

Trusteeship + Information from Non-Self Governing Territories.  
Registry Section. Administration of the Non-Self Governing Territory of British Guiana.  
TR 300

(2 of 2)

1/01/1964-31/12/1967

Unclassified

PLEASE RETAIN  
ORIGINAL ORDER

UN ARCHIVES

SERIES	<u>S-0443</u>
BOX	<u>0066</u>
FILE	<u>0003</u>
ACC.	<u>9871</u>

# NATIONS UNIES

### Trusteeship & Information from NSGT

ADMINISTRATION OF THE NON-SELF  
GOVERNING TERRITORY OF

BRITISH GUIANA

TR

300 BRU

PART

PARTIE

**FILE BEGINS**

DOSSIER COMMENCE LE

ENDS

TERMINE LE

[illegible]

TK

300 BRGU



FOR PREVIOUS CORRESPONDENCE  
SEE PERIODIC FILE ENDING  
31 DECEMBER 19 63

REGISTRY FILE CLOSURE FORM

☒ FILE FOR PERIOD OF 1 JAN. 1963  
THROUGH 31 DEC. 1967 CLOSED.  
A NEW PERIODIC FILE WILL BE OPENED  
IF REQUIRED.

☐ PART \_\_\_\_\_ CLOSED.  
SEE PART \_\_\_\_\_

☐ FILE NO. \_\_\_\_\_ CLOSED.  
CORRESPONDENCE CONTINUED UNDER FILE NO.  
\_\_\_\_\_

cc M/S Narasimhan  
Shankar  
Chacko  
Kumar





UNITED KINGDOM MISSION  
RECORDS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

845 THIRD AVENUE  
NEW YORK, N.Y.

24 JAN 1966

(15120/6/66)

19 January 1966.

*you* TR 300 GEN

*XREF* TR 300 FIJI

" TR 300 GIBR

*Seen in Trusteeship*

*No action*

*19/1/66 Janaka*

Your Excellency TR 300 BRGU

*" TR 300 OMAN*

I have the honour to acknowledge Your Excellency's letters of the 10th of January, 1966, transmitting for the attention of my Government the texts of Resolutions 2065 (Falkland Islands), 2066 (Mauritius), 2068 (Fiji), 2069 (twenty-six colonial territories), 2070 (Gibraltar), 2071 (British Guiana), and 2073 (Oman), adopted by the General Assembly during the Twentieth Session.

The texts of these resolutions have been forwarded to the United Kingdom Government.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurance of my highest consideration.

*R. W. Jackling*

(R.W. Jackling)

His Excellency  
U Thant,  
United Nations,  
New York.



TT/am

13 JAN 1966

TR 300 BRITISH GUIANA

10 January 1966

Sir,

I have the honour to transmit herewith for the attention of your Government, the text of resolution 2071 (XX) concerning British Guiana, adopted by the General Assembly at its 1398th plenary meeting on 16 December 1965.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

U Thant  
Secretary-General

His Excellency  
The Rt. Hon. the Lord Caradon, G.C.M.G., K.C.V.O.  
Minister of State for Foreign Affairs  
Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom  
to the United Nations  
845 Third Avenue  
New York 22. N.Y.





UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



10 DEC 1965

Distr.  
LIMITEDA/C.4/L.809/Rev.1/Add.2  
8 December 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twentieth session  
FOURTH COMMITTEE  
Agenda item 23

JR 300 BRGU

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING  
OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES:  
REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE: BRITISH GUIANA

Algeria, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ethiopia, Ghana,  
Guinea, India, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Nepal, Niger,  
Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Syria, Togo, United Arab  
Republic, United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia: joint  
draft resolution

Addendum

Add Sudan and Zambia to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

-----





UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



Distr.  
GENERAL

A/C.4/661  
7 December 1965  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

Twentieth session  
FOURTH COMMITTEE  
Agenda item 23

TR 300 BRGU

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE  
TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES: REPORTS OF THE SPECIAL  
COMMITTEE: BRITISH GUIANA

Statement made by the representative of Venezuela at the 1577th meeting  
of the Fourth Committee on 7 December 1965

Note by the Secretariat: The following statement is circulated to members  
of the Fourth Committee in accordance with a decision taken by the  
Committee at its 1577th meeting, on 7 December 1965.

On 2 December, we first saw the twenty-two-Power draft resolution on  
British Guiana, which appears in document A/C.4/L.809 and was circulated on  
that date.

We should not have taken the floor to comment on the resolution if it had  
taken into consideration the legitimate claim of the people and Government of  
Venezuela to part of our territory which has been occupied by the administering  
Power and annexed to its colony known as British Guiana.

As we all know, outside the United Nations international disputes are not  
always resolved simply because one of the parties has justice and right on its  
side. These are often worth nothing if they are not backed by strength. Within  
the United Nations, strength is represented by the number of votes. It is a fact  
that one group of countries commands a majority of those votes in the General  
Assembly. With right and justice on our side, we appealed to that group at  
least to continue to seek a negotiated solution to the problem underlying our  
dispute with the United Kingdom, without prejudging the substance of the question.  
However, those whose votes give them strength refused us their support even for  
the protection of our rights. We believed that our unblemished anti-colonialist  
record would be enough to win the understanding and co-operation of those for whom



Venezuela has spoken untiringly in defence of their rights and for the liberation of their territory from the colonial yoke. We appealed to those countries which, like ours, have endured the clawings of colonial ambitions. However, we are forced to conclude that the skin is more sensitive when the claws sink into one's own flesh than when they rend the flesh of a distant relative. Venezuela has championed the cause of colonial peoples, as the records of the United Nations show, not merely now when a majority of Member States are anti-colonialist but even and mainly when only a minority were and the majority was formed by the Latin American countries. We always used that majority to protect the lawful rights of colonial peoples. Many countries which are now sovereign States and are seated in this hall are witnesses to that. We greatly appreciated the kind words with which Ambassador Pachachi of Iraq recalled that fact at the 1547th meeting of the Committee on 3 October 1965 (A/C.4/SR.1547). We have always taken the position that all colonial questions, even when they have special features as regards the formula which must be applied in resolving them, are essentially equal, whether they arise in America or on another continent, and are of equal importance in our eyes.

The draft resolution states in its fourth preambular paragraph that the General Assembly is "desirous of ensuring that British Guiana achieves independence under the most favourable conditions".

Does the Committee believe that it would be creating very favourable conditions if it left the newly independent State, in addition to the tremendous racial problem facing it, the burdensome heritage of a territorial dispute with a neighbouring State? Many States represented here suffer from the consequences of such disputes bequeathed by the colonial Power, which poison their relations with brother countries. Some have chosen the easy path of force, without regard for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations of which they are signatories, or for the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV), in order to recover the territories which in their view belonged to them. Venezuela, which is a supporter and defender of law and believes and trusts in the Charter of the United Nations, refuses to admit that when a party to a case has justice and right on its side the use of force and violence is the only means of achieving a solution, at least until all peaceful means have been tried, and we have chosen



the longer and more laborious path of diplomatic negotiation. In 1962, after long years of waiting, we submitted the case to the United Nations and were able to prevail upon the United Kingdom to give effect to the statement it made at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, by agreement with Venezuela, that it would seek a solution to the territorial problem of Guayana Esequiba. Consequently, we request the sponsors of the draft resolution in particular, and the Afro-Asian group in general, to insert a paragraph calling upon the United Kingdom and Venezuela to intensify their efforts to find a solution to the territorial dispute between Venezuela and British Guiana before the date fixed for that colony's independence. The inclusion of such a paragraph would be in keeping with what is stated in the fourth preambular paragraph of the resolution. To permit this situation to remain unsettled would mean creating a future source of danger to the peace and good relations which should prevail between neighbouring and brotherly countries. In that connexion, I should like to quote what Mr. Tabibi, the representative of Afghanistan, said in the Special Political Committee when the question was discussed there in November 1962:

"The frontier dispute between Venezuela and British Guiana was yet another legacy of the colonial era, which had created discord and animosity among many neighbouring nations that might otherwise have been living in peace and amity. Unless a just and honourable solution was found to the dispute, it would remain a hindrance to the progress of those two Latin American countries. ... The new nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America, with the experience of their own sufferings, should work together to improve the principles of international law" (Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Special Political Committee, 349th meeting, p. 125).

Whenever a colonial question relating to a region other than our own is discussed in the Committee of Twenty-Four, to which we have the honour to belong, or in the General Assembly, the Venezuelan delegation tries to study it exhaustively and in detail so that it can present its views with full knowledge of the issues and cast its vote after obtaining as much information as possible from all available sources. We were entitled to expect our friends from other continents to accord us similar treatment in dealing with a colonial question in America.

/...



It has been said that Venezuela has not submitted the question to the United Nations and that, for that reason, what we have requested was not included in the draft resolution. Nothing could be less true.

When the question of British Guiana was first discussed in the United Nations at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly, the Permanent Representative of Venezuela, Dr. Carlos Sosa Rodriguez, sent the Secretary-General a memorandum dated 14 February 1962 in which he set forth the Venezuelan Government's views and the reservations which it had on that question. The memorandum was transmitted by the Secretary-General to the Permanent Missions of Member States as document A/C.4/536.

When the Fourth Committee considered the problem, Dr. Sosa Rodriguez, at the 1302nd meeting of the Committee, gave a detailed explanation of our rights in the matter. When he stated that he was in favour of independence for the United Kingdom colony, which we have always supported, he nevertheless expressed the most categorical reservations with regard to Venezuela's rights to the territory of Guayana Esequiba, which the administering Power had usurped and annexed to the colony. The Venezuelan representative's statement was issued as United Nations document A/C.4/540.

At its seventeenth session, the General Assembly discussed as agenda item 88 "The question of boundaries between Venezuela and the territory of British Guiana". To its letter of 18 August 1962, in which it requested the inclusion of that item in the agenda, the Venezuelan delegation added an explanatory memorandum containing our reasons for making the request. The letter and memorandum were circulated as document A/5168 and Add.1, dated 21 August 1962. This memorandum was followed by a long and detailed statement made at the 348th meeting of the Special Political Committee on 12 November 1962 by the then Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, Dr. Marcos Falcón Briceño. The text of the Venezuelan Minister's statement was issued as United Nations document A/SPC/71. After a debate in the Special Political Committee, the Chairman made the following statement:

"The Committee has heard statements by the Foreign Minister of Venezuela and by the representative of the United Kingdom in which they have set out the positions of their Governments on this matter. The representatives of the Governments of the United Kingdom and Venezuela have authorized me to inform the Committee that, as a result of the



conversations held by them in the last few days with regard to the question of the boundaries between Venezuela and the territory of British Guiana, they have agreed, the first of the aforementioned Governments acting with the full concurrence of the Government of British Guiana, that the three Governments shall examine the documentary material available to all parties relevant to this question. For this purpose they will proceed to make the necessary arrangements through diplomatic channels.

"I am sure that I am interpreting the feelings of the Committee in saying that, in view of the possibility of direct discussions among the parties concerned, we should not proceed further with our debate here. I feel sure that the Committee will also wish me to express the hope that this procedure agreed among the three parties concerned will be fruitful.

"It is my understanding that the parties concerned will inform the United Nations about the results of these conversations."

At its 1191st plenary meeting on 11 December 1962, the General Assembly took note of the report of the Special Political Committee and, hence, of the above-mentioned statement (A/5313). The Committee had decided, moreover, to adjourn its consideration of the item at the request of the Chilean delegation.

The Governments of the United Kingdom and Venezuela took a number of steps to give effect to the statement approved by the General Assembly. The first was the meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the two countries, held in London from 5 to 7 November 1963, which resulted in the publication of a joint communiqué dated 7 November. The communiqué specified the next steps to be taken. Principally, it was decided to appoint experts from both countries to study the relevant documentary material in London and Caracas. The experts were to submit reports to their respective Governments, which would serve as a basis for new conversations. The joint communiqué was transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who in turn circulated it to the Permanent Missions of all Member States as note No. PO 220 VENE (2) dated 15 November 1963.

The reports of the experts provided for in the communiqué were submitted to the respective Governments many months ago. Their contents were carefully studied, and all that remained was to reach agreement on the agenda for the

/...



meeting at the Foreign Ministers' level so that a date could be set for the meeting. Such agreement has now been reached, and we can inform the Committee that the meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom and Venezuela will be held in London on 9 and 10 December. The Government of British Guiana will be represented at the meeting.

In view of the implementation of the statement approved by the General Assembly and the progress made, my delegation refrained from raising the question again either in the General Assembly or in the Committee of Twenty-Four, but it formally reserved its rights whenever the question arose in any organ of the United Nations.

When the Committee of Seventeen, which is now the Committee of Twenty-Four first discussed the question of independence for British Guiana, Dr. Sosa Rodriguez, in expressing support for the draft resolution which the Committee subsequently adopted, explicitly reserved our rights to the territory of Guayana Esequiba. (A/AC.109/PV.90, p. 8, et seq., and A/AC.109/SR.90, p. 5 et seq.)

When I spoke for the first time in the Committee of Twenty-Four on the question of British Guiana on 25 June 1963, I reserved our rights in clear and precise language (A/AC.109/PV.180 and A/AC.109/SR.180). On 23 June 1964 when that Committee adopted a resolution after a long and heated debate, I formally reserved Venezuela's rights, as will be seen in document A/5800/Add.5, the report of the Special Committee, chapter VII, paragraphs 176 and 234. And if the 1965 report does not record Venezuela's reservation it may be found in the summary record of the 389th meeting of the Special Committee (A/AC.109/SR.389).

In the general debate at the General Assembly's eighteenth session (A/PV.1221, 1 October 1963) and nineteenth session (A/PV.1295, 8 December 1964), the Venezuelan Minister for Foreign Affairs informed the Assembly of the progress made in giving effect to the statement approved by the Assembly at its seventeenth session (Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 88, p. 15).

/...



Finally, Dr. Iribarren Borges, the Venezuelan Minister for Foreign Affairs, discussed the question at length on 6 October 1965 during the general debate at the current session (A/PV.1350).

As the foregoing observations make clear, the assertion that this Committee was unaware of the existence of the Venezuelan claim because we had never raised the question in the United Nations is entirely groundless. We have confined ourselves to expressing reservations in moderate but forceful terms whenever necessary instead of raising the question in detail precisely because there is a General Assembly decision which the parties concerned are in the process of carrying out.

However, a new factor has arisen, and we cannot permit it to be taken into consideration in a draft resolution and the interests and rights of the Venezuelan people forgotten or disregarded. The Government of the United Kingdom has set the date for the independence of British Guiana.

Venezuela has never opposed, nor does it now oppose, the granting of independence to that colony. On the contrary, it welcomes this acceleration in the process of eliminating the last vestiges of colonialism in America, since we ourselves were the first to advocate it. However, we must go on record as stating that the United Kingdom can dispose only of the territory which belongs to it, for, in accordance with the principle uti possidetis juris, Guayana Esequiba is part of Venezuelan territory inasmuch as the boundaries of the Captaincy General of Venezuela, an administrative division of Spain, extended to the western bank of the Esequibo River when Venezuela became a sovereign nation in 1810. In accordance with the above-mentioned principle, the new Venezuelan State, when it came into existence as a subject of international law, fell heir to the territory over which the Spanish Crown had exercised all the attributes of sovereignty. At the time that Venezuela declared its independence of Spain in 1810, the British colony did not exist, and the territories that the Netherlands later ceded to Great Britain by the treaty signed at London on 13 August 1814 did not extend beyond the right bank of the Esequibo River.



