

NEWS COMMENTARIES - MAY, 1960.

55.	Federal Constitution Conference in Trinidad	-	2nd May
56.	Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference	-	3rd "
57.	The Commonwealth Idea	-	4th "
58.	The Case of Caryl Chessman	-	5th "
59.	K.S.A.C. Public Cleansing Committee	-	6th "
60.	Speculations about Manley going to Federation	-	7th "
61.	Report on Mr. Manley's return from Federal Conference	-	9th "
62.	Shooting down of American Jet by the Russians	-	10th "
63.	Voting by the West African State of Ghana	-	11th "
64.	The Battle of Words: Sir R. Kirkwood and Hon. Rduelph Burke	-	12th "
65.	Some points on the Annual Report of J.P.S. C. News Headlines of the past several Days	-	13th "
66.	The Rastafarian Troubles: Letter from foreign Govt. Representative	-	14th "
67.	London and the Money Market	-	16th "
68.	Jamaica Federation of Women and Refugees	-	17th "
69.	Africa: In a State of Constant Change	-	18th "
70.	Result of the Summit Meeting Manley's Announcement on the Air Talks - U.K. and U.S.A.	-	19th "
71.	Housing Problem in Jamaica	-	20th "
72.	Housing Problem: The Harbour View Method	-	21st "
73.	" " " " " "	-	23rd "
74.	The Beef Cattle Industry	-	24th "
75.	The End of Empire Day and the First Labour Day Celebrations	-	25th "
76.	Jagan's British Guiana	-	26th "
77.	" " "	-	27th "
78.	Display of Smutty Literature on Bookstands	-	28th "
79.	K.S.A.C. and the Public Cleansing Department Workers Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of U.S.A.	-	30th "
80.	The Earthquake in Chile	-	31st "

NEWS COMMENTARY
For transmission on
Monday May 2nd at 6.15p.m

Good evening: The Premier, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Trade and Industry and a number of experts and advisers left for Port-of-Spain, Trinidad yesterday for the next round of conferences on the Federal Constitution. Before leaving Mr. Manley was forced to make a public statement denying a newspaper report which was published on Wednesday of last week. This report said that top-drawer civil servants had been instructed to prepare a blueprint for Jamaica to leave the Federation unless Jamaica gets its way all along the line. The report gave the impression that our delegation was going down to Trinidad with a sort of tough take-it-or-leave-it attitude; and I personally got the impression from the report that our delegates were hoping that the people of the south Caribbean would supply the excuse for us to quit the Federation. In short, I felt that if this news report was true and we were really just looking for an excuse to get out of the Federation, then why waste time and money by sending our delegation to the conference? Why not just be honest and say 'We quit'?

But on Thursday of last week Mr. Manley issued an official statement saying it was untrue to say Jamaica had either prepared a 'tough line' or instructed its top civil servants to prepare a blueprint for leaving the Federation. Mr. Manley said no responsible person connected with Government could have made such statements. He said this news report was unfortunate because it was calculated to embarrass the Jamaica delegation and to create difficulties for it.

Now, if Mr. Manley had not put out this denial of the news report the people in the south Caribbean would have been justified

in thinking that we are not really interested in the Federation unless what we say and what we want is accepted all down the line. And certainly, on the basis of that news report, Dr. Eric Williams would have been justified if he had said: "So, Jamaica has warned us that she will be tough and she is ready to get out; Allright, let her get tough, we'll get tough too." And the conference would be off to a disastrous start, charged with suspicion and hostility. Mr. Manley's statement has, I hope, cleared the air as far as the people of the south Caribbean are concerned.

Now about the conference itself: as you know, two committees have been at work over the past few months trying to resolve the differences between the views of Trinidad and Jamaica on certain political and economic issues. Trinidad, as you know, wants the Federal Government to have power to levy taxes on the Units. She wants the Federal Government to have more of a say in the affairs of the unit governments because she believes a successful federation must have a strong central government. Jamaica, on the other hand, does not want her complex and delicately planned economic programme upset by having any outside power interfere with it, and so she is in favour of marking time on the question of a strong central government. The present conference is to see what progress the committees have made in their attempts to reconcile these two points of view. For myself, I think that given time and patience these conflicting views can be ~~reconciled~~ reconciled. But we need patience.....Tomorrow I will discuss the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. Goodnight

Handwritten notes:
2nd April
Jamaica
Trinidad
reconciled

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday May 3rd at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Today one of the really remarkable conferences of our time has opened in London. It is not remarkable because it is a conference; the Commonwealth Prime Ministers meet every year so there is nothing unique about that. They met last year and the year before and the year before that and they will meet again next year and the year after and the year after that. What is remarkable is how these conferences came about and the very special meaning they have in the world today.

The Prime Ministers and other Heads-of-State whose meetings opened today represent roughly 500 million peoples - that is, a quarter of all the people on the earth. In terms of countries they represent the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Pakistan, the Central African Federation, Ghana, Ceylon and the Federation of Malaya: eleven countries in all. All the racial strains in the world are found in the countries represented by the Commonwealth Prime Ministers; and there are people of every shade of colour; black, brown, yellow, pink and every kind of mixture of these. (By the way, I have never seen a human being who is really white, so why we call pink-coloured people white, I don't know).

Anyway, as you know, each one of these countries was once a colony of Britain and the people of each were once colonial subjects of Britain. And as you know, at some time or another in the histories of each one of these countries has fought against their colonial status. In South Africa, for instance, there was a full-scale war between Britain and the Boers. In India we saw years of struggle and mass

imprisonments before they achieved independence. The Indian Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, who is probably the most honoured and respected man at the present conference, spent something like 17 years in British prisons in India for leading his country's independence struggle. And Ghana's Kwame Nkrumah had to be released from a British jail to lead his country. In some cases the struggle was not as violent, but in almost every case the colonial people had to use pressure, had to agitate and demonstrate before they won self-government.

Why then did they not turn their backs on Britain when they won their freedom from colonialism? It is when we try to answer that question that we see the remarkable character of the Commonwealth. When Britain found that she could not hold a country by force any longer she faced that fact squarely and set about helping that country to organise its own self-government. In some cases she gave financial aid and in nearly all cases she supplied some of her best civil servants ^{to help} in the organising of that country's affairs. This has made for a smooth transition from colonialism to self-government. Of course there were political and economic considerations involved. But I do not think that was the whole story. I think there was an idea involved too. And I think it was because they bought this idea that Britain's ex-colonies did not cut themselves away when they achieved their freedom. I think in the years to come our own Federation as well as that of Nigeria, that Tanganyika, Kenya, Nyasaland and Uganda will all remain in the Commonwealth when they win their independence because of that idea. Tomorrow I will tell you what that idea is....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday May 4th at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: As I promised you last night, I propose to discuss the Commonwealth idea~~x~~ this evening. To start off let us ask ourselves ^{this} a very important question: What binds the Commonwealth together, and does anybody compel anybody else to be a member? The short answer is that nobody compels anybody else to join and anybody is free to leave the Commonwealth at any time. The thing which binds the Commonwealth together is a body of beliefs held by all its members which has, over the years, become known as the Commonwealth Idea.

Democratic government, the rule of law and the rights of the individual are the cornerstones of the Commonwealth idea.

Those who believe in the Commonwealth idea believe that the best form of government possible in the world is that in which ~~the majority~~ all the citizens of a country choose, by free and secret vote, the men and women who will represent them in parliament and make their laws. They believe that this is only possible where men are free to organise themselves into as many political parties as they choose. They also believe that all citizens, whatever their rank or station or position or wealth, should be ^{equally} subject to the laws made by their freely elected parliament. And they also believe that each citizen should have the right to hold whatever political or religious beliefs he or she might choose. But, you will say, a person or a country can hold these beliefs without belonging to the Commonwealth. That is true. However, the believers in the Commonwealth idea, and I am one of them, will go on to say that the moral authority of the Commonwealth in the world today is because a number of

countries have joined together freely, as equal partners, to give weight to the idea. The Commonwealth and the idea it represents, they will say, is what they hope tomorrow's world will be like: a world in which nations and races will have forgotten their conflicts and differences and meet as equals and friends to plan for the good of all mankind. It is this hope which gives the Commonwealth idea its nobility and makes this week's meetings so important.

