

# **The State, the Government, and the Elections**

(Proletarians and People of Ecuador: Don't Vote!

Except for Power, All is an Illusion!)

Central Committee,  
Communist Party of Ecuador – Red Sun  
December 2012

Translated by Comrade Lucas  
[luchaliberation@protonmail.com](mailto:luchaliberation@protonmail.com)



# Contents

Introduction	1
<b>1.</b> Characterization of the Government	7
<b>2.</b> Revisionism	21
2.1 International Policy of the Regime	24
<b>3.</b> The Revolutionary Situation	26
<b>4.</b> The Elections	29
<b>5.</b> Why Not Vote?	33



# Introduction

“The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.”

Marx and Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*

“An oppressed class which does not strive to learn to use arms, to acquire arms, only deserves to be treated like slaves.”

Mao Tse-tung<sup>1</sup>

Ecuador is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country. Since the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, Yankee imperialism has unleashed bureaucrat-capitalism upon our country – a backward, precarious capitalism intimately-linked to semi-feudalism and subject to the will of imperialism. Bureaucrat-capitalism has neither intended, nor is it able, to materialize the bourgeois revolution, which, among other things, serves to liberate the means of production in the countryside (i.e., land). As Mariátegui put it, the problem of land has remain unsolved, which, in addition to determining the political and administrative character of the entire nation, limits or restricts the development of demo-liberal institutions which, even from the very perspective of bourgeois-democracy, are subject to manipulation, corruption, and dysfunction.

Bureaucrat-capitalism also constrains the development of the national-bourgeoisie, and thus, the materialization of the nation. The increased penetration of

---

<sup>1</sup> This quote, in fact, originates from Lenin in *The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution*. -TRANS.

foreign investment, the consolidation of imperialist oppression, the activation of monopolies, foreign debt, etc. continues to widen the gap and sharpen the contradictions between national and foreign monopoly capital, and between small and medium national production (the petty- and national-bourgeoisie.) By permitting the presence of large monopolies linked to imperialism and to the most backward sectors of the big bourgeoisie, it enables the superexploitation of the proletariat and the impoverishment of its living conditions.

In the field of consciousness, a series of political, cultural, philosophical, and ideological elements persist which keep the masses bound to outdated ideo-spiritual forms, feudal and semi-feudal in character. Taking *latifundismo* as its basis, it is predicated on semi-feudal relations of production, whose main manifestations today are servitude and *gamonalismo*.

Bureaucrat-capitalism has progressed through three stages over the past century: From 1885 to 1926, it was supported by the *Alfarista* Revolution, during which it experienced its first formative stage; its “settlement” stage. From 1945 to 1969, it began to reflect its first fundamental crisis based on the impact of the US economic crisis, the Second World War, and the detachment of the comprador-bourgeoisie and the big landowners from the administration of the old State. This stage is marked by the strengthening of the system of feudalism and the first restructuring of the State. The third stage occurred between the second half of the 1960s and the first half of the 1980s, rushed along due to the influence of the contradictions between Yankee imperialism and Soviet social imperialism, “revolutionary currents” and acute political instability in Latin America,

and the manifestation of the bureaucrat-bourgeoisie in the form of military dictatorships. These “democratic,” “revolutionary,” and “nationalist” forces undertook the second restructuring of the State, characterized by “agrarian reform” and a failed attempt at industrialization, demanded the “finely-tuned” adjustment of the bourgeois-landowner State to new scenarios. Today, the old State is once again rearranging and reformulating its “democratic” administrative structures, resulting in the third restructuring of bureaucrat-capitalism – the first of the current century.

Modern discourse that is geared, supposedly, towards the development of the productive forces and the weakening of monopolistic centers of production is based on outdated conceptions advocated by bourgeois reformism and endorsed by Latin American revisionism in the 50s and 60s under the format of CEPAL (the Economic Commission for Latin America). CEPAL’s premise was to lump together the entirety of Latin America under the insipid and opportunistic label of dependent and underdeveloped countries, thereby deliberately ignoring the feudal and semi-feudal basis of the relations of production, thus justifying the “submission” of “structural” changes to the bourgeoisie. Obviously, it was met with resounding failure. The bourgeoisie is disinterested in developing a revolution since, under imperialist aegis, they have conditioned the burden of feudalism in accordance with their own productive dynamics.

The **State system** is a joint dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie (comprador- and bureaucratic), and the big landowners, who retain power supported by imperialism, as well as the dark forces of revisionism. The **government**



**system** is bourgeois-democratic, constitutionalist, and electoralist. It depends on the electoral system to sustain inter-bourgeois contradictions and reproduce the mechanisms that refine the old State. Today, elections are the fundamental weapons with which the State reproduces its repressive administrative order, an element ever-“strengthened” by the bureaucratic regime. In addition to “cleansing” the electoral system, the State has unleashed a campaign to sway the consciences of young people under the age of eighteen, to involve them in the bourgeois elections, and to thus legitimize, energize, and develop [elections] with respect to the mechanisms of action used up to this point. In the superstructure, opportunist and revisionist leftist forces are tasked with “politically cushioning” the crisis of the old State, further pushing the masses down the path of constitutionalist and electoralist illusion.

