

and should not be allowed to avoid, the necessity of a thorough investigation of the “accidental” bombing of China’s Embassy in Belgrade. D’Alema told Schröder that NATO would lose all confidence among the citizens of its 19 member-states and internationally, if it continued to make foul apologies for the embassy bombing, instead of really telling the public what it was that made such a catastrophe possible.

D’Alema and Schröder also made clear that a solution to Kosovo could only be a diplomatic one, rather than one based on total military victory of NATO over Serbia—a victory that might still be far away. Schröder added that, for Germany, he categorically ruled out any deployment of ground forces for combat missions. This earned him very angry headlines in the British press on May 19, for example in the *Daily Telegraph*, which wrote: “Germany Joins U.S. in Veto of Ground Forces.” The London *Times* said that at the Bari press conference with D’Alema, Schröder had “crippled” the British government’s plan for a ground war against the Serbs.

“The German Chancellor’s outright dismissal of this strategy appeared to isolate Britain among the main players of the alliance,” the *Times* wrote, adding that “France and Italy are also opposed to deploying troops unless there is first a peace agreement and approval by [Serbian President Slobodan] Mr. Milosevic of an international military force in Kosovo with NATO at its core.” The *Daily Telegraph* said that Schröder’s “no” to ground forces “parallels one given to Mr. Blair by President Clinton last month. Mr. Blair tried for hours to persuade the President to endorse the possible use of ground troops if bombing fails to force Milosevic to back down. But he could not.”

For a change, the *Telegraph* coverage of President Clinton’s policy was accurate. Indeed, the American leader rebuffed Blair’s persistent efforts to win him over to a land war in the Balkans, during a lengthy White House meeting two days before the April 23-25 NATO 50th anniversary summit in Washington. Blair, British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook, and British Defense Secretary George Robertson had all lied through their teeth, at an April 25 press conference, when confronted by *EIR* and other news organizations about the U.S.-British rift over the ground troops issue.

Beware another British incident

For reasons all too apparent, the British hawks are getting frustrated: The bombing of the Chinese Embassy on May 7 was about to undo all of the diplomatic efforts for a cease-fire and peace talks on Kosovo, but by May 18, most of the sabotage of that diplomacy had been undone, again, by concerted action among Russia, China, Germany, Italy, and the White House (against strong resistance of the State Department and Pentagon). It cannot be ruled out that sabotage will be tried again, but the peace process has gained momentum in recent days, so that it is much more difficult to derail it. And, what certainly enrages the hawks more than the German Chancellor’s remarks as such, is the fact that the diplomacy

resembles recommendations made by Lyndon H. LaRouche at a Bonn seminar on April 21 (see *EIR*, May 7), when he called for a peace initiative by Clinton, in cooperation with Russia, China, and “at least one leading power on the European continent.”

Indeed, during May 18-20, Deputy Secretary of State Talbott, Finnish President Ahtisaari, and Russia’s Balkan envoy Chernomyrdin held marathon meetings in Helsinki. The first meeting, on the night of May 18, lasted eight hours. The next morning, the three men met for another five hours before Chernomyrdin flew off to Belgrade to meet with Milosevic. When Chernomyrdin returned to Moscow from Belgrade, Talbott was already there, awaiting further consultations.

On May 19, the political directors of the foreign ministries of the G-8 countries also met in Bonn, to draft a UN Security Council resolution, based on the May 6 G-8 communiqué which initiated the present round of diplomacy.

Documentation

Many worldwide believe bombing was deliberate

From the May 12 statement by Pennsylvania State Rep. Harold James. Representative James is the former chairman of the Pennsylvania Legislative Black Caucus, and is Special Assistant to the President, National Black Caucus of State Legislators.

“I call upon President Clinton to take prompt and vigorous action against those in the NATO command structure responsible for the bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, which may include court-martial proceedings. Also, on behalf of the 58,000 constituents in my Philadelphia legislative district, I wish to express the most profound condolences to the families of the innocent Chinese diplomats and journalists who were killed or injured in the NATO attack.

“I questioned the legitimacy of the NATO war in Yugoslavia from the beginning. We were told that the goal was to stop ‘ethnic cleansing’ and genocide. But why was there no action taken when the worst genocide of the post-World War II period was taking place in Central Africa, where more than 6 million Africans have died [since 1993]? . . .