But of course, a hope is one thing and reality is another. Not all the Commonwealth members have lived up or are even trying to live up to the Commonwealth idea. Some, like the racist government of South Africa, are flatly against it, no matter how much they pay lip-service to it. Indeed, South Africa is one of the headaches facing the Commonwealth Prime Ministers. I think they will have to do something about it or risk a split in the Commonwealth; and nothing would be more tragic for the Commonwealth idea than a split along racial and colour lines. All the members of the Commonwealth, except the Central African Federation, have made it clear that they detest South Africa's race policies. But more than that needs to be done if this great idea is to flourish in this world where there is ^{so} much fear, hatred and suspicion among men and nations.

But, with all its faults and weaknesses, the Commonwealth is a great symbol for the future. When the leaders of the other nations of the world can meet together as do our Commonwealth leaders, we will be nearer peace and understanding among men.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday May 5th at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I was very surprised when I heard over J.B.C's 5.30p.m news last night that Mr. Peter Abrahams was a Defence Counsel in the Treason Felony case of Mr. Elaudius Henry and others. I should like you to know that it certainly was not this Peter Abrahams who is now speaking to you.

Now, this evening I want to discuss some aspects of the case of Caryl Chessman who was executed in the United States on Monday of this week. This ~~mx~~ case has, as you know, aroused strong feelings and storms of protest from all over the world. People who are against the death penalty have used the Chessman case as an argument for the abolition of the death sentence; and those who are in favour of it have used the Chessman case to support their arguments. There have been demonstrations, public meetings and newspaper headlines all over the world. And although Chessman is now dead, the great debate has not ended. So, let us try and look as dispassionately as possible at the Chessman case.

As I see it, there are two issue involved. First, there is the case of Caryl Chessman himself; and second, there is the question of doing away with the death sentence. I think very many people have confused these two issues hopelessly.

Now let us look at the Chessman case. Chessman was a juvenile delinquent way back in the 1930s. He was first arrested for stealing a car at the age of 16. He served his sentence but was again arrested for the same crime when he was 18. He showed, even then, a great gift for talking himself out of trouble and wrote such a brilliant essay excusing himself that the judge put him on probation. But a year later he was again arrested; and this time it was not just for

stealing a car, it was for five cases of robbery with violence. He spent four years in prison for these crimes but was paroled in December 1947. A month later, in January of 1948, a gunman driving a car with a red spotlight committed 17 crimes, holding up people and robbing them at the point of his gun. On two occasions after he had held up cars, he forced two women into his own car and raped them. One of the women ~~he so raped~~ was a 17-year-old girl whose name is Mary Lea Meza. Mary Lea Meza was so shocked by this ordeal that it upset the balance of her mind and she had to be put into a mental asylum. She has been in the asylum for nearly 12 years now. This gunman, ~~this rapist~~, was Caryl Chessman and it was for the two ~~rapings~~ ^{his crimes against women} that he was sentenced to death. All those who have raised their voices on behalf of Caryl Chessman have not had one word to say about Mary Lea Meza whose young life had effectively been destroyed by Chessman and who now continues a kind of living death. The life and crimes of Chessman were sordid and savage. Neither his quick brain nor clever pen should fool us about that.

Now for the second issue, that of getting rid of the death sentence. Quite frankly, I have mixed feelings about it. I hate the whole idea of the taking of life. I hope our world will one day be civilised enough for there to be no wars, no murders and no executions. But what are we to do with the killers in our midst today? For myself I can honestly only judge a case on its merits. I find it hard to make any general rule. What I do know is that for me Chessman is a bad symbol to use as an argument against the death sentence.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Friday May 6th at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I ^{am} ~~xxx~~ very glad to see that the Kingston and St. Andrew Corporation Council's Public Cleansing Committee seems to be getting down to the business of trying to clean up the city. You will remember that I spoke about the dirtiness of the city two Saturday ago, and emphasised especially the fact that it was the children who suffered most as a result of the dirt. Well, at its last monthly meeting the Public Cleansing Committee discussed how best to deal with the problem.

I think some very good suggestions were put forward and I particularly welcome Councillor Vicky Grants idea that the city be divided into zones for cleansing purposes. The Town Clerk suggested that notices be published in the press calling on householders to provide rubbish bins within six months. But some Councillors felt that this would impose a hardship on the poorer people of the city who might not be able to afford the price of these rubbish bin, especially if the Committee were to tell the people what kind of bins had to be bought. I certainly agree with those Councillors. It would be both unfair and costly, and beyond the pockets of ~~the~~ a large number of the people of the city. Indeed, I do not see why the city should not supply its own rubbish bins out of the quarter of a million pounds of the tax payer's money which is voted to keep the city clean. This is what happens in most other cities abroad. And the citizens of Kingston certainly pay enough in taxes, both direct and indirect, to be entitled to a free rubbish bin. And even if this cannot be done for everybody, it should be done for those who genuinely cannot afford the price of a bin.

But what is even more important than the rubbish bins at present is the wuestion of the removal of the rubbish. You know how casual some of the men on the city's garbage trucks are. Sometimes you have a case where a person does not want to keep the rubbish at their front gate till the trucks come. That person will wait until he or she sees the truck and then dash out to carry the rubbish to the gate. If the truckmen feel like it they will shoot past without collecting the rubbish, saying that that person is too late. This has happened to me when I lived in the city and I know it is still happening.

Now this is just not good enough and it is time the Public Cleansing Committee and Mr. Minott did something about it. I think they ought to tell these truckmen that they are not doing the citizens of Kingston any favour. It is their duty to clear all the rubbish away. In England no citizen has to put his rubbish out on the street before the ~~xxx~~ garbage men will remove it. The garbage collectors in England go into the yard, go to the back of the house where the rubbish is kept, carry it from there to the trucks, and then bring the empty rubbish bins back to where they were before. That is good service, the kind of service citizens of a proud city expect and get. That is why the streets of English cities are so clean. I should like to see our streets as clean. I should like to see Mr. Minott instruct his men to follow the English example and get the rubbish from the back. That is what we pay them for.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Monday May 9th at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I am sure all of you have heard Mr. Manley's cheerful report over the radio^{last night} on his return from Trinidad. The meetings in Trinidad, Mr. Manley said, had done some very useful work. The question of representation had been settled: Jamaica will get 31 out of the 64 seats in the Federal House of Representatives. And Customs Union will be introduced slowly, spread over a period of ten years.

I am sure many of you will remember that it was not so long ago that it looked as though the Federation would break up over the question of representation. Certainly, those of us who went by the newspaper headlines of those days were led to believe that the south Caribbean was ganging up against giving Jamaica its rightful number of seats. Now the problem has been solved.

The same situation once applied with Customs Union; and again, a workable solution has been found in spite of all the gloomy news headlines. The moral of this, I think, is that we must take our news headlines on Federal matters with a very strong pinch of salt. All these so-called 'insoluble' problems can be solved, as last week's meetings so clearly showed. All that is needed is patience and the will to make our Federation succeed. For myself, I am very proud of the behaviour and the ~~unparalleled~~ solid good sense shown by Jamaica's delegation at last week's meetings. Our people put forward Jamaica's case with firmness and great skill. They refused to be dragged into the heated arguments which Dr. Eric Williams loves so dearly at times. The result ~~was~~ is that the other delegates, especially those from the small islands, got a very much clearer understanding of the problems that have to be worked out before

we can have a really workable Federation which would serve the interests of all the people of the West Indies; and this, I think, was a most important achievement by the Jamaica delegation. It is important that all the problems of the Federation should be faced fairly and squarely. It is important that they should all be discussed, worked out and agreed on before the next step is taken. That is why I agree with Mr. Manley when he says that the question of independence does not really arise. We can have independence any time we want it. But what good would independence be to us unless we have set our own house in order and know where we are going?

