The foreign policy of the United States Government to my country is the result of a remarkable chain of circumstances. The chief elements in it are the unremitting attempts of a small group of people in British Guiana to maintain their positions of privelege, the contradictions in U.S. foreign policy, and finally the peculiar susceptibility of the U.S. system of Government to the manipulation by pressure groups.

These circumstances taken by themselves, may not have led to present U.S. foreign policy to my Government and country. But given the context of the Cold War and the existence of the Cuban regime it became all too easy for a few men in my country and the U.S.A. to tilt the lever of power against my Government.

British Guiana is the kind of country with what one might call an in-built need for a socialist programme. It has a small population but one which is now increasing rapidly and it calls for much heavy expenditure on negative development, sea defences, and river defences, and drainage and irrigation, if civilised life is to be maintained at all. Vast sums of money have to be spent in reclaiming land from the flood and in keeping the sea out. One historian of the territory has remarked that it is a matter of astonishment that the territory was not abandonned long ago.

As with other emergent nations which now demand a place in the sun we have a long lee-way in development to make up. The abolition of malaria after the war has led to rapid population growth. At the same time overseas investers have been showing less and less inclination to come into British Guiana - a world-wide pattern and not peculiar to my own country. All this has coincided with a period of rapid education development in which the people of the country have been exposed to a flow of new ideas and new ways of living. All this has added up to an urgent revolution of "rising expectations". The people of my country look to their Government to carry out a programme which will provide them with the jobs and the higher standards of living they want now. They are not prepared to wait. They demand that their Government should take radical action to bring about a society closer to their aspirations and ideals and that this should be done in the immediate future.

Faced with this demand, any Government which serves the people, if it is to continue to lead them, must resort to state action over a wide field. At one stage of the country's history private enterprise in the form of sugar planters, were willing to undertake the difficult and expensive task of reclaiming land and protecting it from the sea. Private enterprise is no longer interested or willing to tackle such developments. Therefore the people now look to Government to plan and to carry out the large land reclamation schemes on which the future of the country rests. It will probably be readily appreciated that a Government should make itself responsible for such large scale public works. This, in a sense, is the traditional pattern of development. It is increasingly clear, however, that Governments, under the pressure of economic necessity and in the face of the aspirations of their people must embark on industrial development, a field traditionally reserved for private enterprise. British Guiana is so to speak at the end of the road. It has a tiny domestic market. It is not the kind of situation which would attract private capital. What must a Government do when confronted with this situation? It is precisely in the urban area the focus of opposition and discontent that there is growing unemployment. If private enterprise will not put in the factories that should provide the jobs, then Government must do this; and it is only an ideologue who would argue that such state factories in any way diminish freedom.

Radical programmes of action require, if they are to succeed, people who are prepared to experiment with new ideas, techniques, and ways of living. That is why all emergent nations have found it necessary to reshape and replan their educational systems as a matter of urgent necessity. In my country, the educational system has been one of dual control with the Christian churches responsible for the appointment of teachers and ultimately the admission of students. While one readily admits that the Churches have done valuable work in the development of education it is equally clear that the system is now an inflexible one which discriminates against both teachers and students. As with other emergent nations we have found it necessary to cut the Gordian knot of dual control and to attempt the development of a system of education to work national objectives. State factories have been misrepresented as the attempt of my Government to destroy private enterprise. Similarly, the decision to abolish

dual control has been interpreted equally wrongly as an attempt to suppress rel[illegible]ious freedom.

In spite of prolonged efforts I have been able to secure very little International aid. In the absence of such aid (and even when such aid is obtainable, as is premised in the Alliance for Progress) it is necessary that such nations as my own shoudl make every effort to mobilise internal resources. This means in effect the willingness to embark on a far-reaching and comprehensive programme of taxation which would include such taxes as progressive income taxes, property, gift and luxury taxation. The budget of 1963 aimed to mobilise internal resources by the use of such taxes; but it is precisely this budget which was used by a few persons whose positions of privilege were affected to whip up hysteria and provoke riots against the Government, by the very people who stood to benefit most from any development made possible by increased revenue.

These various measures - an egalitarian and austerity budget, the development of a national system of education and the abandonment of dual control, State action to develop industry, and the search for factories and new markets in the Eastern blocs when such market s for equipment are not available on similar terms elsewhere - all this has been interpreted by a few whose positions of privilege have been adversely affected, as the attempt to introduce a totalitarian system of Government, or to develop links with international Communism. A study, however, of the programmes of the leaders of emergent nations shows that whatever might be the ideologies or beliefs which inspire them, they find it necessary to resort to programmes which include more or less the same elements whether one calls it socialism or not, but whose chief characteristic is the fact that the state is required to play a major and creative role in development.

