

Cover-up in embassy attack 'bombs out'

by Dean Andromidas

Following the sound of air raid sirens in Belgrade late in the evening of May 7, three preprogrammed precision-guided munitions zeroed in from different directions on their target, scoring direct hits. The only problem was that the designated target, the "Federal Directorate for Supply and Procurement," turned out to be the Chinese Embassy. Was this a "tragic error," as NATO and the U.S. Secretary of Defense would like the world to believe, or was it the result of deliberate manipulation from within the command and control structure of NATO?

The political "collateral damage" of this attack should be enough to give little credence to the "terrible accident" story that the public and Chinese government are being fed. *EIR's* review of the official story, and its own investigation of standard operational procedures within NATO and U.S. security structures, point to an obvious attempt at a cover-up. More importantly, it points to the same British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) forces that are committed to wrecking the possibility of a consensus among the Clinton administration and continental European nations with Russia and China, for ending the Balkans war.

EIR's initial investigation points to the existence of a structure that is outside the publicly acknowledged NATO command structure, or U.S. publicly acknowledged relevant command and control structures, that was able to intervene on the official NATO and military structures, to insert the coordinates of the Chinese Embassy into the official target list. We are not speaking of a "secret conspiracy," but a non-public structure or "committee" that has been overseeing this complex multinational military air attack on a country in the middle of Europe.

Little information

To date, the only information that has been officially released by NATO, is that NATO aircraft launched a number of precision-guided bombs that made direct hits on the same coordinates as the Chinese Embassy. Although the United States and NATO have offered official apologies to China, no detailed report of what actually happened on the night of May 7 has been released.

EIR asked a U.S. Defense Department spokesman some

very basic questions, including: What type of ordnance was used? What sort of guidance system was involved? How many bombs? How many and what type of aircraft, and from what nation were the aircraft that conducted the attack? The answer was simple: "We haven't specified, other than to say it was a NATO aircraft," the spokesman said. He refused to identify either the type or nationality of the aircraft. On the type of munition, he would only say, "It was a bomb, as opposed to, say, a cruise missile." Whether more information would be released, his reply was equally terse: "I don't know; I don't expect it will be released soon."

In a May 12 briefing at the Defense Department, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Henry Shelton was asked to confirm press reports asserting that a B2 bomber was used. His reply: "I don't think we want to get into the operational level of detail as to what types of weapons we use on what kind of targets."

These answers seem unusual, because the United States has already admitted that it was the source of the target information programmed into the bombs. Why not detail how the bombs were dropped, what kind and whose aircraft were used? Wouldn't these answers at least reassure the Chinese that NATO is being open and in good faith about its apology?

The United States is not the only country on the very short list of countries that are dropping bombs. The others include, most notably, the British, and to a much lesser extent, the French.

The May 10 press conference by Secretary of Defense William Cohen, and the background briefing by two "senior intelligence officials" which immediately followed, were notable for their inconsistencies and vagueness. The one point that seems to have some truth, is that somehow the coordinates of the Chinese Embassy were attached to a target designated as the Federal Directorate of Supply and Procurement. This directorate was a target supplied by the CIA, and its exact address was known. That address was not that of the Chinese Embassy, nor was it ever located at the current site of the Chinese Embassy.

The rest of the press conference was a confused combination of half-truths and lies, to try to explain this discrepancy. The main point in their explanation, was to assert that the new embassy location was not in the mapping database, and that the building address number was not marked on the maps. Therefore, the team in charge of working up the details of target information somehow put this directorate at a different address than they were in fact given, and located it at the address of the Chinese Embassy, which is several hundred meters away.

Despite the thousands of pages of articles, press conferences, and official letters of apology, the above, in essence, represents the sum total of facts that have been made public by the U.S. and NATO authorities. This is important to bear in mind.

The 'Q Committee'

When asked how NATO could make such a "mistake" as dropping a bomb on the Chinese Embassy, a retired military officer, whose 20-year career involved his participation in the Vietnam War, Oliver North and George Bush's wars in Central America, as well as the Persian Gulf War, said simply, "Listen, mistakes like this don't happen. No embassy was ever accidentally bombed in Baghdad, Nicaragua, Panama, or Hanoi. It doesn't happen."