Of course, not all the problems have been solved. There is still the key question of whether we should have a Federal Government with over-riding powers to regulate the economic affairs of the Units or a much looser center leaving over-riding powers in the hands of the Unit governments. This, as you know, is the basic point of conflict between the views of Jamaica and Trinidad. To face this problem the meetings accepted the Jamaican suggestion that two draft constitutions be worked out: one reflecting the Trinidad point of view and the other the Jamaican point of view. These two constitutions are then to be submitted to the next series of meetings which will take place in October of this year. ~~That~~ is likely to be the decisive meeting. I think the success of last week's meetings are a hopeful promise for the very important meetings of this coming October.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday May 7th at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I have received letters from a number of listeners from time to time. Some of these have expressed approval for one or another of these commentaries. Some have asked for copies of the commentaries. And some have been letters of a more personal nature in which a listener has either put forward his or her ideas or asked me a number of questions. I have appreciated getting these letters very much indeed and I do want to thank those of you who have written. But I am sure you will understand and bear with me when I say it is not possible for me to answer all your letters personally. Indeed, if I were to try to answer all your letters you might find that there will be no news commentaries because I will not have the time to prepare them. But I really do thank you very much for writing.

Now this evening I want to talk a little about the speculations that have been going the rounds in the past few days about Mr. Manley going to the Federation. The story, as you know, goes something like this: Mr. Manley will contest the by-election for the St. Thomas seat in the House of Representatives. He will not be opposed by the Jamaica Labour Party and so his victory will be certain. He will then go to the Federal Parliament. Sir Grantley Adams will resign as Prime Minister of the Federation and Mr. Manley will take over.

This story was first published in the Trinidad Guardian early this week. The representatives of our two radio stations in Trinidad picked up the story and sent it to Jamaica, and the buzz of speculation could be heard all over the place. Now what is behind this story? The Gleaner correspondent in Port-of-Spain has sent a

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday May 10th at 6/15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The shooting down by the Russians of an American jet plane 1,300/^{miles}inside Russian territory will, I am afraid, hang like a very dark and gloomy shadow over the East-West Summit meetings which open ~~on May 16th~~ ^{next week Monday} in Paris. I think we might as well face the fact that this incident will cancel all our hopes that Russia and the Western Powers - the United States, France and Britain - will make any real headway in easing international tension. I don't think we can expect any agreement on world disarmament and the control of of atomic and hydrogen weapons. I don't think we can expect any agreement on reuniting Germany which has been cut in two since the end of the Second World War. And I certainly do not think that there will now be any easing of the Cold War of propaganda between Russia and the Western Powers. I think the Western Powers are going to find themselves extremely embarrassed in their talks with Mr. Krushchev; and I think they are going to find him more cocky, more arrogant and more aggressive than he usually is. In terms of the power politics of the Cold War the Americans have given him a wonderful big stick with which to beat the United States in particular and the West in general. In short, Russia has caught the West with its pants down and it is going to make sure that the rest of the world sees just what a propaganda licking it gives the West.

This licking has already started. Mr. Krushchev has produced a confession by the pilot of the plane, Francis Powers, that he was on a spying mission. On Powers was found suicide kit, a dagger, a pistol with a silencer attached to it and a mixed assortment of money including 7,500 Russian rubles. When he produced all this before the Russian parliament Krushchev gloated: "This time the thief was caught red-handed!"

Now, to get this whole story into its proper perspective we have to know the facts of life in great power politics. Of course Powers was spying. Even the United States Government has now admitted that. Every one of the great Powers goes in for spying. Britain has her spies, France has her spies, the United States has her spies and Russia has her spies. Indeed, the Russian spy system is probably the largest in the world today. The Russians have their spies, both paid and unpaid, in nearly every country of the world. I am reasonably certain that there are probably more Russian spies in the United States than there are American spies in Russia. I am sure many of you will remember the great Russian spy ring which was discovered in Canada shortly after the last war; and I am sure many of you will remember the atomic spy Fuchs who handed Britain's atomic secrets over to the Russian. And a few years ago there was a Russian spy case uncovered in Australia. And Europe itself bristles with Russian spies who not only steal information but go in for kidnapping and murder as well.

But of course Mr. Krushchev will conveniently forget all this when he beats the great Russian drum declaring to all the world what bad characters the American 'war-mongers' are and how this proves that they are planning to attack the 'peace-loving' Soviet Union. This is just so much propaganda. In terms of spying it is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. They all go in for it. It is just that the Americans were caught at it this time because they tried something foolish.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday May 11 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last week the people of the West African State of Ghana went to the polls to cast their votes on the next important step in shaping their country's future. They had to vote on two issues. First, they had to say whether they wanted their country to remain a Dominion ~~within~~ within the Commonwealth as it now is or whether they wanted it to become a republic. Secondly, if they voted for becoming a republic, then they had to choose their first President. The two candidates for the Presidency were Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, the Prime Minister and Dr. Joseph Danquah, the Leader of the Opposition.

About half of Ghana's 5½ million people cast their votes. They decided that they wanted Ghana turned into a republic, and they chose Kwame Nkrumah as the first President of the new republic.

Now what is behind this? Why did Ghana decide to be a republic? And what are its plans for the future? Does it plan to leave the Commonwealth?

To answer these questions we must try to understand what goes on in the mind of Kwame Nkrumah. Nkrumah has made modern Ghana and for a long time to come Ghana will be what Nkrumah wants ~~it~~ it to be.

Now, Nkrumah is a very ambitious politician. He is a man with very great dreams and he has the drive and the energy to make those dreams come true. His greatest dream of all is to create a United States of Africa; and, of course, he sees Kwame Nkrumah as the head of such a great union of African states. The late George Padmore, Jomo Kenyatta and I were with him when he first put forward this great dream at one of the early Pan-African Congresses in Manchester, England, in 1945. It seemed a little crazy to all of us then, but

Nkrumah has stuck to his dream and last week's decision to turn Ghana into a republic is another step towards it.

Nkrumah outlined his great dream to us in the following stages: First, ~~Ghana~~ the Gold Coast had to win its self-government and then turn itself into the African State of Ghana. Next it had to help the other West African States to win their self-government. And then it had to lead in the forming of a United States of West Africa. And finally, the United States of West Africa would lead in the setting up of the United States of Africa with a single government running the whole African continent/ with its two hundred million people. Such a government, controlling such a vast area of land with such a huge population, would be one of the most powerful in the world.

It is in pursuit of this dream that Ghana ~~has decided~~ decided to become a republic last week. As the President of an independent republic Nkrumah will have so much more stature and authority. And since he hopes that non-British ~~territories~~ like Guinea, Togoland (which gained its independence last month), Liberia, the Mali Federation, would join in his United States of West Africa, he is making sure that he is in a constitutional position to leave the Commonwealth whenever it suits him. Already there is a loose form of Union between Ghana and Guinea, and President Tubman of Liberia has expressed his interest in the idea. But Nigeria, the largest state in West Africa and with a population of over 30 millions, is very cold to Nkrumah's ideas, and Nigeria is going to be the most important state in tomorrow's Africa. I am sure that Nigeria, not Ghana, will lead tomorrow's Africa; and this fact will stop Nkrumah's great dreams.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday May 12 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: As well as having fireworks at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference and the threat of fireworks at our on Federal conference last week, we also had some verbal sparks flying right here at home. The two local giants who clashed, you may remember, were Sir Robert Kirkwood and the Honourable Rudolph Burke. The battle of words started, you will remember, when Sir Robert said in the Legislative Council, during the debate on the setting up of the new Banana Board, that he now declared our agricultural associations a complete and absolute failure as far as activity is concerned. This judgement of his, Sir Robert said, was based on fifteen years of experience with our agricultural bodies.

Mr. Rudolph Burke was quick to react to this statement. ~~of Sir Robert's~~. He described it as 'a slander on the small farmers' and as disgraceful, 'really disgraceful'. This first reaction of Mr. Burke was expressed in Legco. But the matter did not rest there. ~~On~~ At last Wednesday meeting of the Board of Management of the J.A.S. Sir Robert again came in for strong criticism; and again the attack was led by Mr. Burke, this time in his capacity as President of the J.A.S. The essence of Mr. Burke's attack was that Sir Robert had slandered the small farmers who had helped to build him up. At the end of the debate the Board unanimously went on record stating that Sir Robert had insulted the J.A.S. and that the Board took exception to the place where he had done it and the manner in which he had done it.

~~The only contribution that was made~~

I personally thought all this was good. I think healthy and

vigorous debate is a sure sign of life in any organisation, and I certainly do not think it will do our agricultural organisations any harm. The only part of the discussion I did not like was Mr. Claude Hamilton's comparing Sir Robert 'to a certain animal which always abandoned ships when the ships were about to sink'. This, I thought, was unnecessarily offensive in a very person^{al} sort of way. It should be possible for men in public life to disagree as violently as ~~they~~ ^{like} possible without being personally offensive. Certainly, in all he said, Sir Robert did not stoop to name-calling. But apart from Mr. Hamilton's contribution, I thought this public argument most interesting and instructive. It certainly raised a number of questions in my own mind.

