

Project Democracy to Peru: 'It ain't democracy, unless our guy wins'

by Gretchen Small

You've heard of the "New Economy"? The nation of Peru was just given a brutal lesson in the rules which govern elections under globalization's "New Democracy."

A record 70%-plus of the Peruvian electorate turned out to vote in the Presidential election on April 9; but before the votes were counted, the United States, British, and French governments, the Organization of American States (OAS), and the European Union informed the government of Peru that only one outcome were acceptable: that President Alberto Fujimori be credited with less than 50% of the votes, so that a run-off election with his leading contender, former World Bank official Alejandro Toledo, were required. How Peruvians actually voted is immaterial, government officials were informed. If President Fujimori gets more than 50% of the valid votes cast, the vote will be dismissed as fraud, *ipso facto*, and Peru will be declared "undemocratic," its international ties cut, an economic embargo imposed, and a violent uprising and/or military coup organized by the international community will be arranged to overturn the voters' decision.

The vote was close. Peruvian electoral authorities finally announced on the evening of April 12, that with 97.7% of the vote counted, President Fujimori had received 49.8% of the votes, and Toledo, 40.3%. The remaining 10% of the vote was divided among six other candidates. A run-off election must be held within 40 days.

Just who is the "dictator" here, and who committed the fraud? The "international community" has already informed Peru that they, and their bought-and-paid-for non-governmental organizations (NGOs), intend to run the upcoming elections, and will decide the outcome of the run-off vote. Peru has become a "test case," it is now proclaimed, of the principle that leaders who refuse to bow before globalization, must be "voted" out of office—if necessary, by throwing out

the vote of their own population.

With this, "democracy" under globalization has become synonymous with fraud, in which the self-proclaimed representatives of the "international community" dictate the outcome of elections in advance, and a nation's voters are allowed merely to play out their assigned roles in a democratic theater of the absurd.

There is a cost, however, when "democracy" is shown to be but a new name for dictatorship and fraud. The public display of raw force deployed against Peru during the election count, has not been lost on patriots of other nations, including those within the United States itself, where the same machine which mobilized to crush Peru, is on a drive to eliminate U.S. citizens' right to vote in the course of the year 2000 Presidential elections. Rebellion against this perverse parody of "democracy," will explode worldwide, as it is now exploding against globalization's other hated axiom, free trade.

Transparent coup attempt

Like a twist upon the title of a Gabriel García Márquez novel, this was a tale of a coup foretold. The coup attempted here, however, was not run by President Fujimori, but by Project Democracy, the international apparatus established at the behest of London's Wall Street allies, first made notorious with George Bush and Oliver North's Iran-Contra arms- and drug-running scheme.

The Peru operation hung upon an election-monitoring NGO called *Transparencia*, nominally staffed by Peruvians, but financed principally by Project Democracy's National Endowment for Democracy. As *EIR* documented in our March 31, 2000 issue, *Transparencia* was created by a group of British-trained psychiatrists and terrorist controllers, and is associated with promoters of drug legalization, such as the



Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori

George Soros-funded Andean Council of Jurists.

During the months leading up to the election, *Transparencia* officials stated loudly and repeatedly that no fair elections were possible, as long as President Fujimori was a candidate. Why? Because he is “anti-democratic,” since he deployed the institutions of the nation-state to crush the narco-terrorists, rather than negotiate with them. *Transparencia*’s assignment was to announce a “quick count” of projected election results within a few hours of the polls closing, but before official results were tabulated, based on a sample of returns from a small percentage of polling places.

The U.S. State Department then declared *Transparencia* to be an impartial body, and informed Peruvian government officials that the U.S. government would give greater credibility to *Transparencia*’s results, than to official results. They put their money where their mouth was, and gave *Transparencia* some \$750,000 to run the operation. And so the stage was set.

The first act of the play began when the polling stations closed at 4:00 p.m. on Sunday, April 9.

The first election “results” broadcast in Peru and around the world were exit polls conducted by anti-Fujimori private pollsters Apoyo and CPI International, which gave Toledo a lead over Fujimori of about 48% to 45%. A few hours later, Apoyo and CPI International reversed their earlier projections, to give Fujimori 47% to Toledo’s 42%. But Toledo had already proclaimed himself the first-round victor, charging vote fraud in the later polls. Toledo then made his first move: an attempted violent coup d’état, using methods reminiscent of the Paris Jacobin mobs of the 1780s and ’90s.

