

Elections in Peru: London Candidate Wins

by Luis Ernesto Vásquez Medina

June 27—The June 5 Peruvian Presidential elections had an unexpected result: Ollanta Humala, the City of London's candidate, won. This, despite the fact that just two weeks before the second, run-off vote, Keiko Fujimori, the daughter of former President Alberto Fujimori (1990-2000), was showing a consistent 5-7 point advantage.

What happened in that short period of time that enabled Humala, a long-standing British project, to win, albeit by a narrow margin?

The answer lies in the multi-million-dollar campaign launched from the seats of international financial power to ensure that no new Fujimori came to power in Peru. And the reason the international banks, especially the London banks, hate Fujimori, has little to do with strictly economic issues as such, at a moment when the whole international monetary-financial system is in crisis. The preference of international private banks for former Lt. Col. Ollanta Humala has more to do with the issue of narcoterrorism.

EIR exposed Humala and his "ethno-nationalist" project as a neo-fascist operation created by British-run international Synarchists in its book, *The Return of the Beasts: International Neo-Fascism Behind Humala*, published in Peru during the 2006 Presidential elections, in which Lt. Col. Humala, then a relative unknown, was put up for his first Presidential run. *Return of the Beasts* played a key role in blocking Humala's bid for the Presidency that year, by demonstrating that this unstable, existentialist, drug-pushing former military officer was a tool of unrepentent outright Nazi networks stretching back into France and Spain. Humala's entire family are wild-eyed ideologues of British race science, separatism, and economic feudalism: his father Isaac is a French-trained indigenist; his brother, Antauro, led a military putsch linked to cocaine traffickers in January 2005, not more successful than Ollanta's own 2000 uprising against President Fujimori.

While Humala campaigned by painting the bloody *Sendero Luminoso* leader Abimael Guzmán as a Peru-

vian Robin Hood in the media, candidate Keiko Fujimori mentioned a name at the beginning of the second round of voting that the private London banks did not like at all: in an interview granted to the AFP news agency, she said: "On matters of security, I feel that President [Alvaro] Uribe made great strides and has given stability to Colombia. It is a model that I will follow."

The Uribe Precedent

Alvaro Uribe, who like Alberto Fujimori for most of his Presidency, accepted the economic policies that London dictated, nonetheless demonstrated that a small country such as Colombia, if there is political will, can withstand destruction, if it is prepared to take on the new "Opium War" which Great Britain has unleashed in Ibero-America and globally. When the then-Colombian President, who in the course of two terms in office (2002-10) had succeeded in cornering the narcoterrorist FARC, asked the Colombian population for more time to fulfill his promise to permanently uproot the FARC, the media controlled by the British banks, especially the Rothschild interests, made it clear to Uribe that his persistence in seeking a third term in office could prove fatal. The London *Economist*, owned by the Rothschild interests, in its June 24, 2010 edition, warned Uribe that "they would give him the Fujimori treatment" if he sought another Presidential term. Escalating pressure from London ultimately forced Uribe to back off, and in his place, Tony Blair intimate Juan Manuel Santos threw his hat into the ring, and immediately received the blessing of the pro-FARC Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez. And today, the FARC, once on the ropes, is alive and growing once again.

The ties of the South American narco-guerrillas, such as the FARC, to the bankrupt international financial system, not only have to do with the fact that the drug trade is the business of the international oligarchic banks, but also with the fact that drugs are the main instrument of cultural warfare of the British empire against the sovereign nations of the planet.¹

1. The now infamous "Grasso Abrazo" revealed the alliance between high finance and the Colombia narco-guerrillas. In June 1999, Richard Grasso, then head of the New York Stock Exchange, secretly traveled to FARC-controlled territory in Caguán, Colombia, where he embraced Raúl Reyes, then chief financial officer of the FARC. After the encounter, a photo of the infamous embrace was published by the Colombian Presidency itself, and news of the meeting was published.



Government of Chile

Ollanta Humala won the Peruvian Presidential elections with the backing of the London-based international financial power, which was determined to deny the Presidency to Alberto Fujimori's daughter, Keiko Fujimori (inset), and thereby, protect its narco-dollars.



Congress of the Republic of Peru

No to Another Fujimori in Peru

Rarely has such a filthy and slanderous campaign been held in Peruvian electoral history. Days before the second round of voting, on May 26, the London *Independent* ran a supposed “exposé,” asserting that the “autocratic” Alberto Fujimori was personally directing the political campaign of his daughter Keiko, from the special Peruvian jail cell where he is incarcerated. The *Independent* concluded that this proved that the concerns of national and foreign human rights activists are justified, “that a victory for Ms. Fujimori would see her free her father

and effectively hand him the reins of power, reopening a dark chapter of Peru’s history, which saw extrajudicial killings and corruption.”

