

NOTES ON RIGGED 1968 GUYANA GENERAL ELECTION

80r  
(1301)

Table of statistic for the Corentyne, Berbice where PNC "Gains" are claimed (Five districts of 1964 General Election were split into 6; numbers 2 and 3 were split into 2,3,4).

	<u>PPP</u>				<u>PNC</u>			
	Increase or Decrease				Increase or Decrease			
	<u>1964</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
No. 1	5803	6851	1048	17.7	1042	1240	198	19
No. 2,3,4	13307	11451	-1846	-13.9	2755	6685	3930	142.6
No. 5	6054	6637	583	9.6	1455	1517	62	4.3
No. 6	5331	5806	475	8.9	1405	1590	185	13.2
	<u>30495</u>	<u>30745</u>	<u>250</u>		<u>6657</u>	<u>11032</u>	<u>4375</u>	

Nothing except fraud can explain the sharp PNC gain in Nos. 2,3, and 4 districts as compared with the others, since the Corentyne is a homogeneous area.

These three Corentyne districts, as well as the Suddie district, Essequibo, where the PNC also made a fantastic gain of 144%, are predominantly rice areas, and rice farmers have received about G\$5 less per bag for rice sold to the Government-controlled Rice Marketing Board; and a minimum of G\$3.14 per bag of padi (as compared with G\$5.10 under the PPP regime) from the government-owned Rice Development Corporation.

VOTERS LISTS PADDED IN PNC AREAS

	1964	1968	Inc.	%	New	Increase
	Electors				Votes	on
						90
						1964
						amount
1. Corentyne River	7,784	8,898	1114	14.2	198	19
2. Corentyne Central	16,934	19,074	2140	12.6*	3930	142
3. Corentyne East						
4. Corentyne West	7,919	8,643	724	9.8	62	4
5. Berbice East	7,326	8,067	741	10.	185	13
6. New Amsterdam	5,521	6,146	625	11.3	579	17
7. Berbice River	4,999	5,532	533	10.7	690	31
8. Berbice West	5,917	7,074	1,157	19.6*	474	37
9. Abary	5,064	7,560	2,496	49 *	2538	90
10. Mahaicony	5,726	6,244	518	9	367	21
11. Mahaica	7,825	8,480	655	8.4	429	13
12. Demerara Coast East	6,435	6,628	193	3	219	10
13. Demerara Coast Central	9,430	12,513	3,083	33.4	913	22
14. Demerara Coast West	7,342	6,986	356d		760	37
15. Kitty	8,719	10,481	1,762	20 *	1072	25
16. Campbellville	7,702	9,895	2,193	28.5	1475	36
17. Georgetown North	8,556	9,650	1,094	12.8	1141	27
18. Georgetown Central	8,642	9,601	959	11.1	1216	31
19. Werk-en-Rust	8,079	8,871	792	10	738	14
20. Georgetown South	7,901	10,331	2,430	30.7*	1758	41
21. La Penitence/Lodge	8,448	10,217	1,769	20 *	1414	24
22. Ruimveldt	6,591	7,396	805	12	784	17
23. Houston	8,294	10,393	2,099	25.2*	1556	42
24. Lower Demerara River	6,846	8,707	1,861	27 *	978	47
25. Upper Demerara River	8,837	18,117	9,280	105 *	9761	133
26. Canal Polder	6,440	7,286	846	13	308	13
27. Vreed-en-Hoop	6,895	7,748	853	11	422	23

28.	Leonora	6,865	7,451	586	9	145	6.3
29.	Boerasirie	6,200	6,912	712	11.5	205	15
30.	Essequibo Island	6,119	6,690	571	9.5	492	11
31.	Suddie	7,438	9,583	2,145	28.8*	2940	144
32.	Pomeroon	5,338	6,392	1,054	20	*1984	110
33.	North West	5,212	6,789	1,577	30	* 614	50
34.	Mazaruni- Potaro	6,245	9,701	3,456	55.3*	2675	80
35.	Rupununi	4,045	5,292	1,277	31.8*	83	11

\* 16 districts accounted for 39,979 new electors on roll - 76.5%

In 16 districts, PNC new votes were 33,608 - 78.3%

In 5 PNC stronghold new votes - 21,153 - 50%

In other districts, average increase was 10%.