At around 11:00 p.m., all but one of the opposition candidates, after meeting with *Transparencia*, addressed a crowd of Toledo supporters gathered at his Sheraton Hotel campaign

headquarters. Throwing their support to Toledo, they proclaimed him the next President, and urged the crowd to take matters into their own hands. Toledo then addressed the mob, telling them to march on the Presidential Palace, where partisans of incumbent President Fujimori were holding their own rally. Toledo personally led the march.

Only after the jacobin mob was on its way, did a local television station report on *Transparencia*’s belated “quick count” results: 48.7% for Fujimori, 41.3% for Toledo. Prompt, judicious measures taken by Peruvian law enforcement agencies prevented a bloodbath: The Fujimori partisans were quickly dispersed through back streets, the Toledo supporters entered the central plaza through front streets, and, after a period of time, they were dispersed by the police by use of tear gas, even as some supporters committed acts of vandalism.

‘Only votes that fit, you count’

The second act, staged largely by foreign actors, opened on Monday, April 10, in Washington, D.C. At the midday briefing, State Department spokesman James Rubin announced that no candidate in Peru’s elections would receive more than 50% of the valid votes cast, and that therefore a second-round run-off *would* occur. “We urge the government of Peru and Peru’s elected authorities to take every possible measure to ensure that the next round of voting fully meets democratic standards of openness, transparency, and fairness. The legitimacy of the next President is at stake,” he intoned.

Back in Lima, *Transparencia* called a press conference for 2:00 p.m. to release the final results of their sample vote: a selection of 200,000 votes, or less than 1% of the total. An hour late, the head of *Transparencia* appeared—flanked by U.S. Ambassador John Hamilton, British Ambassador Roger Hart, the head of the OAS observer mission, Eduardo Stein, and a representative of the European Union. *Transparencia*’s Rafael Roncagliolo told the gathered media, “This electoral process has been tremendously irregular, unacceptable, contaminated.” He gave *Transparencia*’s final count: Fujimori won 45% of the vote, Alejandro Toledo 42%, and announced that a second round is required. “If a second round is ruled out, we have every right to believe that there was a well-thought-out fraud,” Roncagliolo threatened.

Transparencia gave no explanation as to why their “100%” sample had been taken from only 700 polling places, rather than the 1,200 which they had covered.

Shortly thereafter, Peruvian officials announced the first official results: With 39% of the vote counted, Fujimori had 49.88% of the votes, Toledo, 39.98%. Since the slowest votes to come in are from the countryside, where even Fujimori’s enemies acknowledge the President has his strongest base of support, the vote pointed to a likely first-round Fujimori victory.

The State Department came back: “Peru’s electoral authorities are not expected to announce official results for sev-

eral days. However, the results of the highly respected Peruvian NGO *Transparencia*'s statistically reliable sampling of actual election returns revealed that no single candidate won an absolute majority and that there will be a run-off," its statement read.

"Nowhere in the world can a sample which has as its base 700 polling places, out of a total of the country's 90,000 polling places, determine the exact results of an election," a feisty President Fujimori declared that night to a press conference, where some 200, mostly foreign journalists pounded him as to why the Peruvian government did not simply agree to hold a second round, "to calm the international community." Pointing out that the final election results were not yet in, Fujimori made the obvious point that statistical averages are not results. The vote of every Peruvian is equally valid, and a statistical margin of error of mere samples wipes out thousands of peoples' votes, he said.

In Peru, the National Office of Electoral Processes (ONPE) will decide the results. Anything else would violate Peruvian law, Fujimori said. "The results must be respected. . . . The will of the people will have to be respected, and other countries cannot disregard this decision."

The line-up against Peru

The plotters growled that Fujimori had shown no sign of conciliation toward their blackmail. Pressure against the country intensified. A series of ultimata were issued in quick succession on Tuesday, April 11:

- At the daily briefing, White House spokesman Joe Lockhardt declared: "We certainly expect that there will be a run-off. We have confidence in the quick count that was done that showed the need for a run-off, and it's very, very important as far as the legitimacies of these elections that the international community and the people of Peru have faith in the process. . . . Serious questions will be raised if the vote count indicated something otherwise."

