

A parallel with Serbia: the hidden agenda of Peru's Democratic Forum

by Gretchen Small

Seventy-five Peruvian social scientists, journalists, businessmen, and party politicians established an umbrella opposition group called the Democratic Forum in April 1993 to coordinate the domestic side of the international operation to overthrow the government of President Alberto Fujimori.

The Forum is modeled on the National Civic Crusade of Panama, a movement established in 1987 with U.S. government funding and direction, whose destabilization of Panama in the name of "democracy" prepared the ground for the U.S. invasion in December 1989. (See *EIR*'s "White Paper on the Panama Crisis," December 1987.) Leaders of the Democratic Forum have already proposed that foreign intervention and occupation of Peru may be required for their project to succeed.

A more precise model for the changes which top controllers of the Forum seek to induce in Peru, however, can be seen in the ethnic genocide in the Balkans unleashed by the communist clique running Serbia today.

This is not a merely theoretical parallel. As we document below, two key leaders of the Democratic Forum, Francisco Sagasti and Max Hernández, function as part of the same psychological warfare division of British intelligence, the Tavistock Institute and its offshoots, which trained the Marxist psychiatrists who are today leading the Serbian Chetniks, the rape camps, and ethnic genocide in the Balkans.

Like their Serb counterparts, Sagasti and Hernández believe that man is inherently evil, infinitely manipulable, and defined by his race. Their stated intent is to turn the Democratic Forum into an instrument to "socially dismantle" Peru, using the psychiatrists in their ranks to direct the outcome of the devastation. In this way they would assure the fate which Sagasti projected for Peru during a 1988 conference at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, D.C.: a bloodbath of years of killing, in which Peru "will become a number of territories within one country as in Lebanon."

It is urgent that these facts be known by both those honest Peruvians fooled into joining the Democratic Forum out of a concern for democratic functioning, and well-meaning U.S. policymakers who may be supporting them on similarly mistaken grounds. Support for the Democratic Forum will not bring any form of democracy to Peru, even a flawed one. It will ensure instead that the Shining Path can regenerate,

sinking Peru into the kind of unimaginable ethnic warfare and genocide the world now witnesses ravaging Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Plotting in Washington

Leaders of the Democratic Forum spent much of the month of June 1993 in Washington seeking money, instructions, and international backing for their war against the government and their country. Two public events built their cause. The first, a June 1-2 strategy session sponsored by a U.S. government think-tank, the Wilson Center, served as a planning session for Forum leaders and supporters with top U.S. and Peruvian experts.

The second event, the June 21 presentation of the Forum in the conference room of the House International Affairs Subcommittee in the U.S. Congress, was more of a publicity event, designed to promote the Forum in Washington as *the* voice of Peruvians while providing an aura of power for the group back in Peru. Public interest from the United States appeared minimal, however. More than half the people attending the event were Peruvians, resulting in the embarrassing spectacle of Forum leaders debating with other Peruvians, in U.S. congressional offices and fractured English, over what strategy to employ to overthrow their own government.

In both events, Forum leaders admitted outright that 1) the Forum does *not* have a strong political base inside Peru, but the Fujimori regime does; and 2) therefore, intervention by the "international community" is required if their project is to succeed. They specified that they consider the primary obstacle which must be removed before their political project can advance to be the alliance between President Fujimori and Army Commander in Chief Gen. Nicolás de Bari Hermoza.

It was during the semi-public Wilson Center symposium that Forum leaders revealed that what they most fear at this time, is that the Army and government might succeed in defeating the Shining Path terrorists. In their view, Shining Path's defeat would irredeemably damage their project to establish what they consider to be "democratic culture" in Peru.

The participants did criticize the Shining Path leadership.

For what? For having made mistakes which allowed the Peruvian Armed Forces to corner them militarily! Forum member Carlos Iván Degregori (an anthropologist, director of the Institute of Peruvian Studies [IEP], and close associate of the Tavistock psychiatrist who runs the Forum, Max Hernández) charged that Shining Path chief Abimael Guzmán was captured in September 1992 only because of Shining Path's errors. But, he insisted, the group would soon be able to rebuild its capability for terror. Shining Path expert Gustavo Gorriti complained that the terrorists had failed to respond

Peru must be put through "a kind of social dismantling process," declared former World Bank official Francisco Sagasti, a leader of the Democratic Forum, to his comrades at the Woodrow Wilson Center's symposium.

