

BRITISH GUIANA'S FUTURE

PEACEFUL OR VIOLENT?

By **CHEDDI JAGAN**



A P. P. P. Publication

Price 1/-

FOREWORD

Cheddi Jagan has brought the story of British Guiana's political life up to date and in doing so he has nailed all the lies that have been peddled around the world and exposed the international conspiracy which was organised to secure the overthrow of the P.P.P. Government. This account of the 1962 and 1963 counter revolutions is authentic even though the facts narrated are bizarre enough to form the theme for a cheap American horror novel in a paper back edition.

The past is here recorded as we stand on the edge of an uncertain future. The British have not always been wise, but sometimes they have sensed an irresistible trend in history and have avoided the temptation to ape their famous forbear — King Canute.

But wise or unwise, the British must yield up power to the people of Guyana; and in Guyana that means the People's Progressive Party — eventually, if not now.

H. J. M. Hubbard.

BRITISH GUIANA'S FUTURE PEACEFUL OR VIOLENT?

by **CHEDDI JAGAN**

The second phase of the battle to overthrow the Government is over. The first phase began last year with the February disturbances which ended in rioting and looting and in the destruction by fire of a large part of the commercial centre of the City. This year's 11-week strike ended in serious clashes, looting, arson and murder. In the smoke of battle the main issues became clouded. One heard of the Government's sinister intentions, of fears and suspicions, of racial strife. But the basic causes of the struggle were not brought to the forefront.

For some time, deliberate attempts have been made to subvert the Government. Subversion has now given way to open rebellion. In 1962, the budget to give effect to the Government's policy of raising large sums for economic development and which was influenced by a Cambridge Economist, Mr. Nicholas Kaldor, was the excuse for the rebellion.

According to the Commonwealth "Commission of Inquiry into Disturbances in British Guiana in February 1962" the Opposition combined "to form a veritable torrent of abuse, recrimination and vicious hostility directed against Dr. Jagan and his government, and each day gave fresh vigour to the agitation."

THE BUDGET

The budget was described and attacked as "anti-working class" and "communistic". It took the Commission to point out that "the contradiction implicit in a measure being both Communist in substance and oppressive of the workers was not a matter which troubled Dr. Jagan's opponents, for political slogans are not infrequently lacking in logic and the multitude to whom they are addressed does not possess the faculty of discerning an incongruity or fallacy in what their leaders expound before them".

The real cause of the disturbances, declared the Commission, was political rivalry and fear that the government might enact measures injurious to the proprietary rights of the upper classes and businessmen. In paragraph 45 of its report, the Commission stated:

"The budget provoked fierce opposition from several

nothing deeply vicious or destructive of economic security in the budget. It had been drawn up on the advice of an experienced economist, who could not be said to have any Communist prepossessions. The budget won immediate approval from many persons. The New York Times said in an editorial that the budget was courageous and economically sound. The London Times in a leading article observed "The immediate problem for the Prime Minister, Dr. Jagan, is how to win some acceptance for his economic proposals which are courageous and certainly not far from what Guiana must have". Sir Jock Campbell, Chairman of Booker Bros. said "It clearly was in intention a serious attempt by the Government to get to grips with the formidable economic problems of the country by a hard programme of self-help. It was radical — what have the people of British Guiana got to be conservative about — but not confiscatory". Senator Tasker of Bookers in British Guiana gave his own opinion about the budget by saying "We assessed it as a realistic attempt to grapple with the economic problems of British Guiana."

Another observer, Professor of Economics, Mr. Peter Newman, pointed out that the budget was the first serious attempt at self-help. In his article on "*Racial Tension in British Guiana*", this is how he put it:

"The first budget of the new Jagan Government, under the influence of the distinguished British economist Nicholas Kaldor, seriously attempt to increase substantially the amount of locally provided funds, to a degree beyond that envisaged by the original plan. A package consisting of higher rates for old taxes (e.g. import duties), new taxes (e.g. capital gains taxes), and a scheme for compulsory private saving, was introduced. As we shall see, the timing of these admirable self-help proposals laid them open to misinterpretation. It is ironic that the grave riots in February of this year were sparked by the first serious attempt to make the Guianese responsible for their own economic development."

THE LABOUR RELATIONS BILL

In 1963, the excuse for the disturbances was the Labour Relations Bill. At the very beginning of the 11-week strike, I indicated that it was politically inspired. This was corroborated very early by Mr. Burnham. Leader of the Opposition and later by Mr. Duncan Sandys. Mr.

Burnham put it to me that the Labour Relations Bill was not the *causa belli* but the *casus belli*, not the cause of but the occasion for the rebellion.

The T.U.C. denied any political motivation. Note, however that the Commonwealth Commission which investigated the riots of February 1962 sparked off by the T.U.C. and the political Opposition had this to say of the T.U.C.:

"There is very little doubt that, despite the loud protestations of the trade union leaders to the contrary, political affinities and aspirations played a large part in shaping their policy and formulating their programme of offering resistance to the budget and making a determined effort to change the government in office.

It has been proved beyond all doubt that the three most important trade unionists, Mr. Ishmael, Mr. Jackson and Mr. Sankar, were deeply involved in politics." (paragraphs 63 and 64).

The T.U.C. claimed that it called its affiliates out on strike not for political but for industrial reasons, that the far-reaching powers which the Bill gave the Government would have enabled it to muzzle and destroy the "free trade union movement". It was not opposed, it said, to the principle of the Bill, i.e. the taking of a poll among workers in any industry or in any bargaining unit to settle jurisdictional disputes between unions and to certify recognition for the purpose of collective bargaining. What it objected to, it said, were the provisions of the Bill which it claimed would have put unlimited powers in the hands of the Government through the Minister and Commissioner of Labour. Yet later, when agreement was reached with the T.U.C. and the employers Association, the T.U.C. still dragged its feet and prolonged the strike. Indeed, towards the very end when the Bill lapsed because of the prorogation of the Legislative Assembly, the T.U.C. insisted that the Bill must not be reintroduced.

Another point raised by the T.U.C. was lack of consultation. However, this was merely an excuse. It is to be noted that in 1962 after objections were raised by the T.U.C. to the budget, the Minister of Finance postponed consideration of it in the Legislative Assembly and fixed a date for discussion on Thursday, February 15, But before these discussions were held, the T.U.C. called a general strike on Tuesday, February 13. Referring to this incident, the *Commonwealth Commission of Enquiry described the T.U.C.'s action as "a breach of faith and a dis-*

play of irresponsibility" and went on to state in paragraph 124:

"The story put forward before us was that the unbending and indeed the provocative attitude of the government was the sole reason for the decision to call a general strike, or at any rate for precipitating that decision. We find it difficult to believe this version and we are of the opinion that the facts have been greatly distorted by the trade union leaders for the purpose of placing the responsibility of arousing the workers' hostility upon the government".

The fact is there was consultation. After the publication and the first reading of the Bill in the Legislative Assembly, the Minister of Labour held talks with the T.U.C. and employers Association. As a result of these discussions, amendments were made to seven of the thirteen clauses of the Bill, involving in all ten basic changes, including the establishment of a Labour Relations Board in place of the *ad hoc* committee of the original Bill.

The T.U.C. was not satisfied with mere consultation. What it wanted was to dictate to the Government, to tell the Government what laws to enact and when to enact them. This became apparent very early in the course of the strike. Incidentally, the Labour Relations Bill formed part of the Manifesto of the People's Progressive Party in 1953, 1957 and again in 1961. Notice of intention to implement the Bill was given in the Governor's Speech at the beginning of the Legislative Session in 1961. It can therefore fairly be said that the Government has a mandate to enact a Labour Relations Bill by virtue of three successful General Elections which the Party won.

