

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Jan 1, 1963 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good-evening: And a very happy New Year to all of you. This is the first day of the New Year and I always find this the most exciting and the most challenging day of the year. When I was younger I used to make a lot of noble resolutions on this day, and if I had executed or lived up to a tenth of those resolutions by the 31st of December I always felt that I had had a good year. Now I make very few resolutions perhaps two or three - but I do try to live up to every one of them. But now, being older, I am not satisfied unless I live up to least 75% of those resolutions.

Anyway, if I had the power to make them, and the power to see that they come true, these are the resolutions I would want to make on behalf of Jamaica on this first day of the New Year.

First, that the peacefulness with which this country has seen the great changes of the past few years should continue in this year and in the future. We need peace - peace in the great wide world - and peace inside the Jamaican society if we are to carry out the big job of creating the good society in which each citizen will be assured his daily bread, his home and his sense of security. So let 1963 be a year of peace, internally and externally.

And let us resolve to create better economic conditions for the majority of Jamaicans this year. But creating better economic conditions does not mean taking from one section of the society to give to another. In a society like ours a certain amount of this sort of thing has to be done. But to simply take from the 'Haves' in order to give to the 'have-nots' will not solve our problems.

The real answer to our problems is to make better use of what we have and to share the fruits of our labour more equally: and this, in practical terms, can be reduced to certain specific lines of action in Agriculture and ~~our~~ our farmers must grow more of the food we need; ~~our~~ our marketing must be so well organised that we can sell this food to the people at the lowest price possible. ~~thereby~~ I think that if we succeed in doing this for our agriculture it will make a world of difference to almost every sector of the economy. So, in terms of agriculture, let us resolve to feed ourselves off our own land in 1963. The money we will save if we do this can then be used for all the urgent social services we need. But to do this we will have to greatly increase the efficiency of our agriculture.

And let our mercantile community resolve to be satisfied with a modest mark-up in 1963; and let our workers resolve to give a full-day's work for a full day's pay; and let both the unions and the employers' organisations resolve to put the interests of country above the sectional interests of their members; and let our M.P.s and leaders resolve to set an example to the rest of us by the way they behave in and out of parliament; and let all of us resolve to uphold the dignity of our leaders and our institutions during 1963.

Above all, let us resolve to work for whatever we want. There is no other way for any individual or any society. There are no Big Daddies to give us hand-outs. If we want to make Jamaica prosperous and secure and self-supporting, then we must roll up our sleeves and do it ourselves. There are still too many of us who look to others to do things for us, or who look for easy shortcuts to personal or national prosperity: let us put this sort of thinking behind us in 1963. The way ahead demands hard work from all of us: so, a prosperous hard-working New Year to all of you. Goodnight.

- 1) Personalities of the Year
- 2) Ransomed Cuban Prisoners
- 3) ~~The U.N. Action in Katanga~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Jan 2 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I do not think it is possible for me to single out one individual in Jamaica whose achievements in 1962 were sufficiently outstanding for him or her to be described as the man or woman of the year. Please remember that both Sir Alexander Bustaman and Mr. Norman Manley are excluded. So, let me instead name the people who seem to me to have made significant contributions in the year just past. Although he is no longer with us, Sir Kenneth Blacburne comes to mind for the graceful and humble and warmhearted manner in which he discharged his duties as the last of the imperial representatives. Next I think Mr. Theodore Sealy deserves special mention for the manner in which he organised the Independence Celebrations. I think he did a first-class job and deserves the thanks of all of us. Another person ~~xxx~~ who did an exceedingly fine job for Jamaica in particular and the West Indies in general was Sir Robert Kirkwood who ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ worked so hard to get those extra ~~suggr~~ allocations from the United States.

If I am reluctant to mention anybody on the political front it is simply because the new government has not really got going yet: Mr. Shearer made a good impression at the United Nations, and Mr. Lightbourne's ^{Ministry} ~~xxxx~~ has made the most news in Jamaica. But not enough has yet happened to say any more than that. I think Mr. Stanley Payton the head of the Bank of Jamaica, was a sane and steady voice at a time when I financial institutions seemed in danger of being disturbed by partisan politics. And I think Mr. G. Arthur Brown

gave sound advice and leadership to the civil servants at a tricky period when they needed it very badly. I think Mr. Noel Crosswell, the Commissioner of Police, has done a great deal to create a better spirit between the police and people of Western Kingston. And if you will forgive me for coming nearer home, I was very impressed by the J.B.C.'s Nuggets for the Needy effort this year and I thought they did exceedingly well to raise over two thousand pounds in something like three hours. But for me the happiest and most promising bit of radio of the year was when I listened on Christmas Day to Ranny Williams and Erica Allen drawing out the youngsters of the Foreshore Road and to hear those youngsters speak and sing and laugh. For me that was something special.....Anyway, these are some of the personalities I will remember whenever I think back to 1962.

I think I will also always remember the mixed feelings with which I ~~xxxx~~ heard the news that the Cuban invasion prisoners had finally been ransomed and would spend Christmas in freedom. Of course I approve of the freeing of the prisoners. But there was something awfully depressing about the blatant bartering of living human beings in exchange for food and medical supplies. It was a cold and sharp reminder, on Christmas eve, that moral barbarism is not a thing of the past, found only in history books. It is as real as the trading of human beings for things, as real as the Berlin Wall; as real as South Africa and as real as the solitary Negro who was turned away from the ship leaving Havana and so/^{was}exposed and condemned - because those were the orders. Perhaps it is as well to remember at times that neither East nor West are all that civilised yet. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Jan 3 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last night's party at Vale Royal in honour of Mr. and Mrs. Duncan Sandys was a delightful and intimate affair. It was a sort of living 'Who's Who' of Jamaican politics, Jamaican diplomacy and Jamaican journalism. And of course it rained. It seems to be a rule that it must rain whenever there is an outdoor party at Vale Royal. Unless this rule is broken before many more wet parties we might all become superstitious about Vale Royal and wet parties.

Anyway, everybody seemed to be having a great deal of fun in spite of the wet, including the Commonwealth Relations Secretary and his wife. They both seemed easy and relaxed and I rather suspect that this part of their trip is more of a holiday than the earlier part.

Certainly, in both Barbados and Grenada Mr. Sandys had some hard and serious business to cope with. My own guess is that the Grenada part of the business might have been the more tricky. Grenada has decided that she wants to enter on a marriage with Trinidad and Tobago and become part of that unitary state. When the West Indies Federation collapsed Trinidad invited whoever wanted to, to join her. Largely as a sort power political manoeuvre the Grenada leaders were the only ones to rise to the bait, and joining a unitary state with Trinidad became an election issue. The then Chief Minister, Mr. Eric Gairy, tried to play it both ways: one day he was in favour of a federation of the 'eight' and the next of joining Trinidad. Mr. Herbert Blaize, on the other hand, had committed himself to union with Trinidad; and it was Mr. Blaize's party that won the election.

But then the government of Trinidad seemed to have second thoughts. They did not change their mind about Grenada's joining them, but they wanted to know what the bride would bring to the marriage. Both Dr. Eric Williams and some of his senior Ministers have put out a number of broad hints that the marriage may not be consummated if Grenada does not bring a reasonable dowry with her. Just what Trinidad considers a reasonable dowry only she knows. Certainly, the out of hand way in which she rejected the offered British aid because she considered it too small, suggests that she has pretty clear ideas on such matters. But Grenada has, for the present at least, nothing but her problems and her poverty to bring to the marriage. And so, if she insists on the marriage and if Trinidad insists on the dowry then Britain will be called upon to foot the bill. And this, I think, brings us to the heart of Mr. Sandys' present visit. At first it was planned that he should visit British Guiana and Trinidad too. But when he had to drastically cut down his time in the region it was the bigger territories that suffered rather than the 'Little Eight' because the real point of the visit was to try and sort out the problems of the eight. Seven of the eight now seem committed to an Eastern Caribbean Federation. The eighth, Grenada, is the odd man out. My guess is that Britain would not object if Trinidad were prepared to accept Grenada without financial strings. But I do not think Britain is prepared to take any sizeable chunk/^{out} of the money she has earmarked for the 'Little Eight' and give it to Trinidad as Grenada's dowry. Britain's major responsibility in the region now, and I think Mr. Sandys has made this plain to Grenada, is to unite all the Winwards and Leewards and give them as decent a start as possible. I hope both Trinidad and Grenada got the message loud and clear. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Jan 4 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking.

Good evening: If appearances mean anything then the United Nations forces in the Congo are now engaged in what looks like the final operation against Moïse Tshombe and his secessionist state of Katanga. But just in case you have forgotten the background to the Congo mess and just in case you think that this is going to be a one-sided or an easy operation, let me remind you of the back ground to the Congo situation.

It all began in 1959 when, as a result of pressure from inside Africa as well as inside the United Nations, the Belgians suddenly, and dramatically withdrew from the Congo. The Belgians had held the Congo as a Colony for seventy-five years, and it was part of Belgian policy not to give the people in their colonies any political rights whatsoever: neither the Africans nor the white settlers had any political rights: there were no elections - either national or local - and so in seventy-five years the Belgians provided absolutely no political training for any of their colonial subjects. Their argument was that to give people experience in political affairs would only lead to discontentment and the emergence of political tricksters who will mislead the mass of the people. In any event, the Belgians frankly had no intention of giving up the Congo because it was the principal source of their wealth. From the Congo they mined eight percent of the world's copper, sixty percent of the world cobalt as well as vast quantities of gold, silver, uranium and other minerals. Nearly all this mineral wealth is found in Katanga and for the best part of seventy-five years it has been mined primarily for the benefit of Belgium through the huge Belgian-controlled Union Miniere holding company. What is not

often realised is the extent of British financial interest in the Congo. Through a company known as Tanganyika Concessions Limited, which is controlled from London, British shareholders held fourteen and a half per cent of all Union Miniere stock and collected over fifteen million pounds in dividends in 1959. If you want to know why Britain often behaves as though she is on Tshombe's side rather than on the side of the United Nations, just remember that British shareholders have a very big investment in Union Miniere and they can and do bring heavy pressure on the British Government. Rightly or wrongly, the Belgians have convinced these British investors that their investments would be safer in a divided Congo with Moise Tshombe having control of the mineral-rich Katanga.

It is because of these 'financial interests' that the United Nations has been unable to resolve the Congo problem so far. On this issue most of western Europe is frankly more concerned with stocks and share and profit margins than with the stability of the Congo or the security of its people. And of course, the other free states of Africa have used the Congo crisis as a political ^{big stick} ~~fast stick~~ with which to ass colonialism and further their own interests. The communists for their part have tried to use the Congo to try and get a foothold in Africa. And the Congolese themselves had just not been prepared to cope with the economic and political vultures all about them. And so you had this great human tragedy of the past two years. Only a small group at the United Nations seemed genuinely concerned about the problems of the people of the Congo. Among them I think the United States played a most honourable part. But the difficulties are still there; the vultures are still there. But this time there is a real chance of success.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Jan 5 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: In 1955 Jamaica used roughly twelve and half thousand tons of animal feed. Of this amount, four thousand, eight-hundred tons was imported and the rest - just under eight thousand tons was produced locally. At today's figures the price of a ton of imported animal feed costs between thirty-five and forty pounds. In 1960 the use of animal feed had almost doubled compared with 1955. In 1960 we ~~xxxxxx~~ used 24,000 tons as against the twelve-and-a-half thousand tons of 1955. But while we used more of the local product in 1955, in 1960 we imported sixteen thousand tons of animal feed and produced only eight thousand tons locally. In 1961 total animal feed consumption went up to thirty-three thousand tons. The coming of Lydford Enterprises boosted our local production of animal feeds to fifteen thousand tons but we still had to import eighteen thousand tons. At forty pounds a ton this meant that we sent seven-hundred and twenty thousand pounds out of the country in 1961 in order to get enough animal feed. I have not got the figures for 1962 but I am reasonably certain that they too will show a dramatic increase in the amount of animal feeds needed because there has been a dramatic increase in our poultry, pig and dairy farming.

Now, the point of giving you all this statistical stuff is to show what an important step forward it would be if Jamaica could produce its own animal feeds.

First, we would ave a minimum of seven-hundred and twenty-thousand pounds a year going out of this country. And if we stop this amount of money from leaving the country, our balance of trade picture is

made that much the better. And seven-hundred and twenty-thousand pounds a year is made available for our investment and development efforts right here in Jamaica. So, by not exporting this money we gain in two ways straight off: we improve our balance of payments position and we create new capital for internal use. But it goes much further than that. Every time we import a ton of animal feed - or indeed of anything else - we are helping to create jobs for the people of the country from which we import. If, on the other hand, we stop importing our animal feeds and manufacture them ourselves, we create jobs for people right here at home. So this is another important factor.

And this, I am very happy to tell you, is exactly what is going to happen right here in Jamaica next month. Jamaica Feeds Limited is expected to start operations next month and in a very short time it will produce all the animal feeds that are needed for the entire island.

What makes this particular item of news so important for me is the fact that Jamaica Feeds Limited is not a company in which you have individual investment with a straight profit motive. The new company has been formed by Seprod Limited and the Jamaica Livestock Association; and this means that whatever profits the company make will not go to any private individual but rather towards improving the livestock industry, the coconut industry and the oils and fats industry. So the success of Jamaica Feeds Limited will mean, ultimately, an important step forward for Jamaican agriculture, the Jamaican employment situation, our manufacturing industries and our balance payments position, and of course the production of our own food. It is not very often that one new industry can have so many beneficial side effects. And so, all power to Jamaica Feeds Limited: it is a big step forward. Goodnight

terms; and in economic terms it depends on a reasonable degree of equity in the distribution of the nations wealth. These, I think, are the foundations of democracy. But these foundations do not lay themselves, they are laid by people and the institutions ~~ixix~~ ^{created} by people. And over the past sixt-five years the 'Jamaica Times' especially under the influence of the elder Durie and of Tom Redcam, did as much as any other single organ - if not more - to shape that independence of thought which we loosely describe as Jamaican middle-class opinion. I know that it is fashionable today to sneer at ^{the} Jamaican middle-class ~~opinion~~. That is allright provided we also remember that nearly all the progress of the past quarter century came about with middle-class leadership. And in the early days it was the opinion of the pushing middle-class, more than anything else, that created ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ the climate for change. Of course, those who believe that modern Jamaica began with 1938 will not agree with this view. For them everything began with the riots and birth of the P.N.P. and the J.L.P. But I think this is a too emotional view of history by people who have been involved in a phase of it, and who see that particular phase as the all-important one: this is very natural, but very false for all that. Anyway, at the centre of this business of creating the climate for change was the 'Jamaica Times'. Now, unhappily because I do not think its usefulness is ended, another phase of Jamaican history is pushing the 'Times' out of existence. The tragedy of this, as far as I am concerned, is that there is as great a need today as there has ever been for the genuinely independent voice of the Jamaica Times.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Jan 8 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: It was just about a year ago that I issued a warning in one of these commentaries about the sugar industry. The Directors of the West Indies Sugar Company had then just had their annual meeting and they had declared a dividend of about four pence in the pound. This, I told you at the time, was a return of about one percent on their investment. But I also told you something more. I told you who the people were who invested their money in the West Indies Sugar Company: I did not tell you all their names because I do not know them. What I did find out was that the West Indies Sugar Company - and in Jamaica this means Frome and Monymusk - got most of their investment capital from what we would call 'small' people in Britain. You may have a widow who has invested part of what her husband left her and their children, and she and the children may be very dependent on the money they get back from the company in the form of dividends; or it may be a retired old soldier or old teacher or old spinster - all people for whom the annual dividend may make all the difference between living reasonably and doing without a lot of ~~the~~ things. For some, getting the annual dividend may mean all the difference between hope and disaster. I do not want to overstate the case but for every big-time capitalistic tycoon who invests, you have literally hundreds of little people; and for them getting some return for their investment is an urgent matter. All this I told you last year. And I told you that on last year's dividend figures, these people would have got more if they had simply put their money into a deposit account in the bank.

Well, the Directors of the West Indies Sugar Company had another

annual meeting last week and their report for the year just ended is even more dismal than it was this time last year.

For 1961 their net profits amounted to one-hundred-and fifteen thousand, five-hundred-and-seventy-three pounds. And it was on this amount that they gave a dividend of four pence in the pound. For the year that has just ended their net profits amounted to fifty-eight thousand, one hundred and seventy-five pounds. This means that profits ~~this year~~ for the year just ended has dropped by nearly a half compared with profits for 1961. If the company were to declare a dividend, the very best they would be able to do for their shareholders would be to offer them something like two-pence in the pound. And stamp duty and postage and cheques would cost more than that. And so, this year, the Company has decided not to pay its ordinary shareholders any dividends. And remember, the bulk of these shareholders are little people who have invested inheritances, life savings and the like.

Now, I am not asking you to feel sorry for these people or to be sentimental about them. These shareholders are not sentimental about you or me. They have put their money into sugar because they hoped to get something out of it, in the same way that the sugar worker goes into the industry in order to get something out of it. If the worker ever reached the point where he got nothing out of the industry, he would pull out and look for work elsewhere. By the same token, if this sort of thing continues these ^{shareholders} ~~people~~ are likely to take their money out of the sugar industry and put it somewhere else. And please do not not say this can't happen: it can, and unless we use our heads, it will. And whatever else we may think we can afford, we cannot afford the collapse of our sugar industry - it employs too many people. So, please let us all think again about the sugar industry. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Jan 9 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Will Dr. Eric Williams be the next Principal of the University of the West Indies? This seems to be a piece of speculative rumour that is going the rounds in the Eastern Caribbean at the moment. It began with the news of Dr. Williams' appointment as pro-Chancellor of the university and as the person who will preside over Council meetings in the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ absence of Princess Alice. In practice this means that Dr. Williams will chair practically all the really important business meetings of the university. And this, in turn means that he will be at the centre of policy-making for the university almost from the moment of Dr. Arthur Lewis' departure. Indeed, I think we shall see the beginning of Dr. Williams' policy-making influence when he delivers the commemoration address at the university graduation exercises on February 16th.

Well now, with that piece of background before us, let us repeat the question: Will Dr. Williams be the next Principal of the university of the West Indies? I do not think so. I do not speak with ^{the} confidence and assurance with which I would if this were a question in a purely Jamaican setting and involving a Jamaican personality. I am sure of myself in exploring Jamaican trends and tendencies and personalities because I am involved both intellectually and emotionally. But within this limitation I doubt very much that Dr. Williams will, at this moment in time, leave Trinidad and give up his position as Prime Minister to come and run the university from Jamaica.

I think ~~THAT~~ for Dr. Williams there is still much too much to be done in Trinidad itself and in the Eastern Caribbean. He has very clear ideas as to exactly what he means by 'West Indian' and I think

that right now he sees more hope of spreading his ideas on West Indian-ism as the head of a reasonably prosperous independent state than as the head of the university. This does not mean that I rule out the possibility of Dr. Williams becoming the head of the university one day. After all, he is a scholar and teacher by training and inclination. But I do not think it is likely to happen now. First, the political and economic institutions of Trinidad have to be stabilised; and this is no overnight job. And besides, as pro-Chancellor he will in fact have all the power he needs to considerably influence thinking at Mona. So the answer to the question is: I do not think so, not for the present at least.

Now for a brief word on another important piece of news. I think the wisdom of bringing the United Fruit Company back to Jamaica has been confirmed by the news that United Fruit has now bought out a sales organisation in Belgium. If Britain enters the Common Market, and we become an Associated State, our bananas - and other fruit and vegetables - will be able to enter Europe on reasonably favourable terms. To have have a distribution organisation ready and waiting, efficient and capable of supplying demand at short notice, this could be of very great value to us.

Finally, to Africa and the Congo. I told you on Friday that the United Nations operation against Mr. Tshombe's Katanga was not likely to be as one-sided as at first appeared, largely because of European financial interests. Well, that is how it is now: the big stall has started and slippery Tshombe is being aided by Britain and the Belgians.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Jan 10 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think that possibly the most interesting and the most important debate in Jamaica today is the one on agriculture. And as with all really important debates it is not a one-dimensional affair but a complex, subtle and many-sided affair. There is the political aspect, there is the organisational aspect, there is the leadership aspect and there is the productivity aspect. And all these aspects touch and overlap at a number of points.

Whatever you or I or anybody else may think of it, the Jamaica Agricultural Society is both the organisation and the voice of the farmers of this country, and one of the most important aspects of the agricultural debate is the nine-months-old conflict that has existed between the present Minister of Agriculture and the organisation. For me one of the surprising aspects of this conflict was the manner in which the Minister set about it. Before he became Minister of Agriculture Mr. Gyles was a member of the leadership of the organisation. So he knew the internal power structure of the organisation as well as anybody else. And he, and the whole country, knew that both Mr. Burke and Mr. Henry were avowed P.N.P. men. But he also knew, or should have known, that these two gentlemen did not achieve their high positions of leadership simply because they were P.N.P. types, but rather because of what they had contributed to agriculture over the years. With this knowledge at his fingertips, and with his awareness of both the economic and political importance of the farmers it was unfortunate for Mr. Gyles, so soon after the J.L.P. victory, to threaten to deal ruthlessly with this organisation. It achieved

the effect of uniting the farmers behind Mr. ~~HENRY~~ Burke and Mr. Henry as they had not been for a long time.

And yet, you know, there were and still are very many people both inside and outside the farming community who felt and still feel that however clumsily Mr. Gyles may have gone about it, the point he was trying to make was important and valid. And that point, stated very simply, was that the top leadership of the J.A.S. had, over the years, come to use the farmers organisation as both an instrument and a platform for furthering their own party political interests. So we ended up with this situation: The Minister charged, and I think with justice, that the top leadership of the J.A.S. had become too politically partisan. But the manner in which he made his charge rallied the rank and file behind the J.A.S. leadership who now seemed to be fighting for the life and independence of the J.A.S. against a threatening government. This led to a situation that was both abnormal and unhealthy for the country's agriculture.

Now, with his dramatic and unexpected appearance at the J.A.S. conference yesterday, Sir Alexander Bustamante has restored the situation to normal. 'Politics,' he said 'Cannot grow yams and bananas. And then he invited the leaders of the organisation to go and talk to him about the rift between themselves and the Minister. It is now up to the Minister and the leaders of the J.A.S. to make use of this normalcy to resolve their differences. The Minister wants less party politics in the J.A.S. Fine. The J.A.S. wants no monkeying with its independence: fine again. But both of these are political positions. And the real solution is for both the Minister and the leaders of the J.A.S. to be more concerned, in Sir Alexander's words, with the growing of yams and bananas. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Jan 11 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Tonight I want us to take a look at the productivity side of the great agricultural debate. We had a dramatisation of this aspect of the debate earlier this week in the conflicting views expressed at the J.A.S. conference by Mr. David Edwards of the University of the West Indies on the one side and Sir Arthur Thelwell on the other.

But before ~~I~~^{we} go on to discuss the disagreement between these two distinguished gentlemen, let us try and put the problem of ^{agricultural} productivity into some sort of proper perspective. According to the Economic Survey for 1961 Jamaica's Domestic Exports for that year amounted to £60.9 million. Just under half of this, thirty-point-four million pounds came from the bauxite industry. Twenty-five-point seven million pounds came from our agriculture. And a mere four-point-eight million pounds came from the new industries on the Foreshore Road and elsewhere, and to which we have given such generous incentives. So, ~~we~~ in terms of earning foreign currency, agriculture is the most crucial next to mining. And the new industries are way, way below. That is point number one. Point number two has to do with employment. Agriculture is still the largest single employer of labour in this country. The Bauxite industry is highly mechanised and uses a very small labour force. So, for all the wealth it brings to the country, it does not help ~~we~~ us very much directly with our unemployment problem. The new industries, will, as a generalisation, employ proportionately more people than bauxite. But they are very small operations, each using between twenty and a hundred-odd people. And to make matters worse they are at present largely confined to the

Corporate Area, thus bringing job opportunities only to the people of Kingston & St. Andrew. So, for the present, the new industries about which we tend to talk so very much, still contribute very little to our exports and very little to our employment situation. But every little is welcome and will help - if it is not too costly. If it costs us as much as Jamaica Woolens did to get one industry going - then, in terms of the returns it is not worth our while, especially if that industry folds up on us. The point is that we must have these industries to diversify and expand the economy - but not at any price. Certainly not at the price the I.D.C. seems to have been paying hitherto. But then I do not think it is really necessary to pay such a price if we are realistic and practical about it. Anyway, the new industries are still babies in terms of job opportunities and earning foreign currency. It is only our agriculture that earns a great deal of foreign currency and gives a livelihood to more Jamaicans^{all over the country}/than all the other undertakings put together.

