

The Communist Party of Peru on Fascism

The following is a compilation of excerpts from various works by Chairman Gonzalo, Mariátegui, and the Communist Party of Peru.

- RedLibrary.xyz, October 2023.

TNF Stands for “The New Flag,” the on-line distributor of some of these works. All works by Mariátegui were retrieved from marxists.org.

Contents

1	The Crisis of Democracy (1923)	5
2	H.G. Wells and Fascism (1927)	11
3	Interview with Chairman Gonzalo (July 1988)	19
4	II Plenum (Feb. 1991)	35
5	Unite the People (Feb. 1998)	45

1 The Crisis of Democracy (1923)

José Carlos Mariátegui.

The symptoms of a crisis of the democratic order could be felt since before the war. What has driven this crisis? The parallel increase and concentration of capitalism and of the proletariat. The countries' economic life and economic forces have passed into the hands of these two great powers, beside which the State has acquired a role, not as referee, but as mediator. The conflicts, the contrasts between one force and the other, could not be solved by the State save through deals, direct agreements between them. In those deals, the State has but played the role of matchmaker. The shape of a new society has been incubating in the form of the old society. The nation, by virtue of the new social reality, has

1 The Crisis of Democracy (1923)

ceased to be a predominantly political entity, to become a predominantly economic entity. This change in the nation's substance has brought about the crisis of the political State. History shows us that a society's forms of social and political organization correspond with the structure, with the tendency of the productive forces. Bourgeois society, for example, has no origin other than in the birth of industry. Within Medieval society, the bourgeoisie was the industrial class, the artisan class. As the bourgeoisie grew richer, as industry grew, the privileges of the aristocracy, of the nobility, became unbearable. The laborer and the bourgeois were mixed at that time into a single class: the people. The bourgeoisie was the people's vanguard and it was the class which led the revolution. Laborer and bourgeois coincided in the wish to abolish the aristocracy's privileges. More than by reasons of ideology, the fall of the aristocracy, of the medieval order, was determined by concrete reasons in the emergence of a new form of production: industry. New forms of production have been created un-

der the democratic order, the bourgeois order. Industry has developed extraordinarily, pushed along by the machine. Huge industrial enterprises have emerged. The expansion of these new productive forces does not allow the old political molds to endure. It has transformed the structure of nations and demands a transformation in the democratic order's structure. Bourgeois democracy has ceased to correspond with the organization of the productive forces which have changed and grown formidably. That's why democracy is in crisis. Parliament is democracy's typical institution. The crisis of democracy is a crisis of parliament. We have already seen how the two great contemporary forces are capital and labor and how, beyond parliament, these forces clash or struggle. Democracy's theorists might suppose that these forces are, or should be, proportionally represented in parliament. But it is not so, because society is not split cleanly between capitalists and proletarians. Between the capitalist class and the proletarian class there are a series of amorphous and intermediary layers. Be-

1 The Crisis of Democracy (1923)

sides, just as the whole proletarian class does not have a precise awareness of its historical and class necessities, the whole of the capitalist class is not gifted with a precise class consciousness. The mentality of the big industrialist or the banker is not the same as the mentality of the medium rentier or retail merchant. This dispersion of social classes is reflected in parliament which, therefore, does not exactly reflect the large interests at play. The political State turns out to be an integral representation of all social layers. But the conservative force and the revolutionary force polarize into single-interest groupings: capitalism and proletariat. Within the parliamentary order there is room only for coalition governments. Today, the tendency is toward factional governments.