There was nothing sinister about the Labour Relations Bill. It was patterned after the National Labour Relations (Wagner) Act of the New Deal Roosevelt Administration. The motivation for this Bill, as indeed its predecessor of the 1953 P.P.P. Government, was the same as that of the New Deal Administration; namely, the elimination of company unions, the ending of jurisdictional disputes and the establishment of democracy in the trade union movement. Jurisdictional disputes have long bedevilled the local trade union movement, and, indeed, on April 5, 1963, eleven days after the publication of the Bill, a jurisdictional dispute between unions at the Rice Marketing Board, which management and the T.U.C. had been unable to resolve, led to rioting and looting in the city in which one person was killed and many injured.

The taking of the poll among workers is now recognised practice under the law in the U.S.A. and Canada. It

has been established *de facto* in Jamaica. This practice is no doubt contrary to that in the United Kingdom. But British trade unionists must recognise the difference between Britain and British Guiana. Britain had a long history of trade unionism preceded by the many battles of its labour movement — Peterloo Massacre, the Chartist Movement, etc. — to preserve trade union rights and civil liberties for the working class. British Guiana is still a colony — the employers here are a law unto themselves. Indeed, for many years they have been the Government and in many respects still are. As a Legislator from 1947 to 1953 I could not enter sugar plantations in my own constituency. It is only recently since the advent of the PPP Government that militant trade unionists of a rival worker-backed sugar workers' union were allowed free access to the workers living in sugar plantations. Officials of the Sawmill and Forest Workers' Union experienced similar difficulties. They were prevented from entering isolated wood grants and quarries where exploitation was rife. (These quarries and grants are generally sited on crown lands). The Government is now proposing to enact legislation to force employers to permit with adequate safeguards the entry of trade union officials and organisers in the workplace of employees.

Opposition to the Labour Relations Bill came from many quarters — an unholy alliance of the Trades Union Council, the two opposition political parties, big business and the press. But in spite of this combination, the "general" strike was not so general. Of the 52,000 workers claimed by the Trades Union Council only about half were on strike. More than 90% of the sugar workers did not go on strike. These workers are represented by the Manpower Citizens' Association whose President, Mr. Richard Ishmael, is also the President of the Trades Union Council by virtue of the large number of delegates accorded the Manpower Citizens' Association (the biggest union in the country with about 20,000 workers) at the annual congress of the Trades Union Council. Many essential services — electricity, water, ferry, hospitals — were maintained. The industries mainly affected were bauxite and manganese.

The bulk of these on strike included civil servants, teachers, government workers in postal and transport services. It is to be noted that the leadership of this latter group comes predominantly from the 'Middle Class', which has to a certain extent been pampered by colonialism, and which is fighting to preserve entrenched positions. The 1962 strike was joined by the Civil Service Association principally because the Government felt that an under-

developed country like British Guiana could not afford the colonial-days luxury of giving its Guianese civil servants free leave return passages for themselves and wives to the United Kingdom along with six months leave for every three or four years of service.

Observers abroad have been perplexed to understand why the Government is opposed by the trades union movement. The answer is to be found in the fact that the Trades Union Council is now an arm of reaction. It is to be noted that prior to the suspension of the Constitution in 1953 the Trades Union Council pursued a militant policy. Its affiliates catering particularly for workers in the sugar plantations, water-front, sawmills, wood grants and quarries were constantly engaged in militant struggles for recognition, improved wages and working conditions. But this militancy also became a victim of the Cold War. Through the influence and pressure of Mr. Serafino Romualdi of the ICFTU and ORIT, the Trades Union Council was disbanded soon after the October 1953 suspension of the Constitution and the forcible removal of the P.P.P. from Office. Six unions controlled by the Opposition, headed by the sugar workers company union, the Manpower Citizens' Association (M.P.C.A.) formed a new Trades Union Council.

Referring to this incident, William H. Knowles in his book "Trades Union Movement and Industrial Relations in the B.W.I." wrote:

"In a move of questionable legality, the anti-Jagan, non-Communist elements of the Trade Union Council voted, while supporters of the People's Progressive Party were out of the country, to dissolve the B.G. Trade Union Council."

The Trades Union Council as at present constituted is dominated by unions associated with civil servants, teachers and other government employees in postal, airline, telephone and transport services, where the political opposition is well entrenched. It is a tragedy of Guyana that the Trades Union Council directs its attacks not as previously against the capitalist and landlords but against a socialist oriented government. This explains why it has been supported by reactionary elements abroad and by Big Business at home.

U. S. INTERFERENCE

The strike was kept going for 11 weeks mainly by funds supplied from the United States. The sum is estimated to be in the vicinity of \$100,000 per week. U.S.

interference has been noticeable for some time. Last year during the February disturbances and earlier during the 1961 elections campaign the Christian Anti-Communist League was very active in Guyana. It admitted helping the political opposition with \$75,000 during the elections.

US trade unionists have also been very active. An unprecedented number of United States trade unionists have visited British Guiana stirring up opposition to the Government. Some of those who visited were:

J. Okeefe	Labour Lawyer, Director, Retail Clerks International Assembly of North America
J. Philpot	Collective Bargaining Director, Retail Clerks International Assembly of North America
Ernest Lee	Then Director of Studies, Inter-American Representative IFCCTE
Morris Paladino	Education Director, ORIT
William McCabe	Inter-American Representative AFL-CIO
Ben Segal	Education Director of the International Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers U.S.A.
William C. Doherty (jr.)	Inter-American Representative of P.T.T.I.
Wallace Legge	Director, Caribbean Activities P.T.T.I.
Jack L. Bernal	Inter-American Representative of ICCFTE
Rene Lioeanjie	NMU Co-ordinator of organising for Latin America.
Pat Terrill	A Director, United Steel Workers of America.
Dr. Dunlop	Head of Econ. Section, Harvard, University.

The records show that there were far more visits of U.S. trade unionists to British Guiana in the 18 months following the 1961 General Elections than in the 18 years preceding the Elections! The motives behind the sudden manifestation of interest are not hard to find.

It is known that the main purpose of these visits was organising opposition by trade unionists to the Govern-

ment. The visitors also conducted courses and seminars at which the themes were invariably how to fight communism and ways and means of opposing the Government.

Mr. William McCabe was an active participant during the whole course of the strike. There is substantial evidence that while the British T.U.C. representatives, Walter Hood and Robert Willis, were endeavouring to effect a settlement, this American trade unionist was doing just the opposite. Indeed, there is proof that Mr. McCabe has been taking a political rather than a wholly trade union interest in our affairs. Incidentally U.S. trade union interference does not seem to be limited only to British Guiana. The Surinam Government has banned the entry of U.S. trade unionists into that country. In Trinidad also there has been an outcry against the meddling of U.S. trade unionists. An editorial in the Trinidad "Guardian" sharply criticised the part played by the U.S. through the trade unionists in the strike. The editorial added that whatever the complexion of the British Guiana Government the strike was a domestic matter and the United States had no right to interfere. Such interference, it concluded, no doubt helped the prolongation of the strike.

U.S. trade union subversion however has not been only a one-way traffic. Leading Guianese trade unionists have been taken under the wings of the U.S. Institute for Free Labour Development sited in Washington and headed by Mr. Serafino Romualdi, a well-known old time hater of the P.P.P., who recently remarked that there would be no U.S. aid for British Guiana so long as he had any say in the matter. This outward traffic of Guianese trade unionists to the United States seem to have one objective — training in the art of subversion to overthrow the P.P.P. Government.

