Chapter XIV

Race, Class, Colour and Religion

> I have dedicated myself to this struggle of the African people. I have fought against White domination . . . against Black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society . . .
>
> Excerpt: Nelson Mandela at Rivonia Trial

In his concluding address at the 1963 Independence Conference, Duncan Sandys said that it was his wish to break the political deadlock and above all to end the problem of racialism which was "the curse of British Guiana today". He attributed blame for our state of turmoil to "the development of party politics along racial lines. In the present acute form, this (racialism) can be traced to the split in the country's main political party in 1955. It was then that the People's Progressive Party, which had previously drawn its support from both the main races, broke into two bitterly opposed political groups, the one predominantly Indian led by Dr. Jagan, and the other, predominantly African, led by Mr. Burnham."

What Sandys failed to observe was the fact that the split was the handiwork of his own Tory colleagues headed by his erstwhile father-in-law, Winston Churchill; and that his colleague, Nigel Fisher, had said that the 1963 strike was politically motivated. I have already shown how the British government and the Robertson Commission engineered the split in the PPP in 1955. I have also set out how the British and American rulers deliberately fomented racial disturbances in order to prevent the transfer of full powers to us.

Like Sandys, many apologists for the British government, including sections of the local and foreign press, have made it appear that the problem is essentially racial, that the political

parties are mainly racial, that the two major races, Indians and Africans, are more or less at each other's throats. The fact is that race and religion have been used by the colonialists to divide and rule and to blur the basic issues, which include the struggle for national liberation from colonialism and imperialism and the struggle of the workers and farmers for freedom from exploitation. These struggles sharpened with the advent of the People's Progressive Party.

Until recently, "race" was merely skin-deep and superficial. Commenting on the question of race the Commonwealth Commission said of the disturbances of February 1962:

> We found little evidence of any racial segregation in the social life of the country, and in Georgetown. East Indians and Africans seemed to mix and associate with one another on terms of the greatest cordiality, though it was clear that the recent disturbances and the racial twist given to them by some of the unprincipled and self-seeking politicians had introduced slight, but it is hoped, transient overtones of doubt and reserve. Among the inhabitants of Georgetown there is, of course, always present the danger that hostile and anti-racial sentiments may be aroused by a clash of the hopes and ambitions of rival politicians. We draw attention to this possibility because there have been indications of such friction in the past, although, as will appear in the course of this report, the disturbances of February 16 did not originate in a racial conflict, nor did they develop into a trial of strength between the East Indians and the Africans.

Race has never been a serious problem. Indians and Africans for many years have played, worked and lived together amicably. Whatever differences existed were mainly economic and vocational. This was highlighted by the Commonwealth Commission. In paragraph 50 of its report, it stated:

> . . . but we are merely drawing attention to the circumstances mentioned above in order to show that there is no clear-cut division between the races and that although, broadly speaking, Dr. Jagan's supporters are for the most part East Indians and the supporters of PNC are drawn mostly from the African races, the

difference is not really racial, but economic and vocational.

During the course of our history, there occurred almost a racial division of labour. After the abolition of slavery, Portuguese immigrants first replaced the freed African slaves. Their numbers, however, were small. Then followed Indians and Chinese. The freed Africans in the meantime moved away to the city and to village settlements adjoining sugar plantations. In the city, they filled the lowest positions in the administration and other unskilled jobs in the government services such as transport, postal, medical, and telecommunications. Those who could not find employment in government services provided unskilled wage-labour for private enterprise in the city, and for sawmills, wood grants, mines and quarries in the Interior. Generally, the Africans shunned the land, especially after the failures of the early cooperative land settlements largely because of inadequate water control.

The Portuguese and Chinese immigrants also followed the example of the Africans. Some of the Portuguese, mainly because of their colour, took their position side by side with the small but powerful British European community in the administrative and technical branches of the civil service. The rest of the Portuguese and the Chinese went into commerce, the Chinese in particular specializing in the grocery trade.

The bulk of the Indians remained in the countryside, mostly in the sugar plantations and in the rice fields. Even up to 1960, they constituted only 22 per cent of the urban population as compared with African — 48.5 per cent, and Mixed — 22 per cent. (See Appendix for the racial breakdown of the population.)