Currently, the intensifying of the class struggle, the expansion of social warfare, has accentuated this crisis of democracy. The proletariat attempts the decisive assault on the State and on political power in order to transform society. Its growth in the parliaments is threatening to the bourgeoisie. Democracy's

legal instruments have turned out to be insufficient for preserving the democratic order. Conservatism has needed to appeal to illegal action, to extra-legal methods. The middle class, society's intermediate and heterogeneous zone, has been the nerve center of this movement. Lacking a class consciousness of its own, the middle class feels itself equally distant from, and inimical to, capitalism and the proletariat, but some capitalist sectors are represented within it. And, as the current battle is waged between capital and the proletariat, all intervention from a third element must operate to the benefit of the conservative class. Capitalism and the proletariat are two great and singular camps of gravitation which draw in the scattered forces. Whosoever reacts against the proletariat serves capitalism. This falls to the middle class, from whose ranks the fascist movement has recruited its partisans. Fascism is not an Italian phenomenon, it is an international phenomenon. The first European country in which fascism appeared was Italy because in Italy the class struggle was

1 The Crisis of Democracy (1923)

in a sharper period, because in Italy the revolutionary situation was most violent and decisive.

2 H.G. Wells and Fascism (1927)

José Carlos Mariátegui.

The judgment on the present of a skillful man in translating the past and imagining the future always has a conspicuous interest. Especially if this man is Mr. H.G. Wells, whom perhaps there is no one in the world who does not know as a methodical explorer of history and utopia. H.G. Wells, from his historian and novelist's study, has set himself to observe "how the world is progressing" and to communicate his impressions to the public through articles. One of the most discussed articles in this series up to today is the one that aims to answer the question: What is fascism?

Wells decided to judge and define fascism when he believed he had abundant materi-

2 H.G. Wells and Fascism (1927)

als for this examination. He had more haste and less caution when studying the Bolshevik revolution. The Soviet experiment and the Moscow scene probably attracted him more due to their romantic mirages of social utopia. On the other hand, his book of impressions about Lenin's Russia, reread at a certain distance, must have revealed to him the difference between his usual speculations as a historian and novelist and the exceptional endeavor of understanding and judging a revolution, its spirit, and its people.

Fascism is no longer the same nebulous entity it was in the days of the March on Rome, when many eminent liberals probably held it in high regard, as the author of *The Outline of History* abdicated before it. The task of studying it is thus quite simplified. Today, scholars have a rich collection of concepts that define the various factors behind the formation of fascism. Mussolini's governmental experiment has reached its fourth anniversary. Therefore, Wells' judgment is based on a broad and secure foundation.

It does not contain, perhaps for this rea-

son, original propositions regarding the origins of the fascist movement. H.G. Wells, in this study, follows more or less the same path as other critics of fascism. He finds the spiritual roots of it in D'Annunzio's ideology and Marinetti's "futurism," already classified as interconnected phenomena.

And, logically, in his conclusions, Wells also offers no originality. His attitude is the characteristic attitude of a reformist, a democrat, albeit tormented by a series of "doubts about democracy" and concerns about reform. Fascism appears to him more like a cataclysm than as the consequence and outcome in Italy of the breakdown of bourgeois democracy and the defeat of the proletarian revolution. As a convinced evolutionist, Wells cannot conceive of fascism as a possible phenomenon within the logic of history. He has to understand it as an exceptional phenomenon. For Wells, fascism is a monstrous, teratological movement, only possible in a people with defective education, prone to all the excesses of action and speech. Mussolini, says Wells, "is a product of Italy, a morbid product." And the Ital-

2 *H.G. Wells and Fascism (1927)*

ian people, a people who have not properly studied world geography or history.

In this, as in almost all the intellectual attitudes of H.G. Wells, one can easily identify the qualities and flaws of the educator, the evolutionist, and the Englishman.

The accusation against the pedagogue involves not only the didactic style of presentation but also the very essence of their judgment. Wells believes that one of the causes of fascism is the inadequate development of secondary and higher education in the Italian nation. In his opinion, poor schools and insufficient colleges have been the primary factors behind the fascist sentiment. However, this concept lacks the broad significance required to be accepted and endorsed. Wells seems to pinpoint the deficiency in secondary and university education and, even more specifically, in the teaching of universal geography and history.

