

2589

CHEDDI JAGAN
ON

CRITICAL
SUPPORT

ADDRESS TO THE
25th ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE
OF

PEOPLES PROGRESSIVE PARTY

3rd August 1975



25^{cts.} Each.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF P.P.P.

Address by Comrade Cheddi Jagan

Comrade Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Comrade Delegates and Observers:

We meet on a very auspicious occasion - the 25th Anniversary of the founding of our Party. During this period, the PPP has become a household word; we can proudly say that we have made an indelible imprint on our land. There can be no history of Guyana without the history of the PPP.

And more than that, it was we who so to speak first placed Guyana on the map of the world. Though our country is small, by our deeds it became known throughout the world - deeds which were honourable because they were rooted in struggle and based on patriotism and working class internationalism.

At the very beginning the PPP formed a vital link with the world revolutionary, national and social liberation movements. We wrote socialism in our banner inspired as we had been by the sacrifice and great achievements of the heroic Soviet people. It is not surprising that in the same year that we celebrate our 25 years, the world celebrated the 30th Anniversary of the defeat of Fascism. Long live the glorious Soviet Union!

The PPP was born in struggle and rooted in the working class. The bullets which snuffed out the lives of the Enmore martyrs acted as a catalyst agent. And the betrayal of the workers by the opportunists and bandwaggoners of the Labour Party set the seal for the birth of the PPP 25 years ago in 1950.

Three trade unions - the Guiana Industrial Workers Union, the British Guiana Labour Union and the Sawmill and Forest Workers Trade Union - were the powerful roots which sustained the Party, and the blood of the Enmore martyrs fertilized the soil on which it grew.

We fought for freedom, democracy, human rights, and socialism.

We strove untiringly for national independence. At the very beginning we declared that our people would never be able to exercise their humanity unless our country was free from colonial rule and foreign domination. Today, the brain-washers of the National Service Scheme are trying to rewrite and distort history; they are teaching the youth that the PPP (as well as the United Force) were against independence. Here is a blatant attempt by the guilty PNC to cast its own sin on the PPP. But let me say this quite clearly: no amount of PNC "soap and detergents" will succeed in washing away our record; all Guyanese know, indeed the whole world knows, that the PPP was the only genuine, consistent force fighting for independence. We, not the PNC, the record will show, are the real patriots.

But ours was not just a struggle in abstraction. We combined the longterm with the immediate. If we were to realise our goals of independence and socialism, we must have democracy, we declared.

For us, the first blow for democracy was the fight for universal adult suffrage. Today, many take for granted that everyone is entitled to vote. But still there are quite a few who are unaware that it was the PPP which first called, before the Waddington Constitution Commission in 1951, for the right of everyone to vote without qualification, and for the voting age to be reduced to age 18.

And a determined move was made to block us from propagating revolutionary ideas. Lionel Luckhoo's "subversive literature" thought control motion in the colonial Legislative Council and the hysteria it generated led to the seizure and burning of nine crates of books and pamphlets imported from England in 1951. Many of our comrades were harassed by the police and some served jail sentences for being in possession of banned literature, deemed subversive by the colonial rulers and the Indo-Saxon and Afro-Saxon collaborators.

But we advocated not only the free dissemination of ideas. We opposed restrictions on the free movement of Guyanese. For four years from 1953 to 1957, many PPP leaders were restricted to the areas where they lived and could not move about freely.

And we removed the bans placed on the entry into Guyana ^{of} progressive West Indians and others at the first opportunity during our 133 days in government in 1953.

Our concern about human rights was also shown by our firm stand against the hated doctrine of apartheid practised by the fascist South African government.

Another strong plank of the PPP was freedom of association particularly as it affected the right of workers to belong to trade unions, and to have recognised the unions of their choice. Unfortunately, our attempts to make this into law failed on two occasions, in 1953 and 1963. This year, the sugar workers must make a determined, all-out stand for recognition of GAWU. If they cannot obtain it by law or administrative procedure, they must get it by militant action.

And we took the lead in enshrining these and other rights in the Fundamental Rights section of our Constitution. The Guyanese people will not easily forget that those who at one time attacked us as Marxists intent on the denial of freedoms are today themselves step by step eroding the Constitutional guarantees. We must make a determined stand to preserve the liberties we fought for and achieved.

By its dynamic and forceful struggle, the PPP did its duty to the Guyanese and international working class.

It is true to say that in Guyana today there is no important facet of life which the PPP did not pioneer: education, health, agriculture, banking, etc.

The achievement in 1951 of one of the most "advanced" colonial constitutions was in itself an indirect help to freedom fighters elsewhere. Another PPP contribution was its opening of the door in 1961 as the first petitioner to the United Nations Decolonisation Committee.

