

## Desperate London, Wall Street Plan Next Stage in Peru Assault

by Cynthia R. Rush

Those London and Wall Street interests which want Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori out of power, to move forward with their strategy to make Peru a “narco-republic,” are in trouble. They had wanted to come away from the June 4-6 meeting of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS), held in Windsor, Ontario, with a continental mandate for invoking the OAS’s “democracy clause”—Resolution 1080—which would have authorized collective action against the Peruvian government on grounds that it had overturned the “democratic order” in the May 28 elections.

The charge was that the elections by which Fujimori won a third term in office were “invalid,” and the equivalent of a “coup” against “the rule of law.” Madeleine Albright’s State Department, in league with the British Crown colony of Canada, intended to impose sanctions and isolate Peru, and thus force Fujimori to back down from his defense of national sovereignty, and agree to leave office or call new elections that might place stooge Alejandro Toledo, in power. Most of the advisers surrounding Toledo advocate drug legalization.

But things didn’t go as planned. Four days before the Windsor summit began, during the special session of the OAS’s Permanent Council held on May 31 in Washington, D.C., Ibero-American governments stated firmly that they wanted no part of collective action against Peru. Foreign minister after foreign minister stood up to say that Peru’s elections are an issue of national sovereignty, and cannot justify foreign intervention. As Uruguay’s Foreign Minister Didier Operti succinctly put it, “There is no norm which empowers the international community to annul a national election.”

Even more categorical were the remarks of Brazilian President Fernando Henrique Cardoso, who, speaking June 2 from Berlin where he was attending a conference, stated that “there was no coup” in Peru. “There was an election . . . a President

was elected.” Cardoso made these statements after consulting with Argentine President Fernando de la Rúa and Chilean President Ricardo Lagos, who were attending the same conference.

Such was the environment going into Windsor. This rebellion among Ibero-American nations forced the United States and Canada to shift gears. Instead of the “democracy clause,” Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy, president of this year’s OAS General Assembly, came up with a resolution that would send an OAS mission, consisting of himself and Secretary General César Gaviria, to Peru for the purpose of “exploring, with the government of Peru and other sectors of the political community, options and recommendations aimed at further strengthening democracy in that country.”

As Lyndon LaRouche explained in his latest interview with the Peruvian magazine *Gente* (see p. 58), this mission is nothing but “a strategic operation” by the U.S. and British governments—the latter represented by Canada—“to try to break Peru, because Peru is key to Mexico and Brazil. . . . This is a test of will, as to whether they can use this to break Peru’s will. The next target, of course, . . . will be Mexico and Brazil.” The mission will travel to Lima before Fujimori’s inauguration on July 28—which it will try to prevent—and report back to OAS foreign ministers in Washington.

Debate on the Canadian resolution was lengthy and acrimonious. The Peruvian delegation, led by Foreign Minister Fernando de Trazegnies, rejected the resolution’s wording, and, firmly backed by Mexico, attacked “the pernicious environment whose clear intention is to promote a new election in which candidate Fujimori would not participate.” But the United States and Canada, with support from Costa Rica and Argentina, and a few others, managed to ram through the resolution, with only minor changes.

As Lyndon LaRouche told *Gente*, “the fight is on,” and

“it’s a very serious fight.” No one should underestimate London’s and Wall Street’s intention of smashing Peru, or the other nations which defended its sovereignty. However, these international financial interests are in a real, and dangerous, predicament.

### What To Do Next?

What they’ve tried so far has failed. An international oligarchy hysterical over the crumbling of the world financial system, could drive forward in its offensive against Peru; but to do so risks causing a backlash far greater than anything seen in the debate of recent weeks. It could lead governments to seriously consider the policy initiatives proposed by Lyndon LaRouche, for the creation of a New Bretton Woods System, committed to protecting and developing sovereign nation-states. That potential is seen in the fact that some Peruvian patriots have chosen to play “the LaRouche card” in the current crisis, granting the U.S. Presidential pre-candidate prominent coverage in both the printed and electronic media. The George Soros-run drug lobby had to dredge up such lowlife as narco-terrorist sympathizer Gustavo Gorriti to smear LaRouche with the worn slanders of “neo-Nazi conspiracy theorist” in an attempt to discredit him (see accompanying article).

