

## EIR Investigation

# U.S. put terrorists in power in El Salvador; Colombia next

by Gretchen Small

For several years now, *EIR* has charged that in the hypocritical name of "democracy," it is *the active policy of the United States government to foment and bring to power communist narco-terrorist forces in Ibero-America*, as the most efficient means to eliminate those institutions and cultural traditions which have guided national development in the region throughout its history. We warned that unless this policy is denounced for what it is, no effective means can be found to stop it.

Many dismissed *EIR's* evaluation as an "exaggeration," the result of "extremism."

Recent revelations regarding El Salvador demonstrate that we have been right, and the skeptics, dead wrong. What is happening under the U.N.-run "peace accord" in that country is that the military is being dismantled and the country handed over to the Farabundo Martí Liberation Front (FMLN), the Marxist insurgency of the Americas most closely allied with the Castro dictatorship for the past 12 years. FMLN leaders, even as they now sip liqueur at U.S. embassy parties, join the Cuban Communist Party in the leadership the São Paulo Forum, a sort of New Age regional "Comintern" tailored to the "post-Cold War" fantasies of Washington.

### Caught red-handed

This could not have happened without the intervention of the United States, as participants in the Salvadoran supranational accord now acknowledge freely. In the pages that follow, we publish a shocking report on the discussions which took place during a three-day "International Seminar

on Peace Negotiations" organized by the Jesuit-run Center for Research and Popular Education (CINEP) in Bogotá, Colombia over Nov. 24-26. Featured speakers at the seminar included several officials of the Central American University in San Salvador and others who played key roles in implementing the supranational "peace" accord now being imposed upon El Salvador.

The topic under discussion was how the FMLN's friends in Colombia could repeat the success in El Salvador. Modifications would be required, but the CINEP conspirators identified the following factors as crucial features of the "peace" fraud operation:

- El Salvador served as a "laboratory" to establish the principle of limited sovereignty as global law. While the U.N. operation in El Salvador is unprecedented, and in violation of the U.N. Charter which prohibits it from intervening in internal conflicts, conference participants cheered at the news that the U.N. Charter is to be changed this year, to eliminate "unconditional respect for national sovereignty."

- The U.N. accord is designed to build up the FMLN as a political force, by providing the FMLN land and money to hand out to the peasantry. "This will mean . . . votes, many votes," one Salvadoran participant grinned. (No wonder that the FMLN has just requested the United Nations keep its mission in El Salvador until the 1994 national elections are held!)

- The United States was, and is, "key to force the [Salvadoran] government to obey the accords." U.S. pressure can be direct—as it was in November when U.S. Gen. George

Joulwan, head of the Southern Command, and Joint Chiefs Chairman Gen. Colin Powell delivered an ultimatum to the Salvadoran military—or applied through fronts, such as the Group of Four, which threatened economic blackmail against El Salvador on behalf of the United States. President-elect Bill Clinton has already informed the Salvadorans that his administration will continue the Bush administration policy full force, participants reported.

- Press coverage favorable to the terrorists is so crucial to selling “peace accords,” both internationally and to a hostile local population, that the press must  *censor*  reports of guerrilla atrocities, participants insisted—a tactic well-used in El Salvador, where the international media promoted the FMLN as “fighters for justice” against a military painted as brutal and owned by the “oligarchy.”

Thus, the question today in Colombia, the CINEP conferees stated, is that if the FMLN military offensive of November 1989 served to bring in the international “mediators,” cannot the current bloody warfare of the Simón Bolívar Guerrilla Coordinator in Colombia bring about the same result? Already, the leading Colombian group in the FMLN/Cuban São Paulo Forum, the M-19, has called for the United Nations or an “independent commission” to replicate the Salvadoran experience with supranational negotiations.

In Colombia, the guerrillas have gone on a rampage since October, bombing the oil pipeline repeatedly. The M-19 pulled out of the government, the better to position itself for an international “mediation” effort.

### **On balance, a disaster**

The peace accord is nearing its final stage in El Salvador. Following ultimatums delivered by U.S. military and diplomatic officials in November, the government of El Salvador has presented plans to purge the Armed Forces of all officers unwilling to accept the takeover of the country by the communist FMLN. According to a list released by the Non-Governmental Commission of Human Rights of El Salvador on Nov. 30, some 223 *officers* are to be purged by the end of the year, beginning with Defense Minister Gen. René Emilio Ponce and his deputy Gen. Orlando Zepeda.

