

UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO
College of Social Sciences

CONGRESS SPEECH
Dr. Cheddi Jagan

1956

Before bringing to your attention the special problems facing our Party, it is necessary for me to review the political situation. Firstly, let me deal with the external situation. Since October 1953, a great many events of great significance have taken place. Some of the most important on the International scene are:

1. The Bandung Conference in early 1955 of 29 African and Asian countries whose main theme was anti-colonialism.
2. The defeat of Imperialist France in Indo-China and the failure of the U.S. backed Diem Government of South Vietnam to hold democratic elections in the whole of Vietnam according to the terms of the Geneva Conference, for fear of a people's anti-imperialist victory.
3. The explosion of the hydrogen bomb in the Soviet Union has strengthened the cause of world peace by restraining the atomaniac imperialists who were basing their strategy on the monopoly of atomic and other nuclear weapons, and on a "preventive war" against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.
4. The growing strength of the "neutralist" nations, which have broken away or are breaking away, from the camp of imperialism and establishing friendly relations with the camp of socialism, India, Burma and Indonesia, three leading countries of the Far East have agreed to have friendly relations with all countries on the basis of Panch Shila - peaceful co-existence and non-interference in internal affairs. The Middle East, led by Saudi Arabia and Syria, are giving the lead to the Arab world for the full and unfettered exercise of their sovereignty.
5. The imperialist nations are becoming more and more exposed in the world forum of the United Nations - the British refused to have the Cyprus issue debated; the walk-out of South Africa on a debate on its Apartheid policy; the French walk-out of the General Assembly on the question to discuss Algeria. In these and other issues the U.S. Government has clearly shown its colours by openly siding with the other imperialist powers. The recent entry of 17 African, Middle and Far Eastern nations has weakened the monopoly of America and her satellites in the United Nations.
6. The National Liberation Movements in the colonies and semi-colonial territories has assumed number one importance on the world political agenda. It is leading to sharp contradictions within the imperialist camp. For instance, the British Government's deportation of Archbishop Makarios has alienated Greece, one of the props of NATO. This action and the likely resulting breach in NATO countries has caused grave concern in Washington which is now interested in the settlement of the Cyprus problem. As a result of the growing strength of the national liberation movement in Algeria, France has been forced to withdraw its European forces committed to NATO. The people of Jordan have forced the King to cause the resignation of a pro-Baghdad Pact

Prime Minister, and the subsequent dismissal of General Club, British Commander of the British-financed Arab Legion. As a result of the Malayan people's revolutionary movement, the imperialists have been forced to grant a measure of independence to the Malayan people.

These then are the main factors in the international situation. These external factors are reacting on our internal situation, and what is the present internal situation? Since the suspension of the Constitution in October 1953, the imperialists have directed their attention on two fronts - the trade union and the political. Comrade Ramkarran will discuss more fully the trade union situation. Suffice it to say that the old militant T.U.C. was disbanded illegally and the new T.U.C. dominated mainly by opportunists right-wing and pro-imperialist labour leaders was set up.

On the political front, the main aim of the imperialists at the beginning was to shift mass support away from our party to the U.D.P. This was to be done in two ways:

- 1) Pump money into the country and let the U.D.P. whose members participated in the interim Government get the credit.
- 2) Imprison, detain and restrict prominent P.P.P. leaders and ban meetings and processions to prevent our Party from maintaining contact with the masses, at the same time allowing free movement to the U.D.P. leaders and turning a blind eye to their illegal political activities.

This policy however did not bear fruit. At the end of one year it became clear to the imperialists that the P.P.P. was still impregnable and they changed their tactics slightly. In addition to the two ways just mentioned they resorted to:

- 1) Driving fear and terror into the minds of the masses by declaring in the Report of the Robertson Commission that there should be an indefinite period of marking time as long as the P.P.P. maintained its present leadership and policies.
- 2) Appealing to the masses to refuse to support the P.P.P. and to P.P.P. members to change their leaders.
- 3) Dividing the P.P.P. leadership into "moderate" and "irresponsibles"; democrats and anti-democrats; socialists and communists; and appealing to the moderates, democrats and socialists (Burnham, Wong, Jainarine Singh) to take over leadership of the P.P.P. or split from the "irresponsible communists" (Jagans, Carter, Benq, Westmass, Ramkarran, King).
- 4) Removing from the political scene the team of Savage-Gutch-Holder who were a constant reminder to the masses as the chief perpetrators in the destruction of the Waddington Constitution and the P.P.P. Government. Note that Renison has done nothing more than Savage did in his early days in B.C., visits all over the country, yet is being received more cordially by the people.

It is in the light of this new situation, and the new manoeuvres by the imperialists in late 1954 and early 1955, that the split of the opportunist Burnham Clique must be viewed. To understand the P.P.P. split is to understand the forces supporting and operating behind Burnham. Burnham's background is essentially middle-class. His father was a schoolmaster. This

has resulted in his closer association with professionals, school teachers, civil servants, other sections of the middle-class and away from the soil, from direct contact with the toiling masses. It is essentially this middle-class which is the prime force behind the Burnham faction. One of the main characteristics of the middle-class is its opportunism, its tack-and-turn, its vacillation, putting itself always in the best position to get the greatest possible gains. The Robertson Commission's "no elections" and "an indefinite period of marking time" became a blank wall to the opportunists. For the professionals like Burnham, the prestige and spoils of office receded into the dim and distant future. Civil servants, teachers, doctors, lawyers saw a barrier to the fulfilment of their ambitions of climbing to the top rounds of the civil service. Those were the considerations and pressures which forced the Burnham faction to try to take over illegally the machinery of the P.P.P., failing which to split from the P.P.P.

