

NEWS COMMENTARIES - JULY, 1960.

107.	Communism: Differences between Russia and China	- 1st July
108.	Beef Prices	- 2nd "
109.	Sabina Park Press Ban	- 4th "
110.	The Citrus Industry	- 5th "
111.	The Gun Menace	- 6th "
112.	Death of Nye Bevan	- 7th "
113.	Algeria	- 8th "
114.	Radio Jamaica' Birthday	- 9th "
115.	Trinidad Oil Strike	- 11th "
116.	Cuba and Cold War	- 12th "
117.	Implications of the Cold War for Jamaica	- 13th "
118.	Hurricane Warning: K.S.A.C. Cleansing	- 14th "
119.	U.S. Presidential Elections: Kennedy Vs Nixon	- 15th "
120.	The Citizen and the Police	- 16th "
121.	Manley on Beef Prices	- 17th "
122.	Referendum Bill: Detention Powers Bill	- 19th "
123.	The Cold War: Cuba and the Congo	- 20th "
124.	Will There Be War: The Factors of War.	- 21st "
125.	" " " " The Factors for Peace	- 22nd "
126.	Service in Stores	- 23rd "
127.	Peter Evans' Complaint to Bar Council on Interviewing Facilities at Prison	- 25th "
128.	Party Political Broadcasts	- 26th "
129.	Local Government Public Relations	- 27th "
130.	Mermaids and Mermen	- 28th "
131.	Monroe Doctrine	- 29th "
132.	Detention Powers Bill K.S.A.C. Cuts Poor Relief	- 30th "

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Thursday June 19 at 6.15p.m.

Peter Abrahams speaking

PASSED FOR BROADCAST

S.C.D.

Good evening: Earlier this week I discussed the communist threat to Japan. It is likely from what I said then that many of you might think that Russia and China, the two great leaders of communism, are working hand in glove and have reached complete agreement on all details of how they will deal with the Western world. Most of us are inclined to see the picture in this light. In broad outline this picture is, of course, correct; but once we look at it carefully and in detail and in detail, we will find that it is not correct. Everything is not smooth between Russia and China. Under the surface of the language of the brotherhood of communists all over the world there is a tough struggle for power going on between Russia and China. The Chinese communists are questioning and challenging Russia's right to be the big brother and leader of world communism. Often, this questioning and challenging is not open and direct. Communist methods are generally indirect and oblique. You are more likely to see an article in a Chinese communist newspaper saying the opposite of what Khrushchev or some other Russian leader has said. This Chinese article will not mention what the Russians have said or which Russian leader had said it. But the implied criticism would be unmistakeable to those who know how to read the hidden meanings in the language of communism. But every now and then these differences between the Chinese and the Russians burst out into the open for all the world to see. Last week just such a row burst out into the open for all of us to see.

Now what was this row about? In the language of communism

b3076

this row is known as "an ideological conflict". In our straightforward language this simply means they have bitter disagreement on very important ideas. And the main idea on which they disagree is the idea of communism itself. The Chinese believe that the Russian policy which Mr. Khrushchev calls 'peaceful co-existence' is so much nonsense. They say that there never can be any peaceful co-existence between capitalism and communism. They say that it is the duty of all communists, and especially of great communist countries, to drive full-speed ahead in the battle against capitalism and to bring in communism fast and by brute force if necessary. When the Russians shot down the U.S. spy plane, and when the Summit meetings collapsed, Chinese newspapers gloated over their Russian friends and there were cries of 'I told you so'. To the Chinese communists all these events proved that 'peaceful co-existence' was an unreal farce. And then the Chinese hit on a new point of attack. They said Russia had now developed to a point where she belonged ~~to~~ among the rich and satisfied nations and had lost her interest in the poorer people of the world. China is now the leader of the poor and exploited peoples of the world. Last week the Russians answered the Chinese charges. They called the Chinese 'infantile' and 'hotheaded' and suggested they were upstarts who did not understand the movements of history. For myself, I think this struggle for leadership of the communist world that is now going on between Russia and China might, in the long run, prove an important factor for world peace. When your enemies scrap among themselves it is a good idea for you just to sit back and watch.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday July 2nd at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

PASSED FOR BROADCAST
6/30/64

Good evening: You will remember that I warned you some time ago that price controls were going to come off beef. I told you then that when this happened I expected all of us to pay even more for our already costly meat. Well, yesterday controls were officially lifted from the price of beef and, as I feared, prices went up steeply. Your piece of fillet will now cost you at least 11/- or 12/- a pound and when there is a shortage you might have to pay more. Before decontrol you could get a piece of fillet for about 8/-. Rump steak has gone up from 4/6 to 6/-; and sirloin roast has gone up from 5/- to 6/6. These are city prices. I expect the country prices to make just as big a leap. Indeed, I think in some places country prices will make an even bigger leap. Heaven only knows how the poorer sections of our community are going to be able to afford these new prices. It would be interesting to see what the poorer housewife will have to pay for her piece of stewing meat. There is one ray of hope still left for us at the moment. The price of imported frozen beef has not yet been raised and there is a chance that it may not be raised. And for the housewife finding herself anywhere near a ~~xxx~~ super-market selling imported meat, I would suggest that she has a look at those packets of stewing lamb. One of these packets of imported stewing lamb, selling for 1/6 or 1/9 can make a delightfully tasty meal for a family of 5 or 6 with each having a generous helping of meat.

I think it is all very well for our merchants to urge us to support Jamaican good. Generally, I agree with them, as long as their

prices are reasonable. But when we can get something which has come from thousands of miles away at a cheaper price than we can get something which was produced right here in Jamaica then I think the merchants are unreasonable to expect us to go on buying Jamaican.

Now there is one thing which I think ought to be faced. There are many people for whom the price increase in beef is going to be a nuisance. They are going to protest about it but they are going to pay the new prices because they want the beef and because they can afford it. Their situation is going to be bad enough: but at least they will still be able to have their piece of beef.

But what about the people who just cannot afford it? They, the poorer people, are in the majority, and they will be the people who will suffer most. This is, in fact, punishing one section of the community more than another. And to me this is economic discrimination. Already there are large numbers of people in this island who can only afford one pound or even a half pound of beef only per week. With the new prices many of these people will not be able to afford even that small amount. I tell you frankly I do not like this business at all and I think government has shown a singular lack of consideration for the position of the poorest sections of our community over this beef price business.

If they had to lift controls, why could they not lift controls on the more expensive cuts only and keep controls on the price of the cheaper cuts. I sure they could have worked out an arrangement where the price of stew meat and the price of soup bones could remain at their present level. This would at least have ensure that a piece beef would be within the reach of even the poorest family in our society. I doubt if the Minister concerned even thought of this.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Monday July 4 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last Friday the Publishers' Association of Jamaica, the Jamaica Broadcasting Corporation and Radio Jamaica, announced that they had decided not to "report or comment on any events taking place at Sabina Park; nor will they give public attention to Sabina Park and the Kingston Cricket Club (the owners of Sabina Park) in any way". In other words, the two radio stations and the Publishers' Association of Jamaica have decided on a complete news 'black-out' as far as Sabina Park and the Kingston Cricket Club are concerned. *Of course the Kingston Cricket Club is still able to by time + space, like anyone else.*

There is one point which the public at large may not know so I think it is a good idea to clarify it here and now. Many of you may ask: Who are the Publishers' Association of Jamaica? It is the organisation which speaks on behalf of practically all the most important newspapers and magazines published in Jamaica. Before the advent of the Sunday newspaper which made its appearance for the first yesterday there were eight newspapers. Two of these, the Gleaner and the Star are dailies: four - Public Opinion, the Jamaica Times, The Voice, Catholic Opinion - are weekly: two - Pagoda and Tribune - are fortnightly. You can expect all these papers to apply the news 'black-out' completely. Not a single item of sporting news dealing with Sabina Park or the Kingston Cricket Club will appear in these papers as long as the ban is on. Then there are the ^{six} ~~five~~ monthly magazines: two of the six are particularly concerned with sport, these are Alva Ramsey's West Indian Sportsman and Foggy Burrow's Sportslife. For these two things are likely to be a bit tricky but I expect them to observe the ban just as completely as the newspapers.

Then there are the four general monthlies - Spotlight, New Day, The West Indian Review and the West Indian Economist. I expect all of these to observe the ban. As a combination these papers and magazines and the two radio stations make up the totality of the Jamaican press and radio. ~~They control all our news. When they decide, as a group, to withhold news on any subject, the blackout is likely to be complete on that subject.~~ [This is the tremendous power of the press.] And the press, knowing how great this power is, and knowing its duty to the public, is not likely to use this great power lightly.