The list was prepared by a commission appointed by the United Nations with the approval of the FMLN, and given the task of “purifying” the Salvadoran military of officers *accused* of human rights abuses or deemed “incapable of living under democracy.” Its deliberations were carried out in secrecy, no justifications were provided for its decisions, and no appeals were allowed.

*EIR*'s Bogotá correspondent talked to one military officer just back from a tour of duty in El Salvador with the United Nations mission. He summarized the situation, saying, “The peace [which] the U.N. has imposed consists of the gradual delivery of power to the Marxists. The United States and the U.N. decided to give power to the FMLN.”

---

## Documentation

---

### U.S. gave the FMLN its greatest victory

*Jesuit priest Rodolfo Cardenal, assistant dean to El Salvador's Central American University, who was in Colombia to give a series of presentations on the Salvadoran peace process, participated in the International Seminar on Peace Negotiations held on Nov. 24, 25, and 26 in Bogotá which was organized by the Center for Research and Popular Education (CINEP).*

“The peace agreement in El Salvador would not have been possible without the backing of the United States. Nothing can be done in Central America without taking into account the approval of the United States,” Cardenal declared in response to a question from *EIR* during the CINEP seminar.

“The United States wanted to negotiate since the end of the Cold War. The United States suggested the formation of a group of ‘friends’ of the U.N. secretary general, made up of Colombia, Mexico, Spain, and Venezuela, to avoid resistance to the direct participation of the United States. I want to say, as I have said in all my presentations, that the pressure of the group of four friends has been fundamental in resolving the three crises that have emerged during the peace process.

“On these three occasions, the Salvadoran government had refused to comply with the agreements and the group of four friends economically blackmailed the Salvadoran government. Venezuela and Mexico threatened to suspend subsidized oil sales, Colombia and Spain threatened to begin a trade blockade, and the United States threatened to stop buying coffee from El Salvador.

“The participation of the United States has been key to forcing the government to comply. For example, in the last crisis, the military officers who, according to the agreements, had to leave the Armed Forces for having violated human rights or because they were incapable of living under a democracy, were ready to make a coup d'état. I'm talking about a few days ago. They thought that Bush no longer governed the United States and that Clinton was not yet President, and so that this was the moment to make a coup d'état. But Bush and Clinton jointly informed the government that both supported the agreements, and forced it to comply. At the same time, the chief of the Southern Command [Gen. George Joulwan] and the chief of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff [Gen. Colin Powell] went to El Salvador and met with the officers,



*Atrocities committed by the Shining Path terrorists in Peru, the friends of El Salvador's FMLN. When the Salvadoran guerrillas launched their famous 1989 "offensive," Shining Path fighters joined them. This was the first step toward the phony "peace accords" imposed on El Salvador by the United States. Peru, Colombia, and other nations are now targeted for the same treatment.*

and warned them that the United States would not permit a coup d'état in El Salvador. In that way, a coup was prevented.

"On numerous occasions when the U.N. secretary general could not resolve some problem, he called on the four friends. If the four friends could not resolve the matter, or it was considered more a matter for the United States, then the U.S. intervened."

During his public conference, Cardenal stated that the most important victory of the FMLN in the peace negotiations has been winning the distribution of 200,000 manzanas (approximately 180,000 hectares), "which is going to be viewed as the FMLN's most important social triumph, since that figure represents more lands than have been distributed under the agrarian reform in all of [El Salvador's] history." These lands were distributed under the command of the FMLN, and will be administered through cooperatives that will receive official government credit. "Of course, this in the future is going to mean votes, a lot of votes."

The most critical point leading to the rescheduling of the agreements was the "purging" and restructuring of the Armed Forces, said Cardenal. The crisis occurred at precisely this point. The government at one point argued that it had already demobilized its rapid-deployment battalions. But in truth, what they had done was transfer the personnel to other battal-

ions. The most serious crisis came on Oct. 31, when the FMLN threatened to withdraw from the agreements because the purging of the Armed Forces had not been carried out. "The United States and the 'friends' intervened, and the rescheduling was carried out."

A committee of three famous lawyers was set up to carry out the purge by indicating which were the officers who had violated human rights or who were "incapable of living in a democracy." In the beginning, people didn't give two cents for the success of this commission, since they were civilians without any apparent power. But "when the commission delivered its report and the scandal broke out and the reaction of the military was made known, then the success of that commission was evident," he said.

According to the report, some 115 military officers are to be relieved of duty, meaning the entirety of the military command would be changed, he explained. The defense minister, all the generals, and all the lieutenant colonels would have to go.