"adequately" to Guzmán's capture, thereby allowing the effects of his capture to multiply against them. Others complained that until Shining Path recovers its capability to act, the population will continue to back the Fujimori government.

Democratic Forum founding member Fernando Rospigliosi, an associate of Degregori at the IEP, took the lead in calling for foreign intervention into Peru, and if necessary, foreign occupation of the country. In a paper prepared for the symposium, Rospigliosi argued that the "international community" must be prepared to back a military coup by "institutionalists" against Fujimori, or if that fails, to intervene directly, as in El Salvador or Cambodia. "The influence which foreign governments and institutions can exercise over Peru today is enormous, given its precarious economic situation and its dependence on the multilateral institutions (IMF [International Monetary Fund], World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank)," he wrote. "There are extreme cases of intervention, such as those in El Salvador or Kampuchea [Cambodia], where the international community formed almost a parallel government. In the case of El Salvador at least, this has been very useful up until now. . . . The international community should be prepared for the possibility of a new military action in Peru and evaluate it closely," he wrote.

In his oral remarks, Rospigliosi called for international "monitoring" of Peru's military, demanding that the international community "understand" that the situation in Peru is similar to that of Panama before the invasion. No one present—journalist Manuel D'Ornellas and Tavistockian Fran-

cisco Sagasti were on the podium with him—objected to this proposal.

"Military analyst" Enrique Obando captured the anti-national outlook of the group. Obando stated angrily that no one in the military, including the "institutionalist" coup-plotters, should be trusted because, he argued, military officers are interested in only two things: the institution of the Armed Forces and the nation, "*La Patria*."

Tavistock's social scientists require chaos

What kind of political project is it, which would be irredeemably hurt by the defeat of the genocidal Shining Path? What concept of "democratic culture" could possibly require the continuation of Shining Path's bestial war against the nation, for Peruvians to accept its tenets?

A good starting place to find answers to these questions is an investigation into the outlook, allegiances, and training of two of the Democratic Forum's top controllers: former top World Bank official Francisco Sagasti, and his associate, the Tavistock-trained psychiatrist and socialist Max Hernández. The two operate as a team within the Forum, using as their base an outfit they have set up called Project Agenda-Peru, which they co-direct.

Who is **Francisco Sagasti**? Before returning to Peru in 1992 to direct the opposition to the Fujimori government, Sagasti served as chief of strategic planning at the World Bank. Prior to that, he had been a visiting professor at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School, the unofficial headquarters of Britain's Tavistock Institute in the United States. A member of the advisory board of *Futures*, the Club of Rome-associated magazine published out of London, in all his posts Sagasti has been an outspoken advocate of malthusianism and environmentalism, the fraudulent doctrines which the international financial institutions use to reimpose colonialism upon the Third World.

In 1989, Sagasti told an international conference at the Center for Human Ecology at Scotland's Edinburgh University that, because it is impossible for the developing nations to acquire the same living standards as the industrialized world, the next decades would see "battles between North and South over the huge difference in material standards of living." Sagasti wrote in *Futures* in April 1989 that many Ibero-American countries "have to abandon their current scientific and technological work," to instead concentrate on creation of low-technology jobs and "adapting technology for the exploitation and processing of primary materials which Latin America has traditionally exported."

Sagasti is downright obsessed with "turbulence" and chaos, the premise of several of his articles. The obsession comes straight from Tavistock, whose operatives have spent decades studying individual and societal reactions to "turbulence" and violence, and designing strategies to twist those reactions to their own ends.

In *World Development* magazine (April 1988), Sagasti

wrote that he bases his work heavily upon the work of three individuals, two of whom advised him directly on this article. All three are top operatives of the Tavistock Institute. They are:

Dr. Fred Emery, a senior psychiatrist at the Tavistock Institute for many years, who moved to the Wharton School in the 1980s. Emery developed the “turbulence” theory in detail. For three decades, he studied how human reactions to a world turned “turbulent”—chaotic, overwhelmingly unpredictable—can be used to ram through a “paradigm shift,” that is, a fundamental change in the “‘mental model’ that underlies the missions, systems of governance, strategies, organizational characters and structures” that characterize a society, group, or an entire civilization.

