

## Sovereignty Is at Stake in Arkansas and Peru

by Dennis Small

There must have been a sense of panicked *déjà vu* in Wall Street boardrooms on May 31, over the scene which occurred that morning in front of the Organization of American States (OAS) building at the corner of 18th Street and Constitution Avenue, in Washington, D.C.

There, a small, spirited rally of supporters of U.S. Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche joined national campaign spokeswoman Debra Freeman on the steps of the OAS, as she called on that body to send an observer mission to the state of Arkansas on June 24, to prevent the state Democratic Party and the Al Gore campaign from stealing upwards of 53,000 votes which were cast for LaRouche in the Arkansas Presidential primary last May 23—as they have publicly stated they intend to do.

Inside, the OAS was holding an emergency meeting to discuss the May 28 elections in Peru, in which anti-drug President Alberto Fujimori was elected to a third term in office, but which the U.S. State Department, on behalf of London and Wall Street financial interests, is trying to proclaim illegitimate, in order to topple the Fujimori government. An OAS observer mission had just returned from Peru, and was scheduled to deliver its report to the assembly.

As Freeman spoke to about a dozen journalists, LaRouche campaign organizers—carrying signs such as “Fujimori Sí, Narcos No,” and “53,000 LaRouche Votes Stolen in Arkansas; Where Is the OAS?”—handed out a leaflet to the string of diplomatic limousines as they drew up to the OAS entrance.

“The OAS must act immediately . . . to prevent further erosion of democratic elections here in the United States,” the leaflet argued. “Today in Peru, the OAS, in the guise of being a ‘mediator’ of election disputes, is playing a most dangerous destabilizing role against that nation’s sovereignty—all because powerful financial interests favoring drug legalization want to overthrow Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori’s

government, whatever the cost. The discussion of invoking OAS Resolution 1080 against Peru is a thinly disguised threat to establish the globalizers’ doctrine of ‘limited sovereignty,’ which could later be applied to other countries in the region,” the LaRouche document stated.

To the horror of Wall Street, and their State Department permanent bureaucrats, the arriving diplomats from across the Americas not only took the LaRouche leaflet; most of them evidently agreed with it, and voted their agreement on the inside. The U.S. proposal to invoke Resolution 1080 to put Peruvian sovereignty in receivership, took a drubbing, as the State Department was only able to muster the support of British colony Canada, and the tiny Central American nation of Costa Rica.

**Mexico’s** OAS Ambassador Claude Heller stated, in barely diplomatic language, that the OAS “cannot, nor should it try, at any time, to replace the functions that belong to the organs of the state and its competent authorities.” Mexican Foreign Minister Rosario Green added, from Mexico City, that Peru’s elections “are solely and exclusively the concern of Peruvian citizens.”

**Brazilian** Ambassador Leite Barbosa told the gathering that concerns over democracy had to be balanced with “the full respect for the personality and sovereignty of states.” And Brazilian government spokesman Georges Lamaziere warned, from Brasilia, that his government “has the non-interference in internal affairs of other countries as a fundamental principle.”

**Uruguayan** Foreign Minister Didier Opperti announced to the press that he had “instructed Uruguay’s OAS delegation to not support any resolution which could lead to the non-recognition of the Peruvian elections.”

And so on.

The U.S. State Department had to settle for a weak resolu-

tion which simply forwarded the Peru discussion to the June 4-6 annual meeting of the OAS General Assembly, in Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

Some circles in and around the Clinton Administration—reportedly including White House drug policy adviser Gen. Barry McCaffrey (ret.)—were not unhappy with this result, since they, too, think that the State Department approach is insane, and that it is destroying U.S. anti-drug cooperation with Peru, which, under Fujimori, has done more than any other nation in the continent to reduce drug production and trafficking.

## The LaRouche Factor

But why the *déjà vu* on Wall Street?