Standing steadfast to principle, the PPP was the only party in the Caribbean which did not join the US coldwar bandwagon. It did not tack and turn and make deals with imperialism. It did not assume an opportunist position even in the face of grave difficulties. It established links with, and lent support to, national liberation movements everywhere.

It is not without significance to note that when the Constitution was suspended in October 1953, the British Tory ruling class in a White Paper declared that we had been supporting "terrorists" in Malaya and Kenya. The Yankee imperialists in the early 1960's attacked the PPP government because it did not join the wolf-pack in blockading Cuba.

But time has vindicated our stand. We are proud that we played a role, however small, in bringing independence to many colonies, and socialism to Cuba. Today, when we see so many flocking to Cuba and embracing the Cuban revolution and the great Cuban leader, Comrade Fidel Castro, when we see the USA and many Latin American countries lifting the criminal OAS blockade on Cuba, we can proudly say this has proved that we were right; we were the pioneers.

In the eyes of the PPP, genuine proletarian internationalism is an essential aspect of true patriotism.

One of the PPP's greatest achievements was the forging of unity between the two major ethnic groups - Black and Indian. When that unity resulted in its victory of 18 out of 24 seats at the 1953 elections, the imperialist cold warriors used the weapon of anti-communism to destroy the first PPP government. Later, after engineering a split in the party, racial division and animosity was used as the excuse for manipulating the electoral system to remove the PPP from the government in 1964.

In many other ways, the PPP fulfilled its role as the vanguard. We were the first in the Caribbean to attack the Puerto Rican economic planning model, which was held up in the late 1950's as the panacea of all the ills facing the Guyanese and Caribbean peoples. Today, all those who embraced it and criticised us have been forced to recognise its inadequacy.

When we pointed out the weaknesses of the Caribbean Federation as a glorified crown colony and refused to join it, we were attacked. Because we welcomed the then progressive turn in politics in Venezuela and Brazil, we were accused of turning our backs on the Caribbean (actually it was the English-speaking Caribbean leaders who had turned their backs on us) and embracing "continental destiny". We are pleased to see that many are now treading the path we blazed in seeing the essential identity of the Caribbean and Latin America.

Many of the shortcomings of CARIFTA and CARICOM which the PPP from the very beginning exposed because of its world view are now coming to light. Our critics are now forced to move in the direction we pointed out.

Even on the question of dress reform, we were the first to introduce the shirt-jac!

We pioneered the way in emphasizing our own history and culture. The PPP government cancelled the lease to the golf club (how the National Park), one of the bastions of colonial privilege.

And above all, we were the first to propagate the ideology of Marxism-Leninism. Today, the erstwhile anti-communists have suddenly taken on this mantle. It is not without amusement that we note that policemen who not too long ago were instructed to seize Marxist books such as Lenin's State and Revolution in their raids of homes and to harass their PPP owners are now exhorted to study Marxism-Leninism. This is a welcome development.

But we must be forgiven if we question the sincerity of some of the new converts like Kit Nascimento who not too long ago were rabid anti-communists. Too many opportunist boot-lickers are bandying the name of comrade. Remember the biblical warning: "Not all who shout Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven." We too can say: "Not all who shout Comrade, Comrade, shall enter into the kingdom of socialism." Down with the sophists!

This new development, however, can initiate a process which even the PNC will find difficulty in halting. It opens the door for a dialogue with PNC rank and filers. It must be our task to raise their understanding and consciousness of the theory and practice of scientific socialism, of Marxism-Leninism.

But let us not be lulled into a false sense of security because of this positive possibility. We must be on guard. We must remember that with the intensification of the international class struggle, and the balance of world forces shifting in favour of socialism, imperialism is becoming more flexible and cunning; it is devising new tactics and strategies. As Marxism-Leninism grips the masses, imperialism will try to distort and derail it.

This 25th Anniversary is a good time to assess the whole complex but fluid situation, to take stock of our own position - our strength and weaknesses - and to determine how we should continue to influence the situation in a positive way. With a view to splitting our ranks and weakening our party and its influence, some idiots and opportunists are constantly harping on the mistakes we made. It is necessary to observe that only fools who do nothing make no mistakes.

The main burden of their attack is that we should not have openly espoused Marxism and given support to the Cuban Revolution. What they fail to note is that had we not taken a firm patriotic position, a world view and resorted to militant action, we would not have been able to win over the masses from the traitors and collaborators. Instead of attacking us, they should direct their guns against those who in the name of tactics betrayed the revolution by splitting and weakening its forces. That would be a correct historical perspective.

The mistake we made was not the espousal of Marxism; it was that we did not fully implement it in practice.

The PPP was a party geared to winning elections; it was not geared to counter subversion, conspiracy and sabotage. It was only in 1961 that we established an ideological school, and only in 1969 that we took a decision to transform our loose mass party into a disciplined Marxist-Leninist party.

