

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday August 1 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: From tomorrow morning any one of us can go into any bank and where in Jamaica and buy a National Savings Bond for one pound. The Bonds cost a pound apiece and each person will be free to buy as many or as few one pound, five pound or ten pound Bonds as we like. If anyone wants Bonds in units of fifty or a hundred pound Bonds, these can be had from the Bank of Jamaica. Bonds in all the other denominations can be had from any commercial bank anywhere in Jamaica. All you have to do is go into a bank and say you want to buy National Savings Bonds. The people at the bank will give you one or more application forms and will help you to fill them out. You then give the bank your one pound and they will give you your National Savings Bond. So that part of it is very simple.

But, you might say, why should I buy National Savings Bonds? What sort of return will I get?

The answer is simple and clear: the government hopes by the sale of National Savings Bonds, to raise a fair amount of the money that we need for development purposes right here in Jamaica. Some of you may remember that just before the government mission went to Washington and London, I discussed the prospects of their raising development money. I told you then that if we approached any outside agencies for assistance for development, these people are likely to ask how much we ourselves have invested in our own development. And I told you that the answer to that would be: very little indeed. I also told you that those people were most likely to say: Let us see you help yourself and then come to us for help. For this reason, I told you, I did not think we would get much grant money for

development purposes. But I also said I did not think we would have much difficulty getting money to borrow, provided our terms were acceptable. Well, this is how it has turned out. We did not get much grant money so now we have to resort to raising loans for development. But loan money has to be paid back and with interests, so it will obviously suit the national economy to raise as much of this money as we need from right here in Jamaica. And so the government has devised this National Savings Bonds scheme which has a present maximum target of five million pounds. So the first reason why you should buy these Savings Bonds is to invest in Jamaica's development.

The second reason is because for every pound you invest, you stand a chance of winning a big money prize. If you buy a one pound Bond tomorrow you can change it the next day and get your pound back. But if you leave your one pound for three months you stand a chance of winning a first prize of one thousand pounds, a second prize of two hundred and fifty pounds, a third prize of one hundred pounds, a fourth prize of fifty pounds or a fifth prize of twenty-five pounds. The first draw will take place early in December and then every month after that. And if you leave your one pound in, you have a chance every month. And you have as many chances as the number of bonds you have. Of course, you do not get any interest on your Bonds. Instead you have a chance to win one of these big prizes every month.

Those are the details of the National Savings Bonds scheme. It gives you a chance to save and at the same time your savings help Jamaica's development as well as giving you a ^{monthly} chance to win one of five big money prizes. So I suggest that you go to your nearest bank tomorrow morning, put down your pound and get your National Savings Bond certificate. It is an excellent ^{and safe} investment both for yourself and for Jamaica. You can't lose, and both you and Jamaica, can gain much. Goodnight.

For transmission on
Thursday Aug 2nd at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

But because I did not name the company concerned - I told you that you could find the advertisement for yourselves in Saturday's daily paper - some people have protested to the wrong rum company. As a result, ^{on Tuesday} I received a letter from Mr. Ken McDonald, the Sales Manager of J.Wray and Nephew Ltd. This is Mr. McDonald's letter:

Well, let me make it quite clear that I was not referring to the Wray and Nephew label. Their label did no violence to the national Coat-of-Arms or to the national motto. They printed the Coat-of-Arms exactly as it is, and they did not monkey around with

the national motto. They did not turn it into: Out of Many, One Rum. I think their label is a dignified commemoration of Jamaica's independence, in much the same way that you ~~xxx~~ have commemoration cups for school children. So it was not Wray and Nephew I was referring to. So please stop cussing out Mr. McDonald and his firm. They are not the culprits.

The good thing is that people have reacted in this way. I am very happy about it because it is only when a vigorous public opinion makes it self felt that we will prevent the repetition of such abuses.

Yesterday the people of this country said a final farewell to Emancipation Day/ for ever. When August comes around next year, we will celebrate Independence Day. Emancipation Day was a counting of the years since Jamaica man became free and ceased to be any man's personal property. The first Monday of next August will be year one in the new period of history when Jamaica man will have complete and absolute control over the shaping of his own destiny. It is a sharp historical break this that makes for two sets of time: Time past, and time future. So, let us resolve to say with the poet: 'The past has been a mint of blood and sorrow; let it not be so for our tomorrow'. We can now count the days and even the hours to midnight on Sunday. And I am satisfied in my own mind now, that no matter how great the outward show of rejoicing, the greatest rejoicing of all will be quiet and inside the hearts and minds of all the small and unimportant people of this land. They know what it is all about. And if there is a touch of uncertainty mixed with their rejoicing, that is a good thing. Only fools go into the unknown without misgivings. And the people of Jamaica are not fools. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Friday ~~Saturday~~ August 3 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking.

Good evening: I think I have told you before that one of the greatest rewards in this job for me is the flow of letters that I receive regularly from listeners. And I am not just thinking of letters of approval from people who agree with what I say. I enjoy receiving letters of disapproval and disagreement just as much. The thing that makes these letters so important to me is the fact that they give me a feeling of intimacy with my listeners: it is a sharing of thoughts and feelings, an exchange of ideas, an argument between friends. And so preparing and broadcasting these commentaries becomes a warm and friendly relationship with large numbers of people whose faces I do not know but from whose letters I learn a very great deal. Indeed, very many of these commentaries are based on questions asked by these listeners or on suggestions they have sent to me. And every now and then I get a letter from a listener that either warms my heart because of its humanity or because it sheds a bright ray of good sense and light on a subject which has been confused by partisan or political views.

A few days ago I received one such letter from Mrs. Rosemary Small of Kingston five. I think there is so much good sense in this letter, that I should like to read it to you. I am sure Mrs. Small will not mind if I say that from her letter it is clear that she did not have the good fortune to have a secondary education. But I have come across very few people with a secondary education who think as clearly and cleanly as she does on one of our most controversial education problems today, this problem of the 70% free places for primary schools. Here is part of Mrs. Small's letter:

"As a Jamaican I think I should have a voice in what is going on around me, and especially in the affairs of my country. Now, sir, there is plenty of talk about the percentage of scholarships for different schools. Of what I gather from the new system, the Minister of Education is looking out for the poor children with which I agree 100%. But at the same time I want to point out that many poor children go to preparatory and secondary schools. The mothers of these poor children are willing to send their children to primary schools but when they are sent there the parents find out that the child won't learn, and in that case there is no opportunity for that child for a scholarship. And so such a parent decides to work hard to send that child to a prep school where there is more opportunity. In these schools if the child is ^{not} bright, he gets more attention, and the teachers have all the qualities to understand the child. Some children need love and affection to learn, and some of the teachers in the primary schools are abrupt. Some people blame the low percentage of scholarships granted to primary schools on the previous government. Is it so? Will the primary schools get the amount of passes for this 70% grant? What will happen to these children who don't have a place of opportunity? If they go to primary school they won't learn, and if they are sent to prep school they will learn but don't get the chance for a free place. I will say again plenty of poor children go to prep schools and their parents do all kinds of odd jobs to keep them there. On this eve of independence we should think carefully how we handle education because that is what builds a nation."

That is Mrs. Small's letter. I will not comment on it except to say that our education authorities would profit greatly by putting as much thought into this matter as Mrs. Small has so obviously done.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday August 4 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking.

Good evening: Tonight I give my last commentary in the old Jamaica, the Jamaica which is a dependent territory of Great Britain. When I speak to you on Monday, it will be in a new Jamaica, a Jamaica that must make all its own decisions without reference to anybody. We have for a few years now enjoyed full internal control of all our own affairs, but in our relations with the outside world Britain has spoken for us. And in other ways Britain has been responsible for us. If you compare Jamaica to a ship entering harbour then you must compare Britain to the pilot steering that ship safely into harbour. Well, at midnight tomorrow, the pilot will have done his job and we will take on the steering of the ship. So, in this last commentary of mine before independence, I should like to look back a little and give thanks for some of the good things that have come out of the dependent status. Of course there were bad things too, a lot of them. And it is the easiest thing in the world to dwell on those. But this evening I prefer to look on the positive side.

The first thing for which I want to give thanks is the peaceful and orderly way in which Jamaica enters on independence. The society is stable. Its citizens walk their land ~~fr~~ in freedom and with a basic sense of security in their dignity as men and women. And this is no small thing. All we have to do is look around at the world to see how very different it could have been. The people of the Congo entered on their independence on a terrible wave of violence and bloodshed and hunger. And at this very moment they have not yet achieved national unity. And the people of Algeria who only recently achieved their independence are in a state of uneasy crisis while

their leaders are enagaged in a bitter struggle for power. In other places independence has led to one party rule and those who are in opposition to the ruling party are in prison. It could ~~have~~ happened here and I think we should all be ~~grate~~ful that it did not. I think we should be grateful to Britain for having been a flexible occupying power, especially since the nineteen thirties. She could have resisted the pressures of the movement towards independence. Other colonial powers did. She did not. Instead, she helped us to build up the institutions that make for stable societies. We have an honest, clean and non-political civil service that is second to none in the world. I think the setting up and training of that civil service is one of Britain's greatest contributions to the order and stability with which we move into independence. I think we can afford now, at this eleventh hour to say a genuine and sincere thank you to Britain. Of course we would have chosen not to be colonials at any stage, if we had any choice. But since we had to be colonials at a certain point in history, being colonial subjects of Britain has made the transition easier than if we had been subjects of any other colonial power.

But of course, the greatest impulse to freedom came from Jamaica's own people and the leaders they threw up in the course of their history. It goes back to the first rebellious Maroons, and to those slaves who kept on revolting and it goes back to George William Gordon and Paul Bogle and Edward Jordan and Robert Hill and it runs down the years to Norman Manley and Alexander Bustamante. These are the pioneers who have shaped and forged the freedom and independence on which we enter at midnight tomorrow. When the moment strikes and the bonfires are lit, remember them, look back for a moment, and be grateful for the kind and the quality of freedom they have forged for this island. Now is the time for reflection and thanksgiving. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday August 6 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: And a great and joyous good morning to you all on this dawn of the birth of Independent Jamaica. This is the first day of independence, a great day for all those who have schemed and thought and fought for the coming of this day; and it is also, from this day onward, the greatest day in the history of Jamaica. So, how did it go? And what will the historians and the citizens of the future say about this day when they look back on it?

I think the verdict of history will be that it was a peaceful day: peaceful in mood, peaceful in spirit, peaceful in atmosphere. The years since the second world war have seen a vast number of countries become independent. And I do not think that in any single one of them has independence come in such a peaceful atmosphere. Oh, yes; there was laughter and there was song, and there was the mounting excitement as we approached midnight last night. And this excitement burst open like a glorious flower when midnight came and Jamaica's flag went up. But over and above all this was the spirit of peace. It was there in the great stadium where thousands upon thousands of people witnessed the central ceremony; and it was so in all the cities and towns and villages of all Jamaica. I hope all those people who prophesied trouble and all those who tried to frighten others by spreading the rumour of trouble around - I hope they will take note and be ashamed. And I hope they will learn to have a little more faith in the good sense and the basic wisdom of their fellow countrymen. It was peaceful; there was no trouble anywhere.

Because I wanted to get as much as possible of the mood and feeling of the people in the first minutes and hours of independence,

I did not go to the National Stadium. Instead, the whole family stocked up with warm clothes and things to eat and we went out to move among the people. And our little seven-year-old was the most excited member of the family. She had made up her mind that she was going to be up to welcome the dawn of an independent Jamaica.

At our village of Red Hills people had started gathering at the square as early as eight o'clock. And the same was true for the people of Rock Hall and Padmore and Cypruss Hall and Sterling Castle and Above Rocks and Parks Road and all the other small places where we went. And everybody was sober and waiting. Many were in churches and many were on their way to church. And the lights were on and the sound-systems were ready for the great linking up with the stadium. And then we drove down into Kingston, passing groups of young people at spots from which they could look down on the city when the fireworks started. And in Kingston, on the housing estates off Washington Boulevard, on the Spanish Town Road, around Back-O-Wall, all over Kingston, wherever we went, it was the same. Peaceful and expectant - a people waiting for the great symbolic moment.

And as the hour approached we drove back into the hills. And at our village all the people had gathered in the square and our own simple ceremony, like similar simple ceremonies throughout the island began. All Jamaica was joined together, united in the same thoughts and feeling, awaiting the same moment. And I knew that as long as I lived, I would never forget this moment. But even more important: I looked down at my little daughter of seven and I saw stars in her eyes. And I prayed that the peace of these first moments of independence would stay with Jamaica forever, that the stars would always shine in the eyes of its little children.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday August 7 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Like most of you, I am very tired this evening and in no mood for work and the thought of having to turn out to work tomorrow is not a happy one. Like most of you, I have celebrated a little too much possibly. There have been all the parties, the official ones and the very many unofficial ones. And let us face it, the wine of the country has flowed freely and I have my share of it. Independence does not come every day - indeed, it comes only once in the life of a country - and so, after the first solemn moments I have had a ball and I hope all of you have also had a ball. So, before we settle down to the realities of the work-a-day world, let me try and recall some of the high moments of the celebrations for me.

I think first and foremost, I will always remember the children. Monday morning was their time. And our school up in Red Hills was typical of what happened at schools all over the islands. The kids had their treat, they marched, and then they ate and drank their fill. But just to say this is to paint a false picture. To get the true picture you have to be there and to see the faces of the children. Little eyes shine like stars, little faces light up in radiant smiles and little hands tremble as they receive their independence gifts and wave their independence flags. Then they show you their independence buttons and try out their independence pens, often on the palms of their hands. And then of course, there was the singing of the children and I know no sound as pure and innocent/as the voices of children raised in song. I think that apart from that highly significant moment at midnight on Sunday, the one that will linger longest in

my memory is that of the children and the pure and unclouded joy with which they celebrated the coming of Jamaica's independence.

There were other moments that will linger long in my memory. One of the most important was just before midnight on Sunday when we found ourselves in a warm and friendly crowd of people on the streets, all listening to the broadcast from the stadium. It was at the point where the leaders of all the churches prayed God's blessing on the nation about to be born. The last of the prayers was by ~~the Reverend~~ ^{Fernando De Souza} Hugh Sherlock. And I saw men and women not bothering to wipe the tears from their eyes as ~~Father Sherlock's~~ ^{Mr. De Souza's} voice broke with emotion, and although we could not see him we all knew that tears of gratitude for a long dream fulfilled, and of hope for the future were running down his face. And we were not ashamed of our tears.

There were other moments. The moment of meeting the charming Princess; the meetings with great and near-great visitors from all over the world who have come here to celebrate Jamaica's Independence with us. There was the moment when the fireworks display started. And there was the very long stretch of time when the two radio stations combined together to ~~xxxxxxx~~ bring a sense of one-ness to all the people of this island, no matter where they were. One distinguished visitor came to my home on Monday morning ~~xxxx~~ just to tell me that in a long life time of travelling and sharing in celebrations - he had seen practically every African independence celebration - he had never seen anything like this. And the thing that ~~impressed~~ ^{impressed} him most of all, he said, was the quiet discipline of the Jamaican people. And because I have great respect for this man's opinion I was proud and happy that he should be so impressed by the people of this island. Tomorrow I'll tell you why. So till then,
Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday August 8 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: When all the ceremonies of our independence celebrations are over, when our Royal visitor and all our other distinguished guests have gone, when the decorations are taken down and the coloured lights are put away and we are all back in the working world of hard realities, how will we look back on these celebrations? And what will be the opinions these visitors carry away ~~from~~ with them?

I think the over-riding impression these visitors will carry away will be of an orderly, disciplined and mature people; a people who know the meaning of freedom and independence. This is no expression of some pious patriotic home. This is a fact which I heard from many of these ~~visitors~~ themselves. Many of them came here with only the haziest notions about Jamaica. Many of them thought Jamaica was just a duplicate of a small African state set in the Caribbean sea. Others thought it was just another ~~xxx~~ small Latin American country. I even met one or two people who seemed surprised that we spoke English. And I am sorry to say that I even heard one visiting journalist sound as though he expected to come to some wild and savage country where half-naked natives live in some sort of ~~jungle~~, and practice all the savagery and juju nonsense that many westerners expect from all dark-skinned people.

And I am very happy to say that I have watched some of these people get one shock after another as they came into contact with the Jamaican people at all levels. What I am not so happy about is the fact that an American visitor came to me on Sunday morning to check on whether it would be safe to go to the stadium. Some

Jaiacan had warned him that there would be trouble. In fact, I was very angry when I heard this and I urged my friend most strongly to go to the stadium. He went. And on Monday morning he phoned me to say what a wonderful and inspiring experience it was. And then he asked the question I half expected. He wanted to know why this particular Jamaican had tried to sell his country short. I told him what I have said very often on this subject. I told him that there are still a handful of Jamaicans who have no faith in the vast majority of their fellow Jamaicans. He understood this. He said the same sort of diehard reactionaries adopted the same sort of attitude in his country. The good thing was that this man had proof positive of the maturity and balance of the Jamaican people by watching them live up to a high occasion. And I know he is one of many who will go away and who will say that at the moment of independence the people of Jamaica proved that they were the most mature, that they were the most politically sophisticated, that they understood the business of power and the use of power better than any other country which has become independent since world war two. More than in all those other countries, democracy and the liberty of the citizen are based on solid foundations. And this is so because the people of this society, not just the leaders, understand the meaning of freedom and independence.

And so, in spite of all the problems ahead of us, and the greatest of these is the poverty among the mass of our people, and for democracy to survive we must overcome it - in spite of this, my faith in the future of this country is based on the understanding and the wisdom shown in these past few days by all the ordinary and humble people of this independent Jamaica. ~~They are the broad base~~

Goodnight

JGh

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday August 9 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Prime Minister's office last Saturday confirmed the rumours about Mr. Neville Ashenheim's appointment as Jamaica's first Ambassador to Washington. This is the first political appointment to a diplomatic post. All the others - that of Mr. ^{Lawrence} Lindo to London, that of Mr. Earle Maynier to Ottawa and that of Mr. Egerton Richardson to the United Nations - all these were Civil Service appointments. But of course, the man who will run the day to day affairs of the Embassy in Washington will be a senior Jamaican civil servant, Mr. Vin Macfarlane who has been appointed Minister-Councilor to the Washington Embassy. So Mr. Ashenheim becomes the first of or straight party political diplomats. This means that any time there is a change of government ^{60'} Mr. Ashenheim is most likely to lose his post. The other four, on the other hand, are civil servants and any change of government ^{will} ~~not~~ ^{will} ~~not~~ to affect them. 1.09"

Some people have expressed the view that in the early stages of our independence, during the years while we are still learning the delicate art of handling our foreign relations, it might be a good idea for all our overseas representatives to be civil servants. They argue that these senior civil servants are the only people with the necessary training and diplomatic skills that are needed for a proper handling of our foreign relations. While I see a lot of virtue in this argument, I am not sure that I am all for it. One of the great virtues of this argument is that it will ensure continuity ^{and stability} in our foreign representation in the event of any sudden or dramatic change of government. ^{2'00} What this argument overlooks is the fact that you do in fact have your senior civil servant, as in the case of Mr. Macfarlane

whose job it is to see that the ^{business} job of the Embassy goes on, no matter what political changes take place back home. Indeed, it is rather unusual that we have three civil servants as our top representatives in Great Britain, in Canada and at the United Nations. Traditionally these posts should be held by the political appointees of the party in power. And the business of these appointees is and should be the promoting and selling of the political and economic policies of the party in power and from whom they get their position. Immediately under each of these political appointees should be a career foreign service official, a ^{top} civil servant, who will run the Embassy and who will see that the decisions of the political man are carried out. In this sense, the structure of the Washington Embassy, and the appointment of Mr. Ashenheim are much more normal and traditional than in the other three cases. I think it is a very tricky business to put civil servants in positions where they have to make political decisions. It so happens that we are very fortunate in the ^{high} quality of the civil servants who head the other three missions.

As to the appointment itself, I think the government has made the best possible choice. Mr. Ashenheim is both able and experienced, and I am sure he can do a first-class job. My only misgiving is that our Washington Embassy might give the appearance and impression that Jamaica is a predominantly fair-skinned country. And this ^{might} ~~will~~ be a real handicap in today's Washington where the dark-skinned ⁴ ~~diplomats~~ far outnumber the fair ones, and where the Administration is very sensitive and responsive to the representations of these dark diplomats. This is a practical, not a racial point. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday August 10 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Russian Premier, Mr. Khrushchev sent Sir Alexander Bustamante a telegram congratulating the people of Jamaica on their attainment of ~~independence~~. This was fine. But the Soviet government also declared its recognition of Jamaica as a sovereign and ~~independent~~ state and expressed its readiness to immediately establish diplomatic relations between the two countries. And there lies one of our key foreign relations problems. Should Jamaica or should Jamaica not establish diplomatic relations with Russia?

At his Press Conference on Tuesday afternoon at the university where we housed the visiting press, one of the foreign press people asked whether Jamaica intended to establish diplomatic relations with the communist countries. Sir Alexander did not say. I am very glad that he held his peace until the Cabinet has discussed the matter and made its decision. But I also think that the Cabinet will have to make up its collective mind quite soon.

The government of Jamaica, and indeed both parties, have made it quite clear that they regard Jamaica as being quite firmly in the Western camp. So there is no doubt on this score. The Russians know it and the Americans know it. But in spite of this the Russians have gone through the normal procedure of good diplomatic practice and sent us their good wishes, announced their recognition of our independence and invited us to establish diplomatic relations. So, what are the possible problems involved?

First let us consider the consequences of refusing to establish diplomatic relations. The Prime Minister could write to Mr. Khrushchev thanking him for his good wishes and recognition and say that ~~the~~

we are a poor and small country who cannot afford to waste any of our resources on setting up Missions in countries with whom we do no business. To this Mr. Khrushchev might reply: It is precisely for that reason, my friend, that we should establish diplomatic relations so that we can do business with you. He might even throw in the offer of technical aid from Russia. So it seems to me that if we do try a polite brush-off it will not succeed.

But what if we reject the invitation to establish diplomatic relations outright? I think they will block our entry into the United Nations. They already have some grounds. ^{Our} ~~I~~ handling of the last visit of the Russian ships was not very diplomatic. And the Premier's off-the-cuff remarks in New York did not improve matters. I think the Russians are very reluctant to oppose our membership of the United Nations. Not because they care particularly about us but because they want to have ~~a~~ the good opinion of the Afro-Asian bloc of nations. It is only if they can show beyond all doubt that they have behaved reasonably and that we have been hostile and provocative that they will resort to vetoing our membership. And if we reject their latest overture they will have three pretty strong counts against us which even the Africans may accept. Can we stall them until after our admittance to the U.N.? My guess is that if we stall them they will stall our admittance. We can certainly try it and see what happens. But it might well be that the Russian price for our admittance to the U.N. is the establishment of diplomatic relations. Certainly, our first foreign relations problem looks like being a very tricky one.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday August 11 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: At his Tuesday Press Conference Sir Alexander Bustamante did say that there would be increased relationships between Jamaica and Nigeria and Ghana. Just what the Prime Minister meant by 'increased relationships' is not very clear though I suppose a fair guess would be the setting up of trade and diplomatic missions. If this is the case, then it is a decision to be welcomed.

An even more important and welcome decision, I think, would be an announcement from the Prime Minister that Jamaica will establish a High Commission Office in Trinidad to cover the Eastern Caribbean. Last Saturday Trinidad Premier, Dr. Eric Williams made it clear that Trinidad proposed to establish a High Commission Office in Jamaica as soon as possible after independence. I think this is no more than practical sense and realism. In their own interests Jamaica, Trinidad and the Federation of the Eight will have to work out a common approach in a number of fields. I think broad agreement on foreign policy for the region is going to be very important; I think working out some agreement on the marketing of our agricultural produce is another important area; I think Dr. Williams' Caribbean Common Market idea is another very important area in which we must co-operate. The alternative to co-operation and a common approach wherever possible is destructive and cut-throat competition among ourselves and political ineffectiveness on the world stage. For these reasons I hope the Jamaican government will set up a High Commission Office in Port-of-Spain.

Now for a word on taxation. When the Prime Minister answered a question about the 'haves' and 'Have-nots' at the same press

conference, he said, and now I quote his own words: "Let me be very frank with you: those who can pay, will have to pay a little more taxes." So it is just a matter of time before some of our taxes go up. To me this has come as no surprise, no matter what was said at election time. Either taxes had to go up or else the promise to make things better for the 'Have-nots' had to be broken. It had to be one or the other; it could not be both. For the details of just what taxes will go up, we will have to wait. But there are pointers to some of the things that will not go up.

For instance I think it is most unlikely that an indirect tax will be placed on all those goods which, to use Mr. Lightbourne's phrase, "are in daily common use". All you have to do is stop and think of all those things which are in daily common use among the majority of the people and you will have some idea. Food, clothing, household good, rum, local beer, local cigarettes and so forth. These are the things Mr. Lightbourne has promised to bring under price control. And so it is most unlikely that a tax increase will be placed on these things. Increases may of course be placed on luxury items like imported liquors and cigarettes and the like. A new business tax is also a possibility, and ^I would certainly like to see a tax increase on these huge imported American cars. But the most likely thing is an increase in personal income tax in the higher brackets.

I know we none of us like taxes, but if we are to create a society in which no man lives below a certain ^{economic} level, then we must find the money for it. And taxation and increased production are the only ways in which we can find the money. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday August 13 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: It was on August 13th, 1961, exactly a year ago today, that the East German communists built The Wall between East and ~~of~~ West Berlin. For all the people of Europe, and indeed for the rest of the world, Berlin had become the ^{central} battleground between communism and democracy. A year ago there was fighting going on in South-East Asia between communists and non-communists. And elsewhere, in many parts of the world, the Americans as the strongest power in the non-communist world, tried to hold the line against the Russians, the strongest power in the communist world. The great war of ideas and propaganda was, a year ago, being waged everywhere: in Africa, in Asia, in Latin America, as well as in Europe. But nowhere ~~else~~ on earth was the Cold War being fought as bitterly, as savagely and as cunningly as in Berlin.

I am sure most of you know the background to the Berlin story. After the second world war, in which America, Russia, Britain and France were on the same side, defeated Germany was divided up into zones of occupation. But when Russia and her western allies fell out, Germany was divided into two. From as far back as May of 1952, the borders between East and West Germany were closed. The only point where there was any sort of contact between East and West Germany was in Berlin. In the divided city workers from the East could cross over to work in the West and go back home in the evenings. But this led to something the communists did not like.

Berlin was, in fact a sort of shop window where anyone could look at both communism and democracy at the same time and take his or her pick. There, side by side, you could judge the two opposing systems.

And millions of Germans and other Europeans did judge the two systems. East Germany and East Berlin were in economic trouble. Food was short and drab and unexciting and many people went hungry. Agriculture was in a mess, and here as elsewhere the communists seemed utterly unable to win the confidence of the peasants or to get them to produce a decent sized crop of any kind. It seems to me that this inability of the communists to come to grips with the problems of agriculture may have a very great influence on the future of communism. In any events, in agriculture, in industry and in every other sector of the economy the East Germans were in a mess. In contrast, the West Germans were doing a booming business. Their farms produced enough to eat and to export; the hum of their factories ensured steady work and high wages and their shops were filled with food and clothes and all the things that make for civilised living. And in Berlin all this could be seen. The communists and the non-communists had started off from the same place at the same time. And non-communists were doing so much better than the communists that it was not funny. And so we had the great waves of escapes from the east to the west, across the comparatively easy and open border between East and West Berlin. And by 1961 the wave of escapes had become such a tide that the communists had to do something. And so, on the 13th of August, 1961, they built The Wall and admitted to the world that they had turned their state into a vast prison camp for its people. I think they also acknowledged by this act the fact that if the people of Germany or of Europe had any freedom of choice, very few of them would choose communism. I think The Wall was a major admission of defeat for communism in Europe. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday August 14 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Whenever I have discussed some aspect of foreign politics, such as the anniversary of the communists' putting up of the Wall between East and West Berlin, with which I dealt last night, I always find listeners asking: why? They want to know why I dealt with that/^{particular}subject and what bearing it has on what happens in Jamaica.

I think much that happens in the outside world will in the future, as it has in the past, great influence ~~what~~ happens in our world. Whether we like it or not, we are a part of the bigger world and we cannot escape being affected by what goes on in the/^{bigger}world. The hard and ugly realities of life will not disappear simply because we shut our eyes and pretend they are not there. We cannot banish the fears of an atomic war by saying we will have no part in it: and you know, the wind that blows radio-active fall-out across the earth, does so with a fine impartiality. It will not say: Jamaicans don't know about these things or Jamaicans don't care about these things, so we will pass them by. No, Jamaica is as much a part of history as is Berlin. And I think it is only if we understand this that we will be able to think and act constructively and creatively in the difficult days that are ahead.

Let me try and spell out what I mean in very concrete terms. Cuba, just 90 miles away from us has set out on the Marxist communist road. Whether we like it or not, this is fact. I think we all of us know the history behind this choice. It was the way chosen by the people of Cuba to rid themselves of political dictatorship and economic desperation. Now, the people themselves may not have intended to replace the Batista dictatorship by a dictatorship of the communist

party. But this is the situation today which is just 90 miles away from us. A very easy and convenient and ostrich-like thing to do is to say 'Allright, that is Cuba. These things happened because there was a dictatorship and a fantastic degree of economic imperialism from the United States. We are not a Latin country. We have had no dictatorship. These things cannot happen here.' Life would be very wonderful if things were as simple as that. The trouble is that it can happen here. We have the first and most important pre-condition for it to happen here: We have poverty on a very striking scale among the majority of our people and we have the economic wealth of the nation concentrated in a very few hands. I am sure most of you still remember the very powerful argument about the 'haves' and the 'Have-nots' that Mr. Seaga put up before the J.L.P. won power. If ^{ever} the day/comes when the 'have-nots' see no hope of improving their conditions under our present system of government, they may turn their backs on this system and try a dictatorship, either of the right or of the left. And no amount of talk about the liberties of the individual will count for much. To the man who is desperately hungry the most important freedom of all is freedom from hunger. These are all things we have to face up to and live with. For instance, the Wall and the situation in East and West Germany is a clear lesson that the only way to contain the communist idea is to create economic prosperity ^{and to} /share it out relatively evenly. And Cuba, 90 miles away, faced with her own problems, is a reminder that the Cold War is on our doorstep and could be within our gates overnight. So whatever happens anywhere in the world these days, is very much your business. To increase what we have and to defend what we value, we must understand the world around us and try to help shape it. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday August 15 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I went to a concert at the State Theatre last Sunday morning, and ever since I have been looking for words to tell you about it, and to try and persuade as many of you as possible to go and listen to this concert. I wish that we had not, all of us, over-used and abused words like: good, excellent, beautiful, rare, great. But we have. Very often we have used any one of these five words to describe what is just passable or what is plain ^{trivial} ~~crap~~. And so it is that when there is a real need to use these words they have lost their value. So I ~~am not~~ am not quite sure in my own mind whether you will put the same value on the words when I say that I thought the whole concert was good, with moments of excellence; I thought the singing was beautiful ^{all} at/times; I thought the intimacy and sense of unity between the conductor and the two hundred and seventy-five singers was something rare, certainly it was something I had not encountered in any other concert in Jamaica previously. And I think Mr. James Verity did a great job in training this vast choral group in a relatively short space of time so that they could sing some of the most difficult choral music in the world, and sing it so well.

For me that Choral Concert at the State on Sunday morning was possibly the most rewarding of all the activities put on by the Arts Celebrations Committee. Of all the activities, this was something uniquely new. We had put on plays before, we had put on pageants before, we had put on roadside concerts. And of course we had put on choral concerts too. But the scale and the quality ^{were} ~~xxx~~ completely different. Never before had the Jamaica Amateur Operatic Society, and the East Queen Street Young Men's Fraternal, and the East Queen

Street Baptist Church~~Street~~ Choir, and the Diocesan Festival Choir, and the Christ Church Vineyard Town Choir - never before had these choral groups come together and been blended so completely and so beautifully into one glorious mass choir, joyously disciplined under the control of a good musician. I understand that one or two musical groups, for petty personal reasons, did not take part when invited. I am sorry but I think the loss is theirs. I think ^{all our possibly} local conductors can learn a great deal from Mr. Verity. And/the most important thing they could learn from him is how to get the best out of the people with whom he works. It was a joy for me to watch what I can only describe as a sort of continuous love affair between the conductor and his musicians.

So please, if you are a lover of good music, do go and see one of these Choral Concerts. You will find it most rewarding as music and it is something new which was not possible three months ago. In fact I am convinced that only Mr. James Verity could have successfully created this mass choir at this time. There is a performance on at the State at eight o'clock tomorrow night - and then every Thursday at the same time until the end of the month. For those who ~~prefer~~ ^{next} a Sunday morning, there is a performance/~~on~~ Sunday morning at eleven. One of the most disappointing things for me was that the State was half empty last Sunday morning. In part this was due to the bad handling of publicity. But I do feel that our audiences should also make a special effort when we do have something as good as this. ~~But~~ there is no need to scold. If you really do love good music you will make sure that you go to one of these great choral concerts. They will only be on another four times. If you miss them, you will be the loser. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday August 16 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: On the editorial page of today's Gleaner there is a letter signed by a Mr. Altamont de Cordova of Montego Bay which accuses me of trying to stir up colour prejudice. The reason why Mr. de Cordova makes this charge against me is because he said I disapproved of the appointment of Mr. N.N. Ashenheim as Jamaica's Ambassador to Washington on the grounds that his skin was too light in colour. That is the essence of Mr. de Cordova's charge.

Let us now contrast that charge with the facts. I made my comments on the appointment to the Washington Embassy exactly a week ago, on Thursday August 9th. I spent nearly all my time discussing the structure of our foreign representation, not only in Washington but elsewhere. And it was only in the last half to three-quarters of a minute that I referred specifically to the appointment of Mr. Ashenheim. And this is what I said:

"As to the appointment itself, I think the government has made the best choice possible. Mr. Ashenheim is both able and experienced, and I am sure he can do a first-class job. My only misgiving is that our Washington Embassy might give the appearance and impression that Jamaica is a predominantly fair-skinned country. And this might be a real handicap in today's Washington where the dark-skinned diplomats far outnumber the fair ones, and where the Administration is very sensitive and responsive to the representations of these dark diplomats. This is a practical, not a racial point."

Those are the words I used specifically about Mr. Ashenheim's appointment, and it is on the basis of those words that Mr. Cordova accuses me of trying to stir up colour prejudice. Now, how far do

you go with this sort of thing? Are we now not to say that we see a point of practical disadvantage because the person concerned happens to be fair-skinned? Are we to lie and be dishonest simply to avoid being accused of stirring up colour prejudice? In any event in this case it seems to me that it is Mr. de Cordova who is obsessed with colour prejudice. Four-fifths of what I said seems to have passed him by. The one thing that seems to have stuck in his mind is the fact that I mentioned fair-skinned and dark-skinned. Everything else I said - and I think the other things I said were very much more important - seem not to have registered. I wonder why? I think we want to watch this thing very carefully. There are people among us who will try to stifle all freedom^{of} ~~and~~ expression and criticism by shouting 'colour prejudice' any time any one says something they do not like. I think Mr. de Cordova was guilty of this. If he were really interested in the facts he could have got the text of what I said from the J.B.C.

But let us get back to the appointment of Mr. Ashenheim. There are a number of people both inside and outside our parliament~~ry~~ who are not happy about it: some for political reasons and some for practical reasons. And I think this is going to be the big thing~~s~~ when we have our first foreign affairs debate. I think some of the views that will be expressed then will be less to the liking of Mr. de Cordova than were. The one aspect of Mr. de Cordova's letter that irritated me is his apparent low opinion of the intelligence of thousand of Jamaicans 'who do not have a high degree of education'. Book learning I think, is not the same things as wisdom and understanding: and that the Jamaicans have. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday August 17 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking.

Good evening: I think we all know that agriculture is still the cornerstone of the Jamaican economy. We have made great strides in trade and industry, and mining and tourism contribute greatly to the national economy. But the ^{vast} majority of Jamaicans still make their living off the Jamaican earth. So, what happens in agriculture is - and will be for a long time to come - of paramount importance to all Jamaica. If we are to balance our trade by cutting down on the imports of food, then our agriculture must be so organised that it will feed all the people and perhaps still have something left over for exports. All this would mean that we must bring more of the Jamaican earth under cultivation, that we must protect our land better, that we must use more modern and up to date methods to achieve higher production per acre and greater efficiency from each person.

Certainly, all things being equal, one would have thought that these are the priorities. I think it would have been reasonable for anybody to assume that the government and all our other agencies concerned with agriculture would have seen these as the major problems increasing the land under cultivation, better land protection and usage and greater efficiency. I think it would ~~be~~ ^{have been} reasonable for us to assume that if there were any fight within our farming interests it would have been on how best to achieve these ends. Unhappily this is not the situation and ever since the last election I have watched a very sad and disturbing pattern unfolding. There is a fight in our agricultural circles. It has many aspects or manifestations. For instance on Tuesday of this week fifteen hundred delegates of the Coffee Growers Co-operative Federation decided at a stormy meeting

that they would fight the government's move to amend the regulations ~~governing~~ governing the membership of the Coffee Industry Board. And on the same day there were stormy scenes that nearly broke up the half-yearly meeting of the Vere Cane Farmers Association. And these are only two instances that can be multiplied.

But are these conflicts on how best to use the land? Indeed no. They are, in the main, straight political conflicts: and this is the tragedy and the danger of this situation.

Take the case of the Coffee Growers. The Bill to amend the regulations governing membership of the Coffee Industry Board had its first reading in the House of Representatives on July 24th. The main feature of the Bill is to give the Minister greater control over the composition of the Board. He will give final approval to three out of five of the Growers' nominees and he will appoint the chairman. In other words the real fight is political. It is a fight for the political control of the running of the industry.

The same sort of thing is going on in the bigger Jamaica Agricultural Society itself. It is no secret that at least 90% of its Board of Management are, to put it mildly, pro-P.N.P. The Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Gyles, knows this. For a long time he has been the lone J.L.P. member on the J.A.S. Board. And so now he has put the quarter of a million pounds government grant to the Society on reserve, which means the Society has to go to him cap in hand every time it needs operational money. Mr. Gyles, let us face it, is using the pressure of his office against those whom he regards as his political opponents. And they in turn are reacting as though Mr. Gyles is their political opponent. The unhappy fact is that both sides know this to be a straightforward power political scrap. And it is ~~the political nature of this scrap~~ that makes it dangerous. I'll tell you why tomorrow. Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday August 18 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think we can fairly say that if the top leaders of the Jamaica Agricultural Society had been pro-J.L.P. instead of pro-P.N.P. we would not now be witnessing this fight between the Minister of Agriculture and the J.A.S. But the moment we say this, we are saying something more: we are saying that the J.A.S. has in fact become politically identified with one party. Let us not shut our eyes to the fact that the two outstanding figures in the J.A.S., Mr. Rudolph Burke and Mr. Willie Henry are also prominent figures in the P.N.P.

If the whole thing is viewed in this strictly party political light Mr. Gyles attempts to give the leadership of our agricultural bodies a more J.L.P. look are reasonable: reasonable that is, if we feel that our agricultural organisations should in fact ~~take over~~ become part of the party political structure of the country.

I personally think it would be a serious mistake to turn our agricultural bodies into party political institutions. The fact that the J.A.S. seems to have moved somewhat in that direction, is no justification for pushing it the whole way. I think the top leadership of the J.A.S. is to blame for the impression that it is a pro-P.N.P. body. But I do not think this justifies Mr. Gyles either trying to break it or capture it for the J.L.P. by manipulating its leadership.

I think a really enlightened approach to our agricultural bodies would be for the Minister to say: 'Look gentlemen, we are all entitled to our own political views because this is a free country. Unfortunately some agricultural leaders have in the past used their organisations

to further the political interests of one party. This must stop. As farmers and leaders of farmers our main interests should be to further the interests of the nation in general and of our farming community/ⁱⁿ ~~and~~ particular. Our first job is to produce food and exports for the nation... And this is how I think we should go about it."

I think if the Minister had done this: if he had gone to our farmers and our farming bodies and said let us forget party politics now and get on with the job - I think he would have won the support of the rank and file membership of the J.A.S. ~~and the~~ and the respect of all farmer, of whatever political view, in Jamaica. Unfortunately the new Minister seems just as politically partisan in his handling of agriculture as those whom he criticises.

I think there have been indications ^{especially the young} that many farmers/are not the role of happy about/the J.A.S. at the present time. Some of these people have called openly for a change of leadership. But Mr. Gyles approach had made them rally around the old leadership.

It seems to me that as well as hurting our agricultural production this injection of party politics into agriculture could lead to a real split between town and country. The farmers may get utterly fed up with being manipulated politically and set up their own party to fight the town politicians.

And so, I sincerely hope that both the Minister of Agriculture and the leaders of the Jamaica Agricultural Society, will stop and think carefully before the fight between them gets out of hand.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday August 20 at 6.15 p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Well I seem to be in trouble again and this time even my poor wife has been dragged into it. Some of you will remember that on Thursday, August 16 I discussed a letter by Mr. Altamont deCordova published in the Gleaner of that day in which he accused me of trying to stir up colour prejudice because of what I said about the appointment of Mr. N. N. Ashenheim as Jamaica's Ambassador in Washington. Well, in today's Star Mr. Vere Johns really has a go at me.

You will remember that I then set out exactly what I had in fact said. I am doing it again for the third time. This is what I said when I referred specifically to Mr. Ashenheim's appointment:- "

"As to the appointment itself, I think the government has made the best choice possible. Mr. Ashenheim is both able and experienced, and I am sure he can do a first-class job. My only misgiving is that our Washington Embassy might give the appearance and impression that Jamaica is a predominantly fair-skinned country. And this might be a real handicap in today's Washington where the dark-skinned diplomats far outnumber the fair ones, and where the Administration is very sensitive and responsive to the representations of these dark diplomats. This is a practical, not a racial point.