I think Sir Robert Kirkwood and the Honourable Rudolph Burke are such old hands at the game of give and take that I am prepared to sit back and watch them fight it out. What I do find a little curious was that the J.A.S. Board of Management should think that Legco was not the place to raise the subject. Why is it not the place? Is the J.A.S. such a sacred cow that people cannot discuss it wherever they want to? Where better can it be discussed than in our parliament? After all, it does get some of the taxpayers money.

But the next round of this scrap is still to come. Sir Robert has now put down a number of questions for Mr. Burke to answer in Legco. And the Honourable Edward Seaga has join the battle by putting down his own list of questions. I think the answers to these questions would be good for our agriculture, and I look forward to the next round in this verbal free for all that is now brewing.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday May 13 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Did you know that you are paying less for your electricity today than you did ~~xxxxxx~~ in 1958? It is a fact; the price that you pay for your electricity has actually been going down, ~~year by year~~. In 1955 you paid 3.66d for every Kilowatt hour of electricity you used. You paid the same in 1956. In 1957 the price went up to 3.75d per Kilowatt hour. In 1958 it dropped to 3.69d per Kilowatt Hour, and last year to 3.56d. And as I understand it, a further drop in price is possible later on. Part of the reason for this is that the more electricity you use the more cheaply can it be produced and sold to you. In fact, electricity is, as far as I can see, one of the very few ~~xxxx~~ household items that has not gone up in price. All this, by the way, I have just discovered by looking at the 1959 annual report of the Jamaica Public Service Company. Of course I have not noticed any saving of money in my own family. But then we are using a lot more electricity than we did a year ago. Last year Jamaicans used 207,905,000 Kilowatt Hours. This was 34,453,000 Kilowatt Hours more than in 1958. And in 1959 4,673 new households started using electricity for the first time, bringing the total number of households to 51,573. Well now, when this new scheme comes into force by which every village in Jamaica with a population of 500 people or more will get electricity, the consumption of electricity is going to shoot up at an amazing rate. And this annual report makes it clear that the company is gearing itself for this tremendous effort to carry light to every corner of this land.

I think we have that rare thing in the Jamaica Public Service Company: a private, profit-seeking company which genuinely serves

the public good of the community.

Now let us look at some of the ugly things that have made the news headlines over the past several days. On Friday night of last week two men who went to visit a patient at the Jubilee Maternity Hospital were set upon and beaten by porters whom they had asked to take a parcel to a patient ~~as it was~~ after visiting hours. There was a nurse present but she, too, ~~had~~ refused to help out by taking the parcel to the patient. On Monday night of this week a policeman ~~and~~ was seriously injured by an attacker on Washington Boulevard while sitting in a car with a woman friend. On Tuesday night a young man was shot to death ~~after being held up~~ while trying to help his father who was held up by a gangster at gun point. The young man's brother was also shot though there is a chance that he might live.

All this violence is disturbing. It suggests that there is an ugly spirit abroad about which something should be done. Why do porters want to attack people trying to get something to a hospital patient? Who was in authority over them? Who exercised control? And there have already been ^a ~~an~~ number of assaults on Washington Boulevard so that we are entitled to expect the police to ~~have done~~ ^{do} something ~~by now~~ to drive these lurking crooks out of that area. And as for the gunman who killed so casually, you can be sure that there is some citizen, somewhere in the Corporate Area tonight whose gun has been stolen. There are too many guns about. Some of us are too gun-happy and it is from us that the gangsters steal their arms and then kill the innocent and the unarmed. I think it is high time ~~the~~ police cleaned up the city. It is also time we made it harder for anybody to get a gun licence. It is too easy now. And so killing becomes easy.

Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Saturday May 14 at 6.15 p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I received a letter earlier this week from one of the representatives of a foreign government who is based in Trinidad. He asked for my views on how serious the rastafarian troubles in Jamaica are. He said that press reports in Trinidad suggested that the supply of arms which were unearthed was linked with Cuba's Castro. He said reports gave him the impression that this movement could become quite serious and that he had even heard suggestions that it could develop into a kind of Mau Mau situation. He wanted to know whether this in fact was the situation.

Now the point about this letter is it comes from somebody who is a very highly responsible person. He is not the kind of person given to false alarm. And yet it is evident from his letter that he has received an alarming picture of the situation here in Jamaica. You and I know that the picture is not as alarming as has been made out. We know that the crude arms and other weapons such as cutlasses and conch shells filled with cement were not important. And yet my correspondent asked about "the supply of arms". When people talk about a supply of arms they generally have a picture in their minds of a number of sub-machine guns, pistols, guns, cartridges hand grenades and the like. We know that there was nothing of the kind involved. But there are very many intelligent people in the outside world who have been misled into even precisely that sort of picture in their minds.

And then you have the reference of a kind of Mau Mau situation. This is a lot of nonsense. The Kenya Mau Mau situation arose because the majority of the citizens of that country objected bitterly to the fact that all power and all privilege was in the hands of a small minority. It was a situation of straightforward racial and colour conflict. There is no such situation in Jamaica. No section of the Jamaican community has to fight for the right to vote. No section of the Jamaican community has

discriminated against the grounds of race and colour. And suddenly the rastafarian movement touches only a small minority of the country's people.

How then did the outside world get this false and highly coloured picture of "the supply of arms" and "a kind of Mau Mau situation?" I think to a great extent the blame lies with our own newspaper representatives. They have sent unnecessarily alarming reports to the outside world. I have seen one or two really horrifyingly alarming reports sent to English newspapers by their Jamaican correspondent. Now, I am not saying that our newspaper men should go in for a kind of "greater Jamaican chauvinism" and suppress the truth. I believe the truth should be told frankly and fearlessly. In the long run, I am sure the truth, however painful can only serve the good of the country. But to so distort the truth as to turn it into ^{such} the ~~alarming~~ ^{reports} ~~lie~~ is, I am afraid, a sign of extreme irresponsibility among some of our newspaper men. If we as newspaper people want the community to treat us with respect and to look on us as responsible then we must behave with responsibility in our handling of the news.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Monday May 16 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: There was a time when the City of London was the financial capital of the entire world. In those days - forty to fifty years¹ ago the influence of London, and especially that part of London know as 'the City', was the most powerful influence in the money markets of all countries of the world. If the City approved an enterprise in Russia or China or America people were willing to invest their money in that enterprise. They knew their money would be safe. They knew this because the businessmen of the City were the most well informed and had the most accurate information from all corners of the earth. The men of the City knew when it was safe or not safe to invest money in a country. Obviously, where a country was having political troubles they would not risk their money. And they certainly would not invest or advise the people who depend on the to invest in a country whose economy was unsound or about whose future they had doubts. The men of the City were only interested in investing their money and the money of their clients in countries and in enterprises of which they felt sure.

Today London is no longer the financial capital of the world. That position is now shared between the United States and Russia: the United States is the^{financial} capital of the Western World and Russia is the financial capital of the Communist world. But although the actual financial power of the City of London has been greatly reduced by the events of the past fifty years, and although Britain and the City of London no longer control the balance of power in the world, the influence of Britain and of the City of London is in some ways greater today than it was in the days when she controlled the

balance of power in the world. In terms of power politics Britain enjoys a prestige and influence way beyond her real physical strength. Both Russia and the United States could wipe out Britain comparatively easily if it came to war: both are giants compared to Britain. And yet both acknowledge Britain as an equal. The United States depends enormously on her partnership with Britain, and the Russians with all their power have a greater respect for Britain than even they are prepared to admit. The reason for this is that Britain/s knows more about the intricacies of power politics than the two great giants. she has been in the game longer and has developed skills which they still lack; and they know it. And the same thing applies in the money markets of the world. What Britain says can generally be relied upon because Britain knows from experience.

