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The Guyanese election of Oct. 5, 1992 is of historic importance for Guyana and for all of Latin America and the Caribbean. For the first time in 28 years, all of the political parties of Guyana and the international observers agreed that the election was free and fair, and a peaceful transfer of power occurred. Guyana now faces the challenge of ethnic reconciliation, but there are grounds for hope since it has a democratic framework within which to work. Guyana is also the last country in South America to have had an internationally accepted election, bringing the hemisphere one step closer to democracy.

The Guyanese election also marks an important event in the history of election monitoring by the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government. Since its formation in 1986, following a Consultation at The Carter Center of Emory University on "Reinforcing Democracy in the Americas," the Council has monitored elections in Panama, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti and sent representatives to witness elections in Suriname and Mexico. The Council project in Guyana was its longest commitment, its largest delegation, and its most active involvement in negotiating electoral reforms. Also unique in the Guyana project is the post-election commitment by the Council and The Carter Center to be responsive to requests from Guyanese to consolidate democracy, build trust among ethnic groups, and promote sustainable development.

I would like to thank personally two members of the Council, who played such an important role in our Guyana Project, Prime Minister George Price of Belize, the Vice Chairman of the Council, and former Costa Rican President Rodrigo Carazo. Both led difficult missions to Guyana and joined me in leading the delegation during the election. In addition, Ben Clave, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, who represented Michael Manley of Jamaica, Senator Ryan Penalvo, who represented Edward Seaga, and Dennis Smith, who represented Erskine Sandiford of Barbados, led missions. Indeed, of all the Council’s efforts, none received more support from the Council members than the Guyana Project. Of 20 members of the Council at the time of the project, three participated and 13 others sent representatives to monitor the election.

I would also like to thank Joao Baena Soares, the Secretary General
of the Organization of American States, for sending his personal representative, Roberto Scainville, and Edward Broadbent of the International Center for Human Rights and Democratic Development for leading a Canadian group of human rights advocates, who formed part of our delegation. I am grateful for the support and participation of David Peterson, Chairman of the Commonwealth Observer Group, who consulted with us and endeavored to coordinate the activities of his group with that of The Carter Center.

Two people deserve special mention. Dennis King directed the Guyana office of the Council/Carter Center over a 16-month period and did a superb job organizing the logistics and deployment of our very large delegation. Robert Pastor, the director of the Latin American Program, helped conceptualize the project and offer strategic advice at critical moments. The Council is indebted to both of them.

Guyana is a small country, but it is an important one for the entire hemisphere. It connects the Caribbean with Latin America, an authoritarian past with a democratic future, an ethnic challenge with a strategy for social and political reconciliation. We, the members of the Council, consider ourselves privileged to have had the chance to help the people of Guyana find their path toward democracy, and we remain ready to be helpful as it moves down that path.

Jimmy Carter
Preface and Acknowledgments

From September 1990 through today, the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, based at The Carter Center of Emory University, has been working with the people and the political leadership of Guyana to construct a democratic foundation for the country. This has been a challenging and rewarding experience and also one that has been frustrating at times.

The mission of the Council was not to bring democracy to Guyana but to reinforce the people's democratic tendencies in as fair and indirect a manner as possible. This is why we refused to consider any involvement until we were invited by all parties. Even then, we sought only to be helpful, not to impose our views; to moderate, not to arbitrate. We avoided any partiality to the political parties and candidates, but we were zealous in our support for an impartial political process.

This report covers the political history of Guyana, the activities of the Council/Carter Center, the electoral framework, and the election itself. It was written by Dennis King, the director of our office in Guyana, and David Carroll, the assistant director of the Latin American Program. I have helped edit it.

Many people and institutions deserve credit for all of their help in our project. We are very grateful to Jim Michel, Bill Shaw, Ken Schofield, and Sharon Isakow of the U.S. Agency for International Development for their support for the project, and to the Ford Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the MacArthur Foundation for helping the Council's overall activities. Dennis King was aided by an able staff in Guyana that included Reymar Mohamed and Pablo Henderson, and I was assisted in Atlanta by David Carroll and Felicia Aguado.

In Guyana, there were many who played a crucial role in facilitating the country's transition to democracy—too many to name here. But I would like to identify three people: Jean-Louis Laverhne, the director of the office of the U.N. Development Program in Georgetown; Clairmont Lye, the project director of the Electoral Assistance Bureau; and Rudy Collins, the chairman of the Elections Commission and the only Guyanese who could pass the test of neutrality and integrity among all the political parties. It is hard to imagine how Guyana could have arrived at a free election without the dedication, perseverance, and courage of all three.

To them and to all the people of Guyana, we dedicate this report.

Robert A. Pastor
Atlanta, Georgia
March 15, 1993
Executive Summary

1. Through a series of legal and administrative electoral reforms began in 1990, a framework was created in Guyana that allowed that country to conduct its first certifiably free and fair election in 28 years.

2. Political parties entered the campaign for the Oct. 5th vote with more confidence in the voters' list and in the machinery established to ensure a clean election than in nearly three decades. Many Guyanese faced long lines at polling places as officials scrupulously followed new procedures. Eighty-one percent of registered voters peacefully cast their ballots on election day.

3. Although the vote was polarized along racial lines in supporting the two oldest and largest political parties, the final election results were accepted by all the Guyanese political parties, and a peaceful transition of government took place within four days of the election. President Cheddi Jagan and former President Desmond Hoyte urged their supporters to observe the constitution and to respect the election results. The police and the army pledged to support the new government.

4. The two international observer groups, the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government and the Commonwealth, significantly contributed to public confidence in the electoral process.

5. The Council played an active role as mediators and conciliators in the process and maintained an office in Georgetown for 16 months. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) gave critical assistance to the elections by providing technical personnel, commodities, and equipment.

6. The Electoral Assistance Bureau provided valuable, non-partisan analysis of the electoral process and later made vital contributions to the Election Commission's preparations to conduct the election.

7. The violence on election day at the Elections Commission building in Georgetown and at regional offices in Linden nearly caused the collapse of the elections. The election's collapse was averted for the following reasons: (1) the people of Guyana did not despair; they continued to vote, despite rumors and threats of violence; (2) the presence of international observers from the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Govern

Prime Minister Sam Hinds (left) and President Cheddi Jagan of the People's Progressive Party/Civic, which won 36 seats in the 65-member National Assembly.
ment and the Commonwealth gave Guyanese confidence in the electoral process. Their visits to two-thirds of the voting sites with systematic forms permitted the groups to inform the Guyanese electorate that disruptions occurred at fewer than 2 percent of the sites. (3) The personal courage of Chairman Collins, who remained at election headquarters while the building was under siege, ensured that the vote count would be completed. (4) The intervention of President Carter, who joined Rudy Collins at the Elections Commission, in securing sufficient police protection of the building. (5) The Quick Count conducted by the Council provided confidence in the official election results, and (6) free elections were supported by several friendly governments, especially Canada, Great Britain, and the United States.

8. The delay in reporting returns to the Elections Commission from polling places in Georgetown and other areas of the country was due primarily to administrative and logistical procedures. Attempts to manipulate the vote count by seizing ballot boxes at a small number of polling places in Linden did not affect the national results.

9. President Jagan committed his government to pursue national reconciliation and development policies that includes all races and ethnic groups. The new finance minister moved quickly to assure Guyanese and foreign investors that the new administration will continue basic economic structural reforms begun under President Hoyte. The government has pledged to open the policy-making process to the public and to financial accountability.
I. Background to the 1992 Guyana Elections

On Oct. 5, 1992 a watershed event in the history of Guyana took place. Guyana held the first elections in 28 years that were internationally monitored, accepted by all parties as free and fair, and resulted in a peaceful transfer of power. Cheddi Jagan emerged the undisputed winner of the general elections with his party receiving 53 percent of the votes. The defeated incumbent President Desmond Hoyte, leader of the Peoples National Congress (PNC), finished with 42 percent and declared, on Oct. 7, that he accepted the results of the elections.

The electoral process, starting with reforms initiated in October 1990 and lasting until the election in 1992, was monitored by members and representatives of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, an informal group of 21 leaders from throughout the Western Hemisphere, which is chaired by former U.S. President Jimmy Carter and based at the Carter Center at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia. Since its formation in 1986, the Council has sent observer missions to monitor or witness elections in Panama (1989), Nicaragua (1990), the Dominican Republic (1990), Haiti (1987, 1990), Suriname (1991), and Mexico (1992).

Starting with its first mission to Guyana in October 1990, the Council/Carter Center played a significant role in shaping the process, mediating agreements between the government and opposition parties, and promoting confidence by the Guyanese in the electoral process. In addition to the Commonwealth, which sent a 26 member delegation, the Council sent a 63-person team to observe the balloting on election day, and concluded that, although there were a number of problems, overall the elections were free and fair.

Although the 1992 elections were of historic importance in Guyana, the international press barely noticed. Outside of Guyana, the only sustained interest came from the neighboring countries of the Caribbean. While not altogether surprising, this neglect of the Guyanese election is unfortunate, not only because the country needs international support to succeed, but also because there are important lessons for other ethnically divided societies in transition to democracy.

Like other countries passing through democratic transitions, Guyana had to deal with the difficulties associated with suspicion among the parties and the lack of experience in the procedures involved in conducting fair elections. Across the globe, the international community is trying its hand at mediating solutions in countries torn by ethnic strife and implementing internationally monitored elections as part of the solution.

Although Guyanese voted along racial lines, political campaigning and the election day itself were remarkably free from appeals to race or ethnic violence. The roles played by the international community and the determination of Guyanese to rejoin the community of democratic nations contributed to an electoral environment that was free from fear and intimidation.

Recent History Through Independence

Situated on the north coast of South America between Venezuela and Suriname, Guyana is one of the three Guianas (along with present-day French Guiana and Suriname) first colonized by the Dutch in the early 1600s. After 1775 the British began to challenge the Dutch in the area currently known as Guyana, and finally gained complete control in 1803. The official territorial transfer came at the Congress of Vienna in 1815 when the Dutch formally ceded the territories of Essequibo, Demerara, and Berbice to Britain. In 1831 the
three territories were consolidated into British Guiana.

Sugar cultivation was the main economic activity in the colony under both the Dutch and the British. To augment the small and dispersed settlements of indigenous Amerindians, slave laborers were imported from Africa to work the fields. After slavery was abolished in 1833, indentured servants were utilized, mostly from India, but also a number of Portuguese and Chinese. While some eventually returned to their homelands, most remained in British Guiana.

In the 1950s and 60s, while still under British rule, the local government was led by Cheddi Jagan, an avowed Marxist and supporter of the Soviet Union and later Cuba. Although Dr. Jagan and his political party, the People’s Progressive Party (PPP), won fair elections in 1953, he was removed from office after only 133 days. In an incident symptomatic of the Cold War tensions of the period, the British suspended the constitution in order to block the “communist” policies of the new leader. However, after a new constitution was in place, Dr. Jagan won fair elections in 1957, and again in 1961. On both occasions, the voting was split along racial lines between the two main groups, Indo-Guyanese supporting Dr. Jagan and Afro-Guyanese supporting Forbes Burnham.

Dr. Jagan’s rule met with strong opposition both at home and abroad. Internationally, Guyana’s support of Cuba and the Soviet Union evoked the hostility of the United States and Great Britain. Domestically, his policies were seen as favoring the rural interests of the Indo-Guyanese over those of the Afro-Guyanese population concentrated mostly in the urban areas and bauxite mining towns. After the 1961 elections the PNC leadership, headed by Forbes Burnham, a former leader in the PPP who split with Dr. Jagan in 1955, organized a strike campaign of government workers. There were several outbreaks of violence and pressure increased for the British to intervene.

Burnham and the People’s National Congress demanded a new constitution so that elections would be based on proportional representation. In Guyana’s racially based political system, the PPP’s traditional base in the Indo-Guyanese community, the largest single ethnic group, was believed to constitute less than half of the total population during the ’50s and ’60s. (In the 1961 election, for example, the PPP’s share of the national vote was 42.6 percent.) The implementation of a system of proportional representation would make it possible for a coalition of forces to outnumber and defeat the PPP’s Indo-Guyanese constituency.
Conceived about the direction the country might take after independence, the United States and Britain helped the PNC to change the electoral provisions of the Constitution. After Jagan agreed to allow the British colonial secretary to rule on the matter at the Constitutional Conference of 1963, a proportional representation system was chosen. The new system enabled a coalition led by the PNC's Forbes Burnham to join forces with a smaller party (The United Force, led at the time by Peter D'Agua) and defeat the PPP in the 1964 elections, which were the last elections accepted as free and fair by all Guyanese political parties, until 1992. Under Burnham's leadership, the country gained its independence from Britain in 1966.

PNC Domination under Forbes

Burnham, 1964-1985

Once in power, Burnham consolidated his role of the country through party "paramountcy" and maintained the PNC's dominance through a series of elections generally viewed as fraudulent by the PPP and some international groups. With control of the legislature, PNC changes in the electoral system were designed to consolidate and perpetuate party control. Most importantly, much of the authority of the Elections Commission to direct the electoral process was transferred to the commissioner of National Registration, who was subject to the authority of the Ministry of Home Affairs. In effect, therefore, control over the production of the voters' list and the appointment of electoral officials were put in the hands of a political appointee working under the direction of a government minister.

In addition, the legislature approved two new methods of casting ballots: "postal voting," and "overseas voting," both of which led themselves to abuse by an elections machinery controlled by the incumbent government. These changes, along with the government's control over the transportation and counting of ballots on election day, figured prominently in subsequent PNC election victories. Having assured itself of control over the electoral machinery after the 1964 election, the PNC went on to win a clear majority in the Parliament in the 1968 elections (30 of 53 seats) and was able to govern without the support of The United Force, its coalition partner after the 1964 elections. In the 1973 elections the PNC's parliamentary majority was increased to 66 percent (37 of 53 seats), giving it enough votes to amend the Constitution unilaterally.

Although Burnham had been perceived by the West as less radical than Dr. Jagan, his ideological approach in office was not much different from Dr. Jagan's. In 1970 Burnham declared Guyana a socialist republic, improved relations with the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba, and nationalized many Guyanese and foreign owned businesses.

Following a national referendum held in 1978 which the opposition boycotted, the national assembly enacted a new Constitution, and postponed elections. The new Constitution was ratified in October 1980, and Burnham was declared executive president. Elections were called for December of that year. As in the past, although Burnham won easily, the 1980 elections were again marred by opposition accusations of fraud. This time, however, an international observer team from the British Parliamentary Human Rights Group led by Lord Avebury added its voice to those who denounced the elections as fraudulent.

The assassination of Walter Rodney, a popular leader of the Working People's Alliance, in June 1980, provoked increased opposition to the government and escalated demands for electoral reform. Eight years after Dr. Rodney's death, an official inquiry that reported death by misadventure was rejected by the opposition.

In the early 1980s, economic conditions deteriorated and the Burnham regime cracked down severely on ns
domestic opposition. Political violence and labor unrest increased and so did the rate of emigration.

Reforms under Desmond Hoyte, 1985-1992

In August 1985, Burnham died after undergoing heart surgery and was succeeded by Desmond Hoyte, the first vice president and prime minister. With elections due later that year and domestic pressure for reform on the rise, Hoyte acceded to some of the opposition's demands by abolishing postal voting and severely limiting overseas voting. Hoyte and the PNC still won the December 1985 elections handily, amidst charges of fraud by the opposition.

In the wake of the electoral defeat of 1985, five of the six main opposition parties agreed to form the Patriotic Coalition for Democracy (PCD) to press for electoral reforms, including the presence of international observers. In the years leading up to the next scheduled election, to be held within five years, PCD leaders developed a list of fundamental electoral reforms necessary for a free and fair electoral process, including the creation of a totally independent Elections Commission with authority over all aspects of the electoral process, the counting of ballots at the polling places, and restricting the military to the barracks on election day. Hoyte met with opposition leaders on several occasions in 1989 to discuss issues of electoral reform, but no significant progress was made.

Given the revenue issues in Guyana for Burnham's power (attempts were made shortly after his death to preserve the corpse), Hoyte continued the rhetoric of cooperative socialism. He was determined to distance himself publicly from the policies of his predecessor. But with the economy in a disastrous state—GDP had declined in real terms by 13 percent between 1980 and 1989—Hoyte moved gradually to try to improve the climate for foreign investment. In 1988, he began negotiations with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) for an economic adjustment program and new development aid.

As an outgrowth of the IMF plan, Hoyte announced the Economic Recovery Plan (ERP) in April 1989. The ERP aimed to privatize several key state-owned industries. Despite problems with industrial unrest, the ERP began to show some positive results by 1991, when GDP growth was reported at 6 percent. But it would take some time before such growth would translate into an improvement in the day-to-day life of most Guyanese.

According to the Constitution, the next elections were due to occur no later than May 1991, and opposition political parties expected them to be held before the end of 1990. In the fall of 1990, with the PCD opposition leaders threatening to boycott unless significant reforms were in place, Hoyte began a slow process of reform.

The first significant reform came on Sept. 29 with the passage of the Elections Laws (Amendment) Act of 1990, which provided the Elections Commission with some degree of control over matters pertaining to elections personnel, including their appointment, remained unclear. According to the amendment, the Elections Commission had the power to "supervise and direct" the functioning of the commissioner of National Registration, Ronald Jacobs, and his subordinates. But the authority to hire and fire key personnel appeared to rest with the commissioner.

In addition, other major problems remained. The most immediate was the flawed voters list which was published in October 1990, on the eve of the first visit by a Council delegation. The list was produced by extracting names from an older national registration list, which had a large number of errors.

Starting with initial contacts in 1990, the Council was involved in Guyana for more than two years. During that time, the Council sent four senior pre-election delegations to visit the country:

2. Led by Prime Minister George Price of Belize, March 25-April 8, 1991;
3. Led by former Costa Rican President Rodrigo Carazo and Benjamin Clare, Jamaica’s minister of state for Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade, Oct. 20-26, 1991; and
4. Led by Jamaican Senator Ryan C. Peralo, July 27-31, 1992. A summary list of the delegation members of each of these missions is provided in Appendix 1. In addition, President Carter and Prime Minister Price led a delegation to observe the elections on Oct. 3-10, 1992. Each of these visits played an important role in helping move the electoral process forward in a manner that all sides could accept. A full report was issued after each visit.

In July 1990, facing increased pressure domestically and internationally to institute democratic reforms, President Hoyte invited the Commonwealth Secretariat to send a delegation to observe Guyana’s national elections scheduled later in the year. The opposition was uncertain about the impartiality of a mission from the Commonwealth and insisted that President Hoyte invite The Carter Center as well. President Hoyte did not agree, and Cheddi Jagan travelled to Atlanta for a meeting with Dr. Pastor on July 9th. Jagan said that he thought elections would be called in September to be held by mid-November, but he considered the voters’ list flawed, and that other electoral reforms were needed first. He requested that The Carter Center send a delegation to monitor the elections. Dr. Pastor explained that the Council/Carter Center would only consider monitoring the elections if invited by all major parties.

Dr. Jagan then travelled to Washington where he briefed

President Desmond Hoyte welcomed President and Mrs. Carter during the first Council visit to Guyana in October 1990.
Carter congratulated President Hoyte for taking "an historic step in trying to bring an end to the very damaging allegations against this country. True or false, these reports have been very damaging and I think this is a major and historic step forward in proving to the world that this is a nation whose elections have complete assurance of being open, fair, honest, and safe."

Stabroek News
Oct. 16, 1990

The October 1990 Delegation Led by President Carter

President Carter, acting as the chairman of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, consulted with several Council members and led a Council delegation to Guyana on Oct. 12-13, 1990. The goal of the delegation was to meet with key leaders in order to learn about Guyanese electoral laws and procedures and to ascertain whether the Council should monitor the elections.

In addition to President Carter, the delegation also included Rosalynn Carter; Benjamin Clare, the minister of state in Jamaica's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and representative of Council member Michael Manley, the prime minister of Jamaica; and Robert Pastor, the executive secretary of the Council and the director of The Carter Center's Latin American and Caribbean Program. The October 1990 visit coincided with publication of the voter's list intended for use in the elections expected in December.

Over the course of an intense two-day visit, the group helped all sides reach agreement on the two most fundamental issues of concern to the opposition: the need for a new voters' list and for the preliminary counting of ballots at the polling places. All sides agreed that a new house-to-house registration would be implemented to update the voters list, and that all parties would receive copies of the new list with sufficient time to review the list before the election.

President Hoyte also agreed to having a preliminary counting of ballots done at the polling places.

Finally, discussions were also held about ideas for expanding and/or reconstituting the Elections Commission, which at the time was made up of three members, one from the PPP, one from the PNC, and the chairman appointed by the president. President Carter made a proposal to expand the Commission and select a new chairman, and noted in his departure statement that while the issue was still unresolved, he hoped it could be satisfactorily worked out. On the basis of the reforms, President Carter recommended to his colleagues on the Council that they agree to observe the elections.

The major agreements reached during President Carter's visit were given legal

March-April 1991
Delegation led by Prime Minister George Price
During March and April 1991, a two-phased Council delegation of nine persons led by Council member Prime Minister George Price of Belize visited Guyana to observe the new house-to-house registration process which had begun on Feb. 17 and was then underway. Team members visited enumerators, party scrutineers, registrars, and deputy registrars in four of the ten electoral regions of the country, and completed more than 200 questionnaires relating to the conduct of the registration exercise. Although the delegation noted a number of problems, it judged that the registration process was progressing satisfactorily and that participation by eligible voters was relatively high; only 3-4 percent refused to register.

In meetings with Commissioner of National Registration Ronald Jacobs, the delegation was also assured of a timetable whereby registration would be completed by May 17, 1991, and a Preliminary Voters List (PVL) would be posted and printed with copies available for all parties by July 1 so that they could review the list. In light of opposition concerns about election personnel, Jacobs also assured the team that a list of all presiding officers would be submitted for review to the entire Elections Commission, and that presiding officers would not be able to bar party polling agents from the polling places, nor prevent them from receiving copies of the statements of poll of the vote count. A number of these points were confirmed in a letter dated April 17, 1991 from Dr. Pastor to Jacobs (Appendix 4).

More significant, the delegation also met with all parties and, in response to the continuing problems raised concerning the composition of the Elections Commission, the Council delegation was able to forge a compromise solution which resulted in the expansion and reconstitution of the Commission. Under the agreement, both the PNC and the opposition would name two additional members to the Commission, and a new chairman would be selected by President Hoyte from a list proposed by the opposition.

President Hoyte indicated that he would respond favorably to this formula if he received a letter from the opposition coalition (PCD) which: (1) indicated their acceptance of the proposal, (2) pledged not to raise any further objections regarding laws affecting electoral procedures, and (3) promised to support a constitutional amendment necessary to effect the change. On April 12, the PCD sent the desired letter (Appendix 5). Following the agreed upon formula, Rudy Collins, formerly the Guyanese ambassador to Venezuela and then a CARICOM assistant secretary
Opening of the Georgetown Office of the Council / Carter Center

In early June 1991, Jennifer McCoy and Dennis King of the Council/Carter Center traveled to Georgetown and met with political parties to assess electoral progress. Their visit followed a five-day trip to Suriname where they served as Carter Center representatives in the Organization of American States (OAS) delegation to observe Surinamese national elections. King remained in Guyana and conducted a nine-day logistical survey of the country to begin preliminary planning for the deployment and support of a delegation of international election observers from the Council.

In order to establish an on-the-ground presence in the country, King returned to Guyana on Aug. 11, to set up a Council office in Georgetown. As mission coordinator for the Council/Carter Center in Guyana, King met regularly with, among others, the government of Guyana; the Elections Commission; party representatives; the Electoral Assistance Bureau; the United Nations Development Program (UNDP); the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES); civic groups; and diplomatic missions and reported routinely to the Atlanta office on developments in the electoral process. King directed preparations for visiting Council delegations and, together with his deputy mission coordinator, Reyma Mohamed; assistant coordinator and radio officer, Pablo Henderson; and senior program assistants, Severin Wilson and Adrian Moore, continued regular visits throughout Guyana to plan for the eventual deployment of election observers. With the exception of King, all staff for the Georgetown office worked and were recruited within the country (Appendix 6). The operational success of the Georgetown Office was due largely to the energy and commitment of this young staff who frequently worked long hours in a sensitive and high-pressure environment.

The Council/Carter Center Georgetown Office staff was expanded for the elections. The energy and commitment of this young staff, who frequently worked long hours in a high-pressure environment, contributed greatly to the success of the mission. Left to right: Severin Wilson, Pablo Henderson, Faro Ali, Ingrid McDonald, Reyma Mohamed (hidden), Marcia Velonis, Dennis King, Melissa Stilt, Winston Cramner, President Carter, Shellen Clowden, Adrian Moore (partially hidden), Owen Verwuy, Gadia Gafaro, Stephen Jutis, Reapnarine Suriram, Vimaldki Singh, Colin Imerery.
The Carter Center mission flew out of Guyana last night a disappointed team after failing to persuade Elections Commission Chairman, Rudy Collins and President Desmond Hoyte the badly flawed preliminary voters list still needs serious surgery.
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mission discovered a large number of duplicate names and more than 50,000 eligible voters missing from the list. It was not until Sept. 28, 1991—just two days before the deadline to dissolve Parliament—that the Elections Commission produced a voters list for the election. This was three months later than the date that Jacobs had promised. On the same day, after being formally notified of the list’s completion, President Hoyte officially dissolved Parliament. According to the Constitution, this meant that elections would have to be held within 90 days, or by Dec. 28, 1991.

The date of the list’s publication also marked the start of the required period of public review of the list for “Claims and Objections.” During this interval, persons could file “Claims” for their names to be added to the list, and/or “Objections” for the removal of names of persons, who were ineligible either because they had emigrated, died, or moved to another area.

The opposition coalition PCD rejected the Preliminary Voters List (PVL) as an unacceptable basis for holding elections, and declared that if the massive errors in the list were not corrected during Claims and Objections, they would demand a new list. Despite a house computer analysis conducted by Fr. Tim Curtis, a volunteer consultant to the Elections Commission, which found an error rate of 33 percent, Chairman Collins ordered the PVL to be published. While Collins was criticized for the decision, opposition leaders aimed their charges of rigging at Commissioner Jacobs and his subordinates and demanded that Jacobs be replaced.

Elections Commission Chairman Collins acknowledged that the published Preliminary List had problems, but insisted that with the support of all parties and the public, the list could be corrected during the 28-day period for Claims and Objections, and that the Final Voters List would be ready in time to hold elections before the year’s end. Two of the opposition members of the Commission, Clement Rohree and Basil Mangal, publicly dissociated themselves from the chairman on this issue.
In response to the delays in the list and the almost total lack of confidence in the work of Jacobs, the Commission passed a "no-confidence" motion in Jacobs on Oct. 4, with the support of Chairman Collins. Symptomatic of the confused lines of authority, however, the Commission had no authority to dismiss Jacobs, since this power rested with the Public Service Commission.

**October 1991 Delegation Led by President Rodrigo Carazo**

In this context of doubt about the list and the prospects for December elections, the Council sent a delegation to Guyana Oct. 20-26 to assess the list and the process of corrections. The delegation was led by Council member former Costa Rican President Rodrigo Carazo. Delegation members conducted a survey of 62 of the 402 Claims and Objections Centers (Appendix 7), spread over six of the country's ten electoral regions, and met with President Hoyte, leaders of the opposition, including Dr. Jagan, the Elections Commission, UNDP technicians assisting the Commission, Commissioner Ronald Jacobs, and the Electoral Assistance Bureau (EAB), which had just completed an exhaustive evaluation of the voters list which indicated a very high rate of errors.

In their meetings with the delegation, opposition leaders continued to call for the transfer of Commissioner of Registration Ronald Jacobs, and demanded that a new voters list be compiled. Recognizing that an agreement to correct or replace the list would require an amendment to the Constitution to reconvene the dissolved Parliament and approve a new law, the delegation suggested that opposition leaders send President Hoyte a letter supporting the postponement of elections to avoid any controversy. A letter to this effect was signed and delivered to the president (Appendix 8).

The delegation concluded that the list was seriously flawed, but the delegation disagreed with the PCD that it was beyond repair. There were also a number of problems in the Claims and Objections process. The delegation's principal conclusion, however, was that the error in the voters list was beyond the capacity of the Commission to rectify in time for a December election. The delegation also found, however, that elections could take place early in 1992 if a detailed plan for the correction of the list and the delivery of elections was implemented immediately. After the repeated delays and missed deadlines in the elections process during 1991, however, Chairman Collins was under pressure to hold elections before the end of the year. President Hoyte had previously expressed confidence in the Chairman's assurance to him that elections could be held before year's end and said he would defer to the judgment of Rody Collins.

The Council delegation was concerned that if the list were published on the eve of the election without the opposition parties having had time to review it, the result could be violence on election day. Instead of allowing this to occur, delegation members briefed President Carter on their return, and President Carter agreed to send a letter to Chairman Collins with a copy to President Hoyte on Oct. 31 (Appendix 9). The letter explained that the Council would need to receive a copy of the voters list at least three weeks before the election in order to review it and determine whether it was satisfactory as a basis for a free election. If the list were unacceptable, or were not received by then, the Council would not observe the elections unless they were postponed with sufficient time to correct the list.

