

“... 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.