Unfortunately, Mr. Vere Johns only read Mr. DeCordova's letter. He did not hear my broadcast of Thursday, August, 9, when I originally discussed the Washington appointment. He did not hear my broadcast of Thursday August 16, when I corrected Mr. deCordova's

false accusation for trying to stir up colour prejudice. Instead on the basis of Mr. deCordova's letter he made the same accusation again. Now I am suppose to have said "Mr. Ashenheim skin is too white". The fact that I never said anything of the kind is just a small unimportant detail. I had always thought and I still think that one of the first responsibilities of a journalist is to make sure of his facts before launching a crusade. Certainly in the case of a journalist of the standing and the experience of Mr. Vere Johns I would have thought he would automatically have checked before using such strong language as "gross impertinence" bad taste and the like.

In all the time that I have been in Jamaica, and it has been a very happy and a very rewarding time, this is the first time that any Jamaican has called me an "outsider". I am very sorry about this because I have become so involved in Jamaica that I had forgotten that there were people like Mr. Johns who will be only too quick to remind me that I am an outsider if they disapprove of what I said. The irony of this situation is that Mr. Johns called me an outsider because he disapprove of something which in fact I did not say.

If it is any comfort to Mr. Johns I should like him to know that he did succeed in upsetting me. I have sent the text of what I actually said in full to the Star and it will be interesting to see if Mr. Johns will correct the very nasty impression he created by publicly accusing me of something I have not done. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Tuesday August 20 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last Monday the Government of the Republic of Ghana expelled two Anglican bishops from the country. The reason for the expulsion was that the Bishop of Accra, Dr. Richard Roseveare, had criticised the Ghana National Youth Movement as a 'godless' organisation. The two Bishops then went to Nigeria; and last Wednesday the Bishop of Accra issued his first/^{public} statement as an interview with a Lagos daily newspaper. In this statement the Bishop said that the Ghana Government had 'increasingly adopted a policy of confining the ~~activities~~ activities of the Church to mere worship and piety'. The Bishop also complained that two pro-Government newspapers had attacked him viciously for what he had said without actually letting their readers know exactly what he had said. He said he went so far as to send a copy of the sermon to which the government objected to the papers in the hope that they would publish it.

It was after this that the waves of reaction came. Christians everywhere were, quite naturally, against the expulsions and said so very forcefully. And of course the old familiar business of saying Ghana was as bad as South Africa was again trotted out. On the other side of the penny, many people, both in Jamaica and elsewhere, who would have made a very great fuss if the expulsions had in fact taken place in South Africa - these people were strangely silent. To these people there seems to be a subtle and delicate colour distinction to good and bad. If South Africa does something which denies the liberty of the subject, that is denounced for the evil it is: if Ghana does the same thing - well, we try to find explanations for it. Or else we keep quiet.

And so we allow our prejudices and our preconceptions to take over instead of examining the facts calmly and clearly. So, what are the facts in this case?

The first fact is that seventy percent of the entire population of Ghana is not Christian. Out of every ten Ghanaians, three are Christians, one is a Moslem, and six follow the animistic or Pagan old African beliefs. So, Christianity is not, as it is here in Jamaica, the religion of the nation. Jamaica is a Christian country. Ghana is not: the Christians are a minority in Ghana.

The second fact is that the Ghanaian majority/^{is} ~~xxx~~ intolerant of any opposition from any minority. In the tribal society there is very little room for opposition and dissent. And although Ghana has moved very rapidly into the twentieth century, the majority of her people are still tribal and their values are still more African than western. And that is why they do not see Nkrumah as a dictator. How can he be a dictator when they put him there? And the way he deals with his enemies is in the old traditional African way and so, whatever the world says, they do not see anything wrong when he puts his enemies in prison or when he expells them.

I think these are the two key facts on which to base any reasonable explanation of the expulsion of the two Bishops, or indeed of any other happening in Ghana. The expulsion of the Bishops is not some particular movement against the church: it is part of the pattern that has seen the opposition imprisoned and newspaper people expelled. The big difference is that the majority of people are behind Nkrumah while the majority in South Africa are against their rulers. I personally disapprove of ^{the methods of} both governments, but that does not alter the hard fact that Nkrumah has the support of the majority of his people. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Wednesday August 27 at 6.15p.m.

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Over the past few weeks we have been so concerned with our own affairs that there has been very little time to look at the outside world. But I think this was something inevitable: independence comes only once in the history of a people. But I think we can now settle down once more and try to get the world picture into some sort of perspective: so, let^{us} have a quick look at recent developments in Africa. Last night I discussed the expulsion of the two Anglican Bishops from Ghana. Well, earlier this month a very serious attempt was made to murder Kwame Nkrumah when he toured the Upper Volta region of his country. The news of this attempt on Nkrumah's life was kept dark for nearly two weeks. And when it did finally come out it nearly stirred up an international incident between Britain and Ghana. Certain sections of the press hinted that Britain was involved in the ~~xxxxx~~ bomb attempt which is said to have killed four ~~xxxxx~~ people, though Nkrumah himself escaped unhurt. In the end the Ghana Government had to issue a statement saying that Britain was not involved. Nkrumah himself blamed 'imperialists and colonialists' for the attempt. A very much more likely explanation^{is} that some of his own political enemies are trying this method of opposition because no other is open to them.

Next door to Ghana, in massive Nigeria, where there has been a measure of political instability in recent months, the Federal Government has launched an ambitious Six-Year Development Programme. If this programme achieves only three-quarters of what it sets out to do, then we will see an amazing social and economic miracle within the next six years.

Among their major objectives is a series of dams along the river Niger to generate enough hydro-electric power to supply the whole country. Next they propose to set up an iron and steel mill which should be in operation by 1966 and which should have a capacity of between 125,000 and 250,000 tons. And so it goes: they plan to step up their number of hospitals, schools, doctors, teachers, houses and jobs. And the Plan spells it all out in great detail: how much will be spent on a given undertaking, and just what they expect to get in return and when they expect to get it.

When Nigeria first achieved her independence I told you that it was just a matter of time before she will become the leading member of the West African group of free African states. Well, if she carries through her six-year plan successfully, I would be prepared to say that she is on her way to becoming the leading state in all of free Africa - not just West Africa. And so far the Nigerians have not interfered seriously with civil liberties, freedom of expression and a multi-party system of government. And these are very hopeful signs for the future of Africa.

Over on the east coast of Africa, things are not quite as good, but they are not too bad either. Tanganyika plans to become a republic at the end of this year and I think Julius Nyerere is likely to be elected President. In Kenya there is still the danger of tribal conflict unless the leaders come together. And Uganda has pushed a new young leader on the world stage. He is Apolo Milton Obote. He is 37, the Prime Minister and the man who will lead his country into independence next October. I think we are all going to hear more of him.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Friday August 23 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: In the now notorious broadcast which dear friend ^{John} Vere did not hear or read before shooting off his mouth, I discussed the very important question of Jamaica's foreign representation abroad. (Incidentally, I want to thank all the very many listeners who have telephoned and written to me over this incident). Your calls and letters almost made me glad it happened). Anyway, in that broadcast I pointed out that three of our four top foreign representatives were senior civil servants, and only one a straight party political appointment. All things being equal then, it is very likely that Mr. Maynier, Mr. Lawrence Lindo and Mr. Richardson will be the first of our top career foreign diplomats. And it is likely that these will be joined later by Mr. Vin Mcfarlane. This raises the very important question: will our ^{top} diplomatic jobs be open only to persons who are either in the higher ranks of the civil service or else who are identified with the party that happens to be in power? If that is to be the case then a very great deal of Jamaican talent may never be used and go to waste. Let us face it, there are a number of very able Jamaicans who could be of very great service to Jamaica. Some of these people are not especially interested in party politics but are interested in being of service to their country. In Britain, and in most western European countries the talents of such people will be used in diplomacy and on special missions and the like. I think an interesting exercise of this type was the last mission to parts of Africa. But this sort of thing is not yet general enough in Jamaica. Here there is still a tendency to put more importance on party loyalty than on ability and loyalty

to country. And so it is that at any given moment in time the talents and the abilities of the members or supporters of one of our major political parties are not being used because that party is out of office, and when you are out of office you are the opposition and so you will not do anything that will bring glory and honour to your opponents. In addition to this wasted talent there is the wasted talent of those who are non-partisan. Both parties tend to be even more distrustful of neutrals than they are of each other. The idea is that 'You must either be for us or against us'. I hope the day comes soon when both parties realise that it is possible not to belong to either party and still do good service to the country. We do not all have to operate as politicians; we do not all have to be in parties; we do not all have to see the world from one point of view only. The really unfortunate ^{part} of all this is the waste of talent which Jamaica cannot afford. And so I hope that somewhere along the line the government and the opposition will work out certain areas in which bi-partisan policies can be pursued in the best interests of Jamaica.

The idea of a bi-partisan approach to foreign affairs has been put forward. I am in wholehearted agreement with this. Jamaica is too small and poor to afford the luxury of making its foreign affairs part of the party political football. I would put foreign policy as the number one priority for working out a bi-partisan policy here at home.

Next I would list a number of Jamaican institutions which should be effectively removed from the arena of party politics. I will give you my ideas on this list tomorrow. So till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

7 ~~Friday~~ Saturday August 24 at 6.15p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: If we work out a bi-partisan policy in our foreign affairs, it would make it possible to appoint the best and most able person to any given ~~ix~~ diplomatic post without any reference to the party affiliations. And this would at once give the government - of whichever party - a much larger pool of talent to choose from, including non-party talent.

On the domestic scene, I should like to see a bi-partisan approach to the problems of bringing education to all our children. I think it is very wrong that education should be approached as a party political matter. This has, unfortunately been the case. Education is and has been a good point-scoring party business. And so we have injected class attitudes and class values into our educational problems.

I should like to see the setting up of machinery for the educational experts in both parties to come together and work out a common, bi-partisan approach to our educational problems. This business of education is such an urgent and desperate ~~one~~ thing that we just cannot afford to play party politics with it. It is on what we do about education today, it is on how we handle these problems today that the shape of tomorrow will be based. So for me, education is as important an area for a bi-partisan approach as is foreign affairs.

The ~~only~~ other areas in which I should like to a bi-partisan approach, because these are matters of life and death for Jamaica, are agriculture and mechanisation and on the question, ticklish and explosive, of population.

On Friday and Saturday of last week I gave you my views on the current conflict between the Minister of Agriculture on the one hand and the leaders of our agricultural organisations on the other. I told you then that our agriculture was being used as a straight party political football. The J.A.S. top leadership, willy-nilly, had become identified with the P.N.P. And so when Mr. Gyles assumed office he approached the J.A.S. with the attitude that ^{its leaders} ~~they~~ were the enemies of his party.

Now, whatever the rights and the wrongs of the case (and I have already given you my views on them) the most important fact of all is that our agriculture is not functioning at maximum efficiency. We are still importing far too much food that could be grown here; and so we have ^{an} ~~the~~ adverse trade balance and an external debt that grows bigger every years. And we just cannot afford this. The only way we can overcome this is by closing ranks and trying to get the best out of the Jamaican earth. And one of things this means is that the J.A.S. and the government should work in the closest co-operation. And when I say the J.A.S. and the government I mean the J.A.S. and any government - P.N.P. or J.L.P. But for this to happen there must a bi-partisan agreement ~~between~~ on the approach to agriculture. And in terms of our sugar exports and of our port the two parties had better work out some common approach to mechanisation before we get squeezed out of the sugar market and shipping prices become even more prohibitive.

All the indications are that if Jamaica is to survive and go forward then the parties must, on a number of ^{major} issues, agree to sink their differences in the interests of the nation. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Thursday August 27 at 6.15p.m.

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: ¹ ~~Tomorrow~~ ^{last Friday} the/Board of Directors of the Jamaica

Broadcasting Corporation ~~will be~~ ^{was} replaced by a new Board of Directors.

For many people this is a straight political affair. The old Board of the J.B.C., these people say, was a predominantly P.N.P. Board. Now that the P.N.P. is out of Office it is natural and reasonable that the J.L.P. government should have a Board that is more in sympathy with it than a straight pro-P.N.P. Board would be. As far as it goes, this makes sense. But how far does it go? And what are the implications behind it?

First, I think if you look very carefully at the composition of the new Board you will find that it looks a little more representative of Jamaican national interests than the old Board looked. Three very clear examples of what I mean are the appointments of the Chairman of the Social Welfare Commission, the Chair man of the Suagar Industry Labour Welfare Board, and the Government Public Relations Officer. These three are not appointed as individuals but as people holding certain offices. Membership of the Board depends on their holding those offices; the moment they ~~cease to hold~~ ^{cease to hold} those offices, they will also cease to be members of the Board of the J.B.C. I frankly like this idea.

The big disadvantage about this idea is that more often than not these very 'representative' people are so busy representing special interests that it becomes difficult to work out an overall national policy.

But we are still faced by a very much more serious long term problem and it is this: if, with every change of government, there

is to be a change in the composition of the Board of the J.B.C, then, it seems to me, it will only be a matter of time before the J.B.C. will be reduced to being the straightforward instrument of the party in power, whether it be J.L.P. or P.N.P. It is true that the terms under which the J.B.C. was set up specifically gives its Board autonomy in all policy matters. But it is extremely difficult, if not impossible for a man to buck the party when he knows he is there as a straight party appointee: furthermore, since his retention of his position depends on that particular party remaining in power, this is going strongly to influence his approach to making policy. In fact, the conditions are such that it is almost impossible for the man not to be partisan.

So the big problem here, it seems to me, is to keep party politics out of the running of the J.B.C. But how do we go about it?

I would very much like to see the government and the opposition come to some sort of agreement on this matter. I think we will find the B.B.C. an excellent model. Its Board of Governors do their work to the best of their ability, without fear or favour, knowing that all the British political parties have accepted the principle that the B.B.C. should be a national institution, above party politics. And I think it is for this reason, because it could operate creatively and without fear, that the B.B.C. was able to make such a major contribution to British life and culture. No Governor of the B.B.C. has ever had his or her appointment revoked because of a change of government, or for party political reasons. But then, they were not appointed on a party basis. I hope we will grow wise enough to do the same with the J.B.C. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Tues Aug 28th at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The news that Dr. Arthur Lewis has decided to leave the University of the West Indies is very disturbing to me. Of course, it is not new. The rumour that Dr. Lewis ~~would~~ was likely to leave has been going the rounds for quite some time now. Now the rumour has been confirmed. Dr. Arthur Lewis has accepted the post of Professor of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University.

One of the striking things about this move is that Dr. Lewis will in fact step down in terms of status: from being the Vice-Chancellor and Principal of one university he will become just an ordinary Professor at another. It is true that the status of Princeton is very high indeed among the universities of the world. But the status of the University of the West Indies is itself pretty high: it is certainly high enough for no-one to be able to say that a professorship at Princeton is the equal of heading our university. Against this, however, we must set the fact that Dr. Arthur Lewis has a very unique reputation as a scholar in his own right; so that basically, ^{and reputation} the quality of the man ~~is~~ such that he can afford to ignore the symbols of status. But none of this tells us why Dr. Lewis decided to leave the University here. All sorts of theories have been put forward but only Dr. Lewis can, if he wishes to, give the real reasons this he may, or may not give when he returns from Turkey next month.

What is very clear is that Dr. Lewis' leaving is almost certain to create - or, at least, to dramatise - some very tricky problems for the university.

One of the most important of these problems is the splitting up of the University. We have already seen tendencies in this

direction. British Guianam had decided to withdraw from ~~participating~~ ^{sharing} the costs of running the university. She plans to set up her own university in the near future. The Trinidad branch of the university at St. Augustine is in fact fast becoming the nucleus of a university of Trinidad; and there is talk of a similar branch being set up in Barbados. Dr. Lewis has a very high reputation in both the West Indies and the outside world. And I think it is fair to say that he commands the respect of all the politicians of the region in a way that no-one else does. And so, more than any other intellectual in the region, he has the influence and the authority to resist any break-away moves and to keep the university together. And so it seems to me that when he goes we will lose a very powerful factor for unity at the university itself and also in the West Indies in general. Indeed, if I were asked for one possible reason why Dr. Lewis has decided to leave and go to an American university I would, ^{possibly} suggest that it is / because of his distress and disappointment at the betrayal of West Indian nationalism. There are ~~many~~ vast numbers of people throughout the region for whom being West Indians is still more important than being Jamaicans or Bajan or Trinidadians or Guianese. I think Dr. Lewis is one of these people.

Just what happens after Dr. Lewis leaves is anybody's guess. I think the vast expansion at the University will slow down because no one else will be able to attract the kind of money he did. But much more important is the question: What sort, what quality of university will we have after Arthur Lewis leaves? Will it remain West Indian or become Jamaican? We have a year to think about these questions. Then Arthur Lewis leaves. Goodnight..

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Aug 29 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I am sure most of you know of the gloom and despair in the building industry. There are people who say that as a result of the Allen Award a number of building projects have been abandoned and the building industry is in danger of coming to a standstill. Well, if the building industry does in fact come to a standstill then we will obviously have priced ourselves out of business. And if that does happen then it will be the workers in the building industry who will suffer most because there will be wholesale unemployment in the industry, and this is bound to affect a lot of other industries. But you know, we can get ourselves into quite a mess of ifs: if this, and if that, and if the other. So, let us try and get away from the ifs and see what the facts are. But the moment you start looking for facts you run into trouble. People ~~in~~ on the employers' side of the building industry will tell you that they paid out something like seventeen million pounds in wages last year, and that their profits amounted to only four million pounds and that therefore any new rise in wages will wipe out their margin of profit. And they will make a pretty convincing case of it. Certainly, you cannot blame a man if he refuses to invest his money in an undertaking that gives him either no return or a return that is so small that it is not worth the risk. But then the workers' side will tell you that those figures are suspect, that they are just book figures and do not really mean very much. And, you know, it is awfully difficult to arrive at any sort of sensible opinion once you do have two such conflicting arguments. The employers side could be right: and the workers' side could be right. And, if you are skilful at them, you can make figures do quite amazing things.

And so we who are outside the building industry are just not in a position to know all the facts. Indeed, it seems to me that very few people inside the industry - both management and labour - know all the facts.

What we do know is that last year showed great activity in the construction and installation sector of our economy. We built Harbour View, Trafalgar Park, Pembroke Hall, the Kingston-Sheraton, the National Stadium as well as a number of smaller housing projects. Some of these carried over in 1962. The Stadium and the Kingston-Sheraton did. Last year the telephone company spend roughly three-quarters of a million pounds on new installations, and the Public Service Company spent roughly two million pounds. The result of all this activity was the last year construction and installation contributed twenty-seven million, seven-hundred-thousand pounds to the nation's wealth. ~~I myself do not think that a general wage increase of 10% would have made any difference to this particular pattern of building last year. And an increase of 15% is in fact the cornerstone of the Allen Award.~~ I think there are really two problems. First, I think that even without the Allen Award we cannot expect the same volume of building this year as we had last. There is no need for another Stadium or Kingston-Sheraton. So there will be fewer jobs for building workers. The second problem is that of making awards retroactive. This, I feel, is dangerous because it will scare investment money away from building. It is also morally wrong. It is wrong to punish a man today for what was not a crime last year. I think retro-activity is a thoroughly bad and dangerous principle in every respect: this is the only thing I don't like about the Allen Award. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday August 30 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: At midnight tonight the independent state of Trinidad and Tobago comes into being. And so, within the space of twenty-four days we are seeing the birth of two independent nations in this area. Exactly twenty-four days ago, Jamaica became independent: now, at midnight, Trinidad and Tobago becomes independent.

One of the odd and distressing things about the West Indian situation is how little the peoples of the West Indies know about each other. Jamaica and the nine other British West Indian islands were once part of the same federation. And yet only a handful of Jamaicans, those at the university, those in senior government posts, a few journalists and a few farmers and businessmen - have any sort of working knowledge of our Caribbean neighbours. I still remember the very great surprise I caused last year when I told listeners that Barbados had had an oil refinery for over a quarter of a century. Well, bearing this in mind, let us salute Trinidad's independence in the most worthwhile and meaningful way possible: let us get to know a little about the place and its people.

To begin with Trinidad itself is the most southerly of all the islands of the British West Indies. It is just off the Latin American mainland, seven miles from Venezuela. It is separated from the mainland by the shallow Gulf of Paria. Tobago, a small hilly island of 116 square miles is nineteen miles to the north-east of Trinidad. More than half of Tobago is under cultivation and agriculture is its main business though it is rapidly becoming very popular as a tourist centre. Trinidad is ~~xxx~~ about 1,150 miles away from Jamaica. To get some sort of working idea of just what this means we have to

remember that New York is about 1,500 miles away from Jamaica, So, the distance between Jamaica and Port-of-Spain is just slightly less than the distance between Jamaica and New York.

The total area of Trinidad is 1,864 square miles, which means that it is less than half the size of Jamaica: and it has a population of eight-hundred and thirty-one thousand, eight hundred. It is less than half the size of Jamaica and it has roughly half as many people as Jamaica. This would still be the case if you added the 116 square miles of Tobago and its population to that of Trinidad.

The people of Trinidad are very much the same sort of mixture as the people of Jamaica - with one very important difference. The people of East Indian descent form the second largest group in the population of Trinidad. In fact, I have not been able to find any recent figures to confirm this. So, while the Indians were roughly 35% of the population about three years ago, they might ~~be~~ ~~th~~ have risen to a higher percentage since. What is definite is that the people of Indian descent and the people of African descent between them make up more than 82% of the total population.

The island has three mountain systems which run from east to west. The land between the northern and central ranges is fertile and well watered and good farming land. South of the central range the water supply is poor. Agriculture and forestry are extensive. The Pitch Lake is in the south-west of the island. Trinidad is not as mountainous as Jamaica: most of the land is below a thousand feet above sea level. So much for the place and its people. Tomorrow I'll tell you about its economy and its politics. And of course, when I speak to you tomorrow it will have achieved its independence. So let us salute it now.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday August 31 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: ~~xxxx~~ One of the things few Jamaicans seem/to know is that Jamaica ~~xxxxxxx~~ is not the richest island in the British Caribbean. The false notion that she is the richest has been perpetrated out of a combination of pure Jamaican chauvinism and the anti-federal spirit that did not hesitate to use the big lie. The fact is that Trinidad and Tobago is not only economically better off than Jamaica, its economy is also more solidly based than that of Jamaica today.

Let us take a few examples. As with Jamaica, the National Income has more than doubled over the past ten years in Trinidad. But whereas Jamaica's percapita income stood at £131 last year. The Trinidad per capita income stood at £207. So on a per capita basis each Trinidadian was £76 better-off than each Jamaican last year. This may not have been so in terms of actual cash, but it would certainly have been a very important factor in determining how much the money you do have can buy and what services the government has to offer and how these are spread around. The first and most obvious result of this is that the cost of living is lower for the average Trinidadian than it is for the average Jamaican. That is example number one. Now for example number two. Last year Jamaica imported goods worth £75.2 million. Against this, she exported goods worth £62 million. This means that in her trading with the outside world last year, Jamaica was in debt to the tune of £13.2 million. Trinidad on the other hand imported goods worth £122.18 million, just a little less than twice the amount Jamaica imported. This means that they are importing a whole lot more food and clothing and other items than we are. And this in turn means that more of these things are available

to more of their people. Remember there are only half as many of them as there are of us, and yet they ~~xxxxxxending~~^{spent} nearly twice as much on imports as we ~~xxx~~ did last year. But let us see the whole picture through. Although they spent £122 millions-plus on imports. They exported good worth £123.38 million. So, after all their high spending when they finished checking their books last year, they owed nobody anything on last year's business and they had made a profit of £x one and a half million pounds on their overseas trading. That, for any business, for any individual, for any society or nation is as sound and healthy an economic position as you could want to be in. And that is the economic state of the newly independent Trinidad and Tobago.

Politically Trinidad is not in quite as happy a position. It has made the most extraordinary strides since the appearance of Dr. Eric Williams on the scene in 1955. I was in Port of Spain at the time and I attended one of the first - if not the very first - of his Woodford Square meetings. Since those days the politics of party and programmes has replaced the politics of person, position and race. But the two-party system is not as deeply bedded as it is in the Jamaican society. And too much depends on one man. Trinidad today is Dr. Eric Williams. Remove him and no one can be sure of what will remain of the political stability of Trinidad. Jamaica has been particularly fortunate in having two instead of just one outstanding leader. Barrow's emergence has strengthened the two-party system in Barbados. Trinidad needs time for this to happen. And so the great weakness with which Trinidad enters on independence is that Eric Williams, for the present is Trinidad and Trinidad is Eric Williams. And absolute power is a most dangerous thing - even in the hands of a saint. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Sept 1st at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Without the past, there can be no present and there can be no future. And yet you know, a number of our West Indian politicians seem to think that the only way in which to create a future for themselves is to wipe out the past. This is not, of course, a purely West Indian phenomenon. It is worldwide. And I think you can measure the political sophistication of a society and its leaders by whether they try to wipe out their past or not. In politically developed countries each generation of politicians tend to want to build on what has gone before. And they all tend to want to give credit to those who have gone before. And as time passes, the party lines are blurred and only the services the man rendered are remembered and honoured. In Britain William Pitt, Benjamin D'Israeli and William Lloyd George are increasingly remembered and honoured as great national leaders. In the United States George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson - and of late even Franklin Roosevelt - are remembered as great national leaders rather than party men. And no aspiring politician, either in Britain or the United States, feels that it is necessary to destroy the reputations of these past leaders in order to build up his own. Indeed, the aspiring politician in these countries wants to be a part of the pattern and tradition which threw up these great men. And it is very interesting to note that it is in societies where this is the pattern that the citizen enjoys greater personal freedom and the tendencies to violence and dictatorship are least.

Hitler had to burn books in an effort to wipe out the liberal Western European traditions of the past; in Stalin's Russia they

rewrote the history of their revolution in order to turn Stalin into sort of an infallible God. In South Africa they have banned books (my own included) and they have reorganised education in such a way that no black boy or girl would be taught to regard himself or herself as the equal of any white person. And in Ghana Kwame Nkrumah has decided to rewrite the history of his country and his people in such a way that everything begins with Kwame Nkrumah. And of course, all these people always find justification for doing this.

Now, I am not saying that we have gone as far as this anywhere in the West Indies. But do you remember Eric Williams' burning of the documents on Chaguaramas about a year or so back? And do you remember Errol Barrow's calculated insult of Grantley Adams shortly after Barrow had won the Barbados elections? And nearer home, do you remember Millard Johnson sneering at Manley and Bustamante as if the history of Jamaica began with him? And even within the two major parties, do you remember the P.N.P.s (when they were in power) who denied that Bustamante made any sort of contribution to the national struggle? And have you heard the rumours going around that Manley's contribution must now be denied? I think this is a dangerously destructive tendency which we want to watch very carefully. What may seem like a clever political expedient could easily undermine the basic liberties of this society.

So., please do not allow this ~~particular~~ rewriting of Jamaica's past - either the distant or the immediate past. It is as we understand and value and cherish that which was good in the past that we can live creatively in the present and make a worthwhile contribution to the future. Without the past there can be no present and there can be no future. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Monday September 3 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Saturday evening's earthquake in Iran (or Persia, as it used to be called) has taken more than ten thousand lives so far. Heaven only knows what the death toll will be when the final count is made. What makes this tragic disaster so much worse is the fact that ~~the death roll need not have been on this terrible scale~~ the death roll need not have been on this terrible scale. With a little thought and a little planning the death roll could have been kept down.

If only a small proportion of the wealth and scientific skill that went into putting the two Russian ~~astronauts~~ into space had been put to the service of detecting and protecting mankind from earthquakes, many of those who died in Saturday's earthquake might still be alive today. By the same token, if a fraction of the American skill and money that went in to the Venus shot had been put to the service of man on earth, many Persians who are now dead may still have been alive today. When you stop to think about it the whole thing becomes utterly fantastic - a sort of mad tragedy of human folly.

We know more about earthquakes today than man has ever known. We know what causes them, and we know what we should do ^{to} ~~the~~ minimise their effects. There is an instrument called a seismograph which can measure the shock waves set up by an earthquake, and which can pinpoint the position of the earthquake by the time-gap between shockwaves. It is not possible to predict earthquakes ^{far} in advance. But with their knowledge of where earthquakes are likely to happen, scientists can prepare for trouble well in advance. And there is warning of a few hours before any major tremor. So there are things we can do.

We know that earthquakes happen most frequently in those areas where the earth's crust is still changing, where there are cracks on the earth's surface. We have even named these areas 'earthquake belts' and they include the shores of the Pacific Ocean (remember the recent Chilian disaster) and a huge area of southern Asia ~~which~~ ^{and} extends all the way to the Mediterranean Sea. So, one of the first things we can do is to make sure that there are checking stations within the earthquake belts. Second we can make sure that machinery is set up ~~so~~ ^{so} that emergency evacuation can get under way within an hour of any warning. Third, we can make sure that the types of houses built within the earthquake belt have steel frames. ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{The most common cause} ~~the xxxxxx~~ of death in earthquakes is the collapsing of houses on people and the breaking out of fires. The hundred odd towns and villages which were destroyed in Saturday's earthquake were mainly stone structures, not re-inforced, and so they became terrible death-traps, as they have been through the ages when one quake could claim thirty or forty or fifty or sixty or even one hundred thousand human lives. The greatest and quickest destruction of the most human beings in history was not at Hiroshima, as many people believe. The bomb at Hiroshima and the bomb at Nagasaki together destroyed only upwards of a hundred thousand people. One earthquake, ^{the} ~~the~~ Shemaka Province of China destroyed over 800,000 people in 1556. In 1920 another 200,000 were destroyed in China, and in 1923 90,000 in Japan. But there is no need for this massive slaughter today. We know enough to prevent much of it. But instead of doing so we are shooting at the Moon and at Venus. And then we think man is so smart. It all seems pretty dumb to me. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Sept 4 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think this business of putting words into people's mouths is getting a little out of hand, especially when it comes from as able a source as the Sunday Gleaner's Political Reporter. On Sunday, in the course of his comments on the J.B.C. the Political Reporter accused me of speaking sneeringly about the Jamaican voters as - and now I quote the words he put into my mouth - "those people who have destroyed the image of West Indian nationhood". The fact is that I never said any such thing and only the Political Reporter knows why he wants to put those particular words into my mouth.

The only time I referred to West Indian nationalism over the past week was when I discussed the news that Dr. Arthur Lewis was leaving the university next September. This I did on Tuesday August 28th and these were the exact words that I used:

"Indeed, if I were asked for one possible reason why Dr. Lewis has decided to leave and go to an American university I would suggest that it is possibly because of his distress and disappointment at the betrayal of West Indian nationalism. There are vast numbers of people throughout the region for whom being West Indians is still more important than being Jamaicans or Bajans or Trinidadians or Guianese. I think Dr. Lewis is one of those people."

These are hardly the words the Political Reporter put into my mouth. But then, this seems to be the silly season for misquotations.

Anyway, let us get on to the much more important question of the use of drugs. Lately there has been a great debate on the drug Thalidomide. A number of pregnant women had used this drug as a tranquiliser. Then some of them gave birth to deformed children. I

think most of us have seen the picture of the very beautiful little boy who was born without arms. As a result of all this, one American mother who had taken Thalidomide decided not to risk having a deformed baby and went to Sweden for an operation. After the operation the doctors confirmed that the baby would have been born deformed. People all over the world are still debating the rights and the wrongs of this woman's action.

What has come out of this business is a new awareness of the possible dangers of these drugs. There is a great debate going on in Britain now about the 'No-Baby' Pill - which is the latest form of birth control. This Pill has been in use for just about a year or so and so far there has been no report of any harm to any woman who has used it. But a year is a very short time and there are doctors who say they will not prescribe it for their patients until it has been tested for ~~twenty~~ years. But almost an equal number of doctors who are only too happy to prescribe it for mothers who do not want to have babies. So this 'No-Baby Pill' looks like being a point of dispute for quite some time to come.

What is of much more immediate concern to us in Jamaican is the news from Washington that one of the ingredients of APC can be harmful to our kidneys if taken in large and repeated doses. Most of us take AP.C. for our headaches or other minor ailments. This is because we want quick relief and also because few of us can afford to go to a doctor for every small ailment. But now the question arises: Are we really doing ourselves any good by seeking quick relief? And what is supposed to be a large dose of A.P.C.? May I suggest that you take it easy on the use of drugs until the experts tell us more about them.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Wednesday Sept 5 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

~~Good~~ evening: The first results of last year's agricultural census which has just been released ~~xxxxxx~~ makes most interesting reading and, I think, gives clear pointers to the future of farming in Jamaica. But before I discuss these pointers, let me give you a rundown of the facts.

The last agricultural census was for 1942. But since then there have been sample survey in 1950, 1954 and 1958. So there has been a continuous check on trends every four to six years.

The most important single piece of information out of the latest census is that Jamaica's small farms are slowly disappearing; and the smaller the farm, the faster it is disappearing. Between 1942 and 1954 there were roughly 139,000 small farms of under five acres each. By 1961 the figure had dropped to 112,600. This means that 26,400 small farms of less than five acres had gone out of existence between 1954 and 1961. Twenty-six thousand farms in seven years. This means that small farms have been disappearing at the rate of close on three thousand eight hundred a year. This is quite an amazing rate for farms to go out of existence.

But this was not all. In the small to medium sized farms the same trend took place, though on a smaller scale. The 1942 census showed a total of 28,000 farms of between five and twenty-four acres. By 1954 the total number of farms in this category had risen to 53,000 - nearly double the 1942 total for 5-24 acre farms. But, between 1954 and 1961 the total in this category had dropped to 41,000. In other words something like 12,000 small to medium-sized farms had disappeared by last year.

And something of this self-same pattern persists, though on a much more modified scale on even larger units. Farms of between 25 and ninety acres rose from a total of 4,000 in 1942 to five thousand six hundred in 1954. But in 1961 the total in this category had dropped to ^{3,800} 3,800. It is only in the farms that are over five hundred acres each that no dramatic change has taken place. Their numbers have remained more or less constant.

The Department of Statistics explains the decline in the number of farms - especially the smaller farms - by pointing to the heavy migration that took place between 1954 and 1961. In addition there is been the steady movement away from the rural areas into the cities. Men have given up scratching a living from the earth in favour of finding a job in some workshop or factory in a town. And so the drift from the land continues.

This is pretty well inevitable. This is what is going on everywhere in the world. The pattern is towards smaller numbers of people remaining on the land and, with the aid of machines, getting more from the land: getting enough to feed the people in the towns and also contributing towards the wealth of the nation. This has been, this is, a logical development towards an efficient and highly productive agriculture. But it poses great challenges and the greatest of these is: What are we to do with the vast numbers who drift to the towns and swell the ranks of the unemployed? Before we can begin to tackle this question it seems to me that we must face up to the fact that the drift from the land is not only inevitable, it is also in the best long-term interests of Jamaican agriculture.

Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Sept 6 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Sir Alexander Bustamante and his team of advisers leave tomorrow for Britain and the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference which begins in London next ^{Monday} week. Many people have remarked on the size of the delegation the Prime Minister is taking with him. Some people have remarked on it quite simply as something striking: others have remarked on it as a form of criticism of the government. I think both attitudes were to be expected. When the P.N.P. was in power many people remarked on the size of the missions they sent abroad, and the J.L.P. (then the opposition party) often criticised them for spending public money on these missions. It is therefore not surprising that P.N.P. supporters should now get their own back. This, after all, is the stuff of party politics.

But party politics aside, the Mission to London is a very large one and I think we should try to examine the possible reasons for its size. As well as the Prime Minister, the mission will include Mr. Sangster, Mr. Lightbourne, ~~Mr. Seaga~~, Mr. Gyles and Mr. Ken Jones, as well as the usual civil service advisors. To the best of my knowledge this is a larger Ministerial mission than Mr. Manley ever took with him when he headed the government. But this government was obviously not elected in order to follow any pattern set by Mr. Manley's government. So let us forget that aspect of it.

One possible reason for the largeness of the delegation - and it is one that makes a lot of sense to me - is that this will be Jamaica's first full-scale exercise in handling external affairs since independence. If I am right then the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference is only one facet of the whole exercise. Out

of the Conference will come a number of issues that are crucial to Jamaica's future. There is the question of the European Common Market. If Britain joins the effects are bound to be profound on Jamaica's agriculture and, to a lesser extent, on her industrialisation plans. So it becomes important that the Ministers concerned with agriculture and with trade and industry should be on hand to be able to tell the Prime Minister what possible effect this or that move might have on agriculture or on trade and industry. Also, it would give the two Ministers a first-hand opportunity to see the problems they face in terms of a world-wide perspective. By being on the spot in London and by possibly slipping over to Europe to see the E.C.M. in operation they are likely to come to grips with the issues involved in a way that is not possible while they sit in their offices in Kingston. I think if we look at it in this light then the largeness of the Mission could be seen as possibly a good thing. It can give our Ministers a firmer and more realistic grasp of the world in which we live - and that is always a good thing for politicians to have. But the taxpayer is not going to be satisfied simply to be paying for the education of his Ministers. And so I should say that the final judgement will depend on what the mission achieves. If it brings back something good and positive for Jamaica then it will be judged a good mission - whatever its size. Nothing succeeds as well as success itself.

Finally, I do hope we will have a better flow of information on the doings of the Mission than we had during the last mission to Washington and London. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Sept 7 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Wednesday news that the United States has ordered a third additional shipment of sugar from Jamaica and the West Indies, is very cheering indeed. As a matter of fact I think that development in the sugar industry over the past three or four weeks have been more cheering than in any other sector of the economy. Three times American sugar interests have called on the West Indies to supply them with extra sugar: this was because other sugar producers could not deliver what they had promised the Americans. And three times the West Indies and Jamaica could, and did, deliver. This is very good and it speaks very well for our sugar industry.

But of course, you know, the Americans did not just pick the name of Jamaica out of a hat and say 'We like you so you must supply us with the sugar'. It was not as simple as that. A very great deal of very hard work has been going on quietly for months now to promote Jamaican and West Indian sugar in the American market. And the man who has been doing all this hard work is Sir Robert Kirkwood, Chairman of the Jamaica Sugar Manufacturers Association as well as of the West Indies Sugar Manufacturers Association.

Sir Robert has spent more time away in Washington over the past six months or so than he has spent at his home. He has talked to Senators and Congressmen and leaders of opinion in every walk of American life. And the positive and the tangible results of all these efforts are the new sugar orders that have come here over the past three weeks. The point is that these windfalls to our sugar industry did not just happen: Sir Robert Kirkwood did an awful lot of hard work to make them happen. And the wonderful thing is that the industry

was ready and able to deliver the goods when the call came.

As you know, a much less~~e~~ happy situation obtains in the building industry. Some of you will remember that it was as recently as Wednesday of last week that I discussed the building industry in the light of the Allen Award. I told you then that it was awfully difficult to get at the facts in the light of the very conflicting arguments put forward by the employers' side on the one hand and the workers' side on the other. But I did also say that if the industry does in fact come to a standstill then we will obviously have priced ourselves out of business. Now, Jamaica Premix Limited has decided to close down its operations in Jamaica rather than carry on under the terms of the Allen Award. The workers were supposed to be paid ~~off~~ ^{earlier} finally/today. Both the Ministry of Labour and the National Workers Union are trying to avert this closure. It is too early yet to know the outcome. But this is certainly a warning that it is possible for labour to price itself right out of business. I sincerely hope that the labour movement will think very carefully around the implications of the developments at Premix. As I told you ~~xxxx~~ ^{on} Wednesday of last week, I think a fall off in building activity is inevitable this year, so there is bound to be a measure of unemployment in the industry. If other firms follow the example of Premix then we could face serious unemployment. So let us think carefully.

Finally, the Government has kept its election promise to cut market fees. As from November 1st market fees will be 25% lower than they now are. So, chalk one up to the government for having kept one promise. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Sept 8 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Board of Management of the Jamaica Agricultural Society this week started discussing a really crucial subject. I think this subject is so important that I should like the entire Jamaican community to think about it and to discuss it. The subject is the control of the use of the Jamaican earth.

A member of the J.A.S. Board, Mr. W.A. Smith, suggested that an organisation be set up to control land usage and to direct how the land should be used. The Board has discussed the idea and will discuss the idea again at future meetings. So, pending those future meetings, here are a few points I should like to put forward to you for discussion among yourselves.

I think we will all agree that proper land usage is a matter of very grave importance for Jamaica's economic future. In order to survive in today's tough competitive world we must learn to feed ourselves and, if possible, to export surplus food. If we do not do this then we will go on getting deeper and deeper into debt through importing food. And sooner or later we will run into a first-class economic crisis, with unemployment, shortage of food and general hopeless and helplessness. For a very long time to come agriculture is going to be the cornerstone of our existence. Manufacturing, mining, tourism and the other sectors of the economy have done exceedingly well, but in spite of that Jamaica is still primarily an agricultural country. And so land is literally the life of this country and its people. This much, I think, most of us would agree with.

And if we agree with this much, then I think we must also agree that much of the life and substance of this country is being wasted.

We all know of the vast acres of sloping hillside land that is either in bush, or, worse still, that has been clear by firing to yield one corn crop and then left, parched and exposed to die. When the life has gone out of the soil they say it is inert. Well, we all know how much inert soil there is in Jamaica; and we all know how much good living soil is carried down to the sea every time we have heavy rains. We know that the land of wood and water will, unless we do something about it, become the ~~the~~ land of floods and droughts. We already have signs and warnings of this. All this we know.

The question is: Knowing all this, what are we prepared to do to correct this situation? I think we ought to face a few hard facts. Fact number one: If any politician or any party does anything which is good and necessary, but which the farming community does not like, that politician and that party are in for trouble. No party can buck Jamaica's farming community and its organisation and win. Fact two: The politicians and the parties know this and so they may know what is the right thing to do and they may still not do it. A case in point is the firing of land, especially hillside land. We all know it is bad. But it is a quick way of clearing the land and the farmers prefer it. And so nothing positive and drastic is done to stop this bad practice. And so we come to the question: are we prepared to make any sacrifices to preserve and restore the Jamaican earth? If so, what sacrifices are we prepared to make? Are we prepared, in the interest of the nation, to accept control and direction? Are we prepared to accept the proposition that no man is entitled to abuse the land, even if he owns it outright? These are only a few of the very important points behind Mr. Smith's suggestion. And I think it is such an important suggestion that I hope you will all think and talk and argue about it. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Sept 10 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The sixteen Commonwealth Prime Ministers today began discussing the implications of Britain joining the European Economic Community - which is the correct formal name of the six European Common Market countries. Reports are that these talks ~~are~~ on the Common Market and Britain's entry are likely to take up the whole of this week. I think this gives us a fair indication of just how vital this question is both to Britain and to the other Commonwealth countries.