“Lyndon LaRouche warned that the NATO war against Yugoslavia was really a British geopolitical manipulation of the United States into a conflict with Russia and China, in order to destroy President Clinton’s policies of cooperation and partnership with those nations. The British, he said, want to use NATO as the military arm of an Anglo-American ‘New World Order,’ to risk world war in a confrontation with Russia and China. This is exactly what seems to be happening.

“... We saw last August how destructive and criminal military actions can be covered over by lies, the way President Clinton was lied to with false reports about terrorism and bomb-making in Sudan, which led to the missile attack against an innocent pharmaceutical plant in Khartoum.

“President Clinton has my full support in cleaning out those networks who are still trying to sabotage his administration from within. China, Russia, India, and other nations are cooperating to build a transportation system from Asia to Europe to Africa, called the Eurasian Land-Bridge, which has the potential to establish peaceful economic cooperation among all the nations of the Balkans, and beyond. I believe this was one of Ron Brown’s goals, and the sooner we return to that policy, the better.”

On May 14, former Nebraska state Sen. John DeCamp sent a communication to Nebraska’s Congressional delegation. Senator DeCamp is a highly decorated Vietnam veteran and was a close friend of the late CIA director William Colby.

“I am writing to you to urge that the Congress undertake an immediate, thoroughgoing investigation of the NATO bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade last weekend. The Chinese have repeatedly charged that the bombing was intentional, and, having some knowledge of military matters, I think they have an excellent basis for that belief. Responsible voices in Europe, such as former Assistant German Defense Minister Willy Wimmer, have also charged that the attack was deliberate.

“Only a blind man could fail to see, that the bombing came immediately on the heels of the G-8 agreement of last week, which put forward a clear pathway to end the war, a pathway which is now in shambles.

“Let me be very clear on the stakes involved. The fruitless war in the Balkans is enraging both the Russians and Chinese, and clearly contains within it the seeds of World War III. Therefore, to pull the world back from the abyss into which it is rapidly plunging, two actions must be taken immediately:

“(And forget not the true story of the ‘Gulf of Tonkin’ incident which triggered the Vietnam War—now reclassified I believe.)

“1. The culprits in the NATO chain of command must be identified, and punished, severely and rapidly.

“2. A large-scale program of economic reconstruction of the entire Balkans area must be put forward as the basis to ‘win the peace’ along the general lines outlined in the G-8 agreement, integrating the Balkans with the great Eurasian Land-Bridge which runs from China to Rotterdam. President Clinton has already put forward a proposal along these lines.

“Regarding point #1 above, I fully endorse the statement of Lyndon LaRouche of May 10, which you no doubt have seen, in particular his call for the courts-martial of those responsible for the bombing of the Chinese Embassy. Such a ‘Dr. Strangelove’ figure as SACEUR Gen. Wesley Clark,

who called for bombing Russian ships supplying oil to Yugoslavia, is clearly capable of almost any madness. . . .”

*Santo Domingo columnist Gerardo Joaquín Brito extensively excerpted LaRouche’s statement in the May 13 issue of **El Nuevo Diario**. The following day, Brito headlined his “International Memorandum” column, “LaRouche, the United States, and Kosovo,” which departs from Dominican practice, in that it cites the British as responsible for the bombing.*

“We must ask ourselves (or better yet, ask Mr. LaRouche) what do the Americans think about this conflict, in which they should not have gotten involved? And, who is dragging whom, is the government of the United States the United Kingdom, or is Her Majesty the White House? . . . Was the U.S. military induced into this unprecedented catastrophe by the arch-powerful British and Tony Blair? . . .

“Weeks before I ran and commented upon the press release . . . by ‘LaRouche’s Committee for a New Bretton Woods’ from the United States, I wrote . . . that ‘many things are very rotten in Denmark,’ regarding the Atlantic Alliance’s bombing of Yugoslavia. Is the economic power of the United Kingdom at stake, or that of the euro? . . . Who is betraying

Schröder vs. BBC over Balkan ground war

On May 19, German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder met with NATO Secretary General Javier Solana in Brussels, after which the two men held a press conference at NATO headquarters. During the press conference, Schröder was bombarded with questions by a gaggle of British journalists, who were hysterical over the German leader’s categorical rejection of the use of ground forces in the current Balkan operation.

