
Fact Sheet

U.S. government policy is to bring 'Shining Path' to power in Peru

I. Introduction

It is current U.S. government policy to bring the murderous "Shining Path" ("Sendero Luminoso") guerrilla movement into power in Peru. It is that policy commitment—not some supposed defense of the abstract principles of democracy—which is behind the Bush administration's attacks against the recent "self-coup" by the Fujimori government and the military in Peru, a coup whose avowed intention and immediate first actions have been to dismantle Shining Path and its support apparatus in Peru.

Key components of this Washington strategy include:

- a) efforts to discredit and dismantle the Peruvian Armed Forces;
- b) international "human rights" support of Shining Path and other narco-terrorist forces;
- c) promotion of El Salvador-style power-sharing negotiations with the terrorists; and
- d) ideological support and justification of Shining Path's genocidal warfare against western civilization.

Ruled out absolutely by Washington are the only two measures which, combined, can actually defeat the insurgency: a significant buildup of the *Peruvian* military, such that it has the means to crush Shining Path; and ending the looting under International Monetary Fund (IMF) policies which is destroying Peru's economy and driving a desperate population into the waiting arms of the terrorists.

II. Anglo-American establishment sets policy

What is the underlying objective of this de facto support for Shining Path, a group which U. S. officials admit intends to carry out a genocide policy matched only by the Nazis in Germany or the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia? The Anglo-American financial elite has declared, in so many words, that it intends to eliminate the nation of Peru from the world map.

Citibank chairman John Reed pronounced the bankers' death sentence on Peru as President Fujimori assumed office on July 28, 1990. "If you look at a map of the world economy, you'll see that there are countries that have disappeared. . . . Peru and Bolivia will disappear. The Soviet Union had better watch out, because it could disappear," Reed told *Veja* maga-

zine during a visit to Brazil. It has happened before in history, he noted. After World War II, the nation of Burma "disappeared. . . . It was a rich country, like Brazil."

This is no idle threat by one banker, but the operational strategy of the Anglo-American financial elite as a whole. This was reflected in a special section of the Summer 1990 edition of the *Wilson Quarterly*, published by the Woodrow Wilson Center, one of the bankers' top think-tanks for Ibero-American policy. Citibank's Reed sits on its board, along with Secretary of State James A. Baker III and Max M. Kampelman, honorary chairman of organized crime's lobby, the Anti-Defamation League. Dwayne O. Andreas, chairman of the grain cartel's Archer Daniels Midland company, is the vice chairman of its board of trustees. The Inter-American Dialogue, the establishment's informal leadership body for the Americas, was founded at the Woodrow Wilson Center; Sol Linowitz, co-chairman of the Dialogue since its founding, sits on the Center's "Wilson Council."

The issue was dedicated to "The Indian Question in Latin America," because, its editors explain, they consider racial conflict to have been the determining feature of Ibero-America's past history, and that the region can expect to be transformed into a battlefield between the races. "Indian studies" must now focus all "scholarly" work on Ibero-America that is being carried out in the U.S., the magazine argues. Any nation which defies this racist view "will ignore the Indian question only at their peril," the editorial threatens. The *Wilson Quarterly* specifies that the anniversary of Columbus's discovery of the New World be celebrated as "the 500th year of Indian resistance" against Spanish culture.

The lead article of the issue covers Peru. Author Peter Klaren, director of Latin America Studies at George Washington University in Washington, D. C., presents as his main thesis that the Spanish conquest was evil because it led to *changes* in the backward and imperial Incan culture, society, and economy. He protests as "brutal subjugation" of the Indians the fact that new food products, such as grains and meat, were introduced into the diet and agriculture of the region; that the Spanish introduced a monetary economy; that the Spanish allowed mixing of the races. "The conversion of

LaRouche: Don't believe Kissinger about Peru

Democratic presidential contender Lyndon LaRouche issued this statement on April 6, on the subject of the top-down coup d'état in Peru:

I particularly wish to warn my friends in Peru, both on the military and the parliamentary side, with whom I have enjoyed a close friendship since 1975, that they should not believe any assurances from Washington currently, to the effect that Washington, in repayment for Peru's submission to International Monetary Fund conditionalities, will actually back Peru in its fight against domestic subversion—specifically, the *Sendero Luminoso* [Shining Path] and similar elements.

