

# OAS Intends To Impose a Dictatorship in Peru

by Sara Madueño de Vásquez

A high-level mission of the Organization of American States, made up of OAS General Secretary César Gaviria and Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy, visited Lima on June 28-30. It arrived with the arrogant intention of putting Peru under its tutelage, to put it on the path of the “new democracy,” of which the OAS would serve as gendarme.

The conditions demanded by the OAS, disguised as “recommendations,” not only constitute a blatant violation of national sovereignty, but violate the mandate of the OAS Assembly itself, which delegated the mission at its Windsor, Canada gathering on June 4-6. Nonetheless, by the time the mission finally left Lima, its members, and those who backed it, had once again discovered that they were not dealing with a colony, but with a sovereign nation-state.

The Gaviria-Axworthy mission presented the government of President Alberto Fujimori with 29 conditions, all premised on the new globalist concepts of “preventive democracy” and “limited sovereignty.” It announced that it would install a Permanent OAS Commission in Lima, which would be charged with “supervising” the fulfillment of those conditions. It further called for reinforcing the office of the People’s Defender, to act as mediator.

The OAS mission no longer insisted on holding a third round of Presidential elections, which was the key demand of Alejandro Toledo, the challenger to Fujimori who lost the second-round vote, with 17% to Fujimori’s 51%. Upon its arrival in Lima, the mission took note of the strong statements of Peruvian Foreign Minister Fernando de Trazegnies, that “the Peruvian government has already rejected the possibility of calling new elections before the conclusion of President Fujimori’s term, and that will be in the year 2005, and the OAS mission knows this, such that any other claim has no basis in fact.”

Even before its arrival, the mission had received a clear message from the Peruvian Armed Forces, not to press the issue of a third round of elections. On June 7, in celebration of Flag Day, the entire Armed Forces command formally acknowledged President Fujimori as the country’s military Commander-in-Chief during 2000-2005. A few days later, the National Electoral Council (JNE) formally recognized Fujimori as President and Commander-in-Chief, for that

same time period. For his part, Fujimori unequivocally stated, just days before the mission’s arrival, that his third mandate “would end on July 28, 2005, not one day later or one day earlier.” Within days of the OAS mission’s departure from Lima, Fujimori responded to the persistent demands of Toledo supporters that he call a referendum to ratify his constitutional mandate, by clarifying yet again, “The constitutional mandate is for five years, and there is no other interpretation.”

## OAS Gendarme

Some of the demands presented by the OAS mission to Peru involved issues that had nothing to do with that organization’s purview. They recommended, for example, a reform of the justice system, to “strengthen the state of law and separation of powers.” In this context, they demanded, among other things, “reform of the military justice system;” “reestablishment of the Constitutional Court,” through reinstating of the three magistrates who had been dumped by the Congress for irregularities; “dissolution of the executive commissions” which had been created for the purpose of reforming the judiciary; and so on. In the section on the balance between human rights and security, they dared to demand “consideration of Peru’s return to the jurisdiction of the Inter-American Human Rights Court,” from which President Fujimori withdrew his nation in May 1999, after that court demanded a new trial, in the civilian jurisdiction, for four Chilean terrorists, members of the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA), and the payment of \$10,000 indemnification to the families of each, supposedly because the military justice system had convicted them in an insufficiently “democratic” way.

At the time, Fujimori had insisted that “we are a sovereign country, and the fundamental concept behind that is that no person, no organization, can give orders to a state.”

Regarding the issue of guaranteeing freedom of expression, the OAS mission demanded the return of property and Peruvian citizenship to Israeli citizen Baruch Ivcher. Ivcher’s Peruvian legal status was revoked after he used his television channel to openly disseminate propaganda in favor of narco-terrorism, and to attack the government’s anti-terrorist campaign as a violation of human rights.

The OAS mission also proposed a Peruvian “electoral reform,” and “oversight” and balance of powers.

Other “conditionalities” demanded by the OAS include putting into effect “necessary and transparent mechanisms for exercising appropriate civil control over the activities of intelligence agencies” and adaptation of the law “to regulate those services,” in order to “put an end to their participation in activities unrelated to national security.” The OAS also proposed “studying measures to begin a process of reforming the Armed Forces,” and although not part of the agenda, the mission called for firing the National Intelligence Service’s

key adviser, Vladimiro Montesinos. Accused by the Project Democracy apparatus of “violating human rights,” Montesinos has for many years been a close collaborator of President Fujimori in the fight against narco-terrorism.