And this gesture denounces the English. The British Empire would not be conceivable on the basis of a people poorly educated in universal geography. The English-

man is necessarily the one for whom geography is of greater importance. A cultured man from Belgium or Switzerland may ignore this science; an Englishman cannot. Without a solid knowledge of geography, England would not be able to maintain its dominance of the seas or its colonial empire on all continents. It is therefore explained why an English teacher considers men of other nationalities to be poorly educated in geography. The same applies to history. History and sociology, in the view of an Englishman, have almost no other purpose than to demonstrate how all human progress culminates in the British Empire and how the evolution of the species culminates in the Englishman.

There is another reason why fascism may appear to an English professor as the result of a particular ignorance of universal geography and history. That reason is that fascism is imperialistic. Fascists aim to restore the Roman Empire. Mussolini's dream looks towards the reconstruction of the imperial Rome. Therefore, the imperialistic sentiment of every British citizen is particularly trou-

2 *H.G. Wells and Fascism (1927)*

bling. This can only be understood as the product of a limited and delayed education in geography and history.

The evolutionist is certainly no less present and visible in H.G. Wells and his opinions. It is as if it is inherent to the English and the educator. The entire pre-war pedagogy is based on an absolute belief in the dogma of progress. And evolutionism, in all its aspects, is becoming increasingly clear as a typical product of the British mentality. All evolutionary theses tend to fundamentally demonstrate that the human future will be a continuation of English history, which crowns the efforts of all races and cultures.

If Great Britain and evolutionism were not in crisis, if many symptoms did not point to their decline, the opinions of Mr. H.G. Wells on fascism would be much more considerable and significant. But in our days, fascism, in truth, has little to fear from reformist and democratic criticism, even if it comes from a writer of Wells' stature. With the simple and worn-out arsenal of evolutionism and liberalism, a serious theoretical of-

fensive against fascism and its condottiero¹ is no longer possible. Revolutionary thought and action, as Mr. Wells himself acknowledges with his “doubts about democracy,” have more modern and cutting-edge weapons.

¹RedLibrary: Italian word for a leader of a band of mercenaries.

3 Interview with Chairman Gonzalo (July 1988)

EL DIARIO: Why do you characterize the APRA¹ government as fascist and corporativist? What do you base this on? What is your opinion of Alan García Pérez's speech at the APRA Youth Congress in Ayacucho and the one he gave in Paita? What is your opinion of the economic measures of the new cabinet?

CHAIRMAN GONZALO: Concerning the characterization of the APRA government. Without looking at its historical aspect, which has other implications that we don't need to

¹RedLibrary: APRA was the political party of Alan García Pérez, the president of Peru from 1985-1990.

3 Interview with Chairman Gonzalo (July 1988)

examine today, the concrete situation that APRA was faced with, when by agreement it was given leadership of the Peruvian state, was one full of dilemmas. There existed two tendencies within it. One was fascist and the other was demo-liberal. This is what was going on in APRA, and we understand that in this case the demo-liberal position meant the maintenance of the reactionary constitutional order established in 1920, in 1933, and in 1979. That's what we mean by the demo-liberal order.

APRA had a problem—its need for investments to be able to push forward the economy, or more exactly, to showcase some successes. This is what they have done, use up what little they had in order to present us with a showcase of successes as fragile as glass. And we are seeing the proof of this today. So there is no way you can say that APRA's plan was a good economic plan, because if it was such a good plan, why are the results so bad? It doesn't make sense. So APRA had to resort to using capital from the comprador bourgeoisie and they, obviously,

demanded certain conditions. In APRA's own documents they say that by the end of 1985 the big bourgeoisie, particularly the comprador bourgeoisie, was already beginning to recover and to cash in. The year 1986 was like paradise for them. They made billions of dollars in profits, as they themselves have said, thinking that later they would reinvest. But this plan was not going to work, the economy was bound to go into crisis and fail, and therefore they could not reinvest. Since then the conflict between them has sharpened further, hence the struggles between the two factions of the big bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, APRA, with regard to the people, was confronted with the immense, unsatisfied needs of the masses. Demagogically, as always, they made promises to everybody; demagogically, because what APRA sought to do was simply try to develop, to unfold the reactionary economic process which could not be carried out without restricting the income of the people, because, where do profits come from? From surplus value. So they had a problem with the masses and they

3 Interview with Chairman Gonzalo (July 1988)

knew it, hence, their repressive, anti-popular, anti-union, anti-worker policies. This could be seen from the beginning. But there were other circumstances, the people's war. Even though they did not want to, APRA had to confront the people's war, which was already a central problem.