The letter was faxed to Guyana, and on Nov. 1, Lt.

**Opposition parties in the Patriotic Coalition for Democracy (PCD) have welcomed the announce ment that the voters list cannot be prepared in time for elections on Dec. 16...**

*Stabroek News*
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Pastor met Deputy Prime Minister Winston Murray in Miami to deliver the letters and to underscore the necessity of postponing the elections and instituting a process to correct the list. At the same time, US congressional leaders urged President Hoyte to postpone the elections, and the US government made a similar appeal. On Nov. 8, Murray and Ambassador Cedric Grant met with President Carter and Dr. Pastor in Atlanta and explained that President Hoyte would announce the date of the elections. President Carter reiterated his position, and urged President Hoyte to make clear in his address that he would postpone the election if the chairman of the Elections Commission determined that he could not complete the registration list on time.

At a PNC rally on Nov. 10, President Hoyte announced that elections would be held on Dec. 16, and noted that this decision was based on the projections of the Elections Commission for the completion of the list. He added, however, that "should the situation change, I would take appropriate action." The call for elections led to a split in the PCD, as the Working People's Alliance (WPA) and Democratic Labour Movement (DLM) announced their boycott of the forthcoming elections, while the PPP went ahead with plans to submit nominations for candidates. In protest of President Hoyte's announcement, East Kwanyana, co-leader of the WPA, began a fast for "real elections." (After 13 days and numerous appeals from religious groups and political parties, he ended the fast on Nov. 23.)

Nearly a month after the Council delegation led by President Carter, Commission Chairman Rudy Collins reached the same conclusion as the Council had earlier. On Nov. 20, he reported that he was "unable to guarantee the presentation of a Final Voters List in sufficient time for it to be verified by the electorate."

On Nov. 28, 1991, in response to Chairman Collins' announcement, President Hoyte decided to postpone the elections, and on Dec. 3 he recalled Parliament to allow for the passage of legislation mandating an election in 1992. President Carter supported this decision and urged donor countries not to penalize Guyana for the delay (Appendix 10). The Council also sent Harry Notfield of Elections Canada to Guyana from Nov. 28 to Dec. 4 to help Chairman Collins design a plan to correct the list that would permit elections to occur in early 1992.

When the Guyanese Parliament reconvened, the Constitution was amended to extend the life of Parliament until a new Final Voters List was completed, but not to exceed Sept. 30, 1992. According to the amendment, President Hoyte was to dissolve Parliament within 30 days of receiving notice from the Elections Commission that the Final List was ready. Elections were then to be held within 30 days of the dissolution of Parliament. Opposition leaders criticized the amendment as granting much more time than was needed to correct the list.
List Correction and Electoral Legislation

From January to May 1992, the Elections Commission was engaged in the process of producing and verifying a new list compiled on the basis of the registration forms collected in the Spring 1991 registration and in the Fall 1991 Claims and Objections Period. The recency of data from these original forms was completed by the end of January, after which the Commission began a series of verification tests on the new list. Important technical and personnel assistance was provided by the UNDP, which supervised the actual day-to-day work involved in the creation of the new voters list.

An important test was passed in April when the results of the so-called "People Test" were released. Aimed at detecting whether names were incorrectly included on the list—which the opposition charged was the case due to the government's "padding" with names of deceased or non-existent persons—the People Test was conducted by selecting a random sample of 6,229 names drawn from the new list and then trying to locate the corresponding people in visits to the field. The test was designed and carried out from mid-February to early April by UNDP technicians and local Guyanese staff working under the direction of John Gargett, a consultant to the UNDP. According to Gargett, the "not found" rate was only 4.4 percent.

In spite of the positive results of the People Test, there remained a number of problems with the list, including a large number of names that had incorrect ID numbers or none whatsoever and a large number of names that were placed in incorrect electoral divisions. Both of these problems required several additional months to correct.

Throughout the spring, two other contentious issues threatened progress in the electoral process: the selection of election personnel and the issue of whether to allow local observers to monitor the election. The People's National Congress charged that raising these issues was a violation of the pledge made by opposition parties in April 1991, following the reorganization of the Elections Commission, that no further demands for electoral reforms would be pressed.

In April 1992, Parliament passed an amendment that made the chief election officer and the commissioner of National Registration subject to the direction and control of the Elections Commission chairman, and gave the chairman complete authority to appoint all other election day officials. The amendment was intended to remove any doubt about the authority of the Commission and Chairman Collins over the commissioner of National Registration as well as any other election personnel. Opposition leaders were opposed to the amendment, however, because its language deviated from that recommended by the Elections Commission, which gave authority to oversee the electoral process to the Commission as a whole, not solely to the chairman.

During March and April, even before legislation was passed granting such authority, the Elections Commission had already begun the process of selecting election personnel, including the ten registrars (one in charge of each of the country's electoral districts) and the 57 deputy registrars. These decisions had been made in the Elections Commission largely through a process of bargaining between the members representing the government and the opposition.
opposition, with Chairman Collins making the final decisions. Not surprisingly, this process led to extended delays and bitter public disagreements about certain decisions. The April amendment, while upsetting to the opposition because it gave Chairman Collins sole authority, ended up facilitating the process.

In May, as the list was nearly completed, a number of groups began to step up the call for local observers to be allowed to monitor the process. In addition, to the support voiced by local opposition political parties, the EAP, the Guyana Human Rights Association (GHRA), and the Guyana Council of Churches (GCC), a number of persons representing international groups also endorsed the idea of local observers, including William Kimberling, deputy director of the U.S. Federal Elections Commission, the delegation members from Caribbean Rights, and the Canadian-based International Center for Human Rights and Democratic Development, led by its president, Edward Broadbent. President Carter's long-standing support for local observers was reiterated in a press statement prior to the period for Claims and Objections in early June (Appendix 11). The Elections Commission eventually voted 4-3, with the support of Chairman Collins, in favor of local observers, after which Chairman Collins wrote to President Hoyte to request that the necessary legislation be introduced. Later, in July, President Hoyte announced that he would not support legislation to allow local observers.

On June 8, 1992, Chairman Collins announced that the new Preliminary List was finally completed and that another 28-day period for Claims and Objections would be allowed. In July, the corrections generated during Claims and Objections were processed and added to the list, and a date for completing the Final List was set for late July.

July 1992

Delegation Led by Senator Ryan Peralto

In anticipation of the announcement of a completed Final Voters List, the Council sent a delegation to Guyana on July 27-31 to assess the list and the state of logistical and procedural preparations for the forthcoming elections. The delegation was led by Senator Ryan G. Peralto of Jamaica serving as the representative of Council member former Jamaican Prime Minister Edward Seaga. During the visit, delegation members met with Chairman Collins and the Elections Commission, President Hoyte, Brig. Joe Singh of the Guyana Defence Force (GDF), and with representatives of the major opposition parties. In addition, the team met with a variety of civic and non-governmental organizations, including the leaders of the Anglican, Moslem, Hindu, and Catholic churches, the Private Sector Commission, the Electoral Assistance Bureau, and the Guyana Press Association.

The delegation found that the new Final Voters List had a high degree of accuracy, and that all parties had either explicitly accepted the list and/or had indicated that it was a vast improvement over the previous year's. In addition, delegation members concluded that significant progress had been made in completing the logistical preparations for the elections. Nonetheless, the delegation noted a number of important issues that remained unresolved, including the final selection of the number and location of polling places and the appointment and training of election day officials.

The delegation stressed that although much progress was achieved in creating the conditions for free and fair elections and in preparing for elections, there had not been a corresponding growth in public awareness. The delegation therefore urged all Guyanese, including the private sector and other non-governmental actors, to assist the Commission in its public information campaign. Making special note of the fact that all parties had expressed their commitment to having a peaceful campaign period and election day, the delegation also urged the Commission to use its good offices to introduce a new Electoral Peace Accord that all
parties could sign. The original Peace Accord, which committed the parties to conduct a campaign free from violence, racial incitement, and vandalism to property, was signed by Dr. Jagdeo and President Hoyte in early October 1991 (Appendix 12). Opposition parties other than the PPP had criticized the Accord as a bilateral agreement between Guyanese's two largest parties and refused to sign because they were not included in drafting the document.

Finally, in regard to the issue of local observers, the delegation noted the Council and President Carter's support for the Elections Commission's decision in favor of permitting local observers, but accused that the presence of party polling agents was much more important to ensuring a free election. Although the Council and others had encouraged the Guyanese to invite other observers, both local and international, President Hoyte made it clear that only two groups would be officially recognized with observer status, the Council/Carter Center delegation and a team from the Commonwealth. On Aug. 10, Chairman Collins informed President Hoyte that the Final Voters List was completed and contained 383,000 names located in ten regions of the country. On Aug. 29, President Hoyte dissolved Parliament and announced that elections would be held on Oct. 5.
III. Electoral Framework and Constitutional Structure

Guyana's constitution provides for national elections to be held every five years, under a system of proportional representation. Divided into ten administrative regions, Guyana simultaneously held national and regional elections on Oct. 5. In the national poll, voters chose among the 11 contesting parties to elect the president and 53 of the 65 members of the single chamber National Assembly or parliament. The remaining 12 members of parliament were selected through procedures intended to reflect local preference through the regional election. Voters were presented with a single ballot; the top portion listed the 11 parties contesting the national elections; the bottom portion of the ballot listed those parties contesting the "regional" seats to parliament (Appendix 13).

Guyanese who had reached the age of 18 by the Qualifying Date of July 31, 1992, were eligible to vote as were Commonwealth citizens 18 or over who had resided in Guyana for one year prior to July 31.

The political parties that contested the elections were represented by lists identifying 53 to 65 candidates. Party lists were submitted to the chief election officer on Sept. 3, Nomination Day, and each list was headed by the party's presidential candidate. The presidential candidate whose party list receives the most votes is elected president. The 53 "national" seats in parliament are selected by an electoral quota, which represents the total number of votes divided by 53. The number of votes cast for any list of candidates is divided by the electoral quota to determine the number of parliamentary seats each party will fill.

The remaining 12 "regional" seats in the National Assembly are determined through a complex series of votes, which began with the elections on Oct. 5. The regional vote elected members to each of Guyana's ten Regional Democratic Councils. The number of seats in each Regional Democratic Council (RDC) is approximately proportional to its population and was contested by parties based on their perceived local support. Following the official declaration of the results of the regional vote by the chief election officer, each RDC met on Dec. 3 and elected from among its members one parliamentary representative to fill each of the ten "regional" seats in the National Assembly. Each RDC also elected two of its members to serve on the National Congress of Local Democratic Organs (NCLDO). On Dec. 10, the NCLDO met and elected two of its members to fill the two remaining seats in parliament.

Elections Commission

The Elections Commission was established by Article 161 of the Constitution and was empowered by other laws to "direct and control" the electoral process. Three of the seven members of the Commission were nominees of the previous government and three were from the former Patriotic Coalition for Democracy. The chairman was chosen by President Hoyte from a list of nominees provided by opposition parties. In October 1991, the government approved an agreement with the United Nations Development Program to provide the Commission with technical assistance in preparing for the elections. The aid package was requested by Chairman Collins and provided for technical personnel, including

1992 Elections Commission
Chairman: Rudy Collins
PNC nominee: Neville Bissessar
PNC nominee: Ken Sampson
Opposition nominee: Miles Fitzpatrick
Opposition nominee: Bud Mangal
Opposition nominee: Ralph Ramkarran
contracted consultants and United Nations Volunteers, computers, software, and funds to move the Commission into a three-story building to house all operations.

The third floor of the new Croal Street building housed the "Command Center" for computer preparation of the list and development of strategic logistical plans to actually conduct the elections. The establishment of the Command Center and the prominent role played by UNDP staff increased public confidence in the electoral process. The Canadian, British, and American missions in Georgetown provided financial or material support in setting up the Commission’s new headquarters.

The prominent role of the UNDP in list preparation, the postponement of the election scheduled for December, and the resignation of Ronald Jacobs all contributed to the creation of a new and hopeful elections environment in the new year.

In January 1992, Chairman Collins created a management team composed of John Gargett, the senior UNDP consultant; Jeff Fischer, International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) consultant for election commodities; Stanley Singh, acting registration commissioner following the exit of Ronald Jacobs, and a number of former government officers from the public service and Foreign Ministry. The chairman attempted to integrate the National Registration Center within the Commission and directed Stanley Singh to establish offices in the Croal Street headquarters of the Commission.

In an effort to build confidence in the integrity of the voters' registry, the specially recruited Guyanese and U.N. personnel which comprised the Command Center staff prepared a new computerized voters list using only "source documents" (the 1991 registration forms). The "People Test," intended to measure the accuracy of the new list, was completed by U.N. staff in the Elections Commission Command Center in late March and found an error rate of less than 3 percent. Although the methodology of the test was criticized by some opposition groups, an independent analysis of the list by the EAB also found a low rate of error in the new list.

In April, the Elections Commission chairman and President Hoyte engaged in a heated, public exchange relating to Chairman Collins' independence and legal authority to prepare the voters list. In a nationwide address, President Hoyte accused the chairman of yielding to pressure from opposition leader Cheddi Jagan in the selection of regional election officers and said that the Commission had taken actions without any legal mandate. In his public response, Collins defended the actions taken by the Commission and said the president was "badly advised" on the issues. He denied being influenced by Dr. Jagan. Chairman Collins had earlier described legislation giving powers to him rather than the full commission as "a slap in the face" to commissioners since it violated draft language agreed to between himself and the attorney general. President Hoyte responded that the partisan nature of Commission meetings slowed the election's progress.
During a full day of training and orientation at the Forte Crest Hotel on Oct. 3, Council observers examined election day procedures. Left to right: John Garget, UNDP consultant; Robert Pastor; President Carter; Rudy Collins, chairman of the Guyana Elections Commission.

and that the February bill was intended to expedite the process. The chairman's outspoken defense of himself and the Commission in the face of unprecedented public criticism by the president served, ironically, to increase confidence, among many, in Chairman Collins' intention to conduct a free and transparent election.

In September, Chairman Collins used his new authority to select presiding officers for the 966 polling places for the 1992 elections from names put together by the Electoral Assistance Bureau (including previous elections officials and persons nominated by private enterprise, churches, and private voluntary organisations) and defused some of the opposition's concerns regarding the electoral machinery. The increasing role of the EAB in preparations for the election was seen as further evidence of Chairman Collins' intention to conduct a fair election.

**Elections Machinery**

Through a series of legislative and administrative reforms, the Elections Commission was given supervisory authority over the National Registration Center including the commission for National Registration. The process of registration of voters is managed by the commissioner of registration and supported by district and deputy registrars at the regional level and divisional registrars. For purposes of the election, Guyana's ten administrative regions are treated as Electoral Districts. Each District is divided into a number of Polling Divisions each containing one or more Polling Places depending on population and logistics.

A returning officer is appointed to manage the electoral process for each district and as many deputy returning officers as are needed depending on population. Each polling place is manned by a presiding officer, an assistant presiding officer, a poll clerk, and a counting assistant. A polling agent from each party contesting the election is also permitted inside the polling place.

The most significant innovation in the electoral process in the 1992 election was the legislative provision that required the counting of ballots at the place of poll immediately upon the close of poll on election day. It placed into prominence the position of presiding officer whose responsibility was to adjudicate on the validity of each ballot, count the ballots cast, record the results and provide a certified written record (statement of poll) of that result among all the political parties then present, as well as transmit copies to the chief election officer and the returning officer for the electoral district.
In summary, the official institutions or persons manning the electoral process are:

1. The Elections Commission: supervises, controls, directs the entire electoral process; Chairman Rudy Collins exercised executive authority over all election officials.

2. Commissioner of Registration: Ronald Jacobs, succeeded by Stanley Singh, prepared and presented the official list of voters.

3. Chief Election Officer: Stanley Singh administered the election and reported the results.

4. Returning Officer: in charge of an electoral district; i.e. one of the 10 regions of Guyana.

5. Deputy Returning Officer: supervises part of an electoral district.

6. Election Clerk: assists returning officer or deputy in his duties.

7. Presiding Officer: supervises polling-day activities at each polling place, counts the votes at the end of the day and certifies the results.

8. Assistant Presiding Officer: assists at the polling place.


10. Counting Assistant: performs delegated functions of presiding officer during the vote count.

The protracted process of selecting officers to man polling places and insufficient preparation for the training of those officers resulted in inconsistent and sometimes contradictory instructions being issued to election day officials. Videos used for training were at variance on some points with either of the two different versions of the presiding officer’s manual; one edition having been distributed by the NRC and another by the Elections Commission. Differing instructions were also provided in training sessions, some being conducted by the NRC and others by the Elections Commission.

Political Parties and Candidates

Eleven parties contested the national elections on Oct. 5. Of the 11, only the People’s National Congress and People’s Progressive Party/Civic contested for local support in all ten regional elections.

Electoral Assistance Bureau

The Electoral Assistance Bureau, led by Chairman Makepeace Richmond and Project Director Clairmont Lye, played a critical role in providing a campaign of civic education of the electoral process and, as election day grew closer, worked closely with the Elections Commission in preparing for administering the election. Funded by the National Democratic Institute, the EAB operated a telephone “hot line” during voters list revision periods in 1991 and 1992 to help voters determine if their names were on the list and conducted media campaigns on registration and voting. The Bureau’s authoritative analysis of the flawed 1991 voters list and the findings of the Council’s October delegation were used by opposition parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Presidential Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People’s National Congress (PNC)</td>
<td>Desmond Hoyte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Progressive Party/Civic (PPP/Civic)</td>
<td>Cheddi Jagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working People’s Alliance (WPA)</td>
<td>Clive Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Labor Movement (DLM)</td>
<td>Paul Ternaese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Republican Party (URP)</td>
<td>Leslie Ramsammy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Republican Party (NRP)</td>
<td>Robert Gangadeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Democratic Front (NDF)</td>
<td>Joseph Bacchus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Democratic Movement (PDM)</td>
<td>Llewelyn John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United Force (TUF)</td>
<td>Manzoor Nadir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Guyanese International (UGI)</td>
<td>Lindley GeBorde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Workers’ Party (UWP)</td>
<td>Winston Payne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as a basis to call for postponing the election to correct the list.

The EAB conducted training sessions for party polling agents and agreed to coordinate election day reports from those agents. Following President Hoyte's announcement of the Oct. 5 date, the EAB was asked by the Elections Commission (to take on several key roles including: 1) coordinating the compilation of nominees to become election day officials, 2) conducting training sessions for volunteers held days before the election, and 3) printing and delivering notices of appointment to election officers in three of the ten electoral districts.

The Campaign

Guyanese law does not define an official campaign period. In mid-August 1992, the People's National Congress began a series of political advertisements on television and newspapers that contributed to speculation that President Hoyte might soon announce the election date. At a PNC rally following the party's annual Congress on Aug. 29, President Hoyte named Oct. 5 as the date for general elections and ended speculation by the opposition that he would delay elections until late in the year. The president's announcement effectively started the campaign period. With less than five weeks remaining until election day, opposition parties that had devoted most of their attention and resources to pressing for a free and fair election were pushed to organize a political campaign of advertising and public rallies. As the leaders of Guyana's two largest parties, President Hoyte and Dr. Jagan were well known to the public, but most parties had not yet released party manifestos or platforms, and the name recognition of many presidential candidates was not high.

As one of the safeguards to prevent fraud on election day, the Election Commission had earlier agreed that ballots for the 1992 vote would be printed outside Guyana. Following the president's naming of Oct. 5 as election day, the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) arranged for the ballots to be printed in Miami and provided staff to supervise the process and accompany delivery of the ballots to Guyana. Upon their arrival in Georgetown, two errors were discovered in the identification of parties contesting the national
On Sunday, Oct. 4, observers participated in a three-hour seminar with presidential candidates from the six most prominent political parties. Left to right: Paul Terrence (DLM), Clive Thomas (WPA), Robert Corbin representing President Hoyte (PNC), Robert Pastor, President Carter, Prime Minister Price (partially hidden), Cheddi Jagan (PPP/Civic), Manzoor Nadir (TUF), Leslie Ramsammy (URP).

Party campaigns were generally centered on the economy and leadership. The PNC presented Desmond Hoyte as having broken with Guyana’s past and of having directed a turnaround in Guyana’s economy by divestment of state-owned corporations, embrace of the free market, and restructuring of Guyana’s external debt. While acknowledging the theoretical correctness of the government’s economic path, the PPP/Civic campaigned on the need for accountability in government and for an end to 28 years of one-party rule. The party charged that the statistical improvement in the nation’s economy had not reached the pocketbook of the average Guyanese and that a Jagan government would include all citizens in a plan to increase development. The WPA presented itself as the only multiracial party in Guyana and the only one capable of ending the country’s history of politics based on race.

Voter education during the campaign was left to the EAB and paid advertisements by the political parties. The Elections Commission provided no coherent public campaign to inform voters of the electoral process or of the procedures that would be followed on election day.

The ruling party’s use of
state-owned media, including the daily Chronicle and the Guyana Broadcasting Corporation, to promote the PNC campaign was criticized by the opposition and independent observers as an abuse of public agencies. The Chronicle carried daily front page stories on the activities of President Hoyte and positive stories on the economy and provided less news coverage to opposition parties. The Chronicle, however, regularly accepted and printed paid advertisements by opposition parties. The other daily newspaper, Stabroek News, ran paid ads from all parties and claimed editorial independence. The WPA charged that news coverage in the Stabroek News was biased in favor of the PPP and made it difficult for smaller parties to get their message to the public. The weekly Catholic Standard provided independent editorial analysis of Guyanese politics by regularly attacking the policies of both major parties. The two private television stations carried paid advertisements from all parties without restrictions. A GBC radio talk show regularly featured a member of government promoting government policies and opposition parties claimed it was difficult for their views to be aired.

Aside from the state media’s bias in favor of the PNC, coverage of the electoral campaign was censored and generally vigorous. Newspapers were continuously available and there were no artificial restrictions on delivery and distribution of newspapers. All political parties were able to adequately deliver their message to the public depending on cash resources.

Voting by Disciplined Forces

Voting by members of the Guyana Defence Force, including the police and the military, took place on Monday, Sept. 28, one week before general elections on Oct. 5. Guyana law provides for separate voting for these service personnel in advance of the national poll so that their duties will not be interrupted on election day. Service personnel voted at 29 polling places across the country in or near police facilities or military barracks. Additionally, several aircraft transported “flying ballot boxes” to some of the more remote, interior Defence Force locations. The vote was conducted and supervised by civilian election officials and polling agents and Commonwealth and Council observers were allowed to witness the process inside the place of poll. After voting ended, ballot boxes were sealed and transported to the Elections Commission where they were added to the regional count returns on Oct. 5. Personnel unable to cast their ballot on Sept. 28 were allowed to vote in the general elections on Oct. 5.

The disciplined forces’ vote was the first test of the Elections Commission’s ability to administer the new electoral laws, procedures, and machinery. While the voting process on
Sept. 28 was generally satisfactory, organizational and procedural problems were experienced at several locations, the most serious occurring in Georgetown at the Pelico Sports Club, Eve Leary. With nearly 2,000 personnel assigned to vote at this location, long lines formed early in the day and voting continued until late in the night as understaffed polling officers grappled with new procedures and impatient voters.

Election-Eve Uncertainties

The day before transitional elections is always a time of high tension. All of the suspicions harbored over decades among the leaders of the various political parties comes to the surface. Reports of administrative foul-ups are interpreted as the tip-of-an-iceberg-like conspiracy to steal the election.

The same syndrome was evident in Guyana. Many normally sober people became convinced that the election was about to be stolen, even before it had occurred. Generally, in transitional elections, the opposition and its supporters are the ones who are most fearful, but in Guyana, the tension was especially high for additional reasons. The governing party had felt that it had lost control over the election machinery to the opposition. The problem was that the Elections Commission had gained some control over the conduct of the election, but most of the power remained in the hands of government bureaucrats, who were resentful of both the government and the Elections Commission for changing the rules of the game without consulting them. The result was confusion, excess of authority and high levels of administrative incompetence.

The nature and the magnitude of the crisis were only recognized the day after the election, but on the eve of the election, two serious problems emerged. The Elections Commission sorted out all of the polling sites too late. It printed the final list of locations only hours before the voting was scheduled to begin, and it did not have sufficient time or high-speed photocopiers to xerox copies of all the voters lists to be packed in ballot boxes and shipped to all the new sites.

A second issue emerged from the fear of opposition parties and the Electoral Assistance Bureau that some polling officers would be ordered by the governing party not to show up on election day. Since the polling officers were in control of the ballots and boxes, that would disenfranchise whole communities. In response to this fear, the Elections Commission and the Electoral Assistance Bureaus appealed for volunteers and trained more than 200 of them to function as a rapid deployment force on election day. As it turned out, only a few were needed to be used.

Dr. Pastor and President Carter met voters in Santa Rosa in Region 1. Jesuit Fr. George Vanierwood is at far right.
IV. Election Day Observation

Observer Training and Deployment

On September 15, the Chairman of the Commonwealth Observer Group, David Peterson, met with President Carter and Dr. Pastor in Atlanta. President Carter and Peterson, a former premier of Ontario, taped a joint statement that was broadcast in Georgetown encouraging Guyanese voters to go to the polls on Oct. 5. The two delegation leaders agreed to coordinate deployment of the two groups and to share results of the observation effort. The Commonwealth observation team, including 26 observers and support staff, arrived in Guyana the week before the election and deployed two-person teams to each region several days in advance of polling day.

While general communication and information sharing between the Commonwealth and the Council was generally good during the year prior to the election, the two groups were unable to efficiently coordinate the deployment of their observers. The result was that representatives of both missions showed up in small interior villages. The Commonwealth observers also decided not to assist in the Council’s Quick Count, and the two groups were not able to reach agreement on the use of a standard observer report form, although several members of the Commonwealth Group did fill out the Council’s forms, and the results were included in the Council’s final assessment. Despite the Commonwealth’s desire to keep its operations independent, Chairman Peterson participated in several joint press conferences, and several members of the Commonwealth did participate in the Council’s briefings.

Several weeks before election day, The Carter Center office in Georgetown established reserved telephone lines with the Electoral Assistance Bureau and with the Elections Commission and established an informal radio network with both the Commission and Canadian, British, and American diplomatic missions to facilitate communication and information sharing on election day.

The 63 international observers deployed by the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government represented 20 countries and included a delegation from the Canadian-based International Center for Human Rights and Democratic Development, led by Ed Broadbent, and Roberto Sciullo, representative of Organization of American States Secretary General Joao Baena Soares. An initia-
tive to include a consortium of Caribbean non-governmental organizations in the Council's delegation, including Caribbean Rights and the Caribbean Council of Churches, did not work because the group rejected a standard Carter Center procedure for review of names of observers to ensure that they were non-partisan and would be perceived as non-partisan.

On Saturday, Oct. 3, the observers attended a day-long program of orientation and training, chaired by Prime Minister Price and President Carter, at the Forte Crest Hotel that examined election day procedures and provided individual site location information (Appendix 14). On Sunday, observers participated in a three-hour seminar with presidential candidates from the six most prominent political parties that explored the Guyanese electoral process and specific election day procedures. Those observers assigned to remote coastal and interior locations departed the Forte Crest shortly after noon for deployment by car, boat, and charter aircraft (Appendix 15).

President Carter and Prime Minister Price were joined by Peterson at a press conference following the political seminar on Sunday (Appendix 16). President Carter said Council observers would conduct a Quick Count of selected polling stations to detect any variation in official election results.

During the afternoon of election eve, Sunday, Oct. 4, all observers throughout the country conducted familiarization visits to their assigned polling places and met with local election officials to review procedures for the following day. Depending on local conditions, observers were assigned from one to eight polling places that were to be visited at random on election day. Due to mountainous terrain isolating many of the Amerindian communities in Region 6, the observer posted to Kungaharu visited polling places by aircraft throughout election day. Because of greater population density and the closer proximity of polling stations along the coast, observers assigned along Guyana's coast from Charity on the Pomeroon River to Stabkun at the Corentyne River visited five to eight polling places. Later in the evening, observers assigned to operate radios conducted a network-wide radio check with mission headquarters in Georgetown. The country-wide radio network was the largest ever established by the Council and included very high frequency (VHF) radios along the coast and high frequency (HF) radios for communication with observers in the country's interior. Jesuit mission radios were used by observers at six locations and were included in the network.

On election day, observers arrived at one of their assigned polling places before 5:30 a.m. and witnessed the procedures for opening the polls. Ballots were to be opened at 6:00 a.m. and close at 6:00 p.m. Voters in line at 6:00 p.m. were to be allowed to cast their ballots. Having witnessed the opening of the polls at their first site, observers then randomly

Voters in Moruga, a mainly Amerindian community in Region 1, patiently waited to vote.
visited the other sites assigned to them and completed a report form at each site which would be used to gauge the effectiveness of election procedures nationally (Appendix II). At each site, observers were asked to identify themselves to the presiding officer and to evaluate the effectiveness of the process after interviews with elections officials, voters, and polling agents. Before the close of polls at 6:00 p.m., observers arrived at a designated polling place to observe the closing process and to witness the counting of ballots. The results of this count were used in the Council’s parallel or “Quick Count”.