This early division of labour occupationally and geographically according to race tended to prevent integration and to arouse racial hostility. Undercutting of wages of the emancipated Africans by cheap Indian immigrant workers was the source of early conflict. So was the division of plantation labour into "field" and "factory". The Indians, the "field slaves", were the least favoured and lowest paid; the Africans, the "house slaves", who provided the factory labour and the domestic retinue were more favoured and better paid. The "mixed" races

were the best treated and the best paid, and constituted the bulk of the emerging middle-class.

Whatever hostility existed, however, was generally contained except on a few occasions when economic conditions badly deteriorated. The gradual abolition in the United Kingdom of the preference on colonial sugar, which commenced in 1846, led to a depression in the colonies during the next decade. Fall in prices of Guyana sugar resulted in a drop in wages, and when the Africans refused to work for the wages offered, immigrants were brought to compete with them. In this situation a little spark was enough to ignite the charged atmosphere. In 1856 the Angel-Gabriel Riots erupted when Africans broke into and looted the business places of the Portuguese who as hucksters, traders and shopkeepers had begun to show signs of prosperity. Similar interracial strife took place between the Africans and the Portuguese in 1889, for the same economic reasons.

During slavery the British planters had quelled slave re-bellions and contained racial hostility by resorting to brutality and repression whenever they felt this was necessary. But this was not enough to maintain their rule. As in India and elsewhere, the planters built up a social system which had a vested interest in the maintenance of the *status quo*.

The social hierarchy was built on "colour". The colour of the person generally determined his social status — the whiter the colour of skin, the higher the social status. At the top were the white planters; at the bottom were the African slaves; in the middle were the "men of colour" who, originally the offspring of the white planters and their African slave concubines, were free, educated and favoured.

The mystique was built up that everything "white" was good; everything "black" was bad. Soon everyone was aspiring to "whiteness", adopting Western cultural characteristics and traits — personal features, dress, music, song. The African was made to despise his own cultural background. With the help of Christian missionaries, the process of de-Africanization began; the African was educated and anglicized. Soon opportunism developed and even "black" men by their accommodation,

behaviour and performance were accepted into the "white" hierarchy of Guyanese "creole" society.

The Indians, although "brown" in colour, were not accommodated within the social hierarchy. They were regarded as outcasts, and despised by the creole society as "coolies", as being culturally different and economically subservient. They were generally illiterate and stuck to Hinduism and Islam despite the efforts of Christian missionaries to proselytize them.

In the early period, there was no real conflict between Africans and Indians; the latter, despised and downtrodden, concentrated on survival. Up to the mid-1920s they had a common enemy — the white planters. At that stage, the Indian sugar workers accepted the African militant trade union leader, Hubert N. Critchlow, as their "Black Crosby"; the class struggle then tended to take on the racial appearance of black against white, and African and Indian against European. It was only when the Indians began to climb out of their "logie" environment and to compete at the middle-class level for jobs and positions of prestige that conflict began, clearly indicating the economic basis of racism.

Racial consciousness first developed in an organized manner in 1919 with the formation of the British Guiana East Indian Association (BGEIA). The Africans founded the Georgetown Branch of the Universal Negro Improvement Association (Marcus Garvey's), the African Communities League and the Negro Progress Convention. The small Portuguese community organized itself around the Portuguese Benevolent Society, which talked of the need to preserve the Portuguese language and to form a Portuguese political party.

But racial consciousness did not act as a barrier to common action on the political and industrial fronts. Indians and Africans were aware of the peculiar disadvantages under which their own races lived. This led to a common assault against the colonial society. And the more moderate leaders were propelled forward by the militant struggles waged on the political and industrial fronts; Indian and African workers rallied together under the leadership of Critchlow in the industrial battles from 1906 to the 1920s for better wages, improved

working conditions and the 8-hour day.

On the political front, too, various measures were effected. Even though some were taken in the context and process of racial self-realization, they did not result in racial conflict. Indeed, they helped to further the common struggle against imperialism.

The ending of indentureship in 1917, which was resisted by the sugar planters, was seen by the Indians as an end to their bondage; the Africans saw it as an end to cheap labour and potential strikebreaking.