This point was made very clear in a recent article by Victor Reisel. This article left little room for doubt about the subversive intentions. Under the caption "Unionists Trained in U.S. to Harry Jagan's Government" it went on to contend that "six courageous men" — all trade unionists — had been recently trained by the American Institute for Free Labour Development in the techniques of anti-Communist campaigning. Amongst these men are "a rather fearless chap by the name of Richard Ishmael, President of the British Guiana Trades Union Council, and General President of the anti-Communist Sugar Workers' Union known as the Man Power Citizens' Association". Continued Mr. Reisel "Jagan has organised opposition groups in an effort to take over British Guiana's organised labour. If he succeeds there will be nothing to stop him

from going internally Cuban. Realising this, the American Institute for Free Labour Development — supported by U.S. labour and industry — rushed the training of six Guianese in Washington. This Institute is directed by Serafino Romualdi, a veteran anti-communist Labour Specialist. Each of the six trainees has specific tasks inside B.G. labour. Ishmael made good his promise last week. There was intense fighting in the dock areas. It soon spread through the city". This was a reference to the rioting in Georgetown on 5th April, 1963. Shamelessly Reisel concluded: "It's a pleasure to report we're giving the Communists a run for their money and guns".

BIG BUSINESS

Big Business played a major role in the 1962 and 1963 disturbances through its most powerful arm, the Georgetown Chamber of Commerce. This body represents all the oldest business houses. It is steeped in sleepy *laissez faire* for generations and implacably hostile to innovation by way of governmental action. It vigorously opposed the Labour Relations Bill as it did its predecessor in 1953 and the Budget in 1962.

The Georgetown Chamber of Commerce came in for serious attack from the Riot Commission. Its irresponsibility was severely criticised. Pointed remarks were made about some of its members. It said that its members "encouraged and fostered" the strike of their employees. Mr. Nascimento, personal assistant to Mr. D'Aguiar and General Manager of the Daily Chronicle, suggested that employers should pay their employees who went on strike, thus subsidising the strike. Messrs. Figueira, Manager of Central Garage, and Bettencourt-Gomes were even more enthusiastic in their support of the strike. Mr. Gajraj "advocated the cessation of all transactions in non-taxable commodities, e.g. sugar, flour, oil and the discontinuance of all credit facilities to their customers; because these actions, he thought, would cripple the people and bring tremendous pressure on the Government. This would lead to economic chaos. "People will then have to go to the banks and draw out their money and that will force government to reduce the tax on savings."

The Commission pointed out that while the Chamber, as such did not sponsor a lockout, it "turned a blind eye to the attitude and intention of its members". The President of the Chamber attempted to explain this by saying that the Chamber being a democratic body could not regulate the individual actions of its members. The Commission's comment on this matter is worthy of note:

"This lamentable confession of impotence scarcely redounds to the credit of a responsible body incorporated by special ordinance and professing the lofty aim of promoting the interest of trade and commerce."

During the 1963 strike, members of the Chamber of Commerce outdid themselves. They not only participated in lockouts. They carried a general trade blockade. The Shipping Association refused to unload ships already in harbour and to bring in other ships which were bound for British Guiana. They even refused to allow goods unloaded in Curacao, Barbados, Trinidad and Surinam to be transported by Government boats and private small crafts. The oil companies refused to release essential supplies of fuel for industries, particularly the rice industry which is seasonal. As a consequence about one-third of the rice crop in 1963 will be lost. And even though the Government was prepared to permit additional insurance cover and to indemnify the oil companies against loss or damage of their ships by fire or sabotage they refused to bring supplies from Trinidad. Had the Cuban Government not helped in sending supplies of fuel oil and flour, the economic life would have come to a standstill. The Police would have been immobilised and the Government would no doubt have been forced to resign.

THE PRESS

The Guianese press was the chief exponent of the "veritable torrent of abuse, recrimination and vicious hostility" directed against the Government. The viciousness of the press attacks was duly noted by the Riot Commission. It devoted three pages in the Appendix of its report to highlight the most outstanding vitriol which it agreed had handsomely contributed to the disorders of 1962.

Traditionally the Press in British Guiana has been three dailies — the 'Evening Post', the 'Daily Chronicle' and the 'Guiana Graphic' with a Sunday 'Argosy' controlled by the 'Evening Post' interests. The 'Graphic' forms part of the giant Cecil King complex which straddles three continents. It is essentially conservative, even platitudinous. Save for an occasional sortie, it rarely ventures out of the field of producing what it assesses to be generally acceptable. In the main then, its political content is factual and up-to-date, if not thought-inspiring. The Mirror, recently established, supports the Government.

Not so, however, the others. The Commission found the 'Chronicle' under the effective control of Mr. D'Aguiar since "his shareholding enabled him to exercise effective

control over the paper" and noted the editor's "transparent loyalty" to him. The 'Daily Argosy' it found "is also hostile to Dr. Jagan". As noted above, the 'Evening Post' and 'Argosy' are controlled by the same interests. Of the big papers then, three are implacably hostile to the Government.

Here are a few of the choice gems among a great welter of similar writing which appeared just before 'Black Friday', February 16:

Daily Chronicle, February 3:

"I suggest that you both appear on one platform..... a general uprising against this budget will force Jagan's Government to either amend their ideas or resign".

Daily Chronicle, February 4:

"Budget is 'Marxist'. A 'vindictive and malicious spirit prowls through the budget'."

Daily Chronicle, February 7:

"'Iniquitous Budget'. Stir yourselves — down with this Shameful Budget. Down with the Government".

Daily Chronicle, February 9:

"All of us are agreed that we are faced with an eventual dictatorship. Dr. Jacob's Radical Budget bears this out in no uncertain terms ... Unite and save us all".

Daily Chronicle, February 11:

"If we could fight together at the barricade and hold back the gathering storm we should be able to make the country safe for our children". "Now more than ever before the red claws of Jagan's Communism are exposed naked for all to see. And this is only the smoke the fire comes later. If now while Britain still exercise sovereignty here, Jagan can move openly to confiscate people's property and their money and destroy our Free Press what wouldn't he do when with the full powers of independence he brings in his Communist forces here to back up with open Communist dictatorship".

"What the Tax means". "What it means is reduce all to position of servitude so that only the state will be wealthy so that the State which now controls your money will control your services and finally your family, your children".

These and more went out under the banner of freedom of the press!

True to form, the Press excelled itself in virulence and dishonesty during the 1963 strike. "Fleeing Youth Gunned to Death by Police" announced a headline of the 'Evening Post' of June 17. Such was its purported understanding of circumstances in which a hardened criminal, found inside a bond at night in a time of both looting and bombing, called to stop by a beat policeman, was shot at while fleeing with a parcel. This was the most dramatic example of attempting to incite the public against a Police Force overworked in the longest crisis in the history of this country. It showed the high-water mark of a period of newspaper highlighting of the 'successes' of squatters whose activities extended to the beating of innocent Indians, the decimation, by bombing and by vandalism, of Government Offices and their personnel and a train of intimidation and hooliganism unparalleled in the history of many a civilised nation.

"Squatters Closed Ministries — Hubbard Seeks Refuge in Freedom House" boasted the same paper, swelling with pride at the "Passive Resistance" campaign, so passive that a Minister had to fly before its bombardment. A few days earlier, it emblazoned the 'feat' of squatters forcing the Premier to 'flee' through the back door of the Public Buildings. It was clear that what the 'Post' succeeded in doing was inciting crowds already restless through the inactivity of striking into seeking excitement in barbaric vandalism and 'feats' of mob assault upon Ministers and also upon peaceful citizens whose only 'sin' was that they were born of Indian descent.

In the political field the 'Post' reached extravagance which must have embarrassed even the T.U.C. still barefacedly insistent that the strike was industrial. "The Government must Resign" proclaimed the 'Post'. Using Georgetown as its criterion it went on "To the people the Government is now just a hollow shell and Government in name only. It is the object of ridicule and the contempt of all because of its inability to do the job for which it was misguidedly elected". In other words it had brushed away the thin veil of industrial hypocrisy with which the strike had been shrouded. It had revealed the naked political objective for which it had been called in the first place, and the fanaticism which inspired its long and violent course.