**Voting Process**

Of the 386 polling places visited by Council observers on election day at 422 locations, 98 percent functioned peacefully and efficiently. Each polling place has a ballot box. Several polling places may be at the same location, e.g., a secondary school building. The meticulous attention to procedural details by election officials and polling agents of all political parties was a tribute to the seriousness and determination of Guyanese. Strict observance of the new and elaborate procedures for voting and counting of ballots may have inadvertently contributed to long lines at some locations and voter frustration.

Procedures for identifying voters were generally effective despite the large number of registered voters without identification cards. In 1991, JIFS had provided the National Registration Center with all necessary commodities for ID card distribution, including cameras, film, laminator, generators, and funding for mobile distribution teams. The NRCC effort at distribution was plagued by poor planning and the lack of direction and management from the Elections Commission. Taking procedures on election day were also generally satisfactory, although some voters reported that they successfully removed the ink with bleach immediately after resuming home from the polling place.

Voters and polling agents reported that most presiding officers were helpful and cooperative in carrying out their duties. The internal layout of polling places allowed voters to mark their ballots in private and to then cast them in the ballot box in full view of polling agents.

Heavy voter turnout and organizational and logistical problems contributed to problems at some polling places. The most significant problems included:

1. Some voters arrived at polling places and found their names correctly listed on either the preliminary or supplementary lists posted outside the

The day-long siege of the Elections Commission headquarters in Georgetown by a violent and angry crowd claiming they were not allowed to vote nearly caused Guyana’s elections to collapse.
Council observer George Foulkes, British Labor MP, was surrounded by people in front of the Elections Commission Building, claiming their right to vote.

A station only to be told that their names were not included on the combined, official voters list used by presiding officers. In some divisions with alphabetical splits (which divided voters alphabetically into two or more boxes at one or more polling locations) a complete divisional list was posted outside the polling place while presiding officers inside used alpha-split lists. Some copies of the final list were printed just hours before the polls were to open and were delivered to each polling place inside the ballot box. Although some presiding officers allowed persons to vote if their names appeared on either list, some were not permitted to vote. This problem affected both Indo-Guyanese and Afro-Guyanese, and the Council found no evidence of racial, ethnic, or party bias in the numbers of persons claiming not to have found their names on the official list. Still, the irregularity generated suspicion and instability in some communities.

2. Many voters were uncertain where to vote as changes were made in the official list of polling places as late as 48 hours before polls were due to open. Within some polling divisions, geographical splits (which designated more than one polling location within a division) and alphabetical splits were made during the week before the election. Although the "final" list of polling places was printed at 2:00 p.m. on Oct. 4, some alpha lists were changed on election day and new polling places added. The failure to produce a complete and accurate list of polling places sufficiently in advance of polling day detracted from efforts by the Electoral Assistance Bureau to notify voters of their polling place.

3. At some polling locations the alphabetical split, directing voters to two separate ballot boxes, was unbalanced resulting in hours of wait in a line to one box and a short, fast moving line to the other.

4. At some polling locations containing three or four ballot boxes, typically a two-story school, the number of voters assigned exceeded the capacity of the facility or personnel to efficiently process voters resulting in long waits and short tempers as the day wore on.

5. Selection and training of elections officials took place too...
close to election day to allow for thorough training. The unfamiliarity of some presiding officers with procedures and documentation contributed to delays in voting, counting, and reporting.

6. Communication between election officials in the field and the Command Center was difficult. An insufficient number of phone lines into the Center and poorly understood radio reporting protocol left some field officials without guidance or direction on how to handle problems as they arose.

7. Communication between the Elections Commission and the Guyana Broadcasting Corporation was inadequate. State radio broadcast unconfirmed reports of disturbances at polling places and contributed to the problems and confusion at some locations by reporting that unregistered voters were being allowed to vote at the Elections Commission in Georgetown.

Election Day Disturbances

While the Oct. 5 vote was generally conducted peacefully and according to procedures at the overwhelming majority of polling places throughout Guyana, violence, intimidation, and attempts to manipulate the process did occur. Council observers witnessed disturbances in Georgetown, Linden, and New Amsterdam.

The day-long siege of the Elections Commission head-quarters in Georgetown by a violent and angry crowd claiming disenfranchisement nearly caused Guyana's election to collapse. Following protracted stoning and attempts to storm the Croal Street building, Guyanese and U.N. elections officials evacuated the building taking computers and radio equipment. Violence and looting spread to Georgetown's business district resulting in at least two deaths and extensive damage. As the crowd in front of the Elections Commission grew to more than 1,500 by early afternoon, observers witnessed the arrival of a succession of minibuses which discharged passengers who immediately joined the crowd.

In mid-afternoon, Chairman Collins permitted the crowd to vote at the Commission headquarters in an attempt to defuse the situation. Although these votes were not counted, elections officials later determined that only 21 percent of those persons who voted at the Elections Commission were registered voters. After returning from a visit to interior polling locations, President Carter joined Chairman Collins, who had courageously refused to abandon the building, and succeeded in convincing President Hoyte and Police Commissioner Lewis that defense of the Elections Commission headquarters was imperative in order to save the election. After nearly nine hours, the assault on the Commission building ended when the crowd was dispersed by the arrival of armed police in force who established a cordon around the block. Guyanese and U.N. members of the Command Center returned to

After returning to Georgetown from visits to polling places in Region 1, President Carter and Dr. Pastor were briefed by Council/Carter Center deputy mission coordinator Rayman Mohammed on the siege of the Elections Commission building. Assistant coordinator and radio officer Pablo Henderson is at far left.
the Grosvenor Square offices with
computers and radios and
reestablished operations.
In Linden, six polling
stations, including the Elections
Commission’s regional office,
were overwhelmed by angry
crowds claiming they had
registered but could not find
their names on the list. Several
of these polling places were
stormed and elections officials
were intimidated and assaulted,
furniture overturned and de-
stroyed and, in some cases,
banner boxes removed. Due to
the violence and intimidation,
two Council observers assigned
to Linden returned to
Georgetown early on election
night. In New Amsterdam, a
crowd occupied a polling place
claiming they were eligible to
vote but were pacified when
officials allowed those not on
the official list to cast their
ballots in a “special container.”

Counting Procedure
Under the electoral reforms
of 1990, the counting of ballots
by the presiding officer at the
polling place occurs immediately
after the close of poll at 6:00
p.m. and is witnessed by party
agents. In this “Preliminary
Count,” the presiding officer
is responsible for accounting for all
ballots and certifying the results
in “The Statement of Poll.” If
unchallenged by noon the next
day, this Preliminary Count
stands as the official result of
that polling place. Copies of
the Statement are made avail-
able to each party polling agent,
any candidate present, and the
district returning officer and
chief election officer. The
Statement of Poll and key to the
ballot box for each polling place
are placed in an envelope and
given to the returning officer
along with the ballot box.
A “Final Count” is con-
ducted by the district returning
officer only if specific divisional
results are contested by a party
counting agent. Otherwise, the
statements of poll for all divi-
sions within the district are
totaled by the returning officer
and reported to the chief elec-
tion officer. Each statement is
sealed inside the appropriate
ballot box and transported to
the Elections Commission.

Quick Count
The Council of Freely
Elected Heads of Government
delegation to Guyana’s elections
conducted an independent
“Quick Count” or parallel count
of national voting results on
Oct. 5. A Quick Count is used
to deter attempts to manipulate
voting results and to detect
fraud in the process if it occurs.
The Court has also proven to
be effective in increasing public
confidence in the official elec-
tion results.

Using a statistical sample of
approximately 7 percent of all
polling places, Council observ-
ors were assigned to collect final
results as soon as the vote count
was completed at specified
determined polling locations
across the country. Using a
Quick Count Report Form
(Appendix 18) observers then
reported the results by radio or
in person to the delegation’s
headquarters in Georgetown.
With a margin of error of 3
percent, the Council’s Quick
Count determined before 1:00
a.m., or seven hours after polls
The people of Guyana did not despair; they continued to vote and to participate in the conduct of the election, including the count, despite rumors and threats of violence.

had closed, that the PPP/Civic had won the national election by a wide margin. The Quick Count projected that the PPP/Civic would receive 54.8 percent of the vote and the PNC 40.6 percent for a 14 percent point spread. Official results later indicated that PPP/Civic had won 53.5 percent and the PNC, 42.3 percent, for an 11 percentage point difference.

On Tuesday morning, Oct. 6, President Carter visited President Hoyte and opposition leader Dr. Jagan and gave them the results of the Quick Count. President Hoyte acknowledged the figures but was unwilling to concede the election until after reviewing the official national returns and tabulations of his own party. Dr. Jagan agreed to calm his supporters and wait for the results to be published by the Elections Commission.

Election Results

Results from the "Preliminary Count" were supposed to be reported to the Elections Commission Command Center on election night by hand delivery, telephone, and an elaborate radio network using secure authorization codes. But by 1:00 a.m., the time that the Council/Carter Center's Quick Count was completed from 69 polling places systematically selected from throughout the country, the Elections Commission had received less than 1 percent of the vote from 12 sites (1.2 percent of all polling places). By 5:00 a.m., the Elections Commission had received 19,293 votes or roughly 3 percent of the eligible votes from 61 or 6.1 percent of all polling places. The release of preliminary results was discontinued soon after this.

The problem was that many election officials in the field had not been trained or told to send their results into the Elections Commission right away. Some of them did that; most sent them to returning officers in each region, and many of these officers kept the individual results until they had received and validated all of them for their region. This was the problem in Region 4 (Georgetown). The returning officer was located a few miles from the Elections Commission, and yet the chairman of the Commission was unable to secure the results from this official for a couple of days.

During the two days following the election, official returns from Guyana’s ten electoral districts slowly arrived at the Commission. Delays were experienced from many polling
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places in Georgetown in Region 4 as well from the more inaccessible interior locations. The delays, some from traditional PNC strongholds of support, created the suspicion that the vote results from these areas were being "fixed" in favor of the ruling party.

On Tuesday, Oct. 6, President Carter and Prime Minister Price held a press conference at the Forte Crest Hotel (Appendix 20). President Carter said that Council observers had been impressed with the care and precision exercised by elections officials during voting and counting of ballots. The former president acknowledged that while delays in returns from some regions including Georgetown was a source of frustration, the Council had seen no evidence that the integrity of reporting the local count to the Elections Commission had been compromised. He said that violence on election day had been "localized" in front of the Elections Commission building with subsequent looting in Georgetown's business district. President Carter announced that he had shared the Council's Quick Count results with President Hoyte and Dr. Jagan earlier that day and that both had agreed to hold the information in confidence.

President Carter asked Dr. Jagan and President Hoyte on Oct 7, to name senior representatives to begin plans for an orderly transition. Ambassador Cedric Grant, Hoyte's special advisor to the president, and Roger Luncheon, a PPP/Civic executive committee member, met with President Carter and Dr. Pastor prior to the president's departure from Guyana in the afternoon and agreed to work together to ensure the continuity of government. Shortly after noon on
Wednesday, President Carter held a final press conference and announced that the Council had found that Guyana’s elections were conducted freely and fairly and that President Hoyte and Dr. Jagen had named representatives to begin transition planning (Appendix 20).

On Wednesday afternoon, Oct. 7, Elections Commission Chairman Royly Collins announced that with 95 percent of the ballots counted, the PPP/Civic had won the presidency with 54 percent of the vote. Chairman Collins said the remaining ballots could not affect the PPP/Civic win. Based on this announcement by the chairman, and President Hoyte’s acceptance of defeat (Appendix 21), plans were made to have the new president sworn in two days later.

In a report to the chairman of the Elections Commission dated Oct. 7, Chief Election Officer Stanley Singh reported the number of votes cast for each list of candidates in the national and regional elections. Of 312,368 ballots counted, Singh reported the PPP/Civic had received 163,079 votes giving it 28 seats in Parliament and the PNC 136,403 votes and 23 seats. The other nine contestants, including the WPA and TUF which had each won a seat in Parliament, had together received less than 5 percent in the national elections. The chief election officer used the electoral quota to allocate the number of seats each party had won in the National Assembly.

In the regional elections, the chief election officer reported that both the PNC and PPP/Civic had each gained control of four Regional Democratic Councils. Both the WPA and TUF gained sufficient seats on regional councils in regions eight and nine, respectively, to allow them a dominating role in determining three more seats. Both parties later announced that they would support the PPP/Civic candidates in elections within regional councils and later, in the National Congress of Local Democratic Organ.

On Nov. 24, Chairman Collins issued the “General Elections Declaration of Results.” Published in the govern-

---

**Jimmy Carter helped curb possible violence while monitoring an election in Guyana.** An aide to the former president says Carter went to the Elections Commission when an angry crowd formed during the vote count. He insisted on police protection there. **The State Department confirms that Carter played a valuable role.**

Wall Street Journal
Oct. 16, 1992
ment Gazette, the official Declaration reported 303,186 "valid votes cast" in the national election, or 9,182 less than reported by the chief elections officer on Oct. 7. Stanley Singh attributed the differences to clerical and calculating errors. The PPP/Civic was recorded as receiving 1,021 fewer votes than the October results and the PNC with 8,117 fewer votes. The adjustment in total votes for each party did not affect the allocation of seats to Parliament but did help to allay fears that the final results would show a rigged increase for the PNC.

On Dec. 7, each of the ten Regional Democratic Councils met to elect one member from each Council as its representative to the National Assembly. (Members of the RDCs were elected in the regional elections on Oct. 5.) In a procedural blunder, the PPP/Civic gained an unexpected seat in parliament when the PNC chairperson at the Region 1 RDC election did not cast a tie-breaking vote. As a result of the RDC elections, the PPP/Civic won six seats in parliament, the PNC three, and the WPA one seat. On Dec. 12, the National Congress of Local Democratic Organizations, composed of representatives from the ten RDCs, met and selected its two members for parliament, both going to the PPP/Civic. The new National Assembly convened on Dec. 17, with the new government commanding a large majority of the votes (Appendix 22).
V. Inauguration and Transition

Guyana law provides for the president to be sworn in by the chancellor or chief justice following the official declaration of election results by the chairman of the Elections Commission. In a short and simple ceremony witnessed by former President Desmond Hoyte, former Prime Minister Hamilton Green, Commissioner of Police Laurie Lewis, and Defence Force Chief of Staff Joe Singh, Cheddi Jagan was sworn in as Guyana’s third executive president on Friday, Oct. 9, just four days after the election. The modest inauguration was held in State House on Main Street and was attended by the Georgetown diplomatic corps and Trinidad and Tobago Prime Minister Patrick Manning. The heads of both the police and army pledged to support the Constitution and the new government. On the following day, Dr. Jagan’s running mate on the PPP/Civic slate, mining engineer Sam Hinds, was sworn in as prime minister.

During the following week, the economic and social life of Georgetown returned to normal as it became apparent that the military, police, and government workers would support the new government. Despite a protracted and public political exchange in which the new government accused departing officials of “booting” state property and the outgoing administration charged its members were “victimized” by new officials, civil servants including the linchpins of government operations, ministry permanent secretaries, remained on the job and government services were uninterrupted.

In his first visit out of Guyana since taking office, Cheddi Jagan addressed the annual summit meeting of Caribbean Community (CARICOM) heads of government in late October in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad. As the first East Indian to be elected leader of a CARICOM member state, President Jagan was warmly received by an organization that had been criticized in the past by Guyanese opposition groups for its reluctance to pressure Guyana into democratic reforms.

In an effort to honor a campaign pledge of transparency and accountability in government, the new administration held public discussions in November on Guyana’s debt with visiting teams from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. New Finance Minister Asgar Ally moved quickly to reassure local and international investors of his government’s commitment to a free market economy and to a continuation of economic reforms begun under President Hoyte.

In the months following the general election, a struggle for the control and direction of the defeated PNC became public as former Prime Minister Hamilton Green was dropped from his party’s list and there-
fore was denied a seat in the new National Assembly. Green resigned his post as deputy leader of the party but denied speculation that he would lead his supporters in a break with the PNC to form a new party. The former minister was the longest serving PNC member of parliament and had been regarded as resistant to President Hoyte’s political and electoral reforms.

In December, President Jagan and new Finance Minister Anagar Ally attended the annual Miami Conference on the Caribbean and on Dec. 4-5, the two joined Guyana Private Sector Commission Chairman Yen Persaud in representing Guyana at the Global Development Conference held at The Carter Center in Atlanta. The conference, co-chaired by former President Carter and U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, was held to consider new initiatives for international assistance to developing countries, like Guyana, undergoing a transition to democracy. Guyana’s was the only delegation at the conference led by its head of government. President Jagan met privately with President Carter and expressed an interest in a continuing Carter Center role in his country’s development. The conference was attended by representatives of international lending institutions, the heads of development agencies including UNICEF and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), non-governmental organizations, and Brian Atwood, President-elect Bill Clinton’s transition director for the U.S. Department of State. At the conclusion of the conference, participants agreed to convene a development assistance Round Table in 1993 with working groups for Ethiopia and Guyana.

In January, laws expired that had expanded the Elections Commission membership and gave executive authority to the chairman. With the expiration of these laws, the Commission reverted to its previous three member composition and the

---

"I have monitored elections in El Salvador and Namibia, but never have I witnessed such a high quality of preparation and such skillful use of observers. You got the best out of each one of us. It was a model of masterful management."

- Angier Biddle Duke
President, Council of American Ambassadors
in a letter to Dr. Pastor
ambigious relationship which existed with the National Registration Center and the Minister of Home Affairs. President Jagan has said that the elections machinery will be reorganized to consolidate responsibility and authority for all electoral matters in the Elections Commission. To build carefully on the democratic success of 1992, proposals for electoral reform should include national consultation and the participation of opposition political parties and civic groups. The desire to hold local elections, and thereby complete the first round of government elections at all levels in Guyana, should be used as an impetus to address the issues of legit and administrative reform.

In February, President Carter sends a three-person team from The Carter Center to Guyana to explore whether the expertise and experience of the Center might contribute to the country’s development and consolidation of democracy. The team was composed of representatives from three programs within the Center and included Jamal Benomar, director of the Human Rights Program; Bekki Johnson, assistant director of operations of Global 2000, the development assistance arm of The Carter Center; and Dennis King, Guyana mission coordinator for the Latin American and Caribbean Program.

During its 17-day visit, the team met with a cross-section of Guyanese society and learned firsthand of Guyanese needs in the areas of the environment, health, human rights, and electoral reform. Upon its return to Atlanta, the team reported to President Carter through the Center’s Guyana Task Force, established to coordinate policy toward the country.

As a result of the elections on Oct. 5, Guyana now has the opportunity to eliminate the racial polarization that has dominated its society since independence and to create an environment that will allow all Guyanese to participate in the country’s development. The success of Guyana’s elections is the first step in its transition to a truly democratic culture. The consolidation of accountable governance in a vibrant, plural democracy will be determined by the willingness of Guyanese to forgo old stereotypes of ethnicity and race and by the willingness of the international community to continue to provide special assistance in the difficult passage to political and economic modernization.
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List of Council Delegations to Guyana


- President Jimmy Carter, Chairman of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government
- Mrs. Rosalynn Carter
- Hon. Benjamin Clare, Minister of State in the Jamaican Ministry of Foreign Affairs and representative of Council member Prime Minister Michael Manley
- Dr. Robert Pastor, Executive Secretary of the Council and Professor of Political Science at Emory University


- Hon. George Price, Prime Minister of Belize and Vice Chairman of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government
- Dr. Robert Pastor, Executive Secretary of the Council and Professor of Political Science at Emory University
- Mr. Dennis Smith, Chief Electoral Officer, Barbados, and representative of Council member Hon. Erskine Sandiford, Prime Minister of Barbados
- Dr. Jennie Lincoln, Associate Director, Latin American and Caribbean Program, The Carter Center
- Dr. Jennifer McCoy, Senior Research Associate, The Carter Center, and Assistant Professor, Georgia State University
- Mr. Glenn Cowan, an elections expert based in Washington D.C.
- Mr. Keith Frederick, elections expert with Frederick and Schneider
- Mr. John Taylor, Visiting Fellow, The Carter Center
- Mr. Dennis King, Coordinator for the Council's Guyana Elections Project

III. Council Delegation to Guyana, October 20-26, 1991

- Hon. Rodrigo Carazo Odio, former President of Costa Rica and member of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government
- Hon. Benjamin Clare, Minister of State in the Jamaican Ministry of Foreign Affairs and representative of Council member Prime Minister Michael Manley
- Dr. Robert Pastor, Executive Secretary of the Council and Professor of Political Science at Emory University
- Prof. Gladstone Mills, Chairman of the Electoral Advisory Committee of Jamaica and Professor Emeritus at the University of the West Indies
- Mr. Harry Neufeld, Director of Information Technology, Elections Canada, computer expert in electoral administration
- Mr. David Carroll, Assistant Director, Latin American and Caribbean Program, The Carter Center
- Mr. Dennis King, Mission Coordinator of Guyana Office of the Council and The Carter Center


- Senator Ryan G. Prasho, General Secretary of the Jamaican Labour Party, and representative of Council member former Prime Minister Edward Seaga of Jamaica
- Mr. Dennis Smith, Acting Permanent Secretary of the Ministry for Community Development and Culture in Barbados and formerly the Chief Electoral Officer, representing Prime Minister Erskine Sandiford of Barbados.
- Mr. Guillermo Echeverria, delegate to the Costa Rican Electoral Tribunal and a representative of former Costa Rican President and Council member Odec Arias
- Mr. Glenn Cowan, an elections expert based in Washington, D.C.
- Mr. David Carroll, Assistant Director of the Latin American and Caribbean Program of the Carter Center of Emory University
- Mr. Dennis King, Mission Coordinator of Guyana Office of the Council and The Carter Center
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EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF GUYANA

2300 MASSACHUSETTS AVE. N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

FAX NO. (202)-232-1297

(202)-265-6910

September 27, 1990.

The Honourable Jimmy Carter,
President,
The Council of Freely-Elected Heads of Government,
The Carter Center, Emory University,
1 Copenhill,
Atlanta, Ga. 30307,

Honourable Jimmy Carter,

I have been instructed by His Excellency, Hugh Desmond Hoyte, S.C., the President of the Republic of Guyana to extend on his behalf an invitation to you to send a delegation under the auspices of the Council of Freely-Elected Heads of Government to observe the forthcoming general elections in Guyana. These elections are constitutionally due by the 31st March, 1991 and as is common in so many Commonwealth countries, the actual date is chosen by the Government.

In issuing his invitation to you, the President has exercised the authority which the General Elections (Observers) Act 1990 has vested in him.

The President has asked me to let you know that he has likewise invited His Excellency, Chief Emeka Anyaoku, the Secretary-General, Commonwealth Secretariat to assemble a similar delegation from the Commonwealth countries and that his request has been accepted.

President Hoyte has also authorised me to initiate and conduct discussions on this issue with the Council.

With the assurances of my highest consideration,

Sincerely,


[Signature]
Ambassador
Dear President Carter,

Following my formal invitation to you and a follow-up visit to the Carter Center for an observer mission to monitor the electoral processes in Guyana, I undertook the additional step for a joint invitation from political parties, civic organisations and religious associations in view of the insurmountable government on the issue. Simultaneously, a Joint Declaration on Foreign Observers, Preliminary Vote-Count and Non-Involvement of the Military in the Electoral Processes was published as a paid advertisement in a major non-government newspaper, a copy of which is enclosed.

I am heartened that while the joint invitation to you was being circulated for signatures, President Hoyte informed me about his agreement to invite the Carter Center to send an observer mission for the forthcoming elections. This is a partial victory which I welcome. It is a signal that the administration could buckle under pressure from within and without to restore democratic government after 26 years of authoritarian rule.

But the struggle, Your Excellency, is far from over. The magnitude of past electoral fraud would require at least two monitors for every polling station to mitigate against repetition of crooked elections in Guyana. So we will press on for official status for monitors from the United Nations, the Organisation of American States, the European Parliament, the UK Parliamentary Human Rights Group, and Our major demands for reconstitution of the Elections Commission, replacement of the present Chairman, fresh enumeration of voters, and a preliminary count of ballots at the place of poll, remain.

To indicate our pleasure in welcoming you to Guyana, I am sending you the text of the joint invitation as circulated and was in the process of being signed by various organisations at the time announcement of President Hoyte's agreement was made.

I hope that you will be able to make an early visit to Guyana as preparations are already underway to rig the forthcoming election. Such a visit long before election day will help to familiarise you with the electoral laws, regulations and machinery, and to get the views of a wide cross-section of the Guyanese community.

With kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Cheddi Jagan,
Minority Leader.
President Jimmy Carter,  
Chairman,  
Council of Freely-Elected Heads of Government,  
The Carter Center at Emory University,  
Atlanta, Georgia 30322.  

Dear Mr. President:  

We have the honor of writing to you in our capacity as representatives of Guyana's political parties, civic associations and religious organizations.  

As you know, the Guyanese people will vote for their President, Prime Minister and representatives to the National Assembly and Regional Councils in elections likely in December, 1990, and not later than March, 1991. The organizations that we represent have pledged to ensure that these elections will be free, fair and democratic.  

We would like to take this opportunity to invite you, as Chairman of the Council of Freely-Elected Heads of Government, to serve as an invited Observer of the electoral process in Guyana. We would encourage you and your esteemed colleagues to visit our country several times to observe all aspects of the electoral process. Each of our organizations would be pleased to offer any assistance that you might require in this regard.  

We hope that you will accept this invitation and that we will have the pleasure of welcoming you to Guyana.  

Please accept these gestures of our regards.  

Sincerely,  

Cheddi Jagan  
People's Progressive Party  

East Kwakwani,  
Working People's Alliance  

Paul Temessue,  
Democratic Labour Movement  

Sara Kings,  
Guyana United Action for Reform and Democracy  

Mike MecCorQuay  
Guyana Human Rights Assn.  

Dr. Reego Daman, Persaud,  
Guyana Hindu Dharmic Sabha  

Rev. Randolph George,  
Anglican Bishop of Guyana  

Leslie Hallamarry  
United Republican Party  

William Payne,  
United Workers Party  

Joseph Ebatah  
National Democratic Front  

Benson Todd,  
Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Guyana  

Budhram Mahadeo  
Guyana Rice Producers Assn.  

Mahdi Fynfie Feroze,  
Guyana Council of Islamic Org.  

Rev. Benedict Singh,  
Catholic Bishop of Guyana  

Georgetown, Guyana,  
September 20, 1990.
October 1, 1990

Hon. Cedric H. Grant
Ambassador of the Republic of Guyana
2490 Tracy Place N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

Dear Mr. Ambassador:

I very much appreciated and enjoyed the time spent with you last week. I also wish to thank you for the invitation to former President Jimmy Carter as Chairman of the Council of Freely-Elected Heads of Government to observe Guyana's elections.

I have read the information that you gave to me with great interest. During our conversation, you asked if I would state again the questions that we have about Guyana's electoral process, but first, let me repeat that these questions are posed in the interest of learning your government's views. Our minds are open as to the fairness of Guyana's electoral process, and we are in the process of seeking information. With that in mind, let me repeat the questions:

1. **Counting and Poll-Watching.** What is the current procedure for counting the ballots and permitting all of the participating political parties to observe both the election and the counting? Would it be possible to permit the ballots to be counted at each local site in the presence of all the poll-watchers and, when possible, accredited international observers? Would it be possible for these people to accompany the electoral officials, the tally sheets, and the ballot box to the district and national vote counting centers? Would such a procedural change require an administrative or a statutory decision?

2. **Registration.** Is a new registration list contemplated for this election? Will there be adequate time for such a list to be prepared and for all parties to review the list to ensure that it is fair and comprehensive?

3. **Electoral Commission.** How are the members of the Electoral Commission chosen? Is it possible to consider reconvening the
Commission to assure that it is perceived as impartial by the widest groups of people?

4. Military. If there are no security problems, is it possible that the military could be stationed in their barracks during the election?

As I was led to believe that the elections could be called within the next two or three months, it would be very useful to have answers, however tentative and preliminary they might be, to these questions as soon as possible. Please call if I can elaborate on any of these questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Robert Pastor
Director
Latin American and Caribbean Program
11th October, 1990.

Dr. Robert Pastor
Director
Latin American and Caribbean program
The Carter Center of Emory University
1 Copnhill
Atlanta, Georgia 30307.

Dear Dr. Pastor,

I am pleased to enclose a Note and accompanying documents which provide the answers to the questions which you posed during our meeting on September 27, and subsequently repeated in your letter of October 1, 1990.

I hope that the answers would provide you with sufficient background information to enable you to finalize your preparation of President Jimmy Carter’s visit to Guyana.

