

212a
1867

THE CARIBBEAN AND CENTRES OF INTERNATIONAL POWER

By Dr. Cheddi Jagan, B.Sc., D.D.S.
General Secretary
People's Progressive Party, Guyana.

— for the Colloquy on "Political Structures and International Relations in the Caribbean" at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, October 21-25, 1974 sponsored by the Institute of Social Investigations in collaboration with the Latin American Council of Social Sciences and U.N.E.S.C.O.

THE CARIBBEAN AND THE CENTRES OF

INTERNATIONAL POWER

BY CHEDDI JAGAN

Introduction

The Caribbean is usually regarded as a collection of mini or even micro states close to the United States of America, a super-power.

In this context, some adumbrate the theory of geographic fatalism; namely, nothing can be done which will offend "the colossus of the North" -- basically an excuse for political inaction.

Others viewing the Caribbean territories as the US strategic backyard, and the Caribbean Sea as "mare nostrum" justify US intervention from time to time.

Still others, viewing the Caribbean as a complex of nation states, dependencies and semi-dependencies associated with different metropolitan powers, concentrate on differences and peculiarities. Concentrating on the "trees" - age, shape, size, they lose sight of the "forest".

While the peculiarities and specifics of the various territories or groups of territories comprising the region -- hispanic and non-hispanic (British, French, Dutch and United States) -- will be noted, it will be the aim of this paper to deal with the Caribbean not in geographic isolation but dialectically and from a world viewpoint.

This means seeing the region under the impact of the same forces influencing developments in Latin America in particular and the world at large in general.

It means seeing the region in the context of inter-imperialist rivalry, the struggle between capitalism and socialism -- the major contradiction of our time -- and the struggle of the so-called third world for national liberation.

While imperialism operates in many spheres, it is in its most fundamental sense an economic phenomenon. However, this will be viewed not mechanically but dialectically showing the close inter-connection and inter-action between the economic base and political, organizational, institutional and ideological superstructure both in the Caribbean and the world at large.

International power will thus be examined from various aspects -- military, political, economic, ideological and cultural.

The paper begins with the early period of rivalry following the papal division of the western world as revealed by the voyages of discovery of Columbus and others at the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th centuries.

It shows US interest in the area beginning towards the end of the 19th century with the enunciation of "Manifest Destiny" in 1819 and the "Monroe Doctrine" in 1823; the attainment of US hegemony through direct and indirect military intervention and economic aggression -- pro-imperialist and reformist developmental strategies, economic blockade, aid and technical assistance.

It illustrates the defensive measures of the other imperialist states and the acceptance by the British particularly with the case of Guyana (1961-64) of the dominant US role in the area.

Further, it deals with the changed international situation consequent on the reality of the growing political, military and economic strength of the socialist world, particularly the Soviet Union; the impact of detente and peaceful co-existence in the area and the new methods, including ideological, for continued domination.

In conclusion the paper discusses the new perspectives opening up for national liberation in the period of deepening crisis of imperialism and the world balance of forces shifting in favour of national liberation and socialism.

§ § § § § § § § § § § §

Since Columbus landed on San Salvador in October 1492, the Caribbean and indeed the entire area that became known as the Latin American continent has received the unenviable focus of international attention. Such attention has on different occasions manifested itself either in sinister cooperation or bitter rivalry.

The earliest wranglings over the "newly discovered" lands occurred between Spain and Portugal. It is scarcely necessary to say that this was not the first time that the lands had been discovered by persons of the so-called Old World. There is sufficient archeological evidence today to support the view that the Norsemen of Scandinavia had direct contact with the area at least 500 years earlier. But for Spain and Portugal this was a New World. Therefore, they sought the blessings of Pope Alexander VI to share it between themselves.

By the issue of three Bulls of Demarcation dated May 3 and 4, 1493, the New World was divided by a north-south line in the Atlantic running one hundred leagues west of the Azores. Spain received the area west of the line while Portugal received the portion east of it with exclusive rights to discover, explore, settle and rule there, while the other half would accrue to Spain.

The first bull gave to "the Catholic kings of Spain and their heirs and successors the countries and islands discovered by their envoys and to be discovered thereafter "together with all their dominions, cities, camps, places and villages, and all rights, jurisdictions and appurtenances of the same." Addressing himself to the Spanish monarch, he strictly forbade "all persons of no matter what rank, estate, degree, order, or condition to dare without your special permit . . . to go for the sake of trade or any reason whatever, to the said islands and countries after they have been discovered and found by your envoys or persons sent out for the purpose!"¹

But Spain wanted even more. And so she had the Pope, himself Spanish, issuing a fourth Bull, September 26, 1493, which nullified the previous demarcations favouring the Portuguese. The new demarcation line allowed greater freedom to Spain to engage in worldwide exploration by westward or southern navigation.

This brought protests from the Portuguese who requested a re-division. After negotiations between the two countries, the Treaty of Tordesillas of June 7, 1494, agreed to a new meridian by which Spanish and Portuguese spheres of influence were defined. It moved the line westward to 370 leagues west of Cape Verde islands. By this treaty, Spain unwittingly gave away a large portion of the South American Coast and Brazil became "Portuguese" territory.

"In appreciation of this fact King Emmanuel of Portugal requested and received from Julius II (the Pope) the Bull Ea Que (1506), which endorsed the Tordesillas meridian and thus rendered it more binding upon Spain."²

The other European powers were also very concerned over what was taking place in this area. On March 5, 1496, - the day which is described as the birthday of the British Empire - Henry VII, King of England, instructed John Cabot to "subdue, occupy and possess" all foreign lands not covered by "Christianity." He was further authorised to "sail under the royal flag and to set up the king's banner as his officers."

And from the King of France, Francis I came the sharp retort: "The sun shines for me as others. I should very much like to see the clause in Adam's will that excludes me from a share of the world". Decades later, in 1580, when Holland declared independence from Spain she also joined the opposition to Spanish monopoly in the so-called New World.

The Protestant Reformation was also used to good effect in opposing Spanish or Catholic (the words were sometimes used interchangeably) domination in America. Greed and the clamour for wealth in the "newly discovered" lands had stimulated a nationalism that at times even took precedence over loyalty to Catholicism. This was particularly exemplified in France, which, although decidedly Catholic, opposed the Papal decree and Spanish monopoly in the area.

The "Great Hunt" had commenced, and in 1680, the Germans joined the pack. Denmark and Sweden also received a chunk of the carcass. The words of Francis Drake aptly epitomised the feeling of the era when he said, "Blame nobody but yourselves if you go away empty." He described the Caribbean as "the Treasure-House of the world."

Latin America, with the Caribbean one of its components, had become the favourite hunting ground of the Spanish, Portuguese, British, French, Dutch and Germans. There were later to carve out their portions of land and men as they went on the rampage on the continent.

Effective Challenge to Spain - the Spread of Colonialism

In the sixteenth century the main challenge to Spanish and Portuguese monopoly in the Americas manifested itself in the freebooter, privateer, and illicit trader, but not in effective and permanent settlement. However, the turn of the century ushered in a new era. The Dutch, English, French and Germans embarked on a policy of **colonisation in the area**. To accomplish this was not too difficult. The Spanish empire was too vast for its weakened military forces to garrison, after the defeat of the Armada in 1588. Also, the north-east of South America and all the eastern Caribbean from the Virgin Islands to Tobago were unoccupied.

Spain's rivals, especially England under Elizabeth I, in 1604, submitted an ingenious argument against Spain's right to the area. They emphasised that prescriptive rights did not exist unless supported by effective occupation of the lands. Nothing that Spain could say or do would be adequate to ward off her European rivals. The persistent attacks and campaigns of the English - Francis Drake, John Hawkins, Walter Raleigh - were too hot for Spain to handle. Consequently, from the seventeenth century onward history was to record the founding of colonies by England, Holland, France, and Germany in Latin America and the Caribbean. Only Sweden failed in her attempt to gain a colony in the area.

It was from this jungle of international rivalry, plotting and scheming that Caribbean and Latin American history emerged. The colonialists were constantly on the move for new conquests, new sources of wealth -- more lands to be colonised, more gold to plunder, more wealth to acquire. No colonial empire really was secure and colonies changed hands at regular intervals. Even the United States, of America, formerly colonies, staked out its own claim later on.

During the thrust of European expansion into the area, the most barbarous wars were launched against the inhabitants of this continent. The thirst for wealth and the search for it resulted in wide-scale massacre of Indian men, women and children. The period 1519-1521 saw the Aztec Empire headed by Montezuma laid low by the treacherous Spanish conquistador, Hernando Cortes and his plundering forces. Today, there is hardly a trace of the original Aztec Capital, Tenochtitlan, in Mexico City where it once proudly stood.

A similar fate awaited the Inca Empire and its capital Cuzco. Between 1531-1535, another Spanish conquistador, Francisco Pizarro, imitating Cortes in the worst demonstration of treachery, lured the unsuspecting Inca leader, Atahualpa, into false security, executed him

and shattered the Inca empire.

The Spanish conquistadors had succeeded in destroying the two great empires of the "New World". They paved the way for permanent Spanish and eventually European occupation of the area. With the Aztec and Inca Empires destroyed, their civilizations rapidly declined and decayed. Deliberate efforts were undertaken to supplant Aztec and Inca cultures with Spanish culture. Christianity blessed Spanish exploitation of the Indians.

It was the Spaniards too who introduced the encomienda system which wretchedly enslaved the Indians. This was a vicious system and the Indians -- the indigenous people of the area -- were almost completely exterminated by it.

They were unaccustomed to long hours of forced labour and were driven beyond endurance by their taskmasters. They fell easy victims to European diseases such as smallpox

It is estimated that between 1492 and 1496 about two-thirds of the Indian population of some 300,000 persons - died. So terrible was the decimation of the Indians by the Spanish conquistadores and encomienderos that "by 1509 there were only 40,000 survivors. By 1514 these were further reduced to about 13,000." ⁴

The brutality was so appalling that certain sections of the Church were forced to denounce it in strong language, an illustration of this being Montesinos' sermon in 1511 when he enquired of his fellow Spaniards:

Tell me, by what right and justice do you keep these Indians in such cruel and humble servitude? Why do you keep them so oppressed and weary, not giving them enough to eat nor taking care of them in their illness? For with the excessive work you demand of them they fall and die, or rather you kill them with your desire to extract and acquire gold everyday. Are these not men?

Later, other former supporters of the encomienda system, for example, Las Casas fought for a better deal for the Indians, though not necessarily from all forms of exploitation, at the hands of the Spaniards.

The Socio-Economic System - Trading, Piracy & Primitive Accumulation

During the early period of colonial expansion in the "New World", the European colonialists relied mainly on trading, at most times illicit, naked plunder, and piracy or buccaneering in their efforts to accumulate wealth. These forms of thievery yielded enormous wealth for the European expansionists.

In 1532, when the Spanish conquistadors, led by Pizarro attacked the Inca Empire and captured their leader, Atahualpa, they demanded a huge ransom for his release. The ransom was paid - "a room 22 feet by 17 feet piled 7 feet deep with gold and silver articles". ⁶ That was taken back to Europe.

In 1628, off Cuba, the Dutch buccaneer, Piet Meyn captured a Spanish treasure fleet, which had earlier stolen from the Indians and plundered their mines in Cuba. The Dutch loot consisted of "117,357 pounds of silver; 135 pounds of gold; 37,375 hides; 2,270 chests of indigo; 7,961 pieces of logwood; 735 chests of cochineal; 235 chests of sugar; together with pearls and spices." ⁷

In 1666, the English seizure of Maracaibo by Drake, provided them with a booty of "pieces of eight". The buccaneers even took with them the ornaments, bells and

paintings of the church there. Two years later in 1668, another English buccaneer, Morgan, entered Porto Bello and left with a quarter million "pieces of eight". In 1673, the English stormed Trinidad taking with them 100,000 "pieces of eight", and ten years later laying their hands on Vera Cruz, then the richest city in this part of the world, and confiscating six million dollars.

Ultimately, buccaneering became a nuisance to the governments which had encouraged it. In 1668, France and Spain signed the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle to be followed two years later by the Treaty of Madrid outlawing this form of plunder. But having gained honour and status by this occupation, many of those involved were not prepared to abandon their practices. As the dates of raids quoted earlier show, buccaneering continued for sometime after it was outlawed.

With buccaneering officially outlawed, the primitive accumulation of wealth by illicit and legal trading became inadequate, and energies were challenged in new avenues founded on permanent settlement and the growing of crops, the most profitable crops at that time being tobacco and cotton.

But with the lapse of time, the tobacco and cotton economies ran into difficulties. At that time too, the European sugar market was booming. The Caribbean was invited to produce sugar. "It is conceived there is a silver mine at St. Christophers . . . such an enterprise would require a great stock, and an infinite number of slaves. The true silver-mine of that Island is Sugar." ⁸ This was how sugar and its relationship to slavery was seen in the seventeenth century.

In the Caribbean the mere mention of sugar elicits another word - slavery. The switch from tobacco to sugar as the main crop in the Caribbean ushered in the socio-economic system of slavery.

The European planters' attempt to enslave the indigenous Indians under the encomienda system, first introduced by the Spanish, was unsuccessful, among the reasons being their hatred of the system.

The failure of the encomiendas - the failure of Indian slavery - made necessary the introduction of slave-trade in the area. And the slave-trade in the Caribbean meant trade in African slaves.

The African slave trade was introduced in the "New World" by the Portuguese in 1482. In 1562, the English buccaneer, John Hawkins, brought 300 slaves from Sierra Leone and sold them to planters in Hispaniola, presently the Dominican Republic. Not long after, the French, Dutch, Spanish slave-traders brought millions of African slaves to the Caribbean as the production of sugar swiftly increased.

Louis XVI, King of France, in a decree on August 26, 1670, said: "There is nothing which contributed more to the development of the colonies and the cultivation of their soil than the labourious toil of the Negroes." This view was widely held by seventeenth century Europeans. Therefore, in order to furnish as much of this cheap (at that time) labour as possible, they embarked on a terrible orgy of looting and murder. Of this period of early colonial expansion, the slave trade exploitation and primitive accumulation, Karl Marx wrote:

The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief momenta of primitive accumulation

The Colonial system ripened, like a hothouse, trade and navigation . . . The treasures captured outside Europe by undisguised looting, enslavement and murder, floated back to the mother country and there turned into capital.

In their great quest for wealth, the slave-traders committed unspeakable crimes on other human beings. Vast numbers of black men, women and children perished in the Passage."

But slavery could not endure the test of time. The deep-seated class contradictions and the dynamic processes of society were forces which the various facets of the slave system could not contend with and resolve.

Resistance to Slavery

Slave-trading in particular and slavery in general were oppressive and repressive innumerable ways. The victims of this vicious system resisted in every possible manner. There have been thousands of runaways and revolts in the Caribbean, some recorded and some not. But among the most well-known are the Saint-Domingue Revolution in 1791, the first and second Maroon Wars of 1734 and 1795, and the Berbice slave rebellion of 1763.

The Berbice Slave Rebellion of 1763 led by Cuffy went far into becoming the first successful slave revolt. The slaves almost completely drove the Dutch out of the country. Their seat of government was seized and a new government of ex-slaves formed. The ex-slaves held a territory in their control for about one year before reinforcements from the Dutch colony of Surinam and from British-controlled Bermuda arrived to put down the revolt. Dissension and vacillation among the leaders of the revolting slaves also assisted to a great extent in defeating their own cause.

The Maroon War of 1734 (the first Maroon War) in Jamaica although not successful in overthrowing the slave system in that country, forced the British sugar planters and slave-owners to respect their right to occupy the area chosen by them.

The Saint-Domingue Revolution of 1791 was the first and only successful slave revolution in the "New World". Led by the great revolutionary, Toussaint L'Ouverture, it was aided by the shifting international alliances and the fluid international situation.

At an earlier period, England and France were at one in opposing the Papal decree in the "New World". But in 1756, the two were crossing swords in the Seven Year's War which ended in victory for Britain in 1763. In that war the British North American colonies fought on the side of Britain against France. However, when the American War of Independence was declared in 1776, it is reported that nine-tenths of the arms used by the American colonies in the crucial battle of Saratoga in 1777 were of French origin. In 1778, France and the American revolting colonies signed an official alliance.

But the pendulum was to swing the other way very soon. In August 1791, following on the heels of the French Revolution of 1789, the slaves of the French colony, Saint-Domingue, revolted. Apart from the positive effects of the French Revolution, the Saint-Domingue or Haitian Revolution was aided by the confusion caused by the entry of British and Spanish troops to assist the Saint-Domingue slave-owners against their revolting slaves. Both Britain and Spain were probably hoping to annex the colony from France if they could put down the revolt. France was thus faced with not only the problem of extinguishing a slave revolt, but also the even more pressing demand of driving out the British and Spanish from her richest colony.

There was even greater confusion among the colonial powers, especially from Britain,

when in 1795 the second Maroon War broke out in Jamaica. This required the presence and attention of British troops stationed in the Caribbean. It meant that British troops fighting in Saint-Domingue were to be despatched speedily to rebellious Jamaica. Thus, while British soldiers, "seasoned" to Caribbean conditions, were being transported away from Saint-Domingue to do combat with the maroons, new "unseasoned" troops had to do battle with the revolting slaves of the French colony - a distinct advantage to the fighting slaves of Saint-Domingue.

End of Slavery and the Swift Transition to Capitalism

The stresses and strains in slavery eventually worked to the detriment of the system. Even though it was a society introduced by the metropolitan powers to maximise the exploitation of their colonies, the very class contradictions from which wealth flowed to Europe became the cancer that was responsible for the society's ultimate destruction.

The endless runaways and revolts, the attacks by the humanitarians, and the developing capitalist system in Europe, especially in Britain, hastened the death of slavery in the Caribbean. Slavery, as a Caribbean institution could not proceed beyond the nineteenth century. In August 1838, the last of English-owned slaves in the Caribbean were released. Before two-thirds of the century had passed, almost every vestige of old European slavery was abolished from the Caribbean.

But the British sugar planters in the Caribbean could hardly do without the cheap labour of the slave system. After unsuccessful experiments with white contractual labour, the system of "indentureship" was embraced. Small numbers of Chinese and Portuguese indentured immigrants were brought, but they were not sufficient to fill the vacuum left by the departed African slaves.

In 1838, in Trinidad, Guyana and Jamaica, the planters finally settled for East Indian indentured labour.

Indian indentureship was a contractual labour scheme, of a 5-year duration in the first instance. It had certain features which were similar to slavery, and also some which were present in feudalism. It was a hybrid of slavery and feudalism and was perhaps unique to British-owned colonies.

In fact, what was being witnessed by historians was a swift transformation from slavery to capitalism in the Caribbean, particularly in the British territories. The Caribbean transformation from primitive communism to slavery to semi-feudalism to capitalism was really a telescoped version of the socio-economic development and transformation of Europe which took place over a longer historical era.

In Europe, slavery and feudalism were distinct socio-economic systems over fairly distinct periods of time, with the latter displacing the former until it became a fetter and was replaced by capitalism.

In the British Caribbean, "chattel" slavery in the sugar plantations was replaced by imperialist wage slavery. The indentured immigrants became wage labourers, not peasants in the full European sense. On the termination of their contracts, they were granted land in lieu of return passages to India. This had to be done in the situation of a grave labour shortage. But the planters saw to it that the land was inadequate and without water control so as to ensure the availability of a continued and cheap source of labour power.

The contact of the Caribbean with Europe and the United States made possible this speedy transformation from slavery to capitalism. But while Europe and North America proceeded to

the peoples sharing the same continent with it, it was a dawn of cruel exploitation and oppression.

It was in this atmosphere that John Quincy Adams enunciated the doctrine of "Manifest Destiny." At a cabinet meeting in 1819, the US Secretary of State observed that the absorption of all North America was "as much a law of nature . . . as that the Mississippi should flow to the sea". It was "a physical, moral and political absurdity" that European colonies "should exist permanently contiguous to a great, powerful, and rapidly-growing nation." ¹⁰

It was in recognition of this doctrine that the Florida peninsula passed into the possession of the United States.

Later, the Monroe Doctrine was conceived. On December 2, 1823, President Monroe of the United States in his message to Congress said:

. . . the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

This part of his message was aimed at preventing any further expansion of Russia on the Northwest Pacific coast. The second part of Monroe's message concerned Latin America and was actually aimed at the Holy Alliance and its plans with regard to the Western Hemisphere. The President's message continued:

We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

Any such attempt would be considered "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

Monroe attempted to create the impression that he and the USA were all for the sovereignty of Latin America. But many had reservations about his position. Bolivar saw early in the Monroe Doctrine the danger of exchanging the "Mother Country" for the "Big Brother". He was not to be influenced by Monroe's overtures. Therefore, the following year, in 1826, he summoned a Congress in Panama of Spanish-American nations and deliberately excluded the United States.

Actually, the Monroe Doctrine was enunciated at a time when it was being rumoured that Spain was about to dispose of Cuba, and perhaps Puerto Rico as well, to either England or France. Thus, US Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams wrote on April 28, 1823, to his Ambassador in Spain:

. . . There are laws of political, as well as of physical gravitation; and if an apple, severed by the tempest from its native tree, cannot choose but fall to the ground, Cuba, forcibly disjoined from its own unnatural connexion with Spain, and incapable of self-support, can gravitate only towards the North American Union, which by the same law of nature, cannot cast her off from its bosom.

Because the United States was a young and still relatively weak nation, Adams desired that "the apple should remain on the tree until the day of its ripening." At that time, having expanded from 1793 to 1824 with the annexation of Florida and Louisiana and the occupation of Indian territory, the United States fell back on a period of "introversion" (isolationism) from 1824 to 1844 "determined by the need to absorb the newly acquired territory and by a defensive attitude toward the European monarchs grouped in the Holy Alliance who wanted to re-establish or expand their colonial empires. . ." ¹²

Era of U.S. Expansion

The day to occupy Cuba was to come - by the close of the nineteenth century. By 1880 the US, although still a debtor nation, had built up enormous capital surpluses and began to export capital. By the turn of the century around 1898, the industrial base of its economy was solidified, its expansion within its own geographic boundaries completed, and its appetite for raw materials -- minerals and foods -- growing.

The time had come to put into practice the declaration of intent of US expansionism abroad enunciated in the "Manifest Destiny" and the "Monroe Doctrine."

By this time, USA had displaced Britain as the leading industrial nation. Steel output for the three leading imperialist nations were as follows:

STEEL PRODUCTION
(Millions of Tons)

	<u>1880</u>	<u>1900</u>	<u>1913</u>
U.K.	1.3	4.9	7.7
U.S.A.	1.2	10.2	31.3
GERMANY	0.7	6.4	18.9

It was now necessary after the period of "extroversion" (intervention) between 1871 and 1891, when California and Texas were seized from Mexico, to speak with a silken voice. Thus, in 1889, the idea of Pan-Americanism, the family of American states, was born, and the first Pan American Conference was summoned with the hope of creating a customs union which would remove customs duties to Americans and increase them to Europeans: a Zollverein. But the Argentinian delegate, Roque Saenz Pena was quick to point out:

"Considering the Zollverein in its political aspects, it would be difficult to ignore that it involves substantial loss of sovereignty." ¹³

Subsequently in the next period between 1891 and 1919, the impetus of the US economy demanded the acquisition of new territories in the Caribbean. This led to the US acting under McKinley's "Big Sister" policy pretending to help the Cubans to drive out the Spanish during their War of Independence in 1895.

But behind the pretence was cold calculation. Senator Albert J. Beveridge spelt this out when on April 27, 1898, he stated:

American factories are making more than the American people can use. American soil is producing more than they can consume. Fate has written our policy for us; the trade of the world must and shall be ours. And we shall get it as our mother, England, has told us how. We will establish trading posts throughout the world as distributing points for American products. We will cover the ocean with our merchant marine. We will build a navy to the measure of our greatness. Great colonies, governing themselves, flying our flag and trading with us, will grow about our posts of trade. Our institutions will follow our trade on the wings of our commerce. And American law, American civilization, and the American flag will plant themselves on shores hitherto bloody and benighted, by those agencies of God henceforth made beautiful and bright. ¹⁴

A year later, in 1899, Whitelaw Reid, who was to be later Peace Commissioner to the Paris Treaty ending the Spanish-American War, observed:

The statesmanship of the past has been to develop our vast internal resources by the protective policy. The statesmanship of the present and future is to extend our commercial relations and secure markets for our marvellous surplus productions. . . New York, not London, is to be the money centre of the world.

This imperialist clarion call, based on nationalist superiority and chauvinism, militarism and intervention, justified in the name of civilisation the war against Spain in 1898. Puerto Rico, the Philippines and Guam were invaded and taken over. Cuba also fell into its possession "for the protection of life, property and individual liberty".

Cuba's sovereignty was impaired by the Platt Amendment of February 1901, under which the USA was permitted military and naval bases, and Cuba could not without US consent enter into treaties, "nor seek loans beyond certain limits." ¹⁶

The Platt Agreement stipulated:

1. Cuba was not to enter into any agreement with a foreign power such as would impair her independence, or to grant permission to any such power to secure a foothold on the island.
2. The U.S.A. had the right to intervene to protect Cuba's independence and to maintain a Government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty.
3. Cuba agreed to sell or lease to the U.S.A. lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points. (Later the number of stations was limited to one).
4. The U.S.A. was authorised to supervise the financial affairs of the republic." ¹⁷

The Spanish-American war also permitted the seizure of the territory of Panama from Colombia, the establishment of a puppet government in Panama, and formal colonial rule over the Canal Zone. It also secured the urgently needed canal route by the Panama Canal Treaty of 1903. When on December 2, 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt stated that the "Congress has wisely provided that we shall build at once an Isthmian Canal, if possible, through Panama," it was the fulfillment of a prophecy of President Rutherford Hayes who in March 1881 had told the US Congress that the "Canal will be a great ocean route between our Atlantic and Pacific coasts and will, in effect, constitute a part of the shoreline of the United States."

And as Juan Jose Arevalo put it: "Since 1914 that shoreline has surrounded, in Yankee territory and waters, the five republics of Central America, plus Mexico, Cuba, Haiti and Santa Domingo. The fate of the ten nations was resolved according to the standards of businessmen and the resources of piracy." ¹⁸

For the Canal Zone \$10 million was paid to Panama, and later \$25 million to Colombia. But handsome profits were made. In 28 years, \$554 million was collected in Canal tolls, of which \$272 million was profit.

With the Roosevelt Corollary of 1904, "protection" gave way to "aggression". President Theodore Roosevelt, justifying US intervention in the domestic affairs of "unstable" countries on the ground that instability was a threat to "civilisation," stated that "the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, however reluctantly . . . to the exercise of international police power."

It did not take long for the US under the new "Big Stick" policy to undertake armed intervention in the Caribbean -- in the Dominican Republic in 1904 and in Cuba in 1906. And despite Woodrow Wilson's avowed policy of non-intervention under "New Freedom" policy, marines were sent later to Cuba and the Dominican Republic.

In 1917, US oil interests stage-managed a military coup overthrowing President Consalves of Costa Rica who had refused to legalise an oil concession to an American company

which was inimical to the national interests.

US expansionist role and methods in this era of the foothold of US imperialism in the Caribbean was summed up by Major General Smedley T. Butler, a former US Marine Commander, in Common Sense, November 1955, when he wrote:

I spent 33 years and 4 months in active service as a member of our country's most agile military force - the Marine Corps. I served in all commissioned ranks from a second lieutenant to a major general. And during that period I spent most of my time being a high-class muscle man for Big Business, for Wall Street, and for the bankers. In short, I was a racketeer for capitalism. Thus I helped to make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenues in . . . I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Bros. in 1909-12. I brought light to the Dominican Republic from American sugar interests in 1916. I helped make Honduras 'right' for American fruit companies in 1923. 19

In this period, the USA established a de facto protectorate over the Caribbean. The military, in the interest of big business, virtually ran the governments and economies of several countries, the so-called protectorates -- Cuba, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Honduras and Panama.

US imperialism thus successfully thwarted the political independence of several nations by instituting neo-colonialism for colonialism.

A classic example was Nicaragua, which also provided the possibility for the building of a canal. Lest it should pose a threat to the US monopoly in Panama, the US government engineered the removal of President Jose Santos Zelega, who consistently refused to sell out his country. His successor, the puppet Adolpho Diaz, who had been "re-elected" with the help of American arms, approved the Byron-Chamorro Treaty of 1914-16 and amended the Constitution to give the USA the right "to intervene in our internal affairs, in order to maintain peace and the existence of lawful government, thus giving the people a guarantee of honest administration." 20

A treasonable act was embellished as honesty. That Treaty provided for the forced surrender of sovereignty. Nicaragua ceded to the United States "in perpetuity and for all time, free from all taxation or other public charge, the exclusive proprietary rights necessary and convenient for the construction of a canal, by any route over Nicaraguan territory."

Even some spokesmen of US empire were shocked by the crude methods used. Elihu Root, Secretary of State, in a letter published in Century after the signing of the treaty in 1914 wrote:

"I am assailed by anxieties and fear when I consider the question whether the Nicaraguan government that celebrated the treaty is really the genuine representative of the Nicaraguan people, and whether that government can be regarded in Nicaragua and in Central America as a legitimate and free agent to authorize the Treaty. I have read the report of the head of our Marines in Nicaragua and I find in it these words:

"The present government is not in power by the will of the people. The elections were in their greater part fraudulent."

And further on I have read in the same report the statement that those who oppose that government make up three quarters of the country.

Can a treaty which is so serious for Nicaragua and in which perpetual rights are conceded in that territory, be celebrated with a President who, we have just cause to believe, does not represent more than one-fourth of those governed in the country, and who is kept in his position by our military

forces and to whom, as a consequence of the treaty, we would pay a considerable sum of money so that he could dispose of it as President? It would cause me disgust to see the United States place itself in such a situation. 21

And Senator Borah in a speech in January 1917, after the ratification of the treaty by the US Senate in 1916, said: "The Bryan-Chamorro Treaty is a downright violation of the most elementary principles of international decency. That treaty, was made with ourselves. The so-called government of Nicaragua has neither power nor authority to contract it." 22

World War I and its Aftermath

American supremacy was established particularly after World War I. By 1914, as has been observed above, Germany and the USA had overtaken Britain as industrial powers. But industrial strength did not correspond with imperial strength, foreign colonial ownership and control. In the ensuing struggle by German imperialism for Lebensraum (living space), US monopolists teamed up with the British Empire. But the war, having exhausted the old imperialist antagonists, helped to elevate the USA into a position of dominance in the export of capital, as the following table shows:

PRIVATE FOREIGN INVESTMENTS 23
(billions of dollars)

	<u>1900</u>	<u>1913</u>	<u>1930</u>	<u>1949</u>
United States	½	3	17	19
United Kingdom	12	17	19	12
France	6	12	7	2
Germany	<u>2½</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>
Total	<u>21</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>33</u>

The new era was noted in the words of President Woodrow Wilson in 1916:

These are days of incalculable change . . . we must play a great part in the world whether we choose it or not. Do you know the significance of this single fact that within the last year or two we have . . . ceased to be a debtor nation and have become a creditor nation . . .? We have got to finance (emphasis added) the world in some important degree. . .