Dishonesty, the chief characteristic of cheap journalism, reached its peak in an editorial which appeared in the 'Post' of June 12. The fact that the T.U.C. on more than one occasion, took long periods to prepare memoranda

setting out their own side in the dispute did not trouble the 'Post'. Under the headline "Provocative Delay", it gave a revealing picture of fascist thinking: "that the Government is probably waiting on time" it wrote with asperity, "is suggested in its approach towards the settlement in dispute. But time for what? in the final analysis it can only mean one thing — the starving of the Worker in surrender. It was evident even in the early days of the strike that Government had plans for a long drawn out struggle. The summoning of British soldiers was a major factor in the overall plan. With them in B.G. Government could safely pursue a policy of attrition without much fear of a physical reprisal". The inference is startling clear. Without the troops there was to have been a rebellion to overthrow the Government.

With its sister-paper the 'Argosy', the double-barrelled attack of verbal violence was kept up throughout the strike. On June 16 the 'Argosy' informed the public that "Government condones Violence" a long tissue of bad lies succeeded by worse logic claiming that the Government stood to gain by violence and was promoting it. Holding up the Minister of Communications to public ridicule and odium, it announced that "Wilson Stops Mercy Flight" a fantastic distortion of a simple issue in which the pilots who had refused to perform important and urgent tasks for Government, sought to use Government facilities to fly in supplies on charter under the pretext of conveying a pregnant woman to Georgetown.

On May 3 and 4 it published on its front page, stories of a plot to burn down the Rice Marketing Board which information it claimed was received via an anonymous telephone call late at night. So important was this anonymous call that it was necessary to editorialise upon it. The Progressive Youth Organisation, claimed the editorial, was behind the arson plot to be committed in order to claim insurance compensation. Thereafter the Rice Marketing Board became a focal point of interest. And it was not long before seventy-odd sticks of dynamite were discovered, fuse smouldering, below its wharf upon which were working nearly four hundred breadwinners.

In January 1963, the Legislative Assembly passed a motion (only Mr. D'Aguiar voting against) condemning as irresponsible and prejudicial to the interests of British Guiana a report in the Daily Chronicle of Tuesday, January 1 that 250 firearms consigned to a local trading com-

pany had been seized by the Security Police. In the course of the debate on the motion, even the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. L.F.S. Burnham, had to state that the report was inaccurate and false and calculated to do harm to the national interest.

Similar wild stories were printed about Cuban warships in the waters of Guiana and about British Guiana being the trans-shipment point for illicit supplies to the Venezuelan guerillas of arms and ammunition. On April 14 the "Sun" the weekly organ of the United Force carried a fantastic story — "**Children May be Sent to Factories: Vicious Plans Bared**". The story went on:

"The Government plans to take children from the upper division of primary schools and put them to work in communist factories. This revelation was made by a source close to the Government which plans to take children who have failed their exams twice in the 4th, 5th, and 6th standards and put them to work in factories to be built here.

Parents are incensed at this news and it is reported that as soon as Jagan removes the Emergency Regulations parents will demonstrate in vicinity of the Public Buildings against this rascally plan of the Government. First the Government took control of schools.

Now the Government plans to throw your children out of the schools and put them to work in factories to be built by Communists. Is this good enough for you, parents?"

All this vile propaganda was directed against the Government which was negotiating with Eastern European countries for the purchase and establishment of factories, factories which are desperately needed for providing jobs to the large number of unemployed (18%) and under-employed (9%) inherited by the P.P.P. Government in 1957.

Such was the role of the "free" press in creating civil unrest. Little wonder that when the T.U.C.'s call for a general strike closed down the daily newspapers, the T.U.C. immediately ordered back to work the printing workers without even prior consultation with the Printing Workers Union. No matter what the Daily Chronicle and Evening Post must continue with their distortions and incitement!

THE POLITICAL OPPOSITION

The Opposition political parties were deeply involved in the disturbances of 1962 and 1963. In 1962, Messrs.

L.F.S. Burnham and Peter D'Aguiar, leaders of the People's National Congress and United Force respectively defiantly led demonstrations through a proclaimed area in the city of Georgetown. They openly incited their supporters.

The report of the Riot Commission in dealing with the contravention of the Proclamation showed how Mr. Burnham worked up his supporters into "a state of frenzy". Referring to public speeches made by Mr. Burnham during the 1962 crisis, it pointed out:

"He began by congratulating his listeners on the splendid performance of the morning when there had been a wholesale breach of the proclamation. In his peroration he declared that Government could not be got rid of by merely saying 'Resign' or 'Down with Jagan'. Those are useful and helpful slogans, but much more than slogans, are required in the present circumstances". (paragraph 75, page 29).

The report also showed how Mr. D'Aguiar "seized every opportunity of attacking Dr. Jagan's Government and inciting the crowds during the week of the disturbances". The Commission said that the list of grievances given by Mr. D'Aguiar and Senator Ann Jardim against the P.P.P. is "little more than a narrative of personal frustration". Speaking of the United Force as a whole the Commission noted:

"The policy of the U.F. was more clear and categoric. Mr. D'Aguiar was expousing the cause of businessmen and the upper middle class. He himself had an important stake in the country and his politics were therefore not quite free from personal motives." (paragraph 76, page 29).

Mr. D'Aguiar in evidence given before the Commission declared that his policy was "to oppose, expose and depose" the Government.

In trying to bring down the Government the 'Big Lie' has now become the main weapon of the U.F. Scare stories are being manufactured daily for publication and consumption in British Guiana and abroad. Hair-raising stories and deliberate lies are printed regularly in the Daily Chronicle, the mouth-piece of the U.F.

In London at the public opening of the Independence Conference in October 1962, Mr. D'Aguiar openly declared that the P.P.P. was in receipt of vast sums of money from the Soviet Union. This sum was claimed to be in the vicinity of \$77,000. Proof of this was demanded that was

never given. In actual fact only about \$16,000 was sent to the Ministry of Education for the payment of passages for a few, and not the allegedly "huge number" of Guianese students who had been awarded scholarships in the Soviet Union. More recently Senator Ann Jardim exhibited at a press conference in Washington photostatic copies of three cheques purporting to be payment made of a sum of about \$128,900 by Barclays Bank to Freedom House. The Manager of Barclays Bank when approached indicated that these were bogus and forged cheques and gave a signed statement that there was no transaction of any kind.

The technique of the 'Big Lie' was duly noted by the Riot Commission. Mr. D'Aguiar had told the Commission that on the morning of the 16th February he did not tell the crowd that the child who had been affected by the tear gas had died. But the Commission remarked that a number of witnesses had given evidence that Mr. D'Aguiar had in fact told the crowd that the child had died. At this stage the Commission remarked.

"We are constrained to observe that his being wedded to truth did not impose so stern a cloisteral isolation upon him as not to permit an occasional illicit sortie, in order to test the seductive and political rewarding adventure of flirting with half-truths".

The Commission found that the false rumour that a child had been killed by tear gas provided the immediate stimulus to violence, and that Mr. D'Aguiar had passed on the false information to the crowd.

The 'Big Lie' is also the technique of the P.N.C. In April 1962, addressing "anti-Castro fixation" Americans in New York City, Mr. Burnham declared that there were 1,000 Cubans in British Guiana. At that time there was exactly one Cuban in the country. His colleague, Mr. Andrew Jackson advised that no U.S. economic aid must be forthcoming to the British Guiana Government!

Coupled with the 'Big Lie' is the use of invective. Prior to the 1961 General Elections, an all-out attack was launched on the U.F. in terms that were highly personal. Its leader was the focus of Mr. Burnham's attack. "Fascist", an ignorant bottler of water with a little tincture", "that rum-seller up the (East) Bank" were some of the juicier epithets employed. It was not long before such literary extravagance was directed at the P.P.P.