Now, the Jamaica press has, for a very long time, had very poor relations with ^{Sabina} ~~Sixx~~ Park. Members of the press going about their duty of reporting the news have been denied entry to the pavilion at Sabina Park. During the third test match between the West Indies and England earlier this year reporters from the Gleaner and Public Opinion were refused entry in spite of the fact that they had passes. And when the publishers wrote the Kingston Cricket Club they had to wait nearly two months for an unsatisfactory reply. Now why this off-hand attitude bordering on contempt for the press? I think Saturday's Gleaner editorial hit the nail squarely on the head. It said, 'that some of the worse features of social snobbery have crept into our amateur sports. There is a high and mighty attitude of class and caste and I am afraid that where you have this attitude you always find that the high and mighty have a contempt for the rest of their fellow men. This, I think, is what has happened at the Kingston Cricket Club. But ~~we~~ ^{it} of the press ~~are~~ ^{is} not respectors of snobbery. ~~and we~~ ^{snobbery} will not put up with ~~it~~ ^{it} because it is not good for sport; it is not good for the country; and it is not good for the Kingston Cricket Club itself. Sabina Park owes both the press and the public at large a lot more consideration and respect than it has given them in the past. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Tuesday July 5 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last Tuesday the Citrus Growers Association held its annual general meeting. At the human level, last Tuesday's meeting was the last one over which Sir Robert Kirkwood would preside, for Sir Robert formally resigned his position as Chairman of the Citrus Growers Association at that meeting. Many of the 200 delegates at the meeting realised that this was a touching moment of parting and showed it in the warmth with which they applauded Sir Robert's farewell speech. I think just how much he was moved by this warmth of the delegates was shown by the fact that Sir Robert departed from his prepared speech at the end to thank the delegates for having even accepted him as a Jamaican and for having/cursed him as a Jamaican. I think this was a proud moment for Kirkwood. I think he has committed himself so completely and unreservedly to Jamaica that it would have been very strange indeed if he had not been accepted and even cursed as a Jamaican. So much for the personal aspect of it. After fifteen years as leader of the industry Kirkwood has vacated the high office of Chairman. In the fifteen years under his leadership the industry had grown and expanded to the point where it produces two million boxes of citrus annually. Indeed, when he took over fifteen years ago you could hardly have called citrus an industry: it had no status; there was hardly any processing and there was no marketing organisation. Today all that has changed and for this the industry owes Kirkwood a real vote of thanks.

Of course, not everything in the garden is lovely, as many of Sir Roberts critics have made plain. His hope that the industry

would by now be producing between five million and seven million boxes of fruit has not been realised. And as you know, the great discontent among large numbers in the industry has led to the setting up of a five-man investigating committee to look into the affairs of the industry. This was a right and wise decision. It is time the industry took stock of itself and map out the next phase of its growth and development. And I think that if the new leadership of the industry learn from its past mistakes and build and improve on the foundations laid by the Kirkwood leadership, there would be hope for the future of the industry.

Now the main problem facing the industry is competition in the overseas markets. This competition is likely to grow very fierce as the British Government carries out its trade liberalisation policy. Citrus from Spain, from Israel, from the United States as well as from other countries will compete with our citrus on the English market. Our own government as well as the British government will do all they can to help the industry to meet this competition. At present a Citrus Development Plan, as part of our new Agricultural Development Plan, is being worked out to help the industry. So it is clear the government will help, but the basic work of preparing to meet this competition will have to be done by the industry itself. To hope to meet this competition our industry must become a hundred per cent more efficient than it now is. The quality of our fruit should be good enough to compete with the best the rest of the world has to offer. To achieve this we must use modern and up-to-date methods of growing and caring for our trees. That is the great challenge to the citrus industry. If it meets that challenge it can beat the competition.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday July 6 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking.

Good evening: I have talked to you before now about the state of gun-happiness of some of our citizens. I have told you that I thought there were too many guns about, and that too many people who had no business to have guns because they were unfit to have such lethal weapons, do in fact go around with guns. I think that all these guns are a menace to the peace and order of our society. I think it is high time that our authorities showed greater restraint in their handing out of licences to any Tom, Dick or Harry to carry a gun. Guns are dangerous weapons. Guns can maim and kill. And guns in the hands of the wrong people, in the hands of irresponsible people, can introduce an ugly form of lawlessness into our community.

My return to the subject of guns is prompted by the news that two men shot each other up over the weekend and are now in hospital. I think the story of these two men is one of the most dreadful and horrifying stories I have ever read. Let me tell you the story again. One man is driving along in a car; another man is riding along on a bicycle. These two men are then involved in an accident. The accident is obviously not very serious because both men are well enough to be able to hurl curse words at each other. Suddenly, each one of them whips out a gun and blazes away at the other. One gets shot in the stomach and the other in the leg and both are now in hospital.

Now this story is, to me, the clearest case of gun-happiness I have come across in a long time. If it were not such a serious thing it would be funny. I suppose it is funny in a horrible sort

of way to have two men blazing away at each other in Wild West style on a Kingston street. I suppose some people might even find it exciting and adding a little spice to life. But just think how near tragedy those two men were. Each might have killed the other and been up for murder. But even worse than that, if any of their shots had gone astray some innocent bystander who had nothing to do with them or with the accident could so easily have been killed or seriously injured: some child playing happily on the sidewalk or going about its parents' business might so easily have had its life snuffed out had some bullet gone astray. And of course, all of this did not enter the minds of these two fine gentlemen as they blazed away at each other, showing just how tough and quick on the draw they could be. I think the whole business was a most dangerous display of irresponsibility on the part of these two men. When people go in for this sort of thing they introduce the law of the jungle into our society. And lawlessness always invites more lawlessness. If this sort of thing goes on unchecked it will only be a matter of time before people settle all their differences by gun-battles in the streets to the danger of everybody else.

I feel we all ought to take this sort of thing very much more seriously than we are now inclined to do. ~~I hope the authorities will deal very sternly with these two gentlemen.~~ But very much more important than that: I feel our authorities are too lax ~~in their~~ and easy about this business of giving people permits to carry arms. The Minister of Home Affairs ought to look into this business himself. It is his duty to see that this indiscriminate arming of irresponsible people is stopped so that we can all go about in peace, knowing that we are protected by the rule of law, rather than threatened by the gun-happy rule of the jungle. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Thursday July 7 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Yesterday's news of the death of Mr. Aneurin Bevan is a very great blow for the British Labour Party and for British socialism. As you know, Mr. Bevan was the deputy leader of the British Labour Party. And at the last Annual Conference of the British Labour Party it was his great influence that prevented a split within that party. Many of Britain's leading Labourites are extremely disappointed with the way in which Mr. Hugh Gaitskell is leading their party. They feel that their party has become too respectable and middle-class and they blamed Mr. Gaitskell's leadership for this. Then too, Mr. Gaitskell and his own supporters had put forward the idea that nationalising the major industries should no longer be one of the main issues on which the Labour Party should fight the Conservatives. The Labour Party, Mr. Gaitskell felt, might never again win power from the Conservatives they did not give up their policy of nationalisation. To many socialists this sort of talking was looked on as selling out their principles. They did not want any part of it and a section of the British Labour Party was all for getting rid of Mr. Gaitskell and putting Mr. Bevan in his place as the top leader. All they needed was Mr. Bevan's consent and encouragement to stage the revolt and overthrow Gaitskell. But Bevan was having none of this. He had fought against Gaitskell for the top position in the Labour Party and he had lost in a straight democratic election, and had been elected deputy leader. He felt he owed his leader a certain loyalty and so he refused to lead the revolt. I think he refused to lead the revolt for two reasons. First,

because he was a good party man who believed in the importance of party loyalty; and second, because he knew that if he led the revolt it might lead to a very serious split inside the British Labour Party. One of the wonderful things about Nye Bevan was this quality of loyalty. He was the most outstanding and the most dominating ~~person~~ personality inside the Labour Party in recent years. And yet he never held a pistol to the head of his party; he never said 'Do what I want or else I'll quit'. He always regarded the party as more important than the person, even when the person was himself. There were times when he disagreed completely with his party's policy on some issue. Once, as Minister of Health in the Labour Party Government, he resigned his position as Minister because there was a basic difference between him and the rest of the Cabinet on a major issue of policy. But he did not, and I don't think anything could, make him resign from the Labour Party. And he was proud of the fact that the great social revolution which took place in Britain after the last war was brought into being by his party and that he had had a major share in it.

Nye Bevan grew up as the poor and hungry son of a poor and hungry Welsh coal-miner. He never forgot where he came from and the people among whom he grew up, even when he walked with kings. I knew him as a tall, thickset and very humble and friendly man. And to listen to Bevan making a speech was an experience. He had a rare magic with words and he loved people; especially the poor, the hungry and the dispossessed and the oppressed. He believed in freedom for all people everywhere and he fought even against his own people for that belief. I think the late Aneurin Bevan was a greater man than many now realise. But I am sure history will give him his right place as a great man.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday July 8 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The ugly war in Algeria is now in its sixth year and people are beginning to not notice the news about it and to forget the causes of that war. But over the past two weeks the war in Algeria became headline news again.