The US was now a financially powerful nation -- so powerful that it was able to buy St. Thomas and St. Croix from Denmark in 1917.

Those were the days when the US dollar was badly needed for effective world trade. Pushed on by Presidents Taft and Wilson, the dollar became a diplomat. The period of "dollar diplomacy" defined by President Taft was a "policy . . . characterised as substituting dollars for bullets" was ushered in.

It was the logical successor in the era of the export of capital to the Monroe Doctrine for the exclusion of competitors and the staking out of hegemonistic claim, and the "open door" demand for "equal rights" in Asia and the Arab world in the era of the export of goods.

Financial investment in the form of loans and the establishment of branch plants replaced trade as the main vehicle for penetration and profit-making in Latin America and the Caribbean. US banking interests succeeded in wresting dominance in the bond and loan markets. And US investments increased from 17 per cent of all investments in Latin America in 1914 (second only to Britain) to 40 per cent in 1929.

U.S. direct investments, the bulk of which were put in mining, agriculture, railway and petroleum, increased from \$1.6 billion in 1914 to \$3.5 billion in 1929. In 1913, Cuba (second to Mexico) and the Caribbean accounted for 20% of direct investment capital in Latin America. ²⁴

And in this era of dollar diplomacy, foreign investment was given protection under the Evart doctrine, which stated that "the person and property of a citizen are part of the general domain of the nation, even when abroad." President Coolidge had pointed out that "there was a distinct and binding obligation in the part of self-respecting governments to afford protection to the persons and property of their citizens, wherever they may be." ²⁵

Serious opposition developed against the interventionist policies and practices of the "Colossus of the North" even to Woodrow Wilson's indirect method of withholding recognition of revolutionary governments. A meeting of the Inter-American Commission of Jurists in Rio de Janeiro in 1927 resolved that "no state can interfere in the internal affairs of another." However, that principle was not accepted by the Sixth International Conference of American States in Havana in 1928.

Because of growing opposition to intervention and revolutionary successes in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Panama and Peru in 1929-30, there were changes in US policies which led to an improvement in US-Latin American relations.

President Hoover made a "goodwill tour" of Latin America during which the term "good neighbour" was often used.

Soon after his inauguration, on the question of intervention, he declared:

I can say at once that it never has been and ought not to be the policy of the United States to intervene by force to secure or maintain contracts between our citizens and foreign States or their citizens.

Prior to that, in 1930, the Memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine, prepared by Secretary of State, J. Reuben Clark, repudiated the Roosevelt Corollary. It had pointed out:

The doctrine states a case of United States vs Europe, not of United States vs Latin America. Such arrangements as the United States has made, for example are not within the Doctrine as it was announced by Monroe.

Earlier, in 1923, Secretary of State Hughes had stated that the Monroe Doctrine did not justify US superintendence or overlordship in the Western Hemisphere.

And with the inauguration of President F.D. Roosevelt and his "New Deal" policy at home and "Good Neighbour" policy for Latin America, there came a formal renunciation of the right of intervention, and the "intermeddling or interference" in the Caribbean and Central and South America.

In his Inaugural Address on March 4, 1933 Roosevelt said:

In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbour - the neighbour who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so respects the rights of others.

Not long after, on December 28, 1933, at a Woodrow Wilson Foundation dinner, he declared that "the definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention." ²⁶

Cordell Hull, U.S. Secretary of State, also performed creditably as the head of the US delegation to the Montevideo Inter-American Conference of 1933 and at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, held in Buenos Aires in 1936, for hemispheric defence, when the issue of sovereignty was high on the agenda.

At Montevideo, the Convention on the Rights and Duties of States declared: "No state has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another". More firmly at Buenos Aires, a protocol was signed which proclaimed:

The High Contracting Parties declare inadmissible the intervention of any one of them, directly or indirectly, and for whatever reason, in the internal or external affairs of any other of the Parties. 27

Removed was the reservation inserted at Montevideo that the United States reserved the rights under "the law of nations as generally understood."

Under Hull's sponsorship, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act providing for the lowering of trade barriers was passed by Congress in 1934.

In Puerto Rico, under the progressive governorship of the New Dealer, Rex Tugwell, certain reforms in consonance with New Deal practices inside the United States were carried out. The Foraker Act of 1900, which had limited land holdings to no more than 500 acres but had been ignored, was reinstated. And to initiate the process of industrialisation, US \$160 million, the proceeds of excise duty on Puerto Rican rum sold in the United States, was made available from 1941 to 1946.

Also with the establishment of Puerto Rico Industrial Development Company in 1942, within five years, the following public enterprises were set up: the Puerto Rico Glass Corporation, Puerto Rico Paper and Pulp Corporation, Puerto Rico Shoe and Leather Corporation, Puerto Rico Clay Products Corporation, a textile mill and a hotel.

Public enterprises in the manufacturing sector, it was felt, would accelerate industrial development.

But the legacy of the past still acted as a dead weight on the progressive Roosevelt administration. Sumner Welles, in contrast to Cordell Hull's observance of the spirit of the Good Neighbour policy, wielded the "big stick." As Ambassador in Cuba at the time of the Batista coup in 1933, he urged the show of force by US warships and the weapon of non-recognition to bring about the downfall of the newly-elected president. After his replacement by Mandieta in 1934, Welles advocated the recognition of the Mandieta regime. The abrogation of the Platt Amendment and a preferential treaty for the purchase of Cuban sugar followed. According to Robin Blackburn, "the abrogation of the Platt Amendment in 1934 was almost as interventionist an act as its institution, since it was intended to strengthen Batista's newly-installed regime. . . . The special mission of Sumner Welles, a trouble-shooter for President Roosevelt, had a more avowedly political purpose: first removing the unpopular dictator, Machado, and then winding down the popular insurrection of 1933-34, which ensued without any loss of US power or possessions." ²⁸

President F.D. Roosevelt's administration had all the strengths and weaknesses of a

progressive bourgeois-democratic regime. Even though he was opposed by the monopolists for his New Deal proposals, in his own way he served their interests. He held the view that "in order to develop sources of raw materials needed in the United States," it was necessary to increase investments in Latin America and the Caribbean.

But there was little capital available for export because of the decline by 42 per cent in industrial production in 1930 and the demand for money inside the USA during the Depression. The establishment of the Export-Import Bank, in 1934, followed by the "World Bank" in 1944, filled the gap and investments maintained through these public institutions.

The Export-Import Bank favoured US capital. But with the stipulation that the money borrowed must be used for the purchase of US equipment and materials, a form of aid deemed packaged unemployment, the loan money never left the United States.

In the 1930's and 1940's under state-monopoly capitalism, this form of aid helped to displace European firms and to strengthen US economic hegemony, a process accelerated in the 1940's by the confiscation and appropriation of German investments. By the end of 1949, US private investments worldwide were more than the combined amount of all the other imperialist powers.

Fascism and U.S. Military Hegemony

The post-depression period in the 1930's witnessed the intensification of inter-imperialist rivalry in the Caribbean and Latin America. The rise of Hitler, Mussolini and Franco in Europe led to the development of fascist movements -- the Integrielistas in Brazil, the Sinarquistas in Mexico, the National Socialist Party in Chile -- and sympathy of many Latin American military leaders for the Axis powers. And with World War II, the impetus was provided for the growth of militarism in the Caribbean and Latin America.

Adolph Hitler in a conversation on November 19, 1937 with Lord Halifax complained that England, France, Belgium, Spain and Portugal had colonies, "only Germany was told that under no circumstances must she have colonies";²⁹ further that "Germany's colonial demands were not prompted by imperial or military ambitions . . . she wanted colonies solely for economic reasons, as a source of supply of agricultural produce and raw materials."³⁰

Hitler then threatened: "As to the colonial question, it was not for Germany to express any wishes. They were two possibilities. First, the free play of forces. What colonies Germany would take in this case could not be foretold. The second possibility was a reasonable settlement."

Conscious of the fact that the Latin American armies were trained almost exclusively by European military missions (Germany in Argentina, Chile and Bolivia and France in Peru, Ecuador, Brazil and Guatemala), and also of the intensive activities of the Germans in the economic and ideological fields, President Roosevelt in a telegram to Hitler on April 15, 1939, offered a junior partnership. But the offer was rejected by Hitler.³¹

With the rise of Hitler in Europe and alliance with fascism threatening to break the US stronghold in Latin America, the US government moved to integrate the military, and thus the economy, of North, Central and South America.

Military solidarity through a defense pact was embodied in the Declaration of Lima of 1938. A year later, the first meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, approved a General Declaration of Neutrality of the American Republics and agreed to the creation of a hemispheric security zone which permitted the military patrolling of waters around the Americas three hundred miles to sea.

In the name of continental unity and security, sovereignty was jettisoned and the idea of a super state led by the USA was formulated. As a leading spokesman of Pan Americanism,

Leo S. Rowe, on the eve of Pearl Harbour, put it: "Now a traditional base of Inter-American co-operation will not be enough. Even the strict idea of national sovereignty will have to undergo modifications. . ."³²

With the second meeting of Foreign Ministers in Cuba in 1940 came the acceptance of Cordell Hull's "no transfer" principle and the adoption of resolutions for mutual defense. Fearing that the Caribbean territories of France and Holland might fall into the hands of the fascist belligerents, the meeting agreed that in the event of such a danger an "emergency committee" of one member from each republic should set up a provisional administration of the territory.

Agreements were also made with Greenland and Iceland for transit rights and military bases, and with Britain in 1940 for military bases in the Caribbean under 99-year leases in Newfoundland, British Guiana, Bermuda, Bahamas, Jamaica, Antigua, St. Lucia and Trinidad in exchange for 50 over-age destroyers.

With the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour in 1941, the opportunity was presented to the United States to displace the Germans and to obtain complete hegemony in the military sphere. Prior to that, its attempts to secure military bases, despite warnings of the Nazi menace, were largely unsuccessful. Many Latin Americans argued that US bases on their soil would endanger the sovereignty of their countries and expose them to attacks. And there was skepticism also about US military aid. When in 1937, Sumner Welles, Under-Secretary of State, proposed the possibility of loans of warship to some countries, Eduardo Santos, the Liberal Party leader of Colombia replied:

Don't do this evil to us. The use of armaments is like the vice of morphine. Once begun, the cure is almost impossible. You will ruin us with cruisers and create for us new problems. . . because there is always someone with the desire to try out the armaments and obtain from them some advantage.³³

The war on American soil in the Western Hemisphere and the Lend Lease Act, under which US arms could be provided, completely transformed the situation. The Caribbean and Central American countries and Brazil declared war. And in 1942, bases were obtained in bilateral agreements by the United States with Brazil, Mexico, Cuba, Panama and Ecuador.

The full co-operation sought by the United States, which had not been obtained at the Conferences at Lima in December 1938 and at Panama in 1940, became a reality at Rio de Janeiro in January 1942. All the republics agreed to speed up the production of raw materials for the US war machine and "to consider any act of aggression on the part of a non-American state against any one of them as an act of aggression against all of them."

The institutions created soon after the Rio Conference to achieve the stated objectives were the Inter-American Commission for Political Defence, and the Inter-American Defence Board.

Under the Lend Lease Act, Latin America was earmarked to receive US\$400 million worth of war goods. The arms buildup, military bases and transit rights, though intended to achieve hemispheric invulnerability and a united front against fascism, initiated in fact, the process of removing European military presence from the Caribbean and Latin America and consolidating US military hegemony.

The Truman Doctrine and the Cold War

The end of World War II marked the beginning of US supremacy in the era of imperialism. Whatever goodwill was created by the "Good Neighbour" policy of Roosevelt was soon dissipated and gradually destroyed. The close relationship and cooperation which had been developed in the fight against fascism was changed after the death of Roosevelt in 1944 into an anti-communist crusade and cold war. The USA embarked on a course, contrary to its traditions, to prevent by whatever means at its disposal national and social revolutions and became the international policeman in defence of the old order and the maintenance of the status quo.

Wartime cooperation was abruptly brought to a halt. During World War II, the Soviet Union, USA, Britain and France together fought successfully against Germany, Italy and Japan. In the fight for freedom and democracy, the equation was liberal capitalism and communism against fascism (decadent capitalism).

In the subsequent cold war period, the equation changed. Fascism was no longer the enemy for the West; it became an ally. Communism became the common enemy; it was regarded as a "disease" which had to be "contained".

This ideological conception, or rather misconception, by the US was the main motivating force governing its foreign policy and therefore the way it reacted to events all over the world. At home, the enemy was communism; overseas, it was the Soviet Union. The policy of "containment" - containment of communism, of socialism, of revolution, of any radical movement or challenge to "the free enterprise system" and Western ideas of democracy - was first promulgated by Winston Churchill in his speech at Fulton, Missouri early in 1946, and a year later by the "Truman Doctrine" enunciated by President Harry Truman.

Churchill set the tone for Truman when he made a call for a western alliance against socialism and revolution, and this in turn had its origins in the success of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. Then, he called for a strangling of the "infant in its cradle." Later, although the Teheran Conference on November 1943 had reached agreement for a future post-war world to be built against fascism in the foundation of Anglo-Soviet-American cooperation, he was pre-occupied with a "black depression" that with the defeat of Hitler, the main task was the defeat of "the bloody Russians." This was in line with the 1942 Memorandum which began the planning of the cold war. It led to the delay during World War II of the opening of the second front in France until June 1944, no doubt based on a hope that the **Germans** and Russians would exhaust and destroy themselves. ³⁴

At Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri on March 5, 1946, Churchill referred to the "police governments" in Eastern Europe, warned of "Communist Fifth Columns" everywhere which were "a growing challenge and peril to civilisation," and called for joint action in bringing about through the preponderance of military power for "a good understanding", namely a showdown with ~~the~~ USSR, the leaders of which, he had always previously regarded "as murderers and ministers of hell."

Harry Truman and Ernest Bevin put into practice the plans of Churchill, the architect of the cold war. ³⁵ Truman followed up Churchill's lead when he sought to present the already developing conflict between the Soviet Union and the USA as a struggle between "two ways of life" with the Soviet Union cast in the role of the enemy.

At Baylor University on March 6, 1947, Truman made a speech on foreign economic policy which clearly stated that governments which conducted planned economies and controlled foreign trade were dangers to freedom, that freedom of speech and worship were dependent on the free enterprise system. He pointed out that controlled economies were "not the American

and "not the way of peace." He urged that "the whole world should adopt the American system" and that "the American system could survive in America only if it became a World system". Calling for action, he implored: "Unless we act and act decisively, it (government-controlled economy and government-controlled foreign trade) will be the pattern of the next century . . . if this trend is not reversed, the Government of the United States will be under pressure, sooner or later, to use these same devices to fight for markets and for raw materials."

The Truman Doctrine was promulgated to deal with a social revolution in Greece. Even before the end of the war the British in Greece were setting out to crush the force most representative of the Greek people and the organisation which had fought with the Allies against the German occupation of their country, and EAM (National Liberation Front). The USA took over from the British and it was in order to rationalise their indefensible support for the return of the monarchy and unpopular Rightist government in Greece that the Truman Doctrine was outlined. ³⁵

Requesting from Congress on March 12, 1947, aid for Greece and Turkey, President Truman attacked the Communists, "a militant minority", for creating political chaos and urged that if the United States were to realise its objectives, it must be "willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes." He proposed that "it must be the policy of the US to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

Earlier in a rabble-rousing speech on October 27, 1945, he had said that US foreign policy was based on "righteousness and justice", that there would be no "compromise with evil." And issuing a warning to the Russians as regards its position in Europe, he roared: "We shall refuse to recognise any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power."

This was the language of the big-stick with the zeal of the Crusades, a "get tough" policy towards the Soviet Union, socialism and national liberation. The attitude behind it captures and epitomises one side of a curious ambivalence observable in US foreign policies almost from the birth of the Republic.

As a nation which had thrown off the British yoke with its Declaration of Independence in 1776, the US was disposed to be sympathetic with and even to actively encourage national liberation movements and national self-determination. These lofty sentiments, however, could not stand up to the pervasive need for fulfillment of the basic ideology of capitalist expansion - the belief that the function of economic enterprise is the pursuit of profit.

Writing on the question of US intervention in Russia after the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917, William Appleman Williams states that ". . . American decision-makers viewed economics as of extremely great, if not literally primary, importance in the dynamic operation of the American system . . . And all of them viewed overseas economic expansion as essential to the continued successful operation of the American free-enterprise system." ³⁶ Earlier, he quoted Woodrow Wilson - "If America is not to have free enterprise, then we can have freedom of no sort whatever." Wilson saw the US inexorably involved in a struggle to "command the economic fortunes of the world". The prize was control of the overseas market to soak up the surpluses - "the market to which diplomacy, and if need be power, must have an open way." Americans, according to Wilson, were "the custodians of the spirit of righteousness, of the spirit of equal-handed justice." He was candidly prejudiced in favour of "those who act in the interest of peace and honour, who protect private rights, and respect the

restraints of constitutional provisions." According to Williams, the competing demands of Christian ethics and national expansion created tremendous moral tension, and Wilson's commitment to the principle of self-determination served only to intensify the dilemma.

Like most liberals, Wilson resolved the dilemma by making a sharp distinction between those who were fit to govern and those who had merely a claim to vote. He noted that "when properly directed, there is no people not fitted for self-government". Intervention in the USSR and elsewhere was justified on the ground of unfitness. It was the duty of the United States to discipline, educate and guide. According to Williams, Wilson thus set about to "teach the South American republics to elect good men" and to establish a government in Mexico "under which all contracts and business and concessions will be safer than they have been". And if governments persisted in being non-conformist and revolutionary then the weapon of non-recognition was utilised.

It was this reversion to type that Truman was regurgitating under the euphemism of "containment" which soon led under "liberation" to intervention by successive administrations in Korea, Guatemala, Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Vietnam.

General Dwight Eisenhower spelt out the mood of US cold warriors during the 1952 election campaign. An exponent of "peace through strength", he called for war. "The government with cold finality," he declared, "must tell the Kremlin that we shall never recognise the slightest permanence of Russia's position in Eastern Europe and Asia." He read out a long list of countries which he said were "suffocating from the Russian pall" and added: "The conscience of America can never know ease until these people are restored to the society of free men."

Commented the Eastern European Observer of August 30, 1952:

Even the British Press showed its anxiety at this outburst and tried to dismiss it as electioneering. But Eisenhower was saying in public what the architects of the Atlantic Pact have been saying in private for years. This is the US counterpart of Churchill's demand for the 'liberation of the ancient capitals of Europe'.

Militarisation of the economy and the arms drive began in earnest. A new draft law was enacted in 1948 and the strength of the armed forces grew from 1,350,000 in 1948 to 3,630,000 in June 1952.

Communism and the Western Hemisphere

The Great October Socialist Revolution was hailed by progressives the world over. But the ruling circles of world capitalism, alarmed at the historic event, launched a counter-revolutionary attack. After the failure of the military intervention, other forms of aggression -- non-recognition, economic and trade blockade -- were used in an attempt to strangle the young socialist state. In time, these also failed. From being the seventh power in the world and the sixth in Europe, the Soviet Union is today, the second power in the world and the first in Europe.

In the meantime, the ideology of the Revolution, Marxism-Leninism, gained ground throughout the world. A few years after 1917, communist parties were established in many countries in the Western Hemisphere. The communists succeeded in getting 600,000 votes in Brazil in the 1945 elections and were a decisive factor in the 1946 elections in Chile. In Uruguay, they held a strong position in the trade union movement. In Cuba and Guatemala also, they exerted strong influence on the trade union and political fronts. Particularly after

the depression in the 1930's their strength was far greater than their actual party enrollment indicated. ³⁸

Socialist ideas were current in the British Caribbean territories in the early 1920's especially as a result of the influence of the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA), whose leader Marcus Garvey "worked in close alliance with the Communists and Socialists, and indeed his debut on the public platform was under the auspices of Hubert Harrison's anti-war Afro-American Liberty League, a left wing organisation.

"When the New York Division of the UNIA was launched in 1917, Harrison became a member. Garvey also worked closely with Philip Randolph who at that time enjoyed a reputation as a militant socialist agitator. Cyril Briggs, the Communist, brought his African Blood Brotherhood into the organisation where it operated as a sort of cadre group. W.A. Domingo, a ³⁹ Marxist and a member of the American Socialist Party was editor of the UNIA's Negro World."

On returning from a visit to the Soviet Union in 1932, Hubert Nathaniel Critchlow spoke highly of the developments in the interest of workers that have taken place in the USSR as a result of its socialist revolution. The reactionaries in Guyana branded him a communist and one local newspaper, the Daily Chronicle, said:

We are very interested in the account Mr. Critchlow brought back to the West Indies of his activities in the Soviet Union. We believe all he said of his experiences and wish to assure him that if and when it suits him we will accommodate him in a cell. ⁴⁰

A message from the Indian Congress to the first British Guiana and West Indies Labour Conference held in Guyana in 1926, requested the Indians "to organise with workers of other nationalities to build a Socialist State."

In Barbados, there was a clash in the early 1930's "between Grantley Adams' type of 'Asquithian liberalism' and the 'Rights-of-Man Socialism' of the Democratic League of Duncan O'Neale, Chennel Wickham and others." ⁴¹

Clement Payne, under whose leadership mass demonstrations took place in 1937, was regarded as a "wide-eyed misguided importer of foreign ideas," and the radical Hubert Seale was depicted as an anarchist.

Nationalist and Socialist tendencies also developed among the young military officers. In Brazil in 1924, Captain-Engineer Luis Carlos Prestes led a column of insurgents which fought for two and a half years and covered nearly 30,000 kilometres. After the internment of his column in Bolivia in 1927, he headed the National Liberation Alliance and in 1935 guided an uprising which was brutally suppressed. While he was in prison in 1943, he was elected in his absence General Secretary of the Communist Party of Brazil.

In 1926, Cesar Augusto Sandino, known as the General of the People, led a revolt against the US invaders in Nicaragua and was the first to form an army of a new type, a partisan army with anti-imperialist ideals.

In 1932, Colonel Marmaduke Grove led a successful uprising in Chile and declared it a Socialist Republic. However, the junta Grove headed soon after was overthrown by the reactionary part of the armed forces.

Colonel Juan Domingo Peron, an adjutant to General Uriburu who was influenced by pro-fascist propaganda and had seized power in 1930, headed the group of United Officers which seized power in 1943. In 1946, he was elected President in the face of strong US opposition. His Justialista Party developed close links with the workers and instituted a constitutional system. The government recognised the right of workers to strike and to engage in trade union activities, and like Mexico in 1924, opened diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Because of these activities, Peron was deemed a radical reformer by the

ultra-right military circles.

In Guatemala, a leftist group of young army officers led by Colonel Jacobo Arbenz, overthrew the rightist military regime of General Frederico Ponce on October 20, 1944 and placed in power the left-of-centre intellectual, Dr. Juan Jose Arevalo.

Like Arevalo, other leftist leaders, particularly in Venezuela, Peru and Costa Rica, came to the forefront helped by the objective situation caused by the Depression, the reform-oriented New Deal Roosevelt administration, and the great contribution made by the Soviet Union in the defeat of the fascist Axis powers.

These positive developments in the hemisphere and the changed balance of world forces caused by the fact that socialism had emerged from a single country into a world socialist system, alarmed the capitalist ruling circles.

On the fiction that the Soviet Union was preparing to launch a war and that Latin America was threatened by "communist ^{subversion} aggression from within and without", President Truman, in the ensuing hysteria, called in May 1946 for the military unification of the continent.

Doing the bidding of the Americans, General Gois Monteiro, Brazilian Minister of War declared in August 1946:

The outbreak of the Third World War is a serious possibility that threatens the peace and security of the hemisphere.

At the February 1945 Conference of the American States in Mexico City, the Act of Chapultepec was adopted which declared that an attack on any American state would be considered as an attack against all and that collective measures would be taken to repel the aggression.

The Conference also decided that the Inter-American Defense Board, established in 1942, should be made a permanent organization. Soon after it recommended a permanent unified military command of the Twenty-one republics, including the standardisation of equipment, training and organisation. This resulted on September 2, 1947, in a military pact, the "International Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance" known as the Rio Pact which would provide for "collective self-defence" and would "tend to serve as a guarantee to peace in the Americas."

In March-May, 1948, the Ninth International Conference of American States at Bogota drew up the Charter of the Organisation of American States (OAS), highlighting the necessity for increasing hemispheric solidarity in political, economic and military matters.

Military aid was stepped up for the oligarchy in the Caribbean and Latin America on the argument that every country should co-operate in meeting the so-called communist threat. It was argued that it was the responsibility of all the states to protect the strategic areas of the hemisphere and the Inter-American lines of communication as these were vital for the security of every American Republic.

Actually, Latin America and the Caribbean faced no such threat. At the time of the Rio Pact (1947) and the National Security Act of 1957, it was certainly one of the most isolated and protected areas, far removed from the centres of international cold-war conflict. And as regards border conflicts and wars between the American states, the OAS was specifically created to cope with that problem. And if the threat was merely internal, the strengthening of the police and not a big military build-up would have been adequate.

Bilateral military treaties were signed with several Latin American and Caribbean States reducing them virtually to client-states of the USA. Such was their vassal status that US laws -- the Law of Reciprocal Aid of 1949 and the Law of Mutual Security of 1951 -- were also applicable to them.

Under this "mutual security" plan the USA, through military missions, military training and military assistance, supplanted the United Kingdom, Germany and France and controlled

Latin America politically and economically.

Under the first Mutual Defense Association (MDA) Agreement between Ecuador and the USA in January 1952, Ecuador agreed "to facilitate the production and transfer. . . of . . . strategic materials required by the United States" and to cooperate in the blocking of trade with the socialist world, and the United States government agreed "to make available . . . equipment, material, services and other military assistance designed to promote the defense and maintain the peace of the Western Hemisphere."⁴²

Eleven other countries signed similar MDA agreements -- Cuba, Colombia, Peru and Chile in 1952; Brazil, Dominican Republic and Uruguay in 1953; Nicaragua and Honduras in 1954; Haiti and Guatemala in 1955.

Military aid for Haiti was requested in 1954 by Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs because "she feels left out since the Dominican Republic is included . . . Haiti has a fairly large army (4,000) and is strategically located in the Windward Passage where many ships were sunk during World War **II**".⁴³

There was also reimbursable military aid for all the twenty Latin American republics.

Between 1946 and 1970, US\$1.3 billion^{went} into Latin America to shore up the armed forces of 20 Latin American countries; as at July 1, 1971, there were 448 representatives of US military assistance Advisory Groups; between 1950 and 1970, 54,290 military students were trained and indoctrinated in the USA and in US overseas bases.

Between 1956 and 1970, AID "public safety" programmes in support of Latin American puppet regimes threatened by popular insurrection spent US\$38,967,000 for specialised police training.

Guyana under the Burnham government has received motor cycles, jeeps, communication equipment and a naval craft. And police officers have been trained in the United States.

In return for military aid, the United States obtained military bases. Apart from those previously established at Guantanamo in Cuba and the Canal Zone in Panama, missile-tracking stations were set up in the Dominican Republic and Fernando de Noronha Island.

In 1958, the United States established its Military Forces Southern Command in the Panama Canal Zone to monitor the situation in Latin America. Also located in this zone is the Special Action Force in Latin America designed for emergency **situations**.

The military build-up was justified on the ground of hemispheric security. But in fact, it was based on military and strategic considerations -- the suppression of national liberation movements and the maintenance of the traditional status quo.

This was pointed out by Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, Roy B. Rubottom in his evidence before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Defending the MDA Program, he stated:

On the political side, our objective is to do all we can to help develop the friendliest possible relationships between ourselves and our neighbours in Latin America, and to encourage and bring about support of United States policies both in this hemisphere and elsewhere in the world.⁴⁴

Several years later, Robert McNamara, the then U.S. Defense Secretary, justifying the use of military assistance to corrupt, pro-American regimes told the Congress in 1967:

Probably the greatest return on our military assistance comes from the training of selected officers and key specialists at our military schools in the United States and overseas. These students are hand-picked by their countries to become instructors when they return home. They are the coming leaders, the men who will have the know-how and impart it to their forces. I need not dwell upon the value of having in positions of leadership men who have first-hand knowledge of how Americans do things and how they think. It is beyond price to us to make friends of such men.⁴⁵

The United States needed the support of the military-cum-latifundist oligarchy especially in the United Nations,⁴⁶ rights to bases and access to raw materials.

Apart from the surrender of sovereignty, the poor Latin American countries were also forced to spend about US\$2,000 million annually for their armed forces because of the "communist aggression" myth. This was not only at the expense of the people's welfare; it also favoured in the political sphere not the democratic and progressive politicians but the reactionary military.

From 1953 to 1958, military men who had taken the anti-Communist pledge and had been given arms and equipment ousted the legal governments and seized power in fourteen Latin American republics. And the liberation movements and the working class bore the brunt of the repression. "In 1957 the Ibanez government used MDAP tanks in the streets of Santiago to break a strike. In that same year Rojas Pinilla in Colombia and Batista in Cuba were using MDAP equipment to quell internal opposition that could hardly be defined as a Communist threat from within."⁴⁷

General Manuel Odria carried out a successful coup in Peru in October 1948, to be followed a month later by Perez Jimenez in Venezuela. Getulio Vargas was overthrown soon after substantial aid was given to the military in Brazil. In a parting suicide note Vargas told the Brazilian people:

I follow the destiny that is imposed on me. After years of domination and looting by international economic and financial groups, I made myself chief of an unconquerable revolution. I began the work of liberation and I instituted a regime of social liberty. . . .

A subterranean campaign of international economic groups joined with national groups revolting against the regime of workers' guarantees. The law of excess profits was stopped in Congress. Hatreds were unchained against the justice of a revision of minimum salaries. . . .

I assumed the government during the inflationary spiral that was destroying the value of work. Profits of foreign enterprises reached 500% yearly. . . I saw the coffee crisis increase the value of our principal product. We attempted to defend its price and the reply was a violent pressure upon our economy to a point of being obliged to surrender. . . .

I cannot give you more than my blood. If the birds of prey wish the blood of anybody, they wish to continue sucking that of the Brazilian people.

I offer my life in the holocaust. I choose this means to be with you always. When they humiliate you, you will feel my soul suffering at your side. . . My sacrifice will maintain you united, and my name will be your battle flag. . . .

I fought against the looting of Brazil. I fought against the looting of the people. . . . I gave you my life. Now I offer my death.

What was taking place in the Caribbean and Latin America was part of a world-wide plan. Following the Rio Treaty, other treaties were signed -- Atlantic Treaty (NATO) on April 4, 1949; South-East Asia Collective Defense Treaty (SEATO) on September 8, 1954; Baghdad Pact (now called Central Treaty Organisation after the Iraq revolution of 1958 led to Iraq's withdrawal) on February 24, 1955 -- under which an "iron ring" of military bases in US-client states was established to "contain" the Soviet Union and the World socialist system. By January 1, 1972, 781,000 US troops were deployed overseas -- 21,000 in Latin America; 216,000 in Southeast Asia; 207,000 in the Far East and Pacific; 287,000 in Europe and 50,000 in other areas.