For the past few months now all of us have heard and read about the big debate as to whether Britain should join the Common Market or whether Britain should not join. Canada, Australia and New Zealand have expressed their views - often quite strongly - on the subject. Indeed, at one stage last year it seemed likely that Canada would lead a sort of breakaway Commonwealth movement, and there was talk of Canada becoming the new leader of a new style Commonwealth which had given up Great Britain. But of course, once the Canadians really stopped and thought of the possible implications of trying to head a predominantly coloured Commonwealth, the idea lost ninety percent of its attraction. The African members of the Commonwealth - Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Tanganyika - have also expressed their views pretty strongly. And as in the case of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, they are very worried about Britain joining the Common Market. Some of them, like Ghana, are flatly and sharply against it. And inside Britain itself the debate has been quite as sharp as it has been in the Commonwealth countries.

And it is this big debate which has tended to obscure one of

the most important aspects of this whole matter. From the way we have all debated whether Britain should go into the Common Market or not, anybody would think that the basic choice was up to Britain and up to us. This means we have assumed that there is a genuine freedom of choice: that Britain could either choose to enter or not to enter. In a sense this is true, but only in a very narrow and limited sense. But the real question is not whether Britain should enter the European Common Market. The real question is whether Britain can afford to keep out of the Common Market. And I think once we look at it from that point of view, the whole complexion of the debate would change.

So, let us ask the question: Can Britain afford to stay outside the European Common Market? I am sure that in the privacy of the Conference Room ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ both Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Heath will try to persuade the Commonwealth Prime Ministers to face the question in this way, because this is the real question. Can Britain afford to stay outside the European Common Market? I think the plain and honest and truthful answer is a definite no. Britain cannot afford to stay outside the Common Market. It is not a question of what she wants or what she does not want. It is a simple question of survival in today's world. In order to survive, in order to no more than hold her own on the world economic scene, in order to retain such political influence as she still has, Britain must join the European Common Market. If she does not, then, first Western Europe will turn against her and squeeze her and then her Commonwealth partners will desert her one by one. So the real question is not whether she should join but on what terms. I will discuss this tomorrow; so till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Tuesday Sept 11 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think once we face the real question about Britain and the European Common Market: Can Britain afford the stay out? Then we are really coming to grips with just about the most significant development of the second half of this century: the dynamic rebirth of Western Europe.

At the end of World War Two Germany lay in ruins, her economy broken, her social and cultural fabric vanished, her children guilt-ridden and demoralised. France, one of Germany's conquerors, was not very much better off. The occupation and the terrible war had nearly bled her white. Italy, which was Germany's partner, also lay in ruins. The countries of the lowlands - the Benelux countries - had been over-run by the conquerors in their jackboots. Europe was sick and beaten and it did not matter who was the conqueror and who the conquered. The new world masters were Russia in the East and America in the West. Britain which had held the tide in the most crucial days had lost greatly in the process and she no longer dominated world politics and world trade. But, in the person of her great leader Churchill, she still dominated men's minds and so for a while she seemed the equal of the giant from the East and the giant from the West. Her mistake was to believe this piece of fiction that she was the equal of Russia and America. And so, when the Western Europeans, with American aid, first tried to lift themselves out of their poverty and despair, Britain would not join them. She thought she was too big, that she could manage on her own with her Commonwealth partners.

And then the miracle began to reveal itself. The West German economy was rebuilt at a fantastic rate. The French economy got going,

Italy, the Benelux countries (Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg) all got going. The European Coal and Steel Authorities, the European Assembly, freedom of movement - all the crazy notions that had seemed a lot of fancy dreams in the minds of people like Jean Monet - suddenly become real.

Today the new Europe is the fastest growing force in the world and in terms of ideas. In political terms it is already a third force and if it maintains its present development there is no knowing where it might end. Indeed, if present trends continue the new Europe might yet grow to a point where its achievements outshine the best that the old Europe offered in the world. In economic terms it bids fair to outgrow the United States over the next decade - if present trends continue. This is the Europe which Britain must either join or be squeezed out of. Pure self interest dictates that she joins. But because of her sense of responsibility towards the Commonwealth she has been arguing and bargaining with the European Economic Community for the protection of Commonwealth interests. If Britain were prepared to abandon the Commonwealth the Europeans would welcome her with open arms because they know she has a great contribution to make to the new Europe. The fact that both President DeGaulle and Chancellor Adenauer are getting fed up with her bargaining is an indication of how hard she is trying to protect Commonwealth interests. So I do not think she deserves any abuse from any Commonwealth country. And you know, when it comes right down to fundamentals, the first responsibility of any British Government is to safeguard the welfare and interests of its own people. And the welfare and interest of its own people demand membership of the European Economic Community. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Wednesday Sept 12 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I honest^{ly} do not think that we need to have gambling in Jamaica in order to attract tourists here. I think the whole assumption that legalised gambling at hotels will attract tourists is false. Gambling does not attract tourists as such. Gambling attracts gamblers. So the point is simply this: if we want to attract gamblers to Jamaica, then by all means legalise Casino gambling at our tourist hotels. Gamblers are attracted~~ed~~ to places where they can gamble.

The people who are trying to push legalised gambling at our tourist resorts make it sound as though all tourists are gamblers. This is a piece of fiction. Gamblers are a minority. The majority of tourists, whether in the south of France or elsewhere, are never found in the gambling joints. So I think we should very clearly separate the two things: gambling is gambling; tourism is tourism. And a flourishing tourist industry is much less dependent on gambling than the promoters of gambling would make out. I think we can build up a very successful tourist industry without introducing gambling and gamblers into Jamaica.

There was one very revealing point that some of the promoters of gambling made in discussing the matter. It was suggested that, ~~Jamaicans~~ in order to make sure that Jamaicans are not corrupted, they should not be allowed to go to these gambling places. In other words, set up gambling here, but exclude Jamaicans from it. The idea seems to be that we would retain our native purity and our native innocence by not coming into contact with gambling and the gamblers even though they are operating on Jamaican soil. In other words, just discriminate

against the natives and everything would be alright. Well, if the ~~xxx~~ promoters of gambling were right, if gambling were in fact essential to a successful tourist industry, I would still not want it, especially on these terms. The point is: they are not right. You can have a highly successful tourist industry without having to sink to the level of importing gamblers and gambling.

The trouble with this sort of thinking is that it still conceives of the Jamaican tourist industry in terms of catering for highly affluent minorities. It is either the international smart set - a small but very rich and influential group who set world fashion of a sort, or it is the tired millionaires or it is the Hollywood set. The trouble about sets like these is that there are so very few of them in the world. Once a place has fallen out of favour with the international smart set you have had it. And Jamaica is 'out' at the moment as far as the international smart set is concerned. We can either wait our turn until we get back into favour with them once more or we can look for other customers. There are not enough millionaires to go round. So, instead of saying 'Allright, the smart set is out, there is a shortage of millionaires, so let us cater to the ordinary common or garden tourist - ' instead of saying that, we are looking for another special minority group, the gamblers this time. How far can this go. Supposing the gamblers, like the other minorities get tired of us and move off, to what lower level do we sink? What other affluent minorities will we be able to attract? I think it is time we stopped thinking of our tourist industry in terms of catering for minorities whether they be the International Set, millionaires or gamblers. The ordinary people of the world still make up the largest numbers of tourists in the world. Let us give them a try for a change. Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Sept 13 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Today is polling day in Grenada and last night the Administrator, Mr. J.M. Lloyd appealed to the voters to make this a quiet election day. Mr. Lloyd, incidentally, will be returning to Jamaica soon to become the permanent civil service head of Jamaica's Ministry of External Affairs.

But let us get back to the Grenada elections. Over the past week or so passions have been mounting; and over the past few days there have been incidents of violence and intimidation. And it is this eruption of violence which has led Mr. Jimmy Lloyd to make his appeal for orderly voting today.

Now, the reason for today's election, as most of you know, is that earlier this year the Grenada constitution had to be suspended because a Commission of Enquiry had found Mr. Gairy's government guilty of mishandling public money and also of trying to, and succeeding, in intimidating and bullying civil servants into doing things irregularly. When all this came out and Grenada's constitution was suspended, an angry protest went up from most West Indian politicians. I was very glad that Jamaican politicians did not join the chorus of protest because I thought at the time and I still think that Mr. Gairy deserved the treatment he got. The unfortunate part of the whole business was that the people of Grenada were also ~~being~~ punished for the sins of Mr. Gairy. But all that is in the past now. The real question is what the future hold for Grenada, and I think that in terms of the future much will depend on how the voters choose today.

Mr. Gairy closed his campaign last night by addressing his

followers from a boat just offshore - while his followers crowded the beach listening. And he tried to make some symbolic connection between his meeting and a gathering that took place on the edge of the sea of Galilee nearly two thousand years ago. Indeed, he is reported to have made free use of the word Galilee. I found this news most depressing. And if Mr. Gairy wins today's elections we can look forward to more such depressing news out of Grenada. The Gairy platform this time is that he wants Grenada to become part of the unitary state of Trinidad and Tobago.

His opponent, Mr. Herbert Blaize, is leading his party on the platform of joining the 'little Eight'. So, if Gairy wins (and if he keeps his election promises) he will try to lead Grenada to become a part of Trinidad and Tobago. But once Mr. Gairy stops and really thinks of what that might do to his own personal position, he is likely to get very worried. Dr. Eric Williams is not the kind of man who will put up with the Gairy brand of politics for longer than he has to. And once Grenada is definitely delivered into the Trinidad-Tobago fold Dr. Williams might have no use for Mr. Gairy. I am sure these thoughts have entered Mr. Gairy's head. If, on the other hand, Mr. Blaize's party wins, Grenada would join the little Eight and that would be the political end of Mr. Eric Gairy. But whatever happens, I think this election marks the turning point for Grenada. After this, the hard facts of life are going to make Grenadians realise that they are very small and very poor and cannot afford the luxury of either Cabinet Government or of Gairy-type politicians.

Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Sept 14 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The news that the United Nations Security Council has unanimously approved Jamaica and Trinidad's application for membership of the world body, means that the General Assembly's debate on these applications later this month, will be something of a formality. So, for all practical purposes we can now safely say the Jamaica membership of the United Nations is a certainty. And that is very good news.

Now let me go on to something which I personally find a little more tricky to handle. A Mr. Crawford from Knockpatrick has written to ask me to comment on the case of Dr. Robert Soblen. Mr. Crawford's letter was written before Dr. Soblen died, so, in a sense, the specific question he asks, does not arise any more. Mr. Crawford's question was: Should Dr. Soblen be returned to the place from which he escaped? And then Mr. Crawford ~~xxx~~ referred me to the Bible, to Deutonomy Chapter 23, verse 15, which says "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. And he also referred me to the first book of Samuel, the 30th chapter, verse 15 which says: "And David said to him, ~~Canst~~ thou bring me down to this company? And he said, ~~Swear~~ unto me by God, that thou wilt neither kill me, nor deliver me into the hands of my master, and I will bring thee down to this company."

From these two references to the Bible it seems that Mr. Crawford is concerned with the principle of the whole question. Was it right for Britain and Israel to make the attempt to send Dr. Soblen back to the United States?

If Mr. Crawford will forgive me, I will not discuss this

question in strictly theological terms. For one thing, I am not qualified to do so. Only a qualified religious leader could do that. But let us ask the question in terms of our relations and responsibilities to our society. First, let us take a very simple case. A man in Jamaica kills another man in Jamaica. He is arrested, tried and found guilty. He is then sentenced to life imprisonment. He appeals, and while the appeal is going on he gets on a plane and gets off at Puerto Rico. Should we now apply the words of Deuteronomy chapter 23, verse 15 to this man? Because if we do, then this man can go scot free once he arrives in Puerto Rico. Indeed, it would mean that any person anywhere can commit murder or a number of murders and then run to another country and be safe. And this would apply to any crime.

The important point of the Soblen case, it seems to me, is that Dr. Soblen was a citizen of the United States. He enjoyed the protection and security that society afforded all its citizens: he also had to bear the responsibilities that citizenship conferred on him. And one of the responsibilities was to submit to and uphold the laws of his society. Another was to do nothing to hurt the security of his society, and, indeed, to do everything to strengthen it. This has nothing to do with political opinions. Communist societies expect no less from their citizens. And whatever the nature of the society, the citizen who breaks the law is punished; and the nature of the punishment is made to fit the crime. These, it seems to me, are the essential facts behind the tragic and emotional drama of the Soblen case. Rightly or wrongly, the society, any society, protects itself by punishing any of its citizens who are caught breaking the rules by which the society lives. This is the essence of the rule of law.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Saturday Sept 15 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I have so far refrained from taking part in the general discussion on what was supposed to have happened between Mr. Edward Seaga and Mr. Herbert Macdonald over the seating of Mr. Manley at the the very successful Ninth Central American and Caribbean Games. I have not said anything so far because I did not think that I could say anything that would be useful in clearing up the matter. And I certainly did not want to make any contribution to furthering any hard feelings and confusion. But now an important piece of information from a reliable source has come to my knowledge and I think it helps to clear the whole matter up, or, at least, to put it in a much more sensible perspective.

The piece of information I have is simply this. On the great day, at the flag raising ceremony, Mr. Manley sat beside Sir Alexander Bustamante, and in front of most of the other Cabinet Ministers, at Sir Alexander Bustamante's special invitation. I understand that the Prime Minister wrote the Leader of the Opposition a letter inviting him to occupy that particular place of honour and distinction.

I think if this particular piece of information had been generally known all the fuss and bother would have been avoided. And you know, once you stop and think of it. This was just the sort of thing Sir Alexander Bustamante would do. And by the same token, if Mr. Manley had headed the government he would probably have done the same sort of thing. Certainly, when I got this piece of information my immediate reaction was: 'Yes, of course, that is the sort of thing Busta would do.'

And, once this seating position had been established for Mr. Manley

by the Prime Minister himself, it was natural, at the Games, for the officials concerned to automatically escort Mr. Manley to the same seating position whenever he visited the Games.

I am sure that Mr. Seaga would not have become involved in this unfortunate incident if he had known how Mr. Manley's seating position came about. Certainly, I would have thought that this was the sort of ~~xxx~~ thing that would be made known to the Ministers of Government at the least.

But I do think that there is a long-term lesson that our younger politicians can learn from this business, and that is how to disagree and fight politically without having to resort to the methods of the gutter. I have never heard either Manley or Bustamante abuse each other or call each other by the foulest names. But I have heard some of our younger politicians of both parties being quite nasty and personal and dirty about each other. I have met both Manley and Bustamante privately and I have never heard the one say a mean or nasty thing about the other. In fact, I have been quite impressed by the respect with which each speaks of the other. Unhappily I cannot say the same about most of our ^{other} ~~younger~~ politicians. And you know, one day both Manley and Bustamante will disappear from the scene and a new generation of leaders will take their place. When that day comes, will it mean a return to the political jungle of dirty and gutter politics? Will personal abuse, character assassination be the order of the day? Unless our younger politicians learn to respect each other, that may indeed become the case. And the road to tyranny has always begun with first contempt for your opponents, then abuse of them, and finally their imprisonment and destruction. In fact, ^{there} ~~it~~ is ^{an} amazing link between genuine good manners and the political health of a society. Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Monday ~~Tuesday~~ Sept 17 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think ~~that these~~ many people have been profoundly interested in last weekend's annual P.N.P. Conference. Indeed, I think that many people who are not normally interested in party conferences have shown very great interest in this one. And the reason for this is not far to seek. I think we all wanted to know just how the P.N.P. had stood up to its defeat last April. Had the defeat shaken the party? And if it had, how badly? And how had the leaders taken it? ~~and~~ And how had the rank-and-file taken it? And had the party found out why it lost the election? And if it had, were there any plans to do anything about it? These were the questions many of us asked ourselves and each other. And I think the interest in this year's P.N.P. conference was basically because most of us wanted some sort of answers to these questions. Furthermore, I think we have received the answers. I do not think they have been given as specific answers to the specific questions I have listed. But for anybody who looks with care at the details of what went on and what was said, and at the major decisions taken, the answers are as clear as though they were specific answers to these specific questions. So let us take a look at these answers.

I think we all know that the defeat at the April general election shook the P.N.P. badly from top to bottom. The annual conference showed beyond all doubt that the party has now shaken off the stunning effects of that defeat. Basically, both the leadership and the rank-and-file membership seemed in a healthier state than a few months before the April elections. The ranks are closed and there has been no serious conflict within the party. Although Mr.

Wills Isaacs resigned the first Vice-Presidency of the party some weeks ago, and although he declined nomination at the conference, there was no hint of any sort of basic conflict. Mr. Glasspole, possibly the ablest administrator in the P.N.P. next to Mr. Manley, was elected first Vice President, thus getting his longed-for recognition 'inside the party.' Dr. Ivan Lloyd was elect Second Vice President and Mr. Allan Isaacs Third Vice President. Mr. Vivian Blake defeated Mrs. Iris King for the Fourth Vice Presidency.

The two most striking points that emerge from the election are: first, Mr. Glasspole's sudden appearance as a dominant political figure within the party. Just a couple of years ago it looked as though Mr. Wills Isaacs had completely wiped out Mr. Glasspole's chances: but today it is Mr. Isaacs who is out of the picture and Mr. Glasspole who is very much in it. But let us not forget that Mr. Wills Isaacs' absence is from his own choice. The second striking thing about the P.N.P. elections is Mr. Allan Isaacs' winning of the Third Vice Presidency. This, I think, establishes Mr. Allan Isaacs firmly as one of the key leaders inside the party and a man with a great future. I also hope it means that that section of the leadership P.N.P./which was always hostile to Mr. Allan Isaacs will now really give him a chance to make the contribution he is capable of.

decisions

But all these important ~~xxxxxx~~ become insignificant beside the key decision taken at the conference: the decision that the National Workers' Union should become affiliated to the party and should have ten members on the National Executive and three members on the Executive Committee of the party. This is the most radical and the most far-reaching decision of the conference. It is one which is bound to change the entire power structure and perspective of the party in the months and years ahead. I will discuss this crucial decision to morrow, so till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

~~Wednesday~~ Sept 18 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: On the day that the National Workers Union sends ten of its members to sit on the National Executive Committee of the People's National Party; and when it sends three of its members to take part in the work of the Executive Committee of the party, on that day the People's National Party will become the most representative political party in the country, as well as being the one that is most democratically controlled. And this will in fact be something completely new in the party political structure of this society.

Now, we all know that the relationship between the Bustamante Industrial Trade Union and the Jamaica Labour Party is one that has been formalised with a greater intimacy between union and party than there was between the P.N.P. and the N.W.U. until this annual conference. But we also know that this was so largely because of the decision of one man who represented in his person both the top leadership of the party and the top leadership of the union. Sir Alexander Bustamante is head of the party and head of the union. And the intimate relations between the J.L.P. and the B.I.TU is a creation of Sir Alexander Bustamante. He has the last say in both; he decides on how both operate. In fact, he is, both actually and symbolically, the unifying factor. He is the party and he is the union. And this is a completely different relationship from the one that is now being established between the People's National Party and the National Workers Union.

In the new P.N.P.-N.W.U. set-up the union will be formally represented on the policy-making and executive bodies of the party.

and it will be represented in such numbers as to ensure that its voice is heard and its influence felt. For instance, if all the middle-class types who work as officers of the union were sent to the National Executive of the party, they would still not make up the ten needed. So, whatever happens a working class element that sees its political problems from a working-class angle is now bound to appear on the P.N.P. National Executive. In fact, my guess is that the union representatives on the National Executive will be almost exclusively working-class. And in the planning of the day-to-day running of the party there will be three men from the union speaking from this distinctly working-class point of view. All you have to do is stop and think a little what a remarkable change this is within the leadership of the P.N.P. The middle-class nationalist party which has been in the van of the independence movement is now trying to transform itself into a party representing all the key interests of the society, except one. The party already represents the best in middle-class interests, it also has strong farming representation inside its ranks. And now it is opening its arms to strong representation from the National Workers Union. Inevitably, this is going to change the P.N.P. itself. At the risk of offending P.N.P. diehards, if an election had to be lost to achieve this, then t'is well that it were lost. Certainly, it looks very much as though out of defeat, the P.N.P. plans to turn itself into the most representative and the most democratic party in this part of the world. Mr. Manley's call for new blood confirms this. ^{It} Certainly, seems to me that the P.N. has learned quickly and well from its defeat. And this may prove very significant for Jamaica. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Sept. 19 at 6.15 p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: ~~This evening I want to read you extracts from~~
a letter which I received from Mr. Richard Strauss, the General
Manager of Tryall Estates in Port Maria. I think this letter is so
important that I am sorry to have had to cut out parts of it for
reasons of time. In any event I am most grateful to Mr. Strauss and
here is the major portion of his letter; Dear Mr. Abrahams, I was
delighted to hear you stress the importance of increased food produc-
tion in your broadcast of the 8th September.

With the world population at present doubling itself every 20
years (and Jamaica's annual population increases alone are themselves
startling), it seems impossible to overemphasise the importance of
taking steps not only to feed, but adequately to feed this increased
population which is still increasing at a faster rate than food pro-
duction. In considering the magnitude of this problem, let us never
forget that there ALREADY are in this world not thousands but millions
who are inadequately fed: hunger is a terrible plight to be in and a
terrible sight to witness. This can be changed but it will need
proper use of the land, hard work and adequate financing. Here are
some ideas for Jamaica: - First: The main Agricultural Development
Programme must be bipartisan. The provision of food for future genera-
tions is no matter for vote catching. This means that all Marketing
Boards, etc. will be chosen on a bipartisan basis: appointments will
be made on merit only: no more jobs for the boys changing with each
Government. Second: All Agriculture plans aimed at maximum production
from each area MUST take zoning and marketing into account. This means:
A comprehensive review of all Jamaica's agricultural land so that the

most suitable crops can be grown in the most suitable areas.

Third: Land Development: Development must be in economic units. India, Kenya and other countries have proved how inefficient and disastrous is land fractionalisation. Tenant farmers, farming (with expert advice) 10, 15, 20 or 25 acre lots could provide the yeoman farmer backbone that Jamaica needs. Where suitable, the land could be terraced by the Government and the rent would include terrace and run-off upkeep. Terracing would both preserve and utilise much of the available hillside land. To overcome existing prejudice against tenant farming, the Government can start with a well thought out small plan - say 300 acres on land which they already own, terracing it and letting it to say 12 selected farmers who undertake to farm this land under advice. Once such a scheme is a financial success, the waiting list for small farms will grow more rapidly than the farms can be made available. This has already been proved in other countries.

Fourth: Costs: All this will cost a lot of money. We should not be ashamed to seek international financial and technical help for a long term well thought out bipartisan development scheme. Nor should we be afraid, in my opinion, of having experts from say France, running two Casinos here if the taxes and shares of the profit help to finance Jamaica's development. These Casinos will attract tourists and residents would have to pay a stiff membership fee - this would keep out all those who cannot afford to gamble. Fifth: Work: Unions, because they are now affiliated to political parties, are tempted to let issues - because of vote catching - get out of perspective. Two factories have recently closed down which, had the workers been represented by Craft Unions, would probably still be open. So we need bipartisan union reform after an agreed Committee has been appointed to study overseas the best examples of high productivity and profit

sharing and to recommend how such methods can best be applied for the benefit of all in Jamaica. For ONLY BY UNREMITTING HARD WORK can such a programme of Agricultural reform be carried out. Finally, Government should offer death duty tax concessions to those who will develop their land for sale to tenant farmers: and a fair price fixed by judicial tribunal based on current value to those have land to sell.

I agree with you Sir, there is urgent need for thought and discussion: and after discussion for ACTION on agreed non party lines.

part of the interesting
That is ~~the~~ letter from Mr. Strauss and I agree with every word ~~of it.~~ *except for the Casino part*
~~Goodnight.~~

find it most stimulating on a most important subject.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Sept 20 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference has ended and it has ended pretty much as I expected it to end. Nothing was settled dramatically and it is very difficult to specify exactly what the conference has achieved. As the Jamaican Prime Minister has commented in London, there has been a lot of talk, talk, talk. And yet I think it would be a mistake to dismiss the conference as having achieved nothing. I think much was achieved that is very important. I think all the Commonwealth Prime Ministers at the conference got a much clearer idea of exactly what the European Common Market is, and got a pretty clear idea of Britain's exact position in relation to it. At the start of the conference I had the odd feeling that not even the so-called older members of the Commonwealth understood the hard facts of Britain's economic position in relation to Europe. Certainly, the Canadians, Australians and New Zealanders sounded off as though Britain could stay out of the Common Market without doing serious long-term damage to herself. And it was up to Dr. Eric Williams, the Prime Minister of the newest member of the Commonwealth, to be the first to see and say publicly just what the real situation was. We have, Eric Williams said in effect, a vested interest in a strong and prosperous Britain: a weak Britain would be of no use to us. By the end of the conference, and in spite of all the words, I had the feeling that most of the delegates understood that the cold hard fact was that Britain could not afford to stay out of the Common Market. This understanding was, I think, an important achievement. And in spite of the gloomy characters who announced, some for the umpteenth time, that this was

the end of the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth seems more alive and real to me than it was before the Conference. This is one of the notable after-effects of these Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conferences. They always end up by giving the Commonwealth idea an invigorating shot in the arm, no matter what differences there might have been.

At the conference before this one - the one at which South Africa was thrown out - another set of gloomy prophets of doom saw that as the end of the Commonwealth. But again after that conference the Commonwealth idea emerged stronger than it had been before. So, ~~if~~ I would not put too much weight on these forecasts of disaster. The Commonwealth is as much an idea as it is a formalised institution. And you know how very difficult it is to destroy an idea, or for an idea to die.

But back to the Commonwealth and the Common Market. Most of the African members have declared themselves against becoming Associate Members, if Britain enters. Trinidad on the other hand, has declared that she will seek Associate membership. I think the Africans are thinking in terms of an African Common Market in the future, and they want to be free to join this. Also, Africa is a vast continuous land mass which could, given massive technical and industrial development, become a world economic force in, say, twenty-five years' time. None of the other Commonwealth countries are in this position so there is no sense in them giving up the possible benefits of Associate membership. And so it would seem to me that Jamaica, and the other countries that are eligible should join. They have a lot to gain by going in with Britain and a lot to lose if she goes in and they stay out. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Sept 21 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking.

Good evening: On Tuesday of this week Jamaica was formally admitted to membership of the United Nations. Mr. Egerton Richardson took his seat as Jamaica's permanent representative, and after the speeches of welcome, he replied. And because of what Mr. Richardson said to the General Assembly we can now begin to answer a very important question. The question is: What is Jamaica's foreign policy? Of course, in a general sort of way, most of us had a sort of rough working idea as to what Jamaica's foreign policy was likely to be. We knew that the leaders of both major parties had declared quite firmly that Jamaica was in the Western camp. The two parties may disagree about the question of American bases here, or at least, on how you go about it, but that is as far as the disagreement goes. Mr. Manley criticised the way in which Sir Alexander Bustamante offered the Americans a base here as a 'crude gesture'. He criticised the way rather than the fact of the offer of a base. We also knew that the P.N.P. seemed to put a little more weight on the African connection than the J.L.P. But here again such difference as there was was a difference of emphasis rather than of principle. But all this was rather general. Now we can say that Mr. Egerton Richardson has, by what he said to the United Nations General Assembly, given the broad outlines of Jamaica's foreign policy. So what are the outlines of this foreign policy?

Let me quote what seems to me the key paragraph of Mr. Richardson's speech. He said: "Because the large majority of our people are African in origin, Jamaica believes it understands and can fully sympathise with the fundamental aspirations of the new nations of

Africa. By the fact of geography, however, we are part of the Western Hemisphere and inevitably we must see many of the problems of the world from that perspective. Perhaps, therefore, in time Jamaica's contribution to the cause of international peace will be the help it can give to the increase in tolerance and understanding between the nations of the different continents."

To me this was the key paragraph in Mr. Richardson's speech. And if you reduce it to non-diplomatic language ~~it~~ we have the following: First, the majority of Jamaicans are dark-skinned people and so they are naturally interested in what goes on in Africa and in what the African people are striving for. But Jamaica is nearer to the United States and Latin American than it is to Africa and this fact is bound to influence the way in which Jamaica will look at the world's problems. In other words, Jamaica is not likely to support everything the Afro-Asian group of countries do because she is not one of them and her situation is such that she cannot see everything as they do. Instead of joining any power groupings, she will work for tolerance between the nations and the continents. And the way in which Jamaica will try to do this would be not by having any theories or supporting any 'isms' but by looking for practical solutions. So there you have the foundation of Jamaica's foreign policy: we are on the side of peace and tolerance between nations, and race and continents and we will do everything ~~we~~ to further this aim without joining blocs and groupings. Of course, much will depend on how this is translated in Jamaica's voting and diplomatic other/activities. But as our very first declaration on foreign relations, I find it excellent. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Sept 22 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: This evening I want to comment on two civil service news items that were made public on Thursday. One is a straightforward promotion which is very welcome indeed and the other is the ending of a contract. Mr. G. Arthur Brown has been appointed Financial Secretary in succession to Mr. Egerton Richardson who is now our permanent representative at the United Nations. If I express satisfaction at Mr. Brown's appointment it is not because I expected anything else: it is the satisfaction of knowing that what should have been done has been done. And I am sure this is the way anybody who knows Arthur Brown will react. He is a first-class public servant who has and will go on serving his country with remarkable ability.

Now for a word about the ending of the contract of Mr. A.E.T. Henry as the Government's Public Relations Officer. Mr. Henry was appointed to the post on contract in 1956/when the P.N.P. ~~was~~ ^{shortly after} gained power. Before Mr. Henry's appointment Mr. Hal Glave who had been trained by the Colonial Office, handled the government's public relations. Under Mr. Glave the operation was a small-scale affair with only a few people. Mr. Glave's title was that of Assistant Public Relations Officer. The post of public relations officer which had normally been filled by the Colonial Office from London was vacant, and had been vacant for quite some time. Mr. Glave had thus done the work of a Public Relations Officer for some time. He had done the work under the first J.L.P. Government and the P.N.P. Government found him on the job. The P.N.P. government had two alternatives: it could promote Mr. Glave and make him Public Relations

Officer, thus making a straight civil service job out of it. The second thing it could do was to turn it into a political job by appointing a political personality. By appointing Mr. Henry the P.N.P. government made the post of Public Relations Officer a straight political job.

I personally think Mr. Henry did a good job of building up the service until it look^d like a government department. ~~But~~ indeed Mr. Henry tried, and I think he succeeded, in being as meticulously non-^{partisan} ~~political~~ as any civil service departmental head. The unhappy fact ^{is} ~~was~~ that the appointment was universally regarded as political and so, inevitably, with a change of government Mr. Henry's contract was bound to be ended. And this has now happened. And this now raises a few questions. ~~xxxxxx~~. First, should Mr. Henry have used the Government Public Relations Department and all its resources to keep the P.N.P. in power? Because if he had and the P.N.P. had won he would still have been in a job today. Second, when Mr. Henry's successor is appointed, is he going to be as non-partisan as Mr. Henry was ~~xxxx~~ especially now that he knows his job lasts only as long as his party is in power? Or will he have learnt from Mr. Henry's experience and use the Public Relations Department to help keep the ruling party in power? It seems to me that the whole business is in something of a mess at the moment. And this is a very great pity because the job of keeping the country informed about itself and keeping the world informed about the country is one of the most sensitive jobs. But as a party political job it ^{will} ~~will~~ only attract party hacks - and that ^{is} ~~is~~ a very sad state of affairs ~~xxxxxx~~ Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Sept 24 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Jamaica is now in its second month as an independent state. The government of Jamaica is now in its sixth month in office. In the last two weeks Jamaica has sat in on the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference, has been formally admitted into membership of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Indeed, since April of this year Jamaica has been making the headlines in the world's press. And the headlines have, on the whole, been very good indeed. When he returned to the island last night, Mr. Sangster reported that Jamaica's name and prestige stand very high in the western capitals at the moment. He said that if Jamaica maintained this good reputation we would be able to get all the help possible from the European Economic Community, from Washington, and from London. In other words, our credit is good and it will suit us to keep it that way.

But all in all, the independence celebrations, the trips to London and Washington, the meetings of the U.N. and World Bank have been something of a big time splash. And we have all been carried away by it a little. It has been a sort of party time and you often make good contacts and good impressions at a party. But no party goes on forever. Sooner or later the party comes to an end, the guests go home and we have to take stock of ourselves in preparation for the work-a-day world. I think Jamaica has not reached this point. The Prime Minister and the other Ministers of Government will be back tomorrow and they, and we, will have to set about looking after the affairs and needs of the country. So I think it would be wise to take stock and see just what our situation is.

Let us begin with the political picture. It seems to me that the political picture is pretty healthy and stable. The events of the last twelve months have confirmed this and so has the annual conference of the People's National Party. The conference showed a P.N.P. that looked much more attractive and dynamic in defeat than ^{during} it looked/its last three years in power. And a strong opposition, as we all know, is one of the greatest safeguards against the abuse of power.

On the whole I do not think the government has made any real attempt to abuse its power or to act unconstitutionally. There is the problem of the Prime Minister being the head of a trade union. But if the Jamaica Times' latest front page story has any foundation in fact then Sir Alexander Bustamante is likely to give up ~~back~~ his presidencies of both the Jamaica Labour Party and the B.I.T.U. when the J.L.P. holds its annual conference in November. According to the Times' story this would clear the way for Sir Alexander to go to King's House as Governor-General. This is a distinct possibility, but I do not think it is as clearcut as the Times makes out. For instance, it is an open secret that things are not very settled inside the J.L.P. And I frankly do not see Sir Alexander giving up the leadership of the party until things are settled. And things may not be settled by November. But I think that whatever he does, Sir Alexander intends to act within the framework of the constitution, partly because that is how he would prefer to act but also because he knows that the P.N.P. would hound him if he did not. So I would say that politically the situation is far from as ugly or menacing as some people make out. Our responsibility is to make sure that any hint of developing ugliness is stopped and stopped quickly.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Sept 25 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last night I told you that I thought the political situation reasonably sound. But this does not of course mean that everything in the garden is lovely. The scrap between the Minister of Agriculture and the Jamaica Agricultural Society is one of the unhappy political factors of today, one of the hints of ugliness about which I talked yesterday. One has also heard much about victimisation and people losing their jobs but it is always difficult to pin these charges down. In any case ^{they} are often the stock in trade of the party political scrap.

Where it does seem to me that things are not so good is in the economy of the country. A careful stocktaking here will show a rather sombre picture. Money is tight. Business people are holding on to their money: they are not spending and they are not investing. And if you ask them some of them will admit frankly that they are holding back. This has been described as some sort of 'standstill'. Unfortunately an economy, any economy rarely, if ever, stands still, it either goes forward or backward. And the present so-called standstill is in fact an imperceptible slipping back.

The people who are holding back their money say they are waiting for the government to give them a lead. And the government, let us face it, has not yet given them a lead. At present the government's position seems to be that it cannot give any kind of lead until its own Development Plan is ready. Meanwhile until the Plan is ready money is going to remain tight and the uncertainty in the country is likely to deepen.

There are other ~~xxxxxxxx~~ factors too. There is, for instance,

the fear of price controls. One businessman told me that he had all but ~~finalised~~ ^{concluded} arrangements for the setting up of a drug making factory here but fear of price controls has put a stop to that. And so we will not have one new factory which would have supplied jobs for a number of people and probably also reduced the cost of our drugs and antibiotics. And yet, you know, this government was elected and one of its election promises was to bring down the cost of living by controlling prices.

Next, I understand that a very large sum of money, something like five ~~million~~ pounds that could have been invested in low cost housing was lost to us because it was ~~the Matalons~~ ^{a certain family business which} who could raise the money and the government did not want to touch any money raised by ~~the Matalons~~ ^{this firm}. Now let me say frankly that I am not interested in how this affects ~~the Matalons~~ ^{any firm or family. Private enterprise}. ^{itself} They can take care of themselves. ~~In making their money they have also made a major contribution to Jamaica's housing needs, and for this I respect them but beyond that I am not particularly interested.~~ ^{getting} What I am concerned about is low cost housing for the homeless and jobs for the jobless.

It seems to me that we will all have to think very carefully about the economy. I think the government must declare its plans soon so as to give the country a lead. I think the business community must accept the fact that this government is committed to bridging the gap between the haves and the have-nots. Not to do so is to defy the clearly expressed will of the majority of their fellow citizens. Above all, I think we must get going now. The party is over. It is time we all settled down to hard honest work. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Sept 26 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: To sum up this stocktaking session let us pause and look at the values of this society. What are the values by which the society live? And what are the factors that are most likely to undermine those values?

The majority of the citizens of this society are Christian and the values by which they live, however imperfectly, are those taught by the Christian church, the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer. These are values which put each individual into a very special and a very unique relationship with his or her God. And this in turn has led to the acceptance in the society of the idea of the sanctity and inviolability of the human person. And so we talk about the 'rights of man': the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, the right to free speech, the right to think freely, the right to work, the right to decide the form of government we have and the right to choose those who will run the government on our behalf. Broadly then, these are the values of our society.

But we do not all put the same weight on each of these 'rights'. To the man who is hungry the most important thing of all is to get bread. The writer or artist or journalist, on the other hand, will be much more concerned with freedom of speech, especially if he is reasonably successful and has forgotten or never known hunger. But then you might have the businessman who is not particularly interested in either freedom from hunger or freedom of speech: for him the number one freedom is likely to be the freedom to hold property and the freedom to make as big a profit as possible. And so we can go on,

showing how we all tend to see and define freedom from an essentially selfish point of view. Price controls, properly operated and regulated, should make life much easier and bring greater material benefits to the poorer sections of the community: but to the businessman it is an infringement on his freedom to make a profit. And so there emerges a conflict of interests between the businessman seeking his profit and the poor and hungry citizen seeking an easier access to food. If the businessman is strong enough to resist the attempts to control prices and to regulate the redistribution of the nation's wealth, he will do so thus depriving the poor citizen of his hoped-for freedom from hunger. Conversely, if the hungry citizens are strong enough they may destroy the business people, nationalise everything and take care of their interests. In each case one section of the community has, in pursuit of its most important freedom, taken freedom from another section. And this sort of conflict of interests is most pronounced in societies where the inequalities are greatest. And let us face it, the inequalities are pretty great in Jamaica.

So how do we get out of this? Indeed, is it possible to get out of this without one group imposing its will on all the others? The communists say no. They say the fight must go on till the interests of the working classes prevail over all other interests. But I think Britain and the Scandinavian countries have shown that a balance can be struck between the conflicting interests within the society: which is what the welfare state^{does} ~~is~~. But for this to happen the society must accept certain values, one of which is that no citizen should be allowed to drop below a certain level of living. The alternative is the ~~the~~ sharpening of the present bitter conflict of interests.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Sept 27 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I sincerely hope that this government is not going to be too cagey about giving out information. Most governments do tend to want to withhold information until they can give it out with the best possible benefit to themselves and their parties. ~~For~~ ^{For} most ~~of these~~ governments the business of public relations seems to be the art of withholding information. Now, I know that we cannot expect this or any government to make all its affairs public. There are always things which must, in the national interest, be withheld from the general public for a time at least. For instance, the contents of the Budget comes to mind immediately. If before Budget Day we all knew what prices would go up or down or what new taxes would be introduced, many business concerns could make fortunes overnight and many people could so arrange their affairs as to get around the proposed increases. In such cases secrecy is very important. And, of course, we do not expect what goes on in the Cabinet to be public property, with the views of each Minister being discussed in our rumshops and other drinking places. These expressions of views that lead up to collective Cabinet decisions must be ~~secret~~ secret and each Minister of government must be conceded the right to withhold information until something has definitely been settled. But once a matter is settled and decided upon then I think all the citizens of the country are entitled to be told as much as possible about it. Once a decision has been taken which is likely to affect all of us then the government, any government, owes it to the people to let them have all the facts as clearly and as quickly as possible.

These remarks of mine stem directly from the fact that on

Tuesday of this week the Minister of Labour, Mr. Lynden Newland, opened a conference between employers' and workers representatives to discuss the establishment of a Fair Labour Code for Jamaica. At this meeting the Minister also presented a draft document as the basis for discussion.

I think there is no doubt at all that this is a very important move. It is important that there should be the most cordial relations possible between management and labour and that these should be based on clearly established principles which are understood and accepted by both sides. And there could be no better way of achieving this than by the adoption of a Fair Labour Practices Code. So I was naturally interested when I heard that the Minister of Labour had actually presented the meeting with a draft of such a code. The idea was that the representatives would take the document as a basis for discussion: they would study it, discuss it and put forward their own ideas - which is the very correct and the very democratic way of going about these things. So I tried to get hold of a copy of this draft Fair Labour Code. I knew you would all be interested and probably have your own discussions on it because this is a matter of national interest. And then I ran into trouble. The Ministry was not prepared to release the document. Well, to cut a long story short, I made it my business to get a copy of the document. And you know, there is not a single thing in this document to justify the attempt to withhold it from the public. In fact, after reading it, I just cannot understand why there was this attempt. In fact there is nothing either confidential or basically new in this document. So there was no need to withhold it. I will give you a summary of the document tomorrow, so till then, goodnight.

Not Broadcast
but for local T. 12

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Sept 28 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Ministry of Labour's Draft of the Fair Labour Code begins by establishing the right of both labour and management to organise themselves freely and without any outside interference. This has been commonly accepted as a right for a very long, so there is nothing new here. Trade unions and employees' organisations have for long written their own constitutions and elected their own officers. Employees have enjoyed the right to strike and employers the right to lock-out. At the very least, employers have always paid lip-service to the principle of fair labour standards; and unions and workers have, again at the very least, paid lip-service to the principle of faithfully discharging their duties and responsibilities to employers and protecting their interests and property. By restating them and putting them in a Fair Labour Code these noble principle may one day become common practice among both workers and employers. So may the proposition that workers should not stage unofficial strikes.

And so we come to the listing of Unfair Labour Practices. It shall be unfair labour practice for employers to interfere with the workers' right to organise, refuse to bargain with the union of the workers' choice, victimise workers for union activity, or lock out their employees as an act of sympathy with other employers. On the other side, it shall be unfair labour practices for the workers or unions to interfere with the employers' right to organise, refuse to bargain collectively with employers, take part in union activity during working hours without the consent of the employer, or stage sympathy strikes or go-slows.