Two weeks ago President Charles de Gaulle of France held a press conference in Paris. At this press conference he told the people of France that a nation's greatness does not depend on colonialism, that the days of empire were over and that it was time to bring the Algerian war to an end. He then issued an invitation to the leaders of the Algerian nationalist movement to come to France for talks to end the war.

Last week Ferhat Abbas, Premier of the 'Algerian Government-in-exile', sent his right-hand man, Ahmed Boumendjel, to France to find out just what is behind de Gaulle's invitation, and also to find out whether President de Gaulle himself will negotiate personally with Ferhat Abbas. Ferhat Abbas' 'Algerian Provisional Government' is not prepared to have talks with anybody but de Gaulle himself. To them, only de Gaulle's hands are clean over this Algerian question. They know that there are powerful forces and persons in both France and Algeria who will do everything within their power to wreck any kind of peace other than a colonialist peace which would make sure that Algeria and Algerians remain colonial subjects of France. They remember that the white settlers of Algeria staged a revolt against President de Gaulle in January of this year because they are not prepared to see an independent Algeria come into being.

Ferhat Abbas and his followers know that the white settlers will do anything and everything in their power to keep Algeria as a part of France. They ^{would} ~~will~~ start a civil war in France itself if they could. The white settlers know large sections of the army are behind them. As soon as the white settlers heard of de Gaulle's invitation to the Algerian nationalists they set up a new political organisation which openly threatened the President of France.

Now the story behind this is very familiar: it is South Africa all over again - only more so if that is possible. Algeria has a population of about 9 million people. About one million of these are white settlers: the rest are Arabs. At present the white settlers are the masters in exactly the same way as the whites of South Africa. They have the best of everything and they want it to stay that way. If Algeria became independent they would lose this special position of privilege they have; so they are against any change. When the Algerian nationalists demand that this system be changed six years ago, the French settlers and the French army in Algeria turned on them with such savage viciousness that the Algerians had to fight back. And the brutality with which the French have carried on their war has been horrible indeed: they have tortured, they have murdered and they have practised some of the most horrible ~~brutalities~~ you can think of on Algerian women. The whole thing is ugly and sordid and a mark of shame on the name of France. And all this has been brought about by one million settlers. De Gaulle's great problem in Algeria is not the Algerians: it is the white settlers who are trying to hold back progress in order not to lose their special privileges.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday July 9 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I don't know if any of you have noticed it but I have, over the past several weeks, used my Saturday evenings to deal with some very controversial topic in our own local affairs. You will remember I talked about the smutty magazines on a Saturday; I talked about the decontrol of beef prices on a Saturday; I talked about the filthy state of Kingston's streets on a Saturday. Looking back, it seems that Saturday has become a sort of day of battle for me. But I gather that you, the listeners do not mind it: in fact, I understand that most of you like it. However, today is a rather special Saturday, so I will not go into battle but rather do a little stock-taking.

Radio Jamaica has put out a news release which says that today marks the 10th birthday of commercial broadcasting in Jamaica. I thought that this was a very modest way of saying that ~~the~~ today is the 10th Birthday of Radio Jamaica itself. And since I have been invited to their staff birthday party after this broadcast, I thought you and I might offer a little toast to RJR before I go on to that party. After all, you listen to it, so it is your station. And by the way, only Al Ponman, Vic Reid and I will be non^{Brim Brimble} staff members at this party.
A

But let us have a quick look at the first ten years of commercial broadcasting in Jamaica - or, as I think we should properly describe it, the first ten years in the life of RJR.

When I came to Jamaica five years ago to write a history of Jamaica for the British Corona Library I wandered all over the island: I went into remote little villages and out-of-the-way rumshops. And nearly everywhere I went I found that the people's contact with what was happening in Jamaica and in the outside world came through RJR. I found a Rediffusion box in nearly every rum shop. And the political arguments and discussions that went on in the rumshops were generally based on the news that the people had heard over RJR. It seemed to me then that it was an amazing thing how RJR had brought the world into even the remotest little rumshop in Jamaica. I wondered how people had got their news before RJR appeared on the scene. Life must have been very isolated, very cut-off, before the magic of radio brought the world into our homes. This, I think, this making the world smaller and bringing it right into our homes, is the first great thing about radio. And since RJR was the first to do this in Jamaica the tribute must go to RJR for pioneering ^{mass} radio in Jamaica. Of course there ^{are} ~~were~~ things on RJR I ^{don't} ~~didn't~~ like. A radio station has to cater to a large number of different tastes and it is impossible to satisfy all the people all the time. For instance, I am too old to get any kick out of C.B. and rock n' roll but there are very many who love it. But for me, one of the really interesting things is the way in which RJR has risen to the challenge of J.B.C. which appeared on the radio scene just over a year ago. We now have two stations and inevitably there is friendly competition. The challenge of J.B.C. has led to RJR improving its quality to a surprising degree over the last year. And this, I think, promises that we, the listeners can look forward to even better radio in the years ahead. And so, ladies and gentlemen, I give you RJR, Jamaica's first radio station which is ten today. May it serve us even better in the ten years to come.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday July 11 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I am sure all of you have heard or read about the Trinidad oil strike which - unless something very special has happened ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ between last Saturday evening and this evening to bring it to an end - is now in its eleventh day. Now, to us in Jamaica an eleven-day-old strike may be a great nuisance, it may cause great hardship to some sections of the community, it may even bring economic disaster to a number of people, but it will not add up to a national crisis. The reason for this is that here in Jamaica we do not have one single industry that so dominates our lives as to make both our government and the vast majority of our people dependent on it. I should say that sugar is possibly the nearest thing to ^a 'national' [^] industry for us. It is our largest employer of labour and it is spread more evenly throughout the island than any other industry. But in spite of that sugar is no longer the cornerstone of our economy: once upon a time it was the cornerstone of our economy. Today it must share pride of place with our bauxite industry and tourism; and in the years ahead, if we keep up with our present industrialisation plans, it will become even less important in the sense of being a key cornerstone in our national economy. Of course, a really serious strike in our sugar industry could have very serious effects. But it would not, I think, threaten to bring our national life to a standstill. The same thing applies to the bauxite and tourist industries. The nation's eggs are not all in one basket and so we are not desperately dependent on any one industry. This I think is one of the big differences between the economies of

Trinidad and Jamaica.

Fifty years ago Jamaica was almost completely dependent on her sugar export industry: fifty years ago Trinidad exported sugar and cacao worth several million West Indian dollars; her oil exports were worth about a million dollars or so. But in 1957 Trinidad's oil industry accounted for 83% of all her exports, while cacao, sugar and rum accounted for just a little over 10% of all exports. And the Trinidad shirt industry, of which some of our Jamaican merchants are so afraid, accounted for only one-tenth of one percent. Oil had in fact become the dominant force in the Trinidad economy. The Central Government of Trinidad got 35% of all its money from the oil industry, and the Port Services Department and the railway got roughly 15% of their money from oil. So something very like half of the national income comes from oil. This is a very striking thing. It is the reason for Trinidad's prosperity. But this oil strike has shown just how vulnerable Trinidad is because its economy is so largely based on one industry. The government has lost vast sums of money through the strike. Transport has come to a standstill. All business has slowed down to a crawl. Housewives are having trouble cooking their food because the oil strike meant the drying up of their kerosene supplies. Drivers have abandoned their cars in the streets because they could not get the gas to run them. In short we have the picture of the entire national business of a people coming to a halt because of a strike in one industry. Latest information is that the strike might end today or tomorrow. I hope it does. But in any case it has shown us the vulnerability of Trinidad's very boyant oil-based economy and the dangers of building our prosperity on one industry.....Goodnight.

NEW COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday July 12 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: A month ago or so we here in Jamaica thought of the Cold War of power politics between communism and democracy as something very far away. We thought of it as something going on in Europe and Asia and Africa. To us the cold war was news which did not touch on our own national and personal lives on this island. But suddenly, unexpectedly, the happenings over the weekend have brought the Cold War right into our backyards. Instead of it being a talking point as it was for us until a few weeks ago, we are now right in the middle of the greatest struggle for power of our time.

As you know, a very narrow strip of water not much more than a hundred miles wide, separate us from Cuba which has suddenly become the storm centre of the cold war between Russia and the United States. And the thing about the cold war which is so dangerous is this: you never know what ^{small} incident could suddenly turn it into a hot war of guns and rockets.