Total military assistance between 1946-1970 under various US military assistance programmes was US\$51,200.3 million, of which \$17,729.3 million went to Canada and Europe. And 319,000 foreign students were given military training in the USA and its overseas bases between 1950 and 1970.

From aid to the fascists in Greece and Turkey, it was a "short" step to aid for Chiang Kai-Chek in China, the French in Indochina, the British in Malaya and the Dutch in Indonesia; intervention in Korea in 1950; the overthrow of the Romulo Callegos government in Venezuela (1948), Mossadegh government in Iran (1953), the PPP government in Guyana (1953), the Arbenz government in Guatemala (1954), the attempted overthrow of the Nasser government of Egypt (1956); the forced resignation of the Quadros government in Brazil (1960); the Bay

of Pigs invasion of Cuba (1961); the overthrow of the Patrice Lumumba government in Congo in 1961; the removal of the Goulart government of Brazil and the PPP government of Guyana (1964); the massive intervention in the Dominican Republic (1965) and in Vietnam (1965-1973); the overthrow of the Nkrumah government of Ghana (1966); the Sukarno government of Indonesia (1970); the Allende government of Chile (1973) and the Makarios government of Cyprus in 1974.

THE INDEPENDENCE STRUGGLE

Colonialism, one of the manifestations of capitalism, came to an end by the latter part of the first half of the nineteenth century in the Hispanic Caribbean and South American territories except in Cuba and Puerto Rico. By 1830, the independent states projected themselves into the international arena.

Cuba became independent in 1902 but until 1959, like the other independent countries, experienced the status of neo-colonialism, "the last stage of imperialism."

The dominant, colonial powers in the Caribbean are the British, French, Dutch and Americans.

The non-~~Spanish~~^{speaking}/Caribbean territories remained non-self-governing until the early 1960's when independence came to Jamaica (1961), Trinidad (1962), Guyana (1966), Barbados (1966), Bahamas (1973) and Grenada (1974). The other 12 British territories, Puerto Rico (only Spanish-speaking territory) the U.S. Virgin Islands and the French and Dutch territories still have a dependent status.

The independence movements of the Caribbean territories were generally related to the world-wide struggle for colonial freedom.

At the end of World War II there were 103 territories with a population of about 700 million which were colonial or non-self-governing. Of these, 10 with about 5% of the total population were Trust territories.

The colonialists couched their roles of economic plunder and racial subjugation with pious philosophical pronouncements. For the British it was "the white man's burden," for the French "la mission civilisatrice" and for the Americans "manifest destiny". Even in the face of these self-serving slogans they continued to commit the worst crimes in the history of civilisation. Among the common examples are the killing of millions of Africans in the "middle passage," indiscriminate slaughter of colonials as at Amritsar in India, the British War Office practice of selling blankets infected with smallpox to American Indians, the head-hunting of communists in Malaya and the use of mobile gallows in Kenya.

In spite of these acts the colonialists were unable to stem the tide of national liberation which developed particularly after World War II. This was because the international situation was altered in favour of the oppressed who gained moral courage and support from the world socialist system which was on the upsurge while imperialism was entering the stage of ever-deepening crises.

U.S.A. and Colonialism

The US attitude to colonialism is ambivalent as was clearly demonstrated during and after World War II. As a country which was founded on a war of independence in 1776, it had a basic sympathy with the colonial underdog; it was disposed to encourage and support the right to national self-determination.

But in the era of imperialism, when the export of finance-capital had supplanted the export of goods of the old colonialism, the USA had achieved the status as the main

exporter of capital and had developed a voracious appetite for raw materials, its position became ambiguous.

It worked with the other imperialist states for the preservation of the colonial status quo, but at the same time it undermined in the colonies the position of the metropolitan states which had built up a closed system of protectionism and trading preferences.

When independence came, it wanted to be in a commanding position; it had learnt that neo-colonialism was less irksome and equally profitable.

The anti-colonial tradition was clearly enunciated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt during World War II, when on February 22, 1942, repudiating Churchill's stand, he declared that the Atlantic Charter which accepted the principle of respect for "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live," applied "not only to the parts of the world that border the Atlantic, but on the whole world."

Churchill who wanted the exclusion of the British Empire had earlier on September 9, 1941, stated: "At the Atlantic meeting, we had in mind primarily the restoration of the sovereignty, self-government and national life of the states and nations of Europe now under the Nazi yoke." ⁴⁸

He observed that point three of the Charter referring to self-determination "was not meant to apply to India, or Burma or to affect in any way the constitutional arrangements within the British Empire."

John Foster Dulles, addressing the United Nations General Assembly in 1947, declared that "the colonial system is obsolete and should be done away with as soon as possible."

At the International Conference of American States in Bogota, Columbia in 1948, an important resolution was passed no doubt under US influence for "putting an end to colonialism and the occupation of American territories by extra-continental countries." An American Commission of Dependent Territories was also set up "to find an adequate solution" to the problem of colonialism in the Western Hemisphere.

But while the USA was proclaiming the right of political independence, it maintained Puerto Rico as a colony and supported the colonial wars of the British in Malaya, the French in Indochina and the Dutch in Indonesia.

Even the nominal independence offered to the Philippines ⁴⁹ was refused Puerto Rico. From 1898, when the U.S.A. captured it from Spain, to 1952, it was an "unincorporated territory". Its Commonwealth status then achieved, was nothing less than a colonial status as was later pronounced in August 1972 by the United Nations Special Committee on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Territories and Peoples, the so-called decolonisation "Committee of Twenty-Four."

In 1939, a bill passed by the Puerto Rico House of Representatives "to create an Industrial Development Company was vetoed by the Governor." ⁵⁰

And in keeping with the tenets of the Truman Doctrine, the process of industrialisation through public enterprise was halted and the factories established earlier were sold to the private sector. Land reform initiated in 1941 under the Foraker "500-acre" Act, was terminated by the end of that decade. Only seven of the 33 corporations owning more than 500 acres had been made into public enterprises; five others had sold part or all of their lands to the colons, the peasant cane farmers.

Puerto Rico also provided a string of military bases and installations - the Roosevelt Roads Naval base, the Ramey Air Force base, installations at Vieques and Culebra. These in

turn provided a link in the chain of bases including Florida, Guantanamo Bay (Cuba); St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands and others for the control of the Caribbean-Gulf of Mexico area, surveillance of all shipping and "protection" of the Panama Canal.

The French Caribbean

Self-determination and independence of French territories in the Caribbean, Martinique and Guadeloupe and French Guiana had been virtually determined and settled at the First Imperial Conference of Free France, held in Brazzaville in January 1944 and presided over by Charles DeGaulle.

Summing up the Conference, Herbert Leuthy in France Against Herself, wrote:

The final resolution of the Brazzaville conference. . . announced imperatively 'that the aims of the work of colonization which France is pursuing in her colonies exclude any idea of autonomy and any possibility of development outside the French empire bloc; the attainment of self-government in the colonies even in the most distant future must be excluded'.⁵¹

Thus, in June 1946, was enacted a French law that "all subjects of overseas territories, including Algeria, possess the quality of citizens with the same rights as French citizens in the home country and the overseas territories."

In the war period when the Vichy traitors collaborated with Hitler, DeGaulle, as the "safe and sane" savior of France, was the only possible choice open to Churchill. This was not fully endorsed by Roosevelt, the U.S. President whose fears were expressed by The New York Times (July 7, 1943) report from Washington that "the General is regarded by some who have known him as animated by dictatorial tendencies."

At about the same time, the Washington Post published the summary of a British official enquiry where it was pointed out that DeGaulle "clearly has fascist and dictatorial tendencies."

These tendencies were shown in a 1939 Memorandum, according to Henri de Kerillis in I Accuse De Gaulle, in which DeGaulle had suggested that a French motorized expeditionary force should be sent into Finland to join Mannerheim so that they might "quickly put to rout the disorganised Russian hordes and march on Leningrad."

DeGaulle, brought to power after the war, laid down the policy of the "Right" at home and overseas. This was demonstrated by his refusal to permit the Communists to head the government after they had won the largest number of votes at the October 1945 elections.

But he resigned in January 1946 because, according to Alexander Werth (France 1940-1955, Holt, New York), "he realized that the Left continued to hold the initiative."

With the departure of DeGaulle, French politics moved more to the Right, and with the Marshall Plan coming more and more under US influence. According to the New York Journal of Commerce (November 30, 1949) there was set up a committee of leading American and French bankers "to stimulate and facilitate development of overseas territories of the French Union."

France became the headquarters of the North-Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), the "Left" were removed from the United front government, and the Communist Party, with the largest bloc of voters amounting to nearly 5½ million in the November 1946 elections (the Gaullists had 5 million and the Socialist Party 3½ million) was debarred from parliamentary participation. And with a large part of the US\$11 billion loans received from the US government between 1946 and 1950, France conducted its suicidal colonial wars.

With the shattering of French prestige through the disastrous defeat of France at Dien

Bien Phu in Indochina in 1954 and the failure of the Israeli-British-French attack against Egypt in 1956 following President Gamal Nasser's nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company and the drain of French manpower and resources in the Algerian war, the way was open for the DeGaulle putsch in 1958, the demise of the Fourth Republic, and a new Constitution giving DeGaulle unlimited powers.

The French Chamber of Deputies voted 569 to 80 for the destruction of the Republic and the establishment of a neo-fascist regime. 139 out of the 175 socialist deputies voted affirmatively with only the Communist Party in opposition. Here the social-democrats behaved the same way as their counterparts in Germany who had paved the way for German fascism under Hitler.

In 1958, DeGaulle transformed the French empire into the French Community. Guinea under Sekou Toure was the only country that opted for independence. Martinique and Guadeloupe maintained their French connection out of deep cultural ties with the metropolis and high personal regard for DeGaulle, the "Liberateur", who had rescued them from the tyrannical Vichy regime.

But even DeGaulle with unlimited powers could not crush the Algerians. France, like the USA in Indochina and Portugal in Africa later learnt the painfully expensive lesson that it was impossible to crush a united and determined national liberation movement. He was consequently forced to sue for peace with the Algerians and to crush the "rightist" generals and French-Algerian colons who had brought him to power.

Subsequently, DeGaulle moved more and more to an independent, even anti-American, position in foreign affairs. This was largely due to two factors; firstly, the growing dominance of US capital in France; and secondly, US support for a strong rearmed and economically powerful Germany.

France, which had suffered from German aggression on three occasions in less than seventy years, could not stomach a resurgent and re-armed Germany in Europe. No doubt, that was the reason for the strong reassurances in 1949 by Premier Schuman that Germany would not be admitted to NATO⁵², the instrument of reaction and provocation.

But Frenchmen lived to see General Hans Speidel, formerly commandant for Hitler of occupied France, appointed as Commanding General of NATO's land forces.

And under the Marshall plan, established in 1947, as The New York Times (July 14, 1947) stated: "the Ruhr is the central feature of American economic planning."

Aroused French nationalism under DeGaulle led to the removal of NATO headquarters from France; support for a neutral Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, the breach of the diplomatic blockade of the People's Republic of China; the wooing of Latin America away from US influence; and closer ties with French territories of Martinique, Guadeloupe and French Guiana in the Caribbean which had been transformed into overseas departments of France on March 19, 1946 by the unanimous vote of the French parliament. Although the scale of social benefits received by the people of Martinique and Guadeloupe were not the same as in France, nevertheless there was apparent largesse in these territories as compared with neighbouring British non-self-governing territories. This accounts for the political strength of the local and foreign bourgeoisie who favour integration with France.

The communists and other progressive forces, not satisfied with colonial status, are fighting for the right of self-determination. The Gaullists have consistently refused to make any concession. With new international developments, particularly in Portugal and its African territories and the growing strength of the left in France, the right of self-

determination will be realized in the not too distant future.

Netherlands Territories

The Netherlands too like France was caught in the same game of domination and dependency at one and the same time.

Prostrate at the end of the war, she was incorporated into the Marshall plan, NATO, the Coal and Steel Community and later the European Economic Community (EEC).

US capital expanded not only in the Netherlands, but also in its overseas territories.

USA undermined the near-monopoly British and Dutch position in natural rubber. In 1949, 49 per cent of Indonesian tin went to the Texas City tin smelter. Dutch Guiana and British Guiana in the immediate postwar period produced mainly through the Aluminum Company of America (ALCOA) nearly three-quarters of the bauxite requirement of the North American aluminium industry. This ore was of a high grade and of strategic importance and was used to combine with low-grade ore in the USA.

In the Dutch Islands of Curacao and Aruba were established US-owned oil refineries to refine crude oil imported from neighbouring Venezuela but produced mainly by Standard Oil. At the same time, there was a shift from European to US banking capital; the British pound sterling was replaced by the US dollar.

At the political level, the Netherlands, after its attempt to re-colonize Indonesia had failed soon after World War II, followed the French lead with their West Hemisphere territories. In 1949, it constituted the Dutch Realm with the Netherlands, Surinam (Dutch Guiana) and the Netherlands Antilles (Curacao, Aruba and Bonaire) as co-equal partners.

But they were equal only in theory. Constitutionally, real political control rested in the hands of the Netherlands government; economically, the Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles were virtually US colonies.

Surinam has opted for independence in 1975 under the leadership of the Nationalist Republican Party. When independence is achieved in the near future, Dutch colonialism will be replaced by US neo-colonialism.

In the Netherland Antilles, automation in the oil refineries has caused increasing unemployment which stands at about 25 per cent. Political development, it would seem, has been retarded by parochialism among the Islands.

The Commonwealth (British) Caribbean

The British connection in the Caribbean was first established in the early part of the 17th Century. And by the first quarter of the 19th Century through inter-imperialist rivalry and wars, Britain succeeded in occupying 17 territories.

African slaves and indentured immigrants, mainly from India, provided the labour for the plantations which were predominantly sugar cane.

The constitutions "granted to the settlers in the majority of Britain's dependencies provided for a form of government which was representative, but which represented, substantially, the interests of the settlers only." ⁵³

But with the intensification of the national liberation and class struggles, and the fear of virtually unlimited powers passing out of the hands of the plantocracy, the constitutions were changed to provide for a Crown Colony system with wholly nominated organs of

government. Although the system was modified from time to time by the inclusion of elect members, effective power remained in the hands of the British government through its representative, the Governor, who was provided with unlimited powers of veto and certification - he could veto any measure passed by the legislature and certify any measure which the latter failed to pass. The British, of course, justified the new system on the ground that it provided for "the direct protection by the Crown of the unrepresented classes, which takes the place of representation."

In Jamaica, after slave revolts and the North Bay Rebellion in 1865, the Crown Colony system was imposed in June 1866 and elections were abolished. Similarly in British Guiana, after labour disturbances and the shooting of workers at Pln. Ruimveldt in 1924, and electoral successes in 1926 of candidates⁵⁴ backed by the British Guiana Labour Union,⁵⁵ the plantocracy was so alarmed that the liberal constitution handed down by the Dutch was suspended and replaced by a Crown Colony constitution.

But constitutional manipulation could not stem the tide of revolt. The Depression of the early 1930's had its impact in widespread poverty throughout the Caribbean. Professor MacMillan, in his book Warning from the West Indies, wrote: "Any social and economic study of the West Indies is . . . necessarily a study of poverty." In Democracy and Empire in the Caribbean, (MacMillan Company, 1947), Paul Blanshard, a former U.S. State Department official wrote:

The labouring population of almost the whole area lives at a level below human decency. The outward signs of Caribbean poverty . . . ragged clothing, bare feet, children with bloated bellies, shacks made of flattened cans, and lines of unemployed workers waiting at closed gates.

Depression and discontent led to mass demonstrations and strikes at the trade union and political fronts under nationalist leaders -- Alexander Bustamante and Norman Manley in Jamaica; Vere Bird in Antigua; Marrayshaw in Grenada; Grantley Adams in Barbados; A.A. Cipriani in Guyana; Uriah Butler and Albert Gomes in Trinidad; Hubert Nathaniel Critchlow, Theo Lee, C.R. Jacob and Ayube Edun in Guyana -- led to the appointment on August 5, 1933 of the Royal Commission headed by Lord Moyne and including the labourite Sir Walter Citrine.

Forced on the defensive the British imperialists played for time and indulged in pious declarations. It is interesting to note at this stage that there was little difference between the Conservative Party and the "socialist" Labour Party.

Malcolm Macdonald, the British Labour Secretary of State for the Colonies, in a speech at the Oxford University Summer School on Colonial Administration, in August 1938, said:

What is the main purpose of the British Colonial Empire? I suggest that it is the gradual spread of freedom among all His Majesty's subjects, in whatever part of the Empire they live . . . Even among the most backward races of Africa, our main effort should be to try and help these people to stand a little bit more securely on their own feet . . . We can see that process going on, and we can say confidently that the trend is towards the ultimate establishment of the various colonial communities as self-supporting and self-reliant members of a great Commonwealth of free peoples and nations.

Viscount Cranbourne, Conservative Secretary of State for the Colonies, in a speech in the House of Commons in July 1942, declared:

We are pledged to guide the colonial people along the road to self-government within the framework of the British Empire.

Colonel Stanley, Conservative Secretary of State for the Colonies, in a speech at Le

in January 1944, pointed out:

Politically our declared aim is gradually to bring the Colonies to a position of self-government within the British Empire.

Clement Attlee, Labour Prime Minister, in a speech in the House of Commons in 1946 said:

We do not desire to retain within the Commonwealth and Empire any unwilling peoples. It is for the people of Burma to decide their own future.

Arthur Creech-Jones, Labour Secretary of State for the Colonies, on July 29, 1947, told the House of Commons:

Our object is to transform the dependencies in the Colonial Empire to responsibility, and to exercise a trust so that each blossoms into a partnership of disinterested service and friendship.

But there is a wide gap between promise and performance. The Atlantic Charter, proclaimed during the war to rally peoples everywhere, including the colonies, to fight against fascism and for democracy and freedom, became a dead letter. As regards its applicability, particularly to India so that that country could join the war against fascism, Winston Churchill made his picturesque declaration on November 10, 1942, that he had "not become the King's first minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

India, Burma and Ceylon which became independent in 1947 (with India dismembered) were exceptions to the general rule, not because of Britain's altruism and generosity but because there was no alternative. It was done to avert revolutions.

According to the Editor of the Daily Mail, "it would have needed an occupation force of 500,000 men" to hold down India.

P.J. Griffiths, leader of the European Group in the Indian Central Legislative Assembly, in a speech to the East India Association in London on June 24, 1946 said: "India in the opinion of many was on the verge of a revolution before the British Cabinet Mission arrived. The Cabinet Mission has at least postponed if not eliminated the danger."

Alan Campbell-Johnson in his Mission with Mountbatten (1951) cited the position of Lord Ismay, Mountbatten's Chief of Staff: "India in March, 1947, was a ship on fire in mid-ocean with ammunition in the hold. By then it was a question of putting out the fire before it reached the ammunition. There was, in fact, no option before us but to do what we did."

As regards Burma, the Times Rangoon correspondent on March 28, 1947 wrote: "The mood of the British officials I have talked to is one of resignation. They have been unanimous in declaring that British policy in Burma has been the only one that our resources permit, and that the Anglo-Burmese Agreement was the only alternative to a widespread rebellion with which we could not have coped." 56

The colonies had been a lucrative booty for Britain, no less than for the other colonial powers. Successive British government spokesmen saw colonial plunder as a pre-requisite for high living standards and "welfarism" at home.

As Chancellor of the Exchequer, Winston Churchill in a budget speech in the House of Commons on April 15, 1929 said:

The income which we derive each year from commissions and services rendered to foreign countries is over £65 million. In addition, we have a steady revenue

from foreign investments of close on £300 million a year . . . That is the explanation of the source from which we are able to defray social services at a level incomparably higher than that of any European country or any country.

Fourteen years later in 1943, Lord Cranborne as Dominions Secretary reiterated Churchill's viewpoint:

Those who could not look beyond their personal interests should remember that employment and standard of living depended mainly on the existence of the Empire.

With Labour, it was the same. Ernest Bevin, Labour Foreign Secretary in a speech in the House of Commons on February 21, 1946, said:

I am not prepared to sacrifice the British Empire because I know that if the British Empire fell . . . it would mean the standard of life of our constituents would fall considerably.

Thus, despite the fact that the Charter of the United Nations in 1945 proclaimed the principle of international accountability of the colonial powers for their non-self-governing territories and the U.N. General Assembly had set up a Committee of 16 Member-states (8 being administering) to examine and make reports,⁵⁷ the Colonial powers had at the end of the war embarked on a course to preserve the pre-war colonial status quo. The British, French and Dutch who had been rudely removed from their seats of power in the Far East by Japan returned to re-establish their authority in their possessions - the British in Malaya, the French in Indochina and the Dutch in Indonesia.

The British embarked immediately after the war on the pretext of capturing a "handful of communists, bandits and territories" in a savage, and ruthless protracted war in Malaya with the help of Gurkha troops, Dyak headhunters, naplam and terror.⁵⁸

The war was fought because Malaya was a large rubber producer and thus "our principal dollar earner," as Prime Minister Anthony Eden declared in 1955, and as one British member of parliament, L. Gamman, picturesquely put it: "If we lose Malaya, people in this country would have to go without breakfast."

With Britain having an annual dollar deficit of about \$500 million, the policy was framed to hold down the colonies and the instrument - the Colonial (later Commonwealth) Development Corporation - was created to tailor their "development" for the production of foods and raw materials, which were required by the United States.

It is in this historical context must be viewed the rejection by the British Labour Government of the demand by the Caribbean Labour Congress (CIC)⁵⁹ at its historic Montego Bay meeting in 1947 for a West Indies Federation with dominion status and internal self-government for each constituent unit.

Present at that historic meeting was the Labour Government's Secretary of State for Colonies, Fabian-socialist Arthur Creech-Jones. So gradual was his Fabian-socialism that the CIC's proposals for constitutional reform for the Windward-Leeward Islands and the minority constitutional proposals of Dr. Patrick Solomon and Victor Bryan of Trinidad and Tobago, which he had previously supported, were not implemented.

In British Guiana, there was grave dissatisfaction because of his agreement to the nomination of Frederick Seaford, the head of the Bookers sugar monopoly, to the Legislative Council after his defeat at the 1947 elections.

But the advent of the cold war was to have a shattering effect in the British Caribbean colonies. Because most of the principal colonial leaders, mainly petty-bourgeois nationalists, had been ideologically moored to British liberalism, fabian socialism and social democracy⁶⁰ through their close links with the British Labour Party and the British Trades Union Congress, they conformed to the changed position of the Labour Government.

The Labour Government at first had not been happy about the objectives of the cold war. Its organ, the Daily Herald, had found the Truman doctrine "grave", "disturbing" and "frightening" and went on to state on March 15, 1947: "Our first reaction to President Truman's speech was one of uneasiness. Our second thoughts are no happier." But under "dollar" pressure from the United States, it lined up behind Washington in the cold war. This was admitted by Winston Churchill who told the House of Commons on March 20, 1950, that "in all the main issues of foreign policy, the opposition, (i.e., the Tories) in the late parliament, supported sustained, and even pointed the course which Bevin (Labour Foreign Secretary) has pursued." Earlier, on February 13, 1948, General George C. Marshall, United States Secretary of State, commenting on the British government's acceptance of United States proposals, had said:

On the recent proposals of Mr. Bevin, they have passed beyond agreement for economic co-operation to the constitution of a Western European Union. This development has been our greatest hope.⁶¹

Apart from dollar support from the USA, Britain needed to hold Malaya, "the biggest dollar earner." Its war in Malaya put the British Trades Union Congress (TUC) in a real dilemma. On the one hand, the British government which it backed was waging the Malayan war; on the other hand, the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) which it also backed was supporting the Malayan patriots, who had been forced to wage a war of national liberation. It resolved the dilemma in favour of imperialism by joining the American Federation of Labor (A.F.L.) in engineering the split of the WFTU and the creation of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU).

This decision was to have a catastrophic effect. Influenced by the British T.U.C., trade union leaders throughout the Caribbean, including the veteran H.N. Critchlow, took part in the ICFTU founding conference in 1949. Previously in 1945, with the President and Secretary of the British Guiana T.U.C., Caribbean trade union leaders had gone to Paris for the inaugural meeting of the WFTU.⁶²

Actually, the rot had set in earlier than 1949. A year before, Grantley Adams, the leader of the Barbados Labour Party, the President of the Barbados Workers' Union and the President of the Caribbean Labour Congress, had defended British colonialism at the United Nations General Assembly meeting in Paris, while the British representative to the United Nations, Sir Hartley Shawcross, did the same in New York. For his defence of colonialism, Adams was roundly attacked. The West Africa Pilot wrote in October, 1948, a caustic editorial:

. . . When a . . . group of black men join hands together in order to see to it that a new day dawns for all men of our colour, there is always a willing Negro to join the forces of the enemy. Our readers . . . should mark and digest the news published . . . about the activities of one Mr. G. Adams of Barbados, in the U.N. sitting in France, and judge for themselves the type of African 'leader' that Britain loves to advertise to the world . . . it is most distressing to note Mr. Adams' every word. But we in this part of the world should not have bothered had Mr. Adams not, without consulting us, without even knowing Africa, gone to array his sentiments before the U.N. We have never said that the British are not any good at all; no Negro of worth has ever said that. But Mr. Adams ought to have known that the over-all policy of the

Colonial Office stands condemned before all men of good will. Mr. Adams, by his irresponsible and inspired utterances . . . has dealt a wicked blow to all suffering peoples. We can assure him that neither history nor African conscience will be kind to him, when, at long last, the black man of the world come to their own.

In Jamaica, the Jamaica Trades Union Congress was ordered by the Norman Manley-led People's National Party to dis-affiliate from the WFTU, and leftists Ken Hill, Frank Hill, Richard Hart and Arthur Henry were expelled from the party in 1952.

Soon after the militant CLC was disbanded. The right-wingers Grantley Adams and Norman Manley were not happy about its general orientation and with left-wingers holding the strategic positions -- Richard Hart as General Secretary and Billy Strachan as Secretary of the influential London Branch

The betrayal of the Caribbean national liberation movement was fully demonstrated during the 1953 crisis in British Guiana when the social democratic leadership applauded the bipartisan imperialist policies and actions of both the Labour and Conservative parties

Because of political agitation by the People's Progressive Party (PPP) universal adult suffrage had been achieved and one of the most "advanced" colonial constitutions with an elected majority in the policy-making Executive Council had been framed for British Guiana.

But soon after, on October 9, 1953, only 133 days after the PPP had won a resounding but unexpected victory of 18 out of 24 seats, the British government landed troops, suspended the Constitution, imposed a Colonial Office dictatorship with the help of local puppets and ruled with emergency regulations, restrictions, detentions and imprisonment.

The British government led by Winston Churchill declared that the removal of the PPP from the government had been done "to prevent Communist subversion of the government and a dangerous crisis both in public order and economic affairs. . . The faction in power have shown by their acts and their speeches that they are prepared to go to any lengths, including violence, to turn British Guiana into a Communist state."

The Chief Secretary, John Gutch reading from the White Paper over the local radio said that: "From actions and public statements of these extremists it is clear that their objective was to turn Guiana into a state subordinate to Moscow and a dangerous platform for extending communist influence in the Western Hemisphere."

A few days earlier, the Colonial Office in London had issued a statement alleging that it was necessary to send naval and military forces "in order to preserve peace and the safety of all classes."

But the reports of British newspapermen⁶⁴ at the time did not bear out any of the allegations made. One such allegation, about a plot to burn down Georgetown, was allegedly made known to the Governor on Wednesday, October 7, but since the Order suspending the Constitution had been signed on October 3, the alleged fire plot could not have been one of the reasons for justifying the suspension.

One British Member of Parliament said that the White Paper was "scraping the barrel for evidence."

The usual proclamations followed. The movements of the PPP leaders were restricted, meetings banned and, in due course, a Commission of Inquiry set up to white-wash the suspension. Later, too, some PPP leaders were imprisoned.

Many reasons for the suspension have been advanced. But there can be little doubt that the compelling reason and the one which made the British government take action to remove

the radical PPP government from office was pressure from the U.S.A.

The US was quick to give its blessings to the British gun-boat action. The US Assistant Secretary of States, Henry Byroade, was reported in The Times (London) of November 2, 1953, as follows:

It is significant that it should have been an American spokesman who on Saturday felt compelled to issue a warning against the hasty shedding of their responsibilities by the Imperial powers . . . Mr. Henry Byroade, the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern & Asian and African Affairs, while declaring that his country will use its influence to help colonial peoples towards self-government - thereby in most cases seconding the efforts to which the suzerain powers are pledged - adds a clear declaration of the perils of 'premature' independence.

The same Henry Byroade, after the CIA-influenced and financed overthrow in August 1953 of the nationalist Mossadegh government in Iran, which had nationalised the British-Anglo-Iranian Oil Company in 1951, and the US takeover of 40 per cent of the exclusive British monopoly in Iranian oil, had lyrically commented: "Out of the black cloud, white rain has descended. His Majesty the Shah and Prime Minister Zahedi are producing sweet remedies. Zahedi's advent to power is a repudiation of the sterile policies of the past." ⁶⁵

And as in Venezuela and Iran, so too in Guyana there was little concern for the democratic process. Anti-communism was merely the cover to hide predatory strategic and business interests.

This first case of direct military aggression in the British Caribbean territories was not an isolated event. It formed part of a general imperialist cold-war policy. When Oliver Lyttleton, the British Government spokesman on colonial affairs, told the House of Commons on October 22nd, 1953, that "Her Majesty's government is not willing to allow a Communist state to be organised within the British Commonwealth," he was merely parroting what the Churchill-Truman axis had formulated in 1946-47.

The place of Guyana within the overall strategy was noted by other spokesmen of US imperialism. After the sweeping PPP victory at the polls, the American syndicated columnist Drew Pearson commented that while the US was trying to preserve "democracy and freedom" in the Far East, Korea and elsewhere, it was allowing a communist government to be established at its back-door. And Time magazine referred to the PPP government as the first communist government to be set up in the British Empire.

It was the publisher of Time and Life, Henry Luce, who earlier in 1941 had proclaimed "the American Century," and in 1947 included the Caribbean and Latin America in the "American World Empire."

Guyana demonstrated that the 20th Century had indeed become "the American Century", with Britain as a junior partner dancing to the tune of US imperialism as was noted by Virgil Johnson, President of the National Industrial Conference Board of the USA, when in a speech to the Investment Bankers' Association on December 10, 1940, he said:

Whatever the outcome of the war, America has embarked on a career of imperialism in world affairs and in every other aspect of her life . . . At best, England will become a junior partner in a new Anglo-Saxon imperialism, in which the economic resources and the military and naval strength of the United States will be the centre of gravity . . . The sceptre passes to the United States. ⁶⁶

As regards Guyana's strategic importance, it is significant to note that one month before the suspension of the Constitution, the Governor had as his house guest an American Congressman, D.L. Jackson, ⁶⁷ who observed on leaving that Guyana was within a strategic zone.

of the United States. In the early 1960's, Guyana was attacked as "the second Cuba" as Chile was a decade later.

