

2759

## CHEDDI RAPS WITH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

QUESTION: In the Chronicle there was an article which quoted Dr. Jagan as calling for unity with the PNC or for us to join hands with the PNC. But later on there was an article in the Mirror stating that Guyana was fast approaching a revolutionary situation. Will Dr. Jagan explain the contradictions in these two statements?

ANSWER: There is no contradiction in those two statements.

Cracks were beginning to appear even within the bureaucracy and the political leadership of the PNC. There were the resignations of some ministers, the dismissal of some ministers, the open positions taken by some bureaucrats who, for instance, were in the Compass group, and so on. In that sense we talk about a revolutionary situation developing, not that a revolutionary situation exists, but that it is approaching.

At the beginning you quoted the article as saying "let us join hands with the PNC". Well, the position is this: All parties which are not Marxist-Leninist with a clear political and ideological line do not have ideological unity and therefore would not have a clear political line.

The PNC is a petty-bourgeois nationalist party. Petty-bourgeois has two characteristics: (1) What is called the 'labour' petty-bourgeois; the person who is sort of a small employer and is also a worker. He has two faces: sympathy for the working class and sympathy with the bourgeoisie because he wants to move from a small petty-bourgeois to a bigger one.

Now the PNC has first of all certain positive things and many negative things, the balance changing from time to time. For instance, last August we showed that in December 1964 to 1970 it had an outright pro-imperialist position. From 1971 to about 1973 it began to take a vacillating position, some anti-imperialist, some pro-imperialist with the balance in favour of imperialism.

Why do we say that? It joined the non-aligned movement, nationalised the bauxite company, recognised Cuba. These are positive developments of an anti-imperialist nature.

On the other hand, the PNC was spouting the Maoist line of "two super powers, two imperialisms", and we unlike others in this country at that time clearly saw that Maoism was going to become a reactionary force in the world.

So there were positive and negative features, but more negative in that period because as I have said, it was spouting the "two super powers, two imperialisms" line which was and still is the line of the Maoists who are working with imperialism.

9

Then during 1974-76 it took a more forthright anti-imperialist position which culminated with Burnham saying at the Cuffy Square that the CIA was responsible for the sabotage of the Cubana airline when eleven Guyanese perished. The Americans withdrew their Charge d'Affairs<sup>e</sup> and Burnham had to recall the Guyana Ambassador in Washington. In other words that was a diplomatic rupture. And that was the period which we say was more anti-imperialist. Then from 1977 they have gone back to imperialism.

We have to also see ~~XXXX~~ certain other things that are taking place in the country like the Cuffy school which they say is teaching Marxist-Leninist theory which influences certain sections of the youth and certain sections of the working class <sup>who</sup> which are with the PNC. We are not saying that this is evidence of a decisive say by those sections in the PNC because the say in the party is balanced in favour of imperialism. Though the party has moved over to the Right, ~~many~~ there are still very many elements who talk about socialism. They are talking.

Therefore our position is: we want unity in Guyana. But we are not just calling for unity; we are saying that it must be founded on certain principles: democracy, anti-imperialism and socialist orientation.

As you probably heard there was a conference among ourselves, the WPA and what is called the Vanguard for Liberation and Democracy. We only agreed on the question on democracy. We didn't agree on economic questions, because you have the Vanguard grouping (the Liberator party, the People's Democratic Movement and the Working People's Vanguard Party) saying that borrowing capital must be encouraged, and such things as the ETB and other outfits the government is establishing must be abolished. Now, we don't agree on some of those positions, and we would not unite with people like those who are anti-communist, who are pro-imperialist, and so forth, in the same way that we would not unite with the PNC on any other conditions except ~~of~~ democracy, anti-imperialism and socialist orientation.

We are not saying that the PNC must come and join us; we are saying that any force in the country which agrees to a programme based on democracy, anti-imperialism and socialism is entitled to join us. But today the PNC is not joining because it is moving towards imperialism. It is also ~~XXXXXX~~ talking about socialism but is not even taking the first steps towards socialism.

But our hope is to avoid a civil war because we are sure that this regime will not allow itself to be removed by elections and therefore there will be a ding-dong battle in which we have to take

the whole international picture into consideration.

Therefore we want to appeal to the masses, like those in the TUC (not the TUC bureaucrats, but the working class <sup>who</sup> makes up the TUC) to apply pressure to bring about a National Patriotic Front of all who want to join on the conditions of democracy, anti-imperialism and socialism.