Immediately after the second round election, it was learned that former President Fujimori had postponed his transfer to Lima’s cancer center, the *Hospital de Neoplásicas*, until after the election, so as to not damage his daughter’s campaign, despite having lost 17 kilos of weight, and the fact that his oral cancer had metastasized.

On May 31, the City of London had made its preferences for Peru known. The *Financial Times* published an article under the title “Humala Is Best for Democracy in Peru.” The daily assured the world that, under the influence of fanatic drug-legalization champion and internationally acclaimed existentialist novelist, Spanish Marquis Mario Vargas Llosa, the Humala government would not ally with Hugo Chávez, but would be more like Lula da Silva in Brazil, who did London’s bidding. It went on to publish a ferocious diatribe against Keiko Fujimori and, in passing, against the Peruvian Armed Forces. She “has not repudiated her father’s policies, and we suspect that she would release him from prison where he is serving a 25-year sentence for corruption and crimes against humanity. In fact, her campaign appears to be run, in part, out of the penitentiary where father Fujimori is being held. The critics say that the

same dirty tricks he used to perpetuate himself in power have been used in her campaign.” Peru’s military intelligence service, it claimed, was at work for her.

Anti-Fujimori NGOs Revived

The campaign orchestrated from London to stop Fujimori included not only the deployment of Vargas Llosa back to Peru, but also the well-financed resurfac-

ing of the whole NGO/media apparatus that had helped overthrow the Fujimori government, with the help of \$1 million contributed at the time by the world's leading drug legalizer, George Soros. The campaign this time was directed at twisting the arm of a financier-linked section of Peru's business sector, and pushing it with the full power of the media into support for Humala.

A key actor in this change on the part of Peru's business community was the president of the Association of Pension Funds, Beatriz Merino, a member of the pro-drug legalization Inter-American Dialogue and a political cohort of Vargas Llosa. Merino, herself a defender of drug legalization who signed the infamous 1986

Inter-American Dialogue call for an end to the war against drugs, met personally with Humala and came out of that meeting to tell the press that she fully believed Humala when he assured her that he was not going to touch the private pension funds, which he had previously announced he would. It was no surprise, therefore, that on June 7, as soon as the results of the elections were made known, Vargas Llosa proposed from Madrid that Beatriz Merino be named Humala's prime minister. Nor was it a surprise when, on that same day, Inter-American Dialogue president Michael Shifter, gave an interview to the New York Council on Foreign Relations in which he praised Humala's victory.

Why London Hates Fujimori

The following excerpt is taken from an article, "South American Summit: Infrastructure Integration Is the New Name of Peace," by Dennis Small, published in the April 15, 2005 edition of EIR.

On Sept. 1, 2000, a summit meeting of the Presidents of South America was held in Brasilia, to promote exactly this policy [of infrastructure integration]. Based on extensive prior discussions with Brazil, Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori delivered a historic speech which called for the formation of "the United States of South America," premised on the physical integration of the continent around joint great infrastructure projects.

"Seen from a satellite," Fujimori told his colleagues, "the South American subcontinent is enormous, more than 20 million square kilometers, which contain resources which make us, united, the number-one mining, fishing, oil, and forestry power in the world. . . .

"And as if this [poverty and drugs—ed.] were not enough—and this is not detected by satellite—we have to add to this already somber panorama a sizable and heavy foreign debt weighing upon the shoulders of our peoples, and whose principal, according to conservative data, has been paid

several times, over the course of these last 25 years."

Fujimori's speech was deemed such a threat by international financial interests, that they promptly put their existing plans to topple his government into high gear, ultimately forcing his resignation on Nov. 20, 2000, less than three months later.

Was Fujimori overthrown because of that speech? Yes—but there was something else. On Aug. 31, the day before he gave the speech in Brasilia, the *Los Angeles Times* let the cat out of the bag, writing: "The Fujimori regime has hardened its tone with anti-U.S. diatribes and a strange affinity for the far-right ramblings of the U.S.-based Lyndon LaRouche movement. . . . His regime could become the model for a trend."

The financiers' fear of such a "LaRouche trend" in Ibero-America was not unwarranted. At the time that the *Los Angeles Times* article was written, and as Fujimori was delivering his speech in Brasilia, plans were being finalized for a visit to Peru by LaRouche in October of that same year. LaRouche was scheduled to meet with the nation's top leadership—including those most active in coordinating with Brazil on the subject of infrastructure integration—and to deliver a number of high-profile speeches, including one slated for a live video-conference to be broadcast across the country. LaRouche was ultimately forced to cancel his trip, because of the growing destabilization of the Fujimori government.