Guyana also had valuable resources. Its bauxite was a high-grade ore, which during the Second World War had been of critical importance to the war effort of the western allies. The US was, and still is today, dependent on this high grade ore from Guyana and Surinam for 'sweetening' its own and imported low grade ore.

There were in Guyana also deposits of manganese, iron ore, columbite-tantalite, the raw material used for producing a high heat-resisting metal used in the manufacture of jet aircraft, and traces of uranium.

About iron ore, the Church Times on October 16, 1953, wrote:

Iron ore deposits covering 75 square miles have been discovered in Venezuela, near the British Guiana border. On the British Guiana side of the frontier, iron ore deposits have also been discovered which may well be a continuation of those in Venezuela. They are claimed to be the biggest in the world.

The frontier between British Guiana and Venezuela, moreover, in the region where the new iron ore deposits have been discovered, is in dispute. This is one reason for the American interest in the deterioration of the situation.

This should be considered against the background of the 1952 Report of the Materials Policy Commission, headed by William S. Paley, which had noted that the "United States appetite for materials is gargantuan - and so far, insatiable." In 1900, US produced 15% more raw materials than it consumed; by 1950, the position was reversed - it consumed 9% more than it produced. And it was projected that the position would worsen later; by 1975, it would consume about 20% more!

Nelson Rockefeller, referring to the importance of Western Hemisphere resources to the US economy, on March 17, 1955, stated:

North American industries every day depend more and more on the raw materials of the Western Hemisphere. These sources are indispensable for the US to maintain industrial production that amounts to more than half of the total goods manufactured in the free world. 68

And Oliver Lyttleton's anti-communist crusade must be seen in the context of Britain's faltering economy and dollar deficit. Addressing the British House of Commons on March 17, 1952, he said:

In the development of the resources of the colonial empire lay our great hope . . . But we could not invest a deficit in developing the colonies . . . We must be able to attract capital in the next few years from outside the sterling area, because our own surplus would not be enough for the job. 69

Of course, the surplus was to come from the United States -- Marshall Plan for Europe, Colombo Plan for Asia, and Point Four Programme for the rest of the underdeveloped territories. As Truman put it in his Inaugural Address of January 1947:

We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advance and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of under-developed areas . . . We should foster capital investment in areas needing development . . . 71

Truman expressed the intention in humanitarian terms - to help the colonial peoples "to produce more food; more clothing, more material for housing and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens."

But that was merely the cover to achieve the expansionist aims of US imperialism for world domination. 72 It is significant that of the US\$7,000 million voted in 1951 for Point

Four aid, the bulk was for military assistance; only \$418 million was for economic help. And as The Times (March 3, 1952) put it: "What is called economic aid is merely a cheaper form of military assistance."

The Rockefeller Report of 1951, Partners for Progress recommended the doubling of US private investments. Consequently, US investments increased in Latin America from US\$3 billion (book value) in 1946 to \$8 billion in 1961; by 1969, total investments rose to over \$13 billion. Worldwide, by the end of 1969, direct US investments abroad amounted to \$70.8 billion, of which about 2/3 (\$47.7 billion) was invested in the developed countries and 26 per cent (about \$20 billion) in the under-developed countries.

By 1952, the United States signed "treaties of technical co-operation with 33 countries." And in the Caribbean, the Caribbean Commission,⁷³ established in 1942, and renamed Caribbean Organisation in 1961 when it was sited in Puerto Rico, was strengthened to achieve greater co-ordination between the United States, Britain, France and the Netherlands.

But side by side with co-operation, there was inter-imperialist competition and rivalry, the result of the unequal development of capitalism. Thus new tactics were devised.

Britain had become aware by the late 1950's from its own experience in the war in Malaya and that of the French in Indochina and particularly from the failure of the 1956 Anglo-French-Israeli-Suez adventure in Egypt that military might alone could not sustain her in maintaining her imperial interests. She was also aware that these were being undermined. In August 1954, after the overthrow of the Mossadegh government, the US had obtained a 40 per cent share in Iranian oil, formerly an exclusive British preserve, and under the "Eisenhower Doctrine" of January 1957 had strengthened its relative position in the Middle East compared with the weakened position of British and French imperialisms.

Against the background of the sharpening of the national liberation struggle, the Soviet offer of rockets and other military aid to Egypt during the Anglo-French-Israeli attack in 1956 and the condemnation of the aggression by 62 states at the United Nations, the failure of the French war in Algeria, the opting out of Guinea in 1958 from the French Community, the Kassim revolution in Iraq and its breakaway from the Baghdad Pact, Soviet presence in the Middle East and Africa, the 1959 Castro revolution in Cuba and the 1960 Soviet decolonisation resolution in the United Nations, the British government began with Prime Minister Harold Macmillan's "wind of change" speech to hasten the process of decolonisation which it had started with the independence of Ghana in 1957.

In his famous speech delivered to the Assembly House in Cape Town, South Africa on February 3, Macmillan said:

The most striking of all the impressions I have formed since I left London a month ago is the strength of this African national consciousness . . . The wind of change is blowing through the continent . . . We must all accept it as a fact. Our national policies must take account of it. I sincerely believe that if we cannot do so, we may imperil the precise balance of East and West . . . As I see it, the great issue in this second half of the twentieth century is whether the uncommitted peoples of Asia and Africa will swing to the East or West. Will they be drawn into the communist camp?

The new tactics called for a relaxation of the hated policy of Apartheid and constitutional manipulation first with federation and later independence.

Apart from the new objective international situation and the changed world balance of forces, the British had learnt from her own and particularly US experience in Latin America that independence, properly managed, was no hinderance to investments and profits. India had shown that profits from investments in 1960 were greater than before independence.

Donald MacLean, who left his top British Foreign Office post for the Soviet Union, in British Foreign Policy Since Suez, wrote: "As part of the process of preparing the

colonies 'for independence', wide use was made of federation of hitherto separate colonies, protectorates, emirates and other territorial units." ⁷⁵ The purpose was to yoke and "contain" the progressive forces, who did not want the colonial status in any form, with the reactionaries who were prepared to "cooperate" with Britain.

One of the objects of the West Indies Federation mooted in the early fifties and launched in 1958 was the inclusion of British Guiana and the containment of the PPP; another was to ensure that when independence came later, there would not be separate entities which like the former Spanish territories would fall under U.S. domination. Unfortunately for the British, the Federation collapsed in 1962.

In the circumstances, independence was granted to the major British Caribbean territories, with the exception of Guyana which became nominally free only after the PPP had been removed from the government.

Britain's subservience to the United States became apparent in the case of Guyana. Although committed to the proposition that the victor (PPP) of the 1961 election would have led the country to independence, and despite its view that "Forbes Burnham was an opportunist, racist and demagogue, intent only on personal power," ⁷⁶ nevertheless, it succumbed to US pressure, "a stiff letter early in 1962" from Dean Rusk, and changed the electoral system in favour of Burnham in accordance with the wishes of the Kennedy administration.

With independence has come, according to William P. Rogers, US Secretary of State in his report, United States Foreign Policy, 1972, "a growing and aggressive nationalism" with "racial and anti-American overtones." But the U.S. is not greatly concerned as "the leaders of the English-speaking Caribbean are uniformly of a moderate political persuasion."

With independence, US influence in the area has also grown. Private investments have increased particularly in bauxite, alumina and petroleum in Jamaica and Trinidad. In the early 1960's, the Texas Oil Company paid T.T.\$302.4 million -- \$19.36 for every \$1.20 share -- in a sensational takeover of the British-owned Trinidad Oil Company. And the US government has put US\$20.3 million in the Caribbean Development Bank.

In the face of growing US penetration, Britain maintains its presence in the area through colonial links with the Associated States and increased aid and investments. Official bilateral aid increased from £11.9 million in 1967 to £27.2 million in 1972, and investments by the Commonwealth Development Corporation rose at the end of 1971 by nearly 150 per cent since the end of 1965.

The Netherlands, also like Britain in a status of dependency on the United States, is prepared to grant independence to its Caribbean territories. Dominated as they now are by US capital, they will on independence become integrated into the US sphere of influence.

The French territories will probably be the last of the Caribbean countries to become independent. France recognises that these territories attest to French grandeur and, anti-American as she is, does not relish the idea of the United States filling any vacuum created by her departure.

Cold War Interventions

British Guiana was not the only cold war victim. In the same period, there were other interventions in the Caribbean.

In 1948, the Venezuelan Government of Romulo Callegos, the renowned patriot and novelist was overthrown by three colonels headed by Colonel Marcos Perez Jimenez. He had come to power through an election in 1947, two years after the dictatorship of General Isaias Medina Angarita had been overthrown.

In April 1948, prior to the elections in Colombia, the popular leader of the Liberals,

Dr. Jorge Elecier Gaitan, "the most important man in the Republic" was murdered, resulting in demonstrations and disturbances. After brutal suppression, a Franco-type dictatorship under Laureano Gomez, a Falangist, was set up in 1949, and Colombia became "part of the Madrid-Buenos Aires Axis." U.S. Secretary of State, George Marshall, ascribed the riots to the communists. But according to the Soviet Literary Gazette: "The Colombian uprising has been plotted by the United States to frighten South American countries into an anti-communist bloc. The United States delegation to the Pan American Conference arranged the shooting of Gaitan to drag out the bugaboo of a communist danger." ⁷⁷

In November 1949, another Falangist and friend of Mussolini, Arnulfo Arias seized power in Panama.

In 1954, the democratically-elected government of Colonel Jacobo Arbenz of Guatemala was overthrown by Colonel Castillo-Armas with the help of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) which had been set up in 1947 as a cold war instrument for the purpose of intelligence, propaganda, subversion and para-military covert operations.

A year earlier in August 1953, another democratically-elected government, that of Dr. M. Massadegh of Iran, had been overthrown after its nationalisation of the Anglo-American Oil Company through CIA-domented subversion and riots and a tanker blockade imposed by the oil monopolies.

And because Cuba after the revolution of 1957-59 embarked on an anti-imperialist, pro-socialist course, the same method -- indirect aggression under the direction and control of the CIA and the Pentagon -- so successfully utilised in Guatemala was attempted to dislodge the Castro government.

On January 3, 1961, President Eisenhower broke off relations with Cuba. And on April 17, 1961, was launched the Bahia de Cochinos (Bay of Pigs) invasion of Cuba, which proved a fiasco.

Senator J. William Fulbright, head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had warned in a memorandum to President John F. Kennedy against the meticulously-planned and prepared (in Guatemala) CIA operation. According to Wise and Ross: "Fulbright also suggested that 'even covert support of a Castro overthrow' probably violated the Treaty of the Organisation of American States as well as United States neutrality laws." ⁷⁸ But President Kennedy approved the invasion plan.

A meeting of American Foreign Ministers in San Jose, Costa Rica in late 1960 resulted in a declaration condemning outside intervention in the Americas and providing for the isolation of Cuba.

An unexpected outcome of this meeting was a near crisis in the Venezuela government. The Democratic Republican Union (URO) was forced to withdraw from the Betancourt-led coalition after one of its leaders, Dr. Arcaya, as Foreign Minister, had refused to sign the San Jose Declaration. It would appear that with the exception of the URO, the two other coalition parties -- the Democratic Action (AD) and Social Christian (COPEI) -- succumbed to US pressure.

Earlier, about six months before, when the Americans tried at the Conference for Democracy and Freedom in the Americas at Maracai, Venezuela to attack Cuba indirectly, ⁷⁹ they had been opposed by all the Venezuelan political parties -- A.D., COPIE and URO in the government and the Communist Party in the opposition.

At another meeting in Punta del Este on January 22, 1962, the American Foreign Ministers declared that "the principles of communism were incompatible with the Inter-American system" and excluded "Cuba from membership in the Inter-American Defense Board." ⁸⁰ By a vote of 14 to 1 with abstentions by Mexico, Ecuador, Brazil, Chile, Argentina and Bolivia, Cuba was

expelled from the OAS.

In March 1964, Thomas Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, elaborated at a secret meeting of US ambassadors in Latin America the "Mann Doctrine" which "confirmed the need of US imperialism to use force to prevent the advance of the democratic movement in Latin America."⁸¹ Soon after on April 1, 1964, under this hard-line, big-stick policy, the government of Joao Goulart in Brazil was overthrown.

Neil Sheehan, in a special article to the New York Times of February 22, 1967, "CIA Is Linked to Strikes that Helped Oust Jagan," documented the CIA operation in Guyana. Soon after on April 16, the Insight Team, in a story in the Sunday Times, "How the CIA got rid of Jagan", wrote: "As coups go, it was not expensive: over five years the CIA paid out something over £250,000. For the colony, British Guiana, the result was about 170 dead, untold hundreds wounded, roughly £10 million-worth of damage to the economy and a legacy of racial bitterness."

The CIA money was channelled through the dummy Cotham Foundation and its agents, Gerald O'Keefe and William McCabe, posing as trade unionists, for an 80-day strike, strife and riots, which according to Drew Pearson, gave the British government the excuse to withhold independence and change the electoral system.

In his syndicated article "Castro and Jagan", Pearson on March 22, 1964 wrote:

The United States permitted Cuba to go Communist purely through default and diplomatic bungling. The problem now is to look ahead and make sure we don't make the same mistake again. We are already on the way of making it in Haiti. But in British Guiana, President Kennedy, having been badly burnt in the Bay of Pigs operation, did look ahead.

Though it was never published at the time this was the secret reason why Kennedy took his trip to England in the summer of 1963. He had promised Premier Fanfani and Chancellor Adenauer to go to Rome and Bonn, but London was added to the itinerary only because of Kennedy's haunting worry that British Guiana would get its independence from England in July, 1963, and set up another Communist government under the guidance of Fidel Castro.

If this happened just before the Presidential election of 1964 and if at that time a Communist Guiana began seizing the Reynolds Metals aluminum operation and other American properties, Kennedy knew the political effect would be disastrous.

It wasn't in the communique issued by the United States and England after the Kennedy-Macmillan meeting, "but the main thing they agreed on was that the British would refuse to grant independence to Guiana because of the general strike against pro-communist Prime Minister, Cheddi Jagan.

That strike was secretly inspired by a combination of U.S. Central Intelligence Agency money and British Intelligence. It gave London the excuse it wanted.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr, special assistant to President Kennedy, wrote that after the PPP's success at the crucial 1961 election,⁸² he saw I.F.S. Burnham in May 1962 in Washington D.C. and his "visit left the feeling as I reported to the President that 'an independent British Guiana under Burnham (if Burnham will commit himself to a multi-racial policy) would cause us many fewer problems than an independent British Guiana under Jagan.' And the way was open to bring it about, because Jagan's parliamentary strength was larger than his popular strength: he had won 57 per cent of the seats on the basis of 42.7 per cent of the vote. An obvious solution would be to establish a system of proportional representation. This, after prolonged discussion, the British government finally did in October 1963; and elections held finally at the end of 1964 produced a coalition government under Burnham."⁸³

It should be noted that the subversive CIA methods perfected in Iran in 1953 and in Guyana in 1962-64 -- strikes, demonstrations, riots, economic blockade, mass media incitemen

were successfully used also in the overthrow of the Allende government in Chile in 1973.

The Dominican Republic was the next victim in the Caribbean. With the failure of indirect military aggression in Cuba in 1961, the Johnson administration resorted to direct aggression in the Dominican Republic in 1965 when it appeared that the revolutionaries, the "Constitutionalists", led by Col. Francisco Caamaño Deno, would succeed in restoring the democratic 1963 Constitution and in installing in power perhaps Juan Bosch who had won an election in December 1962, but had been deposed by a military coup on September 25, 1963.

The intervention which "saved" the country from becoming a "second Cuba" brought back to power Joaquín Balaguer, disciple and colleague of the dictator, Gen. I.R. Trujillo, who after the latter's assassination had become president for a brief period.

Balaguer's neo-Trujillista regime rules virtually with the same methods and ideas of Trujillo under whose regime of over 30 years, there were, according to the report of June 8, 1960 of the Inter-American Peace Committee of the OAS, violations of human rights including "the denial of free assembly and of free speech, arbitrary arrests, cruel and inhuman treatment of political prisoners, and the use of intimidation and terror as political weapons."⁸⁵ And as under the Suppression of Communism Act of South Africa, any criticism was deemed communist and subversive.

In Guyana, Guatemala, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Chile and elsewhere there was little concern about the niceties of parliamentary democracy and the verdict of the ballot box. Strategic and business interests and profits, not democratic principles and free and fair elections, underlined US policies and support for dictators such as Jimenez, Batista, Somoza, Trujillo, Castillo-Armas, Duvalier, Balaguer and others.

Behind the dictators and colonels were the powerful United States monopolies. "The bananas of Central America," cried Romulo Callegos, "the oil of Venezuela, and, to sweeten the pill, the sugar of San Domingo and Cuba bring the fortune-seekers greater profits when they rely on the big stick than on the polling booth where the people can express their own will".

After the overthrow of the Callegos government, taxes imposed on the oil companies headed by the Rockefeller interests were reduced from US\$9.09 per cubic metre to \$7.33 causing Standard Oil to make in 1954 alone a super-profit of US\$331 million and the Venezuelan Treasury to lose \$1,366,000 in the six years prior to 1955. No wonder Perez Jimenez was rewarded by President Eisenhower with the highest US decoration, the US Legion of Merit.

In 1948, US private investments in Latin America were yielding a profit of 22 per cent as compared with only 13 per cent in the United States.

During the decade 1946-56, US companies extracted \$3.17 for every dollar invested; by the 1970's, the amount increased to \$4 for \$1 invested.

As in Venezuela, **communism** was given as the pretext for the overthrow of the elected nationalist government of Dr. M. Mossadegh in Iran in August 1953. Actually, his government had nationalised the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company after the latter refused to revise an archaic agreement under which Iran was receiving a little over one-third of what the Venezuelan government received at that time from the oil companies. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Company had become immensely wealthy at the expense of the Iranian people; in 50 years, with an original investment of only £21.5 million, it made nearly £800 million profit. The British government itself was deeply involved and held £5 million of the total investment. A senior British government minister was able to boast on February 15, 1955, that "the value of the government's £5 million investment went up to nearly £200 million."

Similarly, in Guyana in October 1953, US strategic and business interests were behind the overthrow of the PPP government.

Like Perez Jimenez of Venezuela, Castillo-Armas, who toppled Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala

in 1954, was also rewarded by Eisenhower; he was given an honorary doctorate degree by the University of Columbia during Eisenhower's term as President of the institution -- an award which so infuriated Romulo Gallegos that he renounced the doctorate degree conferred on him by the same university.

Castillo-Armas was rewarded because like so many other traitors he had sold out his country. On the third anniversary of the overthrow of the Arbenz government, the US State Department celebrated the "liberation" of Guatemala. In its Bulletin No. 6465, April 1, 1957 it listed "the glories of this liberation" as follows:

1. The conclusion of an agreement with a United Fruit Company subsidiary providing for the return of property expropriated by the Arbenz Government" (i.e. 234,000 acres);
2. the repeal of laws affecting remittances and taxation of earnings from foreign capital";
3. the signing of an Investment Guarantee Agreement with the United States";
4. the promulgation of a new and more favourable petroleum law" (since which 27 US oil companies have obtained exploration concessions covering all of Guatemala)"⁸⁷

The Geneva Agreement on Vietnam (1954) was not respected by the administration of Dwight Eisenhower for the fact that a year before, addressing the Annual Conference of Governors, he had bluntly stated:

You have seen the war in Indochina described variously as an outgrowth of French colonialism and the French refusal to treat indigenous populations decently. You find it yet described as a war between the Communists and the other elements in Southeast Asia, but you have a confused idea of where is located Laos or Cambodia or any of the other countries that are involved.

You don't know really why we are so concerned within the far-off south-east corner of Asia. Why is it?

. . . Now let us assume that we lose Indochina. If Indochina goes, several things happen right away. The Malaya Peninsula, the last little bit of land hanging on down there, would be scarcely defensible. The tin and tungsten we so greatly value from that area would cease coming. . .

All of that position around there is very ominous to the United States, because finally if we lost all that, how would the free world hold the rich empire of Indonesia?

So you see, somewhere along the line, this must be blocked and it must be blocked now, and that's what we are trying to do.

So when the United States votes \$400,000,000 to help that war, we are not to prevent the occurrence of something that would be of a most terrible significance to the USA, our security, our power and ability to get certain things we need from the riches of the Indonesia territory and from Southeast Asia. ⁸⁸

President Kennedy, addressing the American Society of Newspaper Editors on the last day of the Bay of Pigs fiasco (April 20, 1961), denounced communism as alien to the Western hemisphere. He promised that the USA "regardless of the cost and regardless of the peril" would fight against that ideology to prevent it from succeeding in any part of the hemisphere.

What Kennedy did not mention was the strategic and economic importance of Cuba, that in Cuba, in 1956, as the US Department of Commerce had noted: "The only foreign investments of importance are those of the United States". By 1959, US investment in Cuba was approximately US\$2 billion, or one-sixth of all US investments in Latin America. The invasion was an attempt to protect those investments and to halt the revolutionary process which had began with the opening of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, the signing of a trade agreement in February 1960 for the sale of one million tons of Cuban sugar per year for five years, and US\$100 million low-interest Soviet credit for development and industrialisation.

This event, taking place in the context of the overthrow of the dictatorships of Manuel Odría in Peru (1955), Rojas Pinilla in Colombia (1956), Pérez Jiménez in Venezuela (1958) and Trujillo in the Dominican Republic (1961) in the Western Hemisphere, and soon after the breach of the cold war policy of containment, and Soviet presence, in the Middle East and Africa with the Anglo-French-Israeli fiasco in Egypt in 1956, the Guinea declaration of independence from the French Community in 1958 and the Kassim Revolution in Iraq in 1958 caused consternation in cold war circles. As Philip W. Bonsol, the then U.S. Ambassador in Cuba, in his book Cuba, Castro and the United States put it: "the economic arrangement between Cuba and the Soviet Union seemed intolerable to people accustomed to a dominant position in Cuba." (page 34)

Almost immediately, Washington took a decision to overthrow the Castro government. According to Bonsol:

The top-level decision (for nine months advocated by Vice President Nixon) was taken to allow the Central Intelligence Agency to begin recruiting and training anti-Castro Cuban exiles for military service . . . The economic measures in the American program for the overthrow of Castro included the advice given the oil-refining companies in June to refuse to process Soviet crude oil acquired by the Cuban government, the total suspension of Cuba's sugar quota in July, and the removal of key American and Cuban personnel from leading American companies in such a manner as to create serious difficulties for the Cuban economy. (p. 135).

The next step in the invasion plan was in June 1960 when Soviet crude oil (30 per cent cheaper than oil obtained from the US companies operating in Venezuela) in payment for deliveries of sugar arrived in Cuba. The oil companies, which had been asked to refine it, were willing in their own capitalist interests to do so under protest. But the State Department in the broader strategic interest of imperialism instructed them to refuse. This is how Bonsol related the behind-the-scenes intrigue:

. . . on the afternoon of Saturday, June 4, I received a visit from the Chief Executive in Cuba of a major American oil company who had just returned from Washington. He said that he was calling on me at the request of the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Rubottom, in order to bring me up to date on recent developments with regard to the Guevara demand that the refineries in Cuba handle Soviet crude oil. After confirming my impression that until very recently the companies' position had been that of going ahead with the operation under protest and attempting to secure recognition of their rights through the Cuban courts, he added that this position had been predicted on the assumption that the United States government would not wish to take a stand on the matter. This assumption had now proved to be contrary to the fact.

My visitor went on to tell me that on the previous day representatives of the two American companies with refineries in Cuba had been summoned to the office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Anderson, and had been informed by the Secretary that a refusal to accede to the Cuban government's request would be in accord with the United States government's policy toward Cuba and that the companies would not incur any penalties under American anti-trust laws should they take a joint stand in this matter. They were further told that the situation was being discussed in London with the Shell Company along the same lines. My informant added that there had been a representative of the Department of State present at the meeting conducted by the Secretary of the Treasury. He concluded that the companies had decided to conform their policies to that of their government and that they would refuse the Soviet crude; they understood that the Anglo-Dutch company would follow suit - as indeed it did. (p. 149).⁸⁹

"Representative Democracy" Fiction

In the pursuit of US expansionist aims, behind the rhetoric of upholding democratic institutions and working within the framework of "representative democracy", there was always a great deal of sanctimoniousness and outright deceit.

President Dwight Eisenhower was concerned about "the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex," but in the interest of big business, he sanctioned CIA operations in Guatemala, Iran and Cuba.

He was aware as he wrote in his book Mandate for Change, the White House Years, 1953-56 that "had elections been held as of the time of the fighting, possibly 80 per cent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader rather than Chief of State, Bao Dai." Yet, he cancelled elections planned for 1956 under the 1954 Geneva Agreement to unite North and South Vietnam, and installed the corrupt Ngo Dinh-Diem as head of South Vietnam.

During the 1960 US election campaign, both John F. Kennedy⁸⁰ and Richard Nixon misinformed the nation about the invasion plans against Cuba. Kennedy attempted to gain an electoral advantage by declaring that nothing was being done to help the forces against the Castro government. On October 20, a press release by him stated:⁸¹

We must attempt to strengthen the non-Batista democratic anti-Castro forces in exile, and in Cuba itself, who offer eventual hope of overthrowing Castro. Thus far these fighters for freedom have had virtually no support from our government.

Vice President Nixon, responded that Kennedy's attitude was "dangerously irresponsible;" that to give aid to the anti-Castro forces "would violate 'five treaties' between the United States and Latin America as well as the Charter of the United Nations." ⁸²

This same Nixon, however, according to Wise and Ross later in his book Six Crises admitted that the covert training of Cuban exiles by the CIA was due "in substantial part at least, to my efforts," and that what Kennedy was calling for "was already the policy of the American government -- covertly -- and Kennedy had been so informed . . . Kennedy was endangering the security of the whole operation. . . .

"There was only one thing I could do. The covert operation had to be protected at all costs. I must not even suggest by implication that the United States was rendering aid to rebel forces in and out of Cuba. In fact, I must go to the other extreme: I must attack the Kennedy proposal to provide such aid as wrong and irresponsible because it would violate our treaty commitments." ⁸³

Kennedy's biographers, Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. and Theodore C. Sorenson tried to absolve him from blame for his approval of the invasion by insisting that the plans had been set in train by the previous administration and he "was a prisoner of events."

In late 1961, President Kennedy, after attacking the communists for subversion and condemning Fidel Castro for refusal to hold elections declared:

. . . 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 elections, which he won."

Writing in 1962, to the former President Betancourt of Venezuela, President Kennedy spoke in similar terms:

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 the 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 on effecting change through peaceful and democratic means and avoiding violent interruptions of the constitutional process. ⁸⁴

But that did not prevent the Kennedy administration from intervening in Guyana. Schlesinger disclosed that the State Department at first thought of trying to work with the PPP, "then Rusk personally revised this policy in a stiff letter early in 1962." ⁹⁵

The justification of the 3-pronged attack - CIA subversion and riots inside Guyana, diplomatic pressure on the British government and diplomatic pressure on the Venezuelan government - on the PPP government was that ^{PPP}the/would have abandoned parliamentary democracy. According to Schlesinger, "the President went on to express doubt whether Jagan would be able to sustain his position as a parliamentary democrat. 'I have a feeling', he said, 'that in a couple of years he will find ways to suspend his constitutional provisions and will cut his opposition off at the knees . . . Parliamentary democracy is going to be almost impossible for Jagan to concentrate the energies of his country on development through a parliamentary system'."

Similar concern was expressed about the preservation of democracy in Chile. US Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in September 1974, that Allende "set about to establish what appeared to be a one-party government; he set about to throttle the opposition parties and opposition press." That was the justification for the CIA US\$8 million operation to make it impossible for Allende to govern. According to Kissinger, the CIA activity was designed to prevent the establishment of one-party government by a minority government. "Our concern," he continued, "was the election in 1976 not the coup in 1973."

Actually, a military coup was resorted to because the reactionary forces -- the opposition parties, the CIA and the military -- saw it as the only means to remove Allende. They not only had failed to secure the increase in popular support in the April 1973 Congressional elections to enable them to impeach Allende, but also had lost support. With the increase of electoral strength for the Popular Unity from 36 per cent in 1970 at the Presidential elections to 43 per cent in 1973, despite the economic sabotage and strife, they came to the conclusion that Popular Unity could not be defeated in 1976.

Kissinger is reported to have told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the purpose of the CIA operation was merely to keep the Allende opposition alive and "not to destabilize or subvert" his government. ⁹⁶

This statement must be weighed against all the known pressures exerted on the Allende government, and also the denials in 1973 about US involvement in the coup, which caused Senator Stuart Symington to observe that the disclosures of CIA involvement "certainly does not coincide with the testimony that this committee (Foreign Relations) has received." ⁹⁷

Thus Guyana's case is instructive on this point. On March 22, 1973, William R. Tyler, Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, gave evidence before a Sub-Committee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives. When asked whether the United States government favoured my continuing as head of the government, he replied: "No, the U.S. Government does not." Elford A. Cederberg then queried why even the small amount of technical assistance was being given to British Guiana, and whether Tyler felt that this was justified in view of what he regarded as the People's Progressive Party hostility to the US "way of life," since an independent British Guiana under the People's Progressive Party "will probably vote against us in the United Nations and will probably be oriented towards the Soviet Bloc rather than towards the free world."

Tyler then replied: "I recognise the difficulty there, Mr. Congressman. I am absolutely frank to admit to you I do not think it is a clear-cut case. I think a case can be made out to say that by doing anything for this country we are directly or indirectly improving the political chances of the Leader. On the other hand, if we do nothing, then the economic situation in

that country is such that it will deteriorate and I think we will have there a condition, politically, socially and economically, which will make it easier for the Leader to consolidate his control over the country. What we would like to do is to build up what I might call an infrastructure or base of increased economic and social well-being, so that what democratic forces exist in this country have a chance in the future to gain the upper hand, when it becomes independent. I have no special claim to wisdom on this but we think that on balance, one thing is certain, that if the conditions deteriorate it will make it easier for the Leader to achieve complete control whereas if we build a base there with improvements in the situation, we do retain the hope that the Leader will be succeeded by somebody who is more favourably disposed towards the west."

When pressed further that British Guiana would soon achieve independence under the PPP government, Tyler was most revealing.

Mr. Tyler: "May I remind you, Mr. Congressman, as of now, this country is under control of the parent government."

Mr. Cederberg: "But they can let it go any time desired. Is that right?"

Mr. Tyler: "They can, but if I may go off the record on this?"

No doubt, Tyler was requesting permission to relate in private the sinister plot at the level of the Presidency and the U.S. State Department. During Kennedy's visit to London in May 1963 a similar point of view was expressed by the President's press secretary, Pierre Salinger, on BBC television. And Dean Rusk, U.S. Secretary of State, was reported by the London Times on June 29, 1963, to have urged Lord Home, the British Foreign Secretary, to suspend our constitution or hold a referendum on a new system of voting. The Times and the Guardian, commenting on the talks in May 1963 between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, indicated that Guiana was one of the issues discussed by the two leaders.

