

# ***Opening speech by Dr Alan García Pérez President of the Republic of Peru***

As I inaugurate the XVII Congress of the Socialist International, which embraces seventy-five political movements and represents hundreds of millions of citizens of the world, I extend my greetings to comrades who share our ideals and hopes. You have come from all five continents, speak different languages, belong to different races and represent different historical traditions, yet you have gathered here united in a common bond of solidarity. Solidarity as the guiding principle of democracy and socialism. You have come despite the acts of violence with which totalitarianism and crime sought to prevent and sully this meeting. You have come despite a deliberate campaign in which sensationalist news about Peru was broadcast in order to instill fear in those about to take part in this Congress. But you have come bearing the banner of solidarity for the cause of socialism because you trust that neither dignity nor justice will give way in the face of difficulty. For this reason, as I begin this assembly with a call for action and commitment, I declare that this government, which is the government of all of those present because it is the government of the whole people of Peru, shall not be halted.

12 Faced by the deepest crisis in Peruvian history and inheriting the results of many years of domination, injustice and error, this government will not be halted. The government of Peru will not retract its stand on the foreign debt which overwhelms the poorest countries, impeding their development, and it will not bow to the International Monetary Fund. The government of Peru will continue to defend the sovereignty of a continent threatened by imperialist interventionism in Central America and it will unreservedly, and without subterfuge, support the revolutionary cause of the people of Nicaragua. The government of Peru will turn the crisis into an instrument of social awareness and a lever for democracy. The government of Peru will maintain its goal of a democratic revolution that will enable us to construct a society of freedom, equality and solidarity.

But the government of Peru will also defend the nationalist and popular order proper to a democracy. Some people think that to be open to dialogue democracy must be weak in the face of economic power, criminal acts or violence directed against the people. Yet I tell you that the order which arises out of the citizens' desire for change must be patient, generous, but also firm. Because the people's democracy cannot be weak nor allow itself to be replaced by violence that would mean recognising the right of brute force. When the people vote for justice and nationalism, they also vote to have their decisions respected.

When preparations were underway for this meeting of socialists from all over the world, in the presence of journalists from many different countries, criminal terrorists organised the seizure of several prisons, took hostages and captured arms. Numerous citizens and members of the security forces were also assassinated in the past few days. All this was done so as to blackmail our democracy in front of the peoples of the world with criminal acts which thus show they share the same objectives as the economic power which subjugated the true destiny of the human race.

Observed by the whole world, the government, through its representatives, urged the rebels to surrender. A peace commission made up of men of good faith went to

the prisons to beg, to implore the prisoners to avoid bloodshed. This attempt failed and the state was forced to impose its authority. The dramatic outcome was numerous deaths, including some among the security forces.

But we have the fundamental principle of authority. This is not the brute strength of a dictatorship nor that of tyranny. It is the authority and moral strength of the people. It is the authority and inflexible strength of the law, because the government must stand firm and be severe if the people are to be respected, because only with this popular authority born of suffrage can we build a nationalist and democratic state that opens its doors to the society of free men, where there is no exploitation, no hate, no injustice.

These goals are our way of greeting the socialists and democrats of the world, and our warm homage to the friendly guiding spirit of Olof Palme, our dead companion who pushed for democratic socialism, who was the defender and ally of the poor and who today is a martyr to humanity in its struggle for the future. I welcome you in the name of the Peruvian people and of our renewed democracy. I also welcome you in the name of the great figure of Latin American social justice who raised the banner of anti-imperialism as a revolutionary principle and summoned the masses for sixty years to the cause of justice. I greet you in the name of the founder of the American Popular Revolutionary Alliance, the APRA, in the name of Victor Raul Haya de la Torre.

This is the first occasion on which a world socialist congress has met in Latin America, thus making it the scene of historic dialogue between those who have come from the wealthy and developed countries of Europe, the old world, and we who represent the countries of the Third World, to which capitalism came in the form of imperialist domination, and to which the socialist message at the beginning of the century came as a solution.