I do not wish to weary the members of the Committee with a detailed analysis of the historical and legal facts, which, in any case, we have set forth on other occasions; however, I shall venture to give a brief account of the situation which existed prior to the aggressive actions which culminated in the usurpation of a part of our territory.

When Spain accepted the independence of the Netherlands under the Treaty of Münster, 1648, it agreed to recognize the sovereignty of the Dutch over those territories which they held in America. At the same time, under article 6 of the Treaty, each State undertook to abstain from any shipping or traffic with the territories of the other. It is therefore of the greatest interest to know what territory in America was under Dutch occupation at that time.

The document that sheds most light on this subject is the official record of the establishment of the second West Indies Company, registered in 1674, in which the Dutch Government specified what territories it possessed on the mainland of South America. This document mentions only two settlements in Guiana:

"Plaatsen van Isekepe en Bawromenora" (locations on the Esequibo and the Pomarón).

The maps of the period prove that the Dutch settlements had not been extended any farther.

On the coast they had reached as far as the river Pomarón. To the south, on the river Esequibo, they had reached only as far as the first rapids of the rivers Cuyuni and Mazaruni. These rapids, situated a very short distance from the river Esequibo, were not navigable because the many waterfalls presented an impassable barrier to shipping.

Moreover the Spaniards were not willing to allow the Dutch to spread beyond the boundaries of the territory they had occupied when the Treaty of Münster was signed. Consequently every attempt to extend Dutch rule was repulsed by the Spanish authorities. Even the small slave-trading posts which the Dutch tried at various times to establish in Guianese territory were destroyed by the Spaniards. This happened, for example, to the post which Dutch subjects tried to establish



in 1758 for the slave trade in the Cuyuni river basin: the Spaniards destroyed the post and arrested its occupants. When the Dutch protested that action, the Spanish Government answered that it was fully justified on the basis of the territorial sovereignty exercised by Spain. The Dutch made no reply. The same fate befell the small settlements which the Dutch tried to establish in the coastal area beyond the Pomarón River.

In 1779 Don José Felipe de Inciarte, the Spanish commissioner, found that the Dutch had a small post on the river Moroco. When the Spanish Sovereign was informed of Inciarte's report, he ordered inter alia that a fort equipped with four to six cannon should be built on the estuary of the river Moroco in order to deny passage to any enemy craft and to expel the Dutch from the post or guard station which they had built there. The Spanish Sovereign observed that such action was justified under the laws and general rules of good government in those territories, "which do not permit such foreign incursions into Spanish domains, such as those are".

Many documents of the period provide additional evidence concerning the areas actually occupied by the Dutch:

In 1770 Father Benito de la Garriga, Prefect of the Guiana Missions for more than twenty-three years, testified that the Dutch had never occupied the coast beyond the river Moroco or the inner estuary of the rivers Cuyuni and Mazaruni.

In 1787 - barely nine years before the British occupation of the Dutch possessions in Guiana - Don Antonio López de la Puente was appointed by the Spanish Governor in Guiana to explore the river Cuyuni as far as the boundaries of the Dutch colony. On 26 February 1788 the commissioner submitted a report stating that he had found the first Dutch dwellings at Camaria, only two or three leagues from the confluence of the rivers Cuyuni and Mazaruni.

As to the coastal region, in 1794 - that is to say, two years before the British military occupation of the territory - Mr. Six, the Secretary of the Dutch West Indies Company, addressed a communication to the Spanish authorities in which he stated that the captain and members of the crew of the Spanish ship Nuestra Señora de la Concepción, after being well treated by the Governor-General



of Surinam, had been taken to the river Moroco and left there that from that point, "being in Spanish territory and on their own soil, they might proceed to the nearest Spanish American village".

Thus, on the eve of the British occupation, the Dutch knew very well what were the boundaries of their colony and where Spanish territory began.

In 1796, because of the situation prevailing in Europe, Great Britain placed the Dutch settlements in America under military occupation. Later, under a treaty signed in London on 13 August 1814, the Netherlands ceded to the United Kingdom part of the territory which that Power had occupied in Guiana.

The treaty of cession specifies what the United Kingdom acquired from the Government of the Netherlands:

In paragraph 3 of the first additional article of this treaty, the Government of the Netherlands agreed, for a certain monetary consideration, to cede to the United Kingdom Government full sovereignty over "the settlements of Demerara, Esequibo and Berbice", situated in the Guiana area.

The settlements of Demerara and Berbice, situated in territories which lie on the right bank of the river Esequibo, have never been disputed by Venezuela; neither have the settlements which actually existed on the Esequibo. Those settlements, as already stated, comprised the areas of actual Dutch occupation, legally recognized by the Treaty of Münster, 1648. The total area of the territory ceded by the Netherlands in 1814 was approximately 20,000 square miles.

Private and public British sources, both of the period of the military occupation of the Dutch territories in Guiana and of periods subsequent to the treaty of 1814, confirm the boundaries of the territory that had passed into British hands.

For example in 1797 - one year after the de facto occupation by Great Britain - Mr. Pinkard, medical inspector of British military hospitals, writing from Demerara, referred to the post on the river Moroco as "the most remote point of the Esequibo Colony".

In 1838, Mr. Light, the Governor of British Guiana, wrote:



"The Pomarón River, on the extreme western side of the Esequibo, can be taken as the boundary of the country."

Two years later, in 1840, a British subject was detained at Demerara on a charge of killing an Indian; when his counsel proved that the crime had been committed on the Moroco channel, that afforded sufficient grounds for the court of the colony to disqualify itself, declaring that it had no jurisdiction because the crime had been committed in foreign territory.

Therefore the British themselves recognized that the western boundary of the colony was the river Moroco. Moreover this view agreed with that held by the Venezuelan authorities of the period. In 1817 Simon Bolívar, the Liberator, had declared that the Venezuelan territories in Guiana extended "from the Río Grande up to but not including the Moroco fort".

The situation was changed in mid-Victorian times, when the United Kingdom usurped and forcibly occupied Venezuelan territory to which we have never relinquished our claim. The illegality of those actions was corroborated by an arbitral award which I would more correctly describe as an arbitrary award, and whose validity Venezuela has always denied, holding it null and void. We were not able at that time to oppose violence with force, especially after the bloody struggles for independence which halved our population, that and arbitrary imposition has been a thorn in our side ever since. The only action possible at the time of the aggression was action through the diplomatic channel. On 26 January 1887 the Government of Venezuela addressed a communication to the United Kingdom Government, demanding the evacuation of the illegally occupied territory.

Having received no satisfactory reply to that demand, the Government of Venezuela declared on 20 February 1887 that it was severing its relations with the United Kingdom.

The note breaking off relations read in part as follows:

"The United Kingdom has violated Venezuela's rights of sovereignty and independence, depriving it of the most sacred and inviolable property of a nation, namely its territory."

When Venezuela announced the suspension of relations with the United Kingdom Government, its protest against what had occurred was expressed in the following terms:



"And protests to Her Britannic Majesty's Government, to all civilized nations and to the world at large against the acts of ouster which have been committed against it by the Government of the United Kingdom and which it will not at any time, or for any reason, recognize as capable of affecting in the slightest degree the rights which it has inherited from Spain."

When Venezuela declared itself an independent Republic, it inherited from Spain all the territory which until 1810 had constituted the Captaincy General of Venezuela. Spain itself expressly recognized that fact in the Treaty signed in 1845.

Part of the Captaincy General of Venezuela was the province of Guiana which, as already stated, extended from the river Orinoco to the Esequibo settlements. At no time had Spain accepted any impairment of the exercise of its sovereign rights in that region. Venezuela could not permit any such impairment either, although it now had to face an adversary infinitely more powerful than itself.

In this connexion it is pertinent to quote L. Vladimirov, the distinguished Soviet historian who, in his substantial and well-documented book on United States diplomacy during the Spanish-American War, has the following to say about the struggle between the great Powers for hegemony in the Western hemisphere:

"This struggle was especially heightened by the impudent intervention of the United States in the long Anglo-Venezuelan dispute over British Guiana and Venezuela. The dispute originated in the aggressive acts of British capital, which seized several economically and strategically important areas of Venezuela bordering on British Guiana."

The result of these "aggressive acts" mentioned by the Soviet scholar was the occupation and usurpation of Guayana Esequiba. Attempts are now being made to give these an air of legality by citing the so-called "arbitral award" made by a tribunal of United Kingdom and United States arbitrators under an Anglophile Tsarist Russian Chairman, which was no more than a political compromise imposed on the weak American Republic by the Powers of the period.

Allow me to quote what was said in that connexion by Dr. Ignacio Iribarren Borges, the Minister of Venezuela, in the general debate at the current session, on 6 October 1965:

"My country formally repudiated the so-called arbitral award of 1899 in this very forum of the United Nations on 22 February, 1 October and 12 November 1962, although long before that, on more than one occasion, it



had lodged its claim and protest against the injustice and invalidity of that judgement which purported to determine our boundaries.

"I state once again the unalterable position of my Government. Venezuela does not regard the so-called arbitral award of 1899 as having any validity whatsoever. No award tainted with material defects can be valid.

"I wish to use the words of Dr. Raúl Leoni, President of the Republic of Venezuela, to express in this world forum the unalterable decision of my country's Government on the award I have mentioned: 'Venezuela continues to work actively and is not giving up its aspirations, for they are based on the restoration of rights which were absurdly and brutally flouted on no grounds whatsoever, in a judgement that was contrary to law. The judgement was null and void: that is to say, it has no legal existence.'

"In the name of my country I address myself to all the nations represented here, to the colonial countries of yesterday and to the independent countries of today, our brothers in the struggle for freedom. I ask them all for their moral support in our efforts to secure a just solution to this old territorial problem."

As will readily be inferred from everything we have said so far, we cannot agree that a draft resolution dealing with the decolonization of what is known as British Guiana should make no mention whatsoever of our rights.

So to disregard those rights as to deny the possibility of using a formula which would preserve them without implying any expression of opinion on the substance of the question is to prejudge the issue, by omission, against the Venezuelan position.

My delegation has always voted in favour of all resolutions calling for the independence of British Guiana because it supports and will continue to support the legitimate right of the people of British Guiana to independence; however, in the circumstances we have described, we have no alternative but to vote against the draft resolution submitted to this Committee today.

This in no way signifies that we are voting against the independence of British Guiana. Quite the contrary: we favour that independence, as we always have done. But when we plead for the independence of the British colony we must also plead, on far stronger grounds, for the decolonization of the territory wrested from Venezuela and annexed to that colony.

It is a mistake to think that the accomplished fact of independence for the colony implies the extinction of Venezuela's inalienable rights. The administering

/...



Power cannot simply annex the territory of Guayana Esequiba to its colony and dispose of it as though it were its own. Whatever legal status is given to the British colony in the future, that status will not and cannot signify the extinction of Venezuela's inalienable rights to a territory which belongs to it under the Uti Possidetis Juris of 1810. Those rights will be the same after any change that may take place in the colony as they were before it.

We have said on many occasions that, while colonies should attain independence through the application of the principle of self-determination, colonial territories which have been seized from other States can be decolonized only through restoration to the State from which they were wrested. Any other course would mean allowing the principle of self-determination to be distorted for the purpose of ratifying de facto situations, ignoring the fundamental principles of the territorial integrity of States - a principle embodied not only in the Charter but also in resolution 1514 (XV), operative paragraph 6, which provides that "Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

I consider it pertinent to conclude this statement with a quotation from the formal declaration which was made at the First Special Inter-American Conference, held at Washington in December 1964, and signed by all member States of the Organization of American States, and which supplements previous declarations dealing with occupied territories in America. The declaration states: "That the Council of the Organization shall not take any decision with respect to a request for admission on the part of a political entity whose territory, in whole or in part, is subject, prior to the date of this resolution, to litigation or claim between an extracontinental country and one or more member States of the Organization of American States, until the dispute has been ended by some peaceful procedure."

In conclusion I wish to state once again that Venezuela supports the independence of British Guiana; what we cannot support is the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.809, since that draft resolution, through the deliberate omission of any reference to the existence of the Venezuelan claim, is prejudicial to our rights.





RECORDS CONTROL

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



-9 DEC 1965 Distr.  
LIMITED

A/C.4/L.809/Rev.1/Add.1  
6 December 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twentieth session  
FOURTH COMMITTEE  
Agenda item 23

TR 300 BRGU

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING  
OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES:  
REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE: BRITISH GUIANA

Algeria, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ethiopia, Ghana,  
Guinea, India, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Nepal, Niger,  
Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Togo, United Arab Republic, United  
Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia: joint draft resolution

Addendum

Add Sierra Leone to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

-----



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



RECORDS CONTROL

-6 DEC 1965

Distr.  
LIMITED

A/C.4/L.809/Rev.1  
3 December 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twentieth session  
FOURTH COMMITTEE  
Agenda item 23

TR 300 BRGU

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING  
OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES:  
REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE: BRITISH GUIANA

Algeria, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ethiopia, Ghana,  
Guinea, India, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Nepal, Niger,  
Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Togo, United Arab Republic, United  
Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia: joint draft resolution

The General Assembly,

Having considered the chapters of the reports of the Special Committee on the  
Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of  
Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples concerning British Guiana,<sup>1/</sup>

Recalling its resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, 1654 (XVI) of  
27 November 1961, 1810 (XVII) of 17 December 1962, 1955 (XVIII) and 1956 (XVIII)  
of 11 December 1963,

Noting that British Guiana will achieve independence on 26 May 1966,

Desirous of ensuring that British Guiana achieves independence under the most  
favourable conditions,

1. Approves the chapters of the reports of the Special Committee on the  
Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of  
Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples concerning British Guiana and  
endorses the conclusions and recommendations contained therein;

2. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of British Guiana to  
freedom and independence in accordance with the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV)  
of 14 December 1960;

<sup>1/</sup> A/5800/Add.5, chapter VII; A/6000/Add.7, chapter IX.



3. Requests the administering Power to end the state of emergency and to release all political prisoners and detainees so as to enable them to participate in the political life of the Territory;

4. Appeals to the main political parties to resolve existing differences so as to enable the Territory to achieve independence in an atmosphere of peace and unity;

5. Notes the announcement by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland that British Guiana will attain independence on 26 May 1966 and requests the administering Power not to take any action which might delay the independence of the Territory.