It was to this agriculture that Mr. David Edwards suggested we should apply crop zoning and create economic medium sized farms of between twenty-five and sixty acres for the most ~~rewarding~~ ^{rewarding} farming. And Sir Arthur Thellwell opposed this idea. Instead, he wanted more subsidies and ten families on five acres of land. In effect Mr. Edwards says: let us make agriculture more efficient than it now is because it is in the interest of the economy to do so. Sir Arthur on the other hand says put as many people as possible on the land and subsidise them. It seems to me that/Jamaica's future is more intimately tied up with which view prevails in this particular debate than with almost anything else that is now happening. So please think carefully about it. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Jan 12 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I am sure most of you still remember the appearance of Mr. Millard Johnson on the Jamaican political scene. My own view was and still is that his appearance was useful - even though Mr. Millard Johnson singled me out for abuse. I thought, and I said it at that time, that the Jamaican society could cope with Mr. Millard Johnson. The society did. The one point on which I was really critical about Mr. Millard Johnson was this business of seeing himself and setting himself up as the beginning of the political emancipation movement in Jamaica. In order to do that he had to dismiss or mock at the pioneering hard work done by Mr. Norman Manley and Sir Alexander Bustamante.

The point is: in order to be the pioneer, in order to set yourself up as the great beginner, you have to cancel everything that has gone before. You have to destroy the past and the achievements of the past because as long as they are there you cannot be the Great Beginner. And so the cult of the Great Beginner leads to a dangerously destructive urge within this society.

If you are a musician then all music must begin with you and you will go out of your way to savage the reputation of anybody who was there before you. The music they produced was colonial and reactionary, unrelated to reality, out of touch with the new social forces and the new ferment. And then you will go on to state exactly the kind of music that our times and the new days and the new situation require. And if it so happens that the requirements of the times are exactly the same as the only piece of ~~xxx~~ music you have written. why, that

only goes to show that you are the only person who is in touch with the needs of them times: and so you are the Great Beginner, the beginning of modern Jamaican music. Or if you are a writer then it all began with you, or if you are in the theatre then there was no real theatre until you appeared on the scene, or if you are an artist then they were all colonial artists - victims of an art colonialism - until you appeared on the scene.

The virtue about this is that you are always more important as the pioneer than you would be if you were just one of a long line. So, from the point of view of the Great Beginner this does make sense in a twisted sort of way. From the point of the society, however, it is tragic because it is a continuous attempt to destroy the historical and artistic and literary and political sense of continuity of the society. And one of the most tragic and unhappy results of this is the monumental self-doubt and self-deprecation it engenders. We see it around us all the time. A Jamaican starts a new enterprise - is it television, is a factory, is it a farming co-operative - and everybody expects and prophesies failure. We seem to have a vested ^{Jamaican} interest in everybody else's failure. A/~~xxx~~ gets a big job and instead of seeing it as a great achievement we anticipate his failing at it or else becoming spoiled by it. You know all this as well as I do. You see it around you all the time. Jamaicans are selling Jamaica and their fellow Jamaicans short all the time. And so the way ahead and the way up is made so much more difficult. And it all begins with the warped vanity of the Great Beginner who has to destroy everything in order to be first, and who ends up by unleashing this ugly destructive urge in the society. Let us put an end to it. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Jan 14 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The news of the assassination of Togo's President Sylvanus Olympio means - in my view - that 1963 is likely to be a rough year for politics in Africa. If you exclude the murder of Patrice Lumumba in the Congo, and that was a rather different situation from that of Togo, then the political murder of Olympio introduces a completely new and ^{an} enormously dangerous factor into African power politics; and the new factor is: murder as a valid political weapon.

But let us get our picture straight. Only last week another bomb went off in Ghana, in another attempt on the life of President Nkrumah. And a little earlier we had the news of the short and explosive power struggle between President Leopold Senghor of Senegal and his Prime Minister: Senghor won, and Prime Minister Dia was flung into prison. And of course there are records of other attempts to overthrow this or that African state. So, I am not saying that the attempt to seize power is anything new in Africa. What is new, and especially new for Africa South of the Sahara, is the successful use of murder as a political weapon. And a very striking feature of this new thing is that it was carried out by elements in the country's military service, according to all available reports. Soldiers, the military guardians of the country, whose business it is to defend the land from both internal and external enemies, have turned on the Head-of-State and shot him down in cold blood. And in doing this they have effectively destroyed the proposition that the rule of law is supreme in Togo. In its place they have, in effect, put the alternative proposition that if you are strong enough you can outside the law and bend the law to your will. And the tragedy, as we have seen in

so many cases in the recent past, the tragedy is that once people depart from the strictest observance of the rule of law, no matter how noble their motives for doing so, it invariably ~~leads~~ ^{leads} to dictatorship, tyranny and the rule of fear. And once you are set on this road the way back to the rule of law is a long and hard and terrible journey.

And so it seems to me that the political murder of Sylvanus Olympio will have far-reaching after-effects. I think it is a serious blow to the cause of African stability and African development. Every power-hungry and ambitious young politician will now have this successful example to spur him on. President Nkrumah who may actually be glad of the death of Olympio may yet live to regret it: his own enemies may regard it as a spur to greater effort against him.

What gives the death of Olympio an added dimension of tragedy is the quality of man he was. Let me show you what I mean by quoting some comments Olympio made on the problem of leadership. He once wrote

"The African leader who seriously over-estimates his country's capacity for growth will soon find that he is forced to rely on foreign aid to maintain his political position, and it will be then that the temptation to turn to one or the other power bloc will be greatest. The political leader who promises his people a new highway network or a hundred new schools may find that he has promised too much, that he will at best be voted, and at worst forced, out of office unless he can fulfil his promises. At that moment he may well revert to the dangerous policy of making external political commitments...."

I think Olympio's murder had a lot to do with his approach to the problem of African leadership. But I will tell you about that tomorrow, so till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Jan 15 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I told you last night that I thought that part of the reason for Olympio's murder had to do with the problem of political leadership in Africa. I quote you a passage that Olympio had written on this subject. He talked about the African leader who, in order to gain power, makes fantastic promises which are beyond the possibility of fulfilment because the country just does not have the capacity. This leader then finds himself in the position of either having to deliver what he promised or else of being voted or forced out of power. In order to hold on to power this leader may, in exchange for the needed aid (and now I am quoting Olympio's own words): "Revert to the dangerous policy of making external political commitments, and this policy may be multiplied by its effects upon neighbouring states; for these, anxious to preserve their sovereignty, may turn to the other power bloc."

Those are the murdered man's words and they show how promising his people the moon can lead a politician into bringing the Cold War into Africa.

I am not telling you anything new when I say that these views of Olympio add up to just about as sharp a criticism of the policies of Kwame Nkrumah. It is a simple point of fact that Nkrumah's policies did as much as anything else to bring the Cold War into Africa south of the Sahara: it was there in his brand of Pan-Africanism, with which Olympio did not agree; and in his co-leadership of the Casablanca states. Olympio on the other saw Nkrumah's Pan-African dream as rather unrealistic. He admits the need for co-operation between the independent African states, especially where these states are in the

same region. Then he goes on to say: "Pan-Africanism has been put forward as an all-embracing remedy. (Some people call the same idea African Unity.) Apart from the proposition that few real-life problems are so simple that they possess only one solution, no two African states can agree on a single interpretation of the terms. To discuss the common heritage and institutions of Ghana, the Congo and Ethiopia is clearly unrealistic. More important, however, are the character and complexity of the problems facing us at home. To speak of African Unity in the face of existing economic and social disunity is to avoid the central task to which we are committed - the earliest possible economic and social betterment of our people."

So wrote Sylvanus Olympio. And yet, you know, there are many Jamaicans - and many of them are highly educated - who talk about Africa and the African connection as though they are talking about one unified and simple society.

Anyway, Olympio's concept of leadership led, inevitably, to a fall-out between himself and Nkrumah. They were once very good friends but over the years relations have grown bitterly cold. Indeed, some of Nkrumah's key political enemies, like Gbedemah and Busia were famous operating from Togo. What is likely to happen to these political refugees now is anybody's guess. All the indications are that the people who murdered Olympio are very friendly to Nkrumah so they may hand his enemies over to him. But whatever happens, the real problem of leadership in Africa today is that ^{there} ~~xxx~~ cannot now be a legal and constitutional opposition, subject to and protected by the rule of law. ~~The xxx~~ The opposition must kill or be killed. The death of Olympio heavily underlines this tragedy of African leadership. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Jan 16 at 6.15p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Every now and then there is so much of the bad news that is 'good' news, that it depresses me a little and I try to get away from radio bulletins and newspaper reports of fresh disasters. And the past few days were particularly unpleasant. There was the news of a couple of senseless murders in Jamaica and a dreadful manhunt; there was the killing of one of Africa's wisest leaders; a number of people perished from the cold in the United States and ~~Africa~~ Europe. It was gloom, gloom, gloom. A little too much gloom. I had to remind myself that there were people in the world who were laughing and happy and who loved each other and were gentle and who did not murder and who did not die. But in order to convince myself of what I knew to be the truth I had to shut out the news for at least a dozen hours.

And so it was that I picked up what I thought was an ordinary science-fiction novel. The Jacket told me that this was Hugo Gernsback famous classic, 'Ralph 124C41-plus'. I discovered that this book had been written in nineteen-hundred-and-eleven and it was set in the future, in the year twenty-six-sixty, which is over seven-hundred years ahead into the future. And as I read, I stepped into the world of tomorrow. ~~All the other science-fiction stuff I had read from time to time had been entertaining but the sort of thing you take with a pinch of salt; more invention and imagination than fact. But this one was different.~~ Everything I read in this book was possible. It was very likely that the future would look as this book said. All that has happened since nineteen-eleven tends to confirm this. There was hardly any aviation to speak of in 1911 and yet this book talks of space-ships and space journeys and nuclear power at a time when

this sort of thing was unknown. Certainly, when I finally finished this book I felt I had taken a rare and unique glimpse into what the world of seven hundred years from now could be like.

And before you think I have been sold on a simple piece of science-fiction let me tell you that it is nothing of the sort. What Hugo Gernsback has done is this: he has taken the technical and scientific inventions and knowledge of his time and based his projections on what was actually there. The result is that he has predicted some amazing developments. For anybody to have predicted radar in 1911, years before it was invented, is astounding. He foretold ~~of~~ ^{production of} the/artificial silk and wool, of new lightweight and strong heat-resistant metals capable of ~~standing up~~ ^{withstanding} the friction of space ~~of television, of a~~ ^{of television, of a} journeys; ~~and the xxxxxxxxxx~~ ^{gravity neutraliser}, and then he describes something which is only now becoming a practical possibility. In the story the hero uses a beam of light to cut through metal, to generate the power of a death-ray, to neutralise an enemy attack by using the beam of light as a wall against which the bombs bounce. Does all this sound fantastic? Well, over the past three years scientists have developed what they call the Laser (the word is a condensation for light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation), This is a beam of light that can be controlled ~~xxxxxx~~ and made so powerful that it can cut through the hardest substance you like to name; ^{when perfected} the Laser can be a death-ray, it can be used in surgery, it can be used as a sort of invisible screen warding off ballistic missiles. The Laser is just being developed now; and yet, a man wrote a book over fifty years ago and predicted it. After reading this my depression lifted. No matter what the news bulletins say, it is not all gloom. Some very wonderful things are happening all about us all the time. All we have to do is look and listen. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Jan 17 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The sudden and dangerous crisis that has developed inside the European Economic Community - more popularly known as the European Common Market - is the creation of France's President Charles De Gaulle. And because President De Gaulle is the kind of man he is this could be the most serious crisis for Europe since the end of World War Two. And whether we like it or not, what happens in Europe can still have a most profound effect on the economic and political life of Jamaica. So I think it is in our interest to try and understand this European Common Market crisis.

The crisis began on Monday of this week when President De Gaulle in effect told a press conference that he personally, and therefore France, did not want Britain to be admitted to membership of the Common Market until she had radically changed her relations with the Commonwealth as well as with the United States. He did not put it as starkly as I am doing. But the essence and meaning were beyond doubt.

Then, the following day, we had the news that five of the six Common Market countries, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg were opposed to De Gaulle and wanted Britain to be admitted. So, on the face of it, De Gaulle seems to be alone. But my own view is that if it came to a real showdown West Germany would side with De Gaulle. But the fact of the matter is that France can by herself keep Britain out of the Common Market because the membership rules provide that any new member can only be admitted by unanimous vote. So all the fuss and protestation/^{of the five} is really meaningless if De Gaulle ~~has~~ ^{decided} really decided to dig in his heels. I think that in any show-

each
 down the other five will soon realise that they/have too much to lose by breaking up the Common Market over Britain's entry, and so they will, with the greatest possible regret, dump Britain if they have to.

But is De Gaulle really opposed to Britain's entry? And why? I think that in order to get a sensible answer we might as well ask whether De Gaulle is anti-American. After all, De Gaulle also expressed total opposition to President Kennedy's idea - put forward on the same day in his State of the Union Message - of an Atlantic partnership between the United States and an enlarged Common Market. De Gaulle said that he wanted the Common Market to be "properly European", and not, and now I am quoting his own words: "Any colossal Atlantic community under American leadership and dominance".

And this, I think, brings us to the heart of the matter: who is to lead the new Europe? I think that rightly or wrongly De Gaulle feels that if Britain is admitted into the Common Market she is bound to assume a position of leadership; in time it may well become a dominant position of leadership - especially after De Gaulle and Adenauer disappear from the scene. And I think De Gaulle's fear is that Britain's outlook is not 'properly European', that she does not really buy the concept of the new Europe being economically and politically as important as either Russia or America and, if anything, the superior of both in terms of moral, cultural and spiritual values. If De Gaulle has his way then the new Europe is going to be nobody's stooge and nobody's satellite: instead, it will be the equal of all and the moral superior of most, pointing the way. That is being 'properly European'. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Jan 18 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Earlier this week, in discussing the killing of the President of Togo, I quoted some of this wise man's words of warning against the big promises that political leaders often make in order to get elected. Some of you may remember that his warning made specific mention of 'a new highway network or a hundred new schools'. And then, almost as if to give immediate point and meaning to Olympio's warning, we had the news of thousands of children being turned away from schools in both the Corporate Area as well as in a number of rural areas in Jamaica. The truth of the matter is that there has been so much talk about education, so many promises and so many half-promises, so much politics ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ injected into any discussion of our educational problems, that I am rather glad of this salutary shock to our educationists. Please do not misunderstand me. I am deeply distressed that children should be turned away from schools. What I hope is that this will shake our educationists sufficiently for them to stop talking and to stop playing politics and get on with the job of supplying school places.

And you know, I find this business of school places just a little bit crazy. Most of the time we have sunshine in Jamaica; most of the time the weather is fine; ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ there are times when all we need is shelter from the rain and shade from the bright glare of the sun. And that is about the extent of it. And yet, for some strange reason our educational authorities will not put up the kind of buildings that these conditions indicate. Instead of having supports and an ~~aluminium~~ aluminium roof and perhaps three or four feet of wall - which would give a cheerfully light and airy classroom, especially if it

is surrounded by trees and flowering shrubs - our educational authorities seem to go in for some of the silliest and ugliest and costliest buildings. You know, even if we think England or Scotland or Wales is the cat's whiskers, to try and reproduce the particular classroom where we were happiest while working for our degree is nonsense. The sun hardly ever shines in those countries and so their buildings are designed to keep out the cold. There is no reason for thick walls and pokey little windows in Jamaica. When I was a boy in Africa my classmates and I spent more of our school time in the open under some shady tree. Perhaps this had something to do with fact that our teachers seemed much more cheerful and tolerant and as a result gave us a little better education than children seem to get today. In any case, the idea of a shortage of school places is a little ridiculous: I can understand a shortage of teachers, a shortage of desks and pencil and books. But if we really wanted to we could turn almost every other shade tree - especially in rural Jamaica - into a place where children are educated. And as far as the Corporate Area is concerned, I think that if the people at the Ministry of education would listen to those whose experience is greater than theirs, the whole country would benefit. The churches have been in education for a very long time: they have built classrooms on shoe-string budgets and could certainly be very helpful to the Ministry. But unfortunately, and I have told you about this before, there are some ~~young~~ people who feel they cannot be taught anything because they are officials of the Ministry and because their paper qualifications ~~are~~ are good. I hope this turning away of thousands of children will shake them out of their complacency. Certainly, I think we need to take another really searching look at what constitutes school space. Goodnight.

is surrounded by trees and flowering shrubs - our educational authorities seem to go in for some of the silliest and ugliest and costliest buildings. You know, even if we think England or Scotland or Wales is the cat's whiskers, to try and reproduce the particular classroom where we were happiest while working for our degree is nonsense. The sun hardly ever shines in those countries and so their buildings are designed to keep out the cold. There is no reason for thick walls and pokey little windows in Jamaica. When I was a boy in Africa my classmates and I spent more of our school time in the open under some shady tree. Perhaps this had something to do with fact that our teachers seemed much more cheerful and tolerant and as a result gave us a little better education than children seem to get today. In any case, the idea of a shortage of school places is a little ridiculous: I can understand a shortage of teachers, a shortage of desks and pencil and books. But if we really wanted to we could turn almost every other shade tree - especially in rural Jamaica - into a place where children are educated. And as far as the Corporate Area is concerned, I think that if the people at the Ministry of education would listen to those whose experience is greater than theirs, the whole country would benefit. The churches have been in education for a very long time: they have built classrooms on shoe-string budgets and could certainly be very helpful to the Ministry. But unfortunately, and I have told you about this before, there are some ~~young~~ people who feel they cannot be taught anything because they are officials of the Ministry and because their paper qualifications ~~are~~ are good. I hope this turning away of thousands of children will shake them out of their complacency. Certainly, I think we need to take another really searching look at what constitutes school space. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Jan 19 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abraham speaking

Good evening: As far as the news is concerned this week began rather badly but I am glad to be able to end it on a high and happy note. This high and happy note is the news that sometime this year, most likely in the last quarter of the year, we will have our own detergents ^{factory} in full operation in Jamaica. The coming of this detergent factory to Jamaica is important and happy news for exactly the same reasons that I gave you on Saturday January the fifth when I discussed the setting up of the animal feed factory which will go into operation next month. The only difference is that the ~~setting up of the~~ detergents factory will, in the long run, be a much bigger and more important operation for Jamaica. But let me sketch in the background.

In 1955 Jamaica imported about 276 tons of detergents (you know the stuff, Tide, Omo ^{and} and the like). At an average price of \$200 a ton this works out at just over fifty-five thousand pounds. By 1958 our imports of detergents had gone up to one thousand tons which cost us roughly two-hundred thousand pounds. In 1959 imports of detergents had gone up to one-thousand two-hundred and forty tons, and this cost us just under a quarter of a million pounds. And please remember that every time we imported detergents we exported our precious money.

In 1960 the local soap industry was so disturbed by the inroads made by detergents that they ~~put~~ put pressure on the then government to restrict the importing of detergents. Some of you may remember that at the time I opposed restriction and suggested instead that we produce our own detergents locally. The then Minister of Trade restricted the importing of detergents to 900 tons and I thought my idea of a local factory had been rejected. But apparently the

the Coconut Industry Board as well as those foreign firms which sold detergents here, took the idea very seriously and explored and discussed it. In any event, in 1961 our imports of detergents shot up to 1,668 tons and we exported over three-hundred and thirty-three thousand pounds of our much needed money in the form of payments for these detergents. And last year we imported roughly four-hundred thousand pounds worth of detergents, or roughly about two thousand tons of the stuff.

So the situation quite simply is that detergents is big and growing business. Certainly, this is a ^{point} pound on which I do not have to persuade any housewife. She knows it for her~~self~~. She knows ^{the} ~~that~~ difference it has made to her laundry and her housekeeping. And this means that we either ^{keep} ~~kept~~ on importing more and more detergents and exporting more and more of our badly needed national wealth, or else we produce the stuff locally.

The government has now given Seprod the go-ahead to set up the detergents factory. And as with the animal feeds factory, ^{we will not export our} a minimum of roughly half a million pounds which we would have exported will remain in the country next year and go into local development, and into improving our balance of trade position, and into helping to create jobs for people here. And as with the animal feed factory, the profits from the detergents factory, when they start coming, will benefit all Jamaica because again there are no private share-^{proposed} holders. Seprod, and therefore the/animal feed and detergents ^{are} factories, ~~are~~ owned by the Coconut Industry Board, the most successful Statutory Board in Jamaica. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Jan 21 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, the leader of the British Labour Party, died on Friday night. Today the British Parliamentary Labour Party met and started the long debate that will lead to the choice of a new leader for the British Labour Party. The tributes to Gaitskell's great talents have been paid; his friends all over the Commonwealth and all over the world mourn his untimely death - and at the same time those who were closest to him must set about the very practical business of finding a replacement. This is how it always is when someone dies who is both a person and a symbol. And above all else - for domestic British politics, that is - Hugh Gaitskell represented the acceptable compromise between the leftwing and the rightwing within the British Labour Party. His was a sort of moderate, non-doctrinaire socialism with no dogma to it.

Out of their long experience the British have learnt the importance of institutions and the virtues of compromise. This, to a large extent is responsible for the fact that you find within the British Labour Party opinions that are as rightwing and reactionary as those of any Tory backwoodsman on the one side, and opinions that are as leftwing ~~as~~ ^{any} as those of ~~the~~ Communists ~~and~~ on the other side. But although British maturity is largely responsible for the fact that these political extremes can co-exist within the British Labour Party, the quality of the leaders of the Labour Party had a great deal to do with it.

Some of the biggest battles between the rightwing and leftwing within the Labour Party took place shortly after the second world war,

at the time when Labour had won power and Britain was being turned into the Welfare State under the deceptively quiet leadership of Mr. Atlee. Those were the days when the leadership of the British Labour Party was a roll-call of Britain's political giants: there was Sir Stafford Cripps, there was Ernest Bevin, there was Hugh Dalton, there was Herbert Morrison, there was James Griffiths, and of course there was the fire-eating Aneurin Bevan and his tough and brilliant group of leftwing supporters led by Michael Foot. In those days Labour seemed so rich in leadership material that the death of anyone of these leaders could not possibly have any bearing on an election result. In contrast, the Conservative Party of those days had Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Anthony Eden and no one else that could command national support.

Today the picture is totally different. The death of Mr. Gaitskell has created a crisis for the Labour Party, both internally and on the national scene. Within the party he had established his authority completely and on the national scene it looked very much as though he would lead a revitalised Labour Party to victory at the next elections. He had won every battle inside the party and he seemed ready to wrest the Premiership of Britain from Mr. Macmillan. Now, suddenly, his Labour Party looks divided and leaderless. Certainly, neither Mr. George Brown nor Mr. Harold Wilson nor Mr. James Callaghan presently enjoy the kind of national prestige that wins elections. So Mr. Macmillan might well decide to call elections this year, while the Labour Party is still suffering from the ^{shock,} ~~shock~~ confusion and lack of leadership and direction caused by the death of Hugh Gaitskell

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Jan 22 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The very important meetings between the Minister of Agriculture and the leaders of the Jamaica Agricultural Society, on the future role of the Society, is ~~is~~ either going on now or ~~is~~ about to ~~take place~~ take place soon.

I am glad of this meeting and of the fact that it will be out of the glare of publicity. This will help to remove the question of 'face' from the talk and will thus make easier, we hope, an understanding between the Minister and the Society.

I am sure the ~~the~~ leaders of the Society have much too much sense to misunderstand and misread the meaning of the Prime Minister's intervention in this dispute when he made his surprise appearance at the Half Yearly meeting. If the leaders of the Society read this as a sort of capitulation it might lead them into thinking that they are bargaining from a position of strength. And this, in turn might lead to a certain attitude of arrogance. I think this would be a very grave mistake on the part of the Society. The elected government of the country (no matter of which party) is the highest authority in the land, put there by the majority of the people and we cannot be contemptuous of the government without at the same time being contemptuous of the majority of our fellow citizens. But I am sure this is not a point that I have to bring to the attention of the leaders of the Jamaica Agricultural Society. If anything, they are more acutely aware of it than I am. And so I expect the talks to be cordial, sensible and constructive.

One of the points which I hope will be discussed very carefully, because it is a very important point, is the one on the government's

relations with statutory bodies. And this is not simply an agricultural question: the I.D.C., the Tourist Board, the Coconut Industry Board, and some others, the J.B.C. itself - all these/are statutory bodies and therefore affected by this question. What sort of relations should the government have with these bodies?