The basis of the split was a deal with the imperialists. The imperialists on their part would grant election, the Burnhamites on their part would guarantee to form a Government either by taking over the leadership of the Party and changing its policies, or by splitting from the "communist" faction with a decisive strength and following. This strength was to be based on 11 constituencies, 5 in Georgetown behind Burnham and 6 in the Demerara sugar estate areas behind Lachmansingh.

Unfortunately for them, the Lachmansingh sugar estate support did not materialise after the split. Noting their (Burnham's) weakened position and their inability to capture a majority of the seats and to form a Government, the imperialists could no longer pursue their plan of free elections; The Colonial Office was interested in bargaining with strength. When the strength was not forthcoming it became uninterested.

In this situation the opportunist Burnham clique became isolated and in order to broaden its support at our expense, began making several appeals. These took different forms:

- 1) Appeal to African racialism especially noted in the Buxton village elections.
- 2) Appeal to reactionary and other vacillating elements and to imperialism by using the weapon of anti-communism.
- 3) Appeal to the toiling masses - this role was reserved for L.F.S. Burnham master craftsman in the use of demagoguery and left phraseology.

Despite these tricks and stratagems, the Burnhamite faction continues to lose support. Rational understanding is slowly but surely piercing the racist emotional curtain caused by the split. In this respect, we cannot underestimate the role of our Executive Committee's statement "The Great Betrayal". Neither must we overestimate the political understanding of the people or underestimate the emotional appeal of racialism.

This brings us to the present situation. Lionel Luckhoo, soon after the visit of Campbell of Bookers, has come out with a new party, the National Labour Front. The imperialists have now decided to bury the U.D.P., which before and after October 1953 was the party of imperialism, some native capitalists, middle-class professionals and some African racist rank and file (support from the L.C.P.). The last two years have proved the utter bankruptcy of

the U.D.P. All that it has succeeded in doing is to fill the pockets of its interim legislators and Executive Council members. Campbell of Bookers during his stay here declared that there was no place for a conservative party in Guiana, and that any party thinking in terms of capturing the imagination of the people must think in terms of a welfare state. Note the name of Luckhoo's new party - National Labour Front; and his so-called progressive 4 points - more self-government, more jobs, more schools, more land. There is no doubt that Luckhoo's imperialist backed party is aimed at making inroads into our party and our stronghold, the countryside. Note Luckhoo's declaration that this party is primarily a country party, will operate from the country as its base, that he personally will reside in the countryside among the people. John Carter, leader of the U.D.P. and African League of Coloured Peoples, has failed to win over the countryside, therefore imperialism has chosen an Indian leader to win the Indian masses who predominate in the country. Note Luckhoo's declaration on the cause of his split with the U.D.P. - the question of Federation. He is anti-Federation. Despite imperialist support of Federation, Luckhoo and imperialism both know that at least 95% of the Indians and about 50% of the African working class are opposed to Federation. Good politician that he is, he therefore plugs the anti-Federation line. Other political parties are appearing on the horizon. Robert Adams has formed the New Independent Party. Daniel Debidin is to form an anti-Federation Party. More parties are likely to be formed. Sugrim Singh and the Rev. Bobb, I understand, are to summon a meeting of all political parties and prominent individual politicians to see whether two definite opposing parties with opposing policies can be formed. Campbell of Bookers has called for a united anti-communist front.

What is to be done in this situation? Before we attempt to answer this question, we must first of all precisely know what we are, what sections are behind us, how much force and the nature of this force which our support can muster; how much force is opposed to us, and finally the stage of our development.

What is the PPP? The PPP is a national party, a broad alliance of various democratic sections - working-class, peasantry, middle-class, native businessmen and capitalists - opposed to imperialism. As such, communists, social-democrats, native capitalists, civil servants, professional men can all play their part in, and belong to, such a party.

This formulation is more precise and, therefore, more correct, than Rule 2 (b) of our Party's constitution, which states that the object of our party shall be "to promote the interests of the subject people by transferring British Guiana into a socialist country with a balanced industrial-agricultural economy". While this is a long-term objective, nevertheless it gives the impression that the PPP is a socialist party.

Such a formulation has the danger that it will drive away from the party native capitalists opposed to imperialism, but mortally afraid of socialism-communism. How is our Party different from other national parties such as the People's National Party of Jamaica? Our Party is unique in the history of national movements in that from the very inception it was under left wing Marxist inspired leadership uncompromisingly championing the cause of the working class. The right wing representing the middle and professional class and native capitalists was in the distinct minority. In Jamaica's P.N.P. it was just the opposite. This is how the draft constitution of the People's

Freedom Movement of Jamaica puts it:- "The leadership of the P.N.P. was from the foundation of the party an alliance of left and right elements, but with a bourgeois majority. This majority was not seriously challenged until the T.U.C. had grown considerably in strength at the expense of the Bustamante Union. Then, as was to be expected, the growth of the T.U.C. under left wing leadership resulted in a shift to the left in the composition of the leadership of the Party. At the Annual Conference of the P.N.P. in 1951, ten out of 21 seats on the Executive went to trade unionists. The national bourgeois elements felt that continuance of the alliance with the Marxist left wing under these conditions would mean that the leadership of the national movement would shortly pass out of their hands. Something had to be done and quickly... The right wing, seeing Bustamante's fall as inevitable, acted decisively before leadership of the national movement could pass into other hands of the working-class. They split the P.N.P. and expelled the "Communists".