I would appreciate an early confirmation of this letter as I would like to know that you received it today.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Handwritten: Ambassador]
LIST OF DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED

2. Representation of the People Act, Chapter 1:03 (Laws of Guyana).
3. National Registration Act, Chapter 19:00.
5. Text of Broadcast to the Nation by Minister of Home Affairs on July 13, 1973, on Opposition Leader's incitement to violence which in fact broke out just three days later on Election Day.
6. Directions from the Elections Commission on the right of the representatives of political parties to accompany ballot boxes from polling place to central place of count: Dated 2nd November, 1985, in respect of the Elections held on 9th December, 1985.
8. Extract from Report on 1953 General Elections by Registration Officer, Mr R.R. Harewood.
Note for The Carter Center
The Electoral Process in Guyana: Specific Issues

A ELECTIONS COMMISSION
(1) Constitutional Basis:
The Constitution of Guyana prescribes that elections "shall be independently supervised by the Elections Commission." (Article 62).

(2) Composition:
The composition of the Commission is regulated by the Constitution. Every political party which gains not less than five seats in the elections in the National Assembly is entitled to have one representative on the Commission. (Article 161).

(3) The Chairman:
The Chairman of the Commission is appointed by the President "from among persons who hold or have held office as a judge of a court having unlimited jurisdiction in civil and criminal matters in some part of the Commonwealth or a court having jurisdiction in appeals from any such court or who are qualified to be appointed as any such judge." (Article 161).

(4) Current Composition:
At the last elections (December 9, 1985), only the People's National Congress and the People's Progressive Party qualified to have a member on the Commission by gaining at least five seats in the National Assembly. The Commission, therefore, comprises one representative of the PNC, Mr. Neville Bosumbur; one representative of the PPP, Mr. Clement Rohrer; and the chairman, Sir Harold Smith. As Chief Justice of Guyana, Sir C.H., a distinguished jurist and retired Chief Justice of Guyana. (5) Functions:
Under the Constitution, the Commission
a) "shall exercise general direction and supervision over the registration of electors and administrative conduct of all elections of members to the National Assembly;" and

b) "shall issue such instructions and take such action as appear to it necessary or expedient to ensure impartiality, fairness, and compliance with the provisions of this Constitution or any Act of Parliament as part of persons exercising powers or performing duties connected with or relating to the matters aforesaid." (Article 162).

(6) Recent Extension of Commission's Responsibility:
Originally, it was not intended that the Elections Commission should have executive functions. Its task was to ensure that officials who had statutory duties in relation to electoral matters performed their duties in accordance with the law. The responsibility for issuing orders and notices in connection with these matters rested with the Minister of Home Affairs. The acts which the Minister had to perform were all strictly prescribed by statute and could not in any way influence the course of the elections.

However, the opposition complained stridently about the fact that a Minister was charged with responsibility for performing those formal acts. As a result, the Elections Law (Amendment) Act, 1990, transferred to the Elections Commission all the statutory duties in relation to elections which were formerly exercised by the Minister of Home Affairs.

At the forthcoming elections, it will be the first time that the Commission will become involved in carrying out executive functions such as itself preparing the list of electors, promulgating the necessary statutory orders, instructions, etc.

B. POLL WATCHING
(1) Polling Agents:
a) Every political party contesting the elections has the right by law to appoint a polling agent for each polling place. The polling agent is entitled to be present from the opening to the close of polling to observe the proceedings within the polling place. He has a right to inspect the ballot boxes at the commencement of the poll to satisfy himself that they are empty. Representation of the People Act: Chapter 1:03, Section 24(1)(e).

b) At the end of the poll, the polling agent has the right to see that the ballot box is properly sealed and to affix his own seal and signature. He also has the right to accompany the ballot box from the place of poll to the central count within the region. (See copy of directive dated November 2, 1985, issued by the Chairman of the Election Commission, with respect to the last elections which were held on December 9, 1985).

(2) In addition, every political party contesting the election has the right to appoint a candidate for each polling district. The duly appointed candidate has the right by law to visit polling places within his district at any time during the day Representation of the People Act: Section 79(1)(h).

C. COUNTING OF VOTES
(1) Guyana is divided into ten administrative regions where for the purposes of elections, are deemed to be electoral districts. Votes are counted at a central place of count in each of these districts. It is to be noted that such a provision is not peculiar to Guyana in this region. For example, votes are counted at central places of count in other CARICOM states such as Barbados, St. Kitts and Nevis, and Belize.

(2) At the close of the poll, the ballot boxes are sealed and transported to the central place of count for the actual counting of the votes.

(3) Polling agents are entitled to accompany the ballot boxes from the polling places to the central places of count to ensure the integrity of the boxes.
(1) Each political party is entitled to have the following persons observe the opening of the ballot boxes and the counting of the votes:
(1) A duly appointed candidate.
(2) A duly appointed counting agent.

In addition, the Returning Officer has a discretion to allow any persons to attend and observe the counting. The representative of every party list and the party election agent have traditionally been granted the right to be present.

D. REASONS FOR CENTRAL COUNTING OF VOTES
(1) Logistical:
(a) Guyana has never had a system of preliminary count at each polling place. Even in colonial times, this was found to be impractical, and the votes were counted at central place in each constituency.
See (1) Extract from the Report on the 1953 General Elections compiled by the Registration Officer, Mr. H.R. Horswood: Paragraph 54; and (2) Paper entitled Electoral Systems in Guyana.)
(b) The terrain of Guyana is such that many polling places are accessible only by boat, horseback, or river raft. In other cases, because of the residential patterns in hinterland areas, voters have to walk many miles to reach their polling places. These places have no electricity.
At the end of the poll, therefore, night is usually about to set in. Unless the boxes are moved, they will have to be opened at the polling places. This is clearly undesirable, since the safety of the ballot boxes cannot be guaranteed in those circumstances.
(c) Our general elections is of a threefold nature. Citizens vote for:
1. The President.
2. Members of the National Assembly.
3. Members of the Regional Democratic Councils for the ten regions.
The preliminary count, therefore, would have to determine the votes cast for each of these categories. The magnitude and complexity of such a task and the consequential problems are not difficult to understand.

(2) Safeguarding the constitutional right of freedom of conscience:
(a) Because of the ethnic and cultural make-up of our society, there is a great potential for citizens in small communities—and most of our communities are small—to be coerced by others who might constitute a majority. Thus, at times of elections there is a real danger that, to avoid victimization, persons might feel constrained to vote contrary to their conscience.
(b) The fear of victimization is not speculation; it is a fact that we have repeatedly experienced, particularly in the field of industrial relations in the sugar estates. Trade union enforcers, who also happen to be political enforcers, have been known to cow workers into striking or remaining on strike against their will. At elections, if the preliminary count at a polling place turned up some votes which these enforcers deemed to be "aberrant," they would have a pretty good idea as to who might have cast those votes.
It was for good reason that the British in colonial times did not allow count at the polling places, even under the first-past-the-post system.
(c) Notwithstanding the system in place to ensure real secrecy of the vote in the peculiar circumstances of our country, some persons have still been victimized, assaulted, and harassed in other ways on a rumor or suspicion that they had voted "wrong."
It is for these reasons that the procedure of proxy and postal votes had been introduced. However, in deference to opposition representations, the postal votes have not been abolished and the proxy votes severely restricted.

E. PREPARATION OF THE VOTERS' LIST
(1) The National Registration Act of 1967, Chapter 19:08, requires that a National Register of all citizens 14 years of age and over be established and maintained.
(2) Whenever there are to be elections, the Preliminary Voters' List is extracted from the National Register. The first Register was compiled in 1965. It was formally revised in 1971, 1973, and 1975. In 1979 and 1985, new registers were compiled. In January 1990, the Register was revised.
(3) The law requires that the Register be revised periodically to ensure that it is reasonably accurate. At the time of revision, the names of citizens who have died or migrated are deleted; the names of those who have become eligible by reason of reaching 14 years of age are added; and the names of persons who are otherwise qualified but whose names do not appear are inserted. Between periods of formal revision, the Commissioner has a continuing power to revise the list on the basis of information about which he is satisfied. For example, if the Registrar General informs him of the death of a citizen, he can delete that person's name from the Register.
(4) (a) When the Register is being revised or a new one is being prepared, the same procedures for compiling the certified list of voters apply. Thus:
(i) formal notification is given about the revision;
(ii) registrars and other officials are appointed and their names and the addresses of the place of office published;
(iii) the lists are posted up in accordance with law;
(iv) persons can make claims to have their names inserted or objects to names which they feel are wrongly on the list; and
(v) claims and objections are heard in accordance with law.
(h) When all the requirements of the law are completed, the Registrar is revised accordingly and updated.

(5) When elections are to be held, directions are given to the Commissioner of Registration by the competent authority to prepare the Preliminary List of Voters. Formerly, the competent authority was the Minister of Home Affairs, now it is the Elections Commission.

On receiving the directions, the Commissioner extracts from the National Register the names of all persons who are qualified to vote at the appointed date, i.e., persons 18 years of age and over. This list becomes the Preliminary List of Voters and is posted up at various places in the various registration divisions in accordance with the law.

(6) Once the Preliminary Lists have been posted up, citizens who are eligible to vote have a duty to ensure that their names are on the list. They also have the right to challenge any name which, in their opinion, ought not to be on the list.

(7) The Commissioner of Registration publishes a notice in the Official Gazette and the local newspapers giving all information required by law; for example, the places where copies of the Voters List have been posted up; the names of the electoral officers for the various registration districts and sub-districts and their places of office; the time table for doing all prescribed acts under the law, such as making claims to have one's name inserted on the list, and objecting to names on the list. He also specifies the date for the hearing of claims and objections and for doing other administrative acts leading to the promulgation of the certified Voters List.

(8) In the performance of these functions, he is responsible only to the Elections Commission.

F. USE OF THE MILITARY FORCES ON ELECTION DAY

(a) 1. No military personnel are stationed at very polling place or guard any polling place, as for example, in Jamaica.

2. Only police constables, special constables and rural constables are utilized for this purpose. These are unarmed except for their batons.

3. Under Section 5 of the Defence Act, Chapter 15:01, the Guyana Defence Force is charged "with the defence and maintenance of order in Guyana and with such other duties as may from time to time be defined by the Defence Board."

4. During election periods, because the manpower resources of the police are stretched out very thinly, the Defence Force is called upon to help in the maintenance of law and order. They do not carry out normal police functions, but discharge this responsibility by making patrols, mostly at night in rural areas. They are usually accommo-
dated at police stations or sometimes they establish their own camps.

5. If called upon, they will also assist the police in accompanying convoys taking ballot boxes to a central place of count.

6. In the past, the military have provided logistical support in helping to move ballot boxes in Regions 7, 8 and 9 to the central place of count by air. These areas are forested mountainous regions that are geographically large, in which only helicopters can be used for the aforesaid purpose.

(b) 1. The military, therefore, have no direct role in the electoral process in Guyana.

2. On one occasion, however, during the 1973 elections, there were serious disorders mainly on the Constitution, which required the intervention of the military, although similar incidents, not of the same gravity occurred in a few other places. A Judicial Commission on Inquiry, conducted by the Hon. Justice Dhanesh Jipania, a Judge of the High Court, found that these disorders were the direct result of the Leader of the People's Progressive Party, Dr. Cheddi Jagan's incitement to his supporters.

3. Three days before the elections, the Minister of Home Affairs, who was responsible for law and order, felt it his duty to broadcast to the nation to alert citizens to the inflammatory statements being made by Dr. Jagan. (See copy of Statement by Minister of Home Affairs, Mr. Oscar Clarke, in a Broadcasting made on July 13, 1973). Although Dr. Jagan issued a denial, the very acts which the Minister alleged were being plotted actually took place with tragic consequences. The roads leading from several polling places were blocked with logs, boulders, old vehicles, and other obstacles; and crowds actually besieged the polling places in the area. In the ugly situation which developed, the OPP detachment in that area had to intervene to restore order and in some cases had to enter polling places and take physical control of the boxes at the behest of the terrified election officials. Unfortunately, three people died as a result of the military intervention, one of them by accident. It is this incident which the PPP has used to allege that the military "stole" ballot boxes.

4. Happily, although the PPP Leader still persists to this day with his inflammatory rhetoric and calls for violence, since the 1973 incident there has been no occasion in which the military had to intervene in this way.

* (See the following documents:

(1) Text of Broadcast to the Nation by the President: Mar. 30, 1989.

(2) Press Statement issued by the Commissioner of Police, Mr. Balram Raghunath: October 22, 1988.)
April 17, 1991

Mr. Ronald Jacobs
Chief Electoral Officer and
Commissioner of Registration
National Registration Centre
Georgetown,
Guyana

Dear Mr. Jacobs:

I would like to thank you for the excellent cooperation that you and your electoral officers provided the delegation from the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government led by Prime Minister George Price of Belize during its recent visit to your country. All the members of our team reported that Registrars, Deputy Registrars and enumerators in the regions that they visited were helpful in providing information and frank answers to the numerous questions that were posed. Our people also noted that enumerators often attended meetings with them at some personal inconvenience but nevertheless always retained their good spirits.

Prime Minister Price and I especially enjoyed our highly productive meeting with you on April 4. Your clarifications were precise, useful, and of great importance in demonstrating your interest in doing all that you could to ensure that the election machinery would not only be free, transparent, and fair, but that it be perceived as such by all of the parties. For those reasons, during our press conference on April 5 in Georgetown, the Prime Minister and I complimented you for the completeness and candor of your answers, which we then repeated in some detail for the press. I am enclosing a copy of that statement plus the report on the registration that we have just issued based on our mission. You will notice that it highlights not only the proposal regarding the Election Commission, but also your key explanations, including the following:

-- By mid-April, your office will begin to put into computers the collected registration data;

-- as soon as you receive the film from IFES for identification cards, you will establish and publicize the location and timing when accessible sites in each division will be open for people to
obtain their identification card photos;

--beginning as soon as possible and feasible, your office will establish two accessible sites in each division to be open at specified times, probably on Saturday or Sunday, to allow people who have not yet registered to do so, and you will publicize this sufficiently so as to ensure that everyone will be aware of these new sites;

--you stand ready to receive personally the chief scrutineers of each party to discuss any problems that they may have;

--you will try to mount a major publicity effort yourself and encourage the Elections Commission and leaders from all of the political parties to join you in persuading the people to register and explain how and when they can do it;

--you expect to meet the target date of May 17 for completion of the door-to-door enumeration;

--by mid-June, a draft list containing about 95% of the registrants will be distributed to interested parties;

--by July 1, you expect to have a completed "preliminary list," and you will officially provide two copies of the list and a tape or disk, if so requested, to each of the parties;

--at the same time the lists will be posted at two different convenient locations in each division;

--all of the parties will therefore have about one month to review the registration lists, and this will give the officers adequate time to delete or add names as the case might require;

--you intend to present a list of presiding officers to the Elections Commission for their review and approval;

--Presiding Officers will not be able to bar poll-watchers from voting sites;

--all poll watchers will sign the tally sheets and will retain a copy;

--international observers may also retain a copy of the tally sheet, if they wish;

--and finally, at least one designated opposition poll watcher will always be able to keep each ballot box in sight.

As Prime Minister Price said in his departure statement, we believe the registration and electoral procedures are in place that will permit a free and fair election. You and your staff have
contributed significantly to this promising situation. We also view President Hoyte's statesmanlike position on restructuring of the Elections Commission as reflecting his desire to have an open and honest election.

I have just been in contact with IFES, and they have assured me that they will expedite the dispatch of the film for the identification card and of our other materials.

Please let me know if there are any problems with the summary I have given above of our conversation. I will naturally be sharing copies of this letter with leaders from the various political parties. Again, let me thank you for your cooperation, and express the hope that we will continue to work closely together in the months ahead.

Sincerely,

Robert Pastor
Executive Secretary
Council of Freely-Elected Heads of Government
April 12, 1991

His Excellency
President Hugh Desmond Hoyte
President of Guyana
Presidential Secretariat
New Garden Street
Georgetown

Your Excellency,

The statement issued by Prime Minister George Price and dated April 4, 1991 says that after the Mission's discussions with you and the leaders of the opposition the following proposals emerged:

1) The PNC and the opposition will each appoint two new members to the Elections Commission.

2) A new Chairman will be appointed by the President from a list prepared by the opposition.

The press statement further states: "The President has assured us that he will seriously consider this proposal if he receives a letter from the opposition - the Patriotic Coalition for Democracy - by Friday April 12th, which indicates that (a) they accept this proposal without reservations; (b) pledge not to raise any further objections about the registration and electoral procedures as defined by the law (this obviously does not include objections regarding the implementation of the law); and (c) promise to give public support to the constitutional amendment to affect the change."

The PCD hereby informs you that we accept the above mentioned proposals without reservation and the conditions attached by you to them.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Gail Teamears
Secretary, PCD
Appendix 6

COUNCIL/CARTER CENTER/GEORGETOWN OFFICE STAFF*
1990-1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Coordinator</td>
<td>Dennis King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Coordinator</td>
<td>Rayman Mohamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Coordinator &amp; Radio Officer</td>
<td>Pablo Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Program Assistants</td>
<td>Seyerin Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adrian Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Coordinator</td>
<td>Roopnarine Satram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Coordinators</td>
<td>Mellissa Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valmikki Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Inniss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winston Cramer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Verwey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistants</td>
<td>Farah Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vidyahar Persaud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcia Velosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fadia Gafour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navindra Sahadeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Support Staff</td>
<td>Collin Inverery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shellen Clauden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingrid McDouald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamara Whalen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>Joel Wuesthoff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carter Center Atlanta Interns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joel Friedman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathrynn Kerop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Mantero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suna Kumar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernadene May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kattia Sigui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleen Caron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigurd Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Bedsole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Childress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Most Georgetown staff were University of Guyana students.
** Most Atlanta interns were Emory University students.
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October 26, 1991
Carter Center Report
Appendix 'A'

ASSESSMENT OF THE PRELIMINARY VOTERS LIST
AND CLAIMS AND OBJECTIONS PROCESS

1. Accuracy of the Preliminary List.

Our review of the list indicates that while there are a number of serious flaws in the list, there is no clear evidence of fraud, nor are the flaws necessarily fatal. There are four major types of errors and overlap between them:

(1) Names Missing
Persons registered but their names are not included on the preliminary list (13-21%):
- Curtis Report estimates about 72,400, or 21% of estimated registrants;
- The PNC reported 45,933 persons out of an estimated registration of 343,437 as not on the list (13.3%);
- PPP scrutineers reported that 43,547 of the 229,132 persons in their field sample were not on the list (19%).

(2) Names in Wrong Division
Names are contained on the list but placed in the wrong division (9-13%):
- Curtis Report estimates 38,300 names, or 13% of the list;
- The PPP reported that 17,374 of its field sample of 185,585 (9.4%) were in the wrong division. (The PNC report did not contain this information).

(3) Data Entry Errors
Errors are found in spelling, ID number, occupation, and other voter data (16-18%):
- Curtis Report estimated 16-18%;
- Elections Commission Chairman Collins has made it clear that minor errors of this sort would not by themselves block a voter from participating in the election.
We do not view an error in ID number as a minor problem.

(4) Undocumented Names
Names are on the list but without evidence of registration (and/or for whom no evidence that such persons exist can be found) (21-35%):
- Not considered in the Curtis Report;
- In order to test for this kind of error, it would be necessary to take a sample of names from the list and compare them to registration forms, or to investigate whether a sample of names from either the list or the registration forms can actually be located in the community;
- A names-to-forms test of the first type was done by Dr. Mangal, an Elections Commission member, on a sample of 81 ID numbers selected from the list. The corresponding registration forms for 17 of these (21%) could not be located in
the Elections Commission set of originals;

A names-to-people test by the Electoral Assistance Bureau suggests that the rate of error is in the range of 25-35% of the total list. The study, which included samples divided by ethnic group and rural vs. urban classifications, did not show strong evidence of a pattern of ethnic disfranchisement.

(5) Lists Vary
The individual political parties have received copies of the list provided by the Elections Commission which differ significantly from one another, with totals ranging from roughly 240,000 to almost 300,000.

II. Problems in the Claims and Objections Process

(1) Although the Claims and Objections process would be a valid mechanism for a "clean-up" of a preliminary list with reasonable integrity, the legislation was not envisioned to deal with list problems of the current magnitude.

(2) The officials working in the centers have differing methods and share no clear understanding of how to implement the instructions issued by the Elections Commission Chairman. Consequently, the steps are not being carried out in a consistent manner. Individuals who have registered, but whose names are not on the list have received differing instructions. In some instances, they are told not to file a claim since the divisional registrar will take care of this in the "automatic corrections." In other cases, persons have been told it is necessary to file a claim in order to get on the list.

(3) A field survey conducted by our delegation based on a survey of 62 of 402 Claims and Objections Centers found:
- 16 of the 62 (26%) Claims and Objections centers which we visited were not in possession of the duplicate forms required to carry out the correction measures.
- 23 of the 62 sites visited (37%) indicated that the automatic correction steps were not being implemented for some reason or another.

(4) No accurate statistics or comprehensive controls are being kept on the number of Claims and Objections filed.
- The Commissioner of Registration can only tell us that he "estimates" that returns from 90% of the divisions have been received. But, he is unable to tell us how many are from each division, how many are of each sort, and how long it will require to complete the process correctly.
- The Commissioner of Registration has no statistics whatsoever regarding the number of names reported on divisional lists but for whom no duplicate registration forms could be found (i.e., error type #4 above). Although there seems to be thousands of such cases, there appears to be no standard form or procedure used to handle them.
Given that estimates of the total number of necessary corrections might be as high as 100,000 to 150,000, we believe there will not be enough time to clean-up the list in the time remaining in Claims and Objections period.

- Currently, the total locally generated "automatic" corrections resulting from instructions given by the Chairman and received by the Commissioner of Registration will result in 68,637 names appearing on the supplementary list.
- The returns from individual claims are only now being received. No objections have yet been logged or received by the Commission and we were informed that the last batch of objections are expected to be received by November 13.

The hours of operation of the Claims and Objection Centers have not been consistent or understood by either registration officials or the public. Our survey found that, while this was especially true in the first weeks of Claims and Objections, the situation has improved in recent weeks.

Parties have claimed many centers do not have an adequate number of forms to process the requests that are being made by voters. However, our survey suggests that this has not been a problem.

III. ID Card Distribution

Only 20,000 of the 80,000 persons identified during the registration as lacking an ID card have received new ID cards to date. This does not include any persons who have registered subsequent to the house-to-house enumeration who will also need ID cards.

In addition, a considerable number of people who had lost, or momentarily misplaced their ID cards were assigned "temporary" ID numbers and these numbers are reflected on the list. The ability of these persons to prove their identification is unclear.

There was a commitment made to the Election Commission by the National Registration Commissioner that these problems would be resolved before the list was printed, but little or no progress is reported to have actually occurred.

These are problems which could lead to more serious problems on polling day.
1) When did your claims and objections Center open?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before 9-28-91</th>
<th>9-28-91</th>
<th>9-29-91</th>
<th>Within 1 week after 9-29-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After 10-6-91

(4)

Most centers were opened within one week of the official opening date.

2) What are its hours of operation?

Up to last week there was much confusion over the current hours for opening. Because of the variety of answers obtained from the survey conducted on Saturday, October 19th, classification was difficult. From the survey conducted the following Monday, the divisional registrars seem to be clear that the opening hours are between 9:00am and 7:00pm. However, 1 center was still found closed at 4:00pm, and a further 3 were found closed between 6:30pm-7:00pm on Monday.

3) When were the voters lists posted in this division?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On or before 9-28-91</th>
<th>Within 1 week after 9-28-91</th>
<th>Within 1-3 week after 9-28-91</th>
<th>After 9-28-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Sure

(1)

Most of the lists were posted within one week of the official date.

4) When were you trained for the claims and objections process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before July</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>July/August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claim Prior Training

No date given

(3)

No Formal Training

But were briefed

(2)

Cannot Recall

(1)

No Training

(2)
Most of the divisional registrars were trained between July and September of this year.

5) Where were you trained for the Claims and Objections process? This data was not classified because of variety of answers.

6) How many voters are listed on the voters list served by your office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) How many claims have been registered with your office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>0-50</th>
<th>51-100</th>
<th>101-200</th>
<th>201-500</th>
<th>301-1000</th>
<th>Data Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Answer

(2)

Most of the answers given to this question were just approximate values. It seems as though no record is kept of the actual number of claims that have been made.

8) What type of identification is required to file a claim?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Card</th>
<th>Photographed Identification (Including ID)</th>
<th>Other Not clear Identification (ID card on process plus birth certificate)</th>
<th>No Answer None Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Answer

(1)
1) How many objections have been registered with your office?

Nil          Less than No Answer Doesn't know
             25
(40)         (11)      (8)      (3)

The high number of cases in which no objections have been filed may be explained by the fact that most persons are waiting for the official period for objections (Oct. 30-Nov. 2) to begin.

10) What type of proof is required to file an objection?

No classification was made of the data, because of the wide variation in answers.

11) How many duplicate identification numbers have been found on your list?

Nil          1-25      Data not Available No Answer
            (22)      (30)      (6)      (4)

One case of 945 duplicate numbers was reported. Another case is described as "lots".

12) How many duplicate names have been found on your list?

Nil          1-30      Some No Answer
            (22)      (37)      (1)      (1)

One case is described as innumerable.

13) How many unqualified voters have been found on your list?

Nil          1-30      Not Available No Answer
            (41)      (7)       (1)      (3)

14) Are duplicates of 1991 registration applications available in this center?

Yes          No Only Some No Answer
             (40)      (16)      (5)      (1)
Some of the No Answers include cases where the forms have been loaned to the center to extract information and then returned to the Deputy Registrars.

15) If question 14 is answered yes, are 1991 registrants added to the list without a claim?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that if someone answered No to question 14, then question 15 is not applicable. However, many of the persons who answered No to question 14, nevertheless answered question 15. Most of these answers were No.

16) Are Returns (form 10) reviewed by party scrutineers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, No, but will do so if required</th>
<th>No Party Scrutineers have visited</th>
<th>No form 10 was ever done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Answer
(4)

Some of the No answers may include cases in which there are no party scrutineers, but this was not indicated to the interviewer.

17) To whom and where are Returns, Claims, and Objections sent after leaving your office?

No classifications were made of the data because many persons provided names instead of designations.

18) Has your office been supplied with an adequate number of forms for Claims and Objections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 26, 1931

We, the members of the Patriotic Coalition for Democracy respectively ask the President to reconvene Parliament with the purpose of amending the Constitution for holding elections not later than March 30, 1932, and enacting legislation in keeping with the objective of creating the best possible voters' list that could stand as the foundation for a free and fair election, and a stable democracy.

Adei Jagan, People's Progressive Party

lation, United Republican Party

Dupuit representative, Working People's Alliance

Mary McAndrew, Democratic-Labor Movement
51 October 1991

To Chairman Rudolph Collins

The delegation chaired by President Rodrigo Carazo, Mr. Ben Clark, and Dr. Robert Pastor has reported to me on their visit to Guyana from October 23 – 26. First, I want to say how much we appreciate your cooperation. We believe that your presence and an expanded Election Commission have brought integrity to the electoral process.

However, I share with our delegation considerable unease as to the timetable of completing a final and accurate registration list. In this regard, we were assured by President Hoyte that he intends to allow thirty-five days between his announcement of the date of the election and the election itself, and that he would only announce the date after receiving the final registration list. That would assure the parties and us sufficient time to check the list and reassure the eligible voters that their right to vote will not be denied. We assume that the final list would be centrally printed and distributed to all parties, and I would respectfully request a copy (printed and on diskette) along with full access to the Claims and Objections source documents for our use. A central, computerized list is a prerequisite for a free, fair, and transparent election.

If the President were to announce the date of the election before receiving a final, centralized list, that would not engender confidence in the voters, and this would be a source of concern to us. We would be unable to certify an election as free and fair unless the final list were published at least three weeks before the election, and we received a complete copy that was computerized and printed as well as on a diskette with full access to source documents.

Three weeks would be the minimal time for us to review the list and determine whether it is satisfactory as the basis for a free election, but that is not enough time to provide respect and confidence in the electoral process among the voters. We would do an extensive survey of the list and assess whether it meets the conditions for a free election, and then announce whether we view the registration list as acceptable. If it is unacceptable, we cannot observe the elections unless they are postponed with sufficient time to correct the list.
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I sincerely hope that you can meet the timetable you have set for yourself. I am writing to you to ensure that there will not be any misunderstanding as to the basis on which we will assess the final registration list as it is currently compiled in the Election Commission.

If you judge that the final registration list cannot be ready by the constitutional deadline, and you want to implement the fuller, more systematic plan suggested by Harry Neufeld, I will try to enlist his personal involvement in helping you institutionalize that plan and will try to mobilize all the resources necessary to do so.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. Rudolph Collins  
Chairman  
Elections Commission  
G.P.O. Building  
Georgetown, Guyana

cc: President Hugh Desmond Hoyte
I welcome the decision by President Hugh Demond Hoyte to postpone the Guyanese elections. This was a difficult decision, but given the announcement by Chairman Rudolph Collin that the Elections Commission cannot complete an fully verifiable voters' registration list on time, the President's decision was pragmatic, constitutional, and necessary.