The **character of the revolution** that we Communists promote is New Democratic, in accordance with the historical particularities of Ecuador. In short, it is a bourgeois-democratic revolution of a new type, insofar as it is led by the proletariat. This is the guarantee that this revolution will become inscribed within the context of the Great Proletarian Revolution, and that its democratic processes will manifest socialism in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The military strategy of the proletariat for this type of democratic revolution is People’s War, that is, a war *of* the people. The **forces of the revolution** are: the proletariat as the leading class, the poor peasantry as the main force, and the petty and middle bourgeoisie and their national expressions as allies. The **targets of the revolution** are the three mountains which

exploit the poor peasantry, the working class, and the small and medium (national) bourgeoisie. These three mountains are: imperialism, bureaucrat-capitalism, and semi-feudalism; Bureaucrat-capitalism, as the PCP comrades say, is the “constant mountain that maintains semi-feudalism and semi-colonialism at the service of imperialism.” In addition to these three mountains, we must resolutely incorporate a fourth target of the revolution of a new type: revisionism. Like Chairman Mao said, revisionism is the main danger to the revolution. But we dare to say that it is also the main obstacle for the revolution to be unleashed. If we do not combat and destroy revisionism, we will have achieved nothing.

## **I. Characterization of the Government**

We have maintained since the beginning of its tenure that the government is bureaucratic, fascist, and corporatist. The features of this fascism operate as a vehicle with which the reform, or restructuring, of the State is carried out – the first of this current century. The crisis of imperialism is also evidenced by the total bankruptcy of bureaucrat-capitalism in the semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries. Our country was not exempt from this process, which was palpable at the end of the last century. Tremendous economic crisis drove it towards dollarization and political instability, forging objective conditions that were very favorable to the revolution. These conditions, however, were covertly “neutralized” by the actions of the old State, which mobilized revisionism and opportunism as its support structures. Recycling pseudo-revolutionary, pseudo-anti-imperialist, and “transformative” discourse, they were able to establish a particular political order within an important sector of the masses, which they use to avert revolution and vivify the old State as it jumps from crisis to crisis, revealing its incongruence with the present reality and its incompatibility with the masses and our class.

Their aim is to criminalize poverty, to destroy the revolutionary, peasant, and popular organizations, who were already in the midst of bankruptcy due to the parasitic presence of revisionist leadership. Their aim is to divide them, to neutralize them, or to generate other organizations, supported by political parties such as: the Communist Party of Ecuador (who are stubborn and revisionist), the Socialist Party (or, rather, its remnants), certain sections of the Revolutionary Left Movement (MIR), ex-members of ¡Alfaro Vive, Carajo! (AVC), and others. All these groups have enabled the “accumulation” of the masses

in support of the neutralization of popular organizations who are unsympathetic to the restructuring process.

We see persecution, imprisonment, and severe sentences on charges of subversion and terrorism imposed upon those who carry out strikes and mobilizations that conflict with the restructuring process.

They want to make use of the Secretary of Transparency, who is in the pocket of Edwin Jarrín, the brother of former AVC commander Ricardo Jarrín. With fascist and investigative [*pesquisable*] conduct, they have orchestrated teams of spies who operate within public institutions to monitor the workers, particularly the union leaders.

They aim to control education through reform which is designed to stimulate university education, or make higher education exclusive to the elites, to train researchers and leaders. All this in addition to stimulating technological education [STEM] to provide technical support to the education industry, which is expected to experience a major boost as a result of the reform. This measure, besides proving detrimental to even the most elementary liberties of public, secular education (which has been severely attacked by the government), is not consistent with the objective reality of our country.

We see the brutal and violent repression of small and medium miners – artisans – in order to free up space for the reproduction of large mining companies, especially Chinese companies. We see fascist innovation in the form of the dynamiting of miners' installations and their machinery.

We see the militarization of the country, a rewards plan that amounts to nothing more than buying the solidarity of the masses with regards to matters of security.

That is, a series of measures that have enabled the corporatization of the masses, who themselves are increasingly tied down, and checked [*contrarrestadas*] in their reactions and/or pronouncements.

While it is true that the State has “combated” certain private written and televised **media** monopolies, it has been precisely within this field that it has found the greatest focal point of opposition within the inter-bourgeois contradictions. What was the alternative media they proposed? The strengthening of monopolization over State-owned media, with the justification that public radio and television is “impartial,” that it “belongs to everyone,” in an attempt to discard the class character of the State in favor of “the public.”