These are the key points of the draft Fair Labour Code that the Minister put before the representatives of workers and employers on Tuesday. There are other points too, such as the details on representational rights, collective bargaining, collective agreements, joint industrial councils, grievance procedures, wages, working conditions, and the fact that apprentices should not take part in any industrial disputes. But these, as you know, are all things that are very much with us. And there is certainly nothing here that has not been discussed public at least a hundred times over.

But I think it would be a mistake to assess the potential value of a Fair Labour Code by the newness of the ideas put forward. Indeed I should say that one of the great values of a code such as the one proposed is that it will give formal expression to the relations between workers and managements as they have evolved over the years. It will be a yardstick against which to measure all future relations. Another valuable aspect is that any would-be investor coming to Jamaica will know exactly where he is. If he does not believe in the workers' right to collective bargaining, he will be able to look at Jamaica's Fair Labour Code and he will know that this is no place to come to. Also, a genuinely fair labour code will make it clear that responsibility is a two-way thing, expected from both management and labour. What I do hope is that the people at the discussions will also think of the nation. The majority of the citizens of this country are neither in the unions nor in the employers' organisations. And the nation, after all, is also entitled to a fair deal. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Sept. 28 at 6.15 p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last night I told you that I hoped that this Government would not be too cagey about the giving out of information. I told you that my reason for expressing the hope was because I had run up against difficulty when I tried to get hold of a copy of the Draft of the Fair Labour Code which the Minister of Labour presented to a conference of workers' and employers' representatives at a meeting on Tuesday. Well, as I told you last night I made it my business to get hold of a copy. There was nothing on it to indicate that the document was secret, confidential or not for publication. And when I read it I became satisfied in my own mind that there was in fact nothing secret about it. And so last night I told you that I will give you a summary of it this evening.

I am sorry to tell you now that I am not going to give you a summary of the document. I am not going to give a summary because I have been asked not to and because the reason given for asking me not to do so seems to me good enough. I still do not agree with withholding this document from the public but I understand that the Ministry of Labour has told both the workers' representatives and the employers' representatives that the contents of the document would not be given wide publicity until they have been discussed by the conference. In other words the Ministry had made a commitment and if I gave wide publicity to the document tonight I would be putting the Ministry in the position where it cannot live up to its commitment. And rather than do that I have decided not to discuss the contents of the document. But you know, if the Ministry had told me outright that the reason why they did not want to make the document public

was because they had promised the workers' and employers' representatives not to do so, I would have accepted their position. But instead of doing so they simply stalled me without giving any satisfactory reason. However, even at this point the matter could have been contained. When I got the document I examined it very carefully to see if it was marked "private" "confidential" "not for publication". If it had had any of these marks I would, have respected the nature of the document and not promised to publicise it. And so would any other responsible newsman. But there was nothing to show that this document was either private, confidential, secret, or had any sort of press embargo on it. And this, I think, shows clearly that the Government wants to consult its Public Relations people a lot more than it now does. If the Ministry had wanted the Press to know that it did not want this document made public it was not enough simply to withhold it, unless they were absolutely certain that no pressman could lay his hands on it. This seems to have been their assumption. Well I did lay my hands on it which shows that the assumption was wrong. I think it would have been far wiser to get the Public Relations Office to put Press and radio fully into the picture and to get the co-operation of Press and radio.

In any event I hope that this little incident will bring home to our rulers the fundamental importance of working out good relations with the Press and radio. Finally, I hope no one will be partisan enough to read any sort of interference with freedom of speech into this incident. Nobody has tried to monkey with my freedom of speech. A request was made and because it was reasonable I agreed to it. If it had not been I would not have. That is all. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Sept 29 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think it is time to get away from the grim and heavy news and look at the lighter side of things for a change. So, for this evening at least, to the devil with all the serious and disturbing news that flows in from all over the world. Instead let us look for a piece of news that will make you chuckle or laugh. For me that piece of news came out of South Africa during the week: and that is something in itself.

It goes like this: One night a gentleman was on his way home after a night out with the boys. And you know how it is when a man has a night out with the boys; ^{he} ~~you~~ tend to take a little too much of the 'wine of the country'. And so this gentleman was not exactly sober or even very steady on his feet. Well, the way home led by way of a cemetery and somehow this gentleman of South Africa found himself inside the cemetery. Perhaps he went through a gate or over a wall without knowing it - anyway, there he was inside the cemetery, and before he knew what had happened he found himself at the bottom of a freshly dug grave. The grave was six feet long and three feet wide; and it was seven and a half feet deep. And although the sides of graves are not cemented these sides were pretty smooth. It could be that there was a lot of clay in the soil. But whatever the reason, the sides ~~the sides~~ of the grave were so smooth that the gentleman could find no hold in order to climb out. So there he was, stuck for the night at the bottom of a grave inside this cemetery. Perhaps it was because of what he had shared with the boys but he was not too worried. He settled down as best he could and made himself as comfortable as possible. He had cigarettes but no matches, and that

was the most terrible part of the whole business: alone out there in a cold damp grave and not a match to light a cigarette!

Anyway, time passed: he did not know how much time: perhaps an hour, perhaps two. And then he heard a sound. It was whistling and the whistling was obviously being done by a human being, or so he thought. The whistling drew nearer and nearer until it was right overhead. Please remember that by this time the eyes of the man in the grave had grown accustomed to the darkness of his six-foot-long, three-foot-wide and seven-and-a-half-foot hole. And so it was that he plainly saw another man, mortal and ordinary like himself, fall into the grave. The new man was neither very tall nor very short; neither very thin nor very fat - in fact he was just ordinary and average.

So the man who had fallen into the grave first said: "Have you got a match, friend?" And that did it. The new man shot out of that grave so fast that the first fellow still cannot explain how he did it. He just seemed to defy gravity and take-off, like a rocket. Which just goes to show what miracles we can perform when we get really scared. Remember, the new man had just fallen into the grave. He could not see anything. And suddenly a voice asked him for a match. Wouldn't the thought of being in the same grave as a smoking ghost make you take-off and defy gravity? It certainly would with me - or else give me a heart attack. Anyway, some people came along and helped the first man out of the grave and he told his story. A newspaper then offered a reward of five pounds to the second man if he would come forward. So far he has not. Would you come forward and admit that you were scared into defying gravity and into flying - even for five pounds? Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Oct 1 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The little war in the southern U.S. State of Mississippi looks as though it is drawing to a close; the worst seems to be over. So far two newspapermen have been killed, one from Britain and the other an American, and a large number of people have been hurt in ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ last night's rioting on the campus of the University of Mississippi. And James Meredith, the American Negro whose quiet determination was the start of all this, is now at the university. The Governor of Mississippi, who had said he would go to jail rather than see a Negro admitted to the university, last night made a statement which was in fact a surrender. There was no other way. Right from the outset this business had to end in this way.

I think we can learn two very important things about the United States from the Meredith case. First, let us see the case in the context of the rule of law. James Meredith is an American citizen and the constitution of his country has defined the rights and duties of a citizen. The constitution makes no distinction along race, class, colour or religious lines for any citizen. And the principal instrument for interpreting the American constitution is the American ~~xxxxxxxf~~ legal ~~xxxxxfxxxxxxx~~ Supreme Court, ~~ix~~ the highest authority in the land. Since the second world war American citizens who happened to have dark skins have increasingly gone to the Supreme Court to have their rights as citizens defined whenever they have been discriminated against or been denied their rights. That was how the great school integration movement began. The National Association for the Advancement of Coloured Peoples took a test case to the Supreme Court challenging the idea that Negro children could get 'A separate

but equal education' with white children. In effect, the Association asked the Supreme Court to say whether it is possible to segregate people along colour lines and still say that they are enjoying equality. The Supreme Court gave a clear answer: There ^{can be} ~~xxx~~ no such thing as 'separate but equal'. Any time you separate on grounds of race and colour you deny ~~xxx~~ equality. And the Supreme spoke with the power and authority of the law and the constitution. And so, whatever the ~~xxxx~~ white majority thought or felt, whether they liked Negroes or not, whether they hated them or not, they submitted to the rule of law and Negro kids went into schools with white kids all over the vast land. There were places like Little Rock where the local authorities tried to resist integration and where the racialsists were urged on by highly placed local officials such as Governor Faubus. But wherever there was resistance the law stepped in and broke it. In Little Rock it was under the Administration of th Republic ~~President~~ Eisenhower that the National Guard was called out enforce integration. Now the same thing has happened under President Kennedy. So the first thing is that there is nothing party about this and there is no do-gooding about it. Nobody is being kind to 'poor black James Meredith'; nobody is being 'liberal' or 'progressive'. Meredith has certain rights which some of his fellow citizens are trying to deny him. It is the business of the law to see that they do not get away with it. And ~~this~~ the law is doing. The second thing to learn is that once you have this pattern of the rule of law, and its enforcement then we can fairly say that the United States is within sight of th end of discrimination because the law is against discrimination, and the law is supreme.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Oct. 2 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: If Sunday's reports from Port Antonio are true then the Prime Minister has definitely made up his mind about the Governor-Generalship. Sir Alexander^{Bustamante}/is reported to have told a mass meeting that he intended to remain as Prime Minister, as head of the Jamaica Labour Party and as President of the Bustamante Industrial Trade Union. If this is so then it settles for some time to come, if not forever, the debate about a political Governor-General. You will remember that Mr. Manley made quite an issue of this question at the P.N.P.'s annual conference weekend before last. He promised that he would fight to the bitter end any move to have a Governor-General who was associated with one political party and one trade union. It was during that same weekend that the Jamaica Times carried a front page story predicting that Sir Alexander was likely to resign his party and union offices at the J.L.P Conference in November in order to become Governor-General. I told you about this in my commentary of Monday September 24th, and I also told you that I thought this was highly unlikely because of ^{the} ~~an~~ unsettled state of the leadership inside the party. I frankly did not see Sir Alexander giving up the leadership of the party and the union until things are very much more settled than they now are. And as I told you then, I just could not see Sir Alexander trying to become Governor-General as well as holding on to his other offices, and so I said quite confidently that he would act within the framework of the constitution. Well, if the report from Port Antonio is correct then my assessment of the situation was not wrong.

So who is likely to be the first Jamaican Governor-General after

Sir Kenneth Leaves us? I think it is rather early to sy with any degree of certainty. But a quick look at some of the possible candidates leads me in one direction only. Perhaps it will lead you in the same direction if you tried to list the qualities Sir Alexander and the leaders of the J.L.P will look for in a possible Governor-General. So what are those qualities.

First, I think they will want a man who is completely identified with rural Jamaica but who also has wide experience as a legislator. He will have to be a man of the people, sprung from the people, looking like them and able to reflect their dignity and to dignify them in return. I think the J.L.P. leadership will want such a man not to be either a captain of industry or a giant of agriculture. For preference such a man should be connected with education, agriculture and other good works. So there ~~xxxxxxx~~ are some of the qualities which I think the J.L.P. will look for in any candidate for the Governor-Generalship: a man of the people who has risen by ability and service. Well, now, if you look at some of the older members of the Jamaica Labour Party, some of those who were there way back in the beginning, who comes nearest to fulfilling these requirements? I think Mr. C.C. Campbell, the President of the Senate does. And so I would suggest him as a most likely successor to Sir Kenneth Blackburne. But it is early days yet and I could be wrong. But somehow I do not think I am. Either ^{we} you have a man who is as representative of the people as possible, or else we ask the Queen to send out some retired general or duke. I think the J.L.P. wants a man of the people, hence my suggestion that it could be Mr. C.C. Campbell. Anyway, time will tell. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Oct 3 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The British Socialist Party, more popularly known as the British Labour Party, began its ^{annual} conference in the English seaside town of Brighton on Monday. The key topic this conference will discuss is Britain's application to join the European Common Market. During the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, the Leader of the British Labour Party, Mr. Hugh Gaitskell realised that there was a strong popular wave of opposition to Britain's joining, both inside Britain and in the Commonwealth. He seized on this and came out very strongly against the Common Market. Since then his position has been greatly modified and at the Labour Party Conference the demand is not for Britain to stay out but rather to insist on better terms before entering the Common Market. Mr. Gaitskell and the British socialists feel that they are on to a very popular issue on which they hope to win the next general election. So, in order to win political power the British socialists behave as though they are prepared to oppose Britain's entry into the Common Market if necessary. That is one item concerned with socialists.

Over the weekend we had another item of news concerned with socialists, but this one was right here in Jamaica. It was Sunday's news that a new political party, a socialist party, had been formed in Jamaica. With all this talk of socialists and socialism in the news, it might be useful to try and find out just what we mean by socialism. At its recent annual conference, the People's National Party talked about going back to socialist principles. So, exactly what is this socialism that the British Labour Party, that the P.N.P. and that the new political party are talking about? And do these

people mean the same thing when they use the word?

A dictionary definition of socialism is that it is: the theory or practice of a political or economic system based on the public ownership and operation of the key industries in a country. It aims at greater production and a more equal distribution of the wealth of the nation through government control of the chief means of production such as land, buildings, tool and capital of all kinds.

~~xxxxxxx~~ The difference between socialists and communists believe is that socialists/~~believe~~ that they can achieve these ends by normal democratic means, by supporting parliamentary democracy, the two party or multi-party system and the like. The communists on the other hand, will use parliamentary democracy, the multi-party system and so on as long as it suits them; and when it suits them they will resort to what they call the 'violent overthrow of the capitalist system'. Another complicating factor is that all sorts of people have called their parties 'socialist': fascists, nazis, dictators - have all used the word 'socialism' as a protective umbrella. The communists talk about scientific socialism; the western Europeans talk about democratic socialism. So you see, this word socialism can mean many things to many people. The nearest thing to 'scientific' socialism is Russia: the nearest thing to 'democratic' socialism is Great Britain where all the key utilities are state-controlled, where every child is guaranteed a free education, where no man is allowed to starve. All these things apply in Russia too, of course. The big difference is that in Britain there is democracy as well. So, which brand of socialism does the new party offer us? And how is this going to affect the P.N.P's return to a socialism it has never practised?

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Oct 4 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: On Monday we had the news that the Jamaica Industrial Development Corporation was closing down the plant of Jamaica Woolens Ltd. According to the statement of Mr. Bovell, the new chairman of the I.D.C. this decision was arrived at on the advice of a qualified firm of textile consultants. The I.D.C. had already put over half a million pounds into the plant and this firm of consultants thought our best bet was to accept our losses and close down the plant. As far as these experts were concerned there was no sense in throwing good money after bad. So the bald facts are that in one operation and over a relatively brief period of three years, the I.D.C. has lost half a million pounds of the tax payers' money. I think this calls for an explanation and I hope such an explanation will be given to the nation when next parliament meets.

The I.D.C. was set up in order to spearhead Jamaica's industrial development. It was there to attract foreign capital to Jamaica; and in order to do this it had to make the terms and conditions as attractive as possible. That is why we have all these incentives, tax holidays and other devices for making things as easy as possible for export industries that are set up here. And, of course, often the I.D.C. had to enter into some sort of special relationship with a firm that looked good and promised to do us a lot of good but which was a little short of plant or cash or both. You may have a case where a new firm comes in and is not in a position to pay rent for the first year of operation. In such a case the course of wisdom would be to say: this thing looks good, it will give employment to so many workers, and when it gets going it will bring so much to the

country - and for these future benefits we will give up the first year's rent. This is the sort of thing that happens wherever a country wants to attract investment in new industries. In some cases it is not only necessary to ~~to~~ help with the putting up of buildings and being soft on rent but it is also necessary to advance some money. This is part of the inevitable risk that must be taken in order to attract investment capital. And so there was nothing striking or unusual about the I.D.C. putting money into Jamaica Woolens when it moved from Canada to Jamaica.

What does seem striking to me, going by Mr. Bovell's statement, is the almost casual way in which the I.D.C. pumped large amounts of money into this undertaking. First on the say-so of two I.D.C. officials, then on the say-so of an outside firm of accountants, we lent the company large sums of money. Apparently none of our own experts did any sort of exhaustive investigation of the firm's position in Canada or of the feasibility of its operations here. The result was that we soon had to put some more money into the operation and ended up by taking over a white elephant. I ~~xxxxxxx~~ think the country must be given the full story when parliament meets.

Following the news of the closing down of Jamaica Woolens, we had, on Tuesday, confirmation of the story first carried by the J.B.C. that Mr. Harold Braham had resigned his position as General Manager of the I.D.C. And so, naturally, many people speculated about the connection between the two events. Did Mr. ~~xxxxxxx~~ Braham's resignation have anything to do with the closing down of Jamaica Woolens? I personally do not think so. I'll tell you why tomorrow. So till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Oct 5 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I ended my comments last night by saying that I did not think there was any connection between Mr. Harold Braham's resignation and the closing down of Jamaica Woolens: perhaps it would have been more accurate to say that there was no connection in the timing of these events. I think it was the purest accident that both events were announced this week. I think that if there had been no closing down of Jamaica Woolens the resignation of Mr. Braham would still have taken place. In other words, I think the the new Board of the I.D.C. do not, and indeed cannot blame Mr. Braham for Jamaica Woolens. Jamaica Woolens was the result of a certain policy. Mr. Braham was just the executive officer of that policy. He did not make the policy decisions that ended up with Jamaica Woolens. But of course, by being the chief executive officer he is inevitably associated with it in the public mind.

I think it is in this aspect, that of the public image of the I.D.C. that we can find a possible reason for Mr. Braham's resignation. The previous government had a certain approach towards the question of industrialisation. All the industries they attracted tended to be concentrated on the industrial estate in Kingston. The result was that all the major benefits and all the job opportunities were concentrated in the Corporate Area. And long before the change of government many of us criticised this aspect of policy. Also, local manufacturers, rightly or wrongly felt that the I.D.C. had no interest in them and did nothing to help them, and so they tended to be hostile to the I.D.C. Thirdly, labour got the impression that one of the attractions offered by the I.D.C. was a plentiful supply of cheap

Mr. Bovell's statement on labour. We have a hint of this in the closing down of Jamaica Woolens where it reads, and now I quote: "The Fairfields were anxious to leave Canada because of high labour costs...." ^{this suggests} ~~There it is,~~ and by implication ^{that} Jamaica offered low labour costs. And naturally, the labour movement resented this. Add this up and you have: one, rural Jamaica had no reason to be enthusiastic about the I.D.C. because it did not attract work to the rural areas; two, local industrialists had no reason to be enthusiastic because they felt the I.D.C. was penalising them; three, labour was not enthusiastic because they ^{sold Jamaica} felt the I.D.C./as a market for cheap labour. And these three things added up to a most unhappy public image as far as Jamaica is concerned

The fact that the I.D.C. has, with all its faults, made a major contribution to Jamaica's industrial development has often been forgotten by its critics. For instance, they forget that in 1958 we exported manufactured goods, other than food and drink and tobacco, to the value of just over one million pounds. Last year our export of these goods had gone up to over two and half million pounds: and this thanks to the I.D.C.

But, rightly or wrongly, the I.D.C. now wants to chart new directions. It wants to take industries to the depressed areas of rural Jamaica; it wants to build up happier relations with local manufacturers while still attracting foreign investors. In short, ^{look} the new men at the I.D.C. want to give it a new/that would make it more attractive at home as well as abroad.

As far as I am concerned, I wish the I.D.C. well on its new course and I think that Charley Braham deserves the country's thanks for carrying the ball this far. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Oct 6 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: It was ten o'clock last Saturday night. The place was the Washington Boulevard. A donkey with a young foal was crossing the wide road. A car travelling at high speed ran into the donkey and knocked it down; the car hit it on the ^{right} thigh, breaking the thigh-bone. The broken bone cut through flesh and skin and jutted out. Blood poured from the wound. The car that hit the donkey did not stop and the donkey was left lying wounded and bleeding on Washington Boulevard. You know that is a pretty busy highway, especially during the weekend. So you will have a pretty good idea of how many cars are likely to travel along the Boulevard in one direction or the other on a Saturday night. Well, between ten o'clock when it was knocked down and eleven o'clock, and in spite of all the cars travelling up and down, that wounded and bleeding donkey was left lying in the road. Cars skirted around it but not one of them stopped. You know, even forgetting the suffering of the wounded animal, one would have thought that in order to make the road safer motorists would have helped the creature off the highway. Instead, they went blithely on their way, skirting the suffering animal, as casually, thoughtlessly cruel as only decent human beings can be. At last, after an hour, one person stopped and helped the creature to the side of the road. This person then called the animal hospital at Spanish Town Road. The people at the hospital were concerned but there was nothing they could do because they did not have the funds to run a night ambulance service. The person then called the police stations at Maberley and at Half Way Tree. But the people on duty there did not seem to know what to do. And

all this while the poor bleeding animal was suffering. At last, in desperation the person went to the Maverley Police Station and had the fantastic experience experience of listening to a couple of young policemen arguing as to whether you kill a wounded animal by shooting it in the ribs or chest or ear. The poor good citizen gave up all hope of any help from the police and called Dr. John Masterton and then went back to the animal.

By this time the smell of blood had attracted some hungry stray dogs and only the presence of the good citizen kept them at bay. At last, about one o'clock in the morning, three hours after it had been knocked down, Dr. Masterton put the animal out of its misery.

When the person, ~~xxxxxxx~~, told me of the ^{dreadful} ~~xxxxxxx~~ three hours ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ of trying to get help for a suffering animal, and of the indifference of the majority of people, I felt terribly ashamed of our brand of Christianity and our brand of humanity and our brand of compassion. And you know, this is no isolated thing. The way they transport small stock in trucks is the height of cruelty, and this goes on every day. What makes this particular case so horrible is the fact that I am sure that at least a dozen decent, sensitive, well-educated, cultured people whom I am proud to regard as my friends must have passed that stricken animal.

So please, I beg you, let us put a stop to this cruelty to animals. It is vicious and it is unchristian; and if it is not checked it ends up by making us vicious and unchristian with each other, not just with animals. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Oct 8 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Let us begin by noting with satisfaction the Prime Minister's announcement that Jamaica will establish a High Commission Office in Port-of-Spain. This is as it should be. Let us hope that this is the first step in what will become known in the future as the 'Caribbean approach' to world affairs. I think it is important that the nations of the Caribbean work out such a common approach if they want to make an impact on world affairs. As small and isolated countries the impact of each is not likely to amount to very much. But if they act together as a group and work out ~~an~~ a regional approach to specific matters their influence could be considerable. I am sure this is part of the reason why Dr. Eric Williams has pressed so hard for a Caribbean Common Market, and why Governor Munoz Marin of Puerto Rico has recently written to Sir Alexander Bustamante about regional co-operation through the Caribbean Organisation. Of course, the Caribbean Organisation, which is the ~~successor~~ successor to the Caribbean Commission, is essentially an organisation for dependent territories. It was set up by Britain, France, the Netherlands and the United States to iron-out and streamline their approach to their colonies in this part of the world. So, if the independent territories of the region are to work through the Caribbean Organisation its structure would have to be changed completely. And I think its key personnel would also have to be ~~changed~~ changed. Indeed, I am not sure that even this would do it. Dr. Williams who is bound to be one of the key figures in the planning of any sort of regional approach, has very little time for the Caribbean Organisation. He worked for it when it was the Caribbean

Commission and when it was still based in Port-of-Spain; and Dr. Williams had a very unhappy experience with the organisation. It was from this unhappy experience with the Caribbean Commission that he moved on to active politics. And it is significant that when Dr. Williams gained power in Trinidad, the Caribbean Commission upped and moved its headquarters to Puerto Rico because its officials knew that the new Premier of Trinidad had no time for them and their organisation.

I have restated this bit of old history simply because it seems to me that the people at the Ministry of External Affairs should bear all these factors in mind when they get around to drafting a reply to Governor Munoz' letter to Sir Alexander. It will not suit us to enter into any arrangement without exploring every aspect of it: and we certainly do not want to do anything that would make for any more division than now exists in the region. And so I think it would be useful to find out whether there is a broad body of agreement inside the region as to the kind of co-operation we want to create. Would Trinidad and the Little Eight, or Seven, go along with Governor Munoz's idea of working through the Caribbean Organisation? Or would it be better for these territories to start their own organisation? I hope that these questions will be very carefully explored before any decision is made. And having an office in Port of Spain will ensure that we explore questions of this type in consultation with our friends in Port of Spain and our friends in Bridgetown. And so I hope that we will move quickly but carefully towards working out a distinctive approach to world affairs that will be recognised as the 'Caribbean Approach'. The need is urgent.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Oct 9 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Mr. Chester Bowles is one of President Kennedy's Special Advisers. He is also one of the most internationally minded men in Washington today. He has always been interested in the under-developed countries and over the years he has written and spoken extensively in favour of Asian and African independence. I first met him in New York shortly after the war. In those days the great wave of African independence had not yet begun, but even then Chester Bowles was crusading for it. At that particular meeting in New York a book which he had just published was being launched; and much of this book dealt with what America should do about the under-developed countries. From this you will see that Mr. Chester Bowles' interest in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America is not a thing that began yesterday. Another thing I think you should know about Mr. Chester Bowles is that he is a man of strong and independent views. If he feels a thing is right, he will say so and take the consequences; and if he thinks a thing is wrong he will say so too. Because of this some people call him opinionated. Certainly, as a member of President Kennedy's Cabinet he got himself into trouble because he spoke his mind over the Cuban Bay of Pigs business. His critics said that this showed that he could not work in a team. In any event, Chester Bowles is no tight-lipped, diplomatic career civil servant. And this is the man/whose memorandum to the President dealing ~~with U.S. aid to developing countries was published over the weekend.~~

with U.S. aid to developing countries was published over the weekend. The fact that this memorandum was made public could mean much or little. I think, for instance, that if the Kennedy Administration disapproved strongly of the views expressed in the memorandum, the

President could have asked for it not to be made public. So it could mean that the memorandum reflects the official views of the Kennedy Administration. On the other hand, making the memorandum public could be ^a ~~the~~ routine releasing of important information and opinion to keep the nation informed. My own view is that Mr. Bowles's memorandum is either a straight official policy document or else it is so close to official policy as to make no difference. To me, this document charts the way in which the United States will, from here on, approach the question of aid for developing countries. And this fact makes Mr. Chester Bowles document especially important to Jamaica.

The Bowles document puts Jamaica in the company of Argentina, Chile, Greece and Singapore as 'countries capable of putting their financial houses in order' but who have failed to do so because of 'misuse and maldistribution' of their wealth. And so, because of this 'misuse and maldistribution' of our wealth Mr. Bowles sees our problems as being sufficiently acute to require American aid.

The Bowles document puts a group of other countries which include India, Pakistan, Nigeria, Tunisia, Colombia, El Salvador and Formosa in a second category of countries which are financially poorer than we are but which are showing, and now I quote Mr. Bowles: "Outstanding competence and courage in mustering their own resources".

In other words, to Mr. Chester Bowles, and I suspect to the
~~xxxxx~~ ^{we}
 State Department, we only qualify for aid because we have misused what
 we have and because we do not share what we have justly and fairly.
 I do not like this sort of public judgement on Jamaica any more than
~~xxxxxxotherxxland,xxpoorerxxcountriesxxthanxxJamaicaxxhavexxmadexxbetter~~
 you do. But the big question is: Is it ^{true} ~~true~~? I'll try to answer that
~~usexxofxxwhatxxtheyxxhave.xxIxxamxxsurexxnonexxofxxusxxlikexxtoxxhavexxthisxxsort~~
 tomorrow, so till then, goodnight.
~~ofxxjudgementxxpassedxxonxxJamaica.xxAndxxyet,xxyouxxknow,xxwhenxxyouxxaskxxfor~~
~~helpxxyouxxmustxxtakexxthisxxsortxxofxxthing.xxThexxquestionxxisxxhowxxaccurate~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Wednesday Oct 10 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I know many people are probably extremely angry with the United States because of Mr. Chester Bowles' judgement that the only reason why we need aid is because of the mess we have made of what we have. And I am sure that a number of them will see as 'economic imperialism' Mr. Bowles' suggestion that with whatever aid it gives to countries like Jamaica the 'U.S. should suggest to them corrective measures and provide advice'. And yet, you know, by asking for American aid, we have asked for this sort of judgement and it is a little silly for us to get on our high-horse about it. When you go begging to a man you are in fact inviting him to lecture you. The American government gets its money in exactly the same way that ~~we~~ our government gets its money: from direct and indirect taxes on its citizens. And ~~just as we cut up~~ you know, you and I would cut up ~~very~~ rough if we knew that the Jamaican government was giving away millions of pounds of the taxpayers' money. But somehow we seem to think it perfectly normal for the American government to give away millions of pounds of the American taxpayers' money. And what is more, many of us go on as though we are entitled to this money; we cut up rough if we don't get ^{it} or if questions are asked about how we use it. But I am afraid ~~it~~ we cannot have it both ways. Any time you ask for aid, you must also take the advice that goes with it, or the criticism of how you handle your affairs. From this point of view I have not quarrel with Mr. Bowles' rather harsh judgement of Jamaica.

Where I do tend to quarrel with Mr. Chester Bowles is over the sweeping character of his judgement. It is true that I only have the news service report of his memorandum and not the full text of

the actual document, so I do not know ~~whether he~~ whether he explains what he means when he talks about the 'misuse' of national wealth. And when this word is used about Jamaica and/about a place like Argentina where a dictator took millions out of the country when he fled, then explaining what you mean becomes important. In any case it is a little/^{more than}fantastic ~~xxx~~ to say that any country which more than doubled the gross national product in less than ten years has 'misused' the national wealth. So, unless Mr. Bowles qualifies his statement about the 'misuse' of national wealth very ~~severely~~ it would seem to me that he is blackguarding Jamaica: and not even the fact of giving aid confers this right on anyone.

I think Mr. Bowles is on very much more solid grounds when it comes to the 'maldistribution' of the national wealth. This is a point on which few reasonable people would quarrel with him. And of course there is another point which, whether it is in Mr. Chester Bowles' document or not, is very much there in the minds of the U.S. officials who have to handle all requests for aid. And it is this: Are these people who ask for American aid doing all they can to aid themselves? Are we in Jamaica doing so? To what extent has the private sector of the Jamaican economy, to what extent have our own capitalists, our own business people, invested in Jamaica's development? You know the answer as well as I do and it is not very encouraging. And the Americans know this/^{too} They know that we can invest/^{of the land,} more in Jamaica's future: they know that we can make better use ~~of the land,~~ that we need not import much of the food we now do; and they know we can share what we have a little more equally: and as long as ~~they~~ we expect help from them they are entitled to turn on us and say: 'Allright, but first help yourselves'. goodnight

- 1) Chester Bowles Follow-up
- 2) Return of Jimmy Lloyd
- 3) Opening of Catholic Council

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Oct 11 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I am very glad to see that the Chester Bowles statement about which I talked last night and the night before, does not represent official American policy. A spokesman of the American Embassy here in Kingston told me so last night. So far, so good. But I hope that our own Ministry of External Affairs will not let the matter rest there. Jamaica's name has definitely been damaged by what Mr. Bowles did - and he did it as one of the special advisers to the American President, not as just any private citizen. So just to privately say that it was unfortunate and that he was not speaking for the United States Government, is not enough. I think the Jamaican government should demand an official repudiation by the American government of the Bowles remarks. If the United States government allows a highly placed official to shoot off his mouth without consultation about domestic affairs, that is their business: but when that official shoots off his mouth about other countries whose friendship and goodwill the United States values, then, as far as I am concerned, the matter becomes too serious to be shrugged off. If I were an American citizen concerned with furthering the best interests of my country and trying to win friends for her, I would call for the sacking of Mr. Chester Bowles. But I am not an American citizen so I cannot make such a call. What we can do is insist that the United States ^{officially} remove the slur ~~xx~~ contained in the Bowles suggestion that Jamaica had misused her national wealth. As I said last night, not even the giving of aid gives anyone the right to blackguard Jamaica.

I think the Chester Bowles affair, and the way the Ministry of

External Affairs dealt with it, points up the very important that Ministry will play in the future life of the country. As soon as the Bowles thing was made public ¹ ~~and~~ Ministry went into action. A message went off to Washington to get all the facts and on the basis of the facts representation is either now being made or will soon be made to ensure that the State Department corrects the unfortunate effects of the Bowles statement. And a very important feature of the successful handling of such tricky problems of foreign relations is to do what has to be done with as little fuss, as little publicity and as little noise as possible. So, when I checked, I was really impressed by the quiet smoothness with which the Ministry of External Affairs handled this, and a number of other matters that have come up since independence. The early clumsiness has gone and I got the feeling that the people were getting on top of the job of handling our external affairs. I think much of the credit for building this foreign service from almost nothing must go to Mr. Lawrence Lindo. Mr. Lindo has been appointed Jamaica's High Commissioner in London he has remained here and but ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ headed the Ministry of External Affairs until Mr. Jimmy Lloyd could come home to take over from him. Mr. Lloyd came home today and Mr. Lindo can now begin the handing over. He has laid firm foundations and I expect a first-class foreign service to grow and expand under the guidance of Mr. Lloyd.

But of all the happenings of today all over the world, I think the one event that could most affect the shape of the future was the opening at the Vatican City of the 21st General Council of the Roman Catholic Church by Pope John. More than anything else that happened today this one can change the world. But time is up so I will tell about it tomorrow: Till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Oct 12 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: A 'General Council' of the Roman Catholic Church is a gathering of all the bishops of that Church. And the Council that opened in the Vatican yesterday was such a gathering of some 2,600-odd Catholic Bishops from all corners of the earth. A General Council of the Catholic Church is also a sort of broad and comprehensive policy making meeting: it is at the 'General Council' that the bishops get-together and talk out all the problems that confront the church. Generally speaking these 'General Councils' have been held at critical moments in time and in the history of the church. In the nearly 2,000 years of the existence of the Christian Church this is only the 21st time that there has been such a gathering of Catholic bishops. The last 'General Council' of Catholic bishops began in 1869 and went on until 1870. ^{During that time} ~~for xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ they held four sessions and the princes of the church really let rip with the arguments. At one stage fifty odd bishops stormed out of the council rather than vote on the question of defining the infallibility of the Pope. This Council did not make any really radical or sweeping changes. But the one before, the one that went on from 1545 to 1563, was one of the most dramatic of all the great Catholic Councils. Martin Luther and others had attacked the Catholic Church for selling indulgences - and the idea that the rich could buy their way into heaven. It looked very much as though the Reformation would first undermine the influence of the Catholic Church and then destroy its power throughout the world. And so, with Catholicism in trouble the bishops met at what became known as the 'Council of Trent' between

1545 and 1563. Please note the dates: the Council began in 1545 and went on ~~far~~ until 1563 - that is for eighteen long years! The church was in a mess and so the fathers of the church got together and talked it out as though they had all the time in the world. At one point, round about 1551, the great Martin Luther himself dismissed the 'Council' as a comedy that came too late and could not achieve its purpose. But the Catholic bishops went their own way, fought their battles, examined themselves, look at/ the faults and failures of those who had served the church and brought it to this sorry pass and then passed over a hundred canons. And so, after eighteen years of painful debate within itself, the catholic church brought itself to vigorous life again. I think this is one of the most awesome things about the Christian Church in general and the Catholic Church in particular, this extraordinary capacity for turning in on itself and creating new life/ in times of trouble.

But, you will say, this present 'General Council' is not meeting in a time of troubles. The Catholic Church is stronger and more stable than it has ever been; the faithful today number more than five-hundred million. All that is true. But the majority of Catholics are found in Latin America and southern European where you have massive poverty and overpopulation. And with its sure feel for the historical process the Catholic Church knows that this most revolutionary of all centuries is moving to a point of crisis and climax. There is no standstill. And so it seems to me that with this Council the Catholic is bracing itself for a series of crucial encounters. It has to meet, live with or contend with: the new wave of science, the social and economic demands of the poor, and the challenge of Marxian leadership in all these fields. And how the Catholic church does this may affect all of us in today and tomorrow's world. Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Oct 13 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I thought I had finished with all I wanted to say about Jamaica Woolens Ltd. and then I made the awful mistake of trying to check up on a few figures just to make sure that I had the picture clear. The result was that I discovered first one almost unbelievable thing, then another. First, I discovered that eight junior executive officers, people in the positions of supervisors, technicians and ^{the} like - that eight such people collected between themselves ^{well over two} ~~nearly three~~ thousand pounds a month in the form of salaries, car allowances and housing allowances. The lowest salary any of these people drew was one hundred and fifty pounds a month. If you add the thirty-one pounds a month for car allowance and the forty pounds a month for housing allowance you arrive at the figure of £221 a month. Now, this by any standard you ~~xxx~~ like to use, is extremely high wages for a supervisor. But this is low. ^{Another} ~~Other~~ ~~xxxxx~~ supervisor drew as much as £285 a month as basic salary; and when you added car and housing allowances to this the man collected a total of £381 a month. So this supervisor's total pay (including car and housing allowances) would work out at roughly ~~£4,570~~ £4,570 a year. Have you ever come across any supervisor, no matter how skilled he is, ~~who~~ gets that kind of money anywhere in the world? If you have I would like to know of it because I have not. By the time I had dug up this much it was no shock to me to discover that one gentleman in the managerial class was taking home over £500 a month.

If this were some private undertaking this would be none of your business and none of my business. But this is our business

because the only money the I.D.C. had to put into Jamaica Woolens was the money it got from the government of Jamaica and the only money the government had to give to the I.D.C. was the money it could from the taxpayers of Jamaica. And that makes it our business.

By this time I was ~~more~~ very depressed and just a little scared of what I might find out about the people higher up. But I kept digging because it was too late to stop. And sure enough I found what I feared. The number one man at Jamaica Woolens had been given a contract for five years which assures him over thirteen thousand pounds a year, tax free. Now that it has been decided that Jamaica Woolens must shut down we are still committed to pay this gentleman over thirteen thousand pounds a year until the contract has expired. *unless there is a notice of termination clause* In other words, if this gentleman's contract has to run for another four years then we must find more than fifty-two thousand pounds to give him in order to honour our contractual obligation. This is bad, just about as bad as it can be; and I think it should be accounted for in full.

What makes it so terrifying to me is that fact that if Jamaica Woolens had not failed so dramatically we may never have known what went on, what kind of money was being paid to imported supervisors. I think one of the things that stands out a mile is that we need to have some sort of system of public accounting for the ~~xxx~~ spending of all ^{public} money by statutory bodies. We all know how the government spends our money, we know the salaries of our legislators and civil servants, what has happened inside Jamaica Woolens shows that we need public accounting for semi-government bodies too.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Oct 15 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I spent a few hours in St. Ann's Bay last Saturday; and during those few hours four people buttonholed me at different times to talk about the case of the Reverend Clennon King whose request for political asylum was turned down by the Minister of Home Affairs. All these people seemed ^{disturbed} ~~worried~~ that Mr. Roy McNeill, ~~xxxxxxxx~~ should refuse to allow an American Negro priest to make his home here in Jamaica. And there seemed to me to be very definite confusion in the minds of these people as to exactly what the Minister of Home Affairs refused Mr. King and why he did so. And it made me wonder how many other people might be equally confused about this whole affair. So, let us see if we can sort it out.

First of all let us make clear what the Minister of Home Affairs did not do. The Minister of Home Affairs did not deny the Reverend Clennon King permission to live in Jamaica. The question never came up. Mr. King did not ask the Minister for permission to come and reside here, as anyone who is not a Jamaican or even a British subject would have to do. So the very first thing is that no permission to live here was denied because no permission to live here was asked for.

What was asked for was political asylum, and this is a completely different thing altogether. There is an international convention known as the Right of Asylum to which most countries subscribe. Under this convention a country is required to give protection to a foreigner within its territory, usually to safeguard him from violence or injustice or both, in his own country. And the person

who is entitled to such asylum is usually a political offender in his own country.

You will notice I used words like a person's 'right' to asylum or a person being 'entitled' to asylum. I use these words because if you do in fact qualify for political asylum then it is yours by right and no Minister and no Government ^{will} ~~can~~ turn you away; but you must qualify. And the hard truth is that the Reverend Glenon King just does not qualify, any more than did the four young stowaways who were just returned to B.G.

To qualify for asylum the country to which a person flees must be satisfied that the government of the country from which that person is running/ ^{intended} do him or her terrible violence and injustice if he or she did not flee. The Jewish refugees who fled from the Nazis were fleeing from a government which intended to destroy them ^{They} ~~are~~ the classic example of people 'entitled' to political asylum. But in the case of Mr. King the government of the United States does not intend to do him violence or to harm him for any political views he holds. It is true that some of his fellow citizens, and some of the southern states would like to deprive him and other American Negroes of certain right. But only ^{recently} ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{the} ~~xxxxxxx~~ United States government called out/ ^{hundreds of} soldiers to enforce the rights of one American citizen who happens to be a Negro. ~~xxxxxx~~ The government of the United States and the constitution of the United States are on the side of Mr. King. And for these reasons Mr. Roy McNeill had no choice but to ~~deny~~ deny Mr. King's request. According to international convention Mr. King does not qualify for political asylum. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Oct 16 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: A number of listeners have written to me about my broadcast of Saturday/^{before}~~xx~~ last ~~xxxxx~~ when I spoke about the wounded donkey. (Incidentally, this was the same day on which we had to broadcast two commentaries because of some unfortunate mistake the evening before. Some listeners got very angry with me about this mistake and quite a few of them 'cussed me out' for being lazy and so repeating something I had said the night before. Believe me, it was nothing of the sort. It was an unfortunate mistake with which I had nothing to do and for which everybody concerned was extremely sorry). Anyway, let us get back to the case of the wounded donkey.

