

Document from PCP

Develop the People's War to Serve the World Revolution

Part Two: One Year of APRA Government

In the previous issue of our magazine we published the first half of this important document recently issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Peru (PCP). The first part, entitled "Six Years of People's War," summed up the Peruvian government's efforts to stop the people's war through mass slaughter, as well as the political and military advances achieved so far in the people's war. Here in this current issue we present the second and final part, which analyses the first year of the reactionary government of Peruvian President Alan Garcia whose APRA party came to power in July 1985 — *AWTW*

The Garcia government ended its first year in July (1986 — *AWTW*); therefore it is fitting that we examine some questions concerning its rise and performance.

THE 1985 GENERAL ELECTIONS. Let us remember what Marx taught: "Once every several years the oppressed are permitted to decide which members of the oppressing class are to represent them and crush them in parliament" and let us emphasise, in our case, that it is mainly a question of who is to preside over the government towards that end. It was within this framework that the April 14th 1985 general elections were organised to elect a president, vice-president, senators and deputies. As usual, these elections were called the purest, cleanest and most democratic in Peruvian history and it was said that they "strengthened democracy in the country and throughout Latin America" and represented a defeat for so-called "terrorism." Garcia claimed that he was "elected by the votes of the absolute majority of Peruvians." What is the reality despite all the propagandistic distortions? Let us look at some facts. (See Chart A).

Workers of the world unite! Develop base areas! Communist Party of Peru.



Mayo 87

DESARROLLAR BASE

PARTIDO COMUNISTA DEL

DESARROLLAR LA
GUERRA POPULAR
SURTIENDO
REVOLUCION
RURAL

CHART A
COVERAGE BY DEPARTMENT OF THE
NATIONAL ELECTIONS REGISTRY

Comparison of people who should have been registered, according to the 1981 National Census, and the number of people issued voter registrations cards as reported by the JNE (National Board of Elections) not adjusted for deaths.

Department	% Registered	% Unregistered	Unregistered
Cajamarca	64.4	35.6	198,323
Apurimac	65.2	34.8	60,898
Ayacucho	66.1	33.9	93,170
Piura	68.2	31.8	201,592
Amazonas	68.6	31.4	43,059
Tumbes	72.4	27.6	16,708
Loreto	72.8	27.2	64,521
Pasco	73.1	26.9	30,945
Cuzco	73.4	26.6	127,555
Huancavelica	75.8	24.2	44,974
Puno	75.9	24.1	122,212
Ancash	75.9	24.1	111,324
Tacna	80.4	19.6	17,563
Moquegua	81.8	18.2	11,142
Huanuco	82.6	17.4	45,561
La Libertad	83.9	16.1	91,538
Ucayali	84.3	15.7	16,664
Lambayeque	84.6	15.4	59,678
Arequipa	86.2	13.8	59,783
Junin	87.3	12.7	61,469
San Martin	87.8	12.2	21,224
Madre de Dios	91.5	8.5	1,703
Ica	92.4	7.6	19,460
Callao	93.2	6.8	19,633
Lima	94.7	5.3	161,044
Total not registered by JNE			1,701,743(17%)
Total registered by JNE			8,290,846(83%)
Total of persons who should have been registered according to the Census			9,992,589 (100.0%)

The above table is taken from the April 8th, 1985 issue of *Caretas* magazine. The first thing that stands out is that 17% of those citizens eligible to register have not done so; further, in five departments the percentage of unregistered persons is around a third, while in another five departments this percentage is nearly a fourth; in 13 departments, that is, more than half the total number of departments, including the most important of the Andean region, the percentage of those who have not registered runs from 19.6% to 35.6%. It is rather noteworthy that in Huancavelica 24.2% of the citizens did not register, a percentage that reached 33.9% and 34.8% respectively in the departments of Ayacucho and Apurimac, the area most convulsed by guerrilla warfare, where the state made special efforts to make the elections suc-

cessful. This 17% of those eligible who did not register must be taken into account, especially since these 1,701,743 people amount to 22.5% of those who did vote. Neither the official data issued by the National Board of Elections nor the pompous so-called political analysts have anything to say about these unregistered people; all of them, including the parties of the much-touted "left" have kept a complicit silence meant to cover up the facts and channel the people along the worn-out path of "electoral democracy" preached by General Morales Bermudez at the end of the military government (1968-1980 *AWTW*).

To protect its elections the Peruvian state mobilised 85,000 troops from the three branches of the Armed Forces and 70,000 police, according to the chairman of the Armed Forces Joint Command and the In-

terior Minister. That same Joint Command usurped the functions of the National Board of Elections by changing the voting places, concentrating them in provincial and district capitals "for security reasons" with a view to possible guerrilla actions. Such actions did take place in hundreds of towns in the provinces of Cangallo, Victor Fajardo and La Mar in the department of Ayacucho, as well as in Manta, Acobambilla, Conaica and Lircay in the department of Huancavelica and part of the department of Apurimac; in Tlclacayan and Yanahuanca in the department of Pasco, and in the provinces of Huamalies, Ambo, Dos de Mayo and Maranon in the department of Huanuco. The Joint Command also ordered special security measures "to assure the free exercise of the right to vote" and "protect electoral officials and the voters at large." In this way the reactionary Armed Forces once more stepped in to fulfil their traditional role as the great voter, "guardians of the republic and of democracy" in this country where the citizens and people are considered under-aged incompetents who need military guardianship. Once again we see an exemplary exercise of "the people's sovereignty"!

Let us examine some noteworthy facts about the electoral process. The elections were to have taken place on April 14th from eight in the morning until three in the afternoon. It was said that the polls would be ready at eight without fail, but in many places, including in the capital as well as the provinces, the polls did not open until noon, as the JNE chairman himself admitted. In Concepcion, in the province of Cangallo which is in the department of Ayacucho, 3700 out of 5000 eligible voters did not cast their ballots; soldiers assassinated four peasants in Vilcas and jailed quite a few peasants in Cangallo. In Chingui, in the province of La Mar in the same department, a town turned into a strategic hamlet by the Armed Forces, with eight polling places, all the votes were for the APRA party, there was not a single vote for any other party nor one blank or spoiled ballot; 100% of the ballots were

for Garcia. In the province of Huamanga the Departmental Elections Board received complaints about Armed Forces fraud on behalf of the APRA party committed in the small towns of the San Cristobal de Socos, Huamanga and Acocro districts as well as in other provinces of the department of Ayacucho. There was considerable voter abstention in the towns of Andahuallas in the department of Apurimac. In Huancavelica, 70% did not vote in the Santa Ana and Huachocolpa districts; in Pilpichaca voter registration cards were just stamped, while in Santa Ines the Army pressed the peasants to vote for APRA. These repeated coincidences raise a question: which side were the Armed Forces on? In the province of Alcides Carrion in the department of Pasco the voting was centralised in Yanahuanca, but the elections were held on the 15th, and the same thing occurred in the towns of Caujul, Navan and Cochamarca in Cajatambo province in the department of Lima. Obviously the question arises: are votes valid if they are not cast on election day? And in how many towns did this situation occur? It is very revealing that in Tingo Maria, headquarters of the VII Political-Military Command, there was "remarkable absenteeism" according to the pro-APRA daily newspaper *La Republica*. Finally, in Lima itself, with 40% of the national total of voters, the voting had to be extended until five in the afternoon, while from noon on the TV channels let loose a well-orchestrated publicity campaign in favour of APRA, broadcasting poll results and projections in favour of that party; there was a whole plan aimed at influencing voters, conducted especially through Channel 5, whose owners include one of Garcia's well-known advisers. But this was not all that happened in the capital, which saw the most chaotic recount of votes amid a torrent of denunciations and scandals. Just to cite two eloquent facts: first, half a million votes were missing, the difference, according to the spokesperson for the United Left, between the number of voters and the number of votes counted; these 500,000

CHART B RESULTS OF THE GENERAL ELECTIONS

		%
Eligible for registration	9,992,589	100.00
Unregistered	1,701,743	17.00
Registered	8,290,846	83.00
Did not vote	733,664	8.84
Voted	7,557,182	91.16
Spoiled or blank	1,043,797	13.81
APRA	3,457,030	45.74
United Left	1,606,914	21.26

CHART C PERCENTAGE COMPARISON BETWEEN THOSE ELIGIBLE TO REGISTER, THOSE WHO REGISTERED AND VOTERS

		(a)%	(b)%	(c)%
Unregistered	1,701,743	17.03	20.53	22.50
Didn't vote	733,664	7.34	8.85	9.70
Spoiled and blank			12.59	13.81
TOTALS	3,479,204	34.82	41.97	46.01
APRA	3,457,030	34.59	41.70	45.74
United Left	1,606,914	16.08	19.38	21.26
CODE	773,705	7.74	9.33	10.23
AP	472,627	4.73	5.70	6.25
Others	198,930	2.00	2.40	2.63

a) in relation to 9,992,509 eligible to register

b) in relation to 8,290,846 registered with the JNE

c) in relation to 7,557,182 who voted

votes represent 18.9% of the total cast in the capital city. Second, a thousand record sheets, amounting to 200,000 votes, were withdrawn in order to fix votes in favour of certain senators and deputies. Both these exposures were left forgotten in the final rush to end the counting of the votes in Lima, the last to be forwarded to the National Board of Elections despite the Board's repeated demands. Furthermore, the great scandal made about the rigged votes for senators and deputies, which puts many "fathers of the country" and consequently the validity of parliament itself into doubt, served to hide the main question, that of the fraud carried out around the presidential votes to ensure APRA's election. Here are some pearls of wisdom spoken about the supposed democratic purity and cleanliness of the elections, "the most eloquent proof of democratic vocation . . . a truly genuine democratic race, the mark of an unblemished and flawless civic culture" according to then-president Belaunde.

From the reports published on

the elections we can extract, for instance, the following: (See Chart B).

In this table attention must be paid to those who were not registered, who registered but did not vote or who cast invalid or blank ballots. Their importance can be seen in the next chart: (See Chart C).

In these tables the bottom line is that the total of the unregistered, the non-voters and those who cast blank or spoiled ballots adds up to 3,479,204. This great mass is made up of the unregistered, that is, those who are outside the prevailing political system or are openly against it; the non-voters, who are opposed to the elections or are not interested in them; and those who cast blank or spoiled ballots to formally comply with their legal duty while expecting nothing from the elections or not in agreement with any of the political parties taking part in them. In general terms, this enormous mass of citizens is expressing rejection, alienation or indifference regarding the prevailing

(Continued on page 69)

(Continued from page 65)

Peru

system, its elections which only choose oppressors and its political parties which serve as instruments to maintain, protect and develop the established order. This is, in short, a rejection, an objective and obvious challenging of Peruvian society and its institutions, of this historically decrepit social system that must be swept away with arms in hand as is now being done because there is no other way to replace it with a new social system that will really serve the people. This enormous mass of 3,479,204 people adds up to 34.86% of those eligible to express themselves politically, 41.97% of registered voters and 46.01% of those who voted in the general elections, and this even in terms of the laws imposed by the reactionary Peruvian state; it adds up to is a conclusive and irrefutable truth which the exploiting classes, their political parties and their electioneers and hacks are trying in vain to conceal. The undeniable reality of this mass is a fundamental question in the class struggle in this country. Their potential transforming power, their revolutionary potential, must be taken rather seriously into account, especially since a people's war has been successfully developing and growing for more than six years, and the context for this question is the developing revolutionary situation which will inevitably continue drawing more and more of the masses into real and definitive transformations carried out by means of "the criticism of arms."

Furthermore, these same tables show that the APRA party obtained 3,457,030 votes, i.e. 34.59% of those eligible to vote out of Peru's total population, or 41.70% of those registered, or 45.73% of the voters. One can easily see the falsity of Garcia's assertion that he was "elected by the absolute majority of Peruvians" as he claimed in his message to Congress on July 28th, because 45.74% is not even the absolute majority of voters, still less is 41.70% the absolute majority of those registered, and in no way is 34.59% the absolute majority of

Peruvians eligible to vote. Garcia's "absolute majority of Peruvians" is just another demagogic phrase in his so-called "new style of government" — a style of falsehoods, cynicism and demagogy. Moreover, it must be kept in mind that such "landslide victories" are becoming a common trend in bourgeois elections in many countries. For instance, in the U.S. Reagan was also said to have won a "landslide victory" which did not protect him against the tremendous erosion and loss of his reputation. We saw something similar here, in 1980, when Belaunde's "landslide victory" was followed a year later by his plummeting prestige despite polls attempting to prove otherwise. The roots of these "landslide victories" lie in the way in which the reactionaries manipulate elections, and deeper still, since elections are reaction's way of replacing its members who are to "represent and crush the masses" in the way these elections serve and are channelled to benefit those best suited to perform these functions. What's more, Garcia and his party apparatus obviously failed in their aim of winning an absolute majority in the first round, but nevertheless, in shameless disregard for reality and for the respect the people deserve, Garcia insultingly and insanely declares himself "faithful to my electoral promises, endorsed by more than 80% of the electorate. . . ." Incredible but true! This is a remarkable example of "the new ethical style of government" and the basis of his "great moral authority based on the votes of the absolute majority of Peruvians."