Pinpointing U.S. interference in our domestic affairs, even the Tory M.P. and Colonial Secretary Iain Macleod said in a debate on British Guiana in June 1964, in the House of Commons: "There is an irony we all recognise in the fact of America urging us all over the world towards colonial freedom except where it approaches their own doorstep. When I was last in America. . . I discussed with many people, including President Kennedy, this particular question which weighs anxiously on their minds, I myself think their fears (about Dr. Jagan) are exaggerated. The American attitude seems dangerous because in my experience if you put off independence because you fear you may get left-wing government, the most likely thing to happen is that you will get a government even further to the left."

Iain Macleod, who chaired the 1960 Constitutional Conference, knew that the denial of independence and the imposition of the electoral system of proportional representation in October 1963, was a breach of the formula agreed upon in 1960 for independence. ⁹⁸

Whatever was US concern, the fact is there is a bloody dictatorship in Chile today. Similarly, whatever was Kennedy's concern about the PPP in Guyana, the US-backed PNC has established a neo-fascist regime in Guyana. In 1966, it enacted the National Security Act, far more vicious than the US National Security Act (1951) which spawned McCarthyism in the USA. This measure permits detention without trial and other violations of the rule of law.

The press is muzzled while the regime moves to monopolise the mass media. Civil liberties are denied and thugs, reminiscent of the Hitler youth, are employed to break up political meetings of opposition parties.

The extensive fraud in the 1968 and 1973 elections and the army intervention, seizure and tampering of ballot boxes in 1973 were thoroughly exposed by the Granada Television (UK) documentaries, "The Trail of the Vanishing Voters" and "The Making of a Prime Minister" (1968) and "Mr. Burnham has done it again" (1973).

In "The Making of a Prime Minister", Humphrey Taylor, Director of Opinion Research Centre, who conducted an independent survey in Britain of overseas voters (overseas voting was first introduced in 1968 said: "Obviously I don't know what happened in Guyana, but so far as Britain is concerned, the compilation of the register was a totally dishonest and corrupt operation. And, as we have clearly established, the great majority of people listed do not exist. This I would think is unprecedented for a Commonwealth country, as far as I know; and it's, you know, a pretty awful and disgraceful episode."

And in the transcript of the film, its research editor, Gus Macdonald, pointed out: "It's my firm conclusions that the election inside Guyana was neither free nor fair."

"Mr. Burnham Has Done It Again" shows a Jamaican family and a 6-year-old child in England registered as Guyanese voters!

The Caribbean Contact, a monthly printed in Trinidad by the Caribbean Christian Communications Network in its editorial of August 1973, stated:

. . .Watergate is not an American experience only. Wherever men battle for power, we can expect to find contempt for other people's rights . . . the same corrupt determination, the same despicable logic that the end justifies the means, appears to be behind every electoral tactic of the P.N.C. government and it is this cynical pragmatism which has discredited the results of the general elections of 1963 and again this year 99

Ric Mentus, editor of the Sunday Graphic, in his Sunday Opinion "The Mind Boggles", wrote:

In an election that was remarkable for the spate of controversy it generated from the initial stages of registration of voters right through to the final counting of ballots, both the nature and scope of the irregularities reported are serious enough to demand an impartial inquiry into the entire electoral process . . . the whole nation is perplexed over the double standards being applied to the election procedure and results. The people cannot stretch credibility far enough to embrace both the details of irregularities that they have experienced and the persistent suggestion and indoctrination that has been coming from all officials and semi-official circles. The mind boggles at the enormity of the task and the Guyanese after the election is sadder and a bit more fearful of the future.

If he dares to think about the matter at all, he cannot help coming to the conclusion that whatever was responsible for the stunning victory we have witnessed, it was not fairplay. He will most likely then ask himself, what is there in this two-thirds majority that made it necessary to go to such lengths to get it? And what kind of nation-building are we going to move into from a beginning as suspect and tense as this. . .

The Editor of the Catholic Standard, Father Wong, in his editorial "Fairy Tale Elections", stated: "The July 16 election results, to say the least, puts a severe strain on one's credibility. No one seriously believes it. That this is so must be laid firmly at the door of the government.

"The conduct of the Election arrangements has been most unfortunate. The public and the Opposition parties were treated in cavalier fashion. Information, which must be provided under law, was withheld until the last moment and was often given in an incomplete form.

"The law also was suddenly amended to give a semblance of legality to the situation. What is more to the point is that the staff assembled were not notable for their neutrality.

"To top it all the Government ignored the straight-forward and commendable request that representatives of the Opposition parties should accompany the ballot boxes to the counting centres.

"In the circumstances, the failure to seal boxes, the harassment of election personnel of the other parties who tried to follow the boxes, the wholly inexplicable detention of the

boxes in the Guyana Defence Force compound for a long period -- all these circumstances were bound to attract suspicion.

"At this time there is no rejoicing in the country at the fact that there will be a strong Government. People are fearful and the queues outside the US Embassy every morning will now grow longer.

"It remains to be seen what the miniature Opposition now will do. Will they take their seats in Parliament and try 'to make a go' of it? Or will they, in keeping with the rejection of the Election, refuse to take their seats?

"Whatever the Opposition parties do, they will have to reckon with the feeling among some of their supporters that power can no longer be secured through the ballot box."

On July 22, journalist Rickey Singh in a feature article in the Sunday Graphic on July 22, 1973, pointed out that "highly qualified statisticians in government employment have data which shows that on April 7, 1973, the population of Guyana 21 years and over was 314,564". Large numbers had emigrated, yet the list of voters inside Guyana at May 31, 1973 was 384,434.

Soon after, as a result of government pressure, Ric Mentus, Father Harold Wong and Rickey Singh were relieved of their jobs.

By increasing its votes from 41 per cent in 1964 to 71 per cent in 1973, the PNC minority, neo-fascist regime is in a position to make constitutional amendments for the further erosion of fundamental rights.

The Kennedy administration's contradictory position was previously seen under the Truman administration. In 1948, after the overthrow of the Gallegos government in Venezuela, Truman wrote to the ex-President:

I believe that the use of force to effect political change is not only deplorable, but also contrary to the ideals of the American peoples. The government of the United States proposes to do everything possible, in accordance with its international obligations, to fortify the democratic forces in this hemisphere.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, a year later in 1949, said that "we deplore the action of any group in substituting its judgement for that of the electorate."

Yet after Truman had launched the Korean war, US Ambassador, Ralph H. Archerman, expressing appreciation for the guided-missile-tracking base facilities in the Dominican Republic, praised the Trujillo dictatorship. On June 2, 1952, he told the Dominican people:

All western nations today are striving. . . for the amelioration of mankind. Governments are taking interest in the welfare of peoples. . . . Your own illustrious president . . . Trujillo. . . gave illustration of this trend when, in a speech he made only a few days ago, he reiterated an aspiration he has often voiced before, to raise the standard of living of the Dominican Republic so that his people may benefit from a fuller life. No one can gainsay the great benefits he has already succeeded in bring about. 100

President Lyndon Johnson also uttered hypocritical comments. A year before he reverted to the "big stick" and "gunboat diplomacy" in the Dominican Republic, he had on May 4, 1964, told Latin American ambassadors and Alliance for Progress leaders of US dedication to political democracy and "a peaceful, democratic social revolution across the hemisphere."

President Johnson justified the massive armed intervention on the pretext of saving lives and of stopping the communist takeover. Actually, of the State Department list of alleged communists, many were not communists, some were not in the Dominican Republic and one was a 14-year-old boy. And the "1,000 to 1,500 bodies that are dead in the streets" turned out to be only six.

On this foundation of lies was built the Johnson doctrine, under which the USA appropriated the right to intervene in any country "threatened" by communism.¹⁰¹

This was similar to the Lyttleton doctrine which in 1953, after the landing of troops in Guyana, had stated that the British government was not willing to allow a communist state to be organised within the British Commonwealth.

A month later, on September 1965, resolution No. 560 was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives giving the "right" to the United States to use its armed forces in any country in the Americas.

"Vietnamisation" - Latin Americans to kill Latin Americans

Soon after the intervention in the Dominican Republic, President Johnson called for an Inter-American Peace Force on the basis that independence must give way to interdependence, that sovereignty with its concept of "geographical frontiers" was obsolete and should be replaced by "ideological frontiers". This, he argued, was necessary for the preservation of freedom and democracy. As under the Truman Doctrine, democracy and peace were equated with the free enterprise capitalist system. "The American way of Life" was presumed to be what the Caribbean and the Americas needed, and there must be a collective force to defend the "collective community."

The Johnson administration, abandoning the "silken glove" technique of the Kennedy administration, had previously in August 1964, sanctioned the overthrow of the Goulart government in Brazil, which had embarked on a programme of radical reforms and had restricted the amount of profits foreign companies were permitted to send abroad. U.S. military aid was largely instrumental in ensuring the success of the coup. The Chairman of the House of Foreign Affairs Committee underlined this on May 24, 1965, when he stated: "Every critic of foreign aid is confronted with the fact that the armed forces of Brazil threw out the Goulart government and that U.S. military aid was a major factor in giving these forces an indoctrination in the principles of democracy (sic!) and a pro-US orientation. Many of these officers were trained in the United States under the AID programme." 102

It was significant that after US troops departed from the Dominican Republic following the massive intervention in 1965, Brazilian troops were sent to fill the vacuum. The technique adopted by Johnson was the use of military aid to overthrow progressive regimes and then to use the client state as its instrument against the national liberation struggle, a policy later to become known under the Nixon administration as "Vietnamisation" -- the USA providing the guns and the Asian, African, Caribbean and Latin American peoples providing the manpower and the lives.

Richard Nixon who had been booed and spat upon in Venezuela during his Latin American tour in 1958, proposed in the early 1970's an "Action for Progress" and adopted a "low profile" towards Latin America. He called for an "equal partnership" and a firm commitment to the inter-American system. . . as exemplified by the Organisation of American States and for aid "on a multilateral basis within the American system."

But the verbiage was only a cover for traditional big stick methods. Despite the characterisation of the new policy towards the region by the head of the South American department, Mr. Kubisch, as "mature partnership", it was the Nixon administration which supplied arms to the unpopular PNM regime and ordered U.S. warships into Trinidadian waters during the February-April 1970 uprising in Trinidad, bombed Haiphong and Hanoi and mined the waterways of North Vietnam's ports, secretly and illegally attacked Cambodia and sanctioned the CIA operation in Chile and gave military aid to its armed forces while economic aid was drastically cut.

And the main partners in the Caribbean and Latin America playing the role of the American *milferme* are the sub-imperialisms of Nicaragua under the Somoza dictatorship for Central

America and Brazil under the rule of military gorillas for South America. It is significant that President Nixon heaped lavish praise on the Brazilian dictatorship after the official visit of the Brazilian President to Washington, declaring: "As Brazil goes, so goes the rest of Latin America".¹⁰³

What this signifies can be gleaned from the mouth of one of Brazil's main spokesmen, Defence Minister Costa e Silva, who is reported to have said on April 23, 1965, after a meeting of military leaders with the then President Castelo Branco that "any candidate in the 1966 gubernatorial or presidential elections will be officially recognized only with the approval of the armed forces."¹⁰⁴ This has meant naked fascist dictatorial rule with detention and torture inside Brazil as has been disclosed by Amnesty International and other international organisations, and intervention in the internal affairs of other states - Paraguay, Bolivia, Uruguay. The Brazilian dictatorship helped in the overthrow of the leftist Torres government in Bolivia in 1971.

The Guyana and Brazilian governments have signed technical and cultural cooperation agreements and agreed to cooperate in fighting "terrorism" and in preparing and co-ordinating plans for the design of a bridge over the Takatu River separating the two countries. Brazil will be provided with duty-free ware-house facilities in Georgetown, the capital. In turn, Guyanese army officers receive military training in Brazil, and Guyana is to get aid of \$6 million for the interior highway from Georgetown to Lethem which adjoins Brazil.

As regards the latter project, Alfredo Tarre Murzi, leading Venezuelan Congressman and Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Chamber of Deputies declared in November 1968 when General Jose da Cunha Garcia became Brazilian Ambassador to Guyana that the highway from Boa Vista to Georgetown would be "enormously useful" to Brazil's "aspirations of domination and control over the north-east flank of the South American continent," and would "be a road of political, economic, technical, cultural and military penetration into the heart of Guyana."

President Gerald Ford also sanctions intervention. He too, like Johnson, presumed to know what was good for the Caribbean and Latin American peoples. When asked recently as regards Chile: "Under what international law do we have a right to attempt to stabilize the constitutionally-elected government of another country?" He replied:

I am not going to pass judgement on whether it is permitted or authorized under international law. It is a recognized fact that historically as well as presently, such actions are taken in the best interest of the countries involved.¹⁰⁵

Fortunately, the call for a joint flexible military force to combat national liberation revolutions anywhere, was rejected by the majority of the Latin American states: only five of the countries with the most vicious dictatorial regimes -- Brazil, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Bolivia and Argentina (Argentina later withdrawn) -- agreed to participate.

Fortunately also President Ford's assertion that the United States reserves the right to intervene whenever it thought it was necessary was rejected by many in Congress. Senator Walter F. Mondlane said it was "unbelievable". Democratic Senator Frank Church called it "unsavoury and unprincipled . . . tantamount to saying that we respect no law save the law of the jungle."

Economic Aggression

Apart from direct and indirect aggression, the army, training and control of the military and the police, and the use of client states, economic aggression has also been a weapon in the arsenal of imperialism -- economic blockade, aid with "strings", curtailment of credits

and essential machinery spare parts and the imposition of an economic planning strategy designed to create a status of dependency.

In 1953, a tanker blockade helped to strangle the nationalist government of Dr. Mossadegh of Iran.

Beginning in 1960, the United States government embarked on a policy of economic blockade of Cuba -- refusal to buy sugar and to sell spare parts, pressure on other Latin American states to break off diplomatic, trade and other relations with Cuba. Pressure was exerted on Canada not to sell wheat and flour, and on Britain not to sell buses, to Cuba. Even the Dutch KLM airlines suspended its flights to Havana.

After the PNC regime was installed in Guyana in December 1964 with the help of the CIA, it broke off the trade and cultural links which the PPP government had established with Cuba.

In Guyana, during the 1963 80-day strike, fomented and financed by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), fuel oil from neighbouring Trinidad was cut off.

The imperialists succeeded in strangling the government of Nkrumah in Ghana with a sharp drop in the price of cocoa.

Similar tactics were used against the Allende government of Chile -- spare parts were cut off; the price of copper dropped from 68 cents in 1970 to 59 cents in 1972; foreign credits fell from about \$200 million in 1970 to U.S.\$32 million in 1972.

In the territories where the imperialists held sway, a policy of economic subversion was also carried out. A developmentalist approach with an economic planning strategy geared to satisfy not local-national, but foreign interests was advocated.

What came to be known as the Puerto Rico model of economic planning was fostered in the immediate post-war period. The theoretical justification for this strategy was that capital was necessary for development, that capital was short, that to secure this capital the less developed countries must create an investment climate by granting incentives to foreign investors.

These incentives took various forms:

- (1) Tax holidays - the non-payment of income taxes for periods from 5 years and over. In some countries such as the Bahamas and the Bermudas, foreign investors pay no income taxes;
- (2) Duty free importation of factories, raw materials and building materials;
- (3) Subsidies of various kinds -- low rentals in industrial estates; cheap prices for land and low rates for services such as water, gas and electricity;
- (4) Anti-labour measures which do not encourage the growth of strong, democratically-run trade unions, and which do not provide for workmen's compensation, severance pay, minimum wage and factory safety, etc. Even anti-strike laws are enacted in some territories;
- (5) Repatriation of capital in the form of profits, debt repayment and interest charges.

These incentives in their aggregate were to be such as would facilitate the investors to recover their investments in three to four years.

Despite the ballyhoo about "operation bootstrap" in Puerto Rico, the basic problems of the people remain unsolved. Although Puerto Ricans are free to migrate to the United States, and its low-wage (lower than US) produced goods enter duty-free into the United States, a facility not provided to the territories of other colonial powers by their own metropolis, unemployment is still high, approximating 15 per cent of the labour force. Wages in Puerto Rico are far lower than in the USA, but the cost of living in 1971 was estimated to be 18 per cent higher than in Washington, D.C. According to official estimates, three-quarters of the population earn less than the average income; one-quarter of the latter category does not earn

enough for human survival. Their income is described as truly "sub-human. . . since. . . it does not include more than basic animal necessities, and almost no specifically human necessity." ¹⁰⁶ It is estimated that one out of every five rural Puerto Ricans lives on inadequate welfare in poverty-stricken families.

In the "New Deal" era, Governor Tugwell had stated that in the slums, "the shacks were in rows. . . which left some open spaces for filth to accumulate and the tide lifted the piles of garbage and deposited them again in the same place, twice daily."

In the 1960's, the position hardly changed. A big business management newsletter News Front was forced to admit:

Yes, there are the arrabales, slums of almost unimaginable dreariness. And there are untold numbers of citizens who have not advanced beyond that 1940 per capita (income) rate, and there is a great deal of grubbing around for mere existence, and there is a very serious drug problem, and some class resentment, and more prostitution than the Catholic Church is comfortable with. But Puerto Rico, for all its industry and its population density and its Americanization and its modernization, is still a place in which to live, to breathe; a place to move around in. ¹⁰⁷

For the people, Puerto Rico meant foreign domination, hardships and emigration; for the businessmen a paradise -- in "Puerto Rico, manufacturers average 30 per cent on their investment."

The high hopes of the Puerto Rico model in the English-speaking Caribbean territories to which it was introduced in the early 1950's did not, as in Puerto Rico itself, materialize.

The unemployment and underemployment problem is extremely grave. In Guyana, the rate of unemployment is today about 30 per cent of the labour force. Among youths, the percentage is higher.

Living conditions deteriorated largely because of super-exploitation and the maintenance of the colonial and neo-colonial economic status quo.

In the fifteen-year period, 1950 and 1965, there was a net outflow from US investments from Latin America of US\$7,500 million; from Asia and Africa \$9,100 million. In Puerto Rico, US corporations took out about \$25 million in profits in 1925; by 1968, they were over \$300 million.

But not only did the outflow of profits harm the development of these countries. Foreign capital also perpetuated the status of dependency between the colonies and semi-colonies and the metropolitan countries.

For instance, US investments to the developing countries were for raw materials, mainly minerals. Fifty-nine per cent of the total investment to these countries in 1948 went into extractive industries as compared with the same 59 per cent into the developed capitalist states for manufacturing and merchandising. In 1964, of US investments of US\$1,629 million in Africa, \$860 million was invested in oil and gas, mainly in Libya; \$225 million in manufacturing of which \$192 million was put into South Africa, the imperialist outpost in Africa.

Of the \$20 billion of US investments in the underdeveloped countries up to 1969, \$13.8 billion was put into Latin America -- mainly for the extraction of minerals and other raw materials. Consequently, the Caribbean and Latin American countries "developed" a lopsided economy with dependence of its export income on one crop and/or one mineral.

Like the rest of "third-world", they also suffered from trading and monetary losses. They were caught in the "price scissors" of buying dear and selling cheap. The policy of "tight money", financial orthodoxy and devaluation fostered by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) also caused financial losses.

The resultant plunder of resources and the drain of capital led to the search for state

loans by colonial and neo-colonial regimes. But only those who were prepared to grant incentives to foreign investors and not to carry out a basic programme of socio-economic change, were given loans.

And the aid was granted with strings. It was not given for a planned proportional development of the economy with emphasis on industry and agriculture; it was restricted mainly to infra-structure projects -- roads, sea defence, airstrips and airports, public buildings, stellingings, harbours, communications, etc. -- which constituted an indirect help to the foreign investors.

This was made clear by leading policy-makers. On March 30, 1950, Secretary of State, Dean Acheson testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Point 4 Program put it this way:

I think there is a pretty widely held idea that we are going to build large mills, mines and factories for these under-developed peoples. This is not true.

More revealing was the statement by Mr. John Abbink, one-time Chairman of a U.S. State Department Technical Mission to Brazil. According to the Journal of Commerce of March 23, 1950, he said:

The U.S. must be prepared to 'guide' the inevitable large-scale industrialisation of underdeveloped countries if it is to cushion the shock of intensive economic development abroad on the American economy. . . This industrialisation drive if not controlled by some means (such as the Point 4 Program) would mean a substantial reduction in the size of American export markets.

"It is the policy of my Government" said Mr. Albert J. Powers, a Commerce Department Trade Consultant as head of delegation to the 1955 International Industrial Exposition in Bogota, "not to intervene in the financing of activities which should properly be promoted by private enterprise. It is up to you people to create business and industrial opportunities which will attract investment capital from the United States. Remember, too, that you must offer the possibility of greater profits than can be obtained at home. This is a time of exceptional inducements in my country for domestic financial ventures."

Albert Powers was expressing what the powerful National Association of Manufacturers had earlier stipulated; namely, that during the period of economic aid, the participating countries should not undertake any further nationalisation or initiate projects which had the effect of destroying or impairing private enterprises. He was also reiterating what had become official cold war foreign economic policy of all the imperialist states. For instance, in Britain, Under-Secretary, Mr. Rees-Williams, like Dean Acheson, made it clear in 1949 that it was not the intention of the British government to industrialise its colonial territories. Writing in Fact in March 1949, he stated that "it is no part of our purpose to try and set up everywhere small Lancashires. It is quite obvious that every territory cannot produce everything."¹⁰⁸ The British Minister of Food, emphasised "the development to primary production of all sorts in the colonial territories."

The aid was further restricted by being tied to purchases most often for higher priced goods and services in the donor country. Two-thirds of British aid was so tied. American aid agreements stipulated in addition that goods must be transported in US ships.

More important was the channelling of the aid in such a manner that ultimately the recipient country would become economically, militarily and politically dependent on the United States. For instance, surplus food given as aid under Public Law, PL480 had the effect of arresting agricultural development and later creating a market for relatively higher-priced foods from the United States.

How aid is used to make an underdeveloped country subservient and dependent was highlighted by Nelson Rockefeller. After the downfall of the Mossadegh government in 1953, he wrote in a report to President Eisenhower:

We should ignore the vital fact that virtually all our natural rubber, manganese, chromium and tin, as well as substantial proportions of our zinc, copper and oil and a third or more of the lead and aluminium we need comes from abroad, and, furthermore, that it is chiefly drawn from the underdeveloped areas of Africa and Asia, which are in the orbit of one or other of the military alliances built by the US. This is also true of a major part of our super-strategic material (uranium ore particularly).

The most significant example in practice of what I mean, was the Iranian experiment with which, as you will remember, I was directly concerned. By the use of economic aid we succeeded in getting access to Iranian oil and we are now well established in the economy of that country. The strengthening of our economic position in Iran has enabled us to acquire control over her entire foreign policy and in particular to make her join the Baghdad Pact. At the present time the Shah would not dare even to make any changes in his Cabinet without consulting our Ambassador.

Similarly, the use of aid has been perverted to make into puppets many Presidents and Prime Ministers in the Caribbean and Latin America. By 1969, these countries too were providing the United States with a substantial share of its minerals -- bauxite - 99%; manganese ore - 36%; copper - 60%; iron ore - 43%; lead ore - 31%; zinc ore - 35%; crude petroleum - 31%.

And as in Iran, aid was used to subvert the Pas Estensoro government. By going along with the revolutionary regime, the United States succeeded in getting favourable compensation terms for the nationalised tin mines and a petroleum code, one of the most favourable to the foreign oil companies seeking concessions. According to the Agency for International Development, "the Bolivian government also initiated strong measures to reform and reorganize the nationalized tin mines, passed a revised mining code favourable to private investments, issued a decree for the consolidation and control of the budgets and foreign borrowings of the semi-autonomous government corporations, and promulgated a new investment code and a revised and more equitable royalties schedule designed to encourage private investment. Each of these self-help measures had been strongly urged by AID and their adoption is largely attributable to AID assistance." 109

The end result of the "incentive to capital" Puerto Rican model was a relative decline in the position of the underdeveloped countries. Their share of world income fell from 54% in 1800 to 42% in 1900 and to only 18% in 1962. This in turn led to grave discontent and revolutionary upheavals.

In this new situation of a widening gap between the imperialist and the imperialist-dominated countries, which posed a threat to world peace, the United Nations launched in 1960 the first Development Decade. And with the 1959 Cuban Revolution and the declaration in May 1961 by Premier Fidel Castro that it would take a socialist course, President Kennedy launched his Alliance for Progress. 110

Kennedy's aim was to reform the capitalist-imperialist system so as to make life more tolerable and thus to prevent Latin America from exploding. If there was no evolution, he argued, there was bound to come revolution. That point had been previously emphasised by John Moors Cabot, Assistant Secretary for Latin American Affairs, when in 1954 he said:

Social reform is coming. It may come by evolution or revolution. There are reactionary elements in every country in the hemisphere which do not want social reform. They are willing to tie down the safety valve and wait for the boiler to burst. In many countries liberal elements, confronted by such intransigent opposition have more and more fallen under Communist influence. To my mind there is

nothing more dangerous from the viewpoint of low-range American policy than to let the Communists, with their phoney slogans, seize the leadership of social reform. We simply cannot afford to identify ourselves with the elements which would tie down the social safety valve. That wouldn't protect our national interest; it wouldn't even for long protect our investments."

The Declaration to the Peoples of America, signed on August 17, 1961, described the Alliance for Progress as "a vast effort to bring a better life to all the peoples of the continent". Kennedy called on the ruling Latin American elites to undertake land and fiscal reforms. In turn, the United States promised aid -- in the first two years over \$1.5 billion had been disbursed -- for residential housing, schools, hospitals, water systems, textbooks, agricultural loans. And it was proposed that \$20 billion of investments would become available in the decade to raise per capita growth rate to 2.5 per cent per year.

And in place of the discredited Puerto Rican economic planning model, the United Nations Commission for Latin America (ECLA) proposed a new one, the so-called ECLA model. To stimulate local production, and to prevent the financial losses suffered by developing countries from non-equivalent international trade (buying dear and selling cheap), the policy of import-substitution and the establishment of import-substituting industries was proposed. Land reform was also seen as a necessary measure to stimulate production to meet the demand for agricultural goods imported from abroad, to provide the raw materials for the industrialisation programme, and at the same time to raise productivity and farmers' income to provide the means in the countryside for the locally-produced industrial goods. It was felt also that foreign capital would be required for the establishment of industries and for the payment of land taken over from the latifundistas.

But foreign capital introduced the same, if not greater, problems, than under the Puerto Rican model. While there was greater emphasis on manufacturing industry, a deformed type of capitalism developed in Latin America based on trans-national corporations producing mainly for the domestic market with assembly-type, branch-plants or factories which had become technologically obsolete.

No doubt, big business and the ruling circles in the United States were influential in incorporating in the ECLA model the "open-door" to foreign capital. In a report to President Kennedy in February 1963, Wall Street asked for a "get tough" Latin American policy. Signed by David Rockefeller, President of the Chase National Bank, Emilio G. Gollado, Vice-President of Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, and Walter B. Wriston, Executive Vice-President of the First National City Bank, the report said:

The Alliance for Progress can succeed if -- and only if -- it places far greater emphasis on the encouragement of private initiative and investment, both local and foreign.

The first requirement is that governments -- and, as far as possible, the people -- of Latin America know that the US has changed its policy so as to put primary stress on improvement in the general business climate as a prerequisite for social development and reform.

A second requirement concerns a change in the criteria for granting aid. The US shall concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated.

The plan called for the creation in Latin America of a favourable investment climate. Wall Street also made it clear that it did not want any fundamental change. The Clay Committee on foreign aid in 1963 noted: "We believe the US should not aid a foreign government in projects establishing government-owned industrial and commercial enterprises which compete with existing private endeavours."

Official Washington bowed to the pressure of the monopolies.

In his foreign aid message of 1963, Kennedy expressed the view of big business when he stated: "the primary new initiative in this year's program relates to our increased efforts to encourage the investment of private capital in the underdeveloped countries."^{110(a)}

And the protection of interests of private foreign capital was ensured at the diplomatic level by Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. As Newsweek on April 19, 1965 disclosed: "American diplomats can be expected to intensify their help to US businessmen overseas. Directives now awaiting Dean Rusk's signature will remind US embassies that their efficiency will be rated not only by diplomatic and political prowess but by how well they foster American commercial interests abroad. Moreover, prominent businessmen will be recruited as inspectors of the Foreign Service."

No wonder that by 1964 David Rockefeller, head of the powerful Chase Manhattan Bank, was happy about "the marked change in the attitude of those responsible for the Alliance", and that the State Department had recognized that the Alliance "had had too much emphasis on social reform."¹¹¹

The lending institutions like the World Bank also favoured foreign capital and channelled aid to foster the growth of capitalism. Eugene R. Black, a former President of the World Bank, wrote in the Columbia Journal of World Business:

Our foreign aid programmes constitute a distinct benefit to American business. The three major benefits are: (1) Foreign aid provides a substantial and immediate market for US goods and services; (2) Foreign aid stimulates the development of new overseas markets for US companies; (3) Foreign aid orientates national economies toward a free enterprise system in which US firms can prosper.¹¹²

The British, French and Dutch, like the United States, emphasised the role of private capital. In its aid programme memoranda of 1969 and 1970 to the OECD, the British government stated: "The UK regards private investment as complementary to official aid. One of the main purpose of aid is to build up infrastructure in both physical and administrative capacity, thus helping to create the environment in which private investment can make its characteristic contribution (sic) to development."

Similarly, the Netherlands Minister for Development Cooperation wanted no obstacle to private capital.

In January 1969, he wrote:

If, in the international economy, grandiose words such as 'aid' or 'assistance' are employed, it is because people are trying to delude themselves. It must be clearly seen that it is to the interest, I would even say self-interest, of the rich countries that capital move freely over the surface of our planet without meeting obstacles at every turn.

Foreign capital also demanded regional integration. The imperialist strategists saw the need to organise production on a wider and more intensive scale without national barriers. They thus propagated the concept of "ideological frontiers" instead of "geographical frontiers", namely, that the concept of national sovereignty and independence with trade barriers and tariff walls was old-fashioned and obsolete, that all those who believed in the same ideology ("the defence of freedom," (the euphemism for state-monopoly capitalism) must come together to create what US President, Lyndon Johnson, called "one ideological community."

Advocating regional integration, George Ball, former US Under-Secretary of State, and chairman of the big investment banking firm told the New York Chamber of Commerce: "The multinational US corporation is ahead of, and in conflict with, existing world political organisations represented by the nation-state. Major obstacles to the multi-national

corporation are evident in Western Europe, Canada and a good part of the developing world."

The Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA), the Central American Common Market (CACM) and the Caribbean Free Trade Area (CARIFTA) now the Caribbean Common Market (CARICOM) have become Western Hemisphere counterparts of the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Free Trade Area (EFTA).

Regional integration was justified on the basis that the grouping of territories in Free Trade Areas or Common Markets would facilitate economies of scale and thus cheaper commodity production for the benefit of the consumers. However, it served the multi-national corporations to increase the rate of exploitation. By sharp practices and unfair competition, they eliminated their competitors, and from their monopolistic positions extracted enormous profits.