In Jamaica the right wing controlling the P.N.P. but fearing the left wing supremacy acted decisively and decimated the left. In British Guiana the Burnham right wing unable by constitutional means to gain supremacy acted illegally to take over the Party. While our Party thus had the distinct advantage of left-wing leadership, it suffered also from left deviationist tendencies. Some comrades of the left behaved in a mechanistic fashion; copying wholesale revolutionary tactics and slogans of left parties in the metropolitan, capitalistically advanced countries, without bothering to study carefully our concrete conditions and historical stage of development. Some communists in our party tended to act as communists in a communist party and to make our party into a communist party of an advanced country. They failed to distinguish between the revolution in imperialist countries, to make the necessary modifications as leaders of a mass national party. This no doubt is due to a short-coming of our party organization. Having failed to write our own books and pamphlets, we continue to base our theoretical studies on material from the independent, capitalistically advanced countries like the U.K. and U.S.A. Young cadres particularly tended to swallow wholesale from these sources.

This tendency towards left deviationism and adventurism must be combatted. At times it was condoned in the past in order to protect left strength and unity against the onslaught of the right. Such tendencies have had their toll on our party. And without carefully distinguishing between imperialist capital and native capital has frightened and therefore alienated native capital support for the party. By failing to take advantage of the attack on capitalism in general - contradiction between native capital and imperialist - foreign capital, and to adjust our tactics accordingly, we drove back native and foreign capital into the arms of one party, the U.D.P. It is therefore important for us to retrace our steps and if necessary correct certain mistakes and errors of judgement, certain indiscretions of youthful exuberance.

What is the position with respect to the native capitalist? There are those like Phang, Correia, Wheating, Peter D'Aguiar, who have some associations with foreign capital but who have not gone over completely, have not bound themselves hand and foot to imperialism. There are those like John Fernandes, Raatgever - who have no, or little, if any, connection with imperialism. An African petty bourgeois class is now emerging, free from association with foreign capital. Indian native capitalists are rapidly emerging, but is still organized on an individual and family basis.

While keeping in mind the general interests of native capitalism, we must not fail to take notice of racial, religious, personal and other influences which tend to distinguish the native capitalists, otherwise we will make serious mistakes. For instance, the Portuguese native capitalist is Catholic-reactionary influenced, gets greater facilities from the state machinery and therefore, is closer to imperialism. Whereas the Indian native emerging capitalist poses a threat to Portuguese native capitalism (mainly in commerce), suffers from a feeling of cultural, political and economic oppression and consequently is farther removed from, in fact opposed to, imperialism. There is also this contradiction to be noted in the Indian capitalist. In many cases (Resaul Maraj & Co.; Sankar Bros., Deroop Maraj) he is a dual personality combining the functions of feudalism (landlordism) and native capitalism (rice factory, oil mills, etc.) thus playing a reactionary progressive role at one and the same time. In this instance, it is our duty to split this personality, to carry out an uncompromising struggle against his reactionary feudal, landlord tendencies in the interest of the peasant farmers, at the same time winning him over in his progressive role in our struggle against our common enemy, imperialism. This requires tact and careful handling.

Another important factor to note is that native capital, thus far, is mainly commercial capital. This tends to bring native capital closer to imperialism. The fact though, that imperialism through Bookers, Sandbach Parker, Sproston's, Fogarty's, Wieting & Richter, dominates commerce tends to prevent the open embrace of native commercial capital with imperialism. For this reason we must (1) fight for the removal of all restrictions against native commercial capital, (2) oppose any steps which tend to put the imperialist-commercial firms in a better competitive position (for instance, the refusal of the big commission agents to sell certain lines to native commercial firms. (3) encourage native capital away from commerce into manufacturing.

What then are the actual forces, the class interest behind our Party? For a correct appraisal, we must assess our position in three separate periods - before October, 1953, from October 1953, to the split and from the split to the present time. And consider the role played by Mr. Burnham.

By our successful manoeuvre in breaking away Burnham and Chase from the Denbow-Carter-Critchlow-League of Coloured Peoples in B.G. Labour Union combination, we succeeded in destroying the reactionary racist influence of the League of Coloured Peoples, in welding the two major race groups behind our Party. Burnham and Chase, therefore, brought into the Party (1) African working-class and racial support (2) Middle-class (civil servants, teachers, professionals, etc.) support.

Before October, 1953, therefore, supporting our party were:

- (1) the overwhelming mass of workers and farmers of all races.
- (2) sections of the middle-class civil servants, professionals, teachers, etc.
- (3) Indian sections of native commercial and industrial capitalist as distinct from Indian landlords.
- (4) sections of African native capitalists.

Portuguese native capitalists and landlords of Indian and other races together with a few other Indian and African merchants were generally opposed to us. After October, 1953, more or less the same force supported us, except that the revolutionary ardour of our support waned. This was due to two factors; (1) the presence of British troops in the colony and use by the imperialists of the weapon of fear, terror and victimisation; (2) the behaviour of Burnham, particularly after April 1954, in refusing to support actively our policy of non-co-operation and to break emergency restrictions opened the door to racialism. Indians began to grumble that the Africans symbolised by Burnham, do not want to make any sacrifices.

What should be the revolutionary tactics of our party in this situation. Let me at this point refer to the teaching of Comrade Stalin. In a speech delivered at a meeting of the students of the University of the Peoples of the East (see Stalin's Marxism and the National and Colonial question) Stalin in 1925 said, among other things: "We have now at least, three categories of colonies and dependent countries. Firstly, there are countries like Morocco which have no proletariat, or almost no proletariat, and which, industrially, are completely undeveloped. Secondly, there are countries like China and Egypt, which are industrially little developed, and which have a comparatively small proletariat. Thirdly, there are countries like India, which are capitalistically more or less developed, and which possess a more or less numerous national proletariat. Clearly it is quite impossible to put all these countries in the same category. In countries like Morocco, where the national bourgeoisie has yet no grounds for splitting into a revolutionary party and a compromising party, the task of the Communist elements is to do everything to create a united national front against imperialism. In such countries as Egypt, or China, where the national bourgeoisie is already split into a revolutionary party and a compromising party, but where the compromising section of the bourgeoisie cannot yet become welded with imperialism, the Communists can no longer make it their aim to form a united national front against imperialism. In such countries, the Communist must pass from the policy of a united national front to the policy of a revolutionary block of the workers and petty bourgeoisie -- the task of this block is to expose the temporising spirit and inconsistency of the national bourgeoisie and to wage a determined struggle against imperialism.