-----



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



RECORDS CONTROL

2 DEC 1965

Distr.  
LIMITED

A/C.4/L.800/Add.1  
2 December 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



Twentieth session  
FOURTH COMMITTEE  
Agenda item 23

TR 300 BRGU

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE  
TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE:  
BRITISH GUIANA

Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India,  
Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia,  
Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, United Arab Republic, United Republic of  
Tanzania and Yugoslavia: joint draft resolution

Addendum

Add Algeria to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

-----





UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



RECORDS CONTROL

DEC 1965

Distr.  
LIMITED

A/C.4/L.809  
1 December 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twentieth session  
FOURTH COMMITTEE  
Agenda item 23

TR 300 BRGU

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF  
INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES:  
REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE: BRITISH GUIANA

Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India,  
Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia,  
Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, United Arab Republic, United Republic of  
Tanzania and Yugoslavia: joint draft resolution

The General Assembly,

Having considered the chapters of the reports of the Special Committee on  
the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting  
of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples concerning British Guiana,<sup>1/</sup>

Recalling its resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, 1654 (XVI) of  
27 November 1961, 1810 (XVII) of 17 December 1962, 1955 (XVIII) and 1956 (XVIII)  
of 11 December 1963,

Noting that British Guiana will achieve independence on 26 May 1966,

Desirous of ensuring that British Guiana achieves independence under the most  
favourable conditions,

1. Approves the chapters of the reports of the Special Committee on the  
Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of  
Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples concerning British Guiana and  
endorses the conclusions and recommendations contained therein;

2. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of British Guiana to  
freedom and independence in accordance with the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV)  
of 14 December 1960;

<sup>1/</sup> A/5800/Add.5, chapter VII; A/6000/Add.7, chapter IX.



3. Requests the administering Power to end the state of emergency and to release all political prisoners and detainees so as to enable them to participate in the political life of the Territory;

4. Appeals to the main political parties to resolve existing differences so as to enable the Territory to achieve independence in an atmosphere of peace and unity;

5. Notes the announcement by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland that British Guiana will attain independence on 26 May 1966 and requests the administering Power not to take any action which might delay the independence of the Territory.

-----



TR 300 REGU

RECORDS CONTROL

12 November 1965

13 NOV 1965

Dear Mr. MacBride,

On behalf of the Secretary-General, I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter No. 5/3857 of 13 October 1965 and to thank you for sending five copies of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry the International Commission of Jurists carried out in British Guiana.

Yours sincerely

Godfrey K. J. Amachree  
Under-Secretary  
Department of Trusteeship and  
Non-Self-Governing Territories

Mr. Sean MacBride  
Secretary-General  
International Commission of Jurists  
2, Quai du Cheval-Blanc, 12 11  
Geneva 24. Switzerland



## ROUTING SLIP

## FICHE DE TRANSMISSION

TO:

A:

H.R. Registry (Conf)

FOR ACTION	POUR SUITE A DONNER
FOR APPROVAL	POUR APPROBATION
FOR SIGNATURE	POUR SIGNATURE
PREPARE DRAFT	PROJET A REDIGER
FOR COMMENTS	POUR OBSERVATIONS
MAY WE CONFER?	POURRIONS-NOUS EN PARLER?
YOUR ATTENTION	VOTRE ATTENTION
AS DISCUSSED	COMME CONVENU
AS REQUESTED	SUITE A VOTRE DEMANDE
NOTE AND FILE	NOTER ET CLASSER
NOTE AND RETURN	NOTER ET RETOURNER
FOR INFORMATION	POUR INFORMATION

Please file. no action  
required.

Date:

22/4

CR. 13 (11-64)

FROM:

DE:

J.M.



## ROUTING SLIP

## FICHE DE TRANSMISSION

TO:

A:

Human Rts

FOR ACTION		POUR SUITE A DONNER
FOR APPROVAL		POUR APPROBATION
FOR SIGNATURE		POUR SIGNATURE
PREPARE DRAFT		PROJET A REDIGER
FOR COMMENTS		POUR OBSERVATIONS
MAY WE CONFER?		POURRIONS-NOUS EN PARLER?
YOUR ATTENTION		VOTRE ATTENTION
AS DISCUSSED		COMME CONVENU
AS REQUESTED		SUITE A VOTRE DEMANDE
NOTE AND FILE		NOTER ET CLASSER
NOTE AND RETURN		NOTER ET RETOURNER
FOR INFORMATION	✓	POUR INFORMATION

This was sent to your  
 office as it is the copy  
 meant for the Chairman  
 of the Human Rts Commission  
 We already have the original  
 and a copy for the Ch. of the  
 Ctee of 21

Date:

19 Nov

FROM:

DE:

J. A. Miles



**PEOPLE'S**

**PROGRESSIVE**

**PARTY**

CABLE ADDRESS: "PPP"

**FREEDOM HOUSE**

Dial 6-2005-6-7

RECORDS CONTROL

41, ROBB STREET, LACYTOWN, GEORGETOWN.  
BRITISH GUIANA, SOUTH AMERICA.

23 NOV 1965

TR 300 BRGU

CJ/RAW:

October 30, 1965

Honourable U. Thant,  
Secretary-General,  
United Nations,  
New York.

*Info to action  
required.  
JW*

Dear Sir:

I attach for your information copies of correspondence between me, on behalf of the People's Progressive Party, and Mr. Anthony Greenwood, United Kingdom Secretary of State for the Colonies with respect to the constitutional and political future of British Guiana.

Yours faithfully,  
People's Progressive Party

*Cheddi Jagan*  
Cheddi Jagan  
Leader

c.c. Chairman, Committee of 24,  
United Nations

✓ Chairman, Human Rights Commission,  
United Nations

Head, British Mission,  
United Nations



COPY

F R E E D O M      H O U S E

41 ROBB STREET  
GEORGETOWN

CJ/RAW:

October 25, 1965

Dear Mr. Greenwood:

As leader of the People's Progressive Party, I acknowledge and record my gratitude for your invitation conveyed by your letter of the 4th day of October, 1965 from His Excellency the Governor to attend a Constitutional Conference in London commencing on November 2nd when the question of a date for this country's independence and other constitutional matters are to be subjects of discussion.

Your invitation marks another development in the distressing events which have befallen this country and its people in their struggle to sever the bonds of Colonialism and to live among nations as a free and sovereign people.

You will be aware that when four weeks ago I met the Premier at his invitation to discuss constitutional matters, I informed him that as an earnest of his government's good faith they should release the detainees and revoke the emergency for which no valid reasons exist for its continuation and so that discussions could take place in an atmosphere free from coercion or oppression. It was and still is the desire of my party to reach the widest possible area of bipartisan agreement and cooperation with all concerned, but as a matter of principle the necessary prerequisites for discussion on these matters must be established. Events before the 1963 Conference and since that time have unfurled with bewildering regularity and with consequences utterly destructive of the institutions of freedom and security in this country. I am therefore constrained to review them.

When in 1960 a Constitutional Conference was called to consider this country's Constitutional future the imperial power designed after deliberation with the representatives from this country a constitution providing for internal self-government and pledged that the country was to advance to independence under the Constitution which had been carefully balanced leaving only the date for independence as a substantial question to be discussed at a future independence Conference which was expected to take place not later than two years after the new Constitution had been in force.

In 1961 my Party won the new elections and was able to constitute the government. The People's National Congress and the United Force inspired and motivated by external support organised for the overthrow of my government and in the course of their activities in February, 1962, corrupted the loyalty of the Public Service, broke the independence and impartiality of the Security Forces by pressing upon them the burdens of a political allegiance; disrupted industry and commerce to a substantial degree and caused wanton destruction of life and property. In 1963 upon the introduction of a Labour Relations Bill in the Legislative Assembly this process was repeated and again the Public Service exhibited their disloyalty and political allegiance and the Security Forces their inefficiency and naked lack of impartiality against all associated with or believed to be supporters of my Party. Industry and commerce were substantially involved in these affairs.

The Rt. Honourable Anthony Greenwood,  
Secretary of State for the Colonies,  
Colonial Office,  
London.



In 1964 when the workers in the sugar industry resorted to strike action to win recognition of a status for collective bargaining the Security Forces displayed to the full their partiality and oppressiveness and took part in murders of supporters of my Party. In the disturbances which arose even British Soldiers performed acts of brutality unworthy of a civilised people as a result of which the imperial power were drawn into the enactment of legislation to withdraw the jurisdiction of the Courts of this country in civil and criminal proceedings involving members of the imperial forces. In these disturbances supporters of my Party suffered most and their suffering was directly proportionate to the unwillingness of the Security Forces to protect them.

The distress and misfortune of the people of this country did not, however, rest in these events for on another front the People's National Congress and the United Force had been able to secure from the imperial power the premiums and rewards which they felt were their due for their activities in 1962 and 1963. They had resisted the grant of independence at the Constitutional Conference in 1962 and the imperial power resolutely refused to honour the pledge made in 1960, insisted on unanimity and thereby caused the Conference to end in deadlock. The imperial power remained adamant in 1963 and when asked to arbitrate over differences and to set a date for independence the imperial power reneged upon the pledge given in 1960 and altered the electoral system on the ostensible ground that the change was necessary to enable a broad based government to win political power upon the support of the various races in the country. As you know, there is grave dissatisfaction and discontent in the country, and the actions of previous British Governments have created obstacles to the resolution of our problems and difficulties.

The decision itself and the events which followed showed that it was taken not because it was intended to end racialism but because it was the wish of the imperial power to remove the People's Progressive Party from office for others whom the imperial power preferred. This fiddled constitutional arrangement was enforced with every conceivable violation of the rule of law. The British Labour Party itself condemned Mr. Duncan Sandys's imposition of proportional representation in this country, and its leading spokesman on colonial and Commonwealth affairs observed that it was riddled with disadvantages which are quite unknown to any other Commonwealth country. In the debate in the House of Commons it opposed the P.R. Order-in-Council and suggested that a team which might consist of perhaps Canada, Jamaica, Trinidad and India and a representative of a West African state should review the situation.

Using the original first-past-the-post constituencies the 1964 elections were nevertheless held on the basis of the most extreme form of proportional representation the makers of which had disregarded all of the still subsisting conditions which based the decision not to use that system when it was proposed at the Constitutional Conference in 1960. It was carried out with a system of proxy voting which opened the way to irregularities which occurred in a substantial degree to favour the People's National Congress and the United Force while the Governor made a premature announcement concerning the appointment of a Premier the effect of which was to alter the course of the election Campaign against the People's Progressive Party. Added to these events which have corrupted substantially the country's institutions, the Governor acting under emergency powers conceded to him by a unilateral amendment of the constitution by the imperial power in 1964 crippled the Legislature by detaining without charge or trial a sufficient number of legislators to prevent my Party from continuing to govern effectively while Security Forces used the enormous powers conceded to them by Emergency Regulations to subject the supporters of my party to persistent and ruthless cruelty, intimidation, and discrimination.

The present government was formed in December, 1964, after the desire to remove my Party from office had been achieved. Since then the institutions of this country are becoming daily more racial in character and widespread discrimination is being practised against persons who are not believed to be supporters of the parties forming the



government. Meanwhile the imperial power has so far granted to this government every indulgence and assistance while it continues to oppress the majority of the country's population denying them even their proper rights of debate in the Legislature the procedures in which have become farcical.

The elections of 1964 were contested by my Party under protest. The electoral system devised in 1963 to remove my Party from office is unacceptable to my Party and to the majority of the people of this country. My party not only secured the highest number of votes at the elections, but was the only party to improve its electoral standing. And had the elections been fought under the traditional first-past-the-post system, my party would have again won 20 out of the 35 seats.

The Conference is being held while this Government acting under powers assumed in the first place by the imperial power but now transferred to them is holding in detention without trial several supporters of my Party under an ostensible emergency which continues by the vote of a simple majority in the Legislature and in complete violation of the rule of law and of the imperial powers obligation in respect of the Statute of the Council of Europe concerning the preservation of fundamental rights and freedoms. It is to my Party incomprehensible that the imperial power should feel free to add absolute power to such despotism and arbitrary rule and their willingness to consider the matters referred to in your invitation without agreement being reached by the people of this country more than half whom are represented by my Party constrains us to decline the invitation in the circumstances.

The goal to which I hope we all aspire cannot be reached from the starting points of suspicion fear and antagonism; and I am of the view that the widest possible consensus should be reached by the Guianese people themselves so that independence could be attained in circumstances in which all the people of this country can feel a sense of satisfaction and achievement.

Yours truly,  
People's Progressive Party

CHEDDI JAGAN

Cheddi Jagan  
Leader



COPY

CJ/RAW:

F R E E D O M      H O U S E

41, ROBB STREET

GEORGETOWN

October 29, 1965

Dear Mr. Greenwood:

Thank you for the message sent through His Excellency in reply to my letter dated October 25, 1965, in connection with the forthcoming Constitutional Conference in London.

As you suggested, I have considered the remarks made in your message. I regret to say, however, that such remarks hold out no promise of any alteration in the existing conditions (political despotism, arbitrary rule, and the like) referred to in the penultimate paragraph of my letter of October 25.

You were kind enough to remind me of the duty I owe to those who voted for my Party. May I say for the record that it is precisely because I have always discharged this duty faithfully, not only to PPP supporters but also to the Guianese people generally, that my Party was made the victim of the recent electoral fraud and, over the past fifteen years, the object of harassment, terrorism and violence. And there is every likelihood, if experience teaches anything, that the PPP and the majority of the population that supports it will fare no better unless there is some change in the traditional attitude of the imperial power towards this territory.

Since your message provides no hope of such a change, the previous decision not to attend the conference remains perfectly consistent with the proper discharge of my duty, which demands that I do not lend support to the formal promulgation of decisions already taken and which are gravely inimical to the interests of the Guianese people.

You expressed the view that "to boycott the conference which is determining the future of your country will be widely regretted" in Britain and elsewhere. Of course, I do not share your view, nor will many others when they consider the inconsistency of your government's attitude to Aden and British Guiana on the one hand and to Rhodesia on the other. The regret which is universally felt by progressive peoples at the Labour Party's failure to harmonize its practices with its professions is manifestly very much greater than any that may be felt at my Party's boycott of the conference in the circumstances described.

When your Party was in the Opposition, for example, both you and your colleagues condemned the Sandys constitutional manipulations. You will recall that you wrote me on April 16, 1964, in these terms: "As you know, we have condemned Duncan Sandys's decision to impose proportional representation in British Guiana, and we expect to express that position when the Order-in-Council giving effect to this decision comes up for debate in the next week or two."

Mr. Arthur Bottomley described the Sandys P.R. formula as "riddled with disadvantages and which is quite unknown in any other Commonwealth country . . . Those who supported him (Sandys) have done so, not because they think this will reduce racialism but because they think it will put someone in power whom they prefer to Dr. Jagan."

The Rt. Honourable Anthony Greenwood,  
Secretary of State for the Colonies,  
Colonial Office,  
LONDON.



And the Rt. Honourable Harold Wilson, then leader of the Opposition, in a debate in the House of Commons in June, 1964, had called the P.R. imposition "a fiddled constitutional arrangement", and had urged that a Commonwealth team which "might consist of perhaps Canada, Jamaica, Trinidad, India and a representative of a West African State" should review our situation.