In the case of the Commonwealth Caribbean, regional integration has helped the USA to undermine the position of Britain. In the first two years of CARIFTA, the United States more than doubled its exports of food into the area. The manufacturing plants, predominantly of the branch-plants, assembly-type, which have been set up mainly in Jamaica and Trinidad, use materials, parts and components imported principally from the United States. Included in the CARICOM Treaty Appendix are twelve foolscap pages listing apples, grapes, rye, barley, oats, wheat, paper, silk, iron, steel in all forms, copper, nickel, tungsten, zinc, tin, molybdenum, tantalum, as well as "all other non-ferrous base metals, unwrought or wrought, which may always be regarded as originating wholly within the Common Market when used in the state described in this list in a process of production with the Common Market."

As a result of this type of deformed industrialisation, Jamaica increased its exports to the region by 60 per cent and Trinidad by 30 per cent. The other territories whose exports increased by less than 10 per cent (for Guyana the increase was only 5 per cent in the same two-year period) are forced to pay higher prices for generally inferior-quality goods. For them, the CARIFTA aim of equitable distribution of benefits has not been realised. They are in the same position as Honduras which complained that "the accelerated pace of economic integration. . . was forced upon Central America", that "its regional trade balance had become unfavourable, its regional terms of trade were deteriorating, its consumer prices were rising, and the number of unemployed artisans was growing as a result of industrial competition from the other Common Market members. Finally. . . Honduras was suffering from diminished fiscal revenues as a result of the exportation by the more developed members of the CACM of their pseudo-Central American products to Honduras exempt from tariffs; Honduras was in effect subsidising the industrial development of the other Central American states. . ." 113

Under regional integration, the ECLA model and the Alliance for Progress, the relative position of the Latin American countries deteriorated. The drain of wealth in the late 1960's and 1970's was even greater than during the earlier period. Profits from investments, debt repayments and interest charges were nearly 2,000 million dollars per year. Even the Alliance for Progress very low projected 2.5 per cent per caput rate of economic growth was not achieved. And the social and economic conditions of the people worsened.

In the 1970's, the multi-nationals became the targets of attacks; they stuck out as "sharks devouring sardines". In this new situation, the imperialists devised the new tactic of partnership.

President Richard Nixon in a number of messages and speeches, including his message to Congress on February 25, 1971 substituted for Kennedy's Alliance for Progress the formula of "equal partnership." "Thus the core of our new foreign policy," said the President, "is a partnership. . . Its necessary adjuncts are strength to secure our interests."

A year earlier, during his African tour, William P. Rogers, U.S. Secretary of State had

proposed partnership not only with capitalists, but also governments, "We believe," he said, "that private investment can and should play a growing role, above and beyond public assistance, in African development. Africans themselves desire to participate in such investment. In many countries, in the face of limited capital resources, it is the government rather than the private sector which has the financial wherewithal to join with foreign private investors. Thus, 'joint ventures' frequently involve a combination of foreign private and African governmental capital. We are prepared to encourage American investors to cooperate in such endeavours under adequate investment protection."

Under the partnership scheme, local personnel were incorporated into the foreign companies at the top levels of management and directorate. Local persons and governments were accepted as shareholders, even to the extent of 51 per cent ownership. This new manoeuvre of joint ventures was aimed at creating a wider social base for capitalism-imperialism for the defense of foreign rather than national interest.

Many joint ventures were established in the Western Hemisphere, particularly in Mexico, Argentina and Brazil. "Mexicanisation" is welcomed by big business. Fortune magazine says that a "company that puts its money into Mexico can be confident of avoiding most of the problems which customarily unnerve foreign investors elsewhere in Latin America. The country has gone for decades without a revolutionary change in government, the dangers of sudden expropriation are minimal, and the currency is stable." 114

Eduardo Frei in Chile also with the blessing of Washington put into practice the joint-venture idea in his "Chileanisation of copper". This was done demagogically to counter the revolutionary demands of Allende's Popular Unity government.

According to Richard Bourne in his Political Leaders of Latin America: "The Chileanisation of copper was an electoral gimmick designed to trump the FRAP proposal for full nationalisation in 1964. There is some evidence that it was produced in haste and cleared by the prospective Christian Democrat foreign minister, Gabriel Valdes, with the State Department and New York banking leaders rather than with the Braden and other companies concerned. The agreement, passed in 1965, provided for the Chilean state to own 51 per cent of the shares in the biggest mine, Braden's El Teniente."

In the Commonwealth Caribbean, regional integration and joint ventures within the framework of the reform-oriented ECLA model and the Alliance for Progress have replaced the pro-imperialist Puerto Rican model. Here too, there will be failure as in Latin America.

In the Central and South American countries, the structure built by the foreign monopolists have brought enormous benefits to themselves and a small local clientele group of politicians, administrators and businessmen in the face of grinding poverty for the masses.

In Brazil, the high growth rates benefitted 5 per cent of the population; 45 per cent had their living standard eroded. Forty-five million have the same total income as 900,000 privileged ones at the top. The Times (London) wrote in 1971: "It is likely that five per cent of the population now control about 45 per cent of the personal wealth today as against some 37 per cent in 1964." 115

In Mexico too, the gap between the rich and the poor has widened. Figures for 1964 show that 0.3 per cent of the Mexican families (33,000 out of 11 million) received 55 per cent of the national income, whereas 85 per cent of the families (9.3 million) got only 23.4 per cent.

This process continued. The New York Times (January 28, 1972) noted:

Mexico's average annual growth rate of 6.5 per cent (at constant prices) in the postwar era took place at the cost of social neglect and economic inequality. The industrial sector that emerged was largely paid for through foreign loans, while the urgent social needs of the population went unattended.

The direction of Mexico's boom was such that the country's economic and social

problems were increasing, Per capita income reached \$700 last year, but it was more a reflection of the enormous wealth acquired by a small group of industrialists rather than a rise in the general standard of living."

For the bulk of the Caribbean and Latin American peoples, the situation has become explosive. The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations at its meeting in Chile in 1965 noted that "at least 100 million Latin Americans are suffering from hunger." According to the ECLIA report, 23 million out of 83 million were unemployed in 1969. The unemployment and underemployment rate increased from 25 per cent in 1960 to 40 per cent in 1972.

Grave dissatisfaction is leading to militancy and the demand for revolutionary change. Instead of meeting this demand, the puppets and the imperialists resort to emasculation and control of the trade union movement, the denial of civil liberties and human rights and ideological warfare -- demagoguery, sloganeering and thought control.

Control of the Trade Union Movement

One of the principal aims of imperialism is the control of the trade union movement. After the American Federation of Labour (AFL) and the British TUC split the WFTU in 1949, the breakaway ICFTU and its Pan-American branch, the Inter-American Regional Organisation of Workers (ORIT) and its Caribbean section (CADORIT) came under the influence of the CIA. Prior to ORIT, the AFL had established the right-wing Inter-American Confederation of Labor (CIT) to counter the influential leftist Latin American Confederation of Labour (CTAL).

The stated objective of ORIT was the fostering of a "free" and "democratic" trade union movement in Latin America and the Caribbean. In actual fact, its main task was to smash or split militant and progressive trade unions.

One of the early "successes" of ORIT was its smashing of the Guyana TUC. After the suspension of the Constitution and removal of the PPP from the government in October 1953, the TUC which had backed the PPP was illegally disbanded in November 1953 through the pressure of the influential Serafino Romualdi, head of ORIT, and a new TUC of company-dominated and conservative trade unions was set up.

Referring to the disbanding and reconstruction of the TUC, 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 Trades Union Council voted, while supporters of the People's Progressive Party were out of the country, to dissolve the B.G. Trades Union Council.

Later, after Burnham had split the PPP in 1955, even some of the militant unions and leaders under his influence joined the new right-wing, anti-communist TUC, Andrew Jackson and Brentnol Blackman, who had been attacked by the British government became pillars of the new TUC.

How reactionary the TUC had become and what role the US trade union movement was playing in British Guiana could be gleaned from a special report, "Facts on Cheddi Jagan and his Communist controlled PPP of British Guiana. Free Labour's 10-year Struggle to Preserve Independence" by Serafino Romualdi. He reported inter alia.

"In order to eliminate, to all intents and purposes, the usefulness of the union (MPCA) Mrs. Jagan in her role of Minister of Labour, Health and Housing, suggested the establishment of a Wages Council in the sugar industry with statutory powers to fix wages and working conditions." Romualdi continued:

"The free labour movement bitterly opposed this measure because, once introduced in the sugar industry (with the consequent elimination of the union), it would have eventually been extended to the bauxite mines, the waterfront and other industries (sic). Rupert Tello termed this Jagan proposal 'especially a weapon to destroy the free trade union movement.' "

Elsewhere in the Caribbean and Latin America the same technique was employed. In

Guatemala where Arbenz electoral success and radical measures threatened the interests of the United Fruit Company, the powerful U.S. monopoly, Romualdi attempted to build a parallel union to woo the workers away from the government. When the attempt failed, George Meany, the head of the AFL, decided that it was time "to break the shackles of communist domination!"¹¹⁶

Similarly in 1962 in the Dominican Republic, the AFL-CIO set up a small dual union (GONATRAL) in place of the United Workers for Free Unions (FOUPSA) after the leader of the latter had refused to take a bribe of \$20,000 to call off a strike against the dictatorship. The Cabral regime which usurped power after the overthrow of the Bosch government decorated Romualdi with a medal for the "defense of freedom" and with transforming "into free democratic trade unions what had been a slave labour movement."¹¹⁷

Actually, under the Juan Bosch government, democratic trade unionism flourished for the first time in the history of the Dominican Republic, and minority trade unions were recognised as the legal bargaining agent in every factory.

Because of its close identification with conservative unions which collaborated with reactionary and dictatorial regimes like that of Batista in Cuba, ORIT began to lose its effectiveness by the early 1960's.

The staff report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (July 15, 1968) says ORIT:

... was originally founded for the specific purpose of combatting communist infiltration of the Latin American labor movement. ORIT has never quite solved the problem of emphasis as between fighting communism and strengthening democratic trade unions. . generally speaking, in ORIT North Americans have emphasized anti-communism; Latin Americans have emphasized democratic trade unionism.

This is one reason for what seems to be a decline in ORIT prestige in Latin America. More fundamental, perhaps, has been the tendency of ORIT to support US government policy in Latin America. ORIT endorsed the overthrow of the Arbenz regime in Guatemala and of the Goulart regime in Brazil. It supported Burnham over Cheddi Jagan in Guyana, and it approved the US intervention in the Dominican Republic. To many Latin Americans, this looks like ORIT is an instrument of the US State Department.¹¹⁸

Thus the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD) was set up in 1962 to save the ORIT unions. The rabid anti-communist, George Meany became President, and J. Peter Grace was appointed Chairman of the Board of Trustees. Grace is the chief executive of the big monopoly, W.R. Grace and Company, with extensive interests in the Caribbean and Latin America. About 95 per cent of its annual six million dollar budget comes from the US Treasury.

The main aim of the AIFLD is to create a docile subservient trade union movement. At its school in Front Royal, training was given to 1,092 trade unionists from the Caribbean and Latin America. The rest of the 188,795 trained by 1972 received their training at Labour Institutes set up in 11 territories in the Hemisphere. "Graduates" from these schools have helped to subvert several progressive, anti-imperialist trade unions and governments.

In an address given in September 1965, J. Peter Grace said:

... AIFLD trains Latin Americans in techniques of combatting communist infiltration. This training has paid off handsomely in many situations. For instance, AIFLD trainees have driven communists from port unions which were harassing shipping in Latin America. After several years of effort AIFLD men were able to take over control of the port union in Uruguay which had long been dominated by communists. AIFLD men also helped drive communists from control of British Guiana. They prevented the communists from taking over powerful unions in Honduras and helped to drive the communists from strong "jugular" unions in Brazil.

In a statement about these trainees made after his visit to Guiana in April 1962, Romualdi said: ". . . it appeared to me that young democratic trade union leaders would need

intensive training to combat Dr. Jagan's efforts. Subsequently, eight Guianese came to Washington in June 1962, as participants in the Institute's first course. In September of that year, six of these men returned to British Guiana, supported by AIFLD internships, enabling them to put into practice, on a full-time basis, what they had learned at our school. . . . When the BGTUC decided to call a general strike in an attempt to put the Institute's six interns, who were working with various local unions, at the disposal of the council's strike committee. . . . In agreement with the Institute's Secretary-Treasurer, Joseph A. Beirne, I instructed the interns to fully devote their efforts to supporting the strike, and extended their internships, which were scheduled to end on June 15, to August 15. . . . I would like to say that I am proud of our graduates in British Guiana. In spite of sacrifices and hardships they kept their places in the front lines of a difficult and, unfortunately, sometimes bloody battle."

In an article "unionists trained to harry Jagan's government, Victor Riesel wrote that among "the six courageous men" who received the AIFLD training was "a rather fearless chap by the name of Richard Ishmael, President of the anti-Communist Sugar Workers' Union known as the Man-Power Citizens' Association." Mr. Riesel continued: "Jagan has organized opposition groups in an effort to take over British Guiana's organized labour. If he succeeds there will be nothing to stop him from going internally Cuban. Realizing this, the American Institute for Free Labor Development -- supported by US 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. . . . It was in Panama City on March 9th that Ishmael met with Joe Curran's colleagues, Shannon Wall, NMU President, and Rene Lioeanjie, NMU Co-ordinator of organizing for Latin America. He told them that British Guiana's anti-Communist unions would try to stop Soviet gun-running. Ishmael said they would picket the Soviet and Cuban ships at the docks. . . . 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 April 5, 1963. Shamelessly, Riesel continued: "It's a pleasure to report we're giving the Communists a run for their money and guns."

Actually, the 80-day strike came about because the PPP government was attempting to make into law the National Labour Relations Bill, patterned after the US Wagner Act, to foster democratic trade unionism and to bring an end to company unions.

As regards L.F.S. Burnham, whom the CIA helped to bring to power after the strife and strike, Riesel wrote on January 14, 1974 (The Daily Journal, Caracas, Venezuela): ". . . . there is the back-slapping Forbes Burnham, prime minister of Guyana (once British Guiana) on the South American north coast.

"Some years ago, when he was leader of the national labor federation there he really ran scared. He came to the US for money and guidance. He would meet quietly in hotel rooms. I know, I was there. . . . Burnham got American money, American labor assistance and got to be prime minister. . . ."

The CIA agents operating inside Guyana were Gerald O'Keefe, posing as an official of the Retail Clerks Association and William McCabe, posing as a representative of the American Federation of State, Country and Municipal Employees (FSCME).

O'Keefe was one of the 50 persons named in the police secret report A Research Paper on the PNC Terrorist Organisation, which gave gory details of arson and dynamiting of government buildings.

The FSCME, according to The New York Times, was "actually run by two (CIA)aides who

operated out of the union's former headquarters in Washington with the knowledge of the union leadership." And CIA funds were channelled for the Guyana operation through the dummy Gotham Foundation.

CIA support for anti-communist trade unions and terrorist activities was disclosed by Thomas W. Braden, European Director of the CIA from 1950-1954. In his article, "I'm glad the CIA is Immoral" (Saturday Evening Post, May 20, 1967) he stated:

Lovestone and his assistant, Irving Brown. . . needed it to pay off strongarm squads in Mediterranean ports so that American supplies could be unloaded against the opposition of communist dock workers. . . With funds from Dubinsky's union, they organized the Force Ouvriere, a non-communist union. When they ran out of money they appealed to the CIA. Thus began the secret subsidy of free trade unions. . . 119

Other skeletons were unearthed after the expose on the CIA in 1967. Newsweek (April 7, 1969) reported the case of a cold-warrior, Franz Olah, of Austria. A "socialist", he emerged from a Nazi concentration camp in 1945 to become in the mid-50's the idol of the ordinary Austrians. Through vicious anti-communism, he captured the presidency of the powerful Austrian Trades Union Federation.

In 1963, he held the powerful post as Interior Minister and was regarded as "the man who saved Austria from the communists." But because of political nepotism and corruption, he was forced to resign from the government in 1964. And in April 1969, a Vienna Judge, ruling that "Olah had misused nearly \$50,000 (US) in union funds sentenced him to a year in jail."

Where did he get all his money to build up his empire and private anti-communist militia? Newsweek says "predictably enough, the CIA refused all comment while the AFL. . . denied that it had ever given any funds to Olah directly. Still, it seemed more than likely that Olah's bonanza had, indeed, come from US Government sources." "Look", said one American official recently, "Austria was a poor country then and the Soviets were on the move all over Europe. Somebody had to help."

Elsewhere as in Guyana, France and Austria, CIA and AFL-CIO collaboration was evident. In Africa, they attempted through the African-American Labour Centre to sabotage the attempts of Dr. Nkrumah and others to set up the All-African Trade Union Federation, the aim of which was freedom from cold-war influences. Jay Lovestone considered Nkrumah's brand of neutralism as "aide-de-camp" of communism.

In the Latin American area, Meany's foreign relations manipulator, Jay Lovestone, renegade of the Communist Party, was the principal link in the business of espionage, infiltration and subversion abroad. According to the New York Post of February 26: "One of Lovestone's 'institutes' actively helped to train Brazilian unionists here to participate in the military coup against Goulart's Brazilian regime. . . an alleged leftist but constitutional government. . . replaced by an oppressive tyranny of the right."

William C. Doherty of the AIFLD later admitted the assertions of the New York Post about the coup against Goulart. In 1968, he told a Senate sub-Committee: "As a matter of fact, some of them (graduates of the AIFLD school from Brazil) were so active that they became intimately involved in some of the clandestine operations of the revolution before it took place on April 1. What happened in Brazil on April 1 (1964) did not just happen -- it was planned -- and planned months in advance. Many of the trade union leaders - some of whom were actually trained in our institute - were involved in the revolution, and in the overthrow of the Goulart regime." 120

In the Dominican Republic, the late Fred A. Somerford, CIA agent posing as US Labour Attache, was the guiding light of CONATRAL which ran an advertisement in the new papers

calling on the people to put their faith not in the regime of the elected President Juan Bosch, but in the "armed forces". An obituary on Somerford, a year after Bosch's downfall said "George Meany wrote a personal letter of commendation to the deceased for his outstanding contribution to the Democratic Labour Movement of the Dominican Republic."

Similarly in Chile, the CIA collaborated with the anti-Allende reactionary political parties and trade unions. Time (September 24, 1973) wrote that its correspondent Rudolph Ranch "visited a group of truckers camped near Santiago who were enjoying a lavish communal meal of steak, vegetables, wine and empanadas (meat pies). 'Where does the money come from?' he enquired, 'from the CIA' the truckers answered laughingly."

No doubt, the CIA and the multinational corporations met the \$30 million per month loss suffered by the truck owners in their 39-day strike.

Their role was documented in hearings of the US Senate sub-Committee on Multinational Corporations. CIA's Western Hemisphere chief, William Broe disclosed that in July 1970, Harold Geneen, Chairman of International Telephone and Telegraph (ITT) told him that ITT was willing to put up a "substantial fund" in support of a conservative candidate for President at the elections of September 4, 1970.

Soon after Allende's victory, John McCone, an ITT director and former head of the CIA, offered Henry Kissinger and Richard Helms, then CIA chief, "up to \$1,000,000 to support any Government plan for the purpose of bringing about a coalition of the opposition to Allende."

On September 29, Broe said that he discussed with ITT Senior Vice-President, Edward Gerrity, "the feasibility of possible actions by US companies designed to create or accelerate economic instability in Chile."

According to the New York Times of 22nd March 1971, ITT "submitted an 18-point plan to the White House, designed to ensure, literally, that Allende should not survive the next crucial six months."

Time (April 9, 1973) states that Broe mentioned such measures as the cancellation of credit by American banks, a slowdown of delivery of machinery spare parts, action to force savings and loan institutions to close down, and the withdrawal of technical assistance.

The crippling strike of the truck owners cost the economy about \$60 million per month.

The CIA-fomented and financed chaos and disorder was then used as the excuse for imperialist-backed intervention. Point 7 of the 18-point ITT plan had proposed that "massive agitation could engender a sufficiently violent climate so as to force the military to intervene." Little wonder that in the face of a credit squeeze on the Allende government, the armed forces were provided with a \$10 million US loan.

In Chile, the armed forces and Carabineri revolted, bombarded the Palace and murdered the President. The only difference in the case of Guyana was that because the country was a British colony, the British armed forces and the Guyana police, under the command of a British Governor and Commissioner of Police respectively, could not overthrow the PPP government. They did the next best thing; they stood by and permitted the counter-revolutionary forces to run riot. The resultant disorder and racial strife was then used by the British government to amend the Constitution and to change the voting system, through which the PPP was ousted from the government.

Ideological Struggle

The Caribbean "so near to the United States and so far from God" also became an arena in the intense battle of ideas to win men's minds, as Harold Macmillan had said in his famous "wind of change" speech. Reactionary ideas intended to perpetuate the free enterprise system were fostered. These took the form mainly of anti-communism, particularly anti-Sovietism and anti-Castroism. The objective was to create confusion in the ranks of the

liberation movement and thus divide and weaken it, to isolate Cuba and the Soviet Union which provide a viable alternative and to provide the "stick" of anti-communism to suppress any progressive movement against colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism.

To carry out this task, CIA created a vast world-wide apparatus and channelled money directly and most indirectly through CIA-formed Foundations to hundreds of organisations. A partial list includes the following: American Federation of State; County and Municipal Employees, and its affiliates in Argentina, Peru, Guyana, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago; Retail Clerks International Association; American Newspaper Guild; Communication Workers of America; Institute of International Research; International Labour Training Programme; World Federation of Organisations of the Teaching Profession; International Confederation of Journalists; International Federation of Petroleum and Chemical Workers; Congress for Cultural Freedom; American Council for the International Commission of Jurists; African-American Institute; American Friends of the Middle East; Institute of International Education; American Society of African Culture; Institute of Public Administration; Atwater Research Programme in North Africa; American National Student Association; International Development Foundation of New York; University of Pennsylvania; National Education Association; International Student Conference of Leyden; US Youth Council of New York; World Assembly of Youth Brussels; International Market Institute; Independent Research Service; India Committee Trust; Asian Students Press Bureau; Council for International Programmes for Youth Leaders and Social Workers; Crossroads Africa; Gambia National Youth Council; Guyana Assembly for Youth; International Union of Young Christian Democrats; International Youth Centre, New Delhi; National Newsmen Club Federation; National Student Press Council of India; North American Secretariat of Pax Ramana; National Federation of Canadian University Students; Synod of Bishops of the Russian Church outside Russia; National Council of Churches; Billy Graham Spanish-American Crusade; Young Women's Christian Association; Radio Free Europe; Centre for International Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; etc.

From the cradle to the grave, the individual was, and is to be constantly bombarded through the press, radio, schools, books, libraries, church, cinema, theatre and organisations of all kinds with such thoughts; ideas; sentiments and customs which serve the interest of the ruling capitalist-imperialist class.

To win "men's" minds meant thought control, ideological control, 'brain washing'. And the technique was that of Goebbels - tell lies and half-truths often enough; and they will be believed as gospel truth.

But the CIA surpassed Goebbels. While Hitler and Goebbels operated under the slogan of national socialism and ^{with} a single party, the CIA worked in the name of freedom and democracy and corrupted right, left and centre.

'Socialists' like Norman Thomas were better fronts to carry out US State Department's anti-communism. And extremist right-wing organisations like 'The Christian Anti-Communist Crusade' and the John Birch Society served to make the US State Department take on the pose as a moderate --- 'neither extremism of the left nor of the right'.

"Socialist" Norman Thomas admitted receiving \$1 million from the CIA which was used for the setting up of seventeen socialist parties in the Caribbean and South America to fight communism.

The Christian Anti-Communist Crusade admitted spending \$45,000¹²¹ during the 1961 election campaign to defeat the PPP and prevent Guyana from becoming "another Cuba." The American Consulate also for the first time took their 16 mm projector and films to the street corners to show anti-communist and anti-Castro films.

Throughout the Caribbean there is a steady stream of researchers and anthropologists, many of whom are CIA agents. Professor Ralph L. Beals reported to the annual meeting of

anthropologists in November 1966 that agents of the intelligence branches of the US Government, particularly the CIA, posed as anthropologists, that "anthropologists . . . have been full or part-time employees of the US intelligence agencies, including the CIA especially, either directly or through grants from certain foundations with questionable source of income. . . . seals warned his colleagues that "although Camelot is dead under that name, in a sense it has only gone under-ground. Similar types of projects have been conducted and are being planned under different names and through other kinds of agencies."¹²²

The reference to CAMELOT is the project which was put through in Chile in 1965, similar to many others undertaken by Latin American Universities for strategic intelligence gathering for the purpose of repression.

In Guyana, the CIA infiltrated the University of Guyana, the Critchlow Labour College and high schools after the ouster of the PPP in December 1964. A memorandum was prepared for the Board of Governors/^{of the University of Guyana} which suggested that if the University was to get funds from Western sources, its image must be changed.

This, of course, meant changing its role as an independent, autonomous body and booting out leftists and socialists.

The memo was withdrawn. But the image-changing went on administratively. Socialist Stuart Bowes, who was appointed to teach economics and sociology, had his contract terminated after the end of one year. And Professor Horace Davis, who was the Dean of the faculty of Social Sciences and head of the Economics Department was not only demoted but virtually not allowed to teach. Subsequently, others with leftist orientation did not succeed in getting their contracts renewed. And in September 1974, a big fight developed when the Board of Governors refused to appoint Dr. Walter Rodney as head of the History Department after the Appointments Committee had selected him for the job.

The Critchlow Labour College was given an annual grant of G\$60,000 by the AIFLD. And Peace Corps personnel were planted in high schools and other strategic points throughout the country to "sell" the American way of life as the best way of life.

Books were distributed in large quantities to libraries, primary and high schools throughout the country. Thousands of copies of What is Democracy, What is Communism, What can Man Believe, have been distributed.

This is a field which the CIA also penetrated. It has used Praeger publishers to put out books with a pro-imperialist slant. The United States Information Agency (USIA) contracted authors for its "book development" to write new books which were then published by private firms. Recently several newspapers rebuked the CIA and USIA for presenting commissioned propaganda work as "independent research."

For instance, on page 351 of the book The Story of American Freedom published by Macmillan for circulation to school children, it is stated: "The struggle between communism and freedom is the principal problem in the world today." In a skillful way the word "communism" is juxtaposed to "freedom". To emphasize the propaganda, the book has a full double page spread entitled "Life in a Dictatorship" and "Life in a Democracy."

Actually what should have been said was the struggle between 'communism' and 'capitalism'. Naturally, young children are not sophisticated enough to detect this subtle form of propaganda. And the CIA will surely not distribute to them books like Professor C.B. Macpherson's The Real World of Democracy, a compilation of lectures given for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the Fourth Series of Massey Lectures. Here the Professor makes the point that in the broader humanistic sense, the socialist East is more free than the capitalist West, which in many ways is a closed society; and that in time the East will be just as free as the West in the formal sense.

The Story of American Freedom presents a fascist type of distortion about Cuba. This

is how it is put: "Another favourite method of the communists is to move into the nation that is having a revolution. This happened in Cuba, where a revolution overthrew a dictator. Many Cubans supported the revolution because they thought it would bring freedom. . . but they soon learned to their sorrow that they had exchanged a bad situation for a worse one under communism."

These lies are debunked even in conservative quarters. The New York Times in an editorial on December 21, 1963, admits: "The Castro regime is certainly strong, possibly stronger than ever . . . There is no apparent weakness of Premier Castro's appeal inside Cuba or of his stature as a world figure . . . All children are getting some education; the great bulk are being well fed and taken care of, however poor their parents. The Negro and mulatto population is getting genuine equality. The Government leaders are untainted by any fiscal scandals. . . To have survived five years was a remarkable feat whose explanation is far more complicated than attributing it solely to Soviet-bloc help."

In another book, Your Country and Mine, published by Ginn and Company, there is reflected the witch-hunt hysteria of the United States. This is what it feeds children and youths in schools and libraries: "The Soviet Union did not want us to help other nations, to make plans for world peace and better understanding . . . Americans knew what the Russian or communist way was. The Russians ruled with an iron hand! The leaders took away all freedom. They made slaves of many people. The people were not allowed to think for themselves. . . Knowing these things has made us more and more thankful for our free America."

Any child fed with this cold-war propaganda can hardly be expected to believe in socialism.

Maybe, this is why the Guyana government cannot get down to finalising the standardisation of school books. School books written or chosen by Guyanese have to be carefully scrutinized: Imperialist propaganda may not find any place to influence the young minds of students and youth.

The CIA did not overlook the cultural and religious fields. Listen to former CIA top man, Thomas W. Braden: "I remember the enormous joy I got when the Boston Symphony Orchestra won more acclaim for the US in Paris than John Foster Dulles or Dwight D. Eisenhower could have bought with a hundred speeches. And then there was Encounter, the magazine published in England and dedicated to the proposition that cultural achievement and political freedom were interdependent. Money for both the orchestra's tour and the magazine's publication came from the CIA, and few outside the CIA knew about it. We had placed one agent in a Europe-based organization of intellectuals called the Congress for Cultural Freedom: Another agent became an editor of Encounter."

Similar CIA "cultural" journals like Encounter were produced in other countries -- Preuves in France, Temo Presento in Italy, Forum in Austria, Hiwar in Lebanon, Der Monat in West Germany and Quadvant in Australia, and others elsewhere.

Minoo Masani, Indian President of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, recently disclosed that because suspicions were aroused about the sources from which the funds came, the Congress had stopped receiving CIA funds since January 1966. In future, he said, the organization would get its support only from the Ford Foundation.

But according to Challenge, March 1967, "the liberal Ford Foundation used only those set up by the CIA or those used unknowingly. The most important foundation in the country -- the Liberal Ford Foundation (which is now financing the CAACP and the Urban League) -- has admitted to having knowingly and willingly participated as a CIA conduit in the scheme to bribe students. Ford has been a major contributor to the NSA; to the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs; and to the Belgium-based IUS competitor; the International Student Conference. NSA's dues and Ford's and FYSA grants accounted for about 95 per cent of the ICS's budget."

In Guyana, as elsewhere in the Caribbean, there has been growing US influence in the ideological field. The so-called Defenders of Freedom, closely identified with the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, carried out in the early 1960's a rabid anti-communist campaign against the PPP government.

Supporting the false ideology of the managerial-technocratic revolution, Sir Arthur Lewis, who "sold" the Puerto Rican model to the British Caribbean territories, declared in his inaugural address in 1965 as the Chancellor of the University of Guyana, that the class struggle was no longer the dominant feature of the world situation today, that the capitalist class and the working class were disappearing, that in their places have now emerged a classless in-between group, the middle class. So far as he was concerned, the main reason for the poverty of poor countries was the lack of technical skills. This, he said, was the reason for the superiority and high living standards in the Western-developed countries, the economic and political domination by the latter of the former.