Eighteen years ago, in April and May 1982, at the height of the Malvinas War of Great Britain against Argentina, LaRouche organizers were an almost daily fixture at the OAS building in Washington. Then, as now, they leafletted arriving diplomatic limousines, and spoke with representatives inside the meetings. Then, as now, the State Department jumped to defend London and Wall Street's interests. And then, as now, Lyndon LaRouche was alone on the U.S. political landscape in defending the principle of national sovereignty of *all* the nations of the Americas, as the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy and national interest.

And then, as now—with their very existence as viable nations at stake—the countries of Ibero-America began to listen to LaRouche, and turn to his policy solutions to the broader crisis. Back in 1982, a powerful international movement coalesced around LaRouche's call for global debt reorganization and a New World Economic Order, which nearly succeeded in check-mating London and Wall Street.

Wall Street's current nightmare is not simply that the nations of Ibero-America are starting to show some spunk in defending the principle of sovereignty—after years and years of servility and submission to the diktats of globalization. The real problem is that they are, once again, *turning to LaRouche* to help them in that task, and are intensely studying his broader policy proposals to address the crisis.

As in every region of the world, the nations of Ibero-America are facing the most existential of crises: whether they will continue to *exist* in the months and years ahead. With the world financial system tangibly crumbling around them, with both "leading" U.S. Presidential candidates, Gore and Bush, promising more of the same lunacy that got the world into this mess, patriots across the Americas have begun to rebel. The financial oligarchy's political control is beginning to crack.

Consider the stunning response across Ibero-America to the news of LaRouche's powerful showing in Arkansas, which was largely blacked out of the major U.S. media.

Leading Peruvian press outlets, starting right before the May 28 elections in that country, began featuring coverage of statements issued by this author during a one-week trip to

Lima, which documented the existence of an international plot to topple President Fujimori, to the benefit of the drug traffickers and bankers, and at the loss of national sovereignty. What particularly interested the Peruvian commentators was the matter of LaRouche's vote in the United States, especially in Arkansas, and the stated intention of the Democratic Party to steal LaRouche's Arkansas vote.

Exemplary is this interchange on Peru's Channel 10 TV on May 25, regarding the various non-governmental organizations's that came to join in the destabilization of Fujimori:

**"Moreli:** The Carter Center and the NDI [National Democratic Institute] have decided to leave Peru and not participate as observers in this Sunday's election.

**"Trelles:** I suppose if these gentlemen are leaving Peru, they are going to Arkansas to find out what happened with the 53,000 votes cast for LaRouche.

**"Moreli:** Yes, I'm sure they are going to take steps in the United States to see what happened with LaRouche's votes. In fact, we extend an invitation to them. We are going to invite them to look into the LaRouche case and tell us: What happened to those 53,000 votes?"

Similarly, there was coverage of the LaRouche vote in Arkansas on a major Argentine radio station, and on television in the Dominican Republic. In Panama, in a interview on the RPC radio network, Panamanian congressman Miguel Bush asked: "How can the OAS and the United States government criticize Fujimori, when they just stole ten delegates from U.S. Democratic Party Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche in Arkansas?"

Then came the bombshell. In its latest issue, which hit the newsstands on June 2, Peru's *Gente* magazine featured a prominent interview with LaRouche, in which he discussed the assault on Peru, his vote totals in Arkansas, and the broader issues of proper U.S. policy toward its sister republics of the Americas. The full text of that interview is published immediately below.

Over the weeks and months ahead, there will be important fall-out from the publication of this interview by Peru's second-largest circulation magazine, which is read by the country's political and economic elite. One week earlier, *Gente* had published an interview with this author, which they ran as their cover story under the headline, "The International Drug Trade Wants To Topple Fujimori" (see *EIR*, June 2). On May 31, *Gente*'s Executive Director, José Enrique Escardó, issued a press release announcing that their reporters had received "multiple threats." But, he added, "despite the repeated threats to which we have been subjected, as a result of the revelations we have published in recent weeks, this Friday, June 2, we will publish a special edition"—in which the LaRouche interview appeared.

As Escardó aptly put it: Patriots must "first think of Peru, above personal or political interest of any kind." That is the kind of thinking that is now spreading across Ibero-America. And that is Wall Street's worst nightmare.