As for the so-called United Left (IU), it obtained 1,606,914 votes, that is, 16.08% of the total number of Peruvians eligible to vote, 19.38% of those registered to vote, and 21.26% of votes actually cast. What role are they playing in the country's class struggle with these votes? First, they are a continuation of the old electoral line, today even more reckless and tied to Soviet as well as Chinese revisionism, to callous bourgeois parliamentarism, to nationalist or inconsistent revolutionary positions that tried to trap the people into parliamentary-

cretinism, unable to understand the necessity of revolutionary violence and still less the ways this violence has been taking shape through six ardent years, and sinking ever deeper into protecting the old order, its rotten parliament and fraudulent elections, its Constitution and laws, and are living trembling with reverential fear before the Armed Forces and the threat of a coup d'etat, and on their knees before APRA and especially before Garcia whom they consider their protective democratic wall. A concentrated expression of this crawling and capitulationist attitude is Barrantes, the APRA man who heads the IU. Further, if we analyse their 16.08%, the reactionary role they play in the service of reaction stands out clearly. This percentage shows they oppose an alignment of the majority of Peruvians against the present system of exploitation and oppression; without their harmful promotion of electoral illusions, a clearer and more vigorous polarisation would have developed. How much harm does this opportunist IU do to the cause of our people's emancipation and to the people's war? Barrantes' own words so often repeated are very revealing. When he handed Garcia victory on a silver platter, this "APRA member who has never been expelled" said, "The battle has not ended; we shall continue with greater strength against imperialism, terrorism and the enemies of the people." Here the key word is "terrorism," a term whose current usage was popularised by Reagan to fight against revolution, a term promoted by all who thrive and prosper with the system. This position is not new, since Barrantes called for "defeating terrorism" during the 1983 municipal elections, and thus it represents a persistent defence of the system and hatred of everything that works to undermine it. This is the same Barrantes, that phony follower of Mariategui and real APRA supporter, who invented the sinister lie that what is going on in Peru is not people's war but only "terrorism" because "a Lin Piaoist line has seized the Party's leadership"; for this fellow the recent elections were "a rejection of ter-

rorism" and once again during his trip to Venezuela in May he said "Shining Path will fail . . . the results of the April 14th elections and the mass turnout were the best rejection of terrorism" clearly coinciding with Belaunde who also said, "The big loser is terrorism." We should think seriously about the role played by electoral opportunism and its divisive efforts, and, as Lenin said, combat it implacably, because without fighting against parliamentary cretinism one cannot seize political power for the class and the people, just as imperialism cannot be swept away without fighting revisionism. Furthermore, that 16.08% for the IU made it easier for APRA to take the presidency, and shamelessly fit the reactionary plan. What was the excuse they invoked? That "the people voted for change by electing the left" as the APRA-ist who heads the IU claimed when he went to congratulate his comrade

us not forget how the IU, particularly its leaders and mainly Barrantes, swindled the masses by serving as a Trojan horse. The people must draw that great lesson and never forget.

As for Accion Popular (former President Belaunde's party — *AWTW*), and the PPC (Popular Christian Party, which supported Belaunde — *AWTW*) allied with the Rank and File Hayist Movement under the CODE label, they obtained 4.73% and 7.74% respectively of the ballots of those Peruvians eligible to vote; thus this sinister effort of the AP/PPC governmental alliance was doomed.

Another point that deserves to be analysed regarding the elections is the so-called "rejection of terrorism." Let us look at the results in Ayacucho, Apurimac and Huancavelica, the region where the people's war has been developing most intensely. (See Chart D).

CHART D
ELECTION RESULTS IN THE DEPARTMENTS UNDER THE
V POLITICAL-MILITARY COMMAND

	AYACUCHO		APURIMAC		HUANCAVELICA	
		%		%		%
Not registered	93,170	33.9	60,898	34.8	44,974	24.2
Registered	181,667	66.1	114,096	65.2	140,868	75.8
Did not vote	38,016	20.9	23,262	20.4	41,577	29.5
Voted	143,651	79.1	90,834	79.6	99,291	70.5
Spoiled and blank	54,043	37.6	33,249	36.6	39,527	39.8
APRA	47,875	33.3	30,354	33.4	29,230	29.4

on election night: "I have come to congratulate him and in this way show that despite our ideological and political differences we can recognise the people's endorsement and thus demonstrate to our people that with their votes they have ousted the political right and have chosen the political expressions of the left" (our emphasis). When Barrantes conceded his defeat, he further said: "The people voted in their majority for the APRA party, and this is why I went to congratulate Dr. Alan Garcia and to tell him that the IU does not want to stand in the way of his taking office." What purpose, then, have the IU served? Simply and plainly to facilitate the triumph of APRA. Today when hunger and genocide fatten themselves even more on our people, let

This table is based on population statistics and on data regarding those registered with the JNE, as well as the vote tabulations from each department established by the Board, as published in the dailies *El Comercio* and *Expreso*, both beyond suspicion of any revolutionary ideas but on the contrary great defenders of the establishment. The first thing that stands out is the high percentage of the unregistered: 33.9% in Ayacucho, 34.8% in Apurimac and 24.2% in Huancavelica; and all this despite the big campaign and pressure the Armed Forces exerted in their efforts to demonstrate a rejection of the people's war, which they call terrorism. Secondly, let us emphasise the percentage of those who did not vote. In the department of

Ayacucho 20.9% of the people did not participate in the elections; nevertheless, the JNE's official results (according to percentage statistics published, not absolute numbers) assert that abstentionism in that department was 1.04%, a big lie to "prove" the majority voted. In Apurimac 20.4% and in Huancavelica 29.5% did not vote, but according to the JNE these percentages were 17.90% and 21.69% respectively; these same figures verify the clumsy adulteration of the data regarding Ayacucho. Thirdly, the percentage of spoiled and blank ballots is very important. In Ayacucho it reached 37.6%, while in Apurimac it reached 36.6% and in Huancavelica 39.8%. The data show that in each case the spoiled and blank ballots equalled and surpassed the percentage obtained by the APRA party, since APRA got only 33.3% in Ayacucho, 33.4% in Apurimac and 29.4% in Huancavelica. Such being the case, who in his right mind can claim that so-called terrorism was defeated in the voting? Besides the fact that it is absurd to speak of defeating armed actions by means of paper ballots, it has been clearly and conclusively shown that in the region of Ayacucho, Apurimac and Huancavelica over a third of those eligible did not register (a quarter in the case of Huancavelica); one-fifth did not turn out to vote (almost 30% in Huancavelica); while in these three departments the number of spoiled and blank ballots largely exceeded those obtained by the APRA party, and this with the help of the Armed Forces and the frauds it committed. So who was defeated? APRA, the Armed Forces, the electioneers and the organisers of this electoral farce, for in short, APRA could not get more than a third of the votes, and so was far from the 45.7% attributed to it on a national level by the JNE, and obviously very far from the 50% plus one vote required to win. However, in a grotesque mockery the official results give APRA 50.19% of the votes in Apurimac, 61.84% in Ayacucho and 41.20% in Huancavelica! How did the JNE rig these figures so as to "defeat terrorism" in the most convulsed region of the

country? They simply waited until June to release the percentage results by department while rejecting or ignoring a tremendous number of challenges, and that was it! The rest is based on the JNE's "unappealable authority"!

And in the rest of the country the situation was the same: a big hue and cry about how the elections were "impeccable and irreproachable," how "the big loser is terrorism" as then-president Belaunde claimed. "We have seen, therefore, the most overwhelming and massive defeat of communist terrorism imaginable," according to the political hack Ulloa, the former executive of International Petroleum who was Belaunde's prime minister, "there were two big losers in Sunday's general elections: The Shining Path . . ." It is very telling that these renowned pro-imperialist reactionaries cooked up this so-called "defeat of terrorism" but it is also rather revealing, in turn, that Barrantes should chime the same tune, boasting, during one of his countless trips abroad, in Mexico, "For me and for the United Left it is very significant that we won in Ayacucho. We have drawn a clear dividing line between ourselves and terrorism, in our speeches. And the fact that the people supported us in Ayacucho, one of the main operational areas of the Shining Path group, means that the people there reject terrorism." Once again this APRA-ist IU mayor (Barrantes was then mayor of Lima and head of the United Left, positions which he subsequently lost — *AWTW*) celebrates his defeats, for the plain truth is that in Ayacucho the IU only obtained 21.23% of the votes, and that Garcia, his comrade, defeated him there, with the aid of the Armed Forces. But the total of non-voters and of spoiled and blank ballots there adds up to 58.5%, overwhelmingly and hopelessly burying both of them. In these elections, as in the past, the Communist Party of Peru limited itself to calling for an electoral boycott, for thwarting and hindering the elections wherever possible, but not for trying to stop the entire process, as the reactionaries mendaciously implied in order to claim a false vic-

tory when they lacked a real one. But the main historical tendency is the fusion of the people's war led by the Party with the great torrent formed by millions of people who did not register, or who registered but did not vote, or who cast blank or invalid ballots. It is this torrent which the Party is helping organise as part of the ocean of armed masses that will inevitably sweep away the old order of exploitation and oppression.

All this fuss and manipulation did not put an end to the electoral contest nor solve the central question of the presidential elections. Article Number 203 of the Constitution stipulates, "The President of the Republic is elected through direct suffrage and by more than one half of the valid votes cast.

"If none of the candidates obtains an absolute majority, a second election is held within 30 days, between the two candidates who have obtained the highest relative majorities." Obviously if one goes around proclaiming to the world one's respect for the Constitution and the established legal order of the Peruvian state, if one proclaims one's respect for "the state ruled by law" and "the sacred rule of law" then one's deeds must conform to the law if one's words and deeds are to be consistent and if one is to assume the exalted title of "constitutional president" and make such a fuss about one's "respect for the democratic set-up." Has this been the case? Obviously not; just the opposite. During the months of April and May the electoral process unfolded amid contention and collusion among the reactionaries, behind the backs of the people, as always; once again the political bigshots, the institutions and powerful interest groups, along with the direct participation of the imperialist superpowers, especially the Yankees, chose who would best serve their interests. This period should be kept in mind to understand the reality and essence of their so-called "democratic elections."

Shortly before the elections, the candidate Garcia told the magazine *Caretas* that if he should end up in second place, he would concede and not take part in a second round of

voting; this was a rather important statement because it is exactly what his comrade Barrantes did later. When the results of the voting were made known, the candidates obtained 45.74% and 21.26% respectively of the valid votes cast; consequently, since no one had won the absolute majority stipulated by the Constitution, a second round of elections was called for. This was acknowledged by the daily *El Comercio* itself in its April 15th issue: "a second round absolutely must be held." Furthermore, this was understood and expressed by the best known IU leaders. The PUM (United Mariategui-ist Party — *AWTW*), one of the parties that makes up the IU, wrote that "the United Left must take part in the second round of elections." The daily *El Diario de la Marka* said May 2nd, "the real right, the right of the big transnational interests, the oligarchy run by imperialism that blindly serves the IMF and shamelessly grants tax exemptions to oil and mining enterprises, this oligarchy is brazenly demanding that the Constitution be pole-vaulted and Garcia be declared president-elect without a second round of elections." Agustin Haya de la Torre agreed: "If APRA has not won 50% plus one of the votes in the April 14 elections, a second round must be held." Senators Carlos Malpica and Rolando Brena took a similar stand. Senator Bernales himself stated, "The electoral law stipulates that if none of the candidates obtain 50% plus one of the votes, a second round must be held; without fail, no matter what. . . . That is why we confidently await a second round in which Barrantes will pull off a surprise victory." And even the revisionist senator Del Prado said, "in any case a second round must take place as much for constitutional reasons as because APRA avoided debating its programme in the first round." These and others were the good intentions then expressed.

But let us remember that on the very night of election day when only the preliminary results and projections were known, D'Ornellas, a well-known journalist linked to Ulloa, Belaunde's Primer Minister

and Yankee imperialism's representative, proposed that Barrantes should concede before the second round. Further, that same day Barrantes himself told Garcia that "the IU does not want to stand in the way of (Garcia's) taking office." Thus since the beginning the mayor sought to pave the way for his co-religionist and was only awaiting the moment and opportunity to do so. The chairman of the Armed Forces Joint Command jumped into the arena April 20th, indicating that, since APRA had received only 47% of the votes, "the possibility of discounting blank and spoiled ballots now arises. I believe it must be recognised that we are in a difficult situation and the appropriate bodies can declare Sunday's election valid despite the results." These positions marked the launching of a big campaign in dailies like *La Republica*, magazines like *Equis X* and radio and television, invoking the "serious risks with which the country and democracy are threatened" amid legal debate over the interpretation of the Constitution. What was APRA's position? Two-faced: while for Alva Castro, now prime minister, "a second round, organising yet another election for the presidency of the Republic, would be a big waste of time that could be better used and of millions upon millions of *soles*", Garcia said. "If it turns out that we don't have 50% of the votes plus one we will have to have a second round of elections to ratify the people's triumph." Fundamentally APRA did not want a second round, and so it hatched up an alliance that would allow it to take the presidency with 45.74% of the votes. As he had so often done during the campaign itself, Garcia made all sorts of promises and told the audience whatever they wanted to hear.