We hope that all parties in Guyana will cooperate with each other now to ensure that the final stages of the electoral process are completed satisfactorily and in a timely manner. The Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government is prepared to work with the Election Commission and all parties to facilitate the preparation of an accurate registration list and a realistic timetable for elections.

We support the work of Chairman Collin to correct the preliminary list and believe that his decision to seek postponement of the elections was a wise one that has the potential of giving voters confidence in the electoral process. We hope that the additional time is used to ensure that the final list is completely acceptable, and that the authority of the Chairman of the Election Commission over the conduct of all aspects of the election is clearly established.

We call on the international community to continue its support to Guyana in the next few months as it adopts a realistic and acceptable timetable for the completion of the list and the holding of elections. In particular, we hope that donor governments will honor their present commitments of support and will pledge to increase their aid significantly after the elections are certified as free and fair.
Atlanta, GA . . . Today, after months of work to correct and verify the voters' list, Guyana's Elections Commission published the Preliminary Voters List (PVL) and began a 28-day period of public review of the document. While the work of the Elections Commission, assisted by the United Nations Development Program, was necessary, it has led to extended delays in the election timetable and to frustration on the part of those anxious to participate in the choice of their next government. The publication of the new PVL, therefore, marks important progress in Guyana's electoral process.

Close public scrutiny will help the Elections Commission produce a final voters list that is acceptable to all sides and that can form the basis for free and fair elections. I therefore urge all Guyanese to go to claims centers to check the roster for their names, and if they have not already registered to vote, to use this opportunity to do so.

As chairman of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, based at The Carter Center of Emory University, let me add that we hope elections will be held soon. We also hope the Elections Commission will permit Guyanese observer groups and the international press to observe the entire electoral process including the counting of ballots. The Council will continue to offer its assistance, as appropriate, to ensure that all eligible voters in Guyana have an opportunity to make democracy work.
The Electoral Accord negotiated by the People’s Pro-
gressive Party and the People’s National Congress is in force. Both parties are expected to scrupulously observe the stipulations in the Accord. This obliga-
tion is binding on the activists and supporters of both parties. The Accord in full is as follows:

THE ELECTORAL ACCORD

We, the signatories hereto

on behalf of the People’s National Congress and the People’s Progressive Party, that are combating public-political campaigns, rallies, meetings and other forms of peaceful activities in connection with the forthcoming general election;

COMMITTED to upholding the basic principle of fundamental freedom of speech and association and all other laws connected thereto;

ACKNOWLEDGING the right of the citizens of Guyana either individually or as a group or through their political parties to express political activities which include the freedom to make house-to-house visits, to read or distribute political literature, to hold public meetings, to hold political meetings, to hold rallies, to publicly address, to make representations, to advocate, to represent their political parties in the electoral process in accordance with the laws of Guyana;

DO AGREE TO THE FOLLOWING:

1. To uphold the principle of peaceful political struggle as provided by the Constitution of Guyana and other laws of the land;

2. To exercise all political parties, organizations, actions groups or individuals shall be permitted to direct, issue, provide or promulgate public information or publish any other political activities or organize or settle groups or against any section of the public, individuals or their property in pursuance of its campaign;

3. To concede violence as a means and course of electoral persuasion and understanding not to encourage, institute directly or indirectly violence or harm against any person in the course of the electoral campaigns or thereafter;

4. To work in full cooperation with all relevant administrative and law enforcement authorities to maintain peace, law and order, throughout the campaigns, so that elections may be held with due regularity in an atmosphere of peace, order and goodwill and that electoral honesty may be preserved;

5. To inform the public of the importance of electoral harmony and racial respect;

6. To refrain from using or permitting as a political strategy or otherwise any appeal to racial hostility or racial loyalty or to promise fear or insecurity based on the above;

7. To ensure that no advantage should be had by any party through free use of public property for electoral purposes;

8. To request public property, and the right of all citizens, groups and political parties lawfully to use their properties in furtherance of their political objectives and philosophy in accordance with the law;

9. To publicly and privately keep party reserves and activities and other individuals, of the resources used in the financing of peaceful conduct after transparent elections, regard-

less of the results. Further that the leaders should not be permitted to use violence but should always act in accordance with the will of the people by virtue of the laws and elections under democratic process in the plural society of Guyana.

This resolution of the People’s National Congress in January 1980, which requires all political parties to cease political activity, thereby agreeing to and enforcing the conditions herein by the authorized representative affixing his signature hereto:

This Done This Day of , 1991 and Signed by the Partie

H.D. Boyce

P.E.O.P.L.E.’S NATION

AL CONGRESS

Chadli Jocado

P.E.O.P.L.E.’S PROG-

RATIVE PARTY
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## General Elections

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D.L.M. (Democratic Labour Movement)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.D.P. (National Democratic Party)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N.R.P. (National Republic Party)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P.D.M. (People's Democratic Movement)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P.N.C. (People's National Congress)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>P.P.P. (People's Progressive Party)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T.U.F. (The United Force)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>U.G.I. (United Ghana International)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>U.R.P. (United Republic Party)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>U.W.R. (United Workers Party)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>W.R.A. (Women's Republic Alliance)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Regional Elections

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D.L.M. (Democratic Labour Movement)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>P.D.M. (People's Democratic Movement)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P.N.C. (People's National Congress)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P.P.P. (People's Progressive Party)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T.U.F. (The United Force)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>U.R.P. (United Republic Party)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>W.R.A. (Women's Republic Alliance)</td>
<td>[Logo]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule for Council/Carter Center Delegation
Guyana Elections Project

Friday, October 2, 1992

All-day travel

Saturday, October 3, 1992

Meetings chaired by Hon. George Price at the Forte Crest Hotel

8:30 - 9:30 - Welcome, Introductions, and Survey of Schedule
Prime Minister George Price
Dr. Robert Pastor
Mr. Dennis King

9:30 - 10:15 - Briefing by Mr. David Peterson, Chairman of the Commonwealth Delegation

10:15 - 10:40 - Briefing by Mr. Edward Broadbent, President International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development

10:40 - 11:00 - Break

11:00 - 12:30 - Briefing on Election-Monitoring by the Council in other Countries and in Guyana
Dr. Robert Pastor
Prime Minister George Price
Senator Ryan Peralto

12:30 - 1:30 - Buffet Lunch - Photo I.D. Cards Issued
Lecture on Guyanese Politics by Professor Gary Brana-Shute

1:30 - 2:15 - Logistics (radio, finance, safety, press); Deployment information
Dennis King and local staff

2:15 - 2:30 - Break

2:30 - 3:30 - Election Day Procedures
S. Singh, Ag. Chief Elections Officer

3:30 - 4:45 - What To Observe? How To do the Quick Count?
Robert Pastor
Dennis King
Glenn Cowan

4:45 - 5:00 - Break
Saturday, October 3rd (contd.)

5:00 - 6:15 - Presentation and Discussion on Election Issues
R. Collins, Chairman, Elections Commission

6:15 - 6:30 - Break and Assemble for Dinner

6:30 - 8:00 - Delegation Dinner with Party Leaders and
Party Presentations by:
Joseph Bacchus      NDF
Robert Ganaddeen   NRP
Llewellyn John     PDM
Lindley Geborde    UGI
Winston Payne      UWP

8:30 - 9:30 - Reception for entire Delegation with Elections
Commission

Sunday, October 4, 1992

Meetings chaired by Former President Jimmy Carter

7:00 - 8:00 - Full Delegation Breakfast

8:15 - 10:30 - Presentations by Party Leaders and Discussion
(15 mins. per party) and discussion

Cheddi Jagan      PPP
Clive Thomas      WPA
Winston Murray    PNC
Paul Tennessee    DLM
Manzoor Nadir    TUF
Leslie Ramsamy    URP

10:30 - 11:00 - Private Discussion by Delegation

11:00 - 11:30 - Press Statement by Former President Carter and
prime Minister George Price, and
introduction of Entire Delegation

[with Commonwealth Group if they desire]

11:30 - Remote Observers Deploy to the Interior

11:30 - 12:00 - Break

12:00 - 1:00 - Remainder of Delegation Lunch and Discussion
Sunday, October 4th (contd.)

1:30  - Coastal Groups Deploy
       - All Observers Make Orientation Visits to
         Polling Stations
       - Georgetown Groups will divide into teams for
         separate meetings and visits.

6:00 - 7:30  - Dinner and Discussion for Georgetown Observers
               Meet for Discussion and Dinner

7:45 - 8:45  - Informal Meeting with Resident Ambassadors

8:00~ 10:00  - Network and Radio Checks

Monday, October 5, 1992 - Election Day

Polls open 6:00 am to 6:00 pm

5:45  - All Observers arrive at designated polling
       places to witness Opening

7:00 - 5:00  - All Observers visit assigned polling places

5:00  - All Observers arrive at designated polling
       place to witness closing, and to collect first
       Quick Count form

7:00 - 8:00  - Observers collect remaining assigned Quick
               Count forms

7:00 - 10:00  - Observers report Quick Count results to Carter
                 Center in person or by radio, as assigned
                 - Return to Forte Crest Hotel

Tuesday, October 6, 1992

All Observers return to the Hotel for Meeting

9:00 - 12:00  - Observers meet as a group to discuss their
                 assessments and evaluate the election

10:00 - 10:30  - One group visits Elections Commission; other
                 groups visit major party headquarters

12:00  - Deadline for filing of objections to local
         counts; Elections Commission Chairman to
         announce unofficial final National Vote Count
**Tuesday, October 6th (contd.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 1:30</td>
<td>Lunch for Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 - 4:30</td>
<td>Delegation will divide into groups to meet with political party leaders and Elections Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 - 6:30</td>
<td>Concluding Press Statement by Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 - 8:00</td>
<td>Reception for Delegation by Resident Ambassadors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Some of Delegation departs on plane to Trinidad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Wednesday, October 7, 1992*

Remainder of Delegation departs
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### POLLING PLACE COVERAGE & GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Polling Locations</th>
<th>Observers</th>
<th>Locations Visited</th>
<th>Geographic Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Monuca/Santa Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hosororo/Manatuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matthews Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Pomeroon River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charity to Supenaam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Wakenaan &amp; Leguan Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Coast &amp; West Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demerara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Linden Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Bank Demerara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Coast Demerara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mabasaica to Rosignol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>East Bank Berbice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Amsterdam to Crabwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bartica &amp; riverine areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kamarang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kurukubaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madhia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Annai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lethem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aishalton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maruranau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kwakwani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>625</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>422</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 16


Former President Jimmy Carter: There will be comments by me and my co-chairman, Prime Minister George Price of Belize, on behalf of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, which includes the leaders of 19 nations, all of us having been elected through democratic processes.

We have worked together in a number of elections, so we will be making a statement on behalf of our observer group.

Two years ago, at the invitation of incumbent President Desmond Hoyte and the opposition party, I came down to Guyana, on behalf of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, outlined the requirements that we saw as necessary for an observer group to ascertain the integrity of an election and presented these ideas to all the parties.

Before I departed Guyana on that brief visit, all the basic principles were agreed, including counting ballots at the polling places, providing the voting list and freedom of the candidates to campaign, and so forth. And so we have been quite pleased at the willingness of the government and the willingness of the opposition parties to work harmoniously and, after difficult debates, to resolve their own opinions into a common purpose.

Since my first visit, the Council has had three other missions that have come to Guyana. The second one was headed by Prime Minister George Price, who will be speaking in just a moment; the third was led by Costa Rican President Rodrigo Carazo, who is sitting two places down on my left. The fourth was by Senator Peralto of Jamaica, who was representing Council member Prime Minister Edward Seaga.

With each visit, it became obvious to us that the electoral process opened a little more and that the fears of a fraudulent election would dissipate.

I would like to ask Prime Minister Price to outline some of the techniques that we would be using, and I will conclude the opening statement. Then I will call the Honorable David Peterson, leader of the Commonwealth Group, and then we will open the session for your questions.

Prime Minister George Price: Thank you, President Carter. We have assembled a large international delegation representing 20 countries, including four from the Caribbean, to observe the electoral process. And we have had extensive briefings from outside experts on how to observe the elections and the count; most importantly the count.

President Carter and I are particularly proud that our delegation includes President Rodrigo Carazo of Costa Rica and, of course, Senator Peralto of Jamaica and, of course, 26 other members, all representatives from the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government. Our delegation also includes a representative from the Organization of American States, Roberto Scioline. It includes a member of Parliament from Great Britain and the Canadian monitoring group led by Edward Broadbent. And, of course, we have met and are collaborating closely with the Commonwealth team led by David Peterson, former premier of Ontario, Canada.

As you know, we have maintained an office in Georgetown since August 1991, and we owe a great debt to the superb work done by its director, Dennis King.

In the last two days, we have invited representatives of all the political parties to meet with us. And, this morning, we had an interesting meeting with them. Now, while there were complaints about the electoral process, they all agreed that they have had an opportunity to get their message across to the people of Guyana and that the basic conditions for free elections exist—the basic conditions. We inform them that the members of our group will visit all 10 Regions and will try to visit, on a random basis, as much as 80 percent of all the polling areas, the polling sites. We have a systematic form to evaluate any electoral irregularities and, at the conclusion of the vote, we will conduct a parallel or a
quick count, as we have done in other countries. This will permit us to ensure that the final results will reflect the preferences of the people of Guyana. And, as we speak, our delegation is beginning to deploy to every Region in Guyana. They will visit polling sites during the day, filling in their forms and witnessing the count tomorrow night. Early Tuesday morning, they will return to Georgetown, and we will meet to combine our evaluations of the elections. The forms will permit us to draw firm conclusions about the process, and we will announce our final evaluation on Tuesday afternoon.

Carter: To conclude our presentation, before we have questions, let me say that there are two roles that we play. The least acceptable one is to detect fraud.

In the Georgetown area, we will be visiting, as observers, more than 95 percent of all the polling places. In the entire country, out of 980 or so polling places, we will be visiting 771. We will witness what is going on. We will communicate with our headquarters by adequate radio. We will be consulting with the party observers at each polling site, working with the officials, working with Chairman Rudy Collins to ensure, during the day, that we know what is going on. And if there is apparent deviation from propriety, it will be obvious to us.

The other means that we have to check any fraud is by our very scientific quick count, which Prime Minister Price will describe. We have selected, scientifically, 10 percent of all the polling places. The identity of those polling places will be kept confidential. But, at the conclusion of voting, our observers will go to those particular sites; they will actually witness the opening of the boxes, the counting of the ballots, and they will report to us here, at headquarters in Georgetown, the results of the quick count. We anticipate that the maximum error in the quick count will be 3 percent. We have never had, so far, any one that were over 2 percent, anywhere that we have done this. The results will be kept quite confidential. I will not divulge this information to the elections officials or anyone else. It will give us an early knowledge of the approximate final return, so that we will be able to detect any substantial deviation from what we have ascertained to be the will of the people.

We met this morning with the political parties. We presented to them the procedures that I have just outlined to you, only more detailed. The question we asked of them was if there is an accurate representation of the will of the Guyanese people, not a perfect election but an acceptable election, based on the will of the people, will you accept it? We promised to consult with them in detail at the end of the polling procedure, and they all agreed that they would accept the results of a free and fair election.

Let me say that, in my opinion, the conditions now exist for an acceptable, free and fair election by the Guyanese people. And my fervent hope is that the news media, in the remaining hours before the people go to the polls, will be constructive in your analysis. It is very important that the doubtful voters be given the confidence or are convinced that they can go to the polls and their votes will count. I hope that you will join with our group in encouraging the maximum number of Guyanese voters to express their will.

After the polling duties are concluded, all our observers will return from all the 10 Regions in Guyana. We will consult with them. I will certainly consult with David Peterson, representative of the Commonwealth group. We will discuss any allegations of impropriety with the leaders of the political parties so that we can erase them. If not, we will investigate them as soon as possible and make an announcement of our own assessment that the election has or has not been a representation of the will of the Guyanese people.

I would like, before I introduce the key members of my delegation, to call on the Honorable Da Peterson, who represents the Commonwealth group, to make any comments he desires.

L-- David Peterson: Thank you, Mr. President. I have had the opportunity of meeting many of you on many other occasions, over the last few days. And, I think you have a clear view of the role of the Commonwealth Observer Group. As you know, we are an independent group, independent from TI Carter Center. That being said, we are coordinating in all respects across this nation. So we will be pooling our resources together in the most efficient ways. We are sharing information and I would say in my view, it has been a model of international cooperation. We will, at the end of the exercise, b
issuing an independent report, because our methods of operation are slightly different from that of The Carter Center.

The Commonwealth has had seven delegations in Guyana over the last couple of years monitoring procedures, putting forward recommendations to the government and has participated in moving the elections forward along with the Carter group and various other groups.

We have been in the country now for two weeks. Our people are deployed in all 10 Regions. They expect to visit all 10 Regions and we believe that, between the two groups officially deployed, we will cover the vast majority of the polling stations and between the two of us, will be able to detect any trends that are unoward, suspicious or sinister in any way. Our plans are that, after the close of the polling tomorrow night before the results are finally issued, we expect to have an interim statement, that is a Commonwealth policy, indicating how it is going until that point in time. And then, on Tuesday afternoon, we issue a final report in consultation with all of our people, who would be back at that point.

As I said, many are deployed now. They have been out in the field for the last two weeks. We have had an opportunity to travel widely. There is not one theory of this election that I have not heard; there is not one plot I have not heard about.

I echo the words of President Carter: there have been lots of problems; they have come a very long way. We are optimistic that this would be pulled together in the next day or so, and we are hopeful that this would be a free and fair election in which the Guyanese people can take ownership and take pride.

We all know the history. We know why we have been invited here. You know why we have been invited here. And so, we are now at the critical point where, should we say the last mile of a 100-mile race, even though lots of things have gone well, major reforms have been instituted, we have got to make sure that we do not stumble in the last day or so. I am optimistic that it is coming together, that there are plans in place to correct any mistakes that develop. And it is inevitable there will be mistakes. There are mistakes in every election in every country in the world. The question is, can they be rectified, or will they nullify the results? But it is coming together. It is coming together, I think, quite nicely.

I want to take this opportunity to thank and encourage all the people that are working in this campaign. Thousands of people—poll clerks, registrars and others—across this country are giving their time to serve their country in a non-partisan and independent way. And, I think, they deserve better. A lot of them might not have political experience, but they struggled as best they could, and I think they would be able to pull it off.

So we will stand ready to make an independent report, I said an interim one tomorrow and the final on Tuesday. And, from our point of view, we wish the Guyanese people well and hope this is a great success.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Carter: Before we take questions, I would like to ask the representatives of 14 of our Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government to stand if you will. Everybody represents one of our Council members.

Let us turn now to the questions of the news reporters; if you have any questions we would be glad to answer them. Let us know what medium you represent and also to whom you want to address your question.

Sandra Baptiste, BBC and Stabroek News: You said, awhile ago, you are satisfied that the basic conditions existed for free and fair and safe elections. I was speaking with some of the political parties up to this morning, and they feel uncomfortable with some of the electoral arrangements. Could you tell us what were some of the major concerns that they raised with you?

Carter: One concern was the voter registration list not being completely accurate. The fact is no one will be permitted to vote unless they are on the voter registration list. This has been worked out laboriously over at least 18 months, but there are still some expressions of concern about past history. In my
judgment, all of the parties have accepted the list as a basis for voting even though they still have concerns about its complete accuracy.

Another concern that was expressed was the tardy sending out of the credentials for voting places officials. That has been acknowledged. There are now standby officials in all 10 Regions and also a group of standby officials, who have been identified from the Elections Commission in Georgetown, who will be dispatched to any polling site where officials are missing tomorrow. This is not a perfect arrangement, but I think it is the best that Rudy Collins and the business community and others could do in order to get this potential problem settled.

Another complaint, by some of the parties, was that their polling officials or observers, to represent the party, had not been given credentials earlier. They have been informed or are being informed that the letter of designation for them, as polling observers of their party, would be acceptable if they did not receive their credentials in a timely fashion.

There were some other complaints that cannot be corrected this late, that the past iniquity in assignment of television time or the past lack of news coverage for some of the more minor parties, at least they are categorized by some people as minor. I am not saying who is minor or major-those were the kinds of things about which we heard. Then the question was asked of them by the international observer, will you accept the results of the elections if the discrepancies, which are acknowledged, would not change the results of the elections? If you have discrepancies of the amount of 1 percent and the victorious party won by 10 percent, then obviously those discrepancies that are there have not changed the will of the people. They all said they would accept the results of a free and fair election.

We have never conducted elections in my country or in any other country where problems did not arise. And we have contact with our own observers throughout the country by VHF or UHF radio. And we encourage the parties, if their observers see a problem in a voting place, first to contact their party leaders and then the Commission through its chairman, Rudy Collins. If they cannot have communications, they can call us on the radio, and we will relay the problem to the Commission.

Those were the kinds of problems they raised.

Cecil Griffith, Voice of America: Did the political parties raise questions about the voting by the Disciplined Forces? You probably are aware the problems that were encountered. Why did you find it necessary, in one of your presentations, to appeal to the press to be constructive?

Carter: One of the parties, at least, expressed concern that the Disciplined Forces, the military and police, could be given another chance to vote on Monday. I think it was the United Republic Party that brought that complaint. Your best source about party complaints would be from the party leaders, not from me. But this is hearsay evidence; I am telling you what they told us. Let them express their concerns to you.

The other question was why do I call upon the press to be constructive? Because I think you ought to be constructive. If you want to be destructive that is a judgment for you to make. But my appeal to you to be constructive was simply because the people of Guyana have had very serious doubt about whether or not their votes would be important or counted. And I think more doubt is cast upon the elections by emphasizing irrelevant and insignificant problems. It might discourage a voter from going to the polls. That is my own personal opinion. I reserve the right to have free speech. I call on the press to be constructive, but the judgment about destructive or constructive is yours to make.

Sharief Khan, Stabroek News: Just taking up from where you left off, since your observers have been on the ground here and having had discussions with the various parties, has anybody expressed any concern that there might be some attempt tomorrow to derail the process through a combination of destabilizing acts on the part of the PNC?

Carter: There were some allegations made this morning that the ruling party was going to try to subvert the elections. Those allegations have been made in the past. I have never been to an election so
In the recent elections, the ruling party had been in power for so many years that there were not legitimate concerns over whether the ruling party would play fair in the elections. In Zambia, the last elections in which we helped, President Kaunda was the leader for 27 years. He was the only leader the country had ever known since independence. There was no doubt that the ruling party there had control of all the media—newspapers, radio, television; they controlled them all. So it is inevitable that there would be some allegations that, if the ruling party wins, it is going to lose or believes that it would lose, it would not accept the results of the elections, they would subvert the elections. That allegation was made.

If the ruling party or any other group or person in Guyana does anything that will subvert the will of the Guyanese people to express their preference for leaders in an honest and free election, this election will be condemned. Our first preference is to avoid fraud and to minimize problems tomorrow. We will work with the political parties and the Elections Commission to make it a successful election and to encourage voters to vote. That is our first role. Our second role is to condemn the election if it is fraudulent. And I would certainly not be reluctant to do so if I feel that the Guyanese people have been deprived of their right to choose their own leaders in an adequately honest and free election. I would condemn this election as fraudulent, in which case, the winners will have won a hollow victory.

I think the international community and the people of Guyana would look upon that administration as fraudulent and unworthy of trust.

This has happened in one case, the case of Panama. We observed that election. We had a quick count which showed that General Noriega's candidates were losing three to one. It was a very accurate quick count. That night, General Noriega sent his armed representatives into the polling places. They captured the polling results. The next afternoon when they announced that his candidates had won, I condemned the election officials, held a press conference, and announced that the election was fraudulent. The international community condemned Panama and General Noriega, who did not even try to have his candidates assume office. He just said the whole election was null and void. This was a horrible thing for Panama to do.

I do not expect it to happen here in Guyana. But it is my duty to give a balanced assessment of the election. If it is fraudulent, I can assure you that the fraud would be detected and those committing fraud would be condemned most severely by the Guyanese people and by the international community.

Paul Persaud, National News Service: Mr. President, could you give us your assessment of the prospects here for a free and fair election compared to the other countries in which you have observed elections?

Carlos: I think the Guyanese situation is better than most countries where we have observed elections.

In Zambian, for instance, the voting list was out dated. It had not been updated for two and a half years. Everyone who reached the voting age during that time had no right to vote. But both parties accepted the deficient voters list in lieu of going through the long process of devising another one.

In Haiti, as you know, the first time that the people tried to vote, in one polling place the Ton Ton Macoutes killed 32 people standing in voting lines. The Haitians were very frightened to go to the polling places, and there was a great doubt that the military would accept the results.

In Nicaragua, the vote was still going on in more than 60 places up near the Honduran border. We could not even register people to vote, and they did not vote. But the election was held.

I have already told you about Panama.

So, I would say that the Guyanese situation, with an accurate voting list, a strong international observer group, a functioning Commission, the support of the government and opposition parties, is in very great shape compared to most of the elections where we have been observers.

Rickey Singh, Caribbean News Agency (CANA): Mr. President, you mentioned that you sought assurances from the contesting parties. Is it necessary for you to have those assurances in writing or you simply accepted their word?
Carter: It is not necessary for me to have the assurances, from the parties, in writing. And they are still free to do as they please.

There was some talk among the parties about other parties taking to the streets. Anybody who takes to the streets is a loser. Someone who has the confidence of the Guyanese people does not need to take to the streets. It is somebody not accepting the democratic process who causes violence or civic disorder.

But I do not think it is necessary to have the parties sign anything. They would not do it even if I asked them to. My belief is that, when the election is over and the two independent observers groups meet, we will meet with Chairman Collins, we will meet with the winners and losers, and when we assess any allegations of impropriety and make a judgment, all the parties, winners and losers, will be winners because Guyana will have a new day of hope and, I hope, greater harmony. And the racial divisions and the divisions based upon past history will be, at least, substantially alleviated if not removed.

I think the international community will look upon Guyana with renewed and positive interest for investment, for assistance and for tourism, having seen a clear demonstration of democracy and freedom here. It is in the interest of the parties here to accept.

Singh, CANA: This second question is for Mr. Peterson. What kind of practical support can the observer mission, at this late stage, possibly give to the Elections Commission to enable a reasonably smooth and efficient process to go on?

Peterson: I think it is very important to note that we are not running the elections. We are observers. We have no power except whatever moral power we have and the power to focus our attention on deficiencies, should that be the case or, hopefully, positives.

So we have certainly, however, within that context, given the benefit of our collective advice to the Commission. The Commission is the independent group running the elections. Whenever they have asked for advice, we have freely submitted and tendered that. But I think it is important, again, to remind you that we are not running the elections. We are not the administrators here.

Errol Pilgrim, Trinidad and Tobago Television (TTT): What I would like to find out, President Carter, is what happens after the elections? Is The Carter Center going to pack up and go home? Or are you going to be sticking around to find out that everything is in place and everything is working? Are you going to be here for some time?

Carter: I do not know. In some elections I have left almost immediately after the key results have been accepted.

In Zambia, we had the results at 9:00 in the morning and the new president was sworn in at 11:00, two hours later. Then there was no need for me to stay, but I did encourage the victor to be generous in victory, and I met with President Kaunda, who had lost, and there was a harmonious relationship between the two men.

I talked last night to the chancellor (of the judiciary) at some length. We had adjacent seats at the boxing match and I had the chance to talk with him about the procedure to be followed. He pointed out that he would immediately consult with the victor for the presidency after he received the elections returns. The elected president would have the decision to make about the time for taking the oath of office and whether it should be done privately or with a public ceremony. So that is a flexible thing. I would hope that, if it is done almost immediately, I would be here and be present. I cannot see here a number of days.

If there is a doubt about the elections result, which could possibly happen with a very close election, then The Carter Center would maintain its interest here until our duties were fulfilled. If the Elections Commission chairman, Rudy Collins, had a list of allegations of impropriety, we would help as requested only, to investigate those allegations to see if they were justified.
In the Dominican Republic this did occur. The difference between the incumbent president and the major challenger was only 1.3 percent. It was very close. There were a number of mistakes made or minor errors. We investigated all of them. It took us three weeks. Our conclusion was that there was no pattern of the errors. It was just the many errors that helped to hurt the winner. So I finally decided on behalf of the group that, in our opinion, it was a legitimate election.

So we will stay as long as necessary until a clear decision is made. I cannot definitely say that I will be here personally, but our people will be here to work and to complete the assessment of the integrity of the election.

Urell Wilkinson, CANA: What happens if there is racial violence?

Carter: We do not have any military force. We do not have any authority at all. We have never asked for any authority over anyone in Guyana. We are just here at the invitation of all the parties, including that of the incumbent president. But I am going to meet, later today, with the commander of the military forces and also with the commissioner of police to talk to them. In my judgment, the leaders of the political parties, this morning, all expressed their total commitment to a peaceful reaction no matter what happens. Even if, during the day, there seem to be problems in the delivery of ballots or the slow movement of ballots, they all pledged to me, and to each other, that they would not resort to any sort of street action that would subvert the peace.