All these conditions are the ones that determined that changes had to take place inside APRA in order to resolve their dilemma. But when did they resolve it? The dilemma got resolved with the genocide of 1986. The class struggle of the masses, the people's war principally, and the genocidal actions pushed APRA to choose fascism and brought about the triumph of the fascist faction. We believe that it was then that it happened, and so began what everyone now recognizes as the loss of prestige and a setback for APRA, not only in Peru, but in the whole world.

Why do we call it fascist? The fascist faction that already existed in APRA took political measures to implement corporativization, although it was already contained in the first speech by García Pérez in July 1985.

What do we understand by fascist and corporativist? For us fascism is the negation of liberal-democratic principles, the negation of the bourgeois-democratic principles which were born and developed in the eighteenth century in France. These principles are being abandoned by reactionaries, by the bourgeoisie world-wide. So it was that the First World War that made us see the crisis of the bourgeois democratic order, that's why later fascism emerged. So, in APRA what is going on is this negation of the principles of the bourgeois-democratic order and we see daily proof of the negation of all the constitutionally established rights and liberties. We see fascism also on the ideological plane as an eclectic system without a defined philosophy. It is a philosophical position made up of fragments chosen from here and there according to what's most useful. This is clearly expressed in García Pérez. When he goes to Harare in Africa he's an African and he salutes the Africans, salutes Kenneth Kaunda. When he goes to India he salutes Gandhi, he's a Gandhian. When he goes to Mexico he

3 Interview with Chairman Gonzalo (July 1988)

hails Zapata, he's a Zapatista. When he goes to the Soviet Union, if he ever does, he'll be the champion of Perestroika. He's like that because this is the ideological and philosophical training of fascism, it does not have a defined stand, it is eclectic and it takes what is at hand.

With regard to its corporativism. We understand corporativism as the setting up of the state based on corporations, which implies the negation of parliamentarism. This is an essential point that Mariátegui gave emphasis to in "Historia de la crisis mundial" ["History of the World Crisis"—TRANS.]. He said that the crisis of bourgeois democracy expresses itself clearly in the crisis of parliamentarism. Looking at the parliament here, while it is true that in the last decades it has been the executive branch that has produced the most important laws in this country, it is during this APRA government that the executive has monopolized the creation of all the fundamental laws for its own purposes. No important laws have come from the parliament. This is a fact, and everything has

been aimed at giving powers to the executive so that it can do and undo as it pleases. Everything is a negation of parliamentarism.

The problem of corporativism in our country is not a recent one. Already in 1933, during the second restructuring of the Peruvian State in this century, when the Constitution was being debated, Víctor Andrés Belaúnde put forward the corporativization of Peruvian society. Villarán, who was the chairman of the reporting committee of the Constitution, opposed it stating: how are we going to corporativize if there are no corporations? It was a way of dodging the issue. Those are precedents. Now that they are talking so much about Mr. Belaúnde, whose works have just been published, it is fitting to remember his stand: in the face of liberalism—which focuses on money—and communism—which negates the individual—what we need are corporatist systems modeled after those of medieval times. It is good to keep this in mind in order to see corporativism's affiliation and its roots, and also keep very much in mind that it is intimately linked to the positions set forth by the

3 Interview with Chairman Gonzalo (July 1988)

Papacy starting in the past century.