The role played by individuals such as Orlando Perez, a former member of the disbanded group Montoneras Patria Libre (MPL), has been fundamental to this process. Even while maintaining a “low profile,” he has played the role of a veritable Goebbels with regards to the information strategy of the restructuring process. On the other hand, the entrenchment of former members or militants of pseudo-revolutionary organizations and other elements of the revisionist left within the mass media have resulted in spaces for these mechanisms to reproduce their scathing verbiage against the fundamental objectives of our class and our people. This is in addition to being the essential support structures that the government uses to operate within the field of consciousness of the exploited workers of our country.

In the **countryside**, there still exists a high concentration of land in the hands of a few, as well as semi-feudal relations of production. There still exist outdated

relations of production such as *arrimazgo* or *arrimados*, in which poor peasants live on medium and large *haciendas*, and pay a certain amount of money, products, or labor as a form of “rent.”

The other system, widespread in the countryside, is known as *a partir*. In this instance, the landowner provides the land, and the farmer provides the labor and agricultural inputs like fungicides, seed, etc. At harvest time, the farmer delivers half his harvest to the landowner. Obviously, the landowner can never lose. This system is practiced throughout the entire country.

It is important to clarify that this system of exploitation has developed in all productive strata of the countryside. In other words, it is not exclusive to the big landowners. This type of relationship also exists between the poor and middle peasantry, constituting an element that is sustained in the field of consciousness at the cultural level.

It also preserves and develops an intertwining of capitalist and feudal production relations, wherein the wage-labor system coexists with payment-in-kind or the possibility of circumstantially occupying land as part of the stipend. Furthermore, these relationships are intertwined with servitude, not to mention the fact that there are scenarios in which the wage-labor system is completely absent in many areas of Carchi, Esmeraldas, Zamora, Napo, and Loja. There are scenarios where the landowner purchases the labor force of the poor peasant, the peon, or the worker, in exchange for a daily wage [*jornal*] without any legal benefits. But the landowner also seizes part of the peasant’s labor force and his surplus time in exchange for other unpaid, subservient duties.

Production in the countryside is not industrialized. Rudimentary tools and implements like the *yunta*, machete, pickaxe, shovel, and hoe are still used in place of mechanized implements.

One of the most abject proofs of feudalism is reflected in the recurrent utilization and appropriation of the labor of the masses under the *minga* system. The State “utilizes” the *unpaid* labor of the masses through euphemisms like “citizens’ participation,” “cooperation,” etc. These aspects are also replicated in the poor *barriadas* in the cities.

The local governments, municipalities, political holdings, and councils urge the masses to contribute “with a counterpart” to any infrastructural project that the State develops, as a condition for compensation to be supplied by State institutions. Water infrastructure (where it exists), second and third-tier roads [non-main roads, dirt paths, local access roads, backroads, etc. - TRANS.], and communal housing are built by the peasant workforce. The State supplies the materials and technical direction. The system is replicated throughout the country, and occurs mainly in the countryside and in the *barriadas*.

The State takes advantage of the community or collective *minga* by using euphemisms like “community work,” “minguería,” [roughly meaning, minga-ism - TRANS.] “community participation,” etc., seizing the unpaid labor force of the peasantry, the communities, and poor *barriadas*. This is a typical expression of the feudal remnants that persist in our country.

However, this governmental process has also promoted a huge “agrarian reform,” which amounts to nothing more than dragging the poor peasant masses down



the bureaucrat-landowner path, which in turn establishes the conditions for semi-feudalism to unfold.

This contraption has not yet proceeded beyond the State purchasing low-quality land from the big landowners and then selling it to the poor peasantry based on the creation of peasants' associations, pushing the peasants to form cooperatives using mortgage credit [*crédito hipotecario*] as a corporate element. It is this means through which land parceling is stimulated by the inefficiency of the cooperatives, which atomize the land upon breaking up (which has been happening quite diastrously). The land is thereupon resold, thus reinforcing the cyclical mechanism of land concentration.

This reform has conclusively failed, firstly because of its bourgeois-landowner nature. The only viable system is **the expropriation of land without compensation from the big landowners, and its distribution to those who truly work it. Even so, this process is in itself fruitless without a thoroughgoing democratic revolution though People's War, led by the proletariat and its Party.**

Secondly, due to the inability of the peasantry to repay their debts to the bank (a situation that is shown clearly in the National Development Bank, which boasts a gross portfolio of \$926m), the State faces great difficulty in the recovery of capital from the peasant sector that has acquired land, mainly in the provinces of Guayas, Manabí, Santo Domingo, Chimborazo, Esmeraldas, Los Ríos and Imbabura. Thus, the State is once again strengthened as the new landowner and the arbiter of the sale of fragmented land, thereby stimulating land parceling and the *minifundios*, and turning once again to semi-feudal

expressions, which leads to the resurgence of medium and large-scale landowners.

The poor-quality of the land is another aspect worth highlighting. The land that is “given” (via mortgaging) to the peasantry does not enable its correct usage, and is not conducive for agricultural production. The land is oversaturated, deforested, arid, and located in places that are difficult to access. In other words, it is the burden of big landed property.