Will the financial oligarchs go out on a limb to try to overthrow the Peruvian President?

The election at Windsor of Luigi Einaudi as the OAS’s Deputy Secretary General is a sign of what London and Wall Street plan for the next stage of the fight. Brought into the State Department in the early 1970s by Henry Kissinger, “Peru specialist” Einaudi—he has spent three decades profiling Peru’s key institutions, especially its Armed Forces—is the embodiment of the enemy Lyndon LaRouche has been battling for thirty years. Like Kissinger, he is a rabid Malthusian, who rants against “population overflow” and the “appalling destructive power” of protectionism (otherwise known as the American System of political economy, in opposition to British free trade).

A longtime *éminence grise* of State Department policy for the Americas, Einaudi has been the driving force behind the proposal to transform the OAS into a regional instrument for supranational government, something he fought for while serving as President George Bush’s Ambassador to the OAS. Removed by the Clinton Administration in 1993, Einaudi returned to the State Department, where he has remained until now.

From his new post at the OAS, and with co-thinker Arturo Valenzuela serving as U.S. National Security Director for Inter-American Affairs, Einaudi will now try to push acceptance of his “preventive diplomacy” initiative, which is intimately linked to the Peruvian situation. This insane concept would allow OAS action against nations which *might*, at some future point, pose a threat to “the rule of law” or the global world order (see “Behind the War on Peru: Wall Street’s Drive for Limited Sovereignty,” *EIR*, June 9, 2000).

### Narco Twins

Any doubts about the purpose of the OAS mission to Peru are dispelled by examining the pedigrees of the Gaviria-Axworthy duo that is preparing to lecture President Fujimori on “democracy.” Someone forgot to add the “narco” to “democracy.”

Who are these guys kidding? This mission is intended only to advance London’s and Wall Street’s agenda for turning the entire Andean region into several squabbling narco-republics—legalizing drugs, handing Colombia over to the FARC narco-terrorists, and overthrowing the one President who defeated narco-terrorism, Alberto Fujimori.

Gaviria and Axworthy are two of the most notorious proponents in the hemisphere, of negotiating a strategic deal with drug-runners and narco-terrorists. As President of Colombia from 1990 to 1994, Gaviria handed his country over to the drug cartels. He oversaw the rewriting of the Colombian Constitution, by a Constituent Assembly whose members had been openly bought and paid for by the drug cartels. Gaviria had been given videotaped documentation of Medellín Cartel agents paying off Assembly members, and he chose to do nothing.

As for Axworthy, three elements of Canadian policy reveal his relationship to the drug trade and narco-terrorists:

1. When the narco-terrorists of the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA) took over the Japanese Embassy residence in Lima in December 1996, it was Axworthy who flew to Lima to personally threaten Fujimori to capitulate and make a deal with these murderers.

2. Axworthy’s Foreign Ministry appears to have a long-standing special arrangement with Colombia’s FARC, when it comes to paying ransom. When 12 Canadians were kidnapped by terrorists in Ecuador in September 1999, Canada’s Secretary of State for Latin America, David Kilgour, then on tour in the region, told reporters that the “best hope is that they have been taken by the FARC.” Why? The “chances of getting them out are excellent,” he explained, because “we have a 1,000% batting average” in ransoming Canadians kidnapped by the FARC!

3. Drug legalization is part of Axworthy’s so-called “human security agenda,” which was a key agenda item at the Windsor meeting. The key role here is played by the Canadian Foundation for the Americas (FOCAL), an agency funded almost entirely by the Canadian government. In 1997, FOCAL called for governments to get out of the business of stopping drugs, and into that of assuring that addicts and other drug users get “the highest quality product possible”! FOCAL’s report, *Hemispheric Addiction: Canada and Drug Trafficking in the Americas*, argued that the time has come for “the legalization of the drug trade . . . to transform the drug problem from a moral issue, to a strictly medical question.” The same FOCAL report defended “narco-guerrillas” as “motivated by political convictions. . . . They want to overthrow the system in place; their aspiration generally is to redistribute the state revenues more equitably.”