Velasco also tried to corporativize the country. That's why he started the formation of corporations of agricultural producers, for example. His own agrarian law 17716 had the political aim of establishing corporatist bases. The industrial law did, too. How? Through the industrial community. His famous political organization, which was never consolidated, also put forward positions which were clearly fascist and corporatist. But they didn't succeed in carrying it out in Peru. And what are they trying to do? What do they want? They want the formation of corporations, that is to organize the producers and all members of society along corporatist lines. Let's assume that the small factory producers, the agricultural producers, merchants, professionals, students, the Church, the Armed Forces, and the Police Forces all name their delegates and, in this way form a corporative system. This is what they are seeking to do and what APRA is doing. And the regions and micro-regions, what is their significance? This whole plan for establish-

ing regions today serves the corporativization of our country, that is why we have to oppose it openly- not only because it represents political maneuvering by APRA for electoral advantage, but because it is a corporatist system, and furthermore, it is putting a country which doesn't even have a consolidated national unity at risk. These are extremely serious matters. For these reasons we say it is a fascist and corporatist government. The road they are trying to promote explains their great preoccupation with the regions that they want to impose, no matter what it takes. This is what we are seeing and hence all these extraordinary parliamentary assemblies which have failed to fulfill what García has called for. Last year he stated, either the regions are formed or I'll stop calling myself Alan García Pérez. A year has passed and I don't know what he is calling himself today, because the regions have not been formed. Now they say by the end of this year. We'll see.

With regard to identifying fascism with terror, with repression, we think that this is a

3 Interview with Chairman Gonzalo (July 1988)

mistake. What's involved is the following: if one remembers Marxism, the State is organized violence, that is the classic definition. All states use violence because they are dictatorships. How else would they assert themselves to oppress and exploit? They couldn't do it. Consequently what happens is that fascism develops a broader, more refined, more sinister violence. But to identify fascism as being the same as violence is a crass error. These are ideas that have developed here in Peru since World War II and they are ideas that Del Prado often promoted and spread. These same ideas were also put forward by Dammert.

Identifying fascism with terror means not understanding Mariátegui, who in "Figuras y aspectos de la vida mundial" ["Figures and Aspects of World Life"—TRANS.], when talking of H.G. Wells, tells us that the bourgeois State goes through a process of development and that it is this process that leads to a fascist and corporative system. This can be understood very well if we study Mariátegui's works, the previously mentioned "Historia de

la crisis mundial” or “La Escena contemporánea” [“The Contemporary Scene”—TRANS.]. Let’s not forget that he lived it, studied it, and came to know it directly.

In this country, we have to look at fascism in its different aspects beginning with its ideology, its politics, and its organizational form, how it uses violence, its terror. Today we see how it practices a skillful violence, more developed, broader, more brutal and vicious. This is what is called terror. But apart from this, white terror has always been practiced, has it not? The reactionaries, when they have encountered difficulties, have always applied white terror. So we should never identify and reduce all fascism simply to terror. We must understand that fascism means a more refined violence, and the development of terrorism, yes, but that is not the totality of it but a component, it is fascism’s means of unfolding reactionary violence.

As for García Pérez’s speech at the APRA Youth Congress: in sum, there is an intense struggle in APRA, which has to do with their next congress, and the problem consists in

3 Interview with Chairman Gonzalo (July 1988)

whether Garcia Pérez will maintain his control over that party or not, while keeping himself in power in collusion with the Armed Forces. For some time it's been apparent that the APRA youth have questioned the work of the government, and this expressed itself in a big way at this congress in Ayacucho. And Garcia Pérez had to make a desperate trip in order to explain, to explain himself and to present himself as the Savior. This is what he wants, because he sees the importance of winning over the youth in the interest of his appetite to be fuhrer. I believe this gets to the essence of it. Concerning what he said about our Party, and the supposed admiration he says he has for it, this simply reveals the struggle inside APRA, because someone who is a genocidal assassin, who daily murders the people, the fighters, the communists, can't have admiration for us. This is demagogical posturing, uncontrollable appetites linked to the APRA Congress and related to his political prospects, because he can still play many cards. The man is quite young.