So I think that is a hypothetical question about racial violence. I would feel inclined to believe that it is almost inconceivable in Guyana. I think that the Guyanese people, no matter what their racial or ethnic origin might be or their political belief, really want to see the country healed, and to see the people of the different racial groups come together and build for the future. That is what, I believe, the Guyanese people want.

Robert Pastor, The Carter Center: I am sorry, we are going to take just two more questions.

Michael Sharples, Radio Jamaica Rediffusion (RJR): Today's Chronicle carries an article critical of an advertisement in yesterday's Stanford News which imputes that the observer groups endorse the PPP/Civic slate. Did the PNC representative raise the question of the impartiality of the observer groups with you at the meeting this morning?

Carter: The PNC was represented here this morning by a very influential spokesman, but he did not raise that question. However, I did see it on the front page of the Chronicle. We had no role to play in that advertisement. We have maintained absolute neutrality, and we will continue to do so. Every person on our entire delegation is pledged not to express any personal preference that might favor any one party over the other. These kinds of things do occur, but I do not lay any blame on anyone. And I think it is a relatively minor issue. Everybody should realize that, no matter what kind of advertisement took place where our photographs occur, we are maintaining absolute impartiality.

Peterson: May I just add to that one point? I agree absolutely with President Carter. Any suggestion that there is any lack of neutrality on any of the observer teams is absolutely, totally false. I am glad you raised the question.

The second point is that if you read that thing, you will note that we are cited in there as chairman of the Canadian Group of The Carter Group, and that is not correct. The Commonwealth team is absolutely independent. So I would hope that you would use your good offices with your impartial friends here, in the room, to clear up those two matters. I thank you.

Carter: This has to be the last question.
Winston Witter, Jamaican Broadcasting Corporation (JBC): There is the thesis here that Washington, D.C., is disposed to dealing with one political party over the other. This thesis states that party is the ruling party. Have you got any vibes from Washington, D.C., that it is disposed to deal with one political party in Guyana over the other?

Carter: No. I have talked personally to President George Bush. I have talked personally to the secretary of state, at that time, Jim Baker. I have talked personally to Larry Eagleburger, who is the present secretary of state. Dr. Pastor has spoken on numerous occasions with the assistant secretary of state for Latin American affairs. They encouraged us to come here and to maintain neutrality. They have never expressed to me or to Dr. Pastor, any preference about the outcome of the elections. And my judgment is that, regardless of the past history of Guyana, the U.S. government is eager to see the Guyanese people have a leader whom they prefer. And I can assure you that our government will be fully supportive of that new administration, no matter who they are.

Let me, again, express my thanks to all of you for coming this morning.
Election Observation Form

In addition to your name, enter the Division Number and Name of the Polling Place observed. There are 625 Polling Divisions and 987 ballot boxes in Guyana. The Division Number (e.g. 223012) of each Polling Place assigned to you can be found on the posted Voters List and on the logistical information sheet provided you on arrival. The Polling Place name is in the name of the building or facility which houses the Polling Place, e.g. New Amsterdam Primary School. Enter the Time and Site by indicating your time of arrival & departure (e.g. 8:15/8:45A).

When you arrive at the site, you should introduce yourself to the Presiding Officer and ask permission to ask him and the other officials and polling agents some questions. You should not disrupt the proceedings. If you have arrived at a difficult moment, you should step back and wait until a more appropriate time. Most of the questions below should be answered with a Y (yes) or N (no).

1. Each Polling Place should be staffed by 4 elections officials: Presiding Officer, Assistant Presiding Officer, Poll Clerk, & Counting Assistant.

2. Indicate the apparent level of training of the Election Officials: Good or Bad (G/B)

3. A sign should be posted on the exterior of the Polling Place indicating the Division Number & Name of the facility. (Y/N)

4. If you were not present for the opening of the poll, ask the Presiding Officer and a Polling Agent for the approximate time.

5/6. The Ballot Box should be opened and shown to be empty in front of Polling Agents and sealed immediately afterward. (Y/N)

7. Each of the 11 political parties contesting the National Election is entitled to have a polling agent inside the Polling Place throughout the day. Put 1 or 0 in parenthesis.

8. The 6-digit Polling Place number is arrived at prior to opening of the poll by random drawing of 6 slips of paper from a container containing 10 slips numbered 1 through 0. (Y/N)
9. The Presiding Officer should stamp the 6 digit number on both
the National and Regional portions of the ballot before giving
it to the voter. The absence of the number will cause the
ballot to be invalid. [Y/N]

10. The official Voters List should be posted conspicuously and
should be available for inspection by voters. The List
consists of two computer print-outs; 1) the Preliminary List
& 2) the Supplementary List, a product of the revision period.
[Y/N]

11. The internal configuration of the Polling Place should allow
most of the Polling Agents an unobstructed view of all
proceedings. [Y/N]

12. Here we need for you to make a judgment as to the ambiance of
the station. Are the officers and the polling agents working
together cordially, satisfactorily, or unsatisfactorily?
(Cordial, Sat., Unsat]

13. A simple, three sided screen should be provided to allow the
voter to mark his ballot out of the view of anyone inside or
outside the Polling Place. [Y/N]

14. Before inking, fingers should be inspected for ink residue,
oil or grease. The finger should be wiped clean & dipped up
to the first joint. [Y/N]

15. A minimum of 1 Police Officer should be assigned to each
Polling Place. The Officer may be posted inside or outside
the building. He is not an Election Official and is on-duty
to keep order. At the direction of the Presiding Officer he
may arrest persons accused of violating election laws. [Y/N]

16. The total number of voters on the official List is the sum of
voters on the Preliminary & Supplementary lists.

17. The Presiding Officer can provide you with the approximate
number of voters who have voted prior to your arrival.

18. The Polling Agents of several parties will be tracking the
number of voters who are allowed to vote without formal
identification (e.g. National Identity Card, driver’s license,
passport).

19. In addition to the above, Presiding Officers may accept
identification any one of the following:

* National Insurance (NIS) Card where the name
  corresponds to the name on the Voters List and the
  verification of one person who has already voted.
b. Birth Certificate where the name corresponds to the name of the Voters List and the verification of one person who has already voted.

c. verification by two persons who have already voted, of the voter's identity.  
(for b. & c. above, the Presiding Officer may select the person or persons who have already voted.)

d. In an Amerindian community, the Captain can verify the voter's identity.

20. As a last step, offer a subjective evaluation of the overall voting process. Satisfactory or unsatisfactory?

21. Any additional serious problems? Yes or No
If yes, describe them.
International Observers of Guyana's Election
Election Observation Form

Name of Observer(s)  N = 586, (61%) Division No.  N/A

Polling Station Name  N/A Time at Site  N/A

1. No. of Election Officers  Ave = 4  2. Well trained?  97% yes
5. Ballot Box Empty  99% yes  6. Locked after Inspection  98.2% yes
7. Polling Agents Present:  Ave = 2.8
   PNC ( ), PPP ( ), WPA ( ), DLM ( ), NDF ( ), NRP ( ), PDM ( ),
   TUF ( ), UGI ( ), URP ( ), UWP ( );
8. Are polling agents satisfied with selection of 6-digit no.  99% yes
9. Is the number stamped on both National and Regional ballots  N/A
10. Is voters' list clearly posted  97% yes
11. Do (most) polling agents have clear view of proceedings?  99.4%
12. Relationship between Election Officers & Polling Agents  96% cord
15. If police present, have they behaved professionally  99% yes
16. Total no. on voters' list  N/A  17. How many voted  N/A
18. Approx. how many did not have I.D. cards  93%
19. Were procedures followed for voters without I.D. cards  93% yes
20. Evaluate overall process (satisfactory, unsatis.)  98% satisfactory
21. Any additional, serious problems

Describe: The two most important problems noted were:
1. Long lines, waiting (22%)
2. Problems with ID and ID procedures (15%)

96
Terms of Reference for the

Quick Count Report Form

The information at the top of the form will be completed for you. You will receive a Quick Count Report Form for each sample site (polling station) assigned to you for the Quick Count. If you are directed to make your Quick Count Report(s) by radio, you will use the Reporting Code to identify the polling station and will not use the polling station name or Division Number.

The Radio Call Sign (e.g., 3-NMEO-5) is your radio identification. You will use this call sign when making your radio report to EAGLE, the Carter Center headquarters in Georgetown.

As the polls close, your highest priority is to retrieve the quick count of the national elections for your assigned sites. It would also be desirable to retrieve the quick count for the regional elections, and we will discuss with you together and individually the best way to try to do both. But remember, our highest priority is to retrieve and send the results of the national elections.

Obtain a copy of the Tally Sheet from the Presiding Officer or a polling agent. Enter the votes cast for each of the 11 parties contesting the NATIONAL election in the block to the right of the party’s initials. [Later, you might enter in the next column the votes cast for each of the 11 parties contesting the REGIONAL election.]
**INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS OF GUYANA'S ELECTION**

**QUICK COUNT REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>REGIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DLM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** ALPHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NDF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** BRAVO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** CHARLIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PDM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** DELTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** ECHO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** FOXTROT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TUF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** GOLF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UGI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** HOTEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>URP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** INDIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UWP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** JULIET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>WPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** KILO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spoiled Ballots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** LIMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Total Ballots Cast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*** MARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Division No.**

**Reporting Code**
Appendix 19

Georgetown, Guyana
on Oct. 6, 1992

Former President Jimmy Carter: First, it’s a pleasure to have this group assembled here, many of them observers who have been working very diligently over the last several days. I see a group who have been here for 15 months or so. And we are also very grateful to have the press come and assemble here with us.

I think it might be good for me, first of all, to thank the Commonwealth Group. You just heard from its chairman, David Peterson. We just sat side by side with them in a very harmonious and peaceful and constructive way to share our problems. We share our achievements as friends and we are grateful to them.

I would like to emphasize the fact that the observers’ role is very carefully limited. We do not have any authority and we have never asked for any authority in any country in which we have served as observers. We are here to expedite the procedures, to offer our assistance if it will be beneficial. We always work through the election officials and the political officials of a country. We do not intrude on our own initiative.

I must say secondly, that my own impressions of this election—the training of poll officials, the conduct of the elections or voters and the harmony that existed within the polling places—have been excellent. We have participated—the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government/The Carter Center—in Africa in a number of elections and I have never seen a better one anywhere. We had an analysis made of 580 of the polling places where our observers were present. This is not the total number but we did an analysis of 580. I’d like to give you just a few statistics based on interviews and our own personal observations. It won’t take very long.

First of all, less than 3 percent were considered to be unsatisfactory. The most prevalent criticism was that the lines moved very slowly. I don’t consider this to be a legitimate criticism, because, in my opinion, the lines moved slowly because the polling officials were so careful and meticulous in the way they administered their duties. I was sometimes frustrated, as an observer, because I felt that they could push the people through faster, but they were very, very careful to do everything exactly right.

In each case when our observers went to the polling place they introduced themselves to the polling officials and had permission to be there. Almost invariably we introduced ourselves to the poll watchers from the different political parties. Before departing, we asked the poll watchers if they had any complaints about the way the polling had been conducted. The result was that there were, in fact, no complaints.

The next thing that we did was to analyze how many elections officials were present. The biggest concern we had, at the previous press conference, was that some of the designated elections officials’ appointments were deliberately not taken up and how do we fill those multiple vacancies. This was not a problem at all. You might be interested to know that 98 1/2 percent of all the polling places had three or more polling officers there. Ninety-nine and a half percent! Eighty-seven percent of all the polling places had four officials on duty.

The earliest place I went to in the Georgetown area had 11 standby elections officials waiting to be called upon to fill vacancies if the officials were not present at any polling place in the region. I thought it was superb!

Another important thing I would like to point out is the time of voting. This, to me, is the best
indication of proper training of officials to hold the post. I've never been in a country before where the polls open on time when we went as observers. In Nicaragua, the first two or three places I went to the people did not start voting until 9:30 in the morning, and it was supposed to begin at 7 a.m.

We reported in each case the exact time when the first voter was approved and cast a ballot. Sixty-eight percent of all the polling places had the first ballot cast at 6:00. At 97 percent of them, polling began at 6:30 a.m. I have never seen this before.

There was no official report of the ballot boxes not being empty. Ninety-nine percent reported that they certified that the boxes were empty. And I presume that in the case of the other one percent, the observer did not know one way or the other.

When I got to the polling places to observe them, later I asked the opposition observers from the political parties if they personally witnessed the emptiness of the boxes. They told me that they had done so. I won't continue this run down, but this is based on actual observations, interviews with the polling officials, and particular interviews with the poll watchers from the opposing political parties who were present. In each case, we recorded all of the parties that were represented by their poll watchers.

Another point I would like to make is that we were all concerned about the violence that erupted yesterday shortly before noon. I happened to have been in Region One when the violence occurred. I finished my assigned polling places to witness and the party that was up in the Santa Rosa area did not get back until 3:30 p.m. This was a very serious incident, totally localized, and concentrated on the Elections Commission's headquarters. When I returned, I contacted the president of the country, talked to the commissioner of police, and urged them, of course they already knew, to return order.

The president told me he was also talking to the chief of staff of the military and that the military and police will be cooperating fully. Later in the afternoon, the crowd built up again. The people were demanding a right to vote, something that we certainly understand. But the people in the Elections Commission's headquarters did not feel at ease or safe. The workers departed—either went to their homes if they were Guyanese or came back to their hotels if they were foreigners helping with the computers and radio system and so forth. I was there myself and again called President Hoyte and the commissioner of police. Commissioner Lewis came over and talked to us and deployed 35 policemen around the Commission's headquarters. They have been there ever since. A few of them were armed.

There was no violence after the breaking of the windows and the throwing of rocks, as far as I know, at the Elections Commission's headquarters. But up and down the street and on some other streets, there were incidents of looting. This was not related, in my opinion, to the elections themselves. And I believe that was adequately cared for. All during the day, today, there has been no intrusion on the integrity of the election headquarters.

I might say, also, that I have witnessed, from the very beginning, the reporting, by Chairman Rudy Collins or his assistants, of the returns as they came in. As you know, most of the votes were not counted until late last night. The polling officers carried their returns to the officers responsible for receiving them, tabulated them, and then most of the people went to bed. I have been concerned, today, about the slowness of the returns coming in. I understand now that Region 4, which was the slowest of all and had the most votes of all, has got most of its returns in and they are being put into the computers now. But every time there was a batch of reports that came in, as soon as they came out of the computer to be tabulated, those results have been given to the news media in Guyana and immediately relayed to the people by the news media. There has been no holding up of that at all.

I have not heard of a single allegation that any violation of integrity of the reports has occurred; no allegations that the returns submitted to the Elections Commission's headquarters were different from the ones that were cast at the polling places. This is very encouraging to me.

The only serious concern that I have now, as an observer, is that the returns have come in slower than I would have anticipated and also slower, I might say, than Chairman Rudy Collins thought they would be coming in. But they are proceeding in an orderly fashion. The reason for this, and this is the last thing I have to say before I answer questions, is that this is a new process. If the United States or Great Britain or Canada or Japan was holding an entirely new election process, we would be, perhaps,
probably much more confused and much slower than I have seen here in Guyana.

In the past, as you all know, the ballot boxes were sealed on election night. They were kept there and then transported by the military. I understand, to central counting places and a day or two later were opened and ballots counted. I don't know if they were always the same ballots or not, I have no way to know that, but at least there were allegations that the integrity of the ballots was violated. That is not the case this time.

The returns being submitted are exactly the same as the counting that took place in the polling places. So I have no criticism of any election officials for the slowness with which the returns have come in. I think that is inevitable with an entirely new process. I would guess that the next time a democratic election is held in Guyana, as prescribed in the Constitution, that all of the processes would be better understood. There won't be a confusion about voting list or whether a person is on the voting list. That has been a major complaint, I think, of the public.

The outline, very briefly, my own observations. I would like to ask Prime Minister George Price if he has additional comments to make, and then we will both be glad to take your questions.

George Price, Prime Minister of Belize: I think that, as President Carter has just said, the voting process worked. I was in a part of the city at 20 voting stations before midday. And then the process was working with a few minor incidents. Then, in the afternoon, there was this violence.

Carter: My own hope is that, as they go through an uncertain night with highly motivated supporters of the contending political parties, the process would be calm.

I understand that both the major political parties are confident that they would win. That is the best circumstance, to avoid the interruptions of the process, if both believe they are going to win, if it is honest and safe. That is my prayer. There would be no comment made by any of us to anyone about the results of our quick count. We are not in the process of announcing election results; those results will only come in any case from the Elections Commission.

Early this morning, I met with President Hoyte at 7:30 and immediately after with Dr. Jagan, and described to them the process and the status of what we do. Both men expressed to me the commitment, it is not the first time, that they would honor the results of the election and would be very glad to work to heal any election wounds that are always inevitable at a time like this, and to work together in the future for a united, progressive, and prosperous Guyana.

I would like to answer any questions if you have any. I would like you to identify yourself if you want to ask a question.

Emilc Woolford, Guyana Television (GTV): When you met with President Hoyte and Dr. Jagan, did you indicate to them the results of your quick count?

Carter: Yes, I gave the two men an indication of our results and reminded them that it was a sample only. They both pledged to me, before I gave them the results, that they would hold that information for themselves.

Woolford (GTV): President Carter, if that information is different from the Elections Commission's, would you stand corrected?

Carter: Yes, I certainly would stand corrected. If there is a substantial difference then I would do my utmost to determine what the differences are there. That has been the case in only one country in which we had that experience. But the prevailing results will, obviously, be those published by the Elections Commission.

Enol Pilgrim, Trinidad and Tobago Television (T&T): President Carter, at your last press conference, you said only losers take to the streets. Do you still hold that view?
Carter: Yes, I still feel that the only reasons you take to the streets is if you do not have confidence in the process and in the ultimate judgment of the people whom you want to represent. I might say that there would certainly be an exception to that rule if an individual voter felt that they were being cheated by the system. Then obviously that voter would have a right to express displeasure in any peaceful manner. But as far as a group of people or party identified taking to the streets, strongly supported by its leaders, that would be an indication that that party has lost confidence that they could win fairly.

Pilgrim (T&TT): There were reports that the violence yesterday was orchestrated by one of the parties. Did your Mission see any evidence to support these reports?

Carter: No, I did not see any evidence of it. As I said I was out of the city when that occurred. If there was any identification of the group or party, I don't know about it.

I personally addressed a number of people who said their names were not on the list and I investigated, as best I could, their allegations. In some cases the voters, the prospective voters, were simply confused about what registration meant. They would show me their Identification Card and say here is my identification card that proves that I am a registered voter. Or they would say I voted in the last election or I voted in 1966 or they would say the registrars came by their homes and identified all the members of a family. And I would say, did you check the Preliminary List? No, I did not have to, they would respond. So some of them were totally just confused about what had to be done by them at registration time to get their names on the registration list.

I might say, too, that I do not claim, I do not think that anyone claims, that the registration list was perfect. The point is that, even with its minor imperfections, all the political parties said we will accept this list even though it might have some imperfections. That was the prevailing point of view. This was published in the news media.

In every respect, as you know, if your name is not on the official voting list, which had been approved by all parties, you would not be given the right to vote.

Question: There are reports that the observers were warned to leave Linden before the votes were counted. Was this report communicated to you? (NOTE: The microphone did not pick up the name of the questioner).

Carter: We had observers in Linden and they reported that they were asked to leave the community before the final vote was counted. Is that correct?

(Note: The comments made by Dr. Marvin Will, one of the members of the observer team assigned to Linden, were made off mike and consequently were not picked up.)

Carter: Is there any other question?

Michael Sharples, Radio Jamaica (RJR): Will you be around for the oath of office?

Carter: I cannot say how long I will be here. My plan had been to leave tomorrow morning. I will have to make a decision about that.

Sharples (RJR): Will the new president be sworn in at a public ceremony?

Carter: Two nights ago, it now seems like longer, I attended the boxing match and sat with the chancellor for a couple of hours. The chancellor, for those who are not Guyanese, is the chief justice of the Supreme Court. He is the top jurist in the country and the one who administers the oath of office. He
explained to me, very carefully that, as soon as the election returns are certified by the chairman of the Elections Commission, he would then contact the winner, who would be the next president, and ask for the person when and how he wants to receive the oath of office. If that person says I would like to receive the oath immediately, the chancellor said he would administer the oath of office in his chambers. If the winning candidate wants to have a public swearing-in ceremony, he would accommodate that inclination. But the entire decision about exactly when and where and how the oath of office would be administered will be up to the candidate of the party that wins the national vote.

My own hope is that the decision can be determined by the Elections Commission and announced in a timely fashion. Or, if not, it would be my duty to remain until I am convinced that the results are dependable.

Lennox Grant, Trinidad Express: There are reports that some ballot boxes were taken from polling stations by activities of one of the political parties. Did any of the observers witness this act of receive reports about it?

Carter: The answer is no. We did not observe that.

Grant: Did they witness any invasion of polling stations in Linden?

Carter: None of our delegation witnessed it. None of us did.

Paul Persaud, National News Service (NNS): You referred to yesterday’s disturbance as serious and you also used the phrase “totally localized.” Do you have any reason for saying it was totally localized?

Carter: I tried to explain when I meant in subsequent words that the violence, as far as I know, was centered around the election headquarters of the Office of the Elections Commission. Subsequent to that, and I think unrelated to the election itself, some of the citizens of Guyana looted some of the stores. This was described to me thoroughly by the commissioner of police, who deeply regretted that two or three of the people were shot. I understand, at least, there was some death. I don’t consider the looting of the stores to be associated with the election process.

This was not the only example of violations of the law. One of our observers was stopped and asked in his official vehicle. He came out okay, he gave the robbers his billfold, his money, and he was not harmed. The driver was beaten.

There were some instances of threats of violence but, as far as the disturbing the electoral process itself, I only know of one instance when the election headquarters was surrounded. It was stoned and all the windows were broken and the workers felt so intimidated that they left. I think that I failed to say when I went into the headquarters and established myself there in the computer room and called around to the hotels and so forth that all the workers came back and they were there when the police arrived.

Wolfgang Steck: In your meetings with President Hoyte and Dr. Jagan did the question of violence erupting as a result of the disappointment of their supporters if they lost the elections come up?

Carter: Yes. In my meetings with Dr. Jagan and with President Hoyte and in my discussions, today, on two occasions with the commissioner of police, we have considered the possibility that if the Elections Commission announces results unfavorable to one of the two major parties, that at least there might be some instances of violence. The political party leaders have both assured me, they didn’t have to but they did, that they would use their utmost influence to discourage their supporters from reacting violently to disappointing news.

I have no way in knowing what the schedule of announcements might be. I would guess that 35 to 40 percent of the total boxes, probably representing a higher percentage of the population, would be
available in the next couple of hours and would be announced by the Elections Commission. We have nothing to do about that. But that might indicate, obviously indicate, a better trend every time you get the follow-up information.

This next announcement by the Elections Commission would, probably, include more ballot boxes from Region 4, which includes Georgetown. I understand from other people, I have no evidence of it myself, that the PNC consider this their stronghold, so that might change their trend.

We have no comment to make about what might occur. I do not have any way of knowing. The only information about results of the voting will come from the Elections Commission, not from me.

Lennox Cornette, Guyana Chronicle: Why are the results from Region 4 slower than the other regions coming in?

Carter: I have spent a great deal of time this afternoon with Mr. Scott, who is the returning officer for Region 4. He has 15 different regions under him and the whole Georgetown area. So there is extra staff there compared to the simpler regions, in the rural areas, with a very small number of boxes. In this case the polling officials make their returns to the deputy or return officers. Those deputies then consolidate those returns and submit them to the returning officer, Mr. Scott. Then Mr. Scott has to double check those against the box numbers and the other identifications such as the number of voters and the name of the presiding officer. It is a very slow and tedious process.

I have been over to that headquarters this afternoon. When I got there, they informed me that almost all of the box returns were then being submitted to the central headquarters.

Another complicated factor in Region 4, that did not exist in any of the other ten, was that they finalized the registration list earlier for the nine outlying regions. And, at the last minute, as you know, they issued some final registration list in the Georgetown area.

And so it is a little more difficult when a major list, that might have had some 2,000 names on it, was divided among five boxes and the first time the voters knew about it was on the election morning. That is what created most of the displeasure. And so before they enter the returns into the computer, they had to know which of those five boxes the returns represent. That is also taking Mr. Scott a longer period of time to complete. But I think I could tell you that he has the situation well in hand and the people are very busy now at the election center entering those data from his returns.

Cornette, Guyana Chronicle: There are some allegations of fraud against the Elections Affairs Bureau. It is claimed that they manipulated the list. Did you find any evidence of this?

Carter: I do not think that is accurate. I tried to investigate all those allegations. As you know, The Carter Center has been involved in this election list process for at least 18 months. One problem was that the National Registration Commission, in some cases, posted the Preliminary List instead of the Final List. People went and saw their names on the Preliminary List and when they arrived at the polling places yesterday morning they had the Final List. And they were disturbed about the differences. It only takes one or two people, out of four or five hundred, to believe that they have been deprived of their right to vote to create a great deal of furor and begin to become legitimately angry. I think this is what happened in Region 4, much more than others, because of the last minute dividing up of the longer list into a shorter list that could be handled at a particular box.

One of the more serious problems was at the Enterprise Nursery and Primary Schools, one of the places I was supposed to observe. It is still a matter of argument. This list was worked out; the people would look at the list the day beforehand. They would stand in line for two hours; they would get the door and tried they were not even on the list. It may be that they just had to walk across the street to another box, but that meant they would have to get back at the end of the line. I sympathize with them. I can understand when they would be angry.

That is what has held up, in some cases, the reporting of the returns here in the Georgetown area.
Woolford, GTV: Mr. Carter, did you get the impression then that the confusion with the list caused some people to feel frustrated with the process and to walk away?

Carter: No, I never did. Also I might say that at the end of the day, with the exception of the line of voters at the Central Elections headquarters, the lines were minimal.

In Guyana, we had people still voting at 1 a.m. after the polls closed at 7 p.m. We didn’t have that in Guyana. So I think it was very orderly, and they did a very good job in dividing up the number of voters so that the people could vote conveniently.

Our information is about 65 to 70 percent of all the registered voters went to the polls yesterday to cast their votes.

Ken Moblet, Associated Press (AP): President Carter, do you still categorize Guyana as the only South American country not to have held free and fair elections in the region?

Carter: What was the categorization I made?

Moblet: That Guyana is the only country in South America not to have held free and fair elections.

Carter: I think I said free and fair elections acceptable by all parties. And my hope is that tomorrow I can say that Guyana has now held a free and fair election acceptable by all parties.

Janet japon: How do you feel that the radio station is carrying incorrect results?

Carter: I do not listen to the radio except every now and then in the automobile when I turn it on, which is very rare. But I never heard it so I do not know how to comment on something about which I am not familiar.

Everybody in Guyana should realize that the only returns that have any significance at all are the ones that are issued by the Elections Commission. I have been really impressed at the central headquarters at the way they have presented them. I am a fairly good computer operator, and I have been there to see, if you are familiar with computers, that they print out the actual results from computer tabulations on a floppy disk. They take that floppy disk with the information downstairs where the press conferences are held. They then put it into a computer there and project the actual returns on a screen right off the computer. They give it not only for the whole nation but separately for every one of the ten regions. So if any one of the news media representatives is interested in knowing the exact figures that Chairman Collins and I and everyone else has, sometimes I do not always have them, but he always does; you can look at those screens. Any other report of the results of the elections is just wishful thinking.

I have been in politics long enough to know that when I pay somebody to run a poll for me—in Georgia, if I pay them $30,000 to run a poll for me in Georgia to see how I am doing against my opponent, then obviously, if there is a doubt about anything, they will make it look good for me.

I would guess that the PNC results from their selected places will be good for the PNC. And I would guess that PPP reports that are coming from around the country would make the PPP look good. So both parties, thinking that those are accurate, might think that they have won. But nobody will win until the Elections Commission gives it official results.

Winston Witter, Jamaica Broadcasting Corporation (JBC): You said that your mission carried out a quick count of the elections results. How do your results compare with those from the Elections Commission?

Carter: I do not comment at all on my own information. We think that it is a scientific analysis. We think it is fairly accurate based on past results. It could be totally erroneous. But under no circum-
stance, even including tenure, will anyone extract any comment from me about our own quick count, except as I told you, I stated it with the two leaders.

Ricky Singh, Caribbean. Contact: Based on your quick count, will you be here for the swearing-in of the new president of Guyana?

Carter: I am expecting that Guyana will have a president sworn in, who has been elected in an open, free and fair election. The identify of that person is unknown to me until I hear from Chairman Collins who it is.

I will take one more question.

