

# British know that to destroy Colombia, Peru must be broken

by Luis Vásquez Medina and Cynthia Rush

As *EIR* reported in its Aug. 6 issue, in his first appearance before the press, Arturo Valenzuela, the newly appointed Director for Inter-American Affairs of the U.S. National Security Council (NSC), defended the proposal put forward in June by the U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States (OAS), which urged the formation of an “early-intervention mechanism” for any Ibero-American country where democracy “is in danger.” Valenzuela’s remarks were covered at length in the July 20 *Washington Times*.

The resolution presented to the OAS proposed that where “democracy” is allegedly threatened, a “Group of Friends” of neighboring countries and key “institutions” would be formed to intervene to “help” resolve the crisis, as occurred against Paraguay in 1996 and 1998. The idea is the brainchild of London-owned geopolitician Luigi Einaudi, also known as “Kissinger’s Kissinger for Latin America,” and of the Inter-American Dialogue (IAD), whose activities on behalf the British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) apparatus—promotion of drug legalization and smashing the institutions of the sovereign nation-state, especially the armed forces—*eir* has thoroughly documented.

Valenzuela, an asset of the IAD, was recently inserted into White House policymaking for Ibero-America, and almost immediately began organizing for the Einaudi proposal. The first target for such a regional intervention is Colombia, where the IAD’s policy is to prevent the Armed Forces from waging total warfare against the narco-terrorist FARC insurgency, and to use internationally backed “peace” negotiations to hand the country over to the drug cartels.

Absolutely related to the IAD assault on Colombia is the ferocious targetting of Peru and its President, Alberto Fujimori. The BAC doesn’t intend to allow a repeat in Colombia of the successful strategy through which Fujimori defeated the narco-terrorist Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso) and MRTA, beginning in the early 1990s. In his remarks, as reported in the *Washington Times*, Valenzuela made the astounding assertion in defense of the “preventive mechanism” proposal, “that had such a mechanism been in place at the time, it might have prevented President Alberto Fujimori’s ‘*autogolpe*’ [self-coup] that extended his own powers while curbing those of the Peruvian Congress.”

In other words, the defeat of Shining Path could have been prevented, had Luigi Einaudi’s “Group of Friends” been around in 1992! It was the 1992 Fujimori “self-coup” which put Peru and its institutions on a war footing which saved Peru from disintegration at the hands of the narco-terrorists.

Valenzuela also enunciated this criminal policy in an interview with the Argentine daily *Clarín*, on Aug. 1. There, he quoted from the letter President Clinton sent to Colombian President Andrés Pastrana a few weeks ago, in which, reflecting the White House’s dangerous acceptance of IAD policy input, Clinton had said that the hardest thing for Colombians to understand is that there can be “no military solution” to the FARC insurgency. Valenzuela argued that the FARC’s having replaced the role of the state in many parts of the country is a problem that has “been going on for many, many years,” and that eliminating the FARC militarily could not solve that “fundamental problem.” The real national security threat to the United States, he lied, is not the drug cartels’ takeover of Colombia, but rather the “drug trade.” The FARC, he said, is only “an element of support for the drug trade,” and “in that sense *only*, the war against the drug trade is also a war against the guerrillas.”

## Get Peru

Ever since the beginning of this year, when President Fujimori publicly disagreed with the way in which the capitulationist Pastrana government was carrying out its so-called “peace plan” with the narco-terrorists in Colombia, the Peruvian government has become one of the main targets of the globalist oligarchy.

The chorus of attacks and slanders against the Fujimori government became particularly strident after the Peruvian President’s July 6 decision to partially withdraw his government from the jurisdiction of the Inter-American Human Rights Court. The court had previously issued a ruling demanding that Fujimori release four Chilean MRTA members who had been convicted for terrorist acts in Peru and jailed. The court claimed that the four hadn’t been given due process—they were tried by a military court—and demanded not only their release, but also payment of a \$10,000 indemnity. Fujimori’s response to this outrageous demand was, “Peru

will not release any terrorist, not a single one!" The real issue here, he said, is "whether the court operates above Peruvian sovereignty. We are a sovereign country, and the fundamental point is that no one, no entity, can give orders to the state."

Especially since mid-July, the traditional international mouthpieces of the BAC, like the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the London *Economist*, and others, have stepped up their attacks against Peru. Threats have ranged from economic blackmail, to hints that Peru needs the kind of treatment that the one-worldists meted out to Panama in 1990. The June 10 issue of the *Economist* referred to Fujimori as an "outlaw."