On April 25th, after Barrantes had met with the AP and APRA top leadership and held an unusual meeting with his two vice-presidential running-mates Bernales and Haya and taking the attempted assassination of the National Board of Elections chairman as a further pretext, Barrantes withdrew his candidacy, amidst the boundless approval of those who had promoted

him and the unhappy confusion of his followers. Some spoke recriminatingly of capitulation to APRA and others like Brena supported the move as having avoided a coup d'etat, but in the end all reconciled themselves to this shameless capitulation to APRA and to reaction as a whole. Barrantes was recognised by the Church when Cardinal Landazuri blessed him and declared that he had earned "the Lord's favour." But this did not solve the problem, since the legal debate continued and attempts to resolve it through an interpretative law failed, while the contradictions amongst the reaction intensified further.

In the end the solution was left in the hands of the National Board of Elections. In a June 1st resolution it said that while "none of the candidates for the Presidency of the Republic has obtained the more than half of the valid votes necessary to be elected as stipulated in Article 203 of the Constitution, the largest relative majorities were obtained by the candidates Dr. Alan Garcia Perez with 45.74% of the votes and Dr. Alfonso Barrantes Langan with 21.25% . . .", and then proceeded to state that "Dr. Alfonso Barrantes declines to take part in the second round of elections." "Neither the Constituent Assembly nor the Legislature," it continued, "foresaw a situation in which one of the two candidates lawfully entitled to participate in the second round of elections would decline." Finally, it made the astonishing claim that "moreover, the APRA presidential list headed by Dr. Alan Garcia Perez has obtained, according to the official tabulation, 53.10% of the valid votes . . ." in order to accept Barrantes' concession, conclude that there would be no second round and "proclaim Citizen Alan Garcia Perez President of the Republic." This resolution is clearly in violation of the Constitution and the laws which govern the Peruvian state's elections; clearly, if according to its stipulations one does not obtain 50% plus one of the total votes, according to their own rules one cannot constitutionally be considered the president, and the resolution

itself says that Garcia only obtained 45.74% of the total ballots cast. Therefore a second round had to be held, and given the imperative character of Article 203, Barrantes' decision not to stand in the second round was inadmissible, as was fully brought out in the debate; finally, the claim of "53.10% according to the official tabulation" is fallacious, absurd and groundless. It is clear that the JNE's resolution only ratifies a connivance and collusion meant to install as president the man best suited to the interests of imperialism and Peruvian exploiters, without having to run the risks of a second round and the consequent dangers of increased abstentionism and even more blank and spoiled ballots, which would have increased the difficulties faced by reaction and further discredited the elections, thus serving to turn the people's hopes increasingly towards armed revolution.

In synthesis, the most salient points of the April 1985 elections described above indisputably demonstrate that just as the counterrevolution has had to violate its own Constitution and laws to combat the people's war, so also in holding their elections amid a developing people's war these reactionaries have been forced to violate their Constitution and electoral laws and to carry out wide-scale fraud in order to replace their officials. Consequently, not only is the parliament of a specious and objectionable composition, but Garcia himself pretends to be president without being the constitutional president of the Peruvian state because the Constitution and the electoral laws have been violated. This incontrovertible truth cannot be covered up by any flattering fanfare or propaganda whatsoever, no matter how vile and high-sounding it may be; moreover, within its own bourgeois-democratic framework, the very Constitution that Garcia pledged to obey stands against him, since its Article 82 states, "No one owes obedience to an usurper government nor to anyone who takes public office or employment in violation of the procedures established by the Constitution and the law."

THE SO-CALLED "NA-

TIONALIST, DEMOCRATIC AND PEOPLE'S STATE." On July 28th 1985, at the beginning of his address to Congress, Garcia said, "I must repeat, to the whole nation, that my commitment is to all of its citizens." These are the same concepts that Belaunde used in 1963 and 1980 when he proclaimed himself "president of all Peruvians" with similar tiresome speeches about "the people's vote" and bragging about "taking office with the support of the masses." Simple coincidence? By no means; this is the same old content and chatter of the exploiting classes and their hacks. But this man who pretends to be president dusts off and recycles old APRA ideas and with his well-known demagogy is given to far-reaching historical analysis, pontificating, "Our history is also the history of our dependence on external forces allied to and expressed through powerful internal interests which have brought our country to its current crisis. Lacking a national agenda, lacking an historical and popular leadership, we have lived by adjusting our economy to the powerful interests of international capital." Further on, when "proclaiming the revolution" he asserted, "The crisis we are going through today is not a crisis that arises from dependency, rather it is dependency itself which is in crisis and there is only one solution to that crisis. The democratic revolution will make us more free, more just and more masters of our own wellbeing, and this revolution which I proclaim is the declaration of the independence of our economic interests." What, in essence, is this all about? What is being covered up? The history of Peru in this century which Garcia claims to outline is in fact a history of domination by imperialism, principally Yankee imperialism, in league with the Peruvian big bourgeoisie and feudal landlords; this exploitation and oppression are the cause of the present crisis and of the ties that bind us to the imperialist system, and not the "lack" of an "agenda" or "leadership," a claim which expresses his "thesis" about our supposed co-responsibility along with im-

perialism's "civilising" domination, a thesis which as an APRA-ist he must believe in, though his demagogy prevents him from saying it. As for the second paragraph, the "crisis of dependency" which he invokes is simply and plainly the crisis of imperialism and its domination which can be solved only by democratic revolution, not merely by "proclaiming the independence of our economic interests" but fundamentally and mainly by political action to destroy the three mountains that weigh upon us, imperialism, bureaucrat capitalism and semifeudalism, a political action that can be carried out only through people's war, and what's more, as part of the world proletarian revolution that will sweep imperialist and reactionary rule from the face of the earth. It is not a matter, as Garcia says, of "new relations" being reinserted within the imperialist system to keep it going, but of the destruction of the system. Thus the question is a political one, a point demonstrated by the great turns in Peruvian history where political and military action preceded economic change. Today in Peru nobody can hide this fact: the pressing need is for democratic revolution, which is already unfolding, carried out by people's war within the framework of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, Guiding Thought. What Garcia is saying is simply the same old rotten APRA nonsense now made up with pseudoscience about a "different future," as can be seen by his different lucubrations in the same message and even more clearly by comparing all this to reality, to practice, which is the highest criterion for truth.

On the so-called "three injustices." This is how Garcia perorates about the "three injustices": "Our economic history has resulted in a situation of profound injustices, and the economic problems we suffer today are because of them." Here the problem is no longer "the crisis of dependency," the phony anti-imperialism has vanished; now it is "profound injustices" that are the cause of our problems. The self-styled anti-imperialist becomes an avenger who

leaps to the fore as the "champion of justice," waving the flag of "Social Justice," that stale slogan of nineteenth-century anarchism, a current trend within APRA represented by the knights of so-called free trade unionism such as Sabroso and his hacks, to say nothing of Gonzalez Prada, a well-known figure whom APRA has always tried to make use of. What, concretely, are these injustices? Let's look at their first "dimension," as Garcia says: "First, there is the regional injustice that separates Lima and the coast from the rest of forgotten Peru. Lima has 80% of the country's industry, located not in the slums which are still provincial, but in the Lima of the wealthy and middle classes, where the state apparatus and the administration of education and health are also concentrated. . . . If things continue like this and the country gets poorer and poorer, for whom will Lima produce?" This "regional injustice" has two outstanding aspects: conditions in Lima, and the state. Why is there such a big difference and separation between Lima and the rest of the country? Because semifeudalism persists, a reality stubbornly denied, although reality itself and especially the people's war are increasingly forcing them to admit the existence of the Andean region, where semifeudal conditions meet the eye at every glance due to the development of a bureaucrat capitalism that increasingly concentrates the means of production in the capital city. It should be recalled that Velasco (head of the self-proclaimed "revolutionary" military junta, 1968-1975 — *AWTW*) also talked about "decentralisation" but promoted centralisation; today centralisation is greater than ever, mainly due to imperialist domination, principally by the U.S. The backward world, particularly Latin America, exhibits a monstrous macrocephaly, as exemplified in Mexico, Brazil and Argentina. This is the cause of the problem and what we should talk about, and not hide behind terms like "regional injustice." Furthermore, this man who pretends to be president talks about "the Lima of the wealthy and middle classes."

The middle classes are the intermediate classes, including the national bourgeoisie and the upper layers of the petite bourgeoisie, the so-called "emergent classes." Is the wealth in their hands? No, it is in the hands of the big bourgeoisie, with its comprador and bureaucrat factions, the big bankers, industrialists, merchants and real estate tycoons who control the ownership of the means of production, along with the biggest imperialist interests also concentrated in Lima. It is the economic power of these classes and of imperialism which is being obscured. In short, the power of the big exploiting classes is being covered up. But Garcia can't be accused of forgetting about classes, because as quoted above he does speak about the "middle classes." The other outstanding aspect is the concentration of state power, of the Armed Forces which are its backbone, and the bureaucracy; they are concentrated in the capital city exactly in order to maintain the landlord-bureaucrat class dictatorship that is the Peruvian state and from there to control the whole country. This is the basic point, and not the concentration of "health and educational administration" which arises on this basis; this is the central question that must be analysed, especially given the growing militarisation and bureaucratisation of the Peruvian state during the last decade as a consequence of the very functioning of the antiquated social system, and especially of the revolutionary development of the masses, particularly the people's war which undermines it and aims to tear it down. Finally, Garcia says, "if things go on this way, for whom will Lima produce?" What does he want? Is he fundamentally in agreement with this "regional injustice"? Is he fundamentally interested in a "market" for the productive system of the exploiting classes and imperialism, which was what earlier interested Velasco, Morales, Belaunde (General Morales succeeded Velasco as head of the junta, and was in turn replaced by the return of Belaunde, originally overthrown by Velasco — *AWTW*) and the rest of the "heads of state" before

them, each in different conditions and circumstances, whose love, as the popular saying goes, was "not for pigs, but for bacon?"

But let's continue with the analysis of these famous "injustices": "There is a second dimension of injustice, an economic divorce between the sectors; when we analyse the country's economic workings we see that there are two clearly separate sectors.

"On one side there is modern industry. . . . This is the modern sector, which contains 85% of Peru's investments but employs only 38% of its people. The other side is the marginalised sector, the rural agriculture of the Andes region, with millions of *comuneros* (Indian peasant communities — *AWTW*) and small landowners, and that other part of humanity that some call the urban marginalised sector, made up of the unemployed and underemployed who almost always live in the slums. It must be asked, if the majority get poorer and poorer for whom will industry produce? If there is no production in the country what will the state administer? I have come to say that there will be no solution as long as the state only concerns itself with industry and administration. There will be no far-reaching revolution until the state goes out to the *comuneros* and the unemployed."

Let us ask ourselves once more, what is modern industry in Peru? Simply bureaucrat capitalism tied to imperialist domination and the feudal landlords. The degree of modern industry's subjugation to imperialism, especially the U.S., can be seen in the following two extracts from industrial studies:

"The dynamic of industrial growth in Peru during the last two decades has been propelled by big enterprises and multinational conglomerates based in the U.S., Europe and Japan, which have tended to establish monopolistic and oligarchical forms as they entered our economy, both in terms of the production as well as the distribution of their products. . . .

"The penetration of large enterprises and multinational conglomerates into 'Peruvian' industrial manufacture has directly

contributed to the slow but steady marginalisation of new and old sections of the national bourgeoisie. . . . Thus in the last two decades the 'national bourgeoisie' has increasingly played the role of developing new industrial groups that with time come under the control of foreign capital. Therefore at present what is developing is an intermediary bourgeoisie emerging from certain groups who based on their prestige, experience and social and economic connections have been integrated into the big enterprises and multinational conglomerates, becoming part of the ever-increasing intermediate sector." (E.A. Anaya, *Imperialismo, industrializacion y transferencia de tecnologia en el Peru*. It must be kept in mind that when the author speaks of the national bourgeoisie he means the domestic bourgeoisie, and moreover, the big bourgeoisie.)

"Perhaps the most significant conclusion to be drawn from a structural analysis is the high degree of control that foreign enterprises still possess in the extractive and industrial sectors of the Peruvian economy. Furthermore, a simple quantification of the level of foreign investment in the country would not give a correct picture of the degree of control foreign capital exerts over the economy. That control has been substantially strengthened due to the strategic character of this investment, since the most important enterprises in each industry are foreign-owned, and since the majority of these enterprises are subsidiaries of large multinational corporations." (J.A. Torres, *Estructura economica de la industria peruana*.)