To make any sort of sense of this question, I think we must ask a further question: What is the point of establishing statutory bodies. I think the only sensible justification for statutory bodies is that they should perform the function for which they were set-up more effectively, more efficiently and more quickly than it can be performed by any government department. If any government department can perform a particular function more effectively than a statutory body then there is no point in having a statutory body to perform that function. I think that once we get this point clear we can begin to answer our first question. The point is that a statutory body is set up to perform a particular function with a greater freedom, a greater flexibility, and greater speed than is possible for a government department. It often also performs functions which a government as such cannot perform. It is easier for the I.D.C. to erect factory buildings than it is for the Ministry of Trade and Industry; it is easier for the Tourist Board to be in constant touch with tourist interest and to promote tourism than it is for the same ministry; it is easier for the Coconut Industry Board to establish a detergents factory; easier for the J.A.S. to organise the farmers. So statutory bodies are much more than just government departments. They are independent bodies set up by the government and subject to broad policy guidance by the government. But here we run into the problem of definitaions, which I will discuss tomorrow: so till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wed Jan 23 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Jamaica Industrial Development Corporation, The Jamaica Tourist Board, The Banana Board **AND A HOST OF OTHERS** are statutory bodies which were established by the government. The Jamaica Agricultural Society on the other hand, pre-dates the government as we know it today. It was formed way back in 1895 and it was incorporated in 1941 by the passing of a special law. So the J.A.S. is a rather special kind of statutory body. But it does get an annual financial grant from the government. And this is one of the key characteristics of the statutory bodies: they can call on the government for financial help. And here that old truism comes into play. 'He who pays the piper, calls the tune'. And the tune in this case is the broad policy guidance these bodies must accept from the government. Certainly, it would be foolish to expect any government to finance any organisation whose functions are calculated to either undermine confidence in that government or else to bring down that government. So the first thing any statutory body must do is accept broad policy guidance from the government of the day.

But what is broad policy guidance? There are some people who feel that the Minister must be in constant touch with the executive head of the statutory body for which he is responsible, in much the same way that he is in constant touch with his permanent secretary. These people will hasten to add that they are only thinking of certain key statutory bodies whose activities can and do affect the government's day to day policies. I would consider the J.A.S., the I.D.C., the Tourist Board as such 'sensitive' statutory bodies. Certainly, we have had dramatic evidence in recent months of what explosive

party political dynamite can be fashioned out of the activities of these bodies. Those who favour constant ^{and direct} Ministerial contact with the statutory bodies justify this by saying that any government has the right to impose its wishes on the statutory bodies.

Then there is the opposite school of thought which feels that once a government has set up a statutory body and laid down its broad policy, that should be the end of it. The Minister should not go near the body and should have no contact with the executive head. These people are inclined to agree that there should be financial accountability to ensure that public money is wisely and carefully spent. But their greatest concern is that there should be no contact between the politicians and the people who work within the statutory bodies. The great fear of these people is that such direct government intervention could lead to a situation where the people working for these bodies are more concerned with winning the approval of the party in power ^{with} rather than/doing what is best for the country.

I am inclined to support a third body of opinion which falls roughly between these two extreme views. I think a certain amount of pressure of some sort is pretty well inevitable. Let us face it, neither ^{once it is in power} party/is going to finance any body to act against it. On the other hand it would be good if the executive officers of these bodies could work in the confident knowledge that they must only take orders from their boards of directors. And I think an ideal long term solution would be to make these boards bi-partisan, with the majority party nominating the chairman and a majority of members on each board and the minority party nominating the rest. Certainly, this seems a most sensible way of ~~ensuring~~ making sure that the usefulness of statutory bodies is not destroyed by extreme party politics. Goodnight.

Some Problems in Civics:
 The attitude to worker.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
 Thursday Jan 24 at 6.15 p.m
 Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Let us treat the rest of this week as 'Civics Week' because I think there are a number of very important civics problems that ought to be given public thought and attention. Every now and then some public spirited citizen will raise his or her voice in protest at the way dirt is dumped at some public place, or at the foul conditions in which food is sold, or at the filthy state of our city streets. Often, this kind of protest has some little effect, the place protested about looks clean for a week or two, and then it all slips back to what it was before the protests were made. This business of keeping up, of sustaining any good effort, is one of the most important problems we face. The fact that conditions are improved under pressure of public opinion and then slip back again when the pressure is no longer there, shows that those whose job it is to keep the city clean are not really interested in what they are doing or understand the importance of it.

And you know, it is all very well for some of us to make a big song and dance about the maturity and the political wisdom and the sophistication of the Jamaican worker - my own view is that we are not doing the Jamaican worker, or Jamaica itself, any service if we do not tell the worker when he is wrong and where he is wrong. And the one point on which I personally will find fault with ^{vast numbers of} ~~the~~ Jamaican workers is their lack of pride in the job. I have often had the impression that the Jamaican worker, male or female, could not care less about how the job is done, provided he or she got the money. There is no pride in the job or in how the job is done; and this in turn means that the worker does not think anything better is expected

of him by his fellow workers or by his employers or by the general public ~~about him~~: or if he does think that they expect something better of him, he could not care less.

I know that some people will be only too eager to agree with me this far. But let us go a little further. Transport these selfsame workers to the United Kingdom or to the United States and there is a fantastic transformation. We have evidence of it. Jamaican workers in Britain have a very high reputation for their industry, trustworthiness and pride in the job. The same thing is true of the United States. In fact the Jamaicans tend to emerge as the leaders in their particular field of activity. So, what is the reason for this odd state of affairs?

The answer is very simple really. In both Britain and the United States there is no shame, no lower of status attached to working with one's hands. A man who is a chimney sweep or who delivers coal or who digs up roads or who sweeps streets is not regarded as being any less than a man who works in an office. Even more: the public cleansing worker in these countries is proud of the job he does because he knows how important his job is to the community, and he knows that both his community and his fellow workers will respect him if he does his job well. And so, when the Jamaican worker suddenly finds himself in a society where there is no lowering of status attached to manual work and where he is respected on the basis of his performance, he sets about and shows what he can do. The fault then is not simply with the worker: primarily it is with the society's attitude to so-called unskilled manual labour. That is problem number one that we must overcome. Good night.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Jan 25 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Among my recent mail from list^eners were two letters that bear very directly on the problems of civics. The first one was from Mr. Desmond Elder of Kingston and dealt with what Mr. Elder described as 'The disgusting conditions of the area immediately surrounding the new Sheraton Kingston'. The Government, says Mr. Elder, has financed and built a pleasant looking structure and has landscaped it; but then the government neglected to finish the project in that the areas to the north, south and south-west of the hotel are eyesores. Add to this the temporary shacks adjoining the Liguanea Club and the approaches to what is in fact an important new tourist attraction becomes anything but attractive.

So ^{the} that situation is that we go to the trouble of building a really impressive new hotel and then we forget or do not bother to make the surroundings ~~exactly~~ attractive. But I do not think it is fair to blame this state of affairs on the central government. If we want to blame it on anybody then I think we should blame it on the Kingston and St. Andrew Corporation Council. It seems to me that once the hotel was up our City Fathers would have seen the importance of making its surrounds as clean and attractive as possible. But in any case, I do not think the fixing of blame is important. A much more important element to me is the fact that the workers of the Public Cleansing Department as well as the entire K.S.A.C. set-up did not of their own accord see that this state of affairs detracts from the hotel.

The second letter, which illustrates the point in ^a rather different way, is from Mrs. Mary Mills of Montego Bay and deals with

attitudes of educated young civil servants in the postal and other government services as well as young shop assistants in their dealings with old and useful citizens who happen to be illiterate. Mrs. Mills speaks from her own experience of the contempt these young people in post offices show to the old people who have to beg their help in filling out forms. And she tells the touching story of an old lady going into a book store to buy a reader for a grandchild she is probably putting through school, and being treated with derision because she could not give the title of the book. The fact that she could describe which book it was ^{was} ignored: the big thing was to show up the old illiterate!

Now, as far as I am concerned this represents just about as false a set of values as you can look for. I think it shows that these young people do not know what is a good citizen. It seems to me that these young people ^{often} forget that in order for them to be in the civil service or to hold down other white collar jobs the older generations, the old illiterates, had to make many **sacrifices**. But above all they seem to be sold on the false notion that a good citizen is judge by the way he or she speaks and dresses and the school he or she went to. And so we get the notion of the good citizen as the smart type who went to the right school; who knows the right people and has the right friends; who does not do manual labour but works in an office or behind a counter. And all those who earn their living by using their hands, and who are illiterate and who do not wear the right clothes and do not have the right manners are made to feel that they are, in Mr. Kipling's words: 'The lesser breed without the law'. And once you make people feel no good; then their behaviour is likely to be no good. So where do we go from here?

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Saturday Jan 26 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: In order to try and pinpoint what seems to me one of our most crucial problems I may have overstated my case; so let me make some qualifications. There are Jamaicans in the civil service, in the post office, in private offices, behind counters, who do not make their fellow-countrymen who are illiterate ~~wh~~ who do manual work, feel inferior. In fact there is a large army of these people who are very good and who are doing everything in their power to correct this state of ~~affairs~~. So the thing I should hate is for any of you to feel that I have been discussing these problems of civics in order to criticise or condemn any section of the Jamaican community. Also, I do not think one can or should use the structure of a society as an excuse for the short-comings of all its citizens.

You have beggars and thieves in every society; you have irresponsible people and anti-social types in every society. So it is not these people I am thinking about. ~~But~~ rather, I am thinking of that worker who is so casual and offhand, who has no pride in his job, who does the least he has to - and yet who is completely transformed when he goes to another country. How do we get him to perform in Jamaica as he performs when he hits Britain and the United States?

First, I think we must learn to give him the respect he is entitled to as a worker. And in order to do that we will have to transform our outlook and our sense of values. And this will only happen when we understand clearly and completely that the man who keeps our streets clean, who sees that our sanitation is in good order, is socially more valuable to the community as a whole than is the man who makes a fortune importing cosmetics. Sure our women must have their cosmetic

But cosmetics are not a necessity in the same way that good sanitation is. The society will not be threatened with dangerous epidemics if the cosmetics business breaks down. All that will happen is that women will be just a little more equal.

By the same token the old illiterate countryman who has five or ten acres in cane or in citrus or in bananas is socially and economically more valuable to the society as a whole than is the bright young insurance executive. Again, the teacher in the countryside maintaining his family as best he can on his meagre salary is socially much more useful to the society as a whole than the merchant who imports the sheerest nylon stockings or the latest style in drainpipe pants or the latest ties or shirts. It seems to me that it is all a question of values and that once we get our values right we will be over the hump. Our street cleaner will know that the society appreciates the importance of his job and he will do it with new pride and a new sense of responsibility so that no-one will have to tell him to tidy up the surrounds of the Sheraton Kingston: he will know that it is part of his responsibility to his community. It will then be the pride of responsibility of the young person in the post office to help the old illiterate. The thing is that once you start going in the right direction it has a snowball effect. But any real beginning must be based on understand. So let us think out our values.

And then let us begin to build a sense of pride in good and honest work that is socially useful; once we do that social responsibility will follow. Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday January 28 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Now that the Prime Minister has announced the composition of the Committee which will examine the school space problem I hope that the public, as well as all the organs of public opinion, will take it easy on the rather hot debate that has been raging around this matter. I hope we will all give the Committee a chance to examine the matter without being subjected to the public pressure and clamour that can often lead to decisions of expediency which are not necessarily good for the country. I know this is what the Americans would call a 'hot potato' of great propaganda value: both politicians and press can go to town on it. But it is also an urgent national matter; and so my hope is that until the Committee has put some ideas before the country we will let it work in peace. Certainly, I do not propose to either nag it, criticise it, or advise it until it has worked out its plans and put them forward. The only thing I would do is to ~~ask~~ urge them to move as fast as possible.

Now for a word about the very urgent matter of Tourism. Over the weekend Mr. Abe Issa, the Chairman of the Jamaica Tourist Board, gave a sort of progress report on the present situation of the Tourist ~~industry~~ trade. Mr. Issa discussed the reasons for the fall off in the trade and some of the things that could and should be done to restore the trade. What I would like to do here is to pick up what seem to me a few fundamental points about the tourist trade.

First let us look at it in terms of the national economy. Tourism what is known as is part of Jamaica's Invisible Trade: invisible because we cannot say that we sold the tourists so many bottles of sunshine or so many pounds of Jamaican service and friendliness and hospitality. But

there is nothing invisible about the results of the tourist trade. In 1956 Jamaica's net earnings from Invisible Trade amounted to just over four million pounds; in 1960 this same invisible trade had risen to twelve million pounds - and tourism was responsible for most of this fantastic rise. In 1961 visitors who came to Jamaica for holidays spent just under thirteen and a half million pounds. They spent this large sum of money on hotels and guest houses, on shopping, on travelling around the island and on entertainment. And once you start thinking carefully about these things you will realise that these activities of the tourists created a large number of jobs for Jamaicans: jobs for hotel workers, for transport workers, for shop assistants. I cannot tell you just how many people are employed either directly or indirectly in the tourist trade but all you have to do is to look at the hotels and at Jamaica's tourist resort areas to realise that it must be a very large number indeed. My own guess is that tourism is probably the second largest employer of labour after sugar. So, for me, purely in terms of creating jobs, tourism is very important. If it collapses it will throw/tens of thousands of ordinary people out of work. That is point number one which I am not sure we all appreciate as fully as we should. Point number two is that it is not in our own interest to treat tourists in such a manner that they don't want to come back. So I would like to see two things done: let us charge the tourist (and everybody else who buys that kind of service) an extra ten percent and do away with the whole business of tipping. The corrupting effect of tipping on both tipper and tipped is horrible to behold; and second, let us make begging a punishable offence. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday January 29 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: It was just twelve days ago - on Thursday January 17th - that I discussed the sudden and dangerous crisis that had developed when President de Gaulle of France suddenly decided that he did not want Britain to be admitted to the European Common Market. Well, ~~because~~ in order to avoid a complete collapse of the talks the Benelux countries - or at least ~~three~~^{two} of them, Belgium and the Netherlands - proposed a postponement. This postponement ended yesterday. Just what the outcome of these resumed talks will be, is anybody's guess. What I feel we ought to do here is to try and clear the air a little and get back to an understanding of the issues involved. At the moment the attempt seems to be to make President de Gaulle villain of the piece and I do not think this is going to help anybody. So, back to fundamentals.

Why does de Gaulle oppose Britain's entry into the Common Market? De Gaulle himself said that he wanted the European Common Market to be 'properly European' and not 'any colossal Atlantic Community under American leadership and dominance.' Rightly or wrongly, he feels that Britain with her special relationship with the United States and with the Commonwealth, will not be primarily concerned with furthering European interests. Rightly or wrongly, as de Gaulle sees it, Britain could, once she assumes leadership within the Community bring Europe under American leadership and dominance.

And you know, the moment you start examining this position dispassionately you find that it is not as unreasonable as British and American propagandists try to make it out.

As a purely objective proposition I think de Gaulle is right in

his view that Britain is not 'properly European' and that her aim is to put the Common Market under American leadership and dominance.

Now, if you see everything in the world in terms of the Cold War between Russia and the United States then it is of course very easy to take a stand on this. That which is against communism is bound to be for the West and for democracy: and since the United States is the most powerful representative of the West and both the economic and military shield of the West, all anti-communists must accept United States leadership. It seems to me that this is in fact the kind of rationalisation that Senator Fulbright and the U.S. Foreign Relations Committee are working towards. I think the concern expressed in the United States when France and Germany signed, on Tuesday of last week, a treaty of political, military and cultural co-operation, is another manifestation of this evolving concept.

But if you do not see everything in terms of the Cold War, then something very interesting comes to light. And that is this: Russia today has her China and her Albania - both communist states that do not accept the proposition ^{that} ~~the~~ Russia is the guardian of all communist wisdom and has a divine right to lead the communist world. And now the United States has her France whose Government is quite as anti-communist as that of the United States but who does not feel that the United States has a divine right to lead the non-communist world. So in this respect we can say that ~~both the United States and Russia~~ ^{both the United States and Russia} are faced with problem of having allies who refuse to be ~~Satellites~~ ^{Satellites}. And the way they react to these 'difficult friends' is strikingly similar in some respects. But much more important is the fact that de Gaulle today represents the fight for European political and economic independence. And this could bear very strongly on the shape of the future: but more on that tomorrow. So till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Wednesday Jan 30 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last night I told you that President de Gaulle of France represents ~~the~~ the fight for European political and economic independence; and I told you that I thought ~~that~~ this could bear strongly on the shape of the future. Let me try to explain:

Europe represents roughly 4,129,908 square miles of land; it represents roughly 600,000,000 people; it represents, in overall terms the highest level of social economic and political justice yet attained by mankind. Within Europe, and especially western Europe, there is a greater freedom for the individual than anywhere else on earth; there is a greater degree of social security; there is a richer flowering of culture and the arts. There is an older and more honoured tradition of dissent than anywhere else in the world. And by the way, the United Kingdom is included in this Europe. It is this Europe that founded empires and trade in slaves and gave the world the scientific and technological knowledge that made possible today's journeys into space and atomic submarines and the miracle of modern television. This is a factual description, not an emotional one. Before, and between the two world wars Europe was the political and economic centre of the world. And then came the collapse of empire and the decline of Europe. In the East and in the West the new political and Economic giants took over. But even in decline Europe represented maturity, a genius for understanding ^{historical} movements and trends and a superlative capacity for survival and recovery. If you want evidence, there is the economic miracle over the past fifteen years or so; there is the political miracle of the creation of the single European identity after centuries of rivalry and war; and there is the signing

last week of the treaty of co-operation between France and Germany, the traditional and historic enemies.

Add all this together: give it ~~economic~~ and military viability, give it a clear and independent political vision, and you have a remarkable new force on the world scene. This is a force that is economically as strong as, and potentially stronger than, the giant of the East on the one side and the giant of the West on the other.

Let us face it, the power conflict between Russia and the United States has led the world into an impasse. As far as the two great powers are themselves concerned, what sort of end can there be to the Cold War? You either have a war in which they destroy each other and most of the rest of the world, or else one capitulates/~~to~~ ^{and} the other becomes the sole ruler of the world. If they avoid war then they will, in the ^scompetition, continue the division of the world into two blocs with each becoming more and more insistent on having dictatorial leadership within its bloc - and in time the value differences might become blurred.

I think the emergence of the new Europe, with ^{the} independent vision that de Gaulle wants for it, can point the way out of this destructive and sterile situation. The Europeans have coped with communism within their own countries and they know that they can lick it economically. And so they do not allow it to become an obsession. And so the new Europe, especially if it is aided and abetted by the new unity of Christendom, could take a new direction that could make the Cold War irrelevant. All this, I suggest, is involved in de Gaulle's fight ^{for the Common Market to be "properly European". Agree or not} ~~against any colossal Atlantic Community under American leadership and dominance.~~ The vision is both grand and heroic. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Jan 31 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: From what I said last night and the night before on France's veto of Britain's membership of the Common Market you will realise that I do not agree with those who see President de Gaulle's action as stemming from arrogance or hatred or the desire to dominate Europe or humiliate Britain. I told you how I saw de Gaulle's motivation and I expressed the view that de Gaulle's concept of a strong and independent new Europe showed a dramatic way out of the present impasse of the politics of the Cold War. But having said all that, and having made it quite clear that I think de Gaulle represents historical progress in this matter, I still find it possible to regret the breakdown of the talks: the immediate consequences of the breakdown could ~~have~~ be to hit some countries, and Jamaica is one of them, pretty hard.

But I think the country that will be hardest hit is the United Kingdom itself: and she is going to be hit where it hurts most - in her desperate drive for markets. In order to maintain the relatively high standard of living ^{+ of employment} of her people Britain must sell her manufactured goods abroad on reasonably good terms. In addition she must continue to give her farmers the assistance and protection they now enjoy. So what are the markets to which she has access? First, there is the Commonwealth. But obviously, if the Commonwealth markets could absorb all of Britain's manufactured goods there would have been no need to look for other markets. Unfortunately, although the Commonwealth is very large in area and population it represents a relatively small market for British manufactured goods. The reason is simple. The vast majority of Commonwealth member countries have a very low spending power.

Canada, Australia, New Zealand are the only member countries with living standard that are anywhere near the living standards of Western Europe or the United States. And these three relatively affluent Commonwealth members have very tiny populations. The members with large populations - the African and Asian members of the Commonwealth - are too poor to be/~~good~~ ^{really large} markets for British manufactured goods. Add to this the fact that in Canada, Australia and New Zealand - as well as in the poorer Commonwealth countries - she has to compete with exports from the United States, Western Europe and Japan, and you have the picture of a country struggling desperately even to retain the small markets within her own Commonwealth. So much for the Commonwealth markets.

As far as United States markets are concerned things are even rougher. American manufacturers want the American domestic market for themselves and they have made it very tough for any outsider to get a foothold. Indeed the United States Congress is very sensitive to the powerful pressures of the business lobby for protection: and the level of protection is very high. And so, in order to get the added markets she needed to no more than hold her own, Britain was forced to turn finally to the flourishing/~~g~~ European Common Market which she had rejected a few years earlier. Now it has rejected her, largely because she would not turn her back on the Commonwealth or the United States. And let us face it the Commonwealth has not often behaved in a manner that deserved this kind of sacrifice from Britain: and the United States has often dealt so harshly with Britain as to make the the so-called Anglo-American partnership a mockery. I think this British ~~sacrifice~~ ^s deserves better partners. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Feb 1 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The technique of ~~what~~ the Americans have so aptly named as 'brainwashing' and the Chinese Communists have so cynically named 'self-cultivation' is one of the most subtle and dangerous things in the world: and it is also one of the simplest things. It is as dangerous and as simple as this: If you or I told ourselves as the very last thing at night/^{and}~~or~~ the very first thing in the morning that life is ugly; and if we interrupted whatever we are doing at regular intervals throughout the day to remind ourselves that life is ugly; and if we regularly told everybody with whom we came into contact that life is ugly; and if we forced this view on those over whom we have power and authority - we will end up ^{accepting it as a}~~facing the~~ fact that life really is ugly. And the people on whom we have forced this view will also end up accepting it as a fact that life is ugly. This is brainwashing in its crudest form; and there are elements of this around us all the time. The selection of our news so that only the ugly and sordid appear in the press or over the radio as 'good news' is an example of this crude form of Brainwashing. And I am very glad to see that the Vatican newspaper has recently attacked this brand of news selection. Because we are fed with this kind of news day after day we end by believing that the world is as ugly as the newspapers say it is. And we expect all our fellow men to behave like the thieves or the murderers or the rapists or the warmongers; or the race-haters or the child-beaters that the news tells us about every day. And this becomes the norm. *I have mentioned this before here.*

I am mentioning ^{it}~~this~~ again because I have detected in recent months what seems to me an unhealthy attempt to brainwash the Jamaican

community about the role played by the trade union movement in the life of the community. Please do not get me wrong. I am not saying the trade union movement in Jamaica should not be criticised. Indeed I think the trade union movement will benefit very greatly ~~from~~ if it got more criticism of a really constructive nature. For instance I would very much like to know what happens to the union dues that members pay: is this money used to set ^{up} workers' educational classes, or an unemployment fund from which the workers can draw in the event of a long strike, or to supplement such sickness benefit as they might get? I would have expected the critics of the trade union movement (who always say that they are speaking or writing for the good of the movement and the country), I would have expected them to deal with these topics which are of vital interest to the whole society. I think that if our unions achieved the setting up of the things I have just mentioned they will, at the same time, have achieved a very high degree of trade union and social maturity which will be reflected in labour relations, productivity and a sense of responsibility to the whole society. But instead of ^{discussing} this the critics go on harping on the politics of the unions until there is an impression that this is both a terrible thing and a uniquely Jamaican thing. Some critics have even gone as far as accusing the unions of preparing the ground for communism. This is utter nonsense. The union-party connection is not the terrible threat it is made out to be. In any case it is there and we are not going to get out of it by smearing the unions. So, let us stop knocking the trade union movement and be at least as constructive in our criticism as we would like the unions to be.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I am sure that all of you who listened to the Arts Celebrations Choir during Jamaica's independence festivities, will wholeheartedly welcome the news of the formation of the Jamaica National Choral and Orchestral Society. The fact that the Society will be under the leadership of Mr. James Verity is added reason for pleasure. Mr. Verity showed us what he can do with the Arts Celebrations Choir and Jamaica can certainly do with what he has to offer.

I do not myself think that there is any question about the need for such a Choral and Orchestral Society. What there does seem to me to be a very great need for is a streamlining and dovetailing of such efforts; and it is on this question of dovetailing and streamlining artistic effort that I would like to say something this evening.

It is an unhappy fact, but a fact all the same, that we waste an awful lot of energy in the wrong kind of artistic competition. I made mention of this in my commentary of Saturday January the 12th when I discussed the destructive impact of the person who has to run down everything that went before in order that he or she can be the Great Beginner. There is a sort of reverse aspect to this too, and you will notice it particularly in the arts.