The situation is somewhat different in countries like India. The fundamental and new feature in the conditions of existence of such colonies as India is not only that the national bourgeoisie has split into a revolutionary party and a compromising party, but primarily, that the compromising section of this bourgeoisie has already managed in the main to come to an agreement with imperialism. Dreading revolution more than imperialism concerned more about its money bags than about the interests of its own country, this section of the bourgeoisie, the wealthiest and most influential section, is completely going over to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution, having entered into a bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country. The victory of the revolution cannot be achieved unless this bloc is broken. But in order to break this bloc, fire must be concentrated on the compromising national bourgeoisie; its treachery must be exposed, the toiling masses must be emancipated from its influence, and the conditions necessary for the hegemony of the proletariat must be systematically prepared - the task is to create a revolutionary anti-imperialist bloc and to ensure the hegemony of the proletariat within this bloc."

In which of the three categories does our country fall? British Guiana seems to fall into the category of Morocco but because of our peculiar party character and development in addition to anti-feudal and anti-imperialist character of our economy is approximating the then China situation.

Comrade Stalin further teaches that:- "In this connection one must not lose sight of two deviations in the practice of the active workers of the colonial East, which must be combatted if genuinely revolutionary cadres are to be trained."

The first deviation consists in under-rating the revolutionary possibilities of the liberation movement and in over-rating the idea of a united all-embracing national front in the colonial and dependent countries, without due regard for the state and degree of development of these countries. This is a deviation to the right which threatens to degrade the revolutionary movement and submerge the Communist elements in the general welter of bourgeois nationalists. It is the direct duty of the University of the Peoples of the East to combat this deviation with the utmost determination. The second deviation consists in over-rating the revolutionary possibilities of the liberation movement and in under-rating the importance of an alliance between the working-class and the revolutionary bourgeoisie against imperialism. The communists in Java, who recently erroneously put forward the slogan of a Soviet government for their country, suffer, it seems, from this deviation. This is a deviation to the Left, which threatens to isolate the Communist Party from the masses and to transform it into a sect.

It is clear from my analysis that in the period of our Party ascendancy up to October 1953 we committed deviations to the left. We definitely over-rated the revolutionary possibilities of our party, the leader of the liberation movement. We allowed our zeal to run away with us; we became swollen-headed, pompous, bombastic. "In order to smash these powerful enemies" said Stalin, "It is necessary to have a flexible and well-considered policy to take advantage of every crack in the enemy camp and skill in finding allies". We were attacking everybody at the same time. We tended towards what Mao Tse Tung called "all struggle and no unity". This is how Comrade Mao Tse Tung attacked the left dogmatists who during the 10 year (1927-1937) civil war period advocated overthrowing everybody. He said, "You cannot overthrow those in power, so you want to overthrow those who are not in power. They are already out of power, yet you still want to overthrow them. We definitely "under-rated the importance of an alliance between the working-class and the revolutionary bourgeoisie against imperialism", it is our task, therefore, to lay the basis for forging such an alliance. As a start our party has issued a call to all political organizations to join us in a joint demand for restoration of constitutional life and end of all emergency restrictions. It is not too much to reveal that talks are now going on between the Burnham faction, the U.D.P. and ourselves on this question.

Some comrades, however, feel that the three 'parties' must proceed immediately to the formation of a united national front which will include a programme and electoral plans (division of seats, etc.) It should be noted that a national front can be or become an electoral front but does not necessarily mean an electoral front.

The Chinese Communists formed two united national fronts, not for electoral purposes but for armed struggle; the first, in 1924 to 1927, directed against Anglo-American imperialism the second in 1937, against Japanese imperialism. We must ask ourselves if a united front is necessary, and if so, who should form the alliance and what the different parties would expect to get out of such an alliance. Although our party is the largest single force in the country, it is still weak. Its strength is more passive than active. Consequently, it is absolutely necessary that we secure allies in our struggle against imperialism. A united front is therefore absolutely necessary. It cannot be too strongly stated that in such a front, the emphasis must be more on struggle than on elections (seats). Such a front must necessarily include the anti-imperialist parties and the party of the national capitalists. This means that our party, the Burnham party which pretensions of anti-imperialism and perhaps the U.D.P. - I say, perhaps the U.D.P. because this party seems to be in the process of disintegration, its imperialist wing now under Luckhoo has broken away. It is left to be seen in the period of fluidity of political parties whether John Carter, the leader of the U.D.P. will continue to speak for the native capitalist (Correia, Phang, Psaila, Gonsalves) and the middle-class (W.O.R. Dendall, Minister of the Interim Govt.,) sections of his party. If he can, then any alliance to be formed should include the UDP. If he cannot, then the representatives of the native capitalists have to be sought out and brought into the alliance. In any case, a programme specifying protection for native industries may ~~have~~ have to be proclaimed to safeguard the interest of native capitalists.