One of the difficulties encountered was that with the "rightist" and "leftist" opportunist splits and betrayals, there was not enough personnel to man both the government and party administration at the same time. The result was that party work suffered while we were marking time in government without power and being sabotaged at the same time.

The mistake we made was to have given priority to government rather than the party, staying in the government too long without independence, assuming responsibility without real power, and thereby undermining our influence, cutting the ground under our feet, at the same time.

Now that the process of party transformation is in train, we must move as rapidly as possible to correct past mistakes and to build a strong party, ideologically and organizationally united, so as to continue to give positive leadership to the Guyanese working class and to influence the situation in the direction of peace, democracy and socialism.

To continue to play our vanguard role, we must properly assess the situation. Up to 1970, because of the government's obvious anti-working class and pro-imperialist policies, it was easy to criticise, expose and oppose the PNC. Today, the position is not so clear-cut. It is complex and has led to some confusion.

Some moves which for years we have been agitating for or would have supported have been made - - recognition of the Soviet Union, China, Cuba, German Democratic Republic and other socialist states; membership of the non-aligned movement; support for the African liberation movements; national ownership and control of natural resources; membership in the International Duxite Association; nationalisation of Demba, Reynolds and Jessels; attack on capitalism and defense of socialism; support of SELA for Latin American and Caribbean economic cooperation; advocacy of Marxism-Leninism.

The PNC would like the Guyanese people to believe that all this is part of, and the unfolding of, a grand design formulated years ago by the master brain of its leadership.

This is far from the truth. The fact is the PNC has no principled position. For it, politics is the art of making deals, even with imperialism. Being opportunistic and pragmatic, its moves are largely determined by countervailing pressures.

Several factors, external and internal, objective and subjective, have influenced developments in Guyana. And certain antagonistic contradictions had to be resolved.

The acceptance, however reluctantly, of peaceful coexistence and detente by U.S. imperialism consequent on the grave fiscal and economic situation, including the devaluation of the US dollar, in the early 1970's opened the door for the PNC regime to modify its outright pro-imperialist, coldwar foreign policies. This was clearly shown in its voting record in the United Nations on the question of the seating of China in that body - - opposition in 1966 and 1967; abstention in 1968, 1969 and 1970; support in 1971.

Also the burning ambition of the PNC publicity-conscious leader to become world renowned, to achieve "a more rewarding position" in world politics, (remember his leader-or-nothing demand in 1953 when he was chairman of the PPP) is acting as a constant pressure on the government to keep pace with the states in the non-aligned movement like Cuba with a firm anti-imperialist position and even to go beyond the permissible limits imposed by imperialism.

On the home front, certain contradictions have developed between the PNC regime and imperialism, which had brought it to power. This was because in Guyana as elsewhere in the "third world", neo-colonial rule and foreign dictated policies led to a widening gap in living standards between the imperialist states and the imperialist-dominated states. For instance, the much-touted \$300 million Development Plan (1966-72), which was supposed to have ushered in the PNC utopia, prematurely collapsed in 1969-70. And for the masses, living conditions deteriorated.

With general discontent even among its own rank and file, and political and ideological pressure from the PPP, the PNC was forced to talk about socialism. But not wishing to make a radical break and to dismantle the imperialist socio-economic structure, it advocated the false ideology of "cooperative socialism;" namely, that cooperatives would be the means by which socialism would be brought to Guyana.

However, as conditions continued to worsen, the PNC was forced to follow the lead of the progressive "third world" countries in the United Nations and elsewhere and advocate measures such as the national ownership and control of natural resources. And with the near-collapse of the economy in early 1974 as a result firstly of the accumulated adverse affects of nearly a decade of pro-imperialist policies, and secondly of the imported inflation from the capitalist world, the PNC government was forced to take some steps against imperialism.

The PNC leadership perhaps more than anyone else realized from the high-jacking and tampering of ballot boxes in the 1968 and especially the 1973 general elections where it stood with the masses. Particularly shocking to it no doubt was the very low turnout of voters in 1973 in its former stronghold, Georgetown. It knew that it could not continue in the old way.

With the country facing bankruptcy, the government suspended shipment in the latter part of 1974 of sugar to the United Kingdom until the price was raised. In search of Arab petro-dollar loans, it broke diplomatic relations with Israel, the base of US imperialism in the Middle East.

Desperately in need of cash, and exposed and attacked by the PPP for vacillating on the nationalisation of Guyana Mines Limited, the bauxite subsidiary of Reynolds Metals Company, and for not even following Jamaica's lead in putting a levy on bauxite because of the 25-year tax-freeze secret deal made with the company in 1965, the PNC government was forced to move. It imposed a levy, but the Company refused to pay and challenged it in court.

