

The U.S. government is committed to bringing Shining Path to power

by Gretchen Small

The following is edited from Mrs. Small's speech to the May 18-22 founding conference of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement in Tlaxcala, Mexico.

In our publications, we have warned that the current policy of the Anglo-American establishment—and therefore, of the U.S. government—is to bring Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso) to power in Peru. Many people have responded that this evaluation is exaggerated, extremist, wrong. They tell us that U.S. policy toward Peru can be criticized, but, they insist, it is solely by error that U.S. policy has repeatedly hit the Peruvian government and military instead of the terrorists; this cannot have occurred because this was the *goal* of the U.S. government. Unfortunately, they are completely wrong.

Do you think that what Shining Path has done in Peru is not known in Washington? They know: Assistant Secretary of State Bernard Aronson told U.S. congressional hearings in March that, if Shining Path comes to power, they will carry out genocide equaled in the twentieth century only by the Nazis and Khmer Rouge, and then he listed their atrocities. Bush's National Security Adviser, Brent Scowcroft—the former president of Kissinger Associates, don't forget—knew very well what he was saying, when he stated on national television April 12 that winning the war against Shining Path is not a priority; the priority for Peru is to follow rules of “democracy”! Let me repeat this so that you hear it clearly. He said: “The heart of democracy is that the rules are more important than winning”—more important, that is, than defeating Shining Path.

Gordon McCormick, director of the Peru project at the U.S. intelligence-run RAND Corp., told U.S. congressmen during hearings in March that it is his evaluation that Shining Path will win, but the U.S. should not do anything about it, except perhaps try to contain it through military deployments around Peru, because Peru is of “limited interest” to the United States. Do not dismiss this as simply McCormick's opinion and hope he has no influence on the U.S. government. McCormick's project on Peru at RAND was financed by the State Department.

The premise upon which that RAND team worked was

that the Peruvian *military* is the biggest threat faced in Peru. How do we know that? Because McCormick prepared a report arguing exactly that for the State Department in 1990—which you can buy from the RAND Corp. McCormick wrote that the *majority* of the assassinations blamed on Shining Path were really done by Peru's military forces; that Shining Path does not play a strategic role in the drug trade, because Shining Path's leaders are too “puritanical” to seriously traffic in drugs; that Shining Path has begun to modify its tactics, and is now more “discriminating” in its “executions.” An open, conscious apology for Shining Path.

What about London's Amnesty International, whose 1991 report on Peru denounces Peru's judiciary—not for freeing terrorist after terrorist—but for not bringing Peru's military and police *to trial*? A report which demands the government make top priority an investigation of the military for “human rights” violations against what they call “an armed opposition group.” Amnesty demanded that the government instruct all military personnel to *disobey orders*, if they think those orders might harm human rights; demanded that the Army hand over the names of all members of any Army patrol to any investigator on demand, and suspend from active duty any officer who is even simply *accused* of violating human rights—even though human rights investigators in Peru today are controlled by Shining Path. Amnesty is demanding that the government produce target lists for Shining Path!

Yet the U.S. Congress and administration use these reports to make U.S. aid to the Peruvian military contingent upon fulfillment of these and other demands by the human rights and democracy crowd.

The evidence is all there to be seen. This support for Shining Path is *conscious and deliberate*.

'Bush manual' targets militaries

The refusal to face up to the fact that the U.S. government is today not just stupid, but very, very evil, and very committed to destroying Peru, is similar to the refusal of others to believe that the U.S. government is out to destroy the military as an institution in Ibero-America. This battle began when we published the famous article “The Bush Manual Plot to

Dismantle Military Ripped by Ibero-Americans” [EIR, Jan. 17, 1992], which denounced the anti-military project run out of the American University and the Uruguayan Peitho Institute. The article reports on the ongoing project which produced the book *Military and Democracy: The Future of Civil-Military Relations in Latin America*, which raves against the Ibero-American military because it still believes its mission includes defending the nation-state, Christian values, and the primacy of good over evil. [EIR first reviewed the book in its Jan. 11, 1991 issue—ed.]

When people in Bolivia began to debate whether or not we were right about the “Bush manual,” the U.S. Embassy took it very, very seriously: They issued a statement Dec. 7 which denied flat out that this book—and here I quote—“has any connection with the U.S. government,” adding that the Pentagon, the White House, and the State Department “deny the existence of any plan or project to recommend the elimination of the Armed Forces of Bolivia or of any other Latin American country.”