Now, I have told you all this because I would like you to understand the importance of what happened on the money market of the City of London last Thursday morning. At 10 o'clock on that morning the Government of Jamaica floated a loan to raise £3,380,000 for development purposes here at home. Five minutes later the loan was over-subscribed and some people with money had even to be turned away. Make no mistake about it, this is big stuff. It means that the most respected and the most hard headed businessmen in the world are saying 'Jamaica is solid. Putting money into Jamaica is a safe bet'. It is ^{remarkable} ~~an~~ ~~amph~~ ~~fantastic~~ vote of confidence in Jamaica, and one which all the world will take note of.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday May 17 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last night I told you about the great vote of confidence the hard-headed businessmen of the City of London passed on us here in Jamaica when they lent us nearly 4,000,000 pounds in five minutes. Well, tonight I should like to pass my own vote of confidence in the women of Jamaica and I hope they will accept it even though I am not a hard-headed businessman of the City of London. In their own way, I think the women of Jamaica did something quite as important on Wednesday of last week as did the businessmen of the City of London on Thursday morning.

Now what did the women do? The Jamaica Federation of Women passed a resolution to ask our government to admit a small token number of refugees into this country. But what, you might ask, makes this so important that you should want to pass a vote of confidence in the women? To answer that I must tell you just a little about the saddest story of our time.

In ~~our~~ most parts of our world today men and women and children are not recognised as being alive unless they have a piece of paper with an official stamp on it to say that they are alive. When Hitler rose to power in Germany he drove hundreds upon thousands of Jews out of that country. They had no bits of paper and became stateless and homeless. The same thing happened in Poland, in Hungary and in other European countries. The Russians who opposed communism had to leave their country and become homeless and stateless. During the fighting the Middle East between Israel and the Arabs nearly two million Arabs became stateless and homeless. And there are over a million ~~sixteen~~ homeless and stateless people who fled from the communists in China. In all there are between eight and twelve

million homeless people in the world today. Among these people you will find scholars, engineers, skilled workers, peasants, artists, writers - all types of people. These people live in relief camps, generally behind barbed wire. The United Nations and the Red Cross and other relief organisations give them food and shelter. But the hard part is that these people cannot make a life for themselves. They cannot go out freely and find work for themselves because they do not have the paper to say that they are alive and can live in a country and try to build up their lives again. A man or woman may have the skills to build a really decent life and make a contribution to the community where he or she lives. But they haven't got that bit of paper and so there is nothing they can do but rot away in a camp. There were many more of them once than there are now. But many countries, especially the United States, Canada, ~~and~~ Britain and Australia have given homes to millions of them. But there are still many left.

Last year the United Nations called on all the countries of the world to make a special effort to solve this great problem. They called the effort 'World Refugee Year'. They asked every country to open its doors to as few or as many refugees as it can. Little St. Lucia has joined this great effort of humanity. In December of last year Mr. Philip Sherlock asked our government to admit a token number of refugee families - just two or three - to show that we care about the suffering of others. And now our women have added their strong voices which I hope government will heed. That is why I am proud of our women. They have proved that we do care about our fellow men.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday May 18 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: A long, long time ago, long before Christ walked the earth nearly 2,000/ years ago, a Roman scholar called Pliny the Elder made a statement about Africa. He said: Always something new out of Africa. If anything, that statement is more true today than it was then. Africa is in a state of constant change today. New nations are being born with breath-taking speed and new problems and questions are coming up so fast that it is difficult to keep track with them. One very important new problem came up in Kenya over the weekend. It is so important that nobody knows quite how it is going to work out in the end. What is certain is that unless it is handled with great care it is going to throw Kenya into a crisis even greater than the crisis of the Mau Mau was. And at the centre of this problem stands Jomo Kenyatta.

As some of you will remember, it was early in March of this year that the British Colonial Secretary Mr. Macleod met the representative of the 66,000 white settlers and the more than 5½ million black Africans to work out a new constitution for Kenya. Under the new constitution every person who could read or write or was over 40 or earned about £75 a year would have the right to vote, whatever his race colour or creed. It was also agreed that there should be a parliament of 65 members and a cabinet in which Africans were promised a number of Ministries. The white settlers felt that the Colonial Office had given the Africans too much. They felt it was just a matter of time before they would be ruled by Africans if this constitution was accepted. Many of the whites started planning to sell their huge farms and leave the country. The Africans, on the other

hand, felt that they had not been given enough. They wanted parliament to be elected by a simple majority as was the case in Ghana and the other free African states. But the Colonial Office insisted that this was the best way to start self-government in Kenya, so the delegates accepted the new arrangement. There would also be an end to the colour bar and the business of the best lands in Kenya being reserved for whites only. At this stage things looked very promising for the future of Kenya. In time the Africans would, as the majority, take over the running of their country.

But last weekend the 10 or so African political parties decided to combine into one party to be known as the Kenya African National Union. And this great new party decided that they wanted Jomo Kenyatta as its leader. They said they were not prepared to work the new constitution unless Kenyatta was released to lead them. Now, the British Government and the Kenya white Settlers have blamed Kenyatta for the Mau Mau troubles. To them he is a wicked and dangerous man with whom they do not want to have anything to do; and they do not want him to take part in the politics of the country. To the Africans, he is a loved and honoured hero, the greatest African leader their country has produced. They do not accept the white judgement passed on Kenyatta. They want him to lead them to full self-government. Now, either the British Government and the settlers will accept the clearly expressed wish of the African people or else we will see a new period of troubles in Kenya. Kenyatta is still the number one man in Kenya today. It may be hard for some to swallow, but this is a fact.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday May 19 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I am very glad to be able to tell you that it is now possible for all listeners who want copies of these commentaries to get them. All you have to do is send me your name and address and the sponsors of this programme will arrange for copies to be sent to you daily.

And now for the news. You will remember that it was on Tuesday of last week that I told you we might as well give up all hope of anything coming out of the Summit meetings. Well, it has happened just as I expected. Mr. Krushchev has used the incident of the spy plane to insult the President of the United States and his country; he has wrecked the conference, and set about giving the West the propaganda licking which I warned you he would. We shall hear more about this in the weeks to come, especially when the pilot of the spy plane is put on trial by the Russians.

The biggest item of foreign news here at home was Mr. Manley's announcement published in the Gleaner on Wednesday that the air talks between the United States and Britain had broken down. You will remember that Mr. Manley was quite bitter about this when he said that the interests of Jamaica and the Caribbean area had been sacrificed to the struggles between British and American air interests. Let us look a little more closely at these air struggles.

Now, in spite of the fact that Britain and the United States are allies there is a considerable amount of competition going on between them to win the markets of the world, and nowhere is this competition more fierce than in the world of civil air transport.

Britain has for a very long time been the main carrier of passengers and cargo by air. Her air lines criss-crossed the entire world and she made a lot of money out of this. But after the last war the Americans came into the picture and offered stiff competition. To make sure that this competition did not get out of hand a conference between Britain and the United States was held in 1946 and an agreement known as the Bermuda Air Agreement was signed. By this deal the British allowed American planes to land in certain of their territories in exchange for ^{the right of} British planes to land in certain American areas. As an example: in order to get American permission for BOAC to make the Kingston-to-New York run, the British may have agreed to permit the Americans to make a New York-to-Nigeria run. This is not the actual exchange arrangement; it is only an example of the sort of deal which was made. Certainly, in terms of the Bermuda Agreement the British ^{the} have legal right to deny the Americans access to certain Jamaican and West Indian air runs. But, as Mr. Manley said, this puts us in the position of being helpless pawns in the Anglo-American struggle for commercial air supremacy. And what makes it worse is that the two competitors are not really equal. Although the talks which broke down were conducted by the two governments, the American officials had to keep on looking over their shoulders to make sure that they were saying what Pan-American and Trans-World Airlines - which are two private companies - wanted them to say. That is why, I suspect, they turned down the British idea for a new agreement for the Caribbean. In any case, it is wrong and humiliating that the interests of the people of this country should, ~~be~~ today, still be at the mercy of the power struggles of others. This is economic imperialism at its worst.

Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday May 20 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: One of the really serious problems that we have to come to grips with here in Jamaica is that of housing. I am thinking of housing for the poor people. I am think of the people who earn between £2 a week and £8 a week. I think the housing problems of the people who earn more than £8 a week are getting less serious than they were a few years ago. People earning more than £8 a week can get in on the new housing schemes. It is almost impossible for people who earn less to get in on them. And I think we should face the fact squarely that the vast majority of our people are in the income bracket of between £2 and £8 a week: this is true of the cities and this is true of the country areas as well. It is something which many of our people tend to forget: we see all the prosperity around us and forget that the vast majority of our people have to make-do on what some of us would spend on an evening's entertainment. I don't think this is a healthy situation. I think places like Back-O-Wall and the Dungle are criticisms of our whole society. And I certainly do not think it is good enough to say, as some of our middle-class do, that these people are there because they are idle and won't shift themselves and so forth. Of course some of them are idle; some won't work; some feel that the world owes them a living. You find people like that in every country and in every society. But I think we are fooling ourselves if we think that they are the majority; they are not: they are a small minority. The majority want, just like you and I, to better themselves, to make a decent living and have a decent home and give their kids the chances they did not have. All these people need is a break, something

to give them a start, and something they can strive towards and hold on to. And I think really low-cost government housing can be just this x 'something'.

I have seen for myself just how decent low-cost housing can change the outlook of people. I have seen people living in London slums which rival some of the slums of our own Kingston; and like the people in our slums they were bitter and frustrated and sullen and anti-social. Then these people had been moved out of the slums into low-cost housing estates; and two years later you would not have recognised them for the same people. They were confident, proud and useful members of their community. I am sure we can do the same thing here.

But, you will say, let us be practical. It is foolish to compare Britain and Jamaica. There are things Britain can do that we cannot do. Where is the money to come from? And who will put up these houses?

I don't myself think that any private builder or contractor would be willing to undertake a housing scheme where the costs are so low that they cannot make a decent profit out of it. And in any case I am thinking of a scheme where the houses would not be sold but let at a very low rent which people earning between £2 and £8 a week can afford. And so I think the only people who can undertake such a scheme would have to be government and our local authorities. And as for the money, I think if the houses can be built cheaply enough that problem will be solved. And I think it has been largely solved by the Harbour View method of building of which I will tell you tomorrow. So, till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday May 21 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: What is the Harbour View method of building ~~x~~ houses? I went and had a look for myself the other day and I found the basic idea behind Harbour View so simple that it took my breath away. Instead of houses being built in the old manner which we know, they are being manufactured: instead of being at a housing site I was at a housing factory. The walls and roofs of the Harbour View houses are cast in moulds flat on the ground. There are 25 acres of casting beds and 12 walls and roofs can be cast at the same time. As soon as these are dry they are lifted up by giant cranes using air suction. They are then stored until they are ^{needed} ~~ready~~ for use. This means that a wall or roof which by the old method would take days or even weeks to put up is manufactured in hours. These are of course all reinforced steel and concrete.

When it comes to putting up the house the giant cranes lift the slabs onto huge trolleys and take them to the ~~xx~~ already-prepared house sites. There the crane with the air suction contraption goes into action again, and while you watch walls are placed into position, the roof is gently lowered over the walls; roof walls and floor are welded together, and in a matter of hours^s your house is^s up. All that now needs to be done is the final rendering, the putting in of doors and windows, the tiling of the floor, and the putting in of fixtures and fittings.

Indeed, so quick is the putting up of the houses once the walls and roofs have been cast, that the people at Harbour View are going to be able to complete 30 houses a week. This to me, is no less than a revolution in building methods in this country. By the time

they have finished - and I understand they will complete the scheme by October of next year - there will be a total of 1,858 houses at Harbour View. There are two types of houses: a three bedroomed one which will cost £2,285. On this the buyer must make a down payment of £235 and monthly payments of £16. 5. 2. which will include interest and sinking fund. The other type is a two bedroomed house. The price of this is £1,975. On this the buyer must put down £200 and make a monthly payment of £14. 10. 3. The 3 bedroomed house at Harbour View is, as you know, more than £600 less in cost than the one at Mona; and of course at Mona there are no two bedroom houses. So it is clear that Harbour View does cater for people whose incomes were too low for them to join the Mona scheme.

Well now, it is this new revolutionary method of building introduced to Jamaica by the Matalons that makes me feel that government and our local authorities should now be able to introduce really cheap government housing for people earning between two and eight pounds a week. I am sure that by using the Matalon method and trimming drastically on the fixtures and fittings, and perhaps producing one and two bedroom houses to begin with, something can be done for the most distressed sections of our community. I do not ~~expect~~ think we can expect private contractors to do this. The Matalons like all other contractors are in this for profit after all. It is to our good that in the process of making their money they are also performing a great public service. But really low cost housing must be non-profit making, and this only government can undertake.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY
For transmission on
Monday May 23 at 6.15p.m

Good evening: There was one very important point I left out of my comments when I dealt with the Harbour View housing scheme on Saturday evening; I did not tell you about the men who do the solid hard work which will result in there being 1,858 new homes in the island in a year's time. In part this was due to the fact that I have only so much time and I can say only so much in that time. But it is also due to the fact that we do take our workers too much for granted most of the time. We notice them and cuss them out when things go wrong. We complain about them and criticise them when they go on strike or there is a go-slow. But when things go well, when they work well and production is up to standard, we take them for granted. I think this is a mistake. I think this is a mistake because every man or woman or child likes to have his or her efforts appreciated. But, you who are an employer will say, we pay them for what they do, we do not have to thank them on top of that. That is true; you do not have to. And it is precisely because you do not have to ~~thank them~~ show your appreciation that your workers will feel good and co-operative if you did it. I think much of the petty troubles in labour relations can be removed if all employers regarded their workers as human beings with feelings instead of just as creatures who are there to do a job of work; and it costs nothing.

But let me tell you the thing that impressed me most about the workers at Harbour View. I saw only four Puerto Ricans on the job - these were the experts, the men with the know-how about the handling of the new machines, the engineers, architects and draughtsmen - the rest, about 450 of them were Jamaicans. And it was impressive to

see how easily they had taken to these new-fangled methods of construction. They handled machines which we had never used in Jamaica before; and they did it as though they had worked with such machines all their lives. They worked with the sureness and self-confidence of men who knew they had mastered their machines; in fact, they had become craftsmen, men who knew how to ply their trade. And this, of course, is of great importance to Jamaica. The greatest wealth of the country - as indeed of any country - is its people and the skills which its people have. And because these 450 men will, by the end of the job, have mastered this new and revolutionary method of building houses, the country will be all the richer for their knowledge and experience; because that knowledge and experience which they have gained can then be used to solve the island's general housing problem. And, in addition to the 450 men directly on the job, there are sub-contractors who employ their own labour force of between 200 and 300 men. These men, too, are making contact, probably for the first time, with new ideas and new techniques of building. So, you can see that one very important side product of the Harbour View scheme is a general upswing in developing Jamaican skills. And this I personally welcome most heartily. It gives the lie to those people who feel that we must forever be importing experts to do things for us. We don't need them ~~to~~ do things for us. What we need them for is to show us how to do the job for ourselves. There is no question in my mind about our ability to learn, and learn quickly.....Tomorrow I want to talk about the price control of beef. Till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Tuesday May 24 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: It looks as though we are in for some trouble in our beef cattle industry. Towards the end of last week we read the news that Caymanas Estate had sold out half its herd of 800 cattle. The reason for this was said to be the government's decision not to lift the price control on beef. The Estate was said to have operated its cattle industry at a loss for a number of years because it hoped controls would be lifted from the price of beef. Now, having given up hope of this happening, they have decided to go out of the cattle business. And over the weekend there was news that Trelawny Estates and the West Indies Sugar Company are likely to follow the example of Caymanas and go out of the cattle business. One report has it that Lynford Farms, which belongs to the Reynolds bauxite company has bought the 400 head of Caymanas cattle. Lydford, as you know, are both cattle farmers and butchers. And there has been pressure from other quarters for government to do away with price control on beef.

Now let us look at the argument for doing away with price control. First, the cattle breeders say that price control means they have to sell their beef at a price that does not make it worth their while to carry on in the business. One report states that Caymanas has lost between £8,000 and £10,000 a year on its cattle. This, if it is true, is a very heavy loss to take year by year. And if it is true then it means that the other cattle breeders must be suffering similar losses. And you can be sure of one thing: people are not going to go on putting money into an unprofitable business. So, on the face of it, it looks as if the cattle breeders have a strong case

But let us look at the other side of the penny. What would happen if price controls were removed? There is one thing we can be sure of, and that is that the price of beef would shoot up; and with the price of beef the cost of living would take a steep climb. As it is now, there are vast numbers of people in Jamaica today who can only afford an occasional piece of beef. I know families up in the hills of St. Andrew where a family of five or six can only afford one or two pounds of beef a week under the present control price. And let us face it, although the controlled price is 2/- a pound people are having to pay 2/3. And in the Corporate Area the controlled price of a piece of Sirloin may be 2/3 but the housewife who refuses to pay 3/6 is unlikely to get it. The Kingston housewife has to pay 2/9 for stew when the controlled price for back steak, short rib, flank briskett, cross rib, shuck and the like is 1/-. And you all know that although the controlled price of Fillet is 6/- in the city and 2/- in the country, you would be considered mad by your butcher if you hoped to get it for that price.