When asked if it isn't possible that NATO's vast military machine might have chosen the wrong target, he said, "Listen, the military does not draft target lists, they do not choose targets. Their role is simply operational. They get the bombing list; it's not much more than a list of coordinates. They do not make the decisions. The way this works is, you have something called the 'Q Committee.' This is the committee that is running the war. We had this in Central America. When we were hitting targets in Nicaragua, those targets were designated by the 'Q Committee,' which had ultimate authority over the Contra operation. At the time, it included Vice President George Bush and others on the National Security Council.

"With this conflict, such a committee would have to exist. It would include people at the level of CIA director, Deputy Secretary of Defense, if not the Secretary himself. In this case, it would be international, and would include a British Deputy Minister of Defense. It's the policy group that is actually running this war. It is this group that oversees the drafting of this list. They have the ability to put the wrong target in the system through their people in the official chain of command. They don't even have to tell that official, 'Hey, were going to bomb the Chinese Embassy'; they just give him the wrong coordinates and say, 'Include this on the next list.' It can be that simple."

Is there a group of people in the appropriate decision-making posts within NATO, Britain, and the United States who have the motive to carry out such an act of war? Yes. The Blair government is united behind the drive for a global "clash of civilizations." Key figures in the Clinton administration, starting with Vice President Al Gore, and including Cohen, Gen. Shelton, and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, have all demonstrated a Kissinger-like loyalty to this British policy. They betray President Clinton all the time on behalf of London—whether they are at all times aware of the extent of their perfidy, or not.

Investigate the NATO military structure

NATO, and its military arm under the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) under the command of Gen. Wesley Clark, the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR), has been even more economical with the facts on the Chinese Embassy affair. No official explanation has been given, or even a dedicated press confer-

ence convened. General Clark's publicly stated confidence in the "system," and his assertion that the bombing was simply a mistake, an anomaly in a perfect system, is indeed grounds for court-martial.

EIR asked a SHAPE spokesman how the bombing lists were compiled. His response was simply to say that it is an alliance task approved and directed by the North Atlantic Council comprised of the 19 NATO member-nations, which is technically the highest political decision-making body in the alliance. The lists are supposedly approved by this council, and then the various nations are allotted tasks according to their capabilities.

When asked how the Joint Staff of SHAPE, i.e., the SACEUR's General Staff, functioned, the spokesman said, "We do not make that information public. We only make public the names of the SACEUR, who is General Clark, and is always an American, his deputy, who is always British, the Chief of Staff, who is always German, and the Deputy Chief of Staff, who is always Italian." He did say that the command structure has been going through a transformation over the last two years, but he would not provide any details.

Nonetheless, according to a former senior NATO officer, the primary operational control center for the bombing would be the J3 Operations.¹ They would receive the target information from all sources, including from the various nations. They would not necessarily choose the targets. A draft list would go up the command ladder for review, and then to North Atlantic Council for *pro forma* approval. The J3 would then oversee the tasking of which national units were to carry out the bombing. Tampering with the list would most likely take place here.

While NATO rhetoric speaks of a great "alliance effort," in reality, the bombing campaign would be firmly in the hands of the BAC. During NATO's 1995 Operation Deliberate Force, which was the bombing campaign used to bring the Bosnian Serbs to the negotiating table at Dayton, the entire command and control structure, down to non-commissioned officers, was comprised of U.S. military personnel. The primary reason was that both the French and the British at the time only reluctantly supported the operation, and there was insufficient interoperability to allow for efficient combat operations.

In the intervening period, this has changed. Under Prime Minister Blair, the British have become the most vocal proponents of bombing. In this respect, it is important to note that the current Deputy SACEUR, Gen. Sir Rupert Smith, had been commander of the United Nations Protection Force in Bosnia during Operation Deliberate Force. Smith was

1. SHAPE's Joint Staff is organized in much the same manner as any military general staff. With J standing for Joint, its various departments are J1, personnel; J2, intelligence; J3, operations; J4, logistics. The SHAPE structure goes up to J9, and covers various responsibilities relevant only to NATO.

said to have been an early proponent of bombing the Serbs. This position no doubt contributed to the fact that Blair nominated Smith for Deputy SACEUR in November 1998. As Deputy SACEUR, Smith would also have operational oversight over the bombing list. Furthermore, as a veteran of Royal Army's Parachute Regiment, he, like General Shelton, has spent much of his career in the Special Forces.