When *EIR* asked if the FMLN expected to win the next elections, Cardenal responded: "In my opinion, the FMLN shouldn't win the presidency and shouldn't have this as its immediate objective. The FMLN is not prepared to win the presidency. I have talked with them, and the majority are in

agreement. Many FMLN leaders think that it were better now to consolidate forces, in the towns, in the assembly, and to allow the right wing to take the presidency and discredit itself by trying to solve the economic crisis. I think the FMLN has learned the lesson of Nicaragua well."

Cardenal also said that the agreement in El Salvador was possible because "the FMLN acquired the status of a belligerent force," and because the first agreement that was signed between the FMLN and the government was "that of human rights," with very precise clauses and with international supervision by the United Nations "which prevented either of the parties from evading their commitments."

### **U.N. official: El Salvador is our laboratory**

*EIR's Bogotá bureau filed the following report on the discussion which occurred during the Nov. 25 panel on "The United Nations and Its Role in Non-International Armed Conflicts," part of the International Seminar on Peace Negotiations organized in Bogotá, Colombia by the Center for Research and Popular Education (CINEP).*

"The intervention of the Organization of the United Nations in El Salvador is highly novel and unprecedented. It is the first time that the U.N. has a mission in which it intervenes in an internal conflict," stated Angel Escudero Paz, a U.N. official representing that organization in Colombia. This intervention, he stated, "corresponds to the new role the United Nations has played since the end of the Cold War."

The official said that although Article 2 of the U.N. founding charter establishes that there should be no intervention in member nations without the approval of the nation subject to the intervention, and establishes unconditional respect for national sovereignty, "there is a new orientation in the United Nations that will lead to a change in its charter next year, despite the fact that the charter is not changeable every year."

"This new orientation has been expressed both by [former Secretary General Javier] Pérez de Cuellar and by [Secretary General Boutros] Boutros-Ghali," who have defended the idea that "when there is systematic violation of human rights, national sovereignty cannot be used as a shield to prevent U.N. intervention." Thus, a change in the United Nations is expected this year "to address this new reality."

Another of the changes that is going to be carried out, he said, has to do with the U.N. Security Council. There will be more permanent members of the security council and the right to veto will be eliminated. "This is the context in which the United Nations took charge of the peace mediation in El Salvador."

Afterwards, Carlos Guillermo Ramos, director of a study center at the Central American University in El Salvador, stated that "El Salvador is a kind of laboratory for the United Nations, a sort of experiment, these are words that I like to use, but they are the truth, a laboratory which, if it works,

will begin to be applied to other countries in the world."

Ramos, however, criticized the double role of the Onusal mission as cease-fire verifier and supervisor of the human rights situation on the one hand, and at the same time the diplomatic negotiator. According to Ramos, this dual role has prevented Onusal from truly denouncing human rights violations for fear of creating diplomatic problems with the Salvadoran government.

Mrs. Myriam Meléndez, from the El Salvador office of national reconstruction, continued with a report on all the agreements signed with the FMLN under the supervision of the United Nations since 1989: the San José Accord, the pacts of Geneva, Caracas, Costa Rica, Mexico, and New York, in addition to the Chapultepec agreement signed in January 1992. Meléndez revealed that with international support, some \$250 million had been obtained for national reconstruction—of which \$120 million was given directly to former FMLN combatants to obtain housing.

Jesús Antonio Bejarano, Colombia's ambassador to El Salvador and former government negotiator with the FARC and ELN guerrillas, also spoke at the forum. There are major differences between the peace process in El Salvador and Colombia, he stated. He began with the fact that the U.N. directly entered El Salvador because the United States wanted it to, and El Salvador depended—and still depends—on the United States, beginning with the Salvadoran military's dependence on U.S. handouts. In the second place, he said, the conflict in Colombia is not "generalized and polarized" as it was in El Salvador. Thirdly, the conflict in Colombia is not an East-West conflict as it was in El Salvador.

"Coercion by the United States was key to the El Salvador peace process. The formation of the group of four friends was also at the U.S.'s request," said Bejarano.

In El Salvador, the mutual lack of confidence between contending forces was resolved through coercion. There are 1,000 U.N. officials in El Salvador supervising the cease-fire. Of these, 700 are military personnel, 150 are police, and the rest are human rights specialists. In the Colombian case, the only solution for resolving the mutual distrust of the conflicting parties is the government's proposal that the FARC and ELN establish themselves in delimited geographic areas. In the case of El Salvador, when there was a violent incident, there were only two hypotheses: It was either the FMLN or the Army. In Colombia, there are at least 12 hypotheses: It could be any one of the different guerrilla groups, the paramilitary squads, the drug traffickers, the common criminals, etc. Only if the guerrilla is established in very specific and controlled geographic territories, argued Bejarano, could a cease-fire be verified in Colombia.