The new writer, the new artist, the new musician, the new actor, has to run down all that has gone before in order to make himself or herself that much bigger. But there is something else too: the old established writer or artist or actor or musician as an equal vested interest in running down the new person because he or she wants to be the only one in the field. This is a sort of artistic cannibalism and I think that it is this sort of artistic competition - this

cannibalistic eating up of each other - that our artists can happily do without. The kind of competition that I should be happy to see in its place is the competition for quality. There is room for both the Little Theatre Movement and a Folk Theatre, and there is nothing wrong in friendly and co-operative rivalry between the two in the interests of better quality and higher standards. Indeed, I am reas~~ured~~ and certain that the older L.T.M. would welcome this/^{and}would give the newer folk theatre all the help possible with costumes, props and the like. What is not welcome is for either to try to low-rate the other or tear it down. Certainly, I think we have a right to expect that the interests of the theatre would be put above the interests of any section of it, and that a time will come when we will witness the kind of co-operation we saw among the choirs during the independence celebrations. Mr. Verity then brought a number of local choirs together and welded them together into a gloriously artistic whole that inspired all who listened.

This is one of the key reasons why I am so happy about the establishment of the Choral Society. It could set the pattern for the streamling of artistic effort and it could help to do away with the impulse towards artistic cannibalism. If all the choirs and the Jamaica School of Music could achieve the same kind of co-operation that was achieved with/^{the}Arts Celebrations Choir then we might well be in for a glorious time with choral and orchestral music in Jamaica. And this, in turn, might have the effect of stimulating a flowering of the entire Jamaican culture]. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Feb 4 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think some of the most interesting and some of the most hopeful trends for Jamaica, showed themselves ~~towards the~~ ^{over the} ~~close of~~ ^{two} last ~~weeks~~. But before discussing these trends let us do a piece of interim stocking-taking on the international scene. So much has happened in recent weeks and especially over the past ten days that it is high time for us to ~~take~~ ensure that we do not lose touch.

Taking a sort of world view of the international scene, I should say that what has been most dramatic has been the changing fortunes of United States policy. The end of 1962 saw United States policy finally coming out on top with a series of decisive political and psychological victories in the Cold War. It all began with the build-up of missile bases in Cuba. Russian communist arrogance, ~~for~~ U.S. leadership Russian contempt for ~~the West~~, had reached such proportions that they set about building these missile bases with only the most casual concealment. I honestly think the Russian assumption was that the United States would ^{would} protest, /make a lot of noise at the United Nations and very little else. Russia knew that there was no unity of approach among the western allies themselves on the Cuban question: the British and Canadian~~s~~ view of Cuba differed markedly from the American view. The Russians assumed that before taking any action the United States would consult her principal allies and that by the time the argument between them had been settled the missiles would be in place for launching, and Russia and Cuba would be able to talk to the United States and Latin America from a new position of strength right inside the American sphere. But they were wrong. The United States acted swiftly and firmly - without consulting any of its allies - and the

Russians suddenly found themselves faced with the choice of either going to war over Cuba or of backing down. They backed down; and the whole balance of the Cold War was changed. After years of being on the defensive the United States suddenly found herself in the position of, as the Americans would say, 'Calling the shots'. And it was a wonderful and a glorious feeling. And please note that they had achieved this wonderful reversal in Cold War fortunes by going it alone, by acting without consulting anybody. ~~And~~ this was not the only point at which going it alone had paid off. Down in south-east Asia the ~~anti-communists~~ communists have been prevented from taking over South Viet Nam simply because the Americans have supplied vast quantities of weapons, an army of 'military advisers', and large sums of money to keep anti-communist resistance alive. This has been going on for quite some time. And more recently, in Africa, United States support for the United Nations Congo operation helped more than anything else to end the long Congo crisis. And here too, the United States acted alone and in the face of the opposition of her allies. And so it should not be a matter of surprise if the United States now tends to want to treat her allies like rubber stamps or if the United States gets angry if they refuse to respond like rubber stamps. She has discovered, by painful experience, that acting on her own/^{and acting toughly,} does pay off. The trouble is that/^{just getting tough} ~~this~~ is no magic obeah, as France and Canada have shown. A mechanical toughness for its own sake has already lost the U.S. much of the/^{Cold War} advantage it had a month ago. How the United States resolves this particular problem seems to me the most important issue on the international scene today. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Feb 5 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Let me talk about the hopeful trends that I mentioned last night. First, let us begin with housing. I do not think that anybody in Jamaica needs to be convinced of the urgent need for new housing. And yet you know, there are fifteen thousand very good Jamaicans citizens who are holding up the government's housing effort. These are the people who have either bought houses from the government or who are tenants on government housing projects or who have borrowed money to build their own homes. Altogether, these people owe the government the grand sum of three-hundred and fifty-seven thousand pounds. Is this one of the hopeful trends I am talking about? Certainly not. What is hopeful is what Mr. Clem Tavares, the Minister of Housing, said about this unhappy state of affairs in a broadcast he made on January 23rd. Mr. Tavares gave us the facts and then he said: "This situation has been developing over a period of years because no serious and sustained efforts have been made to collect arrears due to partisan politics". Mr. Tavares then went on to say that this government was not going to let this state of affairs continue; they were going to collect the money and use it to build more houses. I could not be more on the side of Mr. Tavares.

You know as well as I do that if these fifteen thousand people were tenants of some private landlord or owed the money to some private firm they would have paid up a long time ago. They would have paid up because they would have known that if they did not do so the landlord would have thrown them out or taken possession of the house. But because it was the government, and because the government

is made up of politicians who are dependent on the votes of people like those fifteen thousand, the government has allowed them to live like parasites off the society as a whole. For party political reasons ^(by both the first Labour Administration and the P.N.P.) these people were allowed to rob the nation and slow down its building programme. Now, Mr. Tavares, speaking for this government, has said that his party has turned its back on this kind of 'buying' of goodwill and votes at the nation's expense. This is hopeful trend number one. And if the government sticks to its decision and insists on ~~getting~~ collecting all money that is due it may achieve much more than just collecting £357,000 worth of debts - and having that much money in hand for additional housing. It might also achieve that very much more important result of getting rid of the dangerous politics of the big promise of quick results which has so often ended up in dictatorships. Because make no mistake about it, it is the promise of the slick and quick solution, ^{of} the easy overnight way out of difficulties that has led first, to the acceptance of the great benevolent father-figure and then ~~to~~ the dictator, both of whom start off promising the moon. And let us face it, both parties have made a number of promises of this sort in the past. Old age pensions, free education, homes for all, an end to unemployment: to talk as though all these things can be achieved without hard work and sacrifice on the part of all the citizens of the society, is to promise the moon. I am glad we are getting off the moon-ride. So the fifteen thousand must pay for their homes. And hopeful trend number two came last Thursday when the Prime Minister said straight out that we will have to raise another million pounds a year in taxes to pay for our educational needs. Hopeful trend number three came from the Senate; and I will tell you about that tomorrow. So till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I think we will all agree on Jamaica's basic problems: they are unemployment, shortage of housing, feeding our ever growing population and finding school space for our ever-growing school population - in short, the problem ~~xxx~~ is to make what we have go round and to create more wealth. In dealing with these problems we are faced with certain very clear limitations. First, the land area of Jamaica is limited: it does not matter what we do, we cannot make Jamaica any larger than it is. And this means that if we improve our agricultural methods and production until they reach maximum efficiency there would still be a limit beyond which we cannot improve ~~x~~ because of the limitation of land. The same goes for our resources: they are fixed and once you reach maximum efficiency in their exploitation, there is nothing more you can do. The only thing to which there seems to be no present limit is the growth of the population. And it was on this subject that Senator Sydney Phillips spoke when he took part in the State-of-the-Nation debate last Friday. Senator Phillips who sits on the Government benches in the Upper House, appealed to the government to undertake an immediate campaign of public education in matter of birth control. It is interesting that Senator Phillips spoke of ~~xxxx~~ increasing our agricultural production as well as of educating the country in birth control. And what made this particular discussion one of the hopeful trends of which I spoke last night, is the fact that Senator Douglas Fletcher, the unofficial leader of the opposition in the Senate, welcomed what Mr. Phillips said. So we have two distinguished Senators representing the two opposing parties in our legislature agreeing on the need for public education on birth control.

But this does not mean that Mr. Phillips and Mr. Fletcher were speaking for the political parties they represent in the Senate. Neither the Jamaica Labour Party nor the People's National Party have adopted any stand on the question of birth control. My own view is that the two parties have not touched this question because it has been turned into something ^{that is} politically explosive. The Catholic Church is opposed to birth control on religious grounds, and most of us have heard the slogan that birth control is a plot to kill the Negro. And so you have a religious and a racial force in opposition to birth control. In addition there is the opposition of custom. Mr. Phillips told of a woman being described as a 'mule' if she did not have a child by the time she was twenty. And he told of his visit to a country hospital where one unmarried young woman was having her ninth child and another her twelfth. I would have thought that it was these poor young creatures who had been turned into nothing but breeders who were the mules. But that is a matter of opinion. What is not opinion are the following facts. First, that Jamaica's population increased by over half a million over the past twenty years. Estimates are that there will be two million-one-hundred-and-fifty-thousand ^{Jamaicans} in 1970 if migration comes to an end and we do nothing about birth control. Fact two is that over the past five years we exported more than 100,000 of the population. But now there is restriction on migration. If nothing is done about population then we will have to find roughly 200,000 more jobs between now and 1970 simply to keep unemployment where it now stands. Mr. Phillips says a way out is to make education on ^{birth} ~~family~~ control ~~planning~~ available. I agree with him; and I think this is another issue that should be removed from partisan politics. It is a national matter which should be openly and freely discussed. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Feb 7 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I went to the House of Representatives on Tuesday evening and listened to the discussion on the Watershed Protection Act which was up for second reading. I ~~wall~~ the proceedings a 'discussion' because I think it would be misleading to describe what took place as a debate. Both sides of the House were in basic agreement on the need for this law. Such disagreement as there was, was on detail, not on principle.

And as I sat in the Press Gallery listening to Mr. Gyles, Mr. Munn, Mr. Seiveright ~~and~~ Mr. Roy McNeil and Mr. Manley, I was a little sorry that my good friend Harold Cahusac of Frome was not there beside me. I think he should have been there because I think that more than ~~xxxxx~~ any other single individual Harold Cahusac can claim credit for the ~~fact~~ passing of this Watershed Protection Act on Tuesday night. For more years than he cares to remember Mr. Cahusac has argued and pleaded and agitated and cursed and begged for something to be done to preserve this Jamaican earth. But he has done much more than just talk. I remember just over a year ago when he organised a big Watershed Protection drive. He invited scores of people from all over Jamaica up to Frome and then, after entertaining us, he took us in about a score of landrovers to look at the Watershed Protection work that had been done in his part of Westmoreland. I remember that all this took place during a relatively dry period and most of us had travelled across a parched and dried up land to get to Frome. Mr. Keble Munn who was then the Minister of Agriculture was there; and so was Ken Maxwell, Morris Cargill and Mickey Hendricks. There was also an army of agricultural Extension Officers.

As I said, we had travelled through parched and barren and dry land to get to Frome. And then Cahusac took us to an area where he and his faithful helpers had put into practise all his watershed ~~praxe~~ protection theories. And it was like entering another world. You felt the moisture in the very air you breathed. It was a green world of thick foliage, of damp earth and a lushness such as I have not seen anywhere else in Jamaica. This looked and felt like the land of Wood and Water; this, I thought at the time, was what all of Jamaica must have looked like in the days of the Arawaks. And Cahusac's message that day, as it had been for so many years, was that we could make all Jamaica look as he and his helpers had made that particular part of Westmoreland look: all that was needed was proper Watershed ~~Protection~~. And on Tuesday of this week our rulers passed the law that would make possible this watershed protection.

One of the important details on which there was argument was on the question of who will pay the cost of Watershed Protection. The previous government had prepared a Bill which would have required that people whose land came under a protection scheme should pay a share of the cost. In the new Bill, however, this ~~pposal~~ proposal had been dropped: and the Opposition felt this was a weakness. They felt that if people were given the impression that everything was going to be done for them without charge they will tend not to want to do anything to help themselves. I agree with the Opposition about this. The nation as a whole must not be called upon to subsidise laziness, inefficiency and selfishness. But this is a point of detail which can be resolved. What is important is that the law has been passed. This is the great beginning in the fight to save the Jamaican earth. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: Whenever there is any slackening off in the country's economic activity the temptation to come up with pet solutions is very strong. Very few of us seem able to resist the temptation to offer the 'only solution'. There are unfortunately very few situations where solutions are as simple as that. But the real trouble about this business of offering 'only solutions' is that it tends to build up false expectations and hopes; it perpetuates the notion that there are simple solutions and short cuts to our problems. So, let us take a closer look at the proposition that industrialisation is the 'only solution' to our unemployment problem. As a broad statement I agree with all those people who are pressing for as rapid industrialisation as possible. In fact I would welcome anything that creates new employment opportunities, provided it does not put the country deeper into the red at the same time.

But there are certain very clear limitations at present to industrialisation in Jamaica. One of the key limitations is that we do not have a large and relatively cheap source of power. Let me explain: at the moment the exports from our bauxite and alumina amounts to £30.4 million. (This, incidentally, represents half of the total value of the island's domestic exports). Now, if we had an abundant supply of cheap power it might have been possible to carry the refining of the bauxite beyond the alumina stage: indeed, given ^{such} power and the training of workers, Jamaicans ~~might~~ would have been in a position to produce the finished aluminium right here in Jamaica. And this would have made a world of difference in additional revenue and in additional job opportunities. But the one thing we do

not have in abundance and cheaply is hydro-electric power. So here we have limitation number one. And so we cannot go in for the ~~total~~ exploitation of our richest mineral asset. It is possible that in time we may be able to get the kind of power needed from a small nuclear reactor. But this will be a very expensive process to start with, and in any case, our bauxite deposits may have been exhausted by then.

The point I am trying to bring home is this: In order to industrialise meaningfully from the point of view of the society as a whole, two things are required: first there must be a cheap and abundant supply of power and second, the country must produce the raw materials which are to be turned into finished goods. If the power is too high-priced and the raw materials have to be imported, industrialisation might well turn out to be a costly fiction that benefits only the smart outside operator looking for tax holidays and cheap labour. Please do not get me wrong. I am not hostile to industrialisation. We need desperately to diversify the economy and great efforts have been made in that direction over the past few years. But I think that in our eagerness we have often pampered people who have come here with the most doubtful propositions. And you know, the really successful efforts in this direction have been those industries that are based on local raw materials: mining, oils and fats, sugar, coffee etc - all industries that depend on Jamaican agriculture/^{or the Jamaican earth} for their raw material. To industrialise successfully we must face up to these limitations - and exploit them. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I welcome very much the government's decision to exempt from income tax all gifts to charitable organisations fighting against polio and cancer, as well as all gifts to the College of Arts Science and Technology. I am sure that everybody who is interested in the good work done by the Jamaica Cancer Society and the Polio Rehabilitation Centre will welcome this decision as warmly as I do. So, if I now go on to quarrel with the manner in which the government has set about this matter, please bear with me. I am afraid the government has set about doing a good thing in a very bad way that can do a lot of harm to a number of other voluntary social services.

Let me call a few of my own pet voluntary social organisations to show you what I mean. First, there is the Jamaica Association for Mentally Handicapped Children. I have talked so often about spastic children and the special kind of help they need that I will not repeat it here. Then there is the Society for the Blind and the Association in Aid of the Deaf. I think these bodies serve a purpose which, in pure human terms, is quite as important as the Cancer Polio Society and the/Rehabilitation Centre. And then there are the bodies that look after lost and homeless and helpless little children; bodies like the Child Welfare Association and the Save the Children Fund.

It seems to me that by giving tax exemption only to the anti polio and anti-cancer organisations the government is effectively penalising these other bodies. It is natural for people to want to give so they can deduct from tax what they have given.

What makes this business even worse is that there are twenty-six bodies which make up the Council of Voluntary Social Service: the

the Cancer Society and the Polio Rehabilitation Centre are only two of the twenty-six. And it was the Council, representing all twenty-six bodies, which has been carrying on the campaign for this tax exemption move. Now, without any reference to the Council, it has been decided to exempt from tax gifts for these two charities only.

I should like to think that a mistake was made or that the Ministry of Finance did not consider all the implications of such a decision. I should hate to think that the Ministry is deliberately trying to channel charity in the direction of the Polio Centre and the Cancer Society. What I do know is that this decision has caused very great concern among members of the Council of Voluntary Social Services. I sincerely hope that Mr. Sangster will take another look at what seems to me a manifestly bad decision.

Finally, let me say a brief word ~~about~~ on the current debate on freedom of the press. It seems to me that there are people who are confusing freedom and license. As far as I am concerned, freedom and responsibility go side by side. The fact that I have the freedom of the air imposes a very great responsibility on me. As long as I exercise that responsibility by showing reason and balance, the J.B.C. allows me complete freedom of speech. If on the other hand I abused this freedom by smearing people and trying to undermine the stability of this society, I am sure the J.B.C. will interfere with my freedom to make trouble. This is their responsibility to the society. By the token people have told me very many secrets which no government will get out of me under normal circumstances. But if there is a real emergency and it affects the nation, I will tell. The so-called freedom to be irresponsible is not freedom at all; it is license. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: The news of last Friday's downfall of the Iraqi dictator-in-making, Colonel Abdel Karim Kassem, did not come as a very great surprise to me. What was surprising was the ^{relative} ease with which his enemies did it. Kassem had had just about five years in which to consolidate his powers, and nearly all the reports out of Iraq suggested that he had gone so far in strengthening his hand that the only chance of getting rid of him easily was by way of the assassin's bullet. It was known that Kassem had created so many rivalries within the armed forces, pitting officer against officer and private against private that observers tended to dismiss the possibility of an armed uprising against him. One of Kassem's smartest tricks in the business of holding on to power was to share a single command or other position of high authority between a violently pro-communist officer and a violently anti-communist officer, or between a violently pro-Nasser person and a violently anti-Nasser person. In this way he kept his enemies so busy trying to do each other down, trying to inform on each other, trying to cut each other's throats, that they would not have time to conspire against him: or so he thought. Obviously, he was wrong. They did have time: and they did conspire successfully and the result is that Kassem has died by the violence he himself unleashed in 1958 when he climbed to power over the slaughtered bodies of young King Feisal and scores of hundreds of other Iraqis. And so, those of us who believe that there should be morality and humanity even in power politics can have the grim satisfaction of knowing that here again, a savage and brutal man who lived by the sword has perished by the sword. And this is an important warning for all those who would,

either
~~either~~ in pursuit of power, for its own sake (as was the case with Kassem) or for the good they think they will do with it, use violence as a shortcut. The trouble with violence is that it begets violence; and it is a historical truism that violence is stupid and negative and destructive. Where the destruction of a tyranny compels its use, as in Kassem's case, the great hope is that it should be seen as a necessary evil, something to contain and put aside as quickly as possible.

I think the one Middle Eastern leader who seems to have learnt this particular lesson is Egypt's Abdul Nasser. But then, Nasser has a scholar's sense of history and a deep and passionate concern for the Arab people. When Syria broke away from the United Arab Republic the temptation must have been great to impose reintegration by force. And make no mistake about it, Egypt could have done it if she wanted to. Instead, Nasser talked sadly about the blow to Arab unity and about Arab not shedding the blood of his brother Arab. And while most of the world's commentators saw this as a serious blow to Nasser and his dream of Arab unity, a few of us saw his rejection of violence as a solution to ~~problems~~ the problems of Arab unity, ^{an important} as a long term victory. I think the stage is now set for the results of that victory to be seen. ~~The~~ removal of Kassem will lead to closer ties between Egypt and Iraq; and this, in turn, is bound to help in the coming together of all the Arab states. You may not have formal political unity, but you will have a higher level of co-operation than before and, I think, a lessening of the impulse to solve problems by violence. And in all this, shaping it, Nasser of Egypt is emerging as the undisputed leader. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: The Third Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference ended on Sunday in the cool uplands of Moshi in Tanganyika. Reports are that the conference ended on a high note of criticism of the Western World. These reports have it that when Mr. Jomo Kenyatta spoke at the closing exercises of the conference he let off a powerful blast of criticism against "the Western world" for "betraying everything they pretend to stand for, including the United Nations Charter". Reports also have it that delegates from the Soviet Union and communist China did a lot of hard work whipping up anti-Western feeling. There are reports of the adoption of resolutions denouncing United States military bases, and of support for people fighting for their independence.

Now, the way in which the closing exercises of this conference have been reported could lead anyone to believe that the main purpose of the conference was to attack the West. This is of course so ~~because~~ because those whose business it was to report the conference were more interested in the Cold War aspect of it than they were in the problems of the Afro-Asians. As far as the Russian and Chinese communists were concerned the conference was important only to the extent that they could use it; as far as the western world and the western press was concerned its importance was simply in terms of a new encounter in the Cold War. So, when Julius Nyerere, as host, opened the conference and made it clear that the Africans did not intend to substitute Russian colonialism for the Western colonialism they have just shed, the western world and the western press saw this as a point in their favour and against the Communists. But when Jomo Kenyatta denounced the West for

not living up to its professions this was seen as a point in favour of the communists. In other words, the communists on the one side, and the anti-communists on the other, seem to insist that all the activities of the rest of humanity must be measured, judged and responded to in terms of their conflict. The result of this is that very important matters may take place but because they do not fit into this Cold War pattern they may be dismissed; or even worse, they may be so distorted and twisted as to fit into the Cold War pattern. Because of this, I think some of the very important trends at this conference may have been ignored. So, let us take a brief look at them.

Trend number one, whether you like it or not, is the growing and fine impartiality with which Africa is, in effect saying to both Russia and America: "A plague on both your houses." But if you have followed this conference closely, you will notice that they have used the word 'neutralist' less often here than ever before. Neutralism is in fact an attitude towards the Cold War. But to be sick and tired of it, to want to turn your back on it, to want to get on with the business of creating a decent life for your people, is ~~axgreataxdealaxmoreaxthan~~ ^{to want to not waste your ti} on even ^{this} / 'neutralism'; and / is a great deal more positive. And it is a very interesting fact that both Western Europe and Africa seem to be manifesting this same trend at the same time.

As far as the Africans are concerned I think this trend was set in motion by the Chinese attack on India^{it}. And / led to the second important trend - a refusal to accept everything done by the communist Chinese simply because they are 'non-Europeans'. That was Nkrumah's reaction last year. This year it was rejected at Moshi. And this suggests that Pan-African leadership is fast slipping into the hands of Julius Nyerere.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: What happens in the world around us - the hard news like the overthrow of Kassem in Iraq, like the Third Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference, and the presence of a number of very distinguished visitors here at the moment - all this is very important. But I would like to suggest tonight that although the hard news of happenings is most important it is not as important to us, or to any society like ours, as is the very difficult business of sort out our values and what we consider important and where we are going and how we hope to get there. And we in Jamaica are not as fortunate as the people of ^{and Tobago} Trinidad/who happen to have a distinguished scholar as their Prime Minister, and who has, in his political campaigning done an enormous amount of basic education on this question of the values of his society. And so there tends to be a great deal of confusion among as to the values of our society and as to where we are going.

To help overcome this state of Affairs the Extra Mural Department of the University is now halfway through the second series of its lecture/discussions under the general heading: 'Jamaica and World Politics'. These lectures are open to the public and they take place at half past ten on Sunday mornings. For the past four Sunday mornings a growing number of people have gone to the University to talk about, question and argue out this business of Jamaican values. On Sunday morning Frank Hill lectured on 'Racial Integration in Jamaica' and afterwards we had one of the most stimulating - and at times, explosive discussions that it was my joy to witness. This coming Sunday Peter Evans will be the lecturer and his subject will be 'The Rule of Law'. The following Sunday Michael Manley will lecture on 'Freedom from

Want in the New Jamaica'; and this will be followed by at least three or four other Sunday morning lectures. As far as I am concerned this series of public lectures and discussions add up to just about the most valuable political activity going on in Jamaica at the moment, and I would urge all of you who can to attend them. In terms of working out the values of this society, these discussions are crucial.

And still on this question of values, let me show you one of the ways in which Julius Nyerere is trying to teach values to his people. ~~Nyerere~~ Shortly after Tanganyika became independent Nyerere made a very short speech in parliament. He began by asking a question. His question was: "What is freedom?" Then he answered it in these words: "It is the power that we have to decide what is going to happen in Tanganyika and when it is going to happen and that power we have. All that remains is hard work." Then he goes on to discuss all the hard work that has to be done, and the colonial tendency to blame the imperialists for all our failures and shortcomings. But, he says, there is no-one to blame now, only ourselves. And he ends with these words: "We are not going to be frightened to tell the truth to our people because building a nation is not merely building roads and hospitals and schools, it is building the character of a people and we cannot build the character of our people if we fool them and tell them it is easy. Because it is not easy; life is not easy, and we as their leaders must not come here and give the impression it is easy."