From the letters I received three points have emerged very clearly. First that something must be done to make Jamaicans more conscious of animal suffering. The most popular suggestion was that this be done by a press and radio campaign. I think that is important, but I think even more important than such a campaign would be a clear lead from our churches and from our schools and from the government and from our local authorities. Kindness to all living things is a Christian virtue and if this is spelled out clearly in church a vast army of decent but thoughtless people will be forced to think on the matter.. Next, I think, the most important influence for good can be exerted by teachers in schools. I think the almost traditional kindness of the English child towards animals (and I watched it for nearly twenty years) was fostered as a part of the education of the child. At home the child had, and still has, a cat or a dog or some other pet, and mother, who is always at home with the child, except in very rare circumstances, fosters a tenderness towards

animals from very early on in the child's upbringing. And when the child goes to school the same pattern continues, with teacher taking over the job from mother. The children's newspapers, the Sunday school, the B.B.C. 'Children's Hour' programme, everything around the child, fosters this idea of kindness to all living creatures. When a policeman risks his life to rescue a dog which has fallen into a pit it becomes big news and the policeman becomes a national hero. And so the idea of kindness to animals becomes part of the values of ^{British} ~~English~~ society. And this, I think, has a lot to do with the people of Britain being the kind of people they are - especially when you meet them in Britain. I think this is the sort of climate we want to create here. Unfortunately, mothers in Jamaica spend less time with their children in the years before school than the mothers in England do, and so ~~this~~ the beginning of this important job must be taken over by the teachers.

The way in which the police can help this educating process is prosecuting ~~beingxxxxxx~~ people who are cruel to animal and by making sure that animals are stopped from wandering on the roads. One listener suggests a banning of ~~all~~ drays from highways after dark and another listener makes the very valuable suggestion that we should introduce humane killing of animals. If you have witnessed the killing of a pig or a goat for sale in some country area, you will not need to be convinced of the desperate need for humane killing. And this is where the government and the local authorities can help enormously. To all those who have offered help, I suggest you get in touch with the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. So, let us all set about creating a climate of kindness towards all living creatures. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Oct 17 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: To those people who know him well, and there are many of them in Jamaica, the news of Sir Hugh Foot's resignation as Britain's chief spokesman on Colonial Affairs at the United Nations, did not come as a great shock: it might have come as something of a surprise, but certainly not as a shock. When I look back now to the day when the news first broke, I cannot even say that I was very greatly surprised. Please do not get me wrong. I am not saying that I could see Sir Hugh's resignation coming. If you had asked me the day before he resigned whether there was any issue over which he might resign I do not think I would have thought of Southern Rhodesia. So I am not trying to play prophet after the event. And yet when he did resign I was not surprised at all, and many of his other friends here in Jamaica were ~~xxx~~ either not surprised, or only mildly surprised. And you know, I think the reason for this relative lack of surprise tells us a great deal about Sir Hugh Foot and about this business of being British.

Sir Hugh Foot has had a long and distinguished career in the service of Britain and Britain's colonial empire. All things being equal, a new career as an international diplomat had just started for him. Behind him, part of his proud record, was the settlement of the bitter conflict in Cyprus: before that he had served here in Jamaica with a distinction that had won for him the respect, admiration and affection of practically all Jamaicans. It was reasonable then to think that this man who had served and served so well, deserved great honours which would probably end with a seat in the House of Lords. Certainly, if Sir Hugh Foot had felt that he was too near

retirement to do any more than carry out his brief at the U.N., few people would have quarrelled with him. There comes a time when everyman is entitled to say: I have worked long and hard, now I am just biding time for my pension.

Instead, when it came to an issue over which he could not plead Britain's case with a clear conscience, he resigned, thus embarrassing his own country and throwing his own future into doubt. I am sure Sir Hugh Foot knew that Britain's enemies would try to make political capital out of his resignation. But I am equally sure that he also knew that however embarrassing, the British Government and people would respect his decision because it is based on strong convictions. He knew, as we know, that he will not be haunted or persecuted because of those convictions: he will not have to starve, he will not have to run to another country, he will not have to appear before a committee on un-British activities to defend himself. And all this gives him a unique sense of freedom to live according to the dictates of his conscience and of principle. And this, I think, is one of the wonderful things about being British. And once you get to this point then being British has nothing to do with being either white, or black or blue or green. It has to do with values. At this point too, British values are not white values (indeed there is no such thing as either white or black values) but a high point in human values. And those of us who criticised colonialism did so because those values were not accorded us - and not because we were against them. For Sir Hugh Foot there ^{was} ~~ix~~ no conflict between being white and standing up for blacks: it just did not arise. What arose was a question of values.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Oct 18 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Mr. J.E. Clare McFarlane was buried yesterday. Less than a month earlier his good friend, Mr. W. Adolphe Roberts had died: and so, within the span of one month Jamaica lost its two most senior writers. And so it seems to me fitting that we should try and assess the part played by these two men - not, let me say very quickly, in order to sit in judgement on them, but rather to learn from what they have achieved. And make no mistake about it: both of them have achieved much. One of the major failings of the young Jamaican - and indeed the young West Indian ~~xxxxxxx~~ - writer is that when he should be learning from the achievements of those who went before him, he is so busy tearing them down that there is no time to learn. In order to be the pioneer, in order to be the first, we often have to cancel everything that went before - and so we throw out the baby with the bath water. Whenever any of the younger West Indian writers or intellectuals lament the fact that they do not have a long and ancient past to call on, I see it as part of this business of rejecting ~~of~~ what has gone before. Indeed, this tendency finds expression in our politics as well, where the new young leader seems often to feel that he must completely wipe out the achievements and the good name of the old leader in order to build up his own and and make it more secure. And there are even elements of this impulse to destroy the past in the general thinking on Jamaican institutions. Often the argument starts off with.....'Now that Jamaica is independent.....' and then the arguer goes on to try and get rid of some tried and tested institution - be it the monarchy, Jamaica's two-party system, Jamaica's traditional associations or the like. Always, the impulse

seems to be towards the new and the unknown. And there is nothing wrong with this: indeed, something would be seriously wrong if the young did not always reach towards the new and the unknown. What is wrong is that this is accompanied by the impulse to repudiate or else destroy the old and the known. This is a dangerous impulse which can, if it is not controlled, seriously undermine stability in times of difficulty. And the way to stop it, I think, is to face up to it and then to consciously overcome this destructive urge. And here a sense of the continuous process becomes crucial. Mr. Manley and others have paid homage to the political pioneering of Mr. Adolphe Roberts in the movement that led to Jamaica's independence. And so the politicians seem at this moment in time to have a greater sense of the continuous process than the writers have. The politicians - at least the older ones - seem prepared to admit that things began before them and that it does not take anything away from them to say so. And so Adolphe Roberts, a fine pioneering writer, has been honoured mainly for his political contribution.

But it is not the public show of honour that I am concerned about. What I am concerned about is that most important and that most private honour of all: the quiet homage of your own heart and mind. This, I think, is the kind of homage that Clare McFarlane is entitled to from everyone who writes in Jamaica and everyone who cares about literature in Jamaica. Never mind the politics of the business, never mind whether you like his poetry or not; never mind whether you belonged to the 'Focus' school or the Poetry League school, the hard fact is the Clare McFarlane has nurtured and nursed poetry in Jamaica for over forty years and that is something unique. But he ~~xxx~~ more than that. ~~xxxxxx~~ He also wrote some good poetry about which I will tell you tomorrow. So till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Oct 19 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: We are still talking about Clare McFarlane, and now I want to read a few extracts from some of his poetry:

Know then the battle rages to and fro,
The present and the past in conflict joined,
The future in the issue. Yet fear not!
The spirit that upholds her shall endure,
Though practice fail and custom pass away;
For there's an England greater than Thy England,
A London mightier than thou hast known,
Built from the generations and the years.

That is a bit from McFarlane's 'Daphne'. And you know, if I had been as arrogant as one young writer I know who told me flatly he could not waste his time reading McFarlane, I would have missed a great deal. I would have missed - or it might have taken me longer to arrive at the concept of London and England as more than just physical locations but also symbols of values, and without that, Sir Hugh Foot's resignation about which I talked a couple of nights ago, would have had less meaning. So, this poet who so many young writers dismiss as old fashioned has helped to shape my values. And the misguided young writer who did not have time to read Clare McFarlane does not know what he has missed. It seems to me that so many young Jamaican writers miss so much because they think they are too smart and too modern to learn anything from Clare McFarlane. This is of course what always happens when you try to reject your past and those who have shaped your past: you become very clever and very good at tearing down and destroying. The trouble is you have nothing on which to build and so you are always beginning from scratch. And so you do not have that sense of time and space, that sense of history which McFarlane describes as 'Twilight forever

lives, forever dies'. And you know, in one poem 'On National Vanity', McFarlane offers us more distilled wisdom than you can find in the writings of those who would sell his work short.

But it is not my purpose to defend Clare McFarlane's work or to justify it. It needs no such activity from me or from anyone. What I am trying to say is that because of this destructive urge within the society, because of the strong impulse to pull down those who have gone before, many of us have not given ourselves a chance to really appreciate and benefit from the life and work of people like J.E. Clare McFarlane and W. Adolphe Roberts. And the loss is ours, not theirs. The tragedy is that this is the kind of loss Jamaican literature need not sustain. All that is needed is for our young writers to build on the foundations laid by the writers of the past. But for this we need humility. You only learn when you are not dead sure that you know everything. I think Clare McFarlane and Adolphe Roberts have a great deal to teach the younger writers of Jamaica if only they will learn.

My silent tribute to these two Jamaican pioneers is to go back and re-read everything they have written. I suggest you do the same: and let us begin with *these lines by McFarlane:*

Love will awaken all lovely things at last.

One by one they shall come from the sleep of Time

Bearing in triumph the deathless dreams of the past.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Oct 20 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Way back on September the 12th, when the idea to introduce casino gambling was first being pushed by tourist interests, I told you that I honestly did not see any real connection between gambling and tourism. I told you I thought it was false to assume that legalised gambling would attract tourists: gambling, I told you, does not attract tourists as such: legalised gambling attracts gamblers and gamblers, wherever you go, whether it is the south of France or elsewhere, are a minority. The majority of tourists do not go to any place simply in order to gamble. I also told you that from my own personal observation of tourism in the South of France I am satisfied that a flourishing tourist industry was much less dependent on gambling than the people who wanted it made out. Now I am very glad indeed to see that the Minister of Trade and Industry has said firmly that gambling was not the answer.

I am glad the Minister has done this because it seemed to me at one stage that we were in danger of getting the issues confused. The churches have, and I personally agree with them, opposed the introduction of casino gambling from a christian point of view. And this resulted in a big debate about the so-called 'old fashioned' approach of the churches, and about this being the only way to cure a sick child, and about the child not really being sick but dying, and about church lotteries, horse racing, football pools and a hundred and one other side issues. The practical point which I am happy the Minister has now endorsed is that casino gambling is not the answer to our troubles. And he has listed some of things that have caused our tourist industry to be in the state it now is.

The Minister ^{blamed} ~~said~~ high rates and the behaviour of some of the ^{shops} ~~who~~ ^{operators of} free ports, taxis, the hotels, the airlines, have not ^{who} ~~been~~ ⁿ given ~~en~~ value for money. ^{They} ~~se~~ have been charging high prices and giving low quality ~~service~~. I do not think everybody in the industry agrees with the Minister. I have myself been given strong and sound arguments to justify the rates that are being charged in our luxury tourist hotels. And you know, they do compare reasonably well with rates in other places. So I ^{this it is more the quality of service than} ~~do not think it is just the~~ rates. ^{But} I think the rates certainly limit the kind of people who will want to come to Jamaica for a holiday to those above a certain income. The person in the lower middle-class income bracket who gets two or three weeks a year and who has to save up to take the family on holiday - such a person just cannot come to Jamaica. You will find many such people in Puerto Rico: there they travel in busses with the ordinary citizens (no air-conditioned busses, by the way) and most of them eat in local eating places. But then the majority of tourist resorts are not in the luxury class. They are there to cater for this kind of person. Then there is transport. You can get to Puerto Rico from New York at a fraction of what it costs to come here and that again cuts out your lower middle-class family. So it seems to me that on top of all the point Mr. Lightbourne has mentioned, such as giving full value for money and lowering air rates, the tourist industry should also ask itself whether it wants to attract the lower middle-income tourist. He will not be a ^{free spender} ~~big spender~~ or tipper, in fact he will watch every penny, as you and I do. But his numbers are legion. Does the tourist industry want him?

, Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Oct 22 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Now that my prediction of October the 2nd has been confirmed and Mr. C.C. Campbell's appointment as our next Governor-General has been announced, let us take a close look at the possible implications of having a native Jamaican Governor-General.

I think ~~possibly~~ the most serious and the most dangerous implication is the possibility that the Governor-Generalship of Jamaica may become a party political matter. The reason why Sir Kenneth Blackburne, the reason why all the Governors in the past, were, with rare exceptions, able to be so useful to Jamaica, was because they were above party politics. They were the Queen^{ly} or the King's representatives. And whether Jamaicans approved or disapproved of what they did, everybody accepted it as being done in the interests of the nation as a whole. And so King's House and the person who occupied it, became symbols of ~~Jamaican~~ unity for all Jamaica. And because ~~it~~^{the} was a symbol of unity and, until very recently, the real source of all power in Jamaica, the office of Governor was the most important single stabilising factor in the society. And so, ~~symbolically~~^{symbolically}, the man at King's House meant a number of very important things to the country. First, and paradoxically perhaps, he meant ~~with~~ dependence, ~~and~~ security and colonialism. His presence meant a limiting of the freedom of choice of all Jamaicans. Until recently he could over-rule the decisions of the politicians, and if need be enforce his own decision with all of Britain's military might. And he acted as a restraining influence on the politicians.

Second, his presence represented the over-all unity of the society: opposing parties, conflicting factions and interests, differing groups and classes all looked to him to maintain a just balance. Third, he represented national rather than partisan recognition. Although he had increasingly in recent years to act on the advice of the party in power, there were areas in which he could, on his own, pay tribute to personal achievement by personally recognising it. He invited distinguished citizens to the many functions of the Governor on the basis of his assessment of their merit and standing in the community - and not on the basis of how they stood with the party in power.

And so, in these ways, he contributed greatly to the sense of national unity within the society. Because of his presence and what it represented, it was possible for many citizens to see the interests of the nation as being above those of party and person: indeed, he himself was the symbol of this concept of the nation.

But all this was relatively easy for a man who represented an outside power and who was accountable to such an outside power. He could afford to be detached. But that is only part of the reason. The other part is that the system under which he operated made it possible and indeed easy to be above the party battle. Now that the system of his appointing has changed, and now that he is to be a native son, there is the danger that his great usefulness as a symbol of national unity will be destroyed, unless we make great ~~xxxx~~ efforts to avoid this. I think a party political Governor-General ~~xxxxxx~~ will be a tragedy ~~xxxxxx~~ Jamaica. Tomorrow I will tell you how I think we can avoid such a tragedy. So, till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Oct 23 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Let us explore a possible chain of events in the political life of Jamaica. Let us assume that the appointment of the Governor-General is regarded as a purely party political thing. And let us assume that the party in opposition does not approve of it because it is good opposition politics not to. And let us further assume that King's House, or wherever else the Governor-General may be living becomes a place to which only those who are in political favour are invited. And having assumed this much all you will have to do is stop and think a little to realise what it will mean for Jamaica. The idea of national unity will be utterly destroyed. When one party is in power all the honours and all the jobs, beginning with the Governor-Generalship, will go to the supporters of the party in power. The opposition and th supporters of the opposition will be excluded and reduced to second or third-class citizenship. And then, when you have a change of Government, there will be a clean sweep, from the Governor-General downwards. Everybody who can be fired will be fired. The new party will put in its own man who will invite only the supporters of the new party, and all honours and favours will only go to them.

And once you have this situation, you have a situation where party becomes more important than country: where loyalty to party, where service to party, are more important than loyalty and service to country. And the trouble about this sort of thing is that once it begins there is no telling where it might end: it could spread to the civil service, the police force, even the defence force. There will then be no single person or institution to regard as a uniting

the right of Cuba or indeed of any other sovereign state to deciding its own affairs in its own way. We may not agree with the system of government or in the way they run their affairs: but this is their business, not ours - as long as they show the same respect for our business and our ways. I think some of you may still remember that I have spoken up loud and clear for Cuba's right to choose her own way and go her own way.

But, you know, these self-same rights that we are prepared to concede to Cuba, we must concede to the United States as well. Just like Cuba, the United States has the right to choose its own way of government and has the right to provide for its own defence. And I am completely satisfied in my own mind that the United States saw a genuine threat to its own security in the Soviet arms build-up in Cuba. As far as the United States is concerned Cuba was being turned into a Soviet military base just off the coast of the United States. She felt she had to do something about it and she did. The alternative was to do nothing and end up with Russian holding a pistol to her head. These are the cold hard facts of power politics. Russia wants a powerful foothold in this part of the world to spread her own influence, ideas and power. Here, as elsewhere in the world the United States is the great obstacle to this spread of Russian power: this is the basis of the Cold War. Cuba itself is incidental to this bigger design. And certainly when you look at it in the terms of cold power politics, America has at least as much right to prevent Cuba becoming a Soviet base, as Russia had a few years ago when she created a crisis to make sure that Finland did not become an American base near her border. But for me there is an even more important and an even more tragic aspect to this ~~extra~~ crisis over Cuba of which I'll talk tomorrow. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Wednesday Oct 24 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Seventeen years ago today the United Nations came into being as an expression of the will of fifty-one nations to abolish war, tyranny, oppression and hunger from the world. As with so many great movements and organisations, this one was born out of war - out of the Second World War which was the most destructive and the most impersonal war so far conducted by mankind throughout its turbulent history. In all earlier wars men had faced each other in battlefields all over the world and looked at each other across some 'no-man's-land' before destroying each other. In the Second World War, for the first time, a man could sit in one country and push a button and send a machine to another country, carrying death and destruction. For the first time in his history, man made war a total thing in the Second World War: ~~new~~ new born babies, old grannies cats, dogs, birds, fish, flies, flees, ~~and~~ bedbugs and even the food we had to eat - all were involved. There was no 'no-man's land' and no battlefield. War was total and everywhere. And the two atomic bombs that were dropped on Japan gave warning that destruction could be total too. But, compared with the weapons man has developed today, all the weapons of the Second World War were primitive. Today's weapons are much more 'sophisticated' - and that is the word the scientists themselves use - 'sophisticated'. The two atom bombs that were dropped on Japan were not 'sophisticated', they only killed upwards of one hundred thousand people in a single flash: the new 'bombs' we are told, will do much better. One of the new ones, we are told, is 'sophisticated' enough to wipe out the more than four hundred thousand people of the Corporate Area in one total and

This is a tragic situation that makes puppets of peoples and countries and nations. And I think that my own strongest long-term criticism of the leaders of the Cuban revolution is that they have turned themselves, their country and their people into just another ^{set} puppet in this ideological conflict. I think by doing this they have destroyed the great symbolism of the Cuban revolution - the symbolism and the reality of redistributing the wealth of Latin American nations, of offering land to the peasant, schools for his children, freedom and a new/patriotism and a new hope to all. I still think all this was implicit in the early Castro movement and it was this that made so many of us support it against both the Batista dictatorship and that section of Americans who had a stranglehold on the country's economy. In those days Cuba looked like being as meaningful a symbol for this part of the world as India - which is now being attacked by Communist China - as India was for Asia, as Egypt was for the ~~Middle~~ Arab world and as places like Ghana and Guinea were for Africa. These were underdeveloped countries that were unwilling to be anybody's satellites. We needed such a symbol desperately in this part of the world: and Cuba could have been that symbol. And people all over the hemisphere would have supported her. Instead she has elected to go in for ^{the} discredited European-style leftist tyranny and the bankrupt politics of the Cold War. That Cuba, for which so many of us had such high hopes, should by becoming a satellite bring world war so close to us, is the final condemnation of the whole business of being satellites, ~~especially~~ ^{any kind of satellite but} especially satellites of a cynical leftism that holds human life and human dignity cheap. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on 1962
Thursday Oct 25 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I know a large number of listeners have been waiting impatiently for me to comment on the crisis over Cuba. In fact, some were so impatient that they started phoning me on Wednesday morning to find out why I had said nothing about the crisis the night before and wanting to know when I would say anything about it. And to all of them I said: I would comment on the crisis just as soon as the government of Jamaica gives the country a clear lead by declaring where it stands. Now, the government has given us that clear lead and I feel that I can make some useful comments. But before I comment on the crisis itself, let me explain to you why I felt it was important to wait until the government had taken a stand. It seems to me that if we are going to build up a genuine and undivided national spirit in times of real crisis then we must learn this lesson of waiting for a clear lead.

In a time of real crisis the people of Britain - no matter whether they belong to the Labour Party, the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party - in a time of real crisis they all turn their hearts and minds to number ten Downing Street and the Prime Minister, for he is the ~~xxxxxx~~ chief spokesman of the elected government of the people: and in times of crisis he does not speak for party or faction but for the whole nation. And the same thing applies in the United States, as we saw again this week. Republican leaders who hate the Kennedy Administration with all they have, rallied around the President because this was a crisis and he had to decide and act for the whole nation. I think it is very important that all the people and all the leaders and all the parties of Jamaica learn

how **crucial** a spirit of national unity is in times of crisis. Without such a spirit the country can be gripped by a terrible confusion, and the enemies within the gates will be very quick to exploit such confusion. To hold on to what we have we must keep our heads.

Now for the ^{crisis} ~~xxxx~~ itself. Let me list the questions that I heard asked most frequently. The first and the most important one was: Does this mean world war? And if there is world war, what happens to Jamaica? I do not of course know the answer and I do not think that either Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Khrushchev know the answer. I think both of them are equally anxious about it. I think the most likely chance of war is if one or the other makes a serious miscalculation and forces the hand of his opposite number. For instance, if the Russians instruct one ^{or more} of their ships to defy the American quarantine operation and go to Cuba with arms and refuse to be searched by the Americans - if the Russians do this because they think the Americans are bluffing, the Americans would then either have to give ground or else sink the Russian ships. If the Americans give ground then Mr. Kennedy might as well pick up the telephone and call ~~Mr~~ the Kremlin and say: 'Look Mr. K., you've called our bluff, we give in; you can come and take over. We will be your ever-loving satellites'. If, on the other hand, the Americans sank the Russian ships then the initiative would be with the Russians; they could either withdraw or make war. So the chances of war are as easy as that. And if there is war, then we in Jamaica, and then even Cuba, will become utterly unimportant in the scheme of things. And so on to the second question that has worried most people: Should America have done this? ~~And~~ And should ~~de~~ have done it without reference to the United Nations? I'll look at this question tomorrow. So till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Oct 26 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Should the United States have thrown this partial blockade around Cuba, knowing that it might cause war? Well, let us look at it a little more closely. Why did the Americans do it? ~~They~~ In his speech to the American nation on Monday night, the American President said the American nation had unmistakable evidence that sites for the firing of nuclear missiles had been established in Cuba: in other words, Cuba, 90 miles from the United States, had in effect ~~xxxxxx~~ established Soviet military bases which could hurl nuclear rockets at any point in this hemisphere, including the heart of the United States. I have been listening to reports from all the key centres of the world since Mr. Kennedy made his speech and I have the strong impression that almost everybody accepts ^{the} ~~that~~ fact that there has been this kind of ^{arms} build-up in Cuba. Even the United Nations Secretary-General, U. Thant, tacitly admits this in his call for a suspension of the blockade as well as of the arms shipments ^{Soviet bloc} And of course you have the ~~xxxxxx~~ countries and Cuba saying ~~that~~ the type of arms Cuba stocks and imports is her business and there is no reason why she should be accountable to anybody.

So I think we can say that all the evidence points to the fact that there was a very definite military build-up. ~~and the Americans~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~ground for~~

But surely, Cuba as a sovereign independent country has a right to do as she pleases: she has the right to choose the form of government under which she chooses to live; she has the right to choose her own friends and she has the right to make arrangements for her own defence. I do not think any reasonable person will question

is, we do not know if the Cabinet has seen a draft of it or whether it has been discussed at all. Perhaps we will have a clearer idea about this after Mr. Sangster has spoken tomorrow.

I think the second question is the minds of most people is: What sort of Budget is this likely to be? If by this anyone wonders exactly what Mr. Sangster's proposals will be, then your guess is as good as mine. If, on the other hand, you are interested in possible trends, then I would suggest that you look back to the J.L.P.'s election promises.

They have promised to reduce market fees: and they have done so. Mr. Lightbourne promised price controls on all those goods in common daily use as one way of fulfilling their election promise to bridge the gap between the have and the have-nots. So far the drop in the price of kerosene has made a great deal of difference to the poor country people, and we are all still confused as to exactly what price controls on drugs has achieved. Significantly, figures from the Department of Statistics suggests that for the first time in many months the cost-of-living has not risen. I would say that if you follow this pattern through you might decide that Mr. Sangster's Budget tomorrow will be geared to continue the process of making things easier ^{for} ~~the~~ the poorer sections of the Jamaican community. If a period of ~~austerity~~ ^{a period of} ~~and~~ achieving this means/tight money, then I hope the government will have the courage to follow it through. To go forward, Jamaica ~~xxx~~ ^{must} produce more, earn more and save more. Tomorrow we will know how far Mr. Sangster's Budget faces up to these challenges.

Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Oct 27 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: So far we have discussed the crisis over Cuba in terms of the happenings of the last few days: now I think it is time for us to go a little deeper into it. And this, I think, will bring us to the heart of the matter. So, let us begin with a simple and shocking statement.

If Cuba had not become a 'satellite' of the Soviet Union we would not have this crisis in the Caribbean today. It is because Cuba is located in the Caribbean Sea, just off the shores of the United States, in the American 'sphere of influence' and is a Russian satellite, that we^{do}/have the crisis. Or, let us put it another way, if Finland had become a satellite of the United States and the American had started setting up nuclear rocket bases ninety miles away from the Soviet border, there would have been a similar crisis. Of course, it is likely that the Russians would not have allowed things to go that far. They would have acted much more swiftly and much more ruthlessly, as they showed when they crushed the anti-Soviet Hungarian rising. The point is: in order for this type of crisis to develop a country has to be in one sphere of influence and become a satellite of the other great power. Obviously too, if Cuba were a satellite of the United States there would have been no reason for a crisis to develop. I hope you see what I am driving at. If you look back at all the crises that we have had since the Second World War - from Korea to the Congo to West Berlin to Cuba - they all come back to this simple basic proposition: the bitter ideological conflict between America and Russia, with Russia pressing to extend her power and influence and America pressing to contain it.

symbol for the whole country. And I believe sincerely that Jamaica desperately needs such a unifying symbol at this moment in its history. We need a man who is accepted and honoured by everyone, by P.N.P. and J.L.P; by N.W.U. and B.I.T.U.; by farmers in the rural areas and business people in the urban areas as the symbol of national unity.

I have no doubt in my own mind that Mr. Campbell can be and will be that unifying symbol for all of us - if we, and particularly the political parties allow him.

I think the two parties must now work out a gentlemen's agreement to make sure that when the new Governor-General takes office it will be as the Governor-General of the whole nation, representing the new spirit of independent Jamaica and symbolising its national ~~interests~~ character and interests. This will be relatively easy for the J.L.P. They, after all, chose the new Governor-General. But it is important that they should not regard him, or give anybody the impression that they regard him as 'their' Governor-General. The moment he assumes office, he is Jamaica's Governor-General, above party. The P.N.P. is obviously going to find learning this lesson much harder, as Mr. Manley's remarks about 'poor Campbell' showed. But if the P.N.P. does not learn the lesson then we might well be in for ^{that unhappy} ~~the~~ chain of ^{that takes place} events/when party is more important than country. If the P.N.P. were in power I would be saying the same thing of the J.L.P. because it seems to me that both parties need to think very carefully on this most important of all Jamaica's national and symbolic posts.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Oct 29 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The big news is Mr. Khrushchev's order to take down the Russian rocket bases in Cuba; and, from a long term point of view, his invitation to the United Nations to inspect the dismantling of the rocket bases. As far as we are concerned this means that there will be no war over the situation in Cuba. And that is just about as good as the news can be. And because we can breathe a deal more freely today than we could a week ago, the Budget which Mr. Donald Sangster will present to the House of Representatives tomorrow will have a lot more meaning for you and me than it would or could have had if there had been war. In any case, I propose to discuss the big news on Cuba tomorrow: this evening I want to give you a little bit of background against which to set whatever Mr. Sangster might announce tomorrow.

First, it seems most unlikely that Mr. Seaga will have the J.L.P.'s development plan ready for this year, so ~~whatever~~ ^{the} proposals will ^{will} Mr. Sangster ~~might~~ put forward ~~xxxxx~~, I think, be in the nature of interim proposals to carry us forward until next year, possibly until Budget time next year. In any case, the development plan when it is ready, will be a long-term thing spread over five or ten years or more, whereas the government has to present a Budget to the nation every year. The big thing is that if the J.L.P.'s development Plan were ready Mr. Sangster could have, and probably would have drafted his Budget with the long-term aims of the development plan in mind. Of course, it is possible that Mr. Sangster's proposals will in fact be part of the long term aims of the development plan: ~~we~~ ^{we} don't know, because we do not know at what stage of writing the development plan

blinding flash. And it is this knowledge that should make you and me and every ordinary person everywhere in the world celebrate United Nations Day/^{with}~~and~~ a special thankfulness.

You see, one of the reasons why we are still here today inspite of the totality of World War Two is because only one side had atomic weapons, and so that side could force the peace. Today, the two sides with whom war is most possible, both have highly 'sophisticated' weapons which can, within hours, destroy the world as we know it.

Our one hope for peace these past seventeen years has been the United Nations. At least three times, in Korea, in Berlin and in the Congo it looked as though the peace of the world/^{would}end and the new kind of 'sophisticated' war/^{be}unleashed on mankind. But each time war was averted, largely due to the efforts of the so-called neutralist members of the United Nations. In a very profound sense I think we can say that the smaller and weaker countries of the world have helped to keep the peace of the world because they had the United Nations as a forum from which to address the great powers. For this, if for no other reason, I think we should salute the United Nations: by being the world's greatest talking shop it has helped to keep the world's peace. But it has done more. It has and it still is preaching an international morality to the nations; and however slowly however poorly, the nations are beginning to get the message that political freedom, that economic security, that human dignity - that all these are indivisible. The great cry of mankind, the ancient cry, is still for peace and for bread. And the hope of achieving peace and break lie with the United Nations: if it fails, we fail. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Monday Oct 30th at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Tues

Good evening: The news of the easing of the ~~Cxxx~~ crisis over Cuba has been welcomed with relief all over the world. It is possible that there are people and governments who regret this turn of events: the Chinese communists, for instance, who sounded very much as though they hoped the Cuban crisis will see the beginning of an all-out war between the forces of communism and non-communism. But then the Chinese communists are in the most awful economic mess and anything - even a war of massive destruction - seems welcome to them as a way out. In contrast to the leaders of Chinese communism Mr. Khrushchev and the Russian leaders are positive doves of peace. ^{it is} And this impulse to war, ~~ix~~ expressed in the present mad-dog attack on India, that makes communist China such a disturbing force in the world today. But I will deal with that another time.

For the present, the Cuban crisis seems to be over. The Russians have agreed to dismantle their missile bases, pack them up and take them back home. And, equally important, they have agreed to have United Nations representatives on the spot to see that they do what they say they are going to do. ^{Today} ~~Tomorrow~~ the United Nations Secretary-General, U Thant, arrived in Cuba to work out these details. But although the Russians made the major concession by stepping down from their very tough and warlike position when they realised that the United States was serious, the Americans have also made a very important concession. President Kennedy has made a clear and open declaration that the United States will not invade Cuba. As far as the Cuban people and their leaders are concerned, this is most important. So, the picture now is: The Russians will dismant^{le}

their missile bases and take them, and presumably the Russian military personnel, back home; the United Nations will come in to supervise this operation; and as soon as it is completed the partial American blockade will be lifted. Finally, it seems that from here on the United Nations will have ^a greater say in the settling of the difference between the United States and Cuba.

One of the differences which, I think, has been ^{clarified & probably} settled for good is the establishing of the fact that whether you or I or Cuba likes it or not, the United States is not prepared to have any Russian ~~communist~~ military base set up in this part of the world. I think the Russians have got this point very clearly, and I think the Cubas have got it too. In a sense this is probably the most important point of all that has been established. The Monroe Doctrine which has been ~~scuffed~~ at as outdated and old-fashioned is suddenly a ~~hot~~ more up to date than its critics thought - simply because Mr. Kennedy dug in his heels and called Mr. Khrushchev's bluff.

Another important point of difference has to do with the American Naval base at Guantanamo Bay. One of Dr. Castro's first reactions to the settlement worked out between the United States and the Soviet Union was to demand that the Americans abandon the Guantanamo base. Now, whatever Dr. Castro's reason for making this demand at this time - and there are many who feel it is bitter disappointment at the way things have gone - I hope that when the question of the base does come up, it might be a point of departure for the re-establishment of good relations between Cuba and the United States. Tomorrow I will ^{give you my ideas} ~~discuss~~ some of the conditions for the re-establishment of good relations between the two countries, so till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Oct 31 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: One of the sad things about the human condition is that it is easier to destroy than it is to build. It is always much easier to sow the seeds of doubt and fear and hate and envy than it is to sow the seeds of trust and confidence and love and appreciation. And because this is so many of us, politicians, teachers, parents, leaders of thought, journalists and the like choose the easier way by playing of prejudice and on fear. And one of the meanest and most destructive concepts based on prejudice and fear is the concept of the 'enemy'. For very large numbers of the Americans/Cuba of today and the Cuban leaders in particular, are the 'enemy': and always, the enemy is everything that is horrible and nasty and evil. By the same token, for the leaders of today's Cuba and for very large numbers of Cubans, the United States and its leaders are the 'enemy', and again the enemy is everything that is horrible and nasty and evil. Thus each side has built up ~~and~~ wall of fear and hate against the other. It seems to me that one of the most important things that needs to be done is for this wall of fear and hate to be broken down, if better relations are to be established between the United States and Cuba. The concept of the 'enemy' ~~byxxxxxxxixxxx~~ should be give up by both sides and in its place they should try to cultivate the concept of the neighbour - and if possible, that noble F.D.R. concept of the 'Good Neighbour'.

But to arrive at this point both sides will have to face up to a number of hard facts. So let us list these, beginning with what the Cubans will have to face up to. Cuba will have to face up to the fact that she is in the American sphere; that all twenty

Latin American countries who are members of the O.A.S. sided with the U.S. and against her, and that if she wants the respect of these countries she will have to accord them respect; she will have to face the fact, amply proved last week, that in any real showdown, she might find herself alone; and she must face up to the fact you cannot kick a man in the teeth and then demand that he buys your sugar at special preferential rates. It seems to me that the Cubans have deliberately remembered only the evils of the past relationship with the Yankees. If the concept of the 'enemy' is to be replaced then they must admit that there was good too - that indeed, the Yankees ^{help} fought a war to/achieve the independence of Cuba.

For its part the United States must face up to the fact that much of what happened in Cuba stemmed from earlier American policy there and in Latin America; that it is only yesterday that American policy seemed all for the reactionaries and the rightwing dictators and the strong men; and that the Cubans and all other people do genuinely have the right to run their own affairs in their own way, whether Uncle Sam likes it or not. I think the U.S. should face up to the fact that it did, by all kinds of pressures, try to bring down the Castro regime. I think that if both sides were to face up ^{in the past} to where they have been wrong, it could be the foundation of a new beginning, the start of a happier era of U.S.-Cuban relations. If Cuba's ^{Castro does} ~~leaders do~~ not make this attempt then I see no future for the Cuban revolution. And if the United States does not accomodate Cuba then ^{they run the risk of being compromised with} ~~I see no difference between it~~ and the ruthless and power-hungry ^{that they} communism it opposes. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Nov 1 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The high points in Mr. Sangster's new Budget are very clear - indeed, if you have had a beer today, or if you bought a gallon of gas today or yesterday, you know all about it. Since midnight on Tuesday we have paid a penny more on our bottle of beer and a penny more on our gallon of gas. It is estimated that the penny more we pay on beer will bring the government something like £220,000 in a full year; and the penny more we pay on our gas will bring it about £100,000 a year. So these two items alone will bring the government £320,000 a year. And, for the taxpayers, this is a relatively painless way of doing it. Other tax increases are: a penny more stamp duty on cheques, 2/6 more on the property conveyance stamp duty, higher duty on imported furniture, and a 5% increase on motor car imports. All in all, these tax increases are estimated to bring in something like £580,000 a year.

Against this, the Minister of Finance has announced certain tax cuts. Market fees are cut by 25% as from today. Truck licences will, from next year, cost half of what they now cost - but this is only for trucks which are used to carry people and goods to and from market. Building societies will be relieved of tax on up to 7½% of their reserves until the money is brought into use when it will be taxed. They will also be relieved of stamp duty on transactions of a value below £1,500. At the moment stamp duty is charged on transactions of £500 and over. The tax on boats valued at less than £250 will be removed. The 2/6 withholding tax on money brought into the island for buildings and utilities is to be removed, and so is Estate Duty on new capital. Finally, up to a total of £1,500

earned
the/incomes of husbands and wives are to be seperated for the 1963 assessment. All these cuts and tax reliefs together amount to roughly £188,000 in a full year.

So, the final picture is that the government will collect additional taxes to the tune of £580,000 and will lose £188,000 in the form of tax concessions. And if you tax the losses from the gains, then the Government still comes out £392,000/a year the richer on this transaction. So much for the arithmetic of the business.

The interesting thing from the non-arithmetical point of view is what this budget exercise tells us about the government's thinking. All the concessions, as I suggested would happen on Monday, all the concessions are designed to make things easier for the poorer sections. But this was to be expected if the J.L.P. were to keep its election promises. It is not however a 'soak the rich' budget as one or two rather aggressive capitalist friends of mine suggested to me. In the light of the needs of the country, the need for more houses, more schools, more jobs, more hope, - in the light of these needs, the collecting of roughly half a million pounds a year more in taxes seems to me to be very small beer indeed. The whole exercise seems to be one of making sure that the books look good: that our balance of payments picture should look better than in the past; that our cost of living picture should look better. Please do not think that I am scoffing at this. Balancing our books is very important. But it is not the most important thing Jamaica needs today. Our most important need seems to me to get the economy going. And on this the budget tell us very little. However, we have other clues as to J.L.P. thinking and I will discuss some of these tomorrow: so till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Friday Nov 2 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last night I told you that the Budget tells is very little on how to get the economy going. To see just what I mean, let us examine the four-million-seven-hundred thousand-odd pounds earmarked for capital expenditure. More than a quarter of this sum of money - one-million-three-hundred-and-eighty-odd thousand pounds are our membership subscriptions to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Another one-million-three-hundred-thousand-odd pounds is earmarked for capital grants for roads, water supplies, loans to the K.S.A.C. and Parish Councils, the Water Commission and so forth. When you add these two totals together you are pretty close to three million pounds of the money earmarked for capital expenditure. And all these undertakings do not add up to undertakings that get the economy going: they will keep it ticking over, they will give work to a few thousand men but they will not, of themselves, bring more jobs or more wealth into being.

It is however, when you look at the capital expenditure estimates for the Ministry of Agriculture and for the Ministry of Trade and Industry that you begin to see some sort of value as to where the government is going. In agriculture, over half a million pounds is earmarked for the Agricultural Development Programme; just under a quarter million for the Development of land settlements, and a little less than fifty-thousand pounds for fisheries. In all, the Ministry of Agriculture will spend a total of one-million-four hundred-and-twenty-five-thousand-odd pounds. And if you have kept any sort of check on the way this government has been going about its business, you will realise that agriculture is one of their top

priorities. Indeed, when Mr. Gyles, the Minister of Agriculture spoke at the Farquharson Institute of Public Affairs on Wednesday, he made it very clear that the J.L.P. Government will go all-out to make a success of agriculture. My own information is that the long-term target is nothing less than that Jamaica should feed itself from its own land. And as Mr. Gyles said on Wednesday, there will be special incentives towards this end. So, my guess is that slowly but certainly the move will be towards economic farming. And economic farming means mechanisation and fewer people on the land. When Mr. Gyles talks about his ^{efficient} medium-sized farm of between 25 and 50 acres, he must know that it also means fewer people on the land. The big question which I think has not been faced is that efficient agriculture will almost certainly mean an increase in the ranks of the unemployed.

It is at this point that the Ministry of Trade and Industry comes in. That Ministry has a little over a million and a half pounds to spend for this fiscal year - most of it on promoting industrial development and tourism and on its factory building programmes. And so the grand design seems to me to be an efficient agriculture backed up by new industries in the depressed rural areas, to absorb as much of the landless unemployed as possible. If this design works then Kingston will gradually cease to be the economic centre of Jamaica: there will be a dramatic drop in luxury imports, a period of austerity with features of the welfare state and, later, a more even distribution of the national wealth. And please do not forget that the subscriptions to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund entitles Jamaica to borrow on a really massive scale, if she wishes to. But obviously, she should only borrow in order to generate more wealth. And for this she needs a well thought-out economic plan. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Nov 3 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Two cases of very poor service make me feel that it is time to return to a discussion of service. Most, if not all of us, earn our livings in giving service of some sort in exchange for the money we need to pay our way in the world. In some cases, as with shops and ~~xxxxxx~~ banks and restaurants, the service is sold to the general public. In such cases, if the person who buys the service, either by buying a meal or clothes or by opening an account - if that person is not satisfied with the type of service he gets, he can always show his disapproval by taking his business elsewhere. If you do not like the way a shop assistant behaves you can always refuse to shop at that place; or you can call the management and complain, and because they are dependent on you for their business, they will make sure that the shop assistant behaves next time. If the management does nothing about the unsatisfactory service of its shop assistants, it will soon ~~disappear~~ experience a drop in its business turn-over - and this is something that really hurts any business. I know one downtown eating and drinking place that became so popular that it could hardly cope with all the business, especially at lunchtime. The result was that service became poor: the time-gap between your order and your getting it grew longer. And then the inevitable happened. Customers got fed up and drifted away. Another place opened and, being a new broom, offered and gave better service. And so today you will find most of the people who once went to the original place going to this new place and to other places. In this way they have shown their

disapproval of the poor service of that downtown eating and drinking place. And I think it is going to take ~~along~~ time and a great deal of effort for that place to win back a quarter of the customers it lost. The management of that place is going to painfully learn the lesson that it does not pay to sell your customers short. ~~This~~ And this is fine because the customer can hit back when he or she is not satisfied.