That, very briefly, is the situation in my own country. It is not for me to deal comprehensively with the contradictions of U.S. foreign policy. This has been the subject of study and indeed of dismay of thoughtful critics even in the U.S.A. The New Frontier has enunciated a foreign policy which should be readily acceptable to leaders of emergent countries everywhere. That policy has been described by Professor Rostow one of the architects of "New Frontier" as follows:

" We are dedicated to the proposition that this revolutionary process of modernisation shall be permitted to go forward in independence with increasing degrees of human freedom; We seek two results: first that truly independent nations shall emerge on the world scene; and second that each nation shall be permitted to fashion, out of its own culture and its own ambitions the kind of modern society it wants."

This policy was greeted throughout the emergent world with a sense of relief. One saw in it a creative move away from the old ambivalent U.S. foreign policy of isolation or interference. But as the months have passed hope has turned to dismay and now to increasing bitterness.

The currents which run toward isolation and interference in U.S. national life are currents which run deep. We have seen in recent months a kind of turning back of American public opinion upon itself. The mood has increasingly been one of "let us abandon the underdeveloped world and foreign aid altogether. What have we got for our pains except insults and abuse." Such attitudes and reactions stem of course, from a misunderstanding of the problems and objectives and ways of life of the emergent nations and the strange evangelical urge of Americans to reshape the world after their own image.

It is perhaps this same evangelical urge characteristic of U.S. foreign policy which found its finest incarnation in John Foster Dulles, and which sees the world in terms of good and evil or black and white which has led to the other major feature of U.S. foreign policy - that of interference. In spite of the protestations of the New Frontier, very recent Latin American history is full of examples of democratically elected leaders who have been removed from office as a result of U.S. pressure and because of the radical programmes upon which they were embarked.

The American Government it has been said by one critic is many things. There is not the same clear line of authority and focussed power in the executive which is the main characteristic of the British Parliamentary system. The U.S. system of Government has clearly been a powerful creative instrument in the development of a major and affluent country but it is a system which even its advocates admit is specially susceptible to manipulation by pressure groups and lobbies. In certain circumstances the President, with his executive, has been able to pursue a policy decided upon irrespective of such pressure groups. This has happened during the Rooseveldt era, but apparently cannot be duplicated by the New Frontier. This may be no fault of the energy and ideals of the men who hew the new frontier. The crisis which confronted

the New Dealers was of a domestic nature. The ordinary American was fully aware of it. He could see the growing bread-queues. He was prepared to accept the radical actions of a Rooseveldt. But the current crisis is of an international scene and does not come home as readily to the American people. Thus, the ideals of the New frontier are lost in the jungle so cunningly outlawed by the pressure groups and the lobbies.

Those are the elements which play a decisive role in U.S. foreign policy towards my country and Government. Unfortunately for us we have occurred in the wrong hemisphere. Today U.S. foreign policy in this hemisphere is dominated by the Cold War. U.S. public opinion has been taught to be hysterical about the existence of Cuba. Propagandists and politicians after an easy ticket have put across, all too effectively, the strange, but widely believed idea, that Communism or socialism is a contagious disease from which the hemisphere must be isolated or immunised, Because socialism had come by the revolution of one country it is widely held that this must be the pattern everywhere, and to this is linked the equally strange notion that revolution can be exported like any other commodity. The result of all this Cold War Hysteria is that large sections of the U.S. public and its press are unwilling to accept the thesis that a socialist economic system might be developed by means of persuasion and parliamentary democracy as is being attempted in my country.

Instead, we have seen a situation in which a few people in opposition to my government playing upon American hysteria and fears and using the technique of the big lie, have been able to put their hands on the lever of the American foreign policy and manipulate it against my Government. In effect U.S. foreign policy, because of the Cold War atmosphere, its inherent contradictions, and the peculiar susceptibility of the U.S. system of Government to pressure groups has become the instrument of a small privileged group, who are using it to maintain their positions of privilege and to remove a democratically elected Government from office. This is the pattern which has been set in Latin America and in the Far East, from the Argentina to Vietnam. It is this chain of circumstances which explains why regimes or groups backed by the U.S. foreign policy have invariably failed to win fair and free elections and have been swept away with the dust and debris of recent history.