13 Here we are with different names and doctrines trying to find common objectives for our fight but at the same time recognising the changing nature of our peoples, and our histories.

And we assume the socialist message, when the foreign debt is stifling the poor peoples, when the economic power of the wealthy countries shows its global restrictions, when imperialism threatens the weak, when the armaments race, by both big and small countries, shows the profound irrationality of our times, when ideological fundamentalism appears to be leading us to annihilation. But we get together because we believe in equality of men and of peoples, because we are socialists in human endeavour and because we believe in freedom.

Today the world order is going through the most severe crisis in its history. Neither the systems of the capitalist nations nor the system of the statist nations have provided an answer to the problems of historical development. In fact what is in crisis is the contemporary view which attempted to unify the world with the United States and Europe as the centre of worldwide economic and political power. We have seen how political movements which arose and questioned the world order have eventually come to participate in this order and betray the principles of social revolution.

Once again we are faced with the task of continuing to define justice and liberty as objectives, so that we may discover what it is that unites those who, under diverse political denominations, gather together in this congress. To accomplish this we must first recognise our plural equality. What for centuries we have called western civilisation has always been an ethnocentric pretension. Since the times when the imperialist peoples called the others barbarians, the continuity of the west has been the dominating will for imposing these same principles.

Paradoxically, this civilisation, built to affirm the superiority of a human and cultural group over the others, despite its awareness of the diversities of the human

race, always sought to impose itself as the only form of civilisation. And so socialism, when it declared itself scientific and European a century ago, became imbued by the logic and spirit and the ultimate objectives of the system it proposed to destroy, and in presenting itself in the guise of a total doctrine of penetration, failed to uphold its true nature before other nations.

We, in this century, who really believe in socialism as a right of existence, cannot surrender to this western prejudice. We are not seeking the difference between us so as to impose one group over another: on the contrary, we are seeking the human, the homogeneous, that which unites us all as members of the human race and we say that in spite of space and time we are united by the desire for justice and freedom, to build a better society.

This point of view is very important, since by recognising that the values of socialism can be shared in different situations, we recognise that its objectives are not necessarily an inevitable future, nor are they exclusive to one stage only, but depend on our action, our will.

Socialism and social democracy are not the rational conviction of the inevitable, that would be falling into fatalism; on the contrary, they are the faith that motivates our action, and because we reaffirm this will we are here together.

I feel it is important now to sum up briefly how Latin Americans see the progress and construction of democratic socialism and its concepts in the world.

I have said that justice and liberty are the common goals of social progress but we are aware that since the nineteenth century and due fundamentally to the immortal concepts of Karl Marx, revolutionary objectives are identified with the notion of socialism. And also socialism as a word has a root and semantics that made the doctrine enormously attractive. Socialism means collective will to overcome individual egoism. Socialism means overcoming personal profit for the satisfaction of human needs.

Socialism means dignity, welfare and working for everyone. The name itself of the doctrine, and its root in the word social, made it the basic standard of the multitudes who heard its call without understanding perhaps the complexity of its concepts.

Thus, since the nineteenth century, revolution has been identified with socialism. There have been innumerable definitions and doctrines, models and protagonists but socialism, as a magic word, unifies nearly all the concepts of justice.

And so of all the meanings of socialism, the Marxist doctrine of scientific socialism has risen triumphant because it was presented with the strength of a rational methodological structure and because in its most widespread interpretation it proclaimed that the socialist system was the inevitable future awaiting humanity.

This, it must be remembered, was the conception of socialism that reached Latin America and Peru. However, we must emphasise that before the Soviet revolution ranked scientific socialism as a social project, Latin America had already been shaken by social events of a deep revolutionary nature such as the university reform and the Mexican revolution.