This is the question, and not some cover-up "second dimension of injustice"; what needs talking about is this evil bureaucrat capitalism and especially its subjugation to imperialism — these are the mountains to be overthrown arms in hand so as to build a real national economy that will serve the oppressed masses of people, including an industry for the benefit of the proletariat and the people. But Garcia, cunning and demagogic, poses the question, "if the majority grow

poorer and poorer for whom will industry produce?" Once more it is evident which side he is on and what he is really concerned about.

What is this "marginal sector"? First of all, what is rural Andean agriculture? Concretely, it is semifeudalism, with the three characteristics described by Mariategui: land, serfdom and *gamonalismo* (the rule of local feudal despots — *AWTW*). The land question is the driving force of the class struggle in the countryside, a centuries-old problem of land concentration rooted in feudalism; it was evident that it is one of the country's basic problems in the 1960s, when three agrarian laws were passed regarding the purchase and sale of land that essentially did nothing but preserve the concentration of land, as is shown by the following table from the "General Agrarian Reform and Rural Settlement Board": (See Chart E).

This table clearly shows that the land handed over to individual peasants amounted to only 7.7% of the total that had been appropriated; this means approximately 1,800,000 peasants. According to the 1981 census, there are 6,245,000 peasants, so these much-publicised "agrarian reforms" did not affect so much as a third of the peasantry. If we recall that according to the National Farm Census of 1961, 83.5% of the total farm units owned less than five hectares, or in other words, only 5.4% of the total land, while 1% of the units owned 81% of the land, the question necessarily arises: what is the problem? What is at the root of this situation? This is sharply and seriously shown today by the situation in Puno, which Garcia himself called "another Ayacucho," and indeed that is what Puno is becoming, much to the dismay of Garcia and others. (See Chart F).

This December 1983 chart from the "General Agrarian Reform Board" shows that 23 SAIS with a total of only 20.87% of the families own 52.20% of the awarded land, while 74 peasant communities with 48.59% of the families possess only 2.30% of this land. Further, the associated enterprises (SAIS, CAPS, ERPS — *AWTW*) with

CHART E ADVANCE OF AGRARIAN REFORM 1963-1979

(Summary as of June 24, 1979)

	Units Receiving	Land Received		Beneficiaries	
		Hectares	%	Number	%
Cooperatives	581	2,196,147	25.5	79,568	21.2
Agro-Industrial Units	12	128,566	1.5	27,783	7.4
SAIS	60	2,805,048	32.6	60,954	16.2
ERPS	11	232,653	2.7	1,375	0.4
Peasant groups	834	1,685,382	19.6	45,561	12.1
Peasant communities	448	889,364	10.3	117,710	31.4
Independent peasants	-	662,093	7.7	42,295	11.2
Total	1,907	8,599,253	100.0	375,246	100.0

(SAIS are large state-linked farms established by the Velasco government. ERPS are another form of Velasco's rural enterprises — *AWTW*)

CHART F THE AGRARIAN REFORM IN PUNO D.L. 17716

TYPE	HECTARES		BENEFICIARY FAMILIES	%
	AWARDED	%		
23 SAIS	1,024,287	52.20	6,249*	20.87
16 CAPS	499,503	25.50	6,480	21.64
5 ERPS	216,845	11.06	939	3.13
Total	1,740,635	88.76	13,668	45.64
74 Peasant communities	46,180	2.30	14,547	48.59
72 Peasant groups	131,672	6.80	1,460	4.87
Total	177,852	9.10	16,007	53.46
261 Individuals	41,069	2.10	261	0.87

(* Does not include the 6,663 families of the SAIS communities; in practice they do not receive any significant benefits from the units. They should not be considered "beneficiaries." (This is generally true in all the SAIS in the country). (CAPS are cooperatives established by the Velasco government — *AWTW*)

CHART G LEVELS OF UNEMPLOYMENT, UNDEREMPLOYMENT AND ADEQUATE EMPLOYMENT IN FARM AND NON-FARM SECTORS: 1980-85 (RELATIVE STATISTICS)

UNEMPLOYMENT LEVEL	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT	7.0	6.8	7.0	9.2	10.9	11.8
FARM	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
NON-FARM	10.9	10.4	10.7	13.9	16.4	18.4
RATE OF UNDEREMPLOYMENT	51.2	47.9	49.9	53.3	54.2	54.1
FARM	68.2	61.5	60.9	67.5	63.2	60.4
NON-FARM	41.4	40.3	43.9	45.8	49.6	50.5
RATE OF ADEQUATE EMPLOYMENT	41.8	45.3	43.1	37.5	34.9	34.1
FARM	31.5	38.2	38.8	32.2	36.5	39.3
NON-FARM	47.7	49.3	45.4	40.3	34.0	31.1

45.64% of the total families received 88.76% of the appropriated land, while communities and peasant groups, with 53.46% of the families, only received 9.10%. This is the big basic problem in the

Andean region, the principal problem though not the only one. It is not "another dimension of injustice," but the persistence of semifeudalism with its characteristics of land, serfdom and *gamonalismo*,

and it cannot be resolved by any law passed by the old state but only by the peasantry under the leadership of the Communist Party, conquering and defending the land arms in hand through people's war, as is being demonstrated in our country.

Let's look at the other part of this "injustice," the question of unemployment and underemployment. If we consult the *Statistical Compendium of 1985* published by the National Institute of Statistics, we find: (See Chart G).

Unemployment and underemployment are clearly growing; the former rose from 7% in 1980 to 11.8% in 1985. Moreover, it should be emphasised that in the non-farm sector, that is, concretely, in the cities, unemployment jumped from 10.9% to 18.4% during these same years. Underemployment rose from 51.2% in 1980 to 54.1% in 1985, but this includes both city and countryside, and it is particularly notable that while it dropped from 68.2% to 60.4% during these years in the countryside, in the cities it rose from 41.4% to 50.5%. Is this another form of "injustice"? Not at all: it is simply the necessary consequence of a decrepit semifeudal and semicolonial system with bureaucrat capitalism developing in its midst and of the crisis we are suffering; it is the necessary result of an evil social system that can maintain itself only by condemning two-thirds of the population to hunger, a rotten system that condemns the masses of Peruvian people to living on a per-capita income little changed since 1965. The survival of this social system increasingly requires a more militarised and bureaucratic state gripping the farthest corner and the poorest masses to contain their revolutionary explosiveness and their participation in the people's war, a state ready to repress the people by fire and sword, carrying out continuing genocide; this is what Garcia is trying to conceal behind the phrases "if there is no production in the country what will the state administer" and "the state must go out to the *comuneros* and the unemployed."

Finally, let's analyse the last element of the trinity of injustices Alan

Garcia has pontifically consecrated. Due to its importance, we will refer to it in parts in the order followed in his message: "But injustice in Peru is not only between regions and sections of the population. It is also profound social injustice. I have spoken of a symbolic pyramid. At the peak of this pyramid 2% of the population receive the highest incomes thanks to their monopolistic enterprises and their ownership of the means of production. Frequently these riches created through the efforts of all Peru are achieved at the cost of the hunger suffered by the Peruvian people. . . ." Here, we would point out, the pyramid we have run into is magical and we need to get to the bottom of its symbolism. Let's consider the "2% of the population at its peak." Who does this percentage of the population include, as seen from the standpoint of proletarian ideology? It is the very core of the exploiter classes, the big bourgeoisie (with its comprador and bureaucrat factions) and landlords as well as the most direct representatives of imperialist domination, especially Yankee imperialism. In other words, this 2% is the concentrated expression of the three mountains that oppress the people; they are the core of that minority (which can be calculated at roughly 10% of the population) whose power has to be wholly and completely destroyed, at least on the political and economic level, in order to carry through the democratic stage of the revolution. The essence of this question is not its percentage but its class character. In the same way, the problem is not simply that these people "receive the highest incomes thanks to their monopolistic enterprises and their ownership of the means of production," as Garcia demagogically says, but that they are part of the three targets of the democratic revolution — imperialism, bureaucrat capitalism and semifeudalism. They are clearly monopolists and exploiters in that they have taken possession of the most important social means of production of Peruvian society and the riches created by the masses of people, the exploited, snatched through exploitation and oppres-

sion which daily suck the people's blood while casting them deeper into hunger and poverty.

"But as I have also said," continues this man who pretends to be president, "the state, in order to preserve this pattern of domination and guard the wealth of this 2% of the population, has become an instrument of this unjust concentration of income, a kind of bureaucratic defensive buffer serving the most powerful, and so has become unproductive and centralist. It has given out jobs, but far more than necessary, sometimes in order to pay off political supporters and in other cases to accumulate bureaucratic riches." Once again Garcia, after covering up the class struggle, distorts and confuses the main questions concerning the state, all with his famous "three injustices." What does Garcia seek to accomplish? To reduce the question of the Peruvian state to the statement that it "has become an instrument of an unjust (once more his clumsy magic word) concentration of income," giving away too many jobs "to pay back political supporters," thus becoming "unproductive and centralist" "to preserve a pattern of domination"; therefore the problem would seem to be how to reduce bureaucracy and bring about the long-promised decentralisation. This hides the essence and the main question: the role of the Armed Forces. "The two most characteristic institutions are the bureaucracy and the standing army . . . the bureaucracy and the standing army are 'parasites' stuck to the body of bourgeois society, engendered by the internal contradictions that divide it, but exactly a parasite that 'plugs up' the body's vital pores," as Lenin taught, and he emphasised, "In particular imperialism results in an extraordinary strengthening of the state machinery, a hitherto unknown development of the bureaucratic and military apparatus, in relation to the increase of repression against the proletariat." To this must be added Chairman Mao Tsetung's great summation, "Everything grows out of the barrel of a gun. According to the Marxist theory of the state, the

army is the chief component of state power." This is the only true and scientific way to analyse the problem, emphasising how this man of the so-called "injustices" not only negates the historic process of development of the state, but also seeks to cover up the truth and hide the state's principal component, the very source of reactionary power, a question of the greatest importance especially in a country where revolution and counterrevolution are facing off in armed confrontation. Once again we emphasise the following Marxist thesis: "The standing army and police are the basic instruments of state power. But what other possibility is there?"

After these lies exposed above, Garcia exhibits the reactionary essence of his "symbolic pyramid" with his own demagogic rhetoric: "But proceeding down this road, the state has got itself and the country deeper and deeper into debt, and almost all the debt has been incurred by the top 30% of the country that is urban, industrial and administrative.

"But below that layer there is the 70% of the population that is marginalised, the unemployed and the street vendors, the people from the provinces and the shantytowns." First of all, the Peruvian state's debt has been incurred within the framework of development plans, loans and investments imposed by imperialism on oppressed nations like ours, in concert with the plans the Peruvian exploiters unfold through their state to develop bureaucrat capitalism and evolve semifeudalism. If we focus on the period from 1970 to the present in which foreign debt has greatly increased, we find that from 1974 to 1983 the economic growth rate was almost zero (0.1%), in contrast to the preceding nine years in which the average rate of growth was 5.1%. Industrial production as a percentage of the GNP went from 24.7% in 1970 to 25.1% in 1980 and then dropped to 22.0% in 1984. The manufacturing proletariat which had represented 14.6% of the labour force was reduced to 13.7% in 1980. While business profits went from 17.5% of the national income in 1972 to 31.9% in 1980 (and in

1979 hit 33.3%), wages and salaries which made up 51.2% of the national income in 1972 fell to 39.3% in 1980 (state employees suffered the biggest wage cuts). Hand in hand with this process, the agricultural work force as a percentage of the country's total fell from 43.7% in 1970 to only 35.4% in 1980, while farm production which had accounted for 14.34% of the GNP in 1969 fell to 12.14% at present. Since these people could not be absorbed by industry, there was an inevitable growth in the service sector, from 28.6% in 1970 to 38.8% in 1980. This phenomenon took place in the capital city itself, which is the country's industrial centre, as can be seen in the following data: in 1972 industry employed 19.1% of the economically active population, while by 1981 it only employed 16.9%. Employment in the commercial and service sectors which had accounted for 48% of the economically active population in 1972 rose to 62% in 1981.