On the education front, a joint communal attack was launched against the colonial regime. *Indian Opinion*, the organ of the BGEIA, criticized the government for keeping the Indians in a state of illiteracy; of 20,000 children of school age, only 6,000 were attending school. At the same time, the Africans waged a battle for a more democratic educational system and rejected "Payments by Results" and other limitations of the Elementary Education Ordinance of 1876. The demand by the Indians for the teaching of Indian languages was supported by R. French who, in a debate on the issue by the Teachers Association, argued that unless Indian languages were taught, they would disappear like the African languages.

The Court of Policy agitated successfully for the opening up of the crown lands, which benefited both Africans and Indians who wanted to go in for diamond and gold mining in the Interior and for sugarcane and rice farming on the coast-lands. Although elected under a very restricted franchise and drawn mainly from the middle-class business and professional groups, the legislators represented a broad cross-section of the various ethnic groups and reflected the mood of the people. The majority fought against the retrograde attempts of the planters and their allies to impose the Colonization Bill in 1919 (to re-introduce Indian immigrants), a ban on the importation of American literature calling for Negro freedom, a reactionary Jury Bill, a proposal of the Governor for the enactment of a Vagrancy Law to coerce workers to work on public works at low wages, and other measures inimical to the Indian and African poor.

These industrial and political struggles united the working people of the various ethnic groups in spite of the wishes of the more moderate communal leaders. Commenting on this unity, H. Snell, M.P., writing in the *London Weekly* on March 19, 1927, declared: "That the Colony has been able to reduce these complexities to something like a working plan and succeeded in creating a basis of unity in the common love of their country on the part of African, Hindu and Chinese alike is itself a great achievement, and one that offers bright promise for the future. These separate races do, in fact, live side by side with each other, respect each other's ideals and prejudices, acknowledge allegiance to communal laws and work together for the good of the Colony. Upon a basis of this kind the Colony can build for the future without fear and without failure."

However, this unity and racial harmony were soon to be destroyed. In 1928, the British government smashed the constitution. It decided that for the "good" of Guiana, the constitution should be amended to give the Governor power to create a legislature which he could control. But the real reason was to re-establish power in the hands of the planters from whom it had passed to Guyanese. The Wilson-Snell Constitution Commission noted:

> It is a general phenomenon in tropical colonies that the extension of the electorate and the greater frequency of contests makes it extremely and increasingly difficult for anyone who is not able and prepared to embark more or less whole time on the career of a politician to enter the Legislature by the avenue of the constituencies. The result is the loss to public life of no inconsiderable proportion of those who are best qualified for it, or, in other words, of the small extremely important European class which still controls the principal agricultural and commercial activities of the Colony.

The same Snell, who remarked on the racial harmony prevailing in Guiana lamented the loss to public life of the "European class"! The problem in 1927 was not one of disunity among the Guyanese people; it was one of loss of influence and power in Guiana by the "European class".

After the introduction of the new Crown Colony constitution in 1928 the "European class" regained and maintained control of the legislature, the executive, and the civil service.

The interval between 1928 and 1953 was disastrous for Guyanese unity and nationhood; British divide-and-rule techniques and the competition for jobs and positions of prestige and power at the middle-class level between Indians and Africans led to racial alignments and divisions among the working class.

In this period, a pronounced differentiation took place in the Indian population. Although 90 to 95 per cent still battled for survival on the sugar plantations and rice fields, a small group of landlords, moneylenders, shopkeepers and rice millers emerged. These could now afford the "luxury" of secondary education for their children; they also wanted positions of power and prestige in the legislature and jobs in the civil service for their children. They wished to establish themselves in the creole hierarchy then occupied by the Europeans, Portuguese, Coloured or Mixed, and Africans (in descending order of importance) deploring the fact that up to the early part of the 1920s there was not a single Indian in the public service holding a post higher than what was then a Third Class Clerkship, a position lower than the present-day Class I Clerkship, and that by 1931, only 8 per cent of the positions in the civil service were held by Indians who comprised 42 per cent of the population.

Indians had found closed doors wherever they went, even though they were qualified. This was also my experience in 1938. Discrimination, nepotism and favouritism were widely practised. Dwarka Nath, historian and retired Senior Immigration Agent, in a memorandum on racial imbalances in the public service submitted to the Commission of Inquiry set up by the International Commission of Jurists in 1965, stated:

I speak from personal knowledge when I say that in the now defunct Immigration Department out of 14 or 15 members of the staff from the head of the department downwards, all of whom were either Europeans or fair-skinned Mulattoes, only one officer

had passed the Senior Cambridge examination, the minimum qualification for entry into the Public Service at that time (i.e., in the 1920s). The regulations were not enforced, and anyone with the required colour of the skin could have secured an appointment without any qualifications. As the Europeans withdrew, the Mulattoes took their places. Later the Negroes who were in the lower grade were also promoted. Still later, the Mulattoes and Negroes became the persons who in effect selected the candidates for appointment to vacancies when they occurred. By then there was no shortage of Indians with the necessary qualifications.