To this predominantly agrarian Latin America of the 1920s, still a stranger to urbanisation and industrialism, came the centralist call of the III International. Reviewing today those years of acute conceptual crisis and debate we can see the closed, colonial way in which socialism was presented at that time to the young generation entering politics. It interpreted socialism as basically proclaiming the linearity of one sole history for all the people. Thus the socialist call for unity of the human race was superseded by the historical centralisation of a sole doctrine. From the beginning of this century voices were raised in the continent against this conception, pointing out the Europeanism of this concept, whose ethnocentric character was imbued with the logic of expansionist capitalism itself.

Scientific socialism imposed in those years proclaimed itself to be a closed conceptual structure, as an absolute truth, whose future would necessarily be taken from its own logic and theoretical need rather than from reality.

The socialism which was thus imposed proclaimed as inevitable a social model, one form of property only exceeding all others, and based on only one historical protagonist to bear the future: the industrial proletariat.

But this same philosophy, that presented the concept of abolishing the bourgeois state as an agent of domination, represented the beginning of a new social protagonist, an institution which would be of a temporary, transitional nature to disappear later, but instead of disappearing it consolidated as an expression of what some maliciously called royal socialism: the bureaucratic and omnipotent state as weapon of a new bourgeoisie. The triumph of the Soviet revolution strengthened this concept of socialism, and presented it with a charter of authority before the world. However, the authority that concedes the triumph is sometimes a passing pretension that leads to a lot of mistakes. And today, after all those years, we have seen how this concept, contaminated with westernism, tended to affirm the unification of the world from the centres of economic and political power and has ended up by participating in the structure of world order it set out to destroy, and is today part of the two extreme structures that threaten the world with weapons and rivalry.

Now I would like to point out that in the last sixty years in Latin America strong efforts have been made to reconstruct the revolutionary criteria in the light of continental reality. It has been a real struggle to perfect the objectives, aware of the diversities that cannot be centralised or unified in their history. It has been a struggle to understand that socialism is integrated with culture and changing circumstances. Thus, while the concepts of a closed doctrine were criticised in Europe and overcome by social practice, the same theoretical creation was produced at the beginning of the century in Latin America. In 1918 the university reform youth movement, born in Argentina, brought about a deep cultural change. The reformist students denounced the predominance of European doctrines and texts that distorted or obscured Latin American reality.

The university reform, the forerunner of occurrences in French universities in 1968, called too for imagination in power and the discovery of Latin American reality as an unmistakable historic space-time with the pace of European evolution.

The university reform was translated into a political movement which brought students and intellectuals together, that is to say, the middle class together with the working sector. In Peru, in the 1920s, this was added to joint action for the recovery of the eight-hour working day and culminated with uprisings in the popular universities in an effort to harmonise labour with intellect.

At that time, in Latin America, European doctrines and conceptions were denounced as a feudal power structure such as the liberalism adopted at the time of independence or as the positivism that would later justify dictatorships in the name of progress. But it was pointed out that scientific socialism was of an imitative nature, and at the beginning of the century believed it could see European history and reality in Latin America. Thus the university reform was a deep doctrinal revolution and revealed that basically we have had forms without substance, states without nation, rites without religion, grammar without language, legal codes without law, a proletariat without industry. And so a true and dialectic conception was imposed to reconcile the concepts with reality.

But in the meantime a powerful social movement had influenced the new generation before 1917. In 1910 the greatest collective act in Latin American history had shaken the continent. This was the Mexican revolution whose wealth of popular content has still not been completely delved into and whose revolutionary power still beats in the veins of the Mexican insurgent.

Mexico means the most objective and immediate anti-imperialist option. Zapata and Villa were the forgers of the odyssey against imperial power, but furthermore, in the face of all European-Asiatic theory, the peasant entered on the scene as the historic and revolutionary power in the continent. But to the university reform and the Mexican revolution, as historical events, the intellectual influence of anarchy must be added. But even before socialist theory, liberation doctrine had illuminated and encouraged labour circles, impressing the youth of that time with the certainty that the end in all revolution was not only man's freedom from exploitation by man, but also man's freedom from exploitation by the state.