In point of fact, it is my knowledge of the policy, that it is the intent of leading forces in the United States, particularly those associated with Henry A. Kissinger, such as Luigi Einaudi of the State Department, to encourage a general destruction of the Andean Spine countries along the lines which were previously associated with Che

Guevara and with, naturally, the sponsorship of Fidel Castro. The *América Latina* line [referring to the monthly publication of the Latin America Institute of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences—ed.] has been taken over in a certain form by these elements in Washington and London.

What will be done is simply to use the military situation in Peru at present, to exploit the natural reaction against a military national emergency government to create the situation in which Sendero Luminoso and its allies in Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, and elsewhere, will be activated along the lines suggested by recent U.S. operations in Brazil concerning the Eco-92 summit.

I know there is a tendency in South America and Central America, as in eastern Europe, including the former Soviet Union, to believe that Washington is acting in good faith. I can assure you, that as long as Henry Kissinger and what he represents—including Luigi Einaudi—are represented in policy-shaping of Washington, the intent for the present governments and social forces, especially the military of Central and South America, is indicated somewhat by the situation in El Salvador, and by special reports of which Luigi Einaudi is the sponsor: the liquidation of the military and related institutions of the countries of Central and South America, by one trick of deception or brute force, or another.

Indian peasants into miners and city dwellers . . . combined with racial mixing, created an ever-growing *mestizo* problem," he moans.

Klaren carries this racist outlook forward to say that Shining Path's war against civilization is the continuation of "500 years of Indian resistance." He acknowledges that Shining Path—which he claims has 5,000-7,000 fighters and is "probably the wealthiest guerrilla movement in modern history," collecting "perhaps \$30 million" in war-taxes each year from the Colombian drug traffickers controlling Peru's coca growing—represents "murderous fanaticism," but justifies the rebellion as against the Conquest.

"Andean history is full of desperate Indian peasant uprisings," he writes. "Seeking support of the Indian masses, Shining Path leaders today are not so very different from those Creole rebels of the past. . . . They seek to harness the grievances of the Indian proletariat and dispossessed peasants to their own political agenda."

III. March 1992 congressional hearings echo the theme

The Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on "The Threat of the Shining Path to Democracy in Peru and U.S. policy," on March 11-12. According to the testimony of

U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Bernard Aronson before the committee, the hearings were called at the request of the State Department to generate a national and international debate over how to handle "this hemisphere's most brutal insurgency."

Aronson denounced Shining Path in his testimony, stating that "if Sendero were to take power, we would see this century's third genocide." He offered as solutions, however, continued U.S. support for President Fujimori's IMF program—he argued that this program had allowed Peru to resume debt payments—and proposed "U.S. involvement in a counterinsurgency program in Peru . . . only after careful consideration and debate."

The most significant aspect of Aronson's testimony, however, was that he singled out for praise the testimony of another participant in the hearings, David Scott Palmer. It was the only other testimony Aronson mentioned.

A former State Department official, who continues to advise the Bush administration on Peruvian affairs, Scott Palmer raised the possibility of negotiating a deal with Shining Path at the hearings. Posing whether "a strategy [could] be pursued designed to bring Shining Path to negotiations for a peaceful resolution of the conflict," Palmer answered: "To date, Shining Path has shown no interest whatsoever in engaging the government of Peru in any kind of dialogue. . . .

As long as [Abimael] Guzmán [Reynoso] leads Shining Path, the military option will prevail and no compromise is possible *even though there are some elements within the organization who would prefer a more moderate line*. This means that the government of Peru must respond with military force if it is to have any realistic expectation of ending the insurgent threat” (emphasis added).

Palmer argued that the United States should provide aid and training to Peru’s military, in order to “give the United States the opportunity to influence positively through training and conditionality more complete respect for human rights observance in military operations,” and join Peru’s Congress in opposing the declaration of emergency zones under military control in areas where Shining Path has launched major operations.

The next day, Aronson told the committee that “Scott Palmer, who testified yesterday, posed the problem well. He said revolutions don’t succeed, governments fail.” He left Palmer’s mooted of negotiations unchallenged.