During the 1963 disturbances, the P.N.C. at first operated mostly behind the scenes through the T.U.C. But later after the breaking of the trade blockade and the pro-rogation of the Legislature when the Labour Relations Bill

was no longer an issue it overtly supported the strike. In fact, it practically took command.

It should be noted that in 1953 Mr. Burnham as a Minister of the P.P.P. Government strongly backed a similar measure. The T.U.C. was also then in favour. Trade unionists Andrew Jackson and Brentnol Blackman, as President of the Federation of Unions of Government Employees (F.U.G.E.) and General Secretary of the T.U.C. respectively defended the Bill in the United Kingdom immediately after the suspension of the Constitution in 1953. A decade later they joined in leading the attack against the Bill.

Why this changed position? The reason is that Mr. Burnham broke away from the P.P.P. in 1955 and is now united with the political and trade union opposition of pre-1953. He and two other opportunist P.P.P. leaders swallowed the divide-and-rule bait put out by the British Government. The Robertson Constitution Commission had already in 1954 threatened a perpetual "period of marking time" should the P.P.P. persist with "its present leadership and policies". By 1958 the alliance of Burnham with the reactionary forces was complete. As with Labour Relations Bill, he found himself opposing many of the measures he previously strongly advocated — abolition of dual control of schools, voting at 18, independence etc. Little wonder the Riot Commission observed of the P.N.C. leader:

"The real motive force behind Mr. Burnham's assault was a desire to assert himself in public life and establish a more important and regarding position for himself by bringing about Dr. Jagan's downfall". (paragraph 51, page 18).

Having lost three successive elections since 1953 and seeing little prospect of winning future free and fair elections, the political Opposition has now become bitterly frustrated. It projects this frustration by hurling accusations at the P.P.P. and by embarking on a continuous campaign of plotting, sabotage and violence. Note a few of the handbills calling for violence and blood:

"Let us not be afraid to STRIKE.
Let us not be afraid to be STRUCK.
Let us not be afraid to SHOOT
Let us not be afraid to be SHOT.
Let us not be afraid of ANYTHING.

BECAUSE

VICTORY is at hand."

"If VIOLENCE becomes unavoidable. We must be as RUTHLESS AND more DESTRUCTIVE than CHEDDI'S Armed Forces."

"How long will the dictators triumph? Free yourselves NOW of those who seek to trespass on your rights, or be DOOMED forever. Comrades, the P.P.P. can no longer rule as exhibited; They must RESIGN or be DESTROYED for the benefit of GUYANA. COMrades, the TIME is RIPE."

"We want a reasonable decision:— Either Free Guyana Today or We'll have Blood Tomorrow."

Innocent blood was shed. Government buildings and other public places, including a mosque were bombed.

The background to a great deal of this plotting sabotage and violence was dramatized by a startling discovery made in a police raid at P.N.C. headquarters. Martial plans and manuals together with arms, weapons and materials for the manufacture of explosives were found and seized.

The following document, a plan "X 13" for military action said:—

"These are rules governing X 13.

The committee should comprise of men governing different sections or a particular type of work. The Chairman could be a person employed by the party and of a very high character, subject to the approval of the Council, I, therefore, recommend Comrade Van Genderen. HE will be known or referred to as the 'Old-man'. HE will be responsible directly to the leader Comrade L. F. S. Burnham, for projects, plans, etc., of this organisation, he would be adviser, organiser, and co-ordinator.

Comrade I. Thomas would be responsible for all military training and military advice, posting of men for different duties and all orders should come through him from the committee to the men. All leaders and sub-leaders of the military side should deal directly with COMRADE I. THOMAS, he will be responsible to the committee for all actions taken, *he should not arrive to a decision unless first discussing same with the committee.*

No one should have the right to communicate directly or indirectly to a member or members any orders. All orders must come through the person responsible for that section.

Comrade Wilson would be responsible for radio communication and all records, he will also be responsible

to the committee and no one should have the right to interfere with this field of work, unless first going through Comrade Wilson who would be responsible to the committee.

"Comrade Smith will be responsible for Medical supplies and advice, he will be responsible for all sections taken.

Comrade Leacock will be a spear to the committee and he will be known as Area Commander, he will be responsible to Comrade I. Thomas for all military actions taken in the area. These six gentlemen would form the committee which would dictate the policy of this organisation, and no action should be taken unless the matter was discussed by the committee comprised of the said men".

The list of arms, ammunition, and materials seized at the P.N.C. headquarters included the following:

One knife in sheath; one sixteen gauge empty cartridge; one sixteen gauge empty cartridge; two boxes each containing fifty .22 I.C.I. bullets; one box containing fifty .22 Remington Hi-Speed bullets; one box containing 42 rounds .22 Remington Kleandore bullets; one box containing 25 Eley 16 bore cartridge and 1 only Eley 16 bore cartridge; 1 toy pistol; one bottle containing a quantity of liquid; three boxes each containing 24, 22, and 15 twelve gauge Eley cartridges; one dagger in sheath; 10 boxes each containing 25-16 gauge Eley cartridges and three boxes each containing 21, 17 and 14 — 16 gauge Eley cartridges; one motor cycle chain; one pen knife; one piece wood; one sling shot; one piece wood with metal head; one iron rod and one piece electric wire; one B.S.A. .22 Rifle No. LE64791 with 11 live rounds .22 ammunition property of Desmond Holder; one air rifle marked 'Gecado' Model 25; one piece of pipe; one bicycle chain with taped ends; one cloth sack containing greenish grains; one baton; one bottle marked 'corrosive' on cork and containing liquid; one bottle marked 'Nitric Acid' containing liquid; one bottle with clear liquid marked 'M' and 'AA'; one bottle labelled 'Potassium Nitrate' (Saltpetre) containing liquid; one bottle marked 'Sodium Sulphate' containing liquid; one tin labelled and marked 'Candy Crystal'; one bottle containing liquid and labelled 'Potassium Hydroxide'; one bottle containing liquid and labelled 'Acetone'; one bottle containing clear liquid; one parcel containing sulphur; five target discs; one piece of paper with drawings; one piece of paper with Training Programme; one Browning Baby Pistol Booklet; one Plan;

one piece of paper with Rules; one Fore and Back Sight Gauge Picture;

Below is produced a newspaper copy of the police release of the articles found at the home of the P.N.C.'s leading lights:

"The police in their hunt for arms, ammunition and other documents have found the list of the names of the officers of a detachment of the People's National Congress at the home of Mr. Ivan Thomas, whose name was mentioned in the "X 13" plan found at Congress Place, headquarters of the P.N.C.

Also found was a piece of paper with names of such places as Freedom House, Radio Demerara the Power Station, the Telephone Exchange, Water Works, the Premier's House, Mr Brindley Benn's home and many important places.

A list with names of a number of women, such as Miss Walcott, Miss Durham, Miss Callender, Miss Zephyr, Miss Rodney and others, who have been given special designation in a "detachment" was also found. A book on Guerilla Warfare by Ernesto Che Guevara, of Cuba is among the finds.

RIFLE FOUND

The police in a raid have found one rifle, and 123 rounds of .22 bullets at the home of Mr. Vangenderen. Following is the complete list of things found at the home of Mr. Thomas:

One sheet paper marked, Information for recruits, 13 sheets of typewritten paper or pamphlets dealing with drill), 16 sheets of typewritten matter or pamphlets pinned together, one infantry training book Volume 1 Pamphlet No. 3, one infantry training book Volume 1 Pamphlet No. 11, one infantry training book Volume 1 1950 one infantry training book, Volume 1 Pamphlet No. 8, one small arms training book Volume 1 Pamphlet No. 8, one small arms training book Volume 1 Pamphlet No. 21.