The triumph of the Soviet revolution and scientific socialism was based on these theoretical foundations and influences. It did not, therefore, fall on virgin soil on a continent entranced with revolution. For that reason the great minds in America at that time proclaimed socialism and adopted Marxism, but with reserve. One of them, José Carlos Mariátegui, the immortal author of *The 7 Essays*, despite his European cultural influences, proclaimed socialism as a heroic creation and affirmed that socialism in Peru would not be just another carbon copy.

As a part of a generation marked by the birth of the APRA as an anti-imperialist continental movement, Mariátegui fought to enrich the socialist conception, incorporating into it the Indian question and the strong role of the intellectual sector. After his death Mariátegui was accused of being a populist, a Sorelist, a volunteerist for his sin of having understood that socialism is not a fatalistic inevitability of the future, but a collective and creative action. For this reason the term 'Mariáteguist', in those years, was used as an insult, as a deformation of socialism, and in the name of scientific socialism, dictated by Europe, the political movement was ordered to cleanse itself of such theoretical vices.

16 At the same time Haya de la Torre, who was not only a thinker, but an organiser and leader, drew up his political programme which is the most vigorous effort of his generation to harmonise the various influences.

First of all Haya de la Torre associated libertarian philosophy with Marxist economic and social method, and thus linked socialism as a human action for justice with freedom. Secondly, as a leader of the university reform he proved that history is not the same for all societies, but rather diverse and discontinuous, and he understood that the conflict of capitalism studied in Europe as the struggle of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, was also at the world level and through imperialism, a contradiction between the poor and the wealthy.

For this reason he defined Latin America and its history as a zone of world capitalist expansion and influence, and declared that the first purpose of the revolution was to set up an anti-imperialist state which would rescue historical sovereignty and represent oppressed social groups, in order to build a stable nation.

A previous analysis of imperialism had already been made in Europe as an expansive phenomenon. It is to Haya de la Torre's credit that he described it from the space-time zone which imperialism would reach, and that to face this, he proposed the construction of a national anti-imperialist state, since in this way he enriched the political theory within socialism itself.

European socialism had declared that the state was an institution totally opposed to society as a means of domination and had concluded that the existence of the state itself was an alienation. By putting forward the construction of the anti-imperialist state in Latin America, it revealed that the state is like an institution and in itself the most powerful production means because it is the means of social production and reproduction not as the temporary instrument, but as the essential creator of sovereignty and justice.

Moreover, the answer to imperialism was also the answer to the world system of competition and capitalist egoism. For this reason, by setting up a nation as a state,

the sovereignty was rescued by withdrawing the nation from the capitalist system.

And that is why today, sixty years later, when the socialists of the world sing as they did one hundred years ago, 'Arise the poor of the world', they must know that the poor are no longer in the most developed countries, they must know that the poor are the peoples of the Third World, threatened by economic colonialism, and must understand that anti-imperialism is a banner standing side by side with the ideals of socialism in whose name the 'International' is sung.

A second conclusion is that the anti-imperialist struggle and national construction does not pertain to a certain class in the European sense, but rather to an overall peasant, intellectual, labour and middle class social group threatened by imperialism, and this marks a difference from the conception of European classes brought to Latin America at the beginning of the century, because in Europe the proletariat is defined as the lowest social class risen from industrialism and which, therefore, carries the future in its hands compared to other social classes which come from prior historical systems.

But in Latin America, on the other hand, confronted by the imperialist peril which is the basic contradiction, the working class which arises out of an industry linked to imperialism must be joined by the historic strength of the peasantry which the Mexican revolution vindicated and by the middle classes whose intellectual vanguard underwrote the university reform. In this way classes do not derive, as they do in Europe, from successive historical systems, but rather as social groups all facing the imperialist peril at the same time and becoming totalities within the struggle against it.

In this view, the concept of social class is enriched and widened in practice in the light of a different reality. It posits the thesis of a united worker-peasant front and middle sectors whose unity is forged in the struggle against imperialism, which renders them homogeneous as a front or social class.