At labour colleges and institutes, backed by the AIFLD, trade union leaders are told to separate trade union struggle from political struggle, to concern themselves not with issues such as colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism, but merely with bread and butter ones -- wages and working conditions at the work place -- while at the same time, they are indoctrinated in anti-communism. And by corrupting the trade union leadership and refusing to democratise the trade union movement, the imperialists ensure that there is no effective struggle for better wages and improved working conditions.

The blame for deteriorating living conditions are placed on the people and not where it belongs -- on the socio-economic system of capitalism-imperialism and colonial and neo-colonial rule.

In Guyana, in 1967, the people were dubbed lazy by the Burnham-led PNC regime and called upon to "eat less, sleep less, and work harder" -- quite a sharp contrast from a previous electioneering promise that when the PNC assumed powers, no one would go to bed hungry, and there would be free distribution of milk and cassava.

On the assumption that the ills of the country were due to inefficient and unproductive people, 1968 was dubbed "Efficiency Year".

Meanwhile, Guyana and the Caribbean territories get an ever-increasing number of American evangelist crusaders, no doubt also financed by the CIA like Billy Graham's Latin-American Crusade. The main enemy, these Christian crusaders declare, is communism. Now and then, for good measure, they attack some of the ills of capitalism - not the system itself. All systems are bad, they add; politics and politicians cannot help the people - all the politicians have failed the people, only the return of Christ can save them! Religion in the hand of these "Sunday Christians" is made into an opiate to withdraw the people from the path of struggle.

The bourgeois ideologists who advocate the theory of "convergence" -- capitalism is inexorably moving to socialism and socialism is reverting to capitalism -- also have the same objective as the evangelist; namely, the withdrawal of the people from the struggle.

Other erroneous ideas and half-truths peddled refer to the lack of capital, an excessive birth rate, and a small population as factors militating against economic development. Thus the call for greater incentives to foreign investors, family planning and birth control, and regional integration.

With the assertion by Robert MacNamara, President of the World Bank, that aid would be tied to family planning programmes, birth control centres and clinics have sprung up in several territories.

Other ideological currents -- New Leftism, Maoism, neo-Trotskyism, neo-Pan Africanism, Black Capitalism, Marcussism, "socialism with a human face," "nationalist communism" are being

used to sow confusion, and thus to create disunity in the anti-oligarchy, anti-imperialist front. They have one thing in common -- anti-Sovietism.

It is not accidental that from three separate political positions -- the ultra-leftist Maoist group in China, the revisionist PNC group of Guyana and the rightist Razak group in Malaysia -- the same ideological view is being perpetrated; namely, the so-called "two-super-powers" or "two imperialisms" line which equates socialist USSR with imperialist USA.

This line is clearly intended to isolate the liberation movements in the "third world" particularly from working with their natural allies, the world socialist system headed by the Soviet Union. Thus though appearing to be revolutionary in theory, it actually aids imperialism in practice.

The Maoist group has shown its true colours not only with respect to the Soviet Union but also as regards several national liberation issues.

The Soviet Union is regarded as the greater of the two enemies -- the USA and the USSR.

Peaceful coexistence, at one time violently opposed by the Maoists as a sell-out to imperialism, is now embraced but only with the USA, not with the USSR. The Peking leadership pictures the Soviet Union as "an enemy with whom China cannot live under one sky."

Peking is working for a strong European Economic Community (EEC) as a bulwark against the Soviet Union. That's why it gave former British Tory Prime Minister on his recent visit to China a rousing and pompous reception which is normally accorded only to heads of state or "close political allies." This was done because Heath's party, unlike the British Labour Government, is firmly committed to the EEC, which the Chinese leaders hope would become a "kind of barrier" to detente in Europe and growing cooperation with Western Europe and the socialist states.

As was noted by the Norwegian news agency correspondent in Peking: "it is the consensus of opinion among observers that the demonstratively positive attitude to Heath and his visit is connected with the constant warnings of the leader of the Conservative Party against too fast detente in Europe."

The Peking leadership no longer sees the world polarised in class terms. Less than two years ago, there was in vogue the Maoist concept of the "intermediate zones" -- Asia, Africa and Latin America in the "first zone", and the developed capitalist states in between the USSR and the USA on the one hand and the socialist countries, from Peking's point of view, on the other.

Now it is said there are three worlds - USSR and the USA in the "first world"; Asia, Africa and Latin America in the "third-world", and the in-between developed countries, the "second world."

And the Mao leadership has been assiduously trying to be identified with the "third-world" to gain hegemony of it in satisfaction of its narrow nationalist-chauvinist ambitions. But it has been rebuffed because of its actions on questions such as disarmament, economic assistance, and so on. In recent debates at the United Nations, on the question of disarmament, China's delegation, according to the Indian weekly LINK (15/4/73) spoke more than ten times against the non-aligned countries.

And for the first time in the United Nations, the Chinese representative did not mention Peking's readiness" to render assistance in the economic development of third-world countries by concrete actions."

In the case of Bangla Desh, People's China voted at first against its being seated at the United Nations. When the revolutionaries were being slaughtered in Chile by the military junta after the coup of 1973, little help was forthcoming from China; instead, the Mao group recognised with alacrity the fascist junta.

The Chinese news agency regularly tries to create an image of the PNC regime as

revolutionary, anti-imperialist and pro-socialist. Nothing is said about its demagogic and revisionist ideology of "cooperative socialism" and Burnhamism, the so-called special brand of Marxism-Leninism.

Fortunately, the "two imperialisms" line was vehemently attacked at the Algiers Summit Meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement in September 1973 by the leader of the Cuban delegation, Prime Minister Fidel Castro. He correctly pointed out that it was absurd to equate the Soviet Union with the USA, that "inventing a false enemy can have only one aim to evade the real enemy," that the Soviet Union had given, and continues to give, disinterested aid to Cuba and other liberation movements, that the USA remains the principal imperialist country in the world.

Mr. L.F.S. Burnham, the leader of the Guyana delegation to the Algiers Summit Meeting, although travelling in the same plane with Dr. Castro, did not follow his lead. It seems that he avoided the question by agreeing to Mr. Michael Manley, the leader of the Jamaican delegation, speaking for Guyana and the Commonwealth Caribbean.

Other spokesmen of the PNC regime, however, continue to peddle the erroneous "two super-powers" line. This is because it accords with its junior clientele status and its service to imperialism.

The two super-powers line objectively aids imperialism in the same way as the evangelist line in Guyana which while ostensibly criticising both the PNC and the PPP actually, by disarming the people and presenting them from struggling against the anti-working class PNC regime, aids the PNC and preserves the status quo of neo-colonial rule.

There are also variations on the "two super-powers" theme. Some ideologues would admit that the Soviet Union has made tremendous strides and has gone a long way to satisfy material needs. But simultaneously they add that it has failed to confer freedom. They say that there is no democracy in the USSR. They want "socialism with a human face."

These people fail to interpret objective reality dialectically. They refuse to admit the great changes which have taken place from the days of Stalin to the present time. They confuse aberrations in the norms of socialist legality with socialism itself. They fail to observe the changes from the cult of the personality to collective leadership. They fail also to view freedom from the class point of view and in the context of the necessity to maintain working class power in the face of ruthless class enemies at home and abroad, as have been seen in the case of Chile.

In accordance with their judgements, Cuba is totalitarian, but Guyana and the Commonwealth Caribbean are free. They obviously mistake form for content. Cuba now has basic grass roots socialist democracy as compared with fascism under Batista and colonial and neo-colonial authoritarianism in Guyana and the Commonwealth Caribbean.

The Black Power struggle, which has an impact in the Caribbean, also has certain weaknesses, the "skin strategy" of Black capitalism and neo-Pan Africanism. These concepts separate the Black working class struggle in the USA from the workers' struggle in general, and the African Liberation Movement from the socialist world. The posing of colour - black against white - plays into the hands of the imperialists who hope to divide and weaken the anti-monopoly struggle in the United States and the anti-imperialist struggle in Africa. They know that the fostering of black capitalism will create a black bourgeoisie which will eventually side with capitalism in general and not the blacks who suffer from triple oppression and exploitation in the USA.

Pan-Africanism, concerned with a united and socialist Africa, had two definite streams. The late Dr. W.E.B. Dubois, the famous marxist scholar, who was chosen by Dr. Nkrumah during his first term as President of Ghana to embark on the monumental project, the African

Encyclopedia, led the trend towards a united Africa going to socialism in close cooperation and alliance with the socialist world. George Padmore and C.L.R. James, on the other hand, who for several years took a strong anti-Soviet position, led the trend towards isolationism from the socialist world.

In recent times, neo-Pan Africanism has been given a boost by Stokely Carmichael, the advocate of Black capitalism in the USA and separate organisation of Africans, Indians, Portuguese, Chinese and Amerindians in Guyana. For his advocacy of separate ethnic organisation in Guyana, he was condemned by the People's Progressive Party.

In the same way that separate ethnic organisation is harmful to the liberation movement in Guyana, Black capitalism and neo-Pan Africanism are inimical to the Black liberation movement in America and in Africa.

C.L.R. James also has been a leading light of the neo-Pan African movement. Some years ago, he worked closely with the PNM regime in Trinidad as editor of the PNM paper, The Nation and as adviser to the Prime Minister. (At about the same period, George Padmore was adviser to Kwame Nkrumah). At that time, he was also sympathetic to the PNC and hostile to the PPP. But after his break with Eric Williams, he became more and more hostile to the PNM. At the same time, his influence grew among West Indians who were attending universities in the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada and led to the development of the New Beginning Movement.

Many of the returned students established groups in the Caribbean Islands with a similar orientation and linked up with the neo-Pan African movement.

In Guyana, that movement associated with ASCRIA after the latter's break with the PNC regime, and in Trinidad with the National Joint Action Committee, led by Geddes Granger.

Throughout the West Indies, therefore, the main forces in the neo-Pan African movement were hostile both to the Soviet Union and to the governments of the various Commonwealth Caribbean territories. This was shown up to a marked degree at the Second Preparatory Meeting of the Pan-African Conference, held at Bishop's High School in Guyana.

It became clear after that meeting that either the conference in Tanzania had to be called off or that the groups associated with C.L.R. James should not be allowed to attend.

Imperialism was faced with a real dilemma. It needed Caribbean "Black Power" support for the Tanzania Conference's objective of a united Black (USA, Caribbean and Africa) isolation of the socialist world. At the same time, it did not want attacks by Caribbean Black Power advocates against its client Caribbean states.

Eventually, the establishment "boys" prevailed, and C.L.R. James, Eusi Kwayana, Tim Hector, Geddes Granger and others were refused permission to attend.

It should be observed also that Maoist China which violently opposes the Soviet Union and gives unqualified support to the Caribbean neo-colonial regimes, has a good relationship with Tanzania, one of the sponsors of the Conference. Like the Nyerere and Burnham regimes it too propagates the idea of self-reliance, which also objectively serves the purpose of isolating Guyana, the Caribbean and Africa from the socialist world.

Incidentally, it should be observed also that one of the leading figures of the neo-Pan African movement, a Black Trinidadian now domiciled in the USA, also heads an organisation for the training of technocrats to serve in Africa. A current view expressed by some pro-imperialist ideologues like Sir Arthur Lewis is that there is nothing wrong with the capitalist system, that all that is required is to manage it properly with well-trained managers and technocrats. 122(c)

Technocracy alone without the sound principles of socialist political economy cannot succeed. And self-help and self-reliance, taken too far to the point of isolation, can be dangerous especially for small Caribbean states.

The case of the downfall of Dr. Mossadegh's government in Iran in 1953 must be remembered and digested. After nationalising the British-owned Anglo-Iranian Oil Company in 1951, it refused because of its narrow nationalist, anti-communist position to trade with the socialist world. Inability to sell its oil because of a tanker blockade by the international oil companies, and strikes and riots through CIA subversion as in Guyana in the 1962-64 period, led to its overthrow.

Where there is no isolationism as in Cuba, Vietnam, the Middle East and the Portuguese African colonies, and where the political line of the international communist movement for the unity of the three revolutionary streams -- the world socialist system, the national liberation movements of the "third-world", and the working class and peace forces of the capitalist world -- was observed, success was achieved by the liberation movements. Those who forget this do so at their peril.

Some ideologists like Hubert Marcusse have attempted to revise its basic tenets, they have falsely theorised that in an affluent society, the labour leadership has been "bourgeoisified" and the working class is no longer revolutionary; that the revolution would not be led by the working class but "from without" by peripheral sections of the population, like University academics and students, and declassed elements, the undercultured and "unintegrated"; namely, the slum dwellers of big cities and the landless rural population, whom the anarchist Mikhail Bakunin extolled as the "flower of the proletariat" and the "great popular rebels." Marcusse and the "New Left" sociologists advocate "absence of domination", the "anti-authoritarian revolution" and "the great renunciation" - renunciation of all the institutions and values of modern bourgeois society. "New Radicalism", says Marcusse "opposes both centralised bureaucratic-Communist and semi-democratic liberal organisation. This rebellion contains a strong element of spontaneity, indeed, of anarchism. It expresses new sensitivity, the annoyance with all domination. The anarchist element is an essential factor in the fight against domination."

This is little different from the anarcho-syndicalist views of the French sociologist and philosopher, Georges Sorel, whom Lenin called a "well-known muddler." Sorel preached that the working class needed neither organization, leadership nor objective factors; all it needed for a "spontaneous explosion" was faith in revolution.

Marcusse and others have failed to note the changing role of the working class in the world situation, which is characterized by an intensification of the class struggle through a growing number of strikes and the involvement of increasing numbers of workers as seen in Italy, France and even in Spain. In the 20-year period, 1926-1946, for instance, there were only 50 million strikers. The number increased from 1946 - 1960 to 160 million, and in the 10-year-period, 1961-1971, to 500 million. In 1972, 60 million workers went on strike, of which 40 million were in the developed capitalist countries.

In the 1950's, Aneurin Bevan's challenge to the Gaitskell right-wing leadership in Britain was defeated by the bloc vote of the TUC; today, the position is reversed with the TUC more militant than the constituency representation in the Labour Party - note that the trade unions defeated the anti-strike bill sponsored by two Bevanites, Barbara Castle and Harold Wilson in the last Labour government.

In Trinidad, there is a definite shift from docile trade unions to more militant ones like the Oil-Field Workers Trade Union led by George Weekes. In Guyana, the TUC leadership under pressure reversed its position on the Burnham government's anti-strike, Trade Disputes bill, which forced the government to drop the measure.

This putschist anarchist approach characterized the NJAC outlook to revolution in Trinidad particularly in the February-April 1970 events in Trinidad, and its opting out during the electoral struggle in 1971.

A similar approach led to the defeat of the anti-Gairy forces in Grenada early 1974.

Shortcuts and expediciencies do not bear fruit. Practical political work succeeds only when it is based on correct theories and ideas -- the ideology of Marxism-Leninism. Now that this ideology is being embraced by more and more people, especially the youths and students, imperialism sees as its task to revise and distort it so as to sow confusion in the anti-imperialist ranks; and at the same time, to work for disunity in the socialist world. Henry Kissinger as Howard Professor in 1962 in his book, The Necessity for Choice, referred to "the frequently held view that we should conduct our diplomacy so as to bring about a rift between Communist China and the USSR . . . Of course, the possibility of a rift must not be overlooked. And if it occurs, we should take advantage of it rather than force the erstwhile partners into a new alliance through intransigence."

This policy of divide and rule is seen in practice in Guyana and the Caribbean.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE, DETENTE AND NATIONAL LIBERATION

New perspectives are opening up which favour the struggle for liberation in the Caribbean. This has come about because in this epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism, and particularly in the 1970's, the world balance of forces has shifted in favour of socialism and national liberation.

The world socialist system has grown stronger economically, politically and ideologically. By contrast, the world capitalist system has grown weaker, plagued by a deepening structural crisis.

At the same time, because of the uneven development of capitalism, the United States has lost the commanding position in the capitalist world which it had attained after World War II. Now, it must share power with a resurgent European Economic Community and Japan.

Because of the growing strength and moral prestige of the world socialist system, there have been positive developments on the world front in the struggle between socialism and imperialism, between national liberation and imperialism and between the forces of peace and war.

Imperialism has been forced to restrict its aggressive policy and to abandon its outright violence.

No longer can it willy nilly, use gunboat diplomacy and economic aggression to maintain the status quo.

The United States because of its relatively weakened position was also forced to change its cold-war policy and to accept the policy of peaceful co-existence. This Leninist concept was long regarded as an "insidious communist plot" and "a Trojan horse" of communism by the cold warriors.

Later, when the non-aligned Conference in 1955 at Bandung, Indonesia made peaceful co-existence a cornerstone of its policy, neutralism was declared immoral. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in a speech at Ames, Iowa on June 9, 1956, declared that the U.S. mutual assistance treaties "with forty-two countries of America, Europe and Asia. . . abolish as between the parties, the principle of neutrality, which pretends that a nation can best gain safety for itself by being indifferent to the fate of others. This has increasingly become obsolete conception and, except under very exceptional circumstances, it is an immoral and shortsighted conception." 123

On the following month, Vice President Richard Nixon warned against the "trend of neutralism that makes no moral distinction between the communist world and the free world. With this viewpoint, we have no sympathy." 124

A few days later in Pakistan, he warned all countries not to accept any form of aid from the Soviet Union. In such a situation no Caribbean state was prepared to join the non-aligned movement or to accept peaceful coexistence although there was an overwhelming popular opinion in favour of neutrality in the cold-war conflict.¹²⁵

It was only in the 1970's that the Caribbean countries became directly involved in the non-aligned movement. Cuba, Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica and further afield in Latin America Chile (under Allende) were represented as delegates and Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela as observers at the Second Preparatory Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned countries in Georgetown, Guyana in August, 1972. This was a reflection of the changed international situation. By then ironically, Nixon, one of the staunchest advocates of the cold-war and a rabid anti-communist, had been forced to work for detente and to accept peaceful co-existence.

Prior to that, and especially in the period of the Johnson administration and the early part of the Nixon administration, blatantly-crude cold-war methods had been employed around the globe -- in Brazil against the Goulart regime, Dominican Republic, Vietnam, Greece -- and in the killing of Che Guevara in Bolivia. For a brief while, under the Kennedy administration, there was an attempt at normalizing relations with the socialist world. President Kennedy rejected the Dulles doctrine, accepted neutrality and moved towards detente and an accommodation with the Soviet Union. But even the "New Frontier" liberals lapsed into cold-war methods in the case of Cuba, Guyana and Vietnam. Their advocacy of change was bounded by certain limits. It was to take place firstly within the system by reformist plans like the Alliance for Progress and by democratisation of political life so that the United States would not be identified with the terror and torture of many of the dictatorial regimes which had been receiving its support; secondly, without any change in the international balance of power. This was a limited view which did not see change as a dynamic phenomenon.

According to Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., a Kennedy aide:

Kennedy and Khrushchev would both have said that they wanted to preserve the status quo. But they had incompatible conceptions of what the status quo meant.

For Kennedy the status quo was the existing balance of international force. This did not at all mean that he wanted to freeze the world in its social mould. On the contrary, he believed internal political and institutional change to be both inevitable and desirable. But his hope was that it would take place without transferring power from one bloc to the other and therefore without making either side feel threatened, and constrained to resist change by force.

For Khrushchev, on the other hand, the status quo was something very different: it was in essence the communist revolution in progress (as he hoped) across the world. From this perspective Kennedy's conception of a global standstill was an attempt not to support but to alter the status quo; it was an attack on the revolutionary process itself. This idea of a dynamic or potential status quo was, of course, deeply embedded in Leninist analysis. Reminiscing about Vienna three years after, Khrushchev complained to William Benton that Kennedy had 'by-passed' the real problem. 'We in the USSR', he said, 'feel that the revolutionary process should have the right to exist.' The question of 'the right to rebel, and the Soviet right to help combat reactionary governments. . . is the question of questions. . . This question is at the heart of our relations with you. . . Kennedy could not understand this'.¹²⁶

Unfortunately for the liberals, development is a dynamic process and those who were directly involved -- Quadros, Castro, Goulart, Nkrumah, Sukarno -- could not accept in practice the limits imposed. The Kennedy administration fell back on cold-war methods to resolve its dilemma. The socialist world accepted non-alignment seeing it as a process in the political struggle for change, for socialism. At the Bandung Conference it had a clearcut firm position against colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism. But because with time, the non-aligned states were moving towards socialism and close collaboration with the socialist

world, the main non-aligned leaders were attacked¹²⁷ -- attempts were made in 1956 and again in 1967 to dislodge Nasser; Nkrumah, Sukarno and Obete were overthrown (Lumumba, working closely with Nkrumah, was murdered); attempts are constantly being made to overthrow Sekou Toure and Julius Nyerere.

The non-aligned movement became larger with each successive conference.¹²⁸ But because many were puppet, pro-imperialist states, like the Suharto regime which replaced Sukarno's, the movement became more amorphous in character, losing much of its original zeal and fire.

This duality in its composition explains why on many fundamental issues such as the Vietnam, Middle East, India-Pakistan-Bangla Desh conflicts, the non-aligned movement had not played any significant roles. Performance did not measure up to high-sounding declarations. Many went along with declarations and resolutions but did little to implement them. This was why some had begun to question the efficacy of non-aligned movement and conferences.¹²⁹

It was in this context that Guyana and Trinidad took part in the Summit Non-Aligned Conference in Zambia in 1970. This was the outcome also of a changed situation both internally and externally. Up to that time the independent Commonwealth Caribbean states were pursuing undisguised pro-imperialist domestic and foreign policies. The Burnham-led People's National Congress, on usurping power with the help of the CIA in Guyana in 1965, made concessions to big business and formulated its first development plan on the basis of the discredited Puerto Rican model. It justified US intervention in the Dominican Republic. At the United Nations, it closely followed the lead of the United States. Ted Braithwaite, Guyana's first U.N. Ambassador, after resigning his post in a recent radio interview stated: "Time and time again I was forced to realise that while I was at the U.N. pursuing what I considered to be my country's right to intervene in certain political issues, back in Guyana other presences were dealing with those same issues. . ." resulting in his being told "what the American Secretary of State would wish him to do or what posture he would wish him to assume."

The PNC government had long ostracised the socialist world at the diplomatic, trade and cultural levels until moves towards peaceful coexistence and detente had been taken by Richard Nixon.

It had imposed quantitative import restrictions on trade and a 10% surcharge on goods from the socialist countries. It broke off trade and cultural relations with Cuba which had been initiated by the PPP government. Before its affirmative vote in 1970 at the United Nations for the seating of the People's Republic of China, it advocated the two-Chinas policy of the US government.

The Guyana delegation voted against the seating of China in 1966 and 1967, abstained in 1968 and 1969 and voted for in 1970. Its position was merely a reflection of the twists and turns of US foreign policy.

During that period, more and more countries had been voting for the seating of People's China and the US position was becoming untenable. Also the objective situation then obtaining necessitated a change in the US political line and the acceptance of the policy of peaceful co-existence towards the socialist world as a whole for the purpose of enhancing American trade and resolving its economic difficulties.¹³⁰

The United States was faced in the early 1970's with a grave economic crisis of trade and balance of payments deficits and devaluation of the dollar -- a crisis aggravated by the Vietnam war which was draining away about US\$2 billion per month.

Other factors which necessitated a change in the political direction and the acceptance of peaceful co-existence were the serious unrest inside the United States, other capitalist states taking advantage of the market in the socialist world, and the situation inside the United Nations. Since 1960, polarisation was taking place at the UN with the Soviet Union

and the progressive "third-world" states on the one side, and the United States and other imperialist and "third-world" puppet states on the other. With the rift between the USSR and China already wide, the United States saw that at that historical point China's presence in the United Nations would be to its advantage; it would tend to create ideological confusion and disunity in the anti-imperialist front, thus arresting the struggle for national liberation.

Consequently, while ostensibly opposing China's entry in the United Nations for the benefit of its reactionary supporters at home and abroad, the "green light" was given to client states like Guyana to vote for the seating of China.

The acceptance of peaceful co-existence and the seating of China in the United Nations on the one hand, and pressure from the popular forces like the PPP in Guyana, the Union of Revolutionary Organisations (URO), the National Joint Action Committee (NJAC) in Trinidad and Tobago and other organisations on the other, prepared the way for the Commonwealth Caribbean countries to enter into diplomatic relations with the socialist countries and to join the non-aligned movement. It is significant that the Prime Minister declared the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union from England while on his way to Zambia for the non-aligned summit meeting in 1970. But in keeping with US strategy, it has kept the Soviet Union at arms length, whilst developing the closest relations with Maoist China. An embassy has been established by China in Guyana and diplomatic representatives have been posted at the ambassadorial level in Georgetown and Peking; the same facilities have not been accorded the Soviet Union. Indeed, like the Maoists, the PNC regime attacks the Soviet Union. At the end of the visit of President Nyerere of Tanzania to Guyana in September 1974, a joint communique between Guyana and Tanzania declared -

There were, in fact, disturbing signs that detente amounted to no more than an agreement to manipulate situations and international machinery in the interests of the super powers and in disregard of the interests of other States particularly those of the Third World.

The two-super-powers line and the attack on detente objectively aid imperialism. That was the reason for the strong attack on these false ideas by Premier Fidel Castro at the Non-Aligned Summit Conference in Algiers in September 1973.

Detente has helped to normalise relations in Europe, which was the seat of the last two world wars, leading to the 4-powers agreement on West Berlin and agreements by the Soviet Union, Poland and the German Democratic Republic with the Federal Republic of Germany and the admission of the two German states in the United Nations.

It has also helped to lessen the hysteria of anti-communism, which was one of the main weapons in the third world against the liberation movements. It was the ideological weapon of anti-communism which had been used to **attack many progressive states and leaders.**

With detente and an end to the cold war, disarmament becomes possible, which is conducive to world peace and benefits the third world. The Soviet Union had proposed to the United Nations that a 10 per cent reduction in the arms budget of the big industrialised states should be made and used as a fund to help the developing countries.

Detente is helping to bring about peace in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Before, US imperialism was not prepared to accept a non-aligned Laos and Cambodia; today, it is prepared to do so.

Because of the cold war, economic and diplomatic aggression was carried out against Cuba. With detente, relations with Cuba are now becoming normalised.

In the 1960's US pressure was placed on subsidiaries of US companies operating in Canada

not to trade with Cuba. Today, because of detente, US firms operating in Argentina are allowed to sell goods to Cuba. After the visit to Cuba of two US senators, Jacob Javits and Claiborne Pell, the former declared that "the time does seem propitious to a normalisation." Previously, when asked about the United States normalising its relations with Cuba, Dr. Henry Kissinger had indicated that that was a matter for the OAS. Clearly, the US position on Cuba in 1973-74 was virtually the same as it was on China in 1970. Apart from the fact that there is no political advantage to be gained by the further blockade of Cuba, this Caribbean territory offers distinct economic advantages particularly to the US multinational corporations which have established branch-plants in the Caribbean Common Market region. No doubt these factors were also responsible for the opening of diplomatic relations by Guyana, Jamaica, Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago. With the corrupt hand of Nixon off the Presidential wheel, it is possible that the hardliners in Washington may steer a course away from detente and peaceful co-existence, and normalisation of relations with Cuba. But whatever happens the Cuban revolution cannot be destroyed. Despite hardships and difficulties resulting from the blockade, the revolution has survived. Cuba has made solid progress whilst its Caribbean neighbours which have resorted to a reformist approach are experiencing grave problems. The US Twentieth Century Fund was forced to admit that "Cuba has come closer to some of the goals of the Alliance for Progress than most of the Latin American countries that joined the US-supported development scheme." 131

As the crisis of capitalism deepens and is exported to the Caribbean, the differences will be accentuated. And Cuba will become a greater source of inspiration. She has already given a psychological boost to the Caribbean peoples by exploding the theory of "geographic fatalism" namely, that no country in the region can defy the "mighty" USA and make a revolution.

Her presence is increasingly being felt at international conferences. Its dynamic leadership at the Second Preparatory Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned states resulted in the revolutionary decision for the seating of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia led by Prince Sihanouk - a decision which led to the walkout from the meeting of the client states Malaysia, Laos and Indonesia. Dr. Raul Roa, the leader of the Cuban delegation had called on the meeting to take revolutionary decisions lest the movement becomes "a museum piece."

At the Algiers summit non-Aligned Conference in September, 1973, Cuba played a positive role giving leadership of the progressive tendency within the movement. The leader of the Cuban delegation, Dr. Fidel Castro attacked the peddlers of the two-super-powers propaganda line when he declared to the applause of the conference: "Any attempt to provoke a clash between the non-aligned countries and the socialist camp is flagrantly counter-revolutionary and can only help the imperialists. The inventors of fictitious enemies have only one aim, to abandon the fight against the real enemy."¹³² He led the fight not only for the reaffirmation of the principles of the movement -- the struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism, apartheid and racial discrimination, and opposition to war and aggression -- but more importantly for the end to foreign economic domination through the national ownership of natural resources and industries.

Other positive developments elsewhere in the continent resulting from changed internal and external balance of forces will aid the Caribbean revolution.

The government of Peru headed by General Velasco Alvarado has generally embarked on a programme of anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic reforms. It broke the blockade against Cuba, seized US fishing trawlers in Peru's territorial waters, nationalised US sugar and oil companies and carried out a land reform programme.

U.S. imperialism is clearly unable, because of the change in the world balance of forces,

and particularly changes in Latin America, to use "big stick" methods (landing of marines, economic blockade, restrictions and sanctions) so freely resorted to against Cuba, the Dominican Republic and other countries a decade or so ago. Even sanctions under the U.S. Sugar Act and the Hickenlooper Amendments have not been imposed.

U.S. imperialism is clearly unable because of the change in the balance of world forces and particularly changes in Latin America, to use "big stick" methods so freely resorted to a decade or so ago. It could not impose sanctions against Peru under the U.S. Sugar Act and the Hickenlooper Amendment.

Aggression was used against Panama in 1964 when students were shot. Today that country is taking a firm anti-imperialist position and is advancing to genuine independence.

The Lanusse regime of Argentina opted out of the US-sponsored "Inter-American Peace Forces," and with the Salta Declaration between the Presidents of Argentina and Chile (Allende) and the Argentine-Peruvian communique reaffirmed the right of nations to self-determination, free choice of development paths and genuine political and economic independence.

The Lanusse government of Argentina paved the way for elections, which brought to power after 19 years in exile Juan Peron, whose regime recognised the Cuban government and offered a substantial loan.

Other developments not favoured by the OAS are joint efforts for independence of their economies and contacts with the socialist world. In the late 1950's, only Mexico, Argentina and Uruguay maintained diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R.; now there are 13 countries.

Twelve Latin American countries did not support the U.S. "two-Chinas" policy in the United Nations.

On May 26, 1969, five Andean countries -- Colombia, Chile, Peru, Bolivia and Ecuador -- signed an agreement bringing about the Andean Common Market (ANCOM). Unlike the other regional integration schemes -- the Latin American Free Trade Association, the Central American Common Market and the Caribbean Common Market -- which have been made playgrounds by the transnational corporations, the Andean Common Market have placed restrictions on foreign capital. According to the U.S. News and World Report:

This excludes foreigners from public utilities, transportation and three other fields. It limits their ownership of banks and retail establishments to no more than a 20 per cent share, bars their manufacturing firms based in Andean bloc countries from exporting within the bloc, and sets a ceiling on the profits remittances of 14 per cent of registered capital a year. The new policy also forbids depletion allowances.