The Indians, finding themselves obstructed and rebuffed, concentrated in the only fields open to them — business and the professions — where they could earn an independent livelihood. Later, in the 1960s this proved a source of conflict. Portuguese and European businessmen feared competition from the rising but aggressive Indian commercial and industrial bourgeoisie; Africans feared that Indians armed with high qualifications would supersede them in the public service.

The middle-class Indians also sought to attain their ends by political action. This led the BGEIA to become more and more the political and racial sounding-board of the new rising middle-class Indians.

It was in this narrow context that the struggle prevailed before the formation of the People's Progressive Party in 1950. The BGEIA had fought for limited reforms such as universal adult suffrage. Property, income and literacy qualifications disenfranchised the great majority of the working class. The large majority of Indians were illiterate, and as Dwarka Nath put it for the early period of indentureship: "More than 50 per cent of the indentured workers (in 1870) were unable to earn five shillings (25p) per week, the statutory sum which they were required to earn to avoid criminal prosecution." Clementi's *A Constitutional History of British Guiana* contains the table below, drawn from the voters' list for 1915, which shows the disparity as regards representation for different ethnic groups. The Indians, who made up 51.8 per cent of the adult male population, had only 0.6 per ent of their race registered as voters and constituted only 6.4 per cent of the

electorate. On the other hand, Africans while constituting 42.3 per cent of the adult male population had only 6.8 per cent of their adults registered but that was sufficient to give them 62.7 per cent or an absolute majority of the electorate. The British constituted 1.7 per cent of the adult male population but 46.1 per cent were on the voters' register!

Race and the Vote in 1915

Race	Percentage of each Race in the Adult Male Population	Percentage of each Race in in the Total Electorate	Percentage of Adult Males of each Race registered as Voters
East Indian	51.8	6.4	0.6
African	42.3	62.7	6.8
Portuguese	2.9	11.4	17.7
British	1.7	17.0	46.1
Chinese	0.9	2.4	62.7

The position did not materially change after 1915. Although the income qualification for a person to be registered as a voter dropped from $40 a month to $25, and then to $10 in 1947, the qualification of literacy in the English language disqualified a large percentage of the Indian population.

The League of Coloured People, the spokesman for the middle-class Coloured and African population, supported by the British government, resisted the demand for adult suffrage — the British wanted to maintain the imperialist *status quo*, while the Coloured and African middle-class wanted to preserve their entrenched positions in the governmental apparatus. In this respect, the Guyanese Indians and the Africans play diametrically different roles from their counterparts in East Africa. In East Africa, Indians and other Asians were used as the middle-class buffers by the British ruling class against the African national movement; in British Guiana, the Indians, because of economic and cultural suppression, have by and large played a progressive role in spite of communal tendencies.

For those who attack the Indians for racial exclusiveness

and separatism this commentary by Professor Peter Newman, in his British Guiana, *Problems of Cohesion In An Immigrant Society* (1964) is illuminating: "Not unnaturally, this rebuff (social acceptance) produced a counter-reaction among the Indians, which led them to stress the value of traditional Indian ways of life in the Guyanese context. But this should not be seen as an actual resurgence of Indian culture but rather, as Smith pointed out, as 'a mode of expression of (their) desire to be treated on terms of equality' within a Guyanese universe. It is most emphatically not an expression of separatist tendencies."

Indians, however, achieved constitutional equality with other Guyanese when the discriminatory and limited franchise was extended after much agitation by the PPP and other organizations, to universal adult suffrage in 1953. (They had become "free" like other Guyanese, with the ending of Indian immigration in 1917.) This was the culmination of united working-class struggles into which I had entered in 1945 and which had been led by the PPP. We succeeded in uniting the major ethnic groups. Even the Robertson Commission (1954) conceded this point. In its report, it stated:

> It was largely by the efforts of Dr. and Mrs. Jagan that the PPP was built up and KEPT UNITED . . . In this way racial dissension between African and East Indian elements was minimized and by the time of the election campaign in 1953 a useful political instrument was forged.