Extract From Guardian 13th December 1968

Guyana Votes

Sir, - Sir Lionel Luckhoo's rebuttal of the charge made in last Monday's "World in Action" is disingenuous.

The names and addresses of the 900 "voters" checked in our survey all appear in the final revised lists of the 43,000 Guyanese adults allegedly living in Britain.

While in Georgetown, our reporters obtained all four volumes of the revised British lists and checked them against lists loaned by the Guyana Government Registration Office. They were identical.

Sir Lionel is free to inspect our four volumes and perhaps explain the role played by his high Commission in their compilation.

Until then "World in Action" stands by its conclusions. The vast majority of the 43,000 Guyanese voters in Britain have been invented and the overseas voters' lists for Monday's election are a massive fabrication.

Gus Macdonald,  
Investigation Editor,  
"World in Action"  
Granada Television Ltd.

TRANSCRIPT OF GRANADA'S (T.V.) "WORLD IN ACTION" - The making of a Prime Minister - transmitted on January 6, 1969

A hanged man "voted" in the Guyana General Election.  
So did children.

But people who had been nominated to vote for others - proxies found that the votes had already been cast when they got to the polling booths. A Voters' roll listed 85 people at one address.... the address of a Government party office.

Granada's WORLD IN ACTION Monday January 6, 8.p.m., claims that that the Guyana election was "rigged" both at home and overseas.

The newly re-elected Prime Minister of Guyana, Forbes Burnham, arrives in London today (Monday) for the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference.

He should not be attending, says WORLD IN ACTION. The election was a "fraud" protest Guyana politicians.

WORLD IN ACTION flew two of Burnham's opposition leaders to London to speak - WORLD IN ACTION cameras are banned from Guyana because of an earlier programme (December 9) which exposed the rigging of overseas votes - and they both accuse Burnham of fraud at home.

A WORLD IN ACTION reporter nevertheless went to Guyana, gathered evidence for the programme and brought the two politicians back with him.

They are millionaire conservative Peter D'Aguiar, Leader of the United Force, and Dr. Cheddi Jagan, Leader of the Peoples Progressive Party.

D'Aguiar tells WORLD IN ACTION; "To call it an election is to give it a name it does not deserve."

"It was a seizure of power by fraud, not an election". Although elected, D'Aguiar has insisted he will not take his seat in the Burnham-controlled parliament.

One of Jagan's candidates in the election estimates that 500 votes were faked in his area alone. In some villages - known to be anti Burnham - voters could not get themselves on the electoral roll.

Jagan himself tells WORLD IN ACTION he has evidence of ballot boxes being tampered with, and their seals broken.

Jagan says: "We have in Guyana the makings of a Mr. Smith in Mr. Burnham. A Rhodesian Smith in reverse."

He accuses Burnham of "open fraud," and challenges the Commonwealth Prime Minister's conference to investigate.

Summary of Overseas Voting from GRANADA's World in Action

"The Makings of a Prime Minister" (Jan. 6, 1969)

	<u>Registered Votes</u>	<u>Fairest Estimate of genuine voters</u>
U.K.	44,300	13,050
U.S.A.	11,750	4,700
Rest of World	12,550	12,550 (no survey carried out)
	<u>68,600</u>	<u>30,300</u>

According to Granada's research, the most generous estimate of Guyanese voters abroad should be 30,300 (with assumption that all 12,5000 in the "Rest of the World" are valid), but 36,745 voted. "Inescapably, at least 6,445 votes were faked, and that's being excessively cautious".

FABRICATED LISTS

EVIDENCE OF OPINION RESEARCH CENTRE

Sample of 11,000 names and addresses from the official preliminary registration list, compiled by agents appointed by the Guyana High Commission. (The sampling error using this systematic probability method is unlikely to exceed 3%).

GEORGETOWN, DEMERARA

AFFIDAVIT

I, JOSEPH RUDOLPH SPENCER LUCK, barrister-at-law, of 38 Blygesight Gardens, East Coast Demerara, do solemnly and sincerely declare and affirm as follows.

(1) I am the duly authorised Candidate of the Peoples Progressive Party for the South Georgetown District, at the General Elections.

(2) On the 14th December, 1968 I inspected the list of Proxies prepared by Mr. Alleyne, Returning Officer for the said South Georgetown District.