We are not talking about joining the PNC leadership. The PNC has different elements, different class forces in it, ~~TAKEINGXXXX~~ talking different things. So we are not just looking at leadership per se; we are looking at class forces and class tendencies in the party. This is what is called an objective analysis, a scientific analysis. So there is no contradiction in the two statements.

QUESTION: You are speaking about scientific analysis, but from the PPP's own statement the quantitative analysis is that the PNC is a 10% government. To what class forces in the PNC then are you appealing?

ANSWER: If tomorrow the Vanguard for Liberation and Democracy which probably has just as much as the PNC or less say they are for unity, we are not going to exclude them once they join on the basis of the conditions I have already outlined. It is not ~~AN~~ a question of how many people you've got.

The PNC has power, they have guns. Anybody who wants to live in a dream world and think that the PNC regime is like the Gairy outfit would make a terrible terrible mistake. Gairy was overthrown because his force was only beginning to develop. But only last night I heard that the PNC regime brought in some 13 armoured vehicles. They have a lot of power. So, I repeat: It's not a question of how much people you have.

Let us take Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). The Whites had 3% of the population. The Patriotic Front not only had the vast majority of the people in the country; they also had the Front Line African states from which they had to fight, and they were supplied with all the arms and got military help, including rockets, from socialist countries. But they were still not able to defeat the Salisbury regime of racist Smith in the battlefield.

QUESTION: But that example does not hold good in the Iranian situation! What about Iran?

ANSWER: When we say that the Guyana situation has not reached a revolutionary situation we mean that the working class in Guyana is not yet in a position to fight the decisive battle. This was shown in the last strike. But what happened in Iran? The Shah had

the fifth largest army in the world. But the situation there was ~~different~~ different. The leftist forces which were underground, especially the Communist Party, worked among all the trade unions in key places and they controlled decisive areas of industrial workers.

Now, how did the revolution developed in Iran? First of all everything was closed down as a result of an industrial strike over wages like that which took place in Dominica. All the oil wells, all the oil refineries were closed in Iran, which is the world's second largest exporter of oil to the West. The West needed the oil but could not just use force against the workers. So they temporised. The army could ~~XXX~~ have moved in and mow<sup>ed</sup> down all the workers. But not only the oil field workers went on strike. Other industrial workers, plus electricity and transport workers, were on strike and the whole country was paralysed.

Compare that with our strike, a historical development no doubt which took place in Guyana last year. The bauxite workers for the first time struck for five to six weeks. They were given solidarity by the sugar workers and later urban workers joined them. But the urban strike lasted three days, which allowed the bauxite union to betray the workers and send them back to work.

That didn't happen in Iran. The process there developed just like in Dominica. The Shah wanted to meet the pay-rise demand. Patrick John of Dominica wanted to do the same. But the workers did not want the money since the struggle had developed from industrial to a political strike. In those two countries the demand went up, "The ~~XXX~~ Shah must go; Patrick John must go!"

And in that context, keeping in mind the oil which the West needs, if ~~they~~ the army moved in or the Americans had invaded Iran, the working people were going to blow up everything - all the oil wells and refineries.

Another point. I was in the Soviet Union that very moment when that was happening. Brezhnev issued a warning to the Americans: Iran is on our borders - keep your hands off! That is also important. So it was in that context of a general strike when millions of people poured out into the streets. In addition there was absolute ~~XX~~ unity <sup>for</sup> under Islam. Those were the ingredients ~~XX~~ success in the revolution in Iran, plus the proximity of the Soviet Union and the willingness of the Soviet Union to help the revolution even though it was led by elements who are not Marxists. They would help because the process in Iran was anti-imperialist, not socialist but anti-imperialist.

In Dominica also the thousands who poured into the streets forced the resignation of Patrick John.

So comrades, let me conclude by saying that the Guyana situat-

ion is not the same situation as existed in Iran. I think the better tactics during the strike would have been to escalate the demands for increments, because, incidentally, increments affected only 6% of the bauxite workers, into a demand by the four unions for the implementation of the \$14 minimum wage. If the \$14 demand was made this would have beefed up the support of the bauxite workers since all of them would have come out in support of that. Secondly, there would have been support from workers in the state corporations, including transport, electricity, waterworks etc.. As we know, not all the CGWU workers came out. If they had been called upon to come out on strike on the \$14 issue there could have been a situation similar to that in Iran and Dominica. But the strike collapsed.