But what happens where the customer cannot hit back? When he gets poor and shoddy service at the post office or from the rural water supply people, what does he do? A young Jamaican who recently returned from England spent over an hour the other day at the parcels post office on Orange Street trying to get a parcel of his own used clothes which he had sent home in advance of coming back ~~back~~ because he ~~did not want to~~ ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ pay extra air charges. When he arrived he told the customs people that these clothes were coming by surface mail. But in spite of that, when the clothes arrived, he had to fill out forms all over again, hang around for an hour and then leave without his parcel because the people were too busy and could not find his parcel and then the lunch hour came. The K.S.A.C. rural water supply thing is a little more personal. From twelve noon on Wednesday until ^{eleven} ~~ten~~ o'clock on Thursday morning my home was without water because the people working ^{main} on the ~~road~~ burst the pipe and the gentleman from ^{the} rural water supply department, who saw what ^{landrover} happened and who had a ~~jeep~~ at his disposal, did not think it was important enough to make any kind of effort. The trouble is that the young Jamaican cannot withhold his business from the parcels post office and I cannot withhold my business from the K.S.A.C.'s rural water supply department. If we could we would not get such shoddy service. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Nov 5 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Since this is youth clubs' week, and therefore a week that should be dedicated to the interests of youth - let us talk about youth: but let us do so frankly and honestly and critically instead of going in for the usual pointless platitudes. So, what is the essential problem of youth in Jamaica? And what is the essential challenge of youth to Jamaica?

To the extent that you can generalise about any group of people, I think most of us will agree that one of the basic characteristics of youth - and this applies to youth anywhere in the world - is its deepseated idealism and yearning for nobility of thought and action. You know this as well as I do. Both you and I have passed through this phase of life as young people. This was the time of life when we wanted to do something big and great and good and beautiful. Often, we did not know just what it was that we wanted to do: but we knew we wanted to do something good. Some of us wanted to be great explorers; others wanted to be great fliers or great musicians or great artists or great writers - or great anything - just provided it was great. At that age girls see 'The Lady with the Lamp' who looked after the soldiers in the Crimean War as the most noble example of service, and many of them wanted to be nurses: others developed a passionate love for animals and for them the most noble thing in life was to be the protector of defenceless little creatures. And so it went. Boys and girls dreaming great and beautiful dreams of service and love. You know all this as well as I do. All you have to do is sit back and remember your own high-minded dreams when you were young.

We all wanted to make the world a better place than we found it. But do you remember how the so-called practical realities of life destroyed the dream in us? And what were these practical realities? That our elders and betters judged each other by their material possessions. They showed us that success was measured by how much money you made, and how big a car you ran and how much property you owned. These were the values of the society and in order to live in and with the society, we had to accept these values. We saw for ourselves that the wealth of the successful merchant commanded more respect than the selfless service of the social worker or the teacher. Often we wanted to revolt against the results of this ~~xxxixix~~ ^{false} set of values - and this the grown-ups called the rebelliousness or the radicalism of youth. This was the case in your youth and mine, and this is ^{still} the case for youth today. And you know, I think ^{you and} I would have been ~~x~~ very much better humans being today, and I think ^{our} ~~the~~ world would have been a much better place today, if our elders and betters had set us a better example ^{holding on to their values and} in/serving the community. Perhaps we would not have had to exchange the noble dreams of our youth for the doubtful material security of our middle years. Indeed, I think that if we had channelised the dreams of our youth into transforming the face of the country Jamaica today might have been a vastly different place. And this, I think, is the big challenge for the future: Can we who are in charge today create a climate of thinking, a set of values, that would give today's youth a positive chance to live out its noble dream of service? And remember, for the young there is no better teacher, no greater inspirer than ~~example~~ ^{example}. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY
For transmission on
Tuesday Nov 6 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Cuban situation and the war on the borders between India and China make up the two most urgent problems facing the world today. Because of its closeness to us, the Cuban situation has dominated our attention to such an extent that the very serious happenings in ~~China~~ India have been partly ignored. But you know, if world war does break out, it will indeed be total war, with every corner of the earth and sky and sea as battlefield and with no hiding place anywhere. So while it is natural for us to be more concerned about what happens 90 miles away, it is misguided to think that what happens in faraway India is any less important or meaningful or dangerous to us. In today's world we are all, willy-nilly, intimately involved with each other and no conflict is too far away to bring disaster to us here in Jamaica. For this reason it is most important that we be as up-to-date about the Indian conflict as we are about the Cuban situation. But let us make a concession to proximity and look at Cuba first.

I think the latest developments in Cuba point to two things. The first and most important has to do with a subtle change in Soviet Cuban relations. You will remember that after the height of the crisis, when Mr. Khrushchev agreed to dismantle the Soviet rockets, he also agreed to United Nations inspection of this operation. Developments since have ^{made} it clear that Mr. Khrushchev had/this inspection decision without first consulting the Cuban government. Dr. Castro's refusal to have United Nations inspection, and his public admittance that there were differences between his government and the Soviet government, underscored this change in relations.

The way I see it, it looks very much as though Russia behaved as she would have done with some Eastern European Satellite: when it comes to crucial decisions, you either make a show of consulting your satellites or else you do not consult them at all. Things were happening too fast, the situation was too tense for the Russians to consult Dr. Castro: or else they considered it such a minor detail that nobody bothered. I think the Russians assumed, not unnaturally, that most satellites have a way of falling in line and they expected Cuba to do so. Dr. Castro's reaction must have come as something of a shock, hence the present visit of Mr. Mikoyan. There is an awful lot of rather pointless talk as to who scored what over the Cuban crisis and I certainly do not want to get involved in this. What does seem to me important is that Dr. Castro's defiant reaction to the inspection business in the face of the Russian undertaking, and the Chinese communist support of this, is another blow at the concept of Russia as the sort infallible headquarters of all communist knowledge, wisdom and understanding. And this, from a long-term, historical point of view, is very important indeed.

The second thing that seems to emerge from the latest news on Cuba is Dr. Castro's disappointment with Russian behaviour, in spite of his protestations about Marxism-Leninism. It certainly looks as though Dr. Castro expected the Russians to do more for Cuba ^{in this crisis} than they have/ done. Just how much more and what, is anybody's guess. What I think he did not expect was this unilateral action on the part of Mr. Khrushchev. I think it is because this ^{and angered} upset/him so much that he rejected what amounted to United Nations intervention. And there are many who feel U.N. intervention would be in Cuba's best interests.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Nov 7 at 6.15p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: To begin to make any sense out of the present conflict between India and China we must talk about size. And if we talk about size in terms of land area only then Russia with over eight million square miles of territory is the largest country in the world and China with just under three and three-quarter million square miles is the second largest country in the world. Using this yardstick of size only, India is only the seventh largest country in the world with just over a million square miles. So, in sheer physical size we are dealing with massive countries where one thousand two thousand or even ten thousand square miles of territory is very small indeed. That is point number one.

Point number two still has to do with size. If you measure the size of a country by its land area plus its population then the picture becomes even more dramatic. China has a population somewhere in the region of six hundred to six hundred and fifty million people; making her the largest single country on earth in terms of area and population. India has between four hundred and four-hundred and fifty million people, making her the second largest country on earth by this ~~area~~ area-and-population yardstick. So, this is an encounter of giants, with China having ~~an~~ an advantage of some two-hundred millions in population and more than two million square miles in land.

The third point we have to bear in mind is that the fighting is taking place on 'top of the world', in the high Himalayas, in land where you cannot grow food or building industries unless you spend countless millions on controlling and changing the weather by artificial means. So the land over which they are fighting has

very little value in terms of supplying food or wealth or homes. So we come to our first big point: although the fighting is supposed to be over the borders between India and China, these are just an excuse. China does not need that land to create more land space for its people. So why has she launched this attack on India - because, make no mistake about it, China is the aggressor?

One suggestion to explain the Chinese aggression is that she is diverting attention from her own internal economic failures. I think there is a great deal to this. China is and has for some time now been in an economic mess. The Great Leap Forward fell flat on its face and the mass of the Chinese people have been having a rough time. But important as it is, I think the economic aspect is only one part of the reason. I think the second, and possibly most important part of the reason has to do with the thinking of the Chinese communist leadership on communism and how you bring it about in the world.

I think it is most important to remember this crucial fact about most of the present Chinese leaders. For practically all their lives, they have been at war. From 1911 ~~xxxxxx~~, when Sun Yat-sen led the movement that overthrew the Manchu Dynasty, until 1949 when Mao Tse-tung proclaimed the People's Republic, China's present communist leaders were at war. For the best part of thirty years and more they were either in underground war or openly at war. And so war became a habit, a way of solving problems, something that they understood and handled better than anything else. If I am right in this then I think the thinking of the present rulers of China is the gravest threat to the peace of the world, and the attack on India is a sort of first exercise in the use of war as a political weapon. Only a crushing defeat can show them the folly of this: but can India inflict it?.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Nov 8 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: So much that is interesting and important has happened this week that I find it a little difficult to know where to begin. Out of the meetings of this session of parliament ~~have~~ has come a number of important moves. There are the details of the setting up of a marketing corporation for agricultural products; and there are the new terms of reference for the reconstituted Agricultural Development Corporation. Both of these are matters of very great importance which are likely to have a very profound bearing on the economic future of Jamaica. But I told you about this and about the government's thinking on agriculture in my comments of last Thursday and Friday.

Two other very important local matters of this week was the meeting of the civil servants and the clearing of the air on the relations between the civil servants and the politicians. I think Mr. Arthur Brown did the country a very important service when he outlined the duties, responsibilities and rights of the civil servant. I sincerely hope that both the civil servants and the politicians will take what Mr. Brown said to heart. Indeed, Mr. Arthur Brown in his own person is a wonderful example of the objective civil servant whose job it is to serve the elected government of the country - no matter which party is in power. I hope too that both the politicians and the civil servants will now drop this argument and get on with the urgent business of the country, as Arthur Brown ^{insisted} urged.

And still on the local scene, there was Mr. Seaga's announcement yesterday that the J.B.C. would get the franchise to bring television to Jamaica. In common with a number of other people I had expected

the J.B.C. to get the franchise - unless some very extraordinary new feature cropped up. And there was and is nothing remarkable about this, if you know Mr. Seaga's thinking on the social, cultural and educational needs of Jamaica. To give television to a private company would, almost inevitably, lead to its being operated primarily as a commercial venture with the main motive being the earning of a profit. It would be a private business undertaking and the whole point of any private business undertaking is the making of profits. By giving it to the J.B.C. the government has made sure that this fantastically powerful medium will have ^{as} its primary motive ~~for~~ the serving of the Jamaican community.

There is another point which I think should be mentioned here.
 Jamaica Labour Party
 Before the ~~present government~~ came to power some of its spokesmen had very little time for the J.B.C. They saw it as a waste of public money and there was even talk of it being scrapped or sold. To now entrust the running of television to this same J.B.C. is a clear recognition of its usefulness to the Jamaican community. In this sense, I think Mr. Seaga and indeed the whole government have expressed what amounts to a high vote of confidence in the Jamaica Broadcasting Corporation. Incidentally, the report of the Broadcasting Authority also expresses this same confidence and approval of the J.B.C. though it does not like the 'monotonous similarity' in so-called popular music between the two stations at certain times. I agree completely: but let me note in passing that Canada's C.B.C. gets something like seventy percent of its revenue from the government whereas the J.B.C. gets only something like thirty percent of its revenue from the Government. It has to earn the other seventy percent by catering to the lowest common denominator. Television, fortunately, will not be in that position and that is very good indeed.....Goodnight.

- 1) Nyerere & Tanganyika
- 2) B.G. Independence Conference Collapses
- 3) U.S. Mid-term Elections
- 4) Eleanor Roosevelt

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Nov 9 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: On December 9th of this year the East African Dominion of Tanganyika will become a republic and Julius Nyerere will become its first president. This week Tanganyika held its first presidential election and out of every one hundred people who cast their votes ninety-seven are reported to have voted for Julius Nyerere and three for his rival. And so, this week, Nyerere has given his own answer to the questions so many of us asked when he resigned as Prime Minister of Tanganyika last year. His resignation was part of the master-plan to solidify his Tanganyika African National Union, confuse and rout his enemies and emerge as the strong first president when his country becomes a republic. As this week's voting shows, he has done all this with the skill of a master politician. But the really tough days are still ahead and it will be interesting to see whether Julius Nyerere will avoid the dangers and pitfalls of power which have made Nkrumah a ~~vixen~~ very lonely and almost a prisoner and disturbed man/in his castle in Accra.

The second important item of news from the outside world was the collapse of the British Guiana constitutional conference - which means that that country's move towards independence has once more been put back by the country's leaders. Already these leaders have started blaming each other and everybody else for the collapse of the conference. Mr. Forbes Burnham's Peoples National Congress and Mr. Peter D'Aguiar's United Force both blame Dr. Cheddi Jagan. Jagan, on the other hand, blames the British for the collapse. Burnham and D'Aguiar wanted Jagan to agree to a general election before

independence is proclaimed, and for that election, and possibly all subsequent elections, to be conducted on the basis of proportional representation. Proportional representation means a system of by which parties get parliamentary seats on the basis of the popular vote. For instance, under proportional representation, it would be possible to say that for every five thousand votes or for every ten thousand votes a party gets it should be given one seat. At present

Dr. Jagan has more seats in the Guianese parliament than the two opposition parties combined: but the two opposition parties combined collected more popular votes than Jagan did; so, if the last election had been held under proportional representation Jagan's present majority ~~will~~ would have been cancelled and transformed into a minority

So Jagan does not want a new election before independence, and he certainly does not want it under proportional representation. And so the parties could not arrive at any agreement in London. But Jagan still wanted an independence date chosen and when Britain said that she would only agree if there was agreement among the delegates themselves, Jagan turned around and blamed Britain for the failure of the conference. This is patently nonsense. The real reason for the failure is that British Guiana today is a house divided against itself on ugly racial and communal lines.

And now for the United States:

/? ~~Finally~~ the mid-Term U.S. elections have proved a personal triumph for President Kennedy hard on the heels of the Cuba business. They have also destroyed all Mr. Nixon's political hopes. As of now Mr. Kennedy's opponent at the next Presidential elections look like being Mr. Rockefeller....Finally, the death of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt lady ended the life of a great and gracious/and a very good human being.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Nov 10 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Just before Jamaica's last general elections the Jamaica Public Service Company mounted what was in effect a campaign to try and get the then Government to agree to a raise in electricity rates. This affair became so stormy that it developed into something of an issue and I, as well as others, expressed the view that the company seemed to be playing at politics. Certainly, the timing of the Company's campaign and the manner in which it was conducted supported such a view. And those of us who commented on it at the time suggested that it was not in the company's best interests to get involved or to seem to get involved in the country's politics. At the height of the scrap, and by the time that the matter had become something of a political football, Mr. Wills Isaacs who was then Minister of Trade and Industry, passed regulations freezing rates. About this time, or just a little before, Sir Alexander Bustamante made a public declaration that his party would not agree to a raise in rates, should they be returned to power. He did say, however, that if returned his government would seek ways and means of making it easier for the company to raise money. You will remember that the Company said it needed this additional capital for development purposes.

Now we have the news that the Company has decided to cut its staff by eleven percent - which would be round about a hundred people. The reason for this, the company says, is because its profits have dropped by eighteen percent in the first six months of this year and by twenty-six percent during the third quarter of the year. The workers who will be dispensed with, according to

the Company's President, are those who have been engaged specifically for construction in relation to the Company's development programme. ~~The~~ Company, it seems, has now decided that it is unable to finance that development programme and so it has decided to abandon it.

You will remember that when this issue of higher rates first came up way back before the elections, I told you that it seemed to me that the Company expected us, the consumers, to finance its development programme for it: and I asked why we, the consumers, should be expected to pay, and pay quite high rates for the service we buy, and should also be expected on top of all this to put additional wealth into the pockets of the Company's shareholders by financing their capital programme for them. I did not see any reason for it then and I do not see any reason for it now.

But this time the Company did not ask for a raise of rates - or, if it did, it did not do so publicly.

Instead it has created what you might describe as a 'situation'. Sir Alexander Bustamante's telegram to the Company suggests that he thinks the Company has created this situation as a prelude to a demand for higher rates. And he has made it clear that he will have no part of it and will, if necessary, take counter measures. I hope the Company will think very seriously before its next move. Rural Jamaica desperately needs and must have electricity if there is to be real development. If this operator cannot or will not give it without expecting Jamaica to pay through the nose, then Jamaica must find other ways and means of doing what needs to be done. It would be a mistake for anyone to assume that Jamaica is not capable, or is afraid of such action. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Nov 12 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Saturday's news of the Belgian woman who was freed of the charge of murdering her baby, raises, I think, one of the most serious and difficult moral issues man has to face. And it is this: Have you, or I, or any other human being the right, as individuals, to decide whether another human being should live or die? Has a husband or a father or a mother the right to decide whether a child should live or die?

Now, it is all very well to be high-minded and moral and make sweeping statements about what is right and what is wrong. But I confess I would be hard put to think in moral terms if someone very near and dear to me suffering from a painful and incurable disease were to beg me to help them out of their unending misery. I am not sure of how I would react if such a loved one were suffering ^{from} ~~in~~ an advanced state of, let us say, malignant cancer. Let me put it even more bluntly: if my wife were the victim and I were watching her suffer day after day; and if I knew that the only times she is not in ~~xxxx~~ agony is when she is under the influence of drugs; and if the whole business is one hopeless and unending piece of misery: if in ~~the~~ circumstances she were to ask me to help end her misery - I am not sure of what I would do. What I am sure of is that whatever I do will be based on my love and my concern for my wife and not on any high-minded principles. And I think I can say the same for my wife if I were the victim.

But ~~of course~~ this is a case where we would talk and think the matter out: she will not decide for me and I will not decide for her - we will arrive at something together. And this is a very different

proposition from deciding whether a child should or should not live because it has some physical deformity. I frankly do not think that either my wife or I have any right, once a child is born to us, to destroy the life of that child. And the fact the the child suffers from some physical, or even mental, deformity does nothing to change this fact.

There are two reasons why I feel like this, and both are very practical. The case of Helen Keller is the classic example of one of my two reasons. Miss Keller was born blind, deaf and dumb - and yet this woman lived to contribute more to humanity and to human happiness and understanding than ninety-nine-point-nine percent of those of us who are supposed to be normal. If the parents of Helen Keller had decided to kill her because they thought they knew what a misery her life would be, the world would have been a much poorer place. And this, you must agree, is a very practical reason for denying parents the right to kill their deformed children. Not even love confers this particular type of right to kill. And the second an equally practical reason is that the entire fabric of civilised life and living will break down if you or I or anybody else were free to decide, as individuals, or that human ~~being~~ child should not go on living because of some physical handicap. If such a decision has to be made then it must be a social decision made by a whole society: even then I would not be sure of its rightness or wisdom. What I am sure of in my own mind is that it was wrong for that Belgian mother to take the life of her eight-day-old child. ~~No one - not the mother nor the father nor the relatives nor the family doctor - no one, it seems to me, should~~ ~~have the private right to decide life or death.~~ That is why that Belgian court was so wrong in its sentence. ~~All~~

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Nov 13 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think one of the big problems we face here in Jamaica is dramatised in a letter I received from a Rastafarian who lives at Back-O-Wall and who simply signs himself 'James'. So let me read the letter first and then relate its contents to this big problem of which I speak. This is the letter:

"I am a Rastafarian man with a wife and four children. I do a little gardening work in people's yards. I hear people talking about things of which I know myself, because I and others like me are not fools as some of you take us to be. The other night you talked about a cut of the penny off the price of kerosene: well, that penny cut is only for the man buying a gallon and upwards, not for the poor people who buy a penny-and-a-halfpenny worth or even a quart bottle. The small margin of a penny in the price cut is too small to benefit those who buy in small quantities, so it costs the poorer people the same as it did before the cut. So this is nothing to talk about. Why do you not say it is a shame to see how the price of thread has been raised from 1/9d to 2/-, especially as it is the poor who use thread more than the rich because they have to keep on mending old clothes. And there are other articles for which we are also paying more now. So, talking about a penny off kerosene oil is so much nonsense. Find something else to talk about. We are not fools and as time goes on we will see. I am asking you to tell the government to find work ~~for~~ and jobs for Christmas. I will be listening over the radio to hear if you are doing so for me and then I will know if Mass P is working correct. Don't be afraid to talk your mind. We are meeting hell at a time like now. I can't even give one of my pickney a shoe."

The letter is simply signed James.

Now let us look at this letter. First you will notice that I will be judged as working correct if I do what my Rasta friend James wants me to do - which is to tell the government to provide Christmas work. The inference is that if I do not do this then I am not working correct. And so it would seem that James does not trust me to do or say what is right unless he uses a gentle form of moral blackmail. Next you will notice the way in which he dismisses the reduction in the price of kerosene - I have left out a rather strong word he used in his letter. As far as James is concerned clipping a penny off the price of kerosene seems to be some sort of political fraud because people who buy kerosene in small quantities do not notice the price difference. The point may be true. But the spirit in which the point is made is unhealthy. James is distrustful. The assumption seems to be that there is some trickery and some malice or that some sort of fast one is being pulled in the penny cut on the price of kerosene and in talking about it. And this, I think, is one of the big problems facing Jamaica - this ^{deepseated} ~~deepseated~~ distrust of almost anything the government does: and this is not confined to the present government. I found the same sort of attitude towards the previous government too. There is a sort of general attitude among large numbers of people that no government of Jamaica is any good. I think we must drop this attitude. It is destructive and it is a brake on progress. But I think there is something worse to it. By sneering at your government you also repudiate all responsibility to your society. And this, I think, is what far too many Jamaicans are doing. Tomorrow I will tell you ^{more} ~~what I think we should do~~ about it. So till, then. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Nov 14 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Who are ^{the} ~~are~~ people who are repudiating their responsibility to the Jamaica society? Last night I told you about my Rasta friend James who sneered ^{at} the reduction of the price of kerosene by a penny. I have met my people like James. In fact a sizeable section of the Jamaican community is like that - even though they are not all Rastas. ~~That~~ ^{is} thing is not a party political thing. For them it does not matter which party is in power: they just go on sneering at everything. And if they are poor and if life is hard - it is for James - then they use that as both excuse and justification for this destructive attitude. You know them as well as I do: they will work alright, but only on their terms. They want to get big pay and do little work and come when they like and go off when they like. And if you dare to criticise them they tell you about oppression and exploitation and the like. But they represent only one side of the penny. On the other side you have the affluent citizen, the person who has done well and who owns his house and his car. He may be in the civil service or in business. The one thing he has in common with the poor man of Back-O-Wall is that they both sneer and are contemptuous of the government of the day. Let Manley launch an industrialisation programme and they will find some reason to low-rate it and find fault with what he and his people are doing: let Busta try to create greater equity by cutting down living costs and they will low-rate that and find fault with him and his people. The impulse is to cheapen and to tear down. It is everywhere around us. It is not confined to one section or to one class. It has shot right through the society. And it has resulted in a sort of destructive

meanness with which the society is in danger of choking itself. We all sneer at anybody else's effort to do anything noble and decent. Right now we are seeing an element of this in the two political parties. If you belong to the party in power then the villains of the piece are the people you have just replaced. If you belong to the opposition party then the people in power now just cannot possibly run the government - and so you sneer at them and spread it around, whether it hurts Jamaica or not. Look at your business people and it is the same thing; look at the professional people and it is the same thing; look at organised labour and you have the same thing. Each component part of the society sees itself and sees its interests as being more important than the interests of the society.

And this, I suggest, is part of the reason why there is this great uncertainty in the land today. Nobody trusts anybody else, nobody has any faith in the good intentions and in the motives of anybody else. In short, the problem is one of a state of mind. The problem is for Jamaicans to rediscover themselves now that they are independent, and to rediscover (or give birth to) a faith in each other and in Jamaica and its future. You cannot go on being a guest in the land of your birth or even in the land you have adopted. The guest expects to be served and looked after. The member of the household rolls up his sleeves and shares in creating what is needed. The trouble is that too many Jamaicans, like my Rasta friend James, want to be guests in the land of their birth. It is time to decide to work and press for what they want: and the beginning of this is faith in themselves and in their institutions. That is a key responsibility of the citizen in and to his society. Without that there can be no healthy, stable society. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
 Thursday Nov 15 at 6.15p.m
 Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last night I talked about the basic need of all Jamaicans to have faith in their own institution. This morning I read the news of some J.L.P. Supporters jeering and booing Mr. Manley ~~after~~ as he left Gordon House after last night's sitting of parliament. According to the report, the police had to clear the area before Mr. Manley could drive his car away. I think that was a dreadful. I do not think Mr. Manley deserves this kind of treatment from any group of Jamaicans - no matter what their party. And as I say this I can almost see those of my listeners who are P.N.P. supporters nodding with approval and agreeing with me. What I am afraid of is that many of them will agree with me for the wrong reasons. These same people will see nothing wrong and only cause for amusement if they read the news of a group of P.N.P. supporters jeering and booing at Sir Alexander Bustamante. So, let me make my own view quite clear on this matter. I do not think that either Sir Alexander Bustamante or Mr. Norman Manley deserve this kind of treatment from any group of Jamaicans. Whether you agree or disagree with them, both these men have contributed too greatly to the progress of Jamaica for any other Jamaican to turn on either of them and jeer or boo. If you jeer at ^{Mr. Sir Alexander} Manley or Bustamante you are ^{of the two men} jeering at one or the other or both/who have done more than anybody else in the world to create Jamaica as it is today. Whatever their faults, and we all have our faults, these two men have served Jamaica in a way that is rare and unique. It is part of the meanness and some Jamaicans destructiveness in ~~xxxxxxx~~ that there are still people who want to jeer and sneer at these two great Jamaican patriots. Disagree with

them - that is your right; argue with them - that too is your right; use your vote to remove them from office - that is the most important of all your rights. But you do not have the right to jeer and boo and sneer at them. They are much too big for you or I to do that: they have served too well. But even more important than the fact of the greatness of their contribution is the fact that you reduce yourself and you reduce Jamaica when you try to reduce these men to the cheap level of jeering and sneering. They have become part of those Jamaican institutions that we need to honour and to have faith in if we are to build a stable and prosperous and integrated society. So please, all you J.L.P. fanatics and all you P.N.P. fanatics, and all you non-party scoffers, stop and think about Jamaica's symbols and Jamaica's institutions: and then set about building them up instead of trying to tear them down. Jamaica needs the stabilising influences of all her symbols and all her institutions very badly in these early days of her independence. Her stability demands respect for her political institutions and her national leaders - and this must begin with a due sense of respect for her two most outstanding political leaders.

Finally, yesterday's news of the knighting of Sir Clifford Campbell is very welcome indeed. But the fact that the government has agreed to this signal honour/also suggests that we can now put aside all the talk about Jamaica becoming a republic. The knighting of ~~the~~ Sir Clifford and the Prime Minister's well-known affection for the monarchy means just that. And once again, in terms of the basic need for stability based on known and accepted institutions, this is wise. No elected president could, at present, be as important a symbol as the Queen's representative in Jamaica. Goodnight.

- 1) Anti-Polio treatment
- 2) B.G. Rice
- 3) ~~Abolition of Trade Board~~
Price Controls

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Nov 16 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I hope all of you, especially the mothers with little children, listened to Tuesday evening's broadcast by Dr. Eldermire, the Minister of Health. He talked about the anti-polio campaign which started this week. The Minister said that it looked very much as though next year will be a bad year for polio in Jamaica, and he mentioned figures for 1954 and 1960 to show that children under the age of five years were most likely to be hardest hit by any polio outbreak. So, you mothers who have children of five years and under, please heed the Minister's call and get your children treated. Polio not only deforms and damages the body, it is a killer too. And this killer is likely to be at large in Jamaica next year.

There is another important point to note. In the past the only ~~form~~ treatment against polio was in the form of injections and I know many parents refused to have their children injected because they do not like the idea of 'the needle'. Well, this time there is no need for injections. There is now a new vaccine which can be taken by the mouth. You give it to the child in exactly the same way as you give it cough syrup - and it is just as sweet and nice as cough syrup. So that particular problem is out of the way. But you must see to it that your child gets three doses. The second and third doses each being six weeks after the one before. Just giving your child one dose will not protect it from this killer. So please, mothers, especially those of you in the country areas, as soon as you hear the vaccination people are in your part, get your child or children seen to. It will not cost you anything and it may mean the

difference between the life and death of your children: so for their sakes as well as your own peace of mind, get them vaccinated as soon as possible.

Now for another subject, though still mainly with the housewife in mind. A number of housewives have spoken to me about the problem of rice. Over the past many weeks they have not been able to get British Guiana rice from their local grocers. I am a great rice eater myself and so I have noticed the change in the taste of our rice. In fact, my youngest daughter tried to get me to join her in a strike against the American rice we were forced to eat. So, when a number of housewives asked me to look into the matter - I did so with very great personal interest. Well, from my inquiries, I understand that although the shortage was real and due largely to the negotiating of the B.G. Rice Agreement, we should soon have stocks again. Indeed, there already is a fair amount of bulk rice from B.G. in Jamaica and I was able to get some at nine pence a pound from a Kingston grocer. I also understand that there is a shipment of the packaged B.G. rice at the wharf right now but there is some sort of hold-up because the invoices are not correct. But I certainly expect you to have your packaged B.G. rice available by the end of this month if not earlier.

Finally, a word on price controls. I do not want to pressure the Ministry of Trade but a large number of listeners have asked me: what happened to the control of food prices I talked about months ago. All I can tell you is that Barbados has now imposed price controls on sardines, corned beef and chicken parts. I understand our people are still investigating. I hope it won't go on for too long. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Nov 17 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The discussion on the border fighting between India and China has led to some of the oddest and most interesting political and moral attitudes I have come across in a very long time. Broadly speaking the American attitude seems to be that the Chinese attack on India proves the futility or the wrongness of a neutralist position. I think this has been stated in its most extreme form by Time Magazine; and I rather think that if Time magazine were not so passionately anti-communist it might have approved of the attack on India as a well deserved slap for neutralism and Krishna Menon; but its anti-communism won out and so it implied that if India had been a good fellow-traveller of the West all this might not have happened.

It seems to me that the Europeans were a lot more realistic about the business. They felt that China's attack on India had nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism - and some of them have cited the fact that the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa endorses the Chinese communist position on the border question. They Europeans see this as Chinese expansionism pure and simple and they tend on the whole to discuss the question of India's neutralism in terms of practical political calculations. One way in which this has been expressed was to use Switzerland as an example. Switzerland is a traditional neutral in Europe but Switzerland spends large sums of money to keep a strong and up to date defence force. And so they concluded that if you are a neutralist who wants to survive you should have a strong defence force. And so they do not criticise India's stand, but rather, her preparedness. And this, of course, means a criticism of the failure of Krishna Menon to strengthen India's

defences. This, with variations, is the broad European attitude.

I think I found the Afro-Asian attitude most interesting.

Pakistan saw this as an opportunity to try and force a settlement over / ~~an~~ Kashmir on an embattled India - a cynical exploitation of a political situation. At the U.N. a number of African states that had traditionally voted for ^{Red} China to be admitted to that organisation opposed it this time because of China's attack on India. But there were a few voices (led by the Soviet bloc) ^{who} ~~which~~ declared that China's attack on India was all the more reason for admitting her to membership of the world organisation at this time. And this, oddly enough seems to have found a great deal of favour in certain quarters here in Jamaica. From the most surprising quarters in Jamaica has come the view that Red China must now be admitted to the United Nations. I have a deal of sympathy with the suggestion that if Red China were a member of the U.N. she might not have attacked India. I am not sure that this view is correct but it at least has the merit of being a possibility and of being not utterly immoral. ~~Extremely suggestive~~ Certainly, I have favoured Red China's admittance in the past. But to now press for the ^{admission} ~~admission~~ of Red China, and to use her aggression against India as an argument - is to put a really high premium on lawlessness, aggression and political blackmail. As far as I am concerned to follow this line is to give up the world to the political bully boys. I also find it a fascinating study in the political morality that the late George Orwell so aptly described as: Double-think. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Nov 19 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party is now meeting and what it decides will shape the way in which the Russians deal with the rest of the world for at least the next twelve months. But I think one of the main problems this meeting will deal with is the present conflict of ideas between Russia and China on how communists should deal with the capitalist world. I am sure most of you are at least aware of this conflict between Russia and China, even though you may not know all the details. Broadly speaking, the Chinese communists feel that the Russians have gone soft on capitalism and that is why they put forward the idea of co-existence between communism and capitalist democracy. For this the Chinese denounce the Russians and say that they have become a 'have' among the nations of the world, and since the 'haves' always tend to be conservative, the Russians have become conservative. And certainly, if you look at it from the Chinese communist point of view, this does make sense. The Russians do in fact fear war, and especially nuclear war, desperately. They have some idea of the devastation that a nuclear war can bring, and they know that unlike China, any war in which they are involved directly is almost bound to become a nuclear war. China can attack India without any fear of nuclear weapons being used because neither China nor India have nuclear weapons to use. This would be impossible in any real fighting between Russia and America. And because these two giants have nuclear weapons, the danger of someone on either side accidentally pushing a nuclear button is very real and something the Russians dare not risk - as they showed in the Cuban confrontation.

And let us face it, the Russians have much more to lose than the Chinese/communists. The Chinese have not even begun to really develop their country since they took over power: they have the beginnings of heavy industry and their agriculture is in a mess. And they have little more. The Russians on the other hand, have had forty-five years of real development. The price they have paid for this development has been fantastically high in human life and in human suffering. Millions upon millions of Russians died in the forced collectivisation of the Kulaks and millions more in the bitter purges. But the achievements are real too. Russia today is a first-class modern industrial power whose scientific achievements compel the admiration of even her enemies. Her ~~standard of living~~ ^{standard of living}, though still low by western ~~xxxxxxxx~~ measurements, is a world away from what it was forty-five years ago, and her rate of development has been fantastic. And she has achieved an extraordinary revolution in education. For the Russians, all these are very precious and important gains to which they want to cling and on which they want to improve. And so it is a fact that the Russians have a great deal that they do not want to risk losing by going to war over Cuba or anybody else. In spite of their communism, the Russians have in fact become one of the 'haves' among the nations of the world. And when you have something, you want to hold on to it and to protect it and possibly to add a little more to it: and so you get Mr. Khrushchev's theory of co-existence about which the Chinese are so bitter. So how do you square this in terms of communist ideas? I will try to look at this tomorrow, so till then.

goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Nov 20 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Since what the communists do or do not do is going to have such an important bearing on your life and mine, as well as on what happens in the rest of the world, I think it is worthwhile for us to try and know what this thing is all about because I am convinced that you can only cope with something if you understand it. So, what is this communism which is causing so much trouble and confusion in this world of our.

There are two meanings to communism: first, there is the ancient human ideal which goes back as far as man's recorded history: the sort of idealistic desire in human beings for a fair sharing of such goods and services as exist within the society. You find aspects of this in tribal societies and this was the practice of the early Christian church too. The big point about the idea was that all property used for the production of goods and services was owned by the community or the group rather than by individuals, and that the gains and profits from all such activity went to the community rather than to any individuals. In this broad sense the idea of equality through communism is as old as man himself. But although the ancient Greek philosopher Plato in his ^{book} Republic, and Sir Thomas More in his book, Utopia both advocated forms of communism, they and the other reformers who followed them, did not use that particular word: communism. But the idea and the ideal was there: to own jointly and share equally the good things of this life and this world. And remember these ideas were expressed hundreds of years before Marx or Lenin were about. That was the broad concept of communism.

The narrower concept of communism, as expressed by Russia and China, still pays lip service to the broader ideal of a greater

equality but adds certain other basic beliefs. And one of the most important basic beliefs of this version is what is known as the class struggle. This says that all of history is basically the story of a series struggles between the few who own all the means of production; land, property, factories and the like, and the many who live by work and who have only their labour to sell. This is the class struggle and the only way in which those who work can get justice^{is}/by overthrowing the existing system. And in order to overthrow the existing system every worker and every progressive intellectual must follow the lead of the communist party because it, and it alone, can bring this wonderful utopia. In 1917, when the Russian communists won power by force it became the duty of every communist or fellow-traveller everywhere to work for the interests of Russia, even against those of his or her own country. And so you had the fantastic spectacle over the last forty-five years of ~~people~~ communists all over the world betraying their own countries in the service of Russia. And because the reality of communism was so far from the ideal which gave it birth, a cruel and murdering tyrant was made into a god/^{who could not be criticised}and some of the most brilliant minds and some of the most sensitive artists in the world put their talents into the service of defending what had in fact become the most monstrous tyranny in the world. And so it was that when Staling died and Khrushchev revealst his crimes, ^{this narrower}communism, as a conquering idea and ideal, also died. Now it can only grow and expand as a thing of force, as the new imperialism. And this supplies the big clue to the China-Russia conflict of ideas. But more of this tomorrow.

Till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Nov 21 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think one of the most amazing manifestations of man's desire to do good by his fellow men was exemplified by that large army of artists, poets, intellectuals, musicians, novelists and the like who, in the years between the two wars, turned to the Russian brand of communism as the hope of the world. I grew up during that period and I saw this wonderful wave of idealism that seemed to take hold of all the finest and brightest/and most gifted/ of the young people of the time. From Britain there was Ralph Fox and David Guest and Stephen Spender and a host of others; from Europe there was Arthur Koestler and Ignazio Silone and André Gide and an even vaster army of others; from the United States you had Howard Fast and Louis Fischer and an equally vast army of others. And even the West Indies contributed to this wave in the persons of two brilliant ~~Trinidadians~~ Trinidadians, C.L.R. James and George Padmore. These idealists were willing to lay down their lives for the new Soviet state and what they thought it represented: and many of them did just that in the Spanish civil war.

And then came the disenchantment: the massive witch-hunts and purges and the massive slaughter - and the massive brainwashing about which a bitter Arthur Koestler wrote so brilliantly later. But I think these people expected too much of Russia and her leaders - a very disappointed Dr. Castro today also seems to have made the same mistake of expecting the Russians to be so high principled as to risk their all for a relatively small island in the Caribbean. These people looked to the new Russia as a force that was morally superior to the capitalist world, as a force invested with an idealism

a
^

that bordered on religious faith. Today you will be very hard put indeed to find any intellectual of the stature of those I have named who believes this any more. To the idealistic intellectual of today Russian communism represents brainwashing, the brutal suppression of the Hungarian uprising and the Berlin Wall. ~~And certainly, the only way~~ ~~in which communism can take hold in Western Europe is by~~ force of arms from outside. The European worker knows that he is better off than his Russian counterpart.

Where the Russians still saw a chance of winning friends and influencing people was in places like Africa, Asia and Latin America - the have-nots of the world. But they had grown so used to ordering their satellites around that they tried it out on Guinea's Sekou Toure and he immediately threw them out of his country: this, plus Nasser's reaction has destroyed their influence in Africa for the present. And it is my view that when the smoke clears from the present Cuban affair it will be seen that the Russians have suffered an equally severe setback in Latin America. And so, in its forty-fifth year we can say that Soviet communism has survived and indeed strengthened itself as a state thing; but it has suffered a severe setback as ~~the base of~~ ^{the base of} and idealistic ~~a world conquering/ideology~~. And now Red China has openly challenged ~~Russia's soft~~ ^{Russia's soft} China leadership. ~~She~~ ^{China} wants an open military show-down with capitalism. What happens ^{between these two partners} now is anybody's guess. The interesting thing is that the communist theory of the contradictions within capitalism seems more applicable to communism ^{itself} at the moment. But then so much of the so-called 'scientific' aspect of Marxism has been proved to be awfully half-baked - or else to be pure ritualistic jju and hogwash. What is real is the naked ~~struggle for~~ ^{struggle for} world power in which I personally do not see any conflict between Russia and China.

Goodnight.

For transmission on
Thursday Nov 22 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

I do not think anybody except the top leadership of the Chinese communist party knows for certain what is behind this move. But, of course, there has been a world of speculation. Some people feel that Moscow's moderating influence is responsible for the cease-fire. I do not think so. Moscow can no more order China around than China can order Moscow around. ^{And} Only those people who still see China as a sort of super satellite of Russia will believe the next explanation put forward, which is that the whole thing - the Cuba business and the Indian border business - was organised by Russia in one massive ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ attempt to first utterly confused the western and neutralist camps and then to break their spirit. I frankly do not believe this. In order to believe this one must believe that both the Russian and Chinese communists are so monstrously cynical as to be very much less than human.

My own view is that the most reasonable explanation for the Chinese ceasefire is the one based on calculated Chinese self-interest. This is the view held by some of the most respectable British political observers and it goes something like this:

The Chinese know that Russia disapproves of their attack on the Indians. The Chinese also know that Britain and the United States will not confine themselves simply to shipping arms to India, if it looked as though the Chinese were really seriously invading India. Therefore, a serious invasion of India is most likely to end up with China having to fight against India, Britain, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Furthermore, given the present set-up, it looks very much as though China would have to do this single-handed. Russia, which is currently having a bitter conflict of ideas with China, is less likely to want to stick out her neck for China than she was for Cuba. And so a serious Chinese invasion of India becomes a tricky thing from China's own point of view. If China thought that such an invasion would lead to a final show-down with ~~xxxxxx~~ capitalism - with all the communist countries/fighting together on one side, I think she would have launched the invasion, no matter what the cost. But to take on the capitalist world alone would be committing suicide, and this the Chinese are not prepared to do, hence the ceasefire. They ^{both} have shown/their strength and the velvet glove. But, as I said when the fighting first started, the real issue is one of naked Chinese power: and they ~~willxxxxxxatxxxxxxforwardxxxxxxkixxxxxxxatxxxxxx~~ seem just to have begun to learn the art at which Mr. Khrushchev is such a master - the art of bluff and of confusing your ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxindxxxxxxxxxxxxlxxxxxxChinaxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ enemy - which makes everything so much more tricky. What happens next depends very much on Mr. Nehru, and he is under great pressure from his own people right now. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Nov 23 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Let us hope that all the sordid details of the Jamaica Woolens affair have now been brought into the open. Certainly, it seems so, as far as the hard facts of the case are concerned. What does not seem to have been brought into the open conclusively are the reasons for some of just about the oddest business behavior I have come across. You may remember that I was the first person to bring some of the details of the Jamaica Woolens operation to public attention and to give you details of the fantastic salaries that were being paid, not only to the Managing Director of the Company, but to the supervisory staff as well. What I did wonder about at the time, and I told you so, was whether we would have to pay the Managing Director over thirteen thousand pounds a year until his contract expired or whether there was a notice of termination clause in the contract. I raised this particular question as far back as October 13th. Well, we now have the answer. It seems this gentleman was given a letter of indemnity and something like fifty-thousand pounds of taxpayers' money will have to be found to pay him off.