(3) I discovered that the Returning Officer had allowed a total of 11,285 (one thousand two hundred and eighty-five) electors to vote by proxy out of a total electorate of 10,332 (ten thousand three hundred and thirty-two).

For polling district No. 16, 108 proxies were accepted out of 569 voters, a percentage of 19.

For polling district No. 9, 135 proxies were allowed out of a total electorate of 562 (24 percent).

For polling District No. 6, out of a total electorate of 67,192 proxies have been allowed (28.4 per cent).

(4) The following 58 (fifty-eight) persons who reside at 53 Russell street, Georgetown, have been allowed to vote by proxy:-

- |                           |                         |                          |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Alexander Isabella     | 2. Bacchus, Elsie       | 3. Bobb Clifton E        |
| 4. Bobb Tyrone            | 5. Bowrey Ian G         | 6. Bowrey Lloyd E        |
| 7. Bowrey Lloyd A         | 8. Braithewaite, Ronald | 9. Braithewaite, William |
| 10. Britton, Wendy C      | 11. Caesar, Alphanso    | 12. Caesar Lynette       |
| 13. Carmichael, Caludette | 14. Carmichael, Ivan    | 15. Charles Westford C   |
| 16. Charles, Pauline C    | 17. Collins, Evan       | 18. Comwell, Jacqueline  |
| 19. Cummings, Charles C   | 20. Cummings, Compton   | 21. Cummings, Elaine     |
| 22. Edwards, Eustace      | 23. Edwards, Majorie    | 24. George, Claire       |
| 25. George, Avril         | 26. George Lloyd        | 27. Godfrey Jean C       |
| 28. Grimes, Leroy I       | 29. Hackett Olive R     | 30. Haynes, Ivan C       |
| 31. Jobe, Albertha A      | 32. Johnson, Issac      | 33. Johnson, Asker       |
| 34. Johnson, Ovid L       | 35. Johnson, Mary Ann   | 36. Lucius, Clarisse     |
| 37. Lucius, Ivan          | 38. Mc Gregor, Eileen   | 39. McKenzie, Carmon     |
| 40. McKenzie, Clinton     | 41. Medford, Charles    | 42. Mentis Godfrey       |
| 43. Mentis, Lawrence G    | 44. Osborne, John       | 45. Osborne, Margaret I  |
| 46. Osborne, Nigel S      | 47. Osborn, Sybil       | 48. Payne, Maurice       |
| 49. Peters, Sydney O      | 50. Richards, Colin     | 51. Sealey, Carol        |
| 52. Seymour, Clement      | 53. Smart, Maud         | 54. Smart, Sarah         |
| 55. Talbot, Irene         | 56. Walters, Audrey     | 57. Williams, Cathleen   |
| 58. Williams, Joseph.     |                         |                          |

(5) I personally, on the evening of the 14th December, 1968 visited the said lot 53, Russell Street, Georgetown.

(6) I found that the north half of the said 53 Russell Street, was occupied in the evening by a Masonic Temple and in the day by the New Preparatory School.

The West half of the south half of the said 53 Russell Street was occupied by a family of Indian Origin. The remainder of lot 53 Russell Street, aforesaid, had two

modest cottages, one of which the private residence of the Bowrets, was also used as the area headquarters of the Peoples National Congress.

(7) For the said 53 Russell Street 85 (eighty-five) persons have been registered as electors.

(8) From my personal inspection of the said lot 53 Russell Street, I believe that no more than 15 adults are entitled to be registered as electors and that valid reasons exist for the exercise of the vote by proxy for no more than eight of them. Rather more than fifty of the above proxies are fraudulent.

I make this declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and in accordance with the Statutory Declaration Ordinance.

Affirmed to at Georgetown

Sgd. J.R.S. Luck.

This 15th Day of December, 1968

BEFORE ME

A COMMISSIONER OF OATHS TO AFFIDAVITS.

Lovely Lass,  
West Coast Berbice,  
December 15, 1968

To Returning Officer,  
Abary 10.

Sir, 0

On Thursday Dec. 12, 1968 I submitted a letter to your office to inspect the proxies and to make a copy thereof. I was turned down on the ground that you will have to consult the section quoted by me.