From these figures it can be seen that foreign debt and the various plans carried out have not benefited the "top 30%, the urban, industrial and administrative areas of the country" but instead benefited imperialism, the domestic exploiters and their state, as is seen both in the growth of business profits and the jump in foreign debt from around \$800 million in 1969 to \$16 billion at present. What is Garcia trying to do? To defend his so-called "peak 2% of the population." With his demagogic invention of the "top 30%" he is trying to confuse the proletariat with part of the petite bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie, to mix them up all together in one mass, behind which are hidden the interests of the imperialists, big bourgeoisie and landlords. It is to this phony agglomeration that he demagogically opposes the interests of the "marginalised 70% of the population, farmers and peasants, unemployed and street vendors, people from the provinces and the slums." This can be seen in the following extract from his message to Congress: "Until now the state has not belonged to these people, because it has enriched the few and

extended its scarce resources in employment, health and services to a few others, while remaining alien to the 70% of the population on whom I believe the future of our country's history depends. *We must resolve the social confrontation that pits the owners of the means of production plus their public or private subsidiary groups on one side, against the disinherited who make up the immense majority on the other.*" (emphasis ours)

The reactionary essence of the "symbolic pyramid" built by the man who pretends to be president is this: around his "2%" — the monopolists and the owners of the social means of production — he groups his "top 30%," and to this he opposes his concept of "the marginalised 70%." Thus the two opposed ends of his pyramid, the two terms of the contradiction which gives rise to "social conflict," are, he claims, the "owners of the means of production plus their public or private subsidiary groups" on one side and the "disinherited who make up the immense majority" on the other. Since "we must resolve the social confrontation that pits" them against each other, what is the purpose of this "symbolic pyramid"? Its purpose is to defend the exploiters and oppressors of our people; the rest is foolish imagination, rhetoric and demagogy, at bottom the same old APRA ideas recycled by sprucing them up with the latest pseudo-scientific sociological jargon. He completes his trinity of "injustice" by resolving the question of the Peruvian state with a simple declaration, "*I declare, and this is my pledge, that from this day on the state will belong to all Peruvians,* and if until now no one has spoken in the name of the *comuneros* and the unemployed, from now on the state will speak in their name in favour of righteousness and justice." (emphasis ours) One year after this statement, anyone who believed these hypocritical and arrogant lies and who has confronted the everyday reality of life in this country, cannot but have an increasingly better grasp of what Marxism, the outlook of the proletariat, teaches about the state: "The state is a pro-

duct and a manifestation of the *irreconcilability* of class antagonisms. The state arises where, when and insofar as class antagonisms objectively *cannot* be reconciled. And conversely, the existence of the state proves that class antagonisms are irreconcilable."

In conclusion, the three so-called "injustices" clearly deny the character of Peruvian society, the classes and class struggle that exist within it, and especially the character of the Peruvian state as a landlord-bureaucrat dictatorship, as well as the necessity for revolutionary violence to overthrow the old state and the exploiters in order to initiate the development of a new society. This is the basis on which he proposes his so-called "democratic revolution," which the message referred to defines as follows: "What I have come to propose is something different. *What Peru needs is a democratic revolution*, an historical restructuring that reactivates and frees the profound social forces which have been ignored until now.

"I propose to encourage agricultural production, from which millions of Peruvians have lived in the same way for centuries, so that this land that is now abandoned, seedless, without fertilizers and tractors, this land that is now cultivated only about every eight years, will produce the food that we now buy abroad.

"That is the reactivation of social production. Secondly I propose that the hundreds of thousands of unemployed and underemployed hands in the shantytowns be given access to income or employment. That will be the reactivation of social consumption.

"And in this way, when at the very foundations of society we link agricultural production with consumption by those who today cannot eat because of lack of jobs, a new Peru will arise, which will be the national market for Lima's industrial production, a production now being slowly extinguished due to the lack of buyers. Then public administration, which is mainly centred in Lima and which now appears to be administering an unproductive country, will have an

historical reason to exist in a country reactivated from the bottom up.

"... if we don't decide to change the situation very soon it will be a thousand times worse, with more violence, more recession and more unemployment." (emphasis ours)

Is this the democratic revolution Peruvian society needs, the overthrow of imperialism, bureaucrat capitalism and semifeudalism throughout the country, by means of the people's war which has been developing for six years? No, it is not. Instead it has more in common with the basic problems that have been pointed out and with solutions proposed decades ago. It will suffice to recall some aspects of the "Plan for Economic and Social Development, 1967-1970" passed during Belaunde's first administration, which said, for example, "In general, if present economic tendencies are not vigorously corrected and turned around... they may give rise to severe tensions, with unforeseeable economic, political and social results." "It should be taken into account that the principal political decisions regarding economic development usually have to do with the process of capital formation... they set limits on the consumption of luxury goods in order to free capital and direct it towards investments made attractive by adequate incentives." The development of agriculture, held to be a strategic sector, was given particular importance so as to reduce the importation of agricultural products and especially to expand the national market considered "indispensable for the growth and expansion of industry," requiring "structural changes" and "concentrated direct and indirect state intervention in agriculture." Another basic goal of the plan was industrial development. It emphasised that "at present industry is highly dependent on imported inputs" and claimed that financially "the role of the state in this plan is to transfer income from consumption, especially in the urban areas, to investment; from the point of view of income distribution its role is to transfer income from the city to the countryside." The so-called People's Cooperation organisation,

among others, was set up precisely for the so-called marginalised masses.

Further, to be brief, we will give two quotes from General Velasco's speeches: "In upholding and defending a nationalistic and quite revolutionary policy, we are fulfilling our highest patriotic duty. We believe that our country can attain neither security nor grandeur by leaving untouched its old structure of discrimination against the majority of the nation. We aspire towards the creation of a truly free and just social order, which we consider incompatible with the persistence of the inequalities that have made our country a nation of great injustices." (April, 1969)

"We have correctly and repeatedly emphasised that one of the central goals of our government is vigorous industrial development. Within the traditional framework that prevailed, Peru had no industrial future. The underdevelopment imposed on this country by interest groups with no sense of history had made any real industrial development impossible. The disequilibria of underdevelopment always translate into the existence of social groups made up of millions of our fellow Peruvians whose extremely low buying power would never permit the development of the internal market indispensable for the development of a truly Peruvian industry.

"This was precisely one of the reasons for the agrarian reform. It served not only the need to transform the unequal and unjust system of land ownership, but also to redistribute the wealth so as to increase the buying power of the peasantry, who must become, in the future, the consumers of the products manufactured by the industry that we have lacked.

"... The accelerated development of industry must be a cornerstone of the structural transformations we seek to achieve..." (October, 1969)

What does all this mean? That the various governments of Peru, whether de facto or elected, have been confronting the same problems and making the same statements for decades, all the while seeking

nothing more than to expand Peruvian society by developing bureaucrat capitalism and evolving semifeudalism within the framework imposed by imperialism, mainly Yankee imperialism; each confronting specific conditions giving rise to specific differences, but all striving to maintain and defend the landlord-bureaucrat dictatorship that is the Peruvian state.

In general terms, these are the foundations on which Garcia's July 1985 message is based, upon which his "Nationalist, democratic and popular state" is erected and which guide his government's actions.

The self-proclaimed "nationalist state." "We know that in order to carry out the democratic revolution we must be anti-imperialists," Garcia said before the United Nations. But anti-imperialism does not mean simply defending "the nation against the monopolistic structure of some corporations"; it means frontal combat against the monopolies which form imperialism's economic foundations. Still less does it mean favouring the biggest petrol monopoly in the world as has been done with the contracts awarded to Occidental Petroleum. One cannot call oneself an anti-imperialist and at the same time claim that the problem of foreign debt, one of the gravest and most concrete problems afflicting mainly the backward countries, is a question of "the relationship between the poor and the rich" or "between the North and the South." We all know that that the burning question is the exportation of capital, one of the characteristics of imperialism, an expression of its parasitic character, of living by "clipping coupons," as Lenin wrote. This is a striking and decisive example of the relationship between the oppressed countries and the imperialist countries which exploit and squeeze them — while Garcia implies that the oppressed nations share the responsibility for the overwhelming debt which crushes and suffocates them. One cannot be an anti-imperialist and at the same time seek to separate the problem of foreign debt from the worldwide contention between the superpowers

for hegemony, nor much less pretend to stand aside from that contention, claiming to ignore it, which means to serve it. On the contrary, one should oppose it, denouncing the collusion and contention carried out by Yankee imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism which cast the Third World especially into ever deeper suffering as they unleash counter-revolutionary wars in different parts of the world and prepare for a third world war brandishing their atomic bombs to frighten the oppressed and keep them from fighting back. Likewise one cannot be an anti-imperialist and at the same time call upon the rest of the imperialists, particularly European imperialism, to help out the world's poor, nor much less dream of and await understanding and support from the superpowers themselves. This phony anti-imperialism drops its mask rather quickly when it comes to serving monopolies like Occidental or to recognising and promising to pay the country's foreign debt under the pretext of "honouring our obligations," and even more when Garcia raises an uproar about "imperialist aggression" when "military aid" is suspended, aid whose purpose is to train genocidal officers like Hurtado, nicknamed "The Lorry" (Lieutenant Hurtado, trained by the U.S. Army under a U.S. "aid" scheme, was held responsible for the 1985 Aqomarca roundup and mass murder of peasants — *AWTW*) and others of their ilk. Garcia's "anti-imperialist" accomplices from the chieftains of the Second International to Fidel Castro to the United Left headed by Barrantes added their voices to the clamour for more such "aid." After all this fuss Garcia finally ended up meeting his overdue debt payments and the "military aid" programme to train officers to commit genocide was reestablished. Despite his pompous promise to limit debt repayments to 10% of Peru's export earnings, Garcia ended up paying 35.5% — and 56.9% in the second half of 1985 (14.7% to pay public debt, 6.4% for Central Reserve Bank debt and 35.8% for private debt), according to economists. After threatening to withdraw from

the evil International Monetary Fund if it didn't accept these conditions, and after the IMF rejected them, Garcia concluded that it was better not to withdraw after all. This "nationalist state," then, doesn't really exist; this false anti-imperialism is really pro-imperialism.

The self-proclaimed "democratic state." "Secondly," reads the message that some people found so hopeful, "we need a democratic state, a state which is democratic not only because it was elected and because of its respect for freedom of opinion and expression, but also because of its role as arbiter of justice, and fundamentally because of its new organisational structure." First, regarding its being "democratically elected," we have previously shown that the present APRA government took office in violation of its own Constitution and other laws, that, in short, Garcia did not obtain the 50% plus one of the votes as required by the Constitution to be elected president of this country, but that rather his election was the product of a sinister alliance between Yankee imperialism and the domestic exploiting classes, with the backing of the Armed Forces. Because of this Alan Garcia Perez only acts as if he were president, and consequently the ministers he appoints and the actions they carry out are without any legal basis according to their own set-up. In the same way the Congress of the Republic is deeply tainted by the rigged voting that was exposed and challenged, giving rise to scandals still not cleared up. Regarding "respect for freedom and expression" as it applies within the reactionary order, these freedoms are reserved for the exploiters, the owners of almost all the mass media; but the striking thing is the uniform manipulation that the APRA government has imposed in this field, as obviously and undeniably exemplified in the information given out about the June 19th genocide committed against the prisoners of war. There are indirect and even brutally shameless restrictions placed against the few mass media that escape government control; the censoring and persecu-

tion of the newspaper *El Nuevo Diario* and of television programmes are clear examples. Furthermore, let us ask a simple question: when has any newspaper or other means of mass communication other than *El Nuevo Diario* or *Equis X* agreed to publish any communicate denouncing the persecution, torture, disappearances or genocide carried out against the people? But the freedoms and rights the people have won and have forced into law cannot be reduced to simply freedom of opinion and expression. The right to life and physical integrity, freedom of thought and expression, the inviolability of the home and the mail, the right to assemble, to organise and to strike, job security and social benefits, etc., and also the right to bury one's dead — are any of these respected in this country under their so-called "democratic state"? And this without mentioning the state of emergency and curfew and all that their sacrosanct "defence of the established order" implies. As to the state being an "arbiter of justice," it will suffice to ask the workers of Sima, Moraveco, the miners of Canaria and Pasco, the members of the unions CITE and Sutep (teachers), the doctors, sugar cane workers all over the country, the people of Puno, Cuzco and San Martin, and the inhabitants of shantytowns like Garagay — not to speak of what this "arbiter of justice" did in Aqomarca, Lurigancho and the recent genocide committed in the three shining trenches of combat, nor Garcia's frenetic scream "That's enough! I have run out of patience!" with the workers' struggle nor all the repression against the workers the APRA government has carried out since it took office. All this is part of a policy of "reestablishing the national order and returning to the principle of authority," or as he said in his 1985 message, "If those who don't wish to listen stir things up, the state order will punish them, applying the law firmly and energetically . . . vacillation would promote disorder, instead there will be decisiveness and firmness."

What merits special attention is the claim that the state is

"democratic fundamentally because of its new organisational structure." The Peruvian state is conceived fundamentally as a bourgeois "representative democracy," that is, a parliamentary democracy. Thus, what is meant by a "new organisational structure"? In short, to organise the state along corporatist lines, which is the aim behind the "decentralisation and de-concentration," regionalisation, development committees, micro-regions and "peasant communities as the social base" and the "National Economic Congress," in addition to the state's organisational attempts mainly among the so-called marginalised masses, in the shantytowns and among the peasants of the "Andean trapeze" mountain region, with the planned slum organisations and federations, the "Rimanacuy," the onslaught of "people's cafeterias," "mothers' clubs" and other activities with women through what they call the "Direct Assistance Programme," and the recently-created "Youth Development Programme," as well as the takeover of various "professional associations," etc., and, unavoidably, dual unionism and especially APRA's accelerated formation and training of shock troops, in order to pit the masses against each other as they did, for example, with the PAIT (a minimum-wage government work scheme) during the recent strikes by teachers and doctors. The organisation of these corporatist structures is linked to a fascist political conception whose expression can be seen in the parliamentary crisis increasingly enmeshing the legislative branch, in a systematic denial of rights and liberties, and Alan Garcia's dictatorial actions and moves — rather significantly, his closest henchmen call him "the conductor." In short, does this much-ballyhooed "democratic state" exist? No, absolutely not. What is developing and being prepared is the replacement of the democratic-representative setup by a social-corporatist order, under the leadership of a fascist policy already pushing forward and promising sinister future developments.