Our objective in such a united front is to further the struggle for national independence. This means forging an alliance which will not only make demands for the end of the emergency restrictions and the restoration of constitutional life with a large measure of self-government, but which will specifically agree to a line of action such as a general political strife, non-co-operation, boycott of British goods, boycott of elections under any backward constitution. Recall that the Indian Congress successfully opposed the 1935 constitution by fulfilling its declaration of winning the seats, forming the ministries and then resigning. If some such action is not contemplated, then the demands of the front will be merely paper demands and will be treated with the contempt it deserves by the Colonial Office. We must remember that as a result of external pressures from the world, public opinion and the failure on the part of the local Administration to solve the internal political problems, the Colonial Office is forced to move towards-----on. But it will move so far and no further, no granting us a backward constitution such as was recently given to Trinidad and ----basis of the minority recommendation of Sir John Waddington of the Waddington Constitution-----on Commission. With-----internal pressure, the-----Government will do-----planned. (approx. 60 words missing). We are primarily interested in struggle - Messrs. Burnham and John Carter are primarily interested in "Office". If they are not really interested in struggle, in taking firm and resolute action in support of our demands, then there is no advantage in such a national front. In such a situation, we have everything to lose and nothing to gain. We will have to make concessions to them with regard to electoral seats. We will have to share our platform with them for joint meetings and expose our "territory" to their reactionary ideas. There will be the danger of right deviationism towards "all unity and no struggle". With a united front common programme and the use by them of left phraseology and demagogy, the masses will experience great difficulty in comprehending the differences between us.

Let me now illustrate this danger. All the time Burnham was with us, we had to control his right deviationist tendencies, at the same time not expose him for fear of disrupting the unity of the Party. In 1952, after my motion in the Legislative Council asking Government to lift the ban on the entry of Billy Strachan and Ferdinand Smith, the Burnham faction seriously objected and passed a motion in the Executive of our Party, demanding that all motions I introduce in the Legislative Council must have the prior approval of the Executive Committee of the Party. Procedurally, they were correct; although the practice was established because I was a member of the Legislative Council before the formation of the Party. But what must be noted was not so much their objection to procedure, but their objection to the content of my resolution. In other words, the Burnham clique were prepared to deviate to the right, to sacrifice our proletarian, working-class, internationalist outlook for narrow nationalism.

To concentrate only on the electoral aspect of the united front is to run the risk of disclosing beforehand our plans to the imperialists of stating precisely what our strength in terms of seats will be. In such a case without the emphasis on struggle and the determination to reject a backward constitution the imperialists will devise a constitutional formula to accommodate our strength and prepare the way for betrayal of us by our allies. For this reason therefore, we must guard against a united front which is going to be merely an electoral front.

Some comrades seeing only these dangers and the possible betrayal of our allies oppose the idea of a united front. This is incorrect if a united front prepared for struggle is able to wrest from the Colonial Office an advanced constitution, this is a gain. Even if we make concessions of electoral seats to our allies and they afterwards betrayed the united front government by breaking away from us we would be in a minority position under an advanced constitution. Then too, the people would have experienced their betrayal. This is no worse, in fact is much better, than remaining isolated, allowing the possible formation of a united front against us and the devising of a constitution by the Colonial Office which will contain us in a minority position in the Legislature.

We must take these risks, I pointed out, if a united front dedicated to struggle can emerge. If we can bring about an even broader united front dedicated to struggle for an advanced constitution no less liberal than the Waddington constitution without the complications and disadvantages of an electoral alliance; then by all means we must do so. But this may not be possible. If our 'friends' insist on an electoral alliance, then we will have necessarily to make the united front of struggle into an electoral front also. Let me reiterate that if there is no emphasis on action and struggle for an advanced constitution, then we must at all costs avoid such an alliance.

As I see it, therefore, the following should be our choice in order of merit:

- (1) A united broad national front of struggle, excluding electoral arrangement, for an advanced constitution.
- (2) A limited broad national front of struggle including electoral arrangements, for an advanced constitution.
- (3) Failing the above, remaining alone, continuing the struggle for an advanced constitution, broadening our support, and forming an electoral front, if necessary, after it is known what type of constitution the British Government will impose.

If we should enter a united front, we can overcome the dangers by maintaining our absolute 'independence and autonomy' and adopting at one and the same time a policy of 'unity and struggle'. Noting that such a front will be a unity of left middle and right groups, great care will have to be exerted firstly to guard against left deviationism (all struggle and no unity) which will tend to disruption, and secondly against right deviationism (all unity and no struggle), which will tend to left degeneration. We must adopt a "policy of enlarging and consolidating the left-wing group, of urging the middle group to progress and change, and of isolating the right wing group."

In the interest therefore of such a united front or a broadened People's Progressive Party we must be at all times guided by Comrade Mao-Tse-Tung's three well known principles - "justified", "advantageous" and "restrained". He pointed out - "Persisting in such justified advantageous and restrained struggle, we can develop the progressive forces, win over the middle of the road forces, isolate the diehard forces and make the diehard chary of heedlessly compromising with the enemy".

And now I wish to discuss the next controversial subject - federation. Should B.G. join the proposed West Indian Federation? This question has become clouded because class lines are not clearly drawn. We find that reactionaries such as Nicholson, Bobb, Macnie, Seaford and above all the British Government backed up by the local administration supporting federation, while others like Raategever, Rev. Peters, Phang, Roth, opposing.

Progressives too, appear to be divided on this issue. The P.P.P.'s support of federation with dominion status and self-government for each unity is questioned by some comrades, who, as indicated by Kenaima in Thunder (30.7.55) say that this is the wrong slogan and should be replaced by the slogan of Federation and National Independence. In other words, the Party should advocate the joining of federation now, under the present conditions of a crown-colony status.

These comrades admit that federation, according to the Rance proposals, bring no immediate economic benefits but rather that it is the "desire of Britain to streamline the exploitation of the West Indian Colonies."