Sharief Khan, Stabroek News (SN): The manual circulated us the polling stations said that the results of the count, at their polling stations, should be given to the Elections Commission. In Region 4 this instruction seems not to have been followed. Why is it necessary for the returns to be sent to Mr. Scott?

Carter: That is not true. I am familiar with those instructions that is not the case. You cannot have 327 election officials individually carrying their results into the central headquarters. The central headquarters would not be able to do anything other than welcome people at the door. Also as you may remember, and nobody anticipated this, the Elections Commission was surrounded by police, and the security was very tight. Their instructions as I have told you is that each polling officer delivers the results of his polling station to his superior officer who in turn delivers them to Mr. Scott, who is returning officer for Region 4. That is the way it has been done in a completely proper fashion. I have not had even one allegation, and this is amazing to me, I have not had one allegation, anywhere in Guyana, that the results turned in are different from those tabulated at the polling place. It is remarkable but true. There may have been some allegations, but I have not heard them, and usually people will bring me the worst reports.

If you have one more question, this will be the last question.

Sandra Baptiste, Stabroek News and the BBC: There have been allegations that the Electoral Assistance Bureau (EAB) set out to sabotage the process. Did you find any evidence of this?

Carter: My information, from several weeks ago until now, is that the EAB was a very constructive force, that they did the best they could to support the electoral process. They did not interfere. And when a special problem arose they were there to be called upon by officials responsible for the elections. They never interfered, I know about, they never interfered and they did not take any action unless it was approved. That is the information I have. But I want to express my thanks to them and others who came forward.

One other thing—Ed Broadbent, would you stand up? Ed Broadbent is here from a very fine group from Canada, as part of our delegation. He is fully qualified to head a delegation of his own, but the early decision was made in Guyana that there will be only two observer delegations—one the Commonwealth, the other from the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government and the Carter Center.

And Dennis King—is Dennis here? Dennis, who is obviously working like he always is, came here more than a year ago. He has headed up a group that has prepared us for the elections. I want to thank him.

Obviously George Price, to my left, and I have already thanked the Commonwealth Group. Again I want to express my gratitude to our observers, who have been all over this country, who have learned a lot about Guyana in a very formidable way.

And my hope is that the publicity about the ballot yesterday, which has now covered the world, will be undone, as far as a damaging factor, by opposite reports of a free and optimum fair and safe
election that would be promulgated to the same media tomorrow. The Guyanese people do not deserve to be criticized because of a few hooligans who took the law into their own hands and attacked the Elections Commission Office that was responsible for bringing the honest election to the country. And then followed that up with lawlessness on the streets. I come from a country that has witnessed this same kind of looting. Sometimes the people who began it believe they have a justifiable reason. But it brings discredit on the country.

The Guyanese people, the election officials, the government of Guyana, President Hoyte and the major campaigners in the parties do not deserve to be condemned by the news media throughout the world because a few people got around the election headquarters and broke all the windows with rocks. They did not represent the character of the Guyanese people now or in the future of this great country.

Thank you.
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Edited Transcript of Press Conference Hosted by Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter at the Forte Crest Pegasus Hotel just before his Departure from Guyana on Oct. 7, 1992

Former President Jimmy Carter: I have to leave this afternoon for the airport. I was representing the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government and The Carter Center. This will be the final report I will make from Guyana as I have to leave this afternoon and so, immediately after this press conference, I will be going to the airport.

Representing the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government and The Carter Center, the first thing I want to do is to express my thanks publicly, as I have already done privately, to all the political parties’ leaders, everyone, no matter how many votes they received on Elections Day. I think they all deserve a great debt of our gratitude for an election that has represented, in my opinion, very accurately the will of the people of this country.

I have had several meetings and conversations with President Hoyte and with Dr. Jagan this morning and also been at the Elections Commission and talked to the chairman of police, to the chief of staff of the army and other officials, plus representatives from the other political parties. Let me tell you, very plainly, that all the observers here had come at the invitation of Dr. Jagan, President Hoyte, and all the other political leaders.

To repeat myself from previous news conferences, we have no authority and had never requested any. We have had no expression from any of our people of a preference for any political party, and I never had any.

The election is drawing to a close, including the final tabulation of votes. The only ones authorized to issue these tabulations are the people representing Chairman Rudy Collins at the Elections Central Headquarters. The last time I was over there, about 1:30 or so, they were bringing the news media representatives up to date.

As you probably had observed, the People’s Progressive Party has a commanding lead, based upon the results that have been issued, a difference of about 35,000 votes. There are a little more than 35,000 votes still to be heard from, so it is apparent that, except for a mathematical miracle of 100 percent vote, the People’s Progressive Party will prevail. President Hoyte understands this, and I am speaking for him. He has not conceded the elections, and I don’t think it is proper for him to do so at this time.

The laws of Guyana are very clear. The chairman of the Elections Commission, Rudy Collins, is charged with the responsibility of issuing periodic reports, which he is doing, in addition to the final report when practically all of the returns are in. I say practically, because if there are two or three boxes around the nation that had been lost or destroyed from remote areas and did not come in for a week or two, that will not hold up this final decision.

I spent a great deal of time this morning analyzing the locations where those still missing returns might be. It is my estimate, and this, that the final announcement cannot be made before Friday noon. And only based upon the final announcement can the legal processes of the nation be implemented. That is the inauguration, the swearing-in of a new president. This is completely orderly and in accordance with the laws of this country.

So far as I know the general public is now familiar with the elections results or the trend. The prospective winner has accordingly been identified. The best estimate that the Elections Commission could give is that, in the Regions, the PNC is likely to prevail in six of them and the PPP in four. That would not affect the presidential chair, but it would affect the composition of the Parliament in the future.

I would like to intercede once more to say that these are not the final returns. I am not announcing anything that has not been announced officially at the central elections headquarters.

One other problem has come up this morning because some of the distant Regions are so difficult to reach. After consultations with the chairman and with President Hoyte, the chief of staff of the military, Joe Singh, agreed to use the military radio to call the returning officers in those Regions th
had not completely reported the results to urge them to do so. The military is not receiving any returns at all. They are not acting as an intermediary; those returns are being made directly to the central elections headquarters. The only thing the military is being used for is their radio service to request the slow returning officers to expedite their reports.

One additional thing is that I have been talking to representatives of President Hoyte and Dr. Jagan. President Hoyte has designated Ambassador Cedric Grant to represent him, and Dr. Jagan has recommended Dr. Roger Luncheon to represent him. These two gentlemen, designated by the heads of the two parties, have already met with me and also met with the chairman of the Commonwealth Observer Delegation, Mr. David Peterson, and they will initiate an easier communication between the two major contending parties. They will consult each other in the next few hours more thoroughly. They exchanged telephone numbers and provided some easy way for problems to be resolved while representing the presidential candidates of the two major parties. This, to me, is a very encouraging sign of acceptance of the prospective results.

One other point is that when I leave, the Honorable David Peterson has said that the Commonwealth observers, some of them including him, will be here for another day or two. I will have representatives of The Carter Center and also from the Council of Freely Elect ed Heads of Government, Mr. Ryan Peralto from Jamaica, Mr. Roberto Scioulle, representing the Organization of American States, Dennis King and David Carroll, those four and maybe some others will be here representing the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government.

We do not anticipate any problems, but it is very important that we have communications with our people here on site in Guyana.

And, to conclude my remarks before I answer a few questions, I am very grateful for an opportunity to participate, in a small way at least, in this historic event.

If anyone has any question I will be glad to answer. Please identify yourself.

Sharief Khan, Stabroek News: Some persons close to you told me that you are aware of the sensitive issues surround these elections. Are you leaving convinced that there is no backlash, perhaps now, of violence? Have you had an assurance from anybody that this thing has been fully consorted and a repeat of Monday is not likely?

Carter: Fortunately I think it’s a sure thing that a repeat of the violence on Monday is unlikely. I know it’s a sure thing that it is unlikely. I can’t say it’s a sure thing that it is absolutely impossible. But my own impression was that the people of Guyana and the leaders of the major parties, the bishop and human rights organizations and others have strongly condemned that violation of the peace and that adverse reflection on the character of this country.

My judgment is that it was an event that has caused increased alertness on the part of the police and the military to prevent a recurrence. That, combined with the very harmonious relationship that seems to exist between the PNC and the PPP, acceptance of the results that have been promulgated so far, obviously convinced me that the prospects for the near future and the distant future both are for a peaceful acceptance of the results of the elections.

Ceici Griffith, Voice of America (VOA): In your meeting with Dr. Jagan, did you seek a reassurance from the opposition that they would accept the results and urge their supporters to stay indoors?

Carter: Yes, both President Hoyte and Dr. Jagan assured me, early this morning, as they did the morning of election day, that they would accept the results and that they would urge all their supporters in their parties to follow their leadership in accepting the results.

Early this morning, I had a call from Brigadier Joe Singh, who said that he had met with his chief military commanders yesterday and had a pledge from all of them to accept the results of the elections and continue their loyalty to the president who is being chosen by the people of this country.

Any other questions?
Winston Witter, Jamaica Broadcasting Corporation (JBC): Are you aware of the request being made for international assistance with respect to keeping the peace?

Carter: There have been no requests made for international assistance in keeping the peace. And I might say I have never doubted President Hoyte's ability to prevail in keeping the peace.

Obviously, there was a great deal of confusion on Monday afternoon; the police that were deployed to the elections center were inadequate at first. When they arrived there, as you know, some of the rioters deployed up and down the streets and began to loot the stores, and the police had to go where the most violence was. People in the elections center felt in danger, and many of them departed. I described that at an earlier press conference, but I don't think there is any doubt now or then that President Hoyte had the capability of maintaining order. He acted wisely and expeditiously, in my opinion, with one expectation—that the people in the elections headquarters felt insecure because the police did not stay there. I think they underestimated the problem, and the police followed the rioters to try and control the most intense violence.

Mike McCormack, Guyana Human Rights Association (GHRA): You must have noticed the deep racial divide in Guyana. What do you think?

Carter: Well, the question is about racial division in Guyana. I have examined the elections returns as closely as I could. There are certainly strong patterns of support in the different Regions where African-Guyanese might be in a stronger position in some and the Indo-Guyanese in others. But I have seen nothing here that indicates that they cannot work together harmoniously. I think that both of the men who have been designated to sort the transition happen to be African-Guyanese. I am not sure how it happened, but that, in my opinion, does not matter.

Also, as I pointed out earlier, I noticed that in the PPP delineation of prospective government office, about a third of them, with an Indo-Guyanese leader, will be African-Guyanese. I think this is a very good indication of a determination that the future government will do what it can to bring in what it might consider minority groups to share with them the responsibilities of governing.

Griffith: How soon will you be reporting to Washington on your return?

Carter: Well, I think Dr. Pastor will probably talk to the State Department no later than tomorrow. And we will have, as customary, a fairly definitive written report as soon as it can be compiled, based on the observations of our group. We have stayed in some touch, with constant contact with the State Department while we have been here, but we are not representing the U.S. government at all.

Witter: How likely is the possibility of a repeat of the events on Monday? There have been groups of people again marching around the streets and reports of shots having been fired.

Carter: Yes, I know. I witnessed from my hotel window, as I was preparing to come down here, that several trucks of soldiers went in the area where the helicopter was hovering, and I have had reports that the situation is well in hand. I cannot tell you that there would not be rowdy groups, who are intensely disappointed that they lost, or rowdy groups that are celebrating their victory if they won. I cannot guarantee against everything because that happens in many countries. But I do not consider it to be a threat to the security of this nation or to the permanent peace. It is certainly no threat to the outcome of the elections.

Fr. Andrew Morrison, Catholic Standard: The PNC is protesting violently and strenuously against many discrepancies in the election; would not that incite the people to violence?

Carter: I have met not only with President Hoyte but with several prominent members of the PNC. They pointed out that they have been concerned about some problems with the voters list and some other issues. But I think it is hardly likely, and they do not disagree with this but they can speak for
themselves, that those allegations of impropriety, if all are resolved in their favor, would still not be enough to change the ultimate results of the elections.

However, let me point out that any elector or voter in Guyana has a perfect right to file a lawsuit in the courts, challenging the elections on some ground, and that might very well occur. If so, and if I think I pointed out in a previous press conference, the chancellor has told me, I did not ask him to, that he would resolve those cases expeditiously.

This is an orderly country with a deep commitment to legal processes, and I have no doubt that those challenges would be handled properly and also expeditiously.

Witter: But the PNC is advertising a steady number of 78,000 voters who were disenfranchised.

Carter: I am not a judge or a lawyer, and they will have to bring that up. I did not get that kind of report even from Mr. Coobin, with whom I met, nor did I get that kind of report from President Hoyte.

Allen Chamberlain, London Guardian: There are reports that Mr. Green was orchestrating the violence. Do you care to comment?

Carter: I have never met with Mr. Green. I never met Mr. Green. I saw him in the boxing ring the other night when he was introduced and I was introduced. I would have been glad to meet him, but he has never chosen to meet me.

I noticed in the Chronicle that he denied inciting the violence. I have no information to contradict him.

I must say that my own personal interest in this country will not be ended with the conclusion of this election. The Carter Center is deeply committed to the future of Guyana. I think it is inappropriate for me to come into a nation and to witness a democratic process and then abandon my interest in that country. So we will be pursuing the possibility of encouraging international organizations and national governments, universities, private investors, experts on tourism as requested, to come in and join with the people of Guyana in creating a greater nation.

And I think it is also significant, as I have mentioned before, that we had about 100 international observers here, from more than 20 nations, who will leave Guyana very much thrilled with admiration for this demonstration of freedom and democracy and will be speaking on behalf of the future of Guyana. I am very pleased to have been part of the process.

One more question, then I am going to leave.

Enrico Woolford, GTV News: You mentioned that in the government, in terms of the Parliament and the National Assembly, the PNC may have a lot of seats in the House along with the PPP and they probably will have to work together. While it is not tantamount to a Democratic president and a Republic Congress, what advice did you give to the incumbent or the incoming president, you being a former president yourself?

Carter: None.

Woolford: Is that so?

Carter: I am not here as an adviser. I am just here as an observer. The one thing that I like to share with people who did not win elections is the number of elections that I have lost myself.

I think it has been a gracious attitude expressed to me, today, by both Dr. Jagan and by President Hoyte and I feel, personally, a sense of friendship with these two men and the others in the campaign.

I was interested in the smaller parties, those that got a small number of votes. I have written them a personal letter of thanks and congratulations about their part played in the elections. It seems to me, from the returns, that the two major parties would probably hold all the seats in Parliament. The exact division between the two, as you know, is determined by the outcome of the national elections and
also the regional elections, and that still is an indeterminate figure that can only be resolved when the final returns are in. A couple of Regions are still pretty close, but the present returns show that six will go to the PNC and four to the PPP, and I understand that those ten, subsequently, will choose two more and that’s 12 out of 65.

Dr. Pastor pointed out that Guyana has already set a model of holding up a carefully orchestrated and wholly fair election despite the incidence of violence. We also believe that Guyana can serve as a model of racial harmony and reconciliation between two parties that often, in the past, have not been at all harmonious. And I think that the greatness of Guyana will be proven according to how this election result is seen and how it is used as a foundation for the future prosperity and goodwill and happiness of the Guyanese people.

I hope to come back and visit with you again. Thank you.
Since balloting ceased on October 5th, 1992, I know that every Guyanese has been very anxious to learn the results of the elections.

The relevant information, I am told, has been coming in rather slowly from the various polling districts. This is understandable for, as you know, many of our communities are in farflung and remote areas of our country. Moreover, even in Region No. 4, the returns were not as timely as one would have expected, mainly because, I suspect, of the many checks and balances which the Commission devised and applied.

The Elections Commission gave out interim results periodically but these, of course, were based on partial information.

However, on the basis of the numbers supplied to the PNC Campaign Headquarters by our agents, it appears that the People's Progressive Party will have a majority and it does not appear that the votes not yet counted would materially alter the outcome.

In keeping with requirements of democracy, the People's National Congress will accept the results of the poll. Of course, our acceptance of the results is without prejudice to any right of party might have to approach the Courts of law for an adjudication on a number of perceived administrative and other irregularities which occurred during the elections.

It is important for citizens to know that, under the Constitution, the new President will assume office immediately after the Chairman of the Elections Commission formally announces the results of the poll and not before. My information is that the announcement is likely to take place by the end of this week.
In the meantime, I would urge all Guyanese, in keeping with our democratic culture, to accept the results of the elections. We were determined to ensure their transparency and have succeeded.

We have worked very hard to restore our economy. Let us keep in focus the prime objective of building our economy. No one should do anything that would frustrate the achievement of this objective.

I expect all citizens to accept these political developments, maintain a peaceful and harmonious climate in the society, and keep the welfare and good name of Guyana foremost in their minds.

1972-10-07
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
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COMPOSITION OF THE NEW PARLIAMENT

Members of Parliament were elected as a result of national elections held on October 5, 1992:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People’s Progressive Party/Civic:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fazal M. Alii</td>
<td>15. Una James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Shauk Rabbah</td>
<td>17. Moti Lall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cyril Belgrove</td>
<td>18. Ferenc Mohamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Brindley Benn</td>
<td>19. Moses Nagamootoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indranie Chanderpaul</td>
<td>22. Khemraj Ramjattan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Clinton Collymore</td>
<td>23. Donald Ramoutar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Shirley Edwards</td>
<td>24. Lawrence Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Randolph Evans</td>
<td>25. Clement Rohree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sam Hind</td>
<td>27. Gail Teixeira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People’s National Congress:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Afromuddin Ahamad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Arthur Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amna Ally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Donstan Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Deryck Bernard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gwenneth Bouet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Robert Corbin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jennifer Ferreira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. John Fredericks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Andy Gouveia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Faith Harding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Desmond Hoyte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hukumchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Kenneth King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Patrick McKenzie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Winston Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Sase Narain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Simon Ng-see-queen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Jean Persico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Joan Richards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Chriisa Riehl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. David Subnauth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Kenrick Tyrrell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The United Force:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mamoor Nadir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working People’s Alliance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clive Thomas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total: 53 Seats
10 Members of Parliament were elected by Regional Democratic Councils on Dec. 7, 1992:

**People's Progressive Party/Civic:**

- Region: 1
  - 1. Joseph DeSouza
  - 2. Samad Boksh
  - 3. Ramnarain
  - 4. Harrimarine Badru
  - 5. Karam Karam Rambaan
  - 6. Eugene La Creur

**People's National Congress:**

- Region: 4
  - 1. Ivan Petten
  - 2. Reynold David
  - 3. Phillip Bynoe

**Working People's Alliance:**

- Region: 8
  - 1. Bagot Paul

Sub-Total: 63 Seats

2 Members of Parliament were elected by the National Congress of Local Democratic Organs on Dec. 10, 1992:

**People's Progressive Party/Civic:**

1. Khadim Bacchus
2. Matheson Williams

Total: 65 Seats
Press Clippings
Hoyte agrees to invite Carter observers for elections

Government; yesterday, announced it had agreed to invite the Jimmy Carter Center to mount an observer mission for the forthcoming elections.

A summary from the Office of the President says Hoyte's Ambassador in Washington has directly been instructed to notify Carter of the observer mission on behalf of the President.

The surprise announcement came after a meeting yesterday between Hoyte and US President Carter, but it was put out by an unnamed source.

The Opposition reaction to the announcement was immediately available yesterday, as a Carter spokesman at the press was one of the visitors.

Opposition parties have also, however, announced that they will not participate in the elections.

Yesterday's Hoyte-Carter meeting was described as "friendly and constructive".

According to the Office of the President, Hoyte and Carter have agreed to work together on the election campaign to ensure its peaceful and democratic character.

Hoyte has previously denied any involvement in the elections, and if work is done, will be done in a peaceful and democratic manner.

The announcement comes after Hoyte said that the elections would be free and fair, and would not be subject to any pressure from the United Nations or the Carter Center.

"We are confident that the elections will be peaceful and free, and we are looking forward to working with the Carter Center to ensure that the elections are conducted in a peaceful and democratic manner," Hoyte said.

The announcement was met with混合 reactions, with some expressing concern that the elections would be subject to interference from external actors.

"We are concerned that the elections may be subject to interference from external actors," a Carter Center representative said.

The announcement comes after Hoyte said that the elections would be free and fair, and would not be subject to any pressure from the United Nations or the Carter Center.

"We are confident that the elections will be peaceful and free, and we are looking forward to working with the Carter Center to ensure that the elections are conducted in a peaceful and democratic manner," Hoyte said.

The announcement was met with混合 reactions, with some expressing concern that the elections would be subject to interference from external actors.

"We are concerned that the elections may be subject to interference from external actors," a Carter Center representative said.
Hoyte grants key opposition demands

Stage set for free and fair elections

by Sharief Khan

The amazing electoral reform breakthrough by former US President Jimmy Carter during his historic 15-hour stopover trip here last night has significantly altered the makeup of the local political scene.

Carter managed in advance of 24 hours to assure opposition parties that he would ensure the protection of their leaders and their delegations should they decide to contest the elections. He even has told them that if they wish, their leaders could be protected in the elections.

The local opposition parties are the Commonwealth Movement of Labour and Social Justice (CML), the People’s National Movement (PNM) and the People’s Labour Party (PLP).

The breakthrough came as a 2:50pm Security Service meeting with Hoyte in which the only other persons present were Carter, Hoyte, the opposition leaders and Benjaman. Carter was heard to say that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the package deal.

The former US President said that the Commonwealth Movement of Labour and Social Justice (CML) would contest the elections.

The CML has been led by former Prime Minister John Phillips.

The breakthrough came as a 2:50pm Security Service meeting with Hoyte in which the only other persons present were Carter, Hoyte, the opposition leaders and Benjaman. Carter was heard to say that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the package deal.

The former US President said that the Commonwealth Movement of Labour and Social Justice (CML) would contest the elections.

Carter has said that the package deal will include the protection of the opposition leaders and their delegations should they decide to contest the elections. He even has told them that if they wish, their leaders could be protected in the elections.

The local opposition parties are the Commonwealth Movement of Labour and Social Justice (CML), the People’s National Movement (PNM) and the People’s Labour Party (PLP).

The breakthrough came as a 2:50pm Security Service meeting with Hoyte in which the only other persons present were Carter, Hoyte, the opposition leaders and Benjaman. Carter was heard to say that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the package deal.

The former US President said that the Commonwealth Movement of Labour and Social Justice (CML) would contest the elections.

Carter has said that the package deal will include the protection of the opposition leaders and their delegations should they decide to contest the elections. He even has told them that if they wish, their leaders could be protected in the elections.

The local opposition parties are the Commonwealth Movement of Labour and Social Justice (CML), the People’s National Movement (PNM) and the People’s Labour Party (PLP).

The breakthrough came as a 2:50pm Security Service meeting with Hoyte in which the only other persons present were Carter, Hoyte, the opposition leaders and Benjaman. Carter was heard to say that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the package deal.

The former US President said that the Commonwealth Movement of Labour and Social Justice (CML) would contest the elections.
EDITORIAL:

Thank You Jimmy!

It is amazing! Former US President Jimmy Carter, burned into Guyana on Friday, October 12, 1982 and within 24 hours (the entirety of his stay) breasted out again, having achieved in that ultra short time what the combined opposition political and civic forces tried to achieve in two bone-breaking decades! Thank you President Carter! Do come again soon.

"WAS Demiurged Hoyte in reality Nothing out?" Evidently he was. The FNCD administration was under tremendous pressure to make reforms in the electoral system from both domestic and external sources. This pressure was reaching a dangerous critical mass and the possibility of an election could not continue. What seemed to be a social explosion would be removed, either on polling day itself or after polling day. Trotskyism has now ceased accordingly.

LET us hope that the social explosion has been permanently averted, because of the major concessions granted or agreed to by Mr. Hoyte, in the presence of Mr. Carter. Nobody in their right minds wanted that social explosion. It was the FNCD's last card which it is on the agenda to throw. What seems to have prevailed so far is the FNCD's own fear.

We believe that Mr. Hoyte is the leader of this "other faction" in the FNCD. The other faction, the die-hards who are opposed to democratic norms including free elections, must be contained and watched. These die-hards are an obstacle to political democracy with no place in the 1980s and 1990s.

NOW it must be dealt with them in the best interest of this great nation of ours. It is time we the Guyanese people stop squabbling over the electoral system and which one can call the killing ceremony. This is more now the gladiatorial game and should have been for the past 23 years. While at each other's throats over who will be our Government's modelling creature, we are now lacking at an important and almost essential which is already yapping on our necks. We are on the last in Carlstrom.

President Carter's presence in Guyana was like a white knight in a stuffy room. It is now up to the Guyanese people to do the rest. The government must be for the people and not vice versa. It is time we the Guyanese people take our hands in the electoral system and the people to the government, individually. The Carter Centre has a valid point. Why observe rigged elections? It makes no sense. Better let it be a free and fair election to avoid the results.

President Carter has also shown by example what is expected of other Missions. No longer the Commonwealth Planning Mission. If the electoral laws are to be changed, Missions should play a direct hand to government, individually. The Carter Centre has a valid point. Why observe rigged elections? It makes no sense. Much better to be a free and fair election, to avoid the results.
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I won’t remove Bollers - Hoyte

by Sharief Khan

Opposition parties allege key activists of the ruling PNC are in control of critical areas of the electoral process and claim the Elections Commission is largely subservient to these people.

The President again dismissed the report which he has been advised "in effect" calls for the removal of Bollers.

"I didn’t read this report. I am only going on the basis of what my political people told me. It’s their business to read it not mine."

The Georgetown Chamber of Commerce and Industry and other groups which sponsored the compilation of the report have commended it as an independent and objective study. It will be discussed at an open symposium at the Tower Hotel from 5pm tomorrow.

Hoyte said Jagan was again proposing Bollers be sacked and declared, "I will not have that."

He contended a tribunal will have to find Bollers or any Commission member guilty of misbehaviour before they could be dismissed and added he will not be "controlling its making unjust decisions."

The President also insisted the Commission was in total control of the elections and said his government had given the body “executive functions”. Government, he said, had "nothing to do with the electoral process, from registration down to the declaration of votes."
Bollers to go—Opposition submitting new candidates

By Anand Persaud

AFTER saying last Wednesday at a press confer-
ence that he will not remove Sir Harold Bolsover as Chairman of the Elections Commissi-
on, President Demond Hadco has conceded to the Committee that he will "visibly con-
sider" a list of five candidates supplied by the opposition to replace Bolsover.

This breakthrough came Thursday night
before the Carsie Colonel's party headquarters in Berbice.

Sir Harold was due to leave
next week for his posting in St. Vincent. The
issue was settled after a Thursday morning
meeting with the opposition leaders, led
by Dr. Bharrat Jagdeo, a month after the
Committee had been formed with duties by
the opposition from the Elections Committee.

GUNS

The opposition is to apply
for leave to bring a motion on
the issue of a gun law. The
President was pleased to say that
he was in agreement with the
Committee's proposals in this
matter. The opposition is to
immedi-
ately provide a list of five
provisions that he will accept.

Prime Minister

Bolsover was appointed to the
post of chairman of the Commis-
sion last year by the President. Un-
fortunately, due to an illness,
he was unable to fulfill his obliga-
tions. The outgoing Chief
Bolsover's actions, in the opin-
ion of the opposition, were unac-
cceptable. The ruling party and the op-
opposition would also op-
ter their support for new provisions
in the gun law.

BUSINESS

The national government has
ordered that the President's
orders to bring in a gun law for
the first time in the country's
history be implemented, effective Jan-
uary 19. The President also
ordered that the Cabinet be
asked to implement the gun
law. The opposition has
accepted the new provisions.

As such, it is a violation of
the provisions that the Pres-
ident has ordered that the
President's orders be implemented.

Mr. Bolsover and his ad-
ministration have been seen as
the ones who have been
implementing the gun law
without consulting the
Parliament. The opposition
has been criticising the govern-
ment's actions and has been
demanding that the
President's orders be imple-
menced.

Dr. Bharrat Jagdeo, the
leader of the opposition
party, has said that the
President's orders have been
implemented without con-
sulting the Parliament and
the opposition. The
opposition has been demanding
that the gun law be implemented
in consultation with the
Parliament and the opposition.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The national security
situation in Berbice has
improved significantly. The
opposition has been work-
ing closely with the govern-
ment to ensure that the
country is safe and secure.

Mr. Bolsover has been
working closely with the opposi-
tion to ensure that the
country is safe and secure. The
opposition has been working
closely with the government
to ensure that the
country is safe and secure.

The opposition has been
working closely with the govern-
ment to ensure that the
country is safe and secure. The
opposition has been working
closely with the government
to ensure that the
country is safe and secure.

The opposition has been
working closely with the govern-
ment to ensure that the
country is safe and secure. The
opposition has been working
closely with the government
to ensure that the
country is safe and secure.
Opposition rejects list but Hoyte says election before yearend

By Brandi Perraud

The Political Coalition for Democracy (PCD) is reviewing the preliminary voters roll being published today but moves to force a new list are expected to fall too late with President Berrendon Mottley dissolving Parliament today.