In recent weeks, "Mr. Iran-Contra," Elliott Abrams, has gotten on the Peru case. A thug for Project Democracy's secret, parallel government who served in the Reagan-Bush administration as Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, "right-winger" Abrams shares the "liberal" Dialogue's outlook on Ibero-America, and has worked particularly with Luigi Einaudi, to go after Fujimori. In fact, Abrams and Einaudi testified before the Foreign Operations subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 12, to demand a cut-off of aid to the anti-drug unit of Peru's National Intelligence Service (SIN), because of the SIN's alleged "human rights violations" and "death squad" activity. This, despite the fact that U.S. Ambassador in Peru, Dennis Jett, refuted these charges against the anti-drug unit.

In an Aug. 1 interview with CNN, Abrams charged that Peru is the "only obstacle" to full democracy in the entire continent. Abrams likened Fujimori to former Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet, and likened Vladimiro Montesinos of the SIN, who is an adviser to Fujimori, to Panama's Manuel Noriega. Fujimori immediately shot back that Abrams, who was convicted for his role in illegally channeling funds to the drug-running Nicaraguan "Contras" in the 1980s, "lacks the moral authority" to attack the Peruvian government. Because of that illegal activity, Fujimori recalled, Abrams was investigated and had his lawyer's license suspended.

Isn't it a contradiction, he continued, that Abrams today runs something called the Center for Ethics and Public Policy? Ethics? "I have the impression that [Abrams] has rather an interventionist mentality toward Latin America," he said, adding with some sarcasm that Abrams's description of the Peruvian government as a threat to democracy is surprising. "Did Abrams believe that Shining Path was a threat to democracy? He complains about the loss of life in the war against terrorism in Peru, but never mentioned that there have been greater losses among the terrorists. The most recent example is the capture of [Shining Path leader] 'Feliciano,'" concluded the Peruvian President.

Fujimori was right on the mark in pointing to Abrams's moral degeneracy. Not only was he up to his neck in the illegal diversion of funds to the Nicaraguan Contras, for which he was indicted, but those same drug-trafficking Contras played a role in the Colombian cocaine trade by facilitating the early

1980s introduction of lethal crack cocaine into many major U.S. cities. (See *EIR's Special Report*, "Would a President Bob Dole Prosecute Drug Super-Kingpin George Bush?" September 1996.) Abrams is also the lawyer for Baruch Ivcher, an Israeli citizen whose TV program in Lima was shut down after he used it as a forum for narco-terrorist propaganda against the government. Abrams and the IAD are lobbying on Ivcher's behalf, against Fujimori's "authoritarianism."

Fujimori's tough response enraged Abrams. In an Aug. 4 interview with Lima's Radio Cadena de Noticias, Abrams threatened to overthrow the Peruvian President, boasting of his own role in getting "hundreds" of U.S. Congressmen and Senators to "change" policy toward Peru, and especially toward the SIN, whose anti-drug unit received U.S. funding. But the real issue, he went on, is support for democracy "against individuals like Noriega or Fujimori, who think they are the state, and think they can do whatever they please. And when a government becomes a dictatorship, becomes authoritarian, it is very important that its neighbors, the United States and Latin countries through the OAS, *do something*" (emphasis added). Abrams said that there is "great fear in Washington of the future of democracy in the Andean nations," lumping Fujimori in with Venezuela's tin-pot dictator Hugo Chávez, as a "threat" to the Andean region.

### **Economic warfare brandished**

At the same time, as was insinuated by the London *Economist* and declared outright by Javier Silva Ruete, a former Finance Minister who is the Inter-American Dialogue's man in Peru, Fujimori's "insolence" in rejecting the Inter-American Court's ruling was going to be punished with a total withdrawal of capital from the country. Silva Ruete, who is currently the chief economic adviser to Lima Mayor Alberto Andrade, a challenger to Fujimori in the next Presidential elections in Peru, defined the program that the opposition would bring to those elections, which is nothing short of full-scale globalism. Silva Ruete argued that the phenomenon of globalization, "from which no country can escape," is a two-sided coin, where the economic side represents absolute free trade, and the other side, a total juridical and institutional opening, which he defined as democracy. "I can't manage globalization if I tried to only manage the economic part; It also has to be globalist institutionally and juridically," intoned Silva. That is, "reform" national institutions out of existence.

Thus, economic strangulation, through cut-offs in credit lines that have in fact already begun, would be the decisive means of breaking Peru's tough stance against narco-terrorism. The country is highly vulnerable, because it is already in the throes of a major economic recession as a result of global financial disintegration. London's *Financial Times* identified Peru's banking system as one of three in Ibero-America most likely to collapse.