On the 14th Dec. 1968, in the evening you were again approached by me by the same question, but was told that the proxy list is not completed, your assistant Mr. A.R. Wade reported same to me, and promised to permit me to inspect and make a copy on Sunday Dec. 15, 1968 in the morning.

Today, Dec. 15th 1968 about 9. a.m. your assistant Mr. A.R. Wade, and others in your office reported that you are busily engaged and it was impossible for me to inspect the proxy list.

All for your information.

M. Dutchin  
Assistant Agent.

30th December, 1968.

R. Butler, Esq.,  
Chief Elections Officer,  
Election Office,  
Camp Road, Georgetown.

Dear Sir,

Further to my verbal request to you on December 17, for the lists of proxies, I wish to enquire how soon it will be possible for me to obtain same.

You had indicated to me on December 17 that you did not have the lists of proxies and that within 3 days you would be able to supply me with them. (con't)

(Con't)

I spoke to you again on Saturday, December 21, and you informed me that you had not yet obtained them.

Nearly two weeks have now passed. I do hope you are now in a position to supply me with the lists.

Yours truly,

Cheddi Jagan.

Chairman,  
Elections Commission,  
G.P.O. Building,  
Georgetown.

December 21, 1968

Dear Sir:

As a member of the Elections Commission, I wish to have supplied to me immediately a complete list of proxies issued for the general election. I understand that although the lists of proxies were to be made available four days before polling day, many agents and sub-agents were unable to obtain them from the returning officers for the electoral districts.

In view of the serious complaints which I have received concerning the use of proxies, I need this information to make investigations into the complaints before the results of the elections are declared or approved of by the Commission.

Yours sincerely

Janet Jagan

Office of Elections Commission,  
G.P.O. Building,  
Georgetown,  
23rd December, 1968.

Dear Mrs. Jagan:

I thank you for your letter under date December 21, 1968, which was handed in at the above office at 9.40 a.m. on that day: soon after I telephoned to the Chief Election Officer your request for his urgent attention; I followed that up by sending to him the letter and a short minute. He spoke to me on the telephone and communicated his inability as he was barred by the Election Regulations, 1964, to supply the information you needed.

2. Later that morning was your request as that you "be supplied immediately with a complete list of proxies" I caused to be summoned by telephone a meeting of the Commission for 2.15 p.m. that day and also because the results of the poll were already due for declaration. I telephoned to your office on three occasions to notify you and was told you were not in. I ultimately left a message with a lady clerk who promised to let you know as soon as you returned to the office: she also said she would telephone your home and leave the message; in addition she took down the message in writing and promised me to send the note to your home before she left, I heard nothing further.

3. The Chief Election officer regretted that the lists of proxies in consonance with Regulations 60, 66, 75(1) and 75(2) precluded him from opening the sealed packets which contained the information sought. In the circumstances I am of the view that the Commission has no power at this stage to order the officer to open the packets.

Yours sincerely

Donald Jackson  
Chairman  
Elections Commission

27th December, 1968

The Chairman,  
Election Commission,  
G.P.O. Buildings,  
Georgetown.

Sir:

Many thanks for your letter of the 23rd December, 1968.

It must appear that because the lists of proxies were not made available four days before election in accordance with law there could have been no adequate checking by the election agent and by polling agents of the names and identities of the persons for whom proxy votes were cast.

In the circumstances the fairness of the election and its conduct in accordance with law have become vital issues which directly require the attention of the Elections Commission in terms of article 69 of the Constitution. I would not agree that the Commission has no power to order the opening of packets. The Commission in my opinion has all the powers necessary to direct that the packets be opened and that the information be supplied. The duty and power of the Commission is to ensure that the elections were properly conducted and it could issue the necessary directions to cause the packets to be opened. The Commission's power, resting as it does on the Constitution itself, is based on a higher law than the Election Regulations 1964 as amended. And the latter must give way to it.

I am,  
Yours sincerely,

Janet Jagan

Office of Election Commission,  
G.P.O. Buildings,  
Georgetown,  
27th December, 1968.

Dear Sir,

I thank you for your letter of the 23rd December, 1968, which was forwarded to me by the Office of the Election Commission. I am sorry that I have not been able to reply to you earlier. I have been away from Georgetown for some time. I have just returned and I am now in the office. I have read your letter and I am sorry to hear that you are disappointed. I have discussed the matter with the other members of the Commission and we have decided to reply to you as follows.