Concerning Paita, the "Paita speech," es-

essentially it was a fascist speech, openly fascist. It was not, as some say, to give the parliamentarians who were raising a ruckus a slap on the wrist. That kind of thing is commonplace among them and there is nothing extraordinary about it. But that was not what this was about, it was a strictly fascist speech. Garcia Pérez wants to become fuhrer. There's a reason why they call him "conductor" Many times Congressman Roca himself has called him "conductor." Isn't "conductor" the same as fuhrer? It means the same thing in German. Therefore I think it's correct when some call him "the apprentice fuhrer." But in the end what he is showing us is that he's just a cheap demagogue with a big, unrestrained appetite, ready to do anything to satisfy it. I think self-idolatry is one of his characteristics.

As for the economic measures of the new cabinet, as was inevitable, no one agrees with them. Of course no one agrees with them, and the people least of all, which is what interests us. So a double contradiction emerges. The first one is with the comprador bour-

3 Interview with Chairman Gonzalo (July 1988)

geoisie, because the economic measures are insufficient. They ask the APRA government for more measures and they demand a definition of the plan, because this plan is for 18 months, but consists only of a general outline, without dealing concretely with important problems. (For its five years in office, APRA is going to proceed like this, from one emergency plan to another and yet another. From emergency to emergency, which amounts to the total unraveling of the plans it had thought to implement during its term. I am referring here to their own documents.) And the second contradiction is inevitably with the people, whose belts are being tightened in the interest of generating new capital. How and from where can capital be obtained? By reducing salaries. These are, in sum, the measures, and that's why they have created more problems for APRA than they already had. Meanwhile they continue, demagogically, postponing what the very order within which they operate imposes on them and what they themselves bring on by being puppets, because they have long been in collusion with

the United States, with imperialism. Their ties with the World Bank and the International Development Bank (IDB) are extremely clear, and these are the instruments that the imperialists are using more now due to the discrediting of the IMF—although the prospects are that APRA will return to the fold [of the IMF—TRANS.]. So those economic measures are not resolving the situation, they are worsening it. And we are going to have an extremely grave and critical economic situation which will develop even further, becoming a tremendous burden on the backs of the masses.

4 II Plenum of the Central Committee: Building the Conquest of Power in the Midst of People's War (February 1991)

In the new government plan [TNF: Fujimori] they are managing three counterrevolutionary tasks, in order of their priorities, for the revitalization of bureaucratic capitalism aiming at lowering inflation and for its “reinsertion” into the international financial system, which is nothing but submitting to the conditions imposed by imperialism. In the sec-

4 II Plenum (Feb. 1991)

ond place, to annihilate the People's War by persisting on genocide, the preventative actions, reprisals, war without prisoners and disappearances. The talk of a different "new strategy" is nothing but demagoguery by the crafty Fujimori which will quickly fall apart. The fact remains that up until today he has not defined a "new strategy," and in the third place they are aiming at managing the restructuring of the state and beginning to set out fascist policies and base positions such as "popular participation," "integral democracy," etc. Behind Fujimori, just as yesterday it served Garcia, is the ILD, directed by Hernando de Soto, an international bureaucrat and agent of Yankee imperialism and principal advisor to Fujimori. This Institute for Liberty and Democracy (ILD) is occupying more state, economic and diplomatic positions every day. They have elaborated the so called "Fujimori Doctrine" and the decree on autonomous authority for alternative development as well. In that manner the ILD is a legislative fountain against its own bourgeois democracy. They plan to "jump over integral

democracy with citizen participation.” Their objective is to incorporate the masses into their plans.

They are preparing important new decrees. They start with the premise that they are making a “revolution,” the propagandized modernization and liberalization of the Peruvian economy, and for this they need to restructure their state even though they are advancing at a slower pace. They also need to make points so that principally Yankee imperialism will support them in their so-called “reinsertion.” Among these decrees they are preparing one against labor stability, others on the agrarian question, administrative simplification, etc.