Not too long after, it was announced that a settlement had been reached; the case was withdrawn and the company was nationalised. The fact that Reynolds paid the levy in Jamaica but refused to do so in Guyana would indicate that it found the terms of nationalisation so favourable that it preferred nationalisation to taxation. Nevertheless, nationalisation though late (it should have come soon after, "within months of", the takeover of the Demerara Bauxite Company in 1971) is welcome. Imperialism is thereby weakened in Guyana. The opportunity is now provided to break down the social structure which would have been impossible without nationalisation.

But it must be noted that while the PNC has been forced to take some steps against imperialism, it does not have a consistent, firm anti-imperialist position. Witness that the Booker's monopoly remains intact, and the PNC has declared its intention of working in partnership with it. The foreign banks and insurance companies still have a great influence in the field of finance and credit.

How does imperialism view and respond to the developing situation? Clearly, it is not very happy. Its discomfiture is all the greater firstly because of its failure through the years to build with the National Labour Front, United Force, Guiana United Muslim Party, the Justice Party and others a viable alternative to the PPP; and secondly because of its realisation that the PPP is gaining political support at the expense of the PNC.

Consequently, despite some contradictions between the regime and Anglo-American imperialism, the latter is forced to continue to support the PNC. However, it is playing a hold-me-loose-me political game, lending the government support but at the same time trying to compromise and contain it.

Imperialism is aware of the strength and weaknesses of the PNC and the contradictions within its structure - - its basic opportunism; and its leader, presiding over a largely grasping petty-bourgeois middle class elite on the one hand, and a dispossessed worker-peasant rank and file on the other. In the former, imperialism sees a continuing ally; in the latter, an eventual class enemy.

One group of the PNC elite particularly with a United Democratic Party or United Force background constitutes bureaucratic capitalist climbers with ambitions to becoming industrial and commercial capitalists. They are opposed to change. But because they are wedded to capitalism and imperialism, they would support those measures which are in keeping with the changing tactics and strategies of imperialism.

In this regard, it must be noted that with the intensification of the international class struggle, the strengthening of the camp of socialism and the weakening of the camp of capitalism, the failure of limited military intervention in and economic blockade of Cuba and massive armed intervention in Vietnam, the imperialists have been forced to substitute for "big stick" methods more subtle forms of domination such as regional integration, joint enterprises, multilateral aid, etc., and these are adapted flexibly to suit each particular situation.

For instance, while unity and cooperation among developing countries are essential for development and progress, regional integration of a certain type - - Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA) and the Central American Common Market (CACM) - - also favour the transnational corporations. That was why the PNC regime pushed to bring into being CARIFTA, now CARICOM, in 1968.

And because of the general and growing hostility to the transnational corporations, and the threat of nationalisation consequent on the worsening position of the underdeveloped world, imperialism has advocated and supported partnership in the form of "joint enterprises" so as to create a social base for capitalism-imperialism.

Because tied aid, "aid with strings", created grave debt and balance-of-payments problems for many developing countries and thus became unpopular (for instance in Guyana, the PNC in the early 1970's began describing aid as raid), the US strategists shifted emphasis from bilateral to multi-lateral aid through international and regional lending agencies such as the World Bank, the International Development Association, the Latin American Development Bank, etc.; they have even put in a sizeable amount of money in the Caribbean Development Bank.

Economic consideration also forced a change from a policy of cold war to detent, "from containment to engagement". But a section of the US ruling class hopes to use detente to build bridges with socialist states, not for lasting world peace, but for subversion in the service of imperialism.

In an address to the Council of Foreign Relations at New York in September 1972, William Rogers, former U.S. Secretary of State, speaking about the new strategy, wrote:

"First, we have sought to encourage governments - friendly or unfriendly, partners or competitors - to talk to each other . . . Throughout the world, governments are talking to each other to a degree perhaps unknown since the war . . .

This week a Japanese Prime Minister has visited China, and the establishment of diplomatic relations seems only a matter of time.

We welcome this process in all parts of the world and are glad to have contributed to it by example and encouragement."

Leading US ideologue, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs and professor of law and government at Columbia University, in an article in Span (July, 1973) wrote that in the past when there was confrontation and confusion, fear and apprehension, two syntheses, Liberalism and Marxism, emerged and 'the American system was saved by creatively adapting both . . . to the American context: the Rooseveltian "New Deal." He observed that "the United States . . . has no choice but to remain actively involved in the world . . . a move either to pacificism, or to protectionism, or to isolationism would lead to global anarchy."

How does this US imperialist strategist see the United States maintaining its domination and global influence in this period of growing alienation and crisis of confidence? Firstly, by creating 'a community of the developed nations spanning the Atlantic and the Pacific'; secondly, by engaging "the Communist countries, when they are ready, in globally cooperative undertakings . . . what I once called "peaceful engagement with the East"; thirdly, by providing conceptual leadership not "personal leadership" . . . 'charismatic appeal, real or manufactured by mass media, is not the historical need for the moment. The need is for conceptual leadership . . .'