Let us consider one possibility. The United States has a very strong base at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba. Dr. Fidel Castro's attitude to the United States is very provoking. Castro's followers naturally take their lead from him. Their attitude is provocative too. To them an American soldier on Cuban territory is at the moment ~~ix~~ somewhat like a red rag being waved to a bull. This situation could so easily lead to a flare-up. You might have a small fuss between a Cuban civillian and a U.S. soldier. In other times this sort of fuss may not mean very much. But in today's atmosphere it could easily lead to a serious incident, or even to a riot and demonstrations against

the U.S. base. And if anything like that were to happen just now Castro and his followers are likely to whip up anti-American feeling to fever pitch among the Cuban masses. They are likely to accuse the Americans of 'imperialist aggression' and all other manner of evil things. And before we know where we are we might find ourselves faced with a war situation on our doorstep. The threat to our peace can be as easy and as simple as that because the atmosphere in Cuba is right for it.

And Mr. Khrushchev, the Russian leader, has helped to create this tricky situation and is exploiting it for all he is worth. Mr. Khrushchev has warned the United States bluntly over the weekend that Russia would attack it with rockets if it attacked Cuba. He has boasted of the fact that Soviet rockets were recently fired rockets all the way from Russia to targets in the Pacific Ocean. This, he said, proved that Soviet rockets could now hit the United States any time and anywhere. In other words, the Russian leader has made it plain to Cuba's Castro that the Russian will come to Cuba's aid if there is conflict between Cuba and the United States. This means that the power and influence of Soviet communism is right inside the Caribbean Sea today, right on our backdoor. The United States has reacted with a sharp statement by President Eisenhower saying the United States will not tolerate a Cuban government dominated by International Communism. So there it is, a tense and tricky situation which could so easily lead to war unless it is handled with great care. For us in Jamaica it means that the Cold War is no longer on the other side of the earth. It is right here, within striking distance of us. So it is important for us to keep well-informed on these events which can affect the lives of all of us. Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday July 13 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last night I told you that the Cold War of power politics between the West and the Communist World is right on our doorstep today. Tonight I should like to consider just what this means to us here in Jamaica. But before I go on to that just let me touch on one ~~brief~~ point ~~on~~ which Mr. Wills Isaacs mentioned when he opened Lydford Enterprises' Feed Mill las Friday. At that gathering Mr. Isaacs said that some of the larger nations of the free world did not seem to care about the economic problems of the small emerging nations. He said ^{some of} ~~the~~ capitalists of these countries only thought of places like Jamaica as markets on which to dump their goods far ~~the~~ below the cost of production. Mr. Isaacs warned that this sort of thing led to the wrecking of local industry and that it was this sort of thing which pushed the small emerging nations to a position where they come under Soviet influence. I think our Minister of Trade and Industry was dead right and I am glad he gave this important warning at this time. Cuba is, I think, a classic example of just the sort of thing Mr. Isaacs was talking about. The behaviour of American capitalists in Cuba contributed a great deal to the present situation.

But now let's get back to the point of what the cold war means to us. I think the first problem it raises for us, is the problem of defence. If Cuba does become communist we can be sure of one thing and that is that a communist Cuba will want to export her communism. It is in the nature of today's communism that a communist country tries to promote communism in its neighbouring countries. If Cuba

were to become a communist country I think she would make very great efforts to 'convert' Jamaica to communism. And this attempt at 'conversion' is not always only by peaceful methods, as we have seen from the experiences of other countries. The 'conversion' of Tibet was carried out with Chinese soldiers and Chinese guns. The 'conversion' of Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia were full-scale military affairs. So the question of defence becomes important just in case a communist neighbour wants to convert us by force of arms. Let us face the fact that we cannot deal with a well-armed enemy all by ourselves. An independent Jamaica would be completely at the mercy of a well armed and aggressive communist neighbour. This is one of the problems that is not considered by the people who talk so lightly about an independent Jamaican Republic. For a small unarmed country the price of independence can very often mean political slavery. So how do we face this problem? As part of the Commonwealth we have the assurance that Britain will come to our defence in case of an attack from outside. But Britain is thousands of miles away and a communist Cuba would be just across a narrow stretch of water. So I think it would be more sensible to think in terms of Canada and the United States. Sooner or later we, either as a Jamaica going it alone or as a part of the Federation, will have to face this question of our defence. The coming of the cold war to this region means that we had better face it sooner; it means that we must face the hard fact that in spite of all her faults the United States is the real keeper of the peace in this region; it also means we must make up our minds about what great power we going to turn to ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ in the event of outside aggression. The cold war is here and we must look to our protection.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Thursday July 14 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I am sure we are all relieved and glad that the hurricane scare is over, and that Hurricane Abbey is now a spent tropical storm. There was a time when it really looked as though Abby was going to hit us and hit us hard; and there was a period late on Tuesday afternoon when there was a great deal of confusion and a lot of rumours were flying around in the Kingston area. At that time, when the rumours were at the rifest, I detected a slight hint of panic among some people. But, thanks to the very good service we got from both radio stations, the rumours were soon stopped; the panic disappeared, and people settled down to prepare calmly for the worse - if it came. Fortunately for us it did not come. And so 'hurricane gone' and we can carry on with our daily affairs. I think the quiet and methodical way in which the relief organisations got going and the plans made by the KSAC and others in case of trouble were really excellent.

The only off-beat comment I heard about all the warnings and preparation was told me by a friend. She quoted an old country man who said that all this fuss was very upsetting. All these warnings, the old man said, disturbed him and made him nervous so that he could not relax. First they say hurricane coming; then they say hurricane not coming; then they say hurricane coming again. Then they tell you where it is, how many miles, how big the winds. By the time they have finished telling you all these things you are so nervous that you feel sick. In the old days, said this old man, the first you knew about a hurricane was when it hit you. In those days you had

only one moment of nerves and sickness instead of days of fear and worry. I think the old man has a point, but I myself appreciated know what was happening all the time.

Now let me touch on something which I thought a piece of impertinence when I heard it. As you know, the Kingston and St. Andrew Corporation's Public Cleansing Department has not done its job properly as far as the citizens of Kingston are concerned. There have been complaints about the dirty state of Kingston for a very long time. The citizens have had a very poor service of garbage removal. Their rubbish bins have been left on the streets. Dogs and pigs have turned these bins over and scattered the rubbish in streets and yards. Out of this rubbish has come an army of flies spreading germs and disease, and, as I have told you before, it was the children who were the main victims. This is a very sorry state of affairs, and while it is going on there is a bitter and foolish wrangle going on between the Council and its Superintendent of Public Cleansing. And just the other day I heard the news that one of the members of the Public Cleansing Committee was complaining that the police were not following instructions to prosecute citizens of Kingston for not keeping the front of their houses clean. This Councillor wanted the police to be more vigorous in prosecuting the public. I think this is a piece of gross impertinence. I think this Councillor and indeed the whole Public Cleansing Committee want to first remove the beam out of their own eyes before they see the mote in the eyes of the citizens. Let the Public Cleansing Department do its own job properly first and then point its finger at anybody else. How can people keep their fronts clean when the garbage is not removed? So let us have no more of this impertinence from Councillors, until they've done their own jobs well. Goodnight.

NEW COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday July 15 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Yesterday's news that the Democratic Party of the United States has chosen Senator John F. Kennedy to be its candidate in the forthcoming U.S. Presidential elections means that we are almost certain to see a contest for the most important political office in the world today between two very young men. At that level of politics men are considered young until they are past fifty, and it has been very rare indeed that men under the age of fifty have headed the ~~major~~ governments of the major countries of the world. I suspect one reason for this is that young men tend to be more radical in their outlook than are old men.

But even this pattern seems to be changing today. ~~Now~~ If we run down a list of the world's leaders today we can divided the list into two: one the one side you will have the men who have led yesterday's world; on the other side you will have the men who are likely to lead tomorrow's world. And one of the really interesting differences in such a list ~~now~~ is the fact that the leaders of tomorrow's world are so much younger than were yesterday's leaders when they started out on the road to power. Chiang Kai-shek~~xxxx~~ and Mao Tse-tung of China, Macmillan of Britain, De Gaulle of France, Eisenhower of the U.S. Adenaur of Germany, and Kishi of Japan - these are all old men who ^{were} well past fifty when they took power. The new men - to name only a few - are Nixon and Kennedy of the U.S., Macleod of Britain, Nasser, Nkrumah and Lulumba of Africa, Castro of Cuba, Brandt of Germany. Of these only Nkrumah has reach~~d~~ fifty but even he was under fifty when he first took power. The rest are in their thirties

or forties. So the first thing about the Kennedy nomination is that it confirms this new trend in the world for young men to lead nations. Kennedy is 43 and his rival, Richard Nixon, who ^{seems} ~~is~~ certain to be chosen as the Republican Party's candidate, is 47.