But throughout this whole affair, and every time I dug up any new information about it, one key question kept crowding my mind. It was why? Why did this whole business take place? Why did ~~xxxx~~ a ~~xx~~ bunch of hard-headed businessmen allow this thing to happen. Now it would seem that not every member of the Board of the I.D.C. knew about what was going on: it would seem that large sums of money were committed and spent without the knowledge of the Board of the I.D.C. and without the knowledge of the Ministry concerned. All this I did

not know when I made my first broadcasts. But this knowledge has just strengthened the views I expressed at the time that there should be a public accounting and that if any person or persons are found to be criminally responsible, they should be punished. A public accounting which simply tells us how much we have lost and how it came about and then scores a few political points and then says it is all very unfortunate - such an accounting is just not good enough. I think every taxpayer is entitled to demand more than just that. And this is no witch-hunting idea. This is a profound issue of public confidence. Something important and costly went wrong and we are entitled, not just to know the facts, but to know why it went wrong and who is to blame.

In part at least it seems to me that any law which allows this sort of thing to happen cannot be a very good law. If all that happened at Jamaica Woolens happened legally then I think the laws governing our statutory bodies need overhauling: if it happened illegally, then somebody should be punished. This we cannot escape: either the law is a thoroughly bad one or else the law has been broken.

The Minister has now sent directives to the new Board of the I.D.C. setting out new conditions under which it can advance money. Any/^{money} advances will in future have to be approved by the entire Board, and borrowing can only be done with the approval of the Minister. This is an improvement on the present situation. But I am not sure it is enough. If the law under which the I.D.C. operates is bad, then the personal supervision of any Minister will not make it any better. The ultimate protector of the public interest is and must be the law. That is the meaning of the rule of law - and all of us, Ministers included should be subject to it. So, let us adjust the law. That is the lesson of Jamaica Woolens. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Nov 24 at 6.15p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: On Tuesday November 13th I read you a letter I received from a Rastafarian who lives in Back-O-Wall. In his letter my Rasta friend tended to be a bit sneering of the government's attempt to reduce the cost of living. You will remember I was rather critical of his letter because it seemed to me another example of the rather common destructive attitude that so many Jamaicans have towards the government of the day - be it P.N.P. or J.L.P. These people often speak as though they seen nothing good in any government, and the only time they approve of anything any government does is when it does something that suits them. You will remember that I described this as a situation in which each component part of the society saw itself and its interests as being more important than the interests of the society as a whole.

Well, these comments of mine have provoked an interesting variety of reactions and a number of listeners have told me flatly that I am more than a little unreasonable to expect them to have much faith in either their governments ~~(or their parties)~~ or in their parties. One letter from a very distinguished Jamaican for whom I have a very high regard sums it up in these words: "You chided the public for their tendency to disbelieve anything that the politicians say. Isn't the reason obvious? Such a situation could not have come about had our politicians been truthful and honest in the overwhelming great majority of their statements. For years they have taken pride in being too clever and now they reap their reward."

I think this is a very telling comment, and what is more, I think it is true on the whole. But having said that, what do we do?

Do we say: the politicians are dishonest, the politicians have not kept their promises, so we are going to wash our hands of the whole business? Is that what we say, and if we say that, what does it mean? And where does it get us?

I think that no matter how right we may be, this attitude ends up with each of us blaming somebody else for the ills of the society. We blame the politicians or the business people or the workers - in fact everybody else is at fault except ourselves. And of course we are always expecting somebody else to solve the problems of the society. And this, I feel, is still the major problem. Why blame the politicians for this? They are only a minority and they do not have exclusive rights to make Jamaica the kind of place they want: you have the same right, and once you recognise it, you have more power. You put the politician where he is; you created the government of the country, you cannot now abuse him without abusing yourself. The ultimate responsibility is yours.

Finally, a word on Christmas work. Because of much public concern I have been checking on this and I understand that telegrams have gone out to all local authorities telling them to go ahead with work because all the allocations have been made. The money has been settled, the programmes drawn up and the work should in fact be in progress now. Certainly by Monday morning Christmas work should be underway everywhere in Jamaica. If it is not, please make a big noise. Mr. Sangster tells me there is something like four hundred thousand pounds all told that could be spent on work between now and Christmas. I hope you get your share of it. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Nov 26 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Jamaica Government's 'Independence Loan' stock issue comes into effect tomorrow ~~morning~~ ^{at midday} ~~noon~~. This means that as from ~~bank opening time~~ tomorrow ~~morning~~ anyone of us and any institution can apply for whatever amount of stock we or the institution may want to buy. We can get details and application forms from the commercial banks, from stock brokers, from the Government Savings Bank at Tower Street, from the office of the Accountant General and from the Bank of Jamaica. The loan is for a twenty-year period and carries an interest rate of six-and-a-half percent a year. ^{at 4 1/2 percent} The smallest unit of stock you can buy is for five pounds. An interesting feature of this stock issue is that it is open for three months - from tomorrow until the 28th of February, 1963. Usually this sort of stock issue is either for a day or for a week. Keeping the issue open for three months will give everybody the maximum opportunity to subscribe. Those are the facts of the 'Independence Loan' issue.

When he held his press conference to explain this loan last week the Minister of Finance, Mr. Sangster, said that the government had to raise money for developmental purposes: in order to raise such money the government had to pay interest on what it borrowed. He, Mr. Sangster, would prefer to pay this interest to ^{people in} Jamaica ~~instead~~ of having to send this money abroad. I think this is a most important point. If the government can raise as much as possible of the money it needs for development right here in Jamaica, it will need to borrow that much less from abroad, and that in turn will mean that so much less of the country's wealth will go out of the country to

pay debts abroad. But there is more to it than that. When the government pays interest to people in Jamaica there will be that much more wealth in circulation inside Jamaica. So this would be an all-round gain. The government would get a decent portion of its development money from inside the country. The people of Jamaica who want to save would do so at safe and attractive terms - and the whole country would benefit. In other words, this looks like combining patriotism with a good piece of practical business. But let us face it, this loan issue is attractive mainly to people who want to save for their old-age or to insurance companies and the like - in other words, to long-term savers. And this automatically cuts off a vast section of the Jamaica community. There are very few of us, no matter how patriotic, who can afford to put money by for twenty years. I think that those who can put money by on this loan issue are on to a good thing both for themselves and for the country. But I hope the other ninety percent of the Jamaican community will also be given a chance to contribute to the country's development by making the buying of National Savings Bonds a lot more easy and attractive than it now is. The virtue of National Savings Bonds is that each costs only a pound, can be cashed at any time and offers the owner a chance of winning a big money prize. The great drawback is that they are very difficult to buy. I think they should be made as easy to buy as postage stamps. I think it is important to do this and give the mass of Jamaicans a chance to invest in Jamaica's future. To be really successful the raising of local money must be truly national, calling on every section of the Jamaican community. So go out tomorrow and buy your stocks and bonds and help Jamaica.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Nov 27 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: TRinidad's Prime Minister, Dr. Eric Williams, has just completed a three-month European tour, but this was a tour with a difference. Dr. Williams has done some highly successful business during that three-month tour. So I think it might be very useful for us to take a look at Dr. Williams' European tour. I think two recent items of news about Trinidad make the taking of such a look all the more interesting. First, there was the news that the United States government had agreed to give Trinidad economic aid to the tune of over ten million pounds. And then, on Sunday, there was the news from London that Dr. Williams had rejected a British loan because he found the terms of the loan unacceptable. Just what these terms were we do not yet know. All we have is Dr. Williams' statement that he wanted the loan to put the people of Trinidad and Tobago into jobs, not to provide jobs for British workers. From this a reasonable inference is that the terms ~~xxxxxxxx~~ under which Britain was prepared to lend Trinidad money were, in the view of Dr. Williams, more likely to benefit British workers than Trinidad workers. Certainly, if this is the case then one must sympathise with Dr. Williams. To say any more than this would be to prejudge the matter without having all the facts. What is very interesting, and very revealing, is that Dr. Williams should reject such a loan out of hand. I think it shows a high degree of self assurance and confidence in Trinidad's ability to raise the money she needs elsewhere. And I personally think that Jamaica's leaders could benefit greatly by a close study of the factors that make for Dr. Williams's self assurance and confidence. I think we need to be humble enough to ~~make~~

such a study because Jamaica needs it. Telling our leaders how wonderful they are, what political wisdom they show in this or that inter-party move is not going to help the country. It is a clever and useful political thing for the present government to blame all our troubles on the past government; indeed, a certain amount of this sort of thing is inevitable. But this does nothing to improve the situation of the country. And there is the very real danger - and I think we are having a taste of it right now - there is the real danger that in this business of political point-scoring our leaders might in fact do the country real harm. One simple example is this: if you really sell the idea that Jamaica is bankrupt, that the barrel has in fact been scraped empty, you may, in the process also succeed in scaring money away. And this may be a very successful political move but it can also be a terribly damaging blow to the country, because nobody wants to invest in a bankrupt concern. And that, I suggest, is one of the reasons why money is so tight in Jamaica today.

Dr.

But back to what we can learn from Eric Williams. I think his assurance is based on his very successful talks with the leaders of the European Common Market. I for one, expect very big things for Trinidad from those talks. And the reason for this is that of all the West Indian Leaders Dr. Williams seems to have been the only one who fully appreciated the significance of the E.C.M. and made his plans accordingly. ⁴ He did not play it by the ear or play to the gallery. He studied hard and planned hard for the good of his country: his country and his people will reap the rewards. This business of taking pains and mastering your subject ~~before shooting off your mouth~~ is something all West Indian leaders can learn from Eric Williams. Godni

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Wednesday Nov 28 at 6.15p.m.

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last night I told you I think our political leaders could benefit greatly and be of greater service to the country if they follow ^{ed} Dr. Eric Williams' example of first mastering a problem before either expounding or acting on it. And if any of them are angry that I should hold up Dr. Williams as an example, I would invite them to face ~~that~~ the fact that Dr. Williams has 'delivered'. As my friend Len Nembhard of the Jamaica Times put it, Dr. Williams is no U.S. lackey but he has just received over ten million pounds of aid from the United States. And because he took the trouble to make a careful study of the European Common Market he could choose the best course for Trinidad and declare that she would apply for Associate Membership, even if Britain did not enter. From all this, I expect Trinidad to get at least as much money from Europe as she got from the United States. And the basic reason for this is that Dr. Williams has made it his business to learn and to study hard and to get at the facts and to think them out carefully and then to act. This is a very much more demanding and a very much more difficult way than the normal way where the politician talks first and thinks afterwards and hopes for the best. But if societies like ours are to get anywhere then, sooner or later, we must let hard working and hard thinking take the place of big talking and big bluffing.

A glaring example of just where big talk and big bluff can lead a people is the unhappy Grenada situation. Before his defeat at the polls Mr. Gairy conducted Grenada politics on the basis of big talk and big bluff and for a time he did it so successfully that he sold his own people a false idea of their value and their importance ~~it~~

in the scheme of things. And so, thanks largely to Gairy, the people of Grenada saw themselves as being much more important than they really are. And when the federation broke up and the idea of the 'Little Eight' was born, Mr. Gairy could not resist playing his old game of big talk and big bluff. This time he was playing off Trinidad against Barbados and the other islands of the Windwards and Leewards. He just wanted to have things his own way. He knew the British were anxious to see a federation of the eight and so he thought he could pressure on them by playing hard to get. But things got out of hand, the people of Grenada looked at the relative poverty of the 'Little Eight' and the relative wealth of Trinidad and decided that they would like a share of Trinidad's wealth. And so they elected Herbert Blaize to lead them into a unitary state with Trinidad: Trinidad represented the gravy train, where they could get the most ^{for} ~~with~~ the least effort. The corrupting influence of the Gairy leadership was there. But Trinidad is not so certain she wants any truck with Grenada now and it looks very much as though Grenada's big bluff and big talk politics have led her out into the cold. If Trinidad rejects her, as seems very likely now, she will have to eat humble pie and go begging to the other seven islands. In short, Grenada is in a mess today because she was always looking for a cheap and easy way. And this brings us right back to the central point. There is no cheap and easy way ahead for any of the islands of the Caribbean; there is no cheap and easy way ahead for Jamaica either. The way ahead demands hard thinking, hard planning and then hard work from all of us. The real problem ~~of this moment~~ is that at this moment we do not seem to have begun the hard thinking: some of us know what we want; none of us seem to know how we set about getting it. This can be dangerous - if it lasts too long. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Nov 29 at 6.15p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Governor-General, Sir Kenneth Blackburne, and his family will leave Jamaica tomorrow afternoon. And so will end, as far as Jamaica is concerned, the last tour of duty of an Englishman sent out by the Colonial Office as the Queen's Representative in Jamaica. After Sir Kenneth, and no matter how many Governors-General Jamaica may have, all of them will be chosen right here in Jamaica and their approval by the Queen, or whoever happens to be the monarch at the time, will be a formality. So, both in actual fact as well as symbolically, tomorrow's departure of the last of the British pro-consuls is a very important turning point. I think all the many people and organisations who have gone to King's House to say farewell in these last few days, and all the people and organisations who have carried parting gifts as gestures of affection and appreciation and ~~xxxxxxx~~ remembrance have shown awareness that this is an important turning point.

Please don't get me wrong. I do not think people are saying to themselves: 'This is a turning point, this is significant, so let us make gestures to show that we are aware of it'. Generally speaking people do not operate like that. I think the demonstrations of affection are warmly personal and have nothing to do with the gallery of history. People are doing and saying what they are because this is the way they feel about the Governor-General and his family. And the almost subconscious knowledge that this is also a turning point only adds depth to what is already there. So I would say that basically what we have witnessed over these past few days were demonstrations of personal affection for a good man who has given much to Jamaica,

who has built warm and enduring friendships here, and who has occupied his high office with a modesty and a humility that is an object lesson to all of us.

But no matter how personally we may feel about Sir Kenneth ~~Blackburne~~ Blackburne, the one thing we cannot really do is to separate the man from his office. Without the office he may never have come here. And coming here, to the office, he was as much symbol as man. And the measure of his success as both symbol and man is the intensely personal warmth he has evoked in almost every section of the Jamaican community.

And so, when Sir Kenneth leaves tomorrow and Sir Clifford Campbell moves into King's House, one door will shut symbolically and another door will open. And to us will come a new responsibility. Sir Kenneth was trained to discharge his duties in a certain way. Even after independence when he became Jamaica's first Governor-General and so ceased technically to be a servant of the Colonial Office, a lifetime's training, a lifetime's concept of service and of the traditions in which he grew up travelled with him and helped to shape his attitudes and actions. This is what we might call his 'cultural baggage'. This made Sir Kenneth the man he is; this helped him to perform as he did. For this making of first a good Governor and then a good Governor-General Britain, her people and her institutions can claim credit. Now it is up to us to assume the same sort of responsibility for and towards Sir Clifford Campbell. So, a farewell to Sir Kenneth Blackburne and a welcome to Sir Clifford Campbell.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Nov 30 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Let me confess openly that I am neither happy nor impressed by the current argument between the Prime Minister and Senator Michael Manley over whether machines are going to be used or have been used for loading bananas and whether it is the P.N.P. or the J.L.P. who brought in those machines, kept them in their crates or gave an order that they should be uncrated and used. I am not happy about this argument because it seems to me that no matter who ~~wins~~ scores the most political points, this sort of argument does nothing to serve Jamaica's basic long term needs. I may be wrong but it seems to me that this is just another example of playing politics with the needs of the country.

But let us try to take a dispassionate look at the whole problem. I think both Sir Alexander Bustamante and Mr. ^{Michael} ~~Mixx~~ Manley have established, beyond any reasonable doubt, their sincere interest in the welfare of the workers, so, for me at least, there is no question of doubting their motives. But that does not mean that we must accept what these gentlemen say without any examination. Now, what both these gentlemen appear to be agreed on is that the use of ~~xxxx~~ machines in the loading of bananas will put people out of work. Mr. Michael Manley says that it is for this reason that the P.N.P. shelved the whole question of mechanical loading when it was in power and he accuses the J.L.P. of going back on its election pledge of not accepting mechanical loading. The Prime Minister, on the other hand, says that it was not the J.L.P. which was responsible for the presence of these machines in the country. By implication, at least, both seem agreed that there is somehow something wrong in the

presence and in the use of machines in Jamaica's banana industry. I think the very great weakness of this attitude is that it makes one of the most monumentally false assumptions I have come across. It assumes that the interests of the banana industry - and indeed of the rest of the country - are different from the interests of the workers. This is not something confined to the banana industry, but let us look at it in terms of the banana industry this evening. And let us begin by looking at a few hard facts that you will find in the latest issue of the government publication: Jamaica Now. In Jamaica we produce an average of 2.71 tons of bananas on an acre of land; in Colombia they produce five tons of bananas on that same acre of land; in Costa Rica they produce 6.7 tons on that same acre; and in Brazil they produce 11.75 tons of bananas from one acre of land. Now it stands to reason that Brazil which produces about nine ^{tons more} ~~times as much~~ bananas as we do from one acre, can afford, purely on the basis of production to under-sell us in the open market. When you add to that the fact that Brazil not only produces more, but it also ^{and} cuts shipping/handling costs by using machines and loading more quickly, with the result that ships turn about more quickly - if you add all that together then we just will not stand a chance against Brazil or any of the other banana producers, in open competition. Beside this challenge reality the shape of the present argument is a little silly. I think the real argument should be on ways and means of bringing ^{into use} ~~in~~ machines/as painlessly as possible. It is either that or the ultimate death of the industry. It is not the machines we should fight, but our own ignorance. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Dec 1 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: When it was first announced that one of the changes brought by independence would be that official letters would no longer carry the ~~fiction~~ ^{legend}: 'On Her Majesty's Service' but would carry the ~~fiction~~ ^{legend} instead/ ~~be~~ On Jamaica Government Service, I did not think very much of it. Certainly, I did not think it sufficiently significant to merit any kind of comment. We must expect a certain amount of change just for the sake of change. After all, we had already survived Mr. Willie Richardson's 'The West Indies' with a capital T; and I was reasonably sure that we would survive this latest O.J.G.S. stunt. So, I thought, let the boys have their fling.

But I am afraid I am not as long-suffering as I thought I was. Every day there arrives on my desk at the West Indian Economist a pile of envelopes from the Government's Public Relations Department. This is a very useful service which those of us who are engaged in press and radio value. For years these envelopes carried the On Her Majesty's Service lettering. But for many weeks, possibly running into months, this has been changed. Someone had sat down at some desk and with a ruler, pen-and-ink and very great care, had drawn three neat straight lines through: On Her Majesty's Service. Then, this hard working person had, in a very laboured hand, written above this: O. J. G. S.

At first I tried not to let this bother me, but after a time it got the better of me. After all, just think of the miles and miles of lines that must have been drawn by this person; and just think of how often this poor person must have written O.J.G.S! I think our unions have no business to allow this sort of mechanical slavery!

And then I began to wonder about the poor person who had to do

all this drawing of lines and writing of O.J.G.S. Was not this poor person being encouraged to be disloyal? After all, although it is independent, the Dominion of Jamaica is still a monarchical state. When Princess Margaret opened the first parliament of independent Jamaica and when she read the message from the Queen, the Queen

spoke about my people of Jamaica and, I believe, my parliament - perhaps she used the royal we but that did not change the basic meaning. Our Governor-General, Sir Clifford Campbell ~~thatxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxx~~ could not have received his great honour from the Queen's hand if Jamaica were not one of her Majesty's realms. So, whatever business we do here in Jamaica, is still Her Majesty's business - so I frankly see no reason for the very clumsy O.J.G.S. And you know, all the other Commonwealth countries which are not Republics use On Her Majesty's Service. But when all that is said and done we are still left with the millions of envelopes that have to be used and which that poor person must draw lines on and then painfully write over. I really don't think it is worth it. So please, could we at least ~~are~~ carry on with O.H.M.S. until the envelopes are used up? Perhaps by then we will have regained our sense of proportion.

And talking about a sense of proportion: this is the first day of the month of December, the month of Christmas, the month of operation oversell. For so many people the weeks and days leading up to Christmas are no more than times for a selling spree, in which and every thing, often including the most sacred religious symbols, are shamelessly exploited in the interests of sales. Let us try and contain this rather ugly thing this year. By all means do your selling but please try not to overdo it. Christmas is not, and should not be turned into a pagan feast of wild merchandising: it is and should be the most spiritual and the most Christian time of the year. goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Dec 3 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: It was just over a week ago that I told you that the Christmas work programmes all over Jamaica should be in full swing. To be even more specific, it was on Saturday November the 24th that I gave you this information. You know as well as I do that for very many people in Jamaica Christmas would be a cheerless and miserable business if we did not have the Christmas work programmes at this time of year. Whether any of us think this is a good way of doing it or not is beside the point right now. What is important is that Christmas is approaching and large numbers of Jamaicans have come to expect this form of Christmas work: this has been going on for years and people have been led to expect it. This Christmas work is the one way in which a cheerful and happy Christmas is made possible for a majority of Jamaican families.

It was for this reason that I went to the trouble of finding out just what the position was about ten days ago. I told you then that I understood that telegrams giving local authorities the 'go-ahead' had gone out a week or so ~~ago~~ earlier. I told you that the programmes had been settled and the allocations made. I also told you that I had spoken to Mr. Donald Sangster and he had told me that his Ministry had given the go-ahead for the money to be spent and that there was something like four hundred thousand pounds all told that could be spent on work between now and Christmas.

Well, since I told you all that I have had letters from listeners all over the country and I have also had a number of telephone calls from people in the Corporate Area. . Let me read a bit from one letter which comes from a Mr. Johnson of Albany in St. Mary. It is

dated November the 29th and it says: "I heard you speak about Christmas work to be given to the people everywhere. But we the people of bottom Albany in St. Mary have contacted the Parish Council and also the Public Works Department and we were told that there is none, so I have written to you as a commentator to make a comment on this matter because we are in dire need in this ~~Parish~~ part of the Parish."

That is the heart of Mr. Johnson's letter and I think it speaks for itself. For the information of Mr. Johnson and the other citizens of St. Mary, the government announced on November the 16th that it has allocated the sum of ten thousand pounds to St. Mary for Christmas work. So, the people of bottom Albany should at least get a share of this. Mr. Johnson also asked me which of the government Ministers he should contact about this. Mr. Leopold Lynch the Minister of Local Government ^{the Minister} is in charge of this Christmas work business and I suggest that Mr. Johnson contacts him. And you know, when I travelled through parts of St. Catherine, Clarendon and St. Elizabeth over the weekend I heard a number of comments and complaints which led me to believe that people in authority on the spot were tending to stall on this Christmas work business. If this is so then, as far as I am concerned, this is just about the meanest and nastiest way of playing politics. If the money is there, and you have the go-ahead and if then, for whatever reason, you do not get on with the job then as far as I am concerned you are playing at politics with the hopes and needs of people; and nobody has any right to do that: the country and its people are more important than any party. So, stop this stalling on Christmas work. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Monday Tuesday Dec 3 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: For me, one of the most rewarding experiences is a trip into the country, and the deeper I can get into the country, the better I like it. Part of the reason for this is that I find the Jamaican countryside just about the most beautiful I have seen in a life time of travelling. But I think the other part, and possibly the more important part, is that I find a basic sanity, a basic balance and straightforwardness that is all too often lacking in the Corporate Area. The double-dealing and duplicity that seems to be part of 'big city' life tends to be absent from the country. And this, I think, makes for a greater perspective and a clearer and more honest view of the realities of life. Now, I am not saying that everything in the country is lovely: all I am saying is that I personally find myself thinking a little more clearly and honestly than I do under the heavy pressures of life in the Corporate Area of Kingston and St. Andrew. But more than that: I also find that on the whole the people in the country seem to have a greater sense of reality than the people in Kingston: but here again, I do not want to overstate the matter. We hear all too often that this is good and that is bad, as though life is made up of extremes with things being either all good or all bad. In reality it is more a matter of shades of grey with most things being combinations of good and bad.

And once you look at things in this way, you are less likely to go in for extremes of any sort. You are less likely to be fooled by the lavish promises or ~~extravagant~~ extravagant claims of this or that party or this or that person telling you that all the good is

on the side he backs and all the evil is on the side he is against. Kingston is rather prone to extremes and that is why I find the balancing and sobering aspects of the country areas so important. For this reason I think more people from Kingston should make an effort to get out into the countryside and make a real effort to get to know the thinking and feeling of the people in the country areas. You'd be really surprised at how much city folk can learn from country folk - if they give themselves half a chance.

I had

/ An example of just how basic this rural perspective can be on the road between Gutters and Pepper in St. Elizabeth. The road is steep and requires great care especially when you are travelling down hill; and some of the corners are extremely tight. At one such corner, a police van came hurtling round the bend on the wrong side of the road and I had to all but climb up the bank to get away from it. By the time I came to a stop, angry and shaking, the van was far down the hill. I'm afraid I said some very harsh things about the police, partly to relieve my feeling. And then I realised that a country man, by the side of the road, had watched it all. He shook his head as if to suggest that I had the wrong end of the stick by cursing the police in the van. Then he said:

"Nobody teach them that the law is above them too." And you know, that is just it. So many of the people who enforce the law are not really convinced that they must themselves obey the law in all its details because they themselves are living symbols of the rule of law. Instead they tend to break every petty law that they can get away with because, as the countryman said: "Nobody teach them that the law is above them too". The lesson to learn is that the law is above every single one of us - without any exceptions at all. That's rural perspective for you.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Tuesday ~~Wednesday~~ Dec 4 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Since I still have this rural perspective from my weekend travels in the country, let me continue to skip the so-called 'hard' news in favour of what seems to me much more fundamental. Any reasonably sensitive observer travelling through rural Jamaica cannot miss certain things even if he or she wants to. And because I have been taught ~~it~~ that good teeth are the basis of good health, and because I have experienced this in my own life, I am acutely sensitive to the desperate need for a proper dental service for rural Jamaica. There are hundreds upon hundreds of communities in this island of Jamaica who just do not have ~~any kind of decent~~ access to any kind of decent dental treatment. And certainly, I know I do not have to tell any dentist what a serious situation exists when you have hundreds of thousands of Jamaicans going around with mouths filled with rotten and rotting teeth. They know even better than I do how devastating bad teeth can be on the general health of any community. And if we really believe it when we say that Jamaica's greatest asset ^{is} ~~are~~ her people then we will do everything to make sure that that precious asset ^{is} ~~are~~ is not wasted through bad health. And that, whether we like it or not, is what is happening right now.

I know that some of our young dentists, and some of those who are not so young, give freely of their time and talents to schools and other institutions in the Corporate Area. But Kingston is not Jamaica. And in any case Kingston is so much better served than any other part of Jamaica in this as in so many other respects. If our dentists have any sort of idealistic concept of service then I think it is their duty to tackle seriously the grievous dental problems

of rural Jamaica. At the risk of offending some of my dentist friends let me say that beside this desperate national need I find the Dental Association's preoccupation with being consulted over the Dental Act rather small-minded. This business of decent dental care for the people in the remote areas of Jamaica is fundamental to health and therefore to the productivity of the people. If we are to achieve any of our national targets then we must have a vigorous and healthy people - and the beginning of good health is in the mouth. And so I hope our dentists will set aside all small-mindedness and rise to the challenge of a national dental service that will bring oral hygiene to the remotest corner of this island.

Another, and almost equally urgent challenge is to our young doctors. Here again the Corporate Area is very well served while in certain country ^{parts} ~~areas~~ one doctor is expected to cover a vast area. There are places where you have health centres but because the country doctor is so overworked he cannot get to these centres for weeks and even months at a time. And still our young doctors seem only interested in practising in the big towns. Again I say that if these young doctors want us to take their professions of nationalism and patriotism seriously then they must give us reason to take them seriously. If Jamaica is to go forward then the present ~~verandah~~ patriotism of so many young professional Jamaicans must give way to the making of a genuine contribution. And nowhere are the needs for a genuine contribution as great as in bringing decent dental and medical services to the people of the remotest areas of rural Jamaica. Living with electricity, running water, hospitals and many dentists and doctors around us, we often forget that more than half the population does not enjoy these things. Let us begin to redress this. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Dec. 5 at 6.15 p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good Evening: On Saturday November 24 I told you that the Christmas Work programme should be well ~~on~~ under way by Monday November 26. I told you this because I had checked on the details and because I had spoken to Mr. Donald Sangster, the Minister of Finance, and he had told me that his Ministry had given the go-ahead for Christmas Work a week earlier. Mr. Sangster said that ~~the money~~ telegrams had gone out to local authorities and that something like £400,000 could be spent on work between that date and Christmas.

Well, since I told you all that I had letters from listeners from all over the country as well as a number of telephone calls from people in the Corporate Area. One letter, from a Mr. Johnson of Albany in St. Mary is fairly representative of the kind I have received from country areas. It says "I heard you speak about Christmas work to be given to the people everywhere. But we the people of bottom Albany in St. Mary have contacted the Parish Council and also the Public Works Department and we were told that there is none so I have written to you as a commentator to make a comment on this matter because we are in dire need in this part of the Parish." This letter was dated November 29 nearly a week after I made my broadcast. I sincerely hope that Mr. Johnson and people of bottom Albany have by now started on Christmas work. ~~But~~ For the information of Mr. Johnson Mr. Leopold Lynch the Minister of Local Government announced on November 16 the amounts of money allocated for all the Parishes of Jamaica. Ten thousand pounds was the amount allocated for St. Mary for Christmas work. ~~And Mr. Lynch said that the Minister for the Government Minister he should contact about this business.~~
~~contact~~

Mr. Lynch is the Minister responsible and I suggest that Mr. Johnson contacts him. But I sincerely hope that there will be no need to do so and that the people of bottom Albany and the people of all the other rural areas of Jamaica are by now getting their fair share of Christmas work. Things have started very late this year and there seems to be a certain amount of confusion as well as an element of ~~xxx~~ playing politics but I hope that none of these will interfere with the Christmas work which means Christmas cheer for so very many Jamaican families.

Another letter I received came from the firm of Investment Dealers Annett & Co. dealing with my comments of November 26 when I discussed the Jamaica Independence Loan Issue. The Company feels that I may have given the impression that any investors who take up the new 6½% stock would have their savings tied up until the final redemption date in 1983. They point out that Jamaica Government stock is ~~gilt~~ gilt-edged and very marketable. In other words nobody will have any difficulty at all in selling their stock at any time. Let me quote the Company's own words "We would appreciate your telling the Jamaican Public that their holdings of Jamaica Government stock are highly marketable. If this were generally known, it is possible that several hitherto untapped pools of savings could be channelled into gilt-edged investments."

I am very happy to pass on this information and may I suggest Jamaica Government stock as a wonderful Christmas gift this year. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Dec 6 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I am very happy about the return to Jamaica's banana industry on a large scale by the United Fruit Company. I think getting the United Fruit Company to come back on this scale is a piece of business for which this government in general, and Mr. Gyles in particular, deserve great credit. I think we should all of us be happy about this, if for no other reason than the fact that a ^{fair} number of ^{new} jobs will be created. But although this point is very important to workers in the banana industry, there is a great deal more to it than just that.

It was only last Friday that I gave you figures comparing Jamaica's banana production per acre with production in some of the Central and South American countries. You will remember that we produce only 2.71 tons of bananas on an acre while Colombia produces five tons, Costa Rica 6.7 tons and Brazil 11.75 tons. I told you then that in the face of these figures I found the argument about the use of mechanical means rather pointless because unless we improved our production by any means possible, the competition would force us out of the banana business. The presence of United Fruit on this scale means, quite simply, that we are going to improve production. And you know, whether the unions or the workers or anybody else likes it or not, improving production means adopting certain attitudes and certain courses of action. You cannot cling to old-fashioned and out-dated attitudes about soil usage and the economics of farming and improve output. In order to improve output you must nurse and nurture your soil with the same

care and attention that a good engineer gives to his machines. And the reason should be the same. The engineer is not sentimental about his machine, he does not keep it polished and oiled and in good running order because he loves it: he does it because that is the way in which he gets maximum service out of it. Loving or not loving is not the important point: getting maximum service, maximum efficiency, that is the important point. And it is important for us to develop a businesslike attitude to agriculture. The attitude to agriculture as a sort of social welfare agency still persists. Agriculture is still regarded as one of the key means of easing the unemployment situation. And so you have four or five men spending two or three days doing what one man and a machine would do in half a day. The reason for this is that three or four men would be unemployed if we used only one man and a machine: so we choose to be what we consider humane and inefficient. But are we being all that kind to ourselves and to our agriculture? I think not. I think that unless we do in fact make a business of our agriculture the day will come when it will collapse entirely. But if we do in fact make a business of it, and a profitable business, then we will be faced with some serious problems the chief of which will be unemployment. But the money we make from a successful and businesslike agriculture could then be used to help create other jobs. ~~to help at least some of those who are displaced from the land.~~ The key point is that in order to survive in today's tough world our agriculture must be competitive. This lesson does not seem to have been really learnt yet. I welcome the return on a big scale of the United Fruit Company because I think they will help bring this most important lesson home to us. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Dec 7 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I welcome the news that the government is to hold an inquiry into sanitary conditions in Harbour View. But I hope that such an inquiry will not be confined to Harbour View only because this is not a problem which is confined to a single housing estate. Well, over a year ago I discussed this problem of ^{a proper} sewerage system for Kingston. And you know, not so very long ago, some sewer mains were dug up between Rockfort and Harbour View. I saw one section of those mains being dug up and they did not look as though they had been used. And I do not know what has happened to those mains since they were dug up. The truth of the matter is that we all seem to have accepted septic pits as a fact of Kingston life.

Here we are with a great and growing city on the edge of the sea. We would have thought that one of the first things our city fathers would do would be to lay down regulations setting out the minimum sanitary conditions under which building would be allowed. Certainly, with the sea as near as it is the government itself should have had sewerage mains going down to the sea and it should have been made incumbent for anybody who builds in the city limits to lay pipes so that they could be joined to the sewerage mains. Wherever there was electricity and surfaced roads, and wherever the Kingston and St. Andrew Corporation collected rates and taxes, it should have supplied the streets with a single sewerage system to which each householder in the street could join his own sanitary system. This is what should have been done a long time ago. Certainly, when the pattern of housing development began to emerge an attempt should

have been made to get rid of the old-fashioned septic pit. If this had been done ten years ago it would have been so much easier to do and the cost would have been a fraction of today's costs. If it had been started when the Mona Housing scheme began it would have been easier and cheaper than it would be today: if it had been started when Harbour View or Havendale or any of the other housing schemes began, it would have been so much easier.

Now, when we do get round to installing a modern proper sewerage system - as we must do sooner or later - the cost is going to be fantastic. The longer things like these are left, the more difficult and the more costly they become. And because this business of a proper sewerage system has been left for so long it is going to cost the poor taxpayer an awful lot. But we must begin some time and we must begin somewhere, and I think the inquiry into conditions at Harbour View could be a useful starting point - but only if it is seen as a starting point and not an end in itself. If the Harbor View inquiry leads to a full-scale re-appraisal of the entire sewerage system, and to the laying down of mains ~~throughout~~ throughout our thickly populated urban areas, then it would be a wonderful thing indeed.

What I should also like to see is for the government to find out whether there are scientific and cheaper means of waste disposal than the costly business of laying a network of pipes, joined to one main leading down to the sea: but whatever the method, and whether costly or not, we must modernise our sewerage system. Our septic pits become more dangerous with each passing year. They must be abolished in heavily populated areas. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Dec 8 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I want to talk about milk this evening because it is related to some of our most important problems and needs. But let me first tell you some of the qualities of milk. ~~Roughly speaking~~ Milk from a good and healthy and well-cared-for cow is just about the best food any growing child can have. Health authorities will tell you that it is an essential part of the diet of children. Cows milk is made up roughly of 87 percent water, four percent fat, 3.35 percent protein, 4.9 percent sugar and .75 percent salt or ash. We are of course talking about the milk of a healthy cow. A quart of milk from such a cow is the equal of three-quarters of a pound of good beef. The vitamins A, B, and C. in milk make for growing and for fighting off disease. The minerals in milk are calcium, iron and phosphorus and these help to build bones and teeth and to make rich red blood. The sugar and fats supply the body with heat and energy. And the proteins build body tissue. When you see a young child whose skin glows with health, whose eyes sparkle almost like twinkling stars and whose teeth are white and strong and who is a bundle of energy - you can be almost certain that you are looking at a child who is getting a sufficient supply of good rich milk. And believe me, this is not just something I have learnt from books. It is something I have witnessed for myself with our own children and I have seen it with children growing up in Europe, in Africa, in America as well as right here in Jamaica. And you know, the difference between children who get a full supply of rich creamy milk and children who do not, is fantastic. Those who get their milk are lively, strong, healthy, bright - like growing creatures who could lick the world: those who

do not tend to be dull, listless, weak and sickly and they catch every passing disease. This is fact, not fancy. The milk drinkers also tend to be physically bigger and stronger than the non-milk drinkers. And I do not think I have to tell you that the vast majority of Jamaican children, especially Jamaican children in the rural areas, are not milk drinkers. If you say that every growing child should have at least a pint of milk a day then I am afraid we must say that the vast majority of Jamaican children are not getting their fair share of this essential food. And you know, those Jamaican children who do get fresh cows milk do not always get a very good quality milk. Very few of Jamaica's cows are tested for diseases, and the handling of the milk often leaves much to be desired. And unclean milk is a particularly easy carrier of diseases. For this reason even those children who do get milk do not always get the full value of it. In countries like Britain and the United States there are very rigid laws about a pure milk supply. The point is that good, rich, healthy milk is an absolute essential if we are to have a healthy and vigorous community. And ^{so} it was with very great interest that I met a man who is in the milk business and who told me that it is possible to send refrigerated vans into the country areas with rich nourish^{ing} milk that is absolutely safe and healthy and sell this for as little as a sixpence a quart. I saw this man's plant and I tasted his milk and it was good. If this man can do what he says, and he has convinced me, then I should very much like Mr. Lighbourne and Sir Alexander Bustamante to interest themselves in this matter. I think it is of national importance. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Dec 10 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: From all reports it would appear that the Jamaica Labour Party's 18th annual conference over the weekend was a very successful affair. I got the impression that the spirit was ~~buoyant~~ buoyant ~~buoyant~~ and that both leaders and rank-and-file members felt that the party was in firm control. The mood seems to have been one of high confidence, verging almost on over-confidence: but then, ^{that} is the usual mental state of the party in power. It was the mental state of the People's National Party until the bitter moment of defeat exactly eight months ago today.

Certainly, the J.L.P had reason to be in high spirits. Not only did it win power earlier this year, it was also the party which inaugurated Jamaica's independence and installed Jamaica's first native Governor-General. And both these events will pay high political dividends when next the voters go to the polls. The fact that much of the groundwork was laid by others is part of the party political game. The past government inherited both the good and the bad that its predecessors left and the same is true of this government. And certainly, even the most ardent P.N.P supporter will agree that not everything was lovely during the term of the past government: Jamaica Woolens is very much a case in point. Incidentally, Mr. Lightbourne's announcement at the conference that there will be a public inquiry is very welcome.

I think possibly the most important reason for the spirit of confidence at the J.L.P. conference is the fact that the new government has now developed a real spirit of self-confidence. If I am right in this then I think we will notice a sharp difference in approach over

the next few months. We will notice that J.L.P. leaders and spokesmen will become less and less inclined to spend their time telling of all the faults of the past government. This business of being in power and attacking the record of those who are out of power - especially when it is done all the time and at the slightest opportunity is a form of inferiority complex, and is a certain indication of a sense of personal uncertainty. It is no accident that if you go through the records you will find that Sir Alexander Bustamante and one or two of the older and more experienced of his Ministers, have spent least time attacking the record of the past government. They are sure of themselves, sure of their ability to deliver the goods. I think now that the other Ministers are growing in confidence they too will spend less time setting up clay pigeons to shoot down. And this will be a very good thing for the country. Please don't get me wrong: I am not saying that past records of past governments should not be attacked - all I am saying is that we do not want to spend too much time and energy on that. There are important positive things to be done.

P.N.P. propagandists, some of you may remember, put about the impression that with the J.L.P. in power the country was bound to go down the drain because only they, the P.N.P., knew how to run it. I think the J.L.P. has now shown that they can run the country at least as well. It is obviously silly to try and compare the eight^{months} of the J.L.P. government with the seven years of the P.N.P. government but certainly, on the basis of their performance thus far, I for one see reason for the confidence expressed at the J.L.P.'s 18th annual conference. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Dec 11 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last night I told you that I personally could understand the spirit of confidence that prevailed at the J.L.P. annual conference over the weekend. This does not, of course, mean that I go along with those who have suddenly discovered the wonderful 'genius' possessed by almost every leader of the Jamaica Labour Party. I am always suspicious of overstatement and over-selling - and I am not sure that it ever does anybody or any society or any country any good. In fact, if you look at history you will find that it was the countries and the societies and the individuals who sold themselves the twin pups of their uniqueness and their genius who have caused most of this world's troubles. Old Joe Stalin who murdered millions was a unique genius until he fell from communist grace; Adolf Hitler was another genius and he plunged Europe and the world into the most terrible bloodbath of all time; and strutting little Mussolini was another. So you must please forgive me if I do not go along with the business of uniqueness and genius and any sort of political super-sell. The simple reason why I believe the confidence at the J.L.P. ^{Conference} to be justified is because I think they have turned the trickiest political corner any democratic government faces: that of confidence - both internally and externally.

I think it is fair to say that the past government had built up an enormous fund of goodwill abroad, based largely on the stature and personality of Mr. Manley. But at the same time that this fund of goodwill was being built abroad, confidence in the P.N.P. government was ebbing away at home. Everyone, both at home and abroad accepted the Manley Administration as an able, stable and progressive one

dedicated to creating greater wealth and great opportunity for this country. And for seven years this is precisely what the Manley government did. But the wealth and the opportunity it created seemed to benefit a very small section of the society and most of ~~it~~ the job opportunities were concentrated in the Corporate Area. And so the new wealth and opportunities tended to emphasise and dramatise the wide gap between town and country, between have and have-not. And ~~this~~, whether we like it or not, resulted in a breakdown of confidence in the government of Jamaica. The way the people in the bush saw it was that even the progressive P.N.P. government became reactionary and the servant of vested interest after a period in power. Basically, the J.L.P. rode to power on this point.