There we have it from the mouth of the establishment. The "Atlantic" concept, based on the bankrupt cold-war policy of "containment of communism" of the 1950's and 1960's must give way to a broader global concept with the aim of liberalising and reforming capitalism and and revising scientific socialism. According to this and other advocates of the convergence theory, there is no longer any need for the class struggle, a basic cornerstone of Marxism-Leninism: capitalism will become liberalized and the present day socialism of the socialist states will be transformed into "socialism with a human face."

It is against this background and this development, that some of the PNC policy moves must be viewed.

Another group of the PNC elite wants reform but not revolution. They opportunistically support change, but of a limited character. They support nationalisation and expansion of the public sector and the military-bureaucratic state apparatus as that means more opportunities for personal advancement and in some cases replacement of Anglo-Saxons by and large by Afro-Saxons in top positions with fantastic salaries and allowances. They want state capitalism and "cooperative capitalism", not socialism.

And because of the intense political and ideological struggle in Guyana, imperialism is prepared flexibly to adjust even to nationalisation provided generous compensation is paid. contracts are awarded such as for sales agency for the Guyana Bauxite Company to Philipp Bros., the US subsidiary of the giant Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa, raw materials are secured, and nationalisation is not used to lay the basis for socialism but is shunted to capitalism.

Experience has taught it in Bolivia and elsewhere that even nationalisation can be contained. In Bolivia, with aid and other means, imperialism was able to compromise and eventually overthrow the petty-bourgeois nationalist regime led by Pas Estenssoro which had nationalised the tin mines and carried out a radical land reform.

What about the PNC worker-peasant rank and file supporters whose conditions have rapidly deteriorated over the past 3 years? They have seen state capitalism in practice at the nationalised Guyana Bauxite Company (Guybau) and they do not like it. No doubt that was why the PNC had to divert 24 buses from the Coast to take their supporters to Linden (the bauxite township) on the 4th Anniversary of vesting day (July 15, 1975).

The PNC rank and filers want fundamental change which will bring an end to unemployment and declining living standards. For 25 years they have been hearing from the PPP that only socialism holds the answer. And no doubt they have been influenced by the positive gains made by the working people in the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist states. They may know little or nothing about the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism (it cannot be otherwise in view of the previous outright anti-Marxist, anti-Communist PNC stand). But they realise that in more than one-third of the world where that philosophy is embraced and scientific socialist ideas have been put into practice, an end has been brought to unemployment, backwardness, hunger and misery.

The PNC leader and the few socialists in the PNC hierarchy (they can be counted on the fingers of one hand) are therefore forced to attack capitalism and advocate socialism and Marxism-Leninism.

But imperialism is not unduly worried about talk unless it is translated into action.

In the United States, the liberal bourgeoisie is also now talking about socialism. And it must not be forgotten that the CIA paid \$1 million (US) to the Socialist Party of America, whose leader admitted setting up 17 socialist parties in Latin America to fight communism. And even so-called Marxists - Trotskyites, Maoists, Marcusists, "New

Leftists" are, consciously or unconsciously, used by imperialism to fight against scientific socialism.

Imperialism therefore sees as its principal tasks firstly, the keeping of Guyana within the imperialist orbit through multilateral if not bi-lateral aid and such other means as the distortion and revisionism of Marxism-Leninism and the cultivation of "nationalist socialism" or "nationalist communism", so-called "socialism with a human face" divorced from the revolutionary world socialist system; secondly, the strengthening of its influence among the PNC middle class through scholarships, technical assistance, seminars, sponsored no-expense-barred tours to distort and contain the process in Guyana; and if later this proves impossible, through the training and indoctrination of police and military personnel to subvert the regime; fourthly, changing of the political line and programme of the PPP through infiltration and even assassination; and fifthly, the strengthening of the ultra-rightist forces, especially the racist elements in the Indian community, who, taking advantage of the discriminatory policies of the PNC, utilise emotive and reactionary slogans for their counter-revolutionary ends.

What about the PNC? Two courses are open to it: firstly, to halt the anti-imperialist process and make a compromise with imperialism; secondly, to opt for the non-capitalist path by taking a firm stand against imperialism, by-passing capitalist development and moving rapidly to socialism.

A compromise with imperialism will mean the continuation of the present policy of placating both sectors of the PNC at the expense of the nation - the petty bourgeois middle class with bigger jobs and astronomical salaries through nationalisation, expansion of the public sector and the military-bureaucratic state apparatus, state capitalism and cooperative capitalism; the rank and file with preferential treatment for lower-level jobs, land and loans, and through National Service.