Dr. Eric Trist, effectively, the head of Tavistock operations within the United States since 1960. A Mason, Trist was one of the brains behind the creation of the zero population growth movement internationally. He collaborated with Emery in developing the “turbulence” theories, and advised Sagasti on his development planning paper.

Dr. Russell Ackoff, director in the 1980s of the Wharton School’s Management and Behavior Research Center. Ackoff worked at Tavistock for over a decade, continuing to serve on the editorial board of Tavistock’s magazine *Human Relations* after he moved to Wharton, where he worked with Sagasti. In interviews published by *EIR* in March 1982, Ackoff argued that developing countries such as Mexico and India should forget about modern technology. “They don’t need the technology, they don’t know how to use it. . . . We look at the underdeveloped natives [sic] and we usually say, ‘What’s the point of developing them, they’re happy?’ ”

Nazi-communist psychiatrists

What about Sagasti’s partner, **Max Hernández**?

Hernández trained as a psychiatrist in Great Britain in the 1960s, at the University of London’s Institute of Psychiatry, the Institute of Psychoanalysis, and finally, the Tavistock Institute’s clinic. He returned to Peru in the early 1970s to teach at San Marcos University, building up a coterie of students within the ultra-left milieu in which he concentrated his organizing. He maintained his international ties, however, serving from 1987-89 as vice president of the Freudian International Psychoanalytical Association.

Hernández believes that human beings are inherently sick and impotent. Freud taught us that ideology “arises from our inability to accept our helplessness and defenselessness,” Hernández wrote in 1988; a delusory attempt “to cover the narcissistic wound caused to mankind by the progress of rational knowledge.” The role of psychoanalysis, he argues, is to reverse the centuries of dominance in the world of “western rationalism, whose narrow-mindedness was demonstrated by Freud.”

Hernández bases his work on the same school of radical anti-western psychiatry and philosophy in which the leader-

ship of the Serbian butchers ravaging Bosnia and Croatia was trained: the Marxist ideologues at the Institute of Social Research (“Frankfurt School,” founded by the Comintern in the 1920s) who cooked up the insane philosophy known as “deconstructionism.” Throughout his writings, Hernández cites the leading figures of this school: philosophers Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Jürgen Habermas, and psychiatrist Dr. Jacques Lacan. The last two in particular are the leading intellectual influence cited by the Marxist psychiatrists who today lead Serbia’s genocide (see *EIR*, Feb. 12, 1993).

The dismantling of Peru

What do they seek in Peru today? Let us return to the discussions at the Wilson Center this past June, with Tavistock’s methodology now in mind. Sagasti there outlined four points which are crucial for understanding the hidden agenda which motivates the Tavistockian duo controlling the Democratic Forum:

First, a commitment to driving Christianity out of Peru. “The European conquest of the Inca empire was the traumatic foundation of Peru; a catastrophic event,” Sagasti stated. But the current crisis is “the most profound crisis Peru is enduring in more than a century,” and opens up the possibility of changing that basic parameter.

Second, the premise that the Catholic Church and military are *equivalent* to the bestial Shining Path. How? Sagasti argued that the only institutions which remain standing and functional in Peru are “what sociologists call total institutions,” because they provide people with principles, values, norms, guidance for actions, and day-to-day codes for behavior. There are three of these left in Peru: the Catholic Church, the military, and Shining Path, he stated.

Third, that the Fujimori government will not be able to carry out the radical economic shock program he considers necessary to its ultimate conclusion. “Unhealthy tendencies” to weaken the program are cause for concern. “A well-seasoned team of policymakers and managers” running a “democratic” government must be established to guarantee economic shock, he argued.

How are these goals to be secured? Peru must be put through “a kind of social dismantling process,” Sagasti explained to his comrades at the Wilson Center. The older generation should be written off as unable to change their vices, habits, and ways of thinking. But “political training” can change the generation of 40- to 50-year-olds and younger. This is where psychiatrist Max Hernández enters the picture, Sagasti stated. Hernández’s role is to “understand the peculiar psychological needs” of people caught up in the “political learning process.”

The Democratic Forum has thus become the mechanism through which Tavistock intends to control what Sagasti euphemistically calls the “social guidance dimension” of dismantling Peru in the name of “democratic governance.”