So where do we go from here? If price control is removed large numbers of us will be condemned to having to go without beef because prices will go up beyond our pockets. If it is not removed then, we hear, we are in danger of having no beef cattle industry. For myself, I wonder if the beef industry is really in such a mess. In any case, I think government should take a very close and careful look at it and let us know all the facts. To just lift controls would be to punish the poorer sections of our society.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday May 25 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: So we have seen the end of Empire Day and witnessed the first Labour Day celebrations in Jamaica. This is ^a ~~the~~ sign of the times; it is yet another proof, if proof were needed, that Empire and all that is meant by it, are as dead as a frozen duck. As Jamaica's own poet, George Campbell declared a ^{fifteen} ~~few~~ years ago:

Now we are tenants at will no longer
There's more room;
More right of way
In the land; still not our own,
In the land for us unknown;
And our children; theirs' to be Home
For tomorrow. Still unpurchased

Now we turn tenants at will no longer
Spiritual heirs of God. Our spirits stronger.
Let's now look to inheritance
Of our earth. With claims made stronger
By our achievements, our natural dignity

This land will speak with voices
Of destiny. Voices from victory
Of ownership in proud estate.

The poet, George Campbell, was fifteen years ahead of the rest of us but he saw with true vision that this day would come; that there would be an end to Empire and to Empire Day. It is for precisely this reason that we need our poets and our artists and our writers. They are the ones who will look ahead for us; dream ahead for us; and map a way into the future. I hope our politicians and all those others, trade unionists and party workers and supporters thought of this when they celebrated Labour Day yesterday.

It is because Imperialism is, basically, a spent force, because the British no longer have the old imperialist attitudes towards the

so-called 'backward' peoples of their former colonies, that I find myself a little suspicious when British Guiana's Dr. Cheddi Jagan flings accusations of bad~~y~~ faith at the British. Dr. Jagan says that he is 'fed up' with the attitude of the Colonial Office and the British Government. He says he wants to resign from the present B.G. government because he and his Ministers do not really have any power. Why should Dr. Jagan make all this fuss at this time when it is only a few weeks since the British Government agreed to a new constitution for B.G.?

Under the new constitution, you will remember, B.G. will hold general elections in August of next year and the party which wins the elections will have full ~~entire~~ control of all the country's internal affairs except for control of the police and internal security. But control of these two matter will be transferred to the winning party six months later, if it runs its government well and without trouble. Of course this is not what Dr. Jagan wants. He would like to have complete independence straight away. But neither Jamaica nor Trinidad nor Barbadoes got complete self-government in one sweep. And the way they arrived at the positions they now enjoy was by first working constitutions similar to the one which will come into force in B.G. next year. And the British government has accepted the right of the Guianese to complete independence after they have worked the new constitution for two years. Then why all this fuss at present? I think Dr. Jagan is plainly playing at politics at the moment and using the British as a whipping boy to cover up ^{the} very serious racial situation which has developed in his country. I will tell you more about this tomorrow. So, till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday May 26 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Jagan's British Guiana is, as I am sure most of you know, a vast land of 83,000 square miles. To get an idea of just how big it is, try to imagine Jamaica as being twenty times larger than it now is. And yet this vast land has a population of not quite 600,000 people, according to estimates made at the beginning of last year. British Guiana then, with almost twenty times as much land as we have, has ~~xxxxxxxx~~ only about one-third the number of people we have in Jamaica. This, you would say, is land enough to satisfy everybody, to make everybody happy.

But there is a snag to it. Four out of every five acres of this land is in deep ^{mountainous} forests and jungles, and most of it is unexplored and unexploited, so that ^{most of} the 600,000 Guianese live on the low-lying coastal plain. It is on this coastal plain that they grow their crops - cane, rice and coconuts/ - and rear their cattle. The country's minerals - its gold, bauxite, diamonds and manganese - are found inland, in the equatorial forest. And the reason why the mineral wealth of the country has not been more fully exploited is because it is not easy to cut ways through the forests and open up the land. More than three-quarters of British Guiana, then, is unopened, unexplored and unexploited land. Opening up this land, clearing it and taming it, making it enrich the lives of the people - that is the great and creative challenge I would love to see the leaders and people of British Guiana take up.

Instead, British Guiana faces us with a sad and destructive racial situation. Almost half of British Guiana's population - roughly 259,000 people - are East Indians. There are roughly 183,000

Negroes, 62,000 people of mixed racial origin, small colonies of Chinese, Portuguese and other Europeans, and 22,000 Amerindians who are descendents of the original inhabitants of the country. From this you will see that the two major groups in B.G. are the 259,000 East Indians and the 183,000 Negroes; and they are at the centre of B.G.'s racial problem. There is rivalry between Negroes and Indians for jobs, for houses, for position and for political power. Of course there is rivalry for these things everywhere. When two men go after the same job here in Jamaica, there is rivalry between them. But, happily for us, this rivalry is not expressed in racial terms, ~~here in Jamaica~~. We do not say blue man is fighting green man for the job. To us both blue man and green man are Jamaicans and so we have two Jamaicans going after the same job. This is so because being Jamaican is more important than being either black or brown or yellow or white. Unfortunately this is not the position in B.G. The Indians support Dr. Jagan because he's an Indian; the Negroes support Mr. Burnham because he's a Negro. Each racial section is more concerned with its own racial interests than it is concerned for the good of the whole country; or else, it sees the interests of its own section as being the same as the interests of the nation. And so, in the end, you get a situation where racial jealousies and racial rivalries become so important that they can seriously hinder the advance of a country. We have seen this happening in other parts of the world. It is an old and sad story. Now, how do Jagan and Burnham fit into this situation? How can they work their way out of it? And why does this make Jagan fuss so violently just now? I will try to answer these questions tomorrow evening. So, till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Friday May 27 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: You will remember I ended my comments last night by asking how Jagan and Burnham fitted into B.G.'s racial situation, how they could work their way out of it, and why Jagan was fussing so violently just now.

Well now, I do not think that either Jagan or Burnham like this racial conflict between the Negroes and the Indians of their country. And I certainly do not think that either of them have encouraged it or tried to exploit it. You will remember that in the early days of B.G.'s struggles Jagan and Burnham were in the same party and worked hand in hand with each other. I think in those days both leaders saw clearly how important it was to create a national unity that would bring Indian and Negro together.

I think in those days Cheddi Jagan understood clearly the great problem facing his Indian community. He knew that the Indians stuck together as a racial group. They clung to their religion and the old ways imported from India. He knew that their great difficulty was one of the mind: that they found it very hard to regard themselves as West Indians plain and simple; they found it hard because deep down they were unwilling to be just West Indians like all other West Indians. And I am sure that he knew that unless this outlook could be changed there might be trouble ahead.

And the same goes for Burnham and his Negro community. Burnham knew that the Negroes distrusted the Indians and feared their numbers. He knew many Negroes were prejudiced against Indian. And I am sure that he knew unless this fear, this distrust, this prejudice was overcome there might be trouble ahead.

And so these two leaders set about jointly trying to educate

their people into a spirit of nationalism, into a spirit of being Guianese first and only Negroes or Indians after. For a time it looked as though they would succeed and as though the future of B.G. would not be one of communal strife and racial hatred.

But ~~there~~ their great effort soon collapsed and there was a split between Burnham and Jagan. And with the split came racial and communal feeling and thinking. But I think you ought to note one very important thing. In spite of all the bitter words that they have flung at each other, neither Jagan nor Burnham have, to my knowledge, done or said anything to encourage and feed the racial fears and prejudices of their followers. It is therefore clear that both men are against it.