Now these two young men are both forceful, ambitious, tough-minded and gifted. Nixon who is the Vice President of the United States at present, showed just how tough-minded he could be when he stood up to Khrushchev in Moscow in one of the most famous cussing matches of our time. Nixon came up from a humble background of poverty and fought his way to the top. Kennedy on the other hand was born with at least half a dozen golden spoons in his mouth. His father, Joseph Kennedy, who was U.S. Ambassador to Britain during Roosevelt's time, was a man who turned almost everything he touched into millions of dollars, and young Kennedy is a millionaire many times over. But money has not made Kennedy soft, as he has shown by the very powerful political machine he has created to win this nomination, and by the tough and ruthless campaign he has conducted. Kennedy has had to fight the opposition of ex-President Harry Truman, Mrs. Eleneor Roosevelt and the whole Democratic Party machine. To fight all that and win you need to be tough. Kennedy is a Catholic, Nixon is a Protestant. Nixon, too, has his enemies who call him 'tricky Dick' It is one of these two young men, then, who will be the next President of the United States. At the moment it could be either one. But whichever one it is, he will confirm the fact that tomorrow's political world belong to the ~~younger~~ men. And I am not so sure that this is such a bad thing in this revolutionary ago of ours. The strains and stresses of our time demand the strength and resilience of youth. But can the young be as responsible as the old?.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday July 16 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: On Tuesday of this week the Star carried a story on its back page under the heading: "Citizens of Balaclava Report Police Brutality". The story was that sometime in March of this year a new set of policemen were transferred to the station at Balaclava and that from there on things began to go wrong until they flared up last week into a charge of police brutality.

The news story goes on to set down in his own words the case of a man named Wilfred Maxwell who was assaulted by a Special Constable. This special constable was then joined by another constable, a full time member of the force. The second constable, it is alleged, then used his baton on Maxwell, and after this the two constables dragged him for half a mile along the main street to the police station. The story is that Maxwell was dragged by his feet, his head bumping on the asphalt road so that he became unconscious. His clothes were so torn that he was almost stark naked. One eye-witness is reported to have said: "I couldn't believe it was a human being they were dragging; I thought it was a hog".

One of the eye witnesses of the Maxwell business was a woman named Etta Forbes who tried to intervene on behalf of Maxwell. The story goes on to give Etta Forbes' own account of how she was later assaulted by a police sergeant and then arrested.

When Forbes and Maxwell appeared before the Resident Magistrate's Court in Balaclava last week, the magistrate dismissed the charges brought by the police against Forbes and Maxwell. In other words, the police and their witnesses were discredited in court.

Now this whole case sounds to me ugly and disturbing from beginning to end. It is dreadful to think that there are still people in our police force who have such a basic contempt for the dignity of the ordinary citizen of this country. And I think we ought to face the fact that this sort of thing happens generally to only a certain section of our community. There are still members of our police force who have a caste and class grading for the way in which they treat our citizens. The citizen who is known to be wealthy or to enjoy a high social position is most unlikely ever to experience such rough handling at the hands of the police. It is the poor and the weak and those who have no influence: it is ^{with} those people whom the police feel will not make a fuss that they take these liberties. Some policemen harass and bully the weak and the defenceless. This is a dreadful state of affairs.

It is because there are policemen who still behave in this way that many of our people will have nothing to do with the law. It is because of this that many people will not lift a finger to help a policeman when he asks for help. This sort of thing makes us lose our respect for the law and for those who are there to enforce the law. People will only respect the police force if the police force shows them respect. It is important for the police to know that they are the servants of the public, especially the poorest and weakest sections of the public: they are not our masters; they have no business to be pushing people around like arrogant nazis. But let us not make the mistake of condemning the whole police force for the faults of a few. But I do think it is important for the authorities to realise that it is the few bad ones who give the whole force a bad name. For the good of the country the bad ones ought to be rooted out of the police force. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday July 18 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: A few very important events took place last week here at home which I did not have a chance to comment on: this evening I would like to remedy that. First there was Mr. Manley's statement about beef prices on Wednesday of last week at the J.A.S. annual meeting. Mr. Manley issued a very stern warning to cattle growers that government was going to fight the high beef prices. He said that unless beef prices came down to reasonable levels again government would import beef. He went on to say that if it was necessary government would set up refrigeration services in every important town on the island to make sure that the ordinary citizens got their beef at a fair price.

I think this was very good news and I am sure every housewife welcomes it. Of course, I personally think that such a clear and firm statement should have been made at the same time that price controls were lifted from beef. I think if this statement had been made then it might have sobered those get-rich-quick gentlemen among our butchers sooner and we might not have had the few weeks of fantastic prices which we have suffered. And I am sure that things would have been even better if there had been a stock of imported meat in the island on the day that price controls came off our local beef. That, more than anything else, would have kept prices at a reasonable level.

But when all that is said and done one fact stands out and I think it is a very important fact that we should note very carefully. Mr. Manley himself mentioned that fact in his speech. It is this:

the majority of housewives have taken a very firm stand. Up and down the country you women - at least most of you - have refused to pay fancy prices for your piece of meat. You have dug in your heels and said firmly that you were not prepared to pay the unreasonable prices asked. And in many places butchers found they could not get rid of their meat. Beef which was generally sold off within a few hours on a Friday afternoon, was still unsold on Saturday morning. I travelled across the island over the past weekend and I saw this sort of thing in many places. So it is fair to say that basically it was you, the housewife, who stopped the sky-rocketing of beef prices. This is the important fact which I think we ought to note. Our women, our mothers, our housewives, all of you who run our homes, you are the people with the final power to put a check on the cost of living. If you, as a group, decided collectively that the price of some item of foodstuff is unreasonable and that you are not prepared to pay that price, I think you can have a considerable influence in reducing that price to a fair level. And if that foodstuff is a perishable commodity like meat or green vegetables, then your influence is vital. The butcher must sell his meat before it goes bad. Of course he can corn it; but he still has to sell that. And so, if you hold out, he will become reasonable. The power is in your hands. But please remember that it is very important to use power reasonably and only when prices are really unfair and unjust. Tomorrow I should like to discuss two Bills that Mr. Manley tabled in the House of Representatives on Wednesday of last week. Till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday July 19 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The first Bill tabled by Mr. Manley in the House which I should like to discuss, is known as the Referendum ~~Law~~ (Federation) Law, 1960. This Bill makes it legal for the Governor to set a date, about a year from now, for us, the citizens of Jamaica to go to the polls to vote on one single issue. The issue on which we are going to vote is whether we the voters wish Jamaica to stay in the Federation or get out of it. There will be only one question on the ballot paper. The words of the question will be very clear and very simple. They will read: "Should Jamaica remain in the Federation of the West Indies?" That is all: "Should Jamaica remain in the Federation of the West Indies?" And there will be a space for you to ^{put} ~~write~~ your answer; ~~and you will only need to write one word.~~ You can either ^{answer} ~~write~~ "No", or you can ^{answer} ~~write~~ "Yes". If the majority of us ^{answer} ~~write~~ "No" on our ballot papers then Jamaica will get out of the Federation: if the majority of us ^{answer} ~~write~~ "Yes" ^{we} will stay in the Federation. It is as simple as that. But behind this simplicity is, I think, something so important that it is almost terrifying. We the voters who are not experts in matters of high politics are going to decide the future of our descendants for hundreds of years to come. That is the terrifying part of it. The glorious part of it is that it is we, the ordinary people with all our weaknesses, who are going to make this most important decision. To me it is this fact that makes democracy real. And it is the first time in the history of this island that the people have been asked one really important question with the sure knowledge that their

rulers are going to do exactly what the majority tells them to do. I myself think that over and above all other considerations Mr. Manley has shown his real faith and trust in the people of this island when he decided to have a referendum which this Bill will make legal.

The second Bill, ~~the Emergency Powers Bill~~, is one that I am not so happy about. Under this Bill government will have the power to detain any person who is reasonably believed to be taking part in subversive activities; when this Bill becomes law a person suspected of planning insurrection or taking part in subversive activities or keep arms with the idea of staging a revolt, can be held for a period of up to six months. The Bill also gives government greater powers to search for arms and other weapons.

Now the reason behind this Bill is to be found in the events that took place in the Red Hills and Sligoville areas when when had the island greatest manhunt. It was then discovered that our laws did not provide for government to detain people without having to bring a charge against them. This meant that we could not do anything against a person until some law had been broken. The new Bill will give government the powers to prevent something the Sligoville affair happening before the people concerned have a chance to break the law or do any real damage. And ~~fix~~ this ~~fix~~ new law will only remain in operation for a year, though it can be renewed if government feels it still needs the special powers. So basically it is a safety measure. The reason why I say I am not happy about it is because ^{the authorities feel} its introduction means that/there are still people at large who want to bring violence and disorder to replace the present peace and democratic progress of this island. This detention measure is a necessary one, but I regret that it is necessary for us to have it.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday July 20 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking.

Good evening: It looks very much as though the Russians are stepping up their Cold War effort and doing so with great success at the expense of the United States. The two areas in which the Russians have operated most successfully and most dramatically recently have been in Cuba and in the Congo.