The self-proclaimed 'People's

State." "But," reads the 1985 message, "the people's state must resolve the immediate and grave problems the country faces." How has the economy been run — has it benefited the masses of people? Previously in this same message Garcia had warned, "*I hereby announce, as is my duty, that we are instituting a government austerity programme to reorder the economy and promote its revolutionary transformation. . . .*" (emphasis ours) Immediately after taking office, Garcia put into effect an emergency plan that was simply a modified version of Argentine President Alfonsin's, with the goal of what was called "expansive adjustment" (Alfonsin's plan, consented to by International Monetary Fund head J. de Larosiere, aimed to bring that indebted country into compliance with the IMF). This plan had to be readjusted in October 1985, again in February 1986, and then once more in July 1986. In general we can say that this plan has had to be increasingly modified to meet the need to develop bureaucrat capitalism under imperialist domination, principally that of the U.S., linked to semifeudalism, while focusing on overcoming the crisis bureaucrat capitalism has undergone since 1974 and anxiously seeking to "reactivate the economy." For a long time the government hailed the great successes of the "new economy" it had launched, but the reality turned out to be quite different and today the man who pretends to be president has had to call for "thinking it over," to face facts and drop the premature claims of triumph that had filled the air for months.

Let us examine some points. There was a lot of talk about the sharp reduction of inflation, but now it is clear that it was Belaunde, with the inflationary increases and devaluations at the end of his government, who made the present government's so-called "success" possible. As United Left member J. Iguiniz said, "After an economic package like this, it is normal for inflation to level off or fall, as was the case with previous adjustments." But furthermore, the containment of inflation, which is basically

recessive, should have generated "higher real wage increases than turned out to be the case," so that, consequently, "By holding back wage increases, the government had held back the reactivation of the economy." Thus, according to this writer, the government does not deserve any credit for reducing inflation, and at the same time it has held back wages and the much-talked about economic expansion.

If we analyse the problem of real wages more deeply, we see that by January 1986 they had declined to only 89.4% of their purchasing power of July 1985. Furthermore, it should be emphasised that when the July 1985 wage increases were decreed, "salaries jumped curiously higher than wages," while workers without collective bargaining contracts received higher increases than those covered by such contracts — the former rising by 8.8%, the latter by 4.9%. As *Actualidad Economica* said, "The real May-February wage increases in industries where there is no collective bargaining compared to similar enterprises with collective bargaining contracts is particularly noteworthy: 36.9% vs. 4.6%!" The APRA government's class outlook and goals in this are rather indicative. Concerning the boost in the minimum wage the government has bragged about so much, the following should be emphasised: what does a wage of 700 *intis* a month mean when a minimum monthly budget just for food is 2,586 *intis*? How much has the price of food gone up between July 1985 and June 1986? 210.8%, taking into account only the most basic items people usually eat in the cities, particularly the capital, without including milk, bread, sugar and rice, items under price control which have appeared and disappeared from the market time and again.

What has happened in the countryside? There have been grandiose plans, especially regarding the so-called "Andean trapeze" region. Interest-free loans for the region were announced, but these credits were extended to only eight or ten percent of producers, and many of them were not in the mountains. Then there was the 3,200 million *inti*

"Fund to Promote Agriculture and Guarantee Food," 80% of which goes for crops cultivated on the Coast. Actually the "trapeze" region has received only 50,000 *intis*, given to an undetermined number of communities, half in cash and the rest to be delivered, through the usual intermediaries, in materials for community projects. What can be accomplished with this, and for whose benefit? It is easy to see that these materials will benefit whoever controls them, especially APRA party members, who will take advantage of the peasants' free labour. It should be kept in mind that the *People's Cooperation* scheme, in its so-called community works, ended up paying only 23% of their costs, while the peasants paid the remaining 77% with their own hands. This scheme is still in operation, let us recall. Furthermore, the blows dealt to domestic agricultural production by big increases in imported foodstuffs should also be kept in mind, as should the fact that despite this scheme's emphasis on the development of domestic agricultural production in the mountains in particular, it envisions subjugating it to low prices and state control.

We should give some emphasis to the PAIT, another scheme that the government brags about. It employed about 50,000 people in 1985, especially in Lima and the surrounding shantytowns, 80% of them women, paying minimum wage, partly in goods. As the government itself admits, the programme supplements others already in practice elsewhere, and it is inevitably leading to more unemployment. But moreover, the PAIT is a method to organise and control the marginalised masses, to use them against others among the masses. Now the government is seeking to expand the number of people involved to 150,000, of whom 80,000 would be in the mountains and the rest on the coast, mainly in Lima. We can easily see the corporatist political goals that lie at the heart of the PAIT. In the same vein, we should emphasise the overall attacks on the proletariat and the workers in general, and especially underline the so-called "job security" law

which violates the Constitution and opens the way for massive numbers of workers to become redundant. This aspect is even worse in the so-called "Emergency Employment Scheme," which allows public as well as private enterprises to hire personnel for up to two years at minimum wage, provided they are also paid "all the benefits provided for by law," of course; this means that the two-thirds or so of the workforce which is unemployed or underemployed, this huge army of the hungry, will be thrown into the maws of capital accumulation to be squeezed to the last drop like a lemon for the sake of profits. All this without mentioning the government's measures to undermine the workers' grievances, to destroy and divide their unions and to prevent strikes, so as to force the working class and working people to accept the crumbs thrown to them with gratitude for the kindness of their exploiters and the "people's state."

Despite everything being said, neither health nor education receive any consideration. Further, also in violation of the Constitution, to reduce state health expenses they have combined social security services with those of the Ministry of Health, to the detriment of the interests of the workers and working people. Education is also undergoing an assault by APRA teachers and authorities, in order to seize control of it. The government's effort to take direct control of the state universities represents an extremely important attempt to fulfill an old APRA dream. This is the reason for unleashing the campaign against the universities and labeling them "centres of terrorism" several months ago.

To all this must be added the reduction in export earnings by \$500 million this year, plus the increase in imports, leading to a deficit commercial balance which began to appear in June, alongside the foreign exchange deficit beginning last February. Furthermore, despite government denials there is a growing budget deficit, which clearly in this country has always hurt the people, and of course all this inevitably comes on top of the growing foreign debt problem. But we

must have faith, because as the message we've referred to says, "food does not spring up overnight . . . nor do wages . . . but anyway, a people's government starts by strengthening the national morality, which must be guarded over by the country's police forces." We've already seen this "morality" — the reorganisation of the police is its best example.

All of this led Garcia to say in his recent July 1986 message, "*This has been a hard year. There have been shortcomings and problems . . . but the truth, sir, is that this has been a difficult year and the coming years will be too. . . . Nevertheless, we have made progress during the last twelve months, in regard to social and economic developments, and most importantly, in regard to the development of the nation's patience.*" (emphasis ours)

In sum, is this a "people's state"? Does it serve the masses of people? Absolutely not. It is simply the same pro-imperialist, anti-democratic and anti-people class dictatorship, along with some recycled old ideas, old wine in new bottles, and lots of demagogy, all tending towards the corporativisation of Peruvian society under a fascist political leadership able to draw lessons from its domestic predecessors.

THE GENOCIDE COMMITTED AGAINST THE PRISONERS OF WAR IN THE SHINING TRENCHES OF COMBAT. Despite all the meetings between APRA's CONAPLAN (National Government Planning Commission) and the heads of the Armed Forces and all the Velazcoite military advisers, the reactionary APRA government has not yet made public its so-called "new strategy to fight subversion." Plainly all they have done is to continue the old strategy, which we analysed in the first part; at most they have given the Armed Forces more economic, political and social resources, and a freer hand to develop more counterrevolutionary warfare, now aided by the police, against the raging people's war which has been growing and will continue to grow. At first the present government tried to ignore the

people's war, but it exploded in the government's face with the genocide at Aqomarca; then it tried to evade responsibility for this massacre by removing the chief of the Armed Forces Joint Command. But that was a farce, because that dismissal had already been decided upon a week earlier, due to differences of opinion concerning the entry of Yankee troops into the jungle region, while the other resulting changes in the military were taken care of by the military command itself. However, it should be recalled that several days before the genocide at Aqomarca, General Jarama, then head of the II Military Region, was in Ayacucho accompanied by five generals and eight colonels and lieutenant colonels. What were they doing there? Obviously setting into motion a plan approved by the National Defence Council, presided over by Garcia himself. As for the proposed investigations, they came to naught, despite all the evidence, and as we will see the genocidal criminals Hurtado and Artaza were rewarded and upheld as "heroes of democracy." Thus the firings and the investigation were two sides of the same coin, a manoeuvre especially meant to defend the international image of "Mr Constitutional President, supreme chief of the armed forces and police," who had strutted like a righteous peacock before the United Nations. "Our respect for people's lives and rights constitute the democratic credentials we present to the world. Nothing justifies torture, disappearances or summary execution. Savagery cannot be fought with savagery." Let everyone compare his words and deeds! These words fit in with what he said July 28th 1985, to the so-called "Peace Commission." What was he trying to do? What did he do and how did he end up? Shipwrecked, like a boat that had been leaking all along, as a co-participant in the June genocide; the United Left leadership that solemnly negotiated an amnesty for its jailed followers is still waiting for Garcia to fulfill his promise.

Then came the October 1985 Lurigancho genocide. After this, the reactionary APRA government

staged a big farce about a supposed "mass surrender of *Senderistas*" (as the Peruvian press calls PCP members — *AWTW*) in Llochegua and Corazon-Pata, in La Mar province in the department of Ayacucho. The mass media even broadcast a staged meeting between the "supreme commander" and the "surrendering leaders" Garcia received in the presidential palace, filmed from a distance so nobody could hear anything or see anyone's face, for what were called "understandable security reasons." But this poorly worked-out plan soon fell apart when the declarations of the Marine officer who took part in the operation that started it all were made public: "*The officer himself,*" when interviewed by this correspondent, "*explained that the hundred or so people involved, including men, women and children, did not come to the Armed Forces bases at Corazon-Pata and Llochegua of their own free will, but rather were rounded up by the Marines in the high mountain ranges and were then taken to these camps. When Lieutenant 'Anibal' was asked if they were carrying arms when they surrendered, he said no,*" according to *La Republica* October 25, 1985. (emphasis ours) This was the famous "surrender" hoax.

Nevertheless, these plans, actions, genocides and farces were part of APRA's measures against the people's war. To quote the May 18, 1985, *El Nacional*, "APRA will try to crush terrorism during the first hundred days of its government. This is one of the objectives of the emergency plan, part of the overall APRA plan for the government, elaborated and approved by the National Government Planning Commission (CONAPLAN)." But everything, all the manoeuvres and "objectives," blew up in their faces with the unleashing of a new and thundering offensive in the people's war at the end of that year. The Joint Command itself, presided over by Army Commander in Chief General Guillermo Monzon Arunategui, Navy chief Vice Admiral Victor Nicolini and Air Force head General Luis Abram Cavallerino and their advisors all had to travel

to Ayacucho for several days in early February 1986. Why? Essentially to formulate new plans which were then approved by Garcia's National Defence Council. Thus new operations were launched, especially in the V Political-Military Command Zone. As we've seen in the first section, the revolutionary war developed still further, striking violently and hard in the capital city itself.