My husband Dennis and I arrived in Bolivia one month later, and we did the obvious: We called a press conference, and read from the preface of the book, which states that “primary financial support was provided by the Office of Democratic Initiatives of the U.S. Information Agency”; that the State Department provided “sage advice and assistance with logistics throughout the project”; and lists seven State Department officials who advised the project, including one to whom I will return a little later—Dr. Luigi Einaudi.

So I think it’s fair to say that the U.S. government has “some connection” to the anti-military project.

The two projects, Shining Path and anti-military, are in reality one. I caution you: It would be wrong to try to understand the horror of Anglo-American policy, as some have done, by assuming that they are using Shining Path to destroy the military, and once they have gotten their way, then the U.S. somehow plans to step in to restore order. No, their strategy is to destroy the military, *in order to bring Sendero, and Sendero-like movements to power throughout Ibero-America*. Why? Because that is the most effective way to finally bury the 500-year-old project that is Ibero-America’s contribution to history.

Look again at the new continental movement organized under the banner of “500 Years of Indian Resistance” to Christian civilization. Christianity itself has been declared the enemy! Indians—in every case guided by foreign anthropologists—are marching on Quito, and have been given control over huge chunks of the Amazon. Under this banner, a Shining Path apparatus is rapidly being constructed on a continental scale. It is also no more “native” than Shining Path. In 1990, one of the policymaking forums for the Anglo-Americans, the Woodrow Wilson Center, published a special edition of its magazine dedicated to “the 500th year of Indian resistance.” The Wilson Center has a group of bankers and grain cartel owners on its board, and is a quasi-governmental

body, both heavily financed by the U.S. government, which also appoints a fixed number of board members yearly. Secretary of State James Baker was on the board at the time they began publicly promoting the “500 years of resistance” campaign.

One 1990 issue of the *Wilson Quarterly* is an open threat. According to the magazine’s editors, racial conflicts have been the determining characteristic of Latin American history, and today, it can be expected that this area will rapidly become a racial battlefield. Whatever nation rejects this racist image “will ignore the Indian question only at their peril,” they threaten. They demand that “Indian studies” become the center of all “academic” studies on Ibero-America carried out in the United States. They speak directly of Shining Path. The *Wilson Quarterly* describes Shining Path as simply the latest in a series of justified Indian rebellions against the “brutal subjugation” by the Spanish. What constituted “subjugation”? The fact that the Spanish altered Indian economy and agriculture, and transformed the Indians into miners and city-dwellers. Worst of all, to their mind, was that the Spanish permitted the mixing of the races! With this, the magazine arrives at its central point: “Andean history is full of desperate Indian peasant uprisings,” the magazine argues. “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.”

Note that in another article, one of the most important U.S. anthropologists, Harvard’s David Maybury-Lewis, argues that in the case of Brazil, any discussion of what he calls “the Indian question” is nothing more than “a pretext, or cover, for discussing the military’s development program”—a program that Mayberry-Lewis argues must be stopped at all costs.

Do not forget that a board member of this Wilson Center, Citibank President John Reed, pronounced a death sentence against Peru and Bolivia in 1990, shortly after the center published its call for Shining Path-style Indian “resistance.” “Bolivia and Peru will disappear,” Reed forecasted to the Brazilian magazine *Veja* in July 1990.

The case of David Scott Palmer

I want now to give you an example of how the Black Legend [against Spain and the evangelization of Ibero-America], with its anti-military and Shining Path project spinoffs, all fit together, by reviewing the case of one of the leading U.S. “Senderologists,” a man named David Scott Palmer. Palmer is one of those who portrays Shining Path as a purely native product, which is simply “the most recent manifestation of a historic pattern” of Indian resistance to the Spanish. Palmer made himself most notorious recently, when he proposed before U.S. congressional hearings in March that, if Shining Path chief Abimael Guzmán can be gotten out of the way, negotiations might be held with these killers,

because he argued, "There are some elements within the organization who would prefer a more moderate line."

Now, you might ask, upon what basis does Palmer claim to know that there are "more moderate elements" inside Shining Path? If you look at his published writings for an answer, the most generous conclusion you can reach is that Palmer is in regular contact with "sources" which are, at the least, very, very close to Shining Path.