~~Inxexx~~ In dealing with the Cuban situation Khrushchev has made a great deal of political capital out of the U.S.-Cuban conflict. The way the Russians have handled the situation was to give the outside world the impression that the United States was planning an armed invasion. You will remember that shortly after the Cuban government took over the American and British oil refineries Khrushchev warned the United States that it would come to Cuba's help in the event of an American attack. And yet the United States had made no mention of an attack on Cuba. If anybody was an aggressor in the Cuban situation it was Cuba herself. She had taken over the oil refineries, she had taken over American property and had threatened that she would go on taking American property 'down to their boot strings' if they cut the sugar quota. And when the Americans, as a result of extreme provocation, did finally cut the Cuban sugar quota, it was Fidel Castro who yelled 'economic aggression'. In fact, what we have been witnessing in Cuba lately has been a studied and deliberate provocation of the United States. As I see it, it almost looks as though Cuba is determined to provoke the United States into some action.

Now why is Cuba doing this? I think the only reasonable

answer is that the Castro government is making a tremendous bid for the leadership of ~~the~~ Latin America. He wants to isolate the United States from the rest of Latin America and appear as the Latin American champion against 'Yankee Imperialism'. And I think he knows that nothing would so quickly arouse Latin American sentiment against the U.S. and for Cuba, as would any aggressive act on the part of the United States. This, I think, explains Castro's continued attempts to provoke the U.S. And the fact is that the past record of the United States in Latin America puts her at a considerable disadvantage.

Now to the Russians all this is wonderful. They would welcome any situation which gives them the opportunity to come forward as the champion of the poor and oppressed and exploited people. And they hope, through Cuba, to get a firm foothold in Latin America and so they are fanning the trouble for all they are worth.

Much the same sort of thing applies to the Congo. You will remember that exactly a month ago I told you that the Congo situation was going to get worse and that the Russians were going to exploit it. Well, it has come to pass now. The Congo is in the most awful mess and the communists are waiting to step in as they stepped in in Guinea. Unless the United Nations acts with great speed and greater intelligence the communists will step in.

The Russian design in all this is very clear and very simple. Africa and Latin America are the last two great prizes of the Cold War. Whoever wins Africa and Latin America wins the cold war. And so the Russians are working hard and working well. Just as they have threatened the U.S. over Cuba, so they have threatened Belgium over the Congo. All they have to do is egg on Lumumba in the Congo and Castro in Cuba and watch for any mistakes the West might make. The Russians, whether we like it or not, are doing very well out of the cold war just now. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday July 21 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Since the Russians have stepped up the Cold War over the past few weeks many people have asked the frightening question: "Are we on the brink of another world war?" A number of listeners have asked me this question. I think this is probably the most important question disturbing the minds of people all over the world today. Are we on the point of another world war?

The short answer to this question is that I do not know; and I do not think anybody else knows. I don't think Mr. Khrushchev knows; I don't think Mr. Eisenhower knows; I don't think Mr. Macmillan knows. And if you were to ask anyone of these three world statesmen I am sure each will tell you that he does not want war. And yet there is this danger that the whole world might suddenly go up in flames.

So, having given you my short answer, which is that I do not know, let us balance as carefully as we can the things which might make for war and the things which might work against war.

Now when we look at the things which might lead to war, three dangers stand out sharply and clearly. The first is Cuba. Almost any small incident, such as a clash between Cubans and American soldiers at Guantanamo Bay, could set off a train of violence which could lead to world war. The second immediate danger point is the Congo where the Russians have again threatened action this morning. Here too, the slightest incident could lead to a full-scale war. And what makes the Cuban and Congo situations so tricky is the fact that the leaders of these two countries do not seem to realise that their actions might plunge the whole world into war. A third danger

is the situation between India and China. At the moment the happenings in the Congo and Cuba have pushed the India-China conflict out of our minds, but the situation is still tense and ugly and it is made more so by the aggressive cockiness of the Chinese Communists. If we did not have a man of the stature of Nehru leading India the situation might have been completely out of hand by now. Only his firm will for peace has so far prevented a blow-up which would have caused a world war. These, then, - Cuba, the Congo and India - are the three main danger points where incidents could so easily lead to war.

But there are two other danger points which could also lead to war. Following the U-2 spy plane incident the Russians have shot down more American planes which have flown anywhere near Soviet territory. The last plane the Russians shot down was obviously not over Soviet territory and the Americans have reacted very sharply. Any more shooting down of U.S. planes, especially if they are not over Russian territory, could lead to the Americans retaliating and that, if it happened, is sure to lead to a war in which all of us will be involved.

And the last danger point is one of the mind. There are people in both the U.S. and in Russia who feel that sooner or later there must be a war between Communism and Democracy. The Chinese communists also feel this. Some Americans say, since there must be war, have it now before the communists get any stronger. Hit them with a surprise attack which will knock them out one time. And there are communists who say exactly the same. These are the warmongers on both sides and they are our last and, possibly, greatest danger point. These are the factors that make for war. Tomorrow I will look at the factors that make for peace. So, till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Friday July 22 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last night I told you about the factors which could so easily lead to world war in today's tense international ~~xxxx~~ situation. You will remember I listed these factors as: Cuba, the Congo, the India-China border dispute, the shooting down of U.S. planes by the Russians, and the war-mindedness of some people in both the communist and non-communist worlds. All or any one of these factors could very easily lead to a world war.

Tonight I should like us to consider the factors which make for peace. I think the first, and possibly the most important single thing which makes for peace is the fact that the vast majority of the peoples of the world want peace. The ordinary Chinese or Russian or American or European or Asian or African does not want war. War may come and people will then take up arms and go out to defend their countries. But they will do so because they have to, not because they want to; and they will do so because they have been told that the other side started it and are the aggressors. The mass of the people of the world are against war and this does influence their leaders to a certain extent. Of course, the feeling of the people carries more weight under democracy than it does under communism, but even under communism the feeling of the people is not completely ignored.

A second factor for peace has to do with Russia herself. In the last war Russia lost millions of her finest young citizens. Her army lost more men than any other allied army and it also lost more men than the Germany army which was defeated. Russian industry, ~~was~~

Russian agriculture - the whole fabric of the Russian economy was so battered that the U.S. had to go to the aid of the Russians. So, for the Russians, the last war was a terrible and devastating experience which made them hate war. But, and let us face it, communism is an aggressive and expansionist creed which will drive the Russian people into another war if that is the only way for the communists to achieve their ends. But it is not the only way, as the years since the second world war has shown. Before the second world war Russia was the only communist country in the world. Today communism rules over the vast land mass of China, over all Eastern Europe, over one half of Germany as well as many other Asian countries. And it is beginning to get a foothold in Africa as well as in Latin America. And all this communism^{has} achieved by threat and bluff and without the need to go to war on a big scale. The only war that communism engaged in was in Korea and then it made sure that it did not turn it into a world conflict. And I think the communists learned from the Korean war that the methods of infiltration and the creating of crisis situations suited them very much better than the method of direct war.

Let us face it. The communists have been winning ground without having to go to war. They have bluffed and threatened and pushed the West but they have tended to give way when the situation really looked dangerous. So there you have it. I don't think the Russians want a war right now. I think they might miscalculate a situation and push the U.S. too far and so set off a war. But I doubt it. So, my tentative answer to the question is: "No, I do not think we are ~~like~~ likely to have a world war now". Of course I could be wrong but on balancing all the factors I feel I am right. What I think we will have is a long period of Cold War crisis, and this in itself is dangerous enough.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday July 23 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think we have spent enough time this week looking at world problems and the international gloom of the cold war. After all, the basis of our lives is made up of the little day-to-day things we deal with: it is made up of the cost of our food, the homes we live in and the kind of service we get when we go out to spend our ~~xxxxxx~~ hard-earned money. And it is ~~on~~ the little things that are so important in our lives that I want to comment tonight.

The meanest thing I witnessed this week Was a J.O.S. bus hurtling down one of Kingston's main streets. At a bus stop stood a little old lady. She signalled to the rushing bus; instead of slowing down the bus gathered speed. The old lady stepped off the pavement signalling more frantically. The bus shot past her. It was not during the rush hour and the bus was not crowded. It all happened too fast for me to get the number of the bus with the mean-minded driver. I hope our J.O.S. drivers will not forget that they are hired to serve the public and that they have an especial duty to the very old and the very young.

And now let me touch on another sore point about which many people feel strongly. In our downtown Kingston stores, especially the big ones, many of ~~xx~~ the young men and young women behind the counters seem to think that the shopping public is there for their convenience. I have stood for a full five minutes watching a pregnant woman, obviously hot and tired, trying to attract the attention of a young woman behind the counter. But this young

lady was having such a wonderful conversation with two other young ladies, also behind the counter, that she did not have time for the tired and pregnant customer until the conversation was finished. And when she did get around to serving the woman it was as if she was doing the woman a favour.