In addition were one sheet paper written in ink headed "List of Officers No. 1 Detachment of the P.N.C.", one sheet of paper on which is written in ink demonstration of Crack and Thump, and names of places Freedom House, etc. on the other side is time table of Annual Camp 1961 recruits "D" Company, one sheet of paper with drawings of rifle headed Mechanism of Automatic Rifle, three (3) plans marked A and

B, and C, two (2) blue cards with drill instructions, two sheets, paper showing names, addresses and type of firearms, one type-written sheet of paper headed "These are rules governing X 13 one sketch of Radio Demerara, one book named 'Guerilla Warfare', by Ernesto Che Guevara and one slip of paper with writing headed 'PNC flying squad'."

INDEPENDENCE

The main purpose of these counter-revolutionary activities is to do one or more of three things —

- (i) Suspension of the Constitution;
- (ii) Indefinite delay of independence;
- (iii) Imposition of a constitutional and electoral formula which will bring the Opposition into power.

The Opposition has clearly stated that there shall be "no independence under Jagan". The 1962 disturbances were subsequently used by the British Government firstly to delay independence talks and secondly not to grant independence at all. Talks which were to be held in May 1962 were postponed until October 1962. It is significant that the talks were deferred pending the publication of the Report of the 'Riot' Commission. But because it was favourable to the Government, it was not even considered at the Conference.

Independence was denied in October 1962 on the flimsy excuse that the British Guiana Government and the Opposition could not agree; that the Government would not accede to immediate elections under a changed electoral system from the existing first-past-the-post to proportional representation.

It is to be noted that the main opposition party, the P.N.C. had made independence a major issue at the August 1961 elections. Indeed, it had fixed May 31, 1962, as the date for independence for Guyana.

The records of the pre-election period provide conclusive evidence on these points. On 7th April, 1961, the 'New Nation', the organ of the People's National Congress, published the text of a broadcast made by Mr. Burnham on 27th March. The following is an excerpt from it,

"The forthcoming elections are of tremendous importance. They usher in a new constitution under which elected ministers will have absolute power and responsibility for all internal affairs, and which is but a prelude to full untrammelled independence *within a matter of months*. Yes, Guiana will be independent by 1962".

The 'Sunday Chronicle' of 25th June, 1961 in a report of a People's National Congress meeting, states:

"Mr. Burnham the next speaker said that as soon as the party won he would agitate for Independence and when the West Indies was celebrating their Independence in May next year, British Guiana would be celebrating hers too. He said his Party was after the reality of Independence which would bring new life to British Guiana".

At another meeting Mr. John Carter suggested May 31, 1962 as Guyana's Independence Day. The P.N.C. did not only stop there. It also categorically stated that whichever party won the elections would be leading the country to independence. Examine the following from the 'Chronicle' and the 'Graphic' which reported meetings at which Mr. Burnham and other P.N.C. members spoke:

P.N.C. to stand alone

"The PNC would not form any Government on the results of the August 1961 General Elections unless it gained an overall majority" said Mr. Burnham on Monday night at Queen and Hope Streets.

He was replying to the question whether there would be a PNC-UF merger if neither got a majority at the Elections.

He also said that the PNC would never merge with the PPP as the two parties had nothing in common.

Mr. Burnham stressed that the people had to make up their minds which Party they wanted to lead them to independence.

(Wednesday, July 12, 1961. Daily Chronicle).

(Guiana Graphic, Tuesday, July 18, 1961).

Burnham calls PPP Bandits

"Guiana must get Independence immediately after the General Elections in August, immediately after the Party gets into power. He added, however, that if things turned out differently and another Party got into power (which he doubted) he would still agitate for immediate independence.

He said that he would support any party which got into power on the Independence issue because the election of a Government was the wish of the electorate and there was nothing that any other Party could do but support the Government on Independence.

PNC will give support only for independence

"Mr. Forbes Burnham told the Guiana Graphic that his party will support any other party in their demand for Independence after August 21.

"My support is limited to the demand for Independence and has nothing to do with the ideology or programme of any party. Whichever party is returned in a majority, either directly or indirectly, has got the right to lead the country to Independence."

(Saturday, July 15, 1961. Guiana Graphic).

And then there was the Sydney King issue. Sydney King resigned from the P.N.C. on the eve of the elections. He was then Secretary of the P.N.C. He resigned because of Mr. Burnham's categorical statement about independence.

This is how the 'Daily Chronicle' of Thursday, July 20, 1961 put it:

King drops election bombshell

"Mr. Sydney King, still named Secretary of the PNC threw a bombshell into the General Elections scene yesterday. Copies of a publication over his signature stated that he withdrew as a candidate for PNC in protest against Mr. Forbes Burnham's statement on immediate Independence for B.G. and his support for Dr. Jagan on this issue, if Dr. Jagan wins.

The PNC leader, apparently with the consent of the Ex. Co. decided that if Jagan won, he, Burnham would go with Jagan to London to help Jagan get Independence.

King continuing: 'I am sure that Burnham's statement is dangerous to the African people — I cannot be any part of Burnham's plans. His plan is to help Jagan win Independence. A seat is reserved for him on Jagan's plane, he boasts'."

So shattering was Sydney King's resignation that the PNC took the bull by the horns and issued a statement. This statement was carried in the 'Guiana Graphic' of Friday, July 31:

Sydney King is expelled

"After expelling Sydney King, the PNC released a statement which read in part;

"With respect to the grounds upon which Mr. King has declared his intention not to run as a candidate for the PNC, the Executive Committee declares that it is unequivocally committed to Independence for B.G. and will not swerve from its present policy which has been accepted by the Congress and the Ex Co. of the Party of which Mr. King was a part.

It was advocated by the Party's representatives at the London Constitutional Talks in 1960. Independence is the inalienable right of Guiana, and the PNC.

Though it will always strive to protect the interests of all groups it will never stand in the way of Independence regardless of the party in office."

The above quotations from the reports of the pre-election speeches show that the two major parties agreed that independence should follow soon after the elections, and that the party that won the elections should lead the country into independence without another appeal to the electorate. A study of pre-election writings reveal, too that there was no thought of a change in the electoral system. Proportional Representation was neither advocated, nor was it an issue at the 1961 Elections. It was advocated by the Opposition at the 1960 Constitutional Conference, but was rejected by the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Ian McLeod, who subsequently described it as a "rotten, abominable system" and by knowledgeable officials in the United Kingdom who held the view that the system of proportional representation would tend to crystallise sectionalist tendencies and give them permanence in an aggravated form over the years.

Instead of granting independence, the British Government indicated at the conclusion of the Talks that should social and economic conditions deteriorate it might have to consider the imposition of a solution. This cue was taken up by the Opposition — create enough havoc so that the British Government might have the excuse to suspend the Constitution or impose a solution. This line was openly voiced by the Press supporting the Opposition. During the strike, it advocated British Government intervention to save the people from an "oppressive" Government and a "deteriorating" economy.

Race

Mr. Duncan Sandys, Secretary of State for the Colonies, on his departure after a four-day visit proclaimed that the greatest problem in British Guiana was racial conflict. But what Mr. Sandys and others must note is that the spread of the disorders to the countryside and the racial conflict which ensued was due principally to the fact that Georgetown, predominantly Negro, was not pacified and government supporters, particularly Indians who were openly battered and bludgeoned lost faith in the law enforcing agencies and retaliated. Under the banner of passive resistance the Opposition squatted around government buildings and in government offices, riotously assembled in thousands

in open breach of a proclamation prohibiting the assembly of more than five persons, looted stores, intimidated those who remained at work particularly government employees, and brutally beat up Ministers and government supporters, particularly Indians. Had the disorders been contained at the beginning and Georgetown pacified, there is absolutely no doubt that the racial conflict which subsequently occurred would have been prevented.