For example, he reports that his sources include APRA party members who maintained (and here I quote from an article Palmer wrote in 1985), "secret but regular contacts from 1979 until the present" with leaders of Shining Path. At that time, Palmer expressed hope that Alan García's government, which had just taken office, would enter into a "dialogue" with Shining Path, because of APRA's "ongoing relationship," with it over the years. Palmer, it appears, has been pushing "negotiations" for some time now. Other contacts include members of the United Left (IU) who were discussing with Shining Path how they could join forces. Are those the limits of Palmer's contacts with terrorist forces in Peru? I have no way of knowing, but what is clear, is that Palmer has been remarkably close to Shining Path's operations for nearly three decades.

Shining Path began operations in the department of Ayacucho, Peru, quietly building up networks throughout the community over a period of two decades with the University of Huamanga as its primary base. From the very beginning, Palmer was on the scene. Palmer first arrived in Ayacucho in 1962, as Volunteer Leader of all Peace Corps operations in the department. This was exactly the period that Abimael Guzmán began organizing his group at the University of Huamanga. For the first year and a half, Palmer taught English and social science at the university. He then led a reforestation project in the nearby town of Huancaraylla in the province of Victor Fajardo, an area which became one of Shining Path's first strongholds. Palmer explains that during these two years, "I knew many of the individuals who would in due course emerge as Shining Path activists. These included individuals who eventually emerged as leading members of the Shining Path hierarchy."

Palmer returned to Ayacucho for several months between 1970 and 1972, this time to investigate agrarian reform in the area for his dissertation for Cornell University. During this time, he also taught in the Anthropology Department of the Catholic University in Lima. By then, he wrote, Shining Path was "providing needed paramedical, farming and literacy services" to the peasantry in the Ayacucho area. Shining Path at that time killed government agrarian reform workers sent there, and Shining Path chief Abimael Guzmán had become director of personnel at the University of Huamanga. Palmer returned to "follow up" on his agrarian/peasant investigations in Ayacucho in 1977, and lectured at the University of Huamanga in 1979. Palmer writes that he has had no

contact with "the principals" involved in Shining Path since "they went underground"—but that was around 1978, long after Palmer was carrying out his "agrarian reform" research in areas under their control. In 1980, Shining Path carried out its first act of terrorism in Chusqui, precisely the area where Palmer had carried out his "agrarian" research in the 1970s.

If I were in the Peruvian government, I would want to take a closer look at Palmer's work and contacts. I would also want to inquire of the Bush administration just what role Palmer plays in the planning of policy toward Peru.

Luigi Einaudi, Kissinger agent

You see, Palmer is not simply an academic. He worked at the State Department and U.S. Information Service for more than a decade beginning in the mid-1970s, including serving for several years as director of Latin America studies at the Department's Foreign Service Institute. Sources also report that Palmer is now a consultant to the Bush administration's counterinsurgency planning for Peru. Assistant Secretary of State Bernard Aronson singled out Palmer's March congressional testimony for praise. The question thus may be asked: Is Palmer speaking for the State Department when he speaks of possibilities down the road for negotiations with the Shining Path killers? Does this indicate that the Bush administration has already drawn up contingency options for repeating the kind of power-sharing arrangements with Shining Path that they just carried out with the Farabundo Martí (FMLN) in El Salvador?

But let's return to his 1972 dissertation. Palmer wasn't just studying agrarian reform: His main concern then was Peru's *military*, and how the Velasco military government was able—or not able—to change economic and social conditions in Peru. Advising Palmer on his dissertation was Luigi Einaudi, whom Palmer also credits with helping in a later book.

This is extremely important: If there is one man in the U.S. who can be considered "Mr. Anti-Military" for Ibero-America, it is Luigi Einaudi. Today, he is Bush's ambassador to the OAS, from which post he is coordinating the drive to impose collective government and limited sovereignty upon Ibero-America in the name of "defending democracy." At the time he advised Palmer on his dissertation, Einaudi was working at the RAND Corp., writing profiles of the Ibero-American militaries and Church, while churning out reports on border conflicts between Ibero-American nations. Einaudi presented himself as the "friend" of the Peruvian and Brazilian military, got into the inside, and then wrote up profiles of these two militaries which are still used to make U.S. policy.

Einaudi then moved into the State Department, where he directed the Office of Policy Planning for Ibero-America through four administrations—Democratic or Republican, it

didn't matter. By this time, he was known as "Kissinger's Kissinger for Latin America." As I mentioned, in 1986-87, he also began advising the anti-military project which produced the *Military and Democracy* book.

How the 'Black Legend' fits in

Now we get to the key point of all this, which is what makes it so lawful that the second major interest of this U.S. Senderologist Palmer is the Peruvian military. This is where the Black Legend comes in.