I am sorry that you are disappointed. I have discussed the matter with the other members of the Commission and we have decided to reply to you as follows. I have read your letter and I am sorry to hear that you are disappointed. I have discussed the matter with the other members of the Commission and we have decided to reply to you as follows. I have read your letter and I am sorry to hear that you are disappointed. I have discussed the matter with the other members of the Commission and we have decided to reply to you as follows.

The other members of the Commission have decided to reply to you as follows. I have read your letter and I am sorry to hear that you are disappointed. I have discussed the matter with the other members of the Commission and we have decided to reply to you as follows. I have read your letter and I am sorry to hear that you are disappointed. I have discussed the matter with the other members of the Commission and we have decided to reply to you as follows.

Yours sincerely,  
Donald Jackson  
Chairman  
Election Commission

82r  
(1301)

Extensive fraud helped the PNC to "win" the 1968 general election. With fabricated, padded voters lists, extensive proxy voting and ballot-box tampering, the PNC "polled" 50.4% of the votes cast in Guyana (a majority of one seat) and 55.6% of the local and overseas votes (a working majority of seven).

Through manipulation, the PNC secured 94% of the overseas votes, permitted for the first time in Guyana's history.

The rigging of the election was thoroughly exposed by the Granada Television Company (UK) in its two "World in Action" films; "The Trail of the Vanishing Voters" and "The Making of a Prime Minister".

The transcript of the second film declared that "a hanged man voted in the Guyana General Election. So did children."

Granada's Research Editor, Gus Macdonald commented: "It is my firm conclusions that the election inside Guyana was neither free nor fair."

Mr. Humphrey Taylor, Director of Opinion Research Centre, which conducted an independent survey, said in the second Granada programme:

"Obviously I don't know what happened in Guyana, but so far as Britain is concerned, the compilation of the register was a totally dishonest and corrupt operation. And, as we have clearly established, the great majority of the people listed, do not exist. This I would think is unprecedented for a Commonwealth country, as far as I know; and it's, you know, a pretty awful and disgraceful episode".

Peter d'Aguiar, UF Leader, bitterly stated "To call it an election is to give it a name it does not deserve; it was a seizure of power by fraud, not an election".

Soon after the general election, the unrepresentative PNC regime rapidly moved to erode further the rights of the Guyanese people. It assumed powers to censor and ban films - progressive films dealing with revolts of students and black people and struggles against colonialism and imperialism which we have been screening outdoors; and more particularly, the two Granada films on our election.

On February 24, 1969, the government railroaded a bill through the National Assembly empowering it to prevent any person from leaving the country if the Minister of Home Affairs considers that "it is necessary in the interests of defence, public safety or public order or for the purpose of preventing the subversion of democratic institutions in the country". Guyanese who were awarded scholarships in socialist countries were either refused passports or prevented from leaving the country.

The act also empowers the government to create "protected areas" and to prevent the movement of persons in these areas.

A bill providing for compulsory arbitration and the banning of strikes has been introduced in the National Assembly.

Meanwhile, the government, having ruthlessly crushed the rebellion (January 1, 1969) by small ranchers and Amerindians in the Rupununi Savannahs near the Brazilian Border, is moving to militarize our politics. Venezuela has become the scape-goat. And incessant calls are being made for greater sacrifices to build a bigger army and police so that "our nation can be protected".

The 1969 nudget has imposed greater hardship on the Guyanese people. Taxation mostly on the poor, has been increasing by geometric progression - \$2.77 million in 1966; \$5.4 million in 1967; \$7.95 million in 1968 and \$15.1 million in 1969.

A spiralling cost of living coupled with wages-freeze, cuts in farm prices and support schemes, and cuts in social services is leading to social unrest - crime, delinquency, strikes, mass emigration.

The answer of the PNC puppet regime to increasing dissatisfaction and frustration is the assumption of more and more arbitrary powers - the denial of human rights, discrimination in employment practices, purges in the Public Services, and the move toward a police-state.

Still hanging over the heads of the Guyanese people is the National Security Act (1966), which gave the government powers to suspend the right of Habeas corpus and to restrict and detain any Guyanese without trial for an indefinite period of time. Since the promulgation of this Act, police harassment has been continuous and widespread.

The Minister of the Interior, Mr. ...

Mr. ...