The Robertson Commission went on to state:

> But, except for the Europeans, the PPP could count on a substantial number of supporters among all races and all classes in British Guiana, with the bulk of its supporters naturally to be found among the ordinary working people.

Here, the Robertson Commission commented on and conceded the same unity of the races which Snell had found in 1927 and had commented on as "a great achievement, and one that offers bright promise for the future."

But this racial unity was to be short-lived. As in the post-

1928 period, the British government, after the second suspension of the constitution in 1953, set about to create a rift between the Indians and Africans.

The Robertson Commission did not find Indian-African unity pleasing. This unity, it said, made the people of "United Kingdom origin" anxious:

> The other elements in the community — of Portuguese, Chinese and United Kingdom origin — are much smaller in numbers, though their influence is great. Members of the last-named community are anxious at the way in which the Indian and African sections have now obtained virtual domination through universal adult suffrage. In common with the Portuguese and Chinese, they have no particular enthusiasm for socialist policies, but many members of all three communities have a real understanding of the aspirations of the poorer people. They realize the folly of trying to resist the trend of the times, but they are not unnaturally fearful of the more extreme policies of the People's Progressive Party. We are convinced that, in a country where leaders are needed, they could play a more valuable part than they do.

In 1954, as in 1927, a British Commission was lamenting the loss to the government of the people of "United Kingdom origin" — the "European class" of 1927 — and their great influence.

The Robertson Commission then set out to lay the foundations for suspicion and animosity between the Indian and African peoples who had attained "virtual domination through universal adult suffrage":

> Education is now eagerly sought by Indian people for their children; many Indians have important shares in the economic and commercial life of the colony; the rice trade is largely in their hands from production to marketing. Their very success in these spheres has begun to awaken the fears of the African section of the population, and it cannot be denied that since India received her independence in 1947 there has been a marked self-assertiveness amongst Indians in British Guiana. Guyanese of African extraction were not afraid to tell us that many Indians in British Guiana

which was heavily weighted toward agriculture and drainage and irrigation, was deemed to be essentially designed to help Indians.

By the time of the 1961 election the campaign reached its greatest intensity. Just before the election, Sydney King resigned from the PNC. He charged Burnham with selling out the Africans to the Indians because Burnham had declared that if we won the election, he would join me in the same plane to London to demand independence. King soon started his call for partition. At first he suggested three zones, one for Indians, one for Africans and one for the rest of the population. This culminated later in a joint demand with Dr. Louis Bone to the 1963 London Independence Conference for a partitioned East and West Guiana.

The PNC's defeat at the 1961 election caused it to move further in the direction of African racism; its leadership launched a racist campaign at home and abroad. In New York City and in the UN corridors, American Blacks and African diplomats were told that the PPP government was penalizing the Africans. At home, African workers were told that the Indians owned the lands and the big houses in Georgetown, were taking over Water Street (the commercial centre), and that if they (the Africans) were not careful, the Indians would soon take over their jobs. Burnham and the PNC did not distinguish between the Indian capitalists and the Indian working class.

The PNC denies that it resorted to the powerful slogan of race. It claims that it could have no vested interest in preaching African racism since Africans were in the minority. Actually, its appeal to racism was the only means of preventing Africans from joining us. Because the PPP was the most advanced ideologically, it began to attract the more politically conscious, particularly youths, students and intellectuals of all races after the 1957 election. This has been noted by the Commonwealth Commission (1960) and other independent observers. Professor Peter Newman, of the University of Michigan, wrote about the increasing resort to racist appeals by the PNC in an article "Racial Tension in British Guiana" in

the May 1962 issue of *Race*, pointing out:

The defeat of the Burnham-led party resulted in its increased emphasis on African race-consciousness. Haunted by the fact of a higher rate of Indian population growth (with birth rates, at least for the estate population, around 50 per 1,000), which will soon place Africans permanently into an electoral as well as population minority, it tried to create a Negro solidarity that would prevail at the polls against the existing very slight Indian electoral majority, which, it hoped, might splinter over the appropriate brand of socialism. The PNC approach to the latter issue began its drift rightward as it merged for electoral and racial reasons with the moderate (and mainly African) United Democratic Party; but the rate of drift was checked by the accession of the party from the Jagans' group of Sydney King, a Simon-pure Marxist and militant Negro leader, who became general secretary of the PNC. There was also an ultimate barrier to the extent to which the PNC could move right, formed by the political views of the Portuguese and light-skinned middle classes; any identification of the PNC with this group would at this period have meant the alienation of many poor, urban Negro voters, in addition to being personally objectionable to the Negro leaders of the party.