Palmer is no minor commentator on Peruvian affairs. Currently heading the Latin American Studies Program at Boston University, throughout most of the 1980s Palmer served as associate dean of Latin American studies at the State Department’s Foreign Service Institute, and reportedly still advises the U.S. government on Peru.

A Shining Path “specialist,” Palmer’s knowledge of their leaders is first-hand, extending back to the period in the 1960s when he ran a Peace Corps program out of the University of Huamanga in Ayacucho, Peru, the university where Shining Path was founded, and its leadership recruited. From 1963 to 1978, various leaders of Shining Path held posts at the university, which was dominated by anthropologist Efraín Morote Best, who served as professor and rector during the 1960s and 1970s when Shining Path was being assembled. Morote Best is an outspoken defender of Shining Path into the 1980s, three of whose children joined Shining Path’s ranks, including Osmán Morote Barrionuevo, number two in the Shining Path command.

In April 1984, at a seminar at the U.S. National Defense University, Palmer went so far as to characterize Shining Path’s fighting in Ayacucho as similar in historic importance to Simón Bolívar’s final battle against the Spanish crown in 1824. It is “conceivable,” he stated, “that the Battle of Ayacucho in the 1980s may acquire the same significance for the ‘liberation’ of the marginalized of Latin America that the Battle of Ayacucho of 1824 did in the struggle for independence from Spain.”

IV. OAS Human Rights Commission dialogue with Shining Path

The activities of the Organization of American States Human Rights Commission (OAS HRC) delegation which visited Peru between Oct. 28 and Nov. 2, 1991, exemplify how U.S.-dominated agencies have already been deployed

on behalf of Shining Path’s war of genocide against Peru.

Commission president Patrick Robinson of Jamaica led the delegation, which included commission executive secretary Edith Márquez, and delegates from Venezuela (Marco Tulio Bruni Celli), Argentina (Oscar Luján), Brazil (Gilda Russomano), Honduras (Leo Valladares), and the United States (Michael Reisman).

Its official mandate was to review the human rights situation in Peru, and in particular, nine “disappearances” attributed to the military, which the Bush administration demanded be clarified as a condition for resumption of U.S. anti-drug assistance to Peru. The hemispheric clout which the commission wields was noted by Peru’s *Caretas* magazine, which pointed out in its Oct. 28 issue that previous OAS HRC visits “had made history in the continent. In 1978, the report drawn up by the HRC after its inspection in Nicaragua led the OAS to demand Somoza’s resignation. That same year, the HRC mediated between the Colombian government and the M-19 armed group. . . The 1979 visit of the HRC to [General] Videla’s Argentina marked the beginning of the end of the ‘disappearances.’ ”

The HRC visit to Peru proved equally ground-breaking. In addition to visiting two of Peru’s top drug-traffickers, Carlos Langberg Meléndez and Reynaldo Rodríguez López (alias “the Godfather”) in Lurigancho prison, the HRC held a dialogue with two other prisoners: the second in command of Shining Path, Osmán Morote Barrionuevo, and Alberto Gálvez Olaechea, the righthand man of Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA) commander Víctor Polay Campos.

Peru’s *La República* newspaper noted the importance of the HRC’s “lengthy” exchange with Morote Barrionuevo. “There was an openness on the part of both parties,” *La República*’s sources reported, in part because the commission had previously sent in a representative to talk with Morote Barrionuevo. The Shining Path leader took the HRC visit as a sign that he could be out of jail long before his jail-term is over. According to *Sí* magazine, Morote told OAS lawyer Luis Jiménez, “I may come to visit you at the OAS soon.”

Indeed, the HRC issued no condemnation upon learning of the atrocities carried out daily by Shining Path and MRTA terrorists. Instead, the delegation announced that they were recommending that the OAS Inter-American Court of Justice try Army Gen. José Valdivia, commander of Peru’s Second Military Region, for an alleged massacre which occurred during the time he ran the Ayacucho Military-Political Command. Human rights cases against the military must no longer be tried by military courts, but handled by civilian courts, the OAS HRC recommended.