Such a short-sighted PNC policy will further mean :

1. the continued training of military and police personnel in capitalist states and the strengthening of the military-bureaucratic state apparatus to hold down the people and maintain minority rule;
2. the strengthening within the PNC of the petty-bourgeois middle-class and the muzzling of the workers and farmers through PNC-controlled trade unions like the GUJ and the AAWU, and hand-picked farmers' bodies like Rice Action Committees, Cane Farmers Committees, Farmers Congresses, etc, thus placing structural obstacles to the construction of democracy and socialism;
3. the perpetuation of political and racial discriminatory practices in order to maintain its dwindling support;
4. a step by step move towards, firstly, a de facto, and later, a de jure authoritarian dictatorship. This will be called demagogically a dictatorship of the proletariat, but it will bear no resemblance to a people's democracy or a socialist democracy. Instead, it will be a minority party holding down the people from above through military-bureaucratic rule with all organisations and institutions party-and-state-controlled.

This is not the way to develop a nation. Rule by edict, however well-intentioned, patronage and discrimination cannot build socialism.

Alternatively, the possibilities exist for a real breakthrough in Guyana, of really going rapidly through anti-imperialism to socialism. The PPP, the majority party, is constantly exerting pressure in this direction. And conditions are very favourable, better perhaps than any other country in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Guyana has the possibilities of truly becoming a second Cuba.

If the PNC is sincere about its socialist declarations and intends to take a firm, anti-imperialist course, then in anticipation of possible attack from within and without by reactionary forces, it is duty bound to work out a political solution at home and develop the strongest links with the socialist states, particularly the Soviet Union.

Cuba's ability to deter external aggression, to survive and to build a socialist society was to a large extent dependent on internal unity and the forging of such links.

The PNC should therefore drop the "two-super-powers", the "two imperialisms" line which equates socialist USSR with imperialist USA, and its discriminatory practices such as the surcharge on goods originating in the socialist countries. It must halt the dangerous practice of sending for training and indoctrination military, police and other personnel in the United Kingdom, United States and Brazil, the US gendarme in Latin America. History has shown that when leaders like Nkrumah, Sukarno

and others tried to confront imperialism, they were attacked by their own generals.

The PNC government must also abrogate the secret agreement of 1966 which permits U.S. aircraft to overfly Guyana and the United States to station its personnel, store equipment and supplies, operate communication services and service and maintain aircraft at Atkinson Field (now Timehri airport); further, "to install additional or improve existing equipment at Atkinson Field for navigation, traffic control, or other agreed purposes."

Since anti-imperialism is the road to socialism, this imperialist dagger pointed at the heart of Guyana must be removed.

Also, if the PNC proposes genuinely to tread the progressive path, it must realize that its discriminatory practices play into the hands of the ultra-right reactionary forces in creating a possible fifth column. It must therefore forthwith end the policy of political and racial discrimination.

And it must at the same time implement the pledges made in parliament in 1971 and termed "peace plan" by the Guyana Graphic. Those pledges to ensure and safeguard democratic practices and procedures and fairplay were made after the PPP had given to the PNC government parliamentary support for the nationalisation of the Demerara Bauxite Company. Unfortunately, those pledges have not been fulfilled. Instead, there has been harassment, victimisation and discrimination.

If a political solution is achieved, the nation can be united, and practically the whole people involved and mobilised not only in deterring any moves by the reactionary forces, but also in building socialism.

What should be our position? How should we view and act in the present situation?

Since we are so directly involved in the political drama, we have to be careful not to be guilty of subjectivism and dogmatism. As Marxists-Leninists, we must be scientific and dialectical. This means taking an objective view, seeing things not on the basis of how we feel but how they really are. This means not being dogmatic, rigid and inflexible. If the situation demands it, then we must be fearless in changing our political line.

Up to 1970, the PPP was correct in strongly criticising and opposing the PNC regime because of its outright anti-working class, pro-imperialist, undemocratic, corrupt and discriminatory policies.

Because of the failure of the PNC to implement the "peace plan" of 1971, the army hijacking of ballot boxes and the electoral fraud of 1973, and the shooting and killing of our comrades, we were justified in our campaign of non-cooperation and civil resistance.

Today many evils like the Booker's monopoly, erosion of fundamental rights, absence of democracy, discrimination, corruption and squandermania still persist.

But the PPP cannot close its eyes to the changes brought about especially since its last Congress in September 1974. Have these changes been made against or in co-operation with imperialism in accordance with its changing tactics and strategies? Considering the past deals of the PNC with imperialism, one cannot be too sure; doubts linger. But let us be charitable and give the PNC the benefit of the doubt.

True, the changes have been seriously compromised. But we must remember that the PNC is not the PPP - we cannot expect it to proceed in the same way we would.

The fact is that the changes, though compromised, have the effect of weakening imperialism. If we are to arrive at our goal of socialism, imperialism must first be destroyed. And whoever helps must be praised. We must continue to apply pressure on the PNC government and also take our own initiatives in this direction.