Palmer believes that Ibero-America—its history, its politics, its social dynamics—are all a result of a tradition which he despises. This "Hispanic tradition," he wrote in his dissertation, is "authoritarian, traditional, elitist, patrimonial, Catholic, stratified, hierarchical, and corporative." The problem with the military regime of Velasco, he concludes, is that it is attempting to change the basic model of politics in Peru from one that is "western democratic," to one which is "Hispanic corporativist." But Velasco's efforts will fail, he wrote, because they are "not relevant" to Indian society.

A few years later Palmer wrote a textbook for U.S. students on Peru, published by the CIA's Praeger Press, called *Peru, The Authoritarian Tradition*, which added to the list of terrible things about Spanish history, the fact that it was mercantilist, statist, and centralist—as opposed, he specified, to the "egalitarian, federalist, laissez-faire and 'free trade'" attributes of the English system. That pretty much covers the standard litany!

And where does Palmer acknowledge that he got this litany from? From Howard Wiarda, the "academic" who argues that Ibero-American government and culture must be changed because they embody St. Paul's view of man as expressed in I Corinthians 12! It was an essay presented by Wiarda in 1971, on "The Corporative Model" as the framework from which processes of change in Ibero-American must be judged, which Palmer says he took as the thesis of his work. Believe me, Wiarda shares the "Indian perspective" of the Woodrow Wilson Center crowd. In his 1990 book on *The Democratic Revolution in Latin America*, Wiarda projected that in what he calls "the Indian countries"—Guatemala, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay, Mexico, Peru—"western civilization sometimes represents a very thin veneer that may yet be submerged or swept into the sea. To submerge or sweep it away is certainly the goal of the *mysterious* Sendero Luminoso movement in Peru and is one of the great themes of Peruvian history. . . . A small, white, Catholic, Hispanic, capitalist, western culture has established itself in the coastal city of Lima and has for a long time succeeded in subordinating the 8 or 9 million Indians. . . . But everyone knows (and has known for 500 years) that someday that dormant Indian population may rise up and . . . push the thin veneer of Western civilization into the Pacific."

Shining Path, "mysterious"? What do we have then?

Palmer, a man whose prejudices were shaped by Wiarda; who was advised by Einaudi, a former State Department official still consulting for them; in active contact with networks around Shining Path for three decades, promoting dialogue with these killers even today. Can we still dismiss as rhetoric, the fact that Palmer has twice now compared Shining Path's battle in Ayacucho "for the liberation of the marginalized in Latin America," as potentially of equal historic significance to the last battle of Simón Bolívar against the Spanish Crown?

Does the State Department agree with this evaluation also? You tell me that the United States could not *want* a Shining Path government in power in Peru? That proof of that is the fact that the U.S. is pressuring the government of Peru to let the U.S. participate in counterinsurgency efforts against Shining Path?

'Kissinger created the Khmer Rouge'

I invite those who say our analysis is impossible to study the history of how the U.S., under the direction of that British agent Henry Kissinger, deliberately handed Cambodia over to genocide at the hands of the Khmer Rouge in the 1970s—the Khmer Rouge who are allies of and the model for Shining Path. In 1970, the Khmer Rouge had some 5,000 combatants, when the United States overthrew the government of Prince Sihanouk, began saturation bombing of Cambodia, and invaded Cambodia jointly with the South Vietnamese—who had been enemies of Cambodia for centuries. Three years later, with Cambodia's agriculture and infrastructure bombed into ruins by the U.S., the Khmer Rouge had some 50,000 men under arms and controlled the majority of the country's national territory.

All this was carried out in the name of "fighting communism"—right up to the day that the Khmer Rouge had established their dictatorship. As Prince Sihanouk declared in 1979, "Mr. Nixon and Dr. Kissinger . . . created the Khmer Rouge."

I invite you also to consider how, in 1992, the United Nations, in the name of the new world order, insists that the Khmer Rouge must participate in any "pacification" government in Cambodia, returning to power the assassins who systematically massacred 1 million of their fellow citizens in the name of Maoist egalitarianism, and created the conditions of hunger and collapse in which another 2 or 3 million died.

This is the future which awaits all Ibero-America, if people continue rejecting as "impossible" and "extremist," the clear evidence that the "Bush Manual" against the military, the support for Shining Path, the project to drown the Evangelization of the Americas in Indian blood, are indeed Anglo-American policy. As Helga Zepp-LaRouche noted in her speech [*EIR*, May 22] it is crucial that leaders tell the population the truth, if they have any hope of winning the battle to save their nations.