Unfortunately, when the Labour Party became the government, it not only implemented the "fiddled constitutional arrangement" of the previous Tory government, but also attempted to justify it even though the alleged objective of the Sandys manipulations -- the reuniting of the major ethnic groups -- was not realised. Indeed, the Sandys plan, as we had warned, has exacerbated racial bitterness and now threatens the whole fabric of Guianese society.

All of this is quite in keeping with the partisan nature of the constitutional imposition under which the 1964 general election was held. The attached Appendix contains world press opinion which will confirm that a major electoral fraud was committed here.

It is a matter of regret and bewilderment that your government has also failed to show for the majority of Guianese the same solicitude it has evinced for the settler minority in Rhodesia.

It is appropriate that I should, in turn, ask you to discharge in good faith your duty to the people of this country while you still have the responsibility. You can, no doubt, use your considerable influence to have the detainees released, to terminate the state of emergency, and to lay the basis for full and frank discussions here with a view to the attainment of a political settlement acceptable to the vast majority of the Guianese people.

Clearly, there is urgent need for some constitutional formula that will cause both major political parties to work together. However difficult this may appear, it is the only means of ensuring a truly united, stable and independent Guyana. Unfortunately, the callous disregard of the coalition government headed by Mr. Burnham has frustrated all my efforts to sit around a conference table in Georgetown to achieve this objective. This is no doubt due to the government's belief that with the backing of Washington it can afford to ignore the demands of my Party and the aspirations of more than half of the population.

You suggested that "we should not spend time in recrimination about the past, but should look to the future". What else, may I ask, can the majority of Guianese do but seek guidance for the future from their past, bitter experiences at the hands of successive governments in the United Kingdom? It is my conviction that experience, one of the best teachers, must exert some influence on my Party's view of the future, especially with the continued existence of unfavourable circumstances and conditions which the present Labour government helped create and which it seems reluctant to remove although possessing the necessary power.

Your government has a grave responsibility in deciding whether this country moves toward a dictatorship of the Latin American type, or follows the principles and practices which the British people fought for, won, and now cherish so dearly.

It is my considered view that it would be a betrayal of trust were I to head a PPP delegation to the London talks on freedom and independence when there is a state of Emergency in British Guiana and a virtual police state is in being.



I, too, for the record, reassert the correctness of my review of recent events in Guiana. I am alarmed that you could be so misinformed as to challenge my narration of facts and events, well known to all impartial observers and clearly substantiated by official documents.

In all the circumstances, therefore, I regret that conditions are such that I cannot participate in discussions, let alone be a party to decisions, which, on the basis of experience and present attitudes, could not lead to any extension of freedom and improvement in the material well-being of the Guianese people.

Yours truly,  
People's Progressive Party

Cheddi Jagan  
Leader

Below is a copy of a letter sent from Mr. Greenwood, through His Excellency the Governor to Dr. Jagan dated October 26:

" Thank you for your letter of the 25th October about the Constitutional Conference. I shall be very sorry if your Party declines my invitation to attend it. Entirely agree that the Constitution for Independence should be based on the widest possible measure of agreement among the Guianese people themselves. I therefore urge you most strongly not to throw away the chance of sharing in the making of vital decisions effecting the future of your country. Indeed, it seems to me that you have a duty to those who voted for your Party to represent their interests at this important time.

I do most sincerely ask you to reconsider your intention to boycott the Conference; not only is it impossible to make national progress on a basis of boycott, but in Britain, and in other parts of the world too, to boycott the Conference which is determining the future of your country will be widely regretted.

When you have had an opportunity to consider what I have said above, I should be most grateful if you would let me have at the earliest possible moment your decision about attendance, so that all the necessary arrangements can be made.

For the record I must say that I cannot accept your review of the events in recent years in British Guiana. I am sure however that we should not spend time in recrimination about the past, but should look to the future. "

## PRESS COMMENTS ON 1964 ELECTIONS

A.P. 12.9.64.

Jagan's failure to retain the legislative majority he won in 1961 resulted from a new system of proportional representation devised by the British to drive him from office.

Hal Hendrin, Scripps-Howard Staff writer

"Both Britain and the U.S. look toward a Burnham-led government with favour".

Richard Eder - N.Y. Times December 7, 1964

"....the Colonial Office will continue to exert pressure toward a coalition. Such pressure is likely to be tempered by the difficulty in getting the two rivals (Jagan and Burnham) to agree and by deep United States opposition to Dr. Jagan in the Government."

Nathan Miller - Baltimore Sun 8/12/64

"Pressed by the U.S., Britain is holding the election - being held a year before it was constitutionally scheduled - under a system of proportional representation aimed at preventing the P.P.P. from winning a majority of seats".

Barnward L. Collier - (Boston Globe and N.Y. Herald Tribune)

"The U. S., which is watching the election rather glumly hopes for a D'Aguiar-Burnham victory - but officials in Washington are prepared for Jagan to make a good showing and possibly win a full-fledged majority. If he does, say anxious U.S. officials, there is bound to be trouble"

N.Y. Times - December 18, 1964

"One hopeful aspect of the present situation is the fact that the new electoral system of P.R. designed in London to put Dr. Jagan out of office has prevented either of the two dominant racial groups from capturing the majority of seats in the Legislature".

The Geonomist (December 12, 1964)

"Under the old constituency system, Dr. Jagan would have won enough seats in the Assembly to govern".

U.I.P.

"In London and Washington, the idea of Jagan leading the colony to independence from Britain is anathema".

The New York Daily News

"Britain's Government cagily fixed up a system of voting by proportional representation with a view to butchering the Jagans out of power, and their pro-Western political opponents in, before Guiana is granted full independence by Britain. The plan seems to have worked.



**PEOPLE'S**

**PROGRESSIVE**

**PARTY**

CABLE ADDRESS: "PPP"

**FREEDOM HOUSE**

Dial 6-2095-6-7

NOV-4 1965

41, ROBB STREET, LACYTOWN, GEORGETOWN,  
BRITISH GUIANA, SOUTH AMERICA.

ENCLOSURE ATTACHED

CJ/RAW:

October 30, 1965

Honourable U. Thant,  
Secretary-General,  
United Nations,  
New York.

TO	Mr. Amacher
1	
2	
3	
<input type="checkbox"/> - Action Completed	
<input type="checkbox"/> - Acknowledged	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - No Action Required	
INITIALS <i>jm</i>	

*Identical letter addressed  
to Chairman of Ctee of 24  
TR 300 BR6U*

Dear Sir:

-----  
I attach for your information copies of correspondence between me, on behalf of the People's Progressive Party, and Mr. Anthony Greenwood, United Kingdom Secretary of State for the Colonies with respect to the constitutional and political future of British Guiana.

Yours faithfully,  
People's Progressive Party

*Cheddi Jagan*

Cheddi Jagan  
Leader

c.c. Chairman, Committee of 24,  
United Nations  
  
Chairman, Human Rights Commission,  
United Nations  
  
Head, British Mission,  
United Nations



COPY

F R E E D O M     H O U S E

41 ROBB STREET  
GEORGETOWN

CJ/RAW:

October 25, 1965

Dear Mr. Greenwood:

As leader of the People's Progressive Party, I acknowledge and record my gratitude for your invitation conveyed by your letter of the 4th day of October, 1965 from His Excellency the Governor to attend a Constitutional Conference in London commencing on November 2nd when the question of a date for this country's independence and other constitutional matters are to be subjects of discussion.

Your invitation marks another development in the distressing events which have befallen this country and its people in their struggle to sever the bonds of Colonialism and to live among nations as a free and sovereign people.

You will be aware that when four weeks ago I met the Premier at his invitation to discuss constitutional matters, I informed him that as an earnest of his government's good faith they should release the detainees and revoke the emergency for which no valid reasons exist for its continuation and so that discussions could take place in an atmosphere free from coercion or oppression. It was and still is the desire of my party to reach the widest possible area of bipartisan agreement and cooperation with all concerned, but as a matter of principle the necessary prerequisites for discussion on these matters must be established. Events before the 1963 Conference and since that time have unfurled with bewildering regularity and with consequences utterly destructive of the institutions of freedom and security in this country. I am therefore constrained to review them.

When in 1960 a Constitutional Conference was called to consider this country's Constitutional future the imperial power designed after deliberation with the representatives from this country a constitution providing for internal self-government and pledged that the country was to advance to independence under the Constitution which had been carefully balanced leaving only the date for independence as a substantial question to be discussed at a future independence Conference which was expected to take place not later than two years after the new Constitution had been in force.

In 1961 my Party won the new elections and was able to constitute the government. The People's National Congress and the United Force inspired and motivated by external support organised for the overthrow of my government and in the course of their activities in February, 1962, corrupted the loyalty of the Public Service, broke the independence and impartiality of the Security Forces by pressing upon them the burdens of a political allegiance; disrupted industry and commerce to a substantial degree and caused wanton destruction of life and property. In 1963 upon the introduction of a Labour Relations Bill in the Legislative Assembly this process was repeated and again the Public Service exhibited their disloyalty and political allegiance and the Security Forces their inefficiency and naked lack of impartiality against all associated with or believed to be supporters of my Party. Industry and commerce were substantially involved in these affairs.

The Rt. Honourable Anthony Greenwood,  
Secretary of State for the Colonies,  
Colonial Office,  
London.



In 1964 when the workers in the sugar industry resorted to strike action to win recognition of a status for collective bargaining the Security Forces displayed to the full their partiality and oppressiveness and took part in murders of supporters of my Party. In the disturbances which arose even British Soldiers performed acts of brutality unworthy of a civilised people as a result of which the imperial power were drawn into the enactment of legislation to withdraw the jurisdiction of the Courts of this country in civil and criminal proceedings involving members of the imperial forces. In these disturbances supporters of my Party suffered most and their suffering was directly proportionate to the unwillingness of the Security Forces to protect them.

The distress and misfortune of the people of this country did not, however, rest in these events for on another front the People's National Congress and the United Force had been able to secure from the imperial power the premiums and rewards which they felt were their due for their activities in 1962 and 1963. They had resisted the grant of independence at the Constitutional Conference in 1962 and the imperial power resolutely refused to honour the pledge made in 1960, insisted on unanimity and thereby caused the Conference to end in deadlock. The imperial power remained adamant in 1963 and when asked to arbitrate over differences and to set a date for independence the imperial power reneged upon the pledge given in 1960 and altered the electoral system on the ostensible ground that the change was necessary to enable a broad based government to win political power upon the support of the various races in the country. As you know, there is grave dissatisfaction and discontent in the country, and the actions of previous British Governments have created obstacles to the resolution of our problems and difficulties.

The decision itself and the events which followed showed that it was taken not because it was intended to end racialism but because it was the wish of the imperial power to remove the People's Progressive Party from office for others whom the imperial power preferred. This fiddled constitutional arrangement was enforced with every conceivable violation of the rule of law. The British Labour Party itself condemned Mr. Duncan Sandys's imposition of proportional representation in this country, and its leading spokesman on colonial and Commonwealth affairs observed that it was riddled with disadvantages which are quite unknown to any other Commonwealth country. In the debate in the House of Commons it opposed the P.R. Order-in-Council and suggested that a team which might consist of perhaps Canada, Jamaica, Trinidad and India and a representative of a West African state should review the situation.

Using the original first-past-the-post constituencies the 1964 elections were nevertheless held on the basis of the most extreme form of proportional representation the makers of which had disregarded all of the still subsisting conditions which based the decision not to use that system when it was proposed at the Constitutional Conference in 1960. It was carried out with a system of proxy voting which opened the way to irregularities which occurred in a substantial degree to favour the People's National Congress and the United Force while the Governor made a premature announcement concerning the appointment of a Premier the effect of which was to alter the course of the election Campaign against the People's Progressive Party. Added to these events which have corrupted substantially the country's institutions, the Governor acting under emergency powers conceded to him by a unilateral amendment of the constitution by the imperial power in 1964 crippled the Legislature by detaining without charge or trial a sufficient number of legislators to prevent my Party from continuing to govern effectively while Security Forces used the enormous powers conceded to them by Emergency Regulations to subject the supporters of my party to persistent and ruthless cruelty, intimidation, and discrimination.

The present government was formed in December, 1964, after the desire to remove my Party from office had been achieved. Since then the institutions of this country are becoming daily more racial in character and widespread discrimination is being practised against persons who are not believed to be supporters of the parties forming the



government. Meanwhile the imperial power has so far granted to this government every indulgence and assistance while it continues to oppress the majority of the country's population denying them even their proper rights of debate in the Legislature the procedures in which have become farcical.

The elections of 1964 were contested by my Party under protest. The electoral system devised in 1963 to remove my Party from office is unacceptable to my Party and to the majority of the people of this country. My party not only secured the highest number of votes at the elections, but was the only party to improve its electoral standing. And had the elections been fought under the traditional first-past-the-post system, my party would have again won 20 out of the 35 seats.

The Conference is being held while this Government acting under powers assumed in the first place by the imperial power but now transferred to them is holding in detention without trial several supporters of my Party under an ostensible emergency which continues by the vote of a simple majority in the Legislature and in complete violation of the rule of law and of the imperial powers obligation in respect of the Statute of the Council of Europe concerning the preservation of fundamental rights and freedoms. It is to my Party incomprehensible that the imperial power should feel free to add absolute power to such despotism and arbitrary rule and their willingness to consider the matters referred to in your invitation without agreement being reached by the people of this country more than half whom are represented by my Party constrains us to decline the invitation in the circumstances.

The goal to which I hope we all aspire cannot be reached from the starting points of suspicion fear and antagonism; and I am of the view that the widest possible consensus should be reached by the Guianese people themselves so that independence could be attained in circumstances in which all the people of this country can feel a sense of satisfaction and achievement.

Yours truly,  
People's Progressive Party

CHEDDI JAGAN

Cheddi Jagan  
Leader



COPY

CJ/RAW:

F R E E D O M     H O U S E

41, ROBB STREET

GEORGETOWN

October 29, 1965

Dear Mr. Greenwood:

Thank you for the message sent through His Excellency in reply to my letter dated October 25, 1965, in connection with the forthcoming Constitutional Conference in London.

As you suggested, I have considered the remarks made in your message. I regret to say, however, that such remarks hold out no promise of any alteration in the existing conditions (political despotism, arbitrary rule, and the like) referred to in the penultimate paragraph of my letter of October 25.

You were kind enough to remind me of the duty I owe to those who voted for my Party. May I say for the record that it is precisely because I have always discharged this duty faithfully, not only to PPP supporters but also to the Guianese people generally, that my Party was made the victim of the recent electoral fraud and, over the past fifteen years, the object of harassment, terrorism and violence. And there is every likelihood, if experience teaches anything, that the PPP and the majority of the population that supports it will fare no better unless there is some change in the traditional attitude of the imperial power towards this territory.

Since your message provides no hope of such a change, the previous decision not to attend the conference remains perfectly consistent with the proper discharge of my duty, which demands that I do not lend support to the formal promulgation of decisions already taken and which are gravely inimical to the interests of the Guianese people.