Now, how can they get out of it? Forbes Burnham seems to think that the ~~answer~~ is to be found by joining the Federation. His reasoning is, I think, that the Indians~~xxxxxx~~ would cease to be a majority once B.G. is in the Federation. And, besides, their majority inside B.G. might be wiped out by migration from the other Units. Jagan on the other hand hesitates about joining the Federation precisely because of this possibility of being outnumbered, I think. As things now are he is sure of a majority vote along straight racial line. If things were to change he would not be so sure; and all politicians find power sweet. But I also believe that Jagan has integrity and so the role he now plays puts him in a bit of a mess with his own conscience. And when people are in a mess they tend to lash out. Such, as I see it, ^{is} ~~xxx~~ the background to B.G.'s problems today.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday ~~April~~ ^{may} 28 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I want to tell you about something very sordid and horrible this evening, and I find it rather hard to do so calmly and without getting angry. This is something which I feel should arouse the anger of every parent in Jamaica.

I have two youngsters, a boy and a girl, who are in the early stages of being teenagers. In two or three years' time these youngsters of ours are going to begin to be interested in questions concerned with sex. My wife and I are at present trying our best to prepare the groundwork so that our children can grow up with a healthy attitude on this question. I am sure all of you who are parents are in the same boat as we are, and you are trying to do exactly what we are trying to do. We do not want our children to grow up regarding sex as something smutty about which you snicker in corners, and as something without any moral content at all. We want them to regard it as part of the greater design of ^alife which can be clean and beautiful and creative and founded on a strong sense of family. This, I am sure, is how most families feel when thinking about their children.

Now, I have said all this to clear the air and emphasis the importance of what I am now going to say.

Earlier this week a friend of mine took ~~km~~ me to the magazine counter of a drug store. He picked up two magazines and offered them to me. One was called 'Hit Show' and the other was called 'Confidential'. On the cover of Hit Show was the picture of a woman in thin lacy material which showed more than it covered. She had pulled up this material so that a thigh was exposed and practically all her breasts

showed. I turned the pages and the inside was even worse than the cover. Each page had pictures of women partly undressed posing in the most suggestive manner possible. The intention was clearly to excite sexual interest and some of the poses were downright dirty and sordid.

The main story in the other magazine - 'Confidential' which specialises in dirty, sexual scandals - was a story written by a mother telling all the dirty details of how Castro raped her teenage daughter.

After seeing this, I went around to the bookstores, drugstores, pharmacies and grocery stores where magazines are sold. And the truth is that there is more of this dirt around than I realised. You can buy some form of smut in almost any place where magazines are sold. Your son or daughter can walk in and buy this smutty suggestive stuff. It is cheap, it is sordid and it is calculated to excite/ in a very ugly way.

I don't want my children exposed to this kind of dirt. I am sure you don't. Then why is this stuff allowed into the country? I tried to find out from the Ministry of Trade and Industry, the government Department responsible for permitting such stuff to be imported. Nobody, it seemed, had really thought about this. Well, I think it is time somebody did some thinking. I think it is time we stopped importing this dirt to corrupt our children. I feel so strong about this that I hope as many of you as possible will write ~~either~~ to me, ~~or the the Ministry of Trade and Industry~~ so that we can put a stop to this dirt.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday May 30 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The news that there is to be a tribunal to settle the wage dispute between the K.S.A.C. and the workers of the Corporation's Public Cleansing Department, is something we ought to watch with great interest. You will recall that I have talked to you about the dirt of the city of Kingston and about the casual and haphazard way in which the city's garbage men go about removing the dirt. I should like you to watch ~~xxxxxx~~ carefully to see if there is any improvement in the services you get from these men who are now demanding higher wages.

Now, let us talk about Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States. I think in the last ten days or so Mr. Eisenhower has probably endure the most sad^dening and disappointing experience in his entire career. You will remember that just before the Summit meeting the Russians brought down the U.S. spy plane. I told you at the time that Khrushchev would use the spy plane incident to give the U.S. in particular and the West in general a terrible propaganda licking. Well, Khrushchev singled out President Eisenhower; he insulted the President; he abused him; he mocked ~~at~~ him; he threatened him; and then he treated the President with the greatest contempt by demanding a public apology from the President before he would agree to sit down at the conference table. I do not know of anything like this ever happening at such a high international level in times of peace. Certainly, no other President of the United States in all its history has ever experienced such rude and insulting behaviour as did Mr. Eisenhower. After this, as you know, the Summit

meeting
/collapsed before it had even started.

Now, the question is: why did President Eisenhower put up with all this nonsense from Mr. Khrushchev? Why, when the Russian leader started hurling abuse and insults at him - why did he not walk out? Or, since he stayed, why did he not talk back? Why did he not abuse back. He knew as well as anybody that the one thing the Russians respect is strength and toughness. The United States is strong; and the American people can be as tough as anybody: why did he not show some of that strength and toughness?

I think there are two reasons. The first reason, I think, has to do with the kind of man Eisenhower is himself. I think Eisenhower is one of the two or three most loved, most admired and most respected men who ever became President of the United States: and unlike most of the others he was admired and loved and respected before he became President. To the American people he was a good man and a fine gentleman/~~first and then~~ a great soldier. They chose him for himself, not for what he was or what he could do. Such a man would be too dignified to trade insults with Khrushchev, he would be too much of a gentleman to go in for the gutter politics at which the Russian is such an expert. And the second reason is that Eisenhower wanted history to remember him as the man who brought an end to the cold war and brought peace to the world. This was his greatest personal dream and he was badly hurt when Khrushchev smashed it in front of his face. I don't think he was anywhere near the best President the U.S. ever had; but he's a good man and I felt for him over the past ten days.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday May 31 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The terrible disasters started by the earthquakes in Chile last week have spread their effects across the Pacific Ocean and brought misery to thousands of people. Next to Chile, Japan seems to have suffered most. Tidal waves and minor quakes have reached as far as India and Russia, and even little Albania in the heart of Eastern Europe was so shaken that over 500 homes were seriously damaged. But, as you know, it is Chile which has suffered most with well over 6,000 dead and hundreds of thousands homeless and hungry and in danger of ~~disease~~ disease. The whole face of Chile's landscape has been changed by these earthquakes: valleys have become hills, hills have become flat places.

peasant
A/friend of mine up in the hills of St. Andrew told me very seriously that this was a sure sign that God was losing patience with us human beings because we are forever fighting and killing and getting too big for ourselves. He may be right. But there is a physical and down-to-earth reason for what has happened in Chile.

The earth on which we live is, as you know, only cool on the outside crust. At the centre it is still a mass of hot matter. Now, because there is this hard shell the hot matter inside the earth cools very slowly. It cools slowly because a certain amount of air does reach down to it through cracks and weaknesses on the surface. Earthquakes and volcanoes are the results of these cracks and weaknesses on the surface of the earth.

What happened was the same as happens with anything hot. Take a boiled or roasted sweet potatoe. As it comes out of the fire the outside cools first and as you cut it or bite it air gets into it and

cools the inner part. But even if you did not cut or bite it, the outside would still cool down; and I am sure you have noticed how the skin of your potatoe splits after it has been in great heat and is then allowed to cool. It swells up when it is hot and shrinks when it gets cold.

Well, as more and more of the outer **crust** of the earth cooled down, it shrank and in shrinking cracks appeared on the surface of the earth. If you look at a geographical map of the world you will see a clear outline of these cracks which are called the 'lines of weakness' on the earth's surface. These lines of weakness run through the entire length of the west coast of South America, they swing through Central America, they touch us in the Caribbean (remember our own earthquakes: Port Royal in 1692 and Kingston in 1907). Then the lines of weakness swing up the ~~the~~ west Coast of North American and across the Pacific Ocean to Japan. They reach out to New Zealand, parts of Australia and swing up between Indian and China. These lines of weakness then swing deep into Asia and across southern Europe touching North and East Africa.

From this you will see that there is one vast series of cracks sweeping right round the surface of the earth. And any time there ~~is~~ ^{hot} ~~is/pressure or contraction at the~~ violent ~~at the~~ centre of the earth some part of this cracked 'line of weakness' may collapse and bring disaster with it. It may happen anywhere along the cracked line I have traced for you. Now, the world has the scientific knowledge to be able to check and warn us than an earthquake is coming. But we use that knowledge for weapon and rockets instead of to warn men and so save lives.

Goodnight.