- The head of the OAS observer mission, Eduardo Stein, threatened: "A first-round victory simply would not be a politically acceptable result for the Peruvian electorate or the international community. And it would have grave repercussions for Peru."

- Gen. Barry McCaffrey (ret.), the head of President Clinton's anti-drug program, and considered, up to that point, a friend of Peru, told Ibero-American reporters in Washington that any further U.S. cooperation with Peru will depend on Peru demonstrating "convincingly" that the elections were "clean, and above all reproach."

- The U.S. Senate passed a resolution calling upon the Clinton administration to cut all ties with Peru, should the "international community" not like the vote results.

On Wednesday, April 12, U.S. Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Thomas Pickering called Peruvian Prime Minister Alberto Bustamante, to deliver what a State Department official called a "stark" message to Peru.

Any pretense of concern over how Peruvians voted was dropped. Without a trace of irony, the *Washington Post* reported: "International observers said fraud was not widespread enough to invalidate the results. The only thing that could do that, Stein said, is if Fujimori declares victory in the first round."

The British Ambassador to Peru, Roger Hart, baldly told the press: "What difference does it make whether the result is 50.1% or 49.9%?" Only a second round vote can "clean up Peru's image." The French Ambassador to Peru, Antoine Blanca, after meeting Toledo to convey to him the "full support" of the French government, dismissed talk of Peruvian sovereignty. When it comes to democracy, he said, "no borders exist." The OAS's Stein met for several hours with the Japanese ambassador to Peru, to head off any support from Japan, a country which has been close to the Peruvian government.

The Inter-American Dialogue convened a high-level meeting in Washington, to map out the next phase of the war. Among those present was Bush-man Elliott Abrams (the self-proclaimed "marshall" of the Nicaraguan Contras), who published an article in the *Washington Post* that same day, spelling out the plans under discussion: "If Fujimori . . . declares himself President for five more years, he will be a pariah. We will take the lead in organizing Latin and European democracies to isolate him and his government, block Peru's access to international financial institutions, and end bilateral and multilateral cooperation. We will rally Peru's influential business community by showing it that its interests as well lie in democracy. We will reach out to the Peruvian military to persuade it to back democracy."

'Colombianization' of Peru

Project Democracy won in Act Two, by forcing a second round run-off. But the biggest loser in this affair, may soon prove to be the United States itself, for serving as the instrument of this disgusting show. Relations with Peru have been incalculably damaged, and U.S. relations with Peru's neighbors have been harmed as well. "Senior Latin American diplomats" based in Lima were very upset over the "tough language" used by Pickering, the *New York Times* reported on April 13.

Within Peru, Fujimori's Vice Presidential running mate, Francisco Tudela, has taken the point in articulating the profound outrage at Peru being treated as if it was "a banana republic." In an interview broadcast on cable TV Channel 10 on April 12, Tudela charged that Toledo is organizing "sedition" on behalf of those who control him. "They want to control the Latin American political chessboard. . . . Look at what we have: Colombia in a profound crisis, Mexico, on the eve of an electoral process, the same thing in Venezuela," he said. Tudela named U.S. Vice President Al Gore and the Socialist International in Europe as some of those conspiring to use Peru to set a global precedent. Peru is the "antipasto"

for the appetites of “radical democrats . . . [who] want to tell us how and who should govern us,” he charged. “But we have to exist. We cannot sacrifice our existence to relieve the anxiety of intellectuals and the financial interests of powerful NGOs.”

Tudela pointed to the battle over the drug trade in the region, as a key factor in the assault on Peru. There are two paradigms before the continent, he said: Colombia, and Peru. In Colombia, narco-terrorists rage and the government negotiates, while in Peru there is relative peace, after Fujimori refused to negotiate, and instead crushed the narco-terrorist assault in the early 1990s.