We see more ideas and positions with a fascist base. We are not saying that the government is fascist. Furthermore, we think that the big bourgeoisie is aiming at a substitute replanning of the old bourgeois democracy to a new fascism which would not have the characteristics of the old fascism. Its essence would be the same but the forms would be different. They have to adjust to new condi-

tions of class struggle. We reiterate. Let us think about new fascism and be attentive to its plans.

(...)

Comments on Press Reports by Chairman Gonzalo

(...)

“Part of the state’s restructuring as it seeks to advance in this task, questions the parliamentary demo-bourgeois order. ILD is the source of legislation (neighborhood and rural registration, street vendors, autonomous authority—the Fujimori Doctrine—administrative simplification, etc.), ‘direct democracy’ (participation, integral democracy). This process is and will continue to be directly linked to Yankee imperialism through the ILD (De Soto) which is carrying out the state functions such as the economic and political, for example. As well as fascist base positions, new fascism, substitute plans for the old bourgeois democracy.” - Referring to the implementation of Fujimori’s decrees. March 10,

1991.

(...)

“Questioning the parliament is a basic fascist position which aims against traditional democratic bourgeois state structure sustained by the negation of the principals, liberties and rights established in the 18th century which stands for corporate organization and empowers reactionary violence to the maximum, all in function of the most unrestrained bourgeois class dictatorship (the big bourgeoisie in our case) and in the service of imperialism. Historically, fascism has developed itself the most in critical moments of the old state, principally when the revolution threatens to overthrow the decrepit dominant order but the post World War II fascism cannot, until now, openly develop itself as such, much less carry out corporativization, despite its multiple attempts and ‘theories’: ‘democratic corporativism,’ ‘full participatory democracy,’ ‘social democracy,’ etc. In the 70’s in this country, Velasco’s corporatization failed and in the 80’s Garcia Perez could even advance to the ‘economic congress.’ Today the re-

4 II Plenum (Feb. 1991)

actionarization (TNF: it becomes more reactionary) of the Peruvian state is its natural tendency and the need to newly restructure the old state which is its current task (one of the three, inseparably united: reanimate, restructure and annihilate) Once again, they propose the question of fascism and its confrontation with the rotten 'bourgeois democracy.' It is within these processes and the situation within which we should place Fujimori and his government to unmask his each obvious fascist positions, but without forgetting the following:

1. The crisis of bourgeois democracy which runs through this century has not yet ended. They even attempt to show it as rejuvenated and victorious and more so, as the only viable option.
2. To end bourgeois democracy, with the bourgeois class dictatorship that needs to be demolished completely through revolutionary violence whose concentrated and proletarian expression is the People's War. And build a new state, a

new society, in our case a new democracy which once the democratic revolution is culminated will develop as a dictatorship of the proletariat.

3. The so-called failure of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not such. The problem which arose was the usurpation of power by revisionism which has led to the restoration of capitalism. On the contrary, the dictatorship of the proletariat in a few decades of practice has led the greatest and most profound transformations ever seen in history. As a consequence, the question is the defense of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its indestructible continuation as it is essential for the triumph of communism.
4. The old society generates fascism as an expression of its reactionarization (not the only one, as the other is the actual reactionary evolution of the demobourgeois parliamentary system: the United States, England, France, etc.) principally as a weapon when the revolution

4 II Plenum (Feb. 1991)

threatens to destroy it.

5. Fascism has a prior history in Peru, especially in the 1930s, but without being able to advance. Its biggest failure was with Velasco, which was nevertheless fascism's biggest advance in Peru until now.