Lack of water is another important element to consider. The water law has been unable to, nor is it intended to, resolve this problem, which goes hand in hand with landownership and land quality. However, the principal contradiction continues to be landownership, and with it, the character of the relations of production.

The restructuring of the old State has addressed many more aspects. For example, the repression of the economy, stimulating and potentiating extractive production with aggressive and traitorous policies.

Although it is true that the regime has constructed highways and improved some aspects of public infrastructure, it has not done so out of a desire to serve the masses, but rather, to seek mechanisms with which to expand the domestic market while stimulating the international market. The Manta-Manaos Highway seeks to generate mechanisms, or agile and low-cost ways for the producer to engage in commercial exchange by insisting on the development of the primary sector of the economy, to which the producer is bound.

The peasant masses do not care whether the road is a *pica*, a trail, a path, or a highway if they cannot produce,

and if the little they can produce is beaten by intermediaries, low prices on the market, etc.

But we must make it clear: it is not the case that the regime suddenly complies with the road system without asking for anything in return. No, that does not happen. It has implemented a treacherous and aggressive fiscal policy by multiplying taxes. As Rosa Luxemburg said, with one hand, the State giveth, and with the other, it taketh away, such is the nature of bourgeois reformism.

The government's discourse is bound to the old reformist conceptions of CEPAL of the 1950s, which proposed the substitution of imports of consumer products, particularly in the elite and machinery sectors.

The government has, with greater and greater vehemence, talked about this substitution model from a Keynesian perspective: Increased State control over the economy; higher tax policy; economic growth; comparative advantage, the development of an industrial economy that replaces the primary-export and import model (which has the capacity to recreate the international monopolies and the subjugation of the country by imperialism), etc. The obstacle for the regime is dollarization, because it cannot control inflation via a monetary system, devaluation, etc. Despite pointing out the *importance* of reversing dollarization, the government does not dare do so, since it knows that this will cost it the Presidency.

Although it is a proposal which fails to meet the national requirements from any point of view, it does not correspond to reality. Correa's pragmatism tends to repeatedly fall into contradiction when he declares the necessity of resorting to foreign capital, to stimulate its investment in sectors such as hydrocarbons, mining (the

primary sector), etc. The “State” does not have the necessary resources for this proposed change of economic model, and pretends that foreign investors do not often repatriate capital, that they instead finance or subsidize industrial development. At the end of the day, it only strengthens semi-colonialism.

The development of the productive forces and industrialization require great resources. One of the mechanisms proposed by the government is the “importation” of fixed capital to strengthen or improve constant capital, which, in turn, hands over more and more natural resources to the transnational corporations.

We saw this model of entrapment back in the 1960s, with tepid initiatives undertaken by military dictatorships in Ecuador – initiatives opportunistically supported by domesticated left. Nevertheless, it ended in resounding failure in Latin America.

But the government’s nonsense does not stop there. Alianza País expresses a policy of making amends with the peasantry and the “indigenous” sectors, but still butts heads with them. It strikes at the constitutional mandate implemented by Alianza País and the left wing of “Montecristi Vive,” stipulating “respect for ancestral lands.” All this cheap demagoguery falls apart, because it automatically inserts large-scale “open pit” mining into these scenarios, thus engendering further contradictions with the communities, to which the regime responds violently. This is a manifestation of the ideological-structural weakness of the peasant-indigenous organizations, controlled nowadays by revisionists opposed to the government.

Social vulnerability is also addressed by criminal organizations that spill across the borders in order to

operate from within the masses, striking at them, exploiting them, and enabling their entrapment by the State.

For example, in eastern Ecuador, particularly in the province of Esmeraldas, the practice of artisanal mining has become widespread. On the one hand, this practice is fought against, persecuted, and attacked by the fascist-corporatist regime of Alianza País. On the other hand, it is also targeted by criminal groups with links to Colombian paramilitary groups, who stimulate small and medium-scale artisan production through exploitative credit (usury), and the subsequent purchasing of the “product” (gold), at low costs. The demand for payment of capital and interest entraps small producers, who live amidst “a sort of” multilateral exploitation, disastrous and often bloody in the sense that delay in payment is punishable by death.

And that is yet another aspect of the government, the restructuring, and the crisis of bureaucrat-capitalism. Whether in the cities on behalf of the big bourgeoisie, or in the countryside on behalf of the big landowners, these systems of exploitation introduce a heavy burden – crime – which is placed on the shoulders of the masses, of the people, who also are forced to bear the burden of contract-killings, micro- and macro-drug trafficking, violence, rape, crime, etc. This element has enabled the government’s criminalization of poverty and its campaign to indiscriminately combat it amongst the masses.