This idea which was announced way back in 1924 in Mexico by Haya de la Torre ran parallel to the European attempts to create socialism that culminated in the notion put forward at the German Congress in Bad Godesberg in 1959 that socialism is not the product of an industrial working class but the outcome of creative action by the people as a whole.

Thirdly, as a spin-off from university reform, Aprismo stresses that Latin America has its own distinct history, which is in no way to be equated with European history. This in turn implies a further insight, that every society develops its own space-time and the concepts which define its classes and historical systems may not correctly be transposed onto other societies.

Nevertheless, ensconced in different historical traditions and different times, one single revolutionary purpose exists. This is the most far-reaching finding, because it means that socialism as a system of justice and liberty is not inevitably bound to a single system or society, but may on the contrary be achieved by varying methods in all kinds of society. Thus socialism is not an inevitable system of the future, alien to will-power. Socialism and social democracy are an historic project, a will, and a faith which gradually makes headway and builds up. So that history is not a set of systems alien to the will of man. Men create history by exercising their freedom, endowing their struggle for socialism with the relative contents proper to their time and space. History is just that: the exercise of freedom. Here we can sense the strong influence of libertarian anarchism summed up in masterly fashion by Haya de la Torre who since the 1920s had called for a society of 'bread with liberty'.

As a result, and as Sartre was to say years later, socialism cannot be conceived without freedom. Freedom and democracy are not momentary instruments of bourgeois society. Freedom and democracy are not appearances that socialists should take advantage of and eliminate later on. On the contrary, justice and liberty

are two denominations of socialism.

Socialist and democratic comrades: I apologise for these lengthy reflections. It is not I who should be speaking at this transcendental moment of dialogue. Rather, I should do justice to the man who created these ideas, who refused to copy and imitate the ideas of others, and who even created a term, a new term, 'Aprismo' as a revolutionary philosophy of the continent, while at the same time opening up the frontiers of modern socialism as well.

I have retraced these thoughts in order to show the ideological path taken by thinkers who in the 1920s and under these influences laid the conceptual foundations that today help us to understand that socialism is not authoritarianism and never the misanthropic totalitarianism of a group. Socialism cannot justify the dictatorship of a group or the messianic rule of a personality. Consequently, the state must be made democratic in its political sphere, with its powers curtailed by democratic institutions which are not, as was once thought, bourgeois freedoms pertaining to a system that may be surpassed, but rather human achievements which socialism should conserve and add to.

Fourthly, by reaffirming the revolutionary principle of justice, a special commitment is made to the poor and exploited on the path towards the liberation of society from all its yokes. Hence democracy is envisaged in its multiple, social, political, economic and cultural dimensions, according to which socialism is a field capable of suppressing new forms of alienation that development creates, such as materialist consumerism, of which the most alienated expression is drug addiction and the illicit drug trade.

In conclusion, what characterises Haya de la Torre's teachings is the Latin American sense of his theory; the reaffirmation of the historical identity of the continent, in short, the idea that revolutionary theory is a concept open to reality and to theoretical development. Thus, thanks to Mariátegui and Haya de la Torre, the struggle for social justice and freedom was enhanced by incorporating European methods with Latin American circumstances. This taught us that neither social democracy nor socialism is the product of a single economic history or of an inevitable social system. Nor are they a single form of property, the outcome of actions by a single class, or an absolute truth. Thanks to the intellectual efforts of our thinkers, we learnt that it was much more than this. Thus we salute the Socialist International which in its 1951 Frankfurt declaration pioneered in Europe an understanding of socialism as a process of human action, as an open theory, as a joint effort, as a heroic creation.

It is for this reason that we participate in this dialogue, because this organisation does not attempt to subject its members to a theoretical-practical-centralist set of norms as other world organisations tried to do. If we join in, it is because we recognise each other as equals, as the seeds of international democracy, free of attempts to assert hegemony and free of the colonial spirit. We join together without any closed definition, united by a similar will, with faith and, more importantly, with a commitment to action, while recognising universal values that are not those of just one culture but rather human aspirations.