It should be also noted that U.S.-British cooperation in the recent bombings against Iraq, no doubt has led to similar cooperation in Kosovo.

As for dropping bombs, the only nations known to be in this business are the United States, Britain, and France. There are complaints that the French are not doing their fair share. The other air forces, such as the Germans, Dutch, and Italians, are involved in mostly protection missions for the bombers and are not involved in actually bombing.

Fail safe, is fail safe

The attempt by Defense Secretary Cohen to put responsibility for the bombing on an "institutional failure," can only be judged an extremely poor excuse for a cover-up. The assertion that the Defense Intelligence Agency and the National Imagery and Mapping Agency were not informed about the new Chinese Embassy, is as much of a bald-faced lie as it is ridiculous.

According to one military source with experience in target confirmation, targets are in fact confirmed on the ground. Since the bombing of a nation's embassy is an act of war, these are priority targets to avoid. Their positions are not left to bureaucrats maintaining a database at the National Imagery and Mapping Agency, but are the responsibility of those in charge of the operation. This was the case even in Iraq, where far more bombs were dropped than over Belgrade, with no hits on embassies. This is no doubt the case in Serbia. In fact, there have been press reports that British Special Air Services units which would be responsible for confirming these targets, have been deployed into Serbia and Kosovo.

Furthermore, there are no such things as old maps. The first task any air force pilot must carry out before he gets into his plane, is to check the date on his map. It cannot be more than 30 days old. If this is the case, are we to believe that those planning the missions use maps that are a year old?

Based on two previous bombing campaigns, planning for the bombing of Serbia and Belgrade did not start a few weeks or even a few months before the bombing commenced. The United States began planning for the 1995 Operation Deliberate Force no later than 1993, long before NATO and the UN dared to even contemplate air strikes against the Bosnian Serbs. It is safe to assume that planning for a bombing campaign against Serbia was begun on a contingency basis at the same time or shortly thereafter, allowing for on-the-ground confirmation of bombing targets

long before the air war was launched.

The fact that the type of munition used has not been released also points to a cover-up. Although precision-guided weapons were said to be used, what type has not been confirmed. There are various types of guidance systems that utilize laser designation. While several of these systems use the Global Positioning System, the GPS can be programmed so as to prevent a lock on forbidden targets, including embassies. If such a munition was used, the system must have been tampered with as well. Other laser-guided systems lock onto some form of laser designator, either generated by another aircraft or even from the ground.

Kosovar Albanian tours U.S. for 'LaRouche Doctrine' for Balkans

by Marianna Wertz

Feride Istogu Gillesberg, born in the Drenice region of Kosovo, conducted a three-week emergency tour of the United States for the Schiller Institute in May, to discuss with Americans "The Truth About the War in the Balkans" and Lyndon LaRouche's proposals for resolving that crisis (see *EIR*, April 16). She was joined by her husband, Tom Gillesberg, who is a member of the Danish-Kosovar Society; both are active with the Schiller Institute in Denmark, where they live.

From April 29 to May 17, the Gillesbergs addressed hundreds of Americans in Virginia, Washington, D.C., Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Illinois, California and Texas, at meetings of the Schiller Institute, as well as gatherings in schools, churches, and mosques.

While Feride has numerous relatives who today are missing or refugees, as a result of the "ethnic cleansing" policy of Serbian strongman Slobodan Milosevic, her appeal was not simply to stop what she called the "human and humanitarian catastrophe" for Kosovars, but that Americans understand the deeper, strategic crisis unfolding in the Balkans under British direction, which is leading the world toward war. Indeed, her charge that it is British Prime Minister Tony Blair and the British-American-Commonwealth faction in NATO and the United States — not the Clinton administration per se — which are responsible for the strategic mess in the Balkans, provoked heated discussion and debate at every stop.

The context for her trip, Feride told her audiences, is "the possibility of building up the New Bretton Woods system in the spirit of Mr. LaRouche, and the realization of the New