What then are the impelling reasons which must make the P.P.P. change its stand and support W.I. Federation now unreservedly? They argue that federation "will lay the basis for the unity of the working class movement - trade unions, political parties - in a truly large West Indian national scale and consequently is the road to political power and a people's democracy in the West Indies".

They do not go into the question of "when" and "how" or bother about the realities of the present Guianese and West Indian situations. Their position is one based on mere faith and utopianism. They are supposedly working on the familiar Marxist theory of the unity of opposites; the thesis that as capitalism creates the working class, its future grave diggers, just so federation desired by British imperialism will create its own destruction. Since capitalism creates the working class, its future grave diggers, does it follow we must give every support to the machinations and formation of imperialist capital in order to destroy it? Does it follow that every federation must be joined, regardless of the conditions? Why then is the Central African federation opposed by progressives? [What they fail to appreciate is that Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action. Time and circumstances must

be taken into account. This is how the history of the C.P.S.U. put it: "The Marxist-Leninist Theory must not be regarded as a collection of dogmas, as a catechism, as a symbol of faith, and the Marxists themselves as pendants and dogmatists.]"

Lenin pointed out "Our teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action", Marx and Engels always used to say, rightly ridiculing the learning and repetition by rote of 'formulas' which at best are only capable of outlining general tasks that are necessarily liable to be modified by the concrete economic and political conditions of each separate phase of the historical process. It is essential to realize the incontestable truth that a Marxist must take cognizance of real life, of the concrete realities, and must not continue to cling to a theory of yesterday." Defining dialectics, he said, "Dialectics may be summed up as a theory of unity of opposites. By so doing, the Kernel of dialectics is grasped, but it needs explanation and development". In further amplification of Marxism, Lenin, criticising Bela Kun, the Hungarian Communist, said: "He gives up the most essential thing in Marxism, the living soul of Marxism, the concrete analysis of concrete conditions".

XX Calling for the utmost attention in our study of viewing any situation from all its aspects, not only the universality of contradiction, but also the particularity of contradictions and each aspect of the contradiction. Mao Tse-Tung wrote: "Lenin was expressing this very idea when he said that the most essential thing in Marxism, the living soul of Marxism; is the concrete analysis of concrete conditions. Our dogmatists, contrary to Lenin's teachings, never use their brains to analyze anything concretely; in their writings and speeches they always strike the keynote of the 'eight legged essay' which is void of any content and have brought about a very bad style of work in our party."

Stalin also in his comment on Chinese affairs emphasized the necessity of combining general Marxist-Leninist principles with national characteristics. He wrote "Notwithstanding the ideological growth of our party, unfortunately there is still in our party a certain type of "leaders" who sincerely believe that it is possible to direct the revolution in China, so to speak by telegraph on the basis of the known and universally recognized general principles of the Communist International without taking into consideration the national peculiarities of Chinese economy, Chinese political regime, Chinese culture, Chinese customs and traditions. These leaders differ from the real leaders precisely in that they always have in their pockets two or three ready-made formulae that are "suitable" for all countries and "Obligatory" in all conditions. For them there is no question of taking into account the national character and national peculiarities of each country. For them there is no question of co-ordinating the general principles of the Communist International with the national peculiarities of the revolutionary movement in each country of applying the general principles of the Communist International to the national and state peculiarities of different countries.

They do not understand that the main task of leadership at the present time when the Communist parties have already grown up and have become mass parties consists in finding, grasping and skilfully combining the national and characteristic features of the movement in each country with the general principles of the Communist International in order to facilitate and make practically possible the carrying out of the basic aims of the Communist movement.

Hence the attempts to stereotype the leadership for all the countries. Hence the attempts to apply mechanically certain general formulae regardless of the concrete conditions of the revolutionary movement in different countries. Hence the endless conflicts between formulae and the revolutionary movement in different countries which are the essential outcome of the leadership of these miserable leaders. Our oppositionists belong precisely to this type of these miserable leaders".

Let us therefore, instead of applying certain general formulae and striking the "keynote" of the "eight-legged essay which is devoid of any content" attempt a concrete analysis of concrete conditions."

I have already alluded to the external world situation. I pointed out a dominant factor in the present day situation in anti-colonialism, the growing strength of the anti-colonial world public opinion and the consequent embarrassment of the colonial owning powers. It is in the light of this fact that the support of West Indian Federation (apart from economic exploitation) by the British Government must be viewed. Separately each territory is a potential source of trouble for our masters. In the past decade, riots took place throughout the West Indies, particularly in Grenada. The Tory Government's destruction of the constitution and our government reverberated around the world. The British Honduras situation necessitated a one-man Commission of Enquiry. All of these events hit the world headlines. The size of the territory or the population does not detract from the impact of the issue - anti-colonialism - on world public opinion. Note small Cyprus with its half million people. Britain is now seeking to overcome this embarrassment by federating the separate territories, bringing them under the control of "safe" leaders. With federation, the territorial question will become internal questions to be handled not by the Colonial Office in London but by the Federation and the Prime Minister. It is in this context that the reformation of the West Indian Regiment must be viewed. Territorial movements and questions will be settled not with the movement of British warships and troops, but by West Indian soldiers. It should be of interest to note the slip of the recent Parliamentary delegation. When told of the harsh treatment meted out to Guianese by Britain in the name of democracy, the delegation expressed the view that we would have received worse treatment from our own "friends" in the West Indies. Incidentally the chairman of the delegation disclosed that, contrary to the view previously expressed in the document on federation, the federal body and not the colonial office would be the arbiters of the constitutional development of the various territories! What is behind this idea and what does this mean? It means that the Colonial Office would no longer have to answer before the bar of world public opinion for constitutional and other troubles in the various territories. These would all become internal questions to be handled by the 'safe' federal leaders.