At the meeting of the Special Latin American Co-ordinating Commission in September 1971, there was a vigorous demand for the repeal of the 10 per cent surcharge on imports into the U.S.A. The meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, held in Panama in September 1971, unanimously condemned Washington's attempt to "rescue the dollar" at the expense of the Latin American and other countries.

Despite certain weaknesses, Ancom is a big step forward in the fight for national independence.

The attitude of Peru, one of the signatories of Ancom, was made clear at the OAS Special Commission on the reorganisation of the inter-American system when President Velasco Alvarado emphasized that the true Latin American revolution must be an anti-imperialist revolution.

At the Panama session of the Security Council in 1973, most Latin American representatives condemned foreign interference in the affairs of other states and demanded that it be stopped; they defended control and use of national resources as each country saw fit and the right of Panama to extend its sovereignty over the Panama Canal

Zone.

At the 1973 OAS General Assembly meeting, the majority of the delegates of the Latin American countries condemned the ruthless foreign exploitation of the natural resources of Latin America and demanded "a radical structural transformation of the OAS and advocated the abolition of economic and diplomatic sanctions against Cuba." 133

In the discussions with Dr. Kissinger at the meeting of Foreign Ministers on February 13, 1974 at Tlatelolco, Mexico-City, pressure was exerted for improvements in commercial relations between Latin America and the United States and for the removal of restrictions on the entry of the goods in the US market, abolition of the Hickenlooper Amendment, more multi-lateral development aid, transfer of technology and reform of the OAS to make it truly a Latin American organisation. They also wanted a revision of the collective security system in the Rio Pact of 1947. However, in the "new dialogue", no specific assurances were forthcoming from Secretary of State and Nobel Peace prize winner Dr. Henry Kissinger.

No assurances were forthcoming no doubt because what was being asked though reasonable was not within the realm of realpolitik of the United States. Neither Kissinger nor the American ruling circles for which he speaks with such suave and great skill will readily scuttle the empire and retreat to isolationism and "Fortress America," as some would have the world to believe. Chile is there for all to see.

With her global commitments and investments and her need for raw materials, the United States is hardly expected to commit suicide. As one of the leading spokesmen, Zbigniew Brezinski, put it: "today the US economy depends on other countries more than ever. Certain experts say that this dependency is valid for 26 of the 36 basic raw materials consumed by US industry; and they emphasise that this dependency is increasing in all areas and particularly in energy." 134

And in this regard, the Caribbean and Latin America is a vital area. If the United States is too far outstretched and must disengage as some argued during the later days of the Vietnam debacle, this is the last area from which she will withdraw. Disengagement must not be confused with non-intervention and total retreat. What it means is finding new and more subtle ways of domination and intervention, like "farming out" responsibilities -- South Africa and Rhodesia for Africa and Brazil for the Western Hemisphere -- and shifts in military strategy. The U.S. soldiers will go home, but the Navy will take on a new role to control the world's sea lanes so as to ensure access to raw material, and the Pentagon is planning for greatly expanded airlift capabilities which "will permit intervention anywhere on the globe by transporting entire divisions within hours," 135 as was done in the Arab-Israeli war of September 1973. The more subtle methods were used in Chile which led to the downfall of the Allende government.

The Caribbean peoples must have to realize that mere entreaties to "big brother" of the North will not be enough. They will have to prepare themselves for struggle. In doing so they must first of all understand and recognise the new methods of domination; they must be prepared to deal with both the "carrot" and the "club" techniques.

To achieve success, vanguard Marxist-Leninist parties must be developed and strengthened to educate, guide and organise the masses, and united fronts of all anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic forces must be established on the basis of principled discussions to resolve ideological differences.

Fortunately new forces are emerging which will aid the revolutionary process. For example, two distinct groups have developed in the army in several countries -- the old reactionary gorilla-type defending imperialist positions; and the younger officers with national and patriotic sentiments. The latter group wants an end to the Pentagon's "guardianship". At the tenth Conference of the armed forces commands of the Western Hemisphere

countries, Peru's Minister of Defense spearheaded the attack against the 1947 inter-American agreement on mutual assistance as being interventionist and called for its radical revision.

In the Church has developed a "radical clergy", over 600 of whom signed a petition to the Pope on his visit to Colombia in 1969. They demanded that the Church should identify itself with the masses rather than with the reactionary military and the big landlords. Several have accepted socialism and a few like Camillo Torres of Colombia have joined the ranks of the guerillas.

These trends will be further developed as the structural crisis deepens in Latin America. In turn, they will advance the revolutionary process.

Anti-communism must be combatted. As General Velasco Alvarado, Juan Arevala and Juan Bosch have emphasized anti-communism has always been the weapon of the reactionary and right-wing elements.

Close links must be forged with the Soviet Union and other socialist states. It is suicidal for small Caribbean mini and macro states to preach the doctrine of "Caribbean exceptionalism" and "self reliance". Experience has demonstrated that the imperialists will use all means to attain their ends of domination, and material, moral and political support of the world socialist system is essential to attain political power as in Vietnam and the Portuguest African territories and to hold power and change the neo-colonial structure as in the Middle East and Cuba.

Soviet tanks and other sophisticated military equipment played a pivotal role in the crucial 1968 Tet offensive in South Vietnam.

It is admitted that it was the offer of Soviet help to the Nasser government that forced the British, French and Israelis to stop their war against Egypt in 1956. A note from Premier Bulganin to Prime Minister Anthony Eden on November 5, warned against the continuation of further aggression against Egypt:

In which situation would Britain find herself if she were attacked by stronger states, possessing all types of modern destructive weapons? Were rocket weapons used against Britain and France, you would most probably call this a barbarous action. But how does the inhuman attack launched by the armed forces of Britain and France against a practically defenceless Egypt differ from this?

With deep anxiety over the developments in the Near and Middle East, and guided by the interests of the maintenance of universal peace, we think that the Government of Britain should listen to the voice of reason and put an end to the war in Egypt. We call upon you, upon Parliament, upon the Labour Party, the Trade unions, upon the whole of the British people: Put an end to the armed aggression; stop the bloodshed. The war in Egypt can spread to other countries and turn into a third world war.

The Soviet Government has already addressed the United Nations and the President of the United States of America with the proposal to resort, jointly with other United Nations member-states, to the use of naval and air forces in order to end the war in Egypt and to curb aggression. We are fully determined to crush the aggressors by the use of force and to restore peace in the East. 136

For Soviet aid, President Nasser was to express his deep gratitude. On January 17, in an interview with the Greek newspaper Ethnos, he said: "The Russians gave us arms when the West refused: they supported our views when the West sought the internationalisation of the Canal; when we were attacked by the West, Russia threatened the aggressors; when others refused our requests for wheat, Russia gave us some and also gave us oil. The U.S. had frozen \$50 million, and Britain \$150 million, whereas Russia had helped Egypt. Twenty days ago Egypt had asked for wheat from the West, but had met with refusal because the West wanted payment in dollars. The West refused to buy cotton, but Russia bought, with the result that prices had risen. All this has provoked the keen gratitude of the Egyptian people for the

Soviet Union."

Similarly, the great leader of the Guinea-Bissau revolution, Amilcar Cabral "expressed his gratitude for this help in his speech at the 24th Congress of the CPSU, and again in his address to the jubilee session dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the USSR on what was his last visit to this country. 'On behalf of our people,' he said, 'we wish to express fraternal thanks and appreciation to the Soviet people, the CPSU and its Central Committee for the multiform help you are giving us in our mortal combat with the Portuguese colonialists, in our struggle against war and genocide, for the independence, peace and progress of our African motherland.'" ¹³⁷

During September 1974 Soviet-made tanks appeared in the streets and rockets at the borders of Peru when the reactionary forces attempted to duplicate what had been previously done in Chile against the Allende government.

During the Bay of Pigs invasion, the US government was sent a sharp note by the Soviet Union which no doubt influenced President Kennedy not to launch a full-scale attack against Cuba. ¹³⁸ And Dr. Fidel Castro on more than one occasion has referred to the generous assistance, military and economic, from the Soviet Union without which the Cuban revolution would have encountered many more difficulties. ¹³⁹

And finally, contacts must be deepened with the people of the United States, "the other America" -- the people who have a tradition of struggle for freedom, fairplay and justice, who were instrumental in ending U.S. direct military intervention in Vietnam and are also fighting for their liberation from state-monopoly capitalism.

-----ooOoo-----

1. Earl Parker Hanson in South From the Spanish Main, Delacorte Press, USA 1967, p.6
2. Charles Gibson, Spain in America, Harper Torchbooks, the University Library, Harper and Row, New York, 1966, p. 18.
3. F.R. Augier, The Making of the West Indies, Longmans, 1967, p.13.
4. A. Garcia, History of the West Indies, George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd. London 1965, p. 30.
5. F.R. Augier - op. ci., p. 22.
6. L.S. Stavrian s, Man's Past and Present, Prentice-Hall, Inc, Englewood, Cliffs, 1971, p. 223.
7. E. Williams, From Columbus to Castro, Andre Deutch, London, 1970, p. 84.
8. Eric Williams, op. ci., p. 111.
9. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. 7, Ch. XXX1, cited in R.Palme Dutt, Crisis of Britain and the British Empire, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1957, p 22
10. Julius W. Pratt, A History of United States Foreign Policy, Prentice Hall, Inc. N.J. 1965, p. 75.
11. Ibid p. 77.
12. Roberto Gonzalez Gomez, "Isolationism or No-Interventionism?" Tricontinental 90, OSPAAAL, Havana, 1974, pp. 3 - 17.
13. Juan Jose Arevalo, The Shark and the Sardines, Lyle Stuart, New York, 1961, p. 110.
14. Victor Perlo, American Imperialism, Internacional Publishers, New York, p.11-12.
15. North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA) Yanqui Dollar, New York and San Francisco, p. 4.
16. Ibid, p. 5.
17. A Garcia, op. ci., p. 226.
18. Juan Jose Arevalo, op. ci., p. 57.
19. Victor Perlo, op. ci., p. 13
20. Juan Jose Arevalo, op. ci., p. 71.
21. Ibid p. 83.
22. Ibid, pp. 93 - 94
23. Victor Perlo, op. ci., p. 27
24. NACLA op. ci., p. 13.
25. Julius Pratt, op. ci., p. 370
26. Ibid p. 371.
27. Ibid, p. 372
28. Robin Blackburn, "Cuba and the Super-powers," in Patterns of Foreign Influence in the Caribbean, edited by Claude de Kadt, Oxford University Press, London, 1972, p. 126.
29. Documents and Materials Relating to the Eve of the Second World War, International Publishers, New York. 1948, Vol.1 pp 26-28: Cited in Political Affairs, October 1972, p. 26.

30. Ibid, p. 39
31. Daniel Mason, "US Foreign Policy in Latin America," Political Affairs, Political Affairs Publishers, Inc, New York, October 1972, p. 27 - 28.
32. Juan Jose Arevalo, op. ci., p 112
33. Edwin Lieuwen, Arms And Politics In Latin America, Frederick Praeger, New York, 1960 p 236.
34. In the USA also there were many isolationists who shared similar views. Senator Robert A. Taft had declared: " A victory for communism would be far more dangerous to the United States than a victory for Fascism".
35. For a full account of the background to the cold war, see Carl Marzani, We Can Be Friends, Topical Book Publishers, New York, 1952, pp. 113 - 287 and D.F. Fleming, The Cold War And Its Origins, Doubleday and Company, Inc., New York, 1951, pp. 348-362 on Churchill's Fulton Speech, and pp. 433-476 on the Truman Doctrine.
36. Winston Churchill is quoted in The New York Times, April 12, 1947, "On Greek affairs in 1944-45 I seemed to find myself out of step. But today it seems I was pursuing the exact policy which, little more than two years later, the United States had adopted with strong conviction. This is to me a very intense satisfaction." For a full account of the antecedents of US cold war position, see William Appleton.
37. Williams, "American Intervention in Russia: 1917-20", pp 26-73 in Containment and Revolution, edited by David Horowitz, Beacon Press, Boston, 1967.
38. See Edwin Lieuwen, op. ci., p, 54, for Communist party membership in Latin America in 1957.
39. Richard Hart, "From Garvey to Black Liberation", Thunder, PPT quarterly, Freedom House, Georgetown, Guyana, April - June 1974, pp 8-9.
40. Ashton Chase, A History of Trade Unionism, 1900 - 1961, New Guyana Co. Ltd., Georgetown, Guyana, p 76.
41. "Grantly Adams - The Man and the Myth", Tapia, Tunapuna, Trinidad, July 21, 1974.
42. Edwin Lieuwen, op. ci., p 201.
43. Ibid - p 220 - 221
44. Ibid, p 220
45. Haslemere Group and Third World Front, Get Off Our Backs, Oxford, England, August 1972, p 10.
46. In 1945, Latin America had 39 per cent of the votes at the U.N. With increased membership from "third world" countries, its percentage declined to 24 per cent in 1959 and 20 per cent in 1973.
47. Edwin Lieuwen, op. ci., p 244

48. R.D. Dutt, The Crisis of Britain and the British Empire, Lawrence and Wishart, London 1957, p. 92.
49. According to Victor Parlo *op. ci.*, p. 21, "The Tydings-Mc Duffie Act., provided "independence" on the following terms: retention of United States military bases, retention of all United States private property rights, honoring of all debts to United States bankers, adoption by the Philippines of a constitution satisfactory to Washington, and ending of the duty-free status of Philippine goods in the United States markets.
- It was so clear that this represented not a liberation of the Philippines, but merely a change in the form of rule, that Professor J.R. Hayden, one-time vice-governor of the Philippines, wrote:
- "The Tydings-McDuffie Act provides for the separation of the United States from the Philippines under conditions which would make probable the early ruin of one country and, consequently, the dishonor of the other."
50. Ved P. Duggal's Two Papers on the Economy of Puerto Rico, The Caribbean Institute and Study Centre for Latin America, Inter-American University of Puerto Rico, San German, p. 11, quotes David F. Ross, The Long Uphill Path, a Historic Study of Puerto Rico's Program of Economic Development, p. 53, to say that from 1898 when the U.S.A. captured it from Spain to 1952, Puerto Rico was an "unincorporated territory."
51. Victor Parlo, *op. ci.*, p. 227
52. Premier Schuman told the Chamber of Deputies on July 25, 1949: "Germany will not be admitted to the Atlantic Pact. The question cannot even arise. There is no peace treaty; Germany has no army and cannot have one; she has no arms, and she shall have none".
53. Britain and the Developing Countries - the Caribbean, prepared for the British Information Services by the Central Office of Information, London, January 1973, No. 5941/73.
54. Because of the limitations of the suffrage, candidates for elections were drawn mainly from the ranks of the petty-bourgeois professionals and businessmen.
55. The British Guiana Trade Union, founded in January 1919 by the militant waterfront worker, Hubert Nathaniel Critchlow, was the first registered union in British Guiana.
56. References in this section are found in R. Palme Dutt's *op. ci.*, pp. 199 - 200.
57. The motion in the UN General Assembly in 1947 inviting colonial powers to turn their colonies into trust territories was defeated by a tie-vote of 24 for and 24 against.

58. The methods of limited war successfully tried out by the British in Malaya were later put into practice by the Americans in Vietnam.
59. Formed in 1946 by regional trade unions and political parties with Grantley Adams (Barbados) as President, Richard Hart (Jamaica) as Secretary, and Hubert N. Critchlow (British Guiana) and Norman Hanley (Jamaica) as vice presidents.
60. Sir Grantley Adams, who in 1958 became the first Prime Minister of the West Indies Federation, was, according to his biographer, F.A. Hoyos in Grantley Adams and the Social Revolution, McMillan Education Ltd., London 1974, converted to "Asquithian Liberalism" during his student days at Oxford University in the early 1920's; and "The Fabian Society was in due course in the 1930's to effect a radical change in his political thinking. It began the process of conversion to the ideas of Democratic Socialism and he was merely speaking the truth when he said some years later that 'the Fabian Society has more or less made my political life!...' (p. 70).
61. For a fuller account of the role of the Labour Party, particularly in Guyana, see Chapter "The Labour Party, the Cold War and the Colonies," in Cheddi Jagan's The West On Trial, Michael Joseph, London, 1966, pp. 170-184.
62. For a full account of the formation and split of the WFTU, see extracts from Allen Hutt's A Short History of British Trade Unionism (1800 - 1961) quoted in Ashton Chase's A History of Trade Unionism in Guyana, 1900 to 1961, New Guyana Company Limited, Georgetown, Guyana, pp. 113-115.
63. That betrayal was also evidenced in the acceptance in 1958 of a West Indies Federation on the basis of a crown colony constitution -- collective colonialism -- a far cry from the resolution passed at Montego Bay in 1947, calling for federation with dominion status; the Federation collapsed in 1962.
64. The Times of October 31, 1953, found that "the Communist plot" . . . is not exposed in the White Paper with the clarity and completeness that many in this country expected." The Manchester Guardian of the same date concluded that "the charge of Communism, so much bandied about the early days of the crisis in Guyana, now seems rather a red herring."
65. David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, The Invisible Government, Random House, New York, 1964, p. 110 stated that General Fazollah Zahedi, "the man the CIA chose to replace Mossadegh...fought the Bolsheviks, was captured by the Kurds, and, in 1942, was kidnapped by the British, who suspected him of Nazi intrigues. During World War II, the British and the Russians jointly occupied Iran. British Agents, after snatching Zahedi, claimed they found the following items in his bedroom: a collection of German automatic weapons, silk underwear, some opium, letters from German parachutists operating in the hills, and an illustrated register of Teheran's most exquisite prostitutes."

66. Earlier in 1930, Ludwell Denny, in his book "America Conquers Britain," had stated: "We were Britain's colony once. She will be our colony before she is done: not in name but in fact. Machines gave Britain power over the world. Now better machines are giving America power over the world and Britain. . . Of course, American world supremacy is rather horrible to think about. But American supremacy can hardly be worse than British and others gone before. . . What chance has Britain against America? Or what chance has the world?" R. Palme Dutt, op. ci. p. 18 notes that even earlier on October 25, 1913, Ambassador Page, US Ambassador to Britain in a letter to President Wilson had observed: "The future of the world belongs to us. These English are spending their capital. . . . Now, what are we going to do with the leadership of the world presently when it clearly falls into our hands? And how can we use the British for the highest use of democracy?"
67. Congressman Donald L. Jackson, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Western Hemisphere of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs visited British Guiana on September 26, 1953. On his departure a day after, he said, "The United States considers British Guiana very strategic from the standpoint of hemispheric defence."
68. Juan Jose Arevalo, op. ci., p. 150.
69. R. Palme Dutt, op. ci., p. 287.
70. The Marshall recovery plan for Europe had strategic and political as well as economic objectives. According to the Harriman Report of 1947: "The interests of the United States in Europe cannot be measured simply in economic terms. It is also strategic and political." Ibid, p. 112.
71. Ibid, p. 289
72. As regards the British Empire, the Gray Report of 1950 stated: "Not only is the sterling area an indispensable source of raw materials, but the position of Britain as a banker and trading centre of the world's largest currency area makes Britain's trading and currency policies of great importance to the realisation of United States Foreign economic objectives." Ibid, p. 296.
73. Dr. Eric Williams of Trinidad and Tobago launched out into a political career in 1956 after he had been refused promotion to the top post of Secretary-General.
74. Quoted in Labour Monthly, London, July 1971, page 296.
75. Donald MacLean, British Foreign Policy Since Suez, Hodder and Stroughton, London, p. 148.
76. Arthur M. Schlesinger, A Thousand Days, John E. Kennedy in the White House, Andre Deutsch, London, 1965, p. 668

77. D.F. Fleming, The Gold War and Its Origins, Doublday & Company, New York 1961, p 502.
78. David Wise & Thomas E. Ross, op. ci. p. 43.
79. The Conference proposed a resolution condemning rightist dictatorships in the Caribbean. The Americans with Cuba in mind, wanted an amendment to include "left dictatorship". But with the strong support of the then 4 parties in Venezuela, the Conference defeated the US manoeuvre. The Amerindians had hoped that with the indirect condemnation of Cuba by democratic American public opinion, the ground would have been better prepared for firm action at the official level at San Jose.
80. Julius W. Pratt, op. ci., p. 539
81. Longino Becerra, "US Imperialism in Latin America", Thunder, Guyana, Oct-Dec. 1989, p. 15.
82. The British government had agreed at the 1960 Constitutional Conference in London in 1960 that the party which won the 1961 election would lead the country to Independence.
83. Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., op. ci. p. 668.
84. In a letter to The New York Times in 1958, Balaguer wrote; It is no secret to any Dominican that I am solely an intellectual creation of Generalissimo Trujillo and if there is any merit I have as a member of the spiritual and political family of this illustrious government it is for the fidelity which I employ in reflecting, in my modest interventions as a publicist, the thinking of the man who personifies actually the Dominican life. Quoted in Juan de Onis, "The Hispanic Caribbean" in The United States and the Caribbean, Prentice - Hall, N.Y. 1971, p. 166.
85. E.W. Kenworthy, The New York Times, June 30, 1960.
86. The dictator Manuel Odria of Peru was also given a Legion of Merit award on the same day as Perez Jimenez by President Eisenhower.
87. Herbert Aptheker, op. ci., p. 101.
88. The New York Times, August 5, 1953, quoted in The Vietnam Profiteers, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1960, pp. 5 - 6.
89. Quoted in a review, "The United States and Cuba", by Barry Cohen, Political Affairs, October 1972, New York, pp. 65 - 72 of Philip W. Bonsol's book Cuba, Castro and the United States, University of Pittsburg Press, Pittsburg, 1971.
90. Before Kennedy became President he said that the Cuban Revolution took place after the US had "refused to . . . (Get off our Backs, page 11) . . . New York Times 7. 10. 1960).

- 91. D. Wise and T.B. Ross, op. ci., p. 342.
- 92. Ibid, p. 343.
- 93. Ibid - pp. 342-343, See page 96 for a list of the many occasions when leading spokesmen deliberately tried to deceive the American people and world public opinion.
- 94. After the Romulo Betancourt - led Accion Democratica government of Venezuela had revised in late 1960s to previous pro-Castro policy, the Betancourt doctrine was proclaimed under which was withheld diplomatic recognition of regimes which did not come to power by the constitutional democratic process. That same government however, raised no doubt under U.S. pressure Venezuela's border claim on Guyana when it appeared after 1961 that the PPP would lead Guyana to independence. Prior to that, in 1958, all the four main Venezuelan parties had given an undertaking to the PPP govt-led goodwill mission to Venezuela that they would neither raise nor renounce the claim.
- 95. Arthur M. Schlesinger, op. ci. p 669. The first riots and disturbances occurred in February 1962 against the PPP government on its budget proposals.
- 96. Time; Sept 30, 1974, p 18.
- 97. Ibid, p. 17.
- 98. See Cheddi Jagan, op. ci. p. 258 for the independence formula in Command Paper 998.
- 99. Janet Jagan Army Intervention in the 1973 Elections in Guyana, New Guyana Company, Georgetown Guyana. 1973, p. 89.
- 100. Edwin Lieuwen, op. ci., p 235.
- 101. President Johnson decided to intervene massively in Vietnam after the successful intervention in the Dominican Republic.
- 102. Haslemese Group - op. ci. p 10
- 103. Brazil also plays a reactionary role in the South Atlantic pact with South Africa, Rhodesia, Portugal (before the army coup in 1974) for the curtailment of national liberation in Africa.
- 104. Longino Becerra op. ci. p. 18.
- 105. Time Sept. 30, 1974, p. 16.
- 106. Ved. P. Duggal, op. ci. p. 22
- 107. Quoted by Gus Hall "Why Puerto Rico is the most profitable address in USA", Political Affairs October 1972.
- 108. R. Palme Dutt, op. ci. p 282
- 109. AID, Proposed Economic Assistance Programme FY, 1967 p 75, cited in NACLA, op. ci. p 50.

110. In The New York Times on December 18, 1961, C.L. Sulzberger, stressing the basic motivation of expediency, wrote: "We don't owe Latin America any kind of Marshall Plan, but if anything drastic is accomplished by the Alliance for Progress we now offer, the man to be thanked is Fidel Castro. Without dramatisation of a communist threat, it is arguable that Washington might well have continued dilly-dallying. If the alliance succeeds it should perhaps be marked by statues respectively honouring Kennedy and Castro. The mere reiteration of platitudes like the need for a good-neighbour policy would not have accomplished the needed reveille."
- 110(a). NACLA, op. ci., p. 44
111. NACLA, op. ci., p. 44.
112. NACLA, op. ci., p. 41.
113. NACLA, op. ci., p. 28.
114. Quoted in Susanne Jonas (Bodenheimer) "Mastermining the Mini Market" U.S. Aid to Central American Common Market in NACLA's Latin American and Empire Report, Vol. VII, No. 5, May-June 1973.
115. Political Affairs, October 1972, saying: "Despite the greater national income, the socio-economic structures in Brazil and Mexico have not been able to resolve any of the problems common to most countries of the continent. As industry expanded, so did penetration of foreign, chiefly North American, capital; the position of the landlord oligarchy grew stronger; the concentration of production and capital in the hands of the imperialist monopolies continued unabated; the problems of the small and medium-sized enterprises grew more acute. The increased exports helped expand industry. But an ever greater portion is being used to cover the cost of foreign services. In Brazil, for example, this cost equaled 42 per cent of the total 1966-1970 exports, as against 29 per cent in the 1950's. The foreign debt . . . has doubled . . . (Structural Crisis and Contradictions in Latin America, World Marxist Review, May 1972).
116. Cited by Fred Hirsch, An Analysis of Our AFL-CIO role in Latin America, or Under the Covers with the CIA, San Jose, California, 1974, p. 23.
117. Ibid, p. 25.
118. Ibid, p. 20.
119. Ibid, pp. 15-16.
120. Cited in Thunder, January-March, 1974, p. 33.
121. Where not specifically stated, reference to dollars in this paper means US currency.
122. Cited in Science, December 13, 1966.
- 122(a). This technocratic idea is current in Guyana where 13 of the 25 ministers are technocrats. Imperialism sees the need especially since the Peace Corps came under attack to train Black Americans for service particularly in the Caribbean and Africa. The image of the "ugly American" will be vastly improved when he is black, whether serving as ambassador, technician or manager.
123. D.F. Fleming, op. ci., p. 781.
124. Ibid, p. 782.
125. J. Peter Grace expressed surprise in 1959 when a public opinion poll disclosed such a large percentage -- 68 in Caracas, 66 in Mexico City, 62 in Buenos Aires, 51 in Montevideo, 40 in Bogota, 34 in Lima. See D.F. Fleming, op. ci., p. 966.
126. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., op. ci., pp. 731-732, (emphasis added).
127. The Kennedy administration was particularly peeved that the Non-Aligned Conference in Belgrade in 1961 had not condemned the Soviet Union for resuming atom-bomb testing. The Soviet Union justified its position on the ground that at the time of the agreement the United States had carried out a much larger number of tests and France, a NATO partner, was being allowed to carry out its own independent testing.

128. The Belgrade non-aligned Conference in 1961 had 25 participating states; at Cairo five years later, there were 47 states; at Lusaka in 1970, fifty-four and at Algiers in 1973, seventy-six. The Belgrade conference set out the guidelines for non-alignment and defined non-participation in military alliances to be a fundamental principle.
129. A parallel development took place in the African liberation struggle. Prior to the formation of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) the Casablanca Group, though smaller than the Monrovia Group, was militantly anti-imperialist. That forever was lost when the two groups merged to form the OAU. This was pointed out by President Julius Nyerere on the tenth anniversary of Tanzania's independence. He said: ". . . The Organisation of African Unity formed in 1963 still exists, and most African governments at the very least take note of its decisions and feel the necessity to twist and turn in the pretence that they are observing OAU resolutions, even when most blatantly ignoring them. The name of the OAU is taken in vain by its members as often as it is respected. But the fact that no African nation is willing to leave the Organisation, or to ignore it, is a sign that, however weak it is, the OAU has a worthwhile function. We shall continue to work for its effective greatness."
130. Peter Peterson, one-time U.S. Secretary of Commerce in a special study titled "US-Soviet Commercial Relationships in a New Era" wrote: "With the industrial and technological development of other major economies, the US no longer has the monopoly it once enjoyed. . . Our overall trade balance is a melancholy reminder of these changed circumstances. The increased availability of high technology products elsewhere rendered some of our original curbs on exports to the Soviet Union increasingly anachronistic.
- "The real loser. . . would have increasingly been the US producer and workers, not the Soviet consumer or the Soviet economy.
- "There comes a point at which we must face the fact that business is business, and, if it is going to go on in any event, we might as well get a piece of the action."
- Stressing the advantages also to employment, Peterson also noted: ". . . the goods that we are likely to export to the Soviet Union are products like machine tools, earth-moving equipment of various kinds, consumer goods, grain products, which are characterized by what the economists call 'high labor intensive products.' In plainer language - jobs. On the import side, we plan to import substantial amounts of raw materials which we need, energy which we need, clean energy, I might emphasize. But here again, with low labor content. So I think it is safe to predict that in addition to having a favourable balance of trade surplus, the evidence I think is very persuasive that we will have an even more favourable balance of jobs surplus."
131. James Millette, Cuba Since 1959, Moko Publications, Curepe, Trinidad, W.I. Dec. 1973.
132. Jan Prazsky, "Non-Alignment: Role and Perspectives Commentary", World Marxist Review, Prague, November 1973.
133. How to Understand Latin Americans, Northern Book House, Box 1000, Gravelhurst, Ontario, Canada.
134. Cited by Roberto Gonzales Gomez, op. ci.
135. Franz Shurmann, "U.S. Shifts Military Strategy", Guardian, May 8, 1974.
136. A. Palme Dutt, op. ci., p. 254.
137. New Times, Moscow, No. 4, 1973.
138. According to Julius Pratt, op. ci., p. 539: To a message from Premier Khrushchev, threatening all-out war if the United States should invade Cuba, President Kennedy replied that the United States intended no military invasion of Cuba, but added: "In the event of any military intervention by outside force we will immediately honor our obligations under the inter-American system to protect this hemisphere against external aggression."
139. In his speech to the 4th Conference of Non-aligned Nations in Algiers in 1973, Dr. Fidel Castro stated: "There are those who, with patent historic injustice and ingratitude, forgetting the real facts and disregarding the profound, unbridgeable abyss between the imperialist regime and socialism, try to ignore the glorious, heroic and extraordinary services rendered to the human race by the Soviet people, (APPLAUSE) as if the collapse of the colossal system of colonial rule implanted in the world up to World War II and the conditions that made possible the liberation of scores of peoples heretofore under direct colonial subjugation, the disappearance of capitalism in large parts of the world and the holding at bay of the aggressiveness and insatiable voracity of imperialism - as if all that, had nothing to do with the glorious October Revolution (APPLAUSE)"