The situation now therefore demands a more flexible approach on the part of the PPP. The party had previously declared that it does not have a monopoly on socialism, that it is prepared regardless of ideological and tactical differences to work with others if they are interested in building a socialist Guyana. And this includes the PNC.

Our political line should be changed from non-cooperation and civil resistance to critical support. This can lay the basis for a political solution in our country.

It will also help to frustrate the PNC's attempts to isolate the Party.

If we continue with the old line we face the danger in the new situation of opposing for the sake of opposing and thus playing into the hands of the reactionaries. As revolutionaries, we cannot oppose any and every move just because we are opposed to the PNC. For instance, some conservatives oppose nationalisation because it might lead to discrimination. This cannot be our position. We must press for nationalisation and at the same time fight the monster of discrimination with all our might; we must put much more emphasis on this aspect of our work.

Critical support does not mean unconditional support. It means just what it says giving support for any progressive measure, opposing any reactionary moves, and criticizing all shortcomings.

We, and particularly our friends in the socialist states, have a great duty and a historical role to play. In this regard, we must note the positive role the Soviet Union and other socialist states play directly and indirectly in the struggle against imperialism and for socialism in Guyana and other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. By their policy of peaceful coexistence, disarmament, European security and detente, they are ensuring world peace, the greatest safeguard for humanity everywhere.

But the duty of the socialist states is not only to preserve world peace. They must also constantly strive to weaken imperialism and to change the balance of world forces in favour of socialism.

Through peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition, the socialist states can construct socialism (from each according to his ability, to each according to his labour) in an atmosphere of peace and develop faster in the direction of communism (from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs).

By satisfying man's material and spiritual wants and at the same time creating a new type of man, socialism demonstrates that it is a superior system to capitalism. This permits us more easily to "sell" socialism to the masses and to win them away from the influence of the anti-communists.

The Soviet Union and other socialist states have consistently worked to bring about detente, which has contributed to a relaxation of tensions. This, coupled with their diplomatic presence, has helped to break down anti-communism as a political force in Guyana.

Remember that our fight was not against just the PNC and the UF; our main enemy was Anglo-American imperialism. Anti-communism, anti-Sovietism and anti-Castroism were the biggest weapons used against us. The PPP government was subverted in 1962-64 because of the hysteria created that an independent Guyana under the PPP would become a second Cuba. We cannot forget the removal of Marxist Professor Horace Davis and others from the University of Guyana, the refusal of the administration to permit a series of lecturers on Marxism and the deliberate attempt made to change the image of the University. We are glad that the PNC has been forced to swallow its anti-communist and anti-Cuban sentiments and to advocate Marxism-Leninism.

Socialist states have the duty also through diplomatic and other means to exert influence on "third world" countries like Guyana to break from the capitalist world and cooperate with or join the socialist camp. We must not forget that if imperialism is weakened on the world scene, it makes our struggle for national liberation and socialism easier.

Apart from the positive role played at the state level by socialist countries on the basis of peaceful coexistence, communist and workers parties also aid the revolutionary struggle through solidarity and support at the party level on the basis of proletarian internationalism.

This support has been demonstrated by the many messages of solidarity we have received from fraternal parties, and the presence here with us of the delegation of the Communist Party of Cuba.

We must assiduously work to strengthen our links with fraternal parties, and to uphold the principles of peaceful coexistence and proletarian internationalism. Nothing must be done to hamper or imperil the observance of these principles.

Socialist states also have a responsibility to make sure that petty-bourgeois nationalist governments like the PNC do not exploit the relations between them and make it appear that their parties are the vanguard parties to the detriment of the revolutionary process.

The PNC is carrying out insidious propaganda that there is no difference between the PPP and the PNC. No doubt this is being done to justify for itself the vanguard role and psychologically to prepare the ground for establishing a de facto if not a de jure minority, authoritarian one-party dictatorship.

We must maintain our identity as the PPP. We must vigorously fight against any or all attempts to liquidate our Party.

We must make clear the many differences between the PPP and the PNC. From a principled position, the Party must continue to expose all the distortions and deviations of Marxism-Leninism.

Socialism means public ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange. While supporting the cooperative movement, it must continue to expose and oppose the false ideology that cooperatives will be the means by which socialism will come to Guyana; that the cooperative sector will become the dominant sector. Turning over nationalised enterprises into cooperatives is not the way to build socialism. Rather, it is the way to construct a new form of capitalism, what one PNC minister recently dubbed "people's capitalism."

Further, we do not see the attainment of socialism without first completing the anti-imperialist process by the nationalisation of the Booker's monopoly, the banks and the insurance companies.

Apologists for the PNC try to explain away the government's inaction in this regard by reference to Allende's downfall. They state that if it moved resolutely against the foreign sharks, it would suffer the same fate as that of Allende's Popular Unity government.