**As for the working class** and the other masses of exploited workers, the situation has become equally drastic. The tendency that arises in the midst of imperialist crisis, the crisis of the old State, and the crisis of its government is the super-exploitation of the proletariat, expressed in terms of greater impoverishment, a lower standard of living, a

lower basic wage, and the incapability of labor force reproduction, thereby dispersing revolutionary organizations and enabling police control over them.

The “opening up” of the border has led to the integration of a contingent into the national labor market that has been displaced by foreign bourgeoisies, a contingent willing to sell its labor force for wages far below the minimum. This has generated a phenomenon of “competition” among local and foreign labor in order to “sell,” without even considering the legal aspect, much less the conquests of the working class (basic salary, overtime, vacations, social security, etc.) All this in order to have a minimum income that allows them to survive, and afford them the possibility of reproducing their labor power, the value of which is determined by the amount of time necessary for the sustenance of the worker and his family. (*Contradiction*, no. 12. MLM magazine)

Of course, all this benefits the corrupt bourgeoisie and, above all, the big landowners, who hire farmworkers who migrate from Peru to southern Ecuador for \$6 or \$7 a day – farmworkers who lack any other form of legal support. The same situation is occurring on the northern border with Colombia, though the phenomenon is made more dramatic by the presence of violent actors: drug trafficking, displaced persons, paramilitary groups, etc.

This phenomenon is not limited to the border provinces, but also occurs in metropolises like Guayaquil and Quito, cities where the presence of Cuban immigrants affect the labor market. Many of them offer their services (often qualified and professional) under the same conditions as those near the borders, with the difference being that *their* labor is more qualified, and is used by the bourgeoisie

to alleviate the burden of variable capital, and to obtain higher profits.

The government is trying to maintain the minimum living wage far below the value of the labor force, and adjust it according to levels of inflation, all without considering that this is a reflection of the impact on the price of goods, rather than inter-bourgeois struggle over the distribution of surplus value.

What is the government's strategy that favors or benefits the big bourgeoisie? It is to implement subsidies, granting significant margins to the producers, and having the masses foot the bill for this subsidy under an aggressive fiscal policy. It is to alleviate variable capital through the institution of minimum wages that are not in keeping with added value and the profitability of businesses. And, of course, the government believes that the cost of the basic food basket<sup>2</sup> can be paid not only by the worker, but by his entire family, or, as *Contradiction* magazine puts it: "the distribution of the value of the worker's labor power among several members of his family." Therefore, the government maintains that, if two or three family members earn a salary of \$292, the price for the basic food basket can be met if multiplied by two (i.e., their spouses, their father and mothers), thus satisfying the needs of the family. According to official statistics, this price is \$571. However, the price of the basic food basket is inconsistent with inflation indexes; its true price, as of October [2012], peaked at \$618.25. Income increases when children are incorporated into the productive process, at the government's discretion, of course.

---

2 Basic amount of food needed to survive, usually calculated on a monthly basis.

Contradicting the constitutional mandate, the government has reproduced a tremendous and debilitating system of exploitation by continuing to support the system of outsourcing companies. Public hospitals, ministries, and other bureaucratic apparatuses hire companies that manage cleaning, food, courier, and security personnel, among others. The workers of these companies are undeniably doubly exploited – first by contractors and thence by those to whom they provide their services.

The “compulsory purchasing of resignations” is another method of “union-cleansing [*limpieza*]” in the public sector. Under this strategy, “compulsory resignation” is “purchased” from the workers who are intended to be under evaluation and observation. Many leaders have been divorced from public institutions under this practice.

Another critical element of the working class is its organizational dispersion. The government, in keeping with its fascist-corporatist policy, has neutralized the unions, and with them, the basic organization of the workers. Of course, this neutralization has been practically a passive process. The political and ideological acculation of revisionism in these organizations has eased the process of corporatization.



## **2. Revisionism**

Revisionism lives in the moment. It is in the midst of this process of restructuring that the big bourgeoisie, the big landowners, and imperialism reap the fruits of the strategic labor of this “left.” Little to nothing could have been achieved by the Alianza País regime without the support of the opportunist and revisionist left.

The issue with the left in our country is not that it is “naïve,” or that it buys into the populist discourse of the government, its anti-imperialist, revolutionary chants, its tiresome sloganeering of “*Hasta siempre*, Commander,” or its “citizens’ revolution.” Not at all. It clings to these ideas with great conviction, it is keenly aware of every step it takes in support of bourgeois legalism and constitutionalism. For years they have worked towards this goal – to convince the masses of the ideas of this false revolution and to support the old State, the bourgeois-landowner dictatorship – in the midst of its greatest crisis, precisely when it is crumbling due to the effervescence of popular struggle and the State’s inability to stay afloat.