In typical British fashion, they tried to play word games, to trip up Schröder and force him into a “hypothetical discussion” about conditions under which he might relent and go along with London’s war drive.

Because each of the 19 NATO countries has de facto veto power over any change in NATO policy, and because the ground war option was formally rejected by NATO heads of state during the opening day of the NATO 50th anniversary summit in Washington on April 23-25, Schröder’s position represents the kiss of death for the Blair government’s drive to start World War III in Kosovo. Below is the transcript of one particularly nasty exchange

whom; who is dragging whom? There is a widening political and diplomatic gulf between Russia, Beijing, and the United States.

“... I will conclude by citing a paragraph from the press release: ‘The implication is, that any U.S. official supporting the policies of Her Majesty’s Blair government may be acting treasonously, if not otherwise explicitly guilty of treason, against the U.S.A.’ ”

Chalmers Johnson, from the University of California at San Diego, took part in a May 20 Internet debate among Asia scholars, many of whom offered important insights.

Johnson declares that the bombing was deliberate; unfortunately he lays the blame on “ ‘rogue’ officials of the CIA and the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency combined with right-wing members of the Republican Party [who] want to ruin relations with China and stimulate a new Cold War in East Asia. . . .

“The explanation given by Secretary of Defense William Cohen that the CIA was using an ‘outdated map’ is almost surely a pathetic lie. . . .

“The *modus operandi* of these plotters is to release out-of-context intelligence photos, false intelligence, and conjec-

tures about Chinese espionage in the United States. One of the main sources of such intelligence ‘leaks’ is Lt. Gen. Patrick Hughes, chief of the Defense Intelligence Agency, who regularly supplies Congressman Benjamin Gilman (Republican of New York), chairman of the House International Relations Committee, with intelligence to support American warmongering in East Asia. It is Gilman who has said to the press that ‘North Korea could nuke Seattle.’ ”

Another contribution came from Indian scholar **Shekhar Krishnan** of the University of London School of Oriental and African Studies.

“My initial hunch was that the embassy was intentionally targetted in order to make impossible the passage of the [G-8] Bonn Agreement in the [UN] Security Council. . . .

“This war has been a guise for NATO and the West to establish its military and economic apparatus in Russia’s former sphere of influence and consolidate a geomilitary sphere stretching from western Europe to the Middle East. Remember that the bombing of Iraq continues as we speak. . . .

“The bombing has pushed Russia back to the outsider’s position it had been relegated to by NATO until about a week before the bombing, when the Germans attempted to bring

between the Chancellor and a fulminating BBC correspondent, as reported by Federal News Service:

Mark Laity, BBC News: You have just said that the strategy will not change. There are many military people who believe that air power can achieve very much but it cannot achieve everything. Presumably you believe the only thing that is really unthinkable is to lose the war. If it comes down to a choice between risking losing the war and using ground troops, which would you choose?

Schröder: Please don’t try too hard. I will not participate in this specifically British debate on war theories. I think and I trust that we have a good strategy, a strategy that has indeed been successful in some respect and will continue to be successful, and this is why I refuse to participate in such a theoretical debate.

Q: Could I just pursue you on that, Chancellor. When do you think that ground troops might be—

Schröder: I have said everything that is to be said on this particular issue and you will not get more out of me if you go on pestering me with these questions.

Q: I am not pestering you, you have come to give a press conference, surely journalists have a right to ask the question?

Schröder: Do I look very offended, do I look very angry?

Q: When do you believe the use of ground troops would become thinkable? Under what circumstances

should NATO send ground troops into Kosovo?

Schröder: I think I made myself very clear on this. I oppose sending in ground forces and this is very much to do with the fact that NATO strategy, a strategy that we developed together, is slowly beginning to take effect, and it is supporting a political settlement. So, of course I understand that you have questions, questions that go in a different direction, but I think it would be wrong if I were to respond in a theoretical manner to theoretical questions, because that would be misinterpreted. I support the present strategy of NATO, I think it is promising, it can give us success, this is why I am against changing it; that once the war is over we have to send in a robust international military presence into Kosovo. That we need it, that we have to have it, is something that is obvious and that again is part and parcel of NATO strategy.

Q: In view of the brutal behavior of the Serbs, don’t you think that that would be reason enough to at least think about sending in ground forces?