Alejandro Valencia Villa, University of the Andes professor and CINEP collaborator, followed Bejarano. "One asks oneself if a comparison could be made between November 1989 in El Salvador and November 1992 in Colombia.

One could say that one of the conditions missing [in Colombia] is a generalized guerrilla offensive like that which occurred in 1989 El Salvador. We would have to wait until March 1993 to know if here, too, the conditions exist for a peace intervention by the U.N.”

He added that the Salvadoran process has yielded several lessons for Colombia. The first is that in El Salvador, the negotiations were never interrupted by military actions on either side, as has happened in Colombia. The second is that the negotiations and dialogue were never restricted as to subject matter, nor was any theme considered postponable, while in Colombia the government did not want to discuss certain issues. The third lesson is that a human rights agreement was signed well before the cease-fire was signed.

Colombian Ambassador Bejarano intervened at this point to insist that in Colombia, human rights protection agreements had indeed been signed and that international observers had been accepted, but that the problems of violence in Colombia were much more complex than in El Salvador, while at the same time they corresponded more to internal factors that had to be resolved by the Colombians themselves.

### **The press must censor terrorist atrocities**

*During the Nov. 24 presentation, CINEP collaborator and “independent” television journalist Ramón Jimeno spoke about “The Media in the Peace Negotiations.” Jimeno is the author of a book on the M-19 terrorist assault on the Colombian Justice Palace in November 1985 entitled The Two Occupations (Las Dos Tomas), which presents the terrorist takeover and the military “seizure” of the palace as comparable.*

Jimeno complained of the way in which the press covers military confrontations during peace talks. He complained that on various occasions, guerrilla actions were used as a pretext to suspend dialogue and that neither the journalists nor the owners of the media understand that during a dialogue process where there has been no cease-fire yet declared, “what the military forces of both sides try to do is express themselves with a show of force and to position themselves better for the negotiations.” He criticized the press for describing the guerrillas as common criminals, and protested that the government had put a price on the heads of the guerrilla chieftains.

He stated that the press had shown its weakness vis-à-vis negotiations with the drug traffickers and guerrillas following the kidnappings of such famous journalists as Francisco Santos, son of *El Tiempo*'s director, and Diana Turbay. According to Jimeno, before those kidnappings, *El Tiempo* had opposed negotiations but that afterwards, the newspaper had changed its line and granted space to the demands of the traffickers in its pages. Thanks to that, said Jimeno, there were negotiations with the narcos and that focus of violence ended.

According to Jimeno, when the military operation cur-

## **U.N. military intelligence says FMLN has no backing**

*A military intelligence source from the United Nations Organization in El Salvador (Onusal) offered the following on-the-ground observations of the situation in El Salvador to EIR following the Nov. 25 conference in Bogotá, Colombia organized by the Center for Research and Popular Education (CINEP):*

I have had the opportunity to talk with peasants, with the guerrillas, and with Salvadoran Army officers. The peasants did not support the FMLN. Rather, they feared the FMLN because if they didn't collaborate, they could be killed. The FMLN was never a large organization, nor did it have a chance of winning a military victory.

The FMLN's actions were only massive in 1989, when they announced their great offensive to take power. In fact, they always carried out very small attacks with mortars, which could be carried out with three people in a Renault-4 who later fled. These small attacks were magnified by the international press. Their actions were simply terrorist. A few people could plunge a city or a population into darkness, and these were the great attacks.

The FMLN's famous 1989 offensive, which was in fact the beginning of the peace accords imposed by the United States, was really no such thing. That offensive was carried out by men lent from Nicaragua. Nicaragua sent 7,000 men, and the offensive was carried out with 12,000. The other 5,000 were squads of children under 15 years of age, headed by some “internationalists.” These “internationalists” were Cubans, Colombians, and Peruvians who went to support the FMLN offensive. That is, they were from the FARC, ELN, Shining Path, the

rently ongoing has failed, “the example of the M-19 will become more important. Its legalization demonstrated that it did not pose any threat to the institutions and to democracy. No matter how many concessions are granted to the guerrilla coordinator [FARC-ELN], this will not pose any threat to the institutions.”