You expressed the view that "to boycott the conference which is determining the future of your country will be widely regretted" in Britain and elsewhere. Of course, I do not share your view, nor will many others when they consider the inconsistency of your government's attitude to Aden and British Guiana on the one hand and to Rhodesia on the other. The regret which is universally felt by progressive peoples at the Labour Party's failure to harmonize its practices with its professions is manifestly very much greater than any that may be felt at my Party's boycott of the conference in the circumstances described.

When your Party was in the Opposition, for example, both you and your colleagues condemned the Sandys constitutional manipulations. You will recall that you wrote me on April 16, 1964, in these terms: "As you know, we have condemned Duncan Sandys's decision to impose proportional representation in British Guiana, and we expect to express that position when the Order-in-Council giving effect to this decision comes up for debate in the next week or two."

Mr. Arthur Bottomley described the Sandys P.R. formula as "riddled with disadvantages and which is quite unknown in any other Commonwealth country . . . Those who supported him (Sandys) have done so, not because they think this will reduce racialism but because they think it will put someone in power whom they prefer to Dr. Jagan."

The Rt. Honourable Anthony Greenwood,  
Secretary of State for the Colonies,  
Colonial Office,  
LONDON.



And the Rt. Honourable Harold Wilson, then leader of the Opposition, in a debate in the House of Commons in June, 1964, had called the P.R. imposition "a fiddled constitutional arrangement", and had urged that a Commonwealth team which "might consist of perhaps Canada, Jamaica, Trinidad, India and a representative of a West African State" should review our situation.

Unfortunately, when the Labour Party became the government, it not only implemented the "fiddled constitutional arrangement" of the previous Tory government, but also attempted to justify it even though the alleged objective of the Sandys manipulations -- the reuniting of the major ethnic groups -- was not realised. Indeed, the Sandys plan, as we had warned, has exacerbated racial bitterness and now threatens the whole fabric of Guianese society.

All of this is quite in keeping with the partisan nature of the constitutional imposition under which the 1964 general election was held. The attached Appendix contains world press opinion which will confirm that a major electoral fraud was committed here.

It is a matter of regret and bewilderment that your government has also failed to show for the majority of Guianese the same solicitude it has evinced for the settler minority in Rhodesia.

It is appropriate that I should, in turn, ask you to discharge in good faith your duty to the people of this country while you still have the responsibility. You can, no doubt, use your considerable influence to have the detainees released, to terminate the state of emergency, and to lay the basis for full and frank discussions here with a view to the attainment of a political settlement acceptable to the vast majority of the Guianese people.

Clearly, there is urgent need for some constitutional formula that will cause both major political parties to work together. However difficult this may appear, it is the only means of ensuring a truly united, stable and independent Guyana. Unfortunately, the callous disregard of the coalition government headed by Mr. Burnham has frustrated all my efforts to sit around a conference table in Georgetown to achieve this objective. This is no doubt due to the government's belief that with the backing of Washington it can afford to ignore the demands of my Party and the aspirations of more than half of the population.

You suggested that "we should not spend time in recrimination about the past, but should look to the future". What else, may I ask, can the majority of Guianese do but seek guidance for the future from their past, bitter experiences at the hands of successive governments in the United Kingdom? It is my conviction that experience, one of the best teachers, must exert some influence on my Party's view of the future, especially with the continued existence of unfavourable circumstances and conditions which the present Labour government helped create and which it seems reluctant to remove although possessing the necessary power.

Your government has a grave responsibility in deciding whether this country moves toward a dictatorship of the Latin American type, or follows the principles and practices which the British people fought for, won, and now cherish so dearly.

It is my considered view that it would be a betrayal of trust were I to head a PPP delegation to the London talks on freedom and independence when there is a state of Emergency in British Guiana and a virtual police state is in being.



3

I, too, for the record, reassert the correctness of my review of recent events in Guiana. I am alarmed that you could be so misinformed as to challenge my narration of facts and events, well known to all impartial observers and clearly substantiated by official documents.

In all the circumstances, therefore, I regret that conditions are such that I cannot participate in discussions, let alone be a party to decisions, which, on the basis of experience and present attitudes, could not lead to any extension of freedom and improvement in the material well-being of the Guianese people.

Yours truly,  
People's Progressive Party

Cleddi Jagan  
Leader

Below is a copy of a letter sent from Mr. Greenwood, through His Excellency the Governor to Dr. Jagan dated October 26:

" Thank you for your letter of the 25th October about the Constitutional Conference. I shall be very sorry if your Party declines my invitation to attend it. Entirely agree that the Constitution for Independence should be based on the widest possible measure of agreement among the Guianese people themselves. I therefore urge you most strongly not to throw away the chance of sharing in the making of vital decisions affecting the future of your country. Indeed, it seems to me that you have a duty to those who voted for your Party to represent their interests at this important time.

I do most sincerely ask you to reconsider your intention to boycott the Conference; not only is it impossible to make national progress on a basis of boycott, but in Britain, and in other parts of the world too, to boycott the Conference which is determining the future of your country will be widely regretted.

When you have had an opportunity to consider what I have said above, I should be most grateful if you would let me have at the earliest possible moment your decision about attendance, so that all the necessary arrangements can be made.

For the record I must say that I cannot accept your review of the events in recent years in British Guiana. I am sure however that we should not spend time in recrimination about the past, but should look to the future. "



## PRESS COMMENTS ON 1964 ELECTIONS

A.P. 12.9.64.

Jagan's failure to retain the legislative majority he won in 1961 resulted from a new system of proportional representation devised by the British to drive him from office.

Hal Hendrin, Scripps-Howard Staff writer

"Both Britain and the U.S. look toward a Burnham-led government with favour".

Richard Eder - N.Y. Times December 7, 1964

"....the Colonial Office will continue to exert pressure toward a coalition. Such pressure is likely to be tempered by the difficulty in getting the two rivals (Jagan and Burnham) to agree and by deep United States opposition to Dr. Jagan in the Government."

Nathan Miller - Baltimore Sun 8/12/64

"Pressed by the U.S., Britain is holding the election - being held a year before it was constitutionally scheduled - under a system of proportional representation aimed at preventing the P.P.P. from winning a majority of seats".

Barnward L. Collier - (Boston Globe and N.Y. Herald Tribune)

"The U. S., which is watching the election rather glumly hopes for a D'Aguiar-Burnham victory - but officials in Washington are prepared for Jagan to make a good showing and possibly win a full-fledged majority. If he does, say anxious U.S. officials, there is bound to be trouble"

N.Y. Times - December 18, 1964

"One hopeful aspect of the present situation is the fact that the new electoral system of P.R. designed in London to put Dr. Jagan out of office has prevented either of the two dominant racial groups from capturing the majority of seats in the Legislature".

The Economist (December 12, 1964)

"Under the old constituency system, Dr. Jagan would have won enough seats in the Assembly to govern".

U.I.P.

"In London and Washington, the idea of Jagan leading the colony to independence from Britain is anathema".

The New York Daily News

"Britain's Government cagily fixed up a system of voting by proportional representation with a view to butchering the Jagans out of power, and their pro-Western political opponents in, before Guiana is granted full independence by Britain. The plan seems to have worked.



JOSEPH T. THORSON, HON. PRESIDENT  
OTTAWA, CANADA  
VIVIAN BOSE, PRESIDENT  
MAGPUR, INDIA  
A. J. M. VAN DAL, VICE-PRESIDENT  
THE HAGUE, NETHERLANDS  
JOSÉ T. NABUCCO, VICE-PRESIDENT  
RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL

SIR ADETOKUNBO A. ADEMOLA  
LAGOS, NIGERIA  
ARTURO A. ALAFRIZ  
MANILA, PHILIPPINES  
GIUSEPPE BETTIOL  
ROME, ITALY  
DUDLEY B. BONSAI  
NEW YORK, USA  
PHILIPPE N. BOULOS  
BEIRUT, LEBANON  
U. AN HTOON  
DOON, BURMA  
EL. WHITNEY DEBEVOISE  
NEW YORK, USA  
SIR OWEN DIXON  
MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA  
MANUEL G. ESCOBEDO  
MEXICO CITY, MEXICO  
PER T. FEDERSPIEL  
COPENHAGEN, DENMARK  
T. S. FERNANDO  
COLOMBO, CEYLON  
ISAAC FORSTER  
DAKAR, SENEGAL  
FERNANDO FOURNIER  
SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA  
OSVALDO ILLANES BENÍTEZ  
SANTIAGO, CHILE  
HANS-HEINRICH JESCHECK  
FREIBURG IM BR., GERMANY  
JEAN KRÉHER  
PARIS, FRANCE  
SIR LESLIE MUNRO  
AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND  
PAUL-MAURICE ORBAN  
GHENT, BELGIUM  
STEFAN OSUSKY  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
MED AHMED ABU RANNAT  
KHARTOUM, SUDAN  
THE RT. HON. LORD SHAWCROSS  
LONDON ENGLAND  
SEBASTIÁN SOLER  
BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA  
KENZO TAKAYANAGI  
TOKYO, JAPAN  
PURSHOTTAM TRIKAMDAS  
NEW DELHI, INDIA  
H. B. TYABJI  
KARACHI, PAKISTAN  
TERJE WOLD  
OSLO, NORWAY

# INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF JURISTS

COMMISSION INTERNATIONALE DE JURISTES • INTERNATIONALE JURISTEN-KOMMISSION  
COMISIÓN INTERNACIONAL DE JURISTAS

2, QUAI DU CHEVAL-BLANC, 1211 GENEVA 24, SWITZERLAND • TEL. 42 69 50 • CABLE ADDRESS: INTERJURISTS

SEÁN MACBRIDE  
SECRETARY-GENERAL

VLADIMIR M. KABES  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

17 NOV 1965

October 18, 1965  
Ref. 5/3857

TR 300 BRGU

Dear Secretary-General,

I am sending you under separate cover 5 copies of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry which the International Commission of Jurists constituted at the request of the Government of British Guiana. The Report deals with Racial Problems in the Public Service of British Guiana.

Should you require additional copies, I should be glad to furnish them.

Yours sincerely,

*Seán MacBride*

Sean MacBride  
Secretary-General

U Thant  
Secretary General  
United Nations  
New York  
N.Y., U.S.A.

*cc Mr. C. A. Stavropoulos*



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



RECORDS CONTROL

1 NOV 1965

Distr.  
LIMITED

A/AC.109/L.256  
12 October 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH  
REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE  
DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF  
INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND  
PEOPLES

TR 300 BRGU

DRAFT REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD  
TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF  
INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES\*

(covering its work during 1965)

Rapporteur: Mr. K. NATWAR SINGH (India)

BRITISH GUIANA

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INFORMATION ON THE TERRITORY . . . . .	1 - 59	2
II. CONSIDERATION BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE . . . . .	60 - 81	2
Introduction . . . . .	60	2
A. Written petitions and hearings . . . . .	61 - 77	2
B. Statements by members . . . . .	78 - 81	8
III. ACTION TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE . . . . .	82 - 83	8

ANNEX

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF GOOD OFFICES

\* This document contains the draft chapter on British Guiana. Other chapters of the draft report of the Special Committee will be reproduced as separate documents.



## I. INFORMATION ON THE TERRITORY

(The Annex of the report of the Sub-Committee of Good Offices  
(A/AC.109/L.247) will be reproduced here)

(paragraphs 1-59)

## II. CONSIDERATION BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

### Introduction

60. The Special Committee considered British Guiana at its 386th and 389th meetings on 16 September and 7 October 1965. The Special Committee had before it the report of the Sub-Committee of Good Offices on British Guiana, which is appended to this chapter (see annex). The report was introduced by the Chairman of the Special Committee, speaking as Chairman of the Sub-Committee of Good Offices, at the 389th meeting on 7 October 1965.

### A. Written petitions and hearings

61. The Special Committee had before it the following written petitions concerning British Guiana:

<u>Petitioner</u>	<u>Document No.</u>
Dr. Jagan, Premier, British Guiana	A/AC.109/PET.344
Dr. Cheddi Jagan, Leader, People's Progressive Party	A/AC.109/PET.344/Add.1
Mr. Felix A. Cummings, Director of Information and Public Relations, People's Progressive Party (PPP)	A/AC.109/PET.344/Add.2
Mr. A.D. Watts	A/AC.109/PET.345
Members and Supporters of the PPP, PYO and WPO, Western Leguan	A/AC.109/PET.346
Mr. Abdool Drepaul	A/AC.109/PET.347
Mr. Jaikarran	A/AC.109/PET.348
Mr. Sasenarine Willie on behalf of people of Enmore	A/AC.109/PET.349
Mr. Mamasjanie on behalf of people of East Bank Demerara	A/AC.109/PET.350
Officers and members of the Greenwich Party Group, Women's Progressive Organisation (WPO)	A/AC.109/PET.351
Mrs. Mohammed on behalf of women of Leonora West Coast Demerara	A/AC.109/PET.352

/...



<u>Petitioner</u>	<u>Document No.</u>
Mr. Robert B. Persaud on behalf of the Kiltearn-Brighton PYO Group	A/AC.109/PET.353
Mr. Alfred Beekun R. Singh on behalf of Indians of Abary District	A/AC.109/PET.354
Mr. Arthur Boodram on behalf of the people of New Road Vreed-on-Hoop and of Best Village	A/AC.109/PET.355
Two petitions from the Peoples National Congress (PNC)	A/AC.109/PET.419

62. At its 386th meeting, the Special Committee heard as a petitioner Mr. Felix A. Cummings, Director of Information and Public Relations, People's Progressive Party.

63. Mr. Cummings said that the question of British Guiana's right to self-determination and genuine independence had engaged the attention of the Special Committee on several occasions. In the past the United Kingdom had denied the Territory those rights on the flimsiest pretexts and it had received such support from the United States that there was sometimes reason to wonder which was the real administering Power - the United States or the United Kingdom. It had been found that the Central Intelligence Agency and the so-called trade union leaders of the United States had played a significant role in fomenting the riots of 1962 and 1963 in order to create chaos and confusion so that independence should be denied to the country under Dr. Jagan's leadership.

64. Dr. Jagan had been suspected of policies contrary to United States State Department doctrine: namely, of leaning towards socialism, of rejecting neo-colonialism and imperialism and, worst of all, of not being anti-communist or anti-Castro. Accordingly, it was natural that the imperialist forces should seek to prevent British Guiana from attaining genuine independence. There was no limit to the acts of cruelty committed by the imperialists, whether it was the attack against the heroic Viet-Nameese people, the mass slaughter of defenceless people, the territorial conquests of which Mexico, Panama and Puerto Rico had been the victims, or in more recent times attacks against Nicaragua, Guatemala, Colombia and Honduras.

65. It was in 1953, the year in which the democratic Government of Guatemala had been overthrown and replaced by a military dictatorship, that the democratically elected Government of British Guiana had been deposed by United Kingdom troops at the request of President Eisenhower. The victims were, however, growing stronger and the day would come when such aggressions would have to end.



66. The Committee was aware of the anti-imperialist stand of the People's Progressive Party of British Guiana and of its struggle for the independence, self-determination and complete freedom of the Territory. Again and again, the PPP had declared its belief in socialism, and the elections in Guiana, although held under trying circumstances, had proved that the people supported both the party and its teaching.

