-insurgency warfare. The Land Partnership Plan is simply the institutionalization of these practices.

The primary objective of the sustained violence against the farmers of Daechuri and Doduri is to facilitate US geopolitical objectives in the Korean peninsula. The secondary objective is to break the will of the farmers of Korea. Central to both is the reinforcement of the partition of Korea, mandated after WWII by the United Nations, and cemented by the near-global conflict of the Korean War (1947-49). To achieve this, the reinforcement of South Korea's position as a client state of the US is vital. This is sustained by the use of the standard device, the alleged threat of an imminent North Korean invasion, a claim that is scarcely credible to those acquainted with the actual state of North Korea's economy and armed forces. Similar claims were made about the Soviet Union at the time of its collapse: that it would attack

[CHARUAllLatestEmergencyReports/6DAE1E492715A0C7492571290006EB16;](http://www.charuall.com/LatestEmergencyReports/6DAE1E492715A0C7492571290006EB16;)

http://www1.korea-co.jp/pk/207th_issue/2004071704.htm;

<http://www.greenleft.org.au/back/2006/653/653p23.htm>;

<http://www.iht.com/articles/2005/12/12/business/wtorice.php>;

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/3284049.stm>;

<http://www.american.edu/TED/korrice.htm>

the United States, as a reflex action resulting from fear of the imminent downfall of its economy; this was known as the “wounded bear” theory.²²

North Korea’s armed forces look impressive on paper, but are incapable of fighting a modern army. South Korea has one of the most modern and well-equipped armies in the world; and an attack by North Korea upon the South would invite instant and devastating US retaliation.²³ However, the device is useful, and so it will be sustained.

The political activism of Korean farmers has long been a thorn in the side of the global agricultural industry and as such is consistently denounced by the media. After the Korean War, South Korean agriculture was sacrificed to enable industrialization to take place, with land nationalization less thorough and complete than it appeared on the surface.²⁴ US agribusiness has gradually gained total access to the South Korean agricultural market, with over half of Korea’s food imports now coming from the US. The result could be the total disappearance of the small farmers who are the backbone of Korean agriculture.²⁵ If the farmers of South Korea can be successfully defeated through the subtle warfare of international trade, and the less-

²² <http://www.zmag.org/Chomsky/ni/ni-c07-s02.html>

²³ <http://www.g2mil.com/korea.htm>

²⁴ <http://www.paulnoll.com/Korea/History/South-Korean-past-part3.html>

²⁵ <http://www.paulnoll.com/Korea/History/South-Korean-past-part3.html>

subtle warfare of outright land seizure at Daechuri and Doruri, then Korean nationalism will of itself wither and die, as the South Korea industrial economy is increasingly absorbed into that of the US.²⁶ The destruction of South Korean agriculture is a vital stage in increasing the dependency of the peninsula as a whole upon the United States, given the disastrous condition of North Korean agriculture, as a result of flooding, state mismanagement, and international sanctions imposed by the US.²⁷

These measures are logical and necessary objectives from the viewpoint of the US given the strategic location of the Korean peninsula.²⁸ The paramount objective of the US is to prevent at all costs the unification of the two Koreas. Partition therefore has to be maintained, by all-out war if necessary, as recent events inside Korea demonstrate. The agony of

²⁶

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=CHO20050722&articleId=719>

http://www.cadtm.org/article.php?id_article=1847

²⁷ <http://www.foodfirst.org/node/1182>
<http://www.foodfirst.org/pubs/policy/pb11.html> <http://www.foodfirst.org/node/324>
<http://www.foodfirst.org/media/display.phpid406>

<http://www.foodfirst.org/node/1222>
http://www.hooverdigest.org/084/henrik_sen.html

<http://archives.cnn.com/2000/ASIANOW/east/06/08/korea.us.01/index.html>

http://www.larouchepub.com/other/2002/2945korea_embargo.html

http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/sancti_on.html

<http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=6004>

²⁸

http://www.veteransforpeace.org/A_korean_war_1021003.htm

the Korean peninsula highlights the importance of partition for global planners; it acts as a political, military and psychological weapon to be consistently applied against the threat of nationalism.

Partition's success in containing the 'virus' of radical nationalism can be observed throughout the history of Korea, one of the old nations, first colonized by Japan, then later partitioned into North and South by the UN, acting as a political instrument of the United States and the Soviet Union.²⁹ The post-WWII strategy of conquest had its first success in Korea in 1945, rapidly followed by Vietnam in 1954, when both these nations were partitioned followed by two of the most extensive wars in history on their territories, to secure these highly strategic countries and their not insignificant resources. One notable triumph occurred in Indonesia, after a reliable client regime was installed imposing the fascist "New Order" after the massacre of 1964. Another example was East Timor in 1974, where the indigenous population were cleared from their land by Indonesian forces, acting as contractors for the principal western powers.

The conflict at Daechuri and Doduri now heralds a new phase in the war for control of Asia. The US has now abandoned its previous policy of stabilizing its client Asian states in an unconcealed campaign for control of territory and resources. This heralds a return to

29

<http://www.marxists.org/history/etol/newspape/ni/vol19/no04/notm.htm>
<http://socialismandliberation.org/mag/index.php?aid=487>
<http://www.nautilus.org/DPRKBriefingBook/aboutDPRK/history.html>
<http://www.crystalinks.com/korea.html>

the manifest imperialism of the 19th century, which the architects of the Programme for the New American Century (PNAC), the inspiration for the so-called Global Posture Review, openly celebrate.³⁰

As a result of this process, the Commonwealth states of Australia and New Zealand have stepped into the vacuum created by the decline in the power and influence of the East Asian nations after the economic collapse of 1997-8. The recent Australian move into East Timor is the latest stage in an expansion of Western imperial power and influence into the entire Asia-Pacific region. The oil and gas of the Timor Sea, the property of the people of East Timor are currently being secured by Australia, acting as regional contractor for the United States. The new Okinawa military base in Japan is being pushed through to assist the United States in its move towards the extensive oil and gas resources of the South China Sea and in the longer term towards China itself. The huge expansion of the Camp Humphrey facility is motivated in part by the same objectives.

Therefore, at Daechuri and Doduri, the United States, acting through its client regime, is acting to reinforce the partition of Korea by military force. In resisting this assault, the heroic inhabitants of Daechuri and Doduri battle for the soul of Korea, and in themselves symbolise the farmers of Asia,

30

<http://www.atimes.com/atimes/MiddleEast/EB20Ak02.html>
<http://www.saveptfarmers.org/Daechuribackground>

against whom some of the worst savagery in history has been directed. Their bitter struggle is a microcosm of the global struggle

for land, for food, and for the survival of the ancient nations of the world.