On the other side of the coin are the “oppositional” revisionists who initially supported the regime: the MPD [Democratic People's Movement], Pachakutik, “Montecristi Vive,” and others who serve as the initiators of bourgeois reform. They split with the regime because it did not free up enough political spaces with which they could become entrenched in the bureaucratic apparatus of the State. Now they wander aimlessly in the oppositional camp. In any case, they continue to spout their electoral, bureaucratic discourse. They are substantially no different from the “other” revisionism, which now feeds off the government like a parasite. They want to, or intend to, refine bourgeois-

democracy to preserve the bourgeois-landowner dictatorship.

As the political expressions of revisionism and opportunism, the allies of the old State bear contradictions, but at the end of the day, they collude with the State against our class and the masses. They support and renovate the old State, they painstakingly tweak it and render it functional before new international dynamics. We insist – without them, the current process would have taken on a different form, potentially more violent, which would have been inconvenient for the State’s purposes.

It is precisely our Party – the PCE-SR – that has raised the issue of deepening the struggle against revisionism and opportunism, to graduate past ideological struggle, to expose them, to fight them, to annihilate them in the spaces in which our Party carries out its work. Do not make truces with them, do not compromise. Unsheath the symbols of the proletariat! How can we do otherwise in view of the strategic position they occupy in support of the old State and its joint dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie<sup>3</sup> and big landowners?

Since the government initiated the process of the restructuring of the State, those who have been in charge of political intelligence (that is, civilian control of the State’s intelligence apparatus) have been “socialists” like Ricardo Patiño – brother of the current Chancellor, the

---

3 The original translation says “grandes obreros,” - “big (or, great) workers.” I have never heard this term used in the context of a critique against someone. It is either a very localized term of which I am unaware, or a misplaced expression in the original document. I have inserted what I assume the authors are trying to get across based on the usage of this term (“big bourgeoisie”) in the earlier pages of this document. - TRANS.

Undersecretary of Defense – a puppet manipulated by Lourdes Rodriguez, the former leader of the MPL, and others. Revisionism in the past has controlled the Ministry of the Interior, and when it comes to the organization and control of the masses, they use the Undersecretariat of Political Affairs, the Undersecretariat of the Peoples, and Citizens' Participation – controlled by Mireya Cárdenas and her troupe of *alfaristas* who patrol the mass organizations to keep them in line. That is to say, they have completely encircled the masses in an effort to fuse them to their organizations.

## **2.1 International Policy of the Regime**

The government has opened and subsequently strengthened economic and political international relations, particularly with revisionist China, who has invested about \$7bn in hydrocarbon, mining, and hydroelectric projects, among others. In addition to this, we must mention the intrusion and structural interference exerted by China through the credit system – an instrument of the domination. The case is no different with Russia, Belarus, India, and, to a certain extent, Iran.

Despite the fact that they broke off diplomatic relations with them one year ago, the U.S. continues to be the fundamental, essential protagonist of the economic life of our country. It nourishes the big bourgeoisie, regardless of its faction (comprador or bureaucratic) and the landowners, regardless of the detriment to the country, the workers, the peasant masses, and the small and medium bourgeoisie.

Yankee imperialism continues to be the sole hegemonic superpower – this much must be made clear.

They continue to act as capitalism's nightstick, as the global counterrevolutionary *gendarme*. China does not yet govern the countries over which it lords with the same vigor as the US. They are still far from having attained supremacy in that sense.

The presence of Chinese capital in our country should not make us lose sight of the tasks which we must fulfill. Defining the principal contradiction is fundamental, and we Communists are clear that the main enemy of our people is imperialism, principally Yankee imperialism. The government knows this, and just as soon as they had "raised their voice" [in opposition to the Yankees] they retreated, and begged on their hands and knees for the appointment of a new ambassador – Nathalie Cely, another pro-imperialist.

China can be circumstantially neutralized in this context, if not by the reformist regime, than by any other regime that holds power. The US cannot be. They are here, they survive within the entrails of the State. **They have lifted up the economic structure of our country for more than a century,** and exert powerful, though relative, political influence. They control the big bourgeoisie and the big landowners. The dictatorship operates by and for them. That is the material basis of our condition as a semi-colony.

### **3. The Revolutionary Situation**

There exists a stationary revolutionary situation. That is to say, the objective conditions are there. Given the relations of production, the difficulty of the State in sustaining its current course is evident. However, the levels of organization of the masses, the level of their vanguard, is limited. The state of mind of the masses is afflicted by a new opium, manifest in the false “Citizens’ Revolution,” “socialism of the 21<sup>st</sup> century,” and the elections. This all makes their politicization, to educate them of the need for class organization, of the alliance and its objectives, and above all of the New Democratic Revolution, an arduous task.

The situation of the trade unions is critical, in spite of having Communist presence and leadership in some of the most important and largest unions in the country. The same is true in the class-conscious students’ movement, which has been overwhelmed by the State through the President of the FEUE [Federation of University Students of Ecuador], Carlos Torres, and the burden passed on the PCMLE [Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Ecuador], which was plagued by corruption and the loss of its objectives for the university youth.