Hoyte in a TV and radio interview late yesterday announced he will call elections tomorrow after the end of the year to deal with the voters roll issue.

Our Parliament is dissolving and General Elections will be held within 90 days and if there are no regulations that will result in a new list to be published.

The PCD repudiation of the list has raised great concern over what its ultimate demands will be and protests on an election date are sure list is not possible.

Yesterday, opposition songs were about with agitation over the failure of the preliminary list to allow the selection of one person from each of the Commission in-house computer experts on his personal list.

Commission Chairman Body Collins said this report will be reviewed by the order to the Political Coordinating Team of the preliminary voters roll.

However, yesterday the opposition camp was told that the report was put on the back burner.

Sources say that the report is to be published and a ransom note is to be accepted.

The computer expert's report that was about with agitation over the failure of the preliminary list to allow the selection of one person from each of the Commission in-house computer experts on his personal list.

Commission Chairman Body Collins said this report will be reviewed by the order to the Political Coordinating Team of the preliminary voters roll.

However, yesterday the opposition camp was told that the report was put on the back burner.

Sources say that the report is to be published and a ransom note is to be accepted.

The computer expert's report that was about with agitation over the failure of the preliminary list to allow the selection of one person from each of the Commission in-house computer experts on his personal list.

Commission Chairman Body Collins said this report will be reviewed by the order to the Political Coordinating Team of the preliminary voters roll.

However, yesterday the opposition camp was told that the report was put on the back burner.

Sources say that the report is to be published and a ransom note is to be accepted.
Commission in crisis

by Shafiq Khan

Toll pressure last night built on Elec-
tions Commission Chairman, Mr Pat Collins, to take effec-
tive control of the elec-
toral machinery in the controv-
sersial Registration Commis-
sioner, Mr Ronald Jacobs, refused to be moved and President
Desmond Hoyte held back on announcing an election date.

Jacobs, saying to control of his National Register-
ation Centre with firm
hacking from President
Desmond Hoyte but Com-
missoner member, Mr
Miles Fitzpatrick declared
he was through with the
body if Jacobs estates his
position.

I will not continue to sit on a Commission that
pretends to be in control of
the process but in fact is not!
Fitzpatrick told
Stabroek News last night
after Collins informed him his
group Jacobs refused to be
moved.

Sources said the Com-
misison, by majority with
the backing of Collins,
confirmed a vote of no con-
fidence in Jacobs and the
Chairman has to ap-
noval of the relevant
authorities.

According to the sour-
ces, Collins had asked
Jacobs to cooperate and
hand over control of his
centre to a management
team while being retained as
a technical advisor.

This would have placed
operational control of the
bureaucratic process in the
hands of a new manage-
ment team, one source
said.

Jacobs, however, told
Collins he refused to give
up any of his respons-
hility and the Commis-
sion Chairman expected
to issue a statement on the
status of play at its regular
press briefing today, the
sources said.

Fitzpatrick said he for-
mally informed the Com-
misison he will not be a
member as long as Jacobs
remained in control.

President Hoyte earlier
in the daybrushed off
Jacobs' career telling
reporters he did not know
removing the Registration
Commissioner would bring
the current faults in the
published preliminary list.

He told a press con-
ference at his Winifred
Road office complex he be-
lieved Collins' firing of the
controversial Jacobs as,
Assistant, Mr Herson
Bunyan and Mr Stanley
Browne, contributed to
the problems with the list.

According to Hoyte
the decision to fire Bunyan
and Browne was "bad"
because they were "very
experienced" and Jacobs
had recruited them to as-
sist him in circumstances
in which he had severe
personnel shortages.

"In removing two senior people supporting
him in his work, you ha-
menacing him," Hoyte of-
ficial in defence of Jacobs.

He declared "it would be
a great mistake to
remove (Jacobs); that
would create greater dif-
ficulties than it would solve."

As calls mounted for
extending the revision
period for the preliminary
list in correct errors, Hoyte
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Carter mission
fingers Jacobs

by Shariel Khan

THE Carter Center assessment mission is holding its verdict on the
ousted preliminary voters list until this evening but spokesman, Dr Bob
Patterson yesterday fingered controversial poll architect, Mr Ronald Jacobs,
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Pastor fails to get deal

by Shazif Khan

The Carter Center mission team to Guyana last night discovered a disappointed team after failing to persuade Elections Commission Chairman Rudy Collins and President Desmond Hoyte to accept their proposals that the election be held next month.

The visit by the team, which led by Robert Parish, was intended to add pressure to the Government's decision to delay the election.

A statement issued by the Carter Center said: "The Carter Center team led by Robert Parish, US Ambassador to Guyana, arrived in Georgetown last night to meet with President Desmond Hoyte and Chairman of the Guyana Elections Commission, Rudy Collins. During their meeting, the Carter Center team presented proposals for a delayed election which were rejected by President Hoyte and Chairman Collins. The Carter Center team was disappointed by the outcome of the meeting and returned to the United States."
What happens now?

IT is profoundly disappointing that the Carter team has failed to achieve a reasonable settlement. The list is very badly flawed and cannot possibly be corrected in time. Moreover, no one except the PNC has any confidence in the registration personnel who will be responsible for these corrections. For instance in the Sunday Mirror, Elections Commissioner Clement Rober made great detail an incident at the Dolphine Community High School, where the office of a Deputy Registrar is located, in which he found PNC scrutineers effectively engaged in what seemed to be a plot to new voter registration and the Deputy Registrar turning a blind eye. The PNC has total access to many of these registration officials.

We do not believe a fair election can be held under these conditions. In any event, time has effectively run out for an election to be held by the end of this year, which it must be said things now stand. Return from Registrars showing reportedly about 68,000 errors are being distributed to the parties for them to check with their scrutineers' returns. This may take about two weeks. Claims and objections filed by individuals, which can be filed by early November in the case of objections, also have to be determined. Optimistically, a revised list could be ready by mid-November. This would then have to be published to permit further objections which would have to be deter- mined. It also would have to be circulated to all parties and the PDC had requested these weeks to consider it. They have also asked that a nomination day be not fixed until they have had a chance to see the final list to ensure them to decide whether to participate. That seems only reasonable. Nomination Day must be at least 21 days before polling day.

Either a completely new registration is needed, as the PDC has suggested, perhaps using the Nicaraguan model of voluntary registration, or, at the minimum, new electoral personnel must be appointed and given adequate time to clean up the list. A fair election cannot be envisaged on any other basis.

Mr. Collins must surely recognize, and it would seem logical now for the Election Commission to advise President Hoyte accordingly and outline a new agenda. Nothing less seems acceptable.
Massiah says Hoyte cannot postpone elections

ATTORNEY General Keith Massiah last night contended President Desmond Hoyte could not recall Parliament and postpone elections beyond yesterday to correct the seriously flawed preliminary voters list.

In remarks broadcast on state radio and TV, Massiah declared, "I have no slightest doubt that a state of emergency does not at present exist in Guyana, and that, in any event, the President cannot recall Parliament for the purpose of postponing elections."

His arguments strengthened the President's stand against the plan drawn up by the controversial former minister by current U.S. President Jimmy Carter out of Carter's personal interest.

Kremer however said Massiah was overstepping the line for agreement by leaving it at the President's discretion whether to declare an emergency.

"In any case nothing has been said by Radio Guyana, which is under the Carter plan, to say that it was in the interest of the President to declare an emergency."

The Carter Certificate Mission has not heard of any declaration by the Attorney General and no information has been provided to the President on the matter.

"So the President has not been informed of any recommendation by the Attorney General to declare an emergency."

The Attorney General has said the position is not clear and that he will recall Parliament after a legal opinion is received.

Kremer said that the Attorney General is not in a position to recall Parliament as that would be a violation of the Constitution and would be illegal. He said the Attorney General is not in a position to recall Parliament as he does not have the authority to do so.

The Attorney General was also asked whether the Attorney General is in a position to recall Parliament and to delay the elections. He said that the Attorney General does not have the authority to do so and that the Attorney General is not in a position to recall Parliament as that would be a violation of the Constitution and would be illegal.

CATF can be done: Attorney General Keith Massiah tonight, at the CDF's Director of Information Services, Kesby Alls, on his arrival at the Agency's Visual Production Centre to record his broadcast.

He argued that the atmosphere has emerged in a democracy as to a state of urgent need, and that the Attorney General is not in a position to recall Parliament and to delay the elections.

"We have had a state of emergency but the Attorney General is not in a position to recall Parliament and to delay the elections."

He argued that the Attorney General is not in a position to recall Parliament and to delay the elections.

"We have had a state of emergency but the Attorney General is not in a position to recall Parliament and to delay the elections."

The Attorney General was also asked whether the Attorney General is in a position to recall Parliament and to delay the elections. He said that the Attorney General does not have the authority to do so and that the Attorney General is not in a position to recall Parliament as that would be a violation of the Constitution and would be illegal.

The Attorney General was also asked whether the Attorney General is in a position to recall Parliament and to delay the elections. He said that the Attorney General does not have the authority to do so and that the Attorney General is not in a position to recall Parliament as that would be a violation of the Constitution and would be illegal.

The Attorney General was also asked whether the Attorney General is in a position to recall Parliament and to delay the elections. He said that the Attorney General does not have the authority to do so and that the Attorney General is not in a position to recall Parliament as that would be a violation of the Constitution and would be illegal.
Opposition parties welcome Collins' announcement

He contended that legislation also has to be passed to resolve conflicts of rival authority between the Commission and the elections machinery. Dr. Roppennah was adamant that current constitutional elections personnel will have to be replaced since they have discredited themselves. "There can be no argument for the retention of this machinery," he said adding that this was told to Mr.Hoyte during his WPA's recent meeting with him.

The Democratic Labour Movement (DLM) said that a battle has been won but that both Collins and Mr. Hoyte must decide "whether or not they intend to give leadership to ensure fair elections." The party said that Mr. Hoyte will have to be precise and specific in relation to the electoral reforms to be implemented.

The party is calling for a specific April date for elections, the transfer of Chief Election Officer Ronald Jacob and known PPC activists out of the elections machinery and new community-based registration.

The DLM is also recommending that all contesting political parties should form a committee to monitor the execution of electoral reforms and that should meet once a week. United Republican Party (URP) leader, Dr. Leslie Ramasseny said that "Collins' announcement has put the electoral situation at cross-roads" and said the way is now-clear for the restoration of democracy in Guyana. He said he hoped that discussions with Mr. Hoyte, Collins and the Center will come up with an acceptable plan of action. He said it now has to be made clear that the elections machinery needs revamping.

Attorney Nadir, leader of The United Force said "Collins has come right" and added that the announcement will boost voter confidence. "Clearly he has been frustrated by the election machinery but has come right," he said adding that he had had to be brought under the Commission's control. If the elections are to be postponed, Nadir said that a proper job must be done and there must be new enumeration and special voter ID cards.

The alliance has not said a statement on the new developments and Secretary Gail Teixeira said there are no immedi-
ate plans to do so. A PCD source says serious strains have emerged in the al-
lance since the decision by the three of the six partners to declare themselves for the December 16 date (ANAND PERSAUD)
PNC passes Extension Bill

By Andan Persaud

The PNC, dominated National Assembly yesterday assisted to legislation which could defer general elections until December next year and swept aside amendments put up by the People’s Progressive Party (PPP) seeking to narrow the length of time government can remain in power.

Attorney General Keith Mitchell who plowed the second reading of the bill complained repeatedly that political parties and sections of the press, which he did not identify, had ignored or under-emphasized the provision of the legislation which allows earlier dissolution of Parliament a month after the Chairman of the Elections Commission informs the President that the voters list is complete.

The bill says that Parliament will be dissolved on September 30 next year or on the expiry of a month after the Chairman of the Commission informs President Desmond Hoyte that the list is ready, whichever is sooner.

Mitchell said the President would be bound to dissolve Parliament and convene elections within three months.

Yesterday’s session was marked by the continued boycott of the Working People’s Alliance (WPA) and TUF.

The WPA says it will not attend any session of Parliament related to this bill because there was no prior consultation while TUF has stayed away pending discussion of an elections related motion it has drafted and expects to be put on a Parliamentary notice paper. At the start of the session, Speaker Basil Nairn said that contrary to an earlier Stabroek News report, Parliament Office had not received notice of the TUF motion.

PPP assemblyman and front bench Justice Damas Persaud lobbied to have the bill amended so that the outside dissolution date for Parliament would be the end of May. He charged that the government was continuing in power because of the failure to produce an acceptable voters list.

Government has failed in its responsibility to produce at the appropriate time a proper voters list for elections, he argued.

Even with the stipulation allowing an earlier than September dissolution, Persaud contended it was “unreasonable” for government to keep that date in the bill saying it “would send a wrong signal to the Elections Commission, the country and the world.”

He said the Chairman of the Commission Rudy Collins has indicated that a list could be ready in April and in this circumstance there was no need for the September date.

Persaud also moved an amendment to the bill to delete the clause which fixed the quorum on the Commission as that com- prising the Chairman and not less than half of the members. He said his party did not agree with it because it could reduce the quorum.

From page one

input and effectiveness of either the PNC or opposition members. Persaud’s amendments were not accepted and the PPP voted against the bill which was carried by a 46 to 4 margin.

On the quorum amendment, just before the close of the session and a half hour session, Mitchell rebuffed that no one will be excluded from Commission discussions as a result and added “if you are a member and you take your work seriously, attend.”
VOTERS' LIST WILL BE 99 PER CENT ACCURATE

BY LESA THOMPSON

Elections Commission Chairman Rudolph Collins, reasserting conflicting earlier reports that the Preliminary Voters List should be put out next month with a more than 99 per cent accuracy.

At a Press conference held at the Visual Productions Centre (VPC), Collins told journalists that by the end of May "we should be into the charm and objectives period".

He however declined to give a specific date, choosing not to confide the possibility of a May 13 state of publication for the list, but allowed that political parties should be given advance copies of the new list approximately two weeks in advance of its publication.

Collins, accompanied by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) consultant, John Gergote, held the conference to report on the just-concluded "people's test" and inform the public of the procedures of the voters' list.

He said he could speak now with a "sense of confidence" about the presentation of the Preliminary Voters' List, since with the passing of time the "actions of the Commission, say, now will have been taken to check the accuracy of the list".

The completion of this process, he said, was a "necessity", with the Commission having an entirely new process under development for the checking of the list's accuracy.

"The selection which was completed on January 25th, 1986, necessitated the putting of the preliminary list on the spot but if the list the Commission Chairman stated it is now in which "everyone who is supposed to be on it is on it and every one not supposed to be on it is off of it".

Errors on the list are not present in the new list.

However, he said that a high degree of accuracy, and the integrity of the list were compromised by the public and the political pressure that was being voiced. Among the arguments were that the registration forms might not have been accurate and that the registration exercise itself was not accurate.

In this case, the 99 plus per cent accuracy is meaningful, said Collins.

This, he said, was the Commission's position, in which the member had to demonstrate to the public that "the basis of the political pressure and the basis of the public meetings you will be able to withstand the pressure, get the truth out of the confusion, get the people trust the people's trust in us".

Following the six-week exercise, Gergote has since stated that there is clearly "very little, if any, voter registration manipulation".

Over 2,500 people, or two per cent of the voting population were tested in areas including the accuracy of names and addresses and the existence of people. Fifty-five per cent of these were unrecorded.

Carter Centre representative in Guyana, Denise King was allowed by Collins to observe the test which Collins said was "subject to scrutiny".

"It shows that we now have a list free of political interference and misjudged attempts at manipulation," said Collins.

The Commission is currently conducting a number of additional internal verification tests primarily to locate disqualified voters and to get them placed in their correct civilisation; and to encourage persons with temporary National Identification (ID) numbers to be issued with permanent ones.

The names of persons with temporary numbers are to be published before the final Preliminary Voters List is issued.

CHRONICLE

APRIL 16
A forced rally

The organizers of the Socia-Fast show billed for the National Park last night reportedly called it off because they were advised by government that it would have been a conflict of interest to have a show of this magnitude simultaneously with the PNC rally scheduled for the Square of the Revolu-
tion. Casss Island was scheduled for the biggest night. And judging from past experience roads all around would have been closed to traffic near Square of the Revolution and hundreds would have been bussed in in buses owned by the state and state owned entities.

This is a pappyshow, not a rally. It is using and abusing the resources of the state (police, pressure, state vehicles) to create an illusion, a public event that is artificially built up. It is politics, we suppose, but of the lower variety. None of these activities are available to any of the opposition parties and in fact they have been known to face blackouts at the sites chosen for the meetings and in the reverse case of an opposition rally competing events might well have been staged at the National Park and elsewhere.

There was to be a grand cultural presentation leading up to the rally featuring top bands (this used to be used to be banned under the old electoral regulat-
ions) and a good time was no doubt had by all. The crowd will be vividly, (un)street and a propaganda victory will be proclaimed. All very tedious and depressing, a reminder of the bad old days.

The main interest in the event was whether party leader Desmond Hoyte would announce the election date. At the time of writing this editorial that was not known. But we must record our displeasure and disappointment at the tactics used to mobilize a crowd, some of which really went too far and were quite unacceptable in a democratic society.

October 5 is the day

by Sharief Khan

PRESIDENT Des-

mond Hoyte last night
turned October 5 into a
election day for the na-
tional elections, delayed twice since
December 1999 promising to wage a
"revelentless cam-
paign" against his
political opponents.

He told thousands of his supporters at the city square in the town that the
election will be held on
December 26.

Hoyte said he would stick to his campaign promises and
promised a "new direction" and
campaigning.

"I am the change!"

He told the rally that he was
"transformed" the country

setting it on a course of
"economic prosperity."

He again identified
PPP Leader Ly Chohi
as his main rival in
the elections, never men-
tioning the other candidates
in his address following the end of a special pre-
elections event at the
PNC
party.

Hoyte predicted a
"crushing defeat" of his
rivals at the polls and
added that the campaign strategy be
embraced and embarked
on since last year in an
official campaigning
drive, and claimed, "We are
talking about (my)

presidency."

"I must be judged by
what I have done in my
term of office, on other
issue in relevance, Hoyte
advocated.

Throwing down the gauntlet to Jongi, the PNC
Leader said he hoped the
Civic group was
"ready" as it has cleared
the PNC as "fully
mobilised" and "granted
for battle."
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Carter assures electorate any fraud would be detected

Observers join appeals for full voter turnout

by Sharief Khan

INTERNATIONAL observers yesterday assured Guyanese that the elections were being done free and fair. Today and joined appeals from contesting parties and the Elections Commission for a maximum voter turnout.

The twice-delayed polls are likely to be the first free and fair elections since 1964 with former US President Jimmy Carter yesterday pledging that any fraud would be detected with severe condemnation for the perpetrators.

Carter arrived here Saturday evening to lead a 67-member observer mission from 19 countries that was an arm of the Commonwealth members already deployed around the country.

Last minute studies in the preparations for some 385,000 eligible voters to cast ballots at about 1,000 polling places in the 10 regions have been threatening to derail the process but Carter and Commonwealth mission Leader, former Ontario Premier, David Peterson, were optimistic the elections would come off.

Referring to backup plans to overcome the glitches, including some polling places officials pulling out at the 11th hour, Peterson told reporters: “It is coming together quite nicely”. His observation came at a press conference he shared with Carter at the Portmore Hotel yesterday.

“I feel the conditions now exist for an acceptable, free, fair and safe election”, Carter told reporters urging the “maximum number” of Guyanese to go out to the polls today to express their will.

Carter announced that in the Georgetown district, his team would be visiting more than 95 percent of the polling places to witness proceedings and would also be monitoring 771 polling sites around the country.

The Carter Centre team, he said, would be working with polling officials of prevailing parties and the Elections Commission “to ensure that the day that we know what is going on”.

If there is a pattern of deviation from properties, it will be obvious to us,” he added.

Key Carter aide, Dr. Robert Pastor, told Stabroek News: “I think it is going to work out” and recalled that there were problems on election day in 1997. A year ago, Pastor Bertrand Aristide, was convinced the election was being stolen from him although Carter Centre observers assured them they knew what was happening.

Aristide scored a landslide victory and he was “axed” by the next day. Pastor said.

Prime Minister, Georges Arruge, Prime Minister of Haiti, accompanying Carter, told the press conference that the mission had “extensive briefings from our experts on how to observe the elections” and the counting of ballots. He said the Carter Centre observers would, at random, today be covering.
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Carter assures polling victory

The president, who is in Bolivia, has no illusions about the process.

"I am not expecting a lot of money to come out of it," he said. "What I expect is that we will see a strong move for reform.

"That is what we are working for, and I think we will see it happen."
The People's Progressive Party (PPP) led by veteran politician Dr. Cheddi Jagan were yesterday declared victors by the Elections Commission in what is believed to be Guyana's first free and fair polls since 1953.

The announcement, a green briefer by Commission Chairman Rudy Collins at 5:20 pm, ended six decade anticipation and speculation over the results of a day yesterday.

PPP candidate Dr. Roger Lynchehan speaking to Newsshack News after the declaration by Collins said the party was happy if Jagan had become president.

With 95.63 per cent of the vote counted, a Commission spokesperson declared before a handful of attentive observers that the PPP had secured 58 of 62 seats against 12 for PPP/Civic, with 2.5 per cent each for the PNC.

Earlier a senior Collins told the media that the vote was 60.55 per cent to 39.44 per cent for the PNC.

PNC lawyers are studying the obstacles in the path of an

Jagan wins

by Sharief Khan and Amad Pernard

Mr. Lynchehan with emmissaries Dr. Cedric Grant, (PNC) second from left, Dr. Roger Lynchehan (PPP/Civic) and side Dr. Robert Parker, right, before flying out yesterday. (Ken Moore photo.)
PNC will accept results - Hoyte

INCUMBENT President Desmond Hoyte last night said his party "in keeping with the requirements of democracy," will accept the results of the polls.

Hoyte, in a statement, urged all Guttermen to accept the results of the elections adding "we were determined to ensure transparency and have succeeded." He told all citizens to accept these political developments, maintain a peaceful and harmonious climate in the society and keep the welfare and good name of Guyana foremost in their minds," Hoyte said.

He said he was advised the Elections Commission will make a formal announcement of the results by the end of the week and the new president will assume office immediately after.

He said the acceptance of the results would not prejudice any right of the PNC to go to court on some perceived administration and other issues during the elections.

"He has not conceded the election and I don’t think it is proper for him to do so at this time", Carter said about three hours before Elections Commission Chairman Mr. Rudy Collins was due to make a statement related to the final declaration of the poll results.

Carter said he met several times yesterday with Hoyte, army Chief of Staff Brigadier Joe Singh and Police Commissioner Laurie Lewis and felt a repeat of Monday’s isolated outbreak of violence in the city centre was "unlikely".

The army Chief, Carter said reporters, yesterday informed him he had had a pledge of loyalty to the country’s new president from his military commanders.

He also announced that Hoyte and Jagdeo designated personal representatives to effect a smooth transition of powers.

Jagdeo’s representative, Dr. Roger Luncheon and Hoyte’s emissary, Foreign Affairs adviser Dr. Ceddric Grant set aside by side in the front row at yesterday’s press conference and Carter met them briefly afterwards.

He said the two emissaries yesterday met with him and former Ontario Premier, Mr. David Peterson, the leader of the Commonweallh Observer Group, who has decided to extend his stay here until after the final results are followed through.

According to Carter, Luncheon and Grant will “initiate an easier communication between the two major contending parties” and work to meet with such effort for several hours last night.

He called the decision to appoint Luncheon and Grant’s “very encouraging sign of acceptance of the prospective results”.

Well-placed sources yesterday said key aides of Hoyte were preparing to demit the Office of the President complex on New Garden Street and the incumbent was into several meetings with his senior advisors.

One aide described the atmosphere in the office complex as “very quiet” with the “public servants” on the staff going about their business as usual.

The sources said Hoyte would accept the results and was prepared to concede defeat.

As news of the results spread, the still largely deserted city saw sporadic attempts at rekindling the poll day violence which sprang from the swelling of the Elections Commission Cruel Street office building by a group claiming it had been disentrenched.

With handcuffs shown of “we want Hoyte” a rash made less than spirited attempts at again heading towards PPP Freedom House headquarters on Albert Street but riot police firmly held them off and cordoned the block.

An army helicopter almost immediately flew in and began circling over the rally screeching in the block between Camp and Wellington streets and between Robb and Regent streets.

Armed police were last night on guard in the area and patrols were stepped up.

Carter felt the Monday violence had increased the awareness of the security forces to pick up the pace and presence. Carter added that combined with the “very harmonious relationship that seems to exist between the PNC and PPP, the acceptance of the results as they have been premeditated so far, obviously convince me that the prospects for the near-distant future bode for a peaceful acceptance of the results of the elections.”

The former US President said he did not consider the sporadic attempts at violence a threat to the security of the country.

While he did not consider an appeal of Monday’s street violence in the city was likely, Carter said, “I can’t say it’s a sure thing that it’s absolutely impossible.”
by Shariel Khan

PRESIDENT CHEDDI JAGAN assumed office yesterday simply and unassuming, extending the hand of friendship in victory. It is time to embrace each other and work in unity, the former President said.

It was not a motorcade, no garish hor­ses, no trumpet fanfare, nothing to the extravaganza that marked President Arthur’s inauguration. Instead, Jagdeo’s arrival was quiet, and it was over in about 10 minutes.

Jagdeo de­parted the Palace of the Parliament in a taxi. He shouted at the police for the fence on the road. He added that police had arrested a few people in the crowd.

The ceremony was simple and un­ceremonious. The presence of the media was minimal, and there were no speeches by the President or the Prime Minister.

The new President and his wife, Eileen, were seen shaking hands with the Prime Minister and the Cabinet.

Jagdeo, a former trade union leader, has been a vocal critic of the previous administration and has promised to work for the benefit of the people.

Jagdeo, 74, has been a member of the People’s National Congress (PNC) for over 40 years and has been a prominent figure in Guyana’s politics for decades.

Jagdeo’s inauguration was marked by a series of protests and demonstrations by opposition supporters, who accused the government of corruption and mismanagement.

Jagdeo, in his speech, acknowledged the challenges facing the country and promised to work towards a more equitable and just society.

The new government has promised to implement a number of reforms, including plans to increase investment in education and health care, and to address the issue of gender equality.

Jagdeo also thanked the international community for their support and commitment to Guyana’s development.

The new government has faced criticism from some sections of the opposition, who have accused it of being too close to the previous administration and of not doing enough to address the country’s pressing issues.

Jagdeo acknowledged that the country faces many challenges, but he said he was determined to work towards a better future for all Guyanese.

Jagdeo also thanked the international community for their support and commitment to Guyana’s development.

The new government has promised to implement a number of reforms, including plans to increase investment in education and health care, and to address the issue of gender equality.

The new government has faced criticism from some sections of the opposition, who have accused it of being too close to the previous administration and of not doing enough to address the country’s pressing issues.

Jagdeo acknowledged that the country faces many challenges, but he said he was determined to work towards a better future for all Guyanese.
"Time to embrace each other"
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develop a constructive relationship with Mr Des-
mond Hoyte and the leadership of all parties in
order to deepen our democratic process and
accelerate our economic development."

He also congratulated
army Chief of Staff, brigadier Joe Singh and
Police Commissioner Laurie Lewis, who were
present, for "faithfully main-
taining law and order at
this challenging time."

Jagan assured the two
disciplined forces leaders,
"they can always count on
the full cooperation and
support of my government
in the exercise of these con-
nstitutional duties."

"I salute the major
Western powers for over-
seer the electoral pro-
cess and I must after-
fact orly embrace our
many supporters for their
support, patience and
calm," Jagan declared in
a warm approach.

He wrapped up his ac-
equise remarks with
"Long live national unity.
Long live Guyana!"
before going into a round
of congratulatory bear-
hugging and handshakes
from well-wishers includ-
ing ambassadors and high
commissioners.

The outgoing Presi-
dent and his wife arrived at
4pm and Hoyte was ac-
crowned the National As-
sembly for the last time as
Head of State, then into the
time, stepped Jagan's Prime
Minister designate,
Mr Sam Hinds and his
wife Yvonne.

Immediately after
Jagan entered and, with a
tilt of the head in greeting
to the Hoytes, joined
Chancellor Kenneth
George at a table.

At 4.00pm, Elections
Commission Chairman
Rudy Collins stepped to
the microphone to for-
mally declare Jagan had
been elected President to
sustained applause.

Jagan then accepted
the green-covered folder
which included the Oath of
Office and with a gold-plated
pen formally signed the in-
strument of office.

And at 4.30pm the Na-
tional Assembly was played
to announce the new Presi-
dent had taken office.

Aiden said Jagan was
a "quiet" man who had
last night continuing a
series of meetings to select
his Cabinet. Members of
Parliament, a Speaker for
the National Assembly
and other matters.

The PPP/Civic leader-
ship were in "transition
sessions", one source said.

Reaching out: President Jagan with Mr Hamilton Green and PNC Leader Desmond Hoyte yesterday. (Wes Davis photo.)
You fought a great fight... why do you think you lost?

Complacency!
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