Race is merely superficial and skin-deep. Commenting on the question of race the Commonwealth Commission said of the disturbances of February 1962:

"28. We found little evidence of any racial segregation in the social life of the country and in Georgetown. East Indians and Africans seemed to mix and associate with one another on terms of the greatest cordiality, though it was clear that the recent disturbances and the racial twist given to them by some of the unprincipled and self-seeking politicians had introduced slight, but it is hoped, transient over-tones of doubt and reserve. Among the inhabitants of Georgetown there is, of course, always present the danger that hostile and anti-racial sentiments may be aroused by a clash of the hopes and ambitions of rival politicians. We draw attention to this possibility because there have been indications of such friction in the past, although, as will appear in the course of this report, the disturbances of February 16 did not originate in a racial conflict, nor did they develop into a trial of strength between the East Indians and the Africans."

"50.....but we are merely drawing attention to the circumstances mentioned above in order to show that there is no clear-cut division between the races and that although, broadly speaking, Dr. Jagan's supporters are for the most part East Indians and the supporters of P.N.C are drawn mostly from the African races, the difference is not really racial, but economic and vocational".

Race has never been a serious problem in Guyana. Indians and Africans have for many, many years played worked and lived amicably together. Underlying the superficiality of racialism is the basic problem of the class struggle and the struggle for land and jobs. Prior to the 1955 split in the People's Progressive Party, the Africans and Indians, who constitute the backbone of the working class and peasantry, were united in their struggles against the capitalists and landlords. On every front — sugar plantations, waterfront, mines, mills, quarries etc. — the workers battled for improved wages and working condi-

tions. Since 1953, however, this militancy has been dulled. And this is due principally to the 'terror' rule which followed the 1953 suspension of the Constitution, the 1955 British-engineered Burnham split of the P.P.P. and the subsequent alliance of Mr. Burnham and his working class supporters with those reactionary elements who were opposed to the P.P.P. before the 1953 suspension.

The Indians support the P.P.P. for a complex of reasons, but mainly because of its socialist beliefs and objectives and because it has always led their struggles against landlords, mostly Indian, and sugar plantation capitalists. But the P.P.P.'s support does not come only from Indians. Because it is the most advanced party ideologically, it attracts the more political conscious particularly youths, students and intellectuals of all races. This accounts for the notable shift of young Africans towards the People's Progressive Party and for the racialist (Negro as opposed to Indian) appeal of the People's National Congress. This has been noted by the Riot Commission and such observers as Professor Peter Newman of the University of Michigan, previously of the University of the West Indies.

In paragraph 50 of its Report, the Riot Commission said:

"The political professions of the P.N.C. were somewhat vague and amorphous. There was a tendency to give a racial tinge to its policy. Mr. Burnham expressed the opinion that it was Dr. Jagan who was responsible for this unfortunate development

... We do not, however, think that there is much substance in the contention of Mr. Burnham and it seems to us that whatever racial differences existed were brought about by political propaganda".

Professor Peter Newman in an article entitled "Racial Tension in British Guiana" said:

"Not surprisingly, this attention to a unified African front led to a need for a common enemy, a role which was filled by the East Indians. Operating within the restricted social and economic framework that I have discussed, the main animus of the party (PNC) was focussed on the racial issue, and even official party pronouncements began to take on a racial tinge. Since the P.P.P. continued to maintain a public image of non-partisanship (although its local support was often less unbiased), many African intellectuals, especially among the younger group, began to feel dissatisfied with the racial policies of the PNC. Except in a few cases,

this did not lead them to the PPP, but it did cause them to withhold active participation from the African party; partly as a result, the second-rank leadership of the PNC is distinctly less able than the corresponding echelons of Jagan's party".

The P.N.C., however, continues to peddle the propaganda that the P.P.P. is racial. It ascribes the racialist slogan 'Apan Gaat' to the P.P.P. failing to point out that this slogan originated at the 1953 elections. At that time the P.P.P. was dubbed 'Communist' and opposed by two reactionary racial groupings, the League of Coloured Peoples and the National Democratic Party on the one hand, and the East Indian Association and the Farmers and Workers Party on the other. Apan Gaat was the slogan of the latter.

The leader of the People's National Congress (PNC) Mr. L. F. S. Burnham, according to reports in the local press, was alleged to have stated at a Press Conference in New York City on March 8, 1963, that Dr. Jagan had packed the Police Force with officers of Indian descent and had given civil service posts to "blue-eyed boys of the Party". (Guiana Graphic, March 9, 1963).

Mr. Burnham was also reported to have criticised what he described as the patronage system practised by Dr. Jagan in the British Guiana Civil Service. He charged that there has been "a deliberate lowering of the physical and educational qualifications to permit packing of the police force by Jagan". (Daily Chronicle, March 9, 1963).

These allegations by Mr. Burnham have no foundation in fact.

The ethnic composition of these Service Commissions is as follows:

<i>Public Service Commission</i>	
Indo-Guianese	1
Afro-Guianese	1
Mixed	—
Other	2
Total	4
<i>Police Service Commission</i>	
Indo-Guianese	2
Afro-Guianese	1
Mixed	—
Other	2
Total	5

The present People's Progressive Party (PPP) Government assumed office in September 1961, at which time the ethnic composition of the Government and of the Party in both Houses of the Legislature was as follows:

Government (Council of Ministers)			
Indo-Guianese	...	4	Members
Afro-Guianese	...	3	"
Mixed	...	3	"
Other	...	—	"
Total	...	10	"

Legislative Assembly (Lower House)			
	P.P.P.	P.N.C.	U.F.
Indo-Guianese	11	1	—
Afro-Guianese	7	7	1
Mixed	1	1	1
Other	1	2	2
Total	20	11	4

Senate (Upper House)			
	P.P.P.	U.F.	Governor-Appointed
Indo-Guianese	3	—	—
Afro-Guianese	3	—	—
Mixed	2	—	—
Other	—	1	2
Total	8	1	2

The PNC refused to nominate its quota of 2 members to the Senate. Having lost the elections, it peevishly refused to co-operate. It demanded all the 3 seats reserved for the Opposition.

The racial composition of the Police Force at July 31, 1957, when the former PPP Government assumed office, was as follows:

	Officers	Chief Inspectors	Sub-Inspectors	Other Ranks
Indo-Guianese	2	—	6	140
Afro-Guianese	16	3	35	1,180
European	8	—	—	—
All Others	4	—	11	114
Total	30	3	52	1,434

Information similar to above at the time of assumption of office of the present PPP Government in September 1961 is set out hereunder:

	Chief Inspectors	Sub-Inspectors	Other Ranks
Indo-Guianese	2	4	197
Afro-Guianese	25	34	1,093
European	8	—	—
All Others	3	9	111
Total	41	47	1,401

After the present PPP Government had been in office for approximately 18 months, that is, up to March 31, 1963, the ethnic composition of the Police Force was found to be:

	Chief Inspectors	Sub-Inspectors	Other Ranks
Indo-Guianese	4	6	248
Afro-Guianese	30	38	1,099
European	6	—	—
All Others	5	8	103
Total	45	52	1,450

Ethnic details of the promotions in the Police Force, from Inspector to Deputy Commissioner, made on the advice of the Police Service Commission, during the period September, 1961, through March 31, 1963, are given hereunder:

Indo-Guianese	5
Afro-Guianese	25
European	3
All Others	2
Total	35

The statistics indicate that in July 1957, September 1961, and March 1963, Indo-Guianese constituted 9.7%, 13.5%, and 16.5%, respectively, of the total strength of the Police Force. The corresponding figures for Afro-Guianese are: 33.4%, 77.4%, and 75.4%.