I have myself gone into one of our biggest electrical stores to buy a very small electrical fitment. The first shop assistant had asked me what I wanted promptly enough. When I told him he pointed to a second young chap. This young chap was on the telephone having a private and personal conversation. He looked at me once, asked me what I wanted and when I told him he nodded and turned his back on me and carried on with his telephone conversation. My time did not matter; I had to wait until he was good and ready for me. After four minutes of this I went back to the first young fellow and asked him to serve me. But he couldn't. He did not handle the thing I wanted. So I asked for the person in charge. But the person in charge, another young fellow, showed that he thought I was unreasonable. It was only when I got really vexed that he called the chap from the telephone and got my service. I am sure most of you can cap this little story of mine.

I think we are putting up with much too much nonsense from our shop assistants; I think this bad and shoddy service has become a habit with too many of them. The customer seems to be there for their convenience. I think it is high time all this nonsense stopped. I think it is high time the Jamaica Chamber of Commerce get its members to look into the shoddy service their servants give the buying public. And by the way, I have something very important on suggestive literature for you tomorrow afternoon at five minutes after one; so till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Monday July 25 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Earlier this month a little incident flared up.

~~Which, if it were true, would have been a very serious situation as far as the basic rights of the citizen in our society are concerned. And, if the charges made had been proved true, it might even have led to a serious conflict between the government of Jamaica and the Bar Council of Jamaica, which is the organised body of lawyers in our country. From this you will see that this incident was both serious and important.~~

If the charges made in this little incident had been true, it would have been a very serious situation as far as the basic rights of the citizen in our society are concerned. And, if the charges made had been proved true, it might even have led to a serious conflict between the government of Jamaica and the Bar Council of Jamaica, which is the organised body of ^{Barristers} lawyers in our country. From this you will see that this incident was both serious and important.

~~What was this incident? I am sure most of you will remember that on the 8th of this month there appeared in the Gleaner a letter which Mr. Peter Evans had sent to Mr. Manley the day before. In this letter Mr. Evans protested to Mr. Manley that he had not been given a fair opportunity to interview Reynold Henry at the Central Police Station. Mr. Evans said that the room in which he interviewed the prisoner, Reynold Henry (who, as you know, was a ringleader in the Red Hills-Sligoville affair) - Mr. Evans said that that room was so arranged that he would have had to speak to Henry across a space of about ten feet. Mr. Evans protested vigorously about this. He said it was a professional insult. Indeed, if the facts were as Mr. Evans said, I would have agreed with him and gone a stage further: I would have said it was a definite interference with the rights of the citizen. Because even in prison the individual has certain rights; and one of those rights is to talk to his lawyer in private.~~

What was this incident? I am sure most of you will remember that on the 8th of this month there appeared in the Gleaner a letter which Mr. Peter Evans had sent to Mr. Manley the day before. In this letter Mr. Evans protested to Mr. Manley that he had not been given a fair opportunity to interview Reynold Henry at the Central Police Station. Mr. Evans said that the room in which he interviewed the prisoner, Reynold Henry (who, as you know, was a ringleader in the Red Hills-Sligoville affair) - Mr. Evans said that that room was so arranged that he would have had to speak to Henry across a space of about ten feet. Mr. Evans protested vigorously about this. He said it was a professional insult. Indeed, if the facts were as Mr. Evans said, I would have agreed with him and gone a stage further: I would have said it was a definite interference with the rights of the citizen. Because even in prison the individual has certain rights; and one of those rights is to talk to his lawyer in private.

Now, to deny any prisoner awaiting trial this right to talk freely and privately to his lawyer is a serious matter. Mr. Evans took it seriously, so seriously that he also wrote to the Minister of Home Affairs, to the Attorney-General, and to the Bar Council of Jamaica. One M.H.R., Mr. Max Carey also thought it sufficiently serious to ask a question about the matter in the House of Representatives.

And then, on Thursday of last week, the Bar Council of Jamaica, replied to the letter Mr. Evans had sent. ~~km~~ To me, the reply by the Bar Council was much more important than the reply given by Mr. Manley. In his reply Mr. Manley had said Mr. Peter Evans' charges had not been based on the true facts. But many people, for reasons of their own, might have gone on believing Mr. Evans' charges if the Bar Council had not published its own reply. The members of the Bar Council, said the letter, had visited the interview room at the prison about which Mr. Evans complained. They found the distance between ^{the} prisoner and ^{his} ~~his~~ lawyer ^{was} would not be more than three feet ~~0~~ not 10ft as Mr. Evans had charged. They found that it was possible for lawyer and prisoner to talk privately and described Mr. Evans' charges as "gross exaggerations". In short the Bar Council's letter was ^a rejection of Mr. Evans' charges and, implicit in the letter was a criticism of the way in which Mr. Evans had handled the whole affair.

I think this whole affair ^{is} ~~was~~ important because the charges made were very serious and I am glad they were proved untrue. Another important point is that ^{we} ~~those~~ who set ^{our} ~~themselves~~ up as the guardians of ~~our~~ freedom must be very careful to get ^{our} ~~their~~ facts right. To ~~xxxx~~ attack anybody or any ^{an} ~~institution~~ on false facts is not doing the cause of freedom and civil liberty any good.... Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday July 26 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Towards the end of last week Mr. Donald Sangster, the deputy Leader of the Opposition, tabled a very interesting motion for debate by the House of Representatives. Mr. Sangster's motion asks that a part of government time on the radio stations be allocated to the Opposition. I hope that when the debate on this subject comes up all of you will take a very great interest in it. It is an important subject; and it is particularly important in a country like ours where a large number of our people cannot read and therefore cannot follow current affairs except through the spoken word. The world in which we live today is so complex and so complicated; what happens far away can affect our own lives intimately, and what happens here at home can affect the outside world intimately too. So it is important for us to have an intelligent grasp of what is going on both at home and abroad. And radio is, in my opinion, the most powerful way of bring the world into the home of even the most humble citizen of this island. Also, except for the outstanding leaders like Manley and Busta, Arnett and Sangster, Wills Isaacs and Bob Lightbourne, Glasspole and Tavares, and others in the limelight, we know very little about the personalities of the men who sit in the House and make our laws. Most of the backbenchers on both sides of the House are like shadows to us. I do not think this is good. I think we ought to have a clear and distinct picture in our minds of the personalities whom we have elected to our parliament. In the British House of Commons where you have several hundred Members of Parliament individual personalities stand out very much more than in our House where we have less than fifty members. And I do not think

that our members of parliament are any less colourful than are the English M.P.s. I think the real reason why the majority of our M.H.Rs are shadows in our minds is because the business of our parliament has not been projected into our homes. Many of our people feel that parliament is somewhere in Duke Street and far away from our daily lives. Well, parliament is our business and we ought to know all the men who conduct our business. We ought to know their good points and their faults, we ought to know what they are like, what they are doing so that we can pass judgement on them when next they come to ask for our votes. And this, I think, radio can do for us better than anything else. So, I hope that the debate on Mr. Sangster's motion will result in our hearing the voices, and getting to know the personalities of our law-makers, especially the shadowy back-benchers.

Of course, I don't know what the House will decide on this matter. But what I would like to see is some arrangement whereby we ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ will hear a different M.H.R. each evening while the House is in session. In Britain they have something called "Today in Parliament" in which an M.P. speaks for five minutes on what took place in parliament that day. One day it is someone from the government side; the next day someone from the Opposition. And these people do not just trot out party slogans; they try to give the listeners a true picture of what took place and so bring parliament into the homes of the voters.

I think it is time that we had something like that here in Jamaica. Our future progress demands that all of us take a greater interest in the affairs of our parliament and in the men who make our laws. So I hope Mr. Sangster's motion will be ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ broadened so that parliament can be brought into the homes of the voters of Jamaica.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday July 27 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Monday's Gleaner carried on the same page two news stories about Public Relations. The first story said that the Jamaica Chamber of Commerce was considering the idea of appointing a Public Relations Officer. The second story was that at its July monthly meeting the Manchester Parish Council had passed a resolution approving the spending of £225/as its share of £3,000 a year which will be needed for the setting up of a Public Relations Department by the Association of Local Government Authorities. According to the news story the Manchester Parish Council passed its resolution as a result of a circular it got from the Executive Council of the Association of Local Government Authorities. The Association of Local Government Authorities, it seems, has decided that it needs a full-time public relations officer. They estimate that it will cost them £3,000 to run the public relations department for its first year. The plan is that each Parish Council should make an annual contribution of £225 and the KSAC should make a contribution of £300 a year. There would be a central advisory committee which will work in coöperation with committees to be set up by each Parish Council. And these would direct the work of the public relations department and the public relations officer.