6. Fascism renews its road. It is driven as a necessity of imperialism, principally Yankee imperialism, and of Peruvian reaction facing the conquest of power throughout the country. Obviously it learns lessons from its experience in the country aiming at presenting a 'new popular democratic and revolutionary face,' but its essence is, and will remain, the same: 'old wine, new bottles.' This process will take place (it is already being shown) in sharp struggle and collusion in the heart of the big bourgeoisie, between its comprador and bureaucratic factions and between groups of the same. It is a complex struggle within the heart of reaction whose

contradictions should be utilized as a function of the triumph of the democratic revolution.

7. We should have this situation and perspective in mind to develop the People's War, build the conquest of power and conquer power throughout the country.”
- Based on the denunciation made by [the magazine] “Oiga” on the fascist roots of “participation” in its issue No. 523, Feb. 25, 1991.

“This allows the establishment of a difference between the reactionarization of the state which proposes the bureaucratic bourgeoisie (corporativism based on organized union and institutional participation), and that of the comprador bourgeoisie. The latter doesn't propose corporativism but rather a greater strengthening of presidential power as the axis of the executive which will permit the monopolist economic power in the service of imperialism to directly exercise legislative and state administrative functions. It obviously aims at restricting the growing legislative power

4 II Plenum (Feb. 1991)

and seeks to direct command of the executive power en route to the absolute concentration of functions; questions which undermine the state structure and balance of powers within the traditional demo-bourgeois state.” With regard to the opinion of “El Comercio” on “Original proposal of the ILD,” which was published in “El Peruano” [TNF: official paper of the regime] and later commented on in the column “Sin Confirmar” (“El Comercio”). March 6, 1991.

**5 Unite the People
Against the Fascist,
Genocidal and
Country-Selling
Dictatorship,
Developing the
People's War
Further! (February
1998)**

*Central Committee of the Communist Party
of Peru.*

The National Political Situation

(...)

Concerning the restructuring of the state, since April 5, 1992, they have not been able to advance the way they wanted. Under the tutelage of Yankee imperialism and with a long term plan, they proceeded to carry out a fascist dictatorship within the process of absolute centralization in order to apply the “low intensity warfare” in better conditions. This is a fascist dictatorship with a “democratic” mask. It is fascist for the deceitful negation and manipulation of parliament: On one side it discredits and undermines it (before the coup, trans.), on the other, it uses parliament as a sewer to flush out the laws that it needs (although the most important laws are decreed by the executive.) It is fascist for the negation of the entire demo-liberal judicial order, trampling on its constitution and all the laws whenever it wants to the point that some members of reaction itself, or at least the faction in opposition, have said that “we live in a permanent coup d’etat.” “There is no state of rights,” etc.

A fascist reorganization of the judicial system is taking place, carried forward by a shadowy Marine (Admiral) who was a security chief for Velasco. It is not a coincidence that other former henchmen of Velasco's fascist regime are in the shade of the current government. The manipulated and fraudulent elections are instruments to perpetuate the government, and the so-called "opposition" is the chorus which helps to "legitimize" this monstrosity of "direct democracy." We see corporativism organized as a militarized corporativization, and linked to "low intensity warfare" waged with fire and sword, under the shield of bayonets and genocide. The coercion and hurling of the masses by way of the so-called "self-defense committees," peasant and rural rondas. This corporativism is being propelled by the Ministry of the Presidency through programs such as COFOPRI, FONCODES, INADE, development committees, etc. Regarding their ideological base, it is a crude pragmatism and a perverted eclecticism, and systematically applies the "keep on lying that something will be believed" (Hitler).

5 *Unite the People* (Feb. 1998)

It is a fascism, which is principally propelled by the genocidal, country-selling and fascist armed forces. These armed forces, which constitute the spinal column of the old state. Today they are acting like a militarized political party, complemented by the SIN, the mesnadas, and peasant rondas, armed forces which are run by a clique headed by Hermoza Ríos, and Montesinos, a vulgar CIA agent (U.S. Central Intelligence Agency) who had been expelled from the reactionary army for treason to the fatherland. These fascist armed forces are carrying forward their puppet's (Fujimori) reelection campaign.