This is a dialogue in the complex framework of the history of socialism. Here we unite the paths of the social democracy of Latin America and the democratic socialism in Europe, in a union of grand objectives: liberty, equality and solidarity. When I refer to solidarity, I address those socialists working in wealthy societies or in the governments of richer and more powerful states, and I remind them that they are morally obliged to adopt the cause of the poor peoples of the earth, to opt for these interests when they clash with the economic interests of their countries or states. Otherwise, if they should forget these ethical and human obligations and turn their backs on the legitimate demands of the poor people of this earth, they would

not be socialists.

Socialists and democrats of the world: the government of Peru is a government that fights for your ideals and principles, a government close to your aspirations. Many have thought in the European manner that socialism is only possible as distribution of abundance, and that democracy is the immediate solution to the most serious historical problems. They are profoundly mistaken.

In our poor communities, justice is a patient construction, it takes time, effort, sacrifice. To lapse into disappointment or impatience implies a lack of the strength and constancy of socialism. Peru today, eleven months into the Aprista government, is still ruled by the impact of the gravest crisis in its history. International prices for our products are still falling. On that account alone, we will receive 500 million dollars less this year for our exports than we did last year. The external debt weighs increasingly heavily on the economy of the country, while the inflation unleashed by previous governments has been reduced but not halted, causing impatience among those who fail to grasp Peru as a duty.

Given those problems, the beginnings of reactivation are fraught with difficulty. The redistribution of income to least favoured sectors of the population is starting amidst complications. On the political level, credibility in the democratic system and in the state continues to be precarious. For many years, the people have been taught to distrust government and many are those who vote full of hope but are prepared to lose it rapidly.

Moreover, some sectors do not identify with the government's efforts and rather pin their hopes on the notion that by exacerbating poverty and conflict they may reap electoral rewards in the future.

They do not recall other people's experience, who were many times driven to the black fascism of dictatorships by the worsening of interested confrontations.

And also next to this is the political violence, expressing who knows what criminal interest or purposes, from the anonymity of terrorism. But all this does not frighten us nor will it make us go back. With the same firmness that we defend the law, we shall defend the people from abuse and monopoly.

Comrades: This century has taught us that socialism is not called to power in the crisis of opulence as was believed in the last century. We reach power when disillusion spreads, when the paths shorten. But that is our responsibility. We already know what our role is. Let us swallow the bitter drink of momentary incomprehension to open the path of conscience and of the future.

Elections and opinions are an important part of politics, but truth and history are more important. That is why I tell you that in this government we are testing the ideological itinerary of those who build the social doctrine of Latin America. We are testing the steadiness of democratic socialism. We are testing the firmness of the law. We have said there is no democracy without anti-imperialism and we want to rescue our country and our continent from the world's fluctuating capital interests.

We, together with all the countries of Latin America, have been exporters of raw materials, then societies in the process of colonial industrialisation and now, as a consequence, we are just debtor countries. To us, the foreign debt is the synthesis of the Latin American history of dependency. The foreign debt reflects the low prices paid for our raw materials, the overwhelming interests charged unilaterally and the financial treadmill of new loans to pay for previous debts. He who believes in democracy has to be an anti-imperialist. He who would be an anti-imperialist today must define his position in relation to the debt. One is either with the irrational system in which money has imposed its evil powers or one is with the people. One is either with the banks or with the poor of the world.

The debt is not a political obsession of this government. Its influence determines the level of state expenditure, the level of subsidies to staple foods, the cost of

internal credit, the level of wages and consequently of the entire social structure of the country.

Thus debt is the central theme of the day because synthesised in its solution lies the freedom of peoples and the recovery of their sovereignty. At the next level, however, struggling for emancipation from the debt is also struggling for the cancellation of a social order whose voracity for indebtedness benefits the oligarchies; and at the next and third level, struggling against the debt is to recover our peoples' right to think for and govern themselves economically, breaking the colonial chains of liberalism imposed by the IMF, guardian of the world order. Here is the transcendency of the nationalism we proclaim. To annul the hegemony of monetarist prescriptions is to break the chains of a false theory devised to benefit the world centres of the economy and for the misery and suffering of our peoples. With their doctrines they have opened our economies to destruction, devalued our currencies, raised the price of credit, have rendered the industry useless, driving the masses to despair. And all this in a continent of unlimited agricultural, mining and human riches. They have banished and marginalised cultural forms, and all this in complicity with the ruling classes that played the lackey's role of relinquishing our destiny.