The Manchester Parish Council meeting was thoughtful enough to express the view that it may not be justified " in the light of present financial positions and ramifications" for each parish council to have a public relations officer. This, I am sure, was very thoughtful of the Manchester Parish Council. Just think what

they have saved us from. We might have had to face the dreadful prospect of having fourteen local public relations officers, each getting between £750 and £1,000 a year. Instead, if this move of the Association of Local Government Authorities goes through, we will have one public relations department with one public relations officer. Then we will have fourteen public relations committees, and senior civil servant in each Parish Council office will be given the job of public relations as his or her main function. In other words, and in truth and in fact, we really going to have fourteen public relations officers as well as the top man - the public relations officer of the Association of Local Government Authorities - for whom a brand new job will have been created.

Now this, to me, is just about the most monstrous piece of local government nonsense I have come across in a very long time. As far as I am concerned the Jamaica Chamber of Commerce can appoint a dozen public relations officer if it wants to. It is spending its own private money, not public money. Our local government authorities are spending our money - yours and mine. And frankly, I want my money spent on better ~~clinics~~, on better houses, on better roads rather than on this lame-brained public relations scheme. The Government of Jamaica has established a perfectly good public relations department which is doing its job well. That is enough. Our local authorities want to do their jobs and do them well, that would be the very best possible public relations to establish. I hope the Minister of Home Affairs will squash and squash firmly this costly and utterly unnecessary move by the Association of Local Government Authorities.

Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Thursday July 28 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Yesterday morning I started going through a huge pile of papers on my desk. Information and news is my business, and these papers were all items of news from all over the world. As I went through the papers I felt a little ashamed of myself because the dates on some of these papers went as far back as May. And then I came across something that pulled me up sharply. It was a little story dated the 28th of June and it came from the Information Service of the Government of India. It had been sent up to me from the Office of the Indian Commissioner for the West Indies who, as I am sure most of you know, has his headquarters down in Trinidad.

It was a very short item of news. It said the the head of the Indian marine research organisation, a gentleman called Mr. Jones, had reported the capture of two mermaids. The story said that these two mermaids were the only ones to have been caught alive in the world. It said that they could not be kept in zoos because they needed certain sea conditions to go on living. Mr. Jones reported that they lived off sea-grass and that they came up to the surface from time to time to breathe in air. He also said that they suckled their young ones just as human mothers do.

My first reaction when I finished reading this little story, was to want to know more. I went through all the papers to see if there was any more information on these two mermaids. I wanted some description of them, some photograph. But there was nothing more. Then I called a number of people in the office and showed them the story. One or two of the people said they had heard something about

the two mermaids over one of the B.B.C. news bulletins. But the majority of people in my office had not heard about it and were as excited and worked up as I was. For the next hour or so the news of the two mermaids was the main topic in our office. People telephoned their friends to tell them about it. These friends telephoned other friends: and as often happens in such cases, somebody telephoned me to ask if I had heard about it. My secretary kept on asking me questions I could not answer. How tall were these mermaids? What colour were they? Did they look like the pictures of the mermaids we see in story-books and legends? And a wicked friend of mine wanted to know whether mermaids took ordinary fishes for their husbands or whether there were mer-men too. The questions flew thick and fast. One gay young bachelor was all for going to South India to see for himself if they were as pretty and naked as they always are in pictures. And one young mother asked: "But how do they make their children? All these questions I could not answer. All I knew was what I had seen in the little news item: that there are two mermaids alive and in captivity in the South of India.

Well, there it is. For hundreds of years people have thought that these stories of mermaids - creatures who are like human beings from the waist upwards and like fish from the waist downwards - were legends and fancies. Now there is this news that two mermaids have actually been caught alive. And this news comes with the authority of the government of India behind it. So I personally am satisfied that it must be true. What I would like to know is exactly what these half-fish half-women look like. Are they in fact as we have always thought of them? Or are they completely different? I hope we get more news about them soon. Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday July 29 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think it is time we had another look at the Cuban situation as there have been some very interesting developemnts over the past week or so. You will remember that Cuba took her charge of 'economic aggression' against the United States to the United Nations. She was egged on into taking this action by Soviet Russia. Mr. Krushchev had earlier declared that the Monroe Doctrine was dead and should be buried. Up to this point things were very tricky for the United States. Most Latin American countries had a sneaking sympathy for Cuba's defiance of the United States. Most Latin Americans detested United States 'dollar diplomacy' and watched with interest to see just what the United States would do. Any wrong move by the United States would have created a situation in which the whole of Latin America would have turned against her. This was what Mr. Khrushchev wanted. He wanted Cuba to provoke the United States into making a wrong move which would turn all Latin America against her. That was what was behind all his threats and challenges. If Mr. Khrushchev had been more patient, if he had not rushed things and had bided his time, it is very likely that his trouble-making might have been much more successful than it has been. Almost everything was in his favour. The ~~Castro~~ revolution was and still is very popular in Latin America. The Latin Americans approve of Castro's great ~~land~~ reform schemes; they approve of the new jobs his government has created; they approve of the new educational opportunities for everybody; and they approve of his defiance of American big business. All this was in Khrushchev's favour.

But Khrushchev made the big mistake of declaring the Monroe Doctrine dead. To understand why this was such a big mistake we should know something about the Monroe Doctrine.

That Latin America of the 1700s and 1800s was, as I am sure most of you know, the possession of European imperial powers. Spain was the great power in Latin America. The United States won its independence in 1783. This coincided more or less with the collapse of the Spanish power in Latin America. In 1823 the young United States government, under its President, James Monroe, decided that the New World was no longer going to be treated as the political football of Europe. They issued a declaration warning the imperial powers of Europe to keep their hands off the Americas. The American continents, they declared, were no longer to be looked on as subject for further colonisation. This became known as the Monroe Doctrine. And whatever the Latin Americans might feel about the United States they know that it was the Monroe Doctrine which kept the European powers out of their area in the early days of their struggles for nationhood. Had Mr. Khrushchev understood this I don't think he would have been so quick to declare the Monroe Doctrine dead.

As it is, the 21 member nations of the Organisation of American States are meeting next month to seek a settlement of the dispute between Cuba and the United States. What non- of the Latin American nations want is for any European power to come in and interfere, and Mr. Khrushchev has sounded very much as though he wanted to come in and interfere. This mistake of Khrushchev's has given the United States another chance to influence Latin American thinking. How she uses that chance can be very important for both Latin America, the Caribbean and the world. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday July 30 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Some of you may remember that it was on Tuesday of last week that I commented on the Detention Powers Bill which had then just been tabled in the House of Representatives. Since then the House has debated the bill and passed it into law. As you know, there has been a great deal of argument about the Bill. Some people have attacked it bitterly and violently. Matthew Strong has compared it to the notorious Regulation 18b which was in force in Britain during the war and under which people could be and were interned indefinitely and without any trial or any right of appeal to anybody. I think Matthew Strong has ^{again} done what he so often does. He has overstated his case. The powers of the Minister of Home Affairs are not quite the same as were the powers of the British Home Secretary under Regulation 18b. Detention here can only be for a year, not indefinitely. And there is the right of appeal. Now I am not saying Mr. Strong should not protest against this law. All I am saying is there are differences between it and Regulation 18b and that I doubt the wisdom of over-stating any case. There are other people who have seen this Bill as a violent attack on civil liberties and the beginnings of a dictatorship. Again here, I feel the whole thing has been exaggerated.

One of the most interesting features for me was the attitude of those who defended the Bill. The government Ministers who spoke in defence of the Bill seemed very tolerant and understanding about the attitude of the critics of the Bill. Nobody said that it was a good thing to have this law. They said it was a necessary thing; a necessary evil; a sad and unhappy thing that had to be done. I frankly

liked this attitude. It meant that nobody was trying to make a virtue out of this ~~xxx~~ law. And that is a good thing because there is no virtue in this law and its only justification is necessity.

But there were also people who said this law was unnecessary. Before the Red Hills-Sligoville affair I would have been one of those people. Now I am not so sure. And the news that a New York Negro policeman who was arrested was a chief money raiser for the Jamaican insurrectionist movement, has made me even less sure.

Certainly, it is the duty of any good government to take such action as it feels is necessary when the public safety is threatened. Any government that does nothing to protect the public safety when it is threatened is a bad government. And good governments must at times perform unpleasant duties. To me then, this detention law is an unpleasant but necessary duty which the government had to perform.

Now let me touch brief on something which I think was both unpleasant and ~~unnecessary~~ unnecessary. The KSAC Poor Relief Committee has decided to cut the amount of poor relief paid to the ^{more than} 800 paupers on the Corporation's poor relief register. The maximum these people used to get was 30/- a week. Now the maximum will be a £1 a week. To live off 30/- a week is little enough in all conscience. To have that small sum cut by a third seems to me dreadfully heartless. The reason for the cut is, I understand, that the Poor Relief Department's money has been cut by £3,000. Could not this cut have been made elsewhere? I hope both Mr. Seiveright and the KSAC will look into this matter again. It would be a dreadful shame if the weakest and poorest people in our society are so penalised. A good society takes good care of its weak and its helpless citizens. Let us prove ourselves to be such a society. Goodnight.