I think that in the business of sorting out our values Jamaica's leaders could not do better than take Nyerere's advice and tell the people the truth; and the truth, which builds character, is that it is not easy. Freedom is not easy because life is not easy. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Feb 14 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think one of the really important problems that we must get out of the way as soon as possible, was shown up by the context in which the Jamaica Industrial Development Corporation's new chairman held his first press conference on Tuesday of this week. Mr. J.L.R. Bovell has been chairman of the I.D.C. over the past nine months and this was the first time that he met the press and radio formally to issue a policy statement. But this very important meeting was overshadowed by the public inquiry into Jamaica Woolens. I think everybody at the ~~the~~ I.D.C. gathering was aware of this fact; and I think this was most unfortunate because I think it put the I.D.C. in a very false and a very unhappy picture. And in terms of Jamaica's basic interests this is a very bad thing. So, let us try and get away from the unhappy partisan umbrella and see the I.D.C. and its functions for what they are.

First, let us get the position of the I.D.C. clear. Fundamentally both major political parties are in favour of industrial development and so both are in favour of the I.D.C. So, the existence of the I.D.C. and the aims of the I.D.C. are not things over which the two parties fight. And the basic aim of the I.D.C., to which both P.N.P. and J.L.P. are committed is, to quote the Law: "to stimulate, facilitate and undertake the development of industry in Jamaica". There can be no question about the need to do this. And Mr. Bovell himself said at the conference that on the whole the history of the I.D.C. has been one of success. It seems to me most important that we should remember this if we are to have a sense of proportion about the I.D.C. It has had its failures - and one particularly terrible one - but it

has also had its successes; and the successes, according to Mr. Bovell, outweigh the failures. Another important point to remember is that this one terrible failure has led to a tightening up of financial regulations to ensure that this sort of money cannot be spent in future without prior reference to the responsible Minister of Government who, in turn, is responsible to the taxpayers.

when you examine

So, ~~before examining~~ Mr. Bovell's policy statement in detail, ~~let~~ please bear these ~~unestablished~~ three points clearly in mind.

Point number one

ⁿFirst, the I.D.C. as such is a Statutory body whose business it is to promote the development of industry in Jamaica: and since both parties are committed to this we can safely say that the aims of the I.D.C. are above party politics. Of course there are differences of emphasis between the parties on how best this development should be carried on. Also, as I told you in my discussion of Statutory bodies on January the 22nd and 23rd, I think that any Minister in any government has the right to put as the head of a statutory body someone in whom he has confidence, someone who will see that his government's broad policy directives are not frustrated. It seems to me that the thing most dangerous to statutory bodies is for them to be totally dislocated every time there is a change of government. Point number two is that in spite of the present shadow over it the I.D.C. has been reasonably successful. I am very glad that Mr. Bovell made this point because by doing so he has helped to lift discussion of the role of the I.D.C. out of the party political bog into which many people who should know better want to keep it. And point number three is that industrial development, like agricultural development, may have party aspects or party lines; but the fundamental need, the precondition for success, is that everybody in the country, P.N.P. J.L.P. and the rest must want ^{it} ~~them~~ to succeed - for the good of the country. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: A number of listeners have asked me why I have not commented on the controversy over the proposal to build a new residence for the Prime Minister in the grounds of King's House. The answer is very simple. When there was the controversy over the sixty-five thousand pounds spent on fixing up Vale Royal, I did not comment on that matter, and I think that if you buy the proposition that what is sauce for the goose must be sauce for the gander, you will agree that I have disqualified myself from commenting on the new proposal. But why did I disqualify myself? Again the answer is simple there are some things on which I just do not feel qualified to comment, and this business of a home for the ^{political} Head-of-State is one of them. I cannot begin to guess at all the functions and responsibilities that a future Jamaican Prime Minister is going to have to undertake to be able to say, today, what I think the size of his official residence should be and where it should be. I have seen Vale Royal and I think it is a very sumptuous residence for a man in Mr. Sangster's position, and except for the fact it tends to rain, I think it is a fine place for state receptions. Furthermore, I think it will do very nicely for a couple with no children or whose children have grown up and gone away. But what happens if the day ever comes when we have a young man of about the age of President Kennedy with a growing family as our Prime Minister? Obviously, the two bedrooms at Vale Royal just will not do for mother, father and half a dozen lively youngsters. And you know, you and I might be able to leave the smaller place and move into a larger one, but the homes of Prime Ministers are supposed to be fixed and permanent landmarks in the society.

So, you see, it is very difficult for me to have hard and fast views on something like this. We may in future have more visits from other Prime Ministers who may come here as house guests of our Prime Minister instead of being house-guests of the Governor-General.

And as to the question of whether the time to build is now ~~and~~ my answer is that if a thing has to be done the sooner it is done, the better. Next there is the question of whether we can afford the fifty-five thousand pounds now. Again my answer will be in the form of a question, or rather, a series of questions: Can we afford democracy now? Can we afford the costly clumsiness of the parliamentary system? And that big talking-shop called the House of Representatives ^{own} And my answer is yes every time. The choice is not between saltfish and education. We want both because we need both.

And while still on this subject of democracy and its symbols, I should very much like our protocol people to work out when certain national symbols can appropriately be used. I understand the national Anthem has been played at certain receptions on the arrival of the Prime Minister. Some listeners have expressed the view that the Anthem should only be played on the arrival of the Governor-General. I honestly do not know which is the correct procedure. I think it would be very useful indeed in the protocol people will issue a clear statement saying exactly when and on whose arrival the national Anthem should be played. I do not think the present confusion is good for building up the proper attitude towards the National Anthem and other symbols. What I do know with absolute certainty is that in order to deepen ~~weaken and~~ and enrich the national spirit, the national symbols of Jamaica should be held higher than any party and any person.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: There is a very interesting social problem in which most of us are involved nearly all the time and yet on which very few of us think at all. This is the problem of the social debt, the problem of who in society owes who what. Let me make myself clear. If you are a parent who is putting a number of children through school do you ~~feel~~ expect these children to feel indebted to you? If you are a parent with grown-up children do you remind them of all the sacrifices you made for them and of all that they owe you? Probably you do not put it as clear and sharply as this. Perhaps you only hint at it, as a kind of pressure; or perhaps you think it ~~only~~ to yourself and build up secret resentments. But perhaps you are a parent who has put it outright to your child that he or she owed you something for all the sacrifices you have made. And perhaps you have had a child snap back at you: 'I didn't ask to be born, did I?' I think most parents know what I am talking about. They either encountered this sort of thing as children themselves or with their own children.

But it is not restricted to parents only. In politics you have the person and the party who talk about the ingratitude of the voters who have not re-elected them. Conversely, you have the voters who feel that once they have elected a man he owes them the eternal debt of having to provide them with jobs, with homes, with security to which they have become entitled for life by the simple act of voting. You find this sort of thing in business too: you have the employers who feel ^{their} that/workers owe them a permanent debt of gratitude for being employed and that this debt can only be discharged by showing a sort

of slavish loyalty to the boss and his interests: the boss, of course, does ^{not} owe the worker any responding loyalty. On the other side of the penny you have the workers who feel that all the bosses in creation owe them a permanent debt because they are workers. The teachers feel their pupils owe them debts of gratitude; you hear about the writer or artist or musician owing his society this or that or you hear about the society owing the writer or the artist or the musician this or that.

Now, the only reason why I have raised this matter is because it has become such a part of us that we do not even stop to think about it: it is like breathing in and breathing out. The trouble is that unless we do start thinking about it we are going to turn ourselves into a neurotic and self-pitying society. When you feel that everybody owes ^{you} ~~me~~ something and nobody pays you what they owe you you are liable to start feeling sorry for yourself: and there is no meaner, uglier and more destructive an emotion than self-pity.

The child did not ask its parents to bring it into the world; the voters did not ask the politician to become a politician; nobody asked anybody to become a writer or artist or a businessman or a worker. Each person has gone the way he or she has gone by a combination of social factors and ^{by} choice. The one thing that is common to all of us is that we live in the same society and that we are interdependent on each other. In that sense we all have a debt towards each other and towards our society. But let us discharge our debt to each other creatively and constructively. It is basically a matter of attitude: If our attitude is strong and giving the society will be so; if it is mean and self-pitying, so will the society be. And you know, each one of us owes Jamaica a great deal more than Jamaica owes ~~us~~ us. Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: The Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, is now on the second half of his very busy day in the Corporate Area. He arrived in Kingston this morning. Since then he has called on the Prime Minister, on the Leader of the Opposition, and on the Mayor of Kingston. He has had lunch with the Cabinet, and he has been the main speaker at a meeting called jointly by the local United Nations Association and the University of the West Indies. In a short while from now he will be the guest of honour at a government reception at Vale Royal. And later this evening he will be the guest of honour at a dinner party at King's House, where he will stay overnight. Tomorrow morning he will visit the University; then, afterwards, he will hold a Press Conference at King's House. He will then tour Western Kingston; and in the afternoon he will inspect a Guard of Honour at the airport before leaving us.

Now the first thing that strikes you about this programme that I have just outlined is that it is the kind of programme that we usually lay out for visiting Royalty or a Head-of-State. This is the type of programme that we had when the British Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Macmillan visited us, and later, when Princess Margaret came. There were slight variations of course: neither the Prime Minister nor the Princess addressed the kind of public meeting U Thant addressed at the University this afternoon. But within these inevitable variations the pattern was basically the same.

I think it is most interesting to ask ourselves why we are according this kind of public honour to the Secretary-General of the United Nations: he is not a Royal personage; he is not a Prime Minister

or any other constitutional head of state; so why this very special honour?

I think that **fundamentally** the reason is to be found in our attitude to the United Nations. For us, as indeed for the majority of mankind, the United Nations represents a series of interlocking hopes and dreams - and prayers. First, if the day ever comes when war is abolished from the face of the earth; if the day ever comes when men and nations get rid of all their conventional and unconventional weapons and turn them into ploughshares and other instruments of productivity; if that day ever comes it will be because of the existence and the efforts of the United Nations. So, behind the warmth of our reception ~~for~~ ^{of} U Thant is this basic human desire for peace in our world.

Second, and equally important for countries like Jamaica, is what the United Nations ^{Organisation social and} represents in economic terms. The Charter of the United Nations lays down that the basis for a lasting peace in the world must be the abolition of economic want, of unemployment, of disease and of ignorance in all countries. So, in our struggle towards a better life and a fairer sharing of what we have, we can call upon the skill and the know-how ~~of~~ and the help of the United Nations without any fear of being dominated and being pushed around, because the United Nations also represents morality in international affairs.

Finally, our welcome to U Thant ^{carries} ~~is~~ undertones of our hopes for the very great tradition which started with Trygve Lie and for which Dag Hammarskjöld laid down his life - the tradition of service to all mankind. ^{Today} U Thant is the symbol of all this and more: in honouring him, we honour humanity's highest hopes. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: One of the by-products of U Thant's visit to Jamaica has been to stimulate greater interest in the United Nations and its work by vast numbers of citizens. I think this is a very good thing and I hope this interest will be sustained. Indeed, I hope that as a result of this visit the local United Nations Association will be able to establish branches throughout the country. I know that there are some people who do not see the point of this, but there is an important point to it, you know. One of the greatest single enemies of any society is ignorance. Let me try and illustrate my point. During the final operation to settle the Katanga business in the Congo many people expressed the view that the United Nations had no business to send a force into Katanga to bring Mr. Tshombe to heel. But when I questioned these people as to why they felt like this, I discovered that they just did not have all the facts about the Congo situation and that their reactions were based on slanted propaganda. It is always easy to mislead people who do not ~~know~~ know the facts of a case. On the other hand it is extremely difficult to mislead people who are well-informed and know the facts about a given situation. So, simply in order to be well-informed about what goes on at the United Nations, and therefore in the greater world, I should like to see as many people as possible become members of the local United Nations Association. And the more well-informed the Jamaican community is, the less are the chances of some smart political operator destroying Jamaican freedom by promising the moon.

But apart from political education and putting us on our guard against would-be dictators, I think there are a number of very practical

ways in which we can benefit directly by making use of the facilities of the United Nations.

Most of us have some sort of rough idea about the General Assembly and the Security Council and the International Court of Justice. A few of us may even know about some of the other Departments like the Atomic Energy Commission, The Trusteeship Council and the like. And I am sure most of us know about the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund because Jamaica has so recently become members of these two special agencies.

But how many of us know about the very important commissions which do a lot of very basic work without getting any publicity? For instance, did you know that there is a Commission on the Status of Women? And one on population? Well, these two commissions do exist and I think we can call on them to do very important work for us. I would like the U.N. Commission on Population and the Economic and Employment Commission to be invited to send a team out here to study our population and employment problems as one single whole and then to make recommendations to the government. These people will lay bare the facts and suggest possible ways of getting over our problems but the decision as to what we do will be up to us. The point is that these people are trained in this type of research and they will not have any political axe to grind. And through Unesco I think it will be possible for the local United Nations Association to get gifts of reading matter into the island. Often in my travels through rural Jamaica I have been distressed by the shortage of reading matter. I am sure Unesco will help us overcome this shortage once we tell them of it. These are just a few ways in which the United Nations can be of practical and immediate use to us. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: This is National Dental Health Week and my friends of the Dental Association have mounted an interesting exhibition at the St. Andrew Parish Library. In addition many of them either have done so or plan to visit teachers colleges, child care institutions and primary and secondary schools in the Corporate Area. And for the country districts there will be mobile vans equipped with posters literature and films.

I think this is a fine effort and I am glad it is taking place. But I am also unhappy about an aspect of it, and at the risk of being called a kill-joy I must talk about this unhappy aspect because it is symptomatic of a key Jamaican problem.

If you live in the Corporate Area then all the benefits and all the advantages of this Dental Health Week will be available to you. The Slogan: 'Give your teeth a bright future' will have very real meaning. If, on the other hand, you do not live in the Corporate Area then the nearest you will come to giving your teeth a bright future, will be as near as we get to Hollywood when we go to the cinema. So, for some Jamaicans - the Jamaicans in Kingston - this Dental Health Week will be a boon and a blessing. For other Jamaicans - the Jamaicans outside Kingston - it will be news about what is happening in Kingston with a film show and posters as a sort of sop. And the thing that I object to is that this effort should be called 'National'. We must learn that Jamaica is more than the Corporate Area.

The sad part about this is that my friends of the Dental Association know the urgent and desperate need for dental help in rural Jamaica;

they know so much better than I do how a diseased mouth can spread the disease to the whole body; they know better than I do that for their slogan to be really meaningful they themselves should go out to these rural parts and preach and illustrate the message of good oral hygiene. Instead, and I say this very sadly, they preach to those who are largely converted and who have all or most of the facilities for dental hygiene available. How much more 'National' in character, how much more useful this effort would have been if each member of the Association had been called upon to spend one day in this week in some remote part of rural Jamaica, looking after the teeth of local communities and instructing them in oral hygiene. Perhaps it is still possible for the Dental Association to do this: certainly only some such action would make National Dental Week meaningful.

And from a long term point of view I sincerely hope that the Dental Association will get its members to devote one day a week to conducting ~~a~~ clinics in rural Jamaica where this sort of service is most needed. I am certain that the Ministry of health would welcome any such move. There is no question of how desperately the people in rural Jamaica need the help of our dentists: I hope our dentists will answer this need.

Finally, let me just remark on the dangers of getting sick over the weekend. Unless you have a doctor/for a friend or can get to a hospital, it is very dangerous to get sick at weekends. So until the B.M.A. and the Dental Association instruct their members that people other than their friends may be sick at weekends, you'd better try and hold on till Monday. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I think the day will come when the people of Jamaica will look back from the distance of years and see the past few days as marking a significant turning point in Jamaican affairs. So, let us recall some of the things that have happened; let us store them in the treasure house of our memories. Then, in five or ten years' time we will be able to look back at ~~this~~ ^{that} particular week and say: 'Yes, all this started way back in February of 1963. I can almost see the headlines still. On Tuesday February the 12th, Dr. Eric Williams arrived in Jamaica for a meeting of the Council of the University; Thursday on/February 14th the British Labour Party selected Mr. Harold Wilson to succeed the late Hugh Gaitskell as leader of the party; on Saturday February 16th U Thant, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, arrived in Jamaica.'

But to prove that we will not be talking from hind-sight in five or ten years' time, let us declare now just what it is that was started in February of 1963.

Let us begin with the choice of Mr. Harold Wilson as leader of the British Labour Party. In terms of domestic policy Mr. Wilson's selection is confirmation of the trend towards a British society with just one single class - and that ^{being} the middle-class. The aristocracy has long accepted that it no longer has any real power in British life. Indeed even the peerage is largely middle-class these days. And the really true-blue bloods have made a point of making as close an identification with middle-class attitudes and middle-class values as possible. The one class that seemed to refuse to face the fact of this movement towards a single-class society was the working-class

or, to put it more accurately, large sections of it, people in the trades union movement and in the industrial and grass roots sections of the Labour Party. These were the people who saw working-class government as the alternative to ruling-class government; and for them this was a fixed state of affairs. This, at bedrock, was the cause of all the scrapping inside the British Labour Party over the years. But the Welfare State, free education for all, proper feeding and proper housing for all - all these factors have conspired to undermine the cult of class. Class ~~is~~ difficult to sustain in the face of real equality of opportunity; and ~~the~~ the British Labour Party/(as indeed have all British political parties) to accept and live with the reality of Britain as a single middle-class society. I think the choice of Mr. Wilson over Mr. George Brown is the final acceptance of this fact. If I am right then the next few years will see less and less internal scrapping inside the British Labour Party. Anyway, as far as internal British politics are concerned the choice of Mr. Harold Wilson means, I think, a general acceptance by the last resisters of middle-class status as the norm and ideal for the ~~the~~ entire British society. In other words the choice of Harold Wilson signifies the final acceptance of the end of the class-struggle by the British Labour party.

In external affairs I think it will mean that the differences between the political parties/ inside Britain will be come a deal more blurred than they now are. Mr. Wilson has already indicated that the only difference between himself and Mr. Macmillan on nuclear defence is that he wants the United States to have and handle/ such weapons on behalf of the West; which makes him sound even more pro-American than Mr. Macmillan. It seems to me that Britain looks like achieving the classless society long, long before the communists are in sight of it. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Feb 22 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The most immediate effect of Dr. Eric Williams' visit to Jamaica has been Wednesday's announcement that Jamaica and Trinidad will exchange High Commissioners. Senator Hector Wynter will be Jamaica's first High Commissioner in Port of Spain, and Mr. Matthew Ramcharan will be Trinidad's first High Commissioner in Kingston. This exchange of diplomatic representatives between these two key British Caribbean islands is a very good thing indeed. And I am not thinking about what is sentimentally good but in terms of practical self-interest. Let me give you one example of what I mean.

British Guiana has run herself into a most unhappy financial mess. Investors are unwilling to risk putting their money into that country because of the political situation which was dramatised by the burning of Georgetown. Some of the people who had money invested in Georgetown were insured with firms outside Georgetown. The result was that when the insurance money was paid out it was generally paid out to the overseas head office of the firm. And many a firm has simply decided not to plough the money back into British Guiana. The result of this is a startling flight of capital in spite of the recent Jagan law forbidding the export of money. Now, once you are in such a situation and you need money for development you will look at what you have and see what you can realise on it. B.G. has rice and we all need her rice. Since she needs money badly what is to prevent her from putting something on the price of rice. The price of rice has gone up recently but what's to prevent it going up again? If we are dependent on her for rice she may, in an attempt to get out of her troubles, try to get a little more money out of us. If we have

nowhere else to turn we may be forced to pay her new price or do without. But Trinidad recently started negotiations with Surinam about rice and I understand that Surinam is sending or has sent a trial shipment of rice to Trinidad at a little below the current B.G. price. This is one very ^{close} practical way in which/contact with Trinidad can be to our advantage. I am sure a number of other such practical situations will arise in ~~both~~ the economic and political fields in the future. Dr. Williams has made a closer study of the European Economic Community, he made it his business to establish personal contact with the leaders of the Community during his recent European visit; I think it would be folly if we did not avail ourselves of his special knowledge and contact, or ~~if~~ we did not work together to achieve the best ends possible. Conversely, Trinidad can derive great practical advantages from close contact with Jamaica. Jamaica's planning organisations are older and much more experienced than Trinidad's. It would suit Trinidad to learn from our mistakes and so find shortcuts to planning and development. Jamaica's experience in the international money markets of the world could also be of real value to Trinidad.

And so I would say that if we take up the opportunities created by Dr. Williams' visit the next five to ten years should see a new movement towards closer association in the British Caribbean. But native-born this time, based on self-interest and mutual respect and growing out of the most profound needs of the people of the region. And out of this (And this is one of Dr. Williams' dreams) could come a Caribbean Economic Community, not as rich and powerful as the European version, but strong enough to make all the difference between misery and a decent life for all the people of this part of the world. This, I suggest, could be the most significant trend for ~~the~~ the future.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: For over a month now I have deliberately not said a word about the great agricultural debate. The last time I said anything on this matter was on January the 20th, the day after the Prime Minister appeared at the J.A.S. Conference and appealed for an end to politics because 'politics cannot grow yams and bananas'. I told you at the time that this gesture of the Prime Minister could restore the situation to normal if both the J.A.S. and the Minister of Agriculture allowed it.

But I am afraid that the situation has not been allowed to become normal and in one instance at least all my investigations have led me to believe that it is in fact the J.A.S. that is playing politics, that does not want the situation to be normal. I am referring here to the ^{making of appointments} ~~making of appointments~~ to the Coffee Industry Board.

I have waited a long time before making any comment on this matter because I wanted to be quite sure of my facts and because I wanted to allow time just in case the J.A.S. leadership changed its mind. The facts are still the same and there has been no change of mind.

Let me refresh your memories. On Thursday, February the 7th, the Gleaner carried as its main front page story the news that the Board of Management of the J.A.S. had rejected the Ministry of Agriculture's appointment of it as the 'approved organisation' for the Coffee Industry. The Minister had invited the J.A.S. as the 'approved organisation' to nominate a panel of five coffee growers from whom he, the Minister, would select three to sit on the Coffee Industry Board. By rejecting the appointment the Society got out of having

to nominate five growers. Instead they urged that the Minister appoint the Coffee Growers' Federation as the approved organisation. But the same story carried a report that the Coffee Growers Federation had taken a pledge not to name any panel of growers to serve on the Coffee Board under present conditions. So, both the J.A.S. and the Coffee Growers Federation were in fact bent on boycotting the Coffee Industry Board.

Now this is where the politics come in. On the 9th of January 1961 this selfsame J.A.S. was invited by the then Minister of Agriculture (in the P.N.P. Administration) to name three people to serve on the Coffee Industry Board. On the 19th of January 1961, in answer to the Minister's invitation, the J.A.S. named Mr. W.N. Henry, Mr. A.S. Wilmot and Mr. A.E. Christie. And so these gentlemen joined the Coffee Industry Board. Please note that the Coffee Growers' Federation was in existence at the time. It had been registered on the 31st of August, 1959. So in one instance, under a P.N.P. government the J.A.S. is prepared to does in fact act as the 'approved organisation'. In another instance, under a J.L.P. Government, it refuses to. If the J.A.S. had refused to nominate anyone to the Coffee Board in 1961 its present refusal would have been consistent. As it is, I for one can only interpret it as straight partisan politics. And what makes this even worse is that sometime in/^{December}1961 the Cabinet of the then Government decided that the J.A.S. should be recognised as the 'approved organisation' for the coffee industry for the time being. These are the facts and these facts say quite simply that on this issue the Jamaica Agricultural Society is playing politics right down the line.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Feb 25 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: There is a real crisis in our education today; and it is the worse kind of crisis possible. It is a crisis of confidence or, at least, so it seemed to me until I had time to read Mr. Edwin Allen's statement carefully over the weekend. After reading the statement issued by the Minister on Friday I still think it is a crisis of confidence, but not the desperate kind that I feared before I read the statement.