67. While the PPP, whose attitude was well known, had been teaching the people of British Guiana the virtues of socialism and had obtained a majority of the votes from 1953 to 1964, the imperialists had sought to defeat the people's will and to overthrow the Government of the PPP, which they had managed to do on 9 October 1963. The United Kingdom authorities had promptly enacted repressive measures against the People's Progressive Party and its leaders, with the exception of the Party's then Chairman, Mr. Burnham, the present Premier, who had escaped persecution because he was in the service of the United Kingdom. At present the PPP, although it had won a majority of seats in the last elections, was excluded from the Government and 109,000 constituents were thus in effect disenfranchised.

68. Although they had criticized their predecessors of the PPP on that score, Mr. Burnham and his colleagues had travelled abroad many times and on their travels had sought to create the impression that all was well in British Guiana. They had carefully refrained from mentioning emergency rule, arbitrary arrests and detention, unemployment and economic depression. At the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in London in June 1965, although the question of British Guiana had not been on the agenda, Mr. Williams, the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, and Mr. Shastri, the Prime Minister of India, had taken the floor to criticize the system of proportional representation, which was alien to the Commonwealth and was at the root of that unfortunate state of affairs.

69. When it had been in power, the PPP, on the advice of a person who was now a tax adviser of the United Kingdom Government, had introduced tax reforms which were designed to distribute the tax burden more equitably. The Opposition, however, had promptly dubbed the expert a "communist" and had organized riots against the Government, with the support of the so-called trade unionists of the United States, the Free Institute of Labour, the CIA and business circles. Moreover, those provisions had subsequently been abolished. Furthermore, the

/...



present Government had granted large concessions and a monopoly of the Territory's bauxite, oil and other wealth to foreign interests, no doubt as a reward for having brought it to power.

70. The present Government of British Guiana, which had come to power illegally, was incompetent and prodigal of the country's resources, endangering its future. Moreover, its actions were contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter. The PPP would continue to strive for independence and it demanded that all detainees should be released and that the state of emergency should be ended forthwith as a condition sine qua non of its participation in the conference on British Guiana. It also demanded the inclusion of the question of proportional representation in the agenda of that conference, the holding of fresh elections before a date was fixed for independence, the equitable representation of all racial groups in the police and security forces, the removal of all foreign troops and of all military bases, particularly the United States base at Atkinson Field, and the restructuring and democratization of governmental institutions dealing with law and order. To grant independence to British Guiana in the present circumstances, before those demands had been met, would be to give independence with conditions and reservations, in violation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and of the United Nations Charter. It would also infringe the human rights of colonial peoples.

71. With regard to the second demand, he explained that the PPP wanted the question of proportional representation to be reconsidered in the light of the new arguments presented at the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers by the Prime Ministers of Trinidad and Tobago and of India.

72. With regard to independence for Guiana, he recalled that Mr. Greenwood, Secretary of State for the Colonies, replying to several questions put to him by Sir P. Agnew and Mr. Duncan Sandys, had said that the conference which was to fix the date for the independence of British Guiana would be held on 2 November for the purpose of drafting the Territory's future constitution, determining the various steps in its accession to independence and deciding when they would each be taken. Mr. Greenwood had explained that the United Kingdom Government intended to hold the conference in November in implementation of its pledges, and had added that, while it was difficult to anticipate the results of the conference, it was to be hoped that maximum agreement could be reached, particularly with regard to the date for independence. In that connexion, he drew the Committee's attention

/...



to the section of the final communiqué of the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers dealing with British Guiana and, specifically, to the statement of the United Kingdom on that subject.

73. Turning to another of the PPP's demands, he said that since 1957 his party, in the name of national unity, and citing many examples of abuses in support of its demand, had many times pressed for equitable representation of the various racial groups in the police and security forces. At the present time, only 16.5 per cent of the members of those forces were persons of Indian origin, who constituted 47.8 per cent of the total population; while 75.4 per cent were persons of African origin, who constituted 33 per cent of the total population. The PPP was not advocating the dismissal of the Afro-Guianese members of the police or security forces. It recognized that the situation had been brought about by certain historical circumstances and considered that the balance should be restored by increasing the number of people in those forces, with Guianese filling as many posts as possible.

74. The United Kingdom Government itself had recognized the dangers inherent in the present imbalance. But it was not enough to recognize the problem; an effort should also be made to correct it. Several solutions had already been proposed. The Commissioner of Police had suggested an increase in the number of Indo-Guianese in the forces to 33 per cent in five years. However, even the Governor had not accepted that plan. The PPP had proposed an increase of the police forces to 1,000 men of all races within one year, with an attempt made to select the new recruits in such a way as to restore racial balance. The Secretary of State for the Colonies had proposed the appointment of a commission to study the question; but the coalition Government had challenged the Colonial Secretary's right to handle the matter, on the pretext that it was a domestic issue entirely within its own purview. Mr. Greenwood should have fulfilled the pledge made by his predecessor, but he had preferred to yield to the present Government and to invite the International Commission of Jurists to hold an inquiry. The PPP had no objection, but felt that the problem was a grave social one requiring urgent solution and that lawyers should not be asked to solve it. It would have been better to assign that task to social scientists from, for example, the University of the West Indies. By agreeing that the problem should be placed in the hands of ICJ, the Secretary of State for the Colonies had actually gone back on the undertaking given by his predecessor. That was all the more disappointing in that it was the action of a Labour Government.

/...



75. The Commission had merely been requested to investigate the procedures for the selection, appointment, promotion and dismissal of members of the police and security forces and to make recommendations for eliminating any imbalance based on racial discrimination. From a purely legalistic point of view, ICJ could find that the present procedures were proper and that there was no racial discrimination. That was why the PPP refused to take part in such a farce, and demanded that the Commission's terms of reference should be amended. It demanded that the present state of affairs should be corrected without delay, because it was essential for all workers throughout the Territory to have confidence in government institutions. The PPP was very concerned, because the police and security forces were being used to suppress the rights and freedoms of the Guianese people and to defend the interests of the colonialists and imperialists. The Guianese could not live in peace under a régime which used the organs of government in order to spread terror. It was essential, above all, to preserve national unity.

76. On that subject, the opinion of a distinguished barrister, Mr. J.T. Clarke, was an authoritative one. Mr. Clarke considered that the police force of British Guiana, except for a few officers and men of proven integrity, was notoriously corrupt and was incapable, as at present constituted, of carrying out its duties impartially or efficiently. The hostility to the police displayed by the population during a number of incidents which had occurred since 9 May 1964 further confirmed that the police was far from competent to carry out its duties. Particularly significant in that regard was the matter of the deductions from the wages of sugar workers, made without their authorization and paid over to the Manpower Citizens' Association; it was one of the main causes of friction and unrest in the sugar industry. The abuses to which that procedure was open had never led to a thorough investigation of the whole system - as they should have done, once it had been established that the deductions had been made without authorization. Such injustices had in many cases been committed, but the police had no plans to investigate and to prosecute those against whom there might be evidence of fraud. Incidents of that type had of course raised serious doubts about the administration of justice, and it was highly desirable that the competent authorities should take the necessary measures to bring any guilty persons before the courts for trial.



77. Before concluding, he expressed his gratitude to the various statesmen who, by their actions, had focused attention on the question of British Guiana.

B. Statements by members

78. Introducing the report of the Sub-Committee of Good Offices on British Guiana, the Chairman, speaking as the Chairman of the Sub-Committee, said that as indicated in the report the Sub-Committee was unable, owing to the negative attitude of the United Kingdom Government, to visit British Guiana and to fulfil the Good Offices mission which had been entrusted to it by the Special Committee. The Sub-Committee however continued to believe that the United Nations should ensure that British Guiana accede to independence without delay in an atmosphere of harmony and peace.

79. He suggested on behalf of the Sub-Committee that the Special Committee should take note of the report of the Sub-Committee and endorse conclusions set out therein. He also suggested that the report of the Sub-Committee should be incorporated in the report to be submitted by the Special Committee to the General Assembly at its twentieth session.

80. The representative of the United Kingdom reserved the position of his Government with regard to the Sub-Committee's conclusions and, in particular, to the proposed reaffirmation of the Special Committee's resolution of 23 June 1964 which his delegation had voted against.

81. The representative of the United States of America reserved the position of his delegation with regard to the conclusions contained in the report of the Sub-Committee.

III. ACTION TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

82. At its 389th meeting on 7 October 1965 the Special Committee decided to adopt the report of the Sub-Committee of Good Offices on British Guiana, to endorse the conclusions contained therein and to incorporate that report in its own report to the General Assembly at its twentieth session.

83. In deciding to take note of the report of the Sub-Committee and to endorse conclusions contained therein the Special Committee reaffirmed its resolution of 23 June 1964 (A/AC.109/86) and authorized the Sub-Committee to continue to carry out its task.

/...



ANNEX

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF GOOD OFFICES

(document A/AC.109/L.247 will be reproduced here)  
(paragraphs 1-8)

-----



CVH/mpd

RECORDS CONTROL

ORIGINAL DIRECT

- 8 DEC 1965

TR 300 BR6U

7 July 1965

Dear Mr. Jagan,

In the absence of the Secretary-General and on his behalf, I acknowledge receipt of your letter to him dated 2 July, with which you attached, for his information, a copy of a letter from you to the Rt. Hon. Anthony Greenwood, Secretary of State for the Colonies, and also a printed copy of an open letter which you had addressed previously to Mr. Greenwood.

Yours sincerely,

C. V. Narasimhan  
Chef de Cabinet

Mr. Cheddi Jagan  
Leader  
People's Progressive Party  
41 Robb Street  
Lacytown  
Georgetown  
British Guiana

cc: Mr. Lemieux  
Registry



**PEOPLE'S**

**PROGRESSIVE**

**PARTY**

(13)

CABLE ADDRESS: "PPP"

**FREEDOM HOUSE**

Dial 6-2095-6-7

RECORDS CONTROL

41, ROBB STREET, LACYTOWN, GEORGETOWN  
BRITISH GUIANA, SOUTH AMERICA.

-6 DEC 1965

**ENCLOSURE ATTACHED**

CJ/RAW:

July 2, 1965

The Secretary General,  
The United Nations,  
New York, U.S.A.

*Pamela*

TR 300 BRGU

Dear Sir:

I attach for your information copy of a letter which I have forwarded to the Rt. Hon. Anthony Greenwood, Secretary of State for the Colonies on the question of imbalances in the security forces.

I attach also a printed copy of an open letter which I had addressed previously to Mr. Greenwood.

Yours truly,  
People's Progressive Party

*Cheddi Jagan*

*Cheddi* Cheddi Jagan  
Leader



## *Open Letter to Mr. Greenwood*



### **DR. JAGAN ANSWERS COLONIAL SECRETARY'S ALLEGATIONS IN THE TRIBUNE (LONDON)**

*Sir,*

*I would like to reply to certain allegations which you made in reply to a question from the Tribune.*

*The main allegations are:--*

- ◆ *That the Coalition in British Guiana is representative of the majority of the population.*
- ◆ *That the Coalition has worked well.*
- ◆ *That Burnham is also a Socialist.*

#### **THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM**

In what can only be described as a castrated attempt to justify your acceptance of the new electoral system, you said that my Government did not enjoy the support of the majority of the Guianese people.

If I am to accept seriously the logic of your contention then you are in fact negating the right of the Labour Party



to govern, since it does not enjoy the majority support of the British electorate.

It is patently dishonest to apply this yardstick to British Guiana when you have refused to apply it in your own country. Electoral reform, like charity must begin at home:

I may point out that there have been several colonial territories, where multi-parties systems exist; and where the ruling party does not enjoy the support of the majority of the electorate. Yet in none of these countries did the British Government impose the system of Proportional Representation (PR) Surely what is applicable to one should be equally applicable to all. The excuse or rationale is a transparent one.

You seem to have forgotten that Mr. Harold Wilson described the imposition of PR as a "fiddled constitutional arrangement" and Mr. H. Bottomley said that it was "riddled with disadvantages and which is quite unknown in any other Commonwealth country.

Those who supported him (Sandys) have done so not because they think this will reduce racialism but because they think that it will put someone in power whom they prefer to Dr. Jagan." Was the world not told by the Western press in the language of the Financial Times of December 15, 1964 that "PR has served its purpose in defeating Jagan's Peoples's Progressive Party"?

## THE COALITION

You asserted that the coalition government enjoys the support of the majority of the population. This is definitely not true. It can be established at any time. Nearly 30,000 voters were not enrolled because of the change in the method of registration. Besides, large numbers of people are disenfranchised. More than half of the Guianese people, almost 57 percent; are below the voting age of 21 as compared with only 29 percent in the United Kingdom. A large majority of these are PPP supporters. This is the explanation for the rejection by the Tory government of the demand to Dr. Jagan." Was the world not told by the Western press of the Legislature for voting at 18.

Ideologically, the coalition does not reflect the wishes of the electorate. Both the PPP and PNC declared at the elections in favour of independence and socialism, the latter albeit demagogically. The United Force made its position quite clear as an anti-socialist, pro-big-business party.



The people voted overwhelmingly (PPP 46% and PNC 40%) for socialism and independence. Clearly, they rejected the views of the United Force, whose percentage of vote declined from 16 to 12.

There is no doubt that had the coalition between the PNC and UF become an election issue, the voting strength of these parties would have been substantially reduced.

The present Premier and several of his party spokesmen had rejected any suggestion of forming a coalition with the United Force while the United Force had told its supporters that it was quite capable of forming a government without the support of any other political party.

The Guianese electorate at the time of voting had therefore no indication of the coalition that was to be foisted upon them.

### VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

The December, 1964 election results were a vote of confidence in my party and my government. My party increased its percentage of vote by 3.3 per cent as against a drop by the PNC of .4 per cent, and the UF of 4 per cent. And we demonstrated that had the elections been conducted under our traditional first-past-the-post basis we would have won in the same 20 constituencies out of 35 which we won in 1961. These facts cannot be glossed over by spurious arguments and rationalisations.

I cannot understand the logic which accepts the principle of a coalition yet permits the formation of a government which excludes the largest popular movement.

Neither can I understand the logic by which you arrived at the conclusion that the present coalition enjoys the confidence of the Guyanese people. Perhaps you used the primitive mathematical argument that 40 per cent, plus 12 per cent, makes up a majority support.

Other simple logical contentions can be proposed to show that two minority parties cannot ipso facto make a majority.

Political concepts such as the "popular consensus" and the "national will" cannot be reduced to these naive mathematical formulations. They must be measured not only in quantitative but also in qualitative terms.



## PEACE

You implied that the coalition had restored peace. If by peace, you mean absence of violence, I would agree. The reason is simple. There is no violence because the authors of violence are now in positions of authority.

Surely, you have not forgotten the two secret reports of August and September 1963 of the Security Branch of the Police which I handed to you in November 1964, headed "PNC Terrorist Organisation" outlining the activities of what the Commissioner of Police later called "an organised thuggery" which is centrally directed, in which leading members of the PNC, were cited for being responsible for the bombing of government and other buildings, arson and general intimidation and terror.