This excuse is not justified by the facts. Allende's Popular Unity had no control of the state apparatus and the army; it did not even have a majority in the National Assembly. And there was an entrenched local capitalist-landlord class with well-financed and strong parties and control of the mass media.

In Guyana, the situation is quite different. The PNC has control of the whole state machine, including the police and army; it has a two-thirds majority, although stolen, in the National Assembly. And it is blessed with a situation in which the opposition PPP, representing about 55-60% of the people, has a principled and firm anti-imperialist, pro-socialist position. The United Force which had only 12 per cent support of the electorate in 1964 is now a spent force.

In this sense, Guyana is somewhat unique. Not only the general, but also the particular, must be seen.

The situation is very different from many "third world" countries with petty-bourgeois nationalist governments, where certain positive steps have been taken which have the effect of weakening imperialism. The internal balance of forces in Guyana is far more favourable for revolution.

For instance, if a comparison is made of Guyana and Venezuela, it will be found **that in** both countries the governments have taken more or less the same steps in domestic and foreign policies. But there are big differences.

In Venezuela, there are the traditional military and strong rightist political forces; and thus the grave danger of rightist subversion and/or an imperialist-inspired military coup as in Chile.

In Guyana, on the other hand, the PNC can take a firm stand against imperialism as there is not the same danger of the overthrow of the government by ultra-rightist subversion and/or military coup. But political opportunism prevents it from so doing. It wants to maintain one foot in the imperialist camp, while reaching out half-heartedly with the other to the socialist camp.

In Venezuela, the Communist Party is permitted to function democratically to grow and to influence the political process. And in turn, it gives critical support to the government especially in view of dangers forcing the country from the reactionary forces.

In Guyana, the minority regime is ruling autocratically and using administrative, psychological and other means to restrict and hamstring the majority PPP, to prevent it from playing its vanguard role.

This must be combatted with all the force at our command. Without the PPP, the process against imperialism and for socialism would be halted. It is not by accident

12

that Guyanese are the most politically class-conscious and forward-looking in the whole English-speaking Caribbean. For this achievement, credit belongs to the PPP.

In further elaboration of the differences between the PPP and the PNC, we must point out clearly that socialism cannot be attained by military-bureaucratic minority rule from above. Without majority involvement, without people's democracy, there can be no socialism. There must be democracy at all levels -- central and local government, trade union, industrial.

In Guyana, the road to socialism is being built from the top by an integrated party-state military bureaucratic apparatus and party-state handpicked and controlled organisations.

On the other hand, in Cuba for instance, socialism is being built on 3 foundations-- the party (the Communist Party of Cuba as the vanguard of the working class), the government and the people, each playing its independent role. The Committees for the Defence of the Revolution, and the democratically-run mass organisations like the trade unions, the small farmers association (ANAP), the women's organisations, etc. are some of the grass-roots bodies free from government control through which the people speak.

We must make it clear that it is not enough to send students to learn about fisheries, and others to observe work-study in Cuba. What is needed is to see socialist Cuba as an integrated whole - the theory and practice, philosophy and political economy, of scientific socialism, of Marxism-Leninism.

An end must be put to corruption and extravagance. A corrupt, extravagant regime will not succeed in inspiring the people. A code of conduct supervised personally by the leader of the PNC is not sufficient; there must be a law, a National Anti-Corruption Board and "watch-dog committees" everywhere.

And the PPP must launch a vigorous campaign against political and racial discrimination. Apart from being a denial of basic human rights, it is a course which hampers national development; it places obstacles to the fullest mobilisation of human resources. We must press for Equal Opportunity and Fair Employment Practices legislation and for substantial representations in public service Commissions and Employment Exchanges. We must document all cases of discrimination, and relentlessly pursue them at all levels until this vicious practice is ended.

While there are many pitfalls ahead which must be avoided, there is also clearly a new, broad vista opening up, a stretch of firm, common ground on which the PPP can build and go forward with the working masses. It is with these masses that the Party, as the vanguard of the revolutionary struggle in Guyana, must ever more closely and intimately identify itself, without itself losing its identity, its patriotic commitment to the fullest realisation of the potential of our people and our country.

What we believe in and have fought for is winning out. In Portugal, Greece, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and elsewhere, our brothers who faced great odds, have achieved spectacular successes.

Day after day more and more victories roll in. A few days ago the criminal OAS blockade against socialist Cuba was lifted. Hot on its heels has come the signing of the code of behaviour by 35 European and North American states at the Helsinki European Security Conference --, an achievement which the Soviet Union has steadily worked for. This will deepen detente, improve the chances of peace and security in Europe, and have far-reaching influences everywhere for peace, freedom and socialism.

A great future is before us. Let us move forward with confidence.

In the words of our Party song, let us keep the red flag flying.

LONG LIVE THE WORKING CLASS!

LONG LIVE PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM!

LONG LIVE THE P.P.P.!

AUGUST 3, 1975.