In the lead-up to the elections, other prominent Peruvians, among them the leading journalist Patricio Ricketts, and Congressman Alfonso Baella Tuesta, drew attention to this broader regional fight. Peru’s defeat of narco-terrorism proved “inconvenient” for those who feed off the drug trade, Congressman Baella Tuesta said, in a pre-election TV interview. Referencing the well-publicized visits by New York Stock Exchange president Richard Grasso and his buddy, America Online founder Jim Kimsey, to FARC redoubts in the south of Colombia, Baella Tuesta charged that the “very powerful financial interests—the same ones who travelled from Wall Street to Colombia to meet and discuss business with the leaders of the guerrillas, in the company of Colombian government officials,” are the force behind the insistence that Fujimori be removed.

This is precisely the strategic threat which *EIR* and its founder, U.S. Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, had warned of, when Madeleine Albright’s State Department began its assault on Peru before the elections. The campaign to topple Fujimori and destabilize the one country in the Andean region which demonstrated that terrorism and the drug trade can be beaten, is nothing but the culmination of three decades of a British-centered New Opium War against the Americas as a whole, the United States included. (See *EIR*, April 7, 2000.)

Although the “oust Fujimori” drive has yet to succeed, it has set off waves which already are shattering what little stability is left in the region. Writing in the Colombian daily *El Tiempo* on April 13, Colombian former Foreign Minister Rodrigo Pardo admitted that, for years, he had had a difficult time finding convincing arguments to answer Colombians who said that they, too, needed a Fujimori in their country to put an end to narco-terrorism. “‘We need a Fujimori for Colombia,’ I heard time and again.” Now, “after the hard declarations [against Peru] from governments such as the United States . . . what is clear, is that, in other countries, such as our own, no matter how grave our problems might be, we do not need a Fujimori.”

Bolivia targeted, too

Of all the Andean countries (Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and Chile), Bolivia is the one country out-

side of Fujimori’s Peru, where the government is committed to a hard-line anti-drug policy. Now, the existence of that government also, headed by a retired general, President Hugo Bánzer, is threatened.

Riding on the back of the international anti-Peru campaign, Bolivian coca growers linked with the FARC narco-terrorists of Colombia moved to seize control over protests against World Bank-dictated plans to raise the price of water in various Bolivian cities by 20 to 35%. Led by Evo Morales and his George Soros-funded shock troops in the Andean Council of Coca Producers, protests against water privatization plans in the first week of April turned violent, forcing the imposition of a 90-day state of emergency. Simultaneously with the protests, Congressmen from the Free Bolivia Movement (MBL), a political party in the leadership of Fidel Castro’s continental narco-terrorist association, the São Paulo Forum, launched a campaign for President Bánzer to resign.

Alejandro Toledo, Peru’s Tony Blair

Despite the international brutality against Peru, the outcome of the run-off election is by no means assured. Toledo, Project Democracy’s poster boy, may be loved internationally, but in the past days’ crisis, he revealed himself to Peruvians as a willing tool of those who would return Peru to chaos and terrorism. And that has scared his more thoughtful countrymen.

Before the elections, Toledo promised to lead a “popular upheaval to prevent an illegitimate government from controlling Peru.” Married to a white Belgian anthropologist (the kind that hangs Incan symbols on her gold necklaces), Toledo opened his final campaign rally with an Indian ritual, spoke of splitting the country along its old fault lines, of Andean provinces versus Lima centralism, and promised to hold his inauguration, not in the capital, but in the Indian ruins of Machupicchu. He suggested that, as President, he would consider a major purge of the Armed Forces, and might agree to set up a “Truth Commission” to persecute the military for its anti-terrorist war.

Asked by a Peruvian television commentator on April 12, if perhaps Toledo was a kind of “Andean Mussolini,” Vice Presidential candidate Tudela demurred. “There is a pre-established script. . . . I don’t see a person of flesh and blood, but a theater mask, as if from a Mexican soap-opera.”

Toledo is, indeed, the perfect dope to fulfill this assigned role. Proudly calling himself “the Tony Blair of the region,” he recently reminisced to the *Washington Post* of his student days at San Francisco University, and the most infamous of the United States’s narco-hippie dens of the 1960s, the LSD-ridden, marijuana-sodden district of Haight-Ashbury. As the *Post* reported its conversation with Toledo: “‘Yeah, man, I remember the Sixties in the Haight real well,’ he said in a fluent English, leaning back with a grin. ‘Those were great times, fun times.’”