Before I read Mr. Allen's statement I tended, I suppose like almost everybody else with no particular political axe to grind, to accept the charges made by the teachers' organisations about the non-appointment of Mr. A.G. Byfield to the headmastership of the Trench Town Senior School. I think the reason for this is perfectly understandable. Most of us instinctively feel that teachers have less of an axe to grind than politicians; and in any case our sympathies are, naturally and rightly, I think, on the side of those who look like being the victims of political pressures. So I frankly found myself tending to sympathise with the position of the teachers over the Trench Town issue. But even then I felt distressed because no matter who was right or who was wrong, it seemed to me that this controversy with its very heavy political overtones and undertones was not in the best interests of education in Jamaica. Please do not think that I am against any sort of controversy. There are times when argument and conflict of views are very good: at such times argument and conflict lead to new thoughts, new ideas and new lines of action. This is the creative aspect to conflict. I think the big debate over the 70-30% division of free places, and Mr. Edwin Allen's ideas on Comprehensive

Schools - I think these two debates could have, and should have led to a creative re-appraisal of education in Jamaica. Indeed, to a certain extent I think they have. Unhappily they were shelved too quickly. But I am afraid that this present Trendh Town School debate has hardly anything creative about it; the aspect that could be creative, the question of whether our educational laws need overhauling or not, this was completely overshadowed by the politics that was railroaded into the matter. The teachers charged that the Minister's refusal to appoint Mr. Byfield to head the Trendh Town School was political. The Minister charged that the attitudes and reactions of the teachers was political. I think that if you read the Minister's statement as set out on page seventeen of Saturday's Gleaner you will see that it is not all right on one side and all wrong on the other. Indeed, I think that one of Mr. Allen's strongest points is that he is following a pattern set by his predecessor in asking the School Board to nominate three teachers from whom to choose a head. Mr. Allen also cites a number of instances when his predecessor used his discretion to appoint heads without reference to anybody other than senior members of his Ministry. And then he points out that there is no record of anybody or any organisation protesting against these appointments. I think you all know my very high regard for the great contribution made to Jamaica by the teaching profession. I have told you before now that I do not think we honour them enough or reward them enough. But I am frankly not happy about the wisdom of the stand taken by them in this case. I do not think all virtue or right is on the side of the Ministry. But/I personally expect more good sense, more wisdom, more real understanding of the long-term and short-term needs of the society, from the teachers in the field than I do from any politician or any bureaucrat in any Ministry. The teacher is and must be the bringer of light; ~~not~~ ^{yet} of doubt and confusion. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good Evening: I think ~~one~~ of the trickiest problems any society which has just achieved complete independence must face is the problem of the checks and balances of political power. Often the way in which a society works out this problem in the first months of its independence can determine the shape of the society for generations to come. I think the Jamaican society is now grappling with this particular problem. In the main this grappling is not particularly conscious, but when people stop to think about it they know what the score is. But the expression of it is often misleading.

The concern with ~~the~~ civil liberties and the call for the setting up of a civil liberties organisation is possibly the most conscious expression of this concern about the checks and balances of power in a free society. But those who are interested in civil liberties do not always put it in these terms. They put it in terms which suggest that civil liberties in Jamaica are in danger. When the teachers say: "We want to be free" they make it sound as though they are not free; when union leaders talk about victimisation it sounds as though we are approaching a sort of reign of terror. And this has led to ~~xxxxxxx~~ anxiety and uncertainty in sections of the community - especially in the Corporate Area.

I can predict with reasonable certainty that if this anxiety and uncertainty is fed and built upon we will in fact create a climate in which victimisation, the loss of civil liberties and all manner of other social evils will become more possible. If you tell a man often enough that he lives in a society where it is dangerous to speak his mind, He will come to believe it. He will then transmit this

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: Today is a very important day for the people of the Dominican Republic. For the first time in well over thirty years they have today installed as their freely elected President Juan Bosch. To express Jamaica's congratulations and good wishes, the Prime Minister is now in Sante Domingoxxxx heading an official government delegation. So, let us, the people of Jamaica, express our greetings and good wishes to the people of the Dominican Republic, who have had to travel a long and hard and painful road back to freedom after nearly a lifetime of dictatorship. And let us hope that their newly^{won}/freedom will not again be lost to strongmen/ or dictators. Most important of all, let us learn from them how long and terrible the dark night of dictatorship can be, once a people lose the right to decide for themselves who shall rule them, and for how long. The people of the Dominican Republic, and their nearest neighbours, the people of Haiti, ~~xxxxxxx~~ are the two peoples of the Caribbean sea who have drunk most deeply of the bitter cup of misery imposed by dictatorship. Theirs were dictatorships of the right: in the case of Haiti it still is. And these two countries share the same land area. ^{Hispaniola (which is Haiti & the Dominican Rep.)} ~~Cuba~~ is about fifty miles to the south-east of ~~them~~. ^{Cuba} ~~it~~/too was the bitter victim of along dictatorship: now it has thrown off the brutal rightist dictatorship only to discover that it had chosen the leftist dictatorship of communism. ^{Hispaniola} And/~~it~~ is roughly ^{fifty miles} the same ~~xxxxxxx~~ west of Puerto Rico. We are about a hundred miles away. Puerto Rico and ourselves are the two smallest islands of the Greater Antilles; we are also the two who have escaped the iron heel of dictatorship: we, because of our special relations with

the United Kingdom, and Puerto Rico because of her special relations with the United States.

But we are celebrating the Dominican Republic. It has an area of well over nineteen thousand square miles and a population of roughly three millions. It is estimated that about twenty-nine percent of the population are white; about twelve percent are Negro and the rest, about fifty-nine percent of the population are a mixture of white, Negro and Indian.

The history of these people has not been an easy one. It was the first island discovered by Columbus and until the beginning of the twentieth century it was a sort of pawn in the game of power politics: it suffered a series of revolutions, dictatorships and wars with Haiti. At one stage it became virtual colony of Haiti. Between 1907 and 1924 it was a sort of voluntary financial colony of the United States. That was the only way it could be saved from bankruptcy.

In 1930 General Rafael Trujillo staged a revolution and seized power. Between 1800 and 1900 the Dominican Republic had had ninety-to governments, just eight short of a government every twelve months over a period of a hundred years. That kind of instability was bound to lead to disaster; in this case that disaster was 31 years of dictatorship which ended with ~~thirty years~~ the assassination of Trujillo on the 30th of May, 1961. Since then the people of the Dominican Republic have laboured to the point where they ^{have} now installed a popularly elected President. For these people the past has truly been a mint of blood and sorrow. In saluting them let us hope and pray that this will not be so for their tomorrows. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Feb 28 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Over the past weekend - and rather belatedly for us - I took ~~the~~ my family to see "Finian's Rainbow", the current/^{season's} pantomime. And as usual, rules about bedtime and what you eat and drink were suspended for all members of the family for the evening. The result was that the youngest member of the family had a monumental binge on aerated water, packets of sweets and those little packets of dried and salted ~~shrimps~~. So it is perhaps not surprising that that particular member of the family thought ~~the~~ "Finian's Rainbow" marvelously ~~funny~~ grand. And just in case those of you who are proud of your highbrow tastes want to dismiss the reactions of a little girl, let me remind you that the main purpose of an entertainment is to entertain; and furthermore, let us remember that because they are less pretentious than grown-ups ~~the~~ children are often more honest and genuine in their responses than grown-up. I am not saying that the judgement of children is more reliable than that of grown-ups. What I am saying is that children are more likely to look at something and see it for what it is. Grown-ups are often bogged down by considerations of what is supposed to be fashionable or the way a thing should be done, or how it was done in the West End or on Broadway, or what Time Magazine said about ^{it} The result is that when it comes to simple entertainments grown-ups who ~~regard~~ themselves as sophisticated are often so bemused by their own cleverness that they cannot see the wood for the tress.

I think 'Finian's Rainbow' has suffered particularly from this sophisticated clever grown-up business. And let me confess that it caught me too. I was told it was not as good as the last pantomime,

that it was not, like the others we've had, written by Jamaicans and set in Jamaica - in fact, it was subtly conveyed to me that it was neither pantomime nor play but a rather poor musical, imported from the States, and therefore not up to much. And because this was suggested rather than stated outright, I accepted it. In other words, without quite realising it, I had become part of the climate of opinion that was quietly anti-"Finian's Rainbow" because it was foreign made and not like past pantomimes. The result is that I probably would not have seen "Finian's Rainbow" if the youngest one had not nagged for weeks for us to go.

The whole point about ~~saying~~ telling you all this is to show just how easy it is for us to become utterly parochial about the arts. And let us face it. There are strong forces working for this parochialism. There are people for whom the only good art, the only good music, the only good literature, the only dance, the only good theatre, are found in our own back yards, and limited to a few very simple themes. While I understand and sympathise with what these people are after, I think they overstate their case terribly. And if these people are allowed to get away with this artistic parochialism, the arts in Jamaica could be led ^{into} ~~it~~ a blind alley of narrow, blinkered artistic nationalism. Let us always remember that while all art stems from the particular, all good art is by its very nature universal in appeal. And this applies to the simpler entertainments too. That is why I hope all of you will try to see Wycliffe Bennett's production of Ehaedra before it closes. It shows Jamaica actors grappling with great theatre. ~~And this applies to the simpler entertainments too~~ And 'Finian's Rainbow is grand entertainment with a bright new star in Miss Sheila Rickards. I'm glad I did not miss it. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Mar 1 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The international political picture is going through one of its fluid periods. It is rather as though we are looking at a ^{moving} picture which is out of focus and which the cameraman is trying to bring into focus. Such a picture will grow big, then small; sharp and clear, then cloudy and blurred. And the viewer will have a hard time making any sort of sense out of such an unsteady picture. That is the state of world politics at the moment.

In Brussels the Council of Ministers of the European Common Market has bogged down over the question of signing a trade and aid treaty with eighteen African states. The fact that sixteen of these states are former French colonies, and that they are sponsored by France has led a section of the world press to see this as revenge against France by other members of the Common Market for her veto of Britain's membership. At the moment France buys coffee, bananas and other agricultural produce from these African states at special prices which ensure them a decent protected market. The signing of the pact would transfer this special responsibility from France to the Common Market. Under the Treaty the Common Market would set up a development fund of about two-hundred and fifty million pounds to help these African states. This is the treaty that should have been signed this week. But both the Italians and the Dutch have elections coming up in May and for political reasons these two would much rather postpone the signing of the treaty till after the elections. In the case of the Dutch it might also ~~be~~ incidentally, be a way of showing resentment against the French veto of Britain. But I doubt that it is so in the case of the Italians. Certainly, it seems to me a great

mistake for anybody to think that any of the six Common Market countries will try to wreck this very successful partnership just for the sake of Britain. So, if you want the picture to be a little less blurred and confused take your reports of Common Market troubles with a pinch of salt. No country in Europe loves Britain so much that it is prepared to destroy Europe's future to prove it. They may try delaying tactics to show De Gaulle that they are not rubber stamps: but they will not court disaster for the sake of Britain.

If you need any support for this view all you have to do is look at the United States' revised approach to Europe. Britain is no longer the plenipotentiary through whom Uncle Sam expresses his views to the Europeans. Top ranking American diplomats are in Brussels and at Nato headquarters, and Dr. Hallstein of the European Economic Commission is in the United States to work out details for the updating of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In short the United States/^{Government} has gone through its 'agonising reappraisal' and all the indications are that it is accepting the disturbing fact that Europe will not be anybody's puppet. But while the government seems to have accepted this fact there still seem to be confusion in the Congress and the Senate ^{among} and the people of the United States. And this tends to confuse the picture.

Finally, 'peacemonger' Khrushchev's warlike rumblings ^{Wednesday} on/~~Thursday~~ suggests that he is under pressure from the 'Chinese' faction inside Russia. The Chinese, as you know, are those who want a tough aggressive communist line. The fact that he had to say specifically that Russia would defend China suggests that the pressure is very great indeed. But Khrushchev has been under greater pressure, ^{before -} and survived. He may do it again: or, the Chinese may get him. The picture is fluid.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Goodevening: I have a letter with me this evening. It came from Guy's Hill, St Mary and the person who wrote it to me is Mr. Alfred Williams. Mr. Williams signs himself as an ex-prisoner, someone who has served time in the General Penitentiary. And his letter is about conditions in the General Penitentiary. The letter is not very clear. The spelling is bad, and often I had to guess where a sentence ended and another began. In other words, this letter is from a semi-literate ^{convict} ex-jailbird.

Now, this letter can be approached in two ways. We can say here is someone who obviously has had hardly any education at all; on top of this he is a self-confessed ^{convict} ex-jailbird who does not even go through the motions of pretending that he was innocently convicted. Therefore this man is hardly likely to be a very respectable member of society. We can say that, put his letter into the wastepaper basket and ~~dismiss~~ its contents. That can be the first approach.

The second can be to say: Writing this letter has obviously been a very great effort for this man: the evidence is there in the letter itself. It is always a mental and physical and ~~emotional~~ strain for ~~me~~ a person to do something they are unused to. Also, this man has discharged whatever debt he owed society by suffering imprisonment for it. So the very least we can do for this man is to give him a hearing.

And because my approach is the second one, I am telling you about this letter from Alfred Williams. In addition, there is this problem. In most of the situations and conditions in which we find ourselves,

we can generally do something to correct any glaring abuses. If working conditions or conditions in hospitals are bad, public opinion can and generally does so something about it. The press ^{of radio} may unearth the particular abuse, ~~it~~ and arouse public opinion or else public opinion ^{of radio} may force the press to do something about. The one place where this breaks down is in prison. When people are in prison they are completely cut off from the normal every day world. When they get out of prison they are so anxious to put the experience behind them that they do not talk about it. So the abuses that take place in prison take place in darkness and in secrecy and very rarely come ^{under} the searchlight of public opinion. For this reason I welcomed, in a horrified sort of way, the glimpse of prison life Mr. Williams's letter showed me.

Prisoners, ^{once} ~~when~~ they are inside, ^{seem to be} ~~are~~ completely at the mercy of the warders. If the warder happens to be kindly life is not too bad while that particular warder is on duty; but if the warder is a vicious sadistic brute then life can be hell for prisoners. Mr. Williams talks about a prisoner having his head broken and his hand broken and being put into the 'dumb cell' for several days. Beatings up seem to be a common thing.

Undoubtedly the most dreadful aspect of this ugly business is the ^{and absolute} terrible power the warders seem to have over the prisoners. I think it is wrong for any individual or group of individuals to have that kind of power over anybody. Mr. Williams asks me to appeal to the Minister of Home Affairs to look into these prison conditions. I do so with all my heart. I think that we need some system to ensure that ~~no~~ prisoners are completely at the mercy of prison warders. I am not one who believes in turning prisons into homes away from home. I think people must pay for their crimes; but that does not mean they must be brutalised by their keepers. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Mar 4 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Minister of Finance, Mr. Donald Sangsters, and the Financial Secretary, Mr. G. Arthur Brown, have just returned from a mission to the United States that could be of considerable importance to us. But ~~we~~ we will have to wait until Mr. Sangster has reported to the Cabinet before he can give us any sort of official account of his trip. But even without any information on this very important visit I think there are certain very clear economic indicators that give us some sort of outline of the shape of things to come.

First, we know that somewhere round about the middle of last month the people at the Ministry of Finance had put the final touches to part of this years' Budget. Second, we know that the draft of this government's Development Programme has just been completed and ^{all} that/its long-term projections cannot therefore have been incorporated in next month's Budget. This means that we will not have ^a ~~the~~ clear detailed statement ~~of~~ of where this government plans to go, when Mr. Sangster presents his Budget. For such a detailed statement we will have to wait on the publication of the Development Programme; and present indications are that this will be out round about the middle of this year. And this might well be followed by a second Budget to make financial provisions for the main features of the Development programme.

So, on the face of it the indicators are that the situation is still fluid, in terms of just where the economy is going over the long run. And this has caused great concern in certain business circles in the Corporate Area. Even the very successful Independence

Loan issue, which closed at the record figure of £2.2 million last week, has disturbed many intelligent businessmen who are by no means hostile to the present government. And the reason for their being disturbed is very valid. To what use, they want to know, is the Government putting the £2.2 million. You do not, they say, borrow money on which you have to pay interest and then proceed to put that money in the bank. They say the economy cannot afford to have idle, lazy money lying in the bank, especially if it is borrowed money on which interest has to be paid. I agree with them. The sooner this money is put to work, the better for the economy. But the money must in fact be put to work, not frittered away on the kind of consumer spending spree which brought us close to disaster a year or so back.

I think Mr. Sangster's main fiscal preoccupation, that of getting the country to live within its means, instead of way beyond its pocket is a very necessary one, provided it does not slow down the economy too drastically. And there are many people who feel that the economy cannot be slowed down any more than it has already been. On the other hand, there are people who feel that the present economic pause is a good thing for the country. These people ^{say, and figures support them,} ~~think~~ that since about 1956 ^{the highest percentage} the trend has been for ~~most~~ of the national wealth to gravitate ^{the} towards the non-productive sector of the economy, towards/wholesale ^{trade.} and retail distributions. Certainly, a slowing down in this sector of the economy, especially where it concerns imported luxury items, will not be a bad thing for Jamaica. But you cannot slow down any sector of the economy without creating unemployment in that sector. And this, I think, constitutes one of the major problems in the shaping of our economic future. I will explore this more fully tomorrow: so till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Mar 5 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: If we were to state Jamaica's basic economic ~~problem~~ in its crudest and simplest form, it would go something like this: If Jamaica/~~xxxx~~ were to make the best possible use of her land it would mean mechanising agriculture, stepping up production, and throwing at least fifty percent of those people who now live on the land off it.

Last night/I said that you cannot slow down activity in any sector of the economy without creating unemployment. Now I am saying that you cannot make agriculture ~~xxxx~~ efficient/^{enough} to feed all of us and perhaps earn something over, without also creating large-scale unemployment. To some extent this generalisation would apply to almost any walk of life. Efficiency means either the partial or total displacement of men by machines or else a drastic reduction of the number of men doing a given job. This is one of the realities of life in the twentieth century, it is also one of the great problems Jamaica has to face if it is to work and think its way out of its present economic difficulties. And I certainly do not think that we are either facing this problem or trying to think our way out of it when the leaders of our two major parties accuse each other of being responsible for making the loading of bananas more efficient - as though it were a crime.

It is when we try to find solutions to this problem that we really run into trouble. Employers want efficiency - and therefore mechanisation - as soon as possible. The workers' representatives are dead against it. The government of the day, whether it be P.N.P. or J.L.P. tries to maintain an uneasy balance, meanwhile seeking

to create as many new jobs as possible.

During the P.N.P. regime this creation of new jobs occurred mainly in the ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ^{building} industry, in the growing and expanding wholesale and retail distribution trade and in the new industries on the industrial estate. These were the key sources of new job opportunities. And in the main these job opportunities were in the Corporate Area. In retrospect, the approach of the P.N.P. seems to have been to welcome economic activity wherever possible because all such activity ~~is~~ ^{is} seen as in the long-term good. In the short term however, most activity took place in the Corporate Area, and a non-productive sector of the economy became the strongest, to the detriment of our balance of payments position.

I suggest that it is against this background that we need to read our indicators. And against ~~the~~ ^{is} background the indicators are/ that: there ~~are~~ ^{is} bound to be increased taxation, though this may slow down the economy even more if it is in personal incomes; a great ^{Government} deal of/spending will take place in rural Jamaica and the distressed ^{as well as some Kingston workers} Kingston merchants/will have to go into the country areas if they want to earn a bit of what there is; unemployment will be our biggest problem until the money that is saved is put to work, primarily to bring land that is now unused under/^{efficient} cultivation, and ^{to establish} industries ~~are established~~ in rural Jamaica to absorb those workers who cannot be supported on the land/~~in~~ ^{when it is efficiently run.} under efficiency. This is the challenging situation out of which the government's Development Programme must point the way. ^{And that way} ~~That, plus a world of hard/work.~~ ^{productive out meet} Goodnight.

include a world of hard, productive work

Goodnight

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I have tried to follow the present controversy about who is Jamaica's National Hero, who should be Jamaica's National Hero and how he should be chosen. But you know, every time I try to concentrate seriously on this business my mind sort of slips away into the world of fantasy and I find myself witnessing imaginary conversations between groups of people who once thought themselves to be National Heroes, or whose followers once made them feel that they were National Heroes.

Last night, for instance, I witnessed such an imaginary conversation between the late and unlamented Joseph Stalin and Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini. Stalin had just finished reading the transcript of the speech Mr. Khrushchev had made on earth denouncing him. (Perhaps I forgot to tell you that these people are somewhere on a black cloud beyond Outer Space, in a place called ~~H-E-L-L~~ H-E-L-L pronounced back to front) Anyway, Stalin had just finished ~~the~~ reading the speech in which Khrushchev had accused him of all those terrible things. Both Hitler and Mussolini watched him quietly as he began to shake with rage. His face turned puce, his eyes popped, he began to beat his chest with his fist; he opened his mouth but his rage choked the words. Suddenly his eyes went glassy and he passed out cold. His great anger had stopped the ghostly flow of ghostly blood to his ghostly brain.

"These Russians", Hitler said in disgust. "Such primitive emotional creatures." Mussolini chuckled wickedly and said: "You seem to ~~far~~ have forgotten your own reaction when you first discovered

the fickleness of mortal men". Do you remember the tantrum you threw when we looked down at the Nuremberg trials and people by whom you swore turned and blamed all those atrocities on you. Remember you too went into a fit...."

"You dirty, oily Italian cowards!" Hitler screamed and stalked away." Mussolini threw back his head and roared with laughter. Just then Stalin opened his eyes. Mussolini stopped laughing and said: "Feeling better, old man? It isn't worth it, you know. You and Hitler made the mistake of taking yourselves seriously. I tried to too. But I couldn't keep it up. Every time I stepped up into my shoes, and every time I stepped up onto the box to look tall while I addressed the Roman crowds, some of my closest supporters snickered behind my back. And so, when they told me what a great National Hero I was, I knew that they were only ingratiating themselves. But I liked it all the same. The big thing is to be able to smile at it." I know you and Hitler think it is wrong to laugh at yourselves but look at all the grief and bitterness you carry around with you. ~~But~~ Nobody can decide for tomorrow except tomorrow's people."

"But Lenin and I shaped them!" Stalin roared. "We are their National Heroes for all time!" Hitler, who had come back quietly, said: "You allowed your psychopants to fool you, Herr Stalin. Just look down."

They all lay on ~~the~~ the black cloud and look ^{ed} down on a black Kremlin night where ghostly figures were moving ^{the} /body beside that of Lenin from its place of honour and carrying it to a hole in the earth ~~out~~ in the garden. Stalin moaned and passed out once more. "Sadistic brute!" Mussolini hissed ^{at Hitler} and walked away. Napoleon watched them from a distance, a pitying smile on his lips. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Mar 7 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I think we in Jamaica can, if we allow ourselves, learn a great deal about freedom of speech from what the French would call the Bidault affair. It shows up in a most dramatic form the true meaning/and the wide latitude allowed an organ of public information. So, let us examine it for the great object lesson it is.

The forces involved in this affair are the British Broadcasting Corporation, a former French Prime Minister named M. Georges Bidault, and the British nation and its elected parliament. I am sure that most of you have heard and read about the details of the affair, but let me just give you the outline very quickly. M. Bidault, who was Prime Minister of France in 1940, is today the leader of a terrorist organisation which is dedicated to the destruction of President de Gaulle's government - by violence and murder if necessary. Indeed, de Gaulle is so strongly supported by the majority of the French people that his enemies feel the only way they can get rid of him is to murder him. And as the head of the organisation dedicated to the murder of de Gaulle, Bidault is a wanted man; he is on the run from the French security forces.

Well, on Monday of this week the British Broadcasting Corporation Television Service shocked all of Britain and most of the rest of the world by showing the film of an interview one of the B.B.C.-T.V. representatives had had with M. Bidault. Almost immediately after the film was shown the storm broke. British newspapers wanted to know if the authorities had given permission for M. Bidault to enter Britain. When they discovered that no such permission had been given they attacked the Government, and the Government's security ~~xxx~~ and

immigration services. The attack was immediately taken up by the Labour Party Opposition, whose members asked some very searching and embarrassing questions in the House of Commons.

And now we come to the very interesting point about this affair. The B.B.C. is a public corporation which is dependent for its money on the British Government. And it was the B.B.C.'s broadcasting of the television interview which had led to the embarrassing position in which the British Government found itself. And yet nobody, neither the government, nor the opposition Labour Party nor the press nor the public attacked or blamed the B.B.C. Indeed, at the height of the controversy a spokesman for the government made it very plain that the government had absolutely no say in what the B.B.C. broadcast. And so we have the striking situation that the B.B.C. which is dependent on the government for its finances broadcasts something which causes the government acute embarrassment and yet the government confirms the B.B.C.'s independence and upholds its right to ~~the~~ free speech. This is something very striking in itself.

What makes it even more striking is when we set against the recent jailing of a couple of newspapermen who refused to disclose the source of a story which affected the country's national security. It would seem that the British people and their parliament are agreed that the only justifiable limitation to freedom of speech is when it involves national security: ^{at some great crime like murder} at all other times there are no limits other than legal ones. In fact, in the Bidault affair the British government endorsed the B.B.C.'s right to free speech, even when that freedom put the government itself in a most embarrassing position. For me this is the great significance of the Bidault affair.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I hope you will allow me to come back, rather belatedly, to the subject of dental health. Following on my comments during National Dental Health Week, I received a most interesting letter from from Dr. J.H.B. Monteith, the President of the Jamaica Dental Association. I do not think I can remember a time when criticisms I have made have been accepted with such grace and courtesy, and for this I am most grateful to Dr. Monteith; but there was a lot more to the letter than just that.