From now on, for us nationalism means deciding our own destiny.

But the nationalism that we hoist as a principle of justice must be continental. A century-and-a-half of independent existence confirms that isolated national routes have been exhausted. Way must be made for the solidarity of the future. We have said so when pointing out our current solidarity with the efforts made by the Contadora Group which constitutes the political will of Latin America to stand between the people of a small, sister state, close to us, and the interventionist will of a powerful country. Thus we say that this is a decisive historical moment, it is the hour of the peoples of Latin America because the masses demand leaving subterfuges behind and throwing open the gates of history.

To us democracy means the reconstruction of the state. It means the democratisation of its services and the possible participation of the social sectors in its institutions. This is the reason for our efforts to satisfy the elementary needs of a marginalised population clamouring for water, electricity and work. Thus our effort to rescue Andean Peru from oblivion and from the ancient empire, the traces of which still live on in the peasant community whose example of collaboration we want to take for a new democracy.

To us the effort made towards justice means overcoming the hate and suspicion of other countries and consequently limiting arms expenditures which usually only benefit salesmen and commission agents whose customers are the same countries in which they promote antagonism. And here we call on the socialist and democratic rulers of the richest countries to take conscience of their historical responsibility. How can a poor country which arms itself against another be socialist? How can a rich country, which calculates profits, encourages the manufacture and sale of weapons and death instruments, becoming an accomplice of the commission agents and merchants of human pain, be fully socialist? I say that a socialist must not forget that socialism is solidarity with life.

That is also the reason for us to believe that democracy must overcome the alienation expressed by consumerism. Hence our decision to fight explicitly against the drug traffic which is no great social danger in Peru, but a threat to the youth of other countries, whose defence we take in the name of mankind, to eradicate the drug trade, once and for all.

All this however in the midst of the worst crisis in history and in the face of such incomprehension, particularly on the part of those who are hardly the poorest social group. From this springs an instinctive temptation in the face of organised and political pressure and in the face of the not always responsible exercise of liberties.

There is an instinctive temptation to sacrifice democracy for the crisis in order to act more efficiently. At this point I would like to tell you that this is a dramatic trial of our doctrines. It has always been believed that fascism must arise from crisis, or that in the face of crisis, the concept of socialism as a totalitarian state must triumph. In the name of history and ideas, I tell you that despite the crisis we will maintain full democracy until it matures in the conscience of all citizens.

We will defend the will of the people and its decision to change, we will defend it from disillusion and also from terrorist violence and crime that represents only irrational hatred.

Violence we will oppose with constant and peaceful force of law, for democracy must be the order of justice. We will defend democracy from egoism and immorality, we will defend democracy from injustice that hides behind it. And I tell you that we really will make of this continent of ours the continent of a people that will defeat imperialism, that will overcome the bondage imposed by monopolies and the oligarchy, and that we will build a future as Haya de la Torre wanted it, a society of bread with freedom.

These, comrades, are our goals; with them we greet you and with them we will bid you farewell. Their ideals are genuine and are the marks of a century-long struggle.

To them we give our time, our lives and, should we fall in the struggle for our ideals, we will become part of them. This will be our contribution to the long history of ideas and those who come tomorrow will hear the voice of those who today speak of the future. So take our greetings to your people, to your parties, and when you return say that despite the greatest difficulties, we will continue the struggle, for we have faith. Faith in liberty, faith in justice, faith in solidarity.

Comrades,

Welcome in the name of the people.

Welcome in the name of those who have hope.

Welcome in the name of Haya de la Torre.

Welcome to Peru, homeland of the citizens of the world.