The June 1986 genocide should be seen within this general framework and the specific plans cooked up a year earlier, as well as taking into account the upcoming anniversary of the APRA's first year in government and the planned congress of the so-called "Socialist International" Garcia sought to use as a trampoline to boost his image as a "third world leader" and to strengthen his government's position internationally, seeking to offset the failures suffered by his domestic political and military plans and the setbacks suffered by his international policies. In addition to this framework, there was an intensification of systematic provocations against the prisoners of war, in violation of agreements they had extracted from the Belaunde government and the APRA government itself October 31st 1985, agreements which recognised them as "special prisoners" and acknowledged their rights as guaranteed by international legislation subscribed to by the Peruvian state as well as Peru's Constitution and the relevant laws. These signed documents and rights were won and defended through firm and stubborn struggles; there was really no other way they could have been obtained. These provocations also included Naval incursions in El Fronton, reconnaissance flights over that prison, as well as other provocations against families and supporters of the prisoners of war, and death threats and beatings given to prisoners who were being taken to court. Moreover, a campaign was relaunched to transfer the prisoners to the new Canto Grande concentration camp and prison authorities made provocative statements about it. Parliament ap-

proved a law stipulating that the prisoners should be transferred to prisons in the areas they were from but Garcia postponed its implementation. With all this in mind, it can be clearly seen that there was a plan to commit large-scale genocide, by hook or by crook, and that the APRA government and reactionary Armed Forces were awaiting the most politically favourable moment to carry it out, in order to strengthen their so-called "democracy" and the APRA government, especially Garcia, and deal a heavy blow to the people's war. It was within this political context of acute class struggle and the development of the armed struggle led by the Party, and of the struggle between revolution and counter-revolution in general, waged principally by force of arms for over six years, that the prisoners of war rose up. The reactionary Peruvian state under Garcia's political leadership, his government and its Armed Forces and police, responded with a genocidal extermination that provoked international repercussions and horrified condemnations of this barbarous genocide. Alan Garcia's touted international prestige crumbled like a sand castle; domestically it provoked the APRA government's most serious crisis so far. The genocide sharpened the contradictions within the reaction itself, particularly shaking up the political institutions, including the United Left, whose head, the APRA-ite Barrantes, had acted as an accomplice by proposing a "united front against terrorism," and shocked the masses of people, whose condemnation can never be obliterated. Thus these repeated and unrepentant genocidal murders have provoked worldwide condemnation and a political crisis which will not abate, a crisis with long-term repercussions.

In June the Communist Party of Peru put out the following Resolution:

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

DAY OF HEROISM

Following in the footsteps of its predecessor, since the very start the reactionary APRA government has resorted to genocide against the

people's war, covering it up with pompous demagoguery, with the support and aid of the electoral opportunists. This was amply proven by the crimes committed by the Peruvian state's police and Armed Forces in Aqomarca, Umaru, Bellavista and Lloclapampa.

The reaction took sinister aim against the prisoners of war, planning their genocidal annihilation. This took place October 4th last year, with the cowardly and brutal murder of 13 combatants in the Lurigancho prison. This is another abominable crime that has gone unpunished, and only the victorious people will be able to mete out punishment.

On the 18th of June 1986, at El Fronton, Lurigancho and El Callao, the prisoners of war rose up in rebellion against the new genocide under way, after having publicly and repeatedly denounced, before the courts and the authorities themselves, the slaughter the government and its Armed Forces were plotting. They arose in defence of the revolution and their lives, putting forward 26 very just and reasonable demands.

On the 19th, after the reactionary APRA government headed by Garcia went through the grotesque farce of manipulating the so-called "peace commission," it unleashed the most vile and evil extermination operation, mobilising the Army, Navy, Air Force and police under the Joint Command to carry out the most monstrous genocide, killing hundreds of prisoners of war, guerrilla fighters and sons and daughters of the people and bathing themselves once more in the ardent blood of the people. Let Alan Garcia, his cabinet, the Joint Command, the Armed Forces and the police be covered with indelible ignominy that the people shall never forget and that only the people shall punish!

The combatants of the People's Guerrilla Army, prisoners of war, fought heroically and daringly, upholding the slogan "It's Right to Rebel" and setting a landmark of heroism, valour and courage that history will cherish as exemplary of the heroes that only a people's war can bring forth.

Thus June 19th is forever stamped as the DAY OF HEROISM. The blood of these heroes is already nurturing the armed revolution, fanning its flames, arising like a tremendous flag unfurled and like an inexhaustible war cry summoning the inevitable final victory.

The glorious death of these prisoners of war in battle is wrapped in the blood already spilt, and before it we communists, fighters and sons and daughters of the people pledge our unwavering commitment to follow their shining example, to develop the people's war in order to serve the world revolution until the inextinguishable light of communism dwells upon the whole earth under the forever victorious banners of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao Tsetung, of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism ever green.

Glory to the fallen heroes! Long live the revolution!

Central Committee
Communist Party of Peru,
June 1986

Furthermore, we must also see that the truth comes out and the facts be recorded for history just as they really occurred; as everyone can see, the episodes we have witnessed are already an indelible part of our history, and we must make sure that they are handed down clearly preserved for future generations. The question is, to make it perfectly clear, in the first place, the responsibility of Alan Garcia, the APRA party leadership, the Cabinet, the Joint Command and the Armed Forces and police. It is evident that the political responsibility principally rests with Alan Garcia, who besides acting as president is supreme commander of the Armed Forces, and it was he and his cabinet who directed the genocidal extermination, carried out principally by the Armed Forces under the leadership of the Joint Command, with the aid of the police.

Secondly, the United Left leadership and especially Barrantes, APRA's man who heads that organisation, are also responsible. In particular the mayor is an ac-

complice because his call for a so-called "united front against terrorism" undeniably helped to prepare the genocide.

Thirdly, it is generally known that the leaders of the political parties and of the Church had been informed of the situation and the measures to be taken. Therefore the question arises, what did they do? Doesn't their silence imply co-participation and in some cases complicity?

Fourthly, the cunning distortions and disgusting implications poured out by the press and broadcast media are impermissible. Amongst these, the weekly newspaper *Amauta* has provoked surprise and repugnance. Do such distortions and implications serve the people or do they serve reaction? Whatever disagreements and opposing positions there might be cannot justify vile filth, all the more when it is a matter of fighters willing to give their lives for their ideas, who deserve no less than respect from any decent person.

Fifthly, this genocidal extermination is undeniably a milestone in the class struggle in this country and its repercussions have brought about the APRA government's biggest crisis so far, provoking shock at home and abroad. It shows the decrepitude of the prevailing social system and the incontrovertible need to completely and thoroughly overthrow it, no matter how long it takes, because history already demands it; moreover and very revealingly it has shattered the phony "nationalistic," "democratic" and "popular" mask worn by APRA and the sham president, demonstrating the essence of things for all who wish to see — the fascist and corporatist road the government has set out on and will continue to follow.

Finally, the armed actions unfolding since 1980 show very clearly, even if some people choose not to see it for whatever reasons, that a powerful and ever-growing people's war is developing as the ardent expression of the class struggle, sustained by the masses, whose support is undeniable because without it the persistence of the people's war would be inexplicable. It is a people's war led by the Communist

Party of Peru, following Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, the ever victorious ideology of the proletariat whose emancipation it serves, together with that of the people, as part of the world revolution. The genocide committed in the Shining Trenches of Combat at El Fronton, Lurigancho and El Callao against Party members, fighters of the People's Guerrilla Army and sons and daughters of the people who fought alongside us, is an inseparable part of our people's war; and moreover it is a milestone of that war. With their rebellion they built a monument we will always commemorate as the Day of Heroism, on which are engraved along with others the indelible names of our comrades David Javier Guevara Torres (Alejandro) and Victor Felipe Vidal Marino (Jose).

As for the background to this genocide, we must take into account the different struggles that had taken place in the Shining Trenches of Combat, emphasising among them the joint struggle of July 13th, 1985, in which the first signed agreement was won, and the genocide of October 4th of the same year and its corollary on the 31st of the same month when the second agreement was extracted from the APRA government. As for the facts, a good chronology of the events of June 18th and 19th is needed; moreover the general tendency is to emphasise the events at Lurigancho. Without at all minimising the special importance of the events there, it is also very important to expose what happened at El Fronton; to cover up the events there would mean covering up the responsibility of the Navy, an institution which has carried out sinister genocide and which perversely and bloodthirstily continues this policy today with the disappearance of the bodies of the fallen heroes. We reiterate the Army's responsibility at Lurigancho despite its attempts to make the Republican Guard the scapegoat; the Republican Guard shares the blame but is not the main culprit. It is also appropriate to point out the statements signed by judicial and parliamentary authorities who initially took steps regarding the situation only to be ignored and

who subsequently resigned their posts, whereupon they were replaced by members of the military court of justice. Likewise it is also worth clarifying the role of the so-called "Peace Commission" which either consciously or through manipulation served to make it look like there was mediation when there really was none. Regarding what happened after the genocide, it is key to analyse Garcia's speeches at the Congress of the Second International, on television and above all his performance at Lurigancho. Aware of the facts since the very beginning, he let loose a flood of hysterical demagoguery to cover up, deceive and especially to save his own image. It should also be emphasised that Alva's absence at the start doesn't exempt him in any way from his responsibilities as chairman of the Cabinet; moreover, though he was present at Lurigancho and knew all the facts, he shrewdly kept his silence so as to absolve himself of all responsibility. In the same way then-Justice Minister Gonzalez Posada is also directly responsible despite his cunning resignation for phony "ethical reasons." One fact should be remembered: after the bloody events of January 15th 1986 he said that those accused of terrorism would not be transferred to Canto Grande, but with his "resignation" he seeks to keep his image clean for the future. Apart from this question of political responsibility, it is evident that others responsible are: General Monzon Arrunategui, chairman of the Joint Command, and Vice Admiral Nicolini and General Abram Cavallerino, also of the Joint Command, members, respectively, of the Army, Navy and Air Force and those principally responsible for leading the operations, along with the secondary responsibility of the police. These men, in accordance with the policies of genocide and extermination taught them by their Yankee masters, planned, organised and carried out the genocidal extermination plans in violation of even the most basic and universally accepted rules of warfare such as those of the Geneva Convention. Likewise it is indispensable to analyse the role

played by Congress' Permanent Commission, which instead of dealing with the events as a matter of public interest which should have been openly aired, maliciously treated them as secret and then postponed looking into them until the following session of parliament. The performance of the different parties that belong to the Permanent Commission has been very revealing, especially that of the IU, whose document presented in the Commission condemns those who arose in defence of the revolution and their lives and treats the rights of their relatives as humanitarian gifts for which they should beg.

Finally, we must denounce before the proletariat and peoples of the world the slimy role played by the so-called "Socialist International" in this genocide. It should be recalled that it originated from the old revisionists who defended their bourgeoisies and led the masses to be cannon fodder under the slogan "defend the fatherland" in that first great imperialist war of plunder, in opposition to Lenin's great thesis of turning the imperialist war into a revolutionary war, which when firmly applied led to triumph over the renegades and to the Great October Revolution. The counter-revolutionary work carried out by social-democracy with Ebert at its head should also be recalled — united with the exploiters and German militarists they drowned the German revolution in fire and blood and held back the revolution throughout Europe; sinking further into parliamentary cretinism, they became a prop of imperialism, firemen to be used to smother revolutionary sparks among the proletariat and people. Since the 1950s they have discarded like old leaves the few Marxist terms that, empty of content, had clung to them, in order to continue wheeling and dealing as social democratic parties mainly in the service of European imperialism, and in recent decades in the service of these masters they have tried to extend their influence in Latin America, which was why they were so eager to hold their congress in Lima. We must especially denounce their party boss Willy Brandt for his dirty

and miserable defence of Garcia, seeking to exonerate him of his responsibility for mass genocide while defaming the people's war being waged in Peru. In the same way we denounce Carlos Andres Perez, a bloodstained swaggerer who like his predecessors used fire and sword to crush the Venezuelan armed struggle, and who today, passing himself off as a democrat, has been Garcia's and the APRA's big defender. Thus the self-proclaimed "Socialist International" by trying to cover up the June genocide, has only continued to bathe itself in the blood of the proletariat and the people, this time of the Peruvian proletariat and people, of the hundreds of their sons and daughters who were savagely annihilated; but in doing so they undermined their own congress, which took place in the midst of the shocks and tremours provoked by the genocide they'd tried to cover up, thus sharpening their own internal contradictions, until it fizzled out without grief or glory in the middle of the night, amidst confusion due to changes in agenda and meetings suspended and even prematurely brought to a halt, despite the thousands of soldiers and police guarding their meeting headquarters. In this way the rebellion and the subsequent massacre served to once more unmask the long and black history of the slimy "Socialist International," with a bloody and shocking new lesson that makes plain its pro-imperialist and reactionary essence.

After this genocidal extermination, Garcia tried to wash his indelibly bloody hands and restore his image with huge ads in the principal newspapers of the world costing the Peruvian people eight million dollars, to no avail. Today he continues this effort, cynically and scandalously lying in "interviews" published in foreign publications such as *El Nacional* of Caracas, where he said, "No. At El Fronton the Marines only helped out with explosives to blow open a breach"; referring to the shooting of the prisoners of war at Lurigancho, he says, "We have denounced it. We have arrested a hundred people for that crime, and right now they are being held in jail." However, fac-

ed with the political defeat he has suffered due to his own errors which are as big or bigger than his vanity, he resorts to the same stale insults as Belaunde and others to express the hatred revolution fills him with: "Shining Path' is an anarchistic and cruel outburst, in the style of Pol Pot, and that's why I am vigorously anti- 'Shining Path,'" he recently told the U.S. magazine *Newsweek*. The basic question behind all this demagogic foliage is clear and concrete — the people's war is the main problem confronted by the Peruvian state and its reactionary APRA government, as "Mr constitutional president and supreme chief of the armed forces and police" clearly said in his July 1986 message: "*The foremost obstacle to our democracy is subversive violence*"; further, in the same message, knowing very well what is holding up the reactionary state and himself, he reiterated for the nth time recently, "*I salute and express my full support for the Armed Forces and police, which are loyal, respectful and obedient to the constitutional government.*"

For years now, but especially since the genocide, the condemnations of the people's war have grown, condemning revolutionary violence in the name of bourgeois pacifism and the masses and accusing the Party of being sectarian. We propose that all those who are capable of seeing reality, and especially those who are obligated to see it, think seriously and deeply about the following quotes and experiences.