In the countryside, the situation is different. Here, there is still effervescence. But it still remains necessary to strengthen this movement, because this is where revisionism has retreated in order to seek a base for its electoral plans.

Our fundamental strategy has been to go where the State is not, to take advantage of their weakness manifested in the inter-bourgeois-landowner struggles, the struggles between big mining and small mining, between big lumber and small lumber, between big peasants and small [poor] peasants, between the *latifundio* and the *minifundio*. In

other words, in places where the contradictions are sharpened, and clamor for direction. This is the weak link of the reformist process, and consequently, this is the area in which the New Democratic Revolution must be encouraged and strengthened.

The countryside is the arena of principal contradictions. It is here where the restorationist project and the State lack the strength to resolve or neutralize the principal contradictions. Here, the diverse expressions of revisionism and opportunism are also in contention. Here also exists the contradiction between those in favor of dynamizing the productive forces and those who live bound to their feudal past, reproducing semi-feudalism.

In any case, Maoism is the command and guide of the Democratic Revolution of a new type: New Democracy. We fraternally salute the achievements of the Committee for the Reconstruction of the Communist Party of Ecuador [PCE (CR)] and other organizations that are approaching Maoism through tenacious line struggle.

We do not doubt the fact that, in the midst of these expressions, there are contradictions currently in formation, which would be viewed within the context of line struggle. However, we make it clear that unity can only be formed in terms of ideology. The doors are open, and we must work harder to this end. That being said, the discourse and proposals surrounding unity must be endorsed by practice, and by commitment to construct the instruments of the Democratic Revolution of a new type.



## 4. The Elections

“Only the knaves and fools can believe that the proletariat should first win a majority of votes in elections realized under the yoke of the bourgeoisie, under the yoke of wage slavery, and that only after this should they conquer power. This is the height of silliness or hypocrisy. This substitution of the class struggle and revolution for elections under the old regime, under the old power.”

V. I. Lenin

As we stated in the previous paragraphs, elections serve as the new opium of the people.

In Ecuador, the [upcoming] elections are being held in a critical moment, in an international context characterized by the reelection of Obama in the US – the continuation of a corporatist, expansionist, terroristic, and desperate policy to reconsolidate and expand its spheres of influence throughout the world. Other characteristics are the bankruptcy of capitalism in Europe which foments the discontent of the proletariat, and the crisis in the Middle East, marked by the absence of proletarian leadership.

Democracy and elections today are strengthened by the triumph of Hugo Chavez in Venezuela, Dilma Rousseff in Brazil, [Pepe] Mujica in Uruguay, etc. as part of the bourgeois-reformist projects of socialism of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Bolivarianism, ALBA, etc.

The capitulation and pacification of armed revisionism in Colombia tries to present armed struggle as outdated, anachronistic, and paves the way for the constitutional, electoral, parliamentary path.

In our country, the government has endorsed the idea that a purified, “more reliable,” and refined electoral process

will soon take place. Through the National Electoral Council (CNE), the government has sanctioned parties which have falsified signatures from supporters, registrars, etc.

Contrary to virulent electoralism, the elections in our country do not have the incendiary and belligerent character that reflects inter-bourgeois contradictions, least of all the contradiction between the comprador- and bureaucrat-bourgeoisie; the restructuring process has defined a sort of consensus.

There is no major opposition to the comprador-bourgeoisie or to the government under the auspices of the bureaucrat-bourgeoisie; the latter has greatly benefited from the regime. As we have already stated, the government reconstructs the country based on planning and bureaucracy. The big construction businesses, transnational corporations, banks, etc., execute the projects and provide the fiscal resources with which the government satisfies the requirements not just of the bureaucrat-bourgeoisie, but of the whole bourgeoisie, of the State.

But, of course, there are focal points of contradictions: one banking sector that is united around [Guillermo] Lasso, and another united around [Daniel] Noboa's and [Lucio] Gutiérrez' right-wing populism. But these are only intermittent contradictions that "adorn" the electoral situation, in addition to, of course, confusing the masses and further dispersing them.

On the other hand, the "united left" (as if the left is composed of many different shades and colors) does not pose a threat to the regime, but preaches in favor of its restructuring. It is precisely here where inter-bourgeois contradictions have developed. It is within the factions

bound to the bureaucrat-bourgeoisie where the government struggles to consolidate the restructuring of the State and the refinement of bourgeois democracy. This struggle has now graduated to the electoral plane, once again thrusting the masses into confusion and dispersion, distorting their true objectives in the form of the Democratic Revolution.

Many within the masses are uncertain, or even aligned with the government project. If the elections were held today, the ruling party would, statistically, be elected with 52% of the votes. Either way, the masses lose.

But the government is skillfull. It uses the INFA [Children and Family Institute], the Secretariat of the Peoples, different “social movements,” and co-opted student organizations to promote changes to the Constitution. They have stipulated that members of the repressive apparatus (the Armed Forces and the police) as well as minors (between the ages of 16-18), may be afforded the option to vote, all justified with the slogan of “education in democracy.” The State has also courted the vote of the elderly (over 65 years of age), who make up about 1m voters.