An example may suffice to explain more explicitly this point. In the talks held with the communists of Malaya the British Government cleverly used not the Governor General of Malaya and the Governor of Singapore, who then controlled both external defence and internal security but the Chief Minister, Tengu Abdul Rahman and David Marshall. It was they who finally announced that the war against the liberation forces will continue. The end result was the same, but for world public opinion, the puppet ministers did a better job than could have been done by the Governor.

The London "Observer" on February 26, 1955, called on Britain and U.S.A. to give massive technical and economic aid to "this large group of poor, staggering islands, each of which in isolation is a potential source of dissatisfaction". Continuing, it said: "They need support if they are to resist dissident forces, which as in the recent tragic fate of British Guiana, thrive on local poverty and frustration. Since the Jagan episode, great effort has been made in Guiana. While much is being done in the West Indies more is needed. We should not wait to be prodded by other 'Jagans'".

The "Observer" clearly let the cat out of the bag, exposed the sinister aims of imperialism in its support of federation in this phrase which needs emphasise "this large group of poor staggering islands, each of which in isolation is a potential source of dissatisfaction".

No wonder the official Russian News Agency described the London Conference on Caribbean Federation as "a new stunt of the colonialists" saying that "The idea of federation arose after the national liberation movement of the second world war, and was the result of Britain's desire to retain her colonies and prevent them from falling to the American sphere of influence. There is a real danger that the federation is a trick of colonialism particularly in view of the fact Mr. Lennox-Boyd has said that "the question of Dominion status was not on the Conference's agenda".

That certain leaders of the West Indies have been advocating federation for over half a century does not detract from the correctness of the observation of the Russian News Agency. For British imperialist interest in the Tory Government with Conservative Oliver Stanley in the Colonial Office in 1945, and under Labour Government with Creech Jones in the Colonial Office in 1947. I say "safe" leaders because the British are now convinced that the emerging federal leaders - Manley, Adams, and Co. will hold the ring for imperialism. 1956 is a far way from 1947, when Grantley Adams as the President of the Caribbean Labour Congress was demanding "Federation with dominion status and internal self-government for each unit". The imperialists carefully noted (1) the defence by Mr. Adams of British Colonial policy on the floor of the United Nations General Assembly in Paris 1948. (2) The successful pressure exerted by Manley on the Jamaica T.U.C. forcing the latter to withdraw from the W.F.T.U. (after the formation of the I.C.F.T.U. from the W.F.T.U. and the subsequent expulsion of the so-called reds from the People's National Party. (3) Their illegal disbanding of the progressive Caribbean Labour Congress and (4) last but not least, their congratulations to the British Government for the destruction of the P.P.P. Government in British Guiana.

Official attitude in British Guiana, no doubt reflecting Colonial Office views, can be cited as illustrating Manley's political somersaulting. Up to 1949, when the P.N.P. of Jamaica was the leader and the guide of the progressive movements in the Caribbean, Guianese officialdom, supported by the Chamber of Commerce and King Sugar was opposed to federation. These same interests, noting the changed Manley and the fact that Manley and Adams will undoubtedly emerge as leaders of the federation, are today the most active supporter of Guianese participation in the Caribbean Federation.

Let's leave the political and deal with the trade union aspect of the situation. Our donatists talk about unifying the trade union movement throughout the area, having let's say, one West Indian sugar worker's union, etc. Sounds very good and brilliant on paper. But we have to ask ourselves how this unity will be forged, which aspect will be dominant in this unity, the pro-imperialist right wing leaders or the anti-imperialist left wing leader, etc.

In Jamaica, after the expulsion of the so-called communists by Manley's P.N.P., the National Workers Union was created with Manley's son as its President. Because of this manoeuvre, and the vacillations of Ken Hill, the leader of the T.U.C. was virtually smashed. The Ferdinand Smith-led Agricultural and Sugar Workers Union operating against Manley's Bustamante's trade unions is isolated and opposed by the whole weight of the state machinery.

In Barbados, the Barbados Labour Union is controlled by Grantley Adams.

In Trinidad, Quintin O'Connor of the Federated Workers Union and the recently deceased Alexander of the Waterfront Workers' Union are the trade Union pillars of the new political party of Dr. Williams, political friend of Manley and adviser to the I. C. F. T. U.

In British Guiana, R. Tello, member of the Interim Government is General Secretary of the T.U.C. In the smaller islands, Bird and Bradshaw held forth both on the political and trade union united fronts.

All these trade unions are affiliated to the pro-imperialist I.C.F.T.U. and form a united trade union front in CADORIT, Caribbean arm of I.C.F.T.U. Is this the trade union united front which is going to lead the working class against the fortress of imperialism? Clearly it is more utopianism to think so. If not when is it likely that the working class anti-imperialist trade union leaders will gain control? We are aware of the present difficulties in Guiana. The whole West Indies presents even greater difficulties with the present barriers of bans and restrictions of movement and with the "safe" leaders in power. Some other comrades argued that in the same way that I as a lone member in the old Legislative Council (1948-1952) was able to expose imperialism and further our movement in Guiana, our Federal Legislative members will be able to expose imperialism and further the West Indian liberation movement. This is another form of dogmatism, arguing by simple historical analogy. They fail to take into consideration our operations and activities outside the Legislative Council in practically virgin Guianese political territory and the relative freedom under which we operated in the early days. They fail to take into consideration the strictures and restrictions imposed on us here and abroad as soon as our strength was felt. [They fail to take into consideration the pronouncement of the Lyttleton xx doctrine that H.M.G. will not tolerate the setting up of Communist governments in any part of the Commonwealth, and the effects of this pronouncement on West Indian Leaders and people.] And last but not least they fail to take into consideration that if we support Federation now, unreservedly, we take the chance of losing our mass support and becoming not a mass party but a sect.