V. The ‘Bush manual’ versus the Ibero-American military

The principal target of this human rights campaign is the Peruvian military, who are hardly favorable to handing the country over to Shining Path without a fight. The campaign

against Peru's military is neither incidental nor short-term. The leading policy objective of the Bush administration towards all Central and South America, is to reduce or eliminate outright the institution of the military. The premises of the U.S. anti-military policy were outlined in the book, *The Military and Democracy, the Future of Civil-Military Relations in Latin America*, published by Lexington Books in 1990 (See *EIR*, Jan. 11, 1991). *Military and Democracy* details how the ongoing anti-military project on Ibero-America, run out of American University and the Uruguayan Peitho Institute since 1986, has been financed, advised, and had logistics provided for it by four U.S. government agencies: the Agency for International Development, the State Department's Office of Policy Planning and Coordination for the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, the Office of Democratic Initiatives of the U.S. Information Agency, and the secretary of the U.S. Army.

A leading adviser to the project is Henry Kissinger protégé Luigi Einaudi, the official who headed the State Department Office of Policy Planning for Latin America for two decades before being named George Bush's ambassador to the OAS, where he currently serves.

VI. The El Salvador model

The policy applied by the United States towards El Salvador over the past decade provides a useful model for understanding today's policy vis-à-vis Peru.

The policy of both the Reagan and Bush administrations was premised on ensuring that neither the government nor the military of El Salvador adopted a *war-winning* strategy against the narco-terrorist insurgency. Yes, the United States provided significant military aid to El Salvador, but always with the string attached that military operations be deployed solely as they furthered diplomatic efforts toward negotiations. The culmination of the policy was the late 1991 United Nations accord which brought the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN) into the government of El Salvador, while drastically reducing the national army and placing its officer corps under multinational control.

Now the fraud is being repeated in Peru. The Bush administration publicly calls for a "military" response to Shining Path, but only considers options ranging from escalating covert U.S. operations in Peru, to large-scale invasion by a U.S. or multinational force—*foreign* intervention which will only escalate the crisis.

Then, while pressing for U.S. intervention, the Bush administration raises the prospect of negotiations with Shining Path, while all the time attacking Peru's military establishment, under the guise of concern over "human rights violations" and corruption.

This combination alone—public signaling of U.S. willingness to negotiate and the continuous assault on the military—has already given Shining Path incalculable advantage on the battlefield.

The 'Italian anomaly' may not suit Bush

by Claudio Celani

While on the surface the general elections that took place in Italy on April 5-6 may seem to have brought "ungovernability" in the country, they may paradoxically have the opposite result: a government supported by an unprecedented broad majority in the Parliament, having therefore the needed strength to carry out radical economic reforms. Such reforms, however, may not exactly be the ones advocated by the International Monetary Fund.

The threat of separatism

The main picture emerging from the election is the impressive (though expected) vote for the separatist North League, which got nationally 8.7% (more than 10% if the vote of allied formations is added) and the record loss of the Christian Democratic Party (DC). The DC lost 4.6% from the last political elections, going from 34.3% to 29.7%. Another big loser is the former Communist Party, which split into two formations: PDS (Party of the Democratic Left) and the Stalinist "Communist Refoundation." The PDS got 16.1% and Refoundation an incredible 5.6%; together, however, the two lost almost 5% of the votes that went to the old Communists (26.6%). Another loser is the Socialist Party (PSI) of Bettino Craxi, the main ally of the DC in most governments since the early 1960s. Craxi's PSI was badly beaten in its stronghold, Milan, and went nationally from 14.3% to 13.6%. The other two small parties that supported the Andreotti government, Social Democrats and Liberals, did not change substantially, the former going from 3% to 2.7% and the latter even increasing from 2.1 to 2.8%. The neo-fascist MSI contained its losses (down to 5.4% from 5.9%) and the technocratic Republican Party won a minimal 0.7% despite an aggressive opposition campaign by its leader Giorgio La Malfa, over recent months. Probably the electors did not forget that the Republicans had been in the government for 44 years. Such a political earthquake, which has reduced the majority margin of the four-party coalition supporting the Andreotti government (DC, Social Democrats, Republicans, and Liberals) to an academic dozen votes, was not unexpected.

Months before the vote, opinion polls had projected the rise of North League to about 8-10% of the vote nationally. Calling themselves federalists, but running with a separatist-racist profile ("Northern Italy to the northerners"), the League swept the vote in the northern regions, some places more (the Veneto region), elsewhere less than expected (e.g., the city