In reality, the conditionalities of the Gaviria-Axworthy mission refer to the human rights of terrorists who were taken prisoner during the exemplary battle waged by President Fujimori and the Peruvian Armed Forces against the Shining Path in particular. Through this years-long battle, Peru has proven to the region and to the world that a sovereign victory against that narco-terrorist plague is possible.

On June 30, Gaviria revealed the true “democratizing” intentions of the OAS, of U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, of global speculator, drug legalization advocate, and British pawn George Soros, and of their gaggle of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). When a journalist asked him whether he believed that conditions exist in Peru for its return to the jurisdiction of the Inter-American Human Rights Court, despite the fact that the court sought to review the terrorists’ trials, he answered: “Throughout these two years, there has existed an imbalance regarding what were questions of security and these rights. [Peru] should set aside a large quantity of legislation that has been separating the country from the democratic participation accepted by the community of nations. We believe that this is possible, because although the fight against terrorism has been effective, it is time to return to the full application of human rights.”

As one can imagine, the Peruvian government rejected any discussion of this question from the very beginning. President Fujimori himself, speaking on July 4 in Huamanga, Ayacucho, was emphatic that “the OAS’s proposals have no enforceable validity,” and that the government has a concept of democratization which not only encompasses the institutional aspect, but also addresses, for example, the issue of providing access for Peruvian children to good schools, medical care, and housing. He added that when one seeks a dialogue, one cannot talk about conditionalities. For example, said the President, “If the opposition from the outset states that Peru has to automatically rejoin the controversial Inter-American Human Rights Court, that means that we, as government, would be accepting retreat, such that the four Chilean terrorists would have to be tried again in civilian courts. Then all the terrorist leaders convicted in military courts would have to follow the same course. We cannot accept that *a priori*.”

### **LaRouche Warns, ‘It Will Be a Long War’**

The June 30 *New York Times* warned, in what was a clear threat, that these OAS “recommendations” have the support of President Clinton. In other words, the United States will apply sanctions under Amendment 43 against Peru, which the U.S. Senate has approved and Clinton has signed. That same day, U.S. State Department spokesman

Richard Boucher warned that, given that the OAS recommendations to Peru “are reasonable and global, we urge the government to undertake concrete actions, to demonstrate its commitment to political and democratic reform. We are anxious to see a full response by the Peruvian government to the OAS recommendations.”

Leaving no doubt that these are not idle threats, in the Colombia aid plan approved by the U.S. Senate and signed into law by President Clinton on July 13, Peru was deliberately excluded from the list of those countries which would receive U.S. anti-drug aid. The amount slated for Peru this year was barely \$42 million, a rather insignificant amount compared to the total of \$20 billion earmarked for that purpose. This was done despite the fact that Amendment 43 was explicit that anti-drug aid was *exempted* from any measures undertaken unilaterally by the United States against Peru, as part of the offensive to force Fujimori to carry out the OAS demands.

The threatening and aggressive tone used by the United States toward Peru has continued on a number of flanks. On July 4, for example, U.S. Ambassador to Peru John Hamilton said that “superficial or cosmetic changes will not resolve the credibility crisis” that Peru faces.

In answer to this impertinence, President Fujimori said that Peru did not need other nations’ observations. But the strongest response to Hamilton’s comment came from Brazilian Ambassador to Peru Viegas Filho. During a special ceremony held at his embassy to award the Southern Cross decoration to various prominent government officials, Viegas Filho stressed, “I have no reason to use the words ‘superficial’ or ‘cosmetic’ regarding a task that is only recently taking shape. One must respect the evolution of the circumstances of dialogue, and the willingness to talk, and one must conserve optimism and a constructive appreciation of the possibilities of dialogue, which is an integral element of democracy.” Later, the Brazilian Ambassador stated that his country “considers the first steps that Peru has taken to reinforce democratic institutionality, to be positive,” and “I have no reason to doubt that this dialogue will be successful.”

But Hamilton’s comments were no slip of the tongue. On June 11, a *New York Times* editorial called on the OAS “not to accept a cosmetic change.” The editorial insisted that Fujimori “assaulted democracy in Peru,” and that the OAS “should demand a strict program of democratization, with qualitative changes, beginning with the removal of Montesinos from all political influence.” The OAS should be prepared to act, said the editorial, perhaps instructing its members to withdraw their ambassadors, to deny visas to Fujimori and Montesinos, and to vote against certain loans to Peru by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. If the OAS is not prepared to penalize Fujimori for his contempt of these decisions, “Washington should act on its behalf.”