Not surprisingly, this attention to a unified African front led to a need for a common enemy, a role which was filled by the East Indians. Operating within the restricted social and economic framework that I have discussed, the main animus of the party was focussed on the racial issue, and even official party pronouncements began to take on a racial tinge. Since the PPP continued to maintain a public image of non-partisanship (although its local support was often less unbiased), many African intellectuals, especially among the younger group, began to feel dissatisfied with the racial policies of the PNC. Except in a few cases, this did not lead them to the PPP, but it did cause them to withhold active participation from the African party; partly as a result, the second-rank leadership of the PNC is distinctly less able than the corresponding echelons of Jagan's party.

In paragraph 50 of its Report, the Commonwealth Commission of 1962 said:

The political professions of the PNC were somewhat vague and amorphous. There was a tendency to give a racial tinge to its policy. Mr. Burnham expressed the opinion that it was Dr. Jagan who was responsible for this unfortunate development.

. . . We do not, however, think that there is much substance in the contention of Mr. Burnham and it seems to us that whatever racial differences existed were brought about by political propaganda.

The European ruling class and their local big-business supporters, through their control of the press and radio, joined in the campaign to foment racial feelings between Indians and Africans. This was for them a better means of directing their class hostility against the PPP government. Their ire had been roused by our 1962 working-class budget and our resumption of control of 51 church-run, government-built schools, an action deemed as the attempt of "militant atheistic Communists" to deny liberty.

The British government also joined in the campaign of distortion. Duncan Sandys, on his return to London from Guiana in June 1963, referred to "racial leaders" and "racial parties". Cecil King, the British government's representative in the UN Fourth Committee expressed it in the same terms on July 17, 1964, when he said: "The main cause of the present situation is the organization of political parties on racial lines, each appealing to racial fears and prejudices."

Whatever may be said of the People's Progressive Party, it is not racial. Before the 1962-64 disturbances, it drew, in spite of the 1955 split, from between 15 perc ent to 20 per cent of its support from the African working class. This point was noted by T. McKitterick in his analysis of the results of the 1961 election: he said that had race been the decisive factor, the PPP would not have won the election. He showed that in 4 or 5 constituencies won by the PPP, Indians were definitely in the minority.

Sandys and his apologists who accuse the PPP of Indian racialism should also observe that one of the taxes — an import duty on "Irish" potatoes imposed by the PPP government in 1958 — fell heavily on the Indians to whom

"alloocurry" (curried potatoes) is a regular dish. Our 1962 budget also hit the wealthy Indians; as a result many trekked to the United Force, including the Speaker, Rahman Gajraj. Hari Prashad, wealthy Indian real estate owner and landlord, became chairman of the United Force.

Other prominent Indians like Balwant Singh, Richard Ishmael, Hoosein Ganie also came out against us. And so did Abdool Majeed, a wealthy Indian merchant who was then president of the United Sad'r Islamic Anjuman, and the chairman of the United Force in 196I and 1962.

Sandys's concluding remark at the 1963 Conference that "both parties have, for their political ends, fanned the racial emotions of their followers, with the result that each has come to be regarded as the champion of one race and the enemy of the other", was thus aimed at deliberately misleading the British public and the world and justifying his imposition of proportional representation (PR). His conclusion that PR was the way to solve the racial problem was far from the truth; PR was introduced not to heal but to crystallize and further widen the racial breach. As Eric Lubbock, M.P., wrote in the *Guardian*: "Far from eliminating the poison of racial violence, Mr. Sandys's proposal will inject it into the constitution itself."

In Palestine, India, Cyprus and elsewhere, race and religion were used in the imperialist divide-and-rule game. In Guiana, a multiracial and multireligious society, Proportional Representation was the most effective weapon to keep the working class divided, ruled and exploited. It was precisely with these ends in mind that the British government set its course in 1964.