I showed you that in the second report, 25 of the persons named in the first report were recommended for prosecution and pointed out that because of the complicity of the British and American governments in the disturbances in 1962 and 1963, (Drew Pearson, US journalist wrote on March 22, 1964 that 'the strike was' inspired by a combination of US Central Intelligence Agency money and British Intelligence. It gave London the excuse it wanted) no action was taken and besides the reports were withheld from me and thus not made available for the October, 1963 Constitutional Conference in London.

I suggested to you that had they been available, the outcome of the Conference would perhaps have been different. I requested you to postpone the elections and re-examine the whole situation by appointing a Commonwealth Commission as Mr. Wilson had proposed in June, 1964. You brushed aside my request.

You now say that it would have been a breach of faith to have delayed the elections and it might have led to violence and bloodshed. How could there have been a breach of faith when my government's normal term of office was not to expire until August, 1965? It was indeed a breach of faith that it was being terminated at premature elections in December, 1964 under a rigged constitutional arrangement.

## COLLABORATION WITH U. S.

You seek to justify your and your government's collaboration with American imperialism by referring to the document which I signed giving your predecessor the right to decide. You must not try to throw dust in the eyes of the British public and particularly the Labour Movement.



I signed because of pledges given and commitments made by the British government at the 1960 constitutional Conference which were dishonoured. At that time when proportional representation was demanded by the opposition but rejected by the British Government, the latter in a White Paper said that all matters of substance, save that of independence had been settled and that when another conference was called, the question of independence was to be the main issue.

This is how paragraph 59 of the Command Paper puts it:—

*The revision in 1961, resulting from the deliberations of the Conference formed, in the views of Her Majesty's Government, a comprehensive and carefully balanced whole, naturally leading to the expectation that when another Conference between Her Majesty's Government and a Delegation from British Guiana was held, there should be no question of substance for discussion save that of independence, the principle of which has been accepted in the terms of the formula set out in paragraph 12 of this Report.*

The Sandys imposition exceeded even the wildest expectations of the opposition. It placed a premium on bombings, arson, looting and murder.

If by peace you imply a confidence in the new government, you are sorely mis-informed. I may point out the rate of emigration still continues at an undoubted pace; there is a current run on bank deposits; there is depression in the rice industry; there has been wholesale victimisation of civil servants; there have been attempts to tamper with the Judicial system; there are strong rumours of the New Detention Bill: there is talk of partition throughout the land; there is industrial unrest and fears of inflation.

### SHADOW OF DETENTION

These are the material symbols of the achievements of the new government. You who live in the comfortable remoteness of Whitehall may well pontificate on theories of peace and confidence. But my supporters who live under the ever present shadow of the Mazaruni Detention Camp and who have experienced the bombs and bullets of the government's "centrally organised thuggery" know the stark reality of fear.

You try to justify your betrayal of the cause of socialism in Guyana by referring to Burnham as a



socialist. Anyone can claim to be a socialist; demagoguery is very cheap. Socialism is an outlook and a way of life. Burnham is not a socialist but a demagogue. This has been recognised by many independent observers.

As long ago as 1954, Mr. Gordon Walker, after a visit to British Guiana said that Mr. Burnham had opportunist tendencies and would "tack and turn" as the situation demanded.

The Robertson Commission of 1954 described him as 'ambiguous'. And the Commonwealth Commission into the Disturbances of 1962 described his attitude as 'callous and remorseless' and his party's professions as 'somewhat vague and amorphous. There was a tendency to give a racial tinge to its policy.'

### BACK TRACKED

The Guyanese people know that Burnham has backtracked on many of the progressive stands which he took when he was Chairman of the PPP.

If Burnham was a socialist and was interested in the working class, how is it that he rejected my offer of a PPP-PNC coalition based on parity in the Council of Ministers (Cabinet.)

If, as is alleged, he had personal ambitions to become Premier, there could have been accommodation as I had declared publicly that the question of Premiership was negotiable.

By refusing to join us, and electing to join the United Force in a coalition government, he has abandoned the road to independence and socialism, for the road to capitalism, imperialism and fascism.

### REACTIONARY NATURE OF U. F.

It was the PNC leadership itself, who, prior to the 1961 general elections, launched out an attack on the United Force with such epithets as 'fascist'. More recently, prior to the 1964 elections similar juicy plums were hurled pointing out the reactionary nature of the United Force.

How can we continue to use the term socialist to describe Mr. Burnham when his government has made deals concerning our bauxite and oil resources with the



foreigners without disclosing the particulars and has repealed or drastically modified the budgetary proposals capital gains tax; gift tax; turnover tax; property tax; compulsory savings — which were introduced in 1962 based on the recommendations of Mr. Nicholas Kaldor, now adviser to the British Government.

At a time when the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom has seen it fit to increase capital taxes to a 30 per cent. ceiling, this government has reduced it from 5 per cent to the ludicrous level of 10 per cent.

At a time when your government has tightened on your entertainment allowances, this government has given businessmen a carte blanche. The net effect of the fiscal policy of this government is to emasculate the taxes on capital and to frustrate the attempts of my part to level off inherited inequalities of wealth and to establish in Guyana a system by which social reward would be based on merit and not on the mere ownership of property.

Is there a single socialist proposal contemplated or executed by the coalition? There is nothing to support this myth except the mercurial utterances of a man, distinguished by the fluidity and inconsistency of his political beliefs.

### CONTINUING FRAUD

Mr. Greenwood, you must not talk in demagogic terms about democracy and socialism and shift the burden of your conscience to our shoulders. You say that "so long as the PPP will not take their seats (in the House of Assembly,) there is bound to be doubt about their democratic intentions."

What you have failed to tell the British public is that our refusal to attend was a continuing protest against the fraud perpetrated in Guyana and the continued rule by emergency, suspension of constitutional guarantees and detention. Fourteen of our comrades are still languishing in the fly-infested Mazaruni Concentration camp.

In November, 1961, addressing the National Press Club in Washington, DC, USA, I said, "It is not our concept of democracy which is on trial, but yours." This is even more true now.



How can you talk about democracy when you proceeded by constitutional amendment to remove me from office. Why did you not follow British conventions here? If this was done and I was asked to form the government Mr. Burnham would then have been placed in the position of refusing to join us in a coalition. I could then have continued as a minority government as Mr. Lester Pearson and his predecessor, Mr. Diefenbaker, had done in Canada. And if my government fell subsequently, I could have gone back to the country. The electorate could then have had a clear view of the issues involved and to vote for the alignments or coalitions which they wished.

Even if you could not have postponed the election, you could have found a solution after polling day. That was your responsibility. But you and your government succumbed to the US pressure.

*Today we see the ruthless and predatory actions of US imperialism and the complete subservience of the British Labour government to it in various parts of the world.*

Your government's policy in British Guiana is only part and parcel of the big stick policies now being pursued to maintain the old order. If you still believe in democracy, peace, progress and socialism don't lecture us; put in practice what you preach. This is your duty to the labour movement which placed its faith in you and voted you into office.

Yours truly  
CHEDDI JAGAN.

---



---

# DISMANTLE THE POLICE STATE

---

Printed by New Guiana Company, Ruimveldt, for the  
People's Progressive Party, 41, Robb Street.



June 30, 1965

Rt. Hon. Anthony Greenwood,  
Secretary of State for the Colonies,  
Colonial Office,  
London.

Dear Sir,

I wish to refer to our conversations in London in November, 1964 when you were kind enough to grant me two interviews. I had raised two fundamental questions:

- 1) The postponement of the elections announced for December 7, 1964 and the appointment of a Commonwealth Team to come to British Guiana to help work out a solution to the political impasse.
- 2) Financial help from the United Kingdom government to provide for the expansion of Police and Security Forces and for the correction of imbalances.

You indicated that the Labour government would proceed with the elections as previously announced by the Tory government.

On the question of imbalances, I told you that His Excellency the Governor had indicated that the PNC leader, Mr. L.F.S. Burnham, held the view that any question of imbalances must be all-embracing, to include not only the Police and Security Forces but also land settlement schemes and was thus disposed to the appointment of a Committee with terms of reference acceptable to all the three political parties. I said that my government had no objections to an examination of the Public Service and Land Settlement Schemes but that Police and Security matters were separate and distinct and required urgent attention. I cited the tragic events at Wismar and elsewhere to show the urgent necessity for the correction of imbalances, the principle of which had been recognised by all and had been agreed to by the British Government, a Police Adviser to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and British security officers stationed in the Caribbean. I mentioned that the question of imbalances in the Police and Security Forces was not a matter for consideration and investigation but one of implementation.

I indicated to you that the Governor had given me a preliminary proposal drafted by the Commissioner of Police which indicated a method of correcting the imbalances in the Police Force which would have increased representation of Indo-Guianese who constituted about half of the population of the country from a little over one-sixth in 1964 to about one-third in five years. The Governor had himself stated that he was not happy with the rate of progress suggested in this preliminary report. My office had put up a counter proposal which showed that had the Police Force been increased by about 1,000 men (about twice as many as the Commissioner of Police was asking for), the imbalances could have been corrected in about one year.

As regards the Volunteer Force, I told you that because it was drawn only from Georgetown, New Amsterdam and Mackenzie, it was composed almost exclusively of one ethnic group - about 95% being Afro-Guianese. I pointed out that the massacre and raping of Indians and the wholesale burning of their homes at Wismar occurred principally because the Volunteers and Police stationed there refused to discharge their duties impartially. I indicated my government's proposals to disband the existing Volunteer Force of about 600 men and reconstruct it on the basis of 1,200 men drawn from 12 areas of the country, on the principle that it should reflect a broad cross-section of the country.

/So far ....



So far as my government was concerned therefore, the matter to be investigated as regards the police and security forces was merely one of the methods of implementation for the correction of imbalances. You will recall that at first you felt that the whole issue should be investigated as suggested by the Governor but afterwards, particularly on the intervention by Mrs. Irene White who agreed with me that Police and Security were a separate category from Land Settlements and the Public Service, you concluded that there was a case for urgent consideration of correcting the imbalances in the Police and Security Forces. You finally agreed that you would appoint a Committee to look into the question of imbalances as a whole, that the Committee would include technical experts who had intimate knowledge of the formation and administration of Police Forces, and would give priority to the correction of imbalances in the Police and Security Forces. I urged that the Committee be set up before the date of the elections and you promised to do so if it was possible.

However, on your visit to British Guiana when the PPP delegation met you and raised this question, you suggested that Mr. Burnham and I should meet to discuss it. I told you that I had generally no objections to meeting Mr. Burnham, but I did not consider that there were any grounds for discussion since firstly, press reports had quoted him as saying that he did not recognise any such thing as imbalances in the police and security forces and was opposed to the appointment of a Committee set up by the British government; and secondly, his memorandum submitted through the Governor did not concede the existence of any imbalance in the police and security forces. Further, I pointed out that this was a matter not solely within the competence of the government of British Guiana, but was one which concerned the United Kingdom government, the British Guiana government, and the Opposition, and involved the rights and liberties of the Guianese people as a whole. Our views, I said, on the question of correction of imbalances in the police and security forces had not changed and it was our hope that the British government still held the same view. I concluded by requesting you to proceed with the proposals on the lines of the broad agreement reached in our discussions in London.

Subsequently, Mr. Burnham announced that he was inviting the International Commission of Jurists. The terms of reference were published on Friday, June 18 as follows:

To examine the balance between the races in the security forces, the Civil Service, Government agencies or undertakings (including land settlement schemes) and other areas of Governmental responsibility; to consider whether existing procedures relating to the selection, appointment, promotion, dismissal and conditions of service of personnel are such as to encourage or lead to racial discrimination in the areas concerned; to make such recommendations as are considered necessary to correct any such procedures with a view to the elimination of imbalance based on racial discrimination having regard to the need to maintain the efficiency of the services concerned and the public interest.

These terms of reference were not discussed with us and are completely unsatisfactory to us. They by-pass the main issue of correction of existing imbalances. There is no recognition of the question of imbalances in the police and security forces. What is to be examined is only discrimination which might lead to imbalances in the future and might affect the efficiency of the public services. In the circumstances, we cannot cooperate with this Commission in its assigned task which evades the real issue and upon which there was neither consultation with us nor mutual agreement.

British Guiana is a land of fear. One of the Members of the Commonwealth Team of Observers on the Elections in December, 1964, Mr. Bakar Ali Mirza, underlined this in his separate memorandum in which he said inter alia:

/The.....



The discipline at the Election booths and the freedom of speech for the candidates were technically there, but for the voter, the common man, there are elements in the life of British Guiana which have to be taken into account before deciding, whether the Elections were fair, if by fairness is meant the freedom to vote without any fear of adverse consequences at the time of voting or later on and existence of conditions that will not add to his security, if he did not vote according to a set pattern. The safety and security of a Polling booth has not much meaning, if you have to pass the gateway of fear before entering it, and if your voting itself is predetermined by the demands of your security. In British Guiana, the atmosphere is charged with fear .....

We had some evidence of this fear. The Premier was to unveil the statue of Mr. Critchlow - a national leader - in the Compound of the building where we were meeting. One party had declared its boycott and so we were made to adjourn our meeting an hour earlier. All interviews previously arranged cancelled for security reasons, not ours but of the building. At this meeting, which some of us attended, there was a sprinkling of visitors inside the cordoned-off area of invitees. Outside it, there was a big crowd. This was due partly to the boycott declared by one party and largely because of the fear of violence and personal injury. Men inside would be marked men outside, they were part of a passing pedestrian crowd.

Most of the parties, except the P.N.C. that met us, complained about threats of violence. The P.P.P., the ruling party, even involved the police also as a party to it, and cited cases in support, which we could not possibly investigate. But here was a curious phenomena of a Governing party complaining about its own police. Apparently, it has little control over the administration of the police ..... Mr. D'Aguiar, of the United Force Party put it more elegantly in his broadcast by stating that racialism and violence had become a way of life in British Guiana. If the P.N.C. had no complaint, it is hinted in some quarters that it is because of the huge preponderance of their racial group in the police Force, and the support they seem to possess from the Powers that count. It was even suggested by some Guianese that the Governor's interpretation of the constitution, in answer to a hypothetical question, was for the purpose of helping this particular party. There is no doubt in my mind, and even to a casual observer that a sense of fear exists. Where fear exists, freedom is nominal. The relative quietness of the Election was in no small measure due to the presence of Commonwealth Observers. Every group and party apparently put on their best behaviour. The significant quietness may even lead to the conclusion that previous racial riots were perhaps engineered.