At the conclusion of Jimeno's presentation, CINEP director and Jesuit priest Francisco de Roux complained of the bloc formed by the Colombian media association Andarios, whose members published a joint declaration accepting the press censorship established by the state of emergency, which prohibits the press from giving publicity to the terrorist groups. De Roux said that only *El Colombiano* criticized the Andarios position, and that later both *El Tiempo* and *El Mundo* editorial-

MRTA. . . . To give an example of how important the role of these "internationalists" is, the director of [the FMLN's] Radio Venceremos is a Colombian.

That offensive was a military failure, and afterwards it was very difficult for them to recoup. But at that moment, the idea of "the peace" and the idea that nobody could win was sold. . . . At the same time, the FMLN could only operate with international support. Apart from Nicaraguan backing, there were the refugee camps in Honduras administered by the International Red Cross. In those camps, the family members of the guerrillas received food, health care, and housing, while the other victims of the conflict who were not guerrillas remained without any kind of assistance.

But the guerrillas also went there to rest and recover from their wounds. When they were on Salvadoran territory and the Army chased them, the guerrillas would go to these sanctuaries [no-man's lands along the disputed border between El Salvador and Honduras] and there the Army was restricted. Honduras never dismantled the guerrilla camps for fear of international reaction. . . . In the Red Cross sanctuaries, there were also "Doctors without Borders," who cared for the health of the guerrillas and their families. All of them were Europeans, primarily French. There, recently graduated doctors did their rural internship.

On numerous occasions, the Red Cross intervened to assist the guerrillas logistically. Sometimes the guerrillas were besieged and the Red Cross would enter, allegedly to assist the wounded, but in reality it was to re-supply them.

The most important military victories of the guerrillas were in the diplomatic negotiations and on the streets of U. S. cities, and not on the battlefield. The first thing they demanded was the dismantling of the rapid-deployment battalions. These were a few battalions with their own

aerial capability which enabled them to immediately respond to any FMLN action. This capability, for example, doesn't exist in Colombia, where soldiers have to be transported by land with the serious threat of being ambushed.

The guerrillas today are the ones who are judging the military, to determine who will be promoted and who will not. Three years ago one saw an army in combat. Today one sees a headless, demoralized army, which is going to be reduced by half and which in time will be completely infiltrated by subversion, because it is subversion which is determining the promotions.

Thus, one can summarize the peace the U. N. has imposed as consisting of the gradual delivery of power to the Marxists. The United States and the U. N. decided to give power to the FMLN.

Now the guerrillas are going to have land, cooperatives, administration of credit, and they are going to obtain the votes that they never had before. They are also going to have money from the state, while the only obligation of the guerrilla is to demobilize. They can say they are handing in all their weapons, they can present the same guerrillas over and over again and receive new identification to legalize themselves. Since there is no control, the guerrillas can receive two or three different identifications, and the FMLN can claim that it has already demobilized all its men. Within three years, the state is not going to have any defense, because that has already been destroyed by the peace agreements, and any little group can overthrow a decapitated, demoralized, and infiltrated army.

The guerrillas which before mortified the people by demanding their quotas of money, their collaboration, and who used serious threats to get it, will continue to threaten and demand; only now they will be wearing police uniforms, and now they will receive their quota not only from the citizens, but also from the state itself.

ly attacked *El Colombiano* for having done so.

De Roux accused the owners of the media who signed the Andarios communiqué of "negotiating the consciences of their journalists." Immediately, one of De Roux's collaborators reported that in the city of Cali, the political studies department of the Jesuit Javeriana University conducted a poll in September which claimed that 73% of the population favored dialogue with the guerrillas, while a second poll conducted in November showed that 83% of the people favored a military solution.

According to De Roux, the guerrillas had done nothing extraordinary to make the people change their minds. The only thing that had happened was that the press decided to oppose the dialogues and to seek the military option. "Thus

is demonstrated the press' ability to manipulate, and how they consider themselves the owners of public opinion."

During the question and answer period, an incensed journalist denounced the terrorist actions of the guerrillas during the negotiations, and asked if CINEP was asking the press not to report on "*boleteo* [a form of protection money], extortion, kidnappings, assassinations, and *vacuna*," a variant of extortion. Jimeno responded that it was a fact that the official army financed itself with taxes, which were a kind of *vacuna*, and that all of these guerrilla actions were simply methods of tax collection to maintain themselves. "If one wants to be objective, one must unify one's language. Either you call the army's being financed by taxes *vacuna*, extortion, and *boleteo*, or you call these guerrilla actions tax collection."