Let us therefore examine more concretely the support behind Federation. In the West Indies as a whole with the exception of Trinidad's 1/3 Indian population, there is general support for Federation. The imperialists want it for better economic, political and administrative control, the native capitalists want it for protection, and the people want it because their leaders want it. What is the position in Guiana? Imperialism-Bookers, the Sugar Producers' Association - has declared its support. The native capitalists (Peter D'Aguiar and other Portuguese elements) in the Chamber of Commerce join the imperialist representatives in this body in support of Federation, but for different reasons-protection in a wider home market. "The Indians feeling as they do a sense of national oppression are almost 100% opposed to Federation. This is why the Indian native capitalist who predominate in the Junior Chamber of Commerce go against their class interests and oppose Federation. The Indian capitalist up to this stage puts his 'national'

interests before his 'class' interest. Consequently he can be a resolute ally against imperialism within these considerations. Rahaman Gajraj is the only Indian capitalist who supports Federation. This is more due to political opportunism - support of imperialism by virtue of his position as a nominated member of the executive Council - than to class interests.

Support for Federation also comes from the middle classes, the backbone of the Civil Service. Civil servants see in federation further economic rounds. This explains why the middle-class Negro who predominates in Government services, Portuguese and mixed-race groups support federation. This also explains why an Indian, J.I. Ramphal, supports federation. The position of the African working class is somewhat different. I would say that about half support federation because their leaders - League of Coloured Peoples, John Carter, L.F.S. Burnham - support federation. The other half is opposed to federation, fearing under-cutting and loss of jobs from West Indians who are prepared to migrate to our country. There has been direct experience with this particularly in the interior, in the wood grants and the quarries.

These then are the concrete realities, not as we may desire them, but as they are. Are we to ignore them, even if they are based on prejudices? Or are we to try patiently to explain away these prejudices and misconceptions. Some comrades, taking the path of reckless adventurism want to brush away these realities, want to gamble with the existence and role of our country as leader of the liberation movement. Notice that so strong are these realities that although imperialism supports federation, its party, the Luchoo National Labour Front, is opposed to federation. So strong are these realities that imperialism which at one time (late 1954) was prepared to push British Guiana into federation has now decided that only an elected representative government can decide the question. A stage show here with its 'safe' popular West Indian leaders performed in support of federation and the puppet legislature's overwhelming vote in favour of participation did not convince Guianese and change these realities. And so imperialism made a strategic retreat realising that any force in favour of Guianese participation in federation will only strengthen and intensify its opposition by the addition of compromising forces (such as Raatgever, Roth, etc.) and vacillating forces such as Indian capitalists, etc.

Your adventurists are prepared neither to see nor to understand these shifts and contradictions. Where the imperialists are afraid to tread - to force Guianese Participation into federation they are prepared to rush. They call us opportunists, we who support federation in principle, and say that the minimum condition of Guiana's participation must be dominion status of self-government for such unit, and who would leave the final decision to the people to be expressed by way of a referendum. Is it opportunism to safeguard the life of our party, the leader of the liberation movement in Guiana and the only Caribbean working class-led party with mass followings?

In the history of the C.P.S.U. we read this definition of opportunism: "Opportunism does not always mean a direct denial of Marxist theory or of any of its propositions and conclusions. * Opportunism is sometimes expressed in the attempt to cling to certain of the propositions of Marxism that have already become antiquated and to convert them into a dogma, so as to retard the further development of Marxism and, consequently to retard the development of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. Criticising the German

Marxists in America who had undertaken to lead the American working class movement Engels wrote: "The Germans have not understood how to use their theory as a lever which could set the American masses in motion; they do not understand the theory themselves for the most part, and treat it in a doctrinaire and dogmatic way, as something which has to be learned off by heart and which will then supply all needs without more ado. To them it is a credo and not a guide to action".

Our critics say that we must give the correct lead. Stalin, criticised the ultra left mistake of the Trotskyite opposition on the Chinese question for confusing their own consciousness and understanding with the consciousness and understanding of many millions of workers and peasants. He said "The opposition are right when they say that the party must go ahead. This is an ordinary Marxist proposition, failing the observance of which a Communist Party is not a real communist party. But it is only part of the truth. The whole truth consists in the fact that the Party should not only go ahead, but should also lead the millions. To go ahead and not lead the millions is in fact to fall behind the movement, to lag in its tail. To go ahead and to lose contact with the rearguard and not be capable of leading the rearguard is to make the kind of sally which may ruin the advance of the masses for some time. Leninist leadership in fact consists in the vanguard being capable of leading the rearguard; in the vanguard going ahead without losing contact with the masses. But in order that the vanguard should not lose contact with the masses, in order that the vanguard may be truly capable of leading the millions, one decisive condition is required, namely that the masses should have become convinced from their own experience that the instructions, directions and slogans of the vanguard are correct. The misfortune of the opposition in fact is that they do not recognize this simple Leninist rule for leading the millions; that they do not realize that the Party alone that an advanced group alone without the support of the millions is incapable of accomplishing a revolution and that in the final analysis a revolution is made by the millions of the toilers".

In conclusion, I propose that this Congress of the Party agrees to the following

- (1) That while the Party supports Guiana's participation in a West Indian Federation, on the basis of a constitution providing for Dominion status for the federation and internal self-government for each unit, the issue must be finally decided by the people through a referendum as was done recently in Malta on the question of integration with Great Britain.
- (2) That keeping in mind the need for anti-imperialist unity, the advantages and disadvantages of a united front, the Party Executive should continue to have talks with interested parties for the forging of such unity, but should refrain from committing the party until a Special Conference or annual Conference has ratified its proposals.