From the letter it is clear that the Dental Association is aware of most of the problems I mentioned ⁱⁿ my broadcast of February the 20th. Certainly, they seem aware of the desperate need for dental care in the rural areas. Dr. Monteith says that dentists in these areas have been asked to give talks on dental health and that the Association is willing to send speakers into the rural areas if civic groups would write and ask. So, for the benefit of these groups the address of the Association is Box 19, Kingston 5.

Dr. Monteith also told me about an emergency dental service started by a panel of dentists a few years ago to get over the problem of people who needed attention at weekends and public holidays. The arrangement was for ~~an~~ a certain taxi service to act as liason with patient who needed emergency treatment. But it seems that there was little or no demand for this ~~service~~ and so it was given up. However, Dr. Monteith makes the very important point that if we are really properly educated in matters of dental health these emergencies are likely to be drastically reduced. Certainly ^{by} ~~by~~ this proposition.

Dr. Monteith's final point is that the only solution to Jamaica's dental health problem is to have more dentists. And for this he suggests the setting up of a dental school either at the University of the West Indies or in association with the University. I could not agree more and I hope this will soon be undertaken.

But in the meantime, while we are working towards the turning out of more dentists large sections of the Jamaican population are in urgent need of dental care. Bad teeth means poisoning the blood stream and a sluggish system means bad performance. School children with bad teeth are toxic and sluggish and this shows up in their school work; grown-ups in this state operate at halfcock. So it seems to me important that until we get into that happy situation where we have enough dentists for all of Jamaica, the dentists we do now have should do their best to cover as much of the island as they can. With this in mind, I should like to put two ideas forward for the consideration of the Association.

First, is it possible for members of the Dental Association to ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ have regular clinics at the health centres scattered throughout Jamaica in much the same way that doctors now hold regular clinics at these centres? If this were possible it would do a great deal to improve the dental health of the community. The second idea is to get mobile dental clinics to travel to schools in the rural areas and look after the teeth of school children. It seems to me most important that this business of creating a dentally healthy community should be pursued as a matter of great urgency, both immediately and in the long run. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: On Wednesday of this week Mr. R.A. Foreman, the Chairman of the Agricultural Development Corporation, made a most interesting contribution to the great agricultural debate. Mr. Foreman was speaking at the monthly meeting of the Board of Management of the J.A.S. and he made it very clear that he was expressing his own views and not the policy of the government. And what Mr. Foreman said in the expressing of his own private opinion strikes me as of such fundamental importance that I hope it will be discussed in agricultural circles throughout Jamaica.

Mr. Foreman said that to consider the question of mechanical cultivation of hillside land while land was being fragmented at its present rate was a waste of time. Mr. Foreman said that mechanical cultivation was not economically possible on small holdings. For mechanical cultivation to be feasible a number of small holdings would either have to be opened up co-operatively, or else the holdings would have to be big enough. Now, because this could be viewed as such a radically and provocative idea, let me repeat Mr. Foreman's statement that he was expressing his own private opinion and not the policy of the government.

To show you just how crucial a contribution to the great agricultural debate this is, we will have to go back to early in January when Sir Arthur Thelwell and Mr. David Edwards of the University clashed sharply over the question of the most productive size of our agricultural holdings.

In what I considered a most brilliant analysis of Jamaica's agricultural problems, Mr. Edward suggested that we should apply

crop zoning and create economic medium sized farms of between twenty-five and sixty acres for the most rewarding and most productive farming. Sir Arthur Thelwell on the other hand, wanted more subsidies and up to ten families on five acres of land. You may remember that I commented on these two conflicting viewpoints on Friday January the 11th. I told you at the time, that in effect, Mr. Edwards was saying: Let us make agriculture more efficient than it now is because it is in the interest of the economy to do so. Sir Arthur, on the other hand, was saying: Let us put as many people as possible on the land and subsidise them because this is our greatest and most urgent social need. And I told you at the time that it seemed to me that the shape of Jamaica's future was more intimately tied up with which of these two views prevailed than with almost anything else that was then happening. Nothing that has happened since the 11th of January has made me change my mind.

Now, in expressing his own private opinion, Mr. Foreman has brought an additional dimension to the debate. I think we are all accepting the idea that farming with mechanical aids does mean more efficient farming. What Mr. Foreman has brought home is that it will be a waste to use those mechanical aids on small plots of land, and we are faced with the situation that land holdings, especially in hillside areas, are getting smaller and smaller as a result of fragmentation. Therefore there are two ways out for efficiency: either put a stop to fragmentation or else create a pattern of co-operative farming throughout Jamaica. I think Mr. Foreman has made an important contribution to the great agricultural debate by raising this point. Please think and talk on it. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I am sure most of you saw the report on the front page of this morning's paper in which a prominent Anglican clergyman in Britain ~~xxx~~ is said to have challenged the prevailing and generally accepted attitudes to sexual relationships. According to the report, Canon D.A. Rhymes said that our present moral code that says sex outside of marriage is wrong, is not based on any of the teachings of Christ. There is, he says, no trace of this teaching in the attitude of Christ. And he applies this view to the matter of homosexuality as well. Then, turning to the argument of those people who say that morality should be based on Natural Law, Canon Rhymes asks: What is natural and what is unnatural? And then he comes up with the very reasonable conclusion that it is very doubtful whether nature offers any guidance on morality.

And so, having shown that the accepted Moral Law against ~~xxx~~ extra-marital sex is not based on Christian teaching and that the same moral law against homosexuality is not unnatural - because nothing is unnatural to nature - Canon Rhymes proposes that our present moral code should be replaced by a code 'related to the person and the needs of the person'. If we want people to live well, he says, we must emphasize love, not morality.

Now what does all this mean? If the report is correct it means that the good Canon sees nothing wrong in homosexuality and extra-marital sex because neither the teachings of Christ nor the Laws of Nature specifically say that these are morally wrong.

The thing that worries me is what is likely to happen to society if we accept the Canon's code which, in his own words is: 'related

to the person and the needs of the person.' If you or I or any other citizen has a compulsive need to wreck happy homes or to lead insurrections or to blow up buildings, are we to be free to do so? At the moment society says no. At the moment all of us are, to one extent or another, governed by sets of rules which have grown up over the years and which exist mainly to give order and stability to our society. An important aspect of these rules is the punitive quality which gives them teeth. There are so many things that we do not do because we know that doing them and being caught will lead to punishment. Often, the only reason why we do not do something is for fear of punishment. Often we don't do a thing that we want to do because we know that our society will disapprove. And our society, let us never forget, is a corporate and living entity, something that has evolved and grown and something that has a strong instinct for historical survival: the Jamaican society as such is at least two hundred years older than the oldest living Jamaican. When everyone of us now living is dead the Jamaican society will still be here, and if it is a healthy society its children (our descendants) will still be inhibited from doing certain things because they fear the disapproval of the society. And it is this consciousness of the approval and disapproval of the society which is the cornerstone of so much of our conduct. If you go with me this far you will, I think, agree with me that any code which proposes to put the individual and his personal needs above those of society is, ultimately, dangerous and destructive. Certainly, I agree with the good Canon that we must emphasise love: but ^{The} ~~all~~ ^{which} real love is creative, ^{which} admits of restraint, and is in profound alliance with the noblest impulses of its society. [^] The other, the liberty that is licence, is dangerous. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: The last time that I discussed education was on Monday February the 25th when I discussed the Trench Town School issue. You will remember that Mr. Edwin Allen, the Minister of Education had published his statement on the matter the Saturday before. In that statement he said that his predecessor in office, Mr. Florizel Glasspole, had set the pattern and that he, Mr. Allen, was simply following a pattern set by a P.N.P. Minister. I told you at the time that I thought this was a very strong point in support of Mr. Allen's charge that the attitude of the teachers was partisan and political. And I told you that I was not happy about the wisdom of their stand.

Well, since then, on the eight of March, Mr. Glasspole has issued a statement in which he challenged the Minister's claim that he, Mr. Glasspole, had set the precedent for the Minister's action. Mr. Glasspole said that he did not, in the case of Tarrants Senior School, the case cited in the Minister's statement, ask for the nomination of three names. And then he challenged the Minister to cite chapter and verse. So far the Minister has not yet replied to the Glasspole challenge. And until the Minister does reply we must view his statement with the element of doubt raised by Mr. Glasspole.

Meanwhile, it seems to me that the teachers are trying to get ^{away} from the political overtones and undertones of the Byfield case. I think the decision to let a court of law decide whether the Minister's action was within the law or not is the only sensible way out of this dead-end situation. Whether we like to admit it or not, the rights and wrongs of the Byfield case will always be overshadowed by the fact

that Mr. Byfield is regarded mainly as a political figure.

I think this matter of the injection of party politics into almost every single important Jamaican undertaking is a very serious matter indeed. Unless it is halted it could hurt the society very grievously by turning Jamaica into a house divided against itself.

I hope that the teachers, the logical leaders of public opinion in society - and the Ministry of Education, will so resolve their differences as to be an example to the rest of the country. And I should like the basis for such a resolution should be to take politics out of education and education out of politics. I should like to see the Education Law so rewritten that no Minister of government, now or at any time in the future will be able to interfere in the choosing and appointing of any teachers, from the lowest to the highest. And I should like the law so rewritten that no teacher will be able to turn his profession and his position to party political advantage. I should like the teacher's position to be like that of the senior civil servant: he will have views of his own but as a responsible servant of the state he will not be permitted to take part in party politics of a public nature. And if he or she wishes to stand for elective office they should be required to resign from teaching. I certainly do not think it is good for education for the teaching profession to be treated as the stepping stone to a political career or ^{as} the place where the defeated politician waits till next time. So, let there be an end to the colonialist laws in our education; and let there be an end to the political teacher. If the current controversy leads to this situation then it may yet turn out to have been a very good thing indeed. Certainly, this could be a way out of the present educational mess. I hope it is. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: Last week Mr. Duncan Sandys, the British Commonwealth and Colonial Secretary, inherited or, rather, created another tricky problem by settling a big one. The problem Mr. Sandys had settled was over the Kenya constitution. He had handled the Kenya African leaders, one of whom is the great Jomo Kenyatta, with such skill that they had settled their differences and agreed on a constitution under which the country could move forward to internal self government. But no sooner had Mr. Sandys done this when trouble blew up in his face. On the east Kenya is bordered by the independent state of Somalia. And many of the people who live on the Kenya side of the border regard themselves as Somalis rather than Kenyan. Religion has a great deal to do with it. The Somalis are Muslims, the Kenyans are pagans animists or Christians. And the Muslim religion is very much more than a weekend or Sunday affair, which is what Christianity so often is: it is social, cultural, religious and economic. So the hold of Islam is very strong on its children. And so it was that when these people of Kenya who regard themselves as Somalis heard about the coming of full internal self-government, they demonstrated for their territory to be incorporated with the neighbouring Somalia. The Somali government immediately took up the matter and fired off some protests to Whitehall. Britain assured the government of Somalia that its claims will be given a hearing when Kenya finally moves to full independence. Britain also assured the people of that part of Kenya that they will be given a chance to express their views before any final decision is made. In spite of these assurances the government of Somalia has now broken

off diplomatic relations with Great Britain and the situation on the border between Somalia and Kenya is very tense. It is a situation that could very easily lead to trouble and violence. But because it is still Britain who is handling the situation I think the impulse to violence will be contained. What is indicated though is that after Kenya's independence, when Britain has withdrawn from the picture, we may have a situation on the Kenya Somalia border that could be similar to the Indian-Pakistan border dispute. So I think we are now witnessing the beginnings of what could become a serious border problem in tomorrow's Africa. This is definitely a potential trouble spot.

The other trouble spot, and the one which could be more explosive in the short run, is Southern Rhodesia. Earlier this year a number of events occurred to make for the explosive atmosphere. First, a conservative new all-white/government took over power and immediately set about tightening controls over the huge black majority (There are nearly four million blacks to under a quarter of a million whites). The African nationalist leader, Joshua Nkomo was clamped in jail and the government announced some of the most fantastic penalties (long stretches in jail, floggings and even death) for agitating or acting to change the government. Next, Nyasaland seceded from the Central African Federation and Northern Rhodesia (where ~~there is~~ a black majority/~~dominates the Assembly~~) also said it wanted to get out of the Federation. So the whites of Southern Rhodesia decided to tighten their grip. But without help from Britain they have neither the numbers nor the physical strength of the South African whites. So it looks very much as though we are in for some ugly racial trouble in Southern Rhodesia, which is not yet completely independent.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Mar 14 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: We have had some very dramatic headlines in the news this week. Jamaica will soon have its own international Airline; the International Monetary Fund will arrange for Jamaica to have three and a half million pounds worth of standby credit; the Jamaica government is today floating a one-and-a-half million pound loan on the London money market. These, and a number of others have been the headlines of the week. ^{But} This evening I want to deal with ~~these~~ ^a topics which did not make the main headlines but which ^{is} ~~are~~ very important for all that. Indeed, I should say that the passing of the National Water Authority Law is possibly the most important act of the week as far as the vast majority of Jamaicans are concerned.

If you agree with me that before we can have progress we must have progressive thought, then you and I are saying that all social change, all change of any kind, begins with thinking. If we think something is wrong we are likely to do something about it. If we think something is right and good then we are likely to want to defend it against those who want to destroy it or take it away. But if we ^{have no thought} ~~do not think~~ on the particular subject then we could not care less what happens. If we do not think about Civil Liberties then it does not really matter whether we have civil liberties or not: you cannot lose something that you do not value and do not care about.

But you know, thinking of this kind presupposes certain basic conditions. For a man to think in this sort of civilised way it is necessary for him to live in a civilised way. For a mother to have time to think about the growing and evolving of the minds of

her children, and to help in the process, she must be more than just a breeder of children and a beast of burden. She must have the leisure without which there is no time for thought and reflection, and she must have access to those things which makes for civilised living. And ~~you know~~ two of the key amenities of civilised living are running water and electric light. Those of us who have these two amenities at our fingertips tend to take them for granted: you turn on the tap, you turn off the tap. You touch a switch and you have light and music and entertainment and news and information. We know all this because we have it and we don't think very much about it.

But you know, a huge section of the Jamaican community, possibly more than half, do not have these things. The women have to walk miles to a standpipe and then carry water like beasts of burden did in ancient times. These people live in darkness and in ignorance and so they do not have a chance to make the contribution they could and should to the creative and progressive evolution of their society. I think that to bring these people into the main stream of modern Jamaican life and thought so that they can make their contribution to it, is by far the most important challenge facing Jamaica today. And as far as I am concerned the beginning of this is to give them running water and to give them light. And so, as far as tomorrow's Jamaica is concerned, I would say that the setting up of the National Watershed Protection Water Authority, like the setting up of the ~~SEIXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Authority, ^(and, I hope, a coming National Electricity Authority) is much more important than all the other items of much more dramatic news. This is good news that is in league with the future - if it is carried out successfully. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Goodevening: The Income Tax Amendment Act which was also seen through all its stages in this week's sitting of the House of Representatives deals partly with the very controversial matter of tax exemptions on gifts to certain charities. I am sure most of you are familiar with the controversial aspect of this Act. The government has decided that for next three years all gifts to the Jamaica Cancer Society and the Polio Rehabilitation Centre, as well as to the College of Arts, Science and Technology will be deductible from income tax. When I discussed this proposal way back on February the 9th, I told you how very mixed my own feelings were. I welcomed the idea but I felt that it penalised the other charitable bodies. I still feel the same. It is a good thing but there is the very real danger that it will channel all gifts to ~~charity~~ in the direction of cancer and polio. And let us face it, these ~~two~~ are the two most 'glamorous' charities, charged with drama and the kind of heart-rending appeal that you do find in either neglected or abandoned babies and little children. Anyway, the die has now been cast and these two very worthy charities (which also happen to be the wealthiest of the charitable efforts) look like cornering all the gifts there will be over the next three years. This seems to confirm, at another level, the proposition that: 'To those who have, more will be given: from those who have not, more will be taken'. I sincerely hope that the Jamaica Council of Voluntary Social Services will not throw in its hand. The other charities are going to need their hard work more than ever now that the dice have been loaded against them.

But here is a new point. Yesterday morning a very indignant listener phoned me and told me that he was going to ask, and ask very loudly, why he cannot get tax exemption on gifts to his church. The way he saw it his church, the guardian and shaper of his spiritual and moral values, as well as the shaper of the values of the entire society, had a greater claim on his charity than any other force in the society. I think this is likely to be a strong new front from which this decision of the government is likely to come under fire. My own view still is that the most equitable way out is to set up a Community Chest. Perhaps we will get around to this in time.

One of the dangers of this sort of highly charged and emotional debate is that it can lead to our not seeing the picture in the round. And this is in fact what has happened about this income tax amendment act. Because most of us have been so preoccupied with the charities aspect of it, we have tended to overlook what is, in terms of social and economic reality, by far the most important aspect of it.

Apart from its charity aspect, this amendment to our tax law separates the incomes of husbands and wives for tax purposes in all cases where the joint earned income is not more than fifteen hundred pounds. All you have to do is ^{to} remember ~~ix~~ that somewhere in the region of ninety percent of all wage-earning families do not have an income of over fifteen hundred pounds a year and you will realise what a wide section of the Jamaican community will benefit from this law. So, let us remember this aspect too. It too is part of this highly controversial Income Tax Amendment Act. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: This morning my wife and I drove to a point up in the hills of St. Andrew. It was somewhere between Rock Hall, Padmore and our own village of Red Hills, in what we call the Mount Atlas area, about three thousand feet above sea level. Behind us another couple followed.

We were on our way to get our own green vegetables for the week and we were introducing our neighbours to the place. We had first visited the place the Saturday before. Then, we had bought cabbages, lettuce, celery, radishes, beetroot. All this had been picked fresh from the ground while we waited, had been washed there, and had been put into a celophane bag. There had been enough for my family of five to have fresh green ~~available~~ vegetables every day of the week. And the total bill for this was five shillings. Of course, the cauliflower and the onions and the tomatoes were not ready yet so I rather suspect that when we can get everything we need in green vegetables our weekly bill might go up to ten shillings.

I hope that by now you have seen the point of my telling you about this little piece of family housekeeping. For the first time since we have been in Jamaica - and we are entering our eighth year now - all the green vegetables ~~available~~ on our table were grown right here in Jamaica: and much more important for us as a family, the money green we spent on our/vegetables last week was a quarter of what we normally spend at the supermarket where we used to buy imported celery and lettuce and cabbage and the like. And generally speaking, the imported stuff we had bought had not been a fraction as crisp

and as tasty. So we had locally grown green vegetables which cost us about a quarter of what we normally paid and which tasted very good indeed. This is as far as my family is concerned. As far as Jamaica is concerned for the first time last week we made a positive contribution to the balance of payments position by not having a single item of green vegetables on our table. But we could only do this because we had discovered this market garden up in our hills.

We could only do this because an enterprising Englishman who had come here on another job had, in his spare time, built up, with his own effort and his own money, the most successful market garden I have yet seen in Jamaica.

I believe that most of the key people at the Ministry of Agriculture know of this man's efforts: I believe some of them have been up to see what he has done. I sincerely hope they will not miss the moral of what he has achieved. And please note that he has done this on a seven-acre plot of land.

As far as I am concerned this Englishman has demonstrated the feasibility of a successful market gardening operation in Jamaica on as little as five acre plots of reasonably well cared for land. But to succeed, our farmers must know what they are about, they must be prepared for hard work, and they must have a good/^{and plentiful}water supply. Given these, there is absolutely no reason why we should go on importing vegetables. The stuff can be grown right here. But I'm afraid the very enterprising Englishman is having difficulty marketing it. I suggest that the Ministry gives him a hand. If he goes out of business because he cannot market what he grows it would be the final and total condemnation of the approach to agriculture in Jamaica.

Goodnight,

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Mar 16 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Last week, as a prelude to this week, which is 'Freedom From Hunger' Week, a group of world famous intellectuals issued an appeal from Rome. They called on the nations of the world to concern themselves with feeding the millions of hungry people in the world rather than with building up arms. They did not say this specifically but the fact is that if the United States and Russia would each give the amount of money they spend on one/ yearss armaments and rockets and space vehicles it would ensure that several million people who are now living on the verge of starvation are well-fed, well-clothed and well housed.

Jamaica and the

But what can ~~the extraordinary~~ people of Jamaica do? We obviously cannot contribute vast sums of money to the campaign. Neither the government nor the people have the money. Indeed, we have our own freedom from hunger p roblem right here in Jamaiaa. So, what can we do about Freedom From Hunger Week?

First/ I think we can try to get a clear picture of the size of the problem of world hunger and where we fit into it. Our approach to this sort of problem is often most unrealistic because we do not see the problem in perspective. So understanding becomes important in terms of our own self-interest. There are nearly three thousand million people in the world, but of this lot no more than four hundred million people have enough to eat and have all the amenities of civilised living, and can expect to live until they are between sixty and seventy years old. The rest, the other two-thousand six-

hundred million odd souls do not have enough to eat; they live in the most primitive ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ conditions; often with no sanitation, bad water and no light. These people, more than three-quarters of the earth's population, are lucky if they live to the age of forty or beyond.

This then is the greatest and most important division of the modern world. My own view is that it is much more important and much more crucial than the divisions of the cold war: this is the division between the hungry ones of the world and the well-fed ones of the world. I think that once we get this particular world picture into perspective we can see immediately where Jamaica fits in. Here in Jamaica there are people whose standard of living is high enough ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ for them to live to the ripe old ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ age of sixty and over. This is something we know. And we also know that as time goes on more people live longer. But the majority of the population still do not make sixty. On the other hand the average life expectation of Jamaicans is higher than that of most Asians, Africans and Latin Americans. This means that on this matter of the hungry and the well-fed ones, Jamaica is somewhere in between. As far as the starving Africans, Asians and Latins are concerned, Jamaicans are on the whole doing quite well. But where the well-fed ones are concerned our standards, especially in the rural areas are not so good. The cream of the Jamaican society, those Mr. Seaga described as the 'Haves', live at a standard that is quite comparable with that of the world's well-fed minority. The rest, those that Mr. Seaga described as the 'have-nots' live at a level that is a little higher than the rest of the world's 'Have-nots'. The fact is that we do not have outright starvation in Jamaica. But that does not mean that we do not have our share of the problems of hunger. I'll try to detail some of these tomorrow, so, till then, Goodnight,

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Tuesday Mar 29 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: We are still on Freedom From Hunger Week. Last night I tried to find Jamaica's position in the divided world of the well-fed and the hungry nations. I gave you my view that although Jamaica does have problems of hunger and poverty she does not have the problem of outright starvation that exists in a number of Asian and Latin American countries. Perhaps I ought to add that while the problem of hunger is more acute in parts of Africa than it is in Jamaica, outright starvation is also very unusual in Africa. The picture of ~~xxxx~~ persons dropping dead from starvation is essentially an Asian picture.

So I think we can say with a fair amount of justification that in terms of freedom from hunger Jamaica is among the better-off among the poorer nations of the world. From this you can guess what it must be like to be one of the worse off among these nations. But as I said last night, we do have our own problems of hunger. Some of these problems, the really basic ones, we can only solve by making the Jamaican earth produce more food, by making ourselves as efficient as we can, by setting up more industries - in short, by increasing Jamaican production in every field. To carry out this basic production drive we are going to need help, both from the United Nations and from such friendly countries as the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom. But they will help us only to the extent that we show we want to help ourselves. So the first and major target in coping with our own freedom from hunger problem is an all round increase in production and in efficiency.

The second target is to share what there is more evenly within the society. Many of us want progress but we do not want to pay for it in the form of smaller profits and dividends and higher taxes. The price of progress must be paid and the sooner we learn that the better.

effort towards

The third target in our ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ and freedom from hunger should be education; and it is here, I think, that the local Y.W.C.A. can mount a really important campaign. There is much bad feeding in Jamaica, many Jamaicans suffer from deficiencies, not because of any food shortage but because they have developed bad feeding habits, or else are plainly wasteful of good food. There is an army of young men and women who lose all their teeth before they are twenty-five. In part this is because of our dental health problems, but in the main there is a diet deficiency. Bones are soft and brittle because of a calcium deficiency; eyesight is weak or poor because parents do not give their children nourishing green vegetables. A dozen eggs are sold and the money is used to buy white bread and salt fish and ~~xxx~~ /instead of having a fresh egg or two the child is given bread and saltfish. The better and more nourishing food is exchange for the less sustaining. And then the outside crusts of the white loaf are carefully cut off and thrown away. In this way, and out of ignorance rather than poverty, a great deal of mal-nutrition is about us all the time. We make a great mistake if we regard freedom from hunger as simply having a full belly. Your belly can full of starchy stuff and your body can desperately be/starved of minerals and vitamins. So I hope that during this week and in the weeks and months to come, our freedom from hunger campaign will help our people to make the best use of what they have. We need desperately to learn not to waste our food and starve. Goodnight.

unknowingly
^

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I am very happy to see that J.E.T.A., the co-ordinating body of teachers' organisations has successfully taken the current educational debate out of the narrow confines of the Byfield affair with its political overtones and undertones. I think that now, at last, we are having the really important debate on the future of education in this country and what it means in terms of the shaping of the society. And because this shift has been made away from the Byfield affair we can now see the point of principle on which J.E.T.A. stands. And that point, stated very baldly, is that education must be taken out of the political field. If any of you have not heard these broadcasts I would urge you most strongly to look out for the next one. Indeed, I would suggest to J.E.T.A. that they make copies of the scripts available to people who missed the broadcasts.