These figures do not support Mr. Burnham's allegation made in New York. The slight increase in the percentage of Indo-Guianese in the Police Force from 9.7 in July 1957, to 16.5 in March, 1963, is due to the fact that more people of this ethnic group (47.8% of the population as compared

with 32.8% of Afro-Guianese) are being attracted to the Police Force rather than to any attempt to pack the Force with persons of Indian descent, as alleged.

During the life of the Police Council (under the Chairmanship of the Governor), set up in April, 1960, the Council agreed that there was urgent need for the Police Force to represent as soon as possible a reasonable cross-section of the community.

With regard to the alleged lowering of physical standards required for entry into the Police Force, the only exception made was in respect of the minimum height of 5' 8" of the applicants. The possession of technical (radio or motor mechanic) or general educational (GCE or School Certificate) qualification enabled applicants of all ethnic groups who were slightly below the minimum height to be recruited.

The numbers of persons recruited and/or promoted to vacancies in the Civil Service, on the advice of the Public Service Commission, during the period September, 1961, through March, 1963, are as follows:

	<i>Grade of Senior Clerk and Above</i>	
	<i>Recruited</i>	<i>Promoted</i>
Indo-Guianese	— 136	104
Afro-Guianese	— 212	234
Total	— 348	338

	<i>Below Grade of Senior Clerk</i>	
	<i>Recruited</i>	<i>Promoted</i>
Indo-Guianese	— 157	28
Afro-Guianese	— 200	70
Total	— 357	98

The ethnic composition of Permanent Secretaries and Principal Assistant Secretaries in the Civil Service at present is as follows:

Indo-Guianese	— 2
Afro-Guianese	— 4
Mixed	— 10
Other	— —
Total	— 16

The ethnic composition of Senior Professional and Technical Officers in the Civil Service at the present time is given hereunder:

Indo-Guianese	— 22
Afro-Guianese	— 27
Mixed	— 13
Other	— 11
Total	— 73

The racial distribution of teaching staff in all-age primary schools as of August 31, 1962, ranging from Head-teachers through Pupil and Junior Teachers, is as follows:

Indo-Guianese	974	Teachers
Afro-Guianese	2,000	"
Europeans	3	"
All Others	222	"
Total	3,199	"

The racial composition of the professional staffs of the Education Department and of the Government Training College is as follows:

Indo-Guianese	6
Afro-Guianese	17
All Others	2
Total	25

The foregoing data clearly indicate that there is absolutely no truth in the allegations made by Mr. Burnham of the packing of the various branches of the public service with Indo-Guianese, or of the deliberate lowering of physical and educational standards to permit such packing of the Police Force and that the PPP Government and Legislators represent a fair cross-section of the multiracial Guianese community.

Incidentally, an observation worth noting was made by Mr. Tom McKitterick, journalist and radio commentator immediately after the elections. Analysing the results of the elections, he said that had race been the decisive factor, PPP would not have won. For in 4 or 5 constituencies won by the PPP, Indians were definitely in the minority.

Mr. Sandys on his return from British Guiana to London fell into the error of referring to "racial" leaders and "racial" parties. Whatever the PPP may be, it is not racial.

It has always attacked racialism — in the press, on the platform. Let's hope that race will not be the excuse for hammering the PPP in 1963 as communism was a decade earlier in 1953.

DEMOCRACY AND THE FUTURE

British Guiana is the acid test of western pronouncements and intentions. The West, particularly U.S. and Great Britain, has always proclaimed its beliefs in freedom and democracy, in free and fair elections, in constitutionality and the rule of law. Yet everything possible had been done contrary to these pronouncements. The history of the past decade has shown the use of every means to defeat the People's Progressive Party from the direct use of force in the suspension of the Constitution in 1953 to the splitting of a progressive movement in 1955 and to gerrymandering and manipulation of the electoral boundaries. Also the action of the British Government during the disturbances was not above question. Its tactics emboldened the Opposition in its acts of irresponsibility. It failed to take firm action to prevent hooliganism, terror and violence. Constitutionally, the British Guiana Government is responsible for internal security and the preservation of law and order. The Police Force is constitutionally under the charge of an elected Minister but in reality this is only nominal. For promotion, discipline and control vest in a Police Service Commission of which the Governor is the Executive Head. During the course of the past few months it became apparent that, in effect, direct control is in the hands of the Governor. In other places, for example, Aden, Brunei, Swaziland, the Police and armed forces have been able to preserve order despite the peoples' opposition. Here the situation was allowed to deteriorate and the Ministers' advice was ignored by the Governor and the Commissioner of Police. The 1962 disturbances would not have taken place had the Governor brought in at the appropriate time a unit of the British armed forces stationed at Atkinson Field about twenty-five miles from Georgetown. It was agreed that the troops would have come in to aid the civil power at 1.00 a.m. on Friday, February 16, 1962. They did not come in until 3.00 p.m. when fire and looting had already become rampant.

We do not want mere pronouncements. President Kennedy in a recent letter to President Betancourt of Venezuela said the following:

' I should like, through you, to extend my congratulations and those of the people of this country to the people, government and armed forces of Venezuela for

their action in preserving constitutional democracy against those who have attempted to overthrow your freely elected government.

The preservation and strengthening of freely elected constitutional government is the aspiration of all the peoples of the Americas and progress in this continent under the *Alianza para el Progreso* depends in large measure in effecting change through peaceful and democratic means and avoiding violent interruptions of the constitutional process.

We deeply deplore the loss of life and other heavy casualties which were caused in your country by recent insurrections and extend our condolences to those bereaved."

During his interview with the Editor of *Izvestia* in early 1962, he attacked the communists for subversion and condemned Dr. Fidel Castro for denying freedom and not holding elections. In the same interview he said:

"... the United States supports the idea that every people should have the right to make a free choice of the kind of Government they want. Mr. Jagan who was recently elected Prime Minister in British Guiana is a Marxist, but the United States doesn't object because that choice was made by honest election, which he won".

But what is the reality? Mr. William R. Tyler, Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, giving evidence in March 1963 before a sub-Committee of Appropriations was asked if the U.S. Government favoured my continuing as head of the Government. He replied: "No; the U.S. Government does not." Mr. Dean Rusk, United States Secretary of State reported last July to have urged the MacMillan Government to suspend our Constitution or to hold a referendum on a new system of voting. Simultaneously, United States citizens, agencies and institutions — American Institute for Free Labour Development, Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, ICFTU and ORIT—have been actively engaged in subversion. Without the help given by these organisations, the 1963 strike would have collapsed in a couple of weeks.

The decision of the British Government may well decide whether the road to the future in Guyana will be peaceful or violent. For many years, long before the advent of Premier Khrushchev, the People's Progressive Party has been advocating the peaceful parliamentary road to socialism. The dilemma of the imperialists is that it advocates consti-

tutionalism but it cannot defeat the anti-imperialist People's Progressive Party by its own rules and yardsticks at free and fair elections. It is left to be seen what the final outcome will be. Will the British Government goaded by the U.S. change the electoral system merely to defeat the People's Progressive Party? This in effect would be rigging of elections.

If this is done in Guyana, will it be done elsewhere where communist, socialist and radical parties either alone or in alliance are likely to win elections? Does it mean that the capitalist and allies will permit elections only so long as they can win? Does it mean that they will abandon the trappings of parliamentary democracy and freedom and resort to subversion, force and violence when they are faced with electoral defeat?

If the West is sincere in its pronouncements, it must demonstrate it by granting unconditional independence to Guyana immediately. Only independence can permit of rapid social and economic progress and the removal of doubts and suspicions of our intentions. What happens in Guyana may very well indicate what line of action will be pursued elsewhere and whether there will be peace in the world.