Schröder: I have been trying, I have been trying hard, to make it very clear that I am not willing to participate in theoretical debates about what is going to happen if a, b, c. I understand your desire and your need for a new subject, but it is not all that easy, I understand, to fill the pages of a newspaper day in, day out, with news. But, please understand why I refuse to participate in this extremely theoretical debate.

them in for fear that Joschka Fischer and the Greens might pull out of the government, which would be disastrous for the coherence of European policy toward Kosovo. I don't think that the U.S. and Britain would have sought Russian consultation otherwise; indeed, it has been the trend since the enlargement of NATO to specifically exclude Russia. . . .

"It will be very difficult to get Russia and China to now agree to any kind of negotiated settlement brokered between Russia, the U.S., and the rest of NATO. Russian and Chinese neo-nationalist opinion, provoked by this incident, will scoff at any concessions to Britain, France, and the U.S. in the Security Council now. Neither Moscow nor Beijing will dare encounter the domestic fury of agreeing to the under-negotiation Bonn Agreement. Thus the war will continue outside of the purview of the United Nations and the Security Council, which is precisely in the interests of Anglo-American policy. . . .

"It is also too coincidental that the bombs would happen to hit the only other member of the Security Council not a party to this conflict, while these negotiations were going on. . . .

"This was the last desperate and dangerous way to scuttle a negotiated settlement that was in the offing, and is not in the interest of Britain or America.

"All the citations of ethnic cleansing, and the counterargu-

ments about imperialism and the violation of national sovereignty being traded by both sides seem to obscure the grand strategy of this whole war. It is revolting that this has now been blamed on the CIA, thus allowing the actual responsibilities and design of this incident to retreat behind the iron curtain of national security."

From statements by several Asian governments:

Cambodia: King Sihanouk declared, "I severely condemn those behind this very cruel and unjustifiable act, of which the peaceful embassy of the People's Republic of China was an innocent victim."

Vietnam: The Foreign Ministry declared the attack a "violation of international law." Vietnam News Agency denounced it as "a blatant violation of sovereignty of the People's Republic of China and of international laws."

Thailand: Foreign Ministry spokesman Don Pramudhvinai said, "The Chinese people and government should receive a clear explanation and appropriate compensation. The destruction of an embassy by weapons of war is a violation of international law which is the basis for international relations."

Philippines: Foreign Minister Domingo Siazon expressed regret, adding, "It's time to find a diplomatic solution."

On May 14, former French Presidential candidate Jacques Cheminade, president of Solidarity and Progress, the French co-thinkers of Lyndon LaRouche, issued a statement.

"After the bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade and the removal of the Primakov government in Russia . . . the world is on a course for war. . . .

"1. [The French government] must demand, just as German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder did in Beijing, that the bombing of the Chinese Embassy be entirely brought to light. Unless a serious investigation, leading to the responsible figures, is conducted, we must immediately withdraw our forces from the operation in Yugoslavia. . . .

"2. France must demand the resignation of Gen. Wesley Clark, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, and his court-martial. . . . Failing such a sanction, we must immediately withdraw from NATO, which has, in any case, condemned itself to a disaster. . . .

"5. It must be said loud and clear to the British, American, and Russian governments, that peace in Europe requires that the entire Balkan region benefit from a Marshall Plan, and that Eurasia join forces in a vast plan of mutual development, based on great infrastructure projects, high-speed transportation networks, and development of the most advanced technologies. This 'Eurasian Land-Bridge' would meet the wish expressed by Russia, China, India, and many other countries whose backs are to the wall.

"6. This effort cannot succeed within the monetary and financial order of the IMF. . . . Therefore . . . sovereign states must negotiate a new Bretton Woods. . . ."

LAROCHE ON THE NEW BRETTON WOODS

"The present fatally ill global financial and monetary system must be radically reorganized.

It can not be reformed, it must be reorganized.

This must be done in the manner of a reorganization in bankruptcy, conducted under the authority not of international institutions, but of sovereign governments."

A 90-minute videotape with excerpts from a speech by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. given on March 18, 1998.

\$35 postpaid
Order number
EIE 98-002

EIRNewsService
P.O. Box 17390,
Washington, D.C.
20041-0390

To order, call
1-888-EIR-3258
(toll-free).

We accept Visa or MasterCard.