## 5. Why Note Vote?

Based on principle, Communists must arm themselves with the thesis of combating all systems of domination and alienation of the masses.

Engels, in a very objective manner, defined universal suffrage as a weapon of domination in the hands of the bourgeoisie. That is the truth. In every conflict or war – and even more so in the class struggle, a war unto death – both the forces of reaction and the forces of the revolution strive by all means to dismantle each others' supportive structures. To that extent, it is our obligation to destroy reaction's fundamental weaponry. It is an inevitable necessity to combat and destroy the organs of their domination. This task must be undertaken at the very outset to the extent that allows for the organization of the workers and the development of the consciousness of the exploited – of the people in general.

We agree with the thesis that calling for the abstention from voting, while at the same time not waging People's War, makes no sense. It is evident that the development of People's War is the only guarantee that this voting process, beyond being simply impeded, is neutralized, destroyed, and replaced by new forms of organization. It would not make sense to support and stimulate land seizure, or to struggle for the demands of the working class, if we cannot sustain or defend these gains through revolutionary violence, if there were no Party linked to the United Front and the People's Army, if there were no People's War to thrust these conquests to a higher level – the objective destruction of the Old.

In other words, from that perspective, fighting alongside our class and the masses would only end up

refining the democratic tasks which the State delays or is uninterested in solving. In short, refining democracy.

But this is not our perspective. The PCE-SR considers it critical to rise up, to construct itself alongside the other instruments of the New Democratic Revolution within the context of the popular struggles in which it is forged, consolidated and purified – from where it draws its revolutionary programme. In other words, to temper itself in the heat of fire, to the extent that each step, each struggle, each moment of construction, each relative destruction, has only one direction: to unleash the storm of workers and peasants through People’s War.

Our Party considers the fact that there are conscious mechanisms that can be used to stimulate absention. Of course, the usage of these mechanisms will not be possible (as we aspire) in the cities or on the outskirts of the cities. But it will be possible in places where there is little sign of the State. There, the peasants are indifferent as to whether or not they are certified to vote, they are indifferent to electoral participation. It is there where we must construct a Party, a political force. It does not matter, for now, if the number of class-conscious elements is relatively small. This is our starting point.

On the other hand, we have always proposed the clandestine, conspiratorial construction of the Party, subject to the development of revolutionary violence in direct proportion to our level of advancement, and alongside a correct assessment of our strategic goals. That is to say, in accordance with what Chairman Mao has taught us: Concentric construction of the three fundamental instruments of the Democratic Revolution (New Democracy) – the Party, the Army, and the United Front.

The zones of influence of the PCE-SR are important, especially those in the countryside. If this influence is reproduced – as it should be – and adjusted to the conscious work to which we have dedicated ourselves over these past years, we have no doubt that, alongside a correct propaganda campaign and mobilization, we will be able to promote not only absenteeism, but the fight *against* elections.

Obviously, this process will unfold in the context of our own operational limitations. But it will undoubtedly reflect the process of political and ideological mobility, determined by our participation in the leadership of the worker-peasant-petty bourgeoisie-national bourgeoisie alliance.

If the **abstention** campaign is favorably received by even a few hundred poor peasants, workers, class-conscious students, and progressives in the masses, we are still taking firm strides forward. We are laying the foundations of that prairie that, with a correct and opportune spark, can be ignited. This must be fully understood within the context of the class struggle, and the objectives of political work amongst the masses.

We have waged battles for land, for its defense. This has not been achieved by tossing flowers or making speeches. We have fought revisionism, pressured it, intimidated it, and eventually struck it. We have generated power vacuums upon which, once again, the State has been superimposed. Regardless, we have established the pattern that we intend to follow. This is how we understand the process of the militarization of the Party. We are not run amok with “infantile leftism,” nor do we distance ourselves



from the masses through petty-bourgeois or adventurist violence.

What should we do regarding the elections and the call for abstention, regarding land seizures and the defense of the land, regarding the demands of the masses, of the students' and workers' struggles, regarding our partial losses to revisionism and to the old State? We must conduct a **New Democratic Revolution**, an active and conscious preparation conducted within proletarian and peasant organizations, class-conscious students' organizations, and organizations of the exploited masses in general. We must **prepare the People's War, the direction towards which all our work is pointed**. And we must insist that, at the current moment, the quantitative aspect does not matter, but the qualitative aspect does.

Combat the false constitutionalist illusion of the elections!

Proletariat and people of Ecuador: Don't vote!  
Prepare and develop the People's War!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!

If we do not destroy revisionism, we will have done nothing!

Except for power, all is illusion!

Long live the People's Wars in India, the Philippines, Turkey, and Peru!

To conquer the red sun of liberation: Communism!

Ecuador  
2012