The sense of insecurity is realised by the Common man. Several people told us that they were grateful and lucky that we were in British Guiana, and that they did not know what their fate would be when we left. The present Election has not added to their security. While the system of Proportional Representation makes room for minorities, it also sharpens divisions and creates new ones. When there are two almost equal racial groups the appeal of P.R. is on racial



lines. When it was in British Guiana without the transferable vote, the sense of insecurity that I have referred to above heightens. This situation is further intensified by treating the whole country as one Constituency. Voting is not for an individual but for the whole part, and for the whole life of the Legislature. It is doubly cursed, as it prevents the differences from being localised. It also prevents good men from securing the good will of the other races. It makes the race conflict and sense of fear country-wide. The heavy poll is no more than a seeking for racial security, by grouping one against the other. As for the minorities, the election results showed their fate. They have only helped the formation of a weak Government. No weak Government can solve the problem that British Guiana faces. Where there is a sense of fear and where an Election divides racially and politically, there, I maintain the election cannot be called fair. If just the maintenance of law and order (it may not be possible to maintain it in the next Election) and heavy polling are the criteria of the fairness of Elections, then these exist in ample measure in some dictatorial countries. Political scientists term them unfair.

What Mr. Mirza said about fear is true today. The coalition government continues to rule by emergency and the suspension of fundamental rights laid down in the constitution; there is discrimination in its employment practices.

During the PPP's term of office, the Opposition expressed fear that after independence, there would be a denial of civil liberties and human rights laid down in our constitution. My government had therefore, proposed inter alia:

- 1) To provide machinery for adequate consultation and the recomposition of the Upper House to give parity of representation to the Opposition.
- 2) The appointment of neutral Commonwealth officers to help man a National Army which was to be constituted on the basis of a broad cross-section of the country.
- 3) A Commonwealth or U.N. civil presence for the purpose of observing that fundamental rights laid down in the constitution were honoured.
- 4) A Treaty of neutrality similar to that of Austria to be signed by the great powers which will guarantee the neutrality, sovereignty and territorial integrity of British Guiana.

Now that a considerable section of the community has expressed fears and apprehensions about the future, it is necessary to take similar steps to allay these fears. It is your responsibility to ensure this. If public confidence is to be ensured and governmental institutions are to function democratically in the future, the correction of imbalances in the Police and Security Forces is a basic prerequisite for British Guiana to move forward free from fear to independence and nationhood.

Yours truly,  
PEOPLE'S PROGRESSIVE PARTY

*Cheddi Jagan*  
Cheddi Jagan  
Leader



RECORDS CONTROL

~~TR/300 British Guiana~~

24 FEB 1965

23 February 1965

TR 300 BRGU

Sir,

I have the honour to refer to your letter of 8 February enclosing an advance copy of the report of the Commonwealth Team of Observers on the British Guiana elections.

In accordance with your request, I have brought this report to the attention of the Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General wishes to thank you for your courtesy in providing him with an advance copy of the report. He regrets, however, that it will not be possible for him to make a public statement of the kind you suggest in the last paragraph of your letter.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Godfrey K. J. Amachree  
Under-Secretary  
Department of Trusteeship and  
Non-Self-Governing Territories

Mr. Cecil E. King, C.M.G.  
Minister, Trusteeship Affairs  
United Kingdom Mission to the United Nations  
845 Third Avenue  
New York, N.Y.





*J. V. Chalk*  
UNITED KINGDOM MISSION  
TO THE UNITED NATIONS

845 THIRD AVENUE  
NEW YORK, N.Y.

RECORDS CONTROL

14 OCT 1964

October 13, 1964.

15144/313/64

TR 300 BRGU

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge your letter No. TR.300.BRGU of October 5 about the Subcommittee of Good Offices on British Guiana, and to inform you that I have referred your letter to my Government for instructions.

I will write to you again as soon as I receive my Government's reply.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you Sir, the assurance of my highest consideration.

*Patrick Dean*

Mr. Godfrey K. J. Amachree,  
Under-Secretary for Trusteeship  
and Non-Self-Governing Territories,  
United Nations Secretariat,  
NEW YORK, 17, N.Y.

*No action. File*  
*Registy:*  
*Ans*  
*7/10/64*



RECORDS CONTROL

TR 300 BRGU

6 OCT 1965 5 October 1964

Sir,

..... On behalf of the Secretary-General, I have the honour to refer to the resolution concerning British Guiana which was adopted by the Special Committee on the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples at its 270th meeting (A/AC.109/86 - copy enclosed).

As you are aware, the Sub-Committee of Good Offices on British Guiana, which was established in accordance with operative paragraph 6 of the resolution, has begun its work and is due to submit its report to the Special Committee before the close of its current session.

Operative paragraph 7 of this resolution requested the Secretary-General "to renew his efforts to facilitate the implementation of the recommendations of the Sub-Committee on British Guiana established in 1963". The Sub-Committee of Good Offices, in the carrying out of its task, will no doubt wish to take account of the Secretary-General's efforts to fulfill the mandate conferred on him.

I should be glad to learn to what extent your Government would be prepared to assist in the implementation of the recommendations of the Sub-Committee on British Guiana established in 1963.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Godfrey K. J. Amachree  
Under-Secretary for Trusteeship  
and Non-Self-Governing Territories

H.E. Sir Patrick Dean, K.C.M.G.  
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary  
Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom  
to the United Nations  
845 Third Avenue  
New York 22, N.Y.



ORIGINAL DIRECT

MEC/bh

RECORDS CONTROL

18 SEP 1964

TR 300 BRGU

9 September 1964

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 15 August 1964 addressed to the Secretary-General, enclosing statements by various persons on recent events in British Guiana.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Godfrey K.J. Amachree  
Under-Secretary for Trusteeship  
and Non-Self-Governing Territories

Dr. Cheddi Jagan  
Premier  
Office of the Premier  
Public Building  
Georgetown  
British Guiana



RECORDS CONTROL

*DB*  
ORIGINAL DIRECT

18 SEP 1964

MEC/cc

TR 300 BRGU

..... Le Secrétariat des Nations Unies présente ses compliments à la Mission permanente de la République populaire de Bulgarie auprès des Nations Unies et a l'honneur de lui transmettre ci-joint copie d'une lettre en date du 3 septembre 1964 adressée par le Président du Comité spécial chargé d'étudier la situation en ce qui concerne l'application de la Déclaration sur l'octroi de l'indépendance aux pays et aux peuples coloniaux au Sous-Secrétaire pour la Tutelle et les Territoires non autonomes et concernant la composition du Sous-Comité des bons offices de la Guyane britannique.

Le 4 septembre 1964.

Same letter in French addressed to:

Cambodge  
Côte-d'Ivoire  
Iran  
Italie  
Madagascar  
Mali



- COPIE -

TR 300 BRU

Le 3 septembre 1964

Monsieur le Sous-Secrétaire,

J'ai l'honneur de me référer à la résolution concernant la Guyane britannique adoptée par le Comité spécial lors de sa 270ème séance, le 23 juin 1964.

Au paragraphe 6 du dispositif de cette résolution, le Comité spécial a décidé de créer un sous-comité des bons offices composé de trois membres qui seront désignés par le Président. A sa 278ème séance, le 3 juillet 1964, le Président a informé le Comité spécial que les noms des membres du Sous-Comité des bons offices seraient communiqués par écrit aux délégations en temps voulu par l'intermédiaire du Secrétariat.

Conformément à la résolution du Comité spécial, j'ai nommé le Mali, la Tunisie et l'Uruguay comme membres du Sous-Comité des bons offices de la Guyane britannique. Je vous serais reconnaissant de bien vouloir en faire part aux membres du Comité spécial.

Je vous prie de croire, Monsieur le Sous-Secrétaire, aux assurances de ma haute considération.

Sori Coulibaly  
Président du Comité spécial  
chargé d'étudier la situation en ce qui  
concerne l'application de la Déclaration  
sur l'octroi de l'indépendance aux pays  
et aux peuples coloniaux

M. Godfrey K. J. Amachree  
Sous-Secrétaire  
Département de la tutelle et des  
Territoires non autonomes  
Nations Unies, New York



*Encl*  
ORIGINAL DIRECT

RECORDS CONTROL

MEG/cc

18 SEP 1964

TR 300 BRGU

..... The Secretariat of the United Nations presents its compliments to the Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations and has the honour to transmit herewith a copy of letter dated 3 September 1964, from the Chairman of the Special Committee on the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples addressed to the Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories, regarding the membership of the Sub-Committee of Good Offices on British Guiana.

4 September 1964.

Same letter in English addressed to:

Denmark	United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar
Ethiopia	Tunisia
India	USSR
Iraq	United Kingdom
Poland	United States
Sierra Leone	Yugoslavia
Syria	



- COPY -

TR 300 BR&U

3 September 1964

Sir,

I have the honour to refer to the resolution on British Guiana adopted by the Special Committee at its 270th meeting on 23 June 1964. By operative paragraph 6 of that resolution, the Special Committee decided to establish a sub-committee of good offices of three members to be appointed by the Chairman. At its 278th meeting on 3 July 1964, the Special Committee was informed by the Chairman that the names of the members of the Sub-Committee of good offices would be communicated to delegations, in writing, in due course through the Secretariat.

In accordance with the resolution of the Special Committee, I have nominated Mali, Tunisia and Uruguay to be members of the Sub-Committee of good offices on British Guiana. I should be grateful if you would communicate this to all the members of the Special Committee.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Sori Coulibaly  
Chairman

Special Committee on the situation with  
regard to the implementation of the  
Declaration on the granting of independence  
to colonial countries and peoples

Mr. Godfrey K. J. Amachree  
Under-Secretary  
Department of Trusteeship and  
Non-Self-Governing Territories  
United Nations, New York



*Just*  
ORIGINAL DIRECT

MEC/cc

RECORDS CONTROL

TR 300 BRGU

18 SEP 1964

..... La Secretaría de las Naciones Unidas saluda atentamente a la Misión permanente de Venezuela cerca de las Naciones Unidas y tiene el honor de transmitirle la adjunta carta de fecha 3 de septiembre de 1964 dirigida por el Presidente del Comité Especial encargado de examinar la situación referente a la aplicación de la Declaración sobre la concesión de independencia a los países y pueblos coloniales al Subsecretario de Administración fiduciaria y Territorios no autónomos y que se refiere a la composición del Subcomité de buenos oficios de la Guayana británica.

4 de septiembre de 1964.

Same letter in Spanish sent to:

Chile

Uruguay



- COPIA -

3 de septiembre de 1964

Señor Subsecretario,

Tengo el honor de referirme a la resolución referente a la Guayana británica adoptada por el Comité Especial en su sesión 270a, celebrada el 23 de junio de 1964.

En el párrafo 6 de la parte dispositiva de dicha resolución, el Comité Especial decidió crear un subcomité de buenos oficios compuesto de tres miembros que han de ser designados por el Presidente. Durante la sesión 278a, el 3 de julio de 1964, el Presidente informó al Comité Especial que los nombres de los miembros del Subcomité de buenos oficios serían comunicados por escrito a las delegaciones en el momento oportuno por medio de la Secretaría.

En conformidad con la resolución del Comité Especial, he designado a Mali, Túnez y Uruguay como miembros del Subcomité de buenos oficios de la Guayana británica. Le quedaría muy reconocido si tuviera a bien comunicar estos nombramientos a los miembros del Comité Especial.

Le ruego, Señor Subsecretario, acepte las seguridades de mi más alta consideración.

Sori Coulibaly

Presidente del Comité Especial encargado de examinar la situación referente a la aplicación de la Declaración sobre la concesión de independencia a los países y pueblos coloniales

Señor Godfrey K. J. Amachree  
Subsecretario del Departamento de  
administración fiduciaria y  
territorios no autónomos  
Naciones Unidas, Nueva York

UNITED NATIONS



NATIONS UNIES

NEW YORK

CABLE ADDRESS : UNATIONS NEWYORK • ADRESSE TELEGRAPHIQUE

RECORDS CONTROL

FILE NO.:

18 SEP 1964

Le 3 septembre 1964

TR 300 BRGU

Monsieur le Sous-Secrétaire,

J'ai l'honneur de me référer à la résolution concernant la Guyane britannique adoptée par le Comité spécial lors de sa 270ème séance, le 23 juin 1964.

Au paragraphe 6 du dispositif de cette résolution, le Comité spécial a décidé de créer un sous-comité des bons offices composé de trois membres qui seront désignés par le Président. A sa 278ème séance, le 3 juillet 1964, le Président a informé le Comité spécial que les noms des membres du Sous-Comité des bons offices seraient communiqués par écrit aux délégations en temps voulu par l'intermédiaire du Secrétariat.

Conformément à la résolution du Comité spécial, j'ai nommé le Mali, la Tunisie et l'Uruguay comme membres du Sous-Comité des bons offices de la Guyane britannique. Je vous serais reconnaissant de bien vouloir en faire part aux membres du Comité spécial.

Je vous prie de croire, Monsieur le Sous-Secrétaire, aux assurances de ma haute considération.

Sori Coulibaly

Président du Comité spécial  
chargé d'étudier la situation en ce qui  
concerne l'application de la Déclaration  
sur l'octroi de l'indépendance aux pays  
et aux peuples coloniaux

M. Godfrey K. J. Amachree  
Sous-Secrétaire  
Département de la tutelle et des  
Territoires non autonomes  
Nations Unies, New York



RECORDS CONTROL

TR 300 British Guiana

8 JAN 1964

7 January 1964

*Handwritten initials*  
Sir,

I have the honour to transmit herewith, for the attention of your Government, the text of resolution 1955 (XVIII), adopted by the General Assembly at its 1277th plenary meeting on 11 December 1963 concerning the item entitled: "Question of British Guiana".

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Godfrey K. J. Amichree  
Under-Secretary for the Department of  
Trusteeship and Information from  
Non-Self-Governing Territories

His Excellency  
Sir Patrick Dean, K.C.M.G.  
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary  
Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom  
to the United Nations  
845 Third Avenue  
New York 22, New York





UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



Distr.  
LIMITED

A/AC.109/L.169  
16 November 1964

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

RECORDS CONTROL

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION  
WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION  
OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING  
OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL  
COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

14 DEC 1964

TR 300 BRGU

QUESTION OF BRITISH GUIANA

Report of the Secretary-General

1. At its 270th meeting on 23 June 1964, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted a resolution (A/AC.109/36) on the question of British Guiana. Operative paragraph 7 of the resolution reads as follows:

"7. Requests the Secretary-General to renew his efforts to facilitate the implementation of the recommendations of the Sub-Committee on British Guiana established in 1963;" 1/

2. Following consultations, the Secretary-General, in a letter dated 5 October 1964, inquired of the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the extent to which his Government would be prepared to assist in the implementation of the recommendations of the Sub-Committee on British Guiana established in 1963.

3. In his reply dated 2 November 1964, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom informed the Secretary-General as follows:

"I am instructed to draw your attention to the recent announcement that elections are to take place in British Guiana on the 7th of December of this year, and to the intention of the United Kingdom Government to convene a constitutional conference as soon as possible after the elections to decide on a date for independence. I am also to say, with reference to paragraph 65

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23 (A/5446/Rev.1), chapter X, appendix.



of the report of the Sub-Committee on British Guiana in 1963 (on page 274 of document No. A/5446 of the 30th of October 1963), that in the opinion of the United Kingdom Government existing policies in British Guiana are fully in accordance with the recommendations expressed in that paragraph."

-----