Today, eight months later, the country's money position is steadier; the balance of trade position has improved greatly; the cost of living has at least been held, and although the pattern of ^{the promised} price controls seems a bit confused, ^{it} they hold out the hope of reducing the cost of living; ^{and} the level of government spending is up. These are pretty solid achievements. But possibly the most important achievement of all is that the so-called 'little people' of rural Jamaica seem more to believe that their government is genuinely concerned about their individual and personal little destinies: that government is a sort of state father who will take care of all his children - especially the poorer and weaker ones. This, I think is a key achievement because without this kind of trusting faith of a majority little can be done. The big challenge for the J.L.P. is now to take hold of this faith and hope and turn it into a creative and productive force. And this will demand political courage and a great deal of hard work and, of course, a clear direction as to where they are leading the country, and why. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Dec 12 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: On Saturday evening I told you about the Jamaican who can produce a rich, healthy, full-cream and delightfully tasty milk for as little as a sixpence a quart. What I did not tell you was how this man does it. You will remember that I gave you a chemical breakdown of the amount of water, fat, ~~protein~~, sugar and salt as well as the vitamins and minerals that you find in top quality milk. Well, this man about whom I told you has what is known as an 'iron cow'. This is a elaborate and complicated machine. Into this machine he puts skim milk powder and all the other ingredients needed to make up the quality of milk of which I told you on Saturday. All this then goes through the machine and comes out at the other end either in cartons or bottles as a clean and richly blended milk, without any risk of dangerous germs because there is no ~~sick~~ cow involved that might be carrying some disease such as t.b. and the whole operation is automatic. When we had the U.S. navy here a few weeks back they used this man's milk because they found it the safest - and American are, as you know, very fussy about clean food.

Anyway, on the face of it it would seem that this sort of operation would be ideal here. The children in rural Jamaica are in desperate need of this kind of nourishing milk, if they are to grow strong in mind and body and straight young citizens of tomorrow. But unhappily things are not as simple as that.

We have a dairy industry in Jamaica. This gives work to a number of Jamaicans and gives a livelihood to a lot more. If this milk from the iron cow is sold at a sixpence a quart the chances are that

it will seriously upset the financial situation of the local dairy industry; it might even lead to a collapse of that industry. Certainly, the Manager of United Dairy Farmers expressed grave concern about this possibility in a letter which was published in the Gleaner on October 17th of this year. His concern however, was for the milk industry in the Corporate Area. ~~Myxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ He specifically said that the housewife in the Corporate Area will not pay two shillings for a quart of fresh milk when she could get it at half that price. My concern is that this fresh milk should be available to school children and especially to growing young children in rural areas; and if it can be supplied at a sixpence a quart then I am all for it.

And so, as you see, there is a real problem, a real conflict of interests. If the man with the 'iron cow' of whom I told you on Saturday is allowed to produce and sell as much reconstituted fresh milk as he can, he might and most likely will end up putting the dairy industry out of business - except for the ~~xx~~ cows milk that is sold to the condensery - because he can sell as good or an even better product at less than half the price they charge. Naturally, in its own interests, the industry will try to contain such a man. But you know, there is the national interest too. For me the most important aspect of the national interest is that there should be an abundant supply of cheap safe milk for all our growing children; and of course there is the cost of living too. It seems to me that here we have a classic example of a conflict between the national interest and a special interest. I hope a compromise is possible, but if it is not then we must decide which of these two interests should prevail - the special or the national? Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Dec 13 at 6.15p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: For the past two days I have been doing a sort of private and personal public opinion poll on Tuesday night's rather nasty flare-up in the House of Representatives. And I think that if the Members of the House had heard some of the comments on their behaviour it would have caused them to think very seriously.

Let us be frank about it. On Tuesday night a number of our elected representatives turned our parliament into an ugly and sordid place of shouting and screaming and cursing. And all the nation looked on and listened. Some of the abuse that was hurled across the floor of the House was so sordidly personal that it caused at least one patriotic Jamaican woman to weep for her country.

Now, let us not try to be 'holy holy' about this matter. You cannot conduct party politics in a genuinely free society like a church fair or a Sunday tea party. Sparks are bound to fly sometimes, and a good thing it is that they should. I have sat in the visitors' gallery of the British House of Commons and I have watched and listened while the late Mr. Aneurau Bevan laid the lash of his ~~to~~ brilliant Welsh tongue on Sir Winston Churchill or the Tory Party or Mr. Anthony Eden - as he then was - and the performance was dazzling and uplifting and stimulating. And I have seen and heard Churchill and Eden and others lash back with equal sharpness and vigour. But always, no matter how rough the going became, no matter how hot tempers became, no matter how cutting the words, neither the government Benches nor the Opposition Benches ever forgot the dignity of their parliament, or the fact that the nation was watching and listening. And so you rarely - if ever - heard any Member calling any other

Member a liar or a stinking liar or a filthy liar or a despicable person or a stinking fool or making nasty remarks about the personal, private and marital affairs of any other member. If you felt so strongly that you really wanted to cut a man to the quick then you had to think and find the right words that would cut deep, without reducing the dignity of parliament. And believe you me, when the British House of Commons gets into a really angry mood there is more real verbal fireworks than I have seen and heard at either Headquarters House or Gordon House. And what makes the House of Commons' verbal fireworks so exciting is that it is sharp, it is bright, it is brilliant and it is witty at times: ^{but} you never have the kind of vulgar swearing performance that was witnessed at Gordon House of Tuesday night. Quite frankly, I was ashamed of the manners and morals displayed by our national leaders on Tuesday night.

But much more serious than my being ashamed is the effect of this sort of ugly brawl on people's attitudes to parliament and to politicians. As it is the attitude to ^{politics and to} politicians is not a healthy one: you have examples of this in the widespread use of the words 'politricks' and 'politricksters'. These words clearly imply contempt. And that is very wrong. Politicians and politicians are an essential part of the democratic life of this country. To bring them into disrepute is to bring parliamentary democracy itself into disrepute. And once that happens then all our freedoms are in grave danger. For this reason the manners and morals of our elected representatives must be above reproach. So, let us not have another such ugly display in future. The dignity of parliament is essential to democracy.

Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Dec 14 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: On Friday of last week the Jamaica Chamber of Commerce held a special meeting at which they discussed the question of television and television sets for Jamaica. The people mainly interested were Kingston merchants whose business include the importing of radio of atelevision appliances. So I think one can fairly say that this was a meeting of a special interest group representing prospective importers of television sets. And because television is going to affect the life of this country more profoundly than any other medium of communication, I think it is especially important that we examine all the interests involved in this business with the greatest care.

I think that whenever any proposition or any question about television comes up the first question we should ask is: In whose interest is this? There are of course times when the special interest and the national interest are the same. When that happens we are in a very happy situation. At other times the special interest and the national interest only go along up to a point and then some sort of compromise has to be made. And then there are times when you have a straight conflict between special interests and national interest. When that happens, whoever has greatest responsibility and the power of decision decides what to do about it. A case in point was the decision of the three other interests not to take part in the television consortium that the government proposed. They had the power of decision, they did not like the government's offer - presumably because they did not like the terms under which they were invited to invest - and so they turned it down: they had the right and the

power to do this, and neither government nor the J.B.C. bawled about this decision. By the same token the government had the right and the power to decide how television should operate in this country. It has decided that it must be primarily for the good of society and that the advertiser should have no influence on programming. And so there will be no sponsored programmes as such. Only spots will be sold. The advertisers and the advertising agencies may have preferred something different but I am glad to note that they are accepting the new state of affairs with grace.

So, let us look at the approach of the merchants in this light. Let us call a spade a spade and admit that their principal interest is likely to be to sell as many television sets as they can and get as decent a margin of profit as possible. Fine: I see nothing wrong with this. What I am not so happy about are two key points that came out of that meeting. First, the merchants are mounting a campaign against the use of the European system of television because so they say, it would ~~make~~ make it impossible to import low-cost new or second hand American television sets. And the second point is that the meeting has decided that they will put an 80% mark up on the prices of all the sets they sell. On the first point, that of whether we should use the American or European system, Mr. C. R. Dickenson, a professional engineer, and the Chairman of the Joint Group of Professional Engineers, published a very clear and detailed letter in Tuesday's Gleaner setting out the technical reasons why the European system of television is preferable. ~~Please get hold of Tuesday's Gleaner and read that letter.~~ But there is more than just the technical reason: I will tell you about that and about this 80% mark up in price tomorrow evening. So, till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Dec 15 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abraham speaking

Good evening: Last night I told you ~~that~~ of Mr. C.R. Dickenson's letter in last Tuesday's Gleaner in which he showed why using the European system in our television would suit us better than using the American system. This is such a clear letter on a most important matter by an engineer of very great experience that all who are interested should make a point of reading it. I think it establishes beyond any doubt the superiority of the European system ^{for us} /from the technical, frequency and price points of view.

In addition to that let me mention the question of quality. Whether you like it or not, as a generalisation, the quality of B.B.C. television is superior to that of commercial television: I am of course talking about programmes. I was in Britain in the early days of B.B.C. television and I had a chance to watch the service grow. I have also seen a great deal of American ^{commercial} television. I think it would be obvious bias to say that everything on B.B.C. television was, or is, superior to everything on commercial television either in America or in Europe. This is just not true. Commercial television both in the States and in Britain has produced some magnificent programmes. Indeed, commercial television has at times produced a programme that was better than anything on the B.B.C. So I am not saying that everything on the B.B.C. is at all times better than everything on commercial television. What I am saying is that the general standard, the general quality of B.B.C. television programmes is vastly superior to that of commercial television. And nowhere is this quite as striking as in B.B.C. programmes for children and B.B.C.

documentaries on what is known as fundamental education. I think that in this respect even the programmes of the European commercial stations will be of greater value to us than the vast bulk of American T.V. films. So, purely from the point of view of the kind and quality of programmes that we need and want, I am all for the European system. But this does not mean that we are excluded from American programmes, any more than the Europeans are excluded from American programmes - especially when it comes to major live programmes like the installing of a new President or some big sporting event. A single transformer ^{at the J.B.C.} (a very costly one, it is true) will ensure that we get American pictures as clearly as we get pictures from the rest of the world. So really you see, the only people who should object to the introduction of the European system of television are those who have agencies to sell American television sets and who now face the prospect of watching while all the profits go to the fortunate ones who have European agencies. But for these people to expect, or even to ask, that their interests should prevail over the national interest, is a little more than unreasonable. Television, when it comes, must be in the service of all Jamaica - not in order to bring special profits and special opportunities to any section, unless they coincide with the national interest; and the American system ^{certainly} ~~my~~ coincide with the interests of some merchants; it does not coincide with the national interest. And as for the 80% mark-up proposed, I think it is prohibitive. In Europe the mark-up is between 25% and 30%. And that should be quite adequate for Jamaica - even if the government has to make it so by regulation. Goodnight.

is no way in which you can measure this sort of thing, or even refer to it in a official statement, no mention will be made of what seems to me the most crucial point of the meeting. Indeed, I am reasonably certain that the two leaders will not even discuss the matter as such. But it will be there behind everything they say to each other. And I think the only way we will see what ~~what~~ was achieved in this business of a meeting of minds will be reflected in the policies of the two countries on major matters over the next twelve months.

I think, for instance, that one important pointer that would be of some signifi~~ance~~ to us would be the extent to which the two leaders can work out some sort of agreement on the approach to the Cuban problem. Britain and the United States have not behaved as though they see eye-to-eye on Cuba. Until the American blockade which forced the Russian missiles out of Cuba, Britain had ignored the ~~the~~ American call to put economic pressure on Cuba. Now that America's tough policy has been vindicated in terms of Cold War politics, it would be interesting to see if there is any shift in British policy. In the private language of the State Department policy-makers, the British have tended to pursue a 'soft' line in the Cold War.

I think that if there is any sort of meeting of minds between the two leaders then it will reflect itself in a slight but perceptible shift in policy on both sides. British policy in relation to the Cold War will become tougher without becoming unreasonable or extreme. American policy, now sold on the fact that only toughness pays, will become a deal more flexible than it has been in recent years, because it can now negotiate from a psychologically proven position of strength. And this can change the shape of world politics in the coming year.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Dec 17 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: It is getting so near to Christmas that I hesitate to tackle anything really grim at this time; so let me get this particular point of concern to our health authorities as quickly as possible.

The news of the polio outbreak in British Guiana shows how accurately our own health authorities assessed the situation and acted on it. They told us that it looked very much as though next year would be a polio year and so they acted to counter it with the large-scale oral vaccination campaign for the under-fives. Now, when the outbreak does reach us our youngest and our most susceptible citizens will be effectively protected. I think this is a wonderful piece of foresight and planning on the part of our health authorities.

But this, I think, is only coping with the most extreme end of the problem. We all know that the Polio virus is not so selective as to only attack the under-fives. The under-fives may be most susceptible if they are not protected; but children over five, young men and young women, middle-aged people and old people can also be hit by this crippling and killer disease. So I should like our authorities to find ways and means of making this new oral vaccination available to these people too.

I know many parents of children over-five who are very anxious about their six-and seven-and eight and nine and ten and eleven and twelve-year-olds. Parents of children in these age-groups ~~xxxx~~ have checked with their doctors only to discover that they cannot get this new oral vaccine - even if they are in a position to pay for it. My own family is in this self-same position: we have three youngsters

between the ages of eight and fourteen and like thousands of other parents, my wife and I are worried and will go on being worried until we can vaccinate our children against the approaching Polio virus which is now spreading in British Guiana as it travels in this direction. So I sincerely hope that our health authorities will make this new oral vaccine available to the rest of the community as soon as possible. By all means take care of the under fives first. But once you are satisfied that you have enough in stock to take care of them then release the remainder to the over-fives, preferably to the youngsters first, then to the teenagers, and so on down the line.

Now for a quick word on Tourism and Casinos. In a speech at the official opening of the Rnaway Bay Hotel on Saturday Mr. Robert Lightbourne, the Minister of Trade and Industry, said flatly that he will not permit Casinos in Jamaica. So that settles that. The one important thing I want you to note is that this clear statement from the Minister comes after this particular question has been publicly, and often violently debated in the country. So, both the government and the Minister had a pretty clear idea of how the majority of Jamaicans - or to be more accurate, the leaders of majority opinion in Jamaica, like the churches for instance - feel about Casino gambling. And there is very little doubt that majority opinion is against it. And so, like the previous government they were influenced by public opinion on this matter. And this is the great value of public opinion. It can, and in a healthy society, it does ^{have a} ~~influence~~ powerful influence on policy. And for this reason it should be vigilant and responsible.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Dec 18 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The American President, Mr. John Kennedy, and the British Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Macmillan, will meet and hold talks in the Bahamas tomorrow. In the main their talks ~~would~~ ^{will} be a sort of clearing of the air, a working out of their approach to common problems. They will not necessarily discuss a series of specific problems to which they must find specific and concrete solutions: it will be more an attempt to arrive at a sort of meeting of minds. In this sense it would be wrong for us to expect anything dramatic to come out of these meetings.

And yet, what will come out of the meeting of these two leaders will be very important precisely because it will be the streamlining of an attitude. So, let us look at this question of the shaping of an Anglo-American attitude towards today's problems in the world.

Recently one of Mr. Kennedy's top advisers, Mr. Dean Acheson, rather upset the British by saying they are not the power they once were or still think they are. My guess is that the real point Mr. Dean Acheson was making was that the United States should stop treating Britain as though she were an equal partner in the business of making Western policy. But Mr. Acheson only represents one point of view in American thinking and there were some equally influential people who were quick to repudiate his views. But I think we ought to face the fact that this is one line of thinking. And my own view is that it is a line of thinking that will increasingly prevail. And so I think one of the big points behind the Kennedy-Macmillan talks will be the extent to which American thinking and American action will be influenced by the British. And since there

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Dec 19 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: On Saturday the Associated Press news service carried a news item from London which has disturbed me very greatly. But let me set out the story in all its detail for you.

Mrs. Dorothy Wilkinson is a seventy-five-year-old widow. She is an Anglican and her church is the church of St. Mary's in Ealing, which is a suburb of Greater London. When her husband died, Mrs. Wilkinson had him buried in the church yard. Then she erected a tomb to him and on the tombstone she had the following words printed: 'Forever in my thoughts'.

Well, the vicar of the church, *the Rev. D.S. Richardson* then went to the Church of England Court and applied to the ~~Church~~ Court to order Mrs. Wilkinson to remove those words from the tombstone. The vicar said, and now I am quoting his own words: "It is necessary for the Church to take a strong Christian line. We believe that strong expressions of affection or grief are inappropriate." He also went on to say that burial was becoming very pagan in these days.

On Saturday the Church Court sat and upheld the application of the vicar. It ordered Mrs. Wilkinson to remove the words: 'Forever in my thoughts' from her husband's tombstone. A weeping Mrs. Wilkinson said: "I thought the inscription suitable. My husband meant everything to me. The words 'Forever in my thoughts' are quite true." And then, as an afterthought, she added: "I can't afford to remove it as I have only got a pension coming in."

That, in essence, is the story that came over the Associated Press service on Saturday. A seventy-five year old lady who has the memory of her husband forever in her thoughts is told that by putting

those words on his tombstone she is doing something wrong and is ordered to remove the words. And her local priest who is responsible for this action says that strong expressions of love or sorrow are inappropriate. Inappropriate to what? Is it inappropriate for a Christian to love strongly or to sorrow deeply? Is it inappropriate for a Christian to carry the memory of such a love forever in his or her thoughts? It would seem that this is what the Reverend Richardson feels and thinks and it would seem that the Church of England Court agreed with him.

I frankly find this whole business almost unbelievable. It is of course possible that I have missed some high point of Theology or that the Associated Press story left out something very important. But I do not think the latter is true, and if there is some high point of theology that I have missed, I should be most grateful to anybody who can set me right on it.

At this moment it looks to me quite simply as though some poor old lady is being bullied and harassed by exactly the people who should be comforting her in mind and spirit. And you know, for all the faults of its servants, the church, ~~in~~ in all its branches, is and should be the ultimate comforter. And hounding an old-age pensioner ^{late} for recording that her/husband is forever in her thoughts seems to me lacking in Christian charity: and charity ^{St. Paul} is the greatest of all the Christian virtues. ~~Goodnight.~~

And talking about christian charity, please remember "Nuggets for the Needy". So give as hard as you can. And remember the Nuggets show tomorrow night at the Camb. Goodnight W

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Dec 20 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The House of Representatives rose for the Christmas recess on Wednesday. And as usual when it comes to the Christmas adjournment, our parliament was the heart and soul of brotherly love. People who, a week ago last Tuesday, were hurling curses at each other, were so sweet to each other yesterday that you would not have believed they were the same people.

The Speaker said that he may have been wrong from time to time; that he may have made mistakes, and that even judges sometimes misdirect themselves. He added that the great thing was to learn from one's mistakes. I could not agree more with Mister Speaker. Unless we learn from our mistakes, there can be no going forward. And I think both the Speaker and the House must learn that in today's Jamaica the sort of behaviour that took place in Parliament a week ago last Tuesday does not impress any more. We expect a certain standard of behaviour from our leaders and if they fall below that standard they must expect criticism. If they learn this important lesson then the ugly events of just over a week ago may yet prove to be a blessing in disguise. If, on the other hand, the Speaker or any other member of our Parliament tries to silence valid criticism then, I am afraid, they will have learnt nothing from last week's ugly scenes in parliament. Mister Speaker's remarks yesterday lead me to believe that they have in fact learnt - and that is a good thing.

All our Members of Parliament, on both sides of the House, agreed that this was a great year for Jamaica. In this one single year Jamaica ~~fixxx~~ put the finishing touches to her instruments of

independence - which entailed a high degree of joint action by the two opposing political parties. Then, with everything set and the date for independence selected, Jamaica went to the polls and returned the Jamaica Labour Party to power after seven years of People's National Party rule. Then came independence and the great celebrations. And contrary to many dark and gloomy and fearful warnings, there was no trouble.

Next there was the trip to London where Jamaica's Prime Minister took his place for the first time at a Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference - and Jamaica's free and equal partnership within the Commonwealth was formally acknowledged. Next there was Jamaica's election to Membership of the United Nations Organisation.

And here at home we saw the beginnings of a change in the basic policies of the country: essentially, the change expresses itself in a shift in emphasis. Over the years the wholesale and retail distribution sector of the economy had assumed a disturbing importance. In 1960 it contributed over 40 million pounds to the gross domestic product and in 1961 it contributed over 38 million pounds - and in both years it was the biggest single contributor to the Gross Domestic Product. That section of the economy which built nothing and grew nothing - the most unproductive section - was the strongest, and this was a serious situation. The shift in emphasis is in fact a shift away from this situation. It is also, in declaration at least, so far, a shift towards a greater share of what there is for rural Jamaica. And all these things, those that were achieved and those that are still aims, came to pass in the parliamentary year that that came to an end yesterday. It was indeed a great year for our parliament. And so let me wish our M.P.s a happy and restful Christmas.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Dec 21 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Those of you who have been more or less faithful listeners of mine over the years since I first started these news commentaries - beginning elsewhere and then coming here - will recall that I always talk about Christmas and animals at just about this time of the year. So let me try and persuade you again to think of the animals as you celebrate your Christmas this year. And I think that one of the ways in which can think about the animals practically is to make sure that they do not get frightened and terrorised by bangers and squibs this year. My own impression is that things have improved greatly about this sort of thing. Little boys seem to me a deal more thoughtful about throwing crackers and bangers at cats and dogs. And I think parents can with justice take credit for bringing out the decent impulses in their youngsters. I think - and I have told you so in past years - that youngsters will be only too glad to do the right thing once they get a lead from their parents. And you know, it is very rarely that you find little girls who are cruel or thoughtless about animals. I think the basic reason for this is that mummy's way of 'showing off' to her little daughter is more likely to take peaceful and gentle forms like making pretty things to wear or eat and being gentle with creatures. She does not have to impress her child by showing that she is skilful in her stone-throwing or in her shooting or in her setting of traps. These are the ways in which a father impresses his son. These are supposed to be the 'masculine' ways. And so it is that this business of trying to be a man's man will lead both man and boy into acts of cruelty to animals, not because they mean

to be cruel but because they feel this is the way a man's man is supposed to behave. I have seen a great decline in this attitude over the past five years or so. But some of this attitude still remains. And I think women can help greatly to put a stop to it. If they make it plain to their menfolk - both their grown-up menfolk and their little menfolk - that there is nothing 'soft' or 'cissy' about being gentle to animals I am sure this will help greatly. Most of the cruelty is not intentional. It is casual and thoughtless. And I think we are all of us guilty of this form of cruelty, both with each other and with animals. The big difference is that while we can talk back at each other, the animals cannot. And so it is up to us to think for them in a way that we do not have to think for each other.

Finally, I would like you to think about the Jamaica Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and of the Animal Hospital and Clinic. Between the first of April 1961 and the 31st of March of this year the Animal Hospital took care of a total of 9,913 creatures that need some sort of clinical treatment. Nearly two thousand animals had to be kept in the hospital; nearly fifteen hundred had to be destroyed; and the ambulance had to go out of call nearly two-thousand five hundred times. And over seventy-five percent of this had to be done free of charge. And the Society gets only fourteen hundred pounds a year from the government as a grant. So, the Society and the Hospital are always broke. So why not send a Christmas gift to the animal Hospital at 115 Spanish Town Road, Kingston 14. That would be a truly Christian gesture. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Dec 22 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I have, during this week, watched as the pace of everything quickened. And I have noticed that people are driving faster and seem less willing to give way to anybody else on the roads. We have already had a number of nasty accidents resulting in death and tragedy and heartaches. And unless we take it easy we are likely to have more disaster on the roads. So, please give ~~way~~ and let somebody filter into the traffic line. They are probably just as anxious as you to get somewhere. Above all, please be charitable if somebody is in the wrong. If they are in the wrong accidentally, they will appreciate your charitableness: if they are in the wrong intentionally, your charitable attitude may shame them into better behaviour next time. And please look out for people on cycles and people on foot who are trying to cross roads. The fact that they are not in cars does not mean that they are any less human or any less entitled to consideration. And if you have had a little too much to drink, take it easy. Let somebody else drive you. Or, if you have no driver with you then pull up on the side of the road and take a rest; it might clear your head and it may make all the difference between a happy Christmas and a tragic one. I know that when you have had a few too many you always feel that you can cope: this again is part of that thoughtless masculine vanity and I am as guilty of it as anybody else - so please, be careful and suspicious of that spirit of confidence when you've had a few too many. So, in order to make it a truly happy Christmas I hope all motorists will be careful and courteous with each other.

But this does not apply to motorists only. Will truckmen

who park their trucks on highways at nights please make sure that there is some sort of parking light. Very many Jamaicans have been killed or maimed because some thoughtless truck driver has parked his truck in darkness on a highway because he wanted to save a little battery power or a little kerosene oil. Is it really worth risking one life for the sake of a little battery power or kerosene oil? I don't think so. So will all truckdrivers all over Jamaica take thought for their fellowmen this Christmas season.

And will cyclists please stop riding three and four abreast in busy and heavy traffic. I have seen cyclists behave as though their intention was to cause an accident. We have enough accidents without this sort of meanness. And those silly-clever young ~~xxx~~ cyclists who weave in and out of heavy traffic and think they are smart when they overtake on the wrong side - I should like them to pause and ~~th~~ think. They are not only playing with their own lives but with other people's lives as well.

And I hope people on foot will stop this business of deliberately forcing cars to swerve dangerously close to oncoming traffic because they will not step out of the road. This is the most foolish form of showing off that I know and it has often ended in grief.

I know that the tempers of shoppers and shop-assistants will be getting very frayed round about now. And it is at times like this that good manners, that courtesy separates us from the lower order of animals. The hallmark of civilised living is to be able to show self-restraint and self-control under pressure. The pressure is on us. Let us respond like the civilised people we are: let us be courteous to each other. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Dec 24 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: This morning's news about the number of traffic accidents we have had in Jamaica so far is very alarming. When I said this to a friend he shrugged and said: "No man, it's only seventeen or so odd accidents with about a dozen people. Nobody's been killed yet. You can't expect Christmas to go by without any accidents."

I think my friend expressed a pretty general opinion. We are bound to have a few accidents; let us hope that they are not too serious. The only thing that is wrong with this point of view is that the accident rate is in fact very serious already. Seventeen accidents seem a very small number, especially when you hear about the three hundred accidents in the United States so far; and especially when you hear that the American authorities describe this as a new low for accidents during the Christmas period. But let us look at it a little more closely and see what our seventeen means as against America's three hundred accidents. The United States has a population that is somewhere in the region of two-hundred million people as against our one million-six-hundred thousand odd people. So, in the American context ~~xxxxx~~ there has been one and one-third accidents for every million Americans there are. In Jamaica, on the other hand, and using our own population as the yardstick, we have had slightly more than one accident for every one hundred thousand people we have. In other words, while the Americans have had one and one-third accidents per million people so far, we have had a little over ten accidents per million people so far. Using these figures, the proportionate picture is that so far over the Christmas period Jamaica has had

seven and a half accidents for every one accident in the United States. So please do not dismiss this accident business. The rate is terrible; and only you and I, the people who use the roads, can bring it down. Christmas should be a joyous and peaceful and creative time, not a time for massive slaughter and damage on our roads. So please, take care and make this a truly happy Christmas.

And talking about a happy Christmas, the latest issue of Time Magazine carries an article which shows how far so many of us have departed from the true spirit of Christmas. Under the heading: The Blight Before Christmas, the paper talks about the strains and stresses the average American family faces just before the great day. It begins with these words: "Beginning about Thanksgiving, family quarrels become fiercer, relations with relatives become more strained, tradesmen assume a forced friendliness, and the dispenser of holiday cheer begins to feel there is not an honestly cheery face to be found anywhere." And then it goes into detail: about the money spent, about keeping up with the Joneses, and the mounting frenzied rush that ends up in debt, in hot tempers, in bitterness - and, for the little children, in a mental state called Santa Claustrophobia, when screaming youngsters are forced to sit on the knees of beery commercial father Christmases... This is not the true spirit of Christmas. The true spirit of Christmas is to be found in the quiet family ^{circle:} ~~circle:~~ in the peaceful family atmosphere, where the little children are the most important. For, above all else, Christmas is the celebration of the birth of the little child, Jesus Christ. It is the day of children and of peace to men of goodwill. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Dec. 25 at 6.15 p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: As usual I take my Christmas Commentary from the Bible. The first passage is from Luke Chapter 2:- And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed. And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria. And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; because he was of the house and lineage of David. To be taxed with Mary his espoused wife, being great with child. And so it was, that, while they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered. And she brought forth her firstborn son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room in the inn. And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night. And lo the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you; Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes lying in a manger. And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men". *Personally I prefer the Latin vulgate "Peace to men of goodwill"* The second passage is from 1 Corinthians 13:- Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling x cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge

and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing. Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man I put away childish things. For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known. And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity. May I wish all of you a warm and happy and peaceful Christmas. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmiss ion on
Wednesday Dec 26 at 6.15p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I hope that you have all had a peaceful, restful and happy Christian Christmas. And by Christian I do not mean simply in the spirit of the Christian Church: that is important, but I am willing to stick out my neck far enough to say that the ~~church~~ Christian Church does not always reflect the true spirit of Christ at all times. So, when I say I hope you have had a true Christian Christmas, I exclude nobody because Christ Himself excluded nobody: He did not exlude the Jew, indeed he was a good Jew himself. And by his example I am convinced that he would not exclude the Muslim, Bhuddaist or even the straight unbeliever. Anyway, let us get away from possible argument. I hope yesterday was a really good day and that the youngsters have had great fun.

Ours was a very peaceful day. For the last sixteen^{which is as long as we} years my wife and I have made it a rule always to spend Christmas at home. When the children came the rule assumed the character of an unbreakable custom. When I have been on working trips, I have always hurried back to be at home for Christmas Day. Because for any Christmas morning to break without the entire family having breakfast around the lighted Christmas Tree and then opening the Christmas presents would be unthinkable. For us, the coming together of the family at Christmas is in fact the spirit of Christmas. And so it was yesterday. And I hope it was so for you too. But for many of you this will not be so.

In my years in the West Indies I have noticed that there is a great deal of visiting done on Christmas Day. Families and individuals move from one home to another and sort of make the

rounds on Christmas Day. I have now grown used to it. But I was surprised when I first encountered this because in both Europe and the Christian parts of Africa Christmas was a day when people stayed at home. The only time they go out is to go to Church.

The day for outings is today, Boxing Day. For me, as child in Africa, Christmas was always a quiet and rather solemn religious day. And Boxing Day was the great day of joy.

I still remember vividly the pre-dawn waking on Boxing Day and the ~~FRANTIC PREPARATIONS~~ for the great outings. The women who seem never to go to sleep would be busy baking and packing food. And I was always impressed by the fact that the men seemed to take orders from the women with an unaccustomed humility and fetched and carried as they were ordered to by the women. And then, round about half past four on Boxing Day morning, laden with baskets of food and drink we would all trudge to huge waiting busses and make the long journey out of the city slums to green places beside rivers and there would be music and dancing and feasting and singing and playing all ~~xxxxx~~ the long day. And I still remember how quickly Boxing Day always seemed to pass. And this is the way it will be in parts of Africa today. And you know, it will be like this in parts of Jamaica too - but ~~it~~ not, it seems to me, to the same extent that it was in the Africa of my childhood. But perhaps I am being sentimental. If I am I am not ashamed: Boxing Day has always been the same thing as great fun for me. So, in that spirit, and with all my very best wishes, a Happy Box to all of you. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Dec 27 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: We went to the circus yesterday - all five of us, mummy, daddy and the three children. It would not have been the same thing if we had not all gone: the whole point about going to the circus is that it should be done as a family thing. It is never all that it should be if mummy and daddy are not with the kids.

Anyway, we spent the morning and early afternoon in traditional Boxing Day fashion by visiting friends and then we went to the five o'clock show. And for two wonderful and glorious hours we were part of the two-thousand odd people who were transported into the fairy-tale world of high excitement and great adventure.

But before I mention some of the acts, let me tell you a little about this circus because it is rather different from the circuses we are used to. This one is a three-ringed circus: this means that there are three rings in which three different acts are going on at the same time. All the circuses which we have had in Jamaica in the past have had one ring only, so that all our attention was concentrated on one ring and one performance. With this one there were four times when everybody's attention was so divided between what was going on in Ring One and Ring Three that many youngsters were utterly confused trying to keep up with two things at the same time. But after a while they got used to this and the three-ringed circus became an exciting and fast-moving affair, cramming more acts into the time than the one-ringed circus can. Of course, for all the big acts they used only the centre ring and twelve out of the sixteen acts were in the centre ring, and all of us watched these without any distractions.

And now for the acts themselves. It all began quietly enough

with impressive and skilful but rather tame acts on ladders in two of the three rings. But as soon as that was over we were treated to the lion act with Captain Eddy and the African lions snarling at each other - and we were really gone! We were in a tense, exciting and dangerous world with one man in a cage full of wild beasts. Next came excitement of a different kind: first, ladders swinging high above our heads and then Madeleine Geraldo, graceful and strong and lovely and floating high above us doing the most amazing things on the flying trapeze. By this time things were really moving fast and you could measure it by the quickened way in which youngsters - and oldsters - ~~xxxxxx~~ munched their popcorn or candied apple or floss or what you will - in a sort of mesmerised way. And believe me, I as a part of all this.

Every now and then the clowns or the elephants or the 'only trained Hippopotamus in the world' brought a moment of laughter and relief from the tension. One such moment was gloriously filled with laughter as the ^{two} three-year-old little Canestrelli boy, who was part of the family Trampoline act, did a bouncing ^{summersault} ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ and brought the entire house down. But these were brief moments of relief and the tension soon returned with the daring Trapeze act of the flying Geraldos and the high swinging perch, and the Rola Bola and the really nerve-wrecking high wire act by the Jordans. No wonder we were all a bit limp and dazed when the performance ended.

And to show you what a really great success it was we had a rough time at home this morning persuading our youngest one not to rig up a piece of wire and try to walk along it. She now wants to do the walking on a thin strand of wire act: and we are all on guard.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Friday Dec 28 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Because it broke just a few days before Christmas, a very important piece of news out of Africa has gone almost unnoticed: and yet, as far as I am concerned this is probably the most important piece of news to come out of Africa in 1962. So, let us go back and give this piece of news the full value it deserves.

A few days before Christmas Mr. R.A. Butler, the British Home Secretary, ~~xxxxxxxx~~ who is also the Minister in charge of Central African affairs, announced almost casually that the British Government had decided to allow Nyasaland to secede from the Central African Federation of the two Rhodesias and Nyasaaland. And then bedlam broke out in both London and Central Africa. Sir Roy Welensky, the Prime Minister of the Central African Federation, accused the British Government of treachery to the white people of Central Africa; he said that the British Government had an army stationed in Kenya with the specific intention of forcing Britain new decision on the settler; and then he declared that the settlers would fight if necessary.

In London reaction was just as violent and the diehard Tory African Lobby of which Lord Salisbury is such a powerful and eloquent leader, sounded even more shocked and horrified and bitter than Sir Roy Welensky. Some of you may still remember that it was just ^{under} ~~over~~ ^{two} ~~one~~ year ago that Lord Salisbury unleashed a savage attack on Mr Ian McLeod who was then Colonial Secretary. The reason for that bitter attack was an attempt to forestall what has now happened. I told you at the time that the whole affair was extraordinary and the reason for it was equally extraordinary.

Lord Salisbury was possibly the most powerful single personality in British conservative politics: he was the senior Conservative Minister in the House of Lords until he resigned because of what he described with such bitter savagery as Mr. Macleod's 'indecent haste' to sell the British empire and the white settlers of East and Central Africa down the drain.

What was at stake was whether these territories were to continue to be dominated by the white settler minorities or whether the African majorities were ultimately to take control. And both Salisbury and Welensky knew that the greatest safeguard to continued settler rule was a centralised ^{and federated} settler government under the protection of the present, loaded federal constitution. As long as the Central African Federation could continue under its present constitution, so long would the white settler minorities remain in political control. It was for this reason that both were so bitterly opposed to the secession of Nyasaland. They knew that if Nyasaland seceded it would be only a matter of time before ^{the Africans of} Northern Rhodesia would demand a greater share of power and then withdraw from the Federation. Now, all that Salisbury and Welensky feared has come to pass.

And what all this means is that the British Government has now abandoned the so-called concept of 'partnership between the races' which meant that about a million white settlers had more political power than something in the region of twenty million Africans. And this in turn means that it is only a matter of time before East and Central Africa will cease to be regarded as 'White Africa'. And this in turn means that the bastion of 'white supremacy' in Africa has shrunk fantastically in the closing days of 1962. Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Dec 29 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: There is tonight and there is Monday night and then we will bid ^dgoodbye ^eforver to 1962. There is ~~of~~ course Sunday too, but as far as these commentaries are concerned there is only tonight and Monday night. So let me devote tonight to a quick survey of the highlights of 1962 on the international scene; and let me devote Monday night to a similar survey of the highlights of the local scene over the past twelve months.

I think the three most dramatic events of 1962 on the international scene were: First, the Cuban crisis; second, the Communist Chinese attack on ^{third} ~~India~~; and ~~three~~, the split between communist China and the Soviet Union. I think that of all that happened over the past twelve months, these three events are the most significant because they will have the greatest bearing on the shape of the future.

So let us try to pinpoint the most significant aspect of each of these events. The Cuban crisis - over and above everything else - marks a turning point in the psychological attitude of both the United States and the rest of the non-Communist world to the myth of Soviet political invincibility. Before the Cuban crisis all those of us who are brutally honest with ourselves will admit that we somehow felt that the Russians were bound to win, that the Americans were bound to step down at the last minute and communism will score yet another victory. If the Americans dug ~~in~~ their heels, we felt, it was bound to end up in war, because, let us be frank about it, we just did not ~~entertain~~ the possibility of the Russians stepping down. What we - and so much of the rest of the world ~~had~~ in fact done was to invest the Russians with almost superhuman qualities. ~~Now, because~~

And this business of making supermen out of the Russians has in fact been one of the greatest psychological weapons of Soviet policy. They have nursed and fostered it with care: that is why you do not hear or read about Russian failures. The failures are suppressed and hidden because supermen can make no mistakes. You only hear and read about the spectacular successes and the myth of the supermen grows.

Now, because the Russians had to back down in the Cuban confrontation, the myth is dying. Like all myths, it is taking a little time to die - but it is dying. And I think the effects of the death of this supermen myth will have far reaching effects on world politics in the months and years ahead. If you agree with me that the beginning of everything is thought then I have said enough about this: if you think you are dealing with fallible mortals rather than with infallible supermen the effect on your thoughts and actions are likely to be revolutionary. So for me this is the really big thing of 1962.

In a sense the Chinese attack on India has also had this thought provoking effect. The myth that all any Afro-Asian country has to do is to be neutral with a rather heavy bias in favour of the communists has been exploded forever. India was indeed the symbol and personification of this brand of neutralism and India was savagely attacked - and it was the so-called wicked Anglo-American imperialists who came to her aid. I think we are going to see great and permanent changes in Afro-Asian attitudes because of this. Finally, the fall out between Russia and China has shown, to use a classic Marxist phrase, that the contradictions within communism are greater in the second half of the twentieth century than are those within capitalism. So I should say that in 1962 the most significant thing was the series of ~~xxx~~ psychological defeats suffered by communism all over the world.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Dec 31 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: What are the really significant events of the year that is now dying? I think that two events stand out above all others: first, the coming of independence on August 6th; and second, the General elections of April 10th.

If you want to isolate and separate these two events, then the coming of independence was undoubtedly the most significant event of this or any other year since emancipation. Indeed, August 6th, 1962, marked the high point in the three-centuries-old history of Jamaica. Independence is a once only thing in the history of a people. And that one great moment came in the year that ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ will die at midnight tonight. So, if nothing else happened in 1962, that one single event would have still made ^{this the} ~~it the~~ ^{year in} ~~the greatest single event in~~ modern Jamaican history.

But something else of significance did happen: the people of Jamaica, and specifically the people of rural Jamaica, went to the polls and turned out a stable, experienced and competent government and replaced it by a ^{new} government which was supposed not to have the know-how, experience or ability and talent to run a complex modern state. The new government took over and nothing disastrous or tragic happened. More important, the myth that only one party really had the ability to rule was exploded for good. Today, we do in fact have in Jamaica a reasonably effective government - no matter which party is in power - and a reasonably effective alternative government. And this, I think, is something of vital importance for the health of the society and for the future of democracy in Jamaica.

Let us face, before the last elections there were many people

who felt that the P.N.P. was the only party that could possibly form an effective government, or even a progressive government. And so, even though they did not like/~~all~~ ^{many of} the features of P.N.P. policy they felt constrained to support the P.N.P. because there seemed no positive and creative alternative to it. In fact this attitude became so prevalent in the Corporate Area that the P.N.P. itself began to believe that there was no alternative to P.N.P. rule and this led to a certain ^{showed itself in some of the} arrogance which ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ P.N.P. slogans, as well as in the confident prediction that they will be back in eighteen months' time.

But the P.N.P. has now been shown that it was not/^{and is not} the only possible government. And we do not hear any more talk today about the P.N.P. being back in eighteen months. I think the J.L.P. can fairly regard this as an important psychological victory. ~~I think I have told you before that I think this is a very good thing for Jamaica.~~
 The P.N.P. now knows that it is not the only/^{source of ability and wisdom} ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~: the J.L.P. now knows that it too can rule. And we, the mass of the people, ^{now} know that we can change our government without everything falling apart. And this, you know, is going to make a world of difference. I think that as a result we can look forward to a more humble and receptive P.N.P. in the months and years ahead: and I think that with confidence and tolerant the J.L.P. is likely to become a deal more flexible/^{and} might well surprise all of us by its radical approach to urgent social problems. I think it has already surprised many people. And so to sum up: 1962 saw, in the general elections and in the coming of independence, the full flowering of the political maturity of the Jamaican people and their institutions. Goodnight.