Incidentally, I think that if any practical example were needed of how important it is to get education out of politics, it was given on Tuesday of last week. In the House of Representatives last Tuesday the Minister of Education made a statement to the effect that Mr. Byfield was not qualified to be a head teacher because he had failed the third year teacher training examination in 1935, twenty-eight years ago. I'm afraid this statement of the Minister's depressed terribly. It was debating at a level that Jamaica can do very well without. Whatever else one might say about Mr. Byfield the record is that he has been a first-rate teacher and a first-rate headmaster. I have refused to take sides on this Trench Town matter because, as I

told you as far back as February the twenty-fifth, no matter who was right or who was wrong, it seemed to me that this controversy with its heavy political overtones and undertones was not in the best interests of education in Jamaica. The Minister's statement last Tuesday has underscored this view sadly. It is for this reason that I am so very glad that J.E.T.A. has ~~shifted~~ finally got the debate into the right direction. What I think we do want to ensure for the future is that no teachers' record is ever again assailed in this way for political reasons by any politician of any party. And that, I repeat, means taking politics out of education and education out of politics.

The other depressing aspect about this business is the type of example it sets for the rest of us. I think we want to avoid at all costs any idea that the destroying of reputations, rightly or wrongly, is a valid way of conducting ~~an argument~~ an argument.

Still on education, but at a higher level and of a very much happier nature was the news ~~that~~ that British Guiana will not, after all, withdraw from the University of the West Indies. The immediate credit for this must go to doctor Eric Williams of Trinidad. At the recent meeting of the University Council Dr. Williams was charged with this mission which he has now carried out successfully. And so the disintegrating tendency has been halted and at the University at least the concept of West Indian unity has prevailed. Of course it is not any notions about West Indian unity that has led to Dr. Jagan's new decision. B.G. is in both political and economic trouble and it is in her own interest not to cut off all contact with the other English-speaking territories in the region. But whatever the reason, the fact is that she is staying on as a partner at the University and that is a very good thing.....Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I think that any objective observer will agree the President Kennedy's Costa Rican visit was an unqualified personal triumph. It is a very long time indeed since any American leader has been received with such great warmth. And if we contrast Mr. Kennedy's reception with that accorded to Mr. Richard Nixon during the Eisenhower administration when he was Vice President, the implied change in attitude to the United States is very striking. So let us ask ourselves: what is this change in attitude? How has it come about? And what does it imply for the future?

Now, the six Central American Republics which were represented at the San Jose meetings are only a tiny fraction of all of Latin America, both in terms of land space and of population. This is one limiting factor that we should bear in mind in any overall assessment of the possible impact of the 'Declaration of San Jose'. Another important limiting factor is that Mexico, ~~xxxxix~~ certainly ^{the} most important and the most influential of the Central American republics, was not at the conference. These two factors could seriously limit the influence of the conference if any difficulty were to arise. For example, I think that the 'Declaration of San Jose' notwithstanding, direct any/military action against Cuba would still be most unpopular with the vast majority of Latin Americans. I am not saying that this is what either the six or the United States wants. Indeed, Mr. Kennedy has made it abundantly clear that this is precisely what he does not want. And in this I think Mr. Kennedy is much more on top of the situation than his critics inside Congress and the Senate, than Time Magazine, which seems eager for a little banging excitement, and the

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
 Friday Mar 22 at 6.15p.m
 Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: If you want to get some pointers to the state of the Jamaican economy at present then you can do no better than read the annual Report of the Bank of Jamaica to the 31st December 1962. In it you will find a reasonably clear picture of the state of the nation's finances and the hopeful signs as well as the danger signs. What I hope the officials of the bank will do for Jamaica as soon as possible is to explain why it is that the economy seemed so active two to three years back when we did a considerable amount of deficit budgeting, and why it seems to sluggish now that we are bent on balancing our books. There are people who feel strongly that in spite of our adverse trade figures Jamaica's trading position is very strong and that this is a time for bold developmental budgeting that would create more jobs and put more money into general circulation. They feel that this present holding back is not in Jamaica's long-term interest. One example of this state of mind was the concern expressed recently by the Jamaica Manufacturers Association about the reported volume of lazy money tucked away in savings. I think an exposition on this topic from the Bank of Jamaica would be a most useful service.

But let us deal with some of the high points of the Bank's report. For me the three most important points raised by the report deal with the importing of food, our rising production costs and the mention about the raw materials of agriculture. Another comment was on the decline in the building industry, and it gives me absolutely no pleasure to be proved right when I said, at the time ~~xxxxxxx~~ of the Allen Award, that were in danger of pricing our building industry out of business.

Well, the Bank's report warns that production costs have risen

to dangerous levels in some cases. I should like to draw everybody's attention to this warning. I think it is going to become very meaningful to us in the months and years that lie ahead, and until we have worked a clear and intelligent attitude towards this business of production costs, we will continue to run the risk of pricing ourselves out of business. The bank's report mentions the responsibility of trade unions to see that this does not happen. This need to be mentioned; but I think the responsibility of employers needs to be mentioned as well. The job of increasing production by increasing efficiency and cutting down waste is a joint management-labour exercise; and one of the things we must try to get away from is to either blame only management for all faults or failures or to blame only labour: it is generally six of one and half a dozen of the other, and the sooner we accept it, the better. Where I do think the unions have an especial responsibility is to ensure that their members live up to their contractual ~~responsibilities~~ undertakings. There is no sense in negotiating an agreement and then going out and breaking it with a wildcat strike. You may get away with this sort of thing because the employer has no choice. But don't fool yourself: this sort of thing gets around to other would-be investors. And many of these people will decide whether to invest their money in Jamaica or not on the simple question of whether we have a responsible labour movement which lives up to its obligations or not. This has nothing to do with cheap or servile labour: it is a question of a responsible, self-respecting labour movement. Finally, the report shows that we spent more money on the importing of food than ever before. If we don't stop this ^{we will} ~~we will~~ deserve the trouble that will be in store for us. Goodnight.

every bit of
n

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: At the end of this month the Jamaica Tourist Board, as we now know it, will come to an end. In its place there will be a new, smaller Tourist Board of five members. At the head of this smaller Board there will be ^a full-time official with the title of Director of Tourism, who will be in charge of the day-to-day running of the Board. All this was announced by Mr. Robert Lightbourne at what turned out to be the last meeting of the old Board on Thursday of this week. To the Minister's announcement I can add one or two bits of clarification that I have ferreted out for myself. First, my understanding is that the new five-man Board will be made up of the ^{members of} senior/staff working for the new Tourist Board. In other words the new Board will consist of the paid servants of the statutory body known as the Jamaica Tourist Board. This in turn means that all those special interests which sat on the old Tourist Board that ended its life on Thursday, will not be presented. You will remember that the old Tourist Board membership was in fact made up mainly of these special interests: you had the hotel interests, the guest house interest, the retail and In-Bond trade in the form of Chamber of Commerce representation, as well as the transport and travel agency interests. When the new Board of paid senior officials take over all these special interests will lose their representation on the Board.

But it would be disastrous - if not tragic - if Jamaica's tourist industry were to lose, at one fell swoop, the skills and experience represented by these special interests. The Minister is

acutely aware of this, as his statement ~~xxxxxx~~ at Thursday's meeting of the old Board showed. And so he has announced that there will be an Advisory Committee on which the Director of Tourism can call for guidance. Mr. Lightbourne made it plain that he hoped ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{members of} the old Board ~~xxxxxxx~~ would serve if asked. So the skills and experience of these special interests need not be lost to the tourist industry - unless those special interests withhold them from the new Board: and this, patently, will not suit them. The key new point is that policy on tourism, at least at that level where government spending is involved, will no longer be decided by a Board made up of the representatives of special interests in the tourist trade. Instead, in theory at least for the present, the new Board will shape tourist policies in terms of the national interest.

There has been a long debate on whether there is or has been any conflict ~~of~~ national interest as against special interests as far as the tourist industry is concerned. I think it would be ^a waste of time to go over that debate here. I think the record shows that the tourist industry under Mr. Abe Issa has grown strikingly. The Minister has himself paid tribute to Mr. Issa's hard work and dedication. But equally, it would be silly to pretend that everything in the garden is lovely. But much more important is the fact that this change in the structure of the Tourist Board is part of a trend. Special interests were removed when Legco became the Senate; they were removed from the Trade Board, and now the Tourist Board. This ^{part of} is/a trend. And in the end this trend is bound to reflect a truer ^{for} Jamaican image than of old. And ~~in~~ the tourist industry and for the attitudes of Jamaicans to it this might well prove the best thing in the long run. Time will tell. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Monday Mar 25 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: The Executive of the People's National Party meets in about two and a half hours' time to settle the question of whether Mr. Frank Spaulding will remain Mayor of Kingston for a fourth term., or not. At the moment it looks very much as though Mr. Spaulding will win out. He has built up a very strong political machine for himself in Corporation politics and this now looks like paying off. In the main the issue that the Executive will have to settle this evening is whether the first or the second of the two ballots of the P.N.P. Councillors should be recognised as the official one. If the first ballot is recognised then, short of hair-splitting, Mr. Spaulding can be said to have his two-thirds majority. If the second ballot is recognised, then some new formula may have to be worked out. But I think all this is by now familiar stuff to you. It has been written and talked about as some crucial matter for both the P.N.P. and the Kingston and St. Andrew Corporation Council.

But let me confess frankly that I, myself, am not very impressed with the power political aspect of this affair. Indeed, I think the power-political jockeying, and the building up of personal power machines, and the nasty in-fighting, have all contributed to something very much more serious, very much more dangerous and very much more destructive of the democratic process in Jamaica. And it is on this aspect that I should like the country to do a little thinking. Let me sketch out the essence of this aspect.

Local government is government at grass-roots level. In an

democracy the people participate most directly in the running of their affairs at the local government level. It is at this level that government of the people, for the people, by the people becomes more than an abstraction. And it is a striking fact of history that where local government is strong and healthy and respected, the interests of the people are furthered, and their liberties are protected. For instance, one of the reasons why Britain's teachers are not facing the kind of problem J.E.T.A. is now coping with, is because Local Government, government at the grass-roots level, has a very important say in local education and it will not allow any of the national parties to make a party political football out of education. And so it is in many other very important spheres of public affairs.

Unfortunately, what has happened in Jamaica in recent years has been a very noticeable decline in both the authority of Local Government and public regard for it. Increasingly, powers that should rightly be exercised by our local authorities, are being taken over by the central government. And so the direct contact between the voter and his government at grass-roots level is getting weaker and weaker. And this, I think, is a weakening of democracy itself. It is a breaking of ^{that} ~~the~~ necessary contact between the ruler and the ruled which is the touchstone of democracy. And as far as I am concerned the restoring to local government of the dignity and contact it has lost with the people is infinitely more important than the present power manipulations of local Councillors. To regain that respect local Councillors will have to ~~admit, and overcome the~~ ~~the fact that they~~ ~~they are not doing~~ their failure to truly serve is to blame for ~~the~~ this unhappy state of affairs. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: A United States Presidential Committee headed by the former U.S. military Commander in Berlin, General Lucius Clay has recommended drastic cuts in United States economic and military aid to other countries. I think that this recommendation, coming as it does, in the wake of the 'Declaration of San Jose' dramatises as clearly as anything can, some of the difficulties Mr Kennedy faces in getting his foreign policy really going.

The giving of economic and technical and military aid has become an integral part of United States foreign policy: it has also become a key part of Soviet foreign policy, but not as integral as it is to U.S. foreign policy. If it had not been for United States aid during the war (and some of it went to Russia) the outcome of the second world war may have been very different. And after the war, if it had not been for ^{aid} ~~the~~ under the plan drawn up by General George Marshall, Western Europe might not have been able to resist the dynamic thrusts of communism in the immediate post-war years. American aid has gone out to all corners of the earth, and while this has helped to stem the tide against communism in this or that country, the results have not always been what the Americans planned or hoped for.

I think Western Europe supplies the classic example of what I mean. Under the leadership of France and Germany, Western Europe is today an economic force strong enough to rival the great United States itself. And members of the Common Market countries are meeting this week and out of this may come another severe blow for the United States. By vetoing Britain's membership earlier this year, France made sure that the United States would not influence Common Market

policy through Britain. All that has transpired since has confirmed de Gaulle's belief that Britain inside Europe would have been the thin edge of the American wedge. Now, at this week's meeting France is urging her partners to limit the amount of ~~amaz~~ United States investment in the Common Market countries. If she succeeds, and I think she will, it will mean that ~~the~~ United States influence has been pushed out of Europe, both politically and economically.

Now, all this has led to a great deal of soul-searching in the American people. Unlike the British, they have not yet become reconciled to the ingratitude of the ~~aided~~. They want those they have helped to be grateful and they want to be loved. Instead, de Gaulle and the Western Europeans have administered them this terrible slap in the face. The fact is that many Americans are emotional about this aid, and see it as generosity rather than as what has to be done if their foreign policy is to have a hope of succeeding. And when something like the Common Market business comes up, the emotional reaction is to say: 'After all we've done for them!' or 'Let us stop wasting American money on people who are against us'. But of course Europe is not against the United States; she is simply for herself. I think Mr. Kennedy sees this but I doubt whether he will be able to sell it to the American people. By the same token and in the light of the Clay Committee's recommendations, I very much fear that the American Congress will not give him the money needed for his Central American plan; and the Central American leaders themselves are likely to divert such money as they get into their own pockets or enterprises rather than to eliminate homelessness and hunger. The problem is twofold: to make the aid effective, and to realise that effective aid leads to the type of independence shown by France. And this is quite a pill for the United States. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: This evening I would like to discuss two disturbing items of news that were brought my attention by listeners. The first has to do with sound system noise and when this listener spoke to me about it he was in a state of utter despair.

Not far from where this listener lives somebody operates this sound system. And this noise goes on all through the weekend practically. The result is that the weekend which should be a rest period for this man and his family has become a sort of nightmare of unending noise. The man tells me that the noise is so bad that they ~~are~~ are ashamed of inviting friends for dinner or a drink on any weekend evening. And when this unfortunate man complained to the sound-system operator he was threatened with a beating-up. And this, you know, is a very serious situation. Any society in which one citizen cannot ask another to restrain himself without being threatened with violence, is a society in trouble. To abuse somebody's civic rights and then to threaten him with violence when he complains is to bring in the law of the jungle. But perhaps the worse part about this whole business is the apparent indifference of the police. My informant tells me that he has had very little help from them.

I think we want to take it easy on this sort of thing. We can have our fun without making life a misery for everybody else. But the one thing that must not be allowed is for lawlessness or the law of the jungle to invade our civic life.

Every citizen has a right to enjoy the kind of entertainment he or she wants. But that right is limited by the right of every other citizen. And so we limit the amount of noise we make in order not

or the speed at which we travel, or the use of firearms - we limit our rights in all these things in order not to interfere with the rights and freedoms of our fellow citizens. If you or I could travel as fast as we wanted to and fire off guns whenever the mood takes us, we would be a menace and a danger to everybody else; and if everybody else had the same so-called freedom they would be a menace to us: and it would be only a matter of time before we will all be shooting each other down, cutting each other's throats and killing each other like dogs on the roads. All this happens when there is a breakdown in the rules by which any society conducts itself. And so all of us have a vested interest in making sure that no citizen breaks these rules by denying the rights of any other citizen.

The other disturbing point is also connected with this business of breaking the rules of society, but with a different and more profound social twist this time. It is easy to make a rule ^{saying:} ~~xxxxx~~: 'Thou shalt not steal'. But when a man has no work and is hungry, then the temptation to break that rule is greatest. A man concerned with enforcing the law told me how very unhappy he was by the new wave of petty thieving that has swept through parts of St. Andrew. And then, out of his experience, he said: "It is all this unemployment; there is no work for so many of these young fellows and so they turn to stealing and the police can hardly keep up with it." I know not everybody ^{will} agree with this view. What I am sure everybody will agree with is that there is a rise in unemployment and there is also an increase in petty thieving. Therefore there must be some sort of connection. My own view is the same as that of my law-enforcing friend. Unemployment is demoralising, and demoralisation leads to crime. This is a matter the government needs to watch and handle with care. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Thursday Mar 28 at 6.15p.m
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: If we were to look at this week's news in terms of what could affect the future most, then I would select two items of news out of Britain as pointing most significantly to the shape of things to come. The first and least dramatic of these items - but at the same time the more important - is Mr. Harold Wilson's arrival in the United States today to tell Mr. Kennedy ^{what} ~~of~~ Britain's foreign policy will be if the British Labour Party gains power at the next General Election. The second item ~~is~~ was the very dramatic news of Tuesday's unemployment demonstrations that turned into rioting outside the Mother of Parliaments. Something like three thousand unemployed workers from all parts of the United Kingdom were involved in the rioting. Then, on Wednesday, the following day, something like five thousand angry teachers marched on the House of Parliament to ~~pp~~rotest against the government's new wage scales for them.

I think Mr. Harold Wilson's trip to Washington to tell Mr. Kennedy what his party would do in power: note the difference: Mr. Wilson is ^{going} ~~noting~~/to have talks or to consult with Mr. Kennedy - as Mr. Macmillan was wont to do - he is, and now I quote the news reports either going to 'tell', 'inform', or 'present' his party's policy to the President. I think this and Tuesday and Wednesday's demonstrations outside the British House of Commons, are all part of a single pattern that will have a very strong bearing on our future as much as on the future of the people of Britain. So, let us try and get these developments into perspective.

First the background to the demonstrations. When the Conservative

Party took power from the post-war Labour Government, they took over a country which had gone through one of the most profound and one of the most peaceful social revolutions of all time. The Welfare State was a reality. No man, woman or child, no matter who he ^{or she} was, no matter what his ^{or her} circumstances, was allowed to live below a certain level. To ensure this there were massive state and county council housing schemes; there was free orange juice, good milk at reduced prices as well as a financial subsidy for every child other than the first. Every person over a certain age was entitled to old age pension as well as a tobacco allowance. This was the period of full employment, but even ~~XXXX~~ ^{when} seasonal unemployment took place, nobody suffered very much. The unemployed person had his rent paid and he was made a weekly allowance off which he could live. Where a family was involved the assistance was big enough to ensure that the entire family got the basic necessities of life. Medical treatment and medicine ^{were} free, and every child was entitled, as of right, to a free education up to school leaving standard.

In this atmosphere where everybody had material security, material security ceased to be very exciting. People began to resent the high cost, in taxation, of the Welfare State. All this ^{and a lot more} led to the throwing out of the Labour Government. The voters wanted adventure and free enterprise, and so the benefits of the Welfare State stood still. The Conservatives could not cancel the Welfare State but they weakened it. And so, while costs went up the benefits of the Welfare State did not keep pace. And today, after the Common Market fiasco, Britain faces serious ^{economic} problems. And her unemployment stands at a new high. For the first time since the second world war the British worker seems to be desperate and afraid, as he was in the hungry thirties, when millions were unemployed. This is the background to both the riots and to Mr. Wilson's presence in Washington. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: Mr. Harold Macmillan, the British Prime Minister, must call a General Election between now and August of next year. If there are more unemployment demonstrations and more protest marches from teacher and others, then events may force Mr. Macmillan's hand. Ideally, he would want to pick the moment most favourable to him, either when his government had brought off some big deal abroad or has made a major concession to the voters at home. My guess is that Mr. Macmillan had toyed with the idea of a snap General Election after Britain's admission to the Common Market. But of course, President de Gaulle spoiled that one and nothing has been going right for the British government since.

The death of Mr. Gaitskell, which looked like a crucial blow to the chances of the Labour Party, seems to have led to a new unity within the party. Perhaps this unity has also been helped by the fact that the party can almost smell victory. And now Mr. Wilson, the new Labour Leader, is telling Mr. Kennedy of his party's programme. And there are some very striking features to it.

If Labour wins then Britain will accept the fact and the challenge of her exclusion from the European Common Market, and set about to meet the challenge. She will step-up and streamline and strengthen her trading and political relations with other Commonwealth countries. With this in mind, a Commonwealth Conference will be high on Labour's priorities. For the rest, she will go after trade wherever it can be found, in the communist world, in Latin America, in Asia and Africa as well as with the United States and Europe. The prime consideration will be British and Commonwealth interests. Wherever possible Britain

will enter into agreements to reduce tariff barriers.

It seems to me that if Labour wins, and if Mr. Wilson carries out this economic policy successfully ~~two things are bound to result~~ ^{Then} ~~First~~, the Commonwealth, as an economic grouping, could again become a considerable force in the world. But for this to have any chance the other member countries would have to both pull their weight and play fair with Britain. The tendency in the past has been to expect Britain to do all the giving while everybody else does all the receiving. I think that it was partly in disgust at this doubtful and unbalanced kind of 'partnership' that Britain turned to Europe. Indeed, not even the United States has quite avoided this business of just 'using' Britain. So, for the Commonwealth aspect of Mr. Wilson's blue print to have any hope of success the rest of the Commonwealth will have to do its share. And if that did happen the United States would find, as in the case of the Common Market, yet another ~~and~~ ^{power} independent grouping that refuses to be anybody's satellite.

Indeed, the political aspect of Mr. Wilson's programme gives warning of this independence. Britain will press for the admission of communist China to the United Nations in place of Nationalist China. This is the complete opposite to the U.S. stand. The Conservatives have held the same view but have not pressed it. Britain will also work for a neutralised central European zone which should include East and West Germany and with both the Russians and Americans withdrawing from that zone. This again, is hardly likely to meet with American approval. And certainly, the limited recognition of East Germany which he proposes is going to be most unpopular in Washington. And so we come full circle: the unemployed demonstrations could be the beginning of the pressure to end the Macmillan government; and Wilson in Washington ^{would be} outlining the shape of things to come. ^{only} Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on ¹⁹⁶³
Saturday Mar 30 at 6.15p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: Those of you who have listened to these commentaries for any length of time will know that I am a very firm believer in the rule of law. Where there is no acceptance of the rule of law both the individual and the society find themselves generally in danger. ~~But there is another danger too.~~ But there is another danger too. There is the danger that the rule of law could be used in such a way that it damages the society and deprives the individual of his liberty. For instance, Mr. Adolf Hitler, that terrible murderer who plunged the world into darkness, rose to power in a completely legal way. He did not overthrow the legal government of the day. He was elected to power by normal means. And the evil things he and his followers did were either done or ordered to be done by the elected representatives of the people. And almost every step the Nazis took on their terrible road to cruelty was sanctioned by the duly elected representatives of the German people. The point I want to make is very simple: both legality and the concept of the rule of law can be put into the service of evil and destructive ends. The people we have elected to power can use that legally conferred power to pass laws depriving us of some of our liberties. And having done so they can, in the name of the rule of law, oppress and exploit and brutalise us. And this would still be the rule of law.

The law then, the rule of law, is not of itself good. It is either good or bad according to the way men use it. It is the servant, not the master of man. And so, for the rule of law to be ^a good thing, we must make it good.

There was a time in Britain when the rule of law decreed that

a man be hanged for stealing a sheep. And there was a time when pradael larceny was as cruelly punished in Jamaica. But people saw that this was a cruel kind of justice and so their pressure and their opinion forced changes in these laws.

I am not sure that we do not need certain changes in our pattern of punishment today. For instance, I am think of the case reported in the Star of March the fifteenth, of a young man being sentenced to a total of nine months at hard labour for having stolen a car in August of last year. Now please don't get me wrong. The man was guilty; the sentence was just. The twist to the story lies in the fact that the man stole the car last year and was only sentenced in March of this year - a time-gap of seven months had passed between crime and punishment. And the reason was that the young man had smashed up both the ^{stolen} car and himself pretty badly on the Old Harbour Road. His face and eyes had been very badly damaged, and he was nearly blind when sentence was passed seven months after the crime. And, according to the report, the doctors who took care of him say he will soon be completely blind. Those are the facts: a man had committed a crime, he had broken the rules of society, and according to the law he should be punished. But this young man will soon be blind. And I myself can think of no greater punishment for stealing a car than to go blind. It is like the punishment of God himself. And in the face of it I would have felt much better if our mortal justice had been tempered by a little Christian mercy. I think justice without mercy, without compassion, can be as dangerous as the breakdown of the rule of law. Indeed, the one nearly always follows the other. So, let us have justice and Mercy. Goodnight.