Regarding pacifism. We ask, aren't the calls for peace in accord with the "pacification" sought by the Armed Forces, Garcia, APRA, etc.? Is this a coincidence? No — one should recall what happened in Uruguay in the 1970s. To combat the Tupamaros, the repressive forces also put forward the necessity for "pacification." The revisionists, according to Rodney Arismendi, their leader, promoted a movement for peace, justice, democracy and other pleas; the end result, as we all know, was that all this only served to help the Uruguayan reaction smash the Tupamaros. Is this, then, what they

want in our country? The smashing of the people's war? The difference is that here what is developing is a people's war led by a Communist Party that follows Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, Guiding Thought; we are not Tupamaros, ours is a different ideology with everything that derives from that. These words from Lenin deserve serious consideration: "Marxism is not pacifism. Of course, one must strive for the speediest possible termination of the war. However, the demand for 'peace' acquires proletarian meaning only if it is linked to a call for *revolutionary* struggle. Without a series of revolutions, what is called a lasting peace is a philistine Utopia" — "Whoever wants a lasting and democratic peace must stand for civil war against the governments and bourgeoisie."

On revolutionary violence, Engels' words, called by Lenin a "panegyric on violent revolution," should be kept in mind:

"... That force, however, plays another role (other than that of a diabolical power), in history; that, in the words of Marx, it is the midwife of every old society which is pregnant with a new one, that it is the instrument with which social movement forces its way through and shatters the dead, fossilised political forms — of this there is not a word in Herr Duhring. It is only with sighs and groans that he admits the possibility that force will perhaps be necessary for the overthrow of an economy based on exploitation — unfortunately, because all use of force demoralises, he says, the person who uses it. And this is in spite of the immense moral and spiritual impetus which has been given by every victorious revolution! And this is Germany, where a violent revolution — which may, after all, be forced on the people — would at least have the merit of wiping out the servility which has penetrated the nation's mentality following the humiliation of the Thirty Year's War. And this person's mode of thought — dull, insipid and impotent — presumes to impose itself on the most revolutionary party that history has known!"

And on what Lenin taught, "The necessity of systematically imbuing the masses with *this* and precisely this view of violent revolution lies at the root of the *entire* theory of Marx and Engels."

And furthermore, Chairman Mao's great thesis should be deeply considered,

"The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and all other countries."

"Whoever has an army has power, and war decides everything."

"A few small political parties with a short history, e.g. the Youth Party, have no army and so have not been able to get anywhere.

"In other countries there is no need for each of the bourgeois parties to have an armed force under its direct command. But things are different in China, where, because of the feudal division of the country, those landlord or bourgeois groupings or parties which have guns have power, and those which have more guns have more power. Placed in such an environment, the party of the proletariat should see clearly to the heart of the matter.

"Communists do not fight for personal military power (they must in no circumstances do that, and let no one ever again follow the example of Chang Kuo-tao), but they must fight for military power for the people. As a national war of resistance is going on, we must also fight for military power for the nation. Where there is naivete on the question of military power, nothing whatsoever can be achieved. It is very difficult for the labouring people, who have been deceived and intimidated by the reactionary ruling classes for thousands of years, to awaken to the importance of having guns in their own hands. Now that Japanese imperialist oppression and the nation-wide resistance to it have pushed our labouring people into the arena of war, Communists should prove themselves the most politically conscious leaders in the war. Every Communist must grasp the truth, 'Political power grows

out of the barrel of a gun.' Our principle is that the Party commands the gun, and the gun must never be allowed to command the Party. Yet, having guns, we can create Party organisations, as witness the powerful Party organisations which the Eighth Route Army has created in northern China. We can also create cadres, create schools, create culture, create mass movements. Everything in Yenan has been created by having guns. All things grow out of the barrel of a gun. According to the Marxist theory of the state, the army is the chief component of state power, whoever wants to seize and retain state power must have a strong army. Some people ridicule us as advocates of the 'omnipotence of war.' Yes, we are advocates of the omnipotence of revolutionary war; that is good, not bad, it is Marxist. The guns of the Russian Communist Party created socialism. We shall create a democratic republic. Experience in the class struggle in the era of imperialism teaches us that it is only by the power of the gun that the working class and the labouring masses can defeat the armed bourgeoisie and the landlords; in this sense we may say that only with guns can the whole world be transformed. We are advocates of the abolition of war, we do not want war; but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun."

And since we are on the subject, while discussing other fundamental questions it is not out of place to analyse the profound meaning of the following words by Lenin: "The mind of an opportunist, full of stingy philistinism and 'reformist' stagnation, only sees what occurs around him, namely: only 'municipalities'!

"The opportunist has even grown out of the habit of thinking about proletarian revolution."

Regarding the masses, the following deserves to be studied conscientiously:

"One of the most common sophistries of Kautskyism is its reference to the 'masses.' We do not want, they say, to break away from the masses and mass organisa-

tions! But just think how Engels put the question. In the nineteenth century the 'mass organisations' of the English trade unions were on the side of the bourgeois labour party. Marx and Engels did not reconcile themselves to it on this ground; they exposed it. They did not forget, firstly, that the trade union organisations directly embraced a *minority of the proletariat*. In England then, as in Germany now, not more than one-fifth of the proletariat was organised. No one can seriously think it possible to organise the majority of the proletariat under capitalism. Secondly — and this is the main point — it is not so much a question of the size of an organisation, as of the real, objective significance of its policy: does its policy represent the masses, does it serve them, i.e. does it aim at their liberation from capitalism, or does it represent the interests of the minority, the minority's reconciliation with capitalism? The latter was true of England in the nineteenth century, and it is true of Germany, etc., now.

"Engels draws a distinction between the 'bourgeois labour party' of the *old* trade unions — the privileged minority — and the '*lower* mass,' the real majority, and appeals to the latter, who are *not* infected by 'bourgeois respectability.' This is the essence of Marxist tactics!

"Neither we nor anyone else can calculate precisely what portion of the proletariat is following and will follow the social-chauvinists and opportunists. This will be revealed only by the struggle, it will be definitively decided only by the socialist revolution. But we know for certain that the 'defenders of the fatherland' and the imperialist war *represent* only a minority. And it is therefore our duty, if we wish to remain socialists, to go down *lower* and *deeper*, to the real masses; this is the whole meaning and the whole purpose of the struggle against opportunism. By exposing the fact that the opportunists and social-chauvinists are in reality betraying and selling the interests of the masses, that they are defending the temporary privileges of the minority of workers, that they are the

vehicles of bourgeois ideas and influences, that they are really allies and agents of the bourgeoisie, we teach the masses to appreciate their true political interests, to fight for socialism and for the revolution through all the long and painful vicissitudes of imperialist wars and imperialist armistices.

"The only Marxist line in the world labour movement is to explain to the masses the inevitability and necessity of breaking with opportunism, to educate them for revolution by waging a relentless struggle against opportunism, to utilise the experiences of the war to expose, not conceal, the utter vileness of national-labour politics." (Lenin, *Imperialism and the Split in Socialism*.)

And most especially, this great truth expressed by Chairman Mao Tsetung should be thoroughly and deeply reflected upon, "Marxism consists of thousands of truths, but they all boil down to the one sentence, 'It is right to rebel.' For thousands of years, it has been said that it was right to oppress, it was right to exploit, and it was wrong to rebel. This old verdict was only reversed by the appearance of Marxism. This is a great contribution. It was through struggle that the proletariat learned this truth, and Marx drew the conclusion. And from this truth there follows resistance, struggle, the fight for socialism."

Finally, regarding our supposed sectarianism, we would like to recall Mariategui:

"We are living in a period of total ideological war. Those who represent a renovating force cannot, either by accident or chance, unite or merge themselves with those who represent conservatism or regression. There is a historic abyss between them. They speak different languages and have a different understanding of history."

"I think we should unite the like-minded and not those who differ. We should approach those whom history wants to unite. There should be solidarity between those of whom history requires solidarity. This, it seems to me, is the only possible alliance. A common understanding with a precise and ef-

fective sense of history.”

“I am a revolutionary. But I believe that men who think clearly and definitively will be able to understand and appreciate each other, even while struggling against each other. The one political force with whom I will never reach an understanding is the other camp: mediocre reformism, domesticated reformism, hypocritical democracy.”

These, in our judgement, are some of the basic questions that have emerged after the APRA government's first year. In synthesis, the APRA party, its government and Garcia who heads them both, responding to the development and future perspectives of Peruvian society, which is rotting alive, and of the reactionary Peruvian state, and developing their own contradictions, have plunged into the corporativisation of the Peruvian state and society guided by a fascist political orientation. The key reasons behind this reactionary decision and future perspective are the persistent and unyielding struggle of the people, the masses and the organisations that genuinely defend the people's interests, above all the people's war led by the Communist Party, and, concretely, in the current conjuncture, the sharpening of the class struggle, the intensification of the people's war and the rebellion of the prisoners of war against whom this vile genocidal extermination was unleashed, a genocide which was the last straw and in turn has drawn a line of demarcation and shattered the phony demagogy about the “nationalist, democratic and people's state,” and helped to sharpen the contradiction within which the APRA party is trapped, by exposing its underlying fascist and corporatist essence. Under Garcia's leadership APRA has followed the strategy of relying on the poor masses of the shantytowns, and of winning over the peasants in the mountains, especially in the so-called “Andean trapeze” region, to hold back the people's struggle, especially by using the United Left as shock troops, and of uniting all the reactionaries under APRA's command, to isolate the proletariat,

repress the broad masses and target the people's war. To accomplish this APRA has relied on repression carried out by the Armed Forces and police. Now this strategy will be heightened with even more demagogic lies about the “nationalist, democratic and people's state” and even more pompous verbal anti-imperialism.

During the last year the United Left has supported the APRA government and even acted as its shock troops, mainly due to the work of Barrantes, APRA's man who heads up the IU, and to the course set by its national leadership. Furthermore, in the context of the past months and especially of the crisis generated by the unleashing of the genocide, the United Left — despite its internal contradictions, since its principal aspect is electoralism — has continued to be what the British call “Her Majesty's loyal opposition,” the government's shield against wind and rain, in the name of the “defence of democracy,” as it so often claimed, and even more in the name of “preventing a coup d'etat.” These old opportunist excuses for the most wanton electoralism in our history have been more feverently upheld than ever under the empire of Barrantes and his supporters. Today with the United Left's “disagreements overcome” but its internal contradictions remaining, as well as those between the United Left and APRA, the IU is preparing for the municipal elections into which they and APRA hope to channel the people and keep them from their real interests and true path.

* * *

These are the more than six years of people's war, its flames blazing and spreading, led by the Party, relying on the masses of people, principally the peasants, under the streaming banners of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, the sole and universal world outlook of the proletariat, and Guiding Thought, its application to the concrete reality of the Peruvian revolution. This people's war, which has served the international proletarian revolution since the beginning and will continue to do so, enjoys the support of

the international working class and the world's peoples, of the genuine communists and revolutionaries, and especially of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement of which the Party is a member. This people's war, which will continue to advance undaunted, because as Marx pointed out the banner of armed struggle cannot be lowered until the achievement of communism, pledges more solemnly than ever before, under the Party's leadership, to develop base areas for the emancipation of the Peruvian people and thus advance in fulfilling the main contribution the Communist Party of Peru can make to the world revolution at present. And this Party that is leading the people's war, the greatest accomplishment of the Peruvian proletariat and people, with a profound sense of historical responsibility pledges to strive untiringly for Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to command and guide the world proletarian revolution, since only in this way will it march ahead steadfastly and victoriously, and, with the full conviction that only with guns will we transform the world, holds high the struggle for the proletariat and peoples of the world to take up people's war as the only complete and true proletarian military doctrine and the main form of struggle through which we shall sweep imperialism and reaction from the face of the earth, putting it into practice, as Chairman Mao taught, according to conditions, whether they be of democratic revolution, socialist revolution or the great proletarian cultural revolution, and according to the specific conditions of each concrete revolution as well as of the world revolution taken as a whole.

**DEVELOP THE PEOPLE'S
WAR IN THE SERVICE OF THE
WORLD REVOLUTION!**

**GLORY TO MARXISM-
LENINISM-MAOISM!**

**LONG LIVE THE WORLD
PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION!**

**LONG LIVE CHAIRMAN
GONZALO!**

Central Committee,